

INFORMATION TO USERS

This manuscript has been reproduced from the microfilm master. UMI films the text directly from the original or copy submitted. Thus, some thesis and dissertation copies are in typewriter face, while others may be from any type of computer printer.

The quality of this reproduction is dependent upon the quality of the copy submitted. Broken or indistinct print, colored or poor quality illustrations and photographs, print bleedthrough, substandard margins, and improper alignment can adversely affect reproduction.

In the unlikely event that the author did not send UMI a complete manuscript and there are missing pages, these will be noted. Also, if unauthorized copyright material had to be removed, a note will indicate the deletion.

Oversize materials (e.g., maps, drawings, charts) are reproduced by sectioning the original, beginning at the upper left-hand corner and continuing from left to right in equal sections with small overlaps. Each original is also photographed in one exposure and is included in reduced form at the back of the book.

Photographs included in the original manuscript have been reproduced xerographically in this copy. Higher quality 6" x 9" black and white photographic prints are available for any photographs or illustrations appearing in this copy for an additional charge. Contact UMI directly to order.

UMI[®]

Bell & Howell Information and Learning
300 North Zeeb Road, Ann Arbor, MI 48106-1346 USA
800-521-0600

APPLICATION OF SOCIAL ROLE THEORY
TO THE PHENOMENA OF PERCEIVED AND SELF-REPORTED
USE OF ORGANIZATIONAL POLITICAL BEHAVIOUR

by

WENDY E. O'CONNOR, B.A., M.Sc

A thesis submitted to
the Faculty of Graduate Studies and Research
in partial fulfilment of
the requirements for the degree of

Doctor of Philosophy

Department of Psychology

Carleton University
Ottawa, Ontario
August, 1998
©copyright
1998, Wendy E. O'Connor



National Library
of Canada

Acquisitions and
Bibliographic Services

395 Wellington Street
Ottawa ON K1A 0N4
Canada

Bibliothèque nationale
du Canada

Acquisitions et
services bibliographiques

395, rue Wellington
Ottawa ON K1A 0N4
Canada

Your file Votre référence

Our file Notre référence

The author has granted a non-exclusive licence allowing the National Library of Canada to reproduce, loan, distribute or sell copies of this thesis in microform, paper or electronic formats.

The author retains ownership of the copyright in this thesis. Neither the thesis nor substantial extracts from it may be printed or otherwise reproduced without the author's permission.

L'auteur a accordé une licence non exclusive permettant à la Bibliothèque nationale du Canada de reproduire, prêter, distribuer ou vendre des copies de cette thèse sous la forme de microfiche/film, de reproduction sur papier ou sur format électronique.

L'auteur conserve la propriété du droit d'auteur qui protège cette thèse. Ni la thèse ni des extraits substantiels de celle-ci ne doivent être imprimés ou autrement reproduits sans son autorisation.

0-612-37085-2

Abstract

The present study examined the phenomenon of perceptions and self-reported use of organizational politics within the parameters of social role theory. Participants were 501 employees from the Royal Canadian Mounted Police. A key assumption of social role theory is that individuals in agentic roles are seen as possessing greater physical, intellectual, and economic power than those in communal roles. Applied to the present context, it was argued that the possession of such power may manifest itself politically. It was hypothesized that: a) individuals in communal employment roles (i.e., occupations associated with lower levels of status and authority) perceive their workplace as more political than those in agentic employment roles (i.e., occupations associated with higher levels of status and authority); b) individuals in agentic employment roles engage in more political activity than those in communal roles; c) given the superordinance of employment role, situational variables such as formalization and organizational climate and dispositional variables such as Machiavellianism, work locus of control, need for power, and right-wing authoritarianism account for variations in perceptions and self-reported use of political activity among those occupying the same employment role; and d) violation of role-based expectations (specifically, that individuals in agentic employment roles engage in political activity, whereas those in communal roles do not) deleteriously affects job satisfaction and organizational commitment. None of these hypotheses received empirical support. However, hierarchical multiple regression analyses revealed that: a) organizational climate, Machiavellianism, and work locus of control were significant predictors of perceptions of organizational politics; and b) Machiavellianism

and need for power were significant predictors of self-reported use of political activity.

Limitations of the present study are discussed.

Acknowledgements

I would like to thank Dr. Kim Matheson, my supervisor, and the members of my committee, Dr. Lloyd Strickland and Dr. Shelley Borys, for their contributions to this work.

I also would like to thank Lynn Giff for her unwavering commitment to helping me finish the programme. Without her assistance, I doubt that I would have completed my Ph.D. As well, I would like to thank Dr. Roger Blockley for providing me with a fellowship for the past two terms. His confidence in my academic ability provided a much needed boost to my morale.

A special note of gratitude also is extended to my children, Rachelle and Ryan, who endured the many sacrifices involved in my pursuit of a doctoral degree. Also, I would like to thank my parents, various family members, and friends (especially Minhtri Truong and Megan Poole). Their various forms of assistance over the past four years were much appreciated.

Finally, I want to specially thank Dr. Todd G. Morrison for his continuous support and commitment. Without his encouragement, I feel that the many obstacles I encountered over the past four years would have been insurmountable.

Table of Contents

	Page
Abstract	ii
Acknowledgements	iv
Table of Contents	v
List of Tables	vii
List of Appendices	ix
Introduction	1
Social Role Theory	6
Two Characteristics of Agentic and Communal Employment Roles	12
Standard Application of Hierarchical Level	12
Standard Application of Job Autonomy	15
Situational and Dispositional Determinants of Organizational Politics	16
Formalization	17
Organizational Climate	20
Locus of Control	24
Machiavellianism	27
Need for Power	28
Right-wing Authoritarianism	29
Consequences of Organizational Political Behaviour	31
Social Role Theory and Job Satisfaction/Organizational Commitment	32
Standard Application of Job Satisfaction	33
Standard Application of Organizational Commitment	34
Study One	37
Construction of the Political Activity Scale (PAS)	41
Vignette Version	41
Statement Version	44
Statistical Comparison of the Vignette and Statement Versions of the PAS	44
Participants	45
Measures	47
Results	48
Conclusion	54
Psychometric Properties of the Vignette Version of the PAS	55
Measures	57
Results	59
Discussion	62
Study Two	63
Method	64
Participants	64
Measures	64
Procedure	77

Results	79
Discussion	112
References	132
Appendices	142

List of Tables

		Page
Table 1	Rotated Factor Loadings of Subscales 1 and 2 of the Political Activity Scale	61
Table 2	Biographical Profiles of Sample	65
Table 3	Rotated Factor Loadings of the Political Activity Scale	81
Table 4	Scale Reliabilities, Means, and Standard Deviations for Key Variables	82
Table 5	Intercorrelations Among Key Variables	84
Table 6	Hierarchical Multiple Regression Analysis for the Effects of Employment Role and Situational Variables on Perceptions of Organizational Politics	88
Table 7	Hierarchical Multiple Regression Analysis for the Effects of Employment Role and Situational Variables on Self-reported Use of Organizational Politics	91
Table 8	Hierarchical Multiple Regression Analysis for the Effects of Employment Role and Dispositional Variables on Perceptions of Organizational Politics	93
Table 9	Hierarchical Multiple Regression Analysis for the Effects of Employment Role and Dispositional Variables on Self-reported Use of Organizational Politics	95
Table 10	Hierarchical Multiple Regression Analysis for the Effects of Employment Role, Perceptions of Organizational Politics, and Career Success on Job Satisfaction	98
Table 11	Hierarchical Multiple Regression Analysis for the Effects of Employment Role, Self-reported Use of Organizational Politics, and Career Success on Job Satisfaction	101
Table 12	Hierarchical Multiple Regression Analysis for the Effects of Employment Role, Perceptions of Organizational Politics, and Career Success on Affective Organizational Commitment	103

		Page
Table 13	Hierarchical Multiple Regression Analysis for the Effects of Employment Role, Perceptions of Organizational Politics, and Career Success on Normative Organizational Commitment	105
Table 14	Hierarchical Multiple Regression Analysis for the Effects of Employment Role, Perceptions of Organizational Politics, and Career Success on Continuance Organizational Commitment	106
Table 15	Hierarchical Multiple Regression Analysis for the Effects of Employment Role, Self-reported Use of Organizational Politics, and Career Success on Affective Organizational Commitment	108
Table 16	Hierarchical Multiple Regression Analysis for the Effects of Employment Role, Self-reported Use of Organizational Politics, and Career Success on Normative Organizational Commitment	110
Table 17	Hierarchical Multiple Regression Analysis for the Effects of Employment Role, Self-reported Use of Organizational Politics, and Career Success on Continuance Organizational Commitment	111

List of Appendices

	Page
Appendix A Vignette Version of the Questionnaire (Study 1)	142
Appendix B Statement Version of the Questionnaire (Study 1)	160
Appendix C Personal Attributes Questionnaire	174
Appendix D English Version of the Questionnaire (Study 2)	176
Appendix E French Version of the Questionnaire (Study 2)	198

Introduction

Ferris, Russ, and Fandt (1989) contend that “for years, personal experience, hunches, and anecdotal evidence have supported a general belief that behaviour in and of organizations is often political in nature” (p.143). Few empirical studies have investigated the pervasiveness of political activity in the workplace (Nye & Witt, 1993). Nonetheless, Madison, Allen, Porter, Renwick, and Mayes (1980) found that 60% of the managers in their study believed that organizational politics was ‘frequently,’ or ‘very frequently,’ a part of organizational life. A more general survey of working adults also suggests that organizations are often political in nature (DuBrin, 1991). Specifically, respondents indicated that they had engaged, at least sometimes, in a number of behaviours that could be identified as characteristic of organizational politics (e.g., relying on personal charm and/or physical appearance to get one’s own way).

The ubiquity of a phenomenon attests to neither its scientific nor applied importance. However, organizational politics warrants empirical attention because it may further researchers’ understanding of dysfunctional work environments (Parker, Dipboye, & Jackson, 1995). Nye and Witt (1993) reported that participants’ perceptions of political activity in the workplace correlated negatively with their levels of organizational commitment and job satisfaction. Similarly, Anderson (1994) observed that respondents’ scores on the Dysfunctional Office and Organizational Politics Scale were positively associated with employee turnover and job stress and were negatively related to organizational performance and employee creativity. Finally, Ferris, Frink, Bhawuk, Zhou, and Gilmore (1996a) reported that participants’ perceptions of organizational

politics correlated positively with job anxiety and negatively with global job satisfaction.

These findings underscore the importance of organizational politics, both from the vantage point of the employee as well as his or her employer.

Organizational politics refers to behaviour that: a) occurs on an informal basis within an organization; and b) involves intentional acts of influence that are designed to protect or enhance individuals' professional careers when conflicting courses of action are possible (Drory, 1993; Porter, Allen, & Angle, 1981). It should be noted that numerous definitions of organizational politics have been proposed (Ferris, Fedor, Chachere, & Pondy, 1989). However, the definition used in the present study reflects what researchers typically conceptualize as the core ingredient of organizational politics; namely, that political behaviour in the workplace refers to self-serving behaviours that are not sanctioned by the organization (Ferris et al., 1996a). In accordance with this definition, political behaviour in the workplace consists of three basic elements: informal behaviours (i.e., actions that are not officially sanctioned by the organization), deliberate influence attempts (i.e., actions designed to change another person's behaviour), and conflicts of interest (i.e., situations characterized by opposing goals) (Drory, 1993).

It should be noted that researchers examine individuals' perceptions of political activity in the workplace or their self-reported use of political behaviour. Thus, organizational politics is investigated as a subjective experience, one that may or may not correspond to actual events (Ferris et al., 1996b). The difficulty associated with providing a more "objective" assessment of organizational politics does not necessarily diminish the importance of the construct. For example, Lewin (1936) argues that people respond on

the basis of their perceptions of reality, not reality *per se*. Thus, “perceptions are important to study and to understand, even if they are misperceptions of actual events” (Porter, 1976 as cited in Ferris & Kacmar, 1992, p. 94).

When investigating organizational politics, it is imperative that one identify its behavioural manifestations. A number of theorists (e.g., Allen, Madison, Porter, Renwick, & Mayes, 1979; Gandz & Murray, 1980; Kirchmeyer, 1990) maintain that the following categories reflect the most common types of political activity in the workplace:

a) Blaming or Attacking Others - This category refers to behaviours in which employees find someone to take the blame for their wrong doing, thereby minimizing their association with a negative event (Allen et al., 1979). Employees also may blame or attack others for the purpose of reducing competition for scarce resources (e.g., promotions, office space). Specific behaviours that fall under this category include: discrediting a potential rival in front of persons occupying positions of influence in the organization, blaming competitors for failures, and attributing the accomplishments of a rival employee to luck or other situational factors (Ashforth & Lee, 1990).

b) Use of Information - This category denotes behaviours in which information is withheld, distorted, embellished or selectively edited (Allen et al., 1979). For example, overwhelming individuals with information, so as to obfuscate an important detail that the political actor believes may be detrimental to his or her career.

c) Creating and Maintaining a Favourable Image - This category reflects employees' use of self-promotion and image building to influence others in the organization.

Representative behaviours include: adhering to company norms, associating with the

successful accomplishments of other employees, and drawing attention to one's own positive characteristics and achievements (Arkin, 1981).

d) Developing a Base of Support - This category represents behaviours designed to solicit the support of other employees. For example, obtaining co-workers' endorsement for an idea prior to it being evaluated by management (Allen et al., 1979).

It should not be assumed that the behaviours described above are inherently political. For example, one may blame or attack others merely to exact revenge or to express hostility. However, Drory and Romm (1988) maintain that these types of behaviours become political when they are performed for the purpose of attaining/maintaining specific career goals. Stated simply, political behaviours are always anti-social in the sense that they conflict with the interests of others, whereas non-political behaviours may be prosocial (performed to enhance the well-being of others), socially neutral (performed to satisfy routine job requirements), or anti-social (performed to harm another coworker).

A review of the literature on organizational politics reveals that, at present, there is no framework to guide the systematic accumulation of empirical knowledge. This thesis attempted to address this limitation by applying Eagly's (1987) social role theory to the phenomenon of organizational politics. This crux of this theory is that individuals in agentic roles possess physical, intellectual, and economic power whereas those in communal roles do not (Eagly, 1987). When applied to the employment realm, the possession of such power may manifest itself politically. That is, individuals occupying agentic employment roles such as manager may behave in a manner consistent with the

expectations of their role which includes engaging in organizational politics. Similarly, individuals occupying communal employment roles such as secretary may behave in ways that fit their role by evidencing low levels of political activity. Moreover, research suggests that engaging in political activity may cause individuals to perceive it as normative and, thus, to underestimate its occurrence (Drory & Romm, 1988). This also may explain why individuals in agentic employment roles should engage in more, but perceive less, political activity than those in communal roles.

First, the basic tenets of social role theory were delineated, as this theory provides a theoretical lens through which extant literature on organizational politics may be examined critically. Second, hierarchical level and job autonomy, variables typically represented as antecedents of organizational politics, were explored. In addition, the ways in which social role theory may be used to conceptualize these antecedents as characteristics of an individual's employment role were outlined. Third, the situational and dispositional variables that may affect perceptions and/or self-reported use of political activity were reviewed. As well, the ways in which these dispositional variables account for variations in political perceptions/activity within an individual's employment role were investigated. Finally, the major consequences of organizational politics for employees were described from the vantage point of social role theory.

Social Role Theory¹

Social role theory contends that the roles individuals occupy are a major determinant of the ways in which they are perceived. Specifically, individuals occupying agentic roles are typically perceived as agentic, whereas individuals occupying communal roles are typically seen as communal. Further, social role theory asserts that these perceptions influence the attitudes and behaviours of individuals occupying agentic and communal employment roles (Eagly, 1987). That is, individuals in communal roles may be expected to evidence attitudes and behaviours congruent with communion, whereas individuals in agentic roles may be expected to evidence attitudes and behaviours congruent with agency.

Roles refer to personae that are contextually determined, and are used to “account for differential behaviour in different situations” (De Charms, 1968, p. 279). De Charms (1968) suggests that consistencies in behaviour across situations (or audiences) reflect dispositional characteristics (i.e., traits), whereas behavioural and attitudinal variations that occur when one is in different situations represent roles. Based on De Charm’s (1968) distinction, traits and roles may be viewed as occupying opposite end points on a continuum measuring cross-situational variability (low and high, respectively).

It should be noted that roles may be either manifest or latent. Manifest roles within an organization are universally shared and seen as relevant within a given context.

¹ It is important to note that there are many social role theories (e.g., the social role theory of occupational stress-Biddle, 1979). However, for the purposes of the present study, Eagly’s (1987) social role theory was used. Eagly’s theory attempts to explain gender stereotyping by investigating the differential representation of males and females in specific social roles.

Latent roles, on the other hand, are internalized shared expectations that are believed to affect individuals' attitudes and behaviours (Larwood, Wright, Desrochers, and Dahir, 1998). Within the context of social role theory, agentic and communal employment roles may be conceptualized as latent.

Eagly (1987) contends that the content of most social roles can be represented in terms of agentic and communal dimensions. The former denotes attributes characterized by self-assertion, self-expansion, self-interest, and the urge to master (e.g., aggressiveness, dominance, competitiveness, determination, and decisiveness) whereas the latter reflects qualities concerned with the harmonious functioning of the group, interdependence, and relationships in general (e.g., kindness, warmth, understanding, and an awareness of others' feelings) (Skitka & Maslach, 1996). It has been demonstrated empirically that agentic and communal dimensions are orthogonal (Eagly & Steffen, 1986). For example, factor analyses of attributes deemed representative of agentic and communal dimensions have consistently produced two-factor solutions (Eagly & Steffen, 1984).

One type of social role that has received considerable attention by Eagly and associates is gender role. Eagly and Steffen (1984) contend that stereotypic beliefs about gender roles may stem, in part, from individuals' tendency to perceive women in social roles possessing lower levels of status than the social roles occupied by men. With respect to the employment role, the authors maintain that men typically occupy positions higher in status and authority than do women. The differential distribution of men and women in employment roles that possess varying levels of status, pay, and authority contributes to males being seen as agentic and females being seen as communal.

It is important to note, however, that a number of social roles exist. Moreover, the determination of whether a given social role is agentic or communal has less to do with the characteristics of the individual (e.g., sex) occupying the role than it does with the characteristics (e.g., status) associated with the role. For example, Eagly and Steffen (1986) found that individuals in social roles characterized by low levels of status (e.g., homemaker) were perceived as communal. This effect was observed irrespective of the sex of the individual. In their study, participants read a brief description of a stimulus person who was identified as either a homemaker or employed full-time outside the home. A control condition also was used in which occupational role was not specified. Participants were instructed to rate the stimulus person on a number of attributes, identified in earlier research as being either communal or agentic. Results indicated that the stimulus person's role, rather than his or her sex, determined mean ratings of communion and agency. Specifically, male and female homemakers were seen as more communal and less agentic than their employed counterparts. Statistically significant differences between male and female stimulus persons occupying the same role were not observed. For example, a male homemaker was seen as neither less communal nor more agentic than a female homemaker. These results suggest that when making determinations about an individual's level of agency or communion, role information such as status is used rather than information about the occupant of the role (e.g., sex). Eagly and Steffen's (1986) study also underscores the superordinance of social roles (i.e., the roles occupied by men and women were more important determinants of perceivers' attitudes than sex). A recent study by Kite (1996) has replicated these findings.

If occupying employment roles higher in status, pay and authority contributes to the perception that one is agentic, then it would appear reasonable to conceptualize employment roles that possess higher levels of status, pay, and authority as agentic. Similarly, if occupying employment roles lower in status, pay, and authority contribute to the perception that one is communal, it would appear reasonable to view any employment role that possesses lower levels of status, pay, and authority as communal. This line of reasoning has been adopted by Mason (1995) and Trafimow and Radhakrishnan (1995). Specifically, these researchers classified occupations such as manager, doctor, lawyer, and executive as agentic, and occupations such as secretary, housekeeper, and bank teller as communal. The specific criteria used to make these classifications were not specified. However, the authors' classifications make sense if one adheres to the key assumption that agentic employment roles possess greater levels of status than communal employment roles. Indeed, the results of several national surveys revealed that occupations such as manager, doctor, lawyer, and executive were seen as possessing higher levels of status (based on diverse criteria such as income and employee qualifications) than occupations such as secretary, housekeeper, and bank teller (Stevens & Hoisington, 1987).

Agentic and communal employment roles vary on a number of dimensions (e.g., helpfulness and decision-making ability). However, in the present study, the status differential between the two employment roles was emphasized.

Status and authority can be defined in myriad ways (see Stevens & Hoisington, 1987). However, in keeping with the types of variables examined by researchers interested in organizational politics, hierarchical level and job autonomy were selected to

represent status and authority (Anderson, 1994; Ferris et al., 1996; Gandz & Murray, 1980).

Researchers have examined the association between elements of employment role (e.g., hierarchical level) and organizational politics. However, generating hypotheses in the absence of a theoretical framework is problematic, as it minimizes researchers' ability to establish a common metric from which specific (and uniform) predictions can be made. In the present study, status was seen as one component of employment role which, in turn, was conceptualized as a complex, superordinate determinant of organizational politics, through which various situational and dispositional variables operate. The importance of social role theory becomes apparent when one examines the nature of the hypotheses presented in the study. For example, the interactions posited between employment role and specific situational and dispositional variables are logically compelling only when viewed through the theoretical lens of social role theory.

Factors that may be responsible for variations in political perceptions and behaviours occurring among individuals occupying the same employment role need to be articulated. It was argued that situational characteristics such as formalization and organizational climate may affect the likelihood that an employee will perceive and/or engage in organizational politics. As well, dispositional characteristics such as locus of control, Machiavellianism, need for power, and right-wing authoritarianism were explored. These situational and dispositional variables were selected because they have received the greatest levels of anecdotal/or empirical attention by researchers interested in the phenomenon of organizational politics. Thus, how they operate in conjunction with roles

was of interest.

The situational and dispositional characteristics investigated in the present study were not expected to supersede the effects of employment role. Rather, it was anticipated that these variables account for intrarole variations in perceptions of political activity and self-reported use of organizational politics. For example, as levels of Machiavellianism increase, participants in agentic employment roles should evidence greater levels of political behaviour. Due to role-related constraints, however, the levels of political behaviour reported by those in communal roles should remain low, irrespective of Machiavellianism. Therefore, interactions are anticipated because, in response to dispositional and situational characteristics, levels of political activity may vary substantially for individuals in agentic roles, but not communal roles. Similarly, levels of perceptions of political activity are expected to vary substantially, as a function of these characteristics, for those in communal roles, but not agentic roles.

Outcome variables such as job satisfaction and organizational commitment also were investigated. It was demonstrated that agentic and communal employment roles possess normative expectations with respect to organizational politics that influence the extent to which individuals perceive and/or engage in organizational politics. Stated simply, these normative expectations are that individuals in agentic roles participate in political activity, whereas those in communal roles do not. The violation of these expectations in terms of engaging in behaviour that is seen as contrary to one's role (i.e., being "out-of-role") may negatively affect employees' job satisfaction and organizational commitment.

Two Characteristics of Agentic and Communal Employment Roles:
Hierarchical Level and Job Autonomy

Researchers have examined variables that may predispose the employee to perceive and/or engage in political activity in the workplace. In the present study, hierarchical level and job autonomy were used to operationally define status and authority; two variables which were seen as core ingredients of an individual's employment role. Specifically, it was argued that agentic employment roles may be characterized by higher levels of hierarchy and job autonomy than communal employment roles. First, however, it is necessary to review research examining the extent to which hierarchical level and job autonomy are antecedents of organizational politics. By identifying the ways in which hierarchical level and job autonomy are related to organizational politics, this review will provide necessary context for the predictions between employment role and political activity.

Standard Application of Hierarchical Level.

Hierarchical level (i.e., one's position within the organization) is often viewed as an antecedent of organizational politics. Research suggests that an employee's position within the organization may influence his or her perception of political activity. For example, Ferris and Kacmar (1992) found that non-supervisory personnel perceived their workplace as more political than did supervisory employees. Similarly, results from a survey of individuals holding nonacademic positions at an American university indicated that those employed at lower levels (i.e., non-supervisory positions) viewed the workplace as more political than those employed at higher levels (Ferris et al., 1996b).

Why are hierarchical level and perceptions of organizational politics inversely related? It has been suggested that employees at lower levels are more likely to be affected by political activity and, as a result, see the workplace as more political (Ferris et al., 1996b). In addition, some researchers contend that lower level employees may view their organization as highly politicized so as to justify their position within the company. That is, individuals who are malcontent with their current position in the organization and pessimistic about their opportunity for advancement may see themselves as 'victims' of ubiquitous political activity (Gandz & Murray, 1980). Although intriguing, neither hypothesis has been assessed empirically.

Other theories have focused on why individuals occupying upper level positions within an organization may perceive their workplace as less political, despite others' perceptions that these positions entail a high degree of political behaviour. Among the employees surveyed by Gandz and Murray (1980), political influence behaviour was believed to be most likely to occur at higher organizational levels. For example, 76% of respondents indicated that "the higher you go in an organization, the more political the climate becomes" and only 16% believed that "powerful executives do not act politically." Gandz and Murray (1980) maintain that individuals who are most likely to engage in organizational politics (i.e., employees in middle- and upper-management) may be least willing to admit it exists because political behaviour in the workplace often has a pejorative connotation. Also, it is possible that employees occupying upper level positions within an organization are more regularly involved in political activity and, thus, tend to see it as a natural part of their job (Drory & Romm, 1988). Employees who view

organizational politics as a normative occurrence may underestimate its prevalence.

The relationship between hierarchical level and an individual's intention to engage in political activity also has been assessed. For example, Biberman (1985) observed that employees' hierarchical level was not significantly associated with their intention to engage in organizational politics, as measured by the Office Politics Questionnaire (OPQ). Specifically, respondents in lower and upper-management positions did not obtain significantly different scores on the OPQ. If evaluated within the parameters of social role theory, this finding is not surprising. Biberman's (1985) participants were homogeneous in terms of their hierarchical level (i.e., a majority were in middle-management and professional positions). As all participants were in agentic employment roles, one would anticipate them evidencing similar intentions to behave politically.

Unfortunately, the study conducted by Biberman (1985) is of limited usefulness because it relies on the OPQ, an instrument that measures behavioural intention. Studies applying the theory of reasoned action to a variety of behavioural domains have demonstrated consistently that the correlation between an individual's behavioural intention and his or her performance of that behaviour is often moderate, at best (e.g., Morrison, Gillmore, & Baker, 1995; Van Ryn, Lytle, & Kirscht, 1996). Thus, it would be imprudent to assume that research using the OPQ necessarily provides an accurate interpretation of the true relationship between hierarchical level and self-reported use of organizational politics.

In a recent investigation of employees' self-reported use of organizational politics, as opposed to their intention to behave politically, Fairholm (1993) found that

management personnel employed as both supervisors and non-supervisors in a number of organizations did not differ in their use of organizational politics. Similarly, Kirchmeyer (1990) reported that managers occupying various hierarchical levels reported comparable rates of political behaviour, as measured by the Vignettes of Political Activity Scale (VPAS).

Biberman (1985), Fairholm (1993), and Kirchmeyer (1990) obtained similar conclusions. Thus, hierarchical level does not appear to be related to either the intention to behave politically or self-reported use of political activity in the workplace. However, it should be noted that the respondents in these surveys were managers, an occupation that has been classified as agentic in previous research (Mason, 1995). If individuals in agentic employment roles denote, on average, higher hierarchical levels, then restriction of range with respect to this variable may have been problematic.

Standard Application of Job Autonomy

Job autonomy is defined as “the degree to which a job provides substantial freedom, independence, and discretion to the employee in scheduling work and in determining the procedures to be used in carrying it out” (Hackman & Oldman, 1975, p. 162). Similar to findings regarding hierarchical status, Gandz and Murray (1980) found that, among a sample of Canadian business managers, job autonomy was inversely related to the perception that one’s organization is rife with political activity. Ferris and Kacmar (1992) also observed that participants’ perceived level of job autonomy correlated negatively with perceptions of organizational politics.

At present, there are no published studies investigating whether an employee’s

perceived level of job autonomy affects his or her self-reported use of political activity in the workplace.

Hypotheses

The present study contends that due, in part, to the differential hierarchical levels and levels of job autonomy characteristic of agentic and communal employment roles, the latter are more likely to promote perceptions of political activity, whereas the former are more likely to promote the use of organizational politics.

Thus, it was hypothesized that:

H1a: Participants in communal employment roles will be more likely to perceive the workplace as political than participants in agentic employment roles.

H1b: Participants in agentic employment roles will be more likely to engage in organizational politics than participants in communal employment roles.

Situational and Dispositional Determinants of Perceived and Self-reported Use of Organizational Politics

The preceding section suggests that individuals in communal employment roles perceive their organization as more political, whereas those in agentic employment roles engage in more political activity. However, individuals within a given employment role may differ with respect to perceptions and self-reported use of organizational politics. The factors responsible for such differences yet to be articulated.

The present study contends that situational characteristics such as formalization and organizational climate as well as dispositional variables such as locus of control, Machiavellianism, need for power, and right-wing authoritarianism serve as moderating variables. That is, variations in self-reported use and perceptions of organizational politics

occurring among individuals occupying the same employment role may be accounted for in terms of these situational and dispositional variables. In accordance with social role theory, these variables were not expected to transcend the effects of role. That is, an individual's agentic or communal employment role delimits the parameters within which the situational and dispositional variables exert their effects. For example, as levels of Machiavellianism increase, participants in agentic employment roles should evidence greater levels of political behaviour. Due to role-related constraints (e.g., low levels of status, authority, decision-making ability, flexibility, etc.), however, the levels of political behaviour reported by those in communal roles should remain low, irrespective of Machiavellianism. Similar interactions are anticipated for all other situational and dispositional variables.

Situational Determinants

Formalization Formalization is defined as the extent to which an organization's rules, policies, and work procedures are officially specified (Smith & Grenier, 1982). Researchers have demonstrated consistently that formalization is inversely associated with perceived levels of political activity in the workplace. For example, using a sample of employees holding nonacademic positions at an American university, Ferris et al. (1996b) found that participants' scores on a measure of formalization correlated negatively with their scores on the Perceptions of Organizational Politics Scale (POPS). In an attempt to explain this relationship, Ferris and associates assert that low levels of formalization signify high levels of ambiguity and uncertainty within an organization, elements that may be conducive to organizational politics. A similar interpretation is provided by Madison et

al. (1980).

Unfortunately, these studies do not provide much insight into why ambiguity (i.e., low levels of formalization) affects employees' perceptions of political activity in the workplace. Cobb (1986) posits that organizations with low levels of formalization become relatively more dependent on employees who function effectively under such circumstances. This dependency may result in organizations conferring status and influence to these employees. Cobb (1986) further suggests that this newly acquired status and influence may provide employees with the opportunity to engage in organizational politics. In particular, in situations where the ambiguity in an organization is perceived to be short-lived, employees who have benefitted from this uncertainty may intensify their use of political activity in an effort to consolidate their status and influence. In addition, it is possible that employees are cognizant of the organizational conditions responsible for their newly acquired status, and may attempt to maintain their status by perpetuating ambiguity and uncertainty within the organization through the use of political activity. These explanations are based on the assumption that the perceived increase in organizational politics under conditions of low formalization reflects an actual increase in such behaviour. This assumption has yet to be empirically examined.

Although formalization is often represented as an organizational variable, it may be examined at a departmental level. For example, Madison et al. (1980) investigated the relationship between levels of formalization associated with various departments within an organization (e.g., marketing and production) and the departments' perceived susceptibility to organizational politics. Results indicated that departments possessing

lower levels of formalization (e.g., marketing) were seen as being more conducive to political activity than departments possessing higher levels of formalization (e.g., production).

In summary, low levels of formalization may create a workplace environment conducive to perceptions and self-reported participation in organizational politics. Conversely, high levels of formalization may diminish the likelihood that organizational politics will occur. The research that has been reviewed has identified main effects for formalization. However, as mentioned earlier, in the present study, formalization was conceptualized as a departmental variable that operates within the parameters of individuals' employment role. Specifically, formalization affects the extent to which individuals in communal employment roles (but not agentic roles) perceive the workplace as political and individuals in agentic roles (but not communal roles) engage in organizational politics. Thus, formalization and employment role were believed to have an interactive effect on perceptions and self-reported use of political activity.

The following were hypothesized:

H2a: For perceptions of organizational politics, an interaction between employment role and formalization is expected. Specifically, when formalization is low, individuals in communal roles will perceive the workplace as more political than when formalization is high. However, for employees in agentic roles, perceptions of political activity will be low, irrespective of level of formalization.

H2b: For self-reported use of organizational politics, an interaction between employment role and formalization is expected. Specifically, when formalization is low, individuals in agentic roles will engage in more political activity than when formalization is high. However, for employees in communal roles, self-reported use of political activity will be low, irrespective of level of formalization.

Organizational Climate². This construct represents a “relatively enduring quality of the internal environment of an organization that a) is experienced by its members, b) influences their behaviour, and c) can be described in terms of the values of a particular set of characteristics (or attitudes) of the organization (Tagiuri & Litwin, 1968 as cited in Denison, 1990, p. 25). Although the distinction between climate and related constructs such as organizational culture³ is a “conceptual muddle” (Furnham & Gunter, 1994)⁴, climate was selected rather than culture for the following reasons. First, climate operates at the level of perceptions, attitudes, behaviours and (to some extent) values, whereas culture denotes basic assumptions of the organization that exist at a preconscious, subconscious, or unconscious level (Moran & Volkwein, 1992). As social role theory concerns itself with the ways in which agentic and communal roles influence values, attitudes, and behaviours (Mason, 1995), organizational climate appeared to be a more

2

The term organizational climate may be something of a misnomer. For example, Payne (1990) contends that people in different parts of the organization possess disparate views of its climate. Thus, it may be more accurate to use the term departmental climate.

3

Organizational culture is defined as “a) a pattern of basic assumptions, b) invented, discovered, or developed by a given group, c) as it learns to cope with its problems of external adaptation and internal integration, d) that has worked well enough to be considered valid and, therefore, e) is to be taught to new members as the f) correct way to perceive, think, and feel in relation to those problems” (Schein, 1990, p. 111).

4

Some researchers suggest that to circumvent the problems associated with differentiating the terms organizational climate/culture, one should refer instead to *employees' perceptions of their organization* (Furnham & Gunter, 1993). As well, some researchers maintain that the conceptual distinction between organizational climate and culture has been overstated. That is, both constructs may be seen as examining “the internal social psychological environment of organizations and the relationship of that environment to individual meaning and organizational adaptation” (Denison, 1996, p. 625).

logical choice for use with this theory. Second, as culture purportedly exists at an unconscious level, it is “highly subjective, idiosyncratic, unique... and cannot be properly studied by...the etic/outsider⁵ tradition of psychometrics and survey research” (Furnham & Gunter, 1993, p. 96). As a result, culture research tends to be idiographic, whereas climate research tends to be nomothetic (Xenikou & Furnham, 1996)⁶. The survey methodology employed in the present study was compatible with the examination of organizational climate, rather than culture.

To date, there are no published studies examining the relationship of organizational climate to perceptions and self-reported use of political activity. However, researchers who conceptualize climate as an independent variable report that it may serve as an important determinant of employees’ attitudes and behaviours (Drory, 1993). For example, Gunter and Furnham (1996) reported that indices of organizational climate such as job clarity (i.e., job tasks are specified clearly), interpersonal relations within the organization (i.e., different people in the organization get along), and training adequacy (i.e., people receive adequate training at work) were significant predictors of organizational pride. The latter variable was measured by participants’ responses to the single-item statement, “I feel proud to work for this organization.” The importance of organizational climate is further demonstrated by the authors’ finding that climate was a

5

Given the emic-etic distinction, one may legitimately question whether an individual who does not belong to a given organization (i.e., a researcher) is able to observe or interpret its culture (Moran & Volkwein, 1992).

6

Idiographic emphasizes factors that may be unique to one individual or one class of individuals, whereas nomothetic emphasizes the average behaviour of large groups.

more consistent and powerful predictor of organizational pride than biodata such as age, sex, and length of employment. Katz (1987) provides experimental evidence which underscores the influence of organizational climate on attitudes and behaviours. In this study, male participants were instructed to behave as managers in a company. The independent variable was the climate manipulation. In the first condition, participants read information (e.g., a statement from the company's vice-president) which intimated that the organization possessed a discriminatory (i.e., pro-male) climate. For example, the statement from the vice-president referred to the company as "conservative," and emphasized that managers functioned together like an "effective baseball team." In the second condition, participants were given information which suggested that the company was non-discriminatory. For example, the statement from the vice-president referred to the company as "innovative," and reported that managers "worked together by using listening skills and by understanding customer needs" (Katz, 1987, p. 14). The dependent variable was participants' evaluation of a male or female applicant's suitability for a position within the company⁷. Results indicated that males exposed to a discriminatory organizational climate were less likely than those exposed to a non-discriminatory climate to recommend that a female applicant be hired.

Extrapolating from this research, the present study contends that organizational climate is a situational variable that may affect perceptions and self-reported use of

7

A pre-experimental manipulation check, using subjects who did not participate in the main experiment, revealed that the organization possessing a "pro-male" climate was seen as being more likely to discriminate against a female applicant.

organizational politics. However, in accordance with social role theory's emphasis on the superordinance of social role, climate was seen as influencing the extent to which individuals in communal employment roles (but not agentic roles) perceive the workplace as political and individuals in agentic roles (but not communal roles) report engaging in organizational politics.

The following were hypothesized:

H3a: For perceptions of organizational politics, an interaction between employment role and organizational climate is expected. Specifically, when the climate is unfavourable, individuals in communal roles will perceive the workplace as more political than when climate is favourable. However, for employees in agentic roles, perceptions of political activity will be low, irrespective of organizational climate.

H3b: For self-reported use of organizational politics, an interaction between employment role and organizational climate is expected. Specifically, when the climate is unfavourable, individuals in agentic roles will engage in more political activity than when the climate is favourable. However, for employees in communal roles, self-reported use of political activity will be low, irrespective of organizational climate.

Dispositional Determinants

Researchers have explored whether certain individual difference variables affect perceptions and/or self-reported use of organizational politics. Locus of control, Machiavellianism, and need for power have received the most attention both theoretically and empirically. However, it should be noted that "most" is a relative term (i.e., in some cases, a single published study constitutes the only available evidence). Right-wing authoritarianism also was examined in the present study. This variable has not been related either theoretically or empirically to the phenomenon of organizational politics; however, it was selected for the following reason. Research suggests that right-wing authoritarianism may be characterized by an inappropriate level of submissiveness to

authority figures in the workplace (DeZoort & Roskos-Ewoldsen, 1997). This submissiveness may interfere with the ability to perceive and/or engage in organizational politics. That is, individuals high in right-wing authoritarianism may be reluctant to acknowledge and/or engage in informal activities such as organizational politics that are not sanctioned by authority figures within the organization.

