

The Effects of Political Behavior on the Level of Reaching Individual Career Goals in Business

Prof.Dr.Tahir Akgemci

Selçuk University

Faculty of Economics and Administrative Sciences

Lecturer S.Gökçe Gök

Gazi University

Abstract

The purpose of this study is to uncover the relationship between political behavior, and individual career levels. In this context, a questionnaire was conducted on 75 employees who work in a IT firm in Ankara. The data obtained were analyzed by using SPSS 15.0 software. According to the findings the relationships between political behavior, and individual career levels have been identified.

Keywords: political behavior, power, individual career

1. Introduction

Organizational policy, which emerged in the last thirty years, and attracted the attention of researchers, has shown a rise. Because of handling to translate power into action, which is the potential to affect others successfully, organizational policy has critical importance especially for managers. Despite this, it can be seen that there isn't sufficient knowledge and required successful examples how to apply it in the workplace. Pfeffer's (1981) and Mintzberg's (1983) studies let organizations gain a political perspective and defined each organization as a political arena (Bursa and Bağcı, 2011).

Due to constantly changing external environmental conditions, limited business resources, intense competition, technological innovations and changes, organizations are becoming more political structures day by day, and the use of power and politics in organizations is increasing to the same extent. Therefore, this uncertainty in which organizations are, brings with it the problem to take organizational decisions under political effects. In this context, according to its political aspect decisions in the organization are given based on the effect of non-rational (Miles, 1980; Ferris and King, 1991).

Many modern organizations, in fact, to encourage organizational policy is designed as a system of simultaneous cooperation and competition. Accordingly, the system allows the competitive struggle that predispose to the formation of policy. That is, both a hierarchical organization chart as it reflects a rational division of tasks and a 'cooperative system' for people to climb posed an 'career ladder. Since there is at the base of the organization more place than the top, and there is more fierce competition for places on the top, it leads to much less winners in the career race. This is why for a person dealing with organizational policy is no need, to be cunning or honest in a conscious way (Morgan, 1998: 191).

The purpose of this study is to investigate the relationship between the individual career level and political behavior in organizations. While earlier studies has shown that between career and political behavior is a positive relation, both issues together haven't been studied. Kipnis and Schmidt (1988) 's research results in a salary increase and career advance which was obtained in accordance to people who apply the appropriate political tactics. Again, in a study made between political skills and career; Dix, Savickas (1995) and Blicke (2010) have uncovered that political skills have a strong influence on career.

2. Political Behavior

The causes for both individuals behavior for their own purposes and the basic purpose of the organization is to transform the parties' demands and expectations into positive and tangible results.

In this case, the spontaneously and unconsciously activities of individuals, as the planned and conscious behavior, are composed of two parts. They are meaningful and descriptive behaviours in the sense of the conscious and planned performance for organizational politics. Because to achieve the objectives and expectations of the individuals within the organization, conscious and purposeful behavior as they do in their own interests constitute political behavior. In this sense, the spontaneously and unconsciously performed attitudes and instead their own interests for others benefit performed behavior, cannot be explained with the concepts of 'being political' or 'political act' (Bursali, 2008).

In the structure named organization employees struggle with a variety of ways and methods to interact and direct each other in a particular direction. As a result, these efforts of employees to gain and use power in the organization form the policy within the organization. Organizational policy may cause beneficial or harmful results, and according to these results, political behavior could be called good or bad. However, regardless of the consequences, within the institution, political behavior is inevitable (Stewart, 1972). More or less, political behavior, to be found in every organization leads to the perception that the organization is a "political arena" (Altintas, 2007). Therefore, many different definitions are also used for political behavior. A common feature of these definitions is, that it is perceived negatively in terms of the organization, because political behavior is performed for faster access to personal aims and serves personal interests.

According to R. Miles: "An organization's internal policy is different (authority, purpose, personality, etc.) but for success connected individuals and groups' used objectives, ways, methods and processes to effect each other by using the power they have for to dominate their views on organizational decision-making mechanisms. It is obvious that managers will use a variety of power sources at his disposal to achieve this effect. Even resorting to other methods to improve the power situation is a common practice. Some examples are proving claims with numerical data, putting pressure on other members, making groupings etc. applications. The important thing at this point is that the administrator is to be aware and is to act to ensure optimum benefit for the organization, no matter what way is used without individual aims suppresses organizational interests (Koçel, 2010).

