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It is well acknowledged that employees’ decision to exit an organization can be depicted as a cognitive sequential path which links job performance, job satisfaction, organizational commitment and turnover intentions. In the literature, there are two broad streams of research that focus on the driving forces of this withdrawal process. The first endeavours to understand the role of contextual variables, such as organizational justice and politics perceptions in predicting consequences relevant to the self and to the organization. The second stream leans towards the effect of personal characteristics and behaviors on these variables.

This study builds on previous research concerning these two streams in an attempt to provide a framework that integrates individual political behavior, political skill, organizational justice and politics, into a sequential withdrawal process that starts with job performance and ends at turnover intentions, through the mediating effects of intrinsic job satisfaction and organizational commitment. Drawing on a sample of 545 part-time MBA students and alumni and through the use of structural equation modeling techniques, ANOVA, and moderated regression analyses we provide support to our hypothesized model.

The results of the study suggest that: (a) Three influence tactics categories (i.e., hard, soft, and rational) can significantly affect task performance; (b) the selection of which influence tactic to select in order to achieve task performance is greatly determined by political skill; (c) managers’ political behavior, organizational justice and politics perceptions can predict turnover intentions through their effect on performance and satisfaction; (d) the joint use of seemingly incompatible influence tactics can provide better and more stable results; (e) political skill moderates the relationship between the combined use of influence tactics and performance; (f) organizational justice and politics leverage the relationship between political skill and task performance.
# Table of Contents

**Declaration of Copyright/Originality** .............................................................................................................................. I

**Acknowledgments** ............................................................................................................................................................. II

**Abstract** ............................................................................................................................................................................ III

**Table of Contents** .............................................................................................................................................................. IV

**Table of Figures** ................................................................................................................................................................. IX

**Tables** .................................................................................................................................................................................. X

## Chapter 1 Introduction ..................................................................................................................................................... 1

1.1 Theoretical Foundation and Research Objectives ........................................................................................................ 2

1.2 Research Approach and Methods ...................................................................................................................................... 6

1.3 Contribution to Theory and Practice .................................................................................................................................. 7

1.4 Overview and Outline of the Study ........................................................................................................................................ 9

## Chapter 2 Organizational Justice, Politics, Influence Tactics and Political Skill .................................................. 13

2.1 Introduction ........................................................................................................................................................................ 13

2.2 Theories of Organizational Justice ...................................................................................................................................... 15

2.2.1 How justice evaluations are made ................................................................................................................................. 16

- Relative Deprivation ............................................................................................................................................................ 17
- Homans’s Social Exchanges ..................................................................................................................................................... 18
- Blau’s role expectations ............................................................................................................................................................ 18
- Equity Theory ........................................................................................................................................................................... 19
- Referent Cognitions Theory ..................................................................................................................................................... 20
- Fairness Theory ......................................................................................................................................................................... 21
- Fairness Heuristic Theory ........................................................................................................................................................ 22
- Uncertainty Management Theory ........................................................................................................................................ 23

2.2.2 Why justice matters ............................................................................................................................................................ 23

- Instrumental model ................................................................................................................................................................. 23
- Relational model ....................................................................................................................................................................... 26
- Moral Virtues Model .............................................................................................................................................................. 27
- Deontic theory of fairness ........................................................................................................................................................ 28
- Multiple Needs Model ......................................................................................................................................................... 28

2.2.3 Dimensions of Organizational Justice ............................................................................................................................ 30
CHAPTER 3 JOB PERFORMANCE, JOB SATISFACTION, ORGANIZATIONAL COMMITMENT AND TURNOVER INTENTIONS .............................................................................................................................. 66

3.1 INTRODUCTION .............................................................................................................. 66

3.2 JOB PERFORMANCE ....................................................................................................... 67

3.2.1 Theories of job performance ...................................................................................... 67

3.3 JOB SATISFACTION ........................................................................................................ 70

3.3.1 Defining job satisfaction .......................................................................................... 70

3.3.2 Theories of antecedents job satisfaction .................................................................... 71

Situational theories ........................................................................................................... 72
7.2.3 Achieving task performance by combining hard and soft influence tactics: The moderating role of political skill
7.2.4 Organizational justice and perceptions of organizational politics
7.2.5 Political skill and job performance: The moderating role of justice and politics
7.2.6 Determinants of intrinsic job satisfaction
7.2.7 Determinants of employee commitment and turnover intentions

7.3 IMPLICATIONS OF THE RESULTS
7.4 STRENGTHS OF THE STUDY
7.5 LIMITATIONS OF THE STUDY
7.6 DIRECTIONS FOR FUTURE RESEARCH
7.7 CHAPTER’S OVERVIEW

REFERENCES

APPENDIX 1

APPENDIX 2
TABLE OF FIGURES

**FIGURE 1.** Ferris, Adams, Kolodinsky & Ammeter’s (2002) revised model of Ferris et al. (1989) Perception of Organizational Politics. ................................................................. 37

**FIGURE 2.** Farrell and Petersen’s three dimensional model of political behavior. ............................................. 51

**FIGURE 3.** A nomological network of dispositional and personal ability antecedents of political skill. .......62

**FIGURE 4.** Meyer and Allen’s multidimensional model of organizational commitment, its antecedents, and its consequences. ......................................................................................... 91

**FIGURE 5.** Mobley’s employee turnover decision process. ...................................................................................... 94

**FIGURE 6.** The Price-Mueller causal model of turnover ........................................................................... 95

**FIGURE 7.** Lee and Mitchell’s (1999) unfolding model of voluntary turnover. ................................................. 97

**FIGURE 8.** Hypothesized research model ........................................................................................................ 105

**FIGURE 9.** The moderating role of justice and politics to the relationship between political skill and job performance. ............................................................................................... 126

**FIGURE 10.** Confirmatory factor analysis for hypothesized model. .......................................................... 161

**FIGURE 11.** Measurement model for organizational justice as a second order factor. ................................. 166

**FIGURE 12.** Measurement model for political skill as a second order factor. ............................................ 169

**FIGURE 13.** Hypothesized SEM Model. ........................................................................................................ 175

**FIGURE 14.** The moderating effect of political skill. ......................................................................................... 187

**FIGURE 15.** The Moderating Effect of Perceptions of Organizational Politics. ............................................. 190

**FIGURE 16.** The Moderating Effect of Procedural Justice. ............................................................................... 191

**FIGURE 17.** The Moderating Effect of Informational Justice. ........................................................................ 192
# TABLES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Table 1</td>
<td>Mayes and Allens’ two-dimensional view of organizational politics</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Table 2</td>
<td>Definitions of the 11 proactive influence tactics</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Table 3</td>
<td>Indicative definitions of organizational commitment</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Table 4</td>
<td>Measurement model results</td>
<td>162</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Table 5</td>
<td>Validation of the four-factor model of organizational justice</td>
<td>165</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Table 6</td>
<td>CFA results for organizational justice as a second order construct</td>
<td>167</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Table 7</td>
<td>Validation of the four-factor model of political skill</td>
<td>168</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Table 8</td>
<td>CFA results for political skill as a second order construct</td>
<td>170</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Table 9</td>
<td>Descriptive statistics: mean, standard deviation, and correlations</td>
<td>174</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Table 10</td>
<td>Structural model results (direct, indirect, and total effects)</td>
<td>176</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Table 11</td>
<td>Model statistics against theoretical model</td>
<td>178</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Table 12</td>
<td>ANOVA for task performance</td>
<td>185</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Table 13</td>
<td>Regression-based S.D. analysis</td>
<td>185</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Table 14</td>
<td>Results of hierarchical regression model</td>
<td>186</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Table 15</td>
<td>Results of HRM-based regression analysis</td>
<td>189</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Table 16</td>
<td>Summary of hypothesis testing results</td>
<td>197</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Chapter 1
Introduction

Literature in management and industrial/organizational psychology is dominated by variables such as job satisfaction, organizational commitment, and turnover. A search in an academic journal database could be very enlightening. For example, looking for these exact keywords in the EBSCO database (i.e., Business Source Premier) for the years 2000 to present would return more than 6000 academic journal citations. What is the reason for such an enormous interest in these variables? Organizations have long recognized that retaining the good performers helps to avoid overarching costs derived from recruiting of replacements, training new-comers, loss of know-how, increased administrative demands, and so forth.

For instance, the “CIPD’s recruitment, retention and turnover survey” for 2008 reported a 17.3% as the overall employee turnover rate for the UK (CIPD, 2008). The private sector reported the highest labor turnover rates (20.4%) and the public sector an average of 13.5%. Over 70% of employees believe that employees’ departure from the organization has a negative effect on business performance. Moreover, change of career is deemed to be the most common cause of voluntary employee turnover (55%), followed by promotions outside the organization (45%), level of pay (41%), and lack of career development opportunities (33%). Based on the findings of the CIPD report, the average cost per employee was £5,800, rising to £20,000 for senior managers or directors. Similar findings are reported in the corresponding survey of the US Department of Labour for 2008, which gives an annual rate of over 20% for voluntary turnover. These findings are indicative of the importance of employees’ turnover for individuals, organizations and communities. Therefore, it seems
intriguing to know where the driving forces of the turnover process lie and how do employees reach the decision to exit their organizations.

Building on relevant theory, this study endeavours to integrate two streams of research into a framework so as to understand the process through which employees reach to the decision of exiting the organization. In this thesis we argue that the driving forces responsible for such a decision involve two different levels of analysis. The first focuses on personal characteristics and behaviors that, through their effect on performance, lead to job satisfaction, commitment and ultimately turnover intentions/turnover. The second emphasizes the role of organizational context in determining employees’ level of satisfaction from their work and subsequently to the rest of the withdrawal process. We are not aware of any other study attempting to integrate and empirically test this process (performance-satisfaction-commitment-turnover intentions) from both a micro and a macro political perspective.

1.1 Theoretical foundation and research objectives

Employees’ turnover reflects the number of organizational members who has left during a specific period divided by the average number of people in the same organization during the same period (Price, 1977). Still, for various reasons (e.g., the actual data are unavailable or difficult to acquire, longitudinal design needed), organizational researchers often rely on “surrogate variables” (Dalton, Johnson, & Daily, 1999), such as turnover intentions. Employees may exit an organization either voluntarily or involuntarily. Turnover intention, which will be the final stop in our hypothesized withdrawal process, refers to an employee’s decision to leave an organization (Dougherty, Bluedorn, & Keon, 1985).

Employees choose to exit an organization for a number of reasons (Udo, Guimyryes, & Igbaria, 1997). Still, many researchers (e.g., Griffeth & Hom, 1995; Mobley, 1977; Williams & Hazer, 1986b) acknowledge that this decision stems from job dissatisfaction and low organizational commitment. Job satisfaction reflects cognitive, affective and behavioural responses to one’s job (Hulin & Judge, 2003). On the other hand, organizational commitment represents the relative strength of an individual’s identification with and involvement in an organization (Steers, 1977). Furthermore, as mentioned earlier, top
performers are more likely to exit organizations. As such, it seems very interesting to link performance to the withdrawal process. In this context, this thesis focuses on examining the antecedents of performance and job satisfaction, which are the main predictors of organizational commitment and turnover intentions.

The notions of politics and justice have troubled the minds of philosophers, scholars and organizations, triggering stimulus debates concerning their nature, antecedents and practical implications to individuals or organizations. Irrespective of how these constructs are conceived and materialized, one cannot but recognize their critical role in organizational eurhythmy, since they can designate individual behavior and hence influence organizational outcomes (Harris, Andrews, & Kacmar, 2007a; Roberson & Stewart, 2006).

Two approaches to organizational politics have dominated the literature. The first focuses on employees' influence tactics at work as the best representative of political behavior. This approach regards organizational politics as part of a general set of social behaviors used as tools that can contribute to the basic functioning of the organization (Pfeffer, 1981). Kipnis, Schmidt, and Wilkinson (1980) view organizational politics as means that individuals employ at work to influence their colleagues, subordinates, and superiors to obtain personal benefits or to satisfy organizational goals. Influencing others at work remains a key requirement for effective management and leadership whilst also bearing a significant impact on performance (Falbe & Yukl, 1992; Yukl, 2008). The ability to influence others to carry out specific tasks and requests, formal or informal, over a period of time can be a strenuous task. The means to communicate decisions and ensure their successful implementation can greatly vary.

The conceptual distinction between hard, soft and rational tactics, based on their place on the influence tactics’ strength dimension (Tepper, Brown, & Hunt, 1993), as well as their implications have received scarce attention (e.g. van Knippenberg, Eijbergen, & Wilke, 1999a; van Knippenberg & Steensma, 2003; Yukl & Chavez, 2002). In particular, there has been surprisingly little empirical research on the interaction between hard and soft influence tactics and its effect on job performance. In addition, the premise that managers need to
keep the use of both soft and hard influence tactics at a balance to ensure performance has not been adequately investigated.

Nonetheless, although performance, effectiveness, and career success are determined partly by hard work and perhaps intelligence, other interpersonal competencies such as social astuteness, positioning, and savvy also play critical role (Ferris et al., 2005b; Semadar, Robins, & Ferris, 2006). Whilst being able to influence others at work through persuasion, exchanges, sanctions, and so forth may be stigmatized as a manipulative and self-interested behavior with disruptive organizational implications (Buchanan, 2007), a different perspective acknowledges the importance of these behaviors as beneficial to organizational performance. Mintzberg (1983) suggest that the person exerting influence must not only have some power basis, and expend some energy, but often must do so in a clever manner with political skill. Thereby, knowing which political behavior can lead to the desired output and how it can be put to practice is a skill that has received burgeoning attention during the last few years.

Despite the fact that political skill shares many similarities with other social skills (e.g., emotional intelligence, self-monitoring, leadership self-efficacy), it is perhaps the first social skill construct to be aimed specifically at behavior in organizational settings (Perrewe, Ferris, Frink, & Anthony, 2000, p. 117). Recent changes and new work settings have increased unstructured interaction among work team members, peers as well as supervisors and subordinates, and directly between employees and clients. It is rather unlikely to be considered good at your job if you are not also good at working with and influencing others (Ferris, Davidson, & Perrewe, 2005a). Individuals work in teams, cooperate, receive rewards, are involved in conflict situations, and generally interact with other organizational members. The crucial role of these organizational interactions suggests that the relationship of this type of skills with job performance is not always straightforward, but rather, that several variables related to the inner-organizational context (e.g., perceptions of organizational politics, justice) in which employees function could moderate this relationship.

The second approach in organizational politics literature is more recent and focuses on employees' subjective perceptions of organizational politics rather than on political behavior.
or influence tactics. As suggested by several researchers (Ferris & Kacmar, 1992; Ferris, Russ, & Fandt, 1989b; Vigoda & Cohen, 2002) perceptions of organizational politics represent the degree to which respondents view their work environment as political in nature, promoting the self-interests of others, and thereby contrary to the interests of the entire organization or work unit. They are often enacted behind the scenes and usually occur when rules and procedures that guide decision making are limited or ambiguous (Andrews & Kacmar, 2001). In this context, politics can subsume a negative meaning that encompasses non-sanctioned behaviors with severe implications to an organization’s well-being. In addition, organizational politics is a significant factor able to explain personal and organizational outcomes such as job involvement, satisfaction and organizational withdrawal (Miller, Rutherford, & Kolodinsky, 2008). However, the relationship between the perceived view of the political workplace climate and job performance is still vague (Ahearn, Ferris, Hochwarter, Douglas, & Ammeter, 2004). Relevant research shows that politics is an important component in the workplace that needs further inquiry and examination (Bozeman, Hochwarier, Perrewe, & Brymer, 2001; Harris, Harris, & Harvey, 2007c; Kacmar & Baron, 1999; Vigoda & Cohen, 2002).

**Organizational justice** is concerned with people’s fairness perceptions in their employment relationship and has been a popular field of study in the social sciences for at least 25 years (Fortin, 2008, p. 39). Social scientists have long recognized the importance of the ideals of justice as a basic requirement for both organizational and individual effectiveness. Motivational and psychological theories provided the conceptual tools required to investigate this fundamental construct in the workplace (Colquitt, Greenberg, & Zapata-Phelan, 2005). Even though organizational justice can be perceived in different ways, this study does not only concentrate on distributive and interpersonal justice, which pertain to how fairly resources (e.g. promotions, remuneration) are allocated or how employees are treated following this allocation. Indeed, it also sheds light on the process by which decisions are made and their rationale, which relates to both procedural justice and informational justice.

Inspired by several theories (e.g. social exchange theory, equity theory, cognitive evaluation theory, uncertainty management theory), a large number of researches (e.g. Andrews &
Kacmar, 2001; Harris et al., 2007a; Lemons & Jones, 2001; Rhoades & Eisenberger, 2002) have examined how the perceived political climate (for reviews refer to Ferris et al., 2002) and organizational justice (for reviews refer to Colquitt, Conlon, Wesson, Porter, & Ng, 2001; Fortin, 2008) affect workplace attitudes; thus organizational performance and effectiveness (e.g. stress/strain reactions, turnover intentions, job satisfaction, employee commitment, task performance). Moreover, limited research, both theoretical and empirical, has tapped into how the inner organizational context (politics and justice) relates to employees’ skills as an explanatory mechanism of job performance (Harris et al., 2007a; Roberson & Stewart, 2006).

Given the gaps in the literature as identified and succinctly analyzed in the previous paragraphs, the major research questions addressed in this study are:

- To what extent can individual characteristics (i.e., political skill, influence tactics) determine task performance?
- To what extent does the organizational context (i.e., organizational justice and politics) affect individual and organizational outcomes (i.e., job satisfaction, organizational commitment, and turnover intentions)?
- How do specific constructs mediate relationships among personal and organizational variables and outcomes?
- Can the combined use of seemingly incompatible influence tactics (hard and soft tactics) affect performance and ensure stable results?
- Can political skill moderate the relationship between the use of combined influence tactics and performance?
- Can organizational justice, as well as perceptions of organizational politics moderate the relationship between political skill and job performance?

### 1.2 Research approach and methods

To provide empirical evidence regarding the appropriateness of the proposed model we conducted a large-scale survey at part-time MBA students and alumni of a leading Greek business school (Athens University of Economics and Business). Such a context would favor the collection of a large number of usable questionnaires. In addition, sampling employees
from a wide range of occupations and backgrounds is a strategy that maximizes the external
generalizability of our research (Breaux, Munyon, Hochwarter, & Ferris, 2009; Scandura &
Williams, 2000).

In particular, we contacted 1300 individuals and gathered 545 valid responses (self-reports).
To test all research hypotheses of this thesis we followed several advanced statistical
techniques. First, we checked the appropriateness of our proposed framework. In line with
Anderson and Gerbing’s (1988) two step modeling approach, we conducted a Confirmatory
Factor Analysis (CFA) to test the unidimensionality, reliability and validity of all multi-item
latent constructs (measurement model). After corroborating the measurement properties of
the model, we used Structural Equation Modeling (SEM) and specifically Maximum
Likelihood estimations with bootstrapping sampling procedure offered by the AMOS
statistical package (Arbuckle, 2003). The use of SEM allows the simultaneous estimation of
multiple relationships, thus it is the appropriate method for testing how good the data fit the
hypothesized model.

Nonetheless, the need to examine more complex relationships (variability of the dependent
variable, moderation effects) led to the employment of other statistical techniques as well.
To examine the variability in results concerning task performance when using different
strategies (i.e., hard tactics, soft tactics, combined use of hard and soft tactics), we used one-
way ANOVA followed by a post hoc regression-based analysis. Lastly, to examine for possible
moderating effects we extracted two different subsets from the initial pool (due to some
extra sample selection constrains) that were analyzed with the use of hierarchical regression
analyses.

1.3 Contribution to theory and practice

This thesis aims at filling the gaps identified in the literature and at providing new insights
for further research. As such, it contributes to both theory and practice in various ways:

- Advances current knowledge on influence tactics by researching hard, soft and
  rational tactics, which capture the full range of managers’ actions to achieve
  performance. It provides fresh evidence that all three influence tactics’ categories,
though in differing degrees, can greatly affect task performance. By applying structural equation modeling techniques in a sample of 545 full-time employees we show that all three categories have a positive impact on task performance, with rational and soft tactics outperforming hard tactics.

- **Highlights the invaluable role of political skill on selecting the appropriate influence tactics and on adjusting their use in order to maximize their efficiency.** It shows that political skill is a critical antecedent of influence tactics’ selection, drawing from the limited findings of this newly developed construct.

- **Combines individual and organizational characteristics, in a single model, that affect performance and satisfaction, which are considered as antecedents of organizational commitment and turnover intentions.** It pieces together different streams of research, such as individuals’ political behaviors and perceptions of organizational politics and justice, to explain a model of turnover intentions, which involves the linkage from performance to job satisfaction, commitment and intent to turnover. The appropriateness of this holistic framework was tested in the initial sample of 545 managers. Results from the use of structural equation modeling techniques showed an excellent fit of the data.

- **Provides empirical evidence concerning the nature of organizational justice and political skill as second order constructs.** Confirmatory Factor Analyses performed in the same dataset provide empirical evidence, useful for future researchers, concerning the structure of these two widely used variables. In particular, the findings support that organizational justice and political skill consist of four facets each (i.e., distributive, procedural, interpersonal, and informational; social astuteness, interpersonal influence, networking ability, and apparent sincerity; respectively). Such results provide further evidence concerning the validity of these constructs. Nonetheless, this thesis goes one step further and provides evidence that these conceptually distinct facets can be combined to form second order constructs.

- **Introduces the premise and provide empirical evidence that the joint use of phenomenally incompatible influence tactics (i.e., hard and soft) can yield better and more stable results.** It introduces the notion that seemingly incompatible behaviors can be combined in order to ensure better and more stable performance. Alongside with this theoretical contribution, the thesis provides empirical evidence
that supports the aforementioned premise. Through the use of one-way ANOVA and post hoc regression analysis in 275 middle managers, we provide support to that the joint use of these seemingly incompatible behaviors results in lower variability in task performance. Furthermore, findings of a hierarchical regression analysis advocates for the hypothesis that their combined use can provide additional explanation of task performance's variance.

- **Advances current knowledge by showing that political skill moderates the relationship between the joint use of hard and soft tactics and subordinates’ task performance.** Through moderated hierarchical analysis in the aforementioned subset of 275 middle managers, it provides empirical evidence that political skill positively moderates this relationship. As such, the relationship between the joint use of hard and soft tactics will be stronger in high levels of political skill.

- **Advances current knowledge by showing that organizational justice and politics moderate the relationship between political skill and performance.** Based on a sample of 329 managers (subset of the initial sample), moderated hierarchical regression analysis supports that two facets of organizational justice – procedural and informational – and perceptions of organizational politics leverage the relationship between political skill and job performance.

### 1.4 Overview and outline of the study

The present thesis comprises six chapters that are structured as follows:

**Chapter one** succinctly introduces the theoretical bedrock and relevant literature in the fields of organizational justice, politics, and withdrawal processes, in order to present the research framework and related objectives of this study. Moreover, it identifies the gaps in previous research in an effort to establish the imperative and main contributions of this study.

The following two chapters provide an extensive and in-depth review of all relevant constructs of the proposed model. **Chapter two**, in specific, commences with a brief outline of the four waves of organizational justice theory, pinpointing the value of the integrative as the one that incorporates all recent theoretical advances. In addition, we gather all relevant
theories in order to elaborate how justice evaluations are made, why individuals concern themselves with justice, and highlight the structure of justice, the target of justice judgements, as well as the rationale of justice decisions. Next, the chapter pores over perceptions of organizational politics theory and examines the construct’s facets, antecedents, and consequences for both individuals and organizations. Then, the chapter explores the micro-perspective of organizational politics, which is concerned with the nature of political behavior, types, tactics and their implications to practice. The chapter ends with a thorough examination of a newly developed construct, political skill. In doing so, we review its theoretical foundation, its facets and their significant moderating effects on individuals and organizational outcomes.

Chapter three continues the meticulous review of the literature by focusing on some widely used constructs which constitute the outcome variables of our integrative model that describes a withdrawal process. This chapter begins with an epigrammatic review of the theoretical underpinnings of job performance. Next, we assess various definitions of job satisfaction that view it from different perspectives (e.g., cognitive, affective). Moreover, before mentioning the outcomes of job satisfaction, we highlight situational, dispositional, and interactive theories and their relevance to this widely studied construct in the industrial/organizational psychology field. Next, this chapter turns its attention to the quite extensive body of literature of organizational commitment. For this purpose we juxtapose some indicative definitions of both attitudinal and behavioural commitment. In addition, we review specific, well established multi-dimensional models and we discuss the antecedents of affective, continuance, and normative commitment, along with their consequences. The chapter ends with a succinct overview of turnover intentions, which is the last construct in our proposed withdrawal process. For this purpose, we present some major turnover models, its origins, and detrimental effects on employees, organizations, and communities.

Chapter four integrates the concepts reviewed in the previous two chapters in order to provide a holistic framework that explains the withdrawal process from a micro and macro perspective. In particular, the principal premise of this attempt is to underline the impact of both personal and contextual characteristics on individual and organizational outcomes. Besides its value in integrating different streams of research, this theoretical development
pinpoints how influence tactics, political skill, organizational politics and justice affect a withdrawal process that starts with job performance, continues with intrinsic job satisfaction and commitment, and ends with turnover intentions. Furthermore, this chapter offers an exposition of the advantages of combining hard and soft tactics in order to reduce variation of task performance and elevates the role of political skill as a moderator on the aforementioned relationship. Besides this secondary proposition, we advocated for the role of politics perceptions, as well as informational and procedural justice as leverage for the relationship between political skill and job performance. In this context, we provided a critical analysis of literature, to formulate nineteen hypotheses.

Chapter five addresses the methodological considerations of our empirical research. As such, it provides information on the research design, the data collection process, the questionnaire development methodology, the measures used, and the final sample of the research. Besides the description of the measures employed in this study, we provide an extensive review of several alternative measurement scales for each construct, presenting information regarding their reliability and validity. The latter contributes to a significant degree to the quality of the research we conducted, justifying why the selected measures would outperform the alternative ones. In this chapter we also describe the two step modeling approach followed in this study, which includes the examination of a measurement and a structural model. In particular, confirmatory factor analysis (CFA) was performed to examine the unidimensionality, reliability, and validity of the measurement model. In this context, we also provided valuable evidence for the use of two major multi-facet variables (i.e., organizational justice and political skill) as higher order constructs.

Chapter six presents the findings of the quantitative research, which was conducted to test all hypotheses. As such, we performed four different statistical analyses. First, as part of the two step modeling approach, we tested the appropriateness of the structural model. All the results derived from the statistical analysis are presented, along with the outcome of a bootstrap sampling procedure to further assess the model’s validity. Furthermore, we tested for possible mediation effects. Second, by using a subset of our initial sample we conducted one-way ANOVA followed by a post hoc regression analysis to test the effect of the combined use of hard with soft influence tactics on the variability of task performance. Next,
we performed hierarchical regression analyses to test for possible moderating effects as hypothesized.

Lastly, **chapter seven** discusses the findings of this thesis in relation to the research objectives by confirming the proposed hypotheses. The results of the cross-sectional SEM, ANOVA, and moderated hierarchical regression analyses are presented in a critical stance as we endeavor to merge prior research with existing findings and draw generalizable conclusions. Thereafter, we discuss the practical implications of the study for both individuals and organizations. Moreover, we highlight the strengths and limitations of this study. Finally, we put forward some fresh ideas, carving avenues for future research.
Chapter 2
Organizational Justice, Politics, Influence Tactics and Political Skill

2.1 Introduction

Perceptions of fairness, their relation to distribution of resources and their impact on outcomes were a topic of interest among researchers since antiquity. During the Trojan War, for example, Achilles refused to continue fighting, soon after Agamemnon grabbed Briseis, who considered her as a war trophy, worthy of his value. Pericles, in his funeral oration concluded that “... and where the rewards for merit are greatest, there are found the best citizens” (e.g. Thucydides, c.460/455-c.399 BCE). Plato in his “Republic” as well as Aristotle in “Nichomachean Ethics” were among the first to analyze what constitutes fairness in the distribution of resources between individuals.

At the same time, organizations can be viewed as political arenas (Mintzberg, 1985), therefore achieving primary goals is a continuous negotiation process with other key players over scarce resources. For this reason, the answer to the question of how do employees perceive power in the workplace is crucial. Even though, the political climate is subjective as it measures individual’s perceptions of organizational politics, it can provide valuable information on how individuals respond to their perception of reality (Ferris, Harrell-Cook, & Dulebohn, 2000a). By this way, we can enhance our knowledge on the selection process of political action. Overall, people in organizations are employing various political tactics to promote or safeguard their primary goals. The result of this conflict designates the existing political climate of the organization.
Despite the fact that politics and justice are two notions that are sometimes used interchangeably, they should be treated as distinct. Moreover, limited research, both theoretical and empirical, has tapped into how the inner organizational context (politics and justice) relates to employees’ skills as an explanatory mechanism of job performance (Harris et al., 2007a; Roberson & Stewart, 2006).

Viewing organizations from a political perspective (Mintzberg, 1985) implies that although performance, effectiveness, and career success are determined partly by hard work and perhaps intelligence, other interpersonal competencies such as social astuteness, positioning, and savvy also play critical role (Ferris et al., 2005b; Semadar et al., 2006). Whilst being able to influence others at work through various influence tactics may be stigmatized as a manipulative and self-interested behavior with disruptive organizational implications (Buchanan, 2007), a different perspective acknowledges the importance of these behaviors as beneficial to organizational performance.

Mintzberg (1983) suggested that the person exerting influence must not only have some power basis, and expend some energy, but often must do so in an appropriate manner, with political skill. Thereby, knowing which political behavior can lead to the desired output and how it can be put to practice is a skill that has received burgeoning attention during the last few years.

The purpose of this chapter is to provide an extensive review and critical evaluation of relevant literature on organizational justice and politics from both a micro and a macro perspective. Furthermore, we review the literature concerning proactive influence behaviors, as well as this newly explored construct of political skill. The structure of the chapter is as follows. In the first section we provide a brief outline of the four waves or organizational justice theory and research, pinpointing the value of the integrative as the one that encompasses all theoretical advances. Next, we highlight the theoretical foundation of organizational politics in terms of individual political behavior and perceptions of organizational politics. The chapter concludes by reviewing all recent development of political skill, its nature, its drivers, and its role in achieving personal goals.
2.2 Theories of Organizational Justice

Although attention to matters of justice in the workplace was of at least passing interest to classical management theorists, it wasn’t until the second half of the 20th century – when social psychological processes were applied to organizational settings – that insights into people’s perceptions of fairness in organizations gained widespread attention. Stemming from early conceptualizations (i.e., cognitive dissonance theory, balance theory, psychological reactance), the burgeoning fields of organizational behavior and human resources management found the conceptual materials required to elevate the fundamental matter of justice at the workplace (Colquitt et al., 2005).

Colloquially, the term “justice” is used to connote “oughtness” or “righteousness”. This view of justice, rejuvenated in the centuries following renaissance, conceives justice as a normative ideal (Colquitt et al., 2005). Even though the bedrock of justice lies in the field of morality, it is only recently that their relationship has received increased attention. Folger, Cropanzano, and Goldman (2005) proposed the “deontic response” (i.e., from the Greek word “deon”, which means binding or obligatory) that points out the importance of moral standards as antecedents of justice reactions. Virtually any situation that can be viewed from an organizational justice perspective can also be viewed from a moral one.

Although this prescriptive orientation (i.e., aimed at determining what ought to be done to achieve justice) flourish in contemporary philosophy, today’s view of justice is supplemented by the descriptive approach (i.e., aimed at describing the attitudes and behaviors of people concerning justice) of social scientists (Greenberg & Bies, 1992). Organizational justice is the particular field of social research that has great potential for empirically describing a variety of different types of ethical behaviors and attitudes (Greenberg, 1990). Social scientists have long recognized the importance of the ideals of justice as a basic requirement for both organizational and individual effectiveness. Besides scholars, modern enterprises try to adopt fair practices in their systemic functioning, recognizing that the organizational justice is the cornerstone of organizations.
In general, organizational justice is concerned with people’s fairness perceptions in their employment relationship. This is in accordance with the social science definition that organizational justice is based on people’s perceptions, such that an act is just because someone perceives it to be just (Fortin, 2008, p. 40). The latter differs from the philosophical perspective that considers an act as fair when it complies with a normative ethical or moral standard.

This section aims to provide a multi-perspective view of organizational justice. To do so, we will discuss three fundamental issues in conformance with the conceptual survey of Cropanzano, Bobocel and Rupp (2001). To deal with the first issue – how justice evaluations are made – we view justice from three different perspectives (i.e., (1) process-content, (2) reactive-proactive, and (3) distributive-procedural-interpersonal-informational). The second question – why individuals concern themselves with justice – will be answered by reviewing two content theories. To answer the third, and perhaps the most basic, question – what is organizational justice – we highlight on the structure of justice, the target of our justice judgements, and the rationale of our justice decision.

2.2.1 How justice evaluations are made

In order to explore how justice evaluations are made, we need to explore some theoretical background. Viewing justice through the lens of motivated behavior will enable us classify theories of organizational justice. The term motivation theory is concerned with the processes that describe why and how human behaviour is activated and directed. It is regarded as one of the most important areas of study in the field of organizational behaviour. Motivated behavior suggests that individual and environmental characteristics trigger our judicial mechanism of cognitive and affective responses that guides our behavior (Cropanzano et al., 2001). Therefore, viewing justice as a motivational phenomenon will enable us present a useful classification scheme. There are two different categories of motivation theories such as content theories, and process theories. The former are concerned with identifying the variables that influence motivation (e.g., rewards, needs, incentives) whereas the latter explain a generalized explication of the cognitive steps that lead motivated behaviour. Examples of content theories are Maslow’s hierarchy of needs
theory, outcome/reward models. In contrast, drive theory, equity theory, expectancy theory, and reinforcement theory are examples of process theories. To assess how people make judgement evaluations we will review some process theories. We begin with the equity theory and referent cognitions theory and we finish with the fairness heuristic theory.

More specifically, one of the first theories to explore the psychological processes involved in forming fairness judgments, and particular distributive justice judgements, was equity theory (Adams, 1965). This classic theory became the dominant approach for analyzing issues of justice in the workplace for almost two decades (Colquitt et al., 2005, p. 16). It suggests that individuals examine the ratio of their inputs (e.g., time, effort) relevant to their outcomes (e.g., pay, promotions, skill development) to determine whether they are treated fairly or not. For example, if an employee is putting forth the same amount of effort as another employee (i.e., referent), but the referent is receiving more favourable outcomes, the employee may perceive the distribution of outcomes as unfair. Therefore, such comparison is an important source of evidence used by individuals when forming justice perceptions (Cropanzano et al., 2001). However, other researchers had contributed in the development and enhancement of his theory.

Relative Deprivation

Stouffer and his colleagues (1949) had noticed similar attitudes among soldiers during World War II (Stouffer et al., 1949). In specific, they noticed unfairness perceptions with the Army’s promotion system with respect to promotion opportunities among soldiers stationed in the Military Police (MP) and their counterparts in the Air Corps (i.e., Air Corps officers had more chance of receiving the a specific promotion despite the fact that MP’s had the same qualifications). Nonetheless, MP’s did not compare themselves to the Air Corps officers. Instead, MP’s who earned promotions felt special because they were in the top one-third of their peer group, whereas Air corps officers felt less special because they achieved merely what the majority of their peers had achieved. Though, not explicitly stated (Stouffer et al., 1949, p. 125), such paradoxical phenomena were labelled as “relative deprivation phenomena” and highlighted the idea that people’s reactions to outcomes depend less on the absolute level of those outcomes than no how they compare to the outcomes of others against whom people judge themselves (Colquitt et al., 2005). Researchers have used
relative deprivation as a basis for the assumption that individuals' assessments of fairness require some comparison of their outcomes or situation with those of other individuals (e.g. Crosby, 1976).

**Homans's Social Exchanges**

Building on the notion of relative deprivation, Homans (1961) formulated his conceptualization of how justice is perceived. Over time, he noted that people record exchange histories which create normative expectations for future exchanges. In case of exchanging help (i.e., working overtime) for social approval (e.g., praise, bonus), to the extent that working overtime results in expressions of praise or bonus in past exchanges, thanks or extra payment to be expected whenever he/she works overtime. Moreover, Homans argued that the better established such patterns are, the more strongly it comes to be perceived as normatively appropriate (Colquitt et al., 2005). Thus, employees involved in exchange relationships are sensitive to the possibility that a colleague may be getting more from the exchange or that the other is not adhering to normative precedents. According to Homans (1961, p. 75), distributive justice would be achieved whenever “an individual in an exchange relation with another will expect that the rewards of each will be proportional to the costs and that the net reward of each one be proportional to his/her investments”. Therefore, whenever this ratio is negative (injustice) or positive (justice), the employee would adjust his/her behaviour (e.g., anger, guilt). Furthermore, Homans highlighted issues of relative deprivation, recognizing that people are inclined to disagree about the investments relevant to their social exchange relationships as well as profits or costs incurred when judging profits (Colquitt et al., 2005).

**Blau's role expectations**

Similar to Homans (1961), Blau (1964) noted that expectations are particularly dependent on the benefits of a particular reference group, making satisfaction with exchanges more relative than absolute. His theory included three types of expectations. The first – general expectations – refers to expectations stemming from societal norms and standards. The second – particular expectations – suggests that a specific exchange will conform to acceptable codes of conduct and provide rewards for association that exceed what could be
obtained from other exchange partners. The last – comparative expectations – refers to the profits individuals expect to earn from each exchange relationship that will be used as a standard for judging multiple exchange partners. All these expectations apply to what Blau (1964) termed “fair exchange”. Still, contrarily to Homans (1961), Blau (1964) distinguished between two types of exchanges: a) economic exchanges, and b) social exchanges. The former are contractual in nature in which exchanges are predetermined, while the latter creates future obligations based on trust, in which the nature of the exchange is left to the discretion of the one who makes it. This distinction has had a lasting impact on justice literature since social exchange relationships have the ability to explain effects of justice on work behaviour (Colquitt et al., 2005).

**Equity Theory**

Adams (1963; 1965) formalized Homans’ (1961) ideas about distributive justice exchange relationships in his equity theory, which posits that people compare their own input/outcome ratio to the other’s person ratio (i.e., referent). The notion of comparison with others is borrowed from Stouffer’s and colleagues (1949) relative deprivation. People strive to remove the unpleasant state of inequity (i.e., when they perceive their input/output ratio negatively compared to the referent’s ratio), by altering inputs or outcomes, by cognitive distortion of inputs or outcomes, by leaving the exchange relationship, by altering the other’s inputs or outcomes or by changing the object of comparison (Adams, 1965).

Despite the popularity that the equity theory had received over the past decades, early reviews (e.g. Pritchard, 1969) criticized its conceptual grounds. These criticisms pivoted on three points: 1) the nature of input and outputs, 2) the comparison person and comparison process, and 3) the modes of inequity resolution. Because equity theory identified outcomes and inputs in quantifiable terms, its use was wide in the field of organizational behavior. For this reason, it was considered as “among the more useful middle-range theories of organizational behavior” (Weick, 1966, p. 439), and has been included in a list of the organization behavior theories with the highest scientific validity (Miner, 2003, p. 252-254). In the meantime, this widespread use of equity theory inevitably led to some theoretical refinements, and reformulations of the equity formula (Greenberg, 1990).
Shortly after Adams’s equity theory became popular, an alternative version was proposed by Walster and her colleagues (Walster, Berscheid, & Walster, 1973). This version extended Adams’s (1963; 1965) in two fundamental ways. First, they endeavored (without much success though) to adjust the formula for computing equity ratio that seemed to lead to counterintuitive predictions when handling negative inputs. Second, they distinguished between two forms of inequity restorations and specifically “actual equity” and “psychological equity”. The former involves true modifications to one’s own or another’s outcomes and/or inputs, and the latter involves cognitively distorting reality in a manner that restores equity. Still, their version of equity theory has received little attention, mainly because subsequent research has shown that their suggestions do not hold (Colquitt et al., 2005; Cropanzano & Folger, 1989).

Referent Cognitions Theory

In reflecting the limitations of equity theory, Folger (1987) suggested a more explicit detailing of the cognitive and affective elements that underlie the sense of injustice. The referent cognitions theory (RCT) was an attempt to address these concerns, while at the same time promised to integrate the concepts of distributive and procedural justice (Cropanzano & Folger, 1989, p. 297). RCT posits that “an unfair judgment will result from a situation where an individual believes a more favorable outcome would have resulted from an alternative procedure that should have been used” (Cropanzano et al., 2001, p. 167). Consequently, the referent in this case refers to the awareness of procedural alternatives that would lead to a more favorable outcome. Experimental tests of RCT (e.g. Cropanzano & Folger, 1989; Folger & Martin, 1986) put subjects in situation in which they failed to obtain a desirable reward because of procedures used that were either well justified or poorly justified. Findings indicated that participants who received different outcomes for justifiable reasons were not resentful, despite their dissatisfaction, whereas those whose outcomes were poorly justifiable expressed significant amount of resentment. Yet, despite its contributions, RCT failed to provide an integrative process theory of organizational justice. Although the theory describes the conditions necessary to hold others accountable for unfair treatment, it does not provide any explanation process by which these judgements are
made. Moreover, it ignores the amount of adversity faced by an individual, and the extent to which the situation violates any moral codes of fairness (Folger & Cropanzano, 1998).

**Fairness Theory**

Folger recognized these limitations and some years later he proposed a revised theory, which was coined under the name “*fairness theory*” to reflect its counterfactual approach (i.e., a process of undoing some event by imaging it otherwise) (Colquitt et al., 2005). In addition to these limitations, he also noted that RCT inadequately distinguished between causal responsibility and moral obligation. In other words, an individual should not feel resentful when some extenuating circumstances are responsible for the negative event. This conceptual alteration led to the introduction of fairness theory, as a successor to RCT. Fairness theory seeks to explain when an authority will be held responsible for an unfair incident. In particular, the theory suggests that a person should be held accountable when three counterfactual questions are answered in affirmative (Colquitt et al., 2005, p. 38).

These questions represent three necessary processes that must all occur before a situation can be perceived as being unjust. The first question - “*Have I experienced some loss?*” - extends RCT by capturing both outcome and process concerns. Folger and Cropanzano (2001) named this aspect of the process as the “*would*” component. An individual, for instance, *would* have better results if only a different procedure had occurred. The second question - “*Were there any other feasible courses of action?*” - is strongly influenced by the social account provided by the target and represents the “*could*” component of fairness theory. If the target admits that he or she could have acted differently, he or she would be better off. The last counterfactual question that represents the “*should*” component - “*Were moral and ethical standards violated?*” - highlights the importance of moral violations. Justice, in this case, is a moral virtue that designates how people should treat and interact with one another. This specific aspect of fairness theory posits that interpersonal justice is a facet of organizational justice.
Fairness Heuristic Theory

Recent approaches have focused on the nature of the mental shortcuts used in forming and using psychological judgments of fairness. Two such heuristic conceptualizations have received more attention and specifically fairness heuristic theory (FHT), and uncertainty management theory (UMT) (Colquitt et al., 2005, p. 42). The underlying premise of both theories is that group contexts encompass uncertainty that people need to manage (Blader & Tyler, 2005, p. 339). This uncertainty relates to people’s fear of exploitation or rejection by group authorities, and thus group members search for signals in the environment about whether they could trust authorities and whether they are desirable in the group. At the workplace, employees face the same fears. Consequently, they search for signs (e.g., procedural justice) before safely associating themselves with the organizational and its authorities. The work of Van de Bos and his colleagues (van den Bos, 2001; Van den Bos & Lind, 2002) demonstrates that when other types of information are absent, people rely on procedural justice.

In particular, FHT provides the missing information of how exactly justice evaluations are formed. Moreover, it explains why several previous studies have concluded that evaluations of procedures are more relevant than evaluations of outcomes in making overall fairness judgments (Cropanzano et al., 2001, p. 169). Van de Bos and colleagues (2001) suggested that when forming fairness perceptions, individuals progress through three phases. In the pre-formation phase, individuals collect information concerning the trustworthiness of an authority. Still, such information is often unavailable, thus fairness information is used as a heuristic substitute in making this evaluation. The next phase - formation phase - focuses on how justice judgements are actually formed. During this phase, individuals seek information about their inclusion into or exclusion from the social unit. Information of this kind can be extracted from procedures, such as voice, respect, and so forth. The post-formation phase explains how the formation of these initial fairness perceptions guides reactions to subsequent events, as well as formation of subsequent justice evaluations. However, it should be noted that the FHT’s objective is to understand available information lead to justice perceptions, why people react to perceived justice, but not necessarily to explain why cooperation in particular derives from justice (Blader & Tyler, 2005).
Uncertainty Management Theory

At the beginning of the new millennium, the fairness heuristic theory was expanded to a broader uncertainty management framework. Whereas uncertainty about trust lies at the core of FTH, subsequent studies demonstrated that fairness can be used to cope with other sources of uncertainty. Uncertainty management theory (UMT) was cast as successor of FTH. More specifically, UMT considers many possible factors, besides trust, about which individuals may be uncertain. Therefore, fairness can eliminate uncertainty related to an authority’s trustworthiness, but it can also mitigate the effects of uncertainty that has nothing to do with authority relationships whatsoever (Colquitt et al., 2005). Van den Bos (2005), highlighted another reason why UMT may be important. It contradicts economic perspectives on organizational behavior and managerial practice, which assume that organizational justice is luxury, to be awarded to employees in peaceful times (p. 292). However, UMT suggests that in times of turmoil, organizational justice can be of greater importance.

2.2.2 Why justice matters

In the previous paragraphs we articulated how fairness perceptions are formulated based on some process models. Still, the question of why justice is important to people, and specifically to employees, remains unanswered. All these process models provide an incomplete view of human behavior. This is because they “tend not to emphasize on the fundamental question of why do people engage in goal-oriented behavior in the first place” (Cropanzano et al., 2001, p. 172). Employees are concerned with organizational justice for two reasons: a) it is in their economic best interest, and b) it affirms their identity within valued groups. To explore these reasons, we review five major content theories of justice (i.e., the instrumental model, the group value model, the relational model, the moral virtues model and the multiple needs model).