It should be noted that these dispositional variables were selected to account for variations in perceptions and self-reported use of organizational politics that may occur among individuals occupying the same employment role. For example, two bank managers may report engaging in different levels of political activity because one is more Machiavellian than the other.

Locus of Control. Locus of control⁸ refers to the extent to which individuals perceive themselves as having control over life events (Mudrack & Mason, 1995). Individuals who believe that their outcomes result primarily from their own actions possess an internal locus of control. Conversely, individuals who do not view themselves as the arbiter of their own fate (i.e., regard themselves as being at the mercy of powerful others, chance, and/or luck) possess an external locus of control (Cobb, 1986).

It has been suggested that individuals possessing an external locus of control may be more likely than their internal counterparts to perceive the workplace as political.

8

Locus of control is akin to the origin/pawn distinction outlined by De Charms (1968). An origin is a person “who perceives his [her] behaviour as determined by his [her] own choosing” (p. 273). Thus, an origin denotes an individual with an internal locus of control. A pawn represents a “person who perceives his [her] behaviour as determined by external forces” (p. 273). Thus, a pawn represents a person with an external locus of control.

Research by Moberg (1978 as cited in Vredenburg & Maurer, 1984) provides tentative support for this hypothesis. Unfortunately, researchers have not articulated why this relationship should exist. However, it is possible that “externals” view themselves as unable to manipulate their work environment and concomitantly see themselves as vulnerable to the political machinations of their coworkers.

Porter et al. (1981) maintain that individuals possessing an internal locus of control may be more likely than their external counterparts to engage in organizational politics because they believe in the efficacy of their behaviour. Few researchers have investigated this hypothesis. Among a heterogeneous sample of American employees, Cobb (1986) reported that locus of control was not a significant predictor of involvement in organizational politics. Kirchmeyer (1990) used the four dimensions identified in Rotter's I-E Scale (Collins, 1974) as separate predictors of scores on a measure of political behaviour in organizations (the Vignettes of Political Activity Scale - VPAS). No significant effects were obtained for female participants. However, contrary to the researcher's hypothesis, males who reported an external locus of control on the Easy/Difficult World subscale (i.e., respondents who believe the world contains difficult, complex, and possibly unsolvable problems) obtained higher scores on the VPAS. The remaining three subscales (Just/Unjust World, Predictable/Unpredictable World and Responsive/Unresponsive World) did not emerge as significant predictors. Kirchmeyer did not explain this anomalous finding. However, a detailed rationale for this result appears unnecessary, given the small amount of variance accounted for by this predictor (i.e., scores on the Easy/Difficult World subscale accounted for approximately 3% of the

variance in scores on the VPAS). The minimal practical significance of this finding coupled with the fact that it contradicts earlier theorizing about the relationship between locus of control and organizational politics suggests that it may be artifactual.

At present, the relationship between locus of control and perceptions of organizational politics and self-reported use of political behaviour in the workplace is weak and unclear. This may be due, in part, to reliance on global measures which fail to assess locus of control in specific behavioural areas (Liebert & Spiegler, 1990). For example, neither Cobb (1986) nor Kirchmeyer (1990) assessed situation-specific expectancies; thus, they may have been unable to provide an accurate assessment of the relationship between locus of control and political activity in the workplace. The importance of using specialized locus of control scales has been demonstrated consistently (e.g., LeBrasseur, Blackford, & Whissell, 1988; Whitman, Desmond, & Price, 1987). Therefore, future research investigating the relationship between this variable and organizational politics may benefit from the adoption of locus of control measures that delineate situation-specific expectancies (e.g., Work Locus of Control Scale - Spector, 1988).

In the present study, work locus of control was conceptualized as a dispositional characteristic that interacts with employment role to account for intrarole variations in perceptions and self-reported use of political activity in the workplace. Specifically, it was hypothesized that:

H4a: For perceptions of organizational politics, an interaction between employment role and work locus of control is expected. Specifically, individuals in communal roles possessing an external work locus of control will perceive the workplace

as more political than individuals in communal roles possessing an internal work locus of control. However, for employees in agentic roles, perceptions of political activity will be low, irrespective of work locus of control.

H4b: For self-reported use of organizational politics, an interaction between employment role and work locus of control is expected. Specifically, individuals in agentic roles possessing an internal work locus of control will engage in more political activity than individuals in agentic roles possessing an external work locus of control. However, for employees in communal roles, self-reported use of organizational politics will be low irrespective of work locus of control.

Machiavellianism. Machiavellianism may be conceptualized as a cluster of cynical beliefs about human nature, morality, and the acceptability of using various manipulative tactics to satisfy one's goals (Johns, 1992). Mudrack and Mason (1995) contend that Machiavellians are "cynical, suspicious, motivated primarily by self-interest and expediency, and are relatively unconcerned with considerations of interpersonal attachment, ethics, and conventional morality" (p.640).

Researchers examining the phenomenon of organizational politics have maintained that Machiavellianism constitutes an important individual difference variable with respect to perceptions and self-reported use of political activity in the workplace. For example, it has been suggested that employees high in Machiavellianism may perceive the workplace as more political than those low in Machiavellianism (i.e., Machiavellians may be prone to interpret actions and events in political terms because manipulation and opportunism possess heightened saliency for these individuals) (Mudrack, 1993). Porter et al. (1981) and Ferris et al. (1996a) further hypothesize that employees high in Machiavellianism may be more likely than those low in Machiavellianism to maximize their self-interests through political activity. However, despite the professed importance of Machiavellianism, its

relationships with perceptions and self-reported use of organizational politics have not been investigated empirically.

In the present study, Machiavellianism was conceptualized as a dispositional characteristic that interacts with employment role to account for intrarole variations in perceptions and self-reported use of political activity in the workplace. Thus, it was hypothesized that:

H5a: For perceptions of organizational politics, an interaction between employment role and Machiavellianism is expected. Specifically, individuals in communal roles who are higher in Machiavellianism will perceive the workplace as more political than individuals in communal roles who are lower in Machiavellianism. However, for employees in agentic roles, perceptions of political activity will be low, irrespective of level of Machiavellianism.

H5b: For self-reported use of organizational politics, an interaction between employment role and Machiavellianism is expected. Specifically, individuals in agentic roles who are higher in Machiavellianism will engage in more political activity than individuals in agentic roles who are lower in Machiavellianism. However, for employees in communal roles, self-reported use of organizational politics will be low, irrespective of level of Machiavellianism.

Need for Power. Need for power reflects an individual's desire to exert influence over others (i.e., a person's ability to produce a given effect on the behaviour or emotions of someone else) (Liebert & Spiegler, 1990). To date, the relationship between this variable and perceptions of organizational politics has not been investigated empirically. However, if political activity represents a prime arena for the pursuit and expression of power then it is possible that individuals high in need for power may be more likely to evaluate their work environment in political terms.

Research suggests that individuals' need for power is positively associated with their self-reported use of organizational politics. For example, among samples of business

students and manufacturing employees, Kumar and Beyerlein (1991) observed a significant positive correlation between need for power, as measured by the Dominance subscale of the Manifest Needs Questionnaire (Steers & Braunstein, 1976) and political activity. Cobb (1986) also reported a positive, albeit statistically nonsignificant, correlation ($r=.20$) between need for power and self-reported use of organizational politics. Kirchmeyer (1990) observed that need for power was positively associated with self-reported levels of political activity among female managers, but not among male managers. This gender difference was contrary to the author's hypothesis, and was not explained.

In the present study, need for power was conceptualized as a dispositional variable that interacts with employment role to account for intrarole variations in perceptions and self-reported use of political activity in the workplace. It was hypothesized that:

H6a: For perceptions of organizational politics, an interaction between employment role and need for power is expected. Specifically, individuals in communal roles who are higher in need for power will perceive the workplace as more political than individuals in communal roles who are lower in need for power. However, for employees in agentic roles, perceptions of political activity will be low, irrespective of level of need for power.

H6b: For self-reported use of organizational politics, an interaction between employment role and need for power is expected. Specifically, individuals in agentic roles who are higher in need for power will engage in more political activity than individuals in agentic roles who are lower in need for power. However, for employees in communal roles, self-reported use of organizational politics will be low, irrespective of level of need for power.

Right-wing Authoritarianism. Altemeyer (1988) conceptualizes right-wing authoritarianism as a combination of: 1) authoritarian submission (i.e., high degree of submission to authority figures perceived to be legitimate in the society in which one

lives); 2) authoritarian aggression (i.e., general aggressiveness, directed against various individuals, that is viewed as being sanctioned by established authorities); and

3) conventionalism (i.e., strict adherence to social mores) (Tarr & Lorr, 1991).

To date, there are no published accounts of the relationship between right-wing authoritarianism and perceptions and self-reported use of organizational politics.

However, as mentioned earlier, right-wing authoritarianism may be characterized by an inappropriate level of submissiveness to authority figures in the workplace (DeZoort & Roskos-Ewoldsen, 1997). This submissiveness coupled with right-wing authoritarians' tendency to adhere to social conventions endorsed by society and its institutions may interfere with the ability to perceive and/or engage in political activity. That is, individuals higher in right-wing authoritarianism may be reluctant to perceive or use behaviour that is considered to be subversive or illegitimate.

In the present study, right-wing authoritarianism was conceptualized as a dispositional variable that interacts with employment role to account for intrarole variations in perceptions and self-reported use of political activity in the workplace. It was hypothesized that:

H7a: For perceptions of organizational politics, an interaction between employment role and right-wing authoritarianism is expected. Specifically, individuals in communal roles who are higher in right-wing authoritarianism will perceive the workplace as less political than individuals in communal roles who are lower in right-wing authoritarianism. However, for employees in agentic roles, perceptions of political activity will be low, irrespective of level of right-wing authoritarianism.

H7b: For self-reported use of organizational politics, an interaction between employment role and right-wing authoritarianism is expected. Specifically, individuals in agentic roles who are higher in right-wing authoritarianism will engage in less political activity than individuals in agentic roles who are lower in right-wing authoritarianism.

However, for employees in communal roles, self-reported use of organizational politics will be low, irrespective of level of right-wing authoritarianism.

Consequences of Organizational Political Behaviour

Researchers have examined outcome variables that may be affected by perceptions and self-reported use of organizational politics. Job satisfaction and organizational commitment have received the most empirical scrutiny, in part, because these variables have implications for the effective functioning of both the employee and his or her organization. As a result, they are of considerable importance to industrial organizational psychologists.

Research suggests that organizational commitment is negatively associated with a number of variables including absenteeism and employee turnover (Mowday, Steers, & Porter, 1979) and positively associated with work involvement (Brooke, Russell, & Price, 1988) and employees' perceived levels of competency (Cohen, 1996; Mowday et al., 1979). Research also suggests that job satisfaction is positively correlated with variables such as work involvement (Brooke et al., 1988), work enjoyment (Gunter & Furnham, 1996) and self-perceptions of competence (Sekaran, 1989), and negatively associated with turnover intention (Aryee, Wyatt, & Min, 1991) and work-related stress (Sekaran, 1989).

First, the ways in which job satisfaction and organizational commitment may be examined within the framework of social role theory was discussed. Second, research espousing the traditional viewpoint that job satisfaction and organizational commitment are consequences of organizational politics was outlined.

Social Role Theory and Job Satisfaction/Organizational Commitment

The present study maintains that, due to their varying levels of status and authority, agentic and communal employment roles possess normative expectations with respect to organizational politics. These normative expectations are that individuals in agentic roles participate in political activity, whereas those in communal roles do not. Furthermore, due to these expectations, individuals in communal employment roles should perceive the workplace as political, whereas those in agentic employment roles should not.

Employees may find it aversive when their behaviour is inconsistent with role-based expectations. Further, it is possible that individuals are censured by coworkers and superiors when they engage in behaviour deemed to be “out of role.” Few individuals in communal roles within an organization should engage in political activity. However, among the small proportion who do, the penalties associated with being “out-of-role” may be interact with career success⁹. For example, an individual in a communal role who engages in political behaviour may be punished by his or her co-workers for being out-of-role, while simultaneously receiving benefits from his or her supervisor. These benefits may result in the communal individual reporting high levels of satisfaction and commitment. Conversely, if the same individual engages in political behaviour that does

9

To date, the relationship between organizational politics and career success has received limited empirical scrutiny. However, Judge and Bretz (1994) reported that participants’ use of political behaviours designed to influence their supervisor (e.g., praising the supervisor on his or her accomplishments) was a significant predictor of extrinsic career success. For the latter variable, a composite measure was created by standardizing and summing participants’ current salary, number of promotions with current employer, number of promotions with previous employers, and job level (i.e., number of positions above entry level).

not produce desired outcomes, he or she may experience a precipitous decline in satisfaction/commitment (i.e., the individual has engaged in behaviour that is both ineffective and discordant with his or her role).

Employees in agentic roles who perceive their workplace as political also may be violating a normative expectation. Therefore, they may experience lower levels of job satisfaction and organizational commitment than those in agentic roles who do not perceive the workplace as political¹⁰.

Standard Application of Job Satisfaction.

Job satisfaction is defined as an “individual’s affective reaction to various facets of the work situation” (Shore & Tetrick, 1991, p. 638). Research suggests that perceptions of organizational politics are negatively associated with job satisfaction. For example, Gandz and Murray (1980) found that perceived political activity was a significant predictor of job satisfaction (i.e., individuals who viewed the work environment as political were less satisfied). Similarly, in a large survey of government employees, Nye and Witt (1993) observed a significant inverse relationship between perceptions of organizational politics and job satisfaction. This finding has been replicated in studies conducted by Anderson (1994), Ferris et al. (1996b) and Ferris and Kacmar (1992).

Given the correlational nature of these studies, the direction of causality between organizational politics and job satisfaction is unclear. It is possible, for example, that

¹⁰

More importantly, individuals in agentic roles who perceive the workplace as political should evidence lower levels of satisfaction/commitment because research suggests that perceptions of organizational politics are inversely associated with job satisfaction and organizational commitment.

employees dissatisfied with their jobs may tend to see their organization as highly political. However, researchers examining perceptions of organizational politics typically conceptualize job satisfaction as an outcome variable. A similar interpretation was presented in this study.

To date, the relationship between self-reported use of organizational politics and job satisfaction has not been investigated empirically. However, it would appear reasonable to assert that political behaviour has implications for job satisfaction only to the extent that it contributes to career success. That is, engaging in political behaviour that produces desired career outcomes should increase job satisfaction, whereas engaging in political behaviour that does not produce desired career outcomes should decrease job satisfaction.

Standard Application of Organizational Commitment.

Organizational commitment has been defined as “the relative strength of an individual’s identification with, and involvement in, a particular organization” (Mowday et al., 1979, p. 226). Employees who display this type of commitment support the values and goals of the organization, are willing to expend considerable effort on its behalf, and are strongly motivated to retain their organizational membership (Porter, Steers, Mowday, & Boulian, 1974).

One might assume that organizational commitment is analogous to job satisfaction. Although the two constructs are positively associated with one another (e.g., Bretz & Judge, 1994; Furnham, Brewin, & O’Kelly, 1994; Mowday et al., 1979), researchers argue that they are conceptually distinct (Porter et al., 1974). Organizational commitment

represents a general response to the employing organization whereas job satisfaction refers to the specific task environment in which an employee performs his or her duties (Mowday et al., 1979). The difference between these constructs has been demonstrated empirically. For example, in a recent investigation of British working adults, job satisfaction and organizational commitment shared only 23% of the common variance (Furnham et al., 1994). Thus, from a statistical point of viewpoint, the constructs are not redundant (Briggs & Cheek, 1986). A confirmatory factor analysis conducted by Brooke et al. (1988) underscores the distinction between these two variables. The authors tested a three-factor model in which job satisfaction, organizational commitment, and job involvement loaded on separate factors. Results indicated that this model provided an excellent fit to the data (as determined by the normed fit index). Furthermore, Brooke et al. (1988) observed that one-, and two-factor models provided significantly poorer fit. These findings suggest that job satisfaction and organizational commitment represent distinct constructs.

It has been suggested that employees who view the workplace as politicized may feel deprived and unfairly treated because of political considerations and, thus, evidence low levels of organizational commitment (Drory, 1993). Available research supports this hypothesis. For example, Nye and Witt (1993) reported a significant inverse relationship between perceptions of political activity in the workplace and levels of organizational commitment. Drory (1993) observed a similar relationship, although the result was only marginally significant.

Once again, although the direction of causality is unclear, researchers typically

assume that viewing the work environment as politicized leads to decrements in organizational commitment.

To date, the relationship between self-reported use of organizational politics and organizational commitment has not been investigated empirically. However, it would appear reasonable to assert that political behaviour has implications for organizational commitment only to the extent that it contributes to career success. That is, engaging in political behaviour that produces desired career outcomes should increase organizational commitment, whereas engaging in political behaviour that does not produce desired career outcomes should decrease organizational commitment.

Hypotheses

In the present study, it was maintained that agentic and communal employment roles possess normative expectations with respect to organizational politics. That is, individuals in agentic employment roles may engage in political activity, whereas those in communal employment roles may not. Further, it was proposed that violating this normative expectation may have deleterious consequences in terms of outcome variables such as job satisfaction and organizational commitment. The present study also maintained that the consequences associated with violating this normative expectation are moderated by career success. Specifically, individuals in communal employment roles who engage in political activity (an episode of non-normative behaviour) may evidence high levels of job satisfaction and organizational commitment provided their political behaviour secured desired career outcomes.

Based on this theorizing, the following relationships were hypothesized:

H8a: Due to normative expectations concerning organizational politics, individuals in agentic roles who perceive their organization as political will evidence lower levels of job satisfaction and organizational commitment than those in agentic roles who do not perceive the workplace as political.

H8b: Due to normative expectations concerning organizational politics, individuals in communal employment roles who engage in organizational politics that does not produce desired outcomes will evidence lower levels of job satisfaction and organizational commitment than: a) those in communal roles who engage in political activity that produces desired outcomes; and b) those in communal roles who do not behave politically.

In summary, the predictor variables used in this study were: a) employment role; b) two situational variables (formalization and organizational climate); and c) four dispositional variables (work locus of control, Machiavellianism, need for power, and right-wing authoritarianism). The criterion variables were perceptions of organizational politics and self-reported use of political behaviour. In addition, job satisfaction and organizational commitment were also used as criterion variables, with employment role, perceptions of organizational politics, self-reported use of political behaviour, and career success as predictors.

Study One

Few published instruments measure self-reported use of organizational politics. Moreover, the usefulness of extant measures is limited by their focus on either agentic or communal employees. The purpose of Study 1 was to develop a measure of political behaviour that could be used with heterogeneous samples of employees (i.e., those in a variety of occupations). Two instruments that were used to guide the development of items for this new scale were the Vignettes of Political Activity Scale (Kirchmeyer, 1990)

and the Subordinate Influence Tactics Scale (Wayne & Ferris, 1990). Each of these measures will be discussed briefly.

Vignettes of Political Activity Scale (VPAS). The VPAS contains 20 scenarios, each of which provides an example of political behaviour in organizations. A sample vignette is:

Try to make others like you

Dave manages a media services group within a large utility. Unfortunately, departments can buy better services even cheaper from outside agencies. Dave realizes he has to actively sell within the organization, and tries everything to make people in these departments like him.

The VPAS uses a four-point Likert-type scale (1=not typical of me; 4=very typical of me) in which respondents indicate how typical the behaviour of the person in each vignette is of their own behaviour. Total scores on the VPAS can range from 20 to 80, with higher scores denoting greater levels of self-reported political activity. Research suggests that the scale is reliable (Cronbach's $\alpha=.91$) (Kirchmeyer, 1990). In addition, the VPAS possesses content validity, as it incorporates behaviours proposed by theorists to be characteristic of organizational politics (e.g., Allen et al., 1979; Gandz & Murray, 1980). Kirchmeyer (1990) provides additional evidence attesting to the content validity of this measure. Specifically, the author instructed experienced managers to evaluate each vignette on a four-point scale (1=not political at all; 4=very political). All of the behaviours described in the vignettes were seen by managers as being, at least "somewhat political." There are no additional published studies investigating the reliability and validity of the VPAS.

Subordinate Influence Tactics Scale (SITS). The SITS measures dimensions of influence tactics among subordinates: job focused tactics (i.e., employees manipulate information related to their job performance to make a positive impression on their supervisor); supervisor-focused tactics (i.e., employees praise and/or do personal favours for their supervisor); and self-focused tactics (i.e., employees engage in behaviours designed to create the impression that they are nice and polite) (Wayne & Ferris, 1990). The SITS contains 24 items (12 items for job-focused tactics; 7 items for supervisor-focused; and 5 items for self-focused). For each item, respondents indicate on a seven-point Likert-type scale (1=never; 7=always) whether they have engaged in the specified behaviour in the past three months. Research suggests that the SITS is reliable (alpha coefficients for job-focused, supervisor-focused, and self-focused tactics are .87, .71, and .78, respectively). Evidence attesting to the construct validity of the job-focused and supervisor-focused dimensions of the SITS is provided by Ferris, Judge, Rowland, and Fitzgibbons (1994). The authors hypothesized that job-focused tactics constitute a form of self-promotion which tends to be negatively evaluated by supervisors. Thus, subordinates who engage in these tactics should receive lower performance ratings and fewer resources from supervisors. Supervisor-focused tactics constitute a form of ingratiation which tends to be positively evaluated by supervisors. Thus, subordinates who adopt these tactics should receive more positive evaluations and greater provision of resources. These hypotheses were confirmed (i.e., use of job-focused tactics correlated negatively with scores on measures of supervisor's affect toward subordinates and supervisor's provision of resources, whereas use of supervisor-focused tactics correlated

positively with scores on these measures). To date, there are no published accounts of the construct validity of the self-focused tactics subscale.

Critique of the VPAS and the SITS. As mentioned earlier, the usefulness of the VPAS and the SITS are limited by their narrow focus on specific groups of employees (i.e., the former is designed for use with managers/supervisors, whereas the latter targets non-managerial/non-supervisory employees). Thus, neither scale may be used with samples that represent employees in both communal (e.g., clerical) and agentic (e.g., managers) employment roles. These scales also use different “formats” (vignettes versus statements, respectively) and, thus, cannot be combined or directly compared.

The first part of Study 1 outlined the construction of the Political Activity Scale (PAS). In accordance with the format adopted by Kirchmeyer (1990), a vignette methodology was initially viewed as preferable. This format is used by other researchers in the domain of organizational behaviour (e.g., Eastman, 1994). Moreover, Alexander and Becker (1978) suggest that vignettes are advantageous in survey research because they help to “standardize the social stimulus across respondents” (p. 103). The authors further maintain that vignettes contain important contextual information which may enhance their mundane realism. However, it is possible that respondents may be distracted by the information provided in the vignettes to the extent that it does not fit their own context. For example, a respondent in a communal position may dismiss a political behaviour if it is outlined in a vignette describing an agentic target person. To assess this possibility, parallel versions of the PAS were constructed, one using vignettes and the other using statements.

The second part of Study 1 compared statistically the vignette and statement versions of the PAS. Factor analyses were conducted to ensure that participants' evaluation of the political nature of behaviours described in the PAS did not vary as a function of questionnaire format (vignettes versus statements). Multivariate analyses of variance were then conducted to examine whether: a) the employment status of the target persons described in the vignettes interfered with participants' ability to relate to the political behaviour described therein (i.e., there was concern that participants would dismiss political behaviours engaged in by target persons employed in occupations of higher or lower rank than themselves) and b) participants' responses to the vignettes differed as a function of the target's sex (i.e., male participants may respond to political behaviours engaged in by a male target person and dismiss those associated with a female target person).

The third part of this study assessed the reliability and construct validity of the version that was selected for inclusion in Study 2. A brief review of the research used to investigate the construct validity of this version also was provided.

Construction of the Vignette and Statement Versions of the PAS

Vignette Version. To ensure that the PAS represented a heterogeneous group of political behaviours that would be appropriate for individuals in agentic and communal employment roles, items were selected from both the VPAS and the SITS. Kirchmeyer (1990) does not provide information such as inter-item correlations or factor loadings that would assist in identifying the "best" vignettes contained in the VPAS. Therefore, choosing items from this scale was based on apparent face validity in terms of suitability

for use with a variety of employees. Fifteen vignettes were selected.

Wayne and Ferris' (1990) factor analysis of the SITS was used to select items which appeared to be the best exemplars of non-managerial political behaviour. As mentioned earlier, the authors found that the SITS was a three-dimensional scale. Thus, in the present study, items were eliminated if they had loading values greater than .30 on two or more dimensions and/or had maximal loadings less than .40. Such criteria are routinely used in scale development (e.g., Benson & Vincent, 1980) because they serve to remove items possessing less than optimal levels of construct validity. Statements from the SITS were retained if they had the highest loading value on their respective factor and, as well, if they appeared to be non-redundant with the political behaviours selected from the Kirchmeyer (1990) scale. Vignettes were then written for each of these items. For example, the job-focused tactic "agree with your immediate supervisor's major opinions outwardly even when you disagree inwardly" was expanded to read:

Support the opinions of others, even when you disagree with them

Kathy works as a secretary in the sociology department of a small community college. Due to budget restrictions, the department must choose between purchasing a new photocopier or buying new chairs for several sociology professors. Her supervisor, the head of the department, makes it known that he believes the funds should be spent on new chairs. Kathy does not agree. However, when he solicits her opinion, she tells him that the money should be spent on the chairs, rather than on a new photocopier.

To maximize the likelihood that the PAS provided a comprehensive representation of political behaviour, two additional items were incorporated to reflect behaviours not included in the scales developed by Kirchmeyer (1990) and Wayne and Ferris (1990). One was based on Yukl, Falbe, and Youn's (1993) typology of influence behaviours. The authors identified a tactic entitled personal appeals, which refers to an employee using

feelings of loyalty or friendship toward him or her when asking for something (Yukl et al., 1993). The following vignette was written for this political behaviour:

Use personal relationship with others

Linda works as a tax consultant for a mid-sized accounting firm. Recently, Linda recommended that a small research company owned by her brother-in-law, John, be awarded the contract to conduct the accounting firm's annual evaluation of its employees. Linda knows that with John at the helm, she is guaranteed a favourable employee evaluation.

The final item was developed on the basis of feedback provided by a small sample of female employees from British Columbia and Nova Scotia (N=6). Respondents were given a questionnaire containing a copy of the VPAS and the following definition of organizational politics: "office politics is any informal behaviour that individuals or groups engage in to enhance or protect their career." They were instructed to read the VPAS, and using the definition provided, to describe any additional political behaviours that they had engaged in and/or observed. One respondent suggested a behaviour that satisfied the present study's definition of political behaviour in organizations but was not represented in the VPAS, the SITS, and Yukl et al.'s (1993) typology. The vignette for this behaviour is:

Get others to emphasize your importance to the organization

Bob works as a counsellor for a government-sponsored drug rehabilitation centre. He often informs his clients that, due to government cutbacks, many of the services he provides may be eliminated. Thus, Bob encourages clients to tell his superiors how much they value the services they receive. Bob knows that when clients do this, they will invariably devote much of their conversation to praising him and the work he has done. As a result, Bob's supervisors will be reminded continually that he is a top-notch employee.

The final vignette version of the PAS contained 15 items from the VPAS, 8 items from the SITS, 1 item from Yukl et al.'s typology of influence tactics, and 1 item

developed specifically for this study. A copy of this questionnaire is provided in Appendix A.

To ensure that the occupations in the PAS reflected diverse levels of status, vignettes were randomly selected to describe target persons in high-status (e.g., vice-president of a manufacturing firm), medium-status (e.g., social worker), or low-status occupations (e.g., secretary). The number of vignettes in the high-, medium-, and low-status categories were 8, 8, and 9, respectively. The determination of an occupation's status was made in accordance with status ratings provided by Armstrong and Armstrong (1994) and Bose and Rossi (1983). As well, comparable numbers of male and female target persons were represented in occupations classified as high-, medium-, and low-status.

Statement Version. The statement version of the PAS used the same items as those described above. The only difference is that this version used brief behavioural statements rather than vignettes. For example, the statement version of a scenario presented on the previous page, read “get others to emphasize your importance to the organization.” Participants' responses were then based on the statement only. A copy of the statement version of the PAS is provided in Appendix B.

Statistical Comparison of the Vignette and Statement Versions of the PAS

The vignette and statement versions of the PAS were statistically examined to assess their comparability in psychometric properties such as number of factors extracted and internal consistency. Maximum likelihood estimation was used to assess the factor structure of these versions, with respect to respondents' perception of whether the

behaviours listed in the vignettes and the statements were political. This extraction procedure was chosen because it permits chi-square analysis of model fit. Given the exploratory nature of this study, specific predictions concerning the number of dimensions contained in the vignette and statement versions of the PAS were not formulated. However, if the versions were comparable, it was anticipated that the number of factors extracted for both would be the same.

Multivariate analyses of variance also were conducted to investigate whether respondents differentially related to vignettes describing occupations similar or dissimilar in status to their own. Finally, descriptive statistics were calculated for diagnostic questions examining completion time and perceived difficulty for vignette and statement versions of the PAS. Such questions would be useful in determining which version was more “user-friendly.”

Method

Participants

Convenience samples of employed Canadians (N=161; 58 males and 103 females) from Ontario and Nova Scotia were used. Respondents were obtained through chain-referral sampling (i.e., acquaintances of the researcher were given a copy of either the vignette or statement version of the questionnaire and asked to provide copies of it to their coworkers and employed friends and relatives). Ethical concerns regarding informed consent were satisfied by use of a cover sheet which indicated that participation was strictly voluntary and that all responses would be anonymous and confidential. Completed questionnaires were returned by mail.

Clerical employees, journalists, consultants, lawyers, teachers, nurses, insurance adjusters, and management personnel, among other employment groups, were represented in this sample. Given the heterogeneous nature of the types of occupations represented, the sample appears to possess adequate validity for the purpose of this study.

The number of male respondents receiving the vignette or statement version of the PAS was 28 and 30, respectively. The mean age of male participants was 40.9 years ($SD=10.1$). When asked whether they supervised other employees, approximately 41% ($n=23$) of male respondents answered affirmatively, 59% ($n=33$) indicated that they did not supervise other employees (2 cases unclassified). Specific information about the nature of participants' supervisory role was not obtained. Eighteen percent ($n=10$) were high school graduates, 9% ($n=5$) attended college, 9% ($n=5$) received a college diploma, 11% ($n=6$) attended university, 32% ($n=18$) received an undergraduate degree, 2% ($n=1$) attended graduate school, 19% ($n=11$) received advanced degrees (e.g., Master's), and 2% ($n=1$) received other forms of certification (1 case unclassified).

The number of female respondents receiving the vignette or statement version of the PAS was 53 and 50, respectively. The mean age of female participants was 38.5 years ($SD=9.4$). Approximately 30% ($n=30$) of female respondents stated that they were employed in supervisory positions and 70% ($n=71$) indicated that they were in non-supervisory positions (2 cases unclassified). Sixteen percent ($n=16$) were high school graduates, 14% ($n=14$) attended college, 14% ($n=14$) received a college diploma, 7% ($n=7$) attended university, 31% ($n=31$) received an undergraduate degree, 3% ($n=3$) attended graduate school, 14% ($n=14$) received advanced degrees (e.g., Master's), and

2% (n=2) received other forms of certification (2 cases unclassified).

Measures

Political Behaviour. This construct was measured using vignette and statement versions of the Political Activity Scale (PAS). Both versions began with the following statement¹¹ “office politics is defined as any informal behaviour that individuals or groups engage in to enhance or protect their career.” Both versions consisted of 25 items. Each vignette/statement was responded to along three Likert-type “dimensions.” These “dimensions” are (in order): “how often do you engage in this behaviour while working at your present job?” (1=never; 4=often); “if an individual wanted to engage in this behaviour, would he or she be able to do so in your present job” (1=often; 4=never); and “based on the definition of office politics provided [above], how political do you believe this behaviour is?” (1=not at all political; 4=highly political). Summed total scores on each dimension could range from 25 to 100. For the first dimension, higher scores represent greater use of organizational politics. For the second dimension (reverse-scored), higher scores indicate that participants believe their occupation allows an employee to engage in organizational politics, if so desired. For the third dimension, higher scores indicate that the behaviour described in the PAS is seen as political.

Supervisory Status. Respondents were asked to indicate whether they supervised other employees in their present occupation (1=yes; 2=no).

11

An operational definition of organizational politics was provided to ensure that respondents possessed a uniform interpretation of this construct prior to evaluating the vignettes/statements.

Survey Diagnostics. Respondents were asked to indicate: a) the length of time (in minutes) it took them to complete the survey; b) how difficult they found it to complete (1=not at all difficult; 10=very difficult); and, for the vignette version, c) how useful they found the vignettes in understanding the political behaviour (1=not at all useful; 10=very useful).

Results

An exploratory factor analysis was conducted to assess the dimensionality of each of the vignette and statement versions of the PAS. First, factor analyses were performed on participants' responses to the question, "based on the definition of office politics provided [above], how political do you believe this behaviour is?". Both the vignette and statement versions of the PAS were factor analysed¹². Maximum likelihood estimation was used because it permits chi-square analysis of model fit. Newcomb (1990) recommends evaluating model fit in accordance with the chi-square/degrees of freedom ratio. A value less than 2.0 indicates models that "meet real world criteria for reasonable fit and representation of the data" (Newcomb, 1994, p. 467), whereas values greater than 2 denote inadequate or poorly specified models.

Dimensionality of the Vignette Version of the PAS.

Respondents' ratings of the political nature of the vignettes were factor analysed.

¹²

As mentioned earlier, Wayne and Ferris (1990) reported that the SITS possessed a three-dimensional factor structure. However, the authors' factor analysed participants' self-reported use of political behaviour and not their assessments of whether the behaviour in question was political. Thus, the dimensionality reported by Wayne and Ferris (1990) does not appear to be relevant to the present analysis.

An inspection of the scree plot revealed that a one-factor solution provided the best representation of the data. Maximum-likelihood estimation with a forced one-factor solution was then performed. Results indicated that this factor accounted for 34.1% (eigenvalue=8.5) of the total variance. The factor loadings ranged from .33 to .73, which suggests that all of the vignettes contributed significantly to this one factor. The chi-square/degrees of freedom ratio was 1.71:1.0, which satisfies Newcomb's (1994) criterion for model fit.

Dimensionality of the Statement Version of the PAS.

Respondents' assessments of the political nature of the statements were similarly factor analysed. Once again, inspection of the scree plot revealed that a one-factor model appeared to provide the best fit. Thus, maximum likelihood estimation with a forced one-factor solution was performed. This factor accounted for 45.6% (eigenvalue=11.4) of the total variance. The factor loadings ranged from .31 to .84, which suggests that all of the statements contributed significantly to this factor. The chi-square/degrees of freedom ratio was 1.79:1.0, which again suggests that a one-factor model provided an acceptable representation of the data.

Congruency of the Factor Solutions of the Vignette and Statement Versions of the PAS

The coefficient of congruence assesses the degree of pattern and magnitude similarity between factor solutions (Rummel, 1970). The coefficient ranges from -1.00 (perfect negative similarity) to 1.00 (perfect similarity). A value of zero represents complete dissimilarity. Using the formula provided by Harman (1967), a coefficient of congruence was computed for the one-factor solutions obtained for the vignette and

statement versions of the PAS. A value approximating 1.00 would suggest that these solutions do not differ in a meaningful way in either pattern or magnitude. The coefficient of congruence was .973. Thus, the factor solutions obtained for the vignette and statements versions of the PAS are virtually identical.

Multivariate Analysis of Variance of the Vignette Version of the PAS¹³

As mentioned earlier, it is possible that participants' responses may differ in accordance with the target person's occupation or sex (i.e., respondents may relate only to those descriptions referring to same sex target persons in comparable occupations). For example, a respondent who is in a clerical position may feel that certain political behaviours are not applicable to him or herself, if they are described in a vignette in which the target person is a manager. The content validity of the PAS may be jeopardized if participants dismiss certain political behaviours because of the target person's occupation or sex.

To investigate the first possibility, multivariate analyses of variance (MANOVAs) were conducted for each set of vignettes with target persons in high-status, medium-

¹³

The present series of analyses were concerned with the relationship between participants' supervisory status/sex and the specific properties of the items on the vignette version of the PAS (i.e., occupational status and sex of the target). The statement version of the PAS does not provide information about a target person's sex or occupation. Consequently, the author could not determine whether statements had a male/female target or were high, medium, or low in status. MANOVAs were not performed on the statements because such analyses could not be directly compared with the output obtained for the vignettes. For example, a two-group (supervisor/non-supervisor) MANOVA conducted on the statements (which could not be classified according to status), with self-reported political behaviour as the dependent variable, provides information about whether supervisors are more likely than non-supervisors to engage in organizational politics. This question is not pertinent to Study 1.

status, and low-status occupations. The independent variable was the supervisory status of the respondent, and the dependent variables were the three Likert-type dimensions¹⁴ for each set of vignettes (high-, medium-, and low-status). If respondents' supervisory status affects their answers to these questions, then the usefulness of the vignette methodology is suspect.

To investigate the second possibility, MANOVAs were conducted for the 12 vignettes describing a male target person and the 13 vignettes describing a female target person. The independent variable was the sex of the participant, and the dependent variables were the three Likert-type dimensions described above for each set of vignettes.

Assessments of normality and homogeneity of covariance revealed modest violations of assumptions for MANOVA. Thus, the Pillais Trace V multivariate statistic was used because it is most robust when samples sizes are small and unequal and the assumption of homogeneity of covariance is violated (Tabachnick & Fidell, 1989). Fifteen MANOVAs were conducted in total (9 with participants' supervisory status as the independent variable, and 6 with participants' sex as the independent variable).

High-Status Vignettes. Three two-group (supervisor/non-supervisor) MANOVAs were conducted on the eight vignettes describing target persons in high-status occupations. With respect to self-reported use of the relevant political behaviours, the overall effect for supervisory status was nonsignificant (Pillai Trace $V=.091$, F

14

These dimensions are: self-reported use of political activity, ability to engage in political behaviour in one's present occupation, and assessment of the extent to which the behaviour described in each vignette is political.

(8,69)=.864, ns). Nonsignificant effects also were observed for respondents' assessment of whether their current occupation was conducive to participation in the political behaviours described by the high-status vignettes (Pillai Trace $V=.043$, $F(8,68)=.385$, ns) and their evaluation of whether the behaviours described in these vignettes were political (Pillai Trace $V=.107$, $F(8,66)=.992$, ns). The magnitude of the multivariate statistics indicate that these results do not possess practical significance (Kirk, 1996). Thus, participants occupying supervisory positions did not differ from participants in non-supervisory positions in their responses to the three questions presented with each vignette describing a target person in a high-status occupation.

Medium-Status Vignettes. Three two-group (supervisor/non-supervisor) MANOVAs also were conducted on the eight vignettes describing target persons in medium-status occupations. Once again, no significant effects were found. Thus, respondents' supervisory status did not affect their self-reported use of the political behaviours described by the medium-status vignettes (Pillai's $s=.067$, $F(8,71)=.639$, ns); their assessment of whether their current occupation is conducive to participation in these political behaviours (Pillai's $s=.103$, $F(8,70)=1.01$, ns); and their evaluation of whether the behaviours described in these vignettes were political (Pillai's $s=.064$, $F(8,70)=.603$, ns). Again, these results possessed neither statistical nor practical significance.