The concept of policy for the average individual is the type who is colluding in absentia, planning tricks in secret rooms and trying to protect his own interests who deserves a large number of accusations. According to Serderberg (1984) policy represents every effort done for creating, protecting and changing a common sense or to get rid of something that has gained a common sense. These "common senses" may include the interpretation of what happened in the business environment and may also include the determination of the normative patterns of behavior, what the next move should be.

Pfeffer and Salancik (1974) stated that decisions on the distribution of limited resources between organizational sub-units are almost among the most important decisions in organizations and that these decisions are political processes. Accordingly, individuals or groups, strain to have more influence on decision-making issues such as the determination of operating on the budget, evaluating the selecting and determining criteria, distributing rewards and tasks and making career planning.

These power struggles, which are apparent with the political behavior are actually the most typical example can be seen in the organization. Because, while members in the organization effort to increase their power for a reason; power increase in one side causes the loss of the other party's power. As a result, different definitions of political behavior emphasize that this behavior is not allowed within the organization and is actively managed to impress others and in this way people can get faster the results they want (Mayes ve Allen, 1977; Pfeffer, 1981). In this sense, political behaviors tactics are called as influence tactics (Kipnis et al., 1980).

While some of the employees implement upward tactics towards their tops for such issues as realizing their career goals and salary increases; some may exhibit downward tactics such reasons like getting the support of subordinates, fulfilling their needs and collecting the power by themselves (Appelbaum and Hughes, 1998: 86). Mayes and Allen (1977), define political behavior as the use of influence power to reach the results that are not approved by the organization or to reach the approved results by an inappropriate way. In this context, political behavior refers to an undesired negative situation for organizations.

In Ferris and his friends' study in 1989, political behavior is defined as an influence process, where "Individuals modify their own behavior in a strategic manner to maximize their long or short-term interests, by a way consistent or reverse with others interests".

Here, evaluating the phenomenon of influences as regulate, change and route including life reality power of family, career and all areas of social life would be rather a more rational approach than than a short-term behavior change or influence efforts (Yaylacı, 2006: 94).

Mintzberg (1983) emphasizes that the individual must have two main features to be effective and successful. The first is related with, before individuals show political behavior, They should demonstrate motivation or desire for supplying personal resources (personal connections, knowledge, experience, time, etc.) and this case is defined by the concept "political will". Secondly, he signifies that having political will is not enough for political behavior and also having "political skills" is required (Atay, 2009: 892: 893). Mintzberg (1983), defined the political ability as the required energy for revealing political purposes and identified this as the main priority for political behavior.

It is thought that political behavior provides external adaptation to the environment, progress in work performance and career, an increase in the effectiveness and efficiency of the organization and wage increase. However, when it is supposed that each individual in the organization has similar objectives and requirements, and that promotion and advancement opportunities are scarce and valuable resources, competition and conflicts are likely to be experienced in obtaining them. Scarce resources and many people who want to get them, even if other conditions are not considered, may put the nature of the organization inevitably in a political air.

In a study made by Gandz and Murray, questions about the level of discussed political issues, the promotion policy, payments, the influence degree of the co-operation between departments and the level of widespread political behavior were posed. Research based on the results show that 93% of managers think that workplace policy is a normal thing for most companies, 89% thinks that successful managers should be good politicians, 70% accept the need to act politically for advance in the organization and 76% believes that by the rise in the company the environment politicizes. In contrast, 55% of the same managers think that policies harm the efficiency; and 48% stated that the company's senior management should eliminate the policy. This means that although we accept the existence of power and politics and think that it's necessary for individual success, it is clear that we do not like this concept (Mintzberg, 1983).

2.1. The Sources of Political Behavior

According to Ferris and Kacmar (1998), the sources of political behavior are managerial, organizational, group and individual reasons.

- **Managerial-Organizational Causes:** keeping favoritism in the forefront of rational criteria while evaluating performance in organizations such the lack of fair distribution of resources and the preference of people who will obey managers by the selection of staff and promotion, can be evaluated as widespread political behaviors. Against this kind of political behavior, employees can turn negative consequences of political behavior to their advantage by mobilizing external resources for their own purposes or sucking up to administrators, creating uncertainty, breaking the command chain, establishing a coalition, creating information pollution and building strong relationships with the managers within the organisation (İslamoğlu and Börü, 2007).
- **Individual Causes:** That the Individuals own character traits tend to political behavior, the individual is impervious, try to protect itself from being ostracized by managers and other employees, the desire to pursue a career in the organization in a short time and follow the path to convince others that he is important are widespread behaviors in organizations.
- **Group Causes:** separating strong organizational groups into factions, the existence and effectiveness of groups from which employees avoid to have conflict and that informal relations are like or even more powerful than formal structures can be considered as group causes.