Instrumental model

One important class of theories about why employees care about and react to their justice perceptions focuses on the exchanges of resource based concerns that employees have with
their organization (Blader & Tyler, 2005). The *instrumental model* (Tyler, 1987) posits that people seek control over processes because they are concerned with their own outcomes (p. 333). Thus, procedural justice is valued because it is part of the process by which employees ensure the predictability and favorability of their (long-term) outcomes (Fortin, 2008).

Instrumental models claim that individuals posit no value for fair procedures independent of their association with fair outcomes (Konovsky, 2000, p. 493). The classical instrumental justice theory derives from the work of Thibaut and Walker (1975), which is regarded by many (e.g. Blader & Tyler, 2005; Cropanzano et al., 2001; Greenberg, 1990) as the original effort that delineated the concept of *procedural justice* (Thibaut & Walker, 1975, p. 2) while, at the same time, represented a “*unique marriage of social psychology and law*” (Colquitt et al., 2005, p. 21). Thibaut and Walker (1978; 1975) conducted their research in courtroom settings and distinguished the fairness of the verdict from the fairness of the process leading to the verdict. They examined the role of *process control* (i.e., ability to voice one’s opinion during the procedure) and decision control (i.e., ability to influence the outcome). In simulated dispute-resolution procedures, process control was shown to increase acceptance and fairness perception of verdicts, even if the outcome could not be influenced (i.e., voice phenomenon). The voice phenomenon remains seemingly paradoxical when one views human beings as economically “rational” persons (Cropanzano et al., 2001). Thibaut and Walker extricated from this quandary by recognizing that individuals take a long-term perspective. In other words, individuals are willing to forgo unfavorable outcomes for a short period of time because fair procedures guarantee more beneficial outcomes in the long run.

In Leventhal’s (1976) initial discussion of the limits of equity theory, he noted that Adams’s (1965) theory failed to address the issues of procedural justice identified by Thibaut and Walker (1975). In particular, Leventhal (1980) suggested that procedural justice should transcend the legal context and expand in other allocation contexts. Although Leventhal’s previous work focused on distributive allocation rules, he noted that procedural rules constitute the second category of justice rules. A procedural rule is defined as “*an individual’s belief that allocative procedures which satisfy certain criteria are fair and appropriate*” (Leventhal, 1980, p. 30). He further suggested seven distinct procedural components for evaluating fairness of allocation procedures: (1) the selection of agents, (2)
the setting of ground rules, (3) the gathering of information, (4) the outlining of the structure for making the decision, (5) the granting of appeals, (6) the building in of safeguards, and (7) the use of change mechanisms. Moreover, he argued that six rules can be used to evaluate these seven components outlined above. The first rule is that procedures should be consistent across time and persons (*consistency rule*). The former requires some stability in procedural characteristics, whereas the latter requires that all persons have equal opportunities. The second rule is that procedures should not be affected by personal self-interest or blind allegiance to existing preconceptions (*bias suppression rule*). At the same time, procedures should be based on as much valid information and informed opinion as possible, with a minimum of error (*accuracy rule*). Procedures much also contain some opportunity to modify and reverse decision by allowing for appeals and grievances (*correctability rule*). The fifth rule that encompasses Thibaut’s and Walker’s concept of process control argues that procedures must reflect the basic concerns, values, and outlooks of individuals and subgroups impacted by the allocation (*representativeness rule*). Finally, procedures must be consistent with the fundamental moral and ethical values held by the individuals involved (*ethicality rule*).

Nonetheless, in a second study Levanthal, Karuza, and Fry (1980) asserted that procedural justice could be disregarded in favor of distributive. They argued that procedures are often complex and sometimes ambiguous, and that may not be considered when outcomes conform to one’s expectations. The introduction of procedural justice led researches to develop models consisting of two dimensions of fairness: distributive and procedural (Fortin, 2008).

Generally speaking, favorable outcomes are more likely to engender fairness, whereas unfavorable outcomes are more like to engender perceived unfairness (Ambrose, Harland, & Kulik, 1991; Conlon, 1993). These effects are stronger when the unfavorable outcome is larger, and when it is perceived as a loss rather than as the absence of gain (Byrne, 1999). Still, people may be concerned with injustice for economic reasons, as the instrumental model asserts, but they clearly have other issues as well.
The social exchange theory represents another type of instrumental explanation for why people engage in goal-oriented behaviors. This approach argues that the impact of justice perceptions on employee cooperation is mediated by social exchange variables, such as perceived organizational support and leader-member exchange (e.g., Masterson, Lewis, Goldman, & Taylor, 2000). These social exchange variables emphasize the reciprocal obligations between two parties to a relationship (e.g., employee and employer). According to these theories, the medium of the exchange can be, but not necessarily be, economic in nature. Nevertheless, regardless of the medium, social exchange theory focuses on mutual trade-offs and emphasizes that these trade-offs "represents the glued that binds the parties of the exchange together" (Blader & Tyler, 2005, p. 335).

Social exchange theories share the perspective of the control model that people react to procedural justice because fairness is part of a process in which they accrue and maintain valued benefits. The control model regards procedural fairness as a factor in expectations or perceptions of desired outcomes, whereas the social exchange approach regards procedural justice as part of the exchange of benefits. Despite the fact that the underlying dynamic postulated by each is rather different, both regard procedural justice as instrumental to employees garnering value added outcomes or benefits from their organization. In both cases employees’ reactions to their justice perceptions are rooted in their desire to gain resources or other types of benefits.

Relational model

Lind and Tyler (1988; 1992) offered a somewhat different explanation for why people care about justice. The group-value model (Lind & Tyler, 1988), later renamed to the relational model of authority (Tyler & Lind, 1992), stresses the point that inclusion within a group can provide a sense of self-worth and identity. In this light, justice is important because it conveys information about the quality of one’s relationships with authorities and group members.

Recently, the relational model of authority has been extend into an integrative framework of how procedural justice foster cooperation in groups (i.e., group engagement model) (Blader & Tyler, 2005). The primary insights of the group-value and relational models are that
noninstrumental criteria will affect procedural justice judgments, and that procedural justice is closely linked to group-related concerns. The group engagement model extends this idea and directly argues that these justice-based social identity inferences mediate the impact of justice on employee cooperation. In other words, the model establishes how justice can be linked to understanding the issue of employee cooperation. It does so by emphasizing that group-related identity judgments are shaped by perceived procedural justice and that identity judgments in turn influence and determine employee cooperation.

Relational justice models argue that a primary goal of people for joining working on behalf of groups is to develop and maintain a positive identity, and to fulfill their affiliation and belongingness needs. When employees view their work organizations as operating and treating them in procedurally fair ways, they infer that the organization is one that they be proud of and they are respected members of the organization. When they view the organization as procedural unfair, they evaluate their inter and intraorganizational standing in negative terms. These two evaluations about the standing of the organization and their place in it, in turn, are hypothesized to influence their level of identification with organization. Positive evaluations about these two judgments will in part lead employees to be strongly identified with their organization, because the organization presents an opportunity for them to develop a positive social identity. Contrariwise, negative evaluations about these two judgements are predicted to have the opposite effect on identification, leading the employee to a weak intermingling of the self and the organization. This suggests that employees care about justice because it is a cue that they use to make important relational evaluations. Consequently, employees focus on procedural justice rather than other types of information because it is directly linked to these identity and affiliation-related goals.

Moral Virtues Model

The previous two content theories emphasized either economic concerns (i.e., instrumental models), or social concerns (i.e., relational models). However, despite this difference, they share many similar characteristics. Folger (1998) argued that both perspectives are driven by self interest, but each with an emphasis on different types of outcomes. Yet, the instrumental and the relational approach do not explain why people are concerned with
justice even when there is no direct economic benefit and only strangers are involved (Fortin, 2008). A third complementary perspective was offered by Folger (1998) – the moral virtues model, who argued that there are time when “virtue serves as its own reward” (p. 32). Therefore, people can see virtue as a value in itself and hence justice as an expression of human dignity.

The moral virtue model describes why people value justice, but one can imagine how it can be extended to help develop an understanding of the justice-cooperation link (Blader & Tyler, 2005). At the workplace, for example, if employees regard justice as a moral issue, they will be inclined to be a part of organizations that they see as respecting this moral imperative. Correspondingly, employees will want to disassociate themselves from those organizations that do not demonstrate a concern for issues central to the their sense of morality.

**Deontic theory of fairness**

Recently, the moral virtues model was further expanded by Folger (2001), delineating a “deontic theory of fairness”. This theory acknowledges that the presence of selfish motives does not preclude concerns for others at the same time. This multiple interests approach mean that one of them cannot hold absolute sway. On the contrary, all injustice experiences constitute negative transgression experiences, involving some type of pain, which is held to apply equally to ourselves and even to complete strangers.

**Multiple Needs Model**

According to Cropanzano, Bobocel, and Rupp (2001), the previous three models (i.e., instrumental, relational, moral virtues) share a common thesis, and specifically that justice matters to the extent that is serves some important psychological need. Yet, the models are distinct in their unique emphasis on one need over another. Therefore, justice is relevant to long-term economic benefits (i.e., instrumental model), achieving status/esteem from others (i.e., relational model), and living a virtuous life (i.e., moral virtues model). Although it is debatable the fact that each person value differently these needs, and especially employees, scholars agree that justice is driven by multiple motives.
Driven by the previous assumptions and based on Williams (1997) multiple needs model, Cropanzano, Bobocel, and Rupp (2001) developed a framework that mapped three models of justice onto Williams’s four psychological needs model. More specifically, Williams argued that human beings have at least four interrelated psychological needs: (a) control, (b) belonging, (c) self-esteem, and (d) meaningful existence. Mistreatment by other people (e.g., unfair treatment by the supervisor) may trigger defensive cognitions, negative affect, and coping behaviors.

Many theorists have argued that individuals have a need to control their environment. This need manifests itself as a desire to predict and manage important interactions, including those that involve the exchange and/or receipt of desired outcomes. The relationship between justice and the need for control is well described by the instrumental model. Fair processes allow people to foretell more accurately the allocation of rewards and punishments. In the long run, this augurs well for economic benefits. In fact, the instrumental model is sometimes referred to as the “control model”. Viewing the instrumental model as a manifestation of the need for control suggests that people are interested in predicting the course of events, even when desired outcomes are not received (Cropanzano et al., 2001).

Besides the need for control, individuals are “social animals” who manifest a desire for meaningful attachments to others of their kind. Lack of these attachments may lead individuals to display antisocial or psychotic behavior. Thus, the need for belonging could serve as one mechanism for the relational model. Injustice implies that individuals lack standing or inclusion among a given group. Consequently, injustice tends to separate people from other, while justice brings them closer together. For example, Masterson, Lewis, Goldman, and Taylor (2000) found that interactional justice promoted high quality exchanges between leaders and subordinates (i.e., high LMX).

Moreover, it has been long recognized that people tend to exaggerate their virtues and, at the same time, minimize their failings. Relational theorists have observed that injustice can harm our self-regard (i.e., the positive view of ourselves). Injustice involves withholding dignity and respect. This type of treatment can have severe implications for self-relevant
emotions, even when outcomes are favorable. For example, Weiss, Suckow, and Cropanzano (1999) found that when individuals benefit from an unfair process they tend to experience guilt.

Finally, as Folger (1998) highlighted, justice is strongly related to morality. People care about fairness because they want to be virtuous actors in a just world. To understand what is right, implies the existence of transcendent principles to govern behavior and to understand our own existence.

These four needs described above are interrelated. For example, economic success can boost someone’s self esteem or high self esteem can question someone’s morality. This suggests that any need can be affected by a threat to any other (Cropanzano et al., 2001). As a result, an unfair event has the potential to create a domino effect to the other needs, thereby compounding negative effects.

2.2.3 Dimensions of Organizational Justice

In the previous sections we provided a panoramic view of organizational justice by presenting various conceptualizations of the construct offered by such theorists as Homans, Adams, and so forth. Based on these theoretical advances, this section briefly reviews the most widely used dimensions of organizational justice literature as developed over the years. Currently, organizational justice acknowledges four commonly used inner dimensions: (a) distributive, (b) procedural, (c) informational and (d) interpersonal.

**Distributive justice**

As mentioned in the previous paragraphs, the dominant theory of distributive justice is Adams’s (1963; 1965) equity theory. As such, distributions are judged as fair to the extent that rewards are proportionally matched to contributions. The judgment of fair distribution is “irrespective of whether the criterion of justice is based on needs, equality, contributions, or combinations of these factors” (Leventhal, 1980: 29).
When an individual compares his input/outcome ratio with the ratios of others and finds it lower than expected naturally feels angry or disappointed and, thus, acts to find a new equilibrium. Therefore, we expect that the perception of an employee concerning the distributive justice levels in the organization becomes a necessary precondition or constraint to how he will politically act.

**Procedural justice**

In contrast to distributive justice, which refers to the fairness of the decision outcome, procedural justice concentrates on how an allocation decision is made (Konovsky, 2000). Procedural justice can be objective or subjective. Still, for simplicity reasons, we assume that objective procedural justice leads to subjective justice perceptions.

However, Thibaut and Waker (1975) introduced the concept of procedural justice that stems from their belief that third-party dispute resolution procedures has both a procedure and a decision stage. Leventhal (1976) broadened the theory of procedural justice to non legal contexts, focusing on six specific criteria that characterize a procedure as fair.

**Interpersonal justice**

The concept of procedural justice leads researchers to adopt a two model approach for studying justice. Interactional justice was introduced by Bies and Moag who argued that “people judge the fairness of the interpersonal treatment they receive as organizational procedures are enacted” (Bies & Moag, 1986: 44). Early research suggested that truthfulness, justification, respect and propriety are the primary concerns of interactional justice. Greenberg (1993) proposed that interactional justice consists of two distinct constructs. He argued that justification and truthfulness consists of the informational component, whereas respect and propriety refers to the interpersonal aspect of justice. Few studies have empirically tested this distinction producing substantial results (Colquitt, 2001; Colquitt et al., 2001; Colquitt & Shaw, 2005). Interactional justice is distinguished from procedural justice because it refers to a social exchange between two parts, whereas procedural justice refers to the structural quality of decision process (Roch & Shanock, 2006).
**Informational justice**

Few years later, Greenberg (1993) proposed the separation of the interactional component into two distinct factors, namely interpersonal and informational justice. He argued that justification and truthfulness consists of the informational component, whereas respect and propriety refers to the interpersonal aspect of justice. Thus, informational justice focuses on the amount and quality of information provided concerning procedures and outcomes and as the name suggests focuses on the free flow of information concerning the rationale behind a decision. Subsequently, informational justice changes the reaction and receptivity of employees to procedures (Greenberg, 1993). Informational justice has also been distinguished from procedural justice, because it refers to a social exchange between two parts, whereas procedural justice refers to the structural quality of decision process (Colquitt, 2001; Roch & Shanock, 2006). Even though, interpersonal justice has been a topic of interest for many researchers, there are only a few studies that focus on this informational component (e.g. Ambrose, Hess, & Ganesan, 2007; Ellis, Reus, & Lamont, 2009; Roberson & Stewart, 2006).

In general, all these organizational justice dimensions are vital to employees for many reasons. For example, fair treatment can increase the legitimacy of organizational authorities, thereby diminishing resistance to change. Furthermore, perceptions of fairness can provide incentives and promote cooperation among organizational members. On a personal level, working in a fair environment satisfies various individual needs (e.g., moral and ethical, need for control, belonging, self-esteem). All dimensions of organizational justice have been found to influence several outcome variables, such as job satisfaction, turnover intentions, absenteeism, stress, organizational commitment, trust, conflicts, performance, and organizational as well as interpersonal counterproductive behavior (e.g., sabotage, harm, conflicts, harassment, retaliations) (Colquitt et al., 2001; Conlon, Meyer, & Nowakowski, 2005; Fortin, 2008). Consequently, we argue that organizational justice, taken separately or as one global construct, can greatly influence an individual’s course of political action. For example, organizations that are characterized as unfair can make an individual become more assertive and generally seek non-sanctioned or hard political tactics to safeguard primary goals. Contrarily, organizations that score high in the justice scale can make employees seek sanctioned or soft ways to promote their primary goals.
2.3 Perceptions of Organizational Politics

Actual political behavior differs conceptually from perceptions of politics. The former refers to the objective political behavior engaged in by organizational members, whereas the latter deals with the feelings and/or subjective evaluation of political activities. When members of the organization define their work environment as political in nature, they are expressing a feeling that some people, owing to their power resources and influence skills, receive preferential treatment over others who actually deserve the same benefits as everyone else, but lack similar political aspects (Beugre & Liverpool, 2006). Even though, the political climate is subjective as it measures individual’s perceptions of organizational politics, it can provide valuable information on how individuals respond to their perception of reality (Ferris et al., 2000a). By this way, we can enhance our knowledge on the selection process of political action.

2.3.1 Theoretical contributions

Organizational politics is a complex and often controversial construct. While there is hardly any doubt that workplace politics is a common phenomenon in every organization, very little is known about the nature and boundaries of such politics (Vigoda & Cohen, 2002). As such, organizational politics researchers have failed to provide a commonly accepted definition of the notion. This lack of coherent view of organizational politics is partly attributable to the different perspectives theory has to offer (Gunn & Chen, 2006). More specifically, Bradshaw-Camball and Murray (1991) suggest a trifocal view of organizational politics concerning its nature, determinants and consequences. Each perspective (i.e., functionalist, interpretive, and radical) is based on a different paradigm (Burrell & Morgan, 1979) that views politics from a different angle.

Nonetheless, despite the plethora of differing definitions, most researchers agree that for politics to occur, certain conditions must exist (Bradshaw-Camball & Murray, 1991). More specifically, there must be two or more parties (individuals, groups or a larger entity), some form of interdependence between the parties, and a perception that divergent interests exist between them that could potentially lead to conflict between the parties. Once these
conditions exist, the subsequent actions of the parties involved are taken as “political”. Given this understanding of the phenomenon, they suggest that theoretical models of politics in organizations must adequately answer three critical questions regarding the structure (e.g., parties involved, bases of power), the process (e.g., power use) as well as the outcomes (e.g., impact on relationships, who gets what) of this phenomenon.

One of the earliest conceptualizations of organizational politics in the research literature is from Burns (1961), who argue that politics “are an activity requiring combinations of people” (p. 278) that “involve obligations, which are the exchange currency of resources” (p. 279). Burns’ early depiction of organizational politics places politics at the core of management, since combining people and making exchanges is a significant managerial process through which individual and organizational objectives are met.

Mayes and Allen (1977b) viewed organizations as political coalitions in which decisions and objectives are designated through bargaining process. As such organizational politics “is the management of influence to obtain ends not sanctioned by the organization or to obtain sanctioned ends through non-sanctioned influence means” (p. 675). The latter can be better depicted in a two-dimensional model (see Table 1).

Table 1. Mayes and Allens’ two-dimensional view of organizational politics.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Influence Means</th>
<th>Influence Ends</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Organizationally Sanctioned Non-sanctioned</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizationally Sanctioned</td>
<td>Non-Political Job Behavior</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-sanctioned by the Organization</td>
<td>Political Behavior Potentially Functional to the Organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Organizationally DysfunctionalPolitical Behavior</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As shown in Table 1, when both means and ends are considered legitimate by the organization, a behavior is considered apolitical. The bureaucratic model favors the third combination since it can provide benefits for the organization, despite the fact it pertains non-sanctioned organizational means.
Dating back to Lewin (1936), theoreticians have proposed that individuals react to situations based on their perceptions of reality, rather than reality per se. Yet, these perceptions are the bases of people’s responses; therefore their study seems not only intriguing, but also useful to understand behaviours and decisions. Gandz and Murray (1980) were among the earliest researchers to examine organizational politics perceptions. Their study focuses on the perceptions of and reactions to self-serving and self-advancing behaviours for securing ends, when such ends are opposed to those of others. They found that certain organizational processes (e.g., work appraisals, promotions, transfers) may be more politically oriented compared to those characterized by few established standards and rules, and therefore open to a great deal of subjectivity. Furthermore, they reported that they perceived political activity is more intense at higher managerial levels compared to the lower levels. They also found that high levels of politics are a negative component of overall job satisfaction. Finally, they argued that organizational politics should not be used synonymously with other concepts, such as conflict, influence, or power. On the contrary, they defined politics as a “subjective state in which organizational members perceive themselves or others as intentionally seeking selfish ends in an organizational context when such ends are opposed to those of others” (p. 248). Madison, Allen, Porter, Renwick, and Mayes (1980) reported similar findings in that politics prevail in upper levels of the organization. In addition, they considered that political behaviour is a factor as important or more importance as job performance in promotion decisions.

In the first section of this chapter, we presented Blau’s (1964) and Homans’s (1961) theoretical contributions as to how fairness evaluations are made. Social exchanges can provide some useful insights for organizational politics as well. Porter, Allen, and Angle (1981) theorized that perceptions of politics are formed through social learning from significant others in the organization. All organizations have political norms based on signals originated from the informal organization, which are communicated in a veiled manner, since they are organizationally non-sanctioned. They also asserted that individuals tend to view their own behaviour as apolitical, while judging the behaviour of others as political. Likewise, Drory and Romm (1988, 1990), found in various definitions elements that can differentiate judgements on whether a given situation is political. For example, behavioural elements are of primary important, whereas circumstantial elements are of secondary.
Gandz and Murray’s (1980) findings gave support on the effect of individual variables (e.g., rank, supervisory responsibility) on employee’s perception of organizational politics.

Nevertheless, one of the most often cited definitions of politics is from Mintzberg (1983), who defined politics as “individual or group behavior that is informal, ostensibly parochial, typically divisive, and above all in a technical sense, illegitimate—sanctioned neither by formal authority, accepted ideology, nor certified expertise (although it may exploit any one of these)” (p. 172). This definition is consistent with the commonly shared perception that political behavior is dysfunctional and that organizations would be better off if they could eliminate (Miller et al., 2008).

In their milestone work, Ferris, Russ, and Fandt (1989b) proposed a model that focused on three directions: (a) identification of the antecedents of political behaviour; (b) determination of the consequences of political behaviour; and (c) investigation of both the antecedents and consequences of perceptions of organizational politics. Moreover, in their initial conceptualization, they incorporated two concepts (i.e., understanding and control) as moderators to the relation between politics perceptions and individual/organizational outcomes.

For Kacmar and Baron, organizational politics involves actions by individuals, which are directed toward the goal of furthering their own self-interest without regard for the well-being of others or their organizations.

In their revised model (Ferris et al., 2002) – see Figure 1 – they included personality and demographic influences as moderators to this relation. In addition, they inserted the notion of political skill as a moderator between the recursive relation of organizational citizenship and political behaviour and politics perceptions. Finally, besides these alterations and based on the fruitful empirical results over the years, they included several other notions as antecedents (e.g., positive and negative affectivity, organizational size) or outcomes (e.g., trust, organizational commitment, job performance).
Figure 1. Ferris, Adams, Kolodinsky & Ammeter’s (2002) revised model of Ferris et al. (1989) Perception of Organizational Politics.
2.3.2 The multi-facet nature of politics perceptions

Until 1989, organizational politics troubled researchers only theoretically due to the fact that organizational politics lacked a valid measure. In 1991 though, Kacmar and Ferris provided a measure (Kacmar & Ferris, 1991), which was later refined and validated (Ferris & Kacmar, 1992; Kacmar, Bozeman, Carlson, & Anthony, 1999a; Kacmar & Carlson, 1997). This measure enabled research on organizations politics to flourish and provided a significant amount of empirical evidence concerning their determinants, as well as their effect on individual and organizational outcomes.

The measure comprises three factors: (a) general political behavior, which includes the behaviors of individuals who act in a self-serving manner to obtain valued outcomes; (b) going along to get ahead, which consists of a lack of action by individuals in order to secure valued outcomes; and (c) pay and promotion, which involves the organization behaving politically though the policies it enacts. Since then, the vast majority of studies in the area measure this multi-faceted construct using the well-known measurement scale (i.e., Perceptions of Organizational Politics Scale).

**General Political Behavior**

This facet of perceptions of organizational politics stems from the development of coalitions, based on self-interested rather than on business issues (Witt, 1995). Participating in such coalitions leads to political behaviors for controlling and administering scarce resources to the members of the alliance and making policy changes in their favor. Other researchers (Fairholm, 1993; Zanzi, Arthur, & Shamir, 1991) include controlling information, using surrogates, using outside experts, and controlling the agenda

It is often hypothesized that political behavior in organizations increases when rules and regulations are absent to govern actions (Drory & Romm, 1990; Ferris et al., 1989b; Madison et al., 1980; Tushman, 1977). When specific rules and policies for
guidance are missing, individuals have few clues as to acceptable behavior, and therefore, develop their own. Consequently, when such decision are left to their own, individuals tend to develop self-serving rules that enhance the position of the rule maker. Individuals who are more adept at dealing with ambiguity and uncertainty while at the same time impose their own rules on others are more likely to have their rules adopted (Kacmar & Carlson, 1997).

Another process impacted by uncertainty is decision making. Decision making under uncertainty has been found to be susceptible to political influence (Drory & Romm, 1990). When the information needed to make a rational decision is missing or vague, decision makers rely upon their own interpretations of the data. Conflicting interpretations of the same information can result in ineffective decisions that may appear political to those not directly involved in the decision making process (Cropanzano, Kacmar, & Bozeman, 1995).

Besides uncertainty, scarcity of valued resources (e.g., raises and promotions, budget) generates competition (Cropanzano et al., 1995). Nonetheless, such competition usually leads to conflict, which is an underlying component of political activity. Several researchers have suggested that jockeying for a position that will allow one to receive a valued resource is quintessential political behavior (Drory & Romm, 1990; Farrell & Petersen, 1982). The latter suggests that organizations with limited resources will have a strong political environment. Since scarce resources are typically the case, political activities are considered endemic in organizations.

A closer examination of why resources are scant can help to predict the target of the political activities, as well as their intensity (Kacmar & Carlson, 1997). Any individual who controls valued resources that cannot be secured elsewhere will be a probable target of political influence tactics. In addition, the attractiveness and immediate benefit of the resource will have a significant role in the decision to engage in political activities.
Go along to get ahead

As mentioned in the previous paragraphs, conflict is strongly related to organizational politics. The essence of this connection is that political behavior is self-serving, and thus, has the potential to threaten the self-interests of others. Besides competition, when individuals feel their interests threatened they will probably try retaliate, hence conflict arises. Moreover, the actual influence attempts themselves are an indication of the potential state of conflict that exists between the two parties (Kacmar & Carlson, 1997).

Nonetheless, some individuals may desire to avoid conflict, maintain a low profile, and therefore, not resist others’ influence attempts. While one could characterize such acts as “apolitical”, they are actually a form of political behavior. Drory and Romm (1990) argued that the distinction between political and non-political behavior in organizations can be made on the basis of intent. For example, if a behavior is enacted specifically for the purposes of advancing one’s owns self interests, then the individual is acting politically (Cropanzano et al., 1995). Individuals who “don’t rock the boat” and think that “telling what others want to hear instead of the truth” are not considered a threat by those engage actively in politics. As such, they may welcome them in the group and receive valued resources simply because they stayed indifferent to the groups’ political agenda. Consequently, lack of action, or going along to get ahead, can be a reasonable and profitable road to follow for advancing one’s own self-interests when working in a political environment.

Pay and promotion policies

The third facet of organizational politics captures how organizations can reward and perpetuate political behavior through policy implementation (Kacmar & Carlson, 1997). Even though organizational decision makers may not do so consciously, the human resource systems that are developed and implemented may reward individuals who engage in politics and penalize those who do not. Such practices may
result in the development of a culture in which political activities will become the common practice when doing business (Cropanzano et al., 1995).

Organizations can design reward systems that perpetuate political behavior in several ways. For example, individually oriented rewards induce individually oriented behavior. Individually oriented behavior, as opposed to organizationally oriented behavior, is often self-interested and political in nature. When this type of behavior is rewarded or reinforced, the tactics used to secure the reward will likely be repeated. Therefore, organizations may develop environments that foster and reward political behavior. Rewarding political behavior can lure those who have not acted politically in the past to do so in the future. That is, individuals who perceive themselves as inequitably rewarded relative to others who engage in organizational politics may be more likely to engage in political behaviors in the future (Cropanzano et al., 1995; Ferris et al., 1989b).

2.3.3 Discriminating politics from justice

A question that naturally arises is why researchers should study these two constructs (i.e., organizational politics and justice) together (Beugre & Liverpool, 2006). It is undeniable that these are highly correlated, sharing a common underlying construct. However, their exact relationship is still unclear. Organizational politics and justice can better predict work outcomes, since taken together provide additional variance. Moreover, organizational justice represents a global view, whereas organizational politics a more narrow one. The study of Andrews and Kacmar address this problem, and they argue that examining them altogether provide a better goodness of fit (Andrews & Kacmar, 2001).

Although organizational politics may be closely related to fairness, the two concepts are different (Aryee, Chen, & Budhwar, 2004). In general, research has shown that we can meaningfully understand social settings by thinking in terms of these two related dimensions (i.e., organizational politics and justice) (Cropanzano et al., 1995). A political organization is one characterized by unsanctioned, self-serving behaviors.
with usually detrimental effects to other organizational members or the organization itself. The purpose of political behavior is to obtain some advantage, resource (e.g., promotion, raise), or outcome (e.g., performance evaluation). In contrast, a fair organization is one characterized by procedures that ensures fair treatment in terms of voice, procedures, distribution of resources, advance notice, and so forth.

The similarity between the two concepts lies in the fact that they are both perceptual phenomena. Organizational politics and justice may well exist in an organization. However, employees’ perceptions give meaning to the sense of justice or injustice. As Vigoda and Cohen (2002) put it, “politics in organizations should be understood in terms of what people think the politics is than what is actually is” (p. 312).

Finally, Andrews and Kacmar (2001) note that perceptions of politics undermine fairness in the organization because not everyone engages in politicking to meet their own objectives. Those who do not engage in such political behavior would experience resentment and feelings of procedural and interactional injustice.

2.3.4 Antecedents of politics perceptions

In this section we discuss the three antecedent categories of organizational politics perceptions as delineated in the Ferris et al. model (see Figure 1). These categories are organization influences, job/work environment influences, and personal influences.

Organizational influences

Despite the fact that politics perceptions pertain to an individual-level perceptual phenomenon, we should acknowledge that organization-level factors have the potential to influence participation in political activity. Hence, organizational influences remain an important component. In their initial conceptualization, Ferris and his colleagues (1989b) included four constructs that influence perceptions of organizational politics, namely centralization, formalization, hierarchical level, and
span of control. Nevertheless, subsequent research showed that span of control, which was believed to increase ambiguity and uncertainty due to a supervisor’s inability to pay adequate attention to any one employee, failed to provide statistically significant results.

Due to this lack of empirical evidence, the revised form of the model (Ferris et al., 2002) excluded span of control and included organizational size. The latter draws support from the hypothesis that when size increases, the level of ambiguity increases as well (Fedor, Ferris, Harrell-Cook, & Russ, 1998). Large organizations are often unable to handle effectively communication requirement needed to keep their members fully involved and informed at work. Consequently, individuals rely on politics to deal with information deficiencies at work (Ferris et al., 2002).

The degree of centralization in the organization specifies the level at which most decision making occurs. Highly centralized organizations will have a greater concentration of power and control at top management ranks and less at lower levels. In contrast, as decision making in organization becomes decentralized, employees have more opportunity for input (i.e., Voice). Hence, in highly centralized environments, individuals with little legitimate power use political tactics (Parker, Dipboye, & Jackson, 1995). At the same as individuals lose control over their environment, perceptions of politics increase. Several studies (e.g. Eisenhardt & Bourgeois, 1988; Fedor et al., 1998; Kacmar & Baron, 1999) have found a direct positive relationship with the exception of Parker et al. (1995) who report a negative one.

In addition, the amount of (written) formal rules, policies, and procedures in the organization indicates its level of formalization (Pugh, Hickson, Hinings, & Turner, 1968, p. 75). Formalization has been suggested as a means of reducing political activity (Ferris et al., 1989b). Provided there are appropriate rules and policies in place, employees will have less opportunity to engage in or perceive organizational politics since there will be less uncertainty and ambiguity. Virtually all studies that
report a statistically significant result (e.g. Fedor et al., 1998; Parker et al., 1995) have found a negative relationship.

Last, the relationship between hierarchical level (i.e., one's position within an organization) and perceptions of organizational politics is such that employees perceive that higher levels of the organization are pervaded by politics (Ferris et al., 1989b). It has been suggested (e.g. Ferris & Kacmar, 1992) that employees at lower levels in the organization are likely those most directly impacted by political activities. Therefore, these employees would tend to view their environment as more political than those who are engaged in political activities.

**Job/Work environment influences**

Research has found support for the impact of advancement opportunities, feedback, and interactions with coworkers and supervisors on politics perceptions, which were included in the initial Ferris et al. model. In the revised model (see Figure 1), they also added career development opportunities, accountability, person-organization fit, and participation/involvement.

More specifically, the absence of career development opportunities would lead to heightened levels of politics perceptions since the clear path between skill acquisition and success will inherently become blurred (Parker et al., 1995). Further, if individuals do not see a formal development plan in place or that the organization does not value their growth, they are likely to become more responsible for advancing their own career even if politicking is required (Ferris et al., 2002).

Another variable posited to predict politics perceptions is accountability. Actions of those who perform highly are usually heavily scrutinized. In this regard, they need to show others that they are constantly competent and worthy of organizational rewards (Breaux et al., 2009; Frink & Ferris, 1998). Therefore, active political participation may be used to ensure that their efforts will continue to be viewed positively by company decision makers.
Vigoda (2000) argue that those perceiving a lack of fit with their employing organization view their immediate work environment as political. Employees will experience more ambiguity when an imbalance between individual goals and core values of the firm exists. Thus, in cases where person-organization fit is high, individuals perceive a direct link between performance and outcomes, and thus may rely solely on effort and job-focused behaviors (i.e., less politics). In contrast, those that experience a lack of fit will try to cope with uncertainty and ambiguity by employing political tactics.

Finally, involvement affects politics perception. Theory posits that those involved at work have access to more information than those on the periphery (Ferris et al., 2002). As such, information have the ability to minimize ambiguity or uncertainty, therefore one would expect that involvement and politics perceptions would have a negative relation.

Personal influences

Empirical evidence has provided support for two variables that belong in this category. Valle and Perrewe (2000) found that Machiavellianism has a positive relationship with politics perceptions. Moreover, it has been suggested that positive and negative emotions can influence perceptions of organizational politics. Those possessing high levels of positive affect are enthusiastic and more involved in the social milieu. Consequently, this involvement leads to lower politics. In contrast, negative affect breeds feelings of anger and distrust that ultimately result in increased politics perceptions.

2.3.5 Outcomes of politics perceptions

Organizational politics are a key variable for predicting individual and organizational outcomes. Numerous researches have tested their relation to possible outcomes such as job performance, job satisfaction, organizational citizenship behavior,
organizational commitment, anxiety/tension, turnover, trust and justice (Ferris et al., 2002; Miller et al., 2008).

In brief, research indicates that individuals that report higher levels of politics at work are less satisfied and committed to the organization (Randall, Cropanzano, Bormann, & Birjulin, 1999). Individuals may also react to politics in a variety of ways that include ignoring the environment, choosing to leave, or participating fully with goal of changing or managing the immediate work setting.

Furthermore, because political environments can breed conflicts, uncertainty, and disharmony it is likely that some individuals would question the fairness of decisions made in this arena. In addition, those perceiving a political climate would view individuals in their immediate work groups as less trustworthy (Ferris et al., 2002).

The effect of organizational politics to job satisfaction is clearly a negative one. Witt (1998) reported significant negative correlations between politics perceptions and supervisor ratings. Additionally, Zhou and Ferris reported a negative effect to job satisfaction.

Finally, it is unlikely that individuals will participate in extra-role activities, such as organizational citizenship behaviors, if the link between performance and rewards is blurred by the political activities of others. Contrariwise, politics perceptions have the capacity to affect aspects of cynicism that can extend internal reactions to include outward expression of disdain that my include sabotage, theft, or violence.

2.3.6 The positive side of organizational politics

Despite the fact that the vast majority of researches treat politics perceptions as a negative phenomenon, another stream of research considers politics as necessary or even welcomed. Their champions claim that politics can have a positive side with beneficial effects for the organization. The latter is in accordance with Ferris et al. (2002) who argue that one failing of the research on political behavior in
organizations is that it tends to always view political behavior in the negative or pejorative perspective.

A possible reason for this negative view of politics is somewhat consistent with how conflict has traditionally been approached (Fedor & Maslyn, 2002). Most researchers give support to the argument that “the less conflict the better”. Nonetheless, many researchers consider politics in organizations to be more or less neutral. For example, Ferris, Fedor, Chachere, and Pondy (1989a) viewed political behavior in organizations as behavior that is intended to maximize long, or short-term self-interest, without regard to whether this comes at the expense of the interests of others. The positive or negative nature of political behavior here is seen as a function of attributions regarding the intentions of the actor (Davis & Gardner, 2004), or the personal and organizational outcomes associated with the behavior (e.g., getting the job done; (Kumar & Ghadially, 1989)). More recently, Fedor, Maslyn, Farmer, and Bettenhausen (2008) provide fresh evidence, which indicates that employees perceive both negative and positive political behaviors and that they differentiate these behaviors occurring at different levels in the organization.

It is not at all surprising that behaviors outside of current organizational norms might be perceived as being self-serving and, thus, political, regardless of the actual intentions of those enacting them. Yet, not all behaviors that might be deemed political are necessarily bad for organizations or the individuals involved (Pfeffer, 1992). Organizational theorists have often focused on the importance of aligning personal goals with those of the organization. From this perspective, what may make political (i.e., nonnormative, self-serving) behaviors positive is not whether they are self-serving per se, but, instead, the extent to which these self-serving behaviours are seen as legitimate or consistent with goals that enhance organizational effectiveness (Fedor et al., 2008). Organizations tend to develop systems to handle foreseeable events. Nevertheless, many things happen that organizational decision makers do not plan for, yet must be addressed through ongoing decision making wherein individuals determine the best way to make contributions that help the organization and serve its long-term interests.
Although organizational politics can sometimes be self-serving bound to disruptive results, organizational change requires considerable political activity (Buchanan & Badham, 1999; Buchanan, 2007). Under these circumstances, political behavior is functional, rather than dysfunctional. This functionalism is what characterizes politics as positive.

Fedor and Maslyn (2002) note that political behavior can be positive when it is the only means available to organizational members to achieve performance or to raise issues that seem against the dominant coalition at a particular time. Such behaviors may still be not sanctioned and may partly be pursued for self-interest, but the outcomes can be seen as beneficial to the actors, the work group, or the organization. For example, there can be situations in which an employee can bypass the chain of command to address a problem that the organization faces. As such, positive and negative political behavior may be similar forms of behavior, often unsanctioned and self-serving. The major differences lie in who benefits from the outcomes.

2.4 Influence Behavior

Organizational politics has emerged as an area of considerable interest by constituencies ranging from behavioral science scholars to the general public. Careful examination of the research literature indicates that systematic investigation in organizational politics follows two conceptual streams. The first, as examined in the previous section, examines employees’ perceptions of politics in work environments, the antecedences of such perceptions, and their implications (e.g. Andrews & Kacmar, 2001; Ferris et al., 2002; Ferris, Frink, Galang, Jing, Kacmar, & Howard, 1996; Harris, James, & Boonthanom, 2005). This is the macro-perspective of organizational politics that by nature draws more managerial concern since its side-effects can have a major impact on organizational performance.
The second stream, in which we focus on this section of the thesis, is concerned with the nature of actual political behavior, types of tactics and strategies, and their implications to individuals. This is the micro-perspective of organizational politics and as a research field is more explored by organizational psychologists (e.g. Buchanan, 2007; Falbe & Yukl, 1992; Yukl, Seifert, & Chavez, 2008; Zanzi et al., 1991).

2.4.1 Theoretical background

Influencing others at work for achieving individual and organizational outcomes has been a topic of interest for many decades. Nonetheless, influence tactics have been employed differently across various disciplines, such as organizational behaviour and leadership. Even though some influence tactics types can be used for more than one purposes, they may generate contradictory results for other purposes and contexts (Yukl & Chavez, 2002). Thus, we have to initially dissociate influence tactics into distinct categories. Over the past decades, researchers have identified four general types of influence tactics according to their primary purpose and timeframe: (a) political, (b) impression management, (c) reactive, and (d) proactive.

Political tactics

Despite the fact that sometimes organisational politics and political behaviour may seem similar, they refer to different levels of analysis. Political behaviour (micro-level) deals with influence attempts that occur at the individual and group level, while organisational politics (macro-level) examines the extent to which such behaviours are pervasive in the workplace, decision making, and resource allocation processes within the organisation (Ferris et al., 2002).

The first approach (i.e., micro-approach) advocates that individuals can influence their career progression by employing the proper political tactics (Nabi, 1999). This approach highlights the active role of employees in promoting their own interests and careers. The operationalisation of political behaviour is feasible by using political tactics. To date, research has focused on two major areas of interest. The first
endeavours to provide typologies of political behaviour (e.g. Drory & Romm, 1988; Farrell & Petersen, 1982; Ferris et al., 2000a) or taxonomies of political tactics (e.g. Allen, Madison, Porter, Renwick, & Mayes, 1979; Buchanan, 2007; Farrell & Petersen, 1982; Hochwarter, Pearson, Ferris, Perrewé, & Ralston, 2000; Kipnis et al., 1980), such as coalitions, rationality, assertiveness, and ingratiation. The second relates specific political tactics to career outcomes (e.g. Higgins, Judge, & Ferris, 2003; Judge & Bretz, 1994; Judge, Cable, Boudreau, & Bretz Jr, 1995; Nabi, 2003; Yukl & Falbe, 1990; Yukl & Tracey, 1992). However, these studies approach political tactics unidimensionally, as they only examine single facets compared to the available inventory. These taxonomies are based on the assumptions that: (1) different motives underlie specific tactics; and (2) not all tactics are equally effective for achieving desired outcomes (Judge & Bretz, 1994).

A classical typology, among others (e.g., strategic and tactical) was offered by Farrell and Petersen (1982), who proposed three key dimensions of political behaviour (see Figure 2. The first dimension (internal-external) focuses on political behaviours that employ external or internal resources to succeed. The second dimension (vertical-lateral) of political behaviour recognises the difference between influence processes relating superiors to subordinates and those relating equals. The last concentrates on the third dimension (legitimate-illegitimate) that classifies behaviours according to their social/organisational desirability.
Virtually every employee can easily recall several incidents of workplace politics in which he or she was involved, either directly or indirectly. Depending on how this involvement affected them, they tend to view political behaviours from different perspectives (Kacmar & Carlson, 1997). Thus, organisational politics can be either advantageous or disadvantageous for one’s career progression. For this reason, the present study will solely focus on sanctioned and non-sanctioned political tactics and their effect on career success.

More specifically, this distinction was introduced by Mayes and Allen (1977a), who considered it as a key factor for understanding the role of politics in organisations. Sanctioned (legitimate) political tactics encompass means that individuals consider acceptable because they are part of the organisation’s norms. In other words, these political tactics are considered as positive ways of achieving desired outcomes. Since these tactics are considered desirable with positive effects, they do not have a problem to exercise them openly.

On the contrary, non-sanctioned (illegitimate) political tactics entail behaviours that are not socially desirable. Their use could probably characterise individuals as...
“Machiavellians”, or “unethical”. As a consequence, individuals could feel alienated from their environment and result in negative outcomes and overall ineffectiveness.

Ferris and his colleagues (2000a) argued that despite the fact that non-sanctioned political tactics are socially and organisationally undesirable, their use can result in career advancement. Still, the use of sanctioned political tactics is often welcomed by organisations. People tend to view them favourable, consider them as part of their everyday life, express them openly and do not negatively characterise others that employ them.

Impression management tactics

Impression management is the process by which people attempt to influence the image others have of them (Bolino, Varela, Bande, & Turnley, 2006; Drory & Zaidman, 2007; Jones & Pittman, 1982). People at work control the image they portray in social interactions by intentionally demonstrating behaviours that in due time will change others perceptions (Kacmar & Carlson, 1999). Research on the area focuses on the different tactics actors employ to manage impressions, their underlying motives, as well as their consequences for the involved parties.

Previous studies indicate that people often use impression management during job interviews (e.g. Peeters & Lievens, 2006) and to achieve greater career success (e.g. Judge & Bretz, 1994). In addition, a great deal of research has focused on the ways in which such tactics influence supervisors’ evaluations of their employees (e.g. Bolino & Turnley, 2003a; Wayne & Kacmar, 1991). These investigations reveal that the use of impression management is often an important determinant of the performance ratings that an employee receives and the degree to which supervisors like their subordinates (Bolino et al., 2006).

Tedeschi and Melburg (1984) provide a different classification scheme consisted of four quadrants created by crossing the two dimensions of strategic-tactical and assertive-defensive. Impression management literature acknowledges another two broad categories of tactics, proposed by Kacmar, Delery, and Ferris (1992). The first
focuses on the assessor (i.e., self-focused) and the second on the target (i.e., other-focused). Specifically, the former can be further categorized according to their orientation (Bozeman & Kacmar, 1997). Thus, “content-oriented” tactics focus on the elevation of one’s own qualities or behaviors, while “relation-oriented” tactics represent *patterned regularities of interaction in interpersonal relationships* (Bozeman & Kacmar, 1997: 22). These impression tactics can be further categorized in terms of enhancement, protection, and adjustment.

Over the years, a variety of impression management tactics have been examined in the literature (Gordon, 1996). Some of these tactics are employed by an actor to rectify a negative identity (e.g., accounts, excuses, and apologies), while others are used to establish or extend a positive identity (e.g., self-enhancements and other enhancements) (Kacmar & Carlson, 1999). Moreover, some tactics can either be verbal statements or non-verbal gestures and expressions. For example, they may use verbal statements, alter their physical appearance (e.g., wearing a nice suit), or use non-verbal gestures and expressions (McFarland, Ryan, & Kriska, 2003).