Low-Status Vignettes. Finally, three two-group (supervisor/non-supervisor) MANOVAs were conducted for the dimensions on the vignettes corresponding to low-status occupations. Once again, no significant effects were found. Respondents' supervisory status did not affect their self-reported use of political behaviours described in

the low-status vignettes (Pillai's=.031, $F(9,68)=.240$, ns); their assessment of whether their current occupation prevented participation in these political behaviours (Pillai's=.053, $F(9,68)=.419$, ns); and their determination of whether the behaviours described in these vignettes were political (Pillai's=.090, $F(9,68)=.750$, ns). These results possessed neither statistical nor practical significance.

Vignettes With Male Targets. Three two-group (male/female) MANOVAs were conducted on the vignettes describing male target persons. With respect to self-reported use of the relevant political behaviours, the overall effect for sex of the participant was nonsignificant (Pillai Trace $V=.164$, $F(12,66)=1.08$, ns). Nonsignificant effects also were observed for respondents' assessment of whether their current occupation was conducive to participation in the political behaviours described in vignettes with male target persons (Pillai Trace $V=.227$, $F(12,64)=1.56$, ns) and their evaluation of whether the behaviours described in these vignettes were political (Pillai Trace $V=.127$, $F(12,63)=.765$, ns). These results possess neither statistical nor practical significance. Thus, male and female participants did not differ in their responses to the three questions presented with each vignette that described a male target.

Vignettes With Female Targets. Three two-group (male/female) MANOVAs also were conducted on the vignettes describing female target persons. Again, no significant effects were found. Respondents' sex did not affect their self-reported use of the political behaviours described in the vignettes (Pillai Trace $V=.303$, $F(13,65)=2.18$, ns); their assessment of whether their current occupation is conducive to participation in these political behaviours (Pillai Trace $V=.200$, $F(13,65)=1.25$, ns); and their evaluation of

whether the behaviours described in these vignettes were political (Pillai Trace $V=.144$, $F(13,64)=.827$, ns). Again, these results possessed neither statistical nor practical significance.

Survey Diagnostics for the Vignette and Statement Versions of the PAS

Survey diagnostics revealed that the vignette and statement versions of the PAS were seen as comparable in complexity, $M=2.9$ ($SD=2.1$) and $M=2.8$ ($SD=2.2$), respectively, $t(155)=.32$, ns. The vignette version, however, took significantly longer to complete ($M=25.4$ minutes; $SD=8.8$) than the statement version ($M=20.6$; $SD=10.7$), $t(154)=3.00$, $p<.003$. Finally, results indicated that a majority of participants receiving the vignette version of the PAS, found the descriptions useful in helping them understand the political behaviours in question. On a rating scale of perceived usefulness in which 1 represents not at all useful and 10 represents very useful, the mean rating was 7.5 ($SD=2.7$).

Conclusion

The results from this study suggest that neither version appeared to be superior to the other. Factor analysing participants' responses to the question that measured their assessment of whether behaviours described in the vignettes/statements were political, produced unidimensional factor solutions for both versions. Moreover, the coefficient of congruence revealed that the factor solutions for the vignettes and statements were similar in both magnitude and pattern of loadings. The results from the MANOVAs did not support the concerns that participants would be unable to relate to vignettes if they described occupations dissimilar to their own or target persons of the opposite sex.

Responses of supervisors and non-supervisors to three Likert-type dimensions did not differ as a function of the target person's occupation. As well, male and female participants did not respond differentially to vignettes with male or female target persons. Thus, it was decided that the vignette format would be, at least, equivalent to the statement version in terms of the nature of the results. However, survey diagnostics suggest that the vignette may obtain a better quality of answer. These diagnostic statistics revealed that the vignette and statement versions of the PAS were seen as comparable in complexity. The vignette version had a longer mean completion time than the statement version. This difference, however, may be offset by participants reporting that they found the vignettes helpful in understanding the political behaviours outlined. Further, some of the participants who were given the statement version of the PAS indicated that they found it vague and unclear.

As neither version appears to be superior to the other, the author's decision to use the vignette format is based on its high level of perceived usefulness as well as feedback from respondents who received the statement version of the PAS.

Psychometric Properties of the Vignette Version of the PAS

To reduce item redundancy and scale length, it is desirable to make the scale as parsimonious as possible. The statistical procedures used to reduce the number of items in the PAS are described in this section. Cronbach's alpha and the construct validity of this modified version of the PAS were examined. The construct validity of this measure was assessed by examining its relationship with self-monitoring and centralization. These variables have been explored by other researchers investigating organizational politics

(e.g., Kirchmeyer, 1990; Welsh & Slusher, 1986). A brief review of the relationships among these variables in relation to self-reported use of political activity is presented below.

Self-Monitoring. Self-monitoring refers to the extent to which individuals are sensitive to the subtle cues observed in others and try to manage the impressions that others have of them (Alcock, Carment, & Sadava, 1994). Kirchmeyer (1990) asserts that high-self monitors should report greater levels of political activity than low self-monitors. This hypothesis represents an extension of previous research conducted by Sypher and Sypher (1983). Specifically, these researchers found that self-monitoring correlates positively with persuasion ability and communication effectiveness, two characteristics deemed prototypic of effective “organizational politicians” (Kirchmeyer, 1990). As hypothesized, Kirchmeyer (1990) observed that participants’ scores on a measure of self-presentation ability correlated positively with their self-reported use of organizational politics, as measured by the VPAS. Thus, in the present study, it was hypothesized that high self-monitors should report higher levels of political activity, as measured by the vignette version of the PAS, than low self-monitors.

Centralization. Researchers suggest that when decision-making authority and control are concentrated within upper levels of an organization (i.e., centralization is high), the potential for political activity may increase (Ferris et al., 1996a). To date, there is only one published study examining the relationship between these variables. Welsh and Slusher (1986) developed a measure of political activity that explored the influence strategies used by university faculty members when selecting a dean. The authors

reported a significant, albeit modest, correlation between measures of political activity and centralization. On the basis of this finding, it was hypothesized that respondents employed in organizations perceived to possess high levels of centralization should report greater levels of political activity, as measured by the PAS, than those employed in organizations with low levels of centralization.

Measures

The relevant measures were included in the questionnaires distributed to compare the vignette and statement versions of the PAS. Along with the measures assessing political behaviour, the following scales were included to examine construct validity.

Self-Monitoring. Lennox and Wolfe's (1984) Ability to Modify Self-Presentation subscale (AMSP)¹⁵ was used to measure the "extent to which people regulate their self-representation by tailoring their actions in accordance with immediate situational cues" (Lennox & Wolfe, 1984, p. 1349). This scale contains seven items (e.g., "Once I know what the situation calls for, it's easy for me to regulate my actions accordingly") and, in the present study, used a 7-point Likert-type scale (1=never true; 7=always true). Total scores on the scale can range from 7 to 49, with higher scores denoting greater tendency to modify one's self-presentation. Research suggests that the AMSP possesses adequate internal consistency with alpha coefficients ranging from .78 to .81 (Miller, Omens, &

¹⁵

While past research commonly uses Snyder's (1974) Self-Monitoring scale, it was not used in the present investigation because research suggests that it possesses inadequate psychometric properties. For example, Lennox and Wolf (1984) contend that Snyder's (1974) scale possesses an unstable factor structure, low internal consistency, and questionable content validity (i.e., some items appear to measure extroversion rather than self-monitoring).

Delvadia, 1991; Shuptrine, Bearden, & Teel, 1990). Miller et al. (1991) also provide evidence attesting to the construct validity of the scale. For example, as predicted, the authors found that participants' scores on the AMSP were positively correlated with their levels of extroversion and protective variability (i.e., the extent to which individuals change their behaviour to the demands of the present situation). Also, as per the findings of Lennox and Wolfe (1984), Miller and associates obtained a negative correlation between ability to modify self-presentation and social anxiety (i.e., nervousness when placed in social situations).

Centralization. Aiken and Hage's (1966 as cited in Cook, Hepworth, Wall, & Warr, 1981) Hierarchy of Authority subscale (HAS) was used to measure centralization. This construct is "an organizational characteristic which is reflected in the locus of authority to make decisions affecting the organization" (Cook et al., 1981, p. 207). Thus, when centralization is high, power and control are concentrated at the top of the organization.

The HAS consists of five items (e.g., "Even small matters have to be referred to someone higher up for a final answer") and, in the present study, used a 7-point Likert-type scale (1=never true; 7=always true). Total scores on the scale can range from 5 to 35, with higher scores signifying greater levels of centralization. Research suggests that the HAS is reliable and valid. For example, Ferris et al. (1996) reported an alpha coefficient of .90. Also, as hypothesized, the authors found that centralization was correlated negatively with perceived control over the work environment and perceived understanding of work related events.

Results

Elimination of Items from the Vignette Version of the PAS

To ensure the PAS possesses a high level of content validity, any item that was considered to be “not all political” by 20% or more of respondents was deleted. This process resulted in the removal of vignettes entitled “do personal favours,” “emphasize information to support your case,” and “minimize the importance of negative events.”

To assess whether additional vignettes could be eliminated, the dimensionality of participants’ self-reported use of political behaviour was investigated¹⁶. The chi-square/degrees of freedom ratio recommended by Newcombe (1994) was used to evaluate the fit of the solution (i.e., a ratio less than 2.0 represents adequate fit). One-, two-, and three-factor models were examined. Inspection of scree plots and unrotated factor matrices revealed that the two factor model provided the best fit (ratio=1.16:1.00). The first factor (eigenvalue=5.20) accounted for 23.6% of the variance in the solution and denoted political behaviours that required the support of other employees. Sample items include: “develop strong allies,” “get others to emphasize your importance to the organization,” and “get an expert to support your position.” The second factor (eigenvalue=2.20) accounted for 10.0% of the variance in the solution and reflected duplicitous forms of political behaviour such as “pretend to be interested in the personal

16

It should be noted that this factor analysis differs from the one reported in the section comparing the dimensionality of the vignette and statement versions of the PAS. The previous factor analysis examined responses to dimension 3 (e.g., “Based on the definition of office politics provided on page two, how political do you believe this behaviour is?”). The present factor analysis examined responses to dimension 1 (e.g., “How often do you engage in this behaviour while working at your present job?”).

life of others,” “issue compliments on personal appearance even when they are not warranted,” and “selectively delay work for specific gain.” The correlation between factors 1 and 2 was .42, $p < .001$.

Following the recommendation of Greene and Gynther (1994), any item possessing a maximum loading of less than .30 on either of the two factors was eliminated. This procedure resulted in the elimination of the items “minimize a competitor’s accomplishments” and “take credit for positive events that take place in your work group.”

The items corresponding to factors 1 and 2 were treated as subscales. Reliability analysis was then performed on subscales 1 and 2, and item-total correlations for each subscale were examined. Any vignette which had an item-total correlation less than .25 was deleted. For subscale 1, none of the vignettes had correlations below .25; however, for subscale 2, two vignettes had correlations below .25 and were eliminated: “exaggerate the importance of a task” and “blame others when something you are associated with goes wrong.”

The final version of the PAS consisted of 18 items. Subscale 1 consisted of 11 items and subscale 2 consisted of 7 items. The correlation between participants’ total scores on each subscale was .45, $p < .001$.

The factor loading values and item-total correlations for each subscale are presented in Table 1.

Table 1
Rotated Factor Loadings of Subscales 1 and 2 of the Political Activity Scale

<i>Item</i>	<i>Factor 1</i>	<i>Factor 2</i>	<i>Item-Total Correlations</i>
Pretend to be interested in the personal life of others ² .	-.02	.62	.49
Act as a “model” employee when others are present ² .	.17	.47	.45
Issue compliments on personal appearance even when they are not warranted ² .	.10	.47	.43
Not fully commit yourself until you know which side is “winning” ² .	.32	.43	.50
Praise others on their accomplishments even when you don’t think the accomplishments are very impressive ² .	.32	.55	.45
Develop strong allies ¹ .	.55	.21	.55
Use information to overwhelm others ¹ .	.54	.13	.47
Associate with influential people ¹ .	.75	.12	.68
Selectively delay work for specific gain ² .	.11	.64	.53
Make sure you have the right image ¹ .	.52	.23	.47
Use personal relationships with others ¹ .	.40	.27	.40
Get others to emphasize your importance to the organization ¹ .	.60	.12	.55
Get an expert to support your position ¹ .	.63	-.09	.53
Help others in order to get their help later ¹ .	.54	.20	.50
Make others aware of your accomplishments ¹ .	.41	.15	.39
Make a rival look bad ¹ .	.30	.16	.29
Support the opinions of others, even when you disagree with them ² .	.10	.36	.33
Withhold information ¹ .	.40	.39	.41

Note: ¹ Items from subscale 1; ²Items from subscale 2.

Reliability

Cronbach's alpha for subscales 1 and 2 of the PAS were .81 and .73, respectively. The alpha for the total scale was .84. These value represents adequate levels of internal consistency (Carmines & Zeller, 1979). Mean item-total correlations for subscales 1 and 2 were (in order) .48 and .45. Both values are within the range specified by Briggs and Cheek (1986) for optimal levels of item homogeneity. Alpha coefficients for the self-monitoring and centralization measures used to investigate the construct validity of the PAS were .78 and .89, respectively.

Construct Validity of the PAS

As predicted, total scores on the Political Activity Scale and the Ability to Modify Self-Presentation subscale were positively correlated, $r=.32$, $p < .005$. The correlations between self-monitoring and subscales 1 and 2 of the PAS were $r=.33$, $p < .005$ and $r=.13$, ns. Thus, participants high in self-monitoring reported higher levels of other-directed political activity (subscale 1), but did not evidence higher levels of the duplicitous behaviour represented by subscale 2. Contrary to what was hypothesized, the correlation between total scores on the Political Activity Scale and the Hierarchy of Authority subscale was nonsignificant ($r=-.19$, ns). Non-significant correlations also were observed between subscales 1 and 2 of the PAS and the Hierarchy of Authority subscale ($r=-.18$, ns and $r=-.13$, ns, respectively).

Discussion

The results of this study suggest that the 18-item version of the PAS possessed adequate internal consistency. At present, the validity of the PAS is undetermined. The

hypothesis concerning the relationship between self-monitoring and self-reported levels of political activity was partially confirmed, whereas the hypothesis concerning the relationship between centralization and self-reported levels of political activity was not.

The primary limitation of the present study is its small sample size (i.e., 86 participants completed the vignette version of the PAS). Comrey (1973 as cited in Tabachnick & Fidell, 1989) reports that sample sizes of less than 100 are “very poor” for the purposes of factor analysis. Thus, one may question the stability of the factors identified for the final 18-item version of the PAS (i.e., subscales 1 and 2).

Study Two

Using social role theory as a framework, it was argued that an individual’s agentic or communal employment role may be an important determinant of perceptions and self-reported use of organizational politics. Specifically, those in communal roles will be more likely to perceive the workplace as political, whereas those in agentic roles will be more likely to report engaging in organizational politics.

In addition, it was proposed that situational variables such as formalization and organizational climate and dispositional variables such as work locus of control, Machiavellianism, need for power, and right-wing authoritarianism interact with communal and agentic employment roles to affect the likelihood that employees will perceive or engage in organizational politics. In the present study, these variables were seen as accounting for variations in perceptions of political activity that may occur among individuals in communal roles, and variations in self-reported use of political activity that

may occur among individuals occupying agentic roles.

Finally, the present study maintained that role-inconsistent political behaviour may have deleterious consequences in terms of job satisfaction and organizational commitment. Specifically, perceiving one's workplace as highly political may be conceptualized as role-inconsistent behaviour among individuals occupying agentic employment roles, whereas engaging in political behaviour may be deemed role-inconsistent for those occupying communal roles. These episodes of non-normative (i.e., out-of-role) organizational politics may be associated with lower levels of job satisfaction and organizational commitment.

Method

Participants

Two thousand questionnaires were distributed to regular members, civilian members, and public servants of the Royal Canadian Mounted Police (RCMP) in Ottawa. The response rate was 25% (501 usable questionnaires were returned). Of the total sample, 74% ($n=369$) were male, and 26% ($n=130$) were female (2 cases unclassified).

The mean ages of male and female participants were 43.2 ($SD=7.3$) and 40.5 ($SD=8.5$) years, respectively. The average number of years that males were employed in their present occupation within the RCMP was 8.5 ($SD=8.3$). For females, the mean number of years was 4.0 ($SD=4.9$). Additional biographical data about participants, stratified by gender, are provided in Table 2.

Measures

Agentic/Communal Employment Role. Three independent raters (i.e., two graduate students and one undergraduate) received detailed descriptions of participants'

Table 2

Biographical Profile of Sample, in percentages (N=501)

<i>Characteristic</i>	<i>Males</i> (n=369)	<i>Females</i> (n=130)
Race		
Caucasian	97	95
African-Canadians	0	0
Asian	1	1
First Nations	1	2
Other	1	2
Education		
Grade School	1	2
High School Graduate	18	28
Attended College	16	15
College Diploma	9	17
Attended University	25	11
Undergraduate Degree	21	16
Attended Graduate School	4	2
Master's Degree	4	6
Advanced Degree (e.g., PhD)	1	1
Other Forms of Certification	1	2
Employment Category		
Regular Member	72	21
Civilian Member	21	33
Public Servant	7	46
Salary		
20,000-29,999	3	28
30,000-39,999	7	27
40,000-49,999	7	24
50,000-59,999	37	14
60,000-69,999	31	5
70,000-79,999	9	1
80,000-89,999	2	0
90,000-99,999	2	0
>100,000	1	0

Note: Two cases could not be classified for gender

occupations. These descriptions were prepared by the organization design and job evaluation division of the RCMP. A short-form version of the Personal Attributes Questionnaire (PAQ) (Spence & Helmreich, 1978) was included with each description. The PAQ was used because its masculinity (M) and femininity (F) subscales denote clusters of adjectival descriptors that may be conceptualized as agentic and communal, respectively (Spence & Helmreich, 1978). Each subscale consists of 8 items and, in the present study, uses a five-point semantic differential scale. Scores on the M and F subscales can range from 8 to 40, with higher scores denoting greater levels of agency and communion, respectively. A copy of the PAQ is provided in Appendix C.

The independent raters were instructed to read each job description. For each job description, they were asked to identify, using the PAQ, the kinds of characteristics that they believed were needed to be competent in that job. This instruction was provided to ensure that job traits were not assessed in terms of the characteristics of the sex of the typical job holder, but rather were assessed in terms of the characteristics associated with job tasks.

For each rater, occupations receiving a higher score on the M subscale than on the F subscale were categorized as agentic. Occupations receiving a higher score on the F subscale than on the M subscale were categorized as communal. Occupations were considered to be neutral if they were assigned the same score on both the M and F subscales¹⁷. For each rater, occupations were then coded as 0 (communal) or 1 (agentic).

17

In the present study, one occupation was rated as neutral by one rater. However, the other two raters saw it as being communal. Thus, using the coding system identified

The classifications provided by each rater were then summed for each occupation. Any occupation having a total score equal to or greater than two was classified as agentic, whereas any occupation having a total score less than two was classified as communal.

Hierarchical Level. Initially, this variable was operationalized in terms of participants' managerial/non-managerial status. However, due to an excessive amount of missing data, this indicator could not be used. Consequently, hierarchical level was defined in terms of participants' salary¹⁸. Sypher and Sypher (1983) contend that this variable serves as a useful indicator of hierarchical level.

Job Autonomy. This construct was measured using the Job Autonomy Scale (JAS), a subscale of the Job Characteristics Inventory (Sims, Szilagyi, & Keller, 1976). The JAS measures the extent to which employees believe they have substantial input over scheduling their work and determining work-related procedures. It contains six items (e.g., "How much are you left on your own to do your own work?"). For three of these items, the following five-point Likert-type response scale is used (1=never; 5=very often). For the remaining items, the response scale is 1=my job gives me a minimum amount; 5=my job gives me a maximum amount. Total scores are computed by summing the six items. Scores can range from 6 to 30, with higher scores denoting greater levels of perceived job autonomy. Sims and associates used principal components factor analysis to

above, it was classified as communal.

¹⁸

In comparison to dichotomous classifications of hierarchical level (e.g., management/non-management), salary may serve as a more sensitive indicator because it was measured using a 9-point scale.

assess the construct validity of the JAS, a method recommended by Carmines and Zeller (1979). Results indicated that items from the JAS loaded on a factor distinct from factors corresponding to other subscales of the Job Characteristics Inventory (e.g., job variety, task identity, etc.). Therefore, one may conclude that items from the JAS delineate the same underlying construct. A recent meta-analytic assessment of the Job Characteristics Inventory revealed that the job autonomy subscale is psychometrically robust. Results indicated that the median alpha coefficient for this subscale was .84 (Fried, 1991). Also, as hypothesized, findings from the reviewed studies indicated that employees' perceptions of job autonomy were positively correlated with their job performance and levels of work satisfaction.

Perceptions of Organizational Politics. This variable was measured using the Perceptions of Organizational Politics Scale (POPS) (Ferris & Kacmar, 1992). It contains 31 items (e.g., "Generally, people who have left this organization did so because they realized that just working hard was not enough to get ahead"), and uses a five-point Likert-type response scale (1=strongly disagree; 5=strongly agree). Seven of the items are reverse keyed. Total scores can range from 31 to 155, with higher scores denoting perceptions of greater political activity. Research suggests that the scale is reliable ($\alpha = .91$) and valid (Ferris & Kacmar, 1992). To assess the construct validity of the POPS, the authors hypothesized that perceptions of organizational politics correlate negatively with job satisfaction, perceived opportunities for promotion and job autonomy. These hypotheses were confirmed. A more recent investigation also demonstrates that the POPS is psychometrically robust (Gilmore, Ferris, Dulebohn, & Harrell-Cook, 1996). In

this study, the scale's alpha coefficient was .91. The authors also provide additional evidence supporting the construct validity of the POPS. Specifically, a multiple regression analysis was conducted in which perceptions of organizational politics and length of time that employees had worked for their immediate supervisor served as predictor variables and employee attendance served as the criterion measure. As hypothesized, the interaction between the predictor variables accounted for a significant increment in criterion variance. When employees' tenure was low (as measured by the number of months they had worked for their present supervisor), perceptions of organizational politics were positively associated with absenteeism. Thus, "newcomers [may] react negatively to the uncertainties associated with politics and [may] reduce their exposure to this stressor by being absent more often" (p. 486). However, when employees' organizational tenure was lengthy, no relationship was found between perceived levels of political activity and absenteeism. It should be noted that the authors statistically controlled for the nature of employees' working relationship with their supervisor.

Political Behaviour. Self-reported use of political activity in organizations was assessed with the Political Activity Scale (PAS) developed in Study 1. The PAS contains 18 vignettes, each of which provides an example of organizational politics. Respondents indicate how often they engage in the behaviour outlined in each scenario (1=I never engage in this behaviour; 4=I often engage in this behaviour). Results from Study 1 demonstrated that the PAS contains two internally consistent subscales. The first subscale contains 11 vignettes and reflects other-directed political behaviour (i.e., behaviour that involves employees other than the political actor). Scores on the first subscale can range

from 11 to 44, with higher scores denoting greater political activity. Cronbach's alpha for this subscale was .81. The second subscale of the PAS contains 7 items, and appears to measure more duplicitous forms of political activity. Scores on the second subscale can range from 7 to 28, with higher scores reflecting greater levels of political activity. Results from Study 1 suggest that this subscale is reliable (Cronbach's alpha=.73). The intercorrelation between these subscales was .45, $p < .001$.

Formalization In the present study, the Formalization Scale (FS; Oldham & Hackman, 1981) was used to measure the extent to which participants believe that their department's rules, policies, and work procedures are officially specified. It contains 5 items (e.g., "There is a formal orientation programme for most new members of the department") and uses a five-point Likert-type response scale (1=very inaccurate; 5=very accurate). Summed total scores can range from 5 to 25, with higher scores representing greater levels of formalization. Research suggests that the FS is reliable ($\alpha = .75$) (Ferris et al., 1996a). Oldman and Hackman (1981) investigated the construct validity of the FS by testing relationships proposed by the attraction-selection framework. This framework maintains that organizations with specific structural characteristics attract and/or recruit employees with particular dispositional characteristics (e.g., being male, older, etc.). In accordance with previous research, it was hypothesized that female employees would obtain higher scores on the FS than male employees and that younger employees would obtain higher scores on the FS than older employees (i.e., females and younger employees would be more likely than males and older employees to work in highly formalized organizations). These hypotheses were confirmed. A recent study by Ferris et al. (1996a)

further attests to the validity of the FS. The authors posited that a negative relationship would exist between formalization, as measured by the FS, and perceptions of both organizational politics and control over the work environment. These hypotheses were confirmed.

Work Locus of Control Respondents' perceived control in work settings was assessed with Spector's (1988) Work Locus of Control Scale (WLCS). The WLCS contains 16 items (e.g., "Promotions are usually a matter of good fortune") and, in the present investigation, uses a five-point Likert-type response scale (1=strongly disagree; 5=strongly agree). Eight of the items are reverse keyed. Summed total scores can range from 16 to 80, with higher scores signifying an external work locus of control. Research suggests that the WLCS is reliable (α s range from .75 to .85) and possesses criterion-related validity (i.e., it correlates with Rotter's I-E scale which measures global locus of control) (Spector, 1988). To assess the construct validity of the WLCS, Spector (1988) tested a number of hypotheses. These included: a) participants with an internal work locus of control are more satisfied with their jobs than their external counterparts; b) externality is positively associated with perceived role strain; and c) participants with an internal work locus of control report higher levels of job autonomy than their external counterparts. These hypotheses were confirmed. More recent assessments of the WLCS further attest to its psychometric soundness. Blau (1993) reported an alpha coefficient of .80 and Macan, Trusty, and Trimble (1996) produced averaged alpha coefficients of .87 (sample 1), .79 (sample 2) and .79 (sample 3). In addition, Blau (1993) hypothesized that participants with an internal work locus of control would be more likely than their external

counterparts to engage in “initiative behaviour” (i.e., behaviours in which the employee exceeds basic job requirements). It also was hypothesized that participants with an external work locus of control would be more likely than their internal counterparts to engage in “compliant behaviour” (i.e., behaviours prescribed by job requirements). Both hypotheses were confirmed. Finally, as predicted, Macan et al. (1996) found that participants with an external work locus of control evidenced lower levels of career satisfaction and organizational commitment than their internal counterparts.

Machiavellianism The gender neutral version of the Mach IV (Zook & Sipps, 1986) was used to measure the belief that persuasive, manipulative behaviour assists in the attainment of personal goals. It contains 20 items (e.g., “The best way to handle people is to tell them what they want to hear”) and, in the present study, uses a five-point Likert-type response scale (1=strongly disagree; 5=strongly agree) (Drake, 1995). Summed total scores can range from 20 to 100, with higher scores denoting greater Machiavellian tendencies. The scale possesses adequate internal consistency ($\alpha = .79$; Gable & Dangelo, 1994) and test-retest reliability ($r = .76$; Zook & Sipps, 1986). Mudrack (1993) assessed the construct validity of the Mach IV by examining whether Machiavellians would be more likely than their non-Machiavellian counterparts to perceive organizational behaviour of an uncertain ethical nature as acceptable (e.g., “Staying in the most expensive hotel on a company business trip”). This hypothesis was confirmed. The construct validity of the Mach IV was further substantiated by Christoffersen and Stamp (1995). As predicted, these researchers found that Machiavellianism was positively associated with nonpathological manifestations of paranoia, as measured by Fenigstein and Venable’s

(1992) Paranoia Scale.

Need for Power Steers and Braunstein's (1976) Dominance subscale (DS) from the Manifest Needs Questionnaire was used to examine participants' need for power. The DS contains 5 items (e.g., "I seek an active role in the leadership of a group") and uses a five-point Likert-type scale (1=never; 5=always). Summed total scores can range from 5 to 25, with higher scores denoting greater need for power. Research suggests that the DS possesses satisfactory internal consistency ($\alpha = .74$ - Kirchmeyer, 1990). To assess the construct validity of this measure, Steers and Braunstein posited, in accordance with previous research, that individuals' scores on the DS would correlate positively with their tendency to assume leadership positions within a group and to adopt a "major role" in determining group performance. These hypotheses were confirmed. As predicted, the authors also found that need for power was positively associated with a number of leadership abilities including persuasiveness and self-confidence.

Right-wing Authoritarianism Duncan, Peterson, and Winter's (1997) short-form version of Altemeyer's (1988) Right-Wing Authoritarianism scale was used to measure this construct. The modified version of the RWA contains 12 items (e.g., "The real keys to the 'good life' are obedience, discipline, and sticking to the straight and narrow") and, in the present study, uses a five-point Likert-type scale (1=strongly disagree; 5=strongly agree). Summed total scores can range from 12 to 60, with higher scores representing greater levels of right-wing authoritarianism. Duncan et al.'s (1997) modified version possesses adequate reliability ($\alpha = .84$). The authors also provide evidence attesting to the construct validity of this scale. As hypothesized, scores on the revised RWA were

correlated negatively with participants' self-identification as feminist and with their self-reported participation in a pro-choice rally, but were positively associated with acceptance of traditional gender-roles.

Job Satisfaction Participants' feelings of job satisfaction were assessed using the general subscale of the Job Descriptive Index (JDI) (Smith, Kendall, & Hulin, 1969). The general subscale contains 17 adjectives or short descriptive statements that measure satisfaction with one's job in general. This subscale uses a yes/no format, with higher scores denoting higher levels of satisfaction. Ferris et al. (1996a) report that this subscale possesses a high level of internal consistency (Cronbach's $\alpha=.94$). The authors also provide evidence attesting to the construct validity of this measure. As hypothesized, Ferris and associates reported that scores on the general job satisfaction subscale were negatively correlated with job anxiety, and positively associated with advancement opportunity, control over one's work environment, and satisfaction with present supervision.

Organizational Climate This construct was measured using Taylor and Bower's (1972) Survey of Organizational Climate (SOC). It contains 12 items (e.g., "To what extent is the organization generally quick to use improved work methods?") and uses a five-point Likert-type response format (1=to a very little extent; 5=to a very great extent). Higher scores denote perceptions of a more favourable organizational climate. Momtahan (1995) reports that the scale is internally consistent (i.e., Cronbach's $\alpha=.92$ and $.88$ for samples of pharmacy and nursing staff, respectively). The author also provides evidence which suggests that the SOC possesses construct validity. As hypothesized, scores on the

SOC correlated positively with perceived organizational support and with the affective and continuance dimensions of organizational commitment.

Organizational Commitment Respondents' commitment to their organization was assessed using Allen and Meyer's (1990) organizational commitment scale (OC). The OC measures three dimensions of organizational commitment: affective (i.e., the employee's emotional attachment to, identification with, and involvement in the organization); normative (i.e., the employee's feelings of obligation to remain with the organization); and continuance (i.e., the costs the employee associates with leaving his or her organization) (Dunham, Grube, & Castaneda, 1994). The OC contains 24 items (eight items per dimension) and, in the present study, uses a five-point Likert-type scale (1=strongly disagree; 5=strongly agree). Examples of affective, normative, and continuance items are (in order): I would be very happy to spend the rest of my career with this organization; I think that people these days move from company to company too often; and I feel that I have too few options to consider leaving this organization. Summed total scores can range from 24 to 120, with higher scores representing greater levels of organizational commitment. Research suggests that the OC is reliable (α s = .74-.87 affective subscale; .67-.78 normative subscale; .73-.81 continuance subscale) (Dunham et al., 1994). As well, the construct validity of the OC has been demonstrated. For example, Allen and Meyer (1990) found that the three dimensions of organizational commitment correlated in the anticipated direction with variables such as job challenge and the extent to which employees were able to participate in decisions regarding their own work.

Employees' Career Success Three indicators of career success were obtained

including job level, number of promotions with current employer, and number of promotions with previous employers. These measures have been used in research investigating the relationship between political influence behaviour and career success (Judge & Bretz, 1994). Principal components factor analysis suggested that the item, number of promotions with previous employers, did not load on the same factor as the other two measures, and so was not considered further. A composite measure of career success was created by converting the measures job level and number of promotions with current employer into Z scores, and then summing these scores ($r=.55$).

Demographic Information Respondents were asked to indicate their sex, age, ethnicity, and educational level.

Response Bias The proposed study investigates a sensitive topic in which participants' may be reluctant to provide truthful responses. Furthermore, positively worded scales such as the PAS are being used. Thus, it is imperative that biases such as social desirability and acquiescence be investigated (Kumar & Beyerlein, 1991).

Participants' tendency to respond in a socially desirable manner was assessed using Reynolds' (1982) short-form version of the Marlowe-Crowne Social Desirability Scale (M-C SDS). This version contains 13 items (e.g., "No matter who I'm talking to, I'm always a good listener") and uses a true/false response format. Five items are reverse keyed. Scores can range from 13 to 26, with higher scores denoting greater social desirability bias. Research suggests that this version is reliable ($r_{kr20}=.76$) and possesses criterion-related validity (i.e., it correlates with the long-form version of the M-C SDS) (Reynolds, 1982). Research by Zook and Sipps (1985) also suggests that Reynold's

(1982) version possesses construct validity. In accordance with previous research, the authors hypothesized that male and female participants would not differ in their scores on the short-form M-C SDS. This hypothesis was confirmed.

Couch and Keniston's (1960) Agreement Response Scale (ARS) was used to identify respondents' tendency to agree or disagree with questionnaire items regardless of their content. The short-form version of the ARS contains 15 items and, in the present study, uses a five-point Likert-type scale (1=strongly disagree; 5=strongly agree). Scores can range from 15 to 75. Low scores denote a nay-saying response set (i.e., the tendency to disagree with items, irrespective of their content) whereas high scores represent a yea-saying response set (i.e., the tendency to agree with items, regardless of content).

Research suggests that the scale is reliable (split-half reliabilities ranged from .72 to .86) (Couch & Keniston, 1960). The criterion-related validity of the ARS was examined by correlating participants' responses on this scale with their tendency to agree or disagree with a 360-item instrument measuring a variety of psychological domains (e.g., optimism-pessimism, trust-distrust, rationalism-religiousness, etc.). The authors maintain that the diversity of content on this 360-item measure means that computing a total score "makes no psychological sense" (p. 153). Thus, high or low scores reflect a response set. With all items being scored in a positive direction, the authors observed that responses on the ARS correlated significantly with responses on this measure.

Procedure

Questionnaires were distributed to 2000 RCMP personnel located primarily in the Ottawa area. Copies of the survey were provided in both French and English (see

Appendices D and E), and were distributed by internal mail. Participants were informed that the questionnaire would take approximately one hour to complete and that its purpose was to investigate a variety of work-related attitudes and behaviours including job satisfaction, organizational commitment, and career success. Participants were instructed to return completed questionnaires to drop sites located in targeted RCMP buildings. Ethical concerns regarding informed consent were satisfied by use of a cover sheet which indicated that participation was strictly voluntary and that all responses would be anonymous and confidential. Debriefing sheets were distributed to participants when they returned questionnaires at the drop sites.

As an incentive to complete the questionnaire, the cover sheet indicated that participants could enter a “dinner for two” contest. To safeguard the anonymity of participants’ responses, a special coding scheme was employed, the details of which are presented in Appendix D.

The initial response rate was unacceptable (5%; N=109); thus, the researcher went to each site for a period of two to three days in an attempt to increase participation in the study. The researcher was assigned a location in a high traffic area of each site. Passersby were encouraged to return their questionnaire and to remind fellow employees to do likewise. These on-site visits produced a final response rate of 25% (N=501). This response rate is comparable to rates reported by other researchers investigating organizational politics (Zhou & Ferris, 1995). The present study’s response rate may appear low; however, Kerlinger (1986) reports that returns of less than 40% are not uncommon in survey research. The response rate also is not surprising given the length of

time required to complete the questionnaire (approximately one hour) (Ransdell, 1996). The researcher had no way of determining whether those who agreed to participate in the study differed systematically from those who refused. Thus, it should not be assumed that the sample used in the present investigation was representative of RCMP employees in the Ottawa area.

Results

It should be noted that missing data did not appear to be problematic in the present study. Specifically, the proportion of data missing for the key variables ranged from <1.0% (job autonomy) to 8.4% (perceptions of organizational politics). These proportions are well below the norm for a survey of this length (see Levine, Smolak, Moodey, Shuman, & Hessen, 1994). However, if a participant missed a given item on one of the scales the value for that item was replaced by the mean response given by other participants to that item.

Dimensionality of the Political Activity Scale

Participants' self-reported use of the political behaviours described in the Political Activity Scale were factor analysed in an attempt to replicate the two dimensional factor solution obtained in Study 1. Maximum likelihood estimation with a forced two-factor solution was used. The chi-square/degrees of freedom ratio was greater than 2.0, which suggests that a two factor model does not provide adequate fit. Also, inspection of the unrotated factor matrices revealed that all items on the PAS (with one exception) had their highest loading on the first factor. Thus, in Study 2, the PAS appeared to be best represented as a unidimensional scale. The eigenvalue for this factor was 5.54, which

accounted for 30.8% of the total variance.

Comrey (1973 as cited in Tabchnick & Fidell, 1989) contends that the present sample size (N=501) is “excellent” for the purpose of factor analysis. Thus, the author considers the factor analytic results obtained in Study 2 were considered to provide a more reliable estimate of the true dimensionality of the PAS than the results obtained in Study 1. The factor loadings for the PAS are presented in Table 3.