2.2. The Political Dimensions of Behavior

Farrell and Petersen (1986), classified political behavior into three dimensions. These dimensions represent employees resource searching in order to influence the distribution of advantages and disadvantages or the tactics to manage existing resources.

- **Internal - External Dimensions:** The internal - External Dimension of Political behavior is that the person tends to take the resources within or from outside the institution. In External dimensions, people in the political behavior let include external elements in political behavior and mobilize external resources towards their aims.

These are for example; espionage, leaking confidential information about the institution to the media, to sue and to collaborate with people outside the institution. In the internal dimension, people in the political behavior use existing resources within the organization. For example, by helping others let feel them expecting the same, making difficulties, to object, to collaborate with people in the institution, to rebel, to create chaos and to retaliate, can be sorted in this size.

- **Horizontal - Vertical Dimension:** In the horizontal-vertical dimension of political behavior are influence tactics between the top and subordinate employees or the same level of employees in question.
- **Legitimate - Illegitimate Size:** Under legitimate size, behaviors like complaining to the boss, not obeying the command chain, blocking the functions of the institution policies and decisions by breaking the rules or obeying them too tight and establishing a relationship with professional activities with people outside the institution can be listed. However, since some political behaviors are considered to be detrimental to the corporate functions and policies, are not accepted and considered legitimate. For example, breaking and sabotaging the rules, to snitch, to participate in the protests, noting collectively being ill for not coming to work, insurrection and rioting are some types of this behavior. Since illegitimate political behavior could result in risks like punishing the person or losing the individual's job, it isn't used so much in the organization. As a result, most of the political behaviors in institutions are legitimate.

3. Individual Career

As a natural result of the rapid changes; the career theory and related researches have been dealt with again and reconsidered conceptual. Non flexible career development models are now being invalid; the career development is conceptualized as an ongoing process of self-discovery around the individual's changing business (McMahon et al., 2012: 762). Researchers imply that after the post-modern economy, the 20th century career theories and vocational guidance techniques need a re-adaptation. It is stated that now, The career theory constructed in terms of individual properties of the 21st century must take the place of inadequate approaches, which gradually conceptualize career. Accordingly, new career models in the rapidly changing environment should emphasize labor flexibility, adaptability and lifelong learning (Savickas et al., 2009: 240).

The career concept is used quite often in daily life and has different connotations in people. Sometimes it is a person's progress in expertise, sometimes working in jobs with relationship between them, and sometimes it is used as a concept for regular, planned in the long term and not only the person's work, but family, leisure and social activities. For the individual, the career concept has much more meaning than only a job. It evokes a considerably degree of success in terms of both people and the external environment. Since career stems from the need for success, it gives a sense of determination and success to the person. It explains the facilities people may encounter, the glory, psychological rewards, and the format of a better life (Aldemir, Ataol and Budak, 2001: 165).

Career for individuals is gaining work experience in their profession by setting goals and professional development by taking the necessary education. Since career is a dead-end path, in a world of rapid development, individuals must adapt themselves by improving in the work life (Tengilimoğlu, Atilla and Bektaş, 2009: 191).

Career can be defined with broader expression as money, prestige, the desire to succeed, a better way of life, opportunities for individuals, rewards, promotions and life-long development (Gürüz and Özdemir Yaylacı, 2009: 184). Career is directly linked to personal and organizational goals and is a process associated with the person's work experience, who will live it through his life and keep partly under control (Güzel 2005, 121).

Career can also be defined as "to advance in a chosen line of business which is armed with people's behavior patterns and is chosen as a life-long work in progress series; and to earn more money as a result of it, obtaining more responsibility, more status, power and prestige. Career is based on representing the employee's degree of success, work progress in the relevant position and taking up the organizational ladder (Bayraktaroğlu, 2008: 137).

Watts has put forward the concept of the individual and corporate career. He divided the concept of individual career into two sub-groups, the first are needs, which change according to social observable and identifiable objective career and specific work experience. The second is subjective career, reflecting the values, aspirations, and attitudes (Woodd, 2000: 100).

Responsibility on the individual requires to be active in many aspects. The planning of these activities, the organization of resources and methods to be used at this aim, the execution of activities, the coordination with individual goals and corporate expectations and the evaluation of results is assessed in individual career management (Özden, 2001: 29).