In their framework, Jones and Pittman (1982) identify five impression management tactics: (a) ingratiation, (b) self-promotion, (c) exemplification, (d) supplication, and (e) intimidation. More specifically, through ingratiation, individuals seek to be viewed as likable by flattering others or doing favors for them. The use of self-promotion, is employed when employees seek to be viewed as competent by touting their abilities and accomplishments. With exemplification, employees seek to impress others that they are dedicated by going above and beyond the call of duty. In contrast, with supplication, employees seek to be viewed as needy by revealing their weaknesses or limitations. Finally, through intimidation, they try to create a powerful image by threatening or bullying others. From all these tactics, ingratiation has been more excessively researched (Gordon, 1996; Kacmar, Harris, & Nagy, 2007).

Impression management tactics can be categorized in various ways. Two major categories that appear in the literature are defensive and assertive (Tedeschi & Melburg, 1984). Defensive tactics are used in response to poor performance, such as
accounts, excuses, apologies, self-handicapping, self-deprecation, and learned helplessness. In contrast, assertive strategies are actively used to establish a particular reputation with a specific target audience, and are not merely a reaction to situational demands.

Assertive impression management tactics, in particular, can either be focused on the actor (self-focused) or the target (other-focused). The former are designated to highlight the positive qualities of the actor (e.g., self-promotion) or to draw attention to past accomplishments (e.g., exemplification). The latter are used to increase the target’s interpersonal attraction to or liking for the actor (e.g., flattery, ingratiation, opinion conformity).

Wayne and Ferris (1990) proposed that other-focused tactics include supervisor-focused tactics and job-focused tactics. The former refer to verbal statements and behaviors directed toward the supervisor. The subordinate using such tactics praises the supervisor and does personal favors for the supervisor. The latter (i.e., job-focused tactics) relates to the individual’s job performance. The person employing these tactics usually attempts to manipulate information related to his job performance to make a positive impression on his supervisor. Successfully implemented, such tactics may convince the supervisor that the actor is a model employee (e.g., considerate, nice, polite, hardworking, cooperative, and productive).

Liden and Mitchell (1988) argue that impression management could be used for either short or long-term purposes. Likewise, Tedschi and Melburg (1984) see a clear difference between impression management behavior targeted at obtaining immediate gratification, and impression management behavior geared to influencing future outcomes.

To date, most empirical work on impression management has focused either on how situational or individual factors affect the use of specific impression management behaviors or how certain impression management tactics influence outcomes such
as promotions, performance appraisal ratings, and career success (Bolino & Turnley, 2003b).

Variations of impression management tactics typologies have been used in various contexts, such as job interviews (Higgins & Judge, 2004; Kacmar et al., 1992; Peeters & Lievens, 2006), performance appraisal (Bolino & Turnley, 2003a; Harris, Kacmar, Zivnuska, & Shaw, 2007b; Treadway, Ferris, Duke, Adams, & Thatcher, 2007; Wayne & Kacmar, 1991), as well as career success (Judge & Bretz, 1994; Wayne, Liden, Graf, & Ferris, 1997).

While such behaviors are designed to make employees appear more competent, they often result in very negative outcomes. For example, Judge and Bretz (1994) found that the use of job-focused tactics of impression management was inversely related to career success. Similarly, Wayne and Ferris (1990) found that the use of job-focused tactics was negatively related to supervisor ratings of performance.

**Reactive and Proactive influence tactics**

A similar, but conceptually distinct, stream of research investigates the use of influence tactics in organizations (see Table 2). While impression management refers to behaviors that individuals use to control the images that others have of them, the term influence tactics is used to describe the ways in which individuals use bargaining, reasoning, friendliness, assertiveness, coalitions, and other strategies to influence the decisions or behaviors of their colleagues, superiors, or subordinates (Kipnis & Schmidt, 1988). In comparison to the research on impression management behavior, though, research examining influence tactics has more often focused on the ways that such tactics are used in combination (e.g., Farmer & Maslyn, 1999; Farmer, Maslyn, Fedor & Goodman, 1997; Kipnis & Schmidt, 1983, 1988). For example, Kipnis and Schmidt (1983) identified three styles of influence: a shotgun approach, in which individuals use relatively high levels of influence and emphasize the tactics of assertiveness and bargaining; a tactician approach, in which individuals use only an average amount of influence and emphasize the tactic of reason; and a bystander approach, in which individuals use relatively low levels of influence tactics.
Furthermore, Farmer and Maslyn’s (1999) study supported the validity of these three distinct influence styles.

Political and impression management tactics refer to behaviors that require a substantial amount of time to evolve and generate outcomes. In contrast, reactive and proactive influence tactics are immediately deployed, whereas results can have both short and long term consequences. Reactive tactics are used “to resist unwanted influence attempts by other people, or to influence someone to modify a request so that it is more acceptable” (Yukl & Chavez, 2002: 140). Proactive tactics, with which this paper is concerned, are used to influence someone to carry out a specific task, or immediate request.

Since 1980, two widely used questionnaires have been developed for measuring proactive influence tactics (i.e., Profiles of Organizational Influence Strategies - POIS, and Influence Behavior Questionnaire - IBQ). Regarding the first – POIS – Kipnis, Schmidt, and Wilkinson (1980) collected incidents describing successful and unsuccessful influence attempts across three hierarchical levels (i.e., supervisors, peers, and subordinates). Through this explorative process they identified eight distinct influence tactics: (1) assertiveness, (2) ingratiations, (3) upward appeal, (4) blocking, (5) sanctions, (6) coalitions, (7) rationality and (8) exchange. Schriesheim and Hinkin (1990) further validated them and found support for only six (i.e., ingratiations, upward appeal, coalitions, rationality, and exchange). Preserving the distinction made by Kipnis’ and colleagues (1980) Yukl and Falbe (1990), developed the IBQ that its initial form encompassed eight tactics (i.e., pressure, upward appeals, exchange, coalition, rational persuasion, inspirational appeals, and consultation) that are relevant for leaders in organizations. In its latest form (Yukl et al., 2008), the IBQ includes three additional tactics (i.e., apprising, collaboration, and legitimating tactics). Another two noticeable studies that provide a sound basis for classifying proactive influence tactics are French’s and Raven’s (1959) five-fold typology based on social power (i.e., referent, reward, coercive, legitimate, and expert) and Falbo’s (1977) sixteen power strategies (e.g., assertion, reason, bargaining, and persistence).
To assess the effectiveness of an influence tactic, three criteria are usually employed namely commitment, compliance, and (Falbe & Yukl, 1992; Yukl, 2002). Commitment occurs when the target of the request agrees with an action or decision, is enthusiastic about it, demonstrates an overwhelming effort and persistence, and develops initiatives that facilitate its implementation. Compliance occurs when the target carries out the task or request but is more apathetic rather than enthusiastic and makes only a minimal or average effort, without showing any initiative. Resistance occurs when the target of the influence tactics opposes the requested action and tries to avoid it by delaying, arguing, refusing, or seeking to nullify the request.

**Table 2. Definitions of the 11 proactive influence tactics.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tactic</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rational Persuasion</td>
<td>The agent uses logical arguments and factual evidence to show that a request or proposal is feasible and relevant for important task objectives.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consultation</td>
<td>The agent asks the target person to suggest improvement or help plan a proposed activity or change for which the target person’s support is required.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inspirational appeals</td>
<td>The agent appeals to the target’s values and ideals or seeks to arouse the target person’s emotions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collaboration</td>
<td>The agent offers to provide assistance or necessary resources if the target will carry out a request or approve a proposed change.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apprising</td>
<td>The agent explains how carrying out a request or supporting a proposal will benefit the target personally or help to advance the target’s career.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ingratiation</td>
<td>The agent uses praise and flattery before or during an attempt to influence the target person to carry out a request or support a proposal.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal appeals</td>
<td>The agent asks the target to carry out a request or support a proposal out of friendship, or asks for a personal favour before saying what it is.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exchange</td>
<td>The agent offers something the target person wants, or offers to reciprocate at a later time, if the target will do what the agent requests.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legitimating tactics</td>
<td>The agent seeks to establish the legitimacy of a request or to verify that he/she has the authority to make it.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pressure</td>
<td>The agent uses demands, threats, frequent checking, or persistent reminders to influence the target to do something.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Coalition tactics | The agent enlists the aid of others, or uses the support of others, as a way to influence the target to do something.
---|---
Source: (Yukl et al., 2008)

### 2.4.2 Higher order categories of influence tactics

Theories about how and why particular factors may determine the use of influence tactics may be expanded by an idea about what exactly differentiates tactics from each other. It may therefore prove useful to focus on the characteristics that differentiates one tactic from another rather than on the individual tactics. Hence, the formulation of hypotheses about the relative likelihood that certain tactics rather than others will be used may benefit from a focus on dimensions discriminating between influence tactics.

Several researchers have been concerned with uncovering the underlying dimensions of influence tactics. The dimension with perhaps the greatest acceptance among research is based on the strength of influence tactics. Tactic strength can be defined as “the extent to which using particular influence tactics takes control over the situation and the target, and does not allow the target any latitude in choosing whether to comply” (Tepper et al., 1993). According to their place on the strength dimension, influence tactics may be classified into groups to reflect higher-order categories of influence. A group of hard influence tactics and a group of soft influence tactics may thus be formed on either side of the strength dimensions, while rational influence in the middle.

The higher-order category of hard influence tactics consists of tactics that are relatively controlling and coercive. Influence tactics that have been considered to belong to this category are, for instance, pressure and assertiveness, coalition, legitimating, and blocking. In contrast, the higher-order category of soft influence tactics entails tactics like ingratiation, and inspirational appeals. Although each subcategory of soft tactics can be distinguished from another and each subcategory of soft tactics is recognizable by different influencing behaviour, they all share the relatively large amount of freedom that the target is allowed in choosing whether or
not to comply. Ergo, the distinction between hard and soft tactics mirrors the difference in forcefulness of influence tactics.

A differential use of hard and soft influence tactics has been found for various objectives of influence attempts, for various hierarchical positions of the target of influence, for people having high or low self-esteem, for individuals having high or low status, for high or low competent individuals, for people high or low on Machiavellianism, for transactional and transformational leadership styles, for different levels of educations, for people influencing a group or an individual, and for in-group versus out-group targets. Indeed, the relative frequency with which hard and soft tactics are used seems to be influenced by many determinants.

Despite, however, this varying relative frequency of hard and soft tactic use, there seems to be a consistent general preference for soft tactics over hard tactics. This preference for soft over hard tactics may be explained by the differential burden that the use of these two categories of influence tactic may place on the relationship between agent and target. An influencing agent wields influence with the purpose of having some effect on the target and with the hope of altering the probable course of affairs in a more desired direction. From the perspective of the target, the use of influence will likely be experienced as being aimed at altering his or her behaviour and/or the existing situation. Consequently, the use of influence can come across as unpleasant to the target. In general, the use of harder tactics is perceived as less friendly and less socially desirable than the use of the softer varieties that allow the other person some freedom. Thus, the use of hard tactics, in particular, will be experienced as disagreeable by the target. Therefore, the employment of hard tactics is more likely to place a strain on the relationship between agent and target than the use of softer tactics. Therefore, the reason that earlier studies found that influence behaviour is dominated by the use of soft influence tactics may be that the use of hard tactics will more easily endanger the relationship between agent and target than the use of softer tactics. In congruence with these findings, we predict that in general hard tactics will be deployed less frequently than soft tactics.
2.5 Political Skill

Viewing organizations as political entities (Mintzberg, 1985) implies that although performance, goal effectiveness, and career success are determined partly by hard work and perhaps intelligence, the ability to alter one’s behavior towards one’s objectives requires the combined use of apparently adverse influence tactics and political skill. This skill will designate which influence tactic to select, its frequency, as well as its intensity towards the agent. Excessive or misuse of such tactics can stigmatize one’s behavior as non-sanctioned or self-serving and lead to disruptive organizational implications (Buchanan, 2007).

Without diminishing the value of expertise, hard work and general mental ability, many scholars and managers argue that “the difference between those who make it to the top of their organizations and those who do not is political skill” (Mainiero, 1994, p. 6). In this regard, employees need social effectiveness skills in order to successfully interact and influence others (Kolodinsky, Treadway, & Ferris, 2007). In other words, employees need to combine social astuteness with the capacity to adjust their behavior to different demands and contexts to effectively achieve their primary goals (Ferris et al., 2005b).

Some would doubt that the process of achieving one’s ends through effective exploitation of political skill deviates from the moral standards of meritocracy. This stream of research considers political skill as a negative phenomenon with disruptive effects for the organization. However, we argue that this belief is closely related to a moral standard individuals place based on their previous experience of social exchange. The negative or positive qualifier is largely determined by the perceived intentions underlying the demonstrated behavior (Ahearn et al., 2004).

Pfeffer (1981) was among the first who used the term “political skill” to denote the critical competency for successful social influence in various work settings. Sharing a similar perspective, Mintzberg (1985) asserted that organizations can be viewed as political arenas, in which worker effectiveness is partially determined by ability (i.e.,
political skill) and willingness (i.e., political will) to exert influence behaviors in politically astute ways. Yet, it was only until Ferris and his colleagues (1999) developed a measure that tried to representatively tap the principal aspects of the construct. In particular, most researchers (e.g. Ahearn et al., 2004; Ferris et al., 2005b) agree that political skill refers to the “ability to effectively understand others at work and to use such knowledge to influence others to act in ways that enhance one’s personal and/or organizational objectives” (Ahearn et al., 2004: 311). As such, political skill reflects an interpersonal style that calibrates behavior to different contextual demands, and to do so employing a manner that is genuine and sincere, inspires confidence and trust, and results in effective influence over others at work (Ferris, Treadway, Perrewe, Brouer, Douglas, & Lux, 2007).

Research on the field assumes that political skill encompasses both the “what” - which influence tactic should be used - and the “how” - how this tactic should be implemented - of influence. Personality traits as well as developmental experiences have been proposed as antecedents of political skill. Ferris and colleagues (2008a; 2007) introduced a nomological network for identifying the dispositional and developmental antecedents of political skill. In their framework (see Figure 3). More specifically, politically skilled individuals are perceptive of themselves and their environments, and they are able to identify and seek out the influential people in the workplace. Also, persons high in political skill, have a strong belief in control. The third component, as proposed by Ferris et al. (2007) suggests that being outgoing and positive (i.e., affability) are characteristics found in politically skilled individuals. Furthermore, individuals that disregard irrelevant information or desires, and attend to goal-oriented activities (i.e., action-oriented) usually demonstrate a higher networking ability and interpersonal influence. Finally, learning experiences are considered crucial for the development of all four aspects of political skill.
Political skill has received some empirical attention on how it associates with influence behaviors (e.g. Harris et al., 2007b) or work outcomes (e.g. Ferris et al., 2008a). In addition, there is a burgeoning attention for studying the moderating role of political skill in various contexts (e.g. Blickle et al., 2008; Gallagher & Laird, 2008; Treadway et al., 2007).

2.5.1 Facets of political skill

Political skill encompasses various social competencies that explain how individuals effectively manage politics in organizational life (Ferris et al., 2008a). More specifically, it is regarded as a multi-faceted construct that encompasses four critical facets: (1) Social astuteness, (2) interpersonal influence, (3) networking ability, and (4) apparent sincerity.
Social astuteness

Parales-Quenza (2006) argues that astuteness is more a functional state of social intelligence rather than a personality trait. It refers to an adaptive ability that can be used either pro-actively or reactively, allowing the rationalization of actions. As such, astute individuals can see through the complexity of social interaction and demonstrate intelligent processes in the prediction of intentions.

Astuteness has important functions in everyday life such as in arguing and in justifying actions, behaviors, and social practices. It allows individuals to make strategic shifts in communication and social behavior when the context demands such changes. Being able to interpret the desires, goals and intentions of other people can improve the decision making process to discover which political action suits the occasion best (Ferris et al., 2007). Therefore, individuals having the so-called “sensitivity to others” are often considered as ingenious in dealing with others (Ferris et al., 2005a; Pfeffer, 1992).

Interpersonal influence

Interpersonal influence refers to the ability to act on social cues using a wide variety of influence strategies (Semadar et al., 2006). No matter how thorough a political action plan is, without an inclination to influence others, the plan will probably fail. Politically skilled individuals have convincing a personal style that has a powerful influence on others around them (Ferris et al., 2007). More specifically, individuals with strong interpersonal influence competences can easily adapt their behavior to each social situation in order to elicit the desired responses from others (Perrewe & Nelson, 2004).

To become effective, individuals need to focus on ultimate objectives and remain emotionally detached from the situation (Pfeffer, 1992). Those high in interpersonal influence appear to others as pleasant to work with and productive, and they use such behaviours to control their environment (Ferris et al., 2005a). Therefore, such
individuals are usually seen as competent leaders who play the political game fairly in an effort to motivate others and generally facilitate organizational effectiveness.

Networking ability

Networking ability has been defined not as a psychological trait or possession but rather as an informational and control asset. It refers to the ability to develop friendships, and beneficial alliances within the organizational contexts (Semadar et al., 2006). Individuals that possess the ability to network with others know whom to include in their networks, how to go about building them in a contextually appropriate way, because they understand power structures in the organization, and how to deal with the organizational politics (Blass, Brouer, Perrewe, & Ferris, 2007).

The latter suggest that politically skilled individuals can position themselves more advantageously. Politically skilled persons can greatly improve advancement opportunities or protect from “thin ice”. Such skilled individuals are usually good negotiators, dealmakers and conflict manager. At the same time, they enjoy are respected and liked by those in their network, which can result in significant and tangible benefits, such as increased cooperation and trust (Ferris et al., 2005a). Furthermore, they inspire commitment and personal obligation from those around them. Without diminishing the fact that networking ability may sound somewhat manipulative, or self-serving, it is nonetheless essential for motivating others.

Apparent sincerity

An essential skill for ensuring that influence attempts will be successful is apparent sincerity. It refers to the ability to give the impression that one’s motives and actions are characterized by honesty, morality, openness and authenticity (Ferris et al., 2008a). Politically skilled individuals are keen on hiding any ulterior motives in order to overcome conflicts, obstacles during trade-offs, and secure earnings. Their tactics, in particular, are seen as straightforward, genuine and sincere, disallowing others from describing them as hypocritical. As a result, they inspire trust and confidence
since their actions are not interpreted as manipulative or coercive (Ferris et al., 2007).

2.6 Chapter’s overview

This chapter presented the first part of the literature review. It involved the conceptual elucidation of some fundamental constructs, such as organizational justice, perceptions of organizational politics, and influence tactics. In addition, this thesis provided a succinct overview of a newly developed construct – political skill – which had received a burgeoning attention over the last few years. To succeed in this “quest”, we looked into some major theories that can enhance our view of what constitutes politics and justice, as well as their underlying theoretical foundation. Furthermore, we reviewed some widely accepted models in an attempt to present their driving forces and consequences.

Overall, in this chapter we examined the personal and organizational characteristics that we believe are responsible for determining many individual and organizational outcomes. The following chapter will provide the major contributions related to these outcomes so that we can formulate our research hypotheses of our integrative framework.
Chapter 3
Job performance, job satisfaction, organizational commitment and turnover intentions

3.1 Introduction

In this second literature review chapter we concentrate on outcome variables that constitute the sequential path of a withdrawal process. More specifically, in this chapter we succinctly present all relevant literature to job performance, job satisfaction, organizational commitment, and turnover intentions. The purpose of this chapter is to accumulate a quite extensive body of literature by emphasizing on their theoretical foundation, antecedents, as well as consequences.

The chapter begins with an epigrammatic review of the theoretical underpinnings of job performance. Next, we present organizational commitment from various perspectives and focus on its affective, continuance, and normative aspects. Moreover, we highlight situational, dispositional, and interactive theories related to job satisfaction while grouping its major antecedents and outcomes. The following section concentrates on organizational commitment by reviewing its multi-dimensional nature. In the final section of this chapter, we present some principal turnover/turnover intention models, their origins, and implications on employees, organizations, and communities.
3.2 Job performance

Performance and results are two terms which are often used in a similar way by managers, albeit they refer to different things. Performance refers to behaviors with a cognitive component, observable behaviors that can be evaluated as positive or negative for individual or organizational effectiveness (Campbell, McHenry, & Wise, 1990). Results, which Campbell, Dunnette, Lawler, and Weick (1970) coined as “effectiveness”, are states or conditions of people or things that are changed by performance and consequently either contribute to or detract from organizational goal accomplishment (Griffin, Neal, & Neale, 2000). Results are the route through which an individual's performance facilitates or hinders an organization in reaching its goals (Motowildo, Borman, & Schmit, 1997).

Job performance in particular, is, perhaps, the most important construct in industrial-organizational psychology and human resource management (Campbell, 1990; Viswesvaran & Ones, 2000a). However, despite its importance, relative little is known about its theoretical underpinnings. It has typically been assumed that what constitutes performance differs from job to job. In all these studies (e.g., Conway, 1999; Motowidlo & Van Scotter, 1994; Williams & Anderson, 1991) job performance has been employed differently, to stress different outcome behavioral characteristics, which are significant for the organization. These characteristics can be grouped into four broad dimensions, based on the point of view from which they view job performance: (a) task performance, (b), organizational citizenship behavior, (c), pro-social organizational behavior, and (d) contextual performance. In the following paragraphs we will briefly describe each dimension in an attempt to bring out the meaning of job performance.

3.2.1 Theories of job performance

Job performance typically refers to behaviors that focus on carrying out specific role requirements (tasks). In the current literature, task performance is defined as the expected behaviors “that are directly involved in producing goods or services, or
activities that provide indirect support for the organization’s core technical processes” (Van Scotter, Motowidlo, & Cross, 2000, p. 526). In other words, task (in-role) performance entails the accomplishment of duties and tasks that are specified in a job description (Murphy, 1989).

Nevertheless, Smith, Organ, and Near (1983) argued that organization’s effectiveness require from employees to perform beyond formal role requirements. Therefore, researchers (Bateman & Organ, 1983; Smith et al., 1983) began to explicate a construct they labeled organizational citizenship behavior (OCB). OCB was initially defined as “individual behavior that is discretionary, not directly or explicitly recognized by the formal reward system, and that in the aggregate promotes the effective functioning of the organization” (Organ, 1988a, p. 4). After reviewing empirical research on OCB and related constructs, Organ (1997) suggested that OCB encompasses five dimensions, and specifically: (a) helpfulness (altruism), (b) conscientiousness (compliance), (c) courtesy (helping others by taking steps to prevent problems), (d) sportsmanship (tolerating inconveniences and impositions without complaining), and (e) civic virtue (constructive political involvement in the workplace).

Brief and Motowidlo (1986) proposed a closely related concept they labeled prosocial organizational behavior (POB). POB is defined as “behavior directed toward an individual, group or organization, with the intention of promoting their welfare” (Hanson & Borman, 2006, p. 142). Nevertheless, it differs from OCB in that it can either be functional or dysfunctional. OCB, by definition, includes behaviors that promote the effective functioning of the organization. In contrast, the focus of the POB construct is on promoting others’ welfare, rather than promoting organizational effectiveness.

A few year later, George and Brief (1992) criticized OCB and POB research because of their lack of having a solid grounding theory. For this reason, they introduced the concept of organizational spontaneity in an attempt to better place this research in the context of organizational theory. They defined organizational spontaneity as
“voluntary acts that facilitate the accomplishment of organizational goals, and that are typically outside the primary content dimensions of individuals’ jobs” (Hanson & Borman, 2006, p. 143). In addition, they described five dimensions of organizational spontaneity: (a) helping coworkers, (b) protecting the organization, (c) making constructive suggestions, (d) developing oneself, and (e) spreading goodwill. Organizational spontaneity overlaps greatly with OCB, but differs in that it may or may not be formally rewarded by the organization, whereas OCB, is defined as behavior that is not formally rewarded. Furthermore, POB has been defined as behavior performed with the intention of promoting the welfare of individuals or groups to whom the behavior has been directed. POB can be either role-prescribed or extra-role, and it can be negative towards organizations although positive towards individuals (Tubre, Arthur, & Bennett, 2006).

Finally, Borman and Motowidlo (1993) developed a related theory of performance. Their theory arises from a selection research perspective, and also from a concern that many job performance criteria are too narrow. In brief, they proposed that job performance can be divided into two categories, task and contextual performance. The former, as mentioned previously, refers to employees’ proficiency to perform activities that are formally recognized as part of their job description. The latter (i.e., contextual performance) is defined as job behaviors that “support the organizational, social, and psychological environment in which the technical core must function” (Borman & Motowidlo, 1993, p. 74). These contextual aspects of job performance tend to be more similar across jobs that do task dimensions. Distinguishing between task and contextual performance parallels the social and technical systems that are postulated to make up the organization (Viswesvaran & Ones, 2000b). Borman, Motowidlo and Van Scotter (Borman & Motowidlo, 1993, 1997; Motowidlo & Van Scotter, 1994) identified five categories of contextual performance as follows: (a) volunteering to carry out task activities that are not formally part of the job, (b) persisting with extra enthusiasm to successfully complete task activities, (c) helping and cooperating with others, (d) following organizational rules and procedures even when it is personally inconvenient, and (e) endorsing, supporting, and defending organizational objectives.
3.3 Job satisfaction

Job satisfaction is more than a monotonic transformation of full income and thus a true measure of utility (Hamermesh, 2001). Understanding how workers perceive their work is important because job satisfaction is likely to affect individual and organizational outcomes. There are two main reasons why we study job satisfaction, which can be classified according to the focus on the employee or the organization (Spector, 1997). First, the humanitarian perspective argues that people deserve to be treated fairly and with respect. Job satisfaction is to some extent a reflection of good treatment. In addition, it can be considered an indicator of emotional well-being or psychological health. Second, the utilitarian perspective is that job satisfaction can lead to behaviors that affect organizational functioning. Furthermore, job satisfaction can be a reflection of organizational functioning. Differences among organizational units in job satisfaction can be diagnostic of potential trouble spots. The combination of these perspective can explain and justify the attention that is given to this important variable.

3.3.1 Defining job satisfaction

The concept of job satisfaction has been defined in many ways. The most-cited definition of job satisfaction in organizational research is that of Locke’s (1976), who described job satisfaction as "a pleasurable or positive emotional state resulting from the appraisai of one's job or job experiences" (p. 1304).

Hulin and Judge (2003) define job satisfaction as multidimensional psychological responses to one’s job. These responses have cognitive (evaluative), affective (or emotional), and behavioral components. As such, job satisfaction refers to internal cognitive and affective states accessible by means of behavioral and emotional responses.

In general, satisfaction as an affect (emotion) results from the incumbent’s comparison of actual outcomes with those expected, desired, or deserved. This is
similar to Locke’s (1969; 1976) discrepancy theory, in which job satisfaction is a pleasurable emotional state that stems from the appraisal of one’s job as achieving or facilitating one’s job values or experiences. Locke’s discrepancy theory incorporates contributions from intrinsic motivation theories (Deci & Ryan, 1985; Hackman & Oldham, 1975), need theories (Alderfer, 1969; Maslow, 1954), two-factor theory (Herzberg, Mausner, & Snyderman, 1957), and justice theories (Adams, 1963; Adams, 1965; Clay-Warner, Reynolds, & Roman, 2005). In discrepancy theory, satisfaction is the outcome of the distance between two perceptions concerning aspects of the job with an individual values. This evaluation depends on the individual’s needs, values, beliefs expectations, aspirations, and desires. Nonetheless, this approach has been deemphasised because today most researchers tend to focus attention on cognitive processes rather than on underlying needs.

Brief (1998) argued that commonly accepted definitions of job satisfaction emphasize affect but fail to take into consideration that attitudes also have a cognitive component. An attitude is an evaluation or evaluative judgment made with regard to an attitudinal object, and evaluation is not synonymous with affect (Hamermesh, 2001). Job attitudes are composed of feelings and thoughts about work. Even though most definitions emphasize the affective nature of job satisfaction, most measures tend to have a strong cognitive component (Fritzsche & Parrish, 2005).

According to Weiss (2002), job satisfaction represents an appraisal-based reaction to one’s job that can potentially provoke positive or negative emotions. Evaluations of the work context focus on demands, expectations, and social interactions. If these work characteristics are perceived favourably, positive emotions result. In contrast, if they are viewed with condescension, negative emotions come about.

3.3.2 Theories of antecedents job satisfaction

Job satisfaction is perhaps the most widely studied topic in the industrial/organizational psychology field (Judge, Parker, Colbert, Heller, & Ilies,
There are numerous theories attempting to explain job satisfaction, which can be loosely categorized into one of three categories (Judge & Klinger, 2008): (a) situational theories, (b) dispositional theories, and (c) interactive (person-environment fit) theories. More specifically, situational theories suggest that job satisfaction results from the nature of one’s job or other aspects of the environment. Dispositional approaches assume that job satisfaction is rooted in the personological makeup of the individual. Finally, interactive theories propose that job satisfaction stems from the interplay of situational and personological factors. Each of the three theoretical frameworks has been extensively explored and reviewed. In the following paragraphs, we highlight the major theoretical contributions of such theories and their relevance to job satisfaction.

**Situational theories**

The situational approach attempts to explain job satisfaction by referring to the different facets of the individual’s work as well as the work environment. Situational theories (e.g., need theories, motivation-hygiene model, social information processing, job characteristic model) posit that a series of conditions related to an individual’s work and working environment should be met in order for the individual to experience a certain level of job satisfaction. This implies that organizations may impose deliberate actions to increase job satisfaction by altering situational factors, such as organizational culture, as well as pay and promotion policies. Previous research (Ashford, Lee, & Bobko, 1989) indicates that changes taking place inside organizations (e.g., re-structuring, downsizing, or merging) can cause employees feelings of anxiety, stress, insecurity, and ultimately resulting in demotivation and low satisfaction. As such, situational variables should be taken into consideration when investigating the concept of job satisfaction.

Need theories could be argued to be situations or interactions, or even dispositions. However, since the main practical implications lie in changing the context of the job, they should be classified under the situational theories (Judge et al., 2001c). For instance, Maslow (1954) suggested that there are five major need categories, which
apply to people in general, starting from the fundamental physiological needs an learning through a hierarchy of safety, social and esteem needs to the need for self- fulfillment, the highest need of all. When a lower need is satisfied, the next highest becomes the center of attention. In brief, this theory suggests that employees will always tend to want more from their employers. Even though, it’s intended purpose was not to explain motivation in the workplace, the higher- order needs for esteem and self-fulfillment can provide an impetus to motivation.

Besides need theories, we argue that three other conceptual frameworks are the most influential in the job satisfaction literature. More specifically, Herzberg (1967) tried to determine which factors in an employee's work environment caused satisfaction or dissatisfaction, which led to the development of the two-factor model (also known as motivation-hygiene model). Their model recognized that work characteristics generated by dissatisfaction were quite different from those created by satisfaction. The motivators are intrinsic factors that influence satisfaction based on fulfillment of higher level needs such as achievement, recognition, responsibility, and growth. In contrast, the hygiene factors are extrinsic variables that such as work conditions, pay, and interpersonal relationships that must be met to prevent dissatisfaction, even though by themselves do not provide satisfaction. Herzberg found that the intrinsic factors were more strongly correlated with job satisfaction, compared to the extrinsic ones. As, such, the elimination of hygiene factors from a job would only result in a reduction of the dissatisfaction, but not in an increase of satisfaction. To bring out job satisfaction, according to this two-factor theory, organizations should focus on motivator factors, such as personally rewarding and making work more challenging.

Many of the problems enumerated in Salancik’s and Pfeffer’s (1977) critique of need-satisfaction models originate partially to the failure of some approaches to take into account the social context in which work occurs and how this context affects attitudes and actions. Social information processing approaches to job attitudes argue that job satisfaction is a socially constructed reality (Salancik & Pfeffer, 1978). This theory highlights the effects of context and the consequences of
past choices, rather than individual predispositions and rational decision-making processes (Salancik & Pfeffer, 1978). Individuals form judgements of job satisfaction only when they are asked, based on social sources of information such as interpretations of their own needs, behaviours or cues by their co-workers (Judge et al., 2001c). Social information processing theory argues that job attitudes initiate a rationalizing process through which individuals cognitively construct characteristics of their job that are consistent with the social context (Bakker & Demerouti, 2007). Despite the attention this theory received, it has been heavily criticized (e.g. Miller & Monge, 1985; Stone, 1992), which justifies why there is a decline in its use.

One of the most representative theories belonging to this category is the Job Characteristics Model (Hackman & Oldham, 1975). This model, in specific, suggests that jobs that contain intrinsically motivating characteristics will result in higher levels of job satisfaction. An intrinsically motivating job is defined by five core job characteristics. First, task identity reflects the degree to which work can be seen from a beginning to an end. Second, task significance, represents the degree to which one’s work is seen as important and significant. Third, skill variety shows the degree to which job allows one to do different tasks. Next, autonomy reflects the extent to which individuals have control and discretion over how to conduct the job. Last, feedback represents the degree to which the work itself provides feedback for how one is performing the job. According to the theory, jobs that are enriched to provide these core characteristics are likely to be more satisfying and motivating. It is argued that such characteristics lead to three critical psychological states and specifically, (1) experienced meaningfulness of the work, (2) responsibility for outcomes, and (3) knowledge of results, which in turn, lead to outcomes such as job satisfaction (Judge & Klinger, 2008)

Dispositional theories

In recent years, a burgeoning attention has been given to the hypothesis that factors – called dispositions – within the individual, distinct to the attributes of the job, affect the degree of satisfaction experienced on the job (Judge, Locke, Durham, &
Kluger, 1998). Especially the past 25 years, research on job satisfaction antecedents has been dominated by dispositional approaches. Although the possible effects of dispositions on satisfaction with the job have been recognized for many decades (e.g. Hoppock, 1935; Locke, 1976; Munsterberg, 1913), it was the work of Staw and his colleagues (1986; 1985), who provided empirical support for the dispositional hypothesis (i.e., job attitudes are consistent within individuals). Further, they showed that job satisfaction is a comparatively stable disposition and does not change over time.

Most studies in this area focus on one of four typologies: (1) positive and negative affectivity; (2) the five-factor model of personality; (3) core self-evaluations; (4) other measures of affective disposition. In addition, Judge, Locke, and Durham (1997) introduced the construct of core self-evaluations. Core self-evaluations are fundamental premises that individuals hold about themselves and their functioning in the world. Judge and his colleagues (1997) argued that core self-evaluation is a broad personality construct comprised of several more specific traits: (1) self-esteem; (2) generalized self-efficacy; (3) locus of control; and (4) neuroticism or emotional stability.

As reviewed by Judge and Larsen (2001), studies following the dispositional approach have been both indirect - inferring a dispositional source of job satisfaction without measuring personality - and direct. The former (i.e., indirect studies) (e.g. Judge, Higgins, Thoresen, & Barrick, 1999; Staw & Ross, 1985; Steel & Rentsch, 1997), seeks to provide a dispositional basis to job satisfaction by inference. In such studies, disposition or personality is not measured, but is inferred to exist from a process of logical deduction or induction. The latter (i.e., direct studies) (e.g. Judge, Heller, & Mount, 2002; Judge et al., 1998; Watson, Clark, & Tellegen, 1988) relates a direct measure of a personality construct to job satisfaction.

**Interactive theories**

In his Value-Percept theory, Locke (1976) argues that individuals would determine what satisfied them on the job. Only the unfulfilled values that are important to the
individual would be considered as dissatisfying. Subsequently, this theory predicts that discrepancies between what is desired and what is received are dissatisfying only if the job facet is critical to the individual. Since individuals consider various facets when evaluating their job satisfaction, the cognitive process is repeated for each job facet. Overall satisfaction can be then estimated by aggregating all these sub-evaluations, weighted by their importance to the individual. One strength of this approach is that it elevates the role of individual differences in values and job outcomes. Still, a criticism of the theory is that it ignores influences from exogenous variables, such as associated costs for holding a job or socio-economic conditions (Judge & Klinger, 2008).

Hulin, Roznowski, and Hachiya (1985b) and Hulin (1991) provide another model of job satisfaction that attempts to integrate previous theories of attitude formulation. The model proposes that job satisfaction is a function of the balance between role inputs - what the individual puts into the work role (e.g., training, experience, time, and effort) - and role outcomes - what is received by the individual (pay, status, working conditions, and intrinsic factors) (Judge et al., 2001c). As such, the more outcomes received relative to the inputs invested, the higher job satisfaction will be. Furthermore, according to the Cornell model, an individual's opportunity costs affect the value the individual places on inputs. Periods that exhibit high unemployment rates, for example, individuals will underestimate the value of their inputs due to the low number of position alternatives. Subsequently, the relative outcome/input ratio will be better (higher job satisfaction). Moreover, the model proposes that past experiences concerning outcomes, influence one perceives current outcomes received. This concept of frames of reference, as generated and modified by individuals' experience, accounts, in part, for differences in job satisfactions of individuals with objectively identical jobs.

3.3.3 Outcomes of job satisfaction

Job satisfaction has not received such an extensive attention without reason. On the contrary, it can have significant implication in both personal and organizational level.
In brief, job satisfaction is related to an impressive array of workplace behaviours. Among others, these include: (1) attendance at work (e.g. Dellve, Eriksson, & Vilhelmsson, 2007; Steel, Rentsch, & Van Scotter, 2007; Zeffane, Ibrahim, & Al Mehairi, 2008); (2) turnover decisions (e.g. Shaw, 1999; Shore & Martin, 1989; Tett & Meyer, 1993b); (3) decisions to retire (e.g. Schmitt & McCune, 1981); (4) psychological withdrawal behaviours (e.g. Crede, Chernyshenko, Stark, Dalal, & Bashshur, 2007; Karin & Birgit, 2007; Somers, 1995); (5) prosocial and organizational citizenship behaviours (e.g. Foote & Li-ping Tang, 2008; Moorman, 1993); (6) job performance (e.g. Cropanzano, James, & Konovsky, 1993; Edwards, Bell, Arthur, & Decuir, 2008; Nathanson & Becker, 1973); and (7) life satisfaction (e.g. Rain, Lane, & Steiner, 1991; Rice, Near, & Hunt, 1980).

### 3.4 Organizational commitment

The commitment literature is quite extensive. Organizational commitment has an important place in the study of organizational behavior. This is in part due to the vast number of works that have found relationships between organizational commitment, attitudes and behaviors in the workplace.

Before we define organizational commitment and discuss classification approaches, it is important that we acknowledge the distinction that has been made by Salancik (1977) between attitudinal and behavioral commitment. Attitudinal commitment focuses on the process that people use to evaluate the extent to which their own values and goals are congruent with those of the organization. In contrast, behavioral commitment reflects the process that binds individuals to a course of action and shape beliefs that sustain that action (Meyer, Jackson, & Maltin, 2008).

Commitments in the workplace can take various forms and, arguably, have the potential to influence organizational effectiveness and employee well-being. Despite the increase in attention given to the study of workplace commitment, there still
appears to be little consensus about what commitment is, where it is directed, how it evolves, and how it affects behaviour (Meyer & Herscovitch, 2001).

Organizational commitment represents the relative strength of an individual’s identification with and involvement in a particular organization and it can be characterized by at least three factors (Steers, 1977): (1) a strong belief in and acceptance of the organization’s goals and values; (2) a willingness to exert considerable effort on behalf of the organization; and (3) a strong desire to maintain membership in the organization.

Mowday et al. (1982) provided the first extensive theory of organizational commitment. The authors identified some competing definitions of commitment. These definitions (Mowday et al., 1982, p. 20-21) along with those identified by Meyer and Allen (1997, p. 12) are listed in the following table. Despite the fact that the definitions listed are more than twenty years old, they bear importance to contemporary commitment research, since they form the basis upon which the current view on commitment has been formed. The mere number of different definitions sheds light on the fact that no real consensus exists regarding the very construct of commitment.

**Table 3. Indicative definitions of organizational commitment.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Becker, 1960)</td>
<td>Commitment comes into being when a person, by making a side-bet, links extraneous interests with a consistent line of activity.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Grusky, 1966)</td>
<td>The nature of the relationship of the member to the system as a whole.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Kanter, 1968)</td>
<td>The willingness of social actors to give their energy and loyalty to social systems, the attachment of personality systems to social relations which are seen as self-expressive.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Brown, 1969)</td>
<td>(1) It includes something of the notion of membership; (2) it reflects the current position of the individual; (3) it has a special predictive potential, providing predictions concerning certain aspects of performance, motivation to work, spontaneous contribution, and other related outcomes; and (4) it suggests the differential relevance of motivational factors.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Hall,</td>
<td>The process by which the goals of the organization and those of the</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
A closer look at the definitions listed in Table 3 reveals both points of agreement and disagreement. In broad terms, all definitions of commitment make reference to the fact that commitment is a stabilizing or obliging force, that gives direction to behaviors (e.g., restricts freedom, binds the person to a course of action) (Meyer & Herscovitch, 2001). In the following section, we discuss these differences in more detail by taking into consideration the issue of dimensionality.

### 3.4.1 Nature of commitment

**O’Reilly and Chatman’s multi-dimensional model**

O’Reilly and Chatman (1986) developed a multidimensional framework based on the assumption that commitment reflects an attitude toward the organization, and that there are various mechanisms through which attitudes can evolve. Building on Kelman’s (1958) work on attitude and behavior change, they argued that commitment may take three distinct forms, which they labeled “compliance”,

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author(s)</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Schneider, &amp; Nygren, 1970</td>
<td>Individual become increasingly integrated or congruent.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sheldon, 1971</td>
<td>An attitude or an orientation toward the organization which links or attaches the identity of the person to the organization.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hrebiniak &amp; Alutto, 1972</td>
<td>A structural phenomenon which occurs as a result of individual-organizational transactions and alterations in side bets or investments over time.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salancik, 1977</td>
<td>A state of being in which an individual becomes bound by his actions and through these actions to beliefs that sustain the activities and his own involvement.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wiener &amp; Gechman, 1977</td>
<td>Commitment behaviors are socially acceptable behaviors that exceed formal and/or normative expectations relevant to the object of commitment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marsh &amp; Mannari, 1977</td>
<td>The committed employee considers it morally right to stay in the company, regardless of how much status enhancement or satisfaction the firm gives him or her over the years.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wiener, 1982</td>
<td>The totality of internalized normative pressures to act in a way which meets organizational goals and interests.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mowday et al., 1982</td>
<td>The relative strength of an individual’s identification with and involvement in a particular organization.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
“identification”, and “internalization” (O'Reilly & Chatman, 1986, p. 493). Compliance occurs when attitudes, and corresponding behaviors, are adopted in order to gain specific rewards. Identification occurs when an individual accepts influence to establish or maintain a satisfying relationship. Internalization occurs when influence is accepted because the induced attitudes and behaviors are compatible with existing values.

Yet, in their more recent research, O'Reilly, Chatman, and Caldwell (1991) combined the identification and internalization components to form what they called “normative commitment” (the term here corresponds to Meyer’s and Allen’s affective commitment). Furthermore, compliance (also referred as instrumental commitment) is clearly distinct from identification and internalization. It differs both in terms of the basis for acceptance of influence and in its relation to turnover. While the former has been found to increase turnover, the latter is generally assumed to reduce it (Meyer & Allen, 1997). On the other hand, Meyer and Herscovitch (2001) provide another explanation. More specifically, they suggest that compliance may address employees' motivation to comply with pressures for performance, not with pressures to remain in the organization. As such, rather than measuring commitment to remain, compliance might assess commitment to perform. In such a case, compliance is quite similar to continuance commitment in Meyer and Allen's (1991) model, but with a different behavioral focus.

**Meyer and Allen’s three-component model**

A somewhat different, though not incompatible, approached was taken by Meyer & Allen (1991). They proposed a framework that was designed to measure three different components, rather than types, of organizational commitment, namely affective, continuance, and normative. Affective commitment represents employees’ emotional attachment, identification with, and involvement in the organization. It is argued that employees with a strong affective commitment will have the desire to stay with the organization. Continuance commitment reflects employees’ judgment of whether the costs of leaving the organization are greater than the costs of staying.
Employees who perceive a positive ratio tend to remain with the organization because they need to. Finally, normative commitment refers to employees’ feelings of obligation to the organization. Employees with high levels of normative commitment stay with the organization because they feel they ought to. For example, an employee may feel both a strong attachment to an organization and a sense of obligation to remain (i.e., affective commitment). Another employee may enjoy working for the organization but also recognize that leaving would be very difficult from an economic standpoint (e.g., high unemployment rates) (i.e., continuance commitment). Finally, a third employee may experience a considerable desire, need, and obligation to remain with the organization (i.e., normative commitment).

Other multidimensional conceptualizations

Over the past 3 decades, there have been several other attempts to identify and measure different forms of commitment. For example, Angle and Perry (Angle & Perry, 1981) distinguished between “value commitment” and “commitment to stay”. Likewise, Mayer and Schoorman (1998; 1992) suggested that organizational commitment has two dimensions, which they labeled “continuance commitment” and “value commitment”. The former represents the desire to remain, whereas the latter the willingness to exert effort. Even though these two dimensions seem similar to Meyer’s and Allen’s (1991), there is an important differentiation. Meyer and Allen proposed three component (i.e., affective, continuance, and normative) that have the same underlying behavioral consequence – continued employment. In contrast, Angle and Perry (1981), as well as Mayer and Schoorman (1998; 1992) make their distinction in terms of behavioral consequences. As such, continuance commitment is supposed to be associated with the decision to stay or leave the organizations, whereas value commitment is associated with the exertion of effort toward the attainment of organizational goals.

Moreover, Jaros, Jermier, Koehler, and Sincich (1993) argued for a multidimensional conceptualization of commitment, which also appears similar to that of Meyer and
Allen. Specifically, Jaros et al. distinguished between affective, continuance, and moral commitment. Nevertheless, only in the case of continuance commitment both conceptual definitions coincide. Jaros et al., in particular, emphasize more the actual affect experienced by employees. Further, their definition of moral commitment, as the internalization of goals and values corresponds more closely to Meyer and Allen’s definition of affective commitment.

Finally, based on Etzioni’s (1975) work on organizational involvement, Penley and Gould (1988) developed a multidimensional framework of commitment, distinguishing between three form, and specifically: “moral”, “calculative”, and “alienative”. More specifically, moral commitment conceptually overlaps with affecting commitment in Meyer and Allen’s model and is close to the definition provided by Jaros et al. Calculative commitment resembles compliance as described by O’Reilly and Chatman (1986). Last, their notion of alienative commitment corresponds to some extent to continuance commitment, as defined by Meyer and Allen and Jaros et al.