Scale Reliabilities, Descriptive Statistics, and Intercorrelations

Alpha coefficients, means and standard deviations for all scales are presented in Table 4. Levels of internal consistency were satisfactory, with the possible exceptions of the Formalization Scale ($\alpha=.64$), the Right-wing Authoritarianism Scale ($\alpha=.65$), and the Normative Commitment subscale of the Organizational Commitment Scale ($\alpha=.65$). Confidence intervals (95%) were examined to determine whether participants’ mean scores differed from scale mid-points. With respect to perceptions and self-reported use of organizational politics, the confidence interval for scores on the Perceptions of Organizational Politics Scale also encompassed the midpoint. However, scores on the Political Activity Scale were below the mid-point suggesting that participants appeared to engage in low levels of political activity. For the situational variables, formalization and organizational climate, confidence intervals suggested that participants saw their workplace as highly formalized and their organizational climate as slightly unfavourable. Confidence intervals for the dispositional variables indicated that participants possessed an internal work locus of control, were low in Machiavellianism and high in need for power. Participants’ scores on the measure of right-wing authoritarianism encompassed the scale

Table 3
Rotated Factor Loadings of the Political Activity Scale (Study 2; N=501)

<i>Item</i>	<i>Factor 1</i>	<i>Item-Total Correlations</i>
Pretend to be interested in the personal life of others.	.45	.43
Act as a “model” employee when others are present.	.53	.49
Issue compliments on personal appearance even when they are not warranted.	.48	.46
Not fully commit yourself until you know which side is “winning”.	.50	.47
Praise others on their accomplishments even when you don’t think the accomplishments are very impressive.	.42	.40
Develop strong allies.	.64	.59
Use information to overwhelm others.	.54	.49
Associate with influential people.	.63	.57
Selectively delay work for specific gain.	.56	.51
Make sure you have the right image.	.59	.53
Use personal relationships with others.	.54	.50
Get others to emphasize your importance to the organization.	.61	.56
Get an expert to support your position .	.54	.48
Help others in order to get their help later.	.48	.45
Make others aware of your accomplishments.	.52	.47
Make a rival look bad.	.40	.38
Support the opinions of others, even when you disagree with them.	.26	.26
Withhold information.	.50	.46

Table 4
Scale reliabilities, means, and standard deviations for key variables

Scale (# of items; possible range)	<u>M</u>	<u>SD</u>	Mid-point	95% CI	Alpha
Perceptions of Organizational Politics (31; 31-155)	92.5	16.9	93	90.9, 94.0	.88
Political Activity (18; 18-72)	31.5	7.3	45	30.9, 32.3	.86
Job Autonomy (6; 6-30)	24.1	4.0	18	23.6, 24.4	.81
Formalization (5; 5-25)	20.4	3.7	15	20.1, 20.8	.64
Organizational Climate (12; 12-60)	33.5	8.1	36	32.8, 34.4	.91
Work Locus of Control (16; 16-80)	40.0	8.9	48	38.7, 40.3	.82
Machiavellianism (20; 20-100)	50.1	8.8	60	49.4, 51.0	.73
Need for Power (5; 5-25)	20.5	4.9	15	20.1, 21.0	.76
Right-wing Authoritarianism (12; 12-60)	36.0	5.9	36	35.5, 36.6	.65
Job Satisfaction (17; 17-51)	44.0	7.6	34	43.3, 44.7	.92
Affective Organizational Commitment (8; 8-40)	26.1	6.9	24	25.4, 26.7	.80
Normative Organizational Commitment (8; 8-40)	23.2	5.0	24	22.6, 23.5	.65
Continuance Organizational Commitment (8; 8-40)	28.1	6.6	24	27.4, 28.7	.75

mid-point demonstrating that they appeared to be neither high nor low on this construct. On the outcome measures of job satisfaction and organizational commitment, participants' scores on measures of general job satisfaction and affective and continuance commitment were above the mid-point, suggesting greater levels of each construct. However, scores on a measure of normative commitment were below the mid-point.

Intercorrelations among key variables are presented in Table 5. Given the large sample size, only zero-order correlations that possessed practical significance were discussed (i.e., $r^2 = .10$ or greater). An inspection of this table suggests that perceptions of organizational politics were correlated negatively with formalization and organizational climate. Participants who perceived greater levels of political activity viewed their organization as less formalized and the climate as less favourable. With respect to the dispositional variables, respondents with an external work locus of control tended to view their organization as more political as did those who evidenced higher levels of Machiavellianism. The remaining dispositional variables (need for power and right-wing authoritarianism) did not meaningfully correlate with perceptions of organizational politics. Finally, perceptions of organizational politics were negatively correlated with the outcome measures of job satisfaction and affective organizational commitment. That is, respondents who viewed their workplace as political were less satisfied and less committed. Perceptions of organizational politics did not meaningfully correlate with continuance or normative organizational commitment. As well, perceptions of organizational politics did not correlate meaningfully with hierarchical level (i.e., salary) or job autonomy.

Table 5
Intercorrelations Among Key Variables

Variable	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16
1. Perceptions of Organizational Politics	-															
2. Political Activity	.15	-														
3. Job Autonomy	-.23	-.12	-													
4. Salary	-.20	.02	.14	-												
5. Formalization	-.34	-.12	.11	.14	-											
6. Organizational Climate	-.62	-.04	.27	.21	.38	-										
7. Machiavellianism	.46	.25	-.21	-.16	-.23	-.40	-									
8. Need for Power	-.10	.28	.13	.29	-.01	.10	-.01	-								
9. Right-wing Authoritarianism	-.01	-.01	-.03	-.10	.03	.05	-.01	-.06	-							
10. Work Locus of Control	.58	.04	-.18	-.19	-.24	-.50	.44	-.19	.03	-						
11. Job Descriptive Index	-.45	-.02	.30	.19	.25	.43	-.30	.10	.03	-.41	-					
12. Affective Organizational Commitment	-.47	.01	.18	.28	.22	.55	-.34	.19	.04	-.42	.49	-				
13. Continuance Organizational Commitment	.08	.05	-.09	-.20	.00	-.11	.13	-.15	.06	.21	-.10	.03	-			
14. Normative Organizational Commitment	-.16	-.04	.05	.12	.12	.30	-.19	.07	.22	-.13	.25	.49	.08	-		
15. Career Success	-.24	-.07	.23	.34	.13	.30	-.21	.11	-.09	-.17	.16	.21	-.17	.08	-	
16. Social Desirability	-.07	-.31	.12	-.10	.07	.08	-.24	-.15	.13	-.07	.17	.07	-.01	.13	.07	-

Note: Correlations between .09 and .119, $p < .05$; correlations .12 or higher, $p < .01$. Coefficients in bold possess practical significance ($r^2 = .10$ or more)
Pair-wise deletion was used; thus, n s range from 442 to 501.

Self-reported political activity did not meaningfully correlate with the situational, dispositional, or outcome measures examined in this study.

Differences Associated with Agentic Versus Communal Employment Roles

Salary and Job Autonomy. In the present study, it was hypothesized that agentic employment roles¹⁹ are characterized by higher hierarchical levels (operationally defined as self-reported annual salary) and higher levels of job autonomy than communal employment roles. One-way analyses of variance were conducted on each of these variables to investigate whether differences existed as a function of participants' employment role.

As predicted, agentic employment roles reflected higher hierarchical levels, as measured by self-reported salary ($M=4.29^{20}$, $SD=1.33$), than communal employment roles ($M=1.54$, $SD=.78$, $F(1,464)=271.31$, $p<.001$ ($d=1.53^{21}$, $r^2=.37$). Contrary to what was predicted, participants in agentic ($M=23.96$, $SD=4.07$) and communal ($M=24.45$, $SD=3.24$) employment roles did not differ in their level of job autonomy, $F(1,470)=.89$, ns ($d=.09$, $r^2<.01$).

Perceptions of Organizational Politics. It was hypothesized that participants in

¹⁹

The proportions of participants in agentic and communal employment roles were 80% ($n=403$) and 14% ($n=69$), respectively. Approximately 6% of participants were in occupations that could not be classified as either agentic or communal.

²⁰

Participants' indicated their annual salary on a nine-point scale (1=20,000-29,999; 5=60,000-69,999; 9=100,000-149,999). While technically not an interval scale, to the extent that it is, at least, ordinal, the F-test is robust with respect to this violation.

²¹

Effect size was calculated using the formula for Cohen's d (Wolf, 1986). The d to r transformation formula recommended by Carson, Schriesheim, and Kinicki (1990) was used to produce an r^2 .

agentic employment roles would be less likely than those in communal employment roles to perceive the workplace as political. A one-way ANOVA revealed that participants in agentic ($M=92.18$, $SD=17.01$) and communal ($M=94.61$, $SD=15.99$) employment roles did not differ in their perceptions of organizational politics $F(1,470)=1.22$, ns ($d=.10$; $r^2<.01$).

Self-reported Use of Organizational Politics. It was hypothesized that participants in agentic employment roles would be more likely than those in communal employment roles to engage in organizational politics. As scores on the Political Activity Scale correlated significantly with scores on the Marlowe-Crowne Social Desirability Scale ($r=-.31$, $p<.01$), an analysis of covariance (ANCOVA)²² was conducted. Social desirability served as the covariate, and agentic/communal employment role and self-reported political behaviour served as the independent and dependent variables, respectively. The results of this analysis revealed that agentic ($M=31.84$, $SD=7.36$) and communal ($M=30.36$, $SD=7.08$) participants did not differ in their self-reported use of organizational politics, $F(1,469)=.92$, ns ($d=.004$; $r^2<.01$).

Situational Determinants of Organizational Politics

Perceptions of Organizational Politics. Multiple regression analysis²³ was used to

²²

The absence of a significant interaction between employment role (IV) and social desirability (covariate) suggests that the homogeneity of regression coefficients assumption was not violated. As well, the absolute value of standardized residuals did not exceed 3 which suggests that the data were normally distributed.

²³

For all multiple regression analyses, zero-order correlations were inspected for multicollinearity. All correlation coefficients were below .90; therefore, variable redundancy did not appear to be of concern (Tabachnick & Fidell, 1989). The variance

examine the predictive relationship of agentic/communal employment role, and the situational variables of organizational climate and formalization to perceptions of organizational politics.

To control for the inflated Type 1 error that results from performing a number of multiple regressions on the same data set, a conservative alpha was used ($p < .001$) for R^2 change and for determining the significance of predictor variables. In addition, any multiple regression with an adjusted R^2 value $< .05$ was not considered meaningful (i.e., the regression output would possess a low level of practical significance).

Hierarchical multiple regression was used to investigate the relationship of the aforementioned variables to perceptions of organizational politics. This regression consisted of three steps. In step one, employment role (agentic/communal) was entered. In step two, organizational climate and formalization were entered. Consistent with theoretical expectations, in step three, the interactions between agentic/communal employment role and organizational climate and agentic/communal employment role and formalization were entered.

Table 6 presents the zero-order correlations, the unstandardized betas, the standardized regression coefficients, and the semipartial correlations for each step of the regression. When the interaction terms were entered in the final step, these terms were

inflation factor for all main effect predictors also was less than 10, which indicated an absence of multicollinearity (Stevens, 1992). There were no influential outliers (i.e., Cook's distance did not exceed an absolute value of 1.0). As well, the Durbin-Watson test revealed that autocorrelation among residuals was not problematic. Finally, standardized and studentized residuals approximated an absolute value of 3.0 which suggested that residuals were normally distributed.

Table 6

**Hierarchical Multiple Regression Analysis for the Effects of Employment Role
and Situational Variables on Perceptions of Organizational Politics.**

<i>Criterion Measure: Perceptions of Organizational Politics</i>	<i>r</i>	<i>b</i>	β	<i>sr</i> ²
Step One: Employment Role	.05	1.21	.05	.00
Step Two: Organizational Climate	-.63*	-1.21	-.58*	.29*
Formalization	-.33	-.50	-.11	.01
Step Three: Employment Role X Organizational Climate	.21	.08	.11	.00
Employment Role X Formalization	.13	.17	.15	.00

*p<.001

both found to be nonsignificant ($F(2,466) = .56$, ns; $R^2_{cha} = .00$). Variance from these terms was, therefore, pooled with the error variance, and the main effects were tested against this pooled error term. The final main effects model was significant ($F(3,468) = 105.74$; $p < .001$, $R^2_{adj} = .40$). While employment role continued to be nonsignificant ($F(1, 468) = 2.03$, ns, $sr^2 = .00$), the situational variables contributed unique explained variability in perceptions of organizational politics ($F(2, 468) = 157.90$; $p < .001$; $R^2_{cha} = .40$). Examination of the regression coefficients suggests that when both organizational climate and formalization were considered only organizational climate uniquely predicted perceptions of organizational politics ($\beta = -.58$; $p < .001$; $sr^2 = .29$). The direction of the standardized regression coefficient suggests that the less favourable the organizational climate was perceived to be, the more likely one was to perceive the workplace as political. While formalization did have a significant zero-order correlation with the POPS ($r = -.34$, $p < .001$), this relationship appeared to be redundant with the variance explained by organizational climate.

Self-reported Use of Organizational Politics. Hierarchical multiple regression was used to examine the predictive relationship between agentic/communal employment role, and the situational variables of organizational climate and formalization to self-reported use of organizational politics.

The hierarchical regression consisted of four steps. Due to its significant correlation with self-reported use of organizational politics, scores on the social desirability scale were entered in step one to covary out this bias. In step two, agentic/communal employment role was entered. In step three, formalization and

organizational climate were entered. Consistent with theoretical expectations, in step four, the interactions between agentic/communal employment role and organizational climate and agentic/communal employment role and formalization were entered.

Table 7 presents the zero-order correlations, the unstandardized betas, the standardized regression coefficients, and the semipartial correlations for each step of the regression. When the interaction terms were entered in the final step, these terms were both found to be nonsignificant ($F(2,465) = .29$, ns; $R^2_{cha} = .00$). The variance from these terms was pooled with the error variance, and the main effects were tested against this pooled error term. The final main effects model was nonsignificant ($F(3,467) = 2.58$, ns, $R^2_{cha} = .01$). Neither employment role ($\beta = -.04$, ns), organizational climate ($\beta = .03$, ns), nor formalization ($\beta = -.12$, ns) emerged as significant.

Dispositional Determinants of Organizational Politics

Perceptions of Organizational Politics. Hierarchical multiple regression was used to examine the predictive relationship between the dispositional variables (Machiavellianism, need for power, right-wing authoritarianism, and work locus of control) to perceptions of organizational politics. Employment role was included as a predictor to explore interactions with these dispositional variables on perceptions of organizational politics.

The hierarchical regression consisted of three steps. In step one, agentic/communal role was entered. In step two, Machiavellianism, need for power, right-wing authoritarianism, and work locus of control were entered. In step three, the interactions between agentic/communal employment role and each of the dispositional

Table 7

Hierarchical Multiple Regression Analysis for the Effects of Employment Role
and Situational Variables on Self-reported Use of Organizational Politics.

<i>Criterion Measure: Use of Organizational Politics</i>	<i>r</i>	<i>b</i>	β	<i>sr</i> ²
Step One:				
Social Desirability	-.30*	-.78	-.30*	.09
Step Two:				
Employment Role	-.07	-.44	-.04	.00
Step Two:				
Organizational Climate	-.04	.03	.03	.00
Formalization	-.14	-.25	-.12	.01
Step Three:				
Employment Role X Organizational Climate	-.05	.03	.11	.00
Employment Role X Formalization	-.05	-.07	-.15	.00

* $p < .001$

variables were entered.

Table 8 presents the zero-order correlations, the unstandardized betas, the standardized regression coefficients, and the semipartial correlations for each step of the regression. When the interaction terms were entered in the final step, all terms were found to be nonsignificant ($F(4, 462)=.23$, ns; $R^2_{cha}=.00$). The variance from these terms was, therefore, pooled with the error variance, and the main effects were tested against this pooled error term. The final main effects model was significant ($F(5, 466)=62.10$; $p<.001$, $R^2_{adj}=.39$). While employment role continued to be nonsignificant ($F(1,466)=2.00$; ns, $r^2=.00$), the dispositional variables contributed unique explained variability in perceptions of organizational politics ($F(4, 466)=77.59$, $p<.001$; $R^2_{cha}=.40$). Examination of the regression coefficients suggests that when Machiavellianism, right-wing authoritarianism, need for power and work locus of control were considered, only Machiavellianism ($\beta=.24$, $p<.001$; $sr^2=.05$) and work locus of control ($\beta=.49$, $p<.001$; $sr^2=.18$) uniquely predicted perceptions of organizational politics. The direction of the standardized regression coefficients suggests that participants evidencing higher levels of Machiavellianism and possessing an external work locus of control were more likely to perceive the workplace as political.

Self-reported Use of Organizational Politics.

Hierarchical multiple regression also was used to examine the predictive relationship between the dispositional variables (Machiavellianism, need for power, right-wing authoritarianism, and work locus of control) to self-reported use of organizational

Table 8

**Hierarchical Multiple Regression Analysis for the Effects of Employment Role
and Dispositional Variables on Perceptions of Organizational Politics.**

<i>Criterion Measure: Perceptions of Organizational Politics</i>	<i>r</i>	<i>b</i>	β	<i>sr</i> ²
Step One:				
Employment Role	.05	1.21	.05	.00
Step Two:				
Machiavellianism	.46*	.47	.24*	.05
Need for Power	-.10	-.03	-.01	.00
Right-wing Authoritarianism	-.00	-.08	-.03	.00
Work Locus of Control	.59*	.92	.49*	.18
Step Three:				
Employment Role X Machiavellianism	-.05	-.02	-.04	.00
Employment Role X Need for Power	.07	.03	.03	.00
Employment Role X Right-wing Authoritarianism	.04	-.10	-.15	.00
Employment Role X Work Locus of Control	-.09	.10	.17	.00

* $p < .001$

politics.

The hierarchical regression consisted of four steps. In step one, social desirability bias was covaried out. In step two, agentic/communal employment role was entered. In step three, Machiavellianism, need for power, right-wing authoritarianism, and work locus of control were entered. In step four, the interactive effects between agentic/communal employment role and each of the dispositional variables were entered.

Table 9 presents the zero-order correlations, the unstandardized betas, the standardized regression coefficients, and the semipartial correlations for each step of the regression. The overall model was significant, $(F(10, 461)=12.87; p<.001; R^2_{adj}=.20)$. As before, social desirability remains a significant covariate, R^2 was .09, $F(1,470)=48.01$, $p<.001$. Similarly, the main effect for employment role was nonsignificant, $(F(1, 465)=27.85; R^2_{cha}=.00)$. The overall main effect for the dispositional variables, Machiavellianism, need for power, right-wing authoritarianism, and work locus of control was significant $(F(4, 462) =10.85, p<.001; R^2_{adj}=.18)$. Examination of the standardized regression coefficients suggests that only Machiavellianism ($\beta=.20, p<.001; sr^2=.03$) and need for power ($\beta=.25, p<.001; sr^2=.05$) uniquely predicted self-reported use of political behaviour. Specifically, participants higher in Machiavellianism and higher in need for power were more likely to report engaging in organizational politics. Finally, the inclusion of the interaction terms resulted in a significant increase in explained variability in the PAS $(F(4, 461)=4.53; p<.001; R^2_{cha}=.03)$. Examination of the regression coefficients indicated that this was due to significant effects for the interactions between employment role and Machiavellianism ($\beta=-1.07, p<.001$) and between employment role and work locus of

Table 9

**Hierarchical Multiple Regression Analysis for the Effects of Employment Role
and Dispositional Variables on Self-reported Use of Organizational Politics.**

<i>Criterion Measure: Use of Organizational Politics</i>	<i>r</i>	<i>b</i>	β	<i>sr</i> ²
Step One:				
Social Desirability	-.30	-.77	.30	.09
Step One:				
Employment Role	-.07	-.44	-.04	.00
Step Two:				
Machiavellianism	.25*	.17	.20*	.03
Need for Power	.28*	.37	.25*	.05
Right-wing Authoritarianism	.00	.06	.05	.00
Work Locus of Control	.04	-.02	-.02	.00
Step Three:				
Employment Role X Machiavellianism	-.14*	-.21	-1.07*	.02
Employment Role X Need for Power	-.13	-.03	-.06	.00
Employment Role X Right-wing Authoritarianism	-.07	-.01	-.03	.00
Employment Role X Work Locus of Control	-.07	.19	.77	.02

* $p < .001$

control ($\beta=.77, p<.001$).

To clarify the nature of the interaction between employment role and Machiavellianism on self-reported use of organizational politics, two hierarchical multiple regressions were performed; one for participants in agentic employment roles and one for those in communal roles. For both regressions, social desirability bias was entered in step one, and Machiavellianism was entered in step two.

For participants in employment roles classified as agentic, social desirability bias was a significant covariate, ($F(1,401)=38.99, p<.001; r^2 = .09$); Machiavellianism emerged as a significant unique predictor of political behaviour ($F(1, 401)=24.72, p<.001; R^2_{cha} = .05, \beta=.24$). The nature of this relationship suggests that, as Machiavellianism increased, self-reported political activity increased for those in agentic roles. However, for participants in communal employment roles, Machiavellianism was not uniquely related to engaging in political behaviour ($F(1, 67)=2.34, ns; R^2_{cha} = .03$). These findings are congruent with the present study's expectations.

Two hierarchical multiple regressions also were performed to clarify the nature of the interaction between employment role and work locus of control on self-reported use of organizational politics. Once again, social desirability bias was entered in step one, and work locus of control was entered in step two.

For participants in agentic employment roles, social desirability bias was a significant covariate, $F(1,401)=38.99, p<.001; r^2 = .09$. However, work locus of control was not uniquely related to engaging in political behaviour, $F(1,401)=.02, ns; R^2_{cha} = .00$. For participants in communal employment roles, work locus of control was not uniquely

related to engaging in political behaviour, $F(1,67)=4.44$, ns; $R^2_{cha}=.05$.

Employment Role, Perceptions of Organizational Politics, Career Success and Job Satisfaction

Hierarchical multiple regression was used to examine the predictive relationship of employment role, perceptions of organizational politics and the index of career success as well as interactions between employment role and each of these variables to the general job satisfaction subscale of the Job Descriptive Index (JDI).

The hierarchical regression consisted of four steps. In step one, employment role was entered. In step two, perceptions of organizational politics and the index of career success were entered. In step three, the interactions between agentic/communal employment role and perceptions of organizational politics, agentic/communal employment role and career success, and perceptions of organizational politics and career success were entered. In step four, the three-way interaction between agentic/communal employment role, perceptions of organizational politics, and career success was entered.

Table 10 presents the zero-order correlations, the unstandardized betas, the standardized regression coefficients, and the semipartial correlations for each step of the regression. When the three-way interaction term was entered in the final step, it was found to be nonsignificant ($F(1, 439)= 2.13$, ns; $R^2_{cha}=.00$). This term was, therefore, pooled with the error variance, and the two-way interactions were tested against this pooled error term. These terms were found to be nonsignificant ($F(3, 440)= 3.06$, ns; $R^2_{cha}=.02$). Once again, the variance from these terms was pooled with the error variance and the main effects were tested against this pooled error term. The final main effects

Table 10

Hierarchical Multiple Regression Analysis for the Effects of Employment Role, Perceptions of Organizational Politics, and Career Success on Job Satisfaction.

<i>Criterion Measure: Job Satisfaction</i>	<i>r</i>	<i>b</i>	β	<i>sr</i> ²
Step One:				
Employment Role	-.06	-.67	-.06	.00
Step Two:				
Perceptions of Organizational Politics	-.47*	-.20	-.46*	.20
Career Success	.16	.45	.06	.00
Step Three:				
Employment Role X Perceptions of Politics	.02	-.03	-.23	.00
Employment Role X Career Success	-.18	-.12	-.03	.00
Perceptions of Politics X Career Success	.17	.03	.62	.01
Step Four:				
Employment Role X Perceptions X Success	-.20	-.04	-.77	.00

* $p < .001$

model was significant ($F(3, 443)=44.34$; $R^2_{adj}=.22$). While employment role continued to be nonsignificant ($F(4,462)=.23$, ns; $R^2_{cha}=.00$), together perceptions of organizational politics and career success contributed unique explained variability in job satisfaction ($F(2,461)=64.30$, $p<.001$; $R^2_{cha}=.22$). Examination of the regression coefficient suggests that when both perceptions of organizational politics and career success were considered only perceptions of organizational politics uniquely predicted job satisfaction ($\beta=-.46$, $p<.001$; $sr^2=.20$). The direction of this standardized regression coefficient suggests that participants who perceived their workplace as highly political evidence lower levels of job satisfaction. While career success did have a significant zero-order correlation with job satisfaction ($r=.16$, $p<.01$), this relationship was redundant with the variance explained by perceptions of organizational politics.

Employment Role, Self-reported Use of Political Activity, Career Success, and Job Satisfaction

Hierarchical multiple regression was used to examine the predictive relationship of employment role, self-reported use of organizational politics and the index of career success as well as interactions between employment role and each of these variables to the general job satisfaction subscale of the Job Descriptive Index (JDI).

The hierarchical regression consisted of four steps. In step one, employment role was entered. In step two, self-reported use of organizational politics and the index of career success were entered. In step three, interactions between agentic/communal employment role and self-reported use of organizational politics, agentic/communal employment role and career success, and self-reported use of organizational politics and

career success were entered. In step 4, the three-way interaction between agentic/communal employment role, self-reported use of organizational politics, and career success was entered.

Table 11 presents the zero-order correlations, the unstandardized betas, the standardized regression coefficients, and the semipartial correlations for each step of the regression. When the three-way interaction term was entered in the final step, it was found to be nonsignificant ($F(1, 439) = .56$, ns; $R^2_{cha} = .00$). This term was pooled with the error variance, and the two-way interactions were tested against this pooled error term. These terms were also found to be nonsignificant ($F(3, 440) = 2.08$, ns; $R^2_{cha} = .01$). Once again, the variance from these terms was pooled with the error variance and the main effects were tested against this pooled error term. While statistically significant, the adjusted R^2 did not meet the cutoff criterion of .05; thus, the main effects model will not be discussed further, $F(2, 439) = 5.18$, $p < .001$; $R^2_{cha} = .03$).

Employment Role, Perceptions of Organizational Politics, Career Success, and Organizational Commitment

Three hierarchical multiple regressions were conducted to examine the predictive relationship of employment role, perceptions of organizational politics and career success as well as interactions between employment role and each of these variables to the three dimensions (affective, normative, and continuance) of the Organizational Commitment Scale. Each dimension was treated as a criterion measure.

Each of the hierarchical regressions consisted of four steps. In step one, employment role was entered. In step two perceptions of organizational politics and the

Table 11

Hierarchical Multiple Regression Analysis for the Effects of Employment Role, Self-reported Use of Organizational Politics, and Career Success on Job Satisfaction.

<i>Criterion Measure: Job Satisfaction</i>	<i>r</i>	<i>b</i>	β	<i>sr</i> ²
Step One:				
Employment Role	-.06	-.67	-.06	.00
Step Two:				
Self-reported Use of Organizational Politics	-.05	-.04	-.04	.00
Career Success	.16*	1.26	.17*	.03
Step Three:				
Employment Role X Use of Politics	-.04	.02	.06	.00
Employment Role X Career Success	-.18	-.52	-.12	.00
Use of Politics X Career Success	.14	-.06	-.43	.00
Step Four:				
Employment Role X Use of Politics X Success	-.15	.05	.35	.00

* $p < .001$

index of career success were entered. In step three, interactions between agentic/communal employment role and perceptions of organizational politics, agentic/communal employment role and career success, and perceptions of organizational politics and career success were entered. In step four, the three-way interaction between agentic/communal employment role, perceptions of organizational politics, and career success was entered.

Table 12 presents the zero-order correlations, the unstandardized betas, the standardized regression coefficients, and the semipartial correlations for each step of the regression using affective commitment as the criterion measure. When the three-way interaction term was entered in the final step, it was found to be nonsignificant ($F(1, 440) = .07, ns; R^2_{cha} = .00$). This term was pooled with the error variance, and the two-way interactions were tested against this pooled error term. These terms were found to be nonsignificant ($F(3, 439) = .20, ns; R^2_{cha} = .00$). Once again, these terms were pooled with the error variance and the main effects were tested against this pooled error term. The final main effects model was significant ($F(3, 439) = 51.49; p < .001, R^2_{cha} = .24$). While employment role continued to be nonsignificant ($F(1, 439) = 11.03; \eta^2 = .02$), together, career success and perceptions of organizational politics contributed unique explained variability in affective commitment ($F(2, 439) = 71.80, p < .001; R^2_{cha} = .24$). Examination of the regression coefficient suggests that when both perceptions of organizational politics and career success are considered only perceptions of organizational politics uniquely predicted affective commitment ($\beta = -.45, p < .001; sr^2 = .19$). The direction of this standardized coefficient suggests that participants who perceived their workplace as

Table 12

Hierarchical Multiple Regression Analysis for the
Effects of Employment Role, Perceptions of Organizational Politics,
and Career Success on Affective Organizational Commitment.

<i>Criterion Measure: Affective Commitment</i>	<i>r</i>	<i>b</i>	β	<i>sr</i> ²
Step One:				
Employment Role	-.14	-1.34	-.14	.02
Step Two:				
Perceptions of Organizational Politics	-.48*	-.18	-.45*	.19
Career Success	.21	.79	.11	.01
Step Three:				
Employment Role X Perceptions of Politics	-.04	-.00	-.02	.00
Employment Role X Career Success	-.24	-.22	-.06	.00
Perceptions of Politics X Career Success	.20	.00	.01	.00
Step Four:				
Employment Role X Perceptions X Success	-.23	.01	.14	.00

* $p < .001$

more political evidenced lower levels of affective commitment.

Table 13 presents the zero-order correlations, the unstandardized betas, the standardized regression coefficients, and the semipartial correlations for each step of the regression analysis using normative commitment as the criterion measure. When the three-way interaction term was entered in the final step, it was found to be nonsignificant ($F(1, 439) = .04$, ns; $R^2_{cha} = .00$). This term was pooled with the error variance, and the two-way interactions were tested against this pooled error term. These terms were found to be nonsignificant ($F(3, 440) = .29$, ns; $R^2_{cha} = .00$). Once again, these terms were pooled with the error variance and the main effects were tested against this pooled error term. The final main effects model possessed an adjusted R^2 value less than .05 and, thus, will not be discussed further, $F(3, 443) = 5.44$; $R^2_{cha} = .04$.

Table 14 presents the zero-order correlations, the unstandardized betas, the standardized regression coefficients, and the semipartial correlations for each step of the regression using continuance commitment as the criterion measure. When the three-way interaction term was entered in the final step, it was found to be nonsignificant ($F(1, 439) = 1.09$, ns; $R^2_{cha} = .00$). This term was pooled with the error variance, and the two-way interactions were tested against this pooled error term. These terms were found to be nonsignificant ($F(3, 440) = 1.06$, ns; $R^2_{cha} = .01$). Once again, these terms were pooled with the error variance and the main effects were tested against this pooled error term. The final main effects model possessed an adjusted R^2 value less than .05 and, thus, will not be discussed further, $F(3, 443) = 6.28$; $p < .001$; $R^2_{cha} = .00$.

Table 13

Hierarchical Multiple Regression Analysis for the
Effects of Employment Role, Perceptions of Organizational Politics,
and Career Success on Normative Organizational Commitment.

<i>Criterion Measure: Normative Commitment</i>	<i>r</i>	<i>b</i>	β	<i>sr</i> ²
Step One:				
Employment Role	-.03	-.21	-.03	.00
Step Two:				
Perceptions of Organizational Politics	-.18	-.05	-.17	.03
Career Success	.08	.23	.05	.00
Step Three:				
Employment Role X Perceptions of Politics	.00	-.01	-.12	.00
Employment Role X Career Success	-.10	-.17	-.06	.00
Perceptions of Politics X Career Success	.08	.00	.11	.00
Step Four:				
Employment Role X Perceptions X Success	-.10	-.00	-.11	.00

Table 14

**Hierarchical Multiple Regression Analysis for the
Effects of Employment Role, Perceptions of Organizational Politics,
and Career Success on Continuance Organizational Commitment.**

<i>Criterion Measure: Continuance Commitment</i>	<i>r</i>	<i>b</i>	β	<i>sr²</i>
Step One:				
Employment Role	.08	.76	.08	.00
Step Two:				
Perceptions of Organizational Politics	.09	.02	.05	.00
Career Success	-.17	-1.13	-.17	.03
Step Three:				
Employment Role X Perceptions of Politics	.05	-.01	-.11	.00
Employment Role X Career Success	.17	.09	.02	.00
Perceptions of Politics X Career Success	-.15	.02	.41	.01
Step Four:				
Employment Role X Perceptions X Success	.15	.03	.62	.00

Employment Role, Self-reported Use of Organizational Politics,
Career Success, and Organizational Commitment

Three hierarchical multiple regressions were used to examine the predictive relationship among employment role, self-reported use of organizational politics and career success as well as interactions between employment role and each of these variables to the affective, normative, and continuance commitment dimensions of the Organizational Commitment Scale. Each dimension was treated as a criterion measure.

Each of the hierarchical regressions consisted of four steps. In step one, employment role was entered. In step two self-reported use of organizational politics and the index of career success were entered. In step three, interactions between agentic/communal employment role and self-reported use of organizational politics, agentic/communal employment role and career success, and self-reported use of organizational politics and career success were entered. In step four, the three-way interaction between agentic/communal employment role, self-reported use of politics, and career success was entered.

Table 15 presents the zero-order correlations, the unstandardized betas, the standardized regression coefficients, and the semipartial correlations for each step of the regression (affective commitment as criterion measure). When the three-way interaction term was entered in the final step, it was found to be nonsignificant ($F(1, 439) = .21, ns; R^2_{cha} = .00$). This term was, therefore, pooled with the error variance, and the two-way interactions were tested against this pooled error term. These terms were found to be nonsignificant ($F(3, 440) = 3.0, ns; R^2_{cha} = .02$). Once again, these terms were pooled

Table 15

Hierarchical Multiple Regression Analysis for the
Effects of Employment Role, Self-reported Use of Organizational Politics,
and Career Success on Affective Organizational Commitment.

<i>Criterion Measure: Affective Commitment</i>	<i>r</i>	<i>b</i>	β	<i>sr</i> ²
Step One:				
Employment Role	-.14	-1.34	-.14	.02
Step Two:				
Self-reported Use of Organizational Politics	-.01	-.00	-.00	.00
Career Success	.21*	1.53	.22*	.05
Step Three:				
Employment Role X Use of Politics	-.11	.09	.29	.00
Employment Role X Career Success	-.24	-.58	-.15	.01
Use of Politics X Career Success	.19	-.05	-.40	.01
Step Four:				
Employment Role X Use of Politics X Success	-.21	.03	.21	.00

* $p < .001$

with the error variance and the main effects were tested against this pooled error term. The final main effects model was significant ($F(3, 443)=10.86$; $R^2_{cha}=.05$). Employment role was not significant ($F(1,443)=8.95$, ns; $sr^2=.02$) and, thus, will not be discussed further. However, self-reported use of political behaviour and career success contributed unique explained variability in affective commitment ($F(2,443)=11.69$, $p<.001$; $R^2_{cha}=.05$). Examination of the regression coefficients suggests that only career success ($\beta=.22$, $p<.001$; $sr^2=.05$) uniquely predicted affective commitment. The direction of this regression coefficient suggests that individuals experiencing lower levels of career success evidenced lower levels of affective commitment.

Table 16 contains the results of the regression analysis, using normative commitment as the criterion measure. When the three-way interaction term was entered in the final step, it was found to be nonsignificant ($F(1, 439)=.57$, ns; $R^2_{cha}=.00$). This term was, therefore, pooled with the error variance, and the two-way interactions were tested against this pooled error term. These terms were found to be nonsignificant ($F(3, 440)=2.77$, ns; $R^2_{cha}=.02$). Once again, these terms were pooled with the error variance and the main effects were tested against this pooled error term. The final main effects model was nonsignificant ($F(3, 443)=2.34$, ns; $R^2_{cha}=.01$). None of the predictor variables were significant.

Table 17 contains the results of the regression analysis, using continuance commitment as the criterion measure. When the three-way interaction term was entered in the final step, it was found to be nonsignificant ($F(1, 439)=.25$, ns; $R^2_{cha}=.00$). This term was, therefore, pooled with the error variance, and the two-way interactions were tested

Table 16

Hierarchical Multiple Regression Analysis for the
Effects of Employment Role, Self-reported Use of Organizational Politics,
and Career Success on Normative Organizational Commitment.

<i>Criterion Measure: Normative Commitment</i>	<i>r</i>	<i>b</i>	β	<i>sr</i> ²
Step One:				
Employment Role	.06	-.21	-.03	.00
Step Two:				
Self-reported Use of Organizational Politics	-.04	-.04	-.06	.00
Career Success	.08	.41	.08	.00
Step Three:				
Employment Role X Use of Politics	.05	.07	.34	.00
Employment Role X Career Success	.13	-.26	-.09	.00
Use of Politics X Career Success	-.15	-.04	-.47	.00
Step Four:				
Employment Role X Use of Politics X Success	.14	.03	.36	.00

Table 17

Hierarchical Multiple Regression Analysis for the
Effects of Employment Role, Self-reported Use of Organizational Politics,
and Career Success on Continuance Organizational Commitment.

<i>Criterion Measure: Continuance Commitment</i>	<i>r</i>	<i>b</i>	β	<i>sr</i> ²
Step One:				
Employment Role	.08	.76	.08	.00
Step Two:				
Self-reported Use of Organizational Politics	.05	.04	.05	.00
Career Success	-.17	-1.19	-1.18	.03
Step Three:				
Employment Role X Use of Politics	.07	.05	.19	.00
Employment Role X Career Success	.17	.19	.05	.00
Use of Politics X Career Success	-.17	-.00	-.01	.00
Step Four:				
Employment Role X Use of Politics X Success	.17	.03	.24	.00

against this pooled error term. These terms were found to be nonsignificant ($F(3, 440) = .33$, ns; $R^2_{cha} = .00$). Once again, these terms were pooled with the error term and the main effects were tested against this pooled error term. The final main effects model did not meet the adjusted R^2 cutoff of .05 and, thus, will not be discussed further, $F(3, 443) = 6.56$, $p < .001$; $R^2_{cha} = .03$.

Discussion

Social role theory asserts that agentic and communal employment roles differ on a number of dimensions. For example, agentic roles are characterized by self-assertion, self-expansion, and the urge to master (e.g., dominance and competitiveness). Communal roles, however, are characterized by qualities concerned with the harmonious functioning of the group and interdependence (Skitka & Maslach, 1996). Agentic and communal employment denote shared expectations that influence not only the ways in which role occupants are perceived, but also their attitudes and behaviours. When considering the effects of role, it is the nature of such shared expectations that is of importance. Specifically, when a role is applied to any group of individuals, certain attitudes and behaviours are expected from that group. As well, the behaviour of others revolves around those expectations (Stryker & Statham, 1985). In the present study, it was argued that specific expectations concerning organizational politics are attached to agentic and communal employment roles (i.e., individuals in agentic roles engage in political activity, whereas those in communal roles do not).

Why do these roles possess differential expectations vis-a-vis organizational politics? Many factors may be responsible for these differences (e.g., decision-making

ability, competitiveness, etc.); however, in the present study, status was emphasized. Stated, simply, the differential levels of status associated with each type of employment role were seen as creating different expectations about who should or should not behave politically.

Status was operationally defined in this study in terms of job autonomy and self-reported salary. Sypher and Sypher (1983) and Ferris et al. (1996) also used these measures to define job status. It was anticipated that agentic employment roles would be associated with higher levels of job autonomy and salary than communal employment roles. As expected, participants in agentic employment roles reported earning higher annual salaries than participants in communal employment roles. However, the two groups did not differ on the measure of job autonomy.

The 95% confidence interval for the Job Autonomy Scale (JAS; Sims et al., 1976) suggests that ceiling effects for scores on the JAS may be problematic. That is, most participants reported having a high level of job autonomy. In addition, scores on the Job Autonomy Scale correlated positively with scores on the Marlowe-Crowne Social Desirability Scale. Participants' need to respond in a socially desirable manner by reporting higher levels of autonomy may have contributed to this ceiling effect.

These findings indicate that one of the central assumptions of the present study; namely, that agentic and communal employment roles differ in terms of status received only partial support. Therefore, researchers may benefit from using another measure of job autonomy; one that may not be contaminated by social desirability bias.