Individuals and organizations work collaboratively in career planning. In the process first the individuals abilities and interests are detected, the work performance is evaluated and the activities and tasks planned for the position to gain the necessary qualifications for the work life are determined (Şimşek and Öge 2009, 267).

In individual career planning, employees should assess their own knowledge, skills, and interests, their strengths and weaknesses; they also should recognize opportunities both inside and outside the organization and they should determine short, medium and long-term goals (Bolat and Seymen, 2003). Employees must analyze all aspects of themselves and have to align their skills and what they want to do. As long as a person don't be aware of himself, making a realistic career planning isn't possible (Çiftçi, 2007: 150).

Career planning is generally related to the identification of career goals and career paths. Career goals represents the future status of the efforts to achieve the career section of the employees. And the career path, is a series of activities that shape the careers of employees (Ersen, 1997: 112).

In the individual career planning process, organizations should do career counseling by integrating their system with the human resources plan and they should execute types of training programs in order to increase their performance. Career counseling is to help a person to progress on the career path according to his character and talents (Aytaç, 2010: 392).

Personality, fatal events, family conflicts and divorce have a great impact on individuals careers. Such events can affect career plans and career decisions directly or indirectly. Until the middle of their life and / or later, individuals can change relatively their career due to various causes. However, individuals, make rarely radical changes by taking personal responsibility for their career in order to find their own truth. Often, what individuals are doing, is a valuation process. In other words, individuals often seek opportunities for individual development by approaching their present jobs from different angles.

The individual career planning process consists of five stages (Otte and Kahwei 1995: 3).

- i) Determination of Individual Strengths and Weaknesses (Self-assessment)
- ii) Identification of the Career Goals and Objectives
- iii) Identification of the Career Paths by Researching the Internal and External Organization Facilities
- iv) The Preparation of the Work Programme and the Career Plan
- v) Feedback

4. The Relation between Political Behavior and Individual Career Management

Political behavior of individuals in organizations is due to trying to influence each other for various reasons. This means that the members of the organization want to gain power and use it. The purpose of this is to be effective in the organization. Since Organizations are a political system by nature that, political behavior is normal. Organizations have got purposes, and they benefit from an amount of resources for to achieve them. Since the amount of resources is specific, there is need to sacrifice other demands by taking Some decisions to achieve the target. Organization members enter political struggle in order to don't be the sacrificing part.

These power struggles that marked the political behavior is actually the most typical example of conflict that can be seen in the organization. Since members within the organization struggle to enhance their power for any reason; in this process, one sides power increase causes the other parts power loss.

Considering that the organization is a political environment, it is inevitable for individuals to behave political for their careers. As a result, career success can be achieved. Real or perceived success individuals have acquired through their work experience is called career success (Blicke, 2010).

Advancement opportunities provided to employees in the organization, is extremely important for individuals who want to reach their goals by achieving a certain career. A person's career is not only his work; but it is also the education for to reach the aims, feelings and desires related to his position and so to progress and realize their goals with the gained knowledge, ability and desire to work.

However, if it is considered that each individual in the organization has similar objectives and requirements, whereas promotion and advancement opportunities are more scarce and valuable resources, competition and conflicts are likely to be experienced in obtaining them. Even if other conditions are not considered, Scarce resources and many people who want to get them may put inevitably the nature of the organization in a political climate (Öztürk and Teber, 2006).

This condition is considered as an extremely ordinary and usual behavior for each individual or group who think of their own interests. Positive samples for policy results are to fulfill career goals, to gain recognition and status within the organization, power and position, to obtain personal goals and to make a desired work done. Negative samples are the loss of strategic power, reliability and job, a career decline, negative feelings toward others, internal feelings of guilt, promotion by an insufficient level and low job performance (Kumar and Ghadially, 1989:306).

Individuals, who want to get promoted and achieve their career goals have to compete with others in the organization. In this case, it may be in question that many individuals competing with each other to achieve their purpose demonstrate political actions, and individuals who will take decisions and have the resources in hand, do "nepotism" for their own interests (Gandz and Murray, 1980).

5. The Research Methodology

5.1. The Scope and Method of the Research

With the aim of to identify the political behavior and the individual career levels of the information sector employees, all staff working in one of the largest software companies operating in Ankara were examined by field survey methods. Data on research carried out stemming from the basic purpose of the study, were collected by using 5-point Likert scale survey techniques.