More recently, Meyer and Herscovitch (2001) highlighted the need to look at combinations of the three commitment forms (i.e., affective, continuance, and normative). Specifically, they argued that the varying levels of the three forms will create a distinct “profile” of commitment for each employee, and different profiles will have different implications for job outcomes. Drawing on the theoretical possibility that every employee can be characterized as being either high or low on each of the three forms of organizational commitment, they proposed 8 possible commitment profiles. For instance, a “pure” affective commitment profile describes an individual with high levels of affective commitment but low levels of normative and continuance commitment. Another example is a profile characterized by an individual who is high on all three components of commitment (Wasti, 2005).
3.4.2 Antecedents of organizational commitment

Before presenting the way in which organizational commitment results in specific personal and organizational implications, it is important to understand its antecedents and the processes through which it develops. Employees with strong affective commitment have a desire to pursue a course of action of relevance to a target. The mechanisms presumably involved in creating this desire vary somewhat across the different conceptualizations but include involvement, shared values, and identification (Meyer & Herscovitch, 2001). Therefore, any personal or situational variable that contributes to the likelihood that an individual will (a) become involved in a course of action, (b) recognize the value-relevance of association with an entity or pursuit of a course of action, and/or (c) derive his or her identity from association with an entity, or from working toward an objective, will contribute to the development of affective commitment. In the following paragraphs we succinctly present other variables that have been considered to influence the three most widely used facets of organizational commitment (i.e., affective, continuance, and normative).

Development of affective commitment

A vast number of researches have investigated the linkage between affective commitment and its antecedents. Drawing on previous reviews (e.g., Mathieu & Zajac, 1990; Meyer, Stanley, Herscovitch, & Topolnytsky, 2002; Mowday et al., 1982), Meyer and Allen (1997) identified three major sources for the development of affective commitment: (a) personal characteristics, (b) job characteristics, and (c) organizational characteristics.

Personal or demographic characteristics have been one of the most commonly tested antecedents of organizational commitment (Joiner & Bakalis, 2006). Research on personal characteristics has focused on either demographic or dispositional variables (psychological traits). It is suggested that personal characteristics, which are measured by the demographic variables (e.g., gender, age, tenure, education)
are as well as dispositional variables (e.g., personality traits, personal competences), has little to do with affective commitment (Meyer & Allen, 1997). For example, gender has produced rather inconsistent results, even though in Mathieu and Zajac’s (1990) meta-analysis, women were more affectively committed to the organization than men. Albeit weakly, age is suggested to be positively related to affective commitment (Mathieu & Zajac, 1990). Organizational tenure, however, was more strongly associated with affective commitment, since it is possible that employees need to acquire a certain amount of experience before they are ready to become attached to the organization. On the other hand, highly educated individuals have a negative correlation, since they have high expectations that organizations are usually unable to meet. Besides these demographic characteristic, dispositional variables contribute in developing affective commitment. Employees with particular personality characteristics (e.g., need for achievement) are more or less likely to become affectively committed to an organization (Meyer & Allen, 1997). Some evidence also suggests that employees who had strong confidence in their abilities and achievements report higher affective commitment (Meyer & Allen, 1997).

Furthermore, affective commitment has been positively related to job characteristics, such as job challenge, task identity, degree of autonomy, job context, variety of skills the employee uses, fairness, and so forth. (e.g., Dunham, Grube, & Castaneda, 1994; Steers, 1977). Additionally, affective commitment has been negatively associated with specific “role states”, such as role conflict, role ambiguity, and role overload (Mathieu & Zajac, 1990). Moreover, organizational support can be a positive determinant of affective commitment (Mottaz, 1988; Rhoades & Eisenberger, 2002; Rhoades, Eisenberger, & Armeli, 2001), since employees are more likely to feel an obligation to return the supportive behavior in terms of affective commitment (Shore & Wayne, 1993). The relationship between leaders and employees has been also found to be linked to affective commitment. For instance, transformational and transactional leadership (Bycio, Hackett, & Allen, 1995), supervisor supportiveness (Joiner & Bakalis, 2006), and employee empowerment (Ugboro, 2006) can greatly affect the psychological contract between employees and their organizations. Finally, job satisfaction has been found to exerts a significant
positive effect on affective commitment (e.g., Alexandrov, Babakus, & Yavas, 2007; Meyer & Herscovitch, 2001; Williams & Hazer, 1986a).

Besides demographic, psychological, and job characteristics, literature advocates for the idea that organizational structural variables influence affective commitment. Yet, the evidence concerning the effect of these macro-level variables (i.e., organizational size and centralization) to commitment is neither strong nor consistent (Mathieu & Zajac, 1990). As such, attention shifted to the ways in which organization-level policies are designed. Many researchers found that organizational justice (Konovsky & Cropanzano, 1991), pay and procedural justice (Pare & Tremblay, 2007; Schaubroeck, May, & Brown, 1994), strategic decision making (Kim & Mauborgne, 1993), and upward communication (Konovsky & Cropanzano, 1991) are positively associated with affective commitment.

Development of continuance commitment

Employees who have a strong continuance commitment to an organization stay with the organization because they believe they have to do so (Meyer & Allen, 1997). In Meyer and Allen’s (1991) three-component model they summarized the actions and events that facilitate the development of continuance commitment with respect to sets of antecedents variables: investments and alternatives.

In general, whatever employees perceive as sunk cost, as a result of leaving the organization, are the antecedents of continuance commitment. The notion of investment partially stems from Becker’s (1960) theory, which argued that commitment results from the accumulation of side bets a person makes. Employees’ investment in organizations can take many forms. For example, reallocating a family from another city to reduce expenses, or spending valuable resources to acquire organization-specific skills. Leaving the organization could be interpreted by an employee as a waste of time, money, or effort that was invested.

Besides investments, researchers have hypothesized employee’s perceptions of employment alternatives as a possible antecedent of continuance commitment.
Employees who believe they have several viable alternatives will be less committed that those who are short of options. As such, the perceived availability of possible alternative will be negatively related to with continuance commitment (Meyer & Allen, 1997). For instance, an employee who thinks that finding a job in another company is extremely difficult (very limited alternatives) will be aware of the costs associated with leaving the organization and thus remain.

The availability of alternatives and investment variables have been found to correlate more strongly with continuance commitment than with affective or normative commitment (Meyer et al., 2002). Researchers have provided empirical evidence to support the correlation between continuance commitment and employees’ perceptions concerning their skills’ transferability (Allen & John, 1990). Moreover, employees’ perceptions of employment opportunities that are available to them and attractiveness of alternatives have been negatively correlated with this particular facet of commitment (Allen & John, 1990; Whitener & Walz, 1993). As to other potential antecedents, Meyer, Stanley, Herscovitch, and Toplnytsky (2002) found that continuance commitment was significantly predicted by age, education, organizational tenure, and position tenure, as well as organizational support, transformational leadership, role ambiguity, role conflict, and interactional justice.

**Development of normative commitment**

Psychological processes, such as conditioning and modeling inform employees’ of what the organization expects from them. Over time, individuals internalize these expectations and express them as believing it is appropriate and “right” to possess loyalty toward the organization. Furthermore, when the organization makes investments in employees that are difficult for employees to reciprocate, the latter may develop a sense of indebtedness or obligation toward the organization, leading to normative commitment (Meyer & Allen, 1991).

Finally, although it has yet to be formally investigated, the development of normative commitment may be attributable to the psychological contract between an employee and the organization. Psychological contracts reflects “individual’s
perception of an exchange agreement between oneself and another party” (Rousseau, 1989). In case they are violated can lead to negative consequences for the violator (e.g., distrust, disappointment, and turnover). Whether an employer will finally fulfil the psychological contract, as perceived by the employee, may lead to the furtherance or hindrance, respectively, of that employee’s feelings of obligation and the appropriateness of continuing their current employment relationship (i.e., normative commitment).

Of the three forms of commitment, this form has received the least amount of research attention. Still, existing research has six identified some significant antecedents of normative commitment. In their meta-analysis of organizational commitment, similar to affective commitment, Meyer et al. (2002) found that several demographic characteristics, age, organizational and position tenure, predict normative commitment. In addition, they found organizational support, transformational leadership, role ambiguity, role conflict, interactional justice, distributive justice, procedural justice, job investment, and transferability of skills to be significant predictors.

3.4.3 Outcomes of organizational commitment

Most organizations acknowledge the pros and cons of having a committed workforce. In this section we review the research evidence that relates commitment to various forms of employee outcomes. This linkage is significant for both employees and organizations since it affects organizational outcomes as well as employees’ well-being. In general, literature with regard to the outcomes of organizational commitment is rather clear compared to its antecedents that seem to be more varied and inconsistent due mainly to the several different ways in which it has be defined and operationalized (Reichers, 1985).

Research on commitment outcomes examines whether the different components of commitment have certain consequences. Over the last decades, several studies suggest that employees with strong affective commitment to the organization work
harder and perform better that do those with weak (Meyer et al., 2008; Meyer & Allen, 1997). A number of studies have found that affective commitment has been positively related to work effort and performance (e.g., Bycio et al., 1995; Luchak & Gellatly, 2007; Vandenberghhe, Bentein, & Stinglhamber, 2004).

Nevertheless, Meyer and Allen (1997) argued that the different components of commitment relate to different types of outcomes, therefore continuance commitment may or may not relate to employee performance. For this reason, the relationship between commitment and performance is rather vague. A valuable conclusion among studies that have reported positive correlations between commitment and performance is that most have used measures of affective commitment. Still, it is possible that an obligation to remain will carry with it an obligation to contribute, in which case normative commitment would also correlate positively with effort and performance. In other words, a highly committed employee is usually willing to bring to bear extra effort on behalf of the organization. Hence, employees with a strong emotional attachment (i.e., affective commitment) tend to work harder and therefore are more productive and have a strong emotional desire to remain with the organization. In contrast, an employee that has a tight economic/calculative bond with the organization (continuance commitment) will stay because of the “side-bets” they have invested in the organization.

Wiener and Vardi (Wiener & Vardi, 1980), for instance, reported a significant positive correlation between their measure of normative commitment and work effort. Contrariwise, continuance commitment is perhaps least likely to correlate positively with performance. Under normal circumstances, employees whose tenure in the organization is based primarily on need may see little reason to do more than is required to maintain their membership in the organization (Meyer, Goffin, Gellatly, Paunonen, & Jackson, 1989). Although some significant relationships have been found, the magnitudes of the direct relationships between affective commitment and performance are generally small (Fukami & Larson, 1984). This fact has led researchers to explore the dynamics of different performance dimensions and to investigate moderators of the commitment–performance relationship (Shaw, Delery,
& Abdulla, 2003). Some of the factors include the seriousness with which supervisors value the appraisal process, the value of job performance by an organization and the amount of employee control over outcomes.

Besides the interest in the performance-commitment relationship, researchers on organizational commitment have focused on the influence that commitment exerts on other work-related attitudes. For example, Allen and Meyer (1990) found that employees who have a high level of affective commitment tend to show other positive work related attitudes about the organization. Furthermore, Mathieu and Zajac (1990) found that affective commitment is more significantly related than continuance commitment with job involvement, overall job satisfaction, and satisfaction with other employees (Randall & O'Driscoll, 1997).

Citizenship behavior, or extra-role behavior, has also been studied in regards to organizational commitment. Once again the research is inconclusive about the relationship between citizenship behavior and organizational commitment due to the contradicting findings. For example, Meyer, Allen, and Smith (Meyer, Allen, & Smith, 1993) found a positive relationship between commitment and extra role behavior, while (Van Dyne & Ang, 1998) found no significance between the relationships. Other studies have found that there was a negative relationship between commitment and citizenship behavior (Shore & Wayne, 1993).

Moreover, employee retention and attendance are commitment outcomes that are widely studied. Employee attendance, for instance, is the most positively related outcome to affective commitment. Steers (1977) found that employee commitment was highly related to the attendance of workers. Moreover, Gellatly (1995) found that continuance commitment was related with absenteeism. Respectively, affective commitment is negatively related to absenteeism, intention to leave, and turnover (e.g., Loi, Hang-Yue, & Foley, 2006; Pare & Tremblay, 2007; Steers, 1977; Ugboro, 2006; Vandenbarghe et al., 2004).
Research has also found that those employees who are committed to their profession also have higher levels of commitment to the organization. (Baugh & Roberts, 1994) found that those employees who were committed to both their organization and their profession had high levels of job performance.

Finally, it should be noted that the relation between any component of commitment and behavior can be quite complicated due to the fact that all three components can exert conflicting or contradictory effects on a particular behavior. For example, in the case of the relation between continuance commitment and turnover, although a high level of continuance commitment might be sufficient to tie an individual to an organization, it is not necessarily the case that an individual low in continuance commitment will leave.
Figure 4. Meyer and Allen's multidimensional model of organizational commitment, its antecedents, and its consequences.
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3.5 Turnover/Turnover intentions

Research on turnover/turnover intentions has been one of the most studied topics in management research (Griffeth, Hom, & Gaertner, 2000; Hom & Kinicki, 2001). The term “turnover”, as defined by Price (1977, p. 15), is: “the ratio of the number of organizational members who have left during the period being considered divided by the average number of people in that organization during the period”. Turnover models have been extensively studied, and scholars have provided strong support for the proposition that behavioral intentions (intention to leave) are the most immediate determinant of actual behavior (turnover) (Igbaria & Greenhaus, 1992).

For a plethora of reasons, organizational researchers often rely on what we will refer to as “surrogate” variables (Dalton et al., 1999), such as turnover intention. It could be, for example, that the actual data are unavailable or difficult to acquire. Moreover, actual turnover (used as a dichotomous variable) does not enjoy the statistical properties of intent to leave, which is easily scaled. In addition, actual turnover often requires a longitudinal design or, failing that, the need to assess the factors associated with employees’ departure retrospectively.

Employees may exit an organisation either voluntarily or involuntarily. In this research, “turnover intention” is defined as an employee’s decision to leave an organisation voluntarily (Dougherty et al., 1985; Mobley, 1977). Employees choose to leave an organization for a number of reasons (Udo et al., 1997). For example, some employees leave to escape from negative-perceived work environments, while some leave to pursue opportunities that are more attractive and promising. On the other hand, involuntary turnover is usually employer initiated, where the organisation terminates the relationship due to incompatibilities in matching its requirements. Involuntary turnover can also include death, mandatory retirements, and ill health (Dalton et al., 1999).
3.5.1 Models of turnover

In general, research on employee turnover dates back to March and Simon’s (1958) work, which introduced the theory of organization equilibrium. They argued that employees remain in their organization when the latter can provide sufficient inducement to motivate them to stay. In addition, the perceived desirability of movement and the perceived ease of movement are two primary factors that influence employee turnover (Boswell, Ren, & Hinrichs, 2008). Perceived desirability of movement is mainly influenced by job satisfaction and is often described as a “push” factor. Perceived ease of movement depends on each person’s perception of the availability of jobs in the external job market and is often described as a “pull” factor (Lee, Gerhart, Weller, & Trevor, 2008).

Building on March and Simon’s (1958) conceptual analysis of the withdrawal process, many researchers endeavoured to interpret the process through which employees voluntarily leave their organizations. More specifically, Porter and Steers (1973) asserted that met expectations were the central determinant of employees’ decision to leave the organization. To be more specific, unmet expectations result in employees’ job dissatisfaction that eventually lead to the decision to leave. In contrast, Mobley (1977) suggested that job satisfaction is not directly related to turnover. He advocated for an intermediate linkage model of employee turnover, starting from the evaluation of the present job, which may lead to job dissatisfaction and thoughts of quitting, going through a process of searching for and evaluating alternatives, and resulting in an intention to quit before actual turnover behaviour (see Figure 5).
Two years later, Mobley (1979) proposed a more heuristic model within which quit intention and turnover are determined largely by job satisfaction, expected utility of present work role, and expected utility of alternative work roles, which in turn, are influenced by a number of individual, organizational, and environmental factors (for a schematic representation see: Mobley et al., 1979, p. 517). Steers and Mowday (1981) offered a dual sequence in their extension, suggesting that quit intentions directly lead to turnover or may initiate a search for and evaluation of alternative opportunities. Similarly, based on Mobley’s (1977) model, Hom, Griffeth, and Sellaro (1984) suggested a different path, where some employees may expect to easily find
an alternative job or do not consider finding an alternative and simply decide to quit the job. Finally, Price (1977) developed a model, in which perceived alternative opportunities determine turnover, and job satisfaction influence turnover through its effect on intent to quit. Price and Mueller (1981; 1986) later incorporated various individual and structural determinants of job satisfaction (see Figure 6).

**Figure 6. The Price-Mueller causal model of turnover**

Based on this group of “core models” that continue to shape thinking about turnover theory process today, several other turnover models were developed. Noticeable examples are Farrell and Rusbult’s (1981) multidisciplinary model, Sheridan and Abelson (1983) cusp catastrophe model, Hulin, Roznowski, and Hachiya’s (1985a) labor-economic model, and Lee and Mitchell’s (1994; 1999) unfolding model. Still, in their majority these newer models has often taken the form of refinements to or extensions of the core models (Steel, 2002).

The “unfolding model of voluntary turnover” (Lee & Mitchell, 1994; Lee et al., 1999), in particular, was a major advance in the literature, since it expanded the scope and depth of theory on turnover processes (Maertz & Campion, 2004). More specifically, they introduces decision making concepts from “image theory”, according to which
employees conserve mental resources by deliberating less extensively than is implied in traditional turnover models. For example, employees may automatically screen out job alternatives that produce “image violations”, or lack fit with the employees’ values and goals, or automatically recall preformed behavioural scripts “stored in memory” (e.g., if the merger succeeds; then I will quit). Moreover, the unfolding model introduced the concept of a “shock”, which is an event that leads employees to deliberate about turnover. Overall, Lee and Mitchell indicated five specific decision paths (for more details see Figure 7). Path 1 follows this course: no negative affect is present, but there is a shock matching a preformed behavioral script for quitting, which is then automatically enacted. Path 2 follows this course: no necessary negative affect, a shock and an image violation, and no alternative job considered. In path 3, there is relative dissatisfaction, a shock and image violation, and a consideration of alternatives. In path 4a, there is dissatisfaction, no shock, and no consideration of alternatives. The course of path 4b is similar in essence to Mobley’s (1977) intermediate linkage model and to path 4a, except that path 4b includes job search and consideration of alternatives.
As mentioned previously, employee turnover literature is vast and rather ambiguous. There are several reasons why people choose to quit from the organizations they work. Therefore to capture the sources of employee turnover, we have to rely on some meta-analytic evidence (e.g., Cotton & Tuttle, 1986; Griffeth et al., 2000; Podsakoff, LePine, & LePine, 2007; Salgado, 2002; Zimmerman, 2008), as well as some highly cited and recent reviews (e.g., Boswell et al., 2008; Griffeth & Hom, 1995). Based on these studies, three main factors that lead to employee turnover emerge (i.e., external factors, work-related factors, and personal/dispositional factors).

The asterisk (*) indicates that the route is not classifiable and that it represents a theory of falsification – a way in which an individual could leave an organization that would not be part of one of the model’s paths.

3.5.2 Sources of employee turnover

As mentioned previously, employee turnover literature is vast and rather ambiguous. There are several reasons why people choose to quit from the organizations they work. Therefore to capture the sources of employee turnover, we have to rely on some meta-analytic evidence (e.g., Cotton & Tuttle, 1986; Griffeth et al., 2000; Podsakoff, LePine, & LePine, 2007; Salgado, 2002; Zimmerman, 2008), as well as some highly cited and recent reviews (e.g., Boswell et al., 2008; Griffeth & Hom, 1995). Based on these studies, three main factors that lead to employee turnover emerge (i.e., external factors, work-related factors, and personal/dispositional factors).

Figure 7. Lee and Mitchell’s (1999) unfolding model of voluntary turnover.
More specifically, personal variables that demonstrate strong confidence that they are related to turnover include age, tenure, education, number of dependents, biographical information, met expectations, and behavioral intentions. Age, tenure, and number of dependents are negatively related to turnover; education and behavioral intentions are positively correlated. In addition, people whose expectations are met are less likely to leave. Strong confidence is found also for gender with most studies indicating that women are more likely to leave compared to men. However, a recent meta-analysis (Griffeth et al., 2000) revealed that women’s quit ratings were quite similar to that of men’s. Weak to modest confidence is concluded for marital status and for aptitudes and abilities. Married employees typically are found to be somewhat less likely to quit than unmarried persons are. Griffeth and colleagues (2000) meta-analysis also indicated no relationship between intelligence and turnover.

Besides these personal variables that have been found to affect turnover, Mobley, Griffeth, Hand, and Meglino (1979) predicted that numerous individual differences, including personality and impulsivity, would affect turnover decisions. In a similar vein, Steers and Mowday (1981) placed individual attributes and values as antecedents of turnover. Finally, Hom and Griffeth (1995) developed an integrative model of turnover that included negative affectivity and commitment propensity as antecedents to work-related attitudes and turnover decisions. Zimmerman’s (2008) meta-analysis indicated that personality is related to turnover intentions and behaviors. Specifically, emotional stability and conscientiousness had moderate effects on intentions to quit; and agreeableness, conscientiousness, and emotional stability had moderate effects on turnover. The pattern of these results indicates that although individuals’ intentions to leave their organizations are more strongly influenced by affect-driven dispositions, actual turnover decisions are largely affected by traits related to impulsivity (Zimmerman, 2008).

The second group of factors that can influence turnover intentions/turnover focuses on work-related variables. For example, there is a positive relationship between pay and turnover. Overall job satisfaction, satisfaction with the work itself, pay
satisfaction, satisfaction with supervision, and organizational commitment are negatively related to turnover. In addition, job performance and role clarity are found to be negatively related to turnover. Meta-analyses (e.g., Cotton & Tuttle, 1986) also indicate that task repetitiveness has a positively association with turnover.

Finally, research findings indicate that perceptions of job alternatives are positively related to turnover. The unemployment rate produces moderate confidence that it is negatively related to turnover. It appears that (hard) national economic data are consistently related to aggregate turnover. Moreover, even though Price (1977) concluded that the presence of a union had little or no relationship with turnover, meta-analytic results (e.g., Cotton & Tuttle, 1986) reveal a negative correlation.

3.5.3 Consequences of Employee Turnover

Turnover can be positive and negative to individual employees, organisations and communities. On a personal level, the employee may decide to leave a stressful form of employment and move into a different job that may be more in line with their career objectives. On the other hand, the employee could lose also by disrupting the family’s social support system and walking into a job that does not live up to expectations as promised by the organisation. Turnover is associated with an individual’s ability to move into new organisations, which is vital for the future development of organisations.

The exiting of employees can have both direct and indirect costs. On one hand, an employee’s exit from an organisation is a direct cost, in the form of having to select, recruit, and train a new employee (Dalton, Todor, & Krackhardt, 1982). On the other hand, indirect cost implications include reduced morale, pressure on the remaining staff, costs of learning, and the loss of social capital (Dess & Shaw, 2001). One of the main consequences for organisations that have a high turnover is the financial cost. The total costs of employee turnover are hard to measure, in particular the effects on its intangible aspects, such as organisation’s culture, employee morale, and social
capital or loss of organisational memory (Dess & Shaw, 2001). The focus has been mainly on the tangible costs associated with turnover in the areas of selection, recruitment, induction and training of new staff, and the cost of being short-staffed. The cost of losing a high performer who has a high degree of knowledge, skills and abilities, or an employee, who is employed in an area where there is a labour market shortage, can be substantial to the organisations performance, productivity, and service delivery.

In addition, turnover can have a negative impact on other employees by disrupting group socialization processes and increasing internal conflict, which can lead to triggering additional turnover (Riley, 2006). Turnover of employees may in itself trigger additional turnover by causing a decline in confidence and by highlighting that alternative jobs are available. Moreover, the interpersonal bond that is developed between employees is central to the communication patterns that are characteristic and unique to any organisation. Price (1977) argues that social dynamics and effective communication systems are central to the effective performance levels of work teams. Turnover can have a negative effect on the functioning of an organisation through loss of team integration, cohesion, and morale. It may also lead to increased in-group conflicts and breakdown of interaction with customers.

It is widely believed that a significant amount of turnover adversely influences organisational effectiveness and disrupts performance and productivity (Hom & Kinicki, 2001). In terms of effectiveness, the cognitive withdrawal of the employee prior to separation, and in terms of productivity by reducing the organisations skill level as high turnover disrupts the process of production, leading to inefficiencies (Alexander, Bloom, & Nuchols, 1994). High turnover requires organisations to spend considerable time in inducting the new employees to the social, performance norms and culture of an organisation. According to Shaw, Gupta, and Delery (2005) a negative relationship between workforce performance and turnover has been well established in literature. Indeed, they found significant inverse relationship between
quit rates and productivity, while Alexander and his colleagues (1994) found that voluntary turnover related negatively to cost effectiveness hospitals.

Nonetheless, turnover is not always detrimental to an organization. Despite the fact that many argue about the negative effects of turnover on operating performance due to the disruption of existing routines (Bluedorn, 1982a; Dalton et al., 1982) or the loss of an employee’s accumulated experience (Argote & Epple, 1990), others have suggested that firms may benefit from the innovative thinking or increased motivation that new workers bring to a job (Mowday et al., 1982; Staw, 1980). If employees who perform poorly are encouraged to leave, employees that are more productive can be employed in their place. Furthermore, turnover may lead to movement of employees into new positions and promotion. Dalton and Todor (1979) noted that moderate levels of turnover are acceptable and encouraged as the new employee may contribute fresh ideas, their knowledge, skills and abilities, creative approaches to problem solving, and different working styles that can enhance the social capital of the organisation. These conflicting views suggest that the effect of turnover on performance may depend on the nature of the environment in which turnover occurs (Ton & Huckman, 2008).

3.6 Chapter’s overview

This chapter presented the second part of the literature review. It reviewed four widely used constructs in organizational behavior and managerial research, and specifically, job performance, job satisfaction, organizational commitment and turnover intentions. In this context, we provided the basic definitions and streams of research, followed by their antecedents and consequences for both individuals and organizations. Finally, we presented the main research frameworks that have made major contributions to the literature and have contributed considerably in the development of our conceptual framework. Overall, these two chapters of the literature review have provided the basis for the formulation of our research hypotheses as presented in the following chapter.
Chapter 4

Research Model & Hypotheses

4.1 Introduction

The principal purpose of this study is to present and test a model that identifies the impact of both personal and organizational characteristics on individual and organizational outcomes, while investigating possible mediating and moderating effects. To address this purpose, we grouped the major research questions of this thesis: (1) how do individual characteristics (i.e., political skill, influence tactics) determine task performance? (2) how does the organizational context (i.e., organizational justice and politics) affect individual and organizational outcomes (i.e., job satisfaction, organizational commitment, and turnover intentions?; (3) how do specific construct mediate relationships among personal and organizational variables and outcomes?; (4) how combinations of phenomenally antipodal influence tactics affects performance?; (5) how political skill moderates the relationship between influence tactics ambidexterity and performance?; (6) how procedural and informational justice, as well as perceptions of organizational politics moderate the relationship between political skill and job performance?. These research questions will guide the empirical investigations of the conceptual model. The conceptual model has been developed to test the relationships among the variables that appear to be relevant to the present study.

The chapter consists of three distinct sections. In the first section, we present the main conceptual framework of our thesis followed by the research hypotheses and the relevant theoretical underpinnings. In the next sections we endeavor to
investigate more complex relations, by looking at possible moderating effects. The second section examines how combinations of apparently contradictory influence tactics can yield better results, and looks into possible moderating of political skill in the aforementioned relationship. Lastly, the third section raises a theoretical debate as to how two justice components (i.e., informational and procedural justice) and politics perceptions moderate the relationship between political skill and job performance.

4.2 Main conceptual framework

Organizations around the globe are facing management problems, stemming from low employee motivation, retention and absenteeism (Barnett & Bradley, 2007; Heslin, 2005). As organizations strive to cope with these phenomena that result in low organizational effectiveness, they seem ready to realize their facilitative role in supporting employees to develop their own careers and increase their satisfaction (Barnett & Bradley, 2007). Employees usually view organizations as living entities because they take responsibility for the actions of its members, enacts polices and norms that provide continuity and prescribe role behaviors, and exerts power on individual employees through its agents (Shanock & Eisenberger, 2006).

There is a large number of researches (e.g. Andrews & Kacmar, 2001; Harris et al., 2007a; Lemons & Jones, 2001; Rhoades & Eisenberger, 2002) on how the perceived political climate and organizational justice affect workplace attitudes (e.g., stress/strain reactions, job performance, turnover intentions, job satisfaction, employee commitment). Nevertheless, limited research, both theoretical and empirical, has been done on how the inner organizational context (politics and justice) relates to present employee behavior (Buchanan, 2007).

A question that naturally arises is why researchers should study these two constructs (i.e., organizational politics and justice) together (Beugre & Liverpool, 2006). It is undeniable that these are highly correlated, sharing a common underlying construct.
However, their exact relationship is still unclear. Organizational politics and justice can better predict work outcomes, since taken together provide additional variance. Moreover, organizational justice represents a global view, whereas organizational politics a more narrow one. The study of Andrews and Kacmar address this problem, and they argue that examining them altogether provide a better results (Andrews & Kacmar, 2001).

At the same time, there is a burgeoning attention on the literature concerning influence tactics and their effect on different facets of performance. Besides some noticeable studies (e.g., Falbe & Yukl, 1992; Sparrowe, Soetjipto, & Kraimer, 2006; van Knippenberg et al., 1999a; van Knippenberg & Steensma, 2003; van Knippenberg, van Knippenberg, Blaauw, & Vermunt, 1999b; Yukl & Falbe, 1990), though, the domain remains rather unexplored.

From all the above, it is obvious that both organizations and employees are interested in the conceptual and empirical investigation of the drivers that are responsible for determining organizational, as well as individual outcomes, such as performance, satisfaction, commitment and turnover. In the previous chapters, we reviewed several theories and conceptualizations on the different drivers of these outcome variables. Especially, for constructs, such as job satisfaction, commitment and turnover, there is a vast number of researchers that highlight the role of various antecedents. However, all these studies have a rather narrow focus. Literature lacks an integrative framework that provides combines individual (e.g., influence tactics, political skill) and context (e.g., organizational justice, organizational politics) variables to determine individual and organizational outcomes.

As such, the proposed research model (see Figure 8) aims at combining several different conceptualizations and empirical frameworks, presented in the literature review chapters, in order to derive the critical determinants of several individual and organizational outcomes. The rationale for the proposed interrelations between these variables is thoroughly discussed in the following sections.
Figure 8. Hypothesized research model.
4.3 Research hypotheses of the main conceptual framework

4.3.1 Political skill and influence tactics

In the large and growing body of research into organizational politics, few studies include attempts to evaluate the political skill of the influencer, leaving a critical gap about why influence efforts succeed or fail (Ferris et al., 2005a). Indeed, most work to date has assumed that the mere demonstration of an influence attempt is the same as its effectiveness. Nevertheless, studying what people do to influence others has a narrow perspective, unless it is studied relevant to the context. Political skill is the key variable of what determines both the selection of influence tactics to use in a particular situation and the successful execution of those tactics (Ferris et al., 2005a; Kapoutsis & Papalexandris, 2009; Kolodinsky et al., 2007).

The literature acknowledges the multi-facet nature of political skill (Blickle et al., 2008; Ferris et al., 2005a; Ferris et al., 2005b; Ferris et al., 2007). More specifically, as mentioned in the literature review chapter, it is said to encompass four distinct constructs: Social astuteness, which asserts that individuals can comprehend social interactions and accurately interpret needs, interests and underlying behaviors; Interpersonal influence that refers to the person’s ability to appropriately adjust their behavior to each situation; Network ability, which is important for creating friendships, alliances, and coalitions; and Apparent sincerity, which reflects the ability to display authenticity and sincerity when interacting with others. Each of these facets contributes significantly for effectively selecting influence tactics.

Political skill represents both an ability to influence and a proficiency at influencing others in organizational settings. In sum, political skill can be viewed as an ability (i.e., characteristic of the actor) affecting the choice of influence attempts, promoting the confidence to even attempt influence behaviors, and increasing the effectiveness of the execution of influence. Moreover, theorists have argued that politically skilled individuals are more likely to engage in situationally appropriate influence tactics (Kolodinsky et al., 2007), and will recognize and exploit the most
effective tactics in any given context (Ferris et al., 2007). As such, it should be expected that politically skilled individuals will be more likely to choose and effectively employ the rationality influence tactic.

Dominant in conceptualizations of organizational politics has been the belief that employees engage in individual tactics of influence behavior. Early conceptualizations (Kipnis et al., 1980; Yukl & Falbe, 1990) identified several influence tactics that supervisor and/or subordinates use to ‘get their way’. These tactics ranged from attempts to flatter the target (e.g., ingratiation) to tactics designed to intimidate the target (e.g., assertiveness).

The literature proposes a conceptual distinction between influence tactics, based on the latitude that they give to a target in choosing to comply (Tepper et al., 1993). Thus, tactic strength, which captures this leeway, can be used to distinguish between hard and soft influence tactics. In general, hard tactics, such as pressure and legitimating, involve the use of formal and coercive power in order to control subordinates’ actions. Research findings indicate that their use is associated with increased compliance and can ensure a minimum level of performance. Yet, hard tactics are perceived as more self-serving and less socially desirable, hence leading to increased resistance and demotivation (Falbe & Yukl, 1992). In contrast, soft tactics can boost a target’s affective appraisal and enhance the likelihood of cooperative behavior (Barry & Shapiro, 1992), but can also lead to inertia. Ergo, there are tradeoffs between hard and soft tactics, and as such, some individuals or specific situations may require hard tactics, whilst others may need soft tactics, to be aligned with the specific task objectives. Thus, we argue that political skill will be positively associated with both soft and hard tactics.

**Hypothesis 1a:** Political skill will be positively associated with soft tactics.

**Hypothesis 1b:** Political skill will be positively associated with hard tactics.
Furthermore, we argue that in the middle of the strength dimension lays rationality. Research has shown that rationality, as an influence tactic is a primary consideration within the performance appraisal context. Rationality has been referred to as reasoning and rational persuasion, and it involves the use of logic, factual evidence, or thorough explanations in order to persuade or influence others (Yukl et al., 2008). Higgins, Judge, and Ferris (2003) found that subordinates who utilized rationality to influence their supervisor were more likely to obtain higher performance assessments. Taken together, these results suggest that rational tactics are widely used and generally effective in influencing others at work. Similar to Kolodinsky and his colleagues (2007) we argue that the decision to use, and confidence to apply, the rationality influence tactic is in part a function of one’s political skill. As such, political skill is expected to be positively associated with rational influence tactics.

**Hypothesis 1c:** Political skill will be positively associated with rational influence behavior.

### 4.3.2 Antecedents of job performance

Political skill operates in a number of ways to affect, and ensure the success of, the influence process in organizations. Individuals high in political skill know which particular type of influence tactic or strategy to employ in each situation. In addition, politically skilled individuals know how to execute each selected tactic in the right way and proportion to obtain the desired effect and hence ensure the success of the influence attempt (Ferris et al., 2005a).

Socially astute individuals are highly self aware and capable of interpreting interactions with others (Ferris et al., 2005a). Being able to understand others’ attitudes and work conduct, constitutes the first step in interpreting their behavior, thereby allowing managers to adjust their political actions to different demands and contexts to effectively achieve their primary goals (Ferris et al., 2005b). Furthermore, managers that are socially astute can recognize the desires, needs and aspirations of others (Kolodinsky et al., 2007). They can also ascertain employee’s hidden agendas,
thereby managing conflict and effectively cooperating with others. Thus, this skill can facilitate the decision concerning the political action that best suits different organizational contexts and work situations, thereby enhancing social interactions with subordinates. Therefore, socially astute managers that are aware of the right things to say can effectively present themselves to others and are able to use the appropriate political tactics to become better negotiators and sway subordinates to attain the formal job performance requirements.

Interpersonal influence is a critical managerial skill, since no matter how thoroughly thought out a political action plan is, without the ability to influence others, the plan will probably fail. Managers high on interpersonal influence have a subtle and convincing personal style that exerts a powerful influence on those around them (Ferris et al., 2005a). They induce feelings of empathy and develop good rapport with their subordinates, thus favorably disposing target employees to associate with them. As such, they can communicate more easily and effectively with others and thus can deploy the appropriate political course of action that will reduce communication barriers and resistance to change. Furthermore, managers high on interpersonal influence are considered flexible and adaptive to different contexts and situations. Therefore, they are able to appropriately adjust/calibrate their behavior to each situation so as to elicit particular outcomes from others. An individual with interpersonal influence also enjoys the respect, confidence and trust of those in their network. In this context, managers with interpersonal influence can calibrate their behavior to motivate employees to meet and exceed the formal requirements of the job.

Network ability fosters interactions and collaborations with others that can position themselves to seize opportunities. Managers high on network abilities are adept in conflict management and can effectively exchange benefits to attain their goals, since they hold assets that are necessary for the negotiation. Furthermore they are assumed to favor cooperation, are keen on building relationships, developing friendships and beneficial alliances and generally networking with others. Therefore they are believed to know when to call on others, and to have the ability to use the
appropriate influence tactics to persuade subordinates to perform tasks that are expected of them.

Managers with high apparent sincerity give the impression that their motives and actions are characterized by honesty, morality, and authenticity (Bolino, 1999), while hiding any ulterior motives. They are active listeners and appear to have a genuine interest in other people. They inspire trust and confidence and can secure compliance and commitment to their objectives. Therefore managers high on apparent sincerity are expected to use fitting influence behavior to reduce opposition and motivate subordinates to meet their job requirements. Furthermore, they can provide a good justification for the use of specific tactics, thus being considered as genuine and not self-serving.

In general, individuals high in political skill tend to reflect a sense of calmness, self-confidence, control, and personal security that attracts others, instills in them feelings of comfort, and also contributes to positive affective reactions and trust (Ferris, Munyon, Basik, & Buckley, 2008b). In this respect, supervisors high on political skill are able to adjust their behavior to different demands and contexts to effectively achieve their primary goals (Ferris et al., 2005b). Consequently, a politically skilled supervisor should be able perform better.

**Hypothesis 2:** Political skill will be positively associated with job performance.

In general, hard tactics aim at the subordinates’ cognitive side, while soft tactics aim at their affective side. More specifically, hard tactics, which lie on the one end of the strength dimension, consist of actions that are relatively controlling, direct, and coercive, such as pressure and legitimating. Their main objective is to ensure targets’ compliance or communicate the agent’s dissatisfaction (van Knippenberg et al., 1999b). On the opposite side of the strength dimension, soft tactics, such as ingratiating, consultation and inspirational appeals, comprise of actions that focus on maintaining or improving the agent-target relationship. Their goal is to allow the
target to have the option of whether or not to comply and increase commitment, by behaving in a polite and friendly manner (Barry & Shapiro, 1992).

Employing soft tactics can increase the target’s positive feelings, arouse enthusiasm, and thereby enhance the likelihood of carrying out a specific request (Liden & Mitchell, 1988). Moreover, their use can decrease subordinates’ resistance, while it can increase their confidence and commitment towards task objectives (Falbe & Yukl, 1992). Further, soft tactics are considered to be more socially desirable and contribute to the maintenance of the agent-target relationship. Consequently, supervisors are inclined to employ them in the majority of task requests.

On the other hand, hard tactics involve the use of coercive and controlling power to increase an agent’s responsibility, accountability, and professionalism. As such, they can increase subordinates’ compliance and sway them to perform as expected. Still, their use is usually perceived as more hostile by targets (van Knippenberg & Steensma, 2003). Clearly, hard tactics can place a strain on the agent-target relationship and their use requires good justification and rationale. Failing to do so, their use can easily undermine the relationship between agent and target and lead to demotivation and resistance (van Knippenberg & Steensma, 2003). For example, confronting others face to face, placing strict deadlines, or demanding compliance may be perceived as overly strict, manipulative or even self-serving. For this reason, hard tactics are usually employed after the ineffective use of a soft influence attempt. In addition, they can be used as a “drastic medicine” for situations when compliance is needed. Therefore, we argue that hard tactics could ensure conformity and occasionally achieve a satisfactory level of performance.

Undoubtedly, demanding supervisors that use pressure and seek compliance in a direct and assertive way can trigger feelings of dislike. Nevertheless, they can help attain an average level of performance, which may not be possible through the sole use of soft tactics. Under certain conditions, relational considerations may require the use of harder tactics (van Knippenberg et al., 1999b) to ensure that subordinates adequately complete their assigned duties, to communicate dissatisfaction, or boost
performance over a short period of time. For example, a tight project deadline can compel the supervisor to shift the pressure to subordinates. Further, supervisors may use hard tactics to depict a negative or counterproductive behavior or ensure fair treatment among group members.

**Hypothesis 3a:** Soft tactics will be positively associated with job performance.

**Hypothesis 3b:** Hard tactics will be positively associated with job performance.

Rational persuasion is consistently found to be the most frequently used influence tactic (Pearce, 1997) (Kipnis & Schmidt, 1985; Yukl & Falbe, 1990; Yukl, Falbe, & Youn, 1993). Moreover, a manager's use of rational persuasion is found to result in both a significantly higher level of task commitment (as exhibited by the target of influence) and a significantly higher assessment (by the target) of the manager's overall effectiveness (Yukl & Tracey, 2003; Yukl & Tracey, 1992). With rational persuasion, an agent uses logical arguments and factual evidence to persuade a target that a proposal or request is worthwhile. Rational persuasion is most likely to be effective when the agent and target share a common task objective (Eagly & Chaiken, 1984; Falbe & Yukl, 1992). Results from prior research on the consequences of using rational persuasion have been either positive or non-significant. In the questionnaire study by Kipnis and Schmidt (1988), managers who used rational persuasion more than other tactics in upward influence attempts received the highest performance ratings. Based on the previous syllogisms, the following hypotheses can be formulated:

**Hypothesis 3c:** Rational influence tactics will be positively associated with job performance.

**Hypothesis 4:** Influence tactics will partially mediate the relationship between political skill and task performance.
4.3.3 Influence of organizational justice

In the second chapter, we described organizational politics as purposive actions (either covert or overt) by individuals to promote and safeguard their self-interest, sometimes at the expense of and without regard for the wellbeing of others or their organizations (Allen et al., 1979; Andrews & Kacmar, 2001; Kacmar & Baron, 1999). Despite the fact that politics may be perceived as either positive or negative depending on perspective, its consequences have detrimental effects to individuals and organizations. Because politics are considered necessary for normal business functioning (Byrne, 2005; Ferris et al., 1996), buffering their negative effects becomes critical. For example, Vigoda (2000) asserted that that the lack of minimal justice is a cause of higher perception of POP. In a similar vein, we argue that organizational justice is the mechanism organizations offer for managing these negative effects of organizational politics (Andrews & Kacmar, 2001; Cavanagh, Moberg, & Velasquez, 1981; Cropanzano et al., 1995).

Andrews, Witt and Kacmar (2003) claimed that inappropriate distribution of organisational outcomes leads to jealously and resentment. It creates a perception of unfair treatment and use of unsanctioned behaviours in a manner that is detrimental to others. This experience is likely to erode trust in the organisation.

In Tyler and Lind’s (1992) relational model of authority, it was suggested that fair procedures communicate trustworthiness of management (Lind & Tyler, 1988; Tyler & Lind, 1992). Moreover, as the uncertainty management theory posits, justice can reduce ambiguity in the working environment and give employees a sense of control. Individuals who perceive having control in the environment are more likely to view politics as opportunities rather than negative threats (Ferris et al., 1989b). Consequently, we expect that fairness perceptions should minimize the negative effects of politics because employees feel that their positive relationship with the supervisor indicates that the supervisor is trustworthy, cares about them, and will help them feel in control (Byrne, 2005).
Researchers that have investigated the relationship between justice and politics reveal that although both constructs share a common underlying theme, the concepts are distinct from one another and should be considered unique constructs (Andrews & Kacmar, 2001). These authors found that procedural and distributive justice are found to be negatively correlated with perceptions of politics ($r = -.48$, $r = -.43$, respectively). In addition, Parker, Dipboye, and Jackson (1995) found a negative relationship between work environment and perceptions of politics ($r = -.48$).

Though it has not been studied with politics, interactional and informational justice may also be very relevant in examining mitigating effects on politics. These two recently developed aspects of organizational justice has been linked to positive supervisor–subordinate relations, which ultimately lead to beneficial consequences for the supervisor and organization (Masterson et al., 2000). Fair treatment, information sharing and feedback can build trust in the relationship, and lead to increased extra-role behaviors and commitment (Masterson et al., 2000; Moorman, 1991). Therefore, interactional and informational justice may be important in reducing the negative effects of politics through positive relations of organizational members. As such, we argue that all aspects of justice will mitigate the negative effects of perceived politics.

**Hypothesis 5:** Organizational justice will be negatively associated with perceptions of organizational politics.

### 4.3.4 Determinants of intrinsic job satisfaction

In the previous chapter, job satisfaction was defined as “a pleasurable or positive emotional state resulting from the appraisal of one’s job or job experiences” (Locke, 1976, p. 1300). Organizational politics are a key variable for predicting individual and organizational outcomes. The effect of organizational politics to job satisfaction is clearly a negative one. Gandz and Murray (1980) were among the first to argue that high levels of politics are a negative component of overall job satisfaction. Still, Ferris and his colleagues (1989b) were the first to explicitly suggest that perceptions of
organizational politics (POPS) have a direct and inverse effect on job satisfaction. Besides this study, other researchers (e.g., Bozeman et al., 2001; Cropanzano, Howes, Grandey, & Toth, 1997; Harrell-Cook, Ferris, & Dulebohn, 1999; Valle & Perrewé, 2000; Zhou & Ferris, 1995) have examined this relationship and they found an inverse relationship. In Ferris et al’s (2002) in-depth review on perceptions of organizational politics, they found that in most studies, POPS had a significant negative effect on all aspects of job satisfaction.