Agentic/Communal Employment Roles and Organizational Politics

It was hypothesized that participants in agentic employment roles would be more likely than those in communal roles to engage in organizational politics, whereas those in communal roles would be more likely to perceive the workplace as politicized. Neither of these hypotheses were supported.

Why did participants' perception and self-reported use of organizational politics not vary as a function of employment role? First, it is possible that the sample used in this study may have possessed limited usefulness for the purposes of investigating the relationship between social role theory and organizational politics. As mentioned earlier, participants perceived themselves as possessing a high degree of job autonomy. Furthermore, participants also viewed various RCMP departments as highly formalized. Research suggests that departments with high levels of formalization are not conducive to organizational politics (Madison et al., 1980). Zero-order correlations between formalization and both perceptions and self-reported use of political behaviour were negative (i.e., -34, and -12, respectively). Therefore, as the sample perceived high levels of formalization within their respective departments, the present study's ability to measure organizational politics in general, may have been attenuated. Additional research using samples from less formalized departments within an organization or less formalized organizations may be warranted.

Second, it is possible that the classification of agentic/communal employment roles may have lacked adequate sensitivity. In the present study, each rater's total scores on the

Masculine and Feminine subscales of the Personal Attributes Questionnaire²⁴ (Spence & Henrich, 1978) were used to determine whether he or she perceived a given occupation as agentic or communal. If the rater's Masculine subscale score exceeded his or her Feminine subscale score, the occupation was classified as agentic. If the Feminine subscale score was greater than the Masculine subscale score, the occupation was classified as communal. The classification assigned to each occupation was compared across the three raters. A "majority wins" rule was then adopted to determine the final classification of a given occupation as agentic or communal. Specifically, if two of the three raters classified an occupation as more agentic (i.e., scores on the Masculine subscale for the two raters exceeded their scores on the Feminine subscale), the occupation was coded as agentic. Conversely, if two of the three raters classified an occupation as more communal (i.e., scores on the Feminine subscale for the two raters exceeded their scores on the Masculine subscale), the occupation was coded as communal. This classificatory procedure was used to create discrete groups which then could be compared on the variables of interest (e.g., perceptions of organizational politics).

Alternative approaches were considered. However, they possessed certain limitations that rendered them inappropriate for the purposes of this study. One approach might be to treat Masculine and Feminine subscale scores as continuous variables. However, this would reflect a qualitative change in the present study's interpretation of employment role. One would no longer be discussing agentic and communal employment

²⁴ It should be noted that other researchers have used the masculine and feminine subscales of the PAQ to measure agency and communion, respectively (e.g., Eagly & Steffen, 1986; Glick, 1991).

roles per se; but, rather, employment roles that possessed varying levels of agency and communion. Thus, agency and communion would no longer be a type of employment role, but rather components of an employment role. Such an interpretation would be inconsistent with social role theory, which is the theoretical framework used in the present study.

Another coding procedure that could have been used is the median-split procedure. If this procedure had been used in the present study, the median of raters' scores on the Feminine and Masculine subscales, across all occupations, would be determined. Any occupation that had a Feminine subscale score above the F median, and a Masculine subscale score below the M median would be classified as communal. Any occupation that had an F subscale score below the F median and M subscale score above the M median would be classified as agentic. The disadvantage to this procedure, however, is that it would result in a significant loss of data, and thus a less sensitive analysis (Spence & Helmreich, 1978). Specifically, occupations that fell above the median on both the Feminine and Masculine subscale, and occupations that fell below the median on both the M and F subscales could not be used. Such occupations would be classified as androgynous and undifferentiated, respectively (Spence & Helmreich, 1978). Androgynous and undifferentiated social roles are constructs that do not exist within the parameters of social role theory and, thus, could not be used in the present study.

The disadvantages associated with the alternative classificatory procedures (i.e., loss of data, and reconceptualization of agency and communal as elements rather than type of employment role) rendered them unsuitable for the purposes of this study. The coding

procedure that was adopted minimized loss of data, created discrete groups which could be characterized as agentic and communal, and though the use of multiple raters, insured the uniform nature of these classifications (i.e., at least two raters had to classify each occupation as agentic or communal in order for it to be defined as such).

Finally, it is possible that perceptions and self-reported use of organizational politics did not vary as a function of employment role because the job descriptions presented to raters may have been biased. These job descriptions were task oriented and, thus, may be conceptualized as an instrumental tool.

Aside from possible methodological problems that may be associated with this study, it is possible that social role theory itself was used inappropriately. Eagly and Steffen (1984) used social role theory to account for the ways in which gender roles are stereotyped. Specifically, they argued that females are disproportionately represented in social roles characterized by lower levels of status and authority (e.g., homemaker), whereas males are disproportionately represented in social roles characterized by higher levels of status and authority (e.g., employee). Occupying these types of social roles contribute to male and female gender roles being defined in agentic and communal terms, respectively.

One of the central assumptions of this theory is that individuals' attitudes and behaviours are delimited by their agentic and communal employment roles. The present study applied this assumption to the domain of organizational politics by proposing that an individual's employment role is an important determinant of his or her perceptions and self-reported use of organizational politics . For example, Kirchmeyer (1990) found that

males and females occupying the same employment role (e.g., manager) did not differ in their use of political behaviour. However, this theory also was used to provide a framework for the relationship between the dispositional and situational determinants of organizational politics, as well as outcome measures such as job satisfaction and organizational commitment. In so doing, some of the theoretical assumptions that were made in this study may be questioned. For example, it was argued that situational and dispositional variables exert their influence within the parameters of individuals' employment role. The rationale underlying this argument, however, resided primarily in the desire to ensure that all targeted variables were filtered through social role theory. There was little compelling theoretical justification to assert, for instance, that dispositional variables such as Machiavellianism and need for power should operate within the parameters of a specific employment role. The present study underscores the difficulty associated with applying a theoretical framework to phenomena that, to date, have been conceptualized by researchers as atheoretical.

Situational Variables and Perceptions of Organizational Politics

The present study maintained that variations in perceptions of political behaviour occurring among individuals occupying the same employment role may be attributed to situational (e.g., organizational climate and formalization) variables.

Organizational climate emerged as a powerful situational predictor of perceptions of organizational politics, accounting for 16% of the unique variance. There are no published studies investigating the relationship between climate and perceptions of politics. However, the present research suggests that this may be an important situational

variable. Indeed, in the present study, it emerged as a more powerful predictor variable than formalization, which has received far greater empirical attention. The nature of the relationship between climate and perceptions of politics suggests that participants who saw their organizational climate as favourable were less likely to perceive their work environment as political. Given the cross-situational nature of this study, the direction of causality cannot be determined (i.e., does climate influence perceptions or vice-versa, or both?). Longitudinal research may serve to clarify the relationship between perceptions and organizational climate.

Formalization did not emerge as a significant predictor of perceptions of organizational politics, once climate was taken into consideration. However, as a zero-order correlation between formalization and perceptions was significant ($r=.34$, $p<.001$), it would appear that formalization was redundant with organizational climate. Indeed, inspecting the content of the two scales reveals similarities between some of the items. The redundancy observed in multiple regression analysis also suggests that it may be unnecessary to use both instruments, within the same questionnaire.

It was argued that formalization and organizational climate would contribute to variations in perceptions of political activity for those in communal but not agentic employment roles. The nature of these predictions suggests that there should be significant interactions between employment role and the two situational variables. No significant interactions were observed when perceptions of political behaviour was the criterion measure. Therefore, once again it appears that agentic/communal employment roles did not constrain or facilitate perceptions of organizational politics.

Situational Variables and Self-reported Use of Organizational Politics

Neither formalization nor organizational climate emerged as significant predictors of self-reported use of organizational politics. As there are no published studies examining the relationships between these situational variables and use of political behaviour, it is possible that the null effects obtained in this study are accurate. Indeed, the small correlation observed between scores on the POPS and the PAS attests to the minimal interrelatedness of these phenomena, and suggests that predictors of the former are not necessarily predictors of the latter. For example, inspection of the zero-order correlations revealed that organizational climate correlated significantly with perceptions of organizational politics but did not correlate significantly with self-reported use of political behaviour. Therefore, perceptions and self-reported use of political behaviour may have relationships with other variables that may differ quantitatively.

However, it is possible that formalization and organizational climate failed to emerge as significant predictors because the instrument used to measure political activity may be psychometrically unsound. For example, the dimensionality of the Political Activity Scale (PAS) appeared to be unstable. In Study 1, a two-factor solution was obtained in which 11 items loaded on the first factor (entitled “other-oriented” political behaviour) and 7 items loaded on the second factor (entitled “duplicitous” political behaviour). This two-factor solution was not replicated in Study 2. Instead, a one-factor solution appeared to provide the best representation of the data. Given the small sample used in Study 1 (N=81), the factor analytic results obtained in Study 2 (N=501) likely provide a better representation of the true dimensionality of the PAS. However, in the

absence of additional research, the assertion that the PAS is unidimensional remains speculative.

Several hypotheses used to investigate the construct validity of the PAS were not supported. For example, in Study 1, contrary to what was hypothesized, scores on a measure of centralization did not correlate significantly with scores on the two subscales of the PAS. Moreover, the direction of the correlations was contrary to the study's hypothesis. Parker et al. (1995) report that, as centralization increases (i.e., power and control are concentrated at the upper levels of the organization), individuals possessing minimal levels of legitimate power within the organization should be more likely to engage in organizational politics. In Study 1, however, centralization and self-reported use of political behaviour were inversely related.

An obvious question may be, why was the PAS used in Study 2? The reliabilities of the PAS and both of its subscales appeared satisfactory, and one of the hypotheses developed to assess the scale's construct validity was supported (i.e., self-reported political behaviour correlated positively with self-monitoring). Based on this, it seemed reasonable to use the scale in Study 2 and to reexamine the psychometric properties of the scale.

Finally, restriction of range (i.e., floor effects) on the PAS also may be responsible for the absence of meaningful relationships among self-reported use of political behaviour, organizational climate, and formalization. The 95% CI for the mean score on the PAS was well below the mid-point (see Table 5). Also, the highest score obtained on this scale was 54, which is well below 72, the maximum possible score. The low mean score on the

PAS may reflect participants' actual level of political activity. However, the low score also may stem from participants' reluctance to admit to engaging in organizational politics. The significant negative correlation between scores on the PAS and scores on a measure of social desirability bias provides additional evidence in support of this interpretation.

With respect to future research, the dimensionality of the PAS should be explored further, and additional construct validation work should be conducted. It is recommended that the PAS be distributed to less formalized departments. Furthermore, it may be beneficial to enhance the sensitivity of the response key. The present study used a 4-point Likert-type scale. Using a scale with a larger number of gradations (e.g., 7-point scale) may increase participants' willingness to admit engaging in (modest levels) of political behaviour.

Finally, it was proposed that formalization and organizational climate would contribute to variations in self-reported use of political behaviour for participants in agentic but not communal employment roles. Thus, for example, as levels of formalization decrease, participants in agentic employment roles should evidence greater levels of political behaviour. However, due to role-related constraints, levels of political behaviour evidenced by those in communal roles should remain low, irrespective of variations in formalization. No significant interactions were observed between the situational variables and self-reported political behaviour, which again may stem from the psychometric limitations of the PAS.

Dispositional Variables and Perceptions of Organizational Politics

This study also emphasized that variations in perceptions of political behaviour

occurring among individuals occupying the same employment role may be attributed to dispositional variables (e.g., Machiavellianism, work locus of control, need for power, and right-wing authoritarianism). Of these measures, only right-wing authoritarianism did not emerge as a significant predictor in any of the proposed relationships. As there is neither theoretical nor empirical evidence to suggest that right-wing authoritarianism may be related to organizational politics, the nonsignificant effects observed in the present study may be an accurate reflection of the true relationship between these variables. However, it is possible that the scale used to measure right-wing authoritarianism possessed questionable psychometric properties. Duncan et al.'s (1997) short-form version of Altemeyer's (1988) Right-wing Authoritarianism Scale was selected because the length of the questionnaire used in Study 2 was prohibitive (over 300 items). As well, based on Duncan et al.'s (1997) research, this version appeared to be psychometrically sound. Its alpha coefficient was high and it appeared to possess adequate construct validity (i.e., scores on the short-form version correlated positively with traditional beliefs about women and negatively with endorsement of feminist ideals). However, in the present study, the alpha for the short-form version was low (.65), and scores on this scale did not correlate significantly with any of the other dispositional variables examined in Study 2, including Machiavellianism. In future, it may be more valid to use the 30-item version of Altemeyer's (1988) scale, which possesses high levels of reliability and validity.

With respect to perceptions of political behaviour, only work locus of control and Machiavellianism were significant predictors accounting for 18% and 5%, respectively, of the unique variance. Participants possessing an external work locus of control were more

likely than their internal counterparts to perceive the workplace as politicized. Similarly, those who were more Machiavellian saw their work environment as more political. Given the cross-sectional nature of this study, the direction of causality between these dispositional variables and perceptions is unclear. However, the possibility that dispositional characteristics such as Machiavellianism are consequences, rather than antecedents, of perceptions of organizational politics appears rather unlikely. Thus, this finding provides organizations with a preliminary understanding of the personalities inclined to perceive significant levels of political activity. Specifically, employees who attribute their outcomes to forces beyond their control (i.e., those with an external work locus of control) may view themselves as unable to manipulate their environment and, therefore, feel vulnerable to the political behaviours of fellow employees. Furthermore, employees familiar with deception and manipulative behaviour (i.e., those high in Machiavellianism) may be more inclined to interpret organizational behaviour in political terms because of their awareness of such behaviour.

The substantial amount of variance accounted for, in the present study, by work locus of control underscores the importance of using specialized locus of control scales. Previous research has failed to identify a strong and consistent relationship between locus of control and perceptions of organizational politics. However, this may stem from researchers' reliance on global measures which do not assess locus of control in specific behavioural areas.

It was argued that these dispositional variables contribute to variations in perceptions of political activity for those in communal but not agentic employment roles.

The nature of these predictions suggest that there should be significant interactions between employment role and the four dispositional variables. No significant interactions were observed when perceptions of organizational politics was the criterion measure, suggesting once again that agentic/communal employment roles did not constrain or facilitate perceptions of organizational politics.

Dispositional Variables and Self-reported Use of Organizational Politics

For self-reported use of organizational politics, the dispositional variables Machiavellianism and need for power emerged as significant predictors. As participants' levels of increased so, too, did their use of political behaviour. The proportions of unique variance accounted for by Machiavellianism and need for power were 3% and 5%, respectively. It is possible that no relationship was found for work locus of control and right-wing authoritarianism because neither variable affects self-reported use of political behaviour. The fact that work locus of control emerged as a significant predictor of scores on the POPS but did not emerge as a significant predictor for scores on the PAS underscores the minimal interrelatedness of political perceptions and political behaviour.

Although other studies have demonstrated that need for power is positively associated with political behaviour (e.g., Cobb, 1986; Kirchmeyer, 1990), the author is unaware of any published study that has examined the relationship between Machiavellianism and self-reported use of political behaviour. The present research provides empirical evidence to support the claim that Machiavellianism plays an important role in political behaviour. Indeed, as this variable significantly predicted both perceptions and use of organizational politics, it would appear to be the most influential dispositional

variable of those examined in this study. Therefore, researchers interested in political behaviour in organizations may want to devote more attention to the investigation of Machiavellianism.

Although Machiavellianism and need for power were significant predictors of political behaviour, their zero-order correlations with scores on the Political Activity Scale were rather small. These weak correlations may stem, in part, from restriction of range associated with the Political Activity Scale.

Once again, it was proposed that Machiavellianism, need for power, right-wing authoritarianism, and work locus of control contribute to variations in self-reported use of political behaviour for participants in agentic but not communal employment roles. Thus, for example, as levels of Machiavellianism increase, participants in agentic employment roles should evidence greater levels of political behaviour. However, due to role-related constraints, levels of political behaviour reported by those in communal roles should remain low, irrespective of variations in Machiavellianism.

A significant interaction was found between Machiavellianism and participants' agentic/communal role. The nature of this interaction suggested that Machiavellianism and political behaviours were positively related for those in agentic, but not communal employment roles. This finding suggests that, when an individual occupies a communal employment role, his or her ability to behave politically is circumscribed, irrespective of dispositional characteristics such as Machiavellianism. This interaction was significant, and lends support to social role theory. However, as all of the other hypotheses concerning social role theory were not confirmed, this interaction may not warrant much

scrutiny.

Perceptions of Organizational Politics, Job Satisfaction, and Organizational Commitment

Findings from the present study suggest that perceptions of organizational politics were inversely related to job satisfaction and affective organizational commitment, suggesting that increases in perceptions of organizational politics are associated with decrements in job satisfaction and organizational commitment. The inverse relationship between perceptions of politics and job satisfaction has been documented consistently (e.g., Anderson, 1994; Nye & Witt, 1993).

Two studies have investigated the relationship between commitment and perceptions (e.g., Drory, 1993; Nye & Witt, 1993); however, they used instruments such as Hrebiniak and Alutto's (1972 as cited in Nye & Witt, 1993) four item measure which conceptualize commitment as a unidimensional construct. The present study suggests that perceptions of political activity do not influence all facets of organizational commitment to the same degree. Perceptions did not emerge as a significant predictor of normative or continuance forms of commitment. Normative and continuance commitment reflect endorsement of the Protestant work ethic and the economic necessity of work, respectively. Thus, perceptions appear to influence the employee's emotional attachment to the organization, but do not appear to influence the extent to which the employee feels obligated to stay with the organization (i.e., normative commitment) or the employee's assessment of the costs associated with leaving his or her organization (i.e., continuance commitment). Thus, perceptions of organizational politics may not influence whether employees remain with the organization, but may influence how they feel about working

for the organization.

Self-reported Use of Organizational Politics, Job Satisfaction, and Organizational Commitment

Self-reported use of political behaviour did not emerge as a significant predictor of either job satisfaction or affective, normative, or continuance commitment. The nonsignificance of these relationships is not surprising, as there is little reason to assume that engaging in political behaviour would, by itself, have implications for satisfaction or commitment. Rather, the present study suggested that the extent to which political activity secures desired career objectives should determine whether political activity influences satisfaction and commitment. However, results indicated that the two-way interaction between success and political behaviour did not emerge as a significant predictor for job satisfaction or the three dimensions of commitment. Thus, self-reported use of organizational politics, irrespective of whether it facilitates career objectives, did not appear to influence the outcome measures investigated in this study.

Of course, alternative explanations for the nonsignificant two-way interactions exist. First, as mentioned earlier, the PAS may possess certain psychometric limitations. Second, the present study used a two-item measure of career success that investigated participants' job level and number of promotions with current employer. A more comprehensive measure of career success (i.e., one that does not focus on salary or promotions) may prove useful in future research.

In the present study, it was maintained that agentic and communal employment roles possess normative expectations with respect to organizational politics. That is,

individuals in agentic employment roles engage in political activity, whereas those in communal employment roles do not. Further, it was proposed that violating this normative expectation may have deleterious consequences in terms of outcome variables such as job satisfaction and organizational commitment. The present study also maintained that the consequences associated with violating this normative expectation are moderated by career success. Specifically, individuals in communal employment roles who engage in political activity (an episode of non-normative behaviour) may evidence high levels of job satisfaction and organizational commitment provided their political behaviour secures desired career outcomes.

None of these hypotheses received empirical support. Specifically, three-way interactions between: 1) employment role, career success, and perceptions of organizational politics and 2) employment role, career success, and self-reported use of political activity were not significant predictors of job satisfaction or any of the dimensions of organizational commitment. These nonsignificant results, again may stem from: 1) the psychometric limitations of the Political Activity Scale; 2) an insensitive classification of agentic/communal roles; and 3) a simplistic measure of career success.

Comparison with other Samples

Given that a convenience sample was used in the present study, the issue of generalizability is of paramount importance. Comparisons with other studies that have investigated perceptions and self-reported use of political activity, may provide insight into the extent to which these results are in accordance with previous research.

For example, Ferris and Kacmar (1992) distributed the POPS to over 90 nurses

and their supervisors. Results indicated that participants did not perceive their organization as highly politicized. The mean score for participants was 85 which was below the scale midpoint of 93. Similarly, Ferris et al. (1996) distributed a 40-item version of the POPS to a heterogeneous sample of university employees (N=822). Once again the mean score was below the midpoint which suggests that participants did not perceive their organization as highly political. Similar results were obtained in the present study. With respect to self-reported use of political behaviours, Kirchmeyer (1990) distributed a copy of the Vignettes of Political Activity Scale to approximately 1,000 managerial personnel. Results indicated that participants reported engaging in low levels of political activity. Specifically, participants' mean score on the VPAS was 41 which is well below the scale midpoint of 50. Similarly, in the present study, participants reported engaging in low levels of organizational politics. Comparisons with research by Ferris and Kacmar (1992), Ferris et al. (1996a,b) and Kirchmeyer (1990) suggest that the results obtained in this study are not anomalous.

Conclusion

In conclusion, this study suggests that social role theory does not necessarily provide a useful theoretical framework from which to investigate perceptions and self-reported use of organizational politics. It was emphasized that the nonsignificant findings associated with social role theory may stem from the psychometric limitations of several measures used in the present study. On a more positive note, this research provided evidence that employees possessing certain dispositional characteristics (e.g., Machiavellianism) and operating within certain organizational environments (e.g., those

with unfavourable climates) may be more likely to perceive and/or engage in organizational politics. This type of information may prove useful in developing a profile of the type of employee most likely to perceive and/or engage in organizational politics. As well, it may expand researchers' understanding of the types of organizations most at risk for perceptions and activity.

References

- Alcock, J.E., Carment, D.W., & Sadava, S.W. (1994). A textbook of social psychology. Scarborough, ON: Prentice-Hall Canada Inc.
- Alexander, C.S., & Becker, H.J. (1978). The use of vignettes in survey research. Public Opinion Quarterly, 42, 93-104.
- Alker, H.A., & Poppen, P.J. (1973). Personality and ideology in university students. Journal of Personality, 41, 653-671.
- Allen, R.W., Madison, D.L., Porter, L.W., Renwick, P.A., & Mayes, B.T. (1979). Organizational politics: Tactics and characteristics of its actors. California Management Review, 22, 77-83.
- 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.
- Altemeyer, B. (1988). Enemies of freedom. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Anderson, T.P. (1994). Creating measures of dysfunctional office and organizational politics: The DOOP and short-form DOOP scales. Psychology: A Journal of Human Behaviour, 31, 24-34.
- Arkin, R.M. (1981). Self-presentation styles. In J.T. Tedeschi (Ed.), Impression management theory and social psychological research (pp. 311-333). New York, NY: Academic Press.
- Armstrong, P., & Armstrong, H. (1994). The double ghetto: Canadian women and their segregated work. Toronto, ON: McClelland & Stewart Inc.
- Aryee, S., Wyatt, T., & Min, M.K. (1991). Antecedents of organizational commitment and turnover intentions among professional accountants in different employment settings in Singapore. The Journal of Social Psychology, 131, 545-556.
- Ashforth, B.E., & Lee, R.T. (1990). Defensive behaviour in organizations: A preliminary model. Human Relations, 43, 621-648.
- Benson, P.L., & Vincent, S. (1980). Development and validation of the sexist attitudes toward women scale (SATWS). Psychology of Women Quarterly, 5, 276-288.

- Biberman, G. (1985). Personality and characteristic work attitudes of persons with high, moderate, and low political tendencies. Psychological Reports, *57*, 1303-1310.
- Biddle, B.J. (1979). Role theory: Expectations, identities, and behaviors. San Diego, CA: Academic Press.
- Blau, G. (1993). Testing the relationship of locus of control to different performance dimensions. Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology, *66*, 139-151.
- Bose, C.E., & Rossi, P.H. (1983). Gender and jobs: Prestige standings of occupations as affected by gender. American Sociological Review, *48*, 316-330.
- Bretz, R.R., Jr., & Judge, T.A. (1994). Person-organization fit and the theory of work adjustment: Implications for satisfaction, tenure, and career success. Journal of Vocational Behaviour, *44*, 32-54.
- Briggs, S.R., & Cheek, J.M. (1986). The role of factor analysis in the development and evaluation of personality scales. Journal of Personality, *54*, 106-148.
- Brooke, R.P., Russell, D.W., & Price, J.L. (1988). Discriminant validation of measures of job satisfaction, job involvement, and organizational commitment. Journal of Applied Psychology, *73*, 139-145.
- Carmines, E.G., & Zeller, R.A. (1979). Reliability and validity assessment. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Carson, K.P., Schriesheim, C.A., & Kinicki, A.J. (1990). The usefulness of the "fail-safe" statistic in meta-analysis. Educational and Psychological Measurement, *50*, 233-243.
- Christoffersen, D., & Stamp, C. (1995). Examining the relationship between Machiavellianism and paranoia. Psychological Reports, *76*, 67-70.
- Cobb, A.T. (1986). Informal influence in the formal organization: Psychological and situational correlates. Group and Organization Studies, *11*, 229-253.
- Cohen, A. (1996). On the discriminant validity of the Myer and Allen measure of organizational commitment: How does it fit with the work commitment construct? Educational and Psychological Measurement, *56*, 494-503.
- Collins, B.E. (1974). Four components of the Rotter internal-external scale. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, *29*, 381-391.

- Cook, J.D., Hepworth, S.J., Wall, T.D., & Warr, P.B. (1981). The experience of work. New York, NY: Academic Press.
- Couch, A., & Keniston, K. (1960). Yeasayers and naysayers: Agreeing response set as a personality variable. Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 60, 151-174.
- DeCharms, R. (1968). Personal causation: Internal affective determinants of behaviour. New York, NY: Academic Press.
- Denison, D.R. (1990). Corporate culture and organizational effectiveness. New York, NY: John Wiley & Sons.
- Denison, D.R. (1996). What is the difference between organizational culture and organizational climate? A native's point of view on a decade of paradigm wars. Academy of Management Review, 21, 619-654.
- DeZoort, T., & Roskos-Ewoldsen, D.R. (1997). The submissiveness to organizational authority scale as a measure of authoritarianism. Journal of Social Behaviour and Personality, 12, 651-670.
- Drake, D.S. (1995). Assessing Machiavellianism and morality-conscience guilt. Psychological Reports, 77, 1355-1359.
- Drory, A. (1993). Perceived political climate and job attitudes. Organization Studies, 14, 59-71.
- Drory, A., & Romm, T. (1988). Politics in organizations and its perception within the organization. Organization Studies, 9, 165-179.
- DuBrin, A.J. (1988). Career maturity, organizational rank, and political behavioral tendencies: A correlational analysis of organizational politics and career experience. Psychological Reports, 63, 531-537.
- DuBrin, A.J. (1991). Sex and gender differences in tactics of influence. Psychological Reports, 68, 635-646.
- Duncan, L.E., Peterson, B.E., & Winter, D.G. (1997). Authoritarianism and gender roles: Toward a psychological analysis of hegemonic relationships. Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 23, 41-49.
- Dunham, R.B., Grube, J.A., & Castaneda, M.B. (1994). Organizational commitment: The utility of an integrative definition. Journal of Applied Psychology, 79, 370-380.

- Eagly, A.H. (1987). Sex differences in social behaviour: A social-role approach. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Eagly, A.H., & Steffen, V.J. (1984). Gender stereotypes stem from the distribution of women and men into social roles. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 46, 735-754.
- Eagly, A.H., & Steffen, V.J. (1986). Gender stereotypes, occupational roles, and beliefs about part-time employees. Psychology of Women Quarterly, 10, 252-262.
- Eastman, K.K. (1994). In the eyes of the beholder: An attributional approach to ingratiation and organizational citizenship behaviour. Academy of Management Journal, 37, 1379-1391.
- Fairholm, G. W. (1993). Organizational power politics: Tactics in organizational leadership. Westport, CT: Praeger.
- Fenigstein, A., & Vanable, P.A. (1992). Paranoia and self consciousness. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 62, 129-138.
- Ferris, G.R., Fedor, D.B., Chachere, J.G., & Pondy, L.R. (1989). Myths and politics in organizational contexts. Group and Organizational Studies, 14, 83-103.
- Ferris, G.R., Frink, D.D., Bhawuk, D., Zhou, J., & Gilmore, D.C. (1996a). Reactions of diverse groups to politics in the workplace. Journal of Management, 22, 23-44.
- Ferris, G.R., Frink, D.D., Galang, M.C., Zhou, J., Kacmar, K.M., & Howard, J.L. (1996b). Perceptions of organizational politics: Prediction, stress-related implications, and outcomes. Human Relations, 49, 233-266.
- Ferris, G.R., Judge, T.A., Rowland, K.M., & Fitzgibbons, D.E. (1994). Subordinate influence and the performance of organizational politics: Prediction, stress-related implications, and outcomes. Human Relations, 49, 233-266.
- Ferris, G.R., & Kacmar, K.M. (1992). Perceptions of organizational politics. Journal of Management, 18, 93-116.
- Ferris, G.R., Russ, G.S., & Fandt, P.M. (1989). Politics in organizations. In R.A. Giacalone & P. Rosenfeld (Eds.), Impression management in the organization (pp. 143-170). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

- Fried, Y. (1991). Meta-analytic comparison of the Job Diagnostic Survey and Job Characteristics Inventory as correlates of work satisfaction and performance. Journal of Applied Psychology, 76, 690-697.
- Furnham, A., Brewin, C.R., & O'Kelly, H. (1994). Cognitive style and attitudes toward work. Human Relations, 47, 1509-1521.
- Furnham, A., & Gunter, B. (1993). Corporate assessment. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Furnham, A., & Gunter, B. (1994). Biographical and personality predictors of organizational climate. Psychologia, 37, 199-210.
- Gable, M., & Dangelo, F. (1994). Locus of control, Machiavellianism, and managerial job performance. The Journal of Psychology, 128, 599-608.
- Gandz, J., & Murray, V.V. (1980). The experience of workplace politics. Academy of Management Journal, 23, 237-251.
- Gilmore, D.C., Ferris, G.R., Dulebohn, J.H., & Harrell-Cook, G. (1996). Organizational politics and employee attendance. Group & Organization Management, 21, 481-494.
- Glick, P. (1991). Trait-based and sex-based discrimination in occupational prestige, occupational salary, and hiring. Sex Roles, 25, 351-378.
- Greene, K.S., & Gynther, M.D. (1994). Another femininity scale? Psychological Reports, 75, 163-170.
- Gunter, B., & Furnham, A. (1996). Biographical and climate predictors of job satisfaction and pride in organization. The Journal of Psychology, 130, 193-208.
- Hackman, J.R., & Oldham, G.R. (1975). Development of the Job Diagnostic Survey. Journal of Applied Psychology, 60, 159-170.
- Harman, H.H. (1967). Modern factor analysis (2nd edition). Chicago, Ill: University of Chicago Press.
- Johns, G. (1992). Organizational behaviour: Understanding life at work. New York, NY: Harper Collins Publishers Inc.
- Judge, T.A., & Bretz, R.D. (1994). Political influence behaviour and career success. Journal of Management, 1, 43-65.

- Katz, D. (1987). Sex discrimination in hiring: The influence of organizational climate and need for approval on decision making behaviour. Psychology of Women Quarterly, 11, 11-20.
- Kerlinger, F. N. (1986). Foundations of behavioral research (3rd ed.). New York, NY: Holt, Rinehart, & Winston.
- Kirchmeyer, C. (1990). A profile of managers active in office politics. Basic and Applied Social Psychology, 11, 339-356.
- Kirk, R.E. (1996). Practical significance: A concept whose time has come. Educational and Psychological Measurement, 56, 746-759.
- Kite, M.E. (1996). Age, gender, and occupational label: A test of social role theory. Psychology of Women Quarterly, 20, 361-374.
- Kumar, K., & Beyerlein, M. (1991). Construction and validation of an instrument for measuring ingratiation behaviors in organizational settings. Journal of Applied Psychology, 76, 619-627.
- Larwood, L., Wright, T.A., Desrochers, S., & Dahir, V (1998). Extending latent role and psychological contract theories to predict intent to turnover and politics in business organizations. Group and Organization Management, 23, 100-123.
- LeBrasseur, R., Blackford, K., & Whissell, C. (1988). The Leford test of tenant locus of control: Introducing an effective measure relating locus of control and housing satisfaction. Environment and Behaviour, 20, 300-319.
- Lennox, R.D., & Wolfe, R.N. (1984). Revision of the Self-Monitoring Scale. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 46, 1349-1364.
- Levine, M.P., Smolak, L., Moodey, A.F., Shuman, M.D., & Hessen, L.D. (1994). Normative developmental changes and dieting and eating disturbances in middle school girls. International Journal of Eating Disorders, 15, 11-20.
- Lewin, K. (1936). Principles of topological psychology. New York, NY: McGraw-Hill.
- Liebert, R.M., & Spiegler, M.D. (1990). Personality: Strategies and issues. Belmont, CA: Brooks/Cole Publishing Co.
- Macan, T.H., Trusty, M.L., & Trimble, S.K. (1996). Spector's Work Locus of Control Scale: Dimensionality and validity evidence. Educational and Psychological Measurement, 56, 349-357.

- 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.
- Mason, E.S. (1995). Gender differences in job satisfaction. The Journal of Social Psychology, 135, 143-151.
- Miller, M.L., Omens, R.S., & Delvadia, R. (1991). Dimensions of social competence: Personality and coping style correlates. Personality and Individual Differences, 12, 955-964.
- Momtahan, K. (1995). Introduction of advanced technology into hospitals - Identifying the factors that contribute to its successful implementation: A case study of one hospital. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Carleton University, Ottawa.
- Moran, E.T., & Volkwein, J.F. (1992). The cultural approach to the formation of organizational climate. Human Relations, 45, 19-45.
- Morrison, D.M., Gillmore, M.R., & Baker, S.A. (1995). Determinants of condom use among high-risk heterosexual adults: A test of the theory of reasoned action. Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 25, 651-676.
- Mowday, R.T., Steers, R.M., & Porter, L.W. (1979). The measurement of organizational commitment. Journal of Vocational Behaviour, 14, 224-247.
- Mudrack, P.E. (1993). An investigation into the acceptability of workplace behaviors of a dubious ethical nature. Journal of Business Ethics, 12, 517-524.
- Mudrack, P.E., & Mason, E.S. (1995). More on the acceptability of workplace behaviors of a dubious ethical nature. Psychological Reports, 76, 639-648.
- Newcomb, M.D. (1990). What structural equation modeling can tell us about social support. In B.R. Sarason, I.G. Sarason, & G.R. Pierce (Eds.), Social support: An interactional view. New York, NY: John Wiley & Sons.
- Newcomb, M.D. (1994). Drug use and intimate relationships among women and men. Separating specific from general effects in prospective data using structural equation models. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 62, 463-476.
- Nye, L.G., & Witt, L.A. (1993). Dimensionality and construct validity of the perceptions of organizational politics scale. Educational and Psychological Measurement, 53, 821-829.

- Oldham, G.R., & Hackman, J.R. (1981). Relationships between organizational structure and employee reactions: Comparing alternative frameworks. Administrative Science Quarterly, 26, 66-83.
- 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.
- Payne, R. (1990). Madness in our method: A comment on Jackofsky and Slocum's paper, 'A longitudinal study of climates'. Journal of Organizational Behaviour, 11, 77-80.
- Porter, L.W., Allen, R.W., & Angle, H.L. (1981). The politics of upward influence in organizations. In L.L. Cummings & B.M. Staw (Eds.), Research in organizational behaviour (pp. 109-149). Greenwich, CT: JAI Press.
- Porter, L.W., Steers, R.M., Mowday, R.T., & Boulian, P.V. (1974). Organizational commitment, job satisfaction, and turnover among psychiatric technicians. Journal of Applied Psychology, 59, 603-609.
- Ransdell, L.B. (1996). Maximizing response rate in questionnaire research. American Journal of Health Behaviour, 20, 50-56.
- Reynolds, W.M. (1982). Development of reliable and valid short forms of the Marlowe-Crowne Social Desirability Scale. Journal of Clinical Psychology, 38, 119-125
- Rummel, R.J. (1970). Applied factor analysis. Evanston, Ill: Northwestern University Press.
- Schein, E.H. (1990). Organizational culture. American Psychologist, 45, 109-119.
- Sekaran, U. (1989). Paths to the job satisfaction of bank employees. Journal of Organizational Behaviour, 10, 347-359.
- 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.
- Shuptrine, F.K., Bearden, W.O., & Teel, J.E. (1990). An analysis of the dimensionality and reliability of the Lennox and Wolfe Revised Self-Monitoring Scale. Journal of Personality Assessment, 54, 515-522.
- Sims, H.P., Szilagyi, A.D., & Keller, R.T. (1976). The measurement of job characteristics. Academy of Management Journal, 19, 195-212.

- Skitka, L.J., & Maslach, C. (1996). Gender as a schematic category: A role construct approach. Social Behaviour and Personality, 24, 53-74.
- Smith, H.L., & Grenier, M. (1982). Sources of organizational power for women: Overcoming structural obstacles. Sex Roles, 8, 733-746.
- Smith, P.C., Kendall, L.M., & Hulin, L.L. (1969). The measurement of satisfaction in work and retirement. Chicago, IL: Rand McNally.
- Snyder, M. (1974). The self-monitoring of expressive behaviour. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 30, 526-537.
- Spector, P.E. (1988). Development of the Work Locus of Control Scale. Journal of Occupational Psychology, 61, 335-340.
- Spence, J.T., & Helmreich, R.L. (1978). Masculinity and femininity: Their psychological dimensions, correlates, and antecedents. Austin, TX: University of Texas Press.
- Steers, R.M., & Braunstein, D.N. (1976). A behaviorally-based measure of manifest needs in work settings. Journal of Vocational Behaviour, 9, 251-266.
- Stevens, G., & Hoisington, E. (1987). Occupational prestige and the 1980 U.S. labor force. Social Science Research, 16, 74-105.
- Stevens, J. (1992). Applied multivariate statistics for the social sciences. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Stryker, S., & Statham, A. (1985). In G. Lindzey & A. Aronson (Eds.), Handbook of social psychology (2nd edition). New York: Academic Press.
- Sypher, B.D., & Sypher, H.E. (1983). Perceptions of communication ability: Self-monitoring in an organizational setting. Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 9, 297-304.
- Tabachnick, B.G., & Fidell, L.S. (1989). Using multivariate statistics (2nd edition). New York, NY: HarperCollins.
- Tarr, H., & Lorr, M. (1991). A comparison of right-wing authoritarianism, conformity, and conservatism. Personality and Individual Differences, 12, 307-311.