The prepared survey form consists of two separate parts. In the first part are questions to determine the demographic characteristics of employees. In the other part political behavior-related variables were evaluated in order to measure the employees perception of personal empowerment with a 24-item scale developed by Zanzi et al. (1991). The individual career management scale (Career Self-Management) used in the study is taken from Sturges et al. (2002). The individual career management scale consists of 16 items.

For the purpose of the study 110 questionnaires were distributed. After examining the results of the questionnaire, 80 questionnaires returned, five were excluded from the survey questionnaire because they contain incomplete information and the research was carried out over 75 employees. Data obtained in the study was assessed by using SPSS 16.0 software.

5.2. Findings and Evaluation

The reliability analysis is a many multivariate statistical analysis technique which shows us to what extent consistent results are given in the scale. According to the answers received from the scale for political behavior and individual career measured on this scale with 40 likert-type questions, safe results at a rate of 92,2 (Cronbach's Alpha) were obtained. Likewise, the answers received for only the political behavior of the measured 24 likert type questions and 16 for individual career have given respectively 85% and 89.7% ratios (Cronbach's alpha) reliable results.

Table 1. Reliability Statistics

Both Scales

Cronbach's Alpha	N of Items
,922	40

The Political Behavior Scale

Cronbach's Alpha	N of Items
,850	24

The Individual Career Scale

Cronbach's Alpha	N of Items
,897	16

Prepared by taking the average of the questions that measures the political behavior and individual career level in this survey in order to examine the presence or absence of a relationship between the level of political behavior and individual career, Pearson's correlation analysis was performed. according to the results a high correlation was found between political behavior and individual career (71.5%). This relationship is statistically significant ($p \leq 0,05$).

H0: There is no relationship between political behavior and individual career.

H1: There is a relationship between political behavior and individual career.

Table 2: Correlations

		PD	BK
PD	Pearson Correlation	1	,715**
	Sig. (2-tailed)		,000
	N	75	75
BK	Pearson Correlation	,715**	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	,000	
	N	75	75

***. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).*

There are two dimensions named political behavior scale (PB) and individual career scale (IC) in the general scale. These dimensions average values were used to test whether they vary according to the size of the demographic questions (gender, education status, etc.) or not.

Differences According to Gender and Age

When the hypotheses are examined, it can be said with 95% confidence that gender did not make a significant difference on the PB and IC ($p > 0.05$).

When the ANOVA table was examined for age, there was no significant statistical difference found. There is no relationship between the PB and IC level.

Differences According to the Marital Status

If there is need to install two separate hypotheses for the two scales;

H0: There is no difference between the PB according to marital status.

H1: There is a difference between the PB according to marital status.

H0: There is no difference between the IC according to marital status.

H1: There is a difference between the IC according to marital status.

Table 3: Group Statistics

	Marital Status	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
PB	Single	46	3,3913	,55870	,08238
	Married	29	3,6379	,41653	,07735
IC	Single	46	3,2554	,75102	,11073
	Married	29	3,9397	,56088	,10415

	t-test for Equality of Means						
	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
						Lower	Upper
PB	-2,044	73	,045	-,24663	,12066	-,48711	-,00614
IC	-4,217	73	,000	-,68422	,16227	-1,00763	-,36082

When the table above is analyzed, it can be said with 95% confidence that the marital status of PB makes a significant difference on IC ($p < 0.05$). This means that between political behavior and individual career averages between married and single persons is a statistically significant difference. Compared to the average, married individuals (3.6379) exhibit more political behavior than single individuals (3.3913). Likewise, married individuals (3.9397) invest much more than single individuals (3.2554) for their individual careers.

Differences According to the Education Level

If there is need to install two separate hypotheses for the two scales;

H0: There is no difference between PB according to Education.

H1: There is a difference between PB according to Education.

H0: There is no difference between the IC according to Education.

H1: There is a difference between the IC according to Education.