Perceptions of politics are primarily reflected in employees’ attitudes to elements one considers responsible for the political climate. These may be supervisors, co-workers, and other factors in the organization, which altogether generate overall job satisfaction (Vigoda, 2000). More specifically, POP are usually interpreted as threatening to self-interest. Such perceptions elicit a negative emotional response from employees (Rosen, Harris, & Kacmar, 2009). Consistent with cognitive judgment theories (e.g., Locke, 1976), Rosen, Harris, and Kacmar (2009) argued that environmental features have direct effects on the judgments that comprise job satisfaction. In particular, Weiss and Cropanzano (Weiss & Cropanzano, 1996) highlight the importance of distinguishing between the affective component of job satisfaction, which is influenced by affect elicited via events that occur on the job, and the belief component, which represents evaluations of the job in terms of its features. Based on this stream of research, some studies (e.g., Breckler & Wiggins, 1989; Weiss, Nicholas, & Daus, 1999) have argued that beliefs and affective experiences can independently predict evaluative judgments, such as job satisfaction, of the target object. Thus, features of the work context, such as POP, may have both direct and indirect (through affective states) influences on job satisfaction (Rosen et al., 2009).

We argue that POP will have a negative, direct effect on job satisfaction. This is in line with other researches (e.g., Poon, 2003; Vigoda, 2000) which considered POP as a detrimental factor to the development and maintenance of high quality employee–organization exchange relationships and, as a result, is associated with less favorable evaluations of one’s organization (job satisfaction).
Hypothesis 6: Perceptions of organizational politics will be negatively associated with intrinsic job satisfaction.

Besides the role of POP on job satisfaction, we argue that organizational justice will have a significant positive effect. More specifically, Dailey and Kirk (1992) found that job satisfaction was significantly correlated with perceptions of the procedural justice of performance feedback and planning. In contrast, (Alexander & Ruderman, 1987) found that although both distributive and procedural justice made a significant contribution to job satisfaction, procedural fairness accounted for a larger portion of variance than did distributive fairness. McFarlin and Sweeney (1992), however, reported that distributive justice was a stronger predictor of job satisfaction than procedural justice. Furthermore, Konovsky and Cropanzano (1991) found that job satisfaction was determined by the degree to which explanations of a company’s drug testing were provided to employees (i.e., informational justice) rather than perceptions concerning the outcome or the fairness of the drug testing procedures themselves. Finally, Moorman (1991), as well as Schappe (1998) examined the relative effects of interactional justice (i.e., interpersonal and informational justice), procedural and distributive justice on job satisfaction and found that all these aspects of justice perceptions were individually related to job satisfaction with interactional justice being the strongest predictor.

Consistent with these findings, other studies have shown high correlations between all facets of organizational justice and job satisfaction (e.g., Masterson et al., 2000; Mossholder, Kemery, Bennett, & Wesolowski, 1998). Such findings can be interpreted by using some of the theories we reviewed in the second chapter of this thesis. According to the instrumental model, for instance, distributive justice is the key antecedent predicting workplace attitudes regarding personal outcomes, such as job satisfaction (McFarlin & Sweeney, 1992). This model assumes that workers focus upon distributive fairness in order to maximize their personal outcomes, because they believe that fair distributions will result in favorable distributions (Clay-Warner et al., 2005).
Similar to the personal outcomes model, the group-value model (Lind & Tyler, 1988) suggests that procedural justice will be a consistently important antecedent of job satisfaction and that these effects will be independent of distributive justice (Clay-Warner et al., 2005). This prediction is drawn from the group-value model’s assertion that people value fair procedures for the identity-relevant information that such procedures provide (Lind & Tyler, 1988; Lind & Earley, 1992). A procedurally fair treatment by group authorities communicates respect, which increases self-esteem. Furthermore, because people see authorities as reflective of the general norms and values of the group, they gain self-esteem from belonging to a group whose authorities practice procedural justice. As a result, the group-value model suggests that individuals are concerned about fair procedures above and beyond the instrumental effects that fair procedures have on their outcomes.

Finally, the psychological contract model extends the group-value approach to suggest that the relationship between organizational justice and job satisfaction may not be as straightforward as some researchers have proposed. The effects of procedural and distributive justice on work attitudes, for instance, may depend upon the relationship employees have with their work organizations or the ability of decision makers to treat employees well when sharing procedural information. That is, employees may simply place greater importance on being treated well interpersonally by decision makers than on the formal characteristics of the procedures themselves. Bies and Moag’s (1986) originally argued that individuals draw on interpersonal and informational justice perceptions when deciding how to react to authority figures (i.e., bosses and supervisors) and draw on procedural justice perceptions when deciding how to react to the overall organization.

In general, organization authorities are capable of eliciting positive and negative emotions in others via their adherence to or violation of procedural and interpersonal justice standards (Zapata-Phelan, Colquitt, Scott, & Livingston, 2009). According to Schwarz and Clore (1983), affective states serve informative functions, as individuals utilize their current affective states as information to evaluate how they feel about a given situation. The latter clearly suggests that a fairly treated
individual (who feels positive affect as a result) will tend to evaluate a job as more enjoyable and hence more intrinsically motivating (high intrinsic satisfaction). Contrariwise, an unfairly treated individual (who feels negative affect as a result) will tend to evaluate tasks as less enjoyable and hence less intrinsically motivating (low intrinsic satisfaction).

Based on these theoretical arguments and empirical evidence, we hypothesize that all aspects of organizational justice will have a positive relation to job satisfaction, and specifically to its intrinsic facet.

**Hypothesis 7:** Organizational justice will be positively associated with intrinsic job satisfaction.

In the field of Industrial/Organizational psychology, one of the most researched areas is the relationship between job satisfaction and job performance (Fisher, 2003; Judge, Thoresen, Bono, & Patton, 2001a). The search for a relationship between these two constructs has been characteristically referred to as the “Holy Grail” Landy (1989) of organizational behavior research. The relationship (or lack thereof) has fascinated organizational scholars for decades. Human relationist’s (e.g., Mausner, Herzberg) suggested that improving employee morale should result in higher productivity (“a satisfied worker is a good worker”). Nevertheless, in the 1970s the causal story was reversed. Employees who performed better were expected to be more satisfied if and because they received greater rewards (Lawler & Porter, 1967).

Even though, research evidence is scarce and usually contradictory, in Iaffaldano and Muchinsky (1985) meta-analysis a relationship between job performance and job satisfaction was supported. Across their many studies, they found a mean correlation of .17 (Iaffaldano & Muchinsky, 1985). Moreover, Organ (1988b) found that the job performance and job satisfaction relationship follows the social exchange theory; employees’ performance is giving back to the organization from which they get their satisfaction.
The theoretical rationale for the performance - satisfaction relationship lies in the assumption that performance leads to valued outcomes that are satisfying to individuals (Judge et al., 2001a). Expectancy-based theories of motivation generally support the notion that satisfaction stems from the rewards produced by performance (Vroom, 1964). As Lawler and Porter (1967) noted, “good performance may lead to rewards, which in turn lead to satisfaction” (p. 23).

Finally, the underlying theory of Wanous’s (1974) reciprocal model is that if the satisfaction is extrinsic, then satisfaction leads to performance, but if the satisfaction is intrinsic, then the performance leads to satisfaction. Based on these syllogisms, we argue that job performance (i.e., task performance) will be positively related to intrinsic job satisfaction.

**Hypothesis 8:** Job performance will be positively associated with intrinsic job satisfaction.

### 4.3.5 Determinants of employee commitment and turnover intentions

The relationship between organizational commitment and job satisfaction has been investigated extensively (for some meta-analytic findings refer to: Mathieu & Zajac, 1990; Meyer et al., 2002). Prior research indicates that while it is clear that job satisfaction and commitment are strongly related, there is a long-standing debate in the literature with regard to the directionality between the two concepts. Although it is still controversial, the vast majority of researchers in retailing agree that job satisfaction leads to organizational commitment. For example, Babakus and colleagues (1996) found that job satisfaction has important consequences related to organizational commitment. DeConinck and Bachmann (1994) also found that higher levels of job satisfaction lead to higher levels of organizational commitment. Lastly, Mathieu (1991) and Lance (1991) found that job satisfaction and organizational commitment exert effects on each other, but the effect of job satisfaction on organizational commitment was greater than the effect of organizational
commitment on job satisfaction. Furthermore, the literature indicates that intrinsic satisfaction has a more profound impact on job commitment than extrinsic satisfaction (Lucas, Babakus, & Ingram, 1990). Building on these findings, we argue that intrinsic job satisfaction will have a strong positive association with organizational commitment.

**Hypothesis 9:** Intrinsic job satisfaction will be positively related to organizational commitment.

The most popular and thoroughly validated multidimensional model of organizational commitment is Meyer and Allen’s (1991) three-component model. It encompasses affective, normative, and continuance components, all of which are thought to contribute to employee retention. In a meta-analytic review of the model (Meyer et al., 2002) results showed that all three components display negative associations with intended and actual turnover (-0.17 for affective commitment, -0.16 for normative commitment, and -0.10 for continuance commitment). In addition to these findings, a vast number of studies have reported a significant inverse relationship between organizational commitment and turnover intentions. The work attitudes of job satisfaction and organizational commitment are important in shaping employees’ intentions to stay or leave (Lambert & Hogan, 2009). Organizational commitment, in specific, is the bond between the worker and the organization. Accumulated findings suggest that commitment components exert an influence on membership decisions through different mechanisms. Employees with a strong affective commitment stay with their organization based on the desire to do so, while those with a strong normative commitment stay based on the perceived obligation to do so (Meyer & Herscovitch, 2001). Employees with high commitment are loyal to the organization, share its values, and identify with the goals of the organization (Mowday et al., 1982). Employees tied to the organization have little reason to want to leave. Empirical results have suggested organizational commitment is negatively related to turnover intent. To test whether such a hypothesis is supported in the Greek context we have formulated the following hypothesis.
**Hypothesis 10:** Organizational commitment will be negatively related to turnover intentions.

Meyer and his colleagues (2002) suggested that commitment components are more immediate antecedents of turnover. Nonetheless, we argue that the inclusion of organizational commitment as a mediator in the pay satisfaction-turnover relation should improve our understanding of the mechanisms through which compensation satisfaction influences the withdrawal process. In line with this argument, Williams and Hazer (1986a) identified organizational commitment as a mediator between job satisfaction and turnover intentions. In general, employees who are highly committed to their organization are less likely to leave than employees who are relatively uncommitted. For example, if the individual is satisfied with the working conditions or they have the autonomy they want, the emotional ties and the cost of leaving increases in case of exit.

**Hypothesis 11:** Organizational commitment will partially mediate the relationship between intrinsic job satisfaction and intent to turnover.

Although not having a direct effect, the work environment should have an indirect effect on turnover intent through job satisfaction and organizational commitment. The literature strongly supports the contention that the work environment is salient in helping shape the job satisfaction and organizational commitment of staff. Even though there are many dimensions of the work environment, past research has indicated that organizational fairness is an antecedent of job satisfaction and/or organizational commitment (Lambert & Hogan, 2009).

**Hypothesis 12:** Job satisfaction and organizational commitment will partially mediate the relationship between organizational justice and intent to turnover.
4.4 Achieving job performance by combining hard and soft influence tactics: The moderating role of political skill

Taking into account that individuals usually employ more than one tactics to achieve their desired output, researchers further classify proactive influence tactics into two or more broad meta-categories based on similarities found in these tactics. Kipnis and Schmidt (1988) identify four clusters of influence tactics used by managers. “Shotgun” managers use assertiveness and bargaining to influence targets, “tacticians” rely mostly on reason, “ingratiation” managers use social desirable tactics, and “bystanders” use all tactics in a very low degree. In another study, Kipnis and Schmidt (1985) identify three meta-categories: (a) hard, (b) soft, and (c) rational persuasion.

While the use of soft versus hard influence tactics seems intriguing, researchers have failed to provide much empirical evidence. For example, Case, Dosier, Murkison, and Keys (1988), and Dosier, Case, and Keys (1988) found that combining tactics can be more effective than using single tactics. Nonetheless, their study does not examine how different tactics combinations can influence effectiveness. Falbe and Yulk (1992) filled this gap and found that combined tactics can yield better results. Combining hard with soft tactics, in specific, could guarantee more balanced results in terms of resistance, compliance, and commitment. Recently, Steensma (2007) gives a net utility explanation of why managers prefer the use of specific influence tactics. Among eight distinct influence tactics, soft tactics (e.g., ingratiation, inspirational appeals) were used more frequently than hard ones (e.g., exchanges, pressure).

We argue that employees report higher use of soft tactics for a plead of reasons (van Knippenberg et al., 1999a; van Knippenberg & Steensma, 2003). Using friendly ways as influence means can boost a target’s affective appraisal, thereby enhancing the likelihood of cooperative behavior (Barry & Shapiro, 1992: 1431).

Contrariwise, using coercive and controlling tactics is usually perceived as more hostile and less socially desirable by peers and subordinates. In addition, relying on hard tactics requires a higher level of rationale and justification. As a consequence,
the use of hard tactics can easily undermine the relationship between agent and
target (van Knippenberg & Steensma, 2003: 58). For example, confronting others
face to face, placing strict deadlines, or demanding compliance may be perceived as
overly strict, manipulative or even self-serving; thus increase conflict frequency and
intensity and ultimately result in lower performance, due to low commitment and
motivation.

**Hypothesis 13:** Employees that use hard tactics exhibit higher intragroup
variation in job performance, relative to their mean values of
performance, than employees that rely on soft tactics.

Still, some supervisors argue that being overly friendly and giving more freedom of
choice can sometimes lead to inertia and hence low performance (Yukl & Chavez,
2002). A demanding supervisor that uses pressure and seeks compliance in an
assertive way can trigger feelings of dislike, but at the same time, ensure an average
level of performance. This extra strain placed upon the relationship does not mean
that their use affects general performance in a negative way. The expectation of a
future interaction may often lead to the employment of soft over hard tactics
(Wayne & Ferris, 1990). Therefore, we argue that even though hard tactics can
enforce compliance and occasionally achieve a satisfactory level of performance;
their employment will most likely result in significant variation in performance.

Yulk and Tracey (1992) recognize that the use of pressure tactics (i.e., hard tactics)
will result in target’s compliance, but not in commitment. In addition, some tactics
seem to be incompatible. For instance, when a supervisor uses hard tactics, such as
pressure, to exert downward influence, a simultaneous use of a soft tactic (e.g.,
personal appeals) could create cognitive or psychological inconsistencies.
Nonetheless, Yukl and Chavez (2002) argue that the use of hard tactics may be
necessary to motivate target’s willingness to cooperate. Moreover, Van de Vliert,
Nauta, Giebles, Janssen (1999) present empirical evidence that combining two
apparently different conflict behaviors (i.e., problem solving and forcing) are more
effective than when used in isolation.
**Hypothesis 14:** Employees that combine the use of soft tactics with hard exhibit less intragroup variation than the sole use of hard or soft tactics.

The study of Fable and Yukl (1992) show that combining hard with soft tactics, in specific, can guarantee more balanced results in terms of resistance, compliance, and commitment. Moreover, performance is achieved not only because an employee is committed to the goal, but also because he/she does as expected. In an ideal situation, where all employees know what and to do, soft tactics would seem as the best choice. However, reality has shown that besides motivation and commitment, compliance is necessary as well. For this reason, when an influence attempt has failed, a hard tactic is the most likely to be used as a follow-up tactic (Yukl et al., 1993).

**Hypothesis 15:** The combined use of soft with hard tactics has a positive impact on performance.

Most researchers (e.g. Ahearn et al., 2004; Ferris et al., 2005b) agree that political skill refers to the “ability to effectively understand others at work and to use such knowledge to influence others to act in ways that enhance one’s personal and/or organizational objectives” (Ahearn et al., 2004: 311). As such, political skill reflects an interpersonal style that calibrates behavior to different contextual demands, and does so by employing a manner that is genuine and sincere, inspires confidence and trust, and results in effective influence over others at work (Ferris et al., 2007).

Yulk and Tracey (1992) propose that the effectiveness of an influence tactic depends on five factors: (a) consistency with target’s values and needs, (b) agent’s possession of an appropriate power base, (c) social desirability of the tactic, (d) agent’s skill in using the tactic, and (e) amount of intrinsic resistance by the target due to the nature of the request.

As such, managers need social effectiveness skills in order to successfully interact and influence others (Kolodinsky et al., 2007). Without diminishing the value of
expertise, hard work and general mental ability, many scholars and managers argue that “the difference between those who make it to the top of their organizations and those who do not is political skill” (Mainiero, 1994: 6). In other words, managers need to combine social astuteness with the capacity to adjust their behavior to different demands and contexts to effectively achieve their primary goals (Ferris et al., 2005b).

Individuals high in political skill tend to reflect a sense of calmness, self-confidence, control, and personal security that attracts others, instills in them feelings of comfort, and also contributes to positive affective reactions and trust (Ferris et al., 2008b). A politically skilled individual enjoys the respect and liking of those in their network, resulting in tangible and intangible benefits. Thus, managers high in political skill should be able to harness both soft and hard tactics to motivate subordinate perform (Ferris et al., 2005a).

Socially astute individuals are highly self-aware, capable of interpreting interactions with others. Being able to interpret the desires, goals and intentions of other people can improve social interactions in the workplace as well as help gain customers’ trust, confidence, and so forth (Ferris et al., 2005a). High levels of this particular skill can make employees understand the needs and interests of others and thus become better negotiators. Individuals high in interpersonal influence are considered flexible and adaptive to different contexts and situations. No matter how thorough a political action plan is, without an inclination to influence others, the plan will probably fail. Politically skilled persons are also keen on developing friendships, beneficial alliances and generally networking with others that favors cooperation. Finally, the ability to give the impression that your motives and actions are characterized by honesty, morality, openness and authenticity, while hiding any ulterior motives can help one overcome conflicts, obstacles during trade-offs, and secure compliance and commitment to one’s objectives. These arguments suggest that these skills combined together can become a powerful tool for managing conflict, cooperating effectively with others, issues that will reflect their value on subordinates’ job performance.
**Hypothesis 16:** Political skill positively moderates the effects of the combined use of hard with soft influence tactics on subordinate’s in-role job performance: At high levels of hard x soft tactics, the positive relationship between hard x soft tactics and performance is, in general, stronger for highly politically skilled managers. At low levels of hard x soft, the positive relationship between hard x soft and job performance is, in general, weaker for managers with low political skill.

4.5 Political skill and job performance: The moderating role of justice and politics

In this section will further investigate the relationship between political skill and job performance, whilst also considering the effects that organizational politics and justice bear on this relationship. In summary, drawing from the theoretical bedrock of political skill, we provide evidence of a positive relationship between political skill and job performance and we take existing research one step further, by empirically demonstrating that organizational politics as well as procedural and informational justice moderate this relationship. Figure 9 depicts the hypothesized relationships.

*Figure 9. The moderating role of justice and politics to the relationship between political skill and job performance.*
4.5.1 The Moderating Role of Organizational Politics

Based on the previous syllogisms, it is argued that the impact of an employee’s political skill on job performance will be greatly affected from the organizational political environment. Political skill by definition postulates that those who have them in a high degree will perform well on the job (Ferris et al., 1999). However, when the political workplace climate is perceived as negative, political skill could be effective when used in a self-interest manner. Socially astute persons, with their networking as well as their interpersonal influence abilities will be able to deconstruct the requirements of the “game”, adjust their behavior to fit the climate, and perhaps use friends, allies or form coalitions to achieve their ends.

Nonetheless being able to adjust to any situation does not mean that the person should also be satisfied by that behavior. On the contrary, when the political climate is positive and constructive, the same highly skilled persons will be considered as trustworthy and highly competent by others (Blickle et al., 2008). The latter nurtures cooperation and satisfaction, provides incentives to the individuals, which are all considered as antecedents of job performance (Judge, Bono, Thoresen, & Patton, 2001b; Organ, 1988b). Subsequently, it is expected that in a positive political environment, highly politically skilled persons would perform better compared to a negative one. Therefore, when an employee works in a negative political environment, he or she will meet the case, but in the long run will perform worse, due to low motivation, and emotional distress (Ferris et al., 1996; Perrewe et al., 2000).

In contrast, we argue that employees with low political skill should report worse performance ratings in a positive political environment. For example, an employee, with low political skill, working in a department that supports cooperation among team members, expression of different opinions, and so forth would not be competent to harvest the benefits of working in such a climate. As a result, the employee would receive a performance rating equivalent to his or her real contribution. On the other hand, in a negative political environment, where
manipulation and backstabbing prevails, the same employee is expected to perceive his/her performance to be higher, since performance evaluation is perceived as agreeing with the most influential group. Based on the previous thoughts, we argue that perceptions of organizational politics can moderate the relationship between political skill and job performance.

**Hypothesis 17:** Perceptions of organizational politics negatively moderate the effects of political skill on job performance: At low levels of political skill the positive relationship between political skill and job performance is, in general, weaker for employees working in a positive political climate (i.e., low levels of perceived organizational politics). At high levels of political skill the positive relationship between political skill and job performance is, in general, stronger for employees working in a positive political climate.

4.5.2 The Moderating Role of Procedural Justice

Empirical evidence suggests that different dimensions of organizational justice influence several outcome variables, such as performance, job satisfaction, turnover intentions, absenteeism, stress, organizational commitment, trust, conflicts, and organizational as well as interpersonal counterproductive behaviors (e.g., sabotage, harm, conflicts, harassment, retaliations) (Colquitt et al., 2001; Conlon et al., 2005; Fortin, 2008). However, procedural and informational justice, in specific, seem particularly important during large-scale organizational changes because they place concerns for self-interest and inclusion in high relief (Ellis et al., 2009). McFarlin and Sweeney (1992) suggested that procedural justice is a potent predictor of organizational outcomes.

Procedural justice implies that actions that occur in an organization are fair, in accordance with organizational policies and procedures (Harris et al., 2007a). Moreover, as the uncertainty management theory posits, justice perceptions can help employees to cope with other sources of uncertainty (Lind & van den Bos,
2002). More specifically, the uncertainty management theory considers many possible factors, besides trust, about which individuals may be uncertain. In this context, fairness can reduce uncertainty related to an authority’s trustworthiness (Colquitt et al., 2005). When employees view their work organizations as operating and treating them in procedurally fair ways, they infer that the organization is one that they are proud of and they are respected members of the organization. Respectively, when they view the organization as procedural unfair, they evaluate their inter and intra-organizational standing in negative terms. In appraisal systems for example, we would expect that fair treatment helps to reduce recipient’s uncertainty about their long-term outcomes, thus motivating them to higher performance levels (Roberson & Stewart, 2006: 284).

Consequently, when procedures exist and decisions are implemented in a fair process, ambiguity is reduced. This is in accordance with the findings of Harris, Andrews, and Kacmar (2007a: 142), who argued that “by implementing, communicating, and following clear, unambiguous policies and incentive structures, managers can reduce political perceptions”. Thus, procedural justice is valued because it is part of the process by which employees ensure favorable outcomes (Blader & Tyler, 2005). As such, whenever an employee perceives the organizational environment as unfair, and hence the predictability and favorability of their (long-term) outcomes cannot be ensured, the person is emotionally distressed and dissatisfied that could ultimately lead to feelings of exclusion, whistle-blowing, and a disposition to remain inactive.

Hence, a procedurally just environment can favor the development and deployment of social skills, and particularly those that focus on managing interactions with others in influential ways. In contrast, a lack of just rules and procedures can cast doubt concerning the underlying motives of employing political skill. The latter can give the impression that the employee acts as a “smooth political operator”, leading to feelings of distrust (Valle, 2006).
**Hypothesis 18:** Procedural justice positively moderates the effects of political skill on job performance: At high levels of political skill the positive relationship between political skill and job performance is, in general, stronger for employees working in environments characterized by high levels of procedural justice. At low levels of political skill the positive relationship between political skill and job performance is, in general, weaker for employees working in environments characterized by high levels of procedural justice.

### 4.5.3 The Moderating Role of Informational Justice

Individuals require information from the environment regarding the rationale of the decision making process. Such information is usually representative of supervisor-level communications and has a significant relationship with trust and hence leader-member exchange (Roch & Shanock, 2006). This happens because informational justice is related to perceptions of social exchange with both the supervisor and the organization. Therefore, it is expected that an individual with high political skill would welcome such information that further enhances social astuteness, facilitates the selection of influence tactics, and provides information about key informants. Moreover, informational justice in the workplace is synonymous to feedback, thus it may motivate employees to higher levels of performance in an effort to maintain their status and receive desired outcomes (Roberson & Stewart, 2006). Therefore, political skilled individuals are posited to report higher job performance when information justice is apparent.

On the other hand, when the flow of information is inadequate, individuals will be unable to comprehend and exploit information and thus improve their performance. In organizations where information is not provided or is distorted in the process, members are believed to experience a lack of trust, resulting in low satisfaction and commitment with an analogous impact on performance.
**Hypothesis 19:** Informational justice positively moderates the effects of political skill on job performance: At high levels of political skill the positive relationship between political skill and job performance is, in general, stronger for employees working in environments characterized by high levels of informational justice. At low levels of political skill the positive relationship between political skill and job performance is, in general, weaker for employees working in environments characterized by high levels of informational justice.

### 4.6 Chapter overview

This chapter presented the conceptual framework and subsequent research hypotheses of our thesis. In the first part, we provided the theoretical foundation for the research model, which combined several personal and organizational construct to determine individual and organizational outcomes. For this to happen, a critical analysis of the major findings of the literature review has been undertaken and succinctly presented.

Furthermore, we took a closer look on some relationships and advocated that certain key construct can put a significant leverage. At first, we argued that combining hard with soft influence tactics should generate better and more stable task performance. Then, we provided all theoretical arguments which suggest that political skill moderates the relationship between the joint use of influence tactics and performance. Last, but not least, we looked into the relationship of political skill with performance, by examining possible moderating effects of two specific components of organizational justice – procedural and informational - and perceptions of organizational politics.

In the following chapter, we present the methodological approach used to design a study which would either support or reject these research hypotheses.
Chapter 5
Research Design & Methodology

5.1 Introduction

A common question asked by academics during doctoral defences and a puzzling issue for most newcomer PhD students has to do with the selection of the appropriate research strategy. By a research strategy, we mean the general orientation to the conduct of business research (Bryman & Bell, 2003, p. 25). The strategy for conducting a study can either be based on a single method (i.e., mono-method or mono-strategy) or on a mixture of methods (i.e., multi-strategy). Studies following the mono-method strategy employ either quantitative or qualitative research. In broad terms, qualitative research emphasizes an inductive approach to the relationship between theory and research, in which the main objective lies in the generation of new theories. Contrariwise, quantitative research entails a deductive approach to the relationship between theory and research, in which the accent is placed on the testing of theories. Nonetheless, the distinction between qualitative and quantitative research is often ambiguous, as many studies share characteristics. Especially over the past two decades, the multi-strategy research is gaining ground. Still, its use should not be considered a panacea since such a strategy: a) must be appropriate to the research questions; b) acquires more resources; and c) calls for far too many skills and training that can become a barrier to integration (Bryman & Bell, 2003). This thesis aims to confirm, rather than explore, a hypothesized model. In addition, we are not interested in describing behaviours but rather to generalize
our findings to larger groups of individuals. Consequently, the use of a quantitative approach seems more appropriate.

Once the research strategy has been selected, we need to provide a framework for the collection and analysis of our data (i.e., research design) and decide which research methods to employ. Despite the fact that there are various research designs one can follow (e.g., experimental, cross-sectional, longitudinal, case study), this study focuses on variations in manager's behaviours, therefore more than one case was needed. Moreover, some studies raise some practical considerations. For example, sample size and the statistics employed to process them. Small sample sizes either prohibit the use of advanced statistical techniques (e.g., Structural Equation Modelling), or result in testing restricted theoretical models. Especially, in studies that focus on middle and upper managers, attaining large data sets can be a difficult, time consuming task. In an attempt to overcome this limitation, most researches concentrate on employees from one or two large organizations. Still, such attempts fail to generalize results across different sectors and contexts. Moreover, such studies fail to concentrate on middle managers that are mainly responsible for implementing strategic decisions.

### 5.2 Sample

Of the 1,300 questionnaires distributed to full-time employees, part-time MBA postgraduates and alumni of a leading Greek Business School (AUEB), 545 valid responses were returned indicating a 41.9% response rate. Three hundred and seventy-one of these responses (68.1%) came from part-time postgraduate students and the other 31.9% came from alumni. The average age of the respondents was 35 (SD = 7.65), and nearly 52.5% were women. Regarding the educational orientation of the respondents, 43.3% held a degree in Economics/Business Administration, 14.5% in classical studies, 17.4% in positive sciences, 11.7% in technology and 3.9% in some other field. 67.5% of the managers worked in private companies, 16.9% in pure public organizations and 14.9% in mixed types. From these companies, 52.5%
belonged to the services sector, 15.1% to commerce, 7.7% to the industrial sector, while 23.1% were organizations. The average organizational tenure was 7.64 years (SD = 7.41), while the average work experience was 11.84 years (SD = 7.81). Twenty percent of the employees worked in departments with fewer than 5 persons, 33% with 5-10 persons and 43.3% with more than 10. It is worth noticing that 7.3% of respondents earned less than 1.000 Euros per month, 39.8% between 1.000 and 1.599 Euros, 22.2% between 1.600 and 2.500 Euros and 26% more than 2.500 Euros.

5.3 Procedure

All data used in this study involve respondents’ perceptions gathered by self-reports (i.e., cross-sectional design), despite the problems of relying on these “soft” data (Podsakoff & Schriesheim, 1985). An obvious problem when using self-reports to scale variables of intention, emotions, etc. is that respondents engage in a higher-order cognitive process that requires a high level of abstraction (Podsakoff & Organ, 1986). Another problem arises when the collection of data comes from the same respondents is the attempt from respondents to interpret any correlation(s) among them (i.e., common method variance - variance that is attributable to the measurement method rather than to the constructs the measures represent (Podsakoff, MacKenzie, Lee, & Podsakoff, 2003, p. 879)). Finally, self-reports suffers from what is called “the consistency motif” that refers to respondent’s urge to maintain a consistent line in a series of answers and tend to provide answers according to their perception on how constructs interrelate (i.e., illusory correlations) (Podsakoff & Organ, 1986, p. 534). Besides this problem, many researchers agree that results can be biased due the social desirability effect (i.e., “the tendency on the part of individuals to present themselves in a favourable light, regardless of their true feelings about an issue or topic” (Podsakoff et al., 2003, p. 881).

However, despite the fact that the use of self-reports is heavily criticized from time to time, organizational researchers consider it as the main tool for conducting
empirical research. Podsakoff and Organ (1986) propose some statistical and post-hoc remedies that can abate the damage. Common method variance can be controlled using the Harman’s one-factor test. The rationale of this technique is that if a substantial amount of common method variance is present, either a) a single factor will emerge from the factor analysis (i.e., unrotated solution), or b) one factor will account for the majority of estimated covariance (Podsakoff & Organ, 1986). In addition, social desirability can be eliminated by measuring social desirability (e.g. Crowne & Marlowe, 1960; Strahan & Gerbasi, 1972) and examine its correlation with each of the variables of interest. Then, by partialling out social desirability would remove the common method variance due to social desirability. Moreover, scale trimming can be employed that entails the elimination of items that constitute obvious overlap in what are supposed to be distinct measures (Podsakoff & Organ, 1986, p. 538). Besides these post hoc approaches, there are some procedural techniques that can reduce response bias (Podsakoff et al., 2003; Podsakoff & Organ, 1986). A widely used solution, scale reordering, proposes to reorder items on questionnaires, such that the dependent variable follows the independent one.

Another consideration is associated with the procedure of data collection. Many managers request to ensure their anonymity and confidentiality. From a methodological point of view, this can limit common method variance, but at the same time prevent the use of longitudinal design that could infer causality. Furthermore, many studies are administered in classrooms during training or MBA programmes. However, experience indicates that managers feel reluctant to respond when they feel colleagues monitor them and tend to provide social responsible answers.

Before selecting the proper context for conducting our empirical research, this thesis took into consideration all these limitations and selected the most appropriate context that would generate the most fruitful results. More specifically, one of the objectives of this thesis is to provide empirical evidence from various backgrounds and sectors and generalize results across the population of middle and upper level managers. Simultaneously, acquiring a large dataset will enable us to empirically test
an integrative theoretical model using advance statistical techniques. For this reason, the study was administered in part-time MBA students and alumni at a leading Greek Business School. Part-time MBA students and alumni are considered as managers belonging to top or middle management. They all share a similar educational background, ambitions while they come from different sectors (i.e., private and public companies) and work in various activities (e.g., services, industry).

Employees that volunteered to participate in this research received a 6-page questionnaire accompanied with a cover letter and a prepaid envelop that would be returned sealed to the secretariat, or to the address provided at the envelope, in the following two weeks. The prepaid envelope would enhance participants’ perceptions regarding anonymity and generate a better response rate. The intention of the cover letter was to describe the purpose of the study to respondents, reassure them that the study is anonymous and stress the importance of answering all questions. By this way, common method variance, and specifically social desirability and emotional affectivity, would be reduced, response rate would be improved and missing values would be restrained to a minimum. The complete questionnaire along with the cover letter can be found in Appendix 2.

To further motivate respondents and increase their concentration during the time they dedicate to respond, a web page address was provided promising to provide a report with all descriptive statistics and basic findings. From previous researches conducted in this specific context (e.g. Kapoutsis & Thanos, 2008), the latter was a constant request. Moreover, following suggestions from other studies for maximizing response rate (Roch & Shanock, 2006), we followed up with noncompliant participants twice, once at approximately 7 days and, if needed, again 2 weeks after the initial request. Both follow-ups consisted of a reminder e-mail stressing the importance of this study and significance of their participation.

To assess the questionnaire validity and reduce the effects of common method variance, we employed two types of pilot testing (Schwab, 2005). At first, all measures used in the questionnaire needed to be translated from English and were
further modified to capture the distinctiveness of the Greek context. To ensure face validity, the translated scales were pre-tested on 3 bilingual independent reviewers, following the methodology as described by Oreg (2003, p.681). The reviewers commented on each of the translated items that they found ambiguous or difficult to understand. The pre-test revealed few minor changes that were adopted in the next phase of the pilot test.

The developed questionnaire was administered in two separated groups of 5 part-time MBA students with a 5 day time lag. After discussing with the first group we encompassed their comments into a revised questionnaire. The latter was administered to the second group that made their remarks. Consistent with theory (Schwab, 2005), the results of the pilot test indicated several modifications pertaining to the wording of the items that seemed ambiguous or meaningless in the Greek context.

### 5.4 Measures

Measurement is of vital concern for most studies in social sciences. Measuring elusive, intangible phenomena derived from multiple, evolving theories poses a clear challenge to social science researchers that need to be mindful of measurement procedures and to recognize their pros and cons (DeVellis, 2003). Measurement serves to operationalize the constructs in a theory so that they can be subjected to empirical testing. Even the most intriguing theories are useless if their component constructs are poorly measures (Colquitt & Shaw, 2005, p. 114). However, measures should be subject to evaluation criteria for achieving reliable, valid and replicable results.

Reliability reflects the ability of the results to be repeatable so that they are consistent in various research settings and time periods (Bryman & Bell, 2003). In other words, reliability is closely related to the quality of the measure being used to tap the concepts under investigation. Reliability statistics provide estimates of the
proportion of total reliability in a set of scores that is true or systematic (Schwab, 2005). When considering whether a measure is reliable, three factors are examined. The first examines the stability of the measure. This is usually achieved with the test-retest method (i.e., readministering the same measure to the same sample in different occasions. High correlations between the two occasions indicate a stable measure, even though there are some issues that may bias the result (e.g., contextual changes between the two periods). The most widely used test that is usually reported in all academic papers is internal reliability. When multiple-item measures are used, internal reliability examines the similarity of item scores obtained from a set of cases. With a few exceptions that utilize the split-half method or composite reliability, most researchers use Chronbach's alpha (i.e., average of all possible split-half reliability coefficients). The last type of reliability - interrater – indicates the degree to which a group of observers provide consistent evaluations (Schwab, 2005).

Replicability refers to the clarity of the description of the procedures employed by the researcher (Bryman & Bell, 2003). However, in social sciences, where the research context is constantly changing and the focus is on specific research settings, replicability is difficult to be achieved. Despite these limitations, the ability of measure to replicate results in different circumstances may provide an indication for the measure's validity.

Still, reliability addresses only whether scores are consistent. It does not address whether scores capture a particular construct as defined conceptually (Schwab, 2005). Consequently, validity is a significant criterion, which refers to the integrity of the conclusions. There are four main types of validity and specifically: a) measurement, b) internal, c) external, and d) ecological validity. Construct or measurement validity reflects the ability of a measure to really measure the underlying construct. For example, the degree in which Colquitt's instrument of organizational justice (Colquitt & Shaw, 2005) measures variations of respondent’s perceptions of organizational justice. In order to assure that the measures employed in our study will have construct validity, we reviewed most measurement
instruments for all variables participating in our model and then we selected the ones providing the best reliability and validity. For a researcher to assume causality (i.e., an independent variable to be responsible for the variation in responses of the dependent one) the research design need to be internally valid. However, as in this study, cross-sectional designs preclude any inference on causality since they refer more to relationships rather than influences. Internal validity could be achieved if the researcher follows a longitudinal design. External validity is needed to assure that results of the study can be generalized beyond the specific research context. Last but not least, ecological validity is concerned with the question of whether the finding of the study are applicable to people’s everyday life.

Measurement validity in specific, encompass six types of validity: a) face, b) concurrent, c) predictive, d) construct, e) convergent, and f) discriminant. All these types provide valuable information concerning the measures under investigation. Face and construct – often referred to as translation validity - are usually taken under consideration in the initial phases of measure development since they both focus on whether the operationalization is a good reflection of the construct. The other types – often referred to as criterion-related validity – examine whether the measure of interest is related to another measure judged to be more construct valid. Yet, construct and convergent validity are mostly reported in academic papers since they provide valuable information as to the ability of the construct to relate with others as found in theory and to the ability to predict other measures of the same construct, respectively. Finally, it should be noted that even though reliability and validity are distinguishable, they are related as validity presumes reliability. When a measure lacks internal reliability (i.e., low Chronbach alpha), for instance, it means that it is actually measuring two constructs; hence it cannot be valid.

5.4.1 Organizational justice

Since the mid 70’s there have been several attempts to provide reliable measures of organizational justice (OJ). Most well known scales are epitomized and reviewed by Colquitt and Shaw (2005) and Fields (2002). These measures have been validated in
various contexts, follow different approaches (i.e., direct or indirect) and treat OJ either as a single or multi-facet construct.

Early attempts (Folger, Rosenfield, Grove, & Corkran, 1979) treated OJ as a single item measure using an 11-point scale that examined the relationship between perceptions of fairness and provision of process control among undergraduates. Multi-item measures became more common in the late 80s, when Price and Mueller (1986) developed an indirect approach (Distributive Justice Index), consisting of 6 items using a 5-point scale. This measure focused on the degree to which rewards (e.g., money, recognition) received by hospital employees are perceived to be related to performance inputs (e.g., education, experience). Their scale was used in several different studies reporting a coefficient alpha that ranges from 0.75 to 0.94 (Mansour-Cole & Scott, 1998; McFarlin & Sweeney, 1992; Moorman, 1991). Mansour-Cole and Scott (1998) modified the original scale that resulted in a 5-item scale, to assess the degree of perceived fairness in an employee’s work situation compared with co-workers.

Until then, distributive justice was the only facet of OJ to be measured. One of the first field studies to measure both distributive and procedural justice was Konovsky, Folger and Cropanzano’s study (1987). In their research relating a single event (i.e., pay raise) and OJ on manufacturing plant employees, procedural justice was measured, both directly and indirectly, using 11 items whereas distributive was measured with 4 items. Two years later, Folger and Konovsky (1989) published a more extensive scale consisted of 23-items that encompassed four factors namely feedback (i.e., the effectiveness of the feedback and employee receives - 11 items), planning (i.e., the extent of planning that went into a performance appraisal and pay raise decision - 6 items), resource (i.e., the extent to which an employee had recourse after a after a pay raise decision - 5 items) and observation (i.e., the degree to which a supervisor observed the employee’s performance - 1 item). Coefficient alpha for the full 23-item measure exceeds 0.90 (Lee & Farh, 1999) and for the subscales exceeds 0.85 (Mossholder et al., 1998). A shorter 8-item version of the scale was used by Skarlicki and Folger (1997) to capture the relationship between
Development of organizational justice measures flourished during the 90s. During this decade, different measures were developed to measure the many facets of OJ. The first measure that explicitly separated procedural from interactional justice can be found in Moorman’s (1991) indirect approach. Besides this separation, Moorman placed procedural justice items into a formal decision making system (Colquitt & Shaw, 2005). Moreover, it was the first measure to be subjected to confirmatory factor analysis. Alpha values for the interactive justice subscale ranged from 0.93 to 0.94 (Moorman, 1991; Skarlicki & Folger, 1997) whereas for the procedural subscale was 0.94. A combination of the two subscales (i.e., procedural and interactive) have also been used to assess fairness in treatment of employees and overall procedural justice (Mansour-Cole & Scott, 1998; Skarlicki & Folger, 1997).

During the same period, other researchers developed justice scales to measure specific facets or the construct as a whole (most scales can be found at: Fields, 2002). More specifically, organizational justice was measured by several researchers either as a single construct or a multi-facet one, reporting alpha values that ranged from 0.70 to 0.95 (Grover, 1991; Joy & Witt, 1992; Mansour-Cole & Scott, 1998; Niehoff & Moorman, 1993; Sweeney & McFarlin, 1997).

The most recent indirect measure published in the literature that yields high reliability and construct validity was developed by Colquitt (2001). After performing confirmatory factor analysis on four different models (i.e., overall justice, distributive-procedural, distributive-procedural-interpersonal and distributive-procedural-interpersonal-informational), the four factor structure of OJ generated the most credible results. More specifically, OJ is consisted of four distinct factors, namely distributive (4-items), procedural (7-items), interpersonal (5-items) and informational (4-items). The scale's alpha coefficient in most studies (Ambrose & Schminke, 2003; Colquitt & Shaw, 2005; Roch & Shanock, 2006) ranges from 0.80 to 0.92.
Colquitt’s measure is frequently used in organizational justice research during the last few years (e.g. Ambrose & Schminke, 2003; Roch & Shanock, 2006). Since Colquitt’s measure produces the most credible results regarding reliability and construct validity and integrates all recent theoretical developments and encompasses all four distinct facets of OJ, this thesis will use it in the analyses. Using a 5-point Likert scale (1 = “To a very low degree”; 5 = “To a very high degree”) respondents were asked to report the extent of their agreement on 20 statements (see Appendix 1) describing distributive, procedural, interpersonal and informational justice. Confirmatory factor analysis, however, indicated that 3 items had to be excluded and particular: “Have you been able to express your views and feelings during those procedures?”; “Have you had any influence over the outcome arrived at by those procedures?”; “Has the organization treated you in a polite manner?”.

Perhaps these items were not clearly understood by respondents.

5.4.2 Organizational politics

Building on the foundation laid by organizational politics researchers in the late 1970s and early 1980s, efforts to develop valid and reliable measures of organizational politics began in the late 1980s and early 1990s. The first and most exploited scale to date was developed by Kacmar and Ferris (1992; 1991). More specifically, Ferris and Kacmar (1991) started with a 40-item scale that represented the various elements of perceptions of organizational politics. This scale comprised of five dimensions; “Co-workers”, “General political behaviour”, “Go along to get ahead”, “Pay and promotion” and “Self-serving behaviours”. In additions, Ferris and Kacmar (1992) performed an exploratory factor analysis (i.e., PCA) to a 31-item Perceptions of Politics scale. A three factor solution was found to be the most interpretable resulting in a total of 22 items being retained across the three factors. In particular, supervisor behaviour, co-worker and clique behaviour and organization policies and practices consisted of 12, 6 and 4 items, respectively. Finally, a shortened 12-item scale was proposed encompassing three dimensions, labelled: “General political behavior”, “Going along to get ahead”, and “Pay and promotion” (Kacmar & Ferris, 1991).
Based on concerns regarding the dimensionality and construct validity of the POPS scale, Kacmar and Carlson (1997) produced a refined and revised version of POPS with the use of structural equation modelling techniques (i.e., CFA). This study resulted in the revision of the initial 12-item scale into a 15-item instrument through the removal of several questions and replacement with more representative items. The revised POPS scale comprised of the same 3 factors with each depicting a different angle of organizational politics (Beugre & Liverpool, 2006). “General political behaviour” pertains to issues of process and interactions between individuals. “Going along to get ahead” encompass items that indicate a lack of formal procedures and “Pay and promotion” deals directly with rewards and outcomes.

POPS is the most commonly used instrument for measuring employees’ perceptions of organizational politics. Several studies have used variations of this measure reporting high internal reliability scores (i.e., Cronbach alphas) that ranged from 0.77 to 0.93 (Andrews & Kacmar, 2001; Cropanzano et al., 1997; Ferris et al., 2000a; Harrell-Cook et al., 1999; e.g. Harris et al., 2007c; Kacmar & Carlson, 1997; Treadway, Ferris, Hochwarter, Perrewi, Witt, & Goodman, 2005; Vigoda & Cohen, 2002). Still, another way to measure the political climate of the organization is the scale of Kipnis, Schmidt and Wilkinson (1980) as modified by Christiansen and his colleagues (1997). However, the scale’s length (18 items) as well as its many dimensions (i.e., 6 factors) implies higher methodological costs. Alternatively, the scale of Zanzi and O’Neill (2001) (sanctioned and non-sanctioned political tactics) could be employed, but the results would be debatable since sanctioned political tactics are considered by many (e.g. Ferris et al., 2000a) as non-political actions.

For this study we used 5 items (see Appendix 1) from the revised version of POPS (Kacmar & Carlson, 1997). We excluded all items from the subscale “Pay and Promotion Policies” as it overlapped with several items from the organizational justice measure. Participants responded each question using a 5-point Likert scale (1 = to a very low degree, 5 = to a very high degree) depending on the degree the believed these statement were describing their organization.
5.4.3 Influence tactics

The operationalization of political behavior is achieved by measuring the use of various influence tactics. Early attempts (Bachman, Smith, & Slesinger, 1966; e.g. Spekman, 1979; Student, 1968; Thamhain & Gemmill, 1974) to measure facets of interpersonal influence have used French’s and Raven’s (French & Raven, 1959) five-fold typology of social power (i.e., reward, coercive, legitimate, referent, expert power). However, a close examination of their measures reveals a lack of content validity, while they do not report any reliability values (Podsakoff & Schriesheim, 1985). More recently, Nesler, Quigley, Aguinis, Suk-Jae and Tedeschi (Nesler, Quigley, Aguinis, Suk-Jae, & Tedeschi, 1999) developed a measure that can be used as a global scale. Coefficient alpha values for this scale ranged from 0.72 to 0.92 for the subscales and 0.77 for the global measure. Drea, Bruner, and Hensel (1993) reviewed 25 scales of the operationalization of power and found that while the reliabilities were generally adequate (i.e., in all studies coefficient alpha was above 0.62) there was a respectful amount of variability depending upon the type of power measured and the particular scale employed (Drea et al., 1993, p. 74).