- Taylor, J.C., & Bowers, D.G. (1972). Survey of organizations: A machine-scored standardized questionnaire instrument. Ann Arbor, MI: Center for Research on Utilization of Scientific Knowledge, Institute for Social Research, University of Michigan.
- Trafimow, D., & Radhakrishnan (1995). The cognitive organization of sex and occupation stereotypes. British Journal of Social Psychology, *34*, 189-197.
- Van Ryn, M., Lytle, L.A., & Kirscht, J.P. (1996). A test of the theory of planned behaviour for two health-related practices. Journal of Applied Social Psychology, *26*, 871-883.
- Vredenburgh, D.J., & Maurer, J.G. (1984). A process framework of organizational politics. Human Relations, *37*, 47-66.
- 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.
- Welsh, M.A., & Slusher, E.A. (1986). Organizational design as a context for political activity. Administrative Science Quarterly, *31*, 389-402.
- Whitman, L., Desmond, S.M., & Price, J.H. (1987). Development of a depression locus of control scale. Psychological Reports, *60*, 583-589.
- Wolf, F.M. (1986). Meta-analysis: Quantitative methods for research synthesis. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Xenikou, A., & Furnham, A. (1996). A correlational and factor analytic study of four questionnaire measures of organizational culture. Human Relations, *49*, 349-371.
- Yukl, G., Falbe, C.M., & Youn, J.Y. (1993). Patterns of influence behaviour for managers. Group & Organization Management, *18*, 5-28.
- 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.
- Zook, A., & Sipps, G.J. (1985). Cross-validation of a short form of the Marlowe-Crowne Social Desirability Scale. Journal of Clinical Psychology, *41*, 236-238.
- Zook, A., & Sipps, G.J. (1986). Reliability data and sex differences with a gender-free Mach IV. The Journal of Social Psychology, *126*, 131-132.

Appendix A

Vignette Version of Questionnaire (Study 1)

September 22, 1997

Dear Participant:

I am writing to request your assistance in completing the enclosed questionnaire. My name is Wendy E. O'Connor and I am a Ph.D. candidate at Carleton University. The data collected for this study will assist in the completion of my Doctoral Dissertation.

The enclosed questionnaire asks your opinions about a number of behaviours which employees may engage in to protect or further their career. As a participant, you will be asked a number of questions relating to your employment experience. You will also be asked to provide certain demographic information such as your sex and age. The questionnaire will take approximately one hour to complete.

Your participation is strictly voluntary. Any questions that you do not wish to answer may be omitted. You may choose to withdraw from this survey at any time, and you may do so without reason or consequence. It should also be noted that your responses are anonymous and confidential. Therefore, please try to answer each question as honestly as possible.

To safeguard your anonymity, your name should not appear anywhere on this questionnaire. A separate consent form, which requires your name and signature, has been included. The consent form is kept separate from your responses.

The following people are involved in this research, and may be contacted at any time:

- 1) Wendy E. O'Connor (Principal Investigator, Department of Psychology, Carleton University, 613-520-2600 extension 2683)
- 2) Dr. K. Matheson (Faculty Supervisor, Department of Psychology, Carleton University, 613-520-2600 extension 7513)

This project has been approved by the Ethics Review Committee at Carleton University. However, if you have any concerns about the ethics of this study, do not hesitate to contact Dr. M. Gick (Department of Psychology, Ethics Committee, 613-520-2600 extension 2664).

Finally, there are no physical or psychological risks in this study. However, if you experience undue stress as a result of completing this questionnaire, please contact the Ottawa Distress Centre at 613-238-3311.

Thank you in advance for your participation.

Sincerely,

Wendy E. O'Connor

Informed Consent: Please remove the bottom portion of this questionnaire and return it in a sealed, unmarked envelope.

Signature: I have read the above description of the study concerning the Political Activity Scale (PAS). The data in the study may be used in research. My signature indicates that I agree to participate in the study, and this in no way constitutes a waiver of my rights. Furthermore, I grant Wendy O'Connor permission to use my data in her Doctoral Dissertation or in other research projects, with the proviso that my anonymity be protected.

Participant's Name (please print): _____

Participant's Signature: _____

Date: _____

Part One

Please read these instructions carefully

The vignettes presented below describe a series of work-related behaviours, each of which is underlined for your convenience. An example of each behaviour is also provided. Three questions are presented below each vignette. For each question, please circle the response which you feel is most appropriate.

The first question asks you to indicate whether you have engaged in behaviour similar to the one described in the vignette, while working at your present job.

The second question asks you to indicate whether you believe the behaviour described in the vignette is relevant to your present job. That is, if you wanted to engage in the behaviour described in the vignette, would you be able to do so?

The third question asks you to indicate whether you believe the behaviour described in the vignette represents a form of office politics.

For the purpose of this study, *office politics* is defined as: *any informal behaviour which individuals or groups engage in to enhance or protect their career.*

All of your responses are anonymous and confidential.
Therefore, please try to answer each question as honestly as possible.

1. Exaggerate the importance of a task. George is a researcher for a large accounting firm. He was recently asked to prepare summaries of technical reports the firm had received over the past year. The task is tedious and of little consequence to the functioning of the firm. However, at the monthly staff meeting, George exaggerates the importance of this task.

A. How often do you engage in this behaviour while working at your present job?

1	2	3	4
Never	Seldom	Occasionally	Often

B. If an individual wanted to engage in this behaviour, would he or she be able to do so in your present job?

1	2	3	4
Often	Occasionally	Seldom	Never

C. Based on the definition of office politics provided on page two, how political do you believe this behaviour is?

1	2	3	4
Not at all Political	Slightly Political	Somewhat Political	Highly Political

2. Minimize a competitor's accomplishments. Erica has learned that Michelle, a competing salesperson, earned the annual award for greatest number of new accounts. Erica is upset because she had hoped to win the award. Later, she complains to her sales manager that Michelle had received the award only because she held the highest growth territory.

A. How often do you engage in this behaviour while working at your present job?

1	2	3	4
Never	Seldom	Occasionally	Often

B. If an individual wanted to engage in this behaviour, would he or she be able to do so in your present job?

1	2	3	4
Often	Occasionally	Seldom	Never

C. Based on the definition of office politics provided on page two, how political do you believe this behaviour is?

1	2	3	4
Not at all Political	Slightly Political	Somewhat Political	Highly Political

3. Help others in order to get their help later. Margaret works as a civil engineer for a large firm. She realizes that getting priority treatment from production is critical to the early completion of her new project. Therefore, when she hears the production manager is organizing this year's charity campaign for the firm, she immediately visits him to offer her help in the campaign.

A. How often do you engage in this behaviour while working at your present job?

1	2	3	4
Never	Seldom	Occasionally	Often

B. If an individual wanted to engage in this behaviour, would he or she be able to do so in your present job?

1	2	3	4
Often	Occasionally	Seldom	Never

C. Based on the definition of office politics provided on page two, how political do you believe this behaviour is?

1	2	3	4
Not at all Political	Slightly Political	Somewhat Political	Highly Political

4. Make others aware of your accomplishments. Jason works as a data entry operator for a large consulting firm. Due to a staffing shortage, he is temporarily assigned to another division in which he assists in the reorganization of the division's resource library. While working at this division, Jason continues to meet with his supervisor from data entry. During these informal meetings, Jason makes sure that he tells his supervisor about his most recent accomplishments.

A. How often do you engage in this behaviour while working at your present job?

1	2	3	4
Never	Seldom	Occasionally	Often

B. If an individual wanted to engage in this behaviour, would he or she be able to do so in your present job?

1	2	3	4
Often	Occasionally	Seldom	Never

C. Based on the definition of office politics provided on page two, how political do you believe this behaviour is?

1	2	3	4
Not at all Political	Slightly Political	Somewhat Political	Highly Political

5. Make a rival look bad. Dan works as a chemist in a large research lab. When reading the soon-to-be published study of a co-worker, he notices a careless error in the analysis. He decides to keep quiet about the error although he knows it will be discovered once the study becomes public.

A. How often do you engage in this behaviour while working at your present job?

1	2	3	4
Never	Seldom	Occasionally	Often

B. If an individual wanted to engage in this behaviour, would he or she be able to do so in your present job?

1	2	3	4
Often	Occasionally	Seldom	Never

C. Based on the definition of office politics provided on page two, how political do you believe this behaviour is?

1	2	3	4
Not at all Political	Slightly Political	Somewhat Political	Highly Political

6. Take credit for positive events that occur in your work group. Sarah works as a social worker for a community outreach organization. Over the past six months, Sarah has worked on a project with another group of social workers. Sarah had been appointed project leader because of her seniority, but the bulk of the work was carried out by the other members of the group. The findings of this project are to be presented to a committee of high-ranking community officials. There is no set format for making a presentation to the committee; however, Sarah informs the other social workers that she must present the findings alone.

A. How often do you engage in this behaviour while working at your present job?

1	2	3	4
Never	Seldom	Occasionally	Often

B. If an individual wanted to engage in this behaviour, would he or she be able to do so in your present job?

1	2	3	4
Often	Occasionally	Seldom	Never

C. Based on the definition of office politics provided on page two, how political do you believe this behaviour is?

1	2	3	4
Not at all Political	Slightly Political	Somewhat Political	Highly Political

7. Do personal favours. Joan works as a legal assistant for a small law firm, and is a capable employee. Joan's supervisor, Ann, never asks her to do personal favours. However, Joan often gets coffee for Ann, goes to the local delicatessen to pick up Ann's lunch, etc.

A. How often do you engage in this behaviour while working at your present job?

1	2	3	4
Never	Seldom	Occasionally	Often

B. If an individual wanted to engage in this behaviour, would he or she be able to do so in your present job?

1	2	3	4
Often	Occasionally	Seldom	Never

C. Based on the definition of office politics provided on page two, how political do you believe this behaviour is?

1	2	3	4
Not at all Political	Slightly Political	Somewhat Political	Highly Political

8. Support the opinions of others, even when you disagree with them. Kathy works as a secretary in the sociology department of a small community college. Due to budget restrictions, the department must choose between purchasing a new photocopier or buying new chairs for several sociology professors. Her supervisor, the head of the department, makes it known that he believes the funds should be spent on new chairs. Kathy does not agree. However, when he solicits her opinion, she tells him that the money should be spent on the chairs, rather than on a new photocopier.

A. How often do you engage in this behaviour while working at your present job?

1	2	3	4
Never	Seldom	Occasionally	Often

B. If an individual wanted to engage in this behaviour, would he or she be able to do so in your present job?

1	2	3	4
Often	Occasionally	Seldom	Never

C. Based on the definition of office politics provided on page two, how political do you believe this behaviour is?

1	2	3	4
Not at all Political	Slightly Political	Somewhat Political	Highly Political

9. Withhold information. Robert works as a sales manager for a large retail chain. At the annual meeting, all sales managers outline their marketing strategies for the following year. However, when it is Robert's turn to make his presentation, he deliberately omits some key information. Robert wants to make sure that his innovative marketing plan cannot be used by anyone else.

- A. How often do you engage in this behaviour while working at your present job?
- | | | | |
|-------|--------|--------------|-------|
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| Never | Seldom | Occasionally | Often |
- B. If an individual wanted to engage in this behaviour, would he or she be able to do so in your present job?
- | | | | |
|-------|--------------|--------|-------|
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| Often | Occasionally | Seldom | Never |
- C. Based on the definition of office politics provided on page two, how political do you believe this behaviour is?
- | | | | |
|-------------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|---------------------|
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| Not at all
Political | Slightly
Political | Somewhat
Political | Highly
Political |

10. Pretend to be interested in the personal life of others. Martin works as a research assistant for the government. Although Martin finds Joanna, his supervisor, rather boring, he pretends to be interested in Joanna's personal life. For example, last week, they talked at length about whether Joanna's oldest daughter should remain in private school, and about where Joanna's family should go for their summer vacation.

- A. How often do you engage in this behaviour while working at your present job?
- | | | | |
|-------|--------|--------------|-------|
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| Never | Seldom | Occasionally | Often |
- B. If an individual wanted to engage in this behaviour, would he or she be able to do so in your present job?
- | | | | |
|-------|--------------|--------|-------|
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| Often | Occasionally | Seldom | Never |
- C. Based on the definition of office politics provided on page two, how political do you believe this behaviour is?
- | | | | |
|-------------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|---------------------|
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| Not at all
Political | Slightly
Political | Somewhat
Political | Highly
Political |

11. Act as a "model" employee when others are present. Travis works as a graphics assistant for an advertising agency. Travis takes advantage of the fact that his supervisor travels extensively and is seldom at the agency. For example, Travis often arrives for work somewhat later than he is supposed to, and leaves somewhat earlier. However, when his supervisor is present, Travis becomes a perfect employee (e.g., he never takes longer than the established time for lunch, arrives at work early, etc.).

- A. How often do you engage in this behaviour while working at your present job?
- | | | | |
|-------|--------|--------------|-------|
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| Never | Seldom | Occasionally | Often |
- B. If an individual wanted to engage in this behaviour, would he or she be able to do so in your present job?
- | | | | |
|-------|--------------|--------|-------|
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| Often | Occasionally | Seldom | Never |
- C. Based on the definition of office politics provided on page two, how political do you believe this behaviour is?
- | | | | |
|-------------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|---------------------|
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| Not at all
Political | Slightly
Political | Somewhat
Political | Highly
Political |

12. Issue compliments on personal appearance, even when they are not warranted. Cindy works as an administrative assistant for a large software firm. Cindy believes that her supervisor, Carol, possesses terrible taste in clothes. However, even when she is wearing the tackiest of outfits, Cindy never fails to compliment Carol on her appearance.

- A. How often do you engage in this behaviour while working at your present job?
- | | | | |
|-------|--------|--------------|-------|
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| Never | Seldom | Occasionally | Often |
- B. If an individual wanted to engage in this behaviour, would he or she be able to do so in your present job?
- | | | | |
|-------|--------------|--------|-------|
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| Often | Occasionally | Seldom | Never |
- C. Based on the definition of office politics provided on page two, how political do you believe this behaviour is?
- | | | | |
|-------------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|---------------------|
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| Not at all
Political | Slightly
Political | Somewhat
Political | Highly
Political |

13. Not fully commit yourself until you know which side is “winning”. Karen is an associate professor of psychology at a large university. During departmental meetings, heated exchanges often occur between individuals advocating different positions on a given issue. Karen, however, never completely commits herself to one position. Thus, if something goes wrong, she can bend to the other side, escape any blame, and in so doing, safeguard her promotion opportunities.

- A. How often do you engage in this behaviour while working at your present job?
- | | | | |
|-------|--------|--------------|-------|
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| Never | Seldom | Occasionally | Often |
- B. If an individual wanted to engage in this behaviour, would he or she be able to do so in your present job?
- | | | | |
|-------|--------------|--------|-------|
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| Often | Occasionally | Seldom | Never |
- C. Based on the definition of office politics provided on page two, how political do you believe this behaviour is?
- | | | | |
|-------------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|---------------------|
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| Not at all
Political | Slightly
Political | Somewhat
Political | Highly
Political |

14. Blame others when something you are associated with goes wrong. Allan works as a bank teller. When a customer complains to Allan's supervisor about his service, Allan immediately responds that the problem should be blamed on Joe, another teller at the bank. Allan reports that he is constantly helping Joe with his work and, thus, isn't able to focus on what he is supposed to be doing.

- A. How often do you engage in this behaviour while working at your present job?
- | | | | |
|-------|--------|--------------|-------|
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| Never | Seldom | Occasionally | Often |
- B. If an individual wanted to engage in this behaviour, would he or she be able to do so in your present job?
- | | | | |
|-------|--------------|--------|-------|
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| Often | Occasionally | Seldom | Never |
- C. Based on the definition of office politics provided on page two, how political do you believe this behaviour is?
- | | | | |
|-------------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|---------------------|
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| Not at all
Political | Slightly
Political | Somewhat
Political | Highly
Political |

15. Praise others on their accomplishments, even when you don't think the accomplishment are very impressive. Mindy works as an assistant policy analyst for the government. Her supervisor, Charles, recently received a certificate confirming that he had completed a series of management training courses. Mindy took Charles out for lunch to celebrate his accomplishment, even though she didn't think that receiving a certificate was very impressive.

- A. How often do you engage in this behaviour while working at your present job?
- | | | | |
|-------|--------|--------------|-------|
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| Never | Seldom | Occasionally | Often |
- B. If an individual wanted to engage in this behaviour, would he or she be able to do so in your present job?
- | | | | |
|-------|--------------|--------|-------|
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| Often | Occasionally | Seldom | Never |
- C. Based on the definition of office politics provided on page two, how political do you believe this behaviour is?
- | | | | |
|-------------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|---------------------|
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| Not at all
Political | Slightly
Political | Somewhat
Political | Highly
Political |

16. Develop strong allies. Allison is a vice-president in a bank that appointed a new president earlier this year. It became evident the new president held a very different perspective on banking than Allison, and Allison began to fear that some innovative and popular services may be eliminated. Hence, for the past six months, Allison has been developing strong alliances with other vice-presidents who share her interests and feel similarly threatened.

- A. How often do you engage in this behaviour while working at your present job?
- | | | | |
|-------|--------|--------------|-------|
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| Never | Seldom | Occasionally | Often |
- B. If an individual wanted to engage in this behaviour, would he or she be able to do so in your present job?
- | | | | |
|-------|--------------|--------|-------|
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| Often | Occasionally | Seldom | Never |
- C. Based on the definition of office politics provided on page two, how political do you believe this behaviour is?
- | | | | |
|-------------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|---------------------|
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| Not at all
Political | Slightly
Political | Somewhat
Political | Highly
Political |

17. Use information to overwhelm others. Anthony works as a manager for a large plastics company. He has to report to a senior committee on his recent decision concerning a change in supplier. He suspects the committee will not challenge a decision supported by volumes of information. Hence, he comes to the meeting prepared to overwhelm the committee with graphs, tables, and calculations on the supplier's performance.

- A. How often do you engage in this behaviour while working at your present job?
- | | | | |
|-------|--------|--------------|-------|
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| Never | Seldom | Occasionally | Often |
- B. If an individual wanted to engage in this behaviour, would he or she be able to do so in your present job?
- | | | | |
|-------|--------------|--------|-------|
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| Often | Occasionally | Seldom | Never |
- C. Based on the definition of office politics provided on page two, how political do you believe this behaviour is?
- | | | | |
|-------------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|---------------------|
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| Not at all
Political | Slightly
Political | Somewhat
Political | Highly
Political |

18. Associate with influential people. Paul owns a medical supply company in a small community. His products are competitive but he knows doctors can easily use other suppliers located in the city nearby. To ensure that his company is successful, Paul socializes with influential doctors in the community.

- A. How often do you engage in this behaviour while working at your present job?
- | | | | |
|-------|--------|--------------|-------|
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| Never | Seldom | Occasionally | Often |
- B. If an individual wanted to engage in this behaviour, would he or she be able to do so in your present job?
- | | | | |
|-------|--------------|--------|-------|
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| Often | Occasionally | Seldom | Never |
- C. Based on the definition of office politics provided on page two, how political do you believe this behaviour is?
- | | | | |
|-------------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|---------------------|
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| Not at all
Political | Slightly
Political | Somewhat
Political | Highly
Political |

19. Minimize the importance of negative events. Mildred works as a secretary for a dental office. She accidentally erases a computer disk containing detailed information about approximately 75 patients. To correct the error, Mildred will have to locate each patient's chart and then reenter the patient's data on the computer, a procedure that will take many hours. However, when she informs her supervisor about the mistake, she says that it will only take a "couple of hours" to correct.

- A. How often do you engage in this behaviour while working at your present job?
- | | | | |
|-------|--------|--------------|-------|
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| Never | Seldom | Occasionally | Often |
- B. If an individual wanted to engage in this behaviour, would he or she be able to do so in your present job?
- | | | | |
|-------|--------------|--------|-------|
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| Often | Occasionally | Seldom | Never |
- C. Based on the definition of office politics provided on page two, how political do you believe this behaviour is?
- | | | | |
|-------------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|---------------------|
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| Not at all
Political | Slightly
Political | Somewhat
Political | Highly
Political |

20. Selectively delay work for specific gain. Marsha works as a dietician for a large senior citizens' centre. She promises a co-worker that she will assist him in preparing meal plans for several recently admitted clients. However, when her supervisor, Elizabeth, asks someone to consolidate the centre's computer files, Marsha volunteers. Marsha then tells her co-worker that she is simply too busy to help him at this time. After all, doing favours for her supervisor is more important than helping a co-worker in distress.

- A. How often do you engage in this behaviour while working at your present job?
- | | | | |
|-------|--------|--------------|-------|
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| Never | Seldom | Occasionally | Often |
- B. If an individual wanted to engage in this behaviour, would he or she be able to do so in your present job?
- | | | | |
|-------|--------------|--------|-------|
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| Often | Occasionally | Seldom | Never |
- C. Based on the definition of office politics provided on page two, how political do you believe this behaviour is?
- | | | | |
|-------------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|---------------------|
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| Not at all
Political | Slightly
Political | Somewhat
Political | Highly
Political |

21. Make sure you have the right image. Paula manages an engineering area largely responsible for low profile and production type functions. Yet, to be noticed in her company, one needs a creative and exciting image. Upon hearing about it, she pushes to take a risky but innovative project in an attempt to change the image of herself and her area.

- A. How often do you engage in this behaviour while working at your present job?
- | | | | |
|-------|--------|--------------|-------|
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| Never | Seldom | Occasionally | Often |
- B. If an individual wanted to engage in this behaviour, would he or she be able to do so in your present job?
- | | | | |
|-------|--------------|--------|-------|
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| Often | Occasionally | Seldom | Never |
- C. Based on the definition of office politics provided on page two, how political do you believe this behaviour is?
- | | | | |
|-------------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|---------------------|
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| Not at all
Political | Slightly
Political | Somewhat
Political | Highly
Political |

22. Use personal relationship with others. Linda works as a tax consultant for a mid-sized accounting firm. Recently, Linda recommended that a small research company owned by her brother-in-law, John, be awarded the contract to conduct the accounting firm's annual evaluation of its employees. Linda knows that with John at the helm, she is guaranteed a favourable employee evaluation.

- A. How often do you engage in this behaviour while working at your present job?
- | | | | |
|-------|--------|--------------|-------|
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| Never | Seldom | Occasionally | Often |
- B. If an individual wanted to engage in this behaviour, would he or she be able to do so in your present job?
- | | | | |
|-------|--------------|--------|-------|
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| Often | Occasionally | Seldom | Never |
- C. Based on the definition of office politics provided on page two, how political do you believe this behaviour is?
- | | | | |
|-------------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|---------------------|
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| Not at all
Political | Slightly
Political | Somewhat
Political | Highly
Political |

23. Get others to emphasize your importance to the organization. Bob works as a counsellor for a government-sponsored drug rehabilitation centre. He often informs his clients that, due to government cutbacks, many of the services he provides may be eliminated. Thus, Bob encourages clients to tell his superiors how much they value the services they receive. Bob knows that when clients do this, they will invariably devote much of their conversation to praising him and the work he has done. As a result, Bob's supervisors will be reminded continually that he is a top-notch employee.

- A. How often do you engage in this behaviour while working at your present job?
- | | | | |
|-------|--------|--------------|-------|
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| Never | Seldom | Occasionally | Often |
- B. If an individual wanted to engage in this behaviour, would he or she be able to do so in your present job?
- | | | | |
|-------|--------------|--------|-------|
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| Often | Occasionally | Seldom | Never |
- C. Based on the definition of office politics provided on page two, how political do you believe this behaviour is?
- | | | | |
|-------------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|---------------------|
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| Not at all
Political | Slightly
Political | Somewhat
Political | Highly
Political |

24. Get an expert to support your position. Brian is a vice-president in a prosperous manufacturing firm. Currently, the executives are in the process of selecting the site for a new plant. To help them reach a decision, Brian hires a well-known consultant in the field whose beliefs give support to Brian's preferred choice for the site.

- A. How often do you engage in this behaviour while working at your present job?
- | | | | |
|-------|--------|--------------|-------|
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| Never | Seldom | Occasionally | Often |
- B. If an individual wanted to engage in this behaviour, would he or she be able to do so in your present job?
- | | | | |
|-------|--------------|--------|-------|
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| Often | Occasionally | Seldom | Never |
- C. Based on the definition of office politics provided on page two, how political do you believe this behaviour is?
- | | | | |
|-------------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|---------------------|
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| Not at all
Political | Slightly
Political | Somewhat
Political | Highly
Political |

25. Emphasize information to support your case. Steve works as an advertiser for a large marketing firm. He is preparing a proposal for a new advertising campaign that he believes will help him gain a deserved promotion. Without in any way distorting the facts or lying, he writes the report so as to emphasize that information which best supports his case.

- A. How often do you engage in this behaviour while working at your present job?
- | | | | |
|-------|--------|--------------|-------|
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| Never | Seldom | Occasionally | Often |
- B. If an individual wanted to engage in this behaviour, would he or she be able to do so in your present job?
- | | | | |
|-------|--------------|--------|-------|
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| Often | Occasionally | Seldom | Never |
- C. Based on the definition of office politics provided on page two, how political do you believe this behaviour is?
- | | | | |
|-------------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|---------------------|
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| Not at all
Political | Slightly
Political | Somewhat
Political | Highly
Political |

Part Two

Please answer the following questions about yourself

1. Sex _____ (1=male; 2=female)
2. Present occupation _____ (please fill in)
3. In your present occupation, do you supervise other employees? _____
(1=yes; no=2)
4. **If yes,**
Please indicate how many employees you supervise _____
5. Age _____ (please fill in)
6. Education level completed (please circle the **HIGHEST** level that applies to you)
 - A. High school graduate
 - B. Some college
 - C. College graduate
 - D. Some university
 - E. University undergraduate degree
 - F. Some graduate school
 - G. Master's, Ph.D., M.D., or other advanced degree
 - H. Other (please fill in) _____

Part Three

For questions 1 to 12, place the number which you feel is most appropriate beside each statement

- 7 = always true**
- 6 = almost always true**
- 5 = usually true**
- 4 = sometimes true**
- 3 = seldom true**
- 2 = almost never true**
- 1 = never true**

1. In social situations, I have the ability to alter my behaviour if I feel that something else is called for.
2. Where I work, there can be little action taken until a supervisor approves a decision.
3. I have the ability to control the way I come across to people, depending on the impression I wish to give them.
4. Where I work, a person who wants to make his or her own decisions would be quickly discouraged.
5. Where I work, even small matters have to be referred to someone higher up for a final answer.
6. When I feel that the image I am portraying isn't working, I can readily change it to something that does.
7. I have trouble changing my behaviour to suit different people and different situations.
8. I have found that I can adjust my behaviour to meet the requirements of any situation in which I find myself.
9. Even when it is to my advantage, I have difficulty putting up a good front.
10. In my present job, I have to ask my boss before I do almost anything.

11. Once I know what the situation calls for, it's easy for me to regulate my actions accordingly.
12. In my present job, any decision I make has to have the approval of my boss.

Part Four

The twenty-five vignettes described in Part One of this survey outline behaviours that may be viewed as examples of office politics. However, it is possible that certain behaviours were overlooked. Please take a minute or so to think about behaviours that you believe represent examples of office politics. These may be behaviours that you have performed yourself; behaviours that you have observed other employees perform; or behaviours that you believe "political players" use. Then, write these behaviours down in the space provided below.

Please indicate in minutes:

1. How long you took to fill out the questionnaire _____

Please indicate on a scale of 1 to 10

2. How difficult you found the questionnaire to complete (1=not at all difficult; 10=very difficult) _____

Please indicate on a scale of 1 to 10

3. How useful you found the vignettes in understanding the behaviour (1=not at all useful; 10=very useful) _____

Thank you for your participation !

Appendix B

Statement Version of the Questionnaire (Study 1)**Part One****Please read these instructions carefully**

The items presented below describe a series of work-related behaviours, each of which is underlined for your convenience. Three questions are presented below each item.

The **first** question asks you to indicate whether you have engaged in behaviour similar to the one described, while working at your **present job**.

The **second** question asks you to indicate whether you believe the behaviour described is relevant to your **present job**. That is, if you wanted to engage in the behaviour described, would you be able to do so?

The **third** question asks you to indicate whether you believe the behaviour described represents a form of office politics. For the purpose of this study, office politics is defined as: any informal behaviour which individuals or groups engage in to enhance or protect their career.

All of your responses are anonymous and confidential.

Therefore, please try to answer each question as honestly as possible.

1. **Exaggerate the importance of a task.**

A. How often do you engage in this behaviour while working at your **present job**?

1	2	3	4
“Never”	“Seldom”	“Occasionally”	“Often”

B. Do you believe this behaviour is relevant to your present job?

1	2	3	4
“Definitely Not Relevant”	“Relevant on Few Occasions”	“Probably Relevant”	“Definitely Relevant”

C. Please indicate whether you believe this behaviour represents an example of office politics.

1	2	3	4
“Not at all Political”	“Slightly Political”	“Somewhat Political”	“Highly Political”

2. **Minimize a competitor's accomplishments.**

- A. How often do you engage in this behaviour while working at your present job?
- | | | | |
|---------|----------|----------------|---------|
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| "Never" | "Seldom" | "Occasionally" | "Often" |
- B. Do you believe this behaviour is relevant to your present job?
- | | | | |
|---------------------------|-----------------------------|---------------------|-----------------------|
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| "Definitely Not Relevant" | "Relevant on Few Occasions" | "Probably Relevant" | "Definitely Relevant" |
- C. Please indicate whether you believe this behaviour represents an example of office politics.
- | | | | |
|------------------------|----------------------|----------------------|--------------------|
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| "Not at all Political" | "Slightly Political" | "Somewhat Political" | "Highly Political" |

3. **Help others in order to get their help later.**

- A. How often do you engage in this behaviour while working at your present job?
- | | | | |
|---------|----------|----------------|---------|
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| "Never" | "Seldom" | "Occasionally" | "Often" |
- B. Do you believe this behaviour is relevant to your present job?
- | | | | |
|---------------------------|-----------------------------|---------------------|-----------------------|
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| "Definitely Not Relevant" | "Relevant on Few Occasions" | "Probably Relevant" | "Definitely Relevant" |
- C. Please indicate whether you believe this behaviour represents an example of office politics.
- | | | | |
|------------------------|----------------------|----------------------|--------------------|
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| "Not at all Political" | "Slightly Political" | "Somewhat Political" | "Highly Political" |

4. **Make others aware of your accomplishments.**

- A. How often do you engage in this behaviour while working at your present job?
- | | | | |
|---------|----------|----------------|---------|
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| "Never" | "Seldom" | "Occasionally" | "Often" |

B. Do you believe this behaviour is relevant to your present job?

1	2	3	4
“Definitely Not Relevant”	“Relevant on Few Occasions”	“Probably Relevant”	“Definitely Relevant”

C. Please indicate whether you believe this behaviour represents an example of office politics.

1	2	3	4
“Not at all Political”	“Slightly Political”	“Somewhat Political”	“Highly Political”

5. **Make a rival look bad.**

A. How often do you engage in this behaviour while working at your present job?

1	2	3	4
“Never”	“Seldom”	“Occasionally”	“Often”

B. Do you believe this behaviour is relevant to your present job?

1	2	3	4
“Definitely Not Relevant”	“Relevant on Few Occasions”	“Probably Relevant”	“Definitely Relevant”

C. Please indicate whether you believe this behaviour represents an example of office politics.

1	2	3	4
“Not at all Political”	“Slightly Political”	“Somewhat Political”	“Highly Political”

6. **Take credit for positive events that occur in your work group.**

A. How often do you engage in this behaviour while working at your present job?

1	2	3	4
“Never”	“Seldom”	“Occasionally”	“Often”

B. Do you believe this behaviour is relevant to your present job?

1	2	3	4
“Definitely Not Relevant”	“Relevant on Few Occasions”	“Probably Relevant”	“Definitely Relevant”

- C. Please indicate whether you believe this behaviour represents an example of office politics.

1	2	3	4
“Not at all Political”	“Slightly Political”	“Somewhat Political”	“Highly Political”

7. **Do personal favours.**

- A. How often do you engage in this behaviour while working at your present job?

1	2	3	4
“Never”	“Seldom”	“Occasionally”	“Often”

- B. Do you believe this behaviour is relevant to your present job?

1	2	3	4
“Definitely Not Relevant”	“Relevant on Few Occasions”	“Probably Relevant”	“Definitely Relevant”

- C. Please indicate whether you believe this behaviour represents an example of office politics.

1	2	3	4
“Not at all Political”	“Slightly Political”	“Somewhat Political”	“Highly Political”

8. **Support the opinions of others, even when you disagree with them.**

- A. How often do you engage in this behaviour while working at your present job?

1	2	3	4
“Never”	“Seldom”	“Occasionally”	“Often”

- B. Do you believe this behaviour is relevant to your present job?

1	2	3	4
“Definitely Not Relevant”	“Relevant on Few Occasions”	“Probably Relevant”	“Definitely Relevant”

- C. Please indicate whether you believe this behaviour represents an example of office politics.

1	2	3	4
“Not at all Political”	“Slightly Political”	“Somewhat Political”	“Highly Political”

9. **Withhold information.**

- A. How often do you engage in this behaviour while working at your present job?
- | | | | |
|---------|----------|----------------|---------|
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| “Never” | “Seldom” | “Occasionally” | “Often” |
- B. Do you believe this behaviour is relevant to your present job?
- | | | | |
|---------------------------|-----------------------------|---------------------|-----------------------|
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| “Definitely Not Relevant” | “Relevant on Few Occasions” | “Probably Relevant” | “Definitely Relevant” |
- C. Please indicate whether you believe this behaviour represents an example of office politics.
- | | | | |
|------------------------|----------------------|----------------------|--------------------|
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| “Not at all Political” | “Slightly Political” | “Somewhat Political” | “Highly Political” |

10. **Pretend to be interested in the personal life of others.**

- A. How often do you engage in this behaviour while working at your present job?
- | | | | |
|---------|----------|----------------|---------|
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| “Never” | “Seldom” | “Occasionally” | “Often” |
- B. Do you believe this behaviour is relevant to your present job?
- | | | | |
|---------------------------|-----------------------------|---------------------|-----------------------|
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| “Definitely Not Relevant” | “Relevant on Few Occasions” | “Probably Relevant” | “Definitely Relevant” |
- C. Please indicate whether you believe this behaviour represents an example of office politics.
- | | | | |
|------------------------|----------------------|----------------------|--------------------|
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| “Not at all Political” | “Slightly Political” | “Somewhat Political” | “Highly Political” |

11. **Act as a “model” employee when others are present.**

- A. How often do you engage in this behaviour while working at your present job?
- | | | | |
|---------|----------|----------------|---------|
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| “Never” | “Seldom” | “Occasionally” | “Often” |

B. Do you believe this behaviour is relevant to your present job?

1	2	3	4
“Definitely Not Relevant”	“Relevant on Few Occasions”	“Probably Relevant”	“Definitely Relevant”

C. Please indicate whether you believe this behaviour represents an example of office politics.

1	2	3	4
“Not at all Political”	“Slightly Political”	“Somewhat Political”	“Highly Political”

12. **Issue compliments on personal appearance, even when they are not warranted.**

A. How often do you engage in this behaviour while working at your present job?

1	2	3	4
“Never”	“Seldom”	“Occasionally”	“Often”

B. Do you believe this behaviour is relevant to your present job?

1	2	3	4
“Definitely Not Relevant”	“Relevant on Few Occasions”	“Probably Relevant”	“Definitely Relevant”

C. Please indicate whether you believe this behaviour represents an example of office politics.

1	2	3	4
“Not at all Political”	“Slightly Political”	“Somewhat Political”	“Highly Political”

13. **Not fully commit yourself until you know which side is “winning”.**

A. How often do you engage in this behaviour while working at your present job?

1	2	3	4
“Never”	“Seldom”	“Occasionally”	“Often”

B. Do you believe this behaviour is relevant to your present job?

1	2	3	4
“Definitely Not Relevant”	“Relevant on Few Occasions”	“Probably Relevant”	“Definitely Relevant”

C. Please indicate whether you believe this behaviour represents an example of office politics.

1	2	3	4
“Not at all Political”	“Slightly Political”	“Somewhat Political”	“Highly Political”

14. **Blame others when something you are associated with goes wrong.**

A. How often do you engage in this behaviour while working at your present job?

1	2	3	4
“Never”	“Seldom”	“Occasionally”	“Often”

B. Do you believe this behaviour is relevant to your present job?

1	2	3	4
“Definitely Not Relevant”	“Relevant on Few Occasions”	“Probably Relevant”	“Definitely Relevant”

C. Please indicate whether you believe this behaviour represents an example of office politics.

1	2	3	4
“Not at all Political”	“Slightly Political”	“Somewhat Political”	“Highly Political”

15. **Praise others on their accomplishments, even when you don't think the accomplishment are very impressive.**

A. How often do you engage in this behaviour while working at your present job?

1	2	3	4
“Never”	“Seldom”	“Occasionally”	“Often”

B. Do you believe this behaviour is relevant to your present job?

1	2	3	4
“Definitely Not Relevant”	“Relevant on Few Occasions”	“Probably Relevant”	“Definitely Relevant”

C. Please indicate whether you believe this behaviour represents an example of office politics.

1	2	3	4
“Not at all Political”	“Slightly Political”	“Somewhat Political”	“Highly Political”

16. **Develop strong allies.**

- A. How often do you engage in this behaviour while working at your present job?
- | | | | |
|---------|----------|----------------|---------|
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| “Never” | “Seldom” | “Occasionally” | “Often” |
- B. Do you believe this behaviour is relevant to your present job?
- | | | | |
|---------------------------|-----------------------------|---------------------|-----------------------|
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| “Definitely Not Relevant” | “Relevant on Few Occasions” | “Probably Relevant” | “Definitely Relevant” |
- C. Please indicate whether you believe this behaviour represents an example of office politics.
- | | | | |
|------------------------|----------------------|----------------------|--------------------|
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| “Not at all Political” | “Slightly Political” | “Somewhat Political” | “Highly Political” |

17. **Use information to overwhelm others.**

- A. How often do you engage in this behaviour while working at your present job?
- | | | | |
|---------|----------|----------------|---------|
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| “Never” | “Seldom” | “Occasionally” | “Often” |
- B. Do you believe this behaviour is relevant to your present job?
- | | | | |
|---------------------------|-----------------------------|---------------------|-----------------------|
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| “Definitely Not Relevant” | “Relevant on Few Occasions” | “Probably Relevant” | “Definitely Relevant” |
- C. Please indicate whether you believe this behaviour represents an example of office politics.
- | | | | |
|------------------------|----------------------|----------------------|--------------------|
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| “Not at all Political” | “Slightly Political” | “Somewhat Political” | “Highly Political” |

18. **Associate with influential people.**

- A. How often do you engage in this behaviour while working at your present job?
- | | | | |
|---------|----------|----------------|---------|
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| “Never” | “Seldom” | “Occasionally” | “Often” |

- B. Do you believe this behaviour is relevant to your present job?
- | | | | |
|---------------------------|-----------------------------|---------------------|-----------------------|
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| “Definitely Not Relevant” | “Relevant on Few Occasions” | “Probably Relevant” | “Definitely Relevant” |
- C. Please indicate whether you believe this behaviour represents an example of office politics.
- | | | | |
|------------------------|----------------------|----------------------|--------------------|
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| “Not at all Political” | “Slightly Political” | “Somewhat Political” | “Highly Political” |
19. **Minimize the importance of negative events.**
- A. How often do you engage in this behaviour while working at your present job?
- | | | | |
|---------|----------|----------------|---------|
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| “Never” | “Seldom” | “Occasionally” | “Often” |
- B. Do you believe this behaviour is relevant to your present job?
- | | | | |
|---------------------------|-----------------------------|---------------------|-----------------------|
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| “Definitely Not Relevant” | “Relevant on Few Occasions” | “Probably Relevant” | “Definitely Relevant” |
- C. Please indicate whether you believe this behaviour represents an example of office politics.
- | | | | |
|------------------------|----------------------|----------------------|--------------------|
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| “Not at all Political” | “Slightly Political” | “Somewhat Political” | “Highly Political” |
20. **Selectively delay work for specific gain.**
- A. How often do you engage in this behaviour while working at your present job?
- | | | | |
|---------|----------|----------------|---------|
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| “Never” | “Seldom” | “Occasionally” | “Often” |
- B. Do you believe this behaviour is relevant to your present job?
- | | | | |
|---------------------------|-----------------------------|---------------------|-----------------------|
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| “Definitely Not Relevant” | “Relevant on Few Occasions” | “Probably Relevant” | “Definitely Relevant” |

C. Please indicate whether you believe this behaviour represents an example of office politics.

1	2	3	4
“Not at all Political”	“Slightly Political”	“Somewhat Political”	“Highly Political”

21. **Make sure you have the right image.**

A. How often do you engage in this behaviour while working at your present job?

1	2	3	4
“Never”	“Seldom”	“Occasionally”	“Often”

B. Do you believe this behaviour is relevant to your present job?

1	2	3	4
“Definitely Not Relevant”	“Relevant on Few Occasions”	“Probably Relevant”	“Definitely Relevant”

C. Please indicate whether you believe this behaviour represents an example of office politics.

1	2	3	4
“Not at all Political”	“Slightly Political”	“Somewhat Political”	“Highly Political”

22. **Use personal relationship with others.**

A. How often do you engage in this behaviour while working at your present job?

1	2	3	4
“Never”	“Seldom”	“Occasionally”	“Often”

B. Do you believe this behaviour is relevant to your present job?

1	2	3	4
“Definitely Not Relevant”	“Relevant on Few Occasions”	“Probably Relevant”	“Definitely Relevant”

C. Please indicate whether you believe this behaviour represents an example of office politics.

1	2	3	4
“Not at all Political”	“Slightly Political”	“Somewhat Political”	“Highly Political”

23. **Get others to emphasize your importance to the organization.**

A. How often do you engage in this behaviour while working at your present job?

1	2	3	4
“Never”	“Seldom”	“Occasionally”	“Often”

B. Do you believe this behaviour is relevant to your present job?

1	2	3	4
“Definitely Not Relevant”	“Relevant on Few Occasions”	“Probably Relevant”	“Definitely Relevant”

C. Please indicate whether you believe this behaviour represents an example of office politics.

1	2	3	4
“Not at all Political”	“Slightly Political”	“Somewhat Political”	“Highly Political”

24. **Get an expert to support your position.**

A. How often do you engage in this behaviour while working at your present job?

1	2	3	4
“Never”	“Seldom”	“Occasionally”	“Often”

B. Do you believe this behaviour is relevant to your present job?

1	2	3	4
“Definitely Not Relevant”	“Relevant on Few Occasions”	“Probably Relevant”	“Definitely Relevant”

C. Please indicate whether you believe this behaviour represents an example of office politics.

1	2	3	4
“Not at all Political”	“Slightly Political”	“Somewhat Political”	“Highly Political”

25. **Emphasize information to support your case.**

A. How often do you engage in this behaviour while working at your present job?

1	2	3	4
“Never”	“Seldom”	“Occasionally”	“Often”

B. Do you believe this behaviour is relevant to your present job?

1	2	3	4
“Definitely Not Relevant”	“Relevant on Few Occasions”	“Probably Relevant”	“Definitely Relevant”

C. Please indicate whether you believe this behaviour represents an example of office politics.

1	2	3	4
“Not at all Political”	“Slightly Political”	“Somewhat Political”	“Highly Political”

Part Two

Please answer the following questions about yourself

1. Sex _____ (1=male; 2=female)
2. Present occupation _____ (please fill in)
3. In your present occupation, do you supervise other employees? _____
(1=yes; no=2)
4. Age _____ (please fill in)
5. Education level completed (please circle the HIGHEST level that applies to you)
 - A. High school graduate
 - B. Some college
 - C. College graduate
 - D. Some university
 - E. University undergraduate degree
 - F. Some graduate school
 - G. Master’s, Ph.D., M.D., or other advanced degree
 - H. Other (please fill in) _____

Part Three

For questions 1 to 12, place the number which you feel is most appropriate beside each statement

- 7 = always true**
- 6 = almost always true**
- 5 = usually true**
- 4 = sometimes true**
- 3 = seldom true**
- 2 = almost never true**
- 1 = never true**

1. In social situations, I have the ability to alter my behaviour if I feel that something else is called for.
2. Where I work, there can be little action taken until a supervisor approves a decision.
3. I have the ability to control the way I come across to people, depending on the impression I wish to give them.
4. Where I work, a person who wants to make his or her own decisions would be quickly discouraged.
5. Where I work, even small matters have to be referred to someone higher up for a final answer.
6. When I feel that the image I am portraying isn't working, I can readily change it to something that does.
7. I have trouble changing my behaviour to suit different people and different situations.
8. I have found that I can adjust my behaviour to meet the requirements of any situation in which I find myself.
9. Even when it is to my advantage, I have difficulty putting up a good front.
10. In my present job, I have to ask my boss before I do almost anything.