A milestone in research concerning influence tactics is Kipnis’ (1980) taxonomy that initially encompassed eight dimensions – subscales: (1) assertiveness, (2) ingratiation, (3) upward appeal, (4) blocking, (5) sanctions, (6) coalitions, (7) rationality and (8) exchange. Building on the work of Kipnis’ and colleagues (1980) into organizational influence tactics, several variations have been developed (e.g. Yukl, Chavez, & Seifert, 2005; Yukl & Falbe, 1990; Yukl, Kim, & Falbe, 1996; Yukl & Tracey, 1992). Still, Kipnis’ taxonomy, after its refinement (Hochwarter et al., 2000; Schriesheim & Hinkin, 1990) remains the most extensively used taxonomy when measuring influence tactics. From this taxonomy, political behavior can be further categorized. Falbe and Yukl (1992) stress the benefits of combining political tactics instead of using sole components while others (Kipnis & Schmidt, 1985; Raven, Schwarzwald, & Koslowsky, 1998) combine subscales to create two or three factors (e.g., (a) hard, (b) soft, and (c) rational persuasion. In addition, Valle and Perrewe (2000) grouped Kipnis’ taxonomy into proactive and reactive political behavior.
In this study used 3 subscales from the Schriesheim’s Hinkin’s (1990) measure, and specifically a) Rational influence (reason), b) Assertiveness (hard tactics), c) Ingratiation (soft tactics). In past researches, coefficient alpha values typically range from 0.78 to 0.80 for rationality, 0.73 to 0.76 for assertiveness, and 0.73 to 0.84 for ingratiation (Schriesheim & Hinkin, 1990). Each subscale comprises of 3 items (see Appendix 1) and a 5-point Likert scale was selected. Respondents were asked to report the degree to which they attempted to influence others at work using these four broad categories of interpersonal influence.

5.4.4 Political skill

The original 6-item inventory developed by Ferris and his colleagues (refer to Kolodinsky, Hochwarter, & Ferris, 2004; Perrewe, Zellars, Ferris, Rossi, Kacmar, & Ralston, 2004) treated political skill as an interpersonal style or execution construct of the influence behaviours in organizations (Ferris, Perrewe, Anthony, & Gilmore, 2000b). This construct represented a special type of social competency and astuteness influenced by several types of social skill (i.e., social intelligence, emotional intelligence, ego-resiliency, social self-efficacy, self-monitoring, tacit knowledge and practical intelligence). Studies that used the 6-item measure reported a coefficient alpha internal consistency reliability estimate ranging from 0.71 to 0.95 (Ahearn et al., 2004; Ferris et al., 2005b; Harris et al., 2007b; Kolodinsky et al., 2004; Perrewe et al., 2004).

As the organizational politics literature progressed, with particular reference to that segment relating to political skill, the need to include several important aspects in a representative political skill construct surfaced. More specifically, Ferris and his colleagues (2005b) generated a total of 40 items to representatively reflect the key areas identified to best characterize the political skill construct. After retaining those with the highest item-to-total correlation (i.e., cut-off item-to-total correlation > 0.40) they conducted a principal component analysis with oblique rotation (i.e., cut-off factor loading > 0.35). This process resulted in a set of 18 items that met the criteria for item retention that were later subjected to principal axis factoring to
assess the factor structure of the PSI. The item-to-total correlations for these 18 items ranged from 0.42 to 0.71. In addition, their total score did not correlate significantly with Social Desirability Scale total score. The internal consistency reliability estimate for the 18 items was 0.90. Of the 18 items, only 3 items stemmed from the original 6-item measure.

Principal Component Analysis generated a 4-factor solution that explained 63% of the total variance. These factors were: a) networking ability (six items, $\alpha = 0.87$), b) apparent sincerity (three items, $\alpha = 0.81$), c) social astuteness (five items, $\alpha = 0.79$) and d) interpersonal influence (four items, $\alpha = 0.78$). The four factor structure of the PSI was further validated using confirmatory factor analysis revealing a superior fit compared to the other three models (i.e., one – two and three factor model).

In this study, managers’ political skill was measured using the 18-item PSI (Political Skill Inventory; see Appendix 1), developed by Ferris, Treadway, Kolodinsky, Hochwarter, Kacmar, Douglas and Frink (2005b). Respondents provided their answers on a scale 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree). Confirmatory Factor Analysis, however, indicated that 2 items failed to load satisfactorily on their corresponding factors, and as such they had to be excluded. These items are: “I try to show a genuine interest in other people”; “I spend a lot of time and effort at work networking with others”.

5.4.5 Task performance

The most cited scale to measure in-role (task) performance was developed by Williams and Anderson (1991). It included 7-items and it is considered as a very reliable producing credible results across various studies. In Anderson and Williams’s initial study, a coefficient alpha value of 0.91 is reported, whereas in a very recent study (Zapata-Phelan et al., 2009) the alpha value reported was 0.83.

In this study, we used three items, adopted from their scale using a 5-point Likert scale. Respondents were asked to assess the degree to which their subordinates
“Adequately completed their assigned duties”, “Performed tasks that are expected of them” and “Met formal performance requirements of the job”.

5.4.6 Job satisfaction

Researchers often argue that “once an individual enters an organization, an assessment of his or her job satisfaction is the most useful piece of information for predicting outcomes of relevance to the functioning of that organization” (Weiss, 2002, p. 188). However, measuring job satisfaction adequately can be a strenuous task. The measures used in practice range from single questions to more sophisticated instruments. In the areas of management and psychology, findings are often conflicting and equivocal. One of the reasons for such differences in results can be attributed to the differences in the measurement methods employed. Measures of job satisfaction are usually chosen a priori without being subjected to rigorous validation procedures. This indicates the difficulty in providing an instrument that will be reliable, valid and flexible in its use.

The first contemporary measure of job satisfaction, developed by Hoppock in 1935, was a four-item measure consisted of questions related to various aspects of satisfaction with a person’s job. The coefficient alpha values ranged from 0.76 to 0.98 (Nichols, Stahl, & Manley, 1978). Since Hoppock’s systematic attempt, researchers have developed various measures of job satisfaction based on the different definition of the construct. Another commonly used measure to assess overall job satisfaction - Overall Job Satisfaction - developed by Brayfield and Rothe (1951), consists of 18 items that describes satisfaction when all aspects of the job are considered. In their study, Brayfield and Rothe (1951) empirically showed that Hoppocks’ scale was highly correlated to the Overall Job Satisfaction (i.e., r = 0.997). Coefficient alpha values for the entire measure are above 0.86 (e.g. Moorman, 1993; Shore, Newton, & Thornton, 1990). Shorter versions of the Overall Job Satisfaction has also been used reporting an coefficient alpha value that ranges from 0.88 to 0.90 (e.g. Agho, Price, & Mueller, 1992; Judge et al., 1998).
Nevertheless, the most commonly used facet scales for measuring job satisfaction are the Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire (MSQ) (Weiss, Dawis, England, & Lofquist, 1967) and the Job Descriptive Index (JDI) (Smith, Kendall, & Hulin, 1969). In particular, the MSQ can be found in two versions, the long and the short form. The long form consists of 100 questions that make up 20 subscales measuring satisfaction, such as recognition, security, variety, achievement, etc. Twenty of these items comprise the short form of the MSQ that provide an assessment of the overall job satisfaction. Still, the 20 items can be further separated into a 12-item subscale for intrinsic satisfaction and an 8-item subscale measuring extrinsic satisfaction. Intrinsic Job Satisfaction covers people’s affective reactions to job features that are integral to the work itself (e.g., variety, autonomy). Respectively, extrinsic Job Satisfaction covers features external to the work itself (e.g., pay, the way organization is managed). In comparison with the 100 item measure, the 20 item version of the MSQ has been widely used in several studies (Scandura & Lankau, 1997; Scarpello & Vandenbergen, 1992; Wang, 2007; Welbourne, Eggerth, Hartley, Andrew, & Sanchez, 2007; Wong, Hui, & Law, 1998). In all these studies, MSQ as an overall job satisfaction measure reported coefficient alpha values that range from 0.80 to 0.91. For the intrinsic subscale coefficient alpha values range from 0.82 to 0.85, whereas the extrinsic subscale ranges from 0.70 to 0.77 (Davy, Kinicki, & Scheck, 1997; Wong et al., 1998).

The JDI was originally developed by Smith, Kendall, and Hulin (1969). It uses 72 items, scored dichotomously (i.e., Yes or No depending on whether the item describes the feature in question) to assess five facets of job satisfaction, namely the work itself, pay, promotions, supervision, and co-workers. The ratings with the above facets can be combined to provide an overall measure of job satisfaction (Fields, 2002). Roznowski (1989, p. 813) argued that there was gradual erosion of item quality or item drift of the original JDI and provided an updated version. This version recognized changes in work atmosphere, job content and work technology. Coefficient alpha values for the five factors range from 0.75 to 0.92 (Fields, 2002; Wanberg, 1995).
Global and facet measures are two general ways to measure satisfaction originated from the distinction of bottom-up versus top-down theories (Ho & Au, 2006). The first (e.g., Brayfield-Rothe Job Satisfaction Scale) argue that individuals are predisposed to experience and thus behave in positive or negative ways. The latter (e.g., Job Descriptive Index, Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire) suggests that satisfaction stems from a summation of pleasant and unpleasant experiences. Most researchers adopt the facet approach to measure satisfaction because a) specific facet satisfaction measures may better reflect changes in relevant situational factors, whereas b) a global measure may more likely reflect individual differences than responses to specific items (Fields, 2002; Witt & Nye, 1992).

Still, both approaches suffer from several methodological problems (Ho & Au, 2006). On one hand, facet measures assume that the whole is equal to the sum of its parts, while their inner dimensions are only moderately correlated. Therefore, an improper aggregation would bias the corresponding results. Moreover, sophisticated measures contain too many items for practical use (e.g., JDI-72 items, MSQ-100 items). Consequently, their use can be time-consuming and difficult to administer along with other variables in a single questionnaire. On the other hand, global scales (e.g., Brayfield-Rothe Job Satisfaction Scale) measures job satisfaction from either an affective or cognitive point of view (Moorman, 1993). Affective satisfaction refers to an overall positive emotional evaluation of the job and focuses on whether the job evokes a good mood and positive feelings. However, satisfaction with one’s job involves a cognitive, judgemental process as well. Cognitive satisfaction involves a rational evaluation of the job, such as outcomes, conditions, or opportunities (Moorman, 1993).

Measures of job satisfaction may assess overall satisfaction with a job or satisfaction with several aspects of the job, such as pay, promotion, working conditions, etc. Sometimes, facet measures are averaged together for an overall measure of satisfaction (e.g. Wright & Bonett, 1992).
For this thesis we used 5 items, adopted from the intrinsic subscale of the short version of the MSQ (see Appendix 1). Despite the fact that both MSQ and JDI are cognitive in nature but with some affective influence present (Fields, 2002, p. 3), we selected the MSQ because it is more brief compared to the JDI. Responses were given on 5-point Likert scale, where 1 stands for “Very dissatisfied” and 5 to “Very satisfied”.

5.4.7 Organizational commitment

Similar to job satisfaction, measures of organizational commitment are as diverse as the definitions. Before presenting some of the most widely used measures, there are three conceptual issues to be addressed (Fields, 2002). First of all, any measure of organizational commitment needs to clarify the basis of what constitutes the construct. As shown in previous chapters, OC can be described in an affective way (i.e., the psychological attachment of the employee), or normative (i.e., employee’s approval of mission and values of the organizations), or continuance (i.e., compliance through rewards and punishments) (Meyer & Allen, 1997). A second consideration deals with the manifestation of commitment – attitude or behaviour. Most instruments reflect the employee’s belief and attitudes concerning their relationship with the organization, not their behaviours. The third measurement consideration focuses on the various constituencies to which an employee might be committed (e.g., supervisor, executives, board of directors). Consequently, there are validated measures for commitment to a profession, organization, etc.

The most commonly used measure is the Organizational Commitment Questionnaire (OCQ), developed by Mowday, Steers, and Porter (1979). Before its development, measures of organizational commitment consisted of from two to four items (e.g., Buchanan II, 1974; Gouldner, 1960; Hrebinak & Alutto, 1972). Still, these instruments failed to report adequate validity or reliability (Mowday et al., 1979, p. 227). The OCQ consists of 15 items that describe global organizational commitment. However, even though it is a measure focusing on the commitment of the employee to the organization, it can be used to examine professional commitment or job
commitment with some minor changes to the wording of each item. Mowday, Steers, and Porter (1979, p 226) argued that commitment should have at least three underlying theoretical components: “a) a strong belief in and acceptance of the organization’s goals and values; b) a willingness to exert considerable effort on behalf of the organization, and c) a strong desire to maintain membership in the organization”. However, the OCQ is unidimensional and the majority of researchers using this scale have reported or used a single-factor solution (Hochwarter, Perrewe, Ferris, & Guercio, 1999; Kacmar, Carlson, & Brymer, 1999b). The coefficient alpha values ranges from 0.81 to 0.93 (Fields, 2002). Besides its original 15 item version, the OCQ can be used with only 9 items, by using only the positively worded items (Mowday et al., 1979, p. 229). Coefficient alpha values ranges from 0.74 to 0.92 (Fields, 2002). In addition, in studies that used confirmatory factor analysis (CFA), OCQ showed that discriminate validity with job satisfaction (Mathieu & Farr, 1991).

Meyer and Allen (1997) developed a measure based on the three-component model of commitment (i.e., affective, continuance, normative). This three-facet instrument originally contained 24 items, but was later revised to hold 18 items. In its revised version, each subscale encompassed 6 items to be answered using a 7-point Likert scale. The internal consistency, as represented by the coefficient alpha values, for the affective, continuance and normative commitment scale, respectively, are 0.85, 0.79, and 0.73 (Meyer & Allen, 1997). In other studies (Fields, 2002), coefficient alpha values ranged from 0.77 to 0.88 for affective commitment, from 0.65 to 0.86 for normative commitment, and from 0.69 to 0.84 for continuance commitment. The temporal stability (test-retest reliability) suggests that commitment is in a state of flux in the first employment years but begins to stabilize later on (e.g., above 5 years of tenure) (Meyer & Allen, 1997, p. 120). Moreover, several studies (Fields, 2002) support the three factor structure of the commitment measure and provide further evidence of construct validity.

Despite these widely used measures, two other instruments are worth noticing. First, Cook’s and Wall’s (1980) 9-item measure that describes an employee’s overall organizational commitment. However, the items can be grouped to form subscales
for organizational identification, organizational involvement, and organizational loyalty with 3 items each. Coefficient alpha values ranges from 0.71 to 0.87 (Fields, 2002). The second is more recent and was developed by Balfour and Wechsler (1996). It uses 9 items to measure three facets of global organizational commitment, and specifically: a) affiliation (i.e., 3 items), b) identification (3 items), and c) exchange (3 items) commitment. Coefficient alpha values for the three subscales ranges from 0.73 to 0.81 for affiliation commitment, from 0.69 to 0.72 for identification commitment and from 0.74 to 0.83 for exchange commitment (Balfour & Barton, 1996; Kacmar et al., 1999b).

However, in this thesis organizational commitment was defined as a strong desire to remain a member of a particular organization, give opportunities to change jobs. Shelby, Chonk, and Wood (1985) designed an instrument for measuring the degree of loyalty marketers would have to an organization, give attractive incentives to change jobs, such as higher pay, more autonomy, and better working environment. Additionally, the confirmatory factor analysis they performed indicated a unidimensional factor structure and high degree of internal consistency (coefficient alpha = 0.85). In a recent study (Jones, Chonko, Rangarajan, & Roberts, 2007) the composite reliability of the construct was 0.90.

We believe that the aforementioned measure outperforms all other in this specific context, since the survey was administered to managers that participated or still participate in MBA part-time programs. The latter insinuates that they are all highly ambitious and in their first steps of their careers. As such, 3 items (reverse scaled), adopted from Shelby, Chonk, and Wood were used (see Appendix 1). Participants provided their answers using a 5-point Likert scale (1 = “to a very low degree”, 5 = “to a very high degree”).

5.4.8 Turnover intentions

As highlighted in the literature review chapter, in the past decades, employee turnover has been of interest for both academics and practitioners across a wide
array of disciplines since the pressure for financial performance has elevated the
decisive role of human capital (Lambert, Lynne Hogan, & Barton, 2001). In response
to this demand, Mobley and colleagues (Mobley, Horner, & Hollingsworth, 1978)
presented a four-step causal process to explain the phenomenon of withdrawal.
Nevertheless, the task of measuring turnover is bound to some methodological
considerations.

We defined employee turnover as their volunteered decision to quit from the
organization (i.e., external turnover). Therefore, turnover can only be measured
using objective data proceed from company records. However, in surveys that use
cross sectional data, this is practically impossible. For example, a researcher
interested in voluntary turnover of employees would be obliged to follow a
longitudinal design or, failing that, to assess the factors associated with employee’s
departure, retrospectively (Dalton et al., 1999). While the former seems
methodologically challenging and even though the researcher could access 500
employees, perhaps a no more than 25 individuals would actually leave the
organizational after some time. Hence, the researcher would end up with a very
small dataset, precluding any knowledge extraction. In addition, most studies have a
cross sectional design, therefore obtaining turnover rates is meaningless, except if
we used overall turnover rates of the employee’s organizational as a predictor of the
individual’s satisfaction, commitment or performance. Notwithstanding, many
studies that focus on behavioural or psychological variables, anonymity is necessary;
thus obtaining company records is impossible. Moreover, actual turnover is
measured dichotomously (i.e., (1) stayers; (2) leavers) and as a result it can limit the
use of advanced statistical techniques.

In our case, the focus group of this study was employees from middle and upper
management, with high education level of various disciplines, working in enterprises
and organizations of diverse sectors, activities and sizes. The latter, along with the
methodological constraints described previously led us to rely on a “surrogate
variable”. The use of “intent to leave” variable would allow us to include all these
employees as respondents and use a scale measure as well. Nonetheless, the
surrogate variable should be highly correlated with its actual behavioural counterpart. In two highly cited meta-analyses, actual turnover to quit intention correlations have been reported at 0.31 (Hom, Caranikas-Walker, Prussia, & Griffeth, 1992) and 0.52 (Tett & Meyer, 1993a).

Consequently, instead of using actual turnover, we will measure intention to turnover. However, the turnover literature lacks formally validated scales to represent turnover cognitions (Sager, Griffeth, & Hom, 1998, p. 259). Stemming from the model of Medley and colleagues (1978), most researchers using measures that capture two or three steps of his process model and specifically: a) thinking of quitting, b) intention to search, and c) intention to quit/stay. In the same study, actual turnover was found to be influenced only by intention to quit in a statistical significant degree. Despite the fact that different studies claim to have used different measures for intent to quit, the similarities are overwhelming. For example, Schaubroeck, Cotton, and Jennings (1989) used a scale comprising of two items (i.e., “I often think about quitting”; “I will probably look for a new job in the next year”), reporting a coefficient alpha value of 0.70. Other studies that used this measure report higher alpha values that reach 0.89 (Clugston, 2000). One of the few validated measures was developed by Bluedorn (1982b). In particular, he used three items from the Staying or Leaving Index (SLI) (Bluedorn, 1982a) asking respondents to rate their chances of quitting the company three, six, and twelve months from now. At the same time, placed separately, he used three reversed items to rate their chances of staying for the same time frames. Coefficient alpha values for this scale ranged from 0.85 to 0.95. Other studies that have used this measure also report high reliability scores (Jones et al., 2007). Several other studies (Kacmar et al., 1999b; Lee & Mowday, 1987; Mobley et al., 1978) have used measures of quit intention in an ad hoc basis following the same rationale.

For this thesis, we initially selected three items from Bluedorn’s (1982a) validated measure and specifically: (1) “It is likely that I will actively look for a new job this year”, (2) “I often think about quitting” (3) “I will probably look for a new job in the year”. Studies that used this measure report reliability scores above 0.77 (Jones et
al., 2007; Martin, 1979; Masterson et al., 2000). However, pilot testing indicated the resemblance of the third item as to the first. Therefore, to avoid repetition, the item was deleted from the final questionnaire.

5.5 Measurement model: Confirmatory Factor Analysis (CFA)

To test our hypothesized model we used a two step modeling approach following Anderson and Gerbing’s (1988) recommendations. At first, we performed a confirmatory factor model, which specified the relations for the observed measures to their posited underlying constructs while the latter are allowed to intercorrelate freely. Next, we examined the structural model relationships.

The measurement model provides a confirmatory assessment of convergent and discriminant validity. Given the acceptable level of convergent and discriminant validity, the test of the structural model offers a confirmatory assessment of nomological validity.

In order to assess the appropriateness of the measurement model, we performed a confirmatory factor analysis using Maximum Likelihood estimates with AMOS structural equations software using the 545 cases for all constructs of the research model that are measured with multiple items.

The hypothesized model (see Figure 8) consists of 10 latent factors namely: political skill, soft tactics, hard tactics, rational influence, in-role job performance, organizational justice, organizational politics, satisfaction with job, organizational commitment, and intent to turnover. The total number of estimated parameters is 108, therefore the sample size should exceed the rule of thumb 5:1 sample size to estimated parameter ratio (Bentler & Chou, 1987).
5.6 Measurement model: Unidimensionality, reliability and validity

The analysis of the measurement model involved several tests needed to establish measurement model fit. These tests were used to assess the unidimensionality of the items used to represent each construct, as well as the reliability and the validity of the measurement model. Furthermore, to check for possible common method bias among responses, the Harman’s one-factor test was performed. As such, this exploratory factor analytic procedure, without factor rotation, verified that more than one single factor emerged.

5.6.1 Goodness of fit measures

After estimating a CFA the next step is to assess how well the model matches the observed data. A large class of omnibus tests exists for determining overall model fit. The goodness of fit represents the degree to which the actual covariance matrix is predicted by the estimated model. Goodness of fit measures include absolute fit measures, incremental fit measures and parsimonious fit measures. SEM has no single statistical test that best describes the “strength” of the model’s predictions. Therefore, several goodness of fit measures have been developed to assess the model, so as to minimize the likelihood of making a Type I (i.e., the probability of assuming that there is a difference or association between two or more variables when there is none) or Type II (i.e., the probability of assuming that there is no difference or association between two or more variables when there is none) error.

Many researchers rely on the chi-square test, which represents the discrepancy between the sample and fitted covariance matrices (Hu & Bentler, 1998). In particular, the corresponding probability value associated with chi-square represents the likelihood of obtaining a chi-square that exceeds the chi-square value when the null hypothesis (i.e., model rejection) is true (Byrne, 2001). Thus, the higher the probability associated with chi-square, the closer is the fit between the hypothesized model and perfect fit. Still, the chi-square is considered sensitive to sample size
(Hair, Anderson, Tatham, & Black, 1998b), since for large sample, the chi-square usually finds significant differences resulting in large chi-square values. A significant chi-square indicates lack of satisfactory model fit. Chi-square test is strongly influenced by sample size. A poor fit based on a small sample size may result in a non-significant chi-square, whereas a good fit based on a large sample size will result in a significant chi-square.

The Normed Chi-Square fit index is 1.880, less than the conservative 2 cutoff level, suggesting a good fit for the measurement model (Kline, 2004).

For this reason, other indexes have been proposed as approaches to the model fitting process. More specifically, Bentler's Comparative Fit Index (CFI) and the Bentler-Bonnett Non-normed Fit Index (NNFI or TLI) are popular fit measures that compare the existing model with the independence model. NNFI is preferred over NFI (Normed Fit Index) because the latter is sensitive to sample size and model misspecifications (Hu & Bentler, 1998; Hu & Bentler, 1999; Marsh, Balla, & McDonald, 1988). In our proposed measurement model, NNFI (TLI – Tucker Lewis Index) is 0.930 that exceeds the 0.90 cut-off criterion (Byrne, 2001; Hu & Bentler, 1999; Kline, 2004), while CFI is 0.930, which is above 0.90 and very close to 0.95, indicating a very good fit to the data. Furthermore, the RMSEA (Root Mean Square Error of Approximation) is 0.040 (0.037-0.044), which is considerably less than the threshold 0.06 suggested by Hu and Bentler (1995) indicating a superior fit. Moreover, the value of Bollen’s IIF (Incremental Fit Index) is 0.930, which is also above the 0.90 cut-off criterion (Bagozzi & Yi, 1988). Moreover, the value derived from Hoetler’s test is above the benchmark of 200 (Byrne, 2001) indicating that the model adequately represents the sample data.

Overall, the goodness of fit measures indicates the unidimensionality of the measurement model.
5.6.2 Reliability

To assess reliability, many researchers use coefficient alpha as the internal consistency measure. Still, coefficient alpha as a reliability estimate rests on certain assumptions, which are hardly ever completely met. For example, Cronbach alpha assumes that all factor loadings are equal (i.e., parallelity assumption), it tends to underestimate reliability (Raykov, 1997) and it is usually interpretable as a lower bound of reliability.

Composite reliability, which is preferred in SEM, provides a more accurate measure of overall reliability of a collection of heterogeneous, but similar items. Composite reliability is an index that estimates the extent to which a set of latent construct indicators share in their measurement of a construct, whilst the average variance extracted is the amount of common variance among latent construct indicators (Hair, Anderson, Tatham, & Black, 1998a).

Table 4 presents coefficient (Cronbach) alpha values, as well as composite reliability values for all measures used in the measurement model. Cronbach alpha values ranges from 0.702 to 0.856, while composite reliability from 0.724 to 0.861. As such, all constructs are above the 0.70 cut-off benchmark (Kline, 2004). All these tests support the reliability of the measurement model.

5.6.3 Convergent Validity

In general, validity tests how well a construct is defined by the measures and therefore it helps in assessing that the used measures are actually measuring what they claim to measure and not something else. Convergent validity is the actual general agreement among ratings, gathered independently of one another, where measures should be theoretically related. High correlations between the test scores would be evidence of a convergent validity. That is, we look at the patterns of intercorrelations among our measures. Correlations between theoretically similar
measures should be "high" while correlations between theoretically dissimilar measures should be "low".

Convergent validity can be judged by examining the significance of the factor loadings and the average extracted variance. The factor loadings for all of the items were above 0.60, with the exception of “Apparent sincerity”, one of the facets of political skill. From Table 4, we see that all constructs of our model had an AVE (Average Variance Extracted) above the 0.50 cut-off point (Bagozzi & Yi, 1988), except political skill (AVE = 0.40). However, this value is close to the cut-off point while, the path loadings are considerably significant, thus we consider that we achieved convergent validity. Other researchers, propose that SMCs (Square Multiple Correlations) be equal to or greater than 0.50 along with pattern coefficients equal to or greater than 0.70.

5.6.4 Discriminant Validity

Discriminant validity analysis refers to testing statistically whether two constructs differ. In this study we assessed discriminant validity using 3 different strategies. First, discriminant validity was established between each pair of latent variables by constraining the correlation to unity (1, restricted model) and then testing (using chi-square difference test) whether the model is significantly worse fitting than the one where the correlation is freely estimated (unrestricted model). Since the constrained model had a significantly worse fitting (chi-square(df) = 5272.2(559)) compared to the unconstrained model (chi-square(df) = 1046.9(515)) we can reject the hypothesis that the correlation is 1.0, thus providing some evidence for discriminant validity (Bagozzi & Phillips, 1982; Torkzadeh, Koufteros, & Pflughoeft, 2003).

Additionally, we computed the confidence interval of the paired correlation as depicted in our measurement model. In AMOS, confidence intervals for the paired correlations can be computed by using the bootstrap method (i.e., 2000 bootstrap samples; bootstrap ADF; Bias-corrected confidence intervals at 90%). The confidence interval for the correlation between each pair of critical dimensions does not
produce a value of 1; hence discriminant validity is supported (Bagozzi & Phillips, 1982; Torkzadeh et al., 2003).

Finally, we used Fornell and Larcker’s (1981) criterion, where discriminant validity is shown if the average variance extracted (AVE) is greater than the square of the construct’s correlations with the other factors. In all cases, the AVE was much higher than the squared correlation, thus providing further evidence of discriminant validity.
Figure 10. Confirmatory factor analysis for hypothesized model.
Table 4. Measurement model results.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Items</th>
<th>λ¹ (Cronbach α)</th>
<th>CR²</th>
<th>AVE³</th>
<th>Correlation Confidence Interval (Lower-Upper) ⁴</th>
<th>Goodness of Fit Statistics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Organizational Justice</td>
<td>PJ</td>
<td>0.776*** (21.87)</td>
<td>0.824</td>
<td>0.543</td>
<td>OJ-PC -0.661 : -0.541</td>
<td>Chi-square (df) = 1118.31 (595), p &lt; 0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>DJ</td>
<td>0.606*** (15.13)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>OJ-PSK 0.228 : 0.411</td>
<td>Normed Chi-square = 1.880</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>INTJ</td>
<td>0.719*** (19.32)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>OJ-S 0.006 : 0.192</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>INFJ</td>
<td>0.827*** (24.24)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>OJ-H -0.045 : 0.145</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>OJ-RI 0.004 : 0.175</td>
<td>NFI = 0.861</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political Climate</td>
<td>POPS2</td>
<td>0.630*** (15.99)</td>
<td>0.861</td>
<td>0.556</td>
<td>OJ-JP -0.661 : -0.541</td>
<td>NNFI(TLI) = 0.930</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(PC)</td>
<td>POPS6</td>
<td>0.781*** (21.92)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>OJ-JB 0.520 : 0.654</td>
<td>IFI = 0.930</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>POPS7</td>
<td>0.681*** (17.81)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>OJ-OC 0.247 : 0.428</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>POPS8</td>
<td>0.816*** (23.67)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>OJ-IT -0.481 : -0.283</td>
<td>RFI = 0.861</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>POPS9</td>
<td>0.803*** (23.04)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>PC-PSK -0.163 : 0.028</td>
<td>RMSEA = 0.40 (C.I. = 0.037-0.044)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political Skill</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>0.624*** (14.86)</td>
<td>0.724</td>
<td>0.401</td>
<td>PC-RI -0.070 : 0.106</td>
<td>Hoelter (p &lt; 0.01) = 330</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(PSK)</td>
<td>SA</td>
<td>0.722*** (18.44)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>PC-JP -0.025 : 0.155</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>II</td>
<td>0.685*** (16.96)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>PC-JB -0.504 : -0.368</td>
<td>Null Model chi-square (df) = 8049.34 (595)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>AS</td>
<td>0.474*** (10.56)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>PC-OC -0.454 : -0.271</td>
<td>Null Model AIC = 8189.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soft Influence Tactics</td>
<td>PB1</td>
<td>0.764*** (19.48)</td>
<td>0.782</td>
<td>0.545</td>
<td>PSK-S 0.163 : 0.360</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(S)</td>
<td>PB2</td>
<td>0.756*** (19.20)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>PSK-H 0.020 : 0.261</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PB3</td>
<td>0.692*** (16.74)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>PSK-RI 0.282 : 0.473</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hard Influence Tactics</td>
<td>PB10</td>
<td>0.678*** (16.97)</td>
<td>0.795</td>
<td>0.567</td>
<td>PSK-JB 0.210 : 0.382</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(H)</td>
<td>PB11</td>
<td>0.850*** (24.12)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>PSK-OC -0.227 : -0.010</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variables</td>
<td>Items</td>
<td>$\lambda^1$</td>
<td>$CR^2$ (Cronbach a)</td>
<td>AVE$^3$</td>
<td>Correlation Confidence Interval (Lower-Upper)$^4$</td>
<td>Goodness of Fit Statistics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rational Influence Tactics (RI)</td>
<td>PB12</td>
<td>0.720*** (18.53)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>PSK-IT : -0.063 : 0.142</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PB7</td>
<td>0.727*** (19.06)</td>
<td>0.825 (0.822)</td>
<td>0.611</td>
<td>S-H : -0.110 : 0.085</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PB8</td>
<td>0.810*** (22.59)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>S-RI : 0.155 : 0.332</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PB9</td>
<td>0.806*** (22.47)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>S-JP : 0.204 : 0.430</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>JP1</td>
<td>0.742*** (19.28)</td>
<td>0.811 (0.808)</td>
<td>0.589</td>
<td>S-JB : -0.058 : 0.121</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>JP3</td>
<td>0.776*** (20.76)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>S-OC : -0.166 : 0.017</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>JP4</td>
<td>0.784*** (21.13)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>S-IT : -0.048 : 0.150</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intrinsic Job Satisfaction (JB)</td>
<td>JB2</td>
<td>0.696*** (18.33)</td>
<td>0.855 (0.871)</td>
<td>0.543</td>
<td>H-JB : 0.036 : 0.211</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>JB12</td>
<td>0.788*** (22.19)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>H-OC : -0.182 : 0.020</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>JB13</td>
<td>0.662*** (16.95)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>RI-IT : -0.159 : 0.031</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>JB14</td>
<td>0.819*** (23.63)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>RI-JP : 0.281 : 0.456</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>JB15</td>
<td>0.707*** (18.73)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>RI-JB : 0.072 : 0.228</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational Commitment (OC)</td>
<td>OC1*</td>
<td>0.630*** (15.43)</td>
<td>0.726 (0.711)</td>
<td>0.472</td>
<td>RI-OC : -0.124 : 0.063</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>OC2*</td>
<td>0.792*** (21.65)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>RI-IT : -0.159 : 0.031</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>OC4*</td>
<td>0.626*** (15.15)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>JP-JB : 0.150 : 0.331</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intent to Turnover (IT)</td>
<td>TURN1</td>
<td>0.798*** (21.90)</td>
<td>0.747 (0.743)</td>
<td>0.596</td>
<td>JP-JC : 0.165 : 0.033</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TURN2</td>
<td>0.745*** (19.55)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>JP-JT : -0.023 : 0.172</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: $\lambda^1$ = Standardized regression weights (t-values that indicate robustness are shown in parentheses; ***p<0.001; $CR^2$=reliability (Cronbach’s alpha values are shown in parentheses; AVE$^3$=average variance extracted; NFI= normed fit index; NNFI=non-normed fit index/TLI=Tucker Lewis Index; RFI=relative fit index; IFI= incremental fit index; CFI= comparative fit index; RMSEA=root mean square of error approximation; Correlation Confidence Interval$^4$=derived by bootstrapping 2000 samples.
5.6.5 Organizational Justice as a second order latent factor

In this study, we also tested whether political skill and organizational justice can form higher order constructs comprising of four factors each. Nonetheless, in the hypothesized model, both constructs were measured as first order constructs by using the mean for each facet.

More specifically, organizational justice was measured using initially an 18-item scale that measures four facets of organizational justice, namely procedural, distributive, interpersonal, and informational. However, the fact that organizational justice comprises of four distinct factors has received some validation, but not in the Greek context. For this reason, before checking the possibility of having a second order factor, we need to provide further evidence concerning its validity as a four-factor construct.

Using AMOS, we developed nested models, hypothesizing 4 distinct models. The first model hypothesized our perception that organizational justice is comprised by four factors. The second considered interpersonal and informational justice as a one common factor. The third model treated procedural, interpersonal and informational justice as a single factor. Lastly, the fourth model hypothesized a single factor solution. For selecting the best solution we used the chi-square difference and the most common goodness of fit indexes (i.e., NNFI, CFI, and RMSEA) and AIC. The following table presents the results:
Table 5. Validation of the four-factor model of organizational justice

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Competing Models</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>$\chi^2$ (df)</th>
<th>NNFI</th>
<th>CFI</th>
<th>RMSEA</th>
<th>AIC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Four Factors</td>
<td>Distributive, Procedural, Interpersonal &amp; Informational</td>
<td>325.78(_{113})</td>
<td>0.961</td>
<td>0.968</td>
<td>0.059</td>
<td>439.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Three Factors</td>
<td>Interpersonal and Informational as a common factor</td>
<td>325.78(_{116})</td>
<td>0.813</td>
<td>0.841</td>
<td>0.129</td>
<td>1268.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two Factors</td>
<td>Procedural, Interpersonal and Informational as a common factor</td>
<td>325.78(_{116})</td>
<td>0.727</td>
<td>0.767</td>
<td>0.155</td>
<td>1747.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single Factor</td>
<td></td>
<td>325.78(_{119})</td>
<td>0.591</td>
<td>0.642</td>
<td>0.190</td>
<td>2565.71</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: * The chi-square for all competing models where significant at p < 0.001

After providing validation that organizational justice comprises of four distinct factors, we checked whether these four first order factors are related to the same second order factor (see Figure 11), namely, organizational justice.
The confirmatory factor analysis with four first order factor (procedural, distributive, interpersonal, and informational) and the second order factor (organizational justice) was calculated and the results are shown in Table 6. In same table, we report the results for the unidimensionality, reliability, and validity assessment tests, following the similar procedures as in the measurement hypothesized model.
Table 6. CFA results for organizational justice as a second order construct.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Latent Factors</th>
<th>First order $\lambda^1$ (t-values)</th>
<th>Second order $\lambda^2$ (t-values)</th>
<th>CR$^2$ (AVE$^3$)</th>
<th>Fit Indices</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Procedural</td>
<td>0.518-0.844 (11.214-16.524)</td>
<td>0.782 (11.529)</td>
<td>0.863 (0.562)</td>
<td>$\chi^2$ (df)=325.851 (115) Normed $\chi^2$=2.833</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distributive</td>
<td>0.404-0.893 (9.261-22.668)</td>
<td>0.648 (11.825)</td>
<td>0.863 (0.628)</td>
<td>NNFI=0.962 CFI=0.968 RMSEA=0.058</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interpersonal</td>
<td>0.694-0.934 (16.176-21.893)</td>
<td>0.724 (12.510)</td>
<td>0.903 (0.703)</td>
<td>0.848 (0.583)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Informational</td>
<td>0.736-0.918 (10.496-11.259)</td>
<td>0.888 (8.823)</td>
<td>0.917 (0.736)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: $\lambda^1$= Standardized regression weights (t-values that indicate robustness are shown in parentheses; ***p<0.001; CR$^2$=reliability (Cronbach’s alpha values are shown in parentheses; AVE$^3$=average variance extracted.

Results confirm that organizational justice consists of these four dimensions. Because all facets of organizational justice are valid and reliable, we can use their mean values in our hypothesized model.

5.6.6 Political skill as a second order latent factor

Political skill is a newly developed construct that its four factor structure has been recently validated. Still, we will provide further validation and test whether we can use it as a second order construct. The measure was initially suggested to encompass four facets of political skill, namely social astuteness, interpersonal influence, networking ability, and apparent sincerity. At first, we compare 4 competing models to show that the construct is a four factor construct, following the same methodology as with organizational justice.

Using AMOS, we developed nested models, hypothesizing 4 distinct models. The first model hypothesized our perception that political skill is comprised by four factors. The second considered social astuteness and interpersonal influence as a one
common factor. The last model treated political skill as a single factor. For selecting the best solution we used the chi-square difference and the most common goodness of fit indexes (i.e., NNFI, CFI, and RMSEA) and AIC. The following table presents the results:

Table 7. Validation of the four-factor model of political skill.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Competing Models</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>$\chi^2$ ($df$) *</th>
<th>NNFI</th>
<th>CFI</th>
<th>RMSEA</th>
<th>AIC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Four Factors</td>
<td>Networking ability, social astuteness, interpersonal influence, apparent sincerity</td>
<td>399.182 (98)</td>
<td>0.891</td>
<td>0.911</td>
<td>0.075</td>
<td>507.182</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Three Factors</td>
<td>Networking ability, social astuteness+interpersonal influence, apparent sincerity</td>
<td>654.540 (101)</td>
<td>0.805</td>
<td>0.836</td>
<td>0.100</td>
<td>756.540</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single Factor</td>
<td></td>
<td>1289.731 (104)</td>
<td>0.594</td>
<td>0.648</td>
<td>0.145</td>
<td>1385.731</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: * The chi-square for all competing models where significant at $p < 0.001$

After providing validation that political skill comprises of four distinct factors, we test to verify that these four first order factors are related to the same second order factor (see Figure 12), namely, political skill.
Figure 12. Measurement model for political skill as a second order factor.
The confirmatory factor analysis with four first order factor (networking ability, social astuteness, interpersonal influence, and apparent sincerity) and the second order factor (political skill) was calculated and the results are shown in Table 8. In the same table, we report the results for the unidimensional, reliability, and validity assessment tests, following the similar procedures as in the measurement hypothesized model.

Table 8. CFA results for political skill as a second order construct.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Latent Factors</th>
<th>First order $\lambda^1$ (t-values)</th>
<th>Second order $\lambda^1$ (t-values)</th>
<th>CR$^2$ (AVE$^3$)</th>
<th>Fit Indices</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Networking ability</td>
<td>0.691-0.788 (14.509-16.048)</td>
<td>0.666 (9.521)</td>
<td>0.850 (0.500)</td>
<td>$\chi^2$ (df)=433.068 (100) Normed $\chi^2=4.331$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Astuteness</td>
<td>0.610-0.642 (8.010-8.844)</td>
<td>0.815 (6.665)</td>
<td>0.763 (0.391)</td>
<td>NNFI=0.881 CFI=0.901 RMSEA=0.078</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interpersonal Influence</td>
<td>0.691-0.783 (10.364-10.849)</td>
<td>0.795 (7.500)</td>
<td>0.832 (0.554)</td>
<td>0.795 (0.554)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apparent Sincerity</td>
<td>0.736-0.918 (12.484-13.327)</td>
<td>0.509 (7.658)</td>
<td>0.761 (0.618)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: $\lambda^1$ = Standardized regression weights (t-values that indicate robustness are shown in parentheses; ***p<0.001; CR$^2$=reliability (Cronbach’s alpha values are shown in parentheses; AVE$^3$=average variance extracted

Results confirm that political skill consists of these four dimensions. Because all its facets are valid and reliable, in our hypothesized model we treated them as first order construct by using the mean value for each facet.

5.7 Chapter's overview

This chapter presented the research methods, procedures and measures used for conducting the empirical part of this thesis. In particular, after justifying our decision for a quantitative approach, we described the sample used and analyzed the
procedures used minimize the problems associated with common method variance. Next, we provided an extensive review of the measures used in order to tap the constructs under investigation. For each construct of our model, we critically reviewed several alternative measures before selecting the most appropriate for this context.

Moreover, following Anderson and Gerbing’s (1988) two step approach three measurement models were analyzed covering all the first and second order latent constructs that were measured with the use of multiple indicators. The confirmatory analysis involved the assessment of unidimensionality, reliability, and validity of the measurement model and was assessed for all latent constructs, yielding very satisfactory values that confirmed the adequacy of the measurement model.
6.1 Introduction

As mentioned in the previous chapter, we followed the a two step modeling approach. For this reason, we developed the measurement model and tested how good fitted the data, the reliability of the constructs as well as their validity (convergent and discriminant). Since the measurement model showed a very good fit, reliability and validity, this chapter presents the results of the Structural Equation Modeling (SEM) path analysis.

SEM, or covariance structure modeling, is a general modeling technique widely used in the behavioral sciences, which is particularly suitable for estimating causal models with multiple independent and dependent constructs (i.e., when dependent variables become independent in subsequent dependence relationships) (Hair et al., 1998b). This method has the ability to examine the structure of relationships amongst multiple variables expressed through a series of equations, similar to a series of multiple regression equations. These equations depict all relationships amongst the dependent and independent variables involved in the analysis in one model.

Maximum Likelihood (ML) estimation techniques used in SEM require that the data follow a normal distribution. For this reason, we conducted normality tests to determine if the data should be considered as normal. Even though, the skewness and kurtosis values for normality are far below the recommended cut-off value of 2,
the Mardia’s coefficient greatly exceeds the recommended cut-off value of 3; hence we have indications of significant departure from normality. For this reason, we performed a bootstrapped so that we can use the Bollen-Stine bootstrap p value as well as the confidence intervals of the regression estimates (i.e., to check if they contain the zero value).

All covariances and most variances in the model have fixed according to their estimating values without jeopardizing the overall fit, following the recommendation of MacKenzie, Podsakoff, and Jarvis (2005) and MacCallum and Browne (1993).