11. Once I know what the situation calls for, it's easy for me to regulate my actions accordingly.
12. In my present job, any decision I make has to have the approval of my boss.

Part Four

The twenty-five vignettes described in this survey outline behaviours that may be viewed as examples of office politics. However, it is possible that certain behaviours were overlooked. Please take a minute or so to think about behaviours that you believe represent examples of office politics. These may be behaviours that you have performed yourself; behaviours that you have observed other employees perform; or behaviours that you believe "political players" use. Then, write these behaviours down in the space provided below.

Thank you for your participation !

Appendix C

Personal Attributes Questionnaire

The items below consist of a pair of characteristics, with the letters A through E in between. For example: Not at all artistic A.....B.....C.....D.....E Very artistic.

Each pair describes contradictory characteristics - that is, an individual cannot be both at the same time, such as very artistic and not at all artistic. The letters form a scale between the two extremes.

For each pair of characteristics, please select a letter which corresponds to where *you believe* an employee should fall if he or she is to be competent in the occupation described above. For example, if you think employees in Occupation X do not need to possess any artistic ability in order to be competent in that job, you would choose A. If you think employees in Occupation X must possess artistic ability in order to perform the job competently, you would choose E.

- | | | |
|--|---------------------------|--|
| 1. Not at all independent | A.....B.....C.....D.....E | Very independent |
| 2. Not at all emotional | A.....B.....C.....D.....E | Very emotional |
| 3. Very passive | A.....B.....C.....D.....E | Very active |
| 4. Not at all able to devote self completely to others | A.....B.....C.....D.....E | Able to devote self completely to others |
| 5. Very rough | A.....B.....C.....D.....E | Very gentle |
| 6. Not at all helpful to others | A.....B.....C.....D.....E | Very helpful to others |
| 7. Not all competitive | A.....B.....C.....D.....E | Very competitive |
| 8. Not at all kind | A.....B.....C.....D.....E | Very kind |
| 9. Not at all aware of feelings of others | A.....B.....C.....D.....E | Very aware of feelings of others |
| 10. Can make decisions easily | A.....B.....C.....D.....E | Has difficulty making decisions |
| 11. Gives up very easily | A.....B.....C.....D.....E | Never gives up easily |

12. Not at all self-confident	A.....B.....C.....D.....E	Very self-confident
13. Feels very inferior	A.....B.....C.....D.....E	Feels very superior
14. Not all understanding of others	A.....B.....C.....D.....E	Very understanding of others
15. Very cold in relation to others	A.....B.....C.....D.....E	Very warm in relation in others
16. Goes to pieces under pressure	A.....B.....C.....D.....E	Stands up well under pressure

Items 1, 3, 7, 10, 11, 12, 13, and 16 represent agency (the M subscale). Items 2, 4, 5, 6, 8, 9, 14, and 15 represent communion (the F subscale). For scoring purposes A=1, B=2, C=3, D=4, and E=5. Higher scores on the M and F subscales denote higher levels of agency and communion, respectively.

Appendix D

English Version of Questionnaire (Study 2)

Dear Participant:

I am writing to request your assistance in completing the enclosed questionnaire. My name is Wendy E. O'Connor and I am a Ph.D. candidate at Carleton University. The data collected for this study will assist in the completion of my Doctoral Dissertation. The enclosed questionnaire asks your opinions about a number of employee attitudes and behaviours. As a participant, you will be asked a number of questions pertaining to job satisfaction, career interests and motivation, and various other work interests. You will also be asked to provide demographic information such as your sex and age. The questionnaire will take approximately one hour to complete.

Your participation is strictly voluntary. Any questions that you do not wish to answer may be omitted. You may choose to withdraw from this survey at any time, and you may do so without reason or consequence. It should also be noted that your responses are anonymous and confidential. Therefore, please try to answer each question as honestly as possible. To safeguard your anonymity, your name should not appear anywhere on this questionnaire. A separate consent form, which requires your name and signature, has been included. The consent form is kept separate from your responses.

The following people are involved in this research, and may be contacted at any time: Wendy E. O'Connor (Principal Investigator, Department of Psychology, Carleton University, 613-520-2600 extension 2683) and Dr. K. Matheson (Faculty Supervisor, Department of Psychology, Carleton University, 613-520-2600 extension 7513).

This project has been approved by the Ethics Review Committee at Carleton University. However, if you have any concerns about the ethics of this study, do not hesitate to contact Dr. M. Gick (Department of Psychology, Ethics Committee, 613-520-2600 extension 2664).

There are no physical or psychological risks in this study. However, if you experience undue stress as a result of completing this questionnaire, please contact the Ottawa Distress Centre at 613-238-3311.

If you choose to participate in this study, a prompt response would be greatly appreciated. Researchers from Carleton University will be situated at various RCMP buildings on Monday, October 20th and Tuesday, October 21st to collect the questionnaires. A report outlining the major findings of the study will be made available through your department.

THANK YOU IN ADVANCE FOR YOUR COOPERATION.

“Dinner For Two” Contest

If you would like your name to be placed in a draw to win a **“DINNER FOR TWO”** at the **PELICAN GRILL, 1500 Bank Street (\$75.00 value)**, please use the following coding system to construct your personal identification number. Your personal identification number consists of the **last five digits** of your home telephone number followed by (in order) the **number of brothers** and **sisters** you have. For example, if your telephone number is 737-8028 and you have 0 brothers and 2 sisters, your personal identification number would be: **7 8 0 2 8 0 2**. Using these instructions, please write your personal identification number in the line provided below:

For verification as a prize winner of the **“Dinner For Two”** contest, you must remember your personal identification number.

INFORMED CONSENT: PLEASE SIGN AND REMOVE THE BOTTOM PORTION OF THIS PAGE AND ENCLOSE IT IN A SEALED, UNMARKED ENVELOPE.

I have read the above description of the study concerning employee work attitudes and behaviours. The data in the study may be used in research. My signature indicates that I agree to participate in the study, and this in no way constitutes a waiver of my rights. Furthermore, I grant Wendy O'Connor permission to use my data in her Doctoral Dissertation or in other research projects, with the proviso that my anonymity be protected.

Name (please print): _____

Signature: _____

Date: _____

**FOR QUESTIONS 1 TO 31, PLACE THE NUMBER WHICH YOU
FEEL IS MOST APPROPRIATE BESIDE EACH STATEMENT**

5 = strongly agree
4 = moderately agree
3 = neither agree nor disagree
2 = moderately disagree
1 = strongly disagree

1. Favouritism rather than merit determines who gets ahead around here.
2. There is no place for yes-men or yes-women around here; good ideas are desired even when it means disagreeing with superiors.
3. You can get along here by being a nice person, regardless of the quality of your work.
4. Employees are encouraged to speak out frankly even when they are critical of well-established ideas.
5. There are "cliques" or "in-groups" which hinder the effectiveness around here.
6. It normally takes only a couple of months for new employees to figure out who they should not cross around here.
7. You can usually get what you want around here if you know the right person to ask.
8. When objective standards are not specified, it is common to see many people trying to define standards to meet their needs.
9. There has always been an influential group in this department/division that no one ever crosses.
10. Generally, people who have left this organization did so because they realized that just working hard was not enough to get ahead.
11. People here usually don't speak up for fear of retaliation by others.
12. Rewards come only to those who work hard in this organization.

13. It seems that the individuals who are able to come through in times of crisis or uncertainty are the ones who get ahead.
14. As long as the actions of others don't directly affect me, I don't care what they do.
15. When my supervisor communicates with me, it is to make him or herself look better, not to help me.
16. The old saying that the "squeaky wheel gets the grease" really works around here when resources are distributed.
17. People who are willing to voice their opinion seem to do "better" here than those who don't.
18. Promotions in this department generally go to top performers.
19. My co-workers help themselves, not others.
20. I have seen people deliberately distort information requested by others for purposes of personal gain, either by withholding it or by selectively reporting it.
21. **Managers** in this organization often use the selection system to hire only people that can help them in their future or who see things the way they do.
22. **People** in this organization often use the selection system to hire only people that can help them in their future or who see things the way they do.
23. Pay and promotion policies are generally communicated in this company.
24. I have seen changes made in policies here that only serve the purposes of a few individuals, not the work unit or the organization.
25. Overall, the rules and policies around here concerning promotion and pay are specific and well-defined.
26. The rules and policies concerning promotion and pay are fair; it is how supervisors carry out the policies that is unfair and self-serving.
27. When you need help at work, you can always rely on a co-worker to lend a hand.

28. Connections with other departments/divisions are very helpful when it comes time to call in a favour.
29. Whereas a lot of what my supervisor does around here appears to be directed at helping employees, it is actually intended to protect himself/herself.
30. The performance appraisal ratings people receive from their supervisors reflect the supervisors' "own agenda" rather than the actual performance of the employee.
31. If coworkers offer to lend some assistance, it is because they expect to get something out of it, not because they really care.

FOR QUESTIONS 32 TO 36, PLACE THE NUMBER WHICH YOU FEEL IS MOST APPROPRIATE BESIDE EACH STATEMENT

- 5 = very accurate**
- 4 = somewhat accurate**
- 3 = don't know**
- 2 = somewhat inaccurate**
- 1 = very inaccurate**

32. The department I work for has a large number of written rules and policies.
33. A "rules and procedures" manual exists and is readily available within my department.
34. There is a complete written job description for most jobs in my department.
35. The department I work for keeps a written record of nearly everyone's job performance.
36. There is a formal orientation programme for most new members of my department.

FOR QUESTION 37, PLEASE THINK OF YOUR PRESENT WORK. WHAT IS IT LIKE MOST OF THE TIME? IN THE BLANK BESIDE EACH WORD LISTED BELOW WRITE:

**Y for "YES" if it describes your work,
N for "NO" if it does NOT describe your work, or
DK for "Don't Know" if you cannot decide.**

WORK ON MY PRESENT JOB

- | | | | | |
|-----|-------------|-------|-------------------------------|-------|
| 37. | Fascinating | _____ | Tiresome | _____ |
| | Routine | _____ | Healthful | _____ |
| | Satisfying | _____ | Challenging | _____ |
| | Boring | _____ | On your feet | _____ |
| | Good | _____ | Frustrating | _____ |
| | Creative | _____ | Simple | _____ |
| | Respected | _____ | Endless | _____ |
| | Hot | _____ | Pleasant | _____ |
| | Useful | _____ | Gives sense of accomplishment | _____ |

FOR QUESTION 38, PLEASE THINK OF YOUR PRESENT PAY. HOW WELL DOES EACH OF THE FOLLOWING WORDS DESCRIBE YOUR PRESENT PAY? IN THE BLANK BESIDE EACH WORD LISTED BELOW WRITE:

**Y for "YES" if it describes your present pay,
N for "NO" if it does NOT describe your present pay, or
DK for "Don't Know" if you cannot decide.**

MY PRESENT PAY

- | | | | | |
|-----|-------------------------------------|-------|-------------|-------|
| 38. | Income adequate for normal expenses | _____ | Bad | _____ |
| | Satisfactory profit sharing | _____ | Insecure | _____ |
| | Barely live on income | _____ | Highly paid | _____ |
| | Income provides luxuries | _____ | Underpaid | _____ |
| | Less than I deserve | _____ | | |

FOR QUESTION 39, PLEASE THINK OF THE OPPORTUNITIES FOR PROMOTION THAT YOU HAVE NOW. HOW WELL DOES EACH OF THE FOLLOWING WORDS DESCRIBE THESE? IN THE BLANK BESIDE EACH WORD LISTED BELOW WRITE:

**Y for "YES" if it describes your opportunities for promotion,
N for "NO" if it does NOT describe them, or
DK for "Don't Know" if you cannot decide.**

MY OPPORTUNITIES FOR PROMOTION

39. Good opportunities for promotion _____ Dead-end job _____
 Opportunity somewhat limited _____ Infrequent Promotions _____
 Promotion on ability _____ Regular Promotions _____
 Good chance for promotion _____ Unfair promotion policy _____
 Fairly good chance for promotion _____

FOR QUESTION 40, PLEASE THINK OF THE KIND OF SUPERVISION THAT YOU GET ON YOUR JOB. HOW WELL DOES EACH OF THE FOLLOWING WORDS DESCRIBE THIS SUPERVISION? IN THE BLANK BESIDE EACH WORD LISTED BELOW WRITE:

**Y for "YES" if it describes the supervision you get on your job,
N for "NO" if it does NOT describe it or
DK for "Don't Know" if you cannot decide.**

SUPERVISION ON MY PRESENT JOB

40. Asks my advice _____ Tells me where I stand _____
 Hard to please _____ Annoying _____
 Impolite _____ Stubborn _____
 Praises good work _____ Knows job well _____
 Tactful _____ Bad _____
 Influential _____ Intelligent _____
 Up-to-date _____ Leaves me on my own _____
 Doesn't supervise enough _____ Around when needed _____
 Quick tempered _____ Lazy _____

FOR QUESTION 41, PLEASE THINK OF THE MAJORITY OF PEOPLE THAT YOU WORK WITH NOW. HOW WELL DOES EACH OF THE FOLLOWING WORDS DESCRIBE THESE PEOPLE? IN THE BLANK BESIDE EACH WORD LISTED BELOW WRITE:

**Y for "YES" if it describes the people you work with,
N for "NO" if it does NOT describe them, or
DK for "Don't Know" if you cannot decide.**

PEOPLE ON MY PRESENT JOB

41. Stimulating _____ Talk too much _____
 Boring _____ Smart _____
 Slow _____ Lazy _____
 Ambitious _____ Unpleasant _____
 Stupid _____ No privacy _____
 Responsible _____ Active _____
 Fast _____ Narrow interests _____
 Intelligent _____ Loyal _____
 Easy to make enemies _____ Hard to meet _____

FOR QUESTION 42, PLEASE THINK OF YOUR JOB IN GENERAL. WHAT IS IT LIKE MOST OF THE TIME? IN THE BLANK BESIDE EACH WORD LISTED BELOW WRITE:

**Y for "YES" if it describes your job,
N for "NO" if it does NOT describe your job, or
DK for "Don't Know" if you cannot decide.**

MY JOB, IN GENERAL

42. Pleasant _____ Better than most _____
 Worthwhile _____ Bad _____

Acceptable	_____	Poor	_____
Like to leave	_____	Waste of time	_____
Good	_____	Undesirable	_____
Enjoyable	_____	Makes me content	_____
Inadequate	_____	Excellent	_____
Rotten	_____	Disagreeable	_____
Ideal	_____		

FOR QUESTIONS 43 TO 129, PLACE THE NUMBER WHICH YOU FEEL IS MOST APPROPRIATE BESIDE EACH STATEMENT

5 = strongly agree
4 = moderately agree
3 = neither agree nor disagree
2 = moderately disagree
1 = strongly disagree

43. I do not feel like “part of the family” at my organization.
44. It would be hard for me to leave my organization right now, even if I wanted to.
45. I really feel as if this organization’s problems are my own.
46. I feel that I have too few options to consider leaving this organization.
47. I do not feel “emotionally attached” to this organization.
48. Too much in my life would be disrupted if I decided I wanted to leave my organization now.
49. This organization has a great deal of personal meaning for me.
50. I do not believe that a person must always be loyal to his or her organization.
51. I am not afraid of what might happen if I quit my job without having another one lined up.

52. I think that I could easily become as attached to another organization as I am to this one.
53. One of the major reasons I continue to work for this organization is that I believe that loyalty is important and therefore feel a sense of moral obligation to remain.
54. It wouldn't be too costly for me to leave my organization now.
55. Right now, staying with my organization is a matter of necessity as much as desire.
56. I enjoy discussing my organization with people outside of it.
57. Things were better in the days when people stayed with one organization for most of their careers.
58. One of the major reasons I continue to work for this organization is that leaving would require considerable personal sacrifice -- another organization may not match the overall benefits I have here.
59. I think that people these days move from company to company too often.
60. I do not feel a strong sense of belonging to my organization.
61. Jumping from organization to organization does not seem at all unethical to me.
62. I would be very happy to spend the rest of my career with this organization.
63. If I received another offer for a better job elsewhere I would not feel it was right to leave my organization.
64. I was taught to believe in the value of remaining loyal to one organization.
65. One of the few serious consequences of leaving this organization would be the scarcity of available alternatives.
66. I do not think that wanting to be a "company man" or "company woman" is sensible anymore.
67. A job is what you make of it.
68. On most jobs, people can pretty much accomplish whatever they set out to accomplish.

69. If you know what you want out of a job, you can find a job that gives it to you.
70. If employees are unhappy with a decision made by their boss, they should do something about it.
71. Getting the job you want is mostly a matter of luck.
72. Making money is primarily a matter of good fortune.
73. Most people are capable of doing their jobs well if they make the effort.
74. In order to get a really good job you need to have family members or friends in high places.
75. Promotions are usually a matter of good fortune.
76. When it comes to landing a really good job, who you know is more important than what you know.
77. Promotions are given to employees who perform well on the job.
78. To make a lot of money you have to know the right people.
79. It takes a lot of luck to be an outstanding employee on most jobs.
80. People who perform their jobs well generally get rewarded for it.
81. Most employees have more influence on their supervisors than they think they do.
82. The main difference between people who make a lot of money and people who make a little money is luck.
83. There is no excuse for lying to someone else
84. Honesty is the best policy in all cases.
85. When you ask someone to do something for you, it is best to give the real reasons for wanting it rather than giving reasons which carry more weight.
86. All in all, it is better to be humble and honest than to be important and dishonest.
87. It is wise to flatter important people.

88. The best way to handle people is to tell them what they want to hear.
89. Most people who get ahead in the world lead clean, moral lives.
90. It is possible to be good in all respects.
91. Most people are basically good and kind.
92. Anyone who completely trusts anyone else is asking for trouble.
93. It is safest to assume that all people have a vicious streak and it will come out when they are given a chance.
94. Never tell anyone the real reason you did something unless it is useful to do so.
95. One should take action only when sure it is morally right.
96. The biggest difference between most criminals and other people is that the criminals are stupid enough to get caught.
97. Generally speaking, people won't work hard unless they're forced to do so.
98. Most people are brave.
99. It is hard to get ahead without cutting corners here and there.
100. People suffering from incurable diseases should have the choice of being put painlessly to death.
101. Most people forget more easily the death of a parent than the loss of their property.
102. Barnum was wrong when he said that there's a sucker born every minute.
103. Novelty has a great appeal to me.
104. I crave excitement.
105. It's a wonderful feeling to sit surrounded by your possessions.
106. There are few things more satisfying than splurging on something - books, clothes, furniture, etc.

107. Only the desire to achieve great things will bring one's mind into full activity.
108. Nothing is worse than an offensive odour.
109. In most conversations, I tend to bounce from topic to topic.
110. I really envy the individual who can walk up to anybody and tell the person off to his or her face.
111. I could really shock people if I said all of the dirty things I think.
112. There are few more miserable experiences than going to bed night after night knowing you are so upset that worry will not let you sleep.
113. I tend to make decisions on the spur of the moment.
114. Little things upset me.
115. Drop reminders of yourself wherever you go and your life's trail will be well remembered.
116. I like nothing better than having breakfast in bed.
117. My mood is easily influenced by the people around me.
118. It is always better to trust the judgement of the proper authorities in government and religion than to listen to the noisy rabble-rousers in our society who are trying to create doubt in people's minds.
119. People should pay less attention to the Bible and the other old traditional forms of religious guidance and instead develop their own personal standards of what is moral and immoral.
120. It is important to protect fully the rights of radicals and deviants.
121. "Free speech" means that people should even be allowed to make speeches and write books urging the overthrow of the government.
122. Some of the worst people in our country nowadays are those who do not respect our flag, our leaders, and the normal way things are supposed to be done.
123. In these troubled times, laws have to be enforced without mercy, especially when dealing with the agitators and revolutionaries who are stirring things up.

124. The self-righteous “forces of law and order” threaten freedom in our country a lot more than most of the groups they claim are “radical” and “godless.”
125. If a child starts becoming unconventional and disrespectful of authority, it is his or her parents’ duty to get him or her back to the normal way.
126. In the final analysis, the established authorities, like parents and our national leaders, generally turn out to be right about things, and all the protestors don’t know what they are talking about.
127. A lot of our rules regarding modesty and sexual behaviour are just customs which are not necessarily any better or holier than those which other people follow.
128. The real keys to the “good life” are obedience, discipline, and sticking to the straight and narrow.
129. It is best to treat dissenters with leniency and an open mind, since new ideas are the lifeblood of progressive change.

**FOR QUESTIONS 130 TO 142, PLACE THE NUMBER WHICH YOU
FEEL IS MOST APPROPRIATE BESIDE EACH STATEMENT**

**1 = true
2 = false**

130. It is sometimes hard for me to go on with my work if I am not encouraged.
131. I sometimes feel resentful when I don’t get my way.
132. On a few occasions, I have given up doing something because I thought too little of my ability.
133. There have been times when I felt like rebelling against people in authority even though I knew they were right.
134. No matter who I’m talking to, I’m always a good listener.
135. There have been occasions when I took advantage of someone.
136. I’m always willing to admit it when I make a mistake.
137. I sometimes try to get even rather than forgive and forget.
138. I am always courteous, even to people who are disagreeable.
139. I am never annoyed when people express ideas very different from my own.
140. There have been times when I was quite jealous of the good fortune of others.
141. I am sometimes irritated by people who ask favours of me.

142. I have never deliberately said something that hurt someone's feelings.

**FOR QUESTIONS 143 TO 145, PLACE THE NUMBER WHICH YOU
FEEL IS MOST APPROPRIATE BESIDE EACH STATEMENT**

**5 = very often
4 = often
3 = sometimes
2 = rarely
1 = never**

143. How much are you left on your own to do your own work?
144. To what extent are you able to act independently of your supervisor in performing your job function?
145. To what extent are you able to do your job independently of others?

**FOR QUESTIONS 146 TO 150, PLACE THE NUMBER WHICH YOU
FEEL IS MOST APPROPRIATE BESIDE EACH STATEMENT**

**7 = always
6 = almost always
5 = usually
4 = sometimes
3 = seldom
2 = almost never
1 = never**

146. I seek an active role in the leadership of a group.
147. I avoid trying to influence those around me to see things my way.
148. I find myself organizing and directing the activities of others.
149. I strive to gain more control over the events around me at work.
150. I strive to be "in command" when I am working in a group.

FOR QUESTIONS 151 TO 153, PLACE THE NUMBER WHICH YOU FEEL IS MOST APPROPRIATE BESIDE EACH STATEMENT

- 5 = my job gives me a maximum amount**
- 4 = my job gives me a substantial amount**
- 3 = my job gives me a moderate amount**
- 2 = my job gives me a small amount**
- 1 = my job gives me a minimum amount**

- 151. The freedom to do pretty much what I want.
- 152. The opportunity for independent thought and action.
- 153. The ability to control the pace of my work.

FOR QUESTIONS 154 TO 165, PLACE THE NUMBER WHICH YOU FEEL IS MOST APPROPRIATE BESIDE EACH STATEMENT

- 5 = to a very great extent**
- 4 = to a great extent**
- 3 = to some extent**
- 2 = to a little extent**
- 1 = to a very little extent**

- 154. To what extent is the organization generally quick to use improved work methods?
- 155. To what extent does this organization have goals and objectives that are both clear and reasonable?
- 156. To what extent are work activities sensibly organized in this organization?
- 157. In this organization, to what extent are decisions made at levels where the most adequate and accurate information is available?
- 158. How adequate is the information your work group gets about what is going on in other departments or units?
- 159. To what extent does this organization tell your work group what it needs to know to do the best possible job?
- 160. How much does this organization try to improve working conditions?

161. How receptive are people above your supervisor to ideas and suggestions coming from your work group?
162. To what extent does this organization have a real interest in the welfare and overall satisfaction of those who work here?
163. To what extent are there things about working here (such as policies, practices, or conditions) that encourage you to work hard?
164. When decisions are being made, to what extent are the persons affected asked for their ideas?
165. People at all levels of an organization usually have know-how that could be of use to decision makers. To what extent is information widely shared in this organization so that those who make decisions have access to such knowledge?

FOR QUESTIONS 166 TO 183, PLEASE INDICATE HOW OFTEN YOU ENGAGE IN THE BEHAVIOUR DESCRIBED IN EACH VIGNETTE

- 4 = I often engage in this behaviour**
3 = I sometimes engage in this behaviour
2 = I rarely engage in this behaviour
1 = I never engage in this behaviour

166. Help others in order to get their help later- Margaret works as a civil engineer for a large firm. She realizes that getting priority treatment from production is critical to the early completion of her new project. Therefore, when she hears the production manager is organizing this year's charity campaign for the firm, she immediately visits him to offer her help in the campaign. _____

167. Make others aware of your accomplishments- Jason works as a data entry operator for a large consulting firm. Due to a staffing shortage, he is temporarily assigned to another division in which he assists in the reorganization of the division's resource library. While working at this division, Jason continues to meet with his supervisor from data entry. During these informal meetings, Jason makes sure that he tells his supervisor about his most recent accomplishments. _____

168. Make a rival look bad- Dan works as a researcher in a large chemistry lab. When reading the soon-to-be published study of a co-worker, he notices a careless error in the analysis. He decides to keep quiet about the error although he knows it will be discovered once the study becomes public. _____

169. Support the opinions of others, even when you disagree with them- Kathy works as a secretary in the sociology department of a small community college. Due to budget restrictions, the department must choose between purchasing a new photocopier or buying new chairs for several sociology professors. Her supervisor, the head of the department, makes it known that he believes the funds should be spent on new chairs. Kathy does not agree. However, when he solicits her opinion, she tells him that the money should be spent on the chairs, rather than on a new photocopier. _____

170. Withhold information- Elizabeth works as a sales manager for a large retail chain. At the annual meeting, all sales managers outline their marketing strategies for the following year. However, when it is Elizabeth's turn to make her presentation, she deliberately omits some key information. Elizabeth wants to make sure that her innovative marketing plan cannot be used by anyone else. _____

171. Pretend to be interested in the personal life of others- Martin works as a research assistant for the government. Although Martin finds Joanna, his supervisor, rather boring, he pretends to be interested in Joanna's personal life. For example, last week, they talked at length about whether Joanna's oldest daughter should remain in private school, and about where Joanna's family should go for their summer vacation. _____

172. Act as a "model" employee when others are present- Travis works as a graphics assistant for an advertising agency. Travis takes advantage of the fact that his supervisor travels extensively and is seldom at the agency. For example, Travis often arrives for work somewhat later than he is supposed to, and leaves somewhat earlier. However, when his supervisor is present, Travis becomes a perfect employee (e.g., he never takes longer than the established time for lunch, arrives at work early, etc.). _____

173. Issue compliments on personal appearance, even when they are not warranted- Cindy works as an administrative assistant for a large software firm. Cindy believes that her supervisor, Carol, possesses terrible taste in clothes. However, even when she is wearing the tackiest of outfits, Cindy never fails to compliment Carol on her appearance. _____

174. Not fully commit yourself until you know which side is "winning"- Karen is a nurse at a large hospital. During staff meetings, heated exchanges often occur between individuals advocating different positions on a given issue. Karen, however, never completely commits herself to one position. Thus, if something goes wrong, she can bend to the other side, escape any blame, and in doing so, safeguard her promotion opportunities. _____

175. Praise others on their accomplishments, even when you don't think the accomplishments are very impressive- Mindy works as an assistant policy analyst for the government. Her supervisor, Charles, recently received a certificate confirming that he had completed a series of management training courses. Mindy took Charles out for lunch to celebrate his accomplishment, even though she didn't think that receiving a certificate was very impressive. _____

176. Develop strong allies- Allison is a vice-president in a bank that appointed a new president earlier this year. It became evident the new president held a very different perspective on banking than Allison, and Allison began to fear that some innovative and popular services may be eliminated. Hence, for the past six months, Allison has been developing strong alliances with other vice-presidents who share her interests and feel similarly threatened. _____

177. Use information to overwhelm others- Anthony works as a manager for a large plastics company. He has to report to a senior committee on his recent decision concerning a change in supplier. He suspects the committee will not challenge a decision supported by volumes of information. Hence, he comes to the meeting prepared to overwhelm the committee with graphs, tables, and calculations on the supplier's performance. _____

178. Associate with influential people- Paul owns a medical supply company in a small community. His products are competitive but he knows doctors can easily use other suppliers located in the city nearby. To ensure that his company is successful, Paul socializes with influential doctors in the community. _____

179. Selectively delay work for specific gain- Marsha works as a dietician for a large senior citizens' centre. She promises a co-worker that she will assist him in preparing meal plans for several recently admitted clients. However, when her supervisor, Jackie, asks someone to consolidate the centre's computer files, Marsha volunteers. Marsha then tells her co-worker that she is too busy to help him at this time. After all, doing favours for her supervisor is more important than helping a co-worker in distress. _____

180. Make sure you have the right image- Paul supervises an engineering area largely responsible for low profile and production type functions. Yet, to be noticed in this company, one needs a creative and exciting image. Upon hearing about it, he pushes to take a risky but innovative project in an attempt to change the image of himself and his area. _____

181. Use personal relationship with others- Linda works as a tax consultant for a mid-sized accounting firm. Recently, Linda recommended that a small research company owned by her brother-in-law, John, be awarded the contract to conduct the accounting firm's annual evaluation of its employees. Linda knows that with John at the helm, she is guaranteed a favourable employee evaluation. _____

182. Get others to emphasize your importance to the organization- Bob works as a counsellor for a government-sponsored drug rehabilitation centre. He often informs his clients that, due to government cutbacks, many of the services he provides may be eliminated. Thus, Bob encourages clients to tell his superiors how much they value the services they receive. Bob knows that when clients do this, they will devote much of their conversation to praising him and the work he has done. As a result, Bob's supervisors will be reminded continually that he is a top-notch employee. _____

183. Get an expert to support your position- Brian is a vice-president in a prosperous manufacturing firm. Currently, the executives are in the process of selecting the site for a new plant. To help them reach a decision, Brian hires a well-known consultant in the field whose beliefs give support to Brian's preferred choice for the site. _____

**FOR QUESTIONS 184 TO 199, PLEASE FOLLOW
THE INSTRUCTIONS PROVIDED FOR EACH QUESTION.**

184. Sex _____ (1=male; 2=female)

185. Age _____ (please fill in)

186. Relationship Status (please circle one)

- A. Single
- B. Cohabiting (living together)
- C. Married
- D. Separated
- E. Divorced
- F. Widowed

187. Please indicate the type of position you occupy: (e.g., CR-4; PM-6; FSL-4)

Regular member _____ Rank _____ Length of service _____

Civilian member _____ Job classification _____ Length of service _____

Public Servant (PS) _____ Job classification _____ Length of service (RCMP) _____ (PS)

188. In the appropriate category, please specify the type of position you occupy:

Directorate: _____ Occupation/Profession: _____

Manager _____ Non-Manager _____

Supervisor _____ Non-Supervisor: _____

189. Please indicate the number of years that you were employed with your **previous** employer. _____

190. Please indicate the number of years that you have been employed with your **present** employer (RCMP). _____

191. Please indicate the number of years that you have been employed in your **present** occupation. _____

192. Please indicate the number of promotions with **current** employer (RCMP). _____

193. Please indicate the number of promotions in you career **excluding** those with current employer. _____

194. Education level completed: **(please circle one)**

- A. Grade school
- B. High school graduate
- C. Some college
- D. College graduate
- E. Some university
- F. University undergraduate degree
- G. Some graduate school
- H. Master's degree
- I. Ph.D., M.D., or other advanced degree
- J. Other (please fill in) _____

195. Do you have children?

yes _____ no _____ (if no, please go to question- # 197)

196. **If yes,**

How many children do you have under 6 years of age? _____

197. Yearly salary: **(please circle one)**
- A. \$20,000-\$29,999
 - B. \$30,000-\$39,999
 - C. \$40,000-\$49,999
 - D. \$50,000-\$59,999
 - E. \$60,000-\$69,999
 - F. \$70,000-\$79,999
 - G. \$80,000-\$89,999
 - H. \$90,000-\$99,999
 - I. \$100,000-\$149,999
198. Within your family what birth position do you hold? **(please circle one)**
- A. An only child
 - B. First born
 - C. Born second, but not last
 - D. Born third or later, but not last
 - E. Born last
199. What is your ethnicity? **(please circle one)**
- A. Caucasian
 - B. African Canadian
 - C. Asian
 - D. First Nations
 - E. Other _____

Appendix E

French Version of Questionnaire (Study 2)

Cher (ère) participant(e):

Je vous écris pour solliciter votre aide. J'effectue une enquête que représente le questionnaire ci-inclus et aurais besoin que vous la complétiez. Mon nom est Wendy E. O'Connor et je suis candidate au doctorat à l'Université Carleton. Les données obtenues pour cette enquête formeraient la base de ma thèse de doctorat. Le questionnaire ci-inclus sonde votre opinion concernant les attitudes et comportements des employés. En tant que participant(e), un nombre de questions vous seront posées portant sur la satisfaction au travail, les intérêts de carrière et la motivation, et divers autres intérêts de travail. Il vous sera aussi demandé de fournir des renseignements démographiques tel que votre sexe et âge. Le questionnaire prendra à peu près une heure à compléter.

Votre participation à cette étude est entièrement volontaire. Vous pouvez omettre les questions auxquelles vous ne voulez pas répondre. Vous pourriez choisir de vous retirer de ce sondage à tout moment, et vous pourriez agir ainsi sans raisons ni conséquences. Notez aussi que vos réponses sont anonymes et confidentielles. Veuillez donc répondre avec autant d'honnêteté que possible. Pour garder votre anonymat, votre nom ne doit apparaître nul part sur ce questionnaire. Un formulaire de consentement séparé qui requerra votre nom et signature est inclus. Le formulaire de consentement sera gardé séparé de vos réponses.