6.2 Structural model analyses

This section presents the results of our hypothesized model. Table 9 reports the means and standard deviations for all of the measures, as well as the inter-factor correlations matrix for the study variables.
Table 9. Descriptive statistics: Mean, standard deviation, and correlations.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>S.D.</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Political Skill</td>
<td>3.747</td>
<td>0.462</td>
<td>0.213</td>
<td>0.069</td>
<td>0.061</td>
<td>0.073</td>
<td>0.068</td>
<td>0.086</td>
<td>-0.023</td>
<td>0.088</td>
<td>-0.026</td>
<td>0.010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Hard Influence Tactics</td>
<td>3.026</td>
<td>0.887</td>
<td>0.168***</td>
<td>0.788</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>0.093</td>
<td>0.078</td>
<td>0.036</td>
<td>0.056</td>
<td>0.071</td>
<td>-0.051</td>
<td>0.040</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Soft Influence Tactics</td>
<td>3.762</td>
<td>0.595</td>
<td>0.222***</td>
<td>0.003</td>
<td>0.354</td>
<td>0.064</td>
<td>0.093</td>
<td>0.035</td>
<td>0.039</td>
<td>0.014</td>
<td>-0.033</td>
<td>0.033</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Rational Influence Tactics</td>
<td>4.346</td>
<td>0.534</td>
<td>0.297***</td>
<td>0.196***</td>
<td>0.200***</td>
<td>0.285</td>
<td>0.097</td>
<td>0.033</td>
<td>0.011</td>
<td>0.044</td>
<td>-0.003</td>
<td>-0.039</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Job Performance</td>
<td>4.045</td>
<td>0.588</td>
<td>0.251***</td>
<td>0.150***</td>
<td>0.265***</td>
<td>0.309***</td>
<td>0.345</td>
<td>0.015</td>
<td>0.035</td>
<td>0.068</td>
<td>-0.026</td>
<td>0.039</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Organizational Justice</td>
<td>3.121</td>
<td>0.697</td>
<td>0.268***</td>
<td>0.058</td>
<td>0.085*</td>
<td>0.089*</td>
<td>0.038</td>
<td>0.485</td>
<td>-0.333</td>
<td>0.269</td>
<td>0.196</td>
<td>-0.285</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Political Climate</td>
<td>3.124</td>
<td>0.933</td>
<td>-0.053</td>
<td>0.068</td>
<td>0.070</td>
<td>0.022</td>
<td>0.065</td>
<td>-0.513***</td>
<td>0.870</td>
<td>-0.265</td>
<td>-0.268</td>
<td>0.396</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Intrinsic Job</td>
<td>3.308</td>
<td>0.696</td>
<td>0.272***</td>
<td>0.115**</td>
<td>0.034</td>
<td>0.119**</td>
<td>0.165***</td>
<td>0.554***</td>
<td>-0.408***</td>
<td>0.485</td>
<td>0.237</td>
<td>-0.272</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Commitment</td>
<td>2.704</td>
<td>0.953</td>
<td>-0.060</td>
<td>-0.060</td>
<td>-0.059</td>
<td>-0.005</td>
<td>-0.047</td>
<td>0.295***</td>
<td>-0.302***</td>
<td>0.357***</td>
<td>0.908</td>
<td>-0.648</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Intent to</td>
<td>2.560</td>
<td>1.294</td>
<td>0.017</td>
<td>0.035</td>
<td>0.043</td>
<td>-0.056</td>
<td>0.051</td>
<td>-0.316***</td>
<td>0.328***</td>
<td>-0.302***</td>
<td>-0.525***</td>
<td>1.675</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: *p<0.05; **p<0.01; ***p<0.001; N=545
The covariances are depicted in the upper triangle of the table (grey area) while correlations in the lower triangle (white area).
Figure 13. Hypothesized SEM Model.

CMIN=1164.594
NPAR=73
NNFI=.923
CFI=.923
RMSEA=.042
Table 10. Structural model results (direct, indirect, and total effects).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Effect from</th>
<th>To</th>
<th>Direct effects(^1)</th>
<th>Indirect effects(^2)</th>
<th>Total effects(^3)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Political Skill</td>
<td>Soft influence tactics</td>
<td>0.278 **</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.278 **</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political Skill</td>
<td>Hard influence tactics</td>
<td>0.138 *</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.138 *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political Skill</td>
<td>Rational influence tactics</td>
<td>0.391 **</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.391 **</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political Skill</td>
<td>Job performance</td>
<td>0.158 *</td>
<td>0.175 **</td>
<td>0.333 **</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political Skill</td>
<td>Intrinsic job satisfaction</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.072 **</td>
<td>0.072 **</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political Skill</td>
<td>Organizational commitment</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.034 **</td>
<td>0.034 **</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political Skill</td>
<td>Intent to turnover</td>
<td></td>
<td>-0.024 **</td>
<td>-0.024 **</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soft influence tactics</td>
<td>Job performance</td>
<td>0.221 **</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.221 **</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soft influence tactics</td>
<td>Intrinsic job satisfaction</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.048 **</td>
<td>0.048 **</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soft influence tactics</td>
<td>Organizational commitment</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.022 **</td>
<td>0.022 **</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soft influence tactics</td>
<td>Intent to turnover</td>
<td></td>
<td>-0.016 **</td>
<td>-0.016 **</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hard influence tactics</td>
<td>Job performance</td>
<td>0.120 *</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.120 *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hard influence tactics</td>
<td>Intrinsic job satisfaction</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.026 **</td>
<td>0.026 **</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hard influence tactics</td>
<td>Organizational commitment</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.012 **</td>
<td>0.012 **</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hard influence tactics</td>
<td>Intent to turnover</td>
<td></td>
<td>-0.024 **</td>
<td>-0.024 **</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rational influence tactics</td>
<td>Job performance</td>
<td>0.248 **</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.248 **</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rational influence tactics</td>
<td>Intrinsic job satisfaction</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.054 **</td>
<td>0.054 **</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rational influence tactics</td>
<td>Organizational commitment</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.025 **</td>
<td>0.025 **</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rational influence tactics</td>
<td>Intent to turnover</td>
<td></td>
<td>-0.018 **</td>
<td>-0.018 **</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job performance</td>
<td>Intrinsic job satisfaction</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.217 **</td>
<td>0.217 **</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job performance</td>
<td>Organizational commitment</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.101 **</td>
<td>0.101 **</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job performance</td>
<td>Intent to turnover</td>
<td></td>
<td>-0.072 **</td>
<td>-0.072 **</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational justice</td>
<td>Political Climate</td>
<td></td>
<td>-0.601 **</td>
<td>-0.601 **</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational justice</td>
<td>Intrinsic job satisfaction</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.471 **</td>
<td>0.107 **</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational justice</td>
<td>Organizational commitment</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.269 **</td>
<td>0.269 **</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational justice</td>
<td>Intent to turnover</td>
<td></td>
<td>-0.193 **</td>
<td>-0.193 **</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political Climate</td>
<td>Intrinsic job satisfaction</td>
<td></td>
<td>-0.178 **</td>
<td>-0.178 **</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effect from</td>
<td>To</td>
<td>Direct effects</td>
<td>Indirect effects</td>
<td>Total effects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political Climate</td>
<td>Organizational commitment</td>
<td>-0.083 **</td>
<td>-0.083 **</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political Climate</td>
<td>Intent to turnover</td>
<td>0.059 *</td>
<td>0.059 *</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intrinsic job satisfaction</td>
<td>Organizational commitment</td>
<td>0.466 **</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intrinsic job satisfaction</td>
<td>Intent to turnover</td>
<td>-0.333 **</td>
<td>-0.333 **</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational commitment</td>
<td>Intent to turnover</td>
<td>-0.715 **</td>
<td>-0.715 **</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Goodness of fit statistics

χ² = 1164.594 (Bollen-Stine p=), Nparameters = 73, Normed χ² = 1.967, NFI = 0.855, NNFI = 0.923, RFI = 0.855, IFI = 0.923, CFI = 0.923, PNFI = 0.851, PCFI = 0.919, NCP = 572.594, RMSEA = 0.042 (C.I. = 0.039 – 0.046), AIC = 1310.594, Hoetler (0.01) = 316

Notes: ¹Standardized structural coefficients, *p < 0.05, **p < 0.01.
PNFI= Parsimony NFI; PCFI= Parsimony CFI; AIC= Akaike information criterion; NCP = Noncentrality parameter; C.I. = Confidence Intervals; Hoetler = Hoetler's Critical N.
Table 11. Model statistics against theoretical model.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model description</th>
<th>$\chi^2$ (df)</th>
<th>$\Delta \chi^2$</th>
<th>Normed $\chi^2$</th>
<th>RMSEA</th>
<th>NFI</th>
<th>NNFI</th>
<th>CFI</th>
<th>AIC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Hypothesized</td>
<td>1164.594 (545)</td>
<td>1.967</td>
<td>0.042</td>
<td>0.855</td>
<td>0.923</td>
<td>0.923</td>
<td>1310.594</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. With direct relations of organizational politics to organizational commitment, intent to turnover / without the direct relations of job satisfaction to org. commitment / without the direct relations of org. commitment to intent to turnover.</td>
<td>1318.673 (592)</td>
<td>154.079</td>
<td>2.227</td>
<td>0.048</td>
<td>0.836</td>
<td>0.902</td>
<td>0.903</td>
<td>1464.673</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. With direct relations of organizational justice to organizational commitment and intent to turnover / with direct relations of organizational politics to organizational commitment and intent to turnover / without the direct relation of organizational justice to politics.</td>
<td>1319.842 (589)</td>
<td>155.248</td>
<td>2.241</td>
<td>0.048</td>
<td>0.836</td>
<td>0.901</td>
<td>0.902</td>
<td>1471.842</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Without a direct relation of political skill to job performance / without a direct relation of organizational justice to intrinsic job satisfaction.</td>
<td>1243.353 (594)</td>
<td>78.759</td>
<td>2.093</td>
<td>0.045</td>
<td>0.846</td>
<td>0.913</td>
<td>0.913</td>
<td>1385.353</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Without direct relations of organizational justice to org. commitment / with direct relations of organizational politics to soft, hard, and rational influence tactics.</td>
<td>1226.218 (590)</td>
<td>61.624</td>
<td>2.078</td>
<td>0.045</td>
<td>0.848</td>
<td>0.914</td>
<td>0.915</td>
<td>1376.218</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Without direct relations of organizational</td>
<td>1380.127 (592)</td>
<td>215.533</td>
<td>2.331</td>
<td>0.049</td>
<td>0.829</td>
<td>0.894</td>
<td>0.894</td>
<td>1526.127</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Model description</td>
<td>$\chi^2$ (df)</td>
<td>$\Delta\chi^2$</td>
<td>Normed $\chi^2$</td>
<td>RMSEA</td>
<td>NFI</td>
<td>NNFI</td>
<td>CFI</td>
<td>AIC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>justice and politics to intrinsic job satisfaction / with direct relations of justice and politics to job performance.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Without direct relations of commitment to intent to turnover / without direct relations of job satisfaction to commitment / with direct relations of job performance to commitment and turnover.</td>
<td>1488.514 (592)</td>
<td>323.92</td>
<td>2.514</td>
<td>0.053</td>
<td>0.815</td>
<td>0.879</td>
<td>0.880</td>
<td>1634.514</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: N=545
The structural model shown in Figure 13 was tested using AMOS, using the maximum likelihood estimation method with bootstrap sampling procedure.

As with the CFA, several fit indices were also computed. In specific, the value of Bentler-Bonnet NFI (NNFI), which is a better index compared to NFI that is affected by sample size, exceeds the 0.90 cut-off point. Moreover, Bentler’s comparative index (CFI) is close to 0.95, showing a very good fit to the data. The normed chi-square is below the strict benchmark of 2, while other researchers accept values below 5.

Nonetheless, to further verify that the proposed model best accounts for the covariances among model’s constructs, we developed alternative models to compete our hypothesized. Results of this competing models strategy are presented in Table 11. The hypothesized model was compared with six alternative models in an attempt to demonstrate that no better fitting model exists.

Apart from the various fit indices to compare with the alternative models, we used two more indices (i.e., NCP – Noncentrality Index and ECVI – Expected Validation Index). These two indices are less affected by sample size, they have no cut-off benchmarks, but merely serve as means of comparison of different models. The model scoring the lowest value signifies the most adequate model. Finally, we computed the chi-square differences as well.

In all cases the hypothesized model yields better results compared to the alternative models, since it outperforms in all fit indices. The latter suggests that the hypothesized model fits the data better than the alternative models tested.

### 6.3 Further Analyses

Further analysis of the involved also the examination of mediating effects. Such a procedure is particularly useful when multiple indicators for the latent variable are under consideration.
6.3.1 Mediation Analysis

As organizational behavior researchers have sought to move beyond descriptions and predictions of phenomena to explanations for how situational and personal factors influence organizational outcomes, statistical test of mediation processes have become increasingly important to the scientific status of the field (Wood, Goodman, Beckmann, & Cook, 2008, p. 270). Although there are differences in terminology relative to mediation (e.g. MacKinnon, Fairchild, & Fritz, 2007; MacKinnon, Lockwood, Hoffman, West, & Sheets, 2002), as well as the criteria for claims of mediation (e.g. Baron & Kenny, 1986), there is general consensus that mediation occurs when the effect of one variable on another can be explained by a third, intervening variable (e.g. Baron & Kenny, 1986; James & Brett, 1984; Wood et al., 2008). Mediation models explain “how” an effect occurred by hypothesizing a causal sequence. The basic mediation model is a causal sequence in which the independent variable (X) causes the mediator (M) which in turn causes the dependent variable (Y), therefore explaining how X had its’ effect on Y.

MacKinnon, Lockwood, Hoffman, West, and Sheets identified and compared 14 methods for testing mediation, intervening variables, and indirect effects. In their study, they classified methods into three broad categories: (a) the causal steps approach, (b) differences in coefficients, and (c) products of coefficients. In a recent review, Wood et al. provide a summary of these three approaches and associated statistical test, limitations, as well as some descriptive information concerning their use over the past 25 years in five leading organization studies journals (i.e., AMJ, JAP, OBHD, PPsych, and ASQ). In brief, the most widely used approach (52% of the total citations) is Baron’s and Kenny’s (1986), who specify four conditions for mediation.

In this study, we selected the causal steps approach, since researchers recommend that structural equation modeling (SEM) should be used, rather than regression analysis, when multiple indicators for each latent variable are under consideration to address measurement unreliability (Baron & Kenny, 1986), when the conditions for CFA have been met (i.e., accurate specification of causal order and direction, no unmeasured variables, truly linear relationships, and stationary relationships) (James & Brett, 1984), and when a model
includes latent constructs. In addition, when testing complex models that encompass multiple mediators and dependent variables, SEM outperforms since it can reduce the risk of incorrect inferences for effects that may be because of multicollinearity within sets of variables or a chance finding among multiple tests, which increase when complex models are broken down into simple models and tested separately (Wood et al., 2008, p. 279).

Following the recommendations proposed by James, Mulaik, and Brett (2006), we decide to determine whether each hypothesized mediation relationship deriving from our proposed model is complete or partial. Since complete mediation in psychology is not that frequent due to theoretical ambiguity (Baron & Kenny, 1986), we chose the partial mediation model. To support partial mediation, all relationships between the dependent variable and the independent, as well as between the independent and the mediator / mediator and dependent should be statistically significant. In addition, we used bootstrapping – BC bootstrapping with ADF – since our data lacked multivariate normality while at the same time our proposed model involved multiple mediation (Preacher & Hayes, 2008). Table 10 presents the indirect effects for our hypothesized model.

If we examine the standardized parameter estimates (both direct and indirect), we see that besides the direct effect of political skill on job performance, it also encompasses an indirect effect ($\beta = 0.175, p<0.01$), through the use of influence tactics. Politically skilled individuals are able not only to select the best tactics to achieve their goals but also to implement the tactic efficiently. Hence, besides the direct relation of political skill to job performance as we had hypothesized, there is an indirect effect through the effective use of the appropriate influence tactics. The latter is a case of multiple mediation effects, since we have three distinct mediators, namely hard, soft and rational influence tactics. As a consequence, the total effect of political skill on job performance is the sum of both direct and indirect effect ($\beta = 0.333, p<0.01$).

In the previous section, we gave support to the hypothesis that intrinsically motivated employees facilitate the development of commitment towards the organization. Nonetheless, besides this direct effect, job performance indirectly facilitates the
development of organizational commitment. As a result, the total effect, direct and indirect from both job performance and satisfaction is 0.567 (p<0.01).

Furthermore, results support the hypothesis that organizational justice affects job satisfaction. Yet, besides this direct relationship, organizational justice has an indirect effect through organizational politics. As mentioned in the literature review chapter, justice and politics may seem close, but they are distinct constructs. Employees evaluate organizations as fair based on procedures, distribution of resources, and the way procedures are communicated in terms of behaviors, time and accuracy. In contrast, politics refers to the way means are used to achieve goals and they usually have a negative meaning that lead to disruptive effects. Justice and politics are surely strong antecedents of employee’s job satisfaction. Still, justice affects the workplace political climate and hence causes a greater impact on satisfaction. As shown in Table 10, the total effect of justice on job satisfaction is 0.578 (p<0.01), while the indirect effect is 0.107 (p<0.01).

Moreover, we see that organizational justice has an indirect effect on organizational commitment and turnover intentions. Organizational justice perceptions ensures stability and create a positive environment for employees to show their talents, improve their skills and work in an autonomous way that favors initiatives. As such, intrinsic satisfaction can make them self-confident and proud about their workplace, which ultimately leads to commitment. Consequently, the indirect effect of organizational justice on commitment is 0.269 (p<0.01).

Finally, we see that job satisfaction has an indirect effect (β = -0.333, p<0.01) on intent to turnover. A dissatisfied employee will not be committed to the organization and subsequently think about exiting.

6.3.2 Achieving job performance by combining hard and soft influence tactics: The moderating role of political skill

To test our moderation effect, we selected a subsample from our total 545 cases. The criterion upon selection was that managers should work at private companies employing
more than 50 employees. Participants were required to have tenure of at least 1 year at the particular company, while also having more than 5 subordinates in their sphere of influence. Based on the previous conditions, the subset used for this analysis was dropped to 275.

Moreover, especially for this analysis, we controlled for possible effects by including various relevant control variables. Specifically, we controlled for gender and work experience that may influence the selection of tactics and the development of political skill. In addition, to reduce affectivity bias (Podsakoff et al., 2003) that may appear due to self-reports, we controlled for two personality traits, extraversion and neuroticism. Extraversion ($\alpha = 0.724$) and neuroticism ($\alpha = 0.774$), were measured using 6 and 8 items, respectively, selected from the Big Five Inventory (John, Donahue, Ernst, & Kentle, 1991). Respondents provided answers that describe their psychological state on a scale from 1, “In a very low degree”, to 5, “In a very high degree”.

One-way ANOVA Analysis Results

To examine the task performance variation of different proactive influence tactics, we divided the sample into four groups based on “median cut-off” criterion: (1) the combined group (i.e., soft and hard tactics combined), (2) soft only, (3) hard only, and (4) the “bystanders” consisting of the remaining respondents that reported a simultaneous low use of both hard and soft tactics.

The results of the analysis presented in Table 12 show that the sole use of hard tactics demonstrates the highest standard deviation/mean task performance ratio (i.e., 0.224), followed by the soft only group and bystanders, with the combined group scoring the lowest ratio (i.e., 0.154).
Table 12. ANOVA for Task Performance.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>S.D.</th>
<th>S.D./Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(1) the combined group</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>4.124</td>
<td>0.466</td>
<td>0.113</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2) soft only</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>3.841</td>
<td>0.682</td>
<td>0.178</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3) hard only</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>3.854</td>
<td>0.864</td>
<td>0.224</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(4) bystanders</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>4.026</td>
<td>0.618</td>
<td>0.154</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: \( N_{\text{listwise}} = 275 \)

Test of Homogeneity of Variances: Levene statistic = 2.704 (\( p < 0.05 \)); equal variances assumption is rejected.

To obtain a formal test, after our initial findings, we regressed the four standard deviation values against the four mean task performance values weighted by group size (\( R^2 = 0.731 \)). Results of this analysis are presented at Table 13.

Table 13. Regression-Based S.D. Analysis.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Weight</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>S.D.</th>
<th>Predicted S.D.</th>
<th>Lower bound of 95% confidence interval</th>
<th>Upper bound of 95% confidence interval</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(1) the combined group</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>4.124</td>
<td>0.466</td>
<td>0.492</td>
<td>0.480</td>
<td>0.505</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2) soft only</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>3.841</td>
<td>0.682</td>
<td>0.792</td>
<td>0.773</td>
<td>0.812</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3) hard only</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>3.854</td>
<td>0.864</td>
<td>0.779</td>
<td>0.760</td>
<td>0.798</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(4) bystanders</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>4.026</td>
<td>0.618</td>
<td>0.596</td>
<td>0.582</td>
<td>0.611</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For the soft only group, the actual standard deviation is below the lower bound of the 95% confidence interval, implying smaller variation relative to their mean values. For the hard only group and bystanders, the actual standard deviation is above the upper bound of the 95% confidence interval, implying larger variation. The actual standard deviation for the combined group is within the 95% confidence interval and, at the same time, very close to the predicted standard deviation, which implies normal variation.

Hierarchical Regression Results

Prior to the creation of the interaction terms, we standardized (z-scored) the control and independent variables, following the recommendation of Cohen, Cohen, West, and Aiken.
(2003) to reduce multicollinearity. To further examine multicollinearity, we calculated the variance inflation factor (VIF) for each of the regression equations. The maximum VIF within the models was 1.481, which is far below the cut-off point of 10 (Field, 2005).

Table 14 reports descriptive statistics and correlations for variables assessed in the course of this study and Table 14 summarizes the results of the Hierarchical Regression analysis that tests the existence of significant 3-way interaction effects.

**Table 14. Results of Hierarchical Regression Model.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>In-role Job Performance</th>
<th>Step 1</th>
<th>Step 2</th>
<th>Step 3</th>
<th>Step 4</th>
<th>Step 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Gender</td>
<td>0.002</td>
<td>0.010</td>
<td>0.013</td>
<td>0.016</td>
<td>0.002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Work Experience</td>
<td>0.079</td>
<td>0.115*</td>
<td>0.132**</td>
<td>0.123**</td>
<td>0.116**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Extraversion</td>
<td>0.047</td>
<td>0.021</td>
<td>0.008</td>
<td>0.002</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Neuroticism</td>
<td>0.068</td>
<td>0.080</td>
<td>0.059</td>
<td>0.054</td>
<td>0.065</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Soft Influence Tactics (i.e., ingratiation)</td>
<td>0.127**</td>
<td>0.076*</td>
<td>0.071</td>
<td>0.028</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Hard Influence Tactics (i.e., pressure)</td>
<td>-0.021</td>
<td>-0.011</td>
<td>0.005</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Political Skill</td>
<td>0.041</td>
<td>0.090*</td>
<td>0.095*</td>
<td>0.120**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Soft × Hard Influence Tactics</td>
<td>0.346***</td>
<td>0.327***</td>
<td>0.295***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Political Skill × Soft Influence Tactics</td>
<td>0.059</td>
<td>0.032</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Political Skill × Hard Influence Tactics</td>
<td>-0.067</td>
<td>-0.049</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Political Skill × Soft × Hard Influence Tactics</td>
<td>0.145***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ R^2 \]
0.024 0.063 0.335 0.355 0.400

\[ Adjusted R^2 \]
0.009 0.038 0.315 0.330 0.374

\[ \Delta R^2 \]
0.038* 0.273** 0.019* 0.045***

Notes: \( N_{(listwise)} = 271 \)
* p < 0.05, ** p < 0.01, *** p < 0.001
All variables, except Gender are standardized (z scores).
Unstandardized regression coefficients are reported.
The \( \Delta R^2 \) values indicate the percentage of explainable level of variance in the dependent variables accounted for by each step.
Figure 14. The moderating effect of political skill.

The results of the hierarchical regression analysis show that there is a statistically significant positive interaction between the combined use of hard and soft influence tactics to in-role job performance ($\beta = 0.295, p < 0.001$).

The 3-way interaction hypothesis predicting that political skill moderates the relationship between the combined use of influence tactics and in-role job performance is also supported, since we found a statistically significant positive effect ($\beta = 0.145, p < 0.001$). In order to depict this interaction, we developed a plot based on values that are one standard deviation below (i.e., low level) and above (i.e., high level) the standardized mean. The plot of the interaction presented in Figure 14 shows that when hard and soft tactics are combined in a high degree, highly politically skilled managers have a more positive effect on performance ($p < 0.001$).
6.3.3 Political skill and job performance: The moderating role of justice and politics

To test the moderating effect of two justice dimensions and perceptions of organizational politics on the relations between political skill and job performance, we used a subset of 329 from the initial 545 pool. To test this subset, we kept only those managers that worked in private companies with approximately more than 250 employees.

In addition, we controlled for possible confounding effects by including various relevant control variables. The years of work experience and tenure have been included in the analysis, as they could have an impact on job performance. In addition, the department size may play a significant role with relation to the exchanges among members of the organization that can affect the perception of individuals regarding the role of environmental variables such as politics. As such, we controlled for the department size as the natural logarithm of employees working in the department. Finally, to reduce affectivity bias (Podsakoff et al., 2003) that may appear due to self-reports, we controlled for extraversion and neuroticism.

Table 15 presents the results of the Hierarchical Regression analysis.
Table 15. Results of HRM-Based Regression Analysis.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Job Performance</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b</td>
<td>s.e</td>
<td>t</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Step 1</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>4.008**</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>133.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational Tenure</td>
<td>0.047</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>1.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work Experience</td>
<td>0.096*</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>2.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department Size (log)</td>
<td>-0.022</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>-0.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extraversion</td>
<td>0.043</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>1.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neuroticism</td>
<td>-0.029</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>-0.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ΔR^2</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.10**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Step 2</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political Skill</td>
<td>0.157**</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>4.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceptions of Organizational Politics (POP)</td>
<td>0.004</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>-0.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procedural Justice (PJ)</td>
<td>0.016</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>-1.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Informational Justice (INFJ)</td>
<td>-0.054</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>0.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ΔR^2</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.07**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Step 3</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political Skill x POP</td>
<td>-0.074*</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>-2.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political Skill x PJ</td>
<td>0.098**</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>2.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political Skill x INFJ</td>
<td>0.101**</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>2.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ΔR^2</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.05**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>R^2</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.19**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: 1. *p < 0.05, **p < 0.01
2. All variables in Step 1 and Step 2 are standardized (z scores).
3. Unstandardized regression coefficients are reported.
4. The ΔR^2 values indicate the percentage of explainable level of variance in the dependent variables accounted for by each step.

Prior to the creation of the interaction terms, we standardized (z-scored) the control and independent variable, following the recommendation of Cohen, Cohen, West, and Aiken (2003) to reduce multicollinearity. To further examine multicollinearity, we calculated the variance inflation factor (VIF) for each of the regression equations. The maximum VIF within the models was 1.257, which is far below the cut-off point of 10 (Field, 2005).

The results of the hierarchical regression analysis show that political skill have a positive and significant linear effect on job performance (β = 0.16, p < 0.01).
Regarding the moderating effects, results indicated that all three hypothesized interactions are statistically significant. To depict these interactions, three separate plots were developed based on values that are one standard deviation below (i.e., low level) and above (i.e., high level) the standardized mean.

The interaction between political skill and perceptions of organizational politics is negative ($\beta = -0.07$, $p < 0.05$). The plot of the interaction presented in Figure 15 shows a negative relationship between political skill and job performance. Testing for the significance of the slopes, we found that both slopes for low and high organizational politics were statistically significant (i.e., $p < 0.001$ and $p < 0.10$, respectively).

**Figure 15. The Moderating Effect of Perceptions of Organizational Politics.**

![Figure 15](image)

We also predicted that procedural justice positively moderates the relationship between political skill and job performance. Figure 16 shows a positive relationship between political skill and job performance ($\beta = 0.10$, $p < 0.01$). Especially, at high levels of procedural justice, this interaction is statistically significant (i.e., $p < 0.001$), illustrating that highly politically skilled employees perform much better, compared to those with less political skill. However, at low levels of procedural justice, the relationship between political skill and job performance is not significant ($p > .10$),
indicating that in procedurally unfair environments, political skill do not contribute to job performance.

Finally, as predicted informational justice positively moderates the relationship between political skill and job performance (β = 0.10, p < 0.01). In this respect, at high levels of informational justice political skill have a statistically significant positive relationship with job performance (p < 0.001; see Figure 16). On the contrary, at low levels of informational justice, political skill does not affect, in a statistically significant manner, job performance (p > 0.10), thus indicating that political skill can enhance organizational outcomes only when the flow of information regarding procedures and outcomes is perceived as fair (see Figure 17).

**Figure 16. The Moderating Effect of Procedural Justice.**
**Figure 17. The Moderating Effect of Informational Justice.**

6.4 **Chapter Overview**

This chapter presented the findings of the quantitative research. In this context, four independent analyses were conducted. The first tested the appropriateness of the structural model as hypothesized in chapter 4. Using SEM and specifically Maximum Likelihood estimations, along with a bootstrap sampling procedure showed an exemplary fit of the hypothesized model to the data, with all research hypotheses being supported and the model explaining a total of 0.51 of the variance of turnover intentions. At the same time, alternative models were constructed and contrasted with the hypothesized model, and in all cases the proposed model produced better results.

In addition we performed three other statistical analyses to examine more complex relationships deriving from our theoretical framework. The use of one-way ANOVA and post hoc regression analysis shows that the combined use of seemingly incompatible influence tactics can yield better and more stable results, in terms of variability in task performance. Finally, to examine possible moderating effects we used hierarchical regression analyses, which indicated that justice and politics leverage the relationship between political skill and performance and that political
skill moderate the relationship between the combined use of hard and soft tactics and task performance.
7.1 Introduction

In the literature, there are two main broad research streams. The first is concerned with the role of contextual variables, such as organizational justice and politics in predicting consequences relevant to the self and/or the organizational. The second stream leans towards the effect of personal characteristics and behaviors on performance, as well as other individual/organizational consequences. Nevertheless, research lacks holistic frameworks that shed light on these detrimental effects by combining personal and organizational constructs. The main objective of this thesis was to provide an integrative framework and investigate for possible mediating and moderating effects.

In the first section of this chapter we provide a thorough discussion of the results relevant to the hypotheses deployed in chapter 4. For each hypothesis, we discuss its underlying premises and the corresponding results. The second section presents the practical implications of the study for both individuals and organizations based on the empirical findings of the study. Next, we highlight the strengths of this study, followed by the limitations. In the last section, we suggest ideas for future research.

7.2 Discussion of the results

This thesis investigated two different drivers that influence specific individual and organizational outcomes. First, by focusing on antecedents of job performance, we
explored some key personal characteristics and behaviors through which performance is achieved. Second, we investigated the effects of organizational justice and perceptions of organizational politics on job satisfaction. Overall, we proposed an integrative framework to include all these effects to the employees’ withdrawal process.

To test all research hypotheses of this thesis we followed various methods. More specifically, to test our main research framework we followed a two-step approach. We initially used confirmatory factor analysis (CFA) to assess the appropriateness of the measurement model. At the same time, we also used CFA to test the appropriateness of two higher order constructs, which were included in our main model. The analyses supported the premise that organizational justice is a four factor construct, which encompasses procedural, distributive, interpersonal, as well as informational aspects. Similarly, political skill is also a four factor second order construct, which includes the social astuteness, interpersonal influence, networking ability, and apparent sincerity. As such, a single composite measure for overall organizational justice and political skill was obtained by aggregating the score in the various facets. The inclusion of organizational justice and political skill as second order constructs in our model contributes significantly to the literature, since no other empirical study to our knowledge has examined their second order properties.

All variables of the model, including organizational justice and political skill, were included in an overall measurement model. Results showed a very satisfactory fit ($\chi^2 = 1118.31$, $p < 0.001$; NNFI = 0.930; CFI = 0.930; RMSEA = 0.040), high reliability (Composite reliability = 0.724-0.861), as well as convergent and discriminant validity. Having secured the reliability and validity of the measurement model, we analyzed the structural model. In particular, we examined all the relationships between the variables of the research model, with structural equation modelling. The results of the analysis showed that the model presents exemplary fit ($\chi^2 = 1164.59$; NNFI = 0.923; CFI = 0.923; RMSEA = 0.042). Furthermore, the proposed model was
considerably better than the null model and several alternative models that were constructed based on different conceptualizations.

Nonetheless, the analysis of these relationships provides limited insights as they refer to one-to-one relationships. For this reason, this thesis endeavoured to look into mediating as well as moderating effects. From the structural equation analysis, several indirect effects were analyzed providing useful information as to how some variables intervene in some relations. The investigation of possible moderating effects was performed by creating two separate samples out of the main sample. This was necessary, since the nature of these moderating effects required contexts with many employees, subordinates or managerial tenure.

More specifically, the first of these two studies enabled us to examine several high valued research hypotheses. By comparing the variations on task performance from the sole use of either hard or soft tactics using one-way ANOVA, we revealed that, as expected, soft tactics had a smaller variation in performance. Additionally, we checked whether the combined use of soft and hard tactics produced even smaller variation in performance compared to soft and hard tactics. Results gave support for these hypotheses. Further, results from the hierarchical regression analysis revealed that the combined use of soft and hard influence tactics not only reduce variation in performance, but also have a positive impact. Moreover, findings showed that political skill moderates the aforementioned relationship in a positive way.

In the second study we employed hierarchical regression analysis to investigate the moderating role of procedural and informational justice, and perceptions of organizational politics on the relationship between political skill and job performance. Results supported their moderating role.

Overall, all hypotheses formulated in this thesis were fully supported. Table 16 summarizes these findings.
Table 16. Summary of hypothesis testing results.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hypotheses</th>
<th>Standardized Path coefficients (total effect)</th>
<th>Result</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Political skill and influence tactics</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Hypothesis 1a</em>: Political skill will be positively associated with soft tactics.</td>
<td>0.278**</td>
<td>Supported (+)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Hypothesis 1b</em>: Political skill will be positively associated with hard tactics.</td>
<td>0.138*</td>
<td>Supported (+)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Hypothesis 1c</em>: Political skill will be positively associated with rational influence behavior.</td>
<td>0.391**</td>
<td>Supported (+)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Antecedents of job performance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Hypothesis 2</em>: Political skill will be positively associated with job performance.</td>
<td>0.333**</td>
<td>Supported (+)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Hypothesis 3a</em>: Soft tactics will be positively associated with job performance.</td>
<td>0.221**</td>
<td>Supported (+)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Hypothesis 3b</em>: Hard tactics will be positively associated with job performance.</td>
<td>0.120*</td>
<td>Supported (+)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Hypothesis 3c</em>: Rational influence tactics will be positively associated with job performance.</td>
<td>0.248**</td>
<td>Supported (+)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Hypothesis 4</em>: Influence tactics will partially mediate the relationship between political skill and task performance.</td>
<td>0.175** (indirect³)</td>
<td>Supported (+)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational justice and perceptions of organizational politics</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Hypothesis 5</em>: Organizational justice will be negatively associated with perceptions of organizational politics.</td>
<td>-0.601**</td>
<td>Supported (-)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Determinants of intrinsic job satisfaction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Hypothesis 6</em>: Perceptions of organizational politics will be negatively associated with intrinsic job satisfaction.</td>
<td>-0.178**</td>
<td>Supported (-)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Hypothesis 7</em>: Organizational justice will be positively associated with intrinsic job satisfaction.</td>
<td>0.578**</td>
<td>Supported (+)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Hypothesis 8</em>: Job performance will be positively associated with intrinsic job satisfaction.</td>
<td>0.217**</td>
<td>Supported (+)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Determinants of employee commitment and turnover intentions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Hypothesis 9: Intrinsic job satisfaction will be positively related to organizational commitment. 0.466** Supported (+)

Hypothesis 10: Organizational commitment will be negatively related to turnover intentions. -0.715** Supported (-)

Hypothesis 11: Organizational commitment will partially mediate the relationship between intrinsic job satisfaction and intent to turnover. -0.333** (indirect^3) Supported (+)

Hypothesis 12: Job satisfaction and organizational commitment will partially mediate the relationship between organizational justice and intent to turnover. -0.193** (indirect^3) Supported

Achieving job performance by combining hard and soft influence tactics: The moderating role of political skill

Hypothesis 13: Employees that use hard tactics exhibit higher intragroup variation in job performance, relative to their mean values of performance, than employees that rely on soft tactics. Supported

Hypothesis 14: Employees that combine the use of soft tactics with hard exhibit less intragroup variation than the sole use of hard or soft tactics. Supported

Hypothesis 15: The combined use of soft with hard tactics has a positive impact on performance. 0.295*** Supported (+)

Hypothesis 16: Political skill positively moderates the effects of the combined use of hard with soft influence tactics on subordinate’s in-role job performance. 0.145*** Supported (+)

Political skill and job performance: The moderating role of justice and politics

Hypothesis 17: Perceptions of organizational politics negatively moderate the effects of political skill on job performance. -0.074* Supported (+)

Hypothesis 18: Procedural justice positively moderates the effects of political skill on job performance. 0.098** Supported (+)

Hypothesis 19: Informational justice positively moderates the effects of political skill on job performance. 0.101** Supported (+)

Notes: *p < 0.05, **p < 0.01, ***p < 0.001
7.2.1 Political skill and influence tactics

The influence tactics literature has helped us to better understand “what” people do to influence others (Kolodinsky et al., 2007). Specifically, we focused on three influence categories, based on their position on the strength dimension (Tepper et al., 1993), which capture the full range of an agent’s influence behavior. These influence tactics’ categories represented hard, soft and rational tactics. Research has indicated several driving forces that determine an individual’s selection of which influence tactic to use. These determinants involve “content factors” (e.g., importance of the request, favorability of the request) (Yukl et al., 1996), work values (e.g., career, prestige) (Blickle, 2000), as well as dispositional factors (e.g., locus of control, Machiavellianism, social identity) (Barbuto & Moss, 2006).

Results from the examination of the model’s standardized path coefficients indicate that political skill is a significant determinant of all three influence tactics’ categories (Hypotheses 1a, 1b, and 1c). The most positive relation was found between political skill and rationality (b = 0.39, p < 0.01), followed by soft (b = 0.28, p < 0.01) and hard tactics (b = 0.14, p < 0.05). A politically skilled manager will use less hard tactics compared to soft. Political skill has been proposed to help explain the effects of “how” organizational members differ in their effective use of influence attempts in a work setting. As such, politically skilled individuals strategically select the most appropriate methods of influence for particular contexts, and then effectively execute such influence tactics using a style that ensures interpersonal goal accomplishment (Ferris et al., 2008b). The results also indicate the order in which managers’ will probably select which influence tactic to use. They will most likely start with reason and rational persuasion, and then with soft followed by hard tactics in their attempt influence others.
7.2.2 Antecedents of job performance

Performance is a critical construct in management research and includes various in-role and extra role behaviors. This thesis focused on task performance, its determinants and its effect on job satisfaction. Task performance is a very common outcome variable at most studies in this field of research. Nevertheless, we focused on antecedents that have not yet been examined adequately. As mentioned previously, political skill is a newly developed construct and as such its effect on task performance is still vague (e.g., Ahearn et al., 2004; Ferris et al., 2005a; Ferris et al., 2005b). On the other hand, influence tactics has received some attention concerning their role in performance (e.g., Falbe & Yukl, 1992; van Knippenberg et al., 1999a).

The regression coefficients of the analyzed structural model indicate that all influence tactics have a positive effect on task performance, providing support to hypotheses 3a, 3b, and 3c. As expected, rational and soft influence tactics have the strongest effects ($b = 0.25, p < 0.01$; $b = 0.22, p < 0.01$, respectively). As Falbe and Yukl (1992) denote hard tactics are used mainly to increase a target’s compliance. At the same time, however, they reduce the target’s commitment towards the goal objective and increases resistance. As such, hard tactics can easily undermine the agent-target relationship (van Knippenberg et al., 1999b) and result in stressful events, which ultimately leads to low performance. Nonetheless, hard tactics are used to communicate dissatisfaction, exemplify behaviors, or ensure compliance when situations require so. For this reason, hard tactics can yield better results, even though the effect will be rather low compared to the use of other tactics.

Political skill has a positive overall effect on task performance as well, both directly and indirectly through the proper employment of influence tactics. A politically skilled manager will be able to develop friendships and networks, understand others’ needs, and exert influence convincingly, in a genuineness and authenticity (Blickle et al., 2008). In addition, being politically skilled implies that the manager knows not only which influence tactic to select, but how to deploy it effectively. Consequently, besides its direct effect on performance ($b = 0.158, p < 0.05$), through its mediating
role of influence tactics it has an indirect effect as well (b = 0.175, p < 0.01). As such, hypotheses 2 and 4 are fully supported.

7.2.3 Achieving task performance by combining hard and soft influence tactics: The moderating role of political skill

Prior research has argued that the use of various influence tactics can affect performance by enhancing subordinate’s commitment and compliance, while reducing their resistance to the implementation of a specific task or project (e.g. Falbe & Yukl, 1992; Yukl, 2008; Yukl & Falbe, 1990; Yukl et al., 1993). Nonetheless, the sole use of hard or soft tactics often results in significant variations in performance. For example, a manager that uses only hard tactics to achieve performance can achieve subordinate’s compliance, but at the same time undermines their long-term cooperation. Thus, despite the fact that compliance is achieved phenomenally, in a future exchange subordinates would not be motivated but rather resistant to any change (Falbe & Yukl, 1992). Our findings fully support hypothesis 13 that soft tactics result in lower variation of task performance compared to hard tactics. Hard tactics are not socially desirable and their frequent use can put a heavy strain on employees. The latter creates great uncertainty concerning their effect on performance. In contrast, we found that the sole use of soft tactics moulds a more stable environment that favors sanctioned exchanges that can lead more often to the anticipated results.

On the other hand, even the use of soft tactics alone could create variations in performance. A manager that relies only on friendship increases the degrees of freedom in the team and builds a favorable image as a manager. Nevertheless, the latter can often be viewed as a weakness that leads to inertia and low performance (Yukl & Chavez, 2002). For this reason, using the first subset we hypothesized (Hypothesis 14) that the joint use of hard with soft tactics would ensure more stable results in terms of subordinate’s task performance. Our findings indicate that managers should use soft tactics to increase commitment and cooperation, but when he or she feels that the goal is not achieved; hard tactics should be employed to ensure minimum compliance.
Besides the fact that the ambidextrous use of hard and soft tactics ensured performance stability, we hypothesized (Hypothesis 15) that it also has a positive effect on performance. Surprisingly, the sole use of hard or soft tactics does not have a statistically significant effect on in-role performance. Yet, we found that the combined use has a significant positive effect, providing full support to hypothesis 15. Therefore, it seems that the combined use of apparently different influence tactics ensures both better and more consistent results.

Furthermore, in the same study we investigated this relationship and attempted to broaden the theoretical and empirical foundations on this burgeoning field. At the same time, the effectiveness of the combined use of hard and soft tactics can be greatly enhanced by political skill (Yukl & Chavez, 2002). Thus, our study built on previous research on political skill by examining its moderating role (i.e., 3-way moderation), as a 4-factor second order construct, on the relationship between the combined use of hard and soft tactics and in-role job performance (Hypothesis 16). Our findings provide further evidence concerning the multi-facet nature of political skill while demonstrating its significance in attaining higher performance. More specifically, at high levels of political skill, “ambidextrous managers” will yield better results compared to “bystanders” or those who use only one-dimension. Yet, even low politically skilled managers that use both influence tactics will achieve higher performance.

7.2.4 Organizational justice and perceptions of organizational politics

While organizational politics can be considered the antithesis of justice, it is argued that they have a more complicated relationship (Ferris, Frink, Beehr, & Gilmore, 1995). Past research clearly indicates that the relationship between justice and politics shows that although both constructs share a common underlying theme, the concepts are distinct from one another and should be considered unique constructs (Andrews & Kacmar, 2001). Organizational justice is a broader construct that describes organizational procedures, interpersonal treatment and ensures the fair distribution of scarce resources. Perceptions of organizational politics describe
workplace behaviors to safeguard or promote self-interests. Naturally, these notions are strongly intercorrelated. For example, in cases where the decision making process within the organization is dictated more by politics than by formal rules and procedures then the work environment will be perceived as unjust and unfair (Andrews & Kacmar, 2001). Subsequently, an organization that treats employees in an unfair manner will invoke feelings of distrust, which will lead to an increased political activity.

Based on the existing literature, we expected a negative relationship between these constructs. Nevertheless, to the best of our knowledge, there is not any study examining this relation with organizational justice as a second order factor, which encompasses all its four facets. Indeed, as suggested (hypothesis 5), organizational justice, taken as a four factor construct, has an inverse impact on politics perceptions ($b = -0.601, p < 0.01$), which is line with a significant body of literature (Andrews & Kacmar, 2001; Aryee et al., 2004; Byrne, 2005; Ferris et al., 2002; Harris et al., 2007a).

7.2.5 Political skill and job performance: The moderating role of justice and politics

Prior research has argued that several social skills can affect job performance (Ferris, Witt, & Hochwarter, 2001). Political skill, in particular, is a business oriented construct whose multi-facet nature has only recently been validated in literature (Ferris et al., 2005b). Hence, research on its nature and job-related outcomes is still in its infancy.

In the second subset created, we investigated this relationship and attempted to broaden the theoretical and empirical foundations on this burgeoning field. More specifically, our study built on previous research on political skill by examining its direct relationship, as a 4-factor second order construct, on job performance. Furthermore, the current study empirically tested the extent to which three inner-organizational variables (i.e., organizational politics, procedural and informational justice) moderate this relationship.
The findings provide further evidence concerning the multi-facet nature of political skill while demonstrating its significance in attaining higher performance. Additionally, the inner organizational environment, as captured by organizational politics, procedural and informational justice, has been found to significantly moderate the previous relationship. Organizational politics negatively influence job performance at high levels of political skill. On the contrary, when individuals show a lack of political skill, organizational politics seem to have a positive impact. A possible explanation for this finding could be that in highly negative political environments one’s self evaluation of job performance is subject to the degree that the person agrees with the most influential group.

Respectively, the lack of organizational justice can have a detrimental effect on the positive link between political skill and job performance, by neutralizing this effect in a procedurally and informationally unfair environment. This finding can be attributed to the fact that in environments where rules and procedures are based on unjust criteria or criteria that are not explicitly or timely communicated, this critical competency, even if it exists, it would not find fertile ground to be enacted. In other words, employees with the capacity for political skill, may never utilize it to its fullest extent, if they find themselves in situations where fairness of organizational procedures, processes, and feedback is questionable (Ferris et al., 2000b).

7.2.6 Determinants of intrinsic job satisfaction

According to the hypothesized model, intrinsic job satisfaction has three main determinants, and specifically task performance, organizational politics and justice. The negative impact of politics stems from its impact on the social contract between the employer and the employee (Cropanzano et al., 1997). Job satisfaction reflects the affective response to the execution of this contract (Witt, Andrews, & Kacmar, 2000). Employees will experience reduced job satisfaction when awards, praises, raises and promotions are based on political considerations, rather than merit, or when there are cliques closely tied to organizational leaders that typically get their way even at the cost of productivity. A plethora of empirical evidence has already shown that perceptions of organizational politics are negatively related to job
satisfaction (e.g., Ferris et al., 1996; Kacmar et al., 1999a; Miller et al., 2008; Nye & Witt, 1993; Rosen et al., 2009; Vigoda, 2000; Witt et al., 2000; Zhou & Ferris, 1995). This thesis, however, narrowed its focus on intrinsic satisfaction which deals with the inner satisfaction of a person regarding the job.