Les personnes suivantes font partie de cette recherche, et peuvent être contactées à tout moment: Wendy E. O'Connor (Enquêteur principal, Département de Psychologie, Université Carleton, 613-520-2600, poste 2683) et Dr. K. Matheson (Professeur superviseur, Département de Psychologie, Université Carleton, 613-520-2600, poste 7513).

Ce projet a été examiné par le Comité d'Éthique à l'Université Carleton. Cependant, si vous avez des préoccupations d'ordre éthique concernant cette étude, n'hésitez pas de contacter Dr. M. Gick, Département de Psychologie, Comité d'Éthique, 613-520-2600 poste 2664).

Il n'y aura aucun risque physique ou psychologique dans cette étude. Cependant, si vous éprouvez du stress élevé à la suite de cette enquête, veuillez contacter le Ottawa Distress Centre au 613-238-3311.

Si vous choisissez de participer à cette étude, une réponse rapide serait appréciée. Des chercheurs de l'Université Carleton seront présents dans les édifices de la GRC du lundi, 20 oct. au mardi, 21 oct. pour recueillir les questionnaires. Un rapport des résultats

majeurs de cette étude sera rendu disponible par votre département.

MERCI D'AVANCE DE VOTRE COOPÉRATION

Concours "Dîner Pour Deux"

Si vous voulez que votre nom soit inclus dans un tirage avec pour prix un "Dîner pour Deux" au Pelican Grill, 1500 rue Bank (valeur de \$75.00), veuillez utiliser le système de codes suivant pour créer un numéro d'identification personnel. Votre numéro d'identification personnel contient les **cinq derniers chiffres** de votre numéro de téléphone suivis par le **nombre de frères et de soeurs** que vous avez. Par exemple, si votre numéro est 737-8028 et vous avez 0 frères et 2 soeurs, votre numéro d'identification personnel serait: **7 8 0 2 8 0 2**. En vous référant à ces instructions ci-dessus, veuillez écrire votre numéro d'identification personnel dans l'espace ci-dessous:

Pour les fins de vérification du gagnant du prix "Dîner Pour Deux", vous devez vous rappeler votre numéro d'identification personnel.

CONSENTEMENT AVERTI: VEUILLEZ SIGNER ET DÉTACHER LE BAS DE CETTE PAGE ET LE PLACER DANS UNE ENVELOPPE SCELLÉE ET ANONYME.

J'ai lu la description ci-dessus de l'étude concernant les attitudes et comportements de travail des employés. Les données que je fournirai pourra être utilisées pour des fins de recherche. Ma signature indique que je consens à participer à l'étude, et que cela ne constitue en aucun cas une suspension de mes droits. En plus, j'accorde à Wendy O'Connor la permission d'utiliser mes données dans sa thèse de doctorat ou dans d'autres projets de recherche, à condition que mon anonymat soit protégé.

Nom (lettres moullées): _____
 Signature: _____
 Date: _____

Pour les questions de 1 à 31, placez un numéro qui vous semble le plus convenable à côté de chaque énoncé

5 = tout à fait d'accord
4 = plus ou moins d'accord
3 = ni d'accord ni désaccord
2 = plus ou moins en désaccord
1 = tout à fait en désaccord

1. Ici, c'est le favoritisme plutôt que le mérite qui détermine l'avancement.
2. Quiconque dit oui à tout n'a pas de place par ici; les bonnes idées sont désirées même à l'encontre des cadres supérieurs.
3. Ici, vous pouvez vous faire accepter en étant une personne agréable, quelque soit la qualité de votre performance.
4. Les employés sont encouragés à se prononcer franchement même s'ils critiquent les idées bien établies.
5. Ici, il existe des "cliques" ou "clans" qui nuisent à l'efficacité.
6. Les nouveaux employés normalement mettent quelques mois pour apprendre qui ils ne doivent pas contrarier .
7. Ici, vous pouvez obtenir ce que vous voulez si vous connaissez la bonne personne à qui demander.
8. Quand les standards objectifs ne sont pas énoncés, il est courant que les gens définissent des standards qui conviennent à leurs besoins.
9. Il y a toujours eu un groupe d'influence dans ce département/ cette division que personne n'a jamais contrarié.
10. Généralement, ceux qui ont quitté cette organisation ont ainsi agi car ils se sont rendus compte qu'il ne suffit pas de bien travailler pour avancer.
11. Les gens ici souvent ne s'expriment pas par peur de punition venant des autres .
12. Seulement ceux qui travaillent fort dans cette organisation sont récompensés.
13. Il semble que les individus qui sont capables de se débrouiller en temps de crise ou d'incertitude sont ceux qui avancent.
14. Tant que l'action des autres ne me touche pas directement, je ne me préoccupe pas de ce qu'ils font.
15. Chaque fois que mon superviseur communique avec moi, c'est pour bien paraître et non pour m'aider
16. Comme un proverbe (anglais) l'a dit, "c'est la roue qui grince qui reçoit l'attention" décrit bien la façon dont les ressources sont distribuées ici.

17. Ceux qui veulent exprimer leurs opinions semblent se "débrouiller" mieux que ceux qui ne le font pas.
18. En général, les promotions dans ce département sont réservées au plus performants.
19. Mes collègues s'occupent d'eux-mêmes et non des autres.
20. J'ai vu des gens délibérément déformer, pour des gains personnels, des renseignements requis par leurs collègues, en dissimulant ces renseignements ou en en divulguant qu'une partie.
21. Les **cadres** dans cette organisation se servent souvent du système de sélection pour recruter seulement des gens utiles pour leur futur ou ceux qui partagent leur point de vue.
22. Les **gens** dans cette organisation se servent souvent du système de sélection pour recruter seulement des personnes utiles pour leur futur ou ceux qui partagent leur point de vue.
23. Les politiques de rémunération et d'avancement sont en général communiquées dans cette compagnie.
24. J'ai vu des politiques modifiées pour servir l'intérêt de quelques individus et non d'une unité de travail ou de l'organisation.
25. En général, les règles et politiques ici en ce qui concerne le salaire et l'avancement sont spécifiques et bien-définies.
26. Les règles et politiques d'avancement et de salaire sont justes; c'est la façon dont les superviseurs appliquent ces politiques qui est injuste et biaisée.
27. Quand vous avez besoin d'aide au travail, vous pouvez toujours compter sur un collègue.
28. Les contacts avec d'autres départements/divisions sont nécessaires lorsqu'arrive le moment d'aller chercher une faveur.
29. Ici, le gros de ce que fait mon superviseur peut bien sembler avoir pour but d'aider les employés, mais son véritable intention est de se protéger.
30. L'évaluation des performances par les superviseurs reflète les "priorités" de ceux-ci plutôt que le vrai travail des employés.
31. Si des collègues vous offrent de l'aide, c'est parce qu'ils s'attendent à obtenir quelque chose en retour et non parce qu'ils se font vraiment du souci pour vous.

Pour les questions de 32 a 36, placez un numéro qui vous semble le plus convenable à côté de chaque énoncé

5 = tout à fait exact
4 = plus ou moins exact
3 = ne sais pas
2 = plus ou moins inexact
1 = tout à fait inexact

32. Le département pour lequel je travaille a un grand nombre de règles et de politiques écrites.
33. Il existe un manuel de "règles et procédures" qui est disponible dans mon département.
34. Il existe une description de poste écrite complète pour la plupart des emplois dans mon département.
35. Le département pour lequel je travaille maintient un compte-rendu écrit de la performance de presque tout le monde.
36. Il y a un programme d'orientation formel pour la plupart des nouveaux membres de mon département.

**POUR LA QUESTION 37, PENSEZ À VOTRE PRÉSENT TRAVAIL.
 À QUOI RESSEMBLE-T-IL LA PLUPART DU TEMPS? ÉCRIVEZ DANS L'ESPACE À CÔTÉ
 DE CHAQUE TERME CI-DESSOUS:**

**O pour "OUI" s'il décrit votre travail,
 N pour "NON" s'il NE décrit PAS votre travail, ou
 NSP pour "Ne sais pas" si vous êtes indécis(e).**

LE TRAVAIL À MON PRÉSENT EMPLOI

- | | | | | |
|-----|--------------|-------|------------------------------------|-------|
| 37. | Fascinant | _____ | Fatigant | _____ |
| | Routinier | _____ | Sain | _____ |
| | Satisfaisant | _____ | Provocant | _____ |
| | Ennuyeux | _____ | Sur le qui-vive | _____ |
| | Bon | _____ | Frustrant | _____ |
| | Créateur | _____ | Simple | _____ |
| | Respecté | _____ | Interminable | _____ |
| | Chaud | _____ | Agréable | _____ |
| | Utile | _____ | Donne un sens
d'accomplissement | _____ |

**POUR LA QUESTION 38, PENSEZ À VOTRE PRÉSENT SALAIRE.
COMMENT CHACUN DES MOTS SUIVANTS DÉCRIT-IL VOTRE PRÉSENT SALAIRE?
ÉCRIVEZ DANS L'ESPACE À CÔTÉ DE CHAQUE TERME CI-DESSOUS:**

**O pour "OUI" s'il décrit votre salaire,
N pour "NON" s'il NE décrit PAS votre salaire, ou
NSP pour "Ne sais pas" si vous êtes indécis(e).**

MON SALAIRE PRÉSENT

- | | | | | |
|-----|---|-------|------------|-------|
| 38. | Revenu adéquat pour dépenses ordinaires | _____ | Mauvais | _____ |
| | Partage de profit satisfaisante | _____ | Mal assuré | _____ |
| | Vis à peine avec revenu | _____ | Bien payé | _____ |
| | Revenu procure des luxes | _____ | Mal payé | _____ |
| | Moins que je mérite | _____ | | |

**POUR LA QUESTION 39, PENSEZ AUX CHANCES DE PROMOTION QUE VOUS AVEZ
MAINTENANT. COMMENT CHACUN DES MOTS SUIVANTS DÉCRIT-IL CES CHANCES?
ÉCRIVEZ DANS L'ESPACE À CÔTÉ DE CHAQUE TERME CI-DESSOUS:**

**O pour "OUI" s'il décrit vos chances de promotion,
N pour "NON" s'il NE décrit PAS vos chances de promotion, ou
NSP pour "Ne sais pas" si vous êtes indécis(e).**

MES CHANCES DE PROMOTION

- | | | | | |
|-----|-----------------------------------|-------|-----------------------------------|-------|
| 39. | Bonnes chances de promotion | _____ | Emploi cul-de-sac | _____ |
| | Opportunités quelque peu limitées | _____ | Promotions infrequente | _____ |
| | Promotion basée sur habileté | _____ | Promotions régulières | _____ |
| | Bonne chance de promotion | _____ | Politique de promotion
injuste | _____ |
| | Assez bonne chance de promotion | _____ | | |

**POUR LA QUESTION 40, PENSEZ AU GENRE DE SUPERVISION QUE VOUS RECEVEZ À
VOTRE EMPLOI. COMMENT CHACUN DES MOTS SUIVANTS DÉCRIT-IL CETTE
SUPERVISION? ÉCRIVEZ DANS L'ESPACE À CÔTÉ DE CHAQUE TERME CI-DESSOUS:**

**O pour "OUI" s'il décrit la supervision que vous recevez à votre emploi,
N pour "NON" s'il NE la décrit PAS, ou
NSP pour "Ne sais pas" si vous êtes indécis(e).**

LA SUPERVISION À MON PRÉSENT EMPLOI

40.	Me demande des conseils	_____	Me dit où j'en suis	_____
	Difficile à plaire	_____	Agaçante	_____
	Impolie	_____	Obstinée	_____
	Loue du bon travail	_____	Connaît bien le travail	_____
	A du tact	_____	Mauvaise	_____
	A de l'influence	_____	Intelligente	_____
	À jour	_____	Me laisse me débrouiller	_____
	Ne supervise pas assez	_____	Disponible	_____
	S'emporte facilement	_____	Paresseuse	_____

POUR LA QUESTION 41, PENSEZ À LA MAJORITÉ DES GENS AVEC QUI VOUS TRAVAILLEZ MAINTENANT. COMMENT CHACUN DES MOTS SUIVANTS DÉCRIT-IL CES GENS? ÉCRIVEZ DANS L'ESPACE À CÔTÉ DE CHAQUE TERME CI-DESSOUS:

O pour "OUI" s'il décrit les gens avec qui vous travaillez,
N pour "NON" s'il NE les décrit PAS, ou
NSP pour "Ne sais pas" si vous êtes indécis(e).

LES GENS À MON PRÉSENT EMPLOI

41.	Stimulants	_____	Parlent trop	_____
	Ennuyeux	_____	Malins	_____
	Lents	_____	Paresseux	_____
	Ambitieux	_____	Désagréables	_____
	Stupides	_____	Pas d'intimité	_____
	Responsables	_____	Actifs	_____
	Rapides	_____	Intérêts étroits	_____
	Intelligents	_____	Loyaux	_____
	Se font des ennemis facilement	_____	Difficile à rencontrer	_____

POUR LA QUESTION 42, PENSEZ À VOTRE EMPLOI EN GÉNÉRAL. À QUOI RESSEMBLE-T-IL LA PLUPART DU TEMPS? ÉCRIVEZ DANS L'ESPACE À CÔTÉ DE CHAQUE TERME CI-DESSOUS:

**O pour "OUI" s'il décrit votre travail,
N pour "NON" s'il NE décrit PAS votre travail, ou
NSP pour "Ne sais pas" si vous êtes indécis(e).**

MON EMPLOI, EN GÉNÉRAL

42.	Agréable	_____	Meilleur que la plupart	_____
	Vaut la peine	_____	Mauvais	_____
	Acceptable	_____	Pauvre	_____
	Aimerais quitter	_____	Perte de temps	_____
	Bon	_____	Indésirable	_____
	Amusant	_____	Me rend content(e)	_____
	Inadéquat	_____	Excellent	_____
	Pourri	_____	Désagréable	_____
	Idéal	_____		

Pour les questions de 43 à 129, placez un numéro qui vous semble le plus convenable à côté de chaque énoncé

**5 = tout à fait d'accord
4 = plus ou moins d'accord
3 = ni d'accord ni désaccord
2 = plus ou moins en désaccord
1 = tout à fait en désaccord**

43. Je ne me sens pas faire "partie de la famille" dans mon organisation.
44. Il serait très difficile pour moi de quitter mon organisation maintenant même si je le voulais.
45. Je considère réellement que les problèmes de cette organisation sont les miens.
46. Je n'ai pas beaucoup d'options à considérer si je quitte cette organisation.

47. Je ne me sens pas avoir des “liens émotionnels” avec cette organisation.
48. Ma vie serait très perturbée si je décidais que je voulais quitter cette organisation.
49. Cette organisation a une grande signification personnelle pour moi.
50. Je ne crois pas qu’une personne doit toujours être loyale à son organisation.
51. Je ne crains pas ce qui pourrait m’arriver si je quittais cet emploi et ne pouvais pas en trouver un autre.
52. Je pense que je pourrais tout aussi bien m’attacher à une autre organisation qu’à celle-ci.
53. Une des principales raisons pour lesquelles je continue à travailler pour cette organisation est l’importance que j’attribue à la loyauté et je me sens donc moralement obligé(e) de rester.
54. Il ne me coûterait pas beaucoup de quitter cette organisation maintenant.
55. Pour le moment, rester avec mon organisation est une nécessité aussi bien qu’une question de désir.
56. J’aime parler de mon organisation avec des gens de l’extérieur.
57. Les choses étaient meilleures dans le temps où les gens restaient avec une organisation pour la quasi-totalité de leurs carrières.
58. Je continue à travailler pour cette organisation principalement à cause des sacrifices personnels que je devrais faire au cas d’un départ; d’ailleurs, une autre organisation n’offrirait pas nécessairement les bénéfices que j’ai ici.
59. Je pense que les gens d’aujourd’hui changent de compagnies trop souvent.
60. Je n’éprouve pas trop de sentiment d’appartenance à mon organisation.
61. Changer d’organisation ne me paraît pas du tout contraire à la morale.
62. Je serais très heureux de passer le reste de ma carrière avec cette organisation.
63. Si je recevais l’offre d’un meilleur emploi ailleurs, je ne me sentrais pas justifié(e) de quitter mon organisation.
64. J’ai été formé(e) à croire en la loyauté envers son organisation.
65. Une des conséquences sérieuses du fait de quitter cette organisation serait le manque d’alternatives.

66. Je ne trouve plus très raisonnable le fait de vouloir s'identifier totalement à sa compagnie.
67. Un emploi ne correspond qu'à ce que vous en faites.
68. Pour la plupart des emplois, les gens arrivent à accomplir ce qu'ils voulaient réaliser en premier lieu.
69. Si vous savez ce que vous voulez d'un emploi, vous pouvez en tirer ce dont vous vous y attendez.
70. Si les employés n'aiment pas ce que veut le patron, ils devraient agir à cet égard.
71. Obtenir l'emploi que vous voulez est la plupart du temps une question de chance.
72. Gagner de l'argent est une question de bonne chance.
73. La plupart des gens sont capables de bien accomplir leurs travaux s'ils y mettent de l'effort.
74. Afin d'obtenir un très bon emploi, il vous faut de la famille ou des amis haut placés.
75. Les avancements sont souvent une question de bonne chance.
76. Quand il s'agit d'obtenir un très bon emploi, les contacts valent plus que l'expertise qu'on possède.
77. Les avancements sont réservés aux employés qui font bien leur travail.
78. Pour faire beaucoup d'argent, vous devez connaître les personnes qu'il faut.
79. Il faut beaucoup de chance pour être un employé exceptionnel dans la plupart des emplois.
80. Les gens performants a leurs emplois sont généralement récompensés pour leur bon travail.
81. La plupart des employés ont plus d'influence sur leurs superviseurs qu'ils ne le pensent.
82. La plus grande différence entre ceux qui gagnent beaucoup d'argent et ceux qui en gagnent peu, c'est de la chance.
83. Il n'y a pas d'excuses pour le mensonge.
84. L'honnêteté est la meilleure politique en toutes circonstances.
85. Quand vous demandez a quelqu'un de vous rendre un service, il vaut mieux en donner les vrais raisons plutôt que des raisons qui portent plus de poids.

86. Tous comptes faits, il est meilleur d'être humble et honnête que d'être important et malhonnête.
87. Il est sage de flatter les gens importants.
88. La meilleure façon de s'y prendre avec les gens, c'est de leurs dire ce qu'ils veulent entendre.
89. La plupart de ceux qui réussissent mènent une vie propre et morale.
90. Il est possible d'être bon(ne) sous tous les angles.
91. La plupart des gens sont essentiellement bons et gentils.
92. Quiconque fait confiance complètement à quelqu'un d'autre s'attire des ennuis.
93. Il est plus sûr de supposer que tout le monde possède un côté méchant et qu'il se manifesterà à un moment donné.
94. Il ne faut jamais révéler la vraie raison pour laquelle vous avez fait quoique ce soit à moins que cela serve à un but util.
95. On ne doit agir que lorsqu'on est sûr que l'action est moralement juste.
96. La plus grande différence entre la plupart des criminels et d'autres personnes, c'est que les premiers sont assez stupides pour se faire attraper.
97. En général, les gens ne travaillent pas fort à moins qu'ils y soient forcés.
98. La plupart des gens sont braves.
99. Il est difficile de réussir sans prendre de raccourcis par ci par là.
100. Les gens souffrant de maladies incurables devraient avoir le choix d'une mort sans douleur.
101. La plupart des gens oublient plus facilement la mort d'un parent qu'une perte de leurs biens.
102. Barnum s'est trompé lorsqu'il a dit qu'un naif est né à chaque minute.
103. La nouveauté m'attire beaucoup.
104. J'ai un grand besoin d'excitation.
105. C'est une sensation merveilleuse que de s'asseoir au milieu de ses biens.
106. Peu de choses dépassent la satisfaction de vraiment dépenser follement pour quelque chose - des livres, des vêtements, des meubles, etc.
107. Seul le désir d'accomplir de grandes choses mettrait l'esprit en pleine marche.

108. Rien n'est pire qu'une odeur offensive.
109. Dans la plupart des conversations, j'ai tendance à sauter d'un sujet à un autre.
110. J'envie la personne qui peut aborder n'importe qui pour le gronder en plein visage.
111. Je pourrais vraiment choquer les gens si je disais toutes les choses obscènes que je pense.
112. Il y a peu d'expériences plus misérables que celle d'aller se coucher chaque nuit sans pouvoir dormir à cause des inquiétudes.
113. J'ai tendance à prendre des décisions sous l'impulsion du moment.
114. Je me fâche pour un rien.
115. Laissez des traces n'importe où vous allez et on se rappellera du cheminement de votre vie.
116. J'aime rien de mieux que le petit déjeuner au lit.
117. Mon humeur est facilement influencée par les gens autour de moi.
118. Il est toujours meilleur de faire confiance au jugement des autorités gouvernementales et religieuses que d'écouter les éléments perturbateurs bruyants dans notre société qui sèment des doutes dans nos esprits.
119. Les gens devraient faire moins attention à la Bible et d'autres formes de guides religieux et développer des standards moraux personnels.
120. Il est important de protéger pleinement les droits des radicaux et des marginaux.
121. "La parole libre" signifie que les gens peuvent même avoir la permission de faire des discours et écrire des livres incitant le renversement du gouvernement.
122. Un des pires éléments dans notre pays ce temps-ci est ceux qui ne respectent pas notre drapeau, nos dirigeants, et l'ordre normal des choses.
123. En ces temps incertains, les lois doivent être appliquées sans pitié, surtout quand on a affaire avec des agitateurs et des révolutionnaires qui cherchent à remuer les choses.
124. Les "forces de la loi et de l'ordre" menacent la liberté dans notre pays beaucoup plus que la plupart des groupes dits "radicaux" and "athés".
125. Si un enfant commence à manquer de respect envers les conventions et les autorités, il revient à ses parents de le remettre sur la bonne voie.

126. En fin de compte, les autorités établies, ainsi que nos parents et nos dirigeants nationaux, s'avèrent avoir généralement raison, alors que tous les contestataires ne savent pas de quoi ils parlent.
127. Beaucoup de nos règles en ce qui concerne la modestie et le comportement sexuel ne sont que des coutumes qui ne sont pas nécessairement meilleures et plus sacrées que celles de quelqu'un d'autre.
128. Les vraies clés de la "bonne vie" sont l'obéissance, la discipline, et l'adhésion aux conventions établies.
129. Il vaut mieux de traiter les dissidents de façon généreuse et avec un esprit ouvert, car les idées nouvelles sont essentielles au changement progressif.

POUR LES QUESTIONS DE 130 A 142, PLACEZ UN NUMERO QUI VOUS SEMBLE LE PLUS CONVENABLE A CÔTE DE CHAQUE ÉNONCÉ

1 =Vrai

2 = Faux

130. Il m'est parfois difficile de continuer mon travail sans être encouragé(e).
131. Parfois, j'en veux aux autres quand je n'obtiens pas ce que je veux.
132. Parfois, j'ai abandonné un certain travail par manque de confiance en mes capacités.
133. Il m'est arrivé de vouloir me révolter contre ceux en position d'autorité même si je savais qu'ils avaient raison.
134. Peu importe à qui je parle, je sais toujours écouter.
135. Il m'est arrivé de profiter de quelqu'un.
136. Je suis toujours prêt(e) à admettre mes erreurs lorsque j'en commets.
137. Parfois, je cherche à me venger plutôt que de pardonner et d'oublier.
138. Je suis toujours courtois(e), même avec des personnes désagréables.
139. Je ne suis pas contrarié(e) quand les gens expriment des idées différentes des miennes.
140. Il m'est arrivé que je sois jaloux(se) de la chance des autres.
141. Les gens qui demandent des faveurs m'agacent parfois.
142. Je n'ai jamais délibérément dit des choses qui froissent les autres.

POUR LES QUESTIONS DE 143 A 145, PLACEZ UN NUMERO QUI VOUS SEMBLE LE PLUS CONVENABLE A CÔTE DE CHAQUE ÉNONCÉ

- 5 = très souvent**
4 = souvent
3 = parfois
2 = rarement
1 = jamais

143. A quel point êtes-vous laissé(e) à faire votre travail seul(e)?
144. A quel point êtes-vous capable d'agir indépendamment de votre superviseur à votre poste?
145. A quel point êtes-vous capable d'accomplir votre travail indépendamment des autres?

POUR LES QUESTIONS DE 146 A 150, PLACEZ NUMERO QUI VOUS SEMBLE LE PLUS CONVENABLE A CÔTE DE CHAQUE ÉNONCÉ

- 7= toujours**
6= presque toujours
5= d'habitude
4= parfois
3= rarement
2= presque jamais
1= jamais

146. Je cherche à jouer un rôle actif dans la direction d'un groupe.
147. J'évite d'essayer d'influencer ceux autour de moi et de les faire adopter ma façon de voir les choses.
148. Il m'arrive d'organiser and de diriger les activités des autres.
149. J'essaie d'obtenir plus de contrôle sur les événements autour de moi.
150. J'essaie d'être "le chef" quand je travaille dans un groupe.

POUR LES QUESTIONS DE 151 A 153, PLACEZ UN NUMÉRO QUI VOUS SEMBLE LE PLUS CONVENABLE À CÔTÉ DE CHAQUE ÉNONCÉ

- 5 = mon emploi m'en donne un maximum**
4 = mon emploi m'en donne un degré considérable
3 = mon emploi m'en donne un degré modéré
2 = mon emploi m'en donne peu
1 = mon emploi m'en donne un minimum

151. La liberté de faire ce que je veux.
152. L'opportunité d'agir et de penser de façon indépendante.

153. La capacité de contrôler le rythme de mon travail.

**POUR LES QUESTIONS DE 154 A 165, PLACEZ UN NUMÉRO QUI VOUS SEMBLE
LE PLUS CONVENABLE À CÔTÉ DE CHAQUE ÉNONCÉ**

5 = degré élevé
4 = degré considérable
3 = jusqu'à un certain point
2 = degré passable
1 = degré négligeable

154. A quel point votre organisation adopte-elle rapidement les méthodes de travail améliorées?
155. A quel point cette organisation possède-t-elle des objectifs à la fois clairs et raisonnables?
156. A quel point les activités de travail sont-elles organisées de façon raisonnable dans cette organisation?
157. Dans cette organisation, à quel point les décisions sont elles prises aux niveaux où l'information est le plus adéquate et exacte?
158. L'information qu'obtient votre groupe de travail sur ce qui se passe dans les autres départements et unités est elle adéquate?
159. A quel point cette organisation communique à votre groupe de travail ce dont il a besoin pour faire de son mieux?
160. A quel point cette organisation fait elle un effort pour améliorer les conditions de travail?
161. Les personnes supérieures à votre superviseur sont elles réceptifs aux idées et suggestions venant de votre groupe de travail?
162. A quel point cette organisation possède-t-elle un intérêt réel dans le bien-être et la satisfaction générale de ceux qui travaillent ici?
163. A quel point il y a-t-il des choses reliant à votre travail ici (comme les politiques, pratiques, ou conditions) qui vous encouragent à travailler fort?
164. Quand les décisions sont prises, à quel point demande-t-on l'opinion des personnes touchées?
165. Les gens de tous les niveaux d'une organisation ont souvent du savoir-faire de valeur pour les responsables. A quel point l'information est elle largement partagée dans cette organisation afin que le savoir-faire mentionné soit accessible aux responsables?

**POUR LES QUESTIONS DE 166 A 183, VEUILLEZ INDIQUER LA FRÉQUENCE
AVEC LAQUELE VOUS COMPORTEZ DE LA FAÇON DÉCRITE DANS
CHAQUE ESQUISSE DE CARACTÈRE .**

- 4 = Je me comporte ainsi souvent**
3 = Je me comporte ainsi de temps en temps
2 = Je me comporte rarement ainsi
1 = Je ne me comporte jamais ainsi

166. Aider les autres afin d'obtenir leur aide plus tard. Margaret est ingénieure civile dans une grande compagnie. Elle sait qu'un traitement privilégié du département de production est crucial à l'achèvement à temps de son nouveau projet. Lorsqu'elle apprend que le directeur de production est en train d'organiser la campagne de charité de la compagnie pour cette année, elle lui rend visite tout de suite pour lui parler des besoins de son projet (à elle), et de lui offrir de l'aide pour sa campagne de charité. _____
167. Faire connaître vos accomplissements. Jason travaille comme opérateur des données pour une grande entreprise de consultation. À cause du manque de personnel, il est temporairement relocalisé dans une autre division dans laquelle il aide dans la réorganisation du centre de ressources. Pendant cette période, il continue de rencontrer le superviseur de la division des données. Lors de ces rencontres informelles, Jason s'assure que son superviseur soit au courant de ses récents accomplissements. _____
168. Faire que son rival paraisse mal. Dan travaille comme chercheur dans une grande laboratoire chimique. En lisant une étude par un collègue qui sera bientôt publiée, il aperçoit une erreur d'inattention dans les analyses. Il décide de ne rien dire à ce sujet même s'il sait que l'erreur sera sûrement repérée une fois l'étude publiée. _____
169. Soutenir l'opinion des autres même si vous n'êtes pas d'accord avec eux. Kathy travaille comme secrétaire dans le département de sociologie dans un petit collège communautaire. À cause des restrictions budgétaires, le département doit choisir entre l'achat d'une nouvelle photocopieuse et de nouvelles chaises pour quelques professeurs de sociologie. Son superviseur, qui est chef du département, fait savoir qu'il est de l'avis que les fonds soient dépensés pour les chaises neuves. Kathy n'est pas d'accord. Cependant, quand il lui demande son opinion, elle lui dit que l'argent devrait être dépensés pour les chaises, plutôt que pour une nouvelle photocopieuse. _____
170. Retenir de l'information. Elizabeth travaille comme gestionnaire dans une chaîne de magasins. À la réunion annuelle des gestionnaires de magasins, tous les gestionnaires discutent leurs stratégies de marketing pour l'année à venir. Cependant, quand vient le tour d'Elizabeth de faire son exposé, elle omet délibérément certaines informations importantes. Elle veut s'assurer que son plan innovateur de marketing ne puisse être utilisé dans un autre magasin le premier. _____
171. Faire semblant de s'intéresser à la vie personnelle des autres. Martin travaille comme assistant de recherche pour le gouvernement. Quoiqu'il trouve son superviseur Joanna plutôt ennuyeuse, il fait semblant de s'intéresser à la vie personnelle de Joanna. Par exemple, la semaine dernière, ils ont longuement discuté si la fille aînée de Joanna devrait rester à l'école privée, et l'endroit où la famille de Joanna devrait aller passer les vacances d'été. _____
172. Agir en employé "modèle" quand les autres sont présents. Travis travaille comme assistant graphique pour une agence de publicité. Travis profite du fait que son superviseur voyage très fréquemment et qu'il soit rarement présent à l'agence. Par exemple, Travis arrive souvent un peu plus tard au travail qu'il ne devrait, et part un peu plus tôt. Cependant, quand son superviseur est là, Travis devient un employé parfait (par exemple, il ne met jamais plus de temps que convenu pour son déjeuner, il arrive tôt au travail, etc.) _____

173. Faire des compliments sur l'apparence personnelle, même s'ils sont pas justifiés. Cindy travaille comme assistante administrative pour une grande compagnie de logiciels. Cindy croit que son superviseur Carol n'a pas de goût pour les vêtements. Cependant, même quand elle s'habille de façon très inélégante, Cindy lui fait inmanquablement des compliments sur son apparence. _____
174. Ne pas complètement s'engager jusqu'à ce que vous sachiez quel côté est "gagnant". Karen est infirmière dans un grand hôpital. Pendant les réunions, de vives disputes ont souvent lieu entre des individus de différents points-de-vue sur un certaine question. Cependant, Karen ne prend jamais complètement position. Ainsi, si quelque chose tourne mal, elle peut se pencher de l'autre côté, s'éviter des reproches, et en agissant ainsi, sauvegarder ses chances de promotions. _____
175. Louer les accomplissements des autres, même si vous n'êtes pas impressionné. Mindy travaille comme analyste de politiques adjointe pour le gouvernement. Son superviseur Charles a récemment reçu un certificat confirmant qu'il avait complété une série de cours de gestion. Mindy invitait Charles au déjeuner pour célébrer son accomplissement, même si elle ne trouvait pas le certificat très impressionnant. _____
176. Former des alliances solides. Allison est vice-présidente dans une banque qui vient d'embaucher un nouveau président plus tôt cette année. Il est devenu évident que le nouveau président favorisait une perspective très différente des opérations bancaires qu'Allison, et Allison commençait à craindre que certains services innovateurs et populaires ne soient éliminés. Pour cette raison, Allison a au cours des six derniers mois développé de fortes alliances avec d'autres vice-présidents qui partagent ses intérêts et qui se sentent également menacés. _____
177. Utiliser des informations pour submerger les autres. Anthony travaille comme gestionnaire pour une grandecompanie de plastique. Il doit faire rapport a un comité supérieur au sujet de sa décision récente de changer de fournisseurs. Il a l'impression que le comité ne questionnerait pas une decision basés sur un grand volume d'information. Il se présente donc a la réunion prêt a submerger le comité avec des graphiques, tableaux, et des calculs concernant la performance du fournisseur. _____
178. S'associer avec des gens d'influence. Paul possède une compagnie d'équipements médicaux dans une petite communauté. Ses produits sont concurrentiels mais il sait que les docteurs peuvent facilement se fier à d'autres fournisseurs dans la ville à côté. Paul croit alors que de ses tâches principales consiste à fréquenter les docteurs d'influence dans la communauté. _____
179. Retarder de façon sélective les travaux pour un gain spécifique. Marsha travaille comme diététicienne pour un grand centre de personnes âgées. Elle promet à un collègue qu'elle l'aidera à préparer des plans de repas plusieurs clients nouvellement admis. Cependant, quand son superviseur Jackie cherche de l'aide pour consolider les fichiers du centre, Marsha se porte volontaire. Marsha dit alors a son collègue qu'elle trop occupée pour l'aider. Après tout, rendre service à son superviseur est plus important qu'aider un collègue en difficulté. _____
180. S'assurer que votre image est la bonne. Paul dirige une section d'ingénierie responsable des fonctions secondaires et de production. Cependant, afin d'être remarqué dans cette compagnie, il est nécessaire de paraître créatif et excitant. Lorsqu'il se rend compte de celà, il insiste de se charger d'un projet risqué mais innovateur afin d'essayer de changer son image et celle de sa section. _____
181. Se servir des relations personnelles avec les autres. Linda travaille comme consultante d'impôts pour une firme moyenne de comptabilité. Récemment, Linda recommandait qu'une petite compagnie de recherche appartenant à son beau-frère John soit accordée le contrat d'évaluation des employés de la firme de comptabilité. Linda sait qu'avec John à la direction, elle est garantie une évaluation favorable des employés. _____

182. Faire que les autres mettent l'accent sur votre importance dans l'organisation. Bob travaille comme thérapeute pour un centre de désintoxication subventionné par le gouvernement. Il annonce souvent à ses clients qu'à cause des coupures du gouvernement, beaucoup de ses services pourraient être éliminés. Bob encourage donc ses clients de dire à ses supérieurs à quel point ils ont besoin des services qu'il reçoivent. Bob sait que quand ses clients agissent ainsi, ils le loueraient beaucoup et diraient du bien de son travail. En conséquence, les superviseurs de Bob seront constamment rappelés qu'il est un employé de premier ordre. _____

183. Trouver un expert qui soutient votre position. Brian est vice-président dans une compagnie manufacturière prospère. A présent, les cadres sont en train de choisir le site pour une nouvelle usine. Pour les aider à prendre leur décision, Brian embauche un consultant bien connu dans le domaine dont le point-de-vue soutient le choix du site préféré de Brian. _____

**LES QUESTIONS 184 A 199,
VEUILLEZ SUIVRE LES INSTRUCTIONS POUR CHACUNE DES QUESTIONS.**

184. Sexe _____ (1= homme; 2=femme)
185. Age _____ (veuillez compléter)
186. Statut personnel (veuillez en encercler un)
- a. Célibataire
 - b. Union libre
 - c. marié(e)
 - d. séparé(e)
 - e. divorcé(e)
 - f. veuf/veuve
187. Veuillez indiquer le genre de position que vous occuper: (e.g., CR-4; PM-6; FSL-4)
- Membre régulier _____ Rang _____ Durée de service _____
- Membre civil _____ Classification d'emploi _____ Durée de service _____
- Membre de la
Fonction Publique (FP) _____ Classification d'emploi _____ Durée de service (GRC) _____
(FP) _____
188. Veuillez indiquer le genre de position que vous occupez dans chaque catégorie qui s'applique :
- | | |
|--------------------|------------------------------|
| Directorat: _____ | Occupation/Profession: _____ |
| Manager: _____ | Non-manager: _____ |
| Superviseur: _____ | Non-superviseur: _____ |
189. Veuillez indiquer le nombre d'années pendant lesquelles vous étiez employé(e) chez votre employeur **précédent** _____
190. Veuillez indiquer le nombre d'années pendant lesquelles vous êtes employé(e) chez votre **présent** employeur (GRC) _____
191. Veuillez indiquer le nombre d'années pendant lesquelles vous êtes employé(e) dans la **présente** profession _____

192. Veuillez indiquer le nombre de promotions chez le **présent** employeur (GRC) _____
193. Veuillez indiquer le nombre de promotions dans votre carrière **en excluant** celles chez le présent employeur _____
194. Niveau d'éducation complété: **(veuillez en encercler un)**
- A. Ecole primaire
 - B. Ecole secondaire
 - C. Etudes collégiales entamées
 - D. Diplômé collégial
 - E. Etudes universitaires entamées
 - F. Diplômé de premier cycle universitaire
 - G. Etudes supérieures entamées
 - H. Diplômé de maîtrise
 - I. Doctorat, M.D., ou autres diplômes avancés
 - J. Autre (veuillez indiquer) _____
195. Avez-vous des enfants?
- Oui _____ Non _____ (si non, allez à la question # 197)
196. Si oui,
Combien d'enfants avez-vous en-dessous de 6 ans? _____
197. Salaire annuel: **(veuillez en encercler un)**
- A. \$20,000-\$29,999
 - B. \$30,000-\$39,999
 - C. \$40,000-\$49,999
 - D. \$50,000-\$59,999
 - E. \$60,000-\$69,999
 - F. \$70,000-\$79,999
 - G. \$80,000-\$89,999
 - H. \$90,000-\$99,999
 - I. \$100,000-\$149,999
198. Dans votre famille, quel est votre ordre de naissance? **(veuillez en encercler un)**
- a. enfant unique
 - b. premier né
 - c. deuxième, mais non dernier
 - d. troisième, mais non dernier
 - e. dernier né
199. Quelle est votre ethnicité?
- A. Race blanche
 - B. Canadien d'origine africaine
 - C. Asiatique
 - D. Autochtone
 - E. Autre _____