In line with these studies, our analysis confirmed the existence of an inverse relationship \( (b = -0.178, p < 0.01) \) between politics perceptions and intrinsic job satisfaction (hypothesis 6). This effect is lower compared to the corresponding one found in similar studies, because its effect is mitigated by the positive effect of organizational justice. Looking at the correlation table the correlations between the two constructs is \( r = -0.408 \) \((p < 0.001)\). In the research model, however, politics perceptions encompass the positive effect of organizational justice and hence the negative effect is reduced significantly. Therefore, a manager that perceives his/her environment as self-serving feels tension, anxiety, psychological fatigue, and disenchantedment; thus preventing him/her from enjoying the psychological benefits from work.

In addition, all facets of organizational justice contribute in a positive manner to developing intrinsic satisfaction. Past research has shown that employees’ perceptions of justice affect their overall satisfaction from the job (Bhal & Ansari, 2007; Brief, 1998; Cohen-Charash & Spector, 2001; Colquitt et al., 2001). Still, there is a gap in the literature in associating all different aspects of organizational justice to intrinsic job satisfaction. The SEM regression coefficients provide full support to this hypothesis (hypothesis 7), since organizational justice as a four factor construct has a positive effect on job satisfaction \( (b = 0.578, p < 0.01) \). Working in an environment which is characterized by fairness in outcomes’ distribution, follows clear procedures, favors employees’ voice and treats them in a fair manner, while providing information feedback in an accurate and timely way, will create a positive disposition of the employee. Subsequently, workers who feel that they are treated fairly and that they “get what they deserve” will be intrinsically motivated to reciprocate the confidence and support they enjoy.
There is long standing debate on whether performance leads to satisfaction or the other way round (Iaffaldano & Muchinsky, 1985; Judge et al., 2001a; Petty, McGee, & Cavender, 1984). Our study provides fresh empirical evidence that task performance, in particular, has a positive impact on intrinsic job satisfaction ($b = 0.217$, $p < 0.01$). Looking at the correlation table one can notice that the effect from the SEM analysis is larger compared to correlation between the two variables. This is attributed to the fact that the antecedents of task performance transmit, indirectly, some of their effect through task performance. A manager that performs well will most likely feel competent, confident, and secure regarding their job. The latter can create positive feelings to the manager and ultimately provide motives and incentives.

7.2.7 Determinants of employee commitment and turnover intentions

After having discussed the driving forces of job performance and satisfaction, this thesis examined their subsequent effect on commitment and turnover. Literature abounds with models of employee commitment or/and turnover (e.g., Cho, Johanson, & Guchait, 2009; Riley, 2006; Vandenberghhe & Tremblay, 2008). Nonetheless, this study offers a process perspective of why employees report their intentions of exiting from their current employer.

Intent to turnover was included as an outcome variable in our hypothesized model because it provides a more meaningful perspective on the employee withdrawal process than does including only organizational commitment (Somers, 1995). Turnover intentions is more closely related to work-related variables than is actual turnover, which is influenced by other factors as well (Peters & Sheridan, 1988). As such, the examination of how commitment, satisfaction and organizational justice affect an employee’s desire to leave would provide a broader conceptualization on the withdrawal process (Jaros et al., 1993).

Williams and Hazer (1986a) made the distinction between commitment and job satisfaction in that the former is an affective response to the organization as a
whole, whereas the latter reflects an affective response to specific aspects of the job. Satisfaction and commitment have been extensively researched. Most studies report that both are negatively related to turnover and intent to leave (e.g., Hollenbeck & Williams, 1986; Wagner, 2007), and positively correlated with one another (Bluedorn, 1982b).

Organizational commitment is a common variable in causal models viewed as a mediator of the influences of personal characteristics and work experiences on employee turnover processes (Mathieu & Zajac, 1990). Organizational commitment is seen as a work-related factor and a stabilizing force that acts to maintain a certain behavioral direction (such as continuing in a job) when the desired or expected conditions of a job have not been met (DeCotiis & Summers, 1987). In fact, organizational commitment and turnover research suggests that organizational commitment should be viewed on a continuum, with one end defined by a high degree of commitment and intent to stay with an organization, and the other end characterized by low levels of commitment, coupled with a desire to remain as a member in the organization (Wagner, 2007).

According to the standardized path coefficients of our hypothesized model, intrinsic job satisfaction contributes greatly to developing organizational commitment ($b = 0.466, p < 0.01$). An intrinsically satisfied individual will have a positive disposition towards the organization. Managers will perceive their working environment as constructive that offers incentives and motivates them to deploy their skills and knowledge. Hence, they invigorate the psychological contract with the organization, which result in an affective commitment. In addition, satisfied employees will have a higher continuance commitment, since the costs from exiting will be high. Therefore, hypothesis 9 is fully supported.

Further in this withdrawal process, committed employees will most likely intent to stay in the organization. The direct inverse effect of commitment to turnover intentions, based on the finding of our study, was very strong ($b = -0.715, p < 0.01$). Though the effect is extensively high, it is in accordance with several other studies.
(e.g., Bycio et al., 1995; Griffeth et al., 2000; Lum, Kervin, Clark, Reid, & Sirola, 1998; Wagner, 2007), thus providing support for hypothesis 10.

Many studies conceptualize turnover to be a psychological response and rest on the belief that turnover is an individual choice behavior. At the individual level, satisfaction with one's job is the most frequently studied psychological variable in the satisfaction-turnover relationship (Wagner, 2007). Nevertheless, those models, found in the literature, ignore the mediating role of organizational commitment to the aforementioned relationship. For example, Price and Mueller (1981) provided empirical evidence that job dissatisfaction had an indirect effect on turnover through its direct effect on formation of intent to leave. The statistical analysis of the structural model of this thesis provides additional evidence that job satisfaction indirectly affects turnover intentions. Satisfaction affects commitment, which in turn affects turnover intent. The indirect effect was −0.333 (p < 0.01), the partially mediating effect as described in hypothesis 11 is supported. In a similar vein, we found support that organizational justice, taken as a second order factor, has an indirect effect to turnover intentions (hypothesis 12). Results indicated an indirect inverse effect of −0.193 (p < 0.01).

7.3 Implications of the results

There are several important implications of this study’s results. It has been established both theoretically and empirically that reason, ingratiation (soft tactics), and, in a lower degree, pressure (hard tactics) constitutes major antecedents of job performance. On the one hand, organizations that favors astute employees who can better communicate, engage in interpersonal interactions, and be flexible, can reap great rewards. Politically skilled individuals are keen on getting those around them to work as a team, inspire trust and deal with conflict that often arise (Ferris et al., 2005a). On the other hand, individuals can also benefit from developing their political skill since it will reduce the experiences stress on the job, create feelings of success, confidence, and generally help them view interpersonal interactions as opportunities rather than threats. It seems that our research findings endorse the
argument that political skill “is so fundamental to all jobs that is should be a strong predictor of task dimensions of job performance” (Ferris et al., 2005a).

In addition, the suggested model gives managers the opportunity to check the effectiveness of certain influence tactics categories. In this context, managers should use the whole range of the influence tactics in order to motivate subordinates perform a tasks or requests. When used in isolation, reason and soft tactics can enhance task performance. Hard tactics also contributes, but in a much lower degree. Still, a closer look at the relationship among influence tactics and performance indicates that those managers that the joint use of both hard and soft tactics can lead to better and more stable results. Thus, managers should become more flexible in their behaviors when interacting with others. By doing so, they will be able to apply different methods that even though they may seem incompatible, they can offer great benefits when used appropriately. Again, political skill is significant factor that leverage this joint use. In broader terms, politically skilled managers that combine the use of soft with hard tactics can increase subordinates’ commitment and compliance, while reducing resistance. Lastly, organizations that favor such managers would benefit from the increased performance and overall functioning. Therefore, organizations that want to get the most out of this vital skill, should favor managers that use both hard and soft tactics. Such managers seem more competent, with leading capabilities that can ensure successful implementation of decisions. Nonetheless, to fully capitalize these benefits, organizations should foster for politically skilled managers, since political skill is vital for achieving personal and organizational objectives (Ferris et al., 2005b; Semadar et al., 2006).

Diachronically, one of the main concerns of organizations has been their ability to maintain their personnel (Wright & Bonett, 2007). In the previous section, we stressed the key role of job satisfaction. Having dissatisfied employees can have detrimental effects to organizations and individuals. Besides motivation, job satisfaction is strongly bound to commitment and turnover. A satisfied employee will be less stressed, more confident, creative and proud about his or her work.
Subsequently, this employee will become more attached to the organization (high organizational commitment) and will want to maintain the relationship with the organization. Thus, organizations need to fully understand this sequential process and cater for the appropriate conditions and improve working conditions and other factors responsible for the intrinsic aspect of job satisfaction. Based on the results of this study, we found strong evidence that perceptions of organizational politics are responsible for low (intrinsic) job satisfaction.

Organizations need to become aware of the critical role of organizational justice and politics in justifying the withdrawal process (satisfaction, commitment, and turnover intentions). Working in environments that encourage self-serving and “go along to get ahead” behaviors will greatly demotivate employees, resulting in severe implications (e.g., low organizational performance, increased turnover). Contrariwise, organizations that nurtures just procedures, fair interpersonal treatment and distribute scarce resources according to contribution can greatly increase the job satisfaction and even mitigate the effects of politics. This study showed their moderating role even in the relationship between politically skilled managers and job performance. If the environment is procedurally and informationally unjust, or suffers from politics, it greatly reduces the positive effects of political skill on performance. Therefore, organizations need not only to focus on developing the political skill of their employees but also cater for their employees’ needs to work in just and politically productive environments. Hence, organizational justice truly lies at the core of organizations.

7.4 Strengths of the study

The current thesis has several strengths, both theoretical and empirical, and makes several contributions to the existing literature. First, it provides initial evidence that political skill may contribute to additional explained variance in models involving the effects of social perception on task performance. Because the results indicate that political skill had both direct and moderating effects, consideration of its inclusion in future social effectiveness research would seem warranted.
A second strength is its contribution to the influence tactics literature. This study used three categories of tactics (i.e., soft, hard, rational) based on their place in the influence tactics’ strength dimension, providing fruitful conclusions in a field which is still underexplored. Besides this gap in the literature, our study examined the relationship between these tactics and performance to conclude that the combined use of soft with hard tactics can yield better results in term of task performance. This is the first study to make such an argument, while at the same time provide empirical findings to support it. As such, researchers can replicate study in various contexts and open paths for further examination.

Furthermore, this study provided empirical evidence on the nature of organizational justice and political skill. Regarding the first, it showed that it consists of four conceptually distinct facets (i.e., distributive, procedural, interpersonal, and informational) that can be combined to form a second order construct of organizational justice. On the other hand, political skill was also used as a second order construct that encompasses four conceptually distinct facets (i.e., social astuteness, interpersonal influence, networking ability, apparent sincerity), based on the existing literature. The fact that we used all facets of organizational justice and political skill in a single model (as higher order constructs) enabled us to provide an integrative framework and thus enrich our knowledge on the field. The findings associated with these construct can also help researchers who want to use them as a single construct, without diminishing their explanatory potential.

Moreover, last theoretical contribution of this thesis is its integrative approach. Most studies are interested in specific relationships, such as the driving forces of performance, or the antecedents of job satisfaction and employee turnover. In this study, we piece together different streams of research (e.g., politics and justice, turnover, influence tactics and political skill), add relatively new constructs (e.g., political skill), whilst investigating possible mediating and moderating effects.

To confirm the reliability and validity of this integrative framework this thesis relied on a sample of 545. In the management and organizational behavior literature, there
are only few studies with such an analogue (Masterson et al., 2000). In addition, we sampled employees from a range of occupations and backgrounds in organizations. The fact that we used a total of 545 full-time employees from different contexts is a strategy that maximizes the external generalizability of our research (Breaux et al., 2009; Scandura & Williams, 2000).

7.5 Limitations of the study

Various limitations, which provide meaningful directions for future research, should be noted. First, the design of this study was cross-sectional in nature. As such, participants provided responses to items at just one point in time. Given the subjective nature of most of the items, it is possible that respondents would have provided different responses at different times based on additional interaction with their supervisor/organization or how they were feeling that day, for instance. Even though anonymity, which contributes to limit potential bias (social desirability), can only be ensured in cross-sectional designs, the use of a longitudinal design would have helped to overcome this limitation and capture possible lagged effects. Partialling out the effects of several relevant control variables, and the results from the Harman’s one-factor test, reduced some of our concerns.

Second, our reliance on self-reports suggests that the reported relationships could be potentially attributed to method variance and response range restriction. For example, since managers often rate themselves more positively than do their supervisors (e.g., Folger & Lewis, 1993), it is possible that they gave inflated self-rated political skill and performance scores, a bias that could affect the magnitude of empirical results. Relatedly, the high mean and small standard deviation of job performance, political skill, and influence tactics variables probably indicate that the range of responses for political skill items may have been restricted. Response range restriction inhibits the possibility of finding significant results, due to lack of variance among responses and typically attributed to sampling procedure limitations (Cohen et al., 2003). As evidenced by several small standard deviations in the study, some of the variables in the study had items that had limited response range and therefore little variance. Furthermore, the cognitive evaluation of an employee’s job
performance may be more subtle than that of his or her supervisor, since the latter may capture only those gestures aimed at impressing and favorably biasing the result (Kolodinsky et al., 2007). Still, since supervisor ratings provide a performance assessment that is procedurally independent of the subjects’ scores on job demands and fairness perceptions, future research could consider both aspects of job performance and complement those with objective data.

Third, our research design focuses on higher order categories of influence tactics, despite the fact that each category is only represented by one influence tactic subcategory (e.g., ingratiation for soft, pressure for hard). Future research could include more combinations, such as soft with soft, hard with hard or rational tactics with either soft and hard and test their combined moderation effect on several different aspects of performance or other outcomes. Likely candidates for inclusion as outcome variables could be motivation and commitment. Replicating this study in different contexts, along with different combinations would further enhance knowledge on the field.

7.6 Directions for future research

Our research can be enhanced in many ways. Future studies could investigate possible interaction effects of organizational justice and politics to the relationship between influence tactics and performance measures. Similarly, future research may examine the combined moderation effect of justice and politics on job performance and other outcomes. Likely candidates for inclusion as outcome variables could be job satisfaction, organizational commitment, intent to turnover, and absenteeism. The present findings also merit further attempts to explore the political skill-influence tactics interactions in future research.

In addition, organizational politics can be seen from a constructive or disruptive point of view (Fedor et al., 2008). A negative political environment can attach a self-interested leverage, increasing distrust and conflicts. This could have a significant effect on both tactic selection and tactic efficacy. On the other hand, a positive political environment can create the appropriate preconditions for boosting
influence effectiveness. Therefore, future studies should examine politics from a dual perspective and explore possible nonlinearities (direct and moderated) among different categories of influence tactics (e.g., political tactics, impression management tactics) and performance-related outcome variables. Nurturing for this fair and politically sanctioned environment will ensure that employees will not feel excluded, emotionally distressed, and dissatisfied, which would possibly lead to distrust, apathy, and a disposition to remain inactive. Therefore, employees will be able to develop and deploy their political skill to its fullest extent, and, at the same time, organizations will harvest the benefits of increased job performance.

Finally, the current findings add to the growing evidence that political skill appears to affect important outcomes in work settings. Future social effectiveness research, as well as research involving human resources decisions, would be well served to consider inclusion of the political skill construct in its models. Relatedly, as in most studies (e.g., Ahearn et al., 2004; Blickle et al., 2008; Treadway et al., 2007) our study views political skill from a positive and organizationally sanctioned angle. Yet, political skill could also be construed as a self-interested leverage, increasing distrust and conflicts. Therefore, future studies should examine political skill from a dual perspective and explore possible nonlinearities (direct and moderated) between political skill and performance-related outcome variables.

7.7 Chapter’s overview

This chapter offered a detailed discussion of the results obtained from the analysis of the model and the further analysis of two subsequent models. As such, the overall adequacy of the measurement model was analyzed, placing particular emphasis on the properties of organizational justice and political skill as second order constructs. The results of the structural model we discussed in an attempt to rationalize the findings, extract valuable knowledge and offer fruitful managerial implications. In this regard, the critical role of personal, as well as organizational variables in determining individual and organizational outcomes was assessed.
On one hand, political skill is responsible for selecting the appropriate influence tactics and assures task performance. On the other hand, the organizational context (i.e., justice and politics) along with task performance should be considered as great drivers of turnover intentions, through the mediating role of intrinsic job satisfaction and organizational commitment.

This chapter also discussed possible limitations, such as common method variance generated by the use of self-reports and the cross-sectional design, whilst discussing avenues for future research.
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APPENDIX 1

Influence Tactics Items

- Acted very humbly to him or her while making my request (I)
- Acted in a friendly manner prior to asking for what I wanted (I)
- Made him or her feel good about me before making my request (I)
- Used logic to convince him or her (R)
- Explained the reasons for my request (R)
- Presented him or her with information in support of my point of view (R)
- Had a showdown in which I confronted him or her face to face (A)
- Expressed my anger verbally (A)
- Used a forceful manner; I tried such things as demands, the setting of deadlines, and the expression of strong emotion (A)

Ingratiation = I, Rationality = R, Assertiveness = A

Political Skill Items

- I am good at using my connections and network to make things happen at work. (NA)
- I pay close attention to people’s facial expressions. (SA)
- It is important that people believe I am sincere in what I say and do. (AS)
- When communicating with others, I try to be genuine in what I say and do. (AS)
- I spend a lot of time and effort at work networking with others. (NA)
- I have good intuition or savvy about how to present myself to others. (SA)
- I have developed a large network of colleagues and associates at work whom I can call on for support when I really need to get things done. (NA)
- I spend a lot of time at work developing connections with others. (NA)
- I am good at getting people to like me. (II)
- I am able to communicate easily and effectively with others. (II)
- I am able to make most people feel comfortable and at ease around me. (II)
• I understand people very well. (SA)
• It is easy for me to develop good rapport with most people. (II)
• At work, I know a lot of important people and am well connected. (NA)
• I am particularly good at sensing the motivations and hidden agendas of others. (SA)
• I am good at building relationships with influential people at work. (NA)
• I try to show a genuine interest in other people. (AS)
• I always seem to instinctively know the right things to say or do to influence others. (SA)

**NA = networking ability; II = interpersonal influence; SA = social astuteness; AS = apparent sincerity.**

### Perceived Organizational Politics Scale (POPS) 2/3 factors

• Telling others what they want to hear is sometimes better than telling the truth. (GAGA)
• There is no place for yes-men around here; good ideas are desired even if it means disagreeing. (GAGA)
• Agreeing with powerful others is the best alternative in this organization. (GAGA)
• People in this organization attempt to build themselves up by tearing others down. (GPB)
• Sometimes it is easier to remain quiet than to fight the system. (GAGA)
• There has always been an influential group in this department that no one ever crosses. (GPB)
• It is best not rock the boat in this organization. (GAGA)
• It is safer to think what you are told than to make up your own mind. (GAGA)

**General Political Behavior = GPB; Go Along to Get Ahead = GAGA**

---

### Distributive Justice

- Does your (outcome) reflect the effort you have put into your work?
- Is your (outcome) appropriate for the work you have completed?
- Does your (outcome) reflect what you have contributed to the organization?
- Is your (outcome) justified, give your performance?

### Procedural Justice

- Have you been able to express your views and feelings during those procedures?
• Have you had influence over the (outcome) arrived at by those procedures?
• Have those procedures been applied consistently?
• Have those procedures been free of bias?
• Have those procedures been based on accurate information?
• Have you been able to appeal the outcome arrived at by those procedures?
• Have those procedures upheld ethical and moral standards?

**Interpersonal Justice**

• Has (he/she) treated you in a polite manner?
• Has (he/she) treated you with dignity?
• Has (he/she) treated you with respect?
• Has (he/she) refrained from improper remarks or comments?

**Informational Justice**

• Has (he/she) been candid in (his/her) communications with you?
• Has (he/she) explained the procedures thoroughly?
• Were (his/her) explanations regarding the procedures reasonable?
• Has (he/she) communicated details in a timely manner?
• Has (he/she) seemed to tailor (his/her) communications to individual’s specific needs?

**Task Performance**

• Adequately completes assigned duties.
• Performs tasks that are expected of him/her.
• Meets formal performance requirements of the job

**Intrinsic Job Satisfaction**

• The chance to try my own methods of doing the job
• The chance to work alone on the job
• The chance to do different things from time to time
• The freedom to use my own judgment
• The chance to be “somebody” in the community
Organizational Commitment

- I would be willing to change companies if the new job offered a 25% pay increase.
- I would be willing to change companies if the new job offered more creative freedom.
- I would be willing to change companies if the new job was with people who were more friendly.

Turnover Intentions

- It is likely that I will actively look for a new job this year.
- I often think about quitting.
- I will probably look for a new job in the year.
Η συμμετοχή σας είναι ιδιαίτερα σημαντική αφού θα αναδείξει τους παράγοντες εκείνους που οδηγούν τα στελέχη των ελληνικών επιχειρήσεων στην επίτευξη των εργασιακών τους επιδιώξεων (π.χ. εργασιακή ικανοποίηση). Για το λόγο αυτό σας παρακαλώ να διαθέσετε τα 30' που απαιτούνται για τη συμπλήρωση του ερωτηματολόγιου.

Για όλες τις πληροφορίες που παρέχετε θα υπάρξει απόλυτη εκεμύθεια και πλήρης ανωνυμία σχετικά με την αποτελεσματικότητα των φάκελων.

Στις απαντήσεις σας εκφράστε ελεύθερα την άποψή σας καθώς αυτό θα συμβάλει σημαντικά στην εξαγωγή χρήσιμων πρακτικών συμπερασμάτων και θα επιτρέψει τη σύγκριση με αντίστοιχες έρευνες άλλων χωρών. Παρακαλώ συμπληρώστε όλες τις ερωτήσεις, διαφορετικά το ερωτηματολόγιο δεν θα μπορεί να χρησιμοποιηθεί στις στατιστικές ανάλυσεις.

Τα αποτελέσματα της έρευνας θα ανακοινωθούν αμέσως μετά τη συλλογή και επεξεργασία τους στην ακόλουθη διεύθυνση: www.cirm.aueb.gr/kapoutsis/phd_results/

Στα ευχαριστώ εκ των προτέρων για τη συμβολή σας στη έρευνά μου

Με εκτίμηση,

Ηλίας Καπουτσής (υποψήφιος Διδάκτωρ) *
Ανδρέας Νικολόπουλος (επιβλέπων Καθηγητής)
Ερώτ. 1: Πόσο ικανοποιημένος/η είστε στα ακόλουθα ζητήματα που αφορούν τη δουλειά σας; Χρησιμοποιώντας την ακόλουθη κλίμακα, κυκλώστε τον κατάλληλο αριθμό δεξιά της κάθε πρότασης, ώστε να δηλώσετε το βαθμό ικανοποίησης για το κάθε ένα.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Πολύ διαφανεστήμενος</th>
<th>Διαφανεστήμενος</th>
<th>Ούτε ευχαριστημένος ούτε διαφανεστήμενος</th>
<th>Ευχαριστημένος</th>
<th>Πολύ ευχαριστημένος</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Πόσο ικανοποιημένος/η είστε από:

- το μισθό σας σε σχέση με τον όγκο της δουλειάς που κάνετε;
- τη δυνατότητα να χρησιμοποιείτε δικούς σας τρόπους κατά την εκτέλεση των καθηκόντων σας;
- την ικανότητα του προϊσταμένου σας να παίρνει αποφάσεις;
- την εξασφάλιση που σας παρέχετε για σταθερή απασχόληση;
- τη δυνατότητα να έχετε συνεχώς κάτι να κάνετε;
- τη δυνατότητα που έχετε για προαγωγή στον τομέα που δουλεύετε;
- τη δυνατότητα να κάνετε χρήσιμο σε άλλους στη δουλειά σας;
- τη δυνατότητα να γίνεστε χρήσμος σε άλλους ανθρώπους στη δουλειά σας;
- τους επαίνους που παίρνετε όταν κάνετε καλά τη δουλειά σας;
- την εξασφάλιση που σας παρέχετε για σταθερή απασχόληση;
- τη δυνατότητα να γίνεστε χρήσμος σε άλλους ανθρώπους στη δουλειά σας;
- τη δυνατότητα να κάνετε κατευθύνετε τους άλλους;
- τη δυνατότητα να κατευθύνετε τους άλλους;
- τον τρόπο που η διοίκηση διαχειρίζεται το προσωπικό;
- τον τρόπο που εφαρμόζονται οι πολιτικές της επιχείρησης στην πράξη;
- το αίσθημα πληρότητας για αυτό που κάνετε;
- τη δυνατότητα να θεωρήσετε κάποιος σημαντικό στην επιχείρηση;
- τον τρόπο πώς οι συνάδελφοι σας τα «βρίσκουν μεταξύ τους»;
- τον τρόπο πώς οι συνάδελφοι σας τα «βρίσκουν μεταξύ τους»;
- τις συνθήκες εργασίας;
- τις συνθήκες εργασίας;
- τη δυνατότητα να κάνετε κάτι που αξιοποιεί τις δεξιότητες σας;
- τη δυνατότητα να χρησιμοποιήσετε την αυτόνομη σας κρίση;
- τη δυνατότητα να κατευθύνετε τους άλλους;
- τη δυνατότητα να διεξάχθει συνεχώς κάτι να κάνετε;
- τη δυνατότητα να λειτουργείτε στη δική σας κρίση; Σε πολύ μικρό βαθμό, σε μικρό βαθμό, σε μέτριο βαθμό, σε μεγάλο βαθμό, σε πολύ μεγάλο βαθμό

Ερώτ. 2: Παρακάτω αναφέρονται 18 βασικές δεξιότητες. Χρησιμοποιώντας την ακόλουθη κλίμακα, κυκλώστε τον κατάλληλο αριθμό δεξιά της κάθε πρότασης, ανάλογα με το βαθμό που συμφωνείτε.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Σε πολύ μικρό βαθμό</th>
<th>Σε μικρό βαθμό</th>
<th>Σε μέτριο βαθμό</th>
<th>Σε μεγάλο βαθμό</th>
<th>Σε πολύ μεγάλο βαθμό</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Είμαι καλός/ή στο να χρησιμοποιώ τις επαφές και τις φιλίες προκειμένου να πραγματοποιήσω τους στόχους μου.
- Παρατηρώ προσεκτικά τις εκφράσεις του προσώπου των άλλων ανθρώπων.
- Είμαι σημαντικός/η σε αυτά που λέω και κάνω μια διάταξη μεταξύ τους.
- Αφιερώνω αρκετό χρόνο για να επικοινωνώ με άλλους.
- Είμαι ικανός/ή να κάνω τους περισσότερους ανθρώπους να αισθάνονται άνετα δίπλα μου.
- Καταλαβαίνω του ανθρώπου αρκετά καλά.
- Είμαι καλός/ή στο να κάνω τους ανθρώπους να αισθάνονται άνετα δίπλα μου.
- Είμαι καλός/ή στο να αναπτύξω ένα μεγάλο δίκτυο συναδέλφων και συνεργατών και να μοιράζω τη δουλειά τους.
- Είμαι καλός/ή στο να αναπτύξω ένα μεγάλο δίκτυο συναδέλφων και συνεργατών και να μοιράζω τη δουλειά τους.
- Είμαι καλός/ή στο να αναπτύξω ένα μεγάλο δίκτυο συναδέλφων και συνεργατών και να μοιράζω τη δουλειά τους.
- Είμαι καλός/ή στο να αναπτύξω ένα μεγάλο δίκτυο συναδέλφων και συνεργατών και να μοιράζω τη δουλειά τους.
- Είμαι καλός/ή στο να αναπτύξω ένα μεγάλο δίκτυο συναδέλφων και συνεργατών και να μοιράζω τη δουλειά τους.
Είναι εύκολο για εμένα να αναπτύσσω αμοιβαία συμπάθεια με άλλους.

Στη δουλειά, γνωρίζω αρκετά σημαντικά άτομα και είμαι καλά δικτυωμένος/η.

Είμαι ιδιαιτέρως καλός/ή στο να αντλαμβάνομαι τα κίνητρα και τις «κρυφές σκέψεις» των άλλων.

Είμαι καλός/ή στο να αναπτύσσω σχέσεις με άτομα επιρροής στο τμήμα/επιχείρηση.

Προσπαθώ να δείχνω ένα αυθεντικό ενδιαφέρον απέναντι στους άλλους.

Γνωρίζω από ένστικτο τα κατάλληλα πράγματα που πρέπει να πω ή να κάνω προκειμένου να επιπρέπει τους άλλους.

Ερώτ. 3: Παρακάτω αναφέρονται 7 ιδιαιτέρα χαρακτηριστικά της διαδικασίας που οδηγεί στη λήψη της κατάλληλης στρατηγικής για επίτευξη αποτελεσματικότητας. Χρησιμοποιώντας την ακόλουθη κλίμακα, κυκλώστε τον κατάλληλο αριθμό δεξιά της κάθε πρότασης, ώστε να δηλώσετε το βαθμό που το κάθε ένα επηρεάζει την κρίση σας.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Σε ποιο μικρό βαθμό</th>
<th>Σε μετρίο βαθμό</th>
<th>Σε μεγάλο βαθμό</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Είμαι καλός/ή στο να αναπτύσσω αμοιβαία συμπάθεια με άλλους.

Προσπαθώ να δείχνω ένα αυθεντικό ενδιαφέρον απέναντι στους άλλους.

Είμαι καλός/ή στο να απαντάω σχέσεις με άτομα επιρροής στο τμήμα/επιχείρηση.

Είμαι εύκολο για εμένα να αναπτύσσω αμοιβαία συμπάθεια με άλλους.

Είμαι καλός/ή στο να αναπτύσσω σχέσεις με άτομα επιρροής στο τμήμα/επιχείρηση.

Γνωρίζω από ένστικτο τα κατάλληλα πράγματα που πρέπει να πω ή να κάνω προκειμένου να επιπρέπει τους άλλους.

Ερώτ. 4: Παρακάτω αναφέρονται 18 στρατηγικές που χρησιμοποιούνται ευρέως στην προσπαθεία επίτευξης βασικών εργασιακών επιδιώξεων. Χρησιμοποιώντας την ακόλουθη κλίμακα, κυκλώστε τον κατάλληλο αριθμό δεξιά της κάθε πρότασης, ώστε να δηλώσετε το βαθμό που εσείς χρησιμοποιείτε την κάθε μία.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Σε ποιο μικρό βαθμό</th>
<th>Σε μετρίο βαθμό</th>
<th>Σε μεγάλο βαθμό</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Συμπεριφέρομαι με ταπεινότητα απέναντι στους άλλους όταν είναι να θέσω κάποιο αίτημα.

Ζητάω αυτό που θέλω με φιλικό τρόπο.

Προσπαθώ να κάνω ας έχουν θετική άποψη για εμένα προτού θέσω το αίτημα μου.

Ωπωσιδίως προηγούμενες χάρες/εξυπνεργήσεις που είχα κάνει γι’ αυτούς.

Προσφέρω κάποια αντάλλαγμα (π.χ. αν κάνεις αυτό για μένα, εγώ θα κάνω κάτι άλλο για εσένα).

Δέχομαι να κάνω μια προσωπική θυσία αν κάνοντας αυτό που ζητώ (π.χ. να μοιράσω τη δουλειά μαζίς του/της, να δουλέψω μέχρι αργά, να δουλέψω σκληρότερα).

Ορθοστάσια και επαληθεύσεις που υποστηρίζουν την απόψη μου.

Εκφράζω τον θυμό μου με έντονο τρόπο.

Γνωρίζω από ένστικτο τα κατάλληλα πράγματα που πρέπει να πω ή να κάνω προκειμένου να επιπρέπει τους άλλους.

Ηπατίκη για τους πείσες.

Χρησιμοποιώ τη λογική για τους πείσες.

Αποκτώ την ανεπιθύμητη υποστήριξη των ανωτέρων μου.

Αποκτώ την ανεπιθύμητη υποστήριξη των ανωτέρων μου.

Κάνω επίσης αναφορές στους ανωτέρους ώστε να με υποστηρίξουν.

Στηρίζομαι στην ιεραρχία – σε άτομα δηλαδή που έχουν τη δύναμη να επιβάλουν την απόψη τους.
Εξασφαλίζω την υποστήριξη των συνεργάτων μου.
Εξασφαλίζω την υποστήριξη των υφιστάμενων μου.
Κινητοποιώ άλλα άτομα στην επιχείρηση για να με βοηθήσουν να τους επηρεάσω.

Ερώτ. 5: Σε ποιο βαθμό θεωρείτε ότι συμβαίνουν τα ακόλουθα στην επιχείρηση που εργάζεστε; Χρησιμοποιώντας την ακόλουθη κλίμακα, κυκλώστε το κατάλληλο αριθμό ανάλογα με το βαθμό που συμφωνείτε με τα ακόλουθα.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Σε πολύ μικρό βαθμό</th>
<th>Σε μικρό βαθμό</th>
<th>Σε μέτριο βαθμό</th>
<th>Σε μεγάλο βαθμό</th>
<th>Σε πολύ μεγάλο βαθμό</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

... ενθαρρυνόμαστε να μιλάμε με ειλικρίνεια ακόμη κι όταν διαφωνούμε με τις καθιερωμένες αντιλήψεις.
... το να λέμε αυτό που θέλουν να ακούσουν οι άλλοι είναι μερικές φορές καλύτερο από το να λέμε την αλήθεια.
... επανεκκινούμε να συνεχίσουμε κάποιος αυτές τις διαδικασίες, ανάλογα με τα βαθμίδια που συμφωνείτε με αυτές τις προτάσεις.
... το να λέμε αυτό που θέλουν να ακούσουν οι άλλοι είναι μερικές φορές καλύτερο από το να λέμε την αλήθεια.
... οι καλές ιδέες είναι επιθυμητές ακόμη κι αν διαφωνεί κάποιος με αυτές.
... το να συμφωνεί κάποιος με τους ισχυρότερους αποτελεί την καλύτερη τακτική.
... το να συμφωνεί κάποιος με τους ισχυρότερους αποτελεί την καλύτερη τακτική.
... οι περισσότεροι προσπαθούν να χρησιμοποιήσουν την καιρό κατά την καριέρα τους εμπειρία για να καταλήξουν σε καλύτερες αποτυχίες των άλλων.
... το να λέμε αυτό που θέλουν να ακούσουν οι άλλοι είναι μερικές φορές καλύτερο από το να λέμε την αλήθεια.
... αμοιβαίες συναισθηματικές προτάσεις είναι επιθυμητές μεταξύ υπαλλήλων.
... είναι καλύτερα να παραμείνει κάποιος απομονωμένος και να μην «παράσχει τις νεαρά».
... οι καλές ιδέες είναι επιθυμητές ακόμη κι αν διαφωνεί κάποιος με αυτές.
... το να συμφωνεί κάποιος με τους ισχυρότερους αποτελεί την καλύτερη τακτική.
... το να λέμε αυτό που θέλουν να ακούσουν οι άλλοι είναι μερικές φορές καλύτερο από το να λέμε την αλήθεια.
... επανεκκινούμε να συνεχίσουμε κάποιος αυτές τις διαδικασίες, ανάλογα με τα βαθμίδια που συμφωνείτε με αυτές τις προτάσεις.

Ερώτ. 6: Παρακάτω αναφέρονται 4 προτάσεις που περιγράφουν τα συναισθήματα σας για την επιχείρηση/οργανισμό που εργάζεστε. Χρησιμοποιώντας την ακόλουθη κλίμακα, κυκλώστε το κατάλληλο αριθμό ανάλογα με το βαθμό που συμφωνείτε με αυτές τις προτάσεις.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Σε πολύ μικρό βαθμό</th>
<th>Σε μικρό βαθμό</th>
<th>Σε μέτριο βαθμό</th>
<th>Σε μεγάλο βαθμό</th>
<th>Σε πολύ μεγάλο βαθμό</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Θα ήμουν διατεθειμένος/η να αλλάξω την εταιρεία/οργανισμό εάν:
... μου προσφέρονταν μία νέα δουλειά με 25% αύξηση αποδοχών.
... η νέα δουλειά που θα μου προσφέρονταν που έδινε μεγαλύτερη αυτονομία για δημιουργία.
... η νέα δουλειά μου προσέφερε μεγαλύτερο κύρος.
... στη νέα δουλειά υπήρχαν άνθρωποι πιο φιλικοί μαζί μου.

Ερώτ. 7: Οι ακόλουθες 2 προτάσεις περιγράφουν σκέψεις που κι εσείς μπορεί να έχετε.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Σε πολύ μικρό βαθμό</th>
<th>Σε μικρό βαθμό</th>
<th>Σε μέτριο βαθμό</th>
<th>Σε μεγάλο βαθμό</th>
<th>Σε πολύ μεγάλο βαθμό</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Είναι πιθανόν να αναζητήσω άλλη δουλειά μέσα στην ή τον επόμενο χρόνο.
Συχνά σκέφτομαι να παραιτηθώ.

Ερώτ. 8: Οι ακόλουθες 4 προτάσεις αναφέρονται στις διαδικασίες που χρησιμοποιούνται για να οδηγήσουν στα ανταλλάγματα που λαμβάνετε από την επιχείρηση που εργάζεστε.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Σε πολύ μικρό βαθμό</th>
<th>Σε μικρό βαθμό</th>
<th>Σε μέτριο βαθμό</th>
<th>Σε μεγάλο βαθμό</th>
<th>Σε πολύ μεγάλο βαθμό</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Διαχειριστώ περαιτέρω καλύτερα τις διαδικασίες που οδηγούν στα ανταλλάγματα που θα λάβω.
Είμαι πιθανόν να αναζητήσω άλλη δουλειά μέσα α' αυτόν ή τον επόμενο χρόνο.
Συχνά σκέφτομαι να παραιτηθώ.
Ερώτ. 9: Οι ακόλουθες 4 ερωτήσεις αναφέρονται στα αντάλλαγμα που λαμβάνετε από την επιχείρηση που εργάζεστε. Χρησιμοποιώντας την ακόλουθη κλίμακα, κυκλώστε το κατάλληλο αριθμό τον κατάλληλο αριθμό δεξιά της κάθε πρότασης, ώστε να δηλώσετε το βαθμό που συμφωνείτε με την κάθε μία.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Σε πολύ μικρό</th>
<th>Σε μικρό</th>
<th>Σε μέτριο</th>
<th>Σε μεγάλο</th>
<th>Σε πολύ μεγάλο</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>βαθμό</td>
<td>βαθμό</td>
<td>βαθμό</td>
<td>βαθμό</td>
<td>βαθμό</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Σε ποιο βαθμό:

... τα ανταλλάγματα που παίρνετε ανταποκρίνονται στην προσπάθεια που καταβάλλετε στην εργασία σας; 1 2 3 4 5
... τα ανταλλάγματα που παίρνετε ανταποκρίνονται στην προσπάθεια που λαμβάνετε από την επιχείρηση σας; 1 2 3 4 5
... τα ανταλλάγματα που παίρνετε ανταποκρίνονται στην προσπάθεια που λαμβάνετε από την επιχείρηση σας; 1 2 3 4 5
... τα ανταλλάγματα που παίρνετε απεικονίζουν τη συνεισφορά σας στον οργανισμό; 1 2 3 4 5
... δικαιούστε τα ανταλλάγματα που παίρνετε με βάση την απόδοσή σας; 1 2 3 4 5

Ερώτ. 10: Οι ακόλουθες 9 ερωτήσεις σχετίζονται με τον τρόπο που εφαρμόζονται οι διαδικασίες δίκαια από τη διοίκηση. Χρησιμοποιώντας την ακόλουθη κλίμακα, κυκλώστε το κατάλληλο αριθμό τον κατάλληλο αριθμό δεξιά της κάθε πρότασης, ανάλογα με το βαθμό που συμφωνείτε.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Σε πολύ μικρό</th>
<th>Σε μικρό</th>
<th>Σε μέτριο</th>
<th>Σε μεγάλο</th>
<th>Σε πολύ μεγάλο</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>βαθμό</td>
<td>βαθμό</td>
<td>βαθμό</td>
<td>βαθμό</td>
<td>βαθμό</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Σε ποιο βαθμό η διοίκηση:

... σας συμπεριφέρεται με ευγενικό τρόπο; 1 2 3 4 5
... είναι αξιόπρεπής απέναντί σας; 1 2 3 4 5
... σας συμπεριφέρεται με σεβασμό; 1 2 3 4 5
... αποφεύγει να χρησιμοποιεί ακατάλληλα σχόλια και παρατηρήσεις; 1 2 3 4 5
... είναι ευχάριστη στην επικοινωνία μαζί σας; 1 2 3 4 5
... σας εξηγεί αναλυτικά τις διαδικασίες που οδηγούν στα ανταλλάγματα που λαμβάνετε; 1 2 3 4 5
... χρησιμοποιεί λογικές εξήγησης για να δικαιολογήσει τις παραπάνω διαδικασίες χορήγησης ανταλλάγματων; 1 2 3 4 5
... σας εξηγεί τις λεπτομέρειες έγκαιρα; 1 2 3 4 5
... προσαρμόζει την επικοινωνία σας σε συγκεκριμένες ανάγκες του κάθε ενός; 1 2 3 4 5

Ερώτ. 11: Παρακάτω αναφέρονται 16 προτάσεις που ενδέχεται να χαρακτηρίζουν κι εσάς. Χρησιμοποιώντας την ακόλουθη κλίμακα, κυκλώστε το κατάλληλο αριθμό τον κατάλληλο αριθμό δεξιά της κάθε πρότασης, ανάλογα με το βαθμό που συμφωνείτε.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Θα χαρακτηρίζα τον εαυτό μου ένα άτομο που:</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>είναι συμμετέχει την ακόλουθη κλίμακα</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>είναι υπερβολικό</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>είναι θλιμμένο, στεναχωρημένο</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>είναι επιφυλακτικό</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>είναι χαλαρό, που διαχειρίζεται καλά το ανάγοντα</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>είναι υπερβολικό σε ενέργεια</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>είναι υπερβολικό σε ενέργεια</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>είναι υπερβολικό σε ενέργεια</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>είναι επιφυλακτικό</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>είναι επιφυλακτικό</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>είναι υπερβολικό σε ενέργεια</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>είναι υπερβολικό σε ενέργεια</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>είναι επιφυλακτικό</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>είναι επιφυλακτικό</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ΕΡΩΤ. 12: Παρακάτω αναφέρονται 3 προτάσεις σχετικές με την επίδοσή των υφιστάμενων σας. Χρησιμοποιώντας την ακόλουθη κλίμακα, κυκλώστε το κατάλληλο αριθμό δεξιά της κάθε πρότασης, ανάλογα με το βαθμό που ανταποκρίνεται στην απόδοσή τους.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Πολύ χαμηλή</th>
<th>Κατάλληλη</th>
<th>Μέτρια</th>
<th>Αρκετά Υψηλή</th>
<th>Πολύ υψηλή</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ποιο βαθμίδι πιστεύετε ότι οι υφιστάμενοι σας:
| Ολοκληρώνουν με επάρκεια τα καθήκοντα που τους έχουν ανατεθεί; | 1 2 3 4 5 |
| Εκτελούν τα καθήκοντα όπως αναμενόταν; | 1 2 3 4 5 |
| Καλύπτουν τις τυπικές προϋποθέσεις απόδοσης στη δουλειά; | 1 2 3 4 5 |

ΕΡΩΤ. 13: Παρακάτω αναφέρονται 5 προτάσεις σχετικές με τη δική σας επίδοση. Χρησιμοποιώντας την ακόλουθη κλίμακα, κυκλώστε το κατάλληλο αριθμό δεξιά της κάθε πρότασης, ανάλογα με το βαθμό που ανταποκρίνεται στην απόδοσή σας.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Πολύ χαμηλή</th>
<th>Κατάλληλη</th>
<th>Μέτρια</th>
<th>Αρκετά Υψηλή</th>
<th>Πολύ υψηλή</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Πώς αξιολογείτε τη δική σας απόδοση ως προς:
| Την ποσότητα της δουλειάς που βγάζετε; | 1 2 3 4 5 |
| Τις ικανότητες σας όταν εκτελείτε μια εργασία; | 1 2 3 4 5 |
| Την ποιότητα της δουλειάς που βγάζετε; | 1 2 3 4 5 |
| Τη συνολική σας συνεισφορά; | 1 2 3 4 5 |
| Το χρόνο εκτέλεσης των καθηκόντων σας; | 1 2 3 4 5 |

ΕΡΩΤ. 14: Σημειώστε ένα √ δεξιά της κάθε πρότασης ανάλογα με το αν οι παρακάτω προτάσεις ανταποκρίνονται στον εαυτό σας:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ναι</th>
<th>Όχι</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ΦΥΛΛΟ: Άνδρας ☐ Γυναίκα ☐

ΗΛΙΚΙΑ: 

ΔΡΑΣΤΗΡΙΟΤΗΤΑ ΕΠΙΧΕΙΡΗΣΗΣ ΠΟΥ ΕΡΓΑΖΕΤΕ: 

ΧΑΡΑΚΤΗΡΑΣ ΕΠΙΧΕΙΡΗΣΗΣ ΠΟΥ ΕΡΓΑΖΕΤΕ: 

ΜΙΘΟΣ ΠΟΥ ΛΑΜΒΑΝΕΤΕ ΣΕ ΜΗΝΙΑΙΑ ΒΑΣΗ ΚΑΤΑ ΜΕΣΟ ΌΡΟ: €
Χρόνια στην επιχείρηση: _______ έτη _______ μήνες
Συνολική εργασιακή εμπειρία: _______ έτη _______ μήνες
Σύνολο απασχολουμένων στο τμήμα που εργάζεστε: _____________
Αριθμός υφισταμένων σας: _____________
Τίτλος Πρώτου Πτυχίου: _____________________________________________

Παρακαλώ ελέγξτε ότι έχετε συμπληρώσει όλες τις ερωτήσεις του ερωτηματολογίου
dιαφορετικά το ερωτηματολόγιο δεν θα μπορεί να χρησιμοποιηθεί στις στατιστικές αναλύσεις

....:: ΣΑΣ ΕΥΧΑΡΙΣΤΩ ΠΟΛΥ ::..