Table 4: Differences According to the Education Level

		N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error
PB	Secondary School	2	3,9792	,02946	,02083
	High School	15	3,6389	,28069	,07247
	College- University	52	3,3750	,56375	,07818
	Master	6	3,9097	,15460	,06311
	Total	75	3,4867	,51970	,06001
IC	Secondary School	2	4,5000	,61872	,43750
	High School	15	3,8958	,55935	,14442
	College- University	52	3,3438	,76741	,10642
	Master	6	3,7813	,57520	,23483
	Total	75	3,5200	,75799	,08753

Table 5: Educational levelsANOVA

		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
PB	Between Groups	2,555	3	,852	3,469	,021
	Within Groups	17,432	71	,246		
	Total	19,987	74			
IC	Between Groups	6,064	3	2,021	3,937	,012
	Within Groups	36,452	71	,513		
	Total	42,517	74			

When the ANOVA table is examined, a statistically significant difference ($p < 0.05$) has been found. There is a relationship between the PB and IC level of education. To determine between which education levels differences are, Tukey test statistics is performed and results are shown in the following table.

The following table shows statistically significant difference between College-University and Master level for political behavior. According to this difference, it can be said that Master degrees (3,9097) perform by average more political behavior than College-University graduates (3,3750).

There are statistically significant differences in individual career factors between Secondary School and College-University. According to the findings, secondary school graduates (4.5000) invest more in individual career than College- University graduates (3.3438). Likewise, high school graduates (3.8958) invest more in their individual career than College-University graduates (3.3438).

Table 6: The Educational level TUKEY Test

Dependent Variable	(I) education	(J) education	Mean Difference (I-J)	Std. Error	Sig.
PB	Secondary school	High school	,34028	,37300	,365
		College-University	,60417	,35704	,095
		Master Degree	,06944	,40457	,864
	High school	Secondary School	-,34028	,37300	,365
		College-University	,26389	,14522	,073
		Master Degree	-,27083	,23935	,262
	College-University	Secondary School	-,60417	,35704	,095
		High school	-,26389	,14522	,073
		Master Degree	-,53472*	,21364	,015
	Master	Secondary School	-,06944	,40457	,864
		High school	,27083	,23935	,262
		College-University	,53472*	,21364	,015
IC	Secondary School	High school	,60417	,53938	,266
		College-University	1,15625*	,51631	,028
		Master Degree	,71875	,58504	,223
	High School	Secondary School	-,60417	,53938	,266
		College-University	,55208*	,21000	,010
		Master Degree	,11458	,34612	,742
	College-University	Secondary School	-1,15625*	,51631	,028
		High school	-,55208*	,21000	,010
		Master Degree	-,43750	,30894	,161
	Master	Secondary School	-,71875	,58504	,223
		High school	-,11458	,34612	,742
		College-University	,43750	,30894	,161

Differences According to the Work Time

If there is need to install two separate hypotheses for the two scales;
 H0: According to PB, there is no difference between the work periods.
 H1: According to PB, there is difference between the work periods.
 H0: According to IC, there is no difference between the work periods.
 H1: According to IC, there is difference between the work periods.

Table 7. Differences according to Working Hours

		N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error
PB	0-5 years	39	3,5609	,43720	,07001
	6-10 years	17	3,2966	,76218	,18486
	11-15 years	8	3,3073	,40271	,14238
	15 years	11	3,6477	,30355	,09152
	Total	75	3,4867	,51970	,06001
IC	0-5 years	39	3,4279	,69885	,11191
	6-10 years	17	3,2941	,97872	,23737
	11-15 years	8	3,4688	,38382	,13570
	15 years	11	4,2330	,28103	,08473
	Total	75	3,5200	,75799	,08753

Table 8. Working Time ANOVA Test

		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
PB	Between Groups	1,372	3	,457	1,744	,166
	Within Groups	18,615	71	,262		
	Total	19,987	74			
IC	Between Groups	6,811	3	2,270	4,514	,006
	Within Groups	35,706	71	,503		
	Total	42,517	74			

To investigate whether there is a difference between political behavior and individual career according to the working time, the results of ANOVA were examined and it has been found that it does not make a difference on political behavior, but it can be judged to have an effect on individual career (for IC <0.05). According to the Tukey test statistic results are significant differences between 15 years and more working employees with 0-5 years working employees, and there is a difference between employees working between 6-10 and 11-15 years. According to this differences, the average value of 15 years and more working employees (4,2330) is larger than the other groups average value. This means that 15 years and more working employees invest more in their individual career.

Table 9. Working Time Tukey Test

Dependent Variable	(I) time	(J) time	Mean Difference (I-J)	Std. Error	Sig.	
PB	0-5 years	6-10 years	,26433	,14881	,080	
		11-15 years	,25361	,19873	,206	
		15 years and more	-,08683	,17481	,621	
		6-10 years	0-5 years	-,26433	,14881	,080
	6-10 years	11-15 years	-,01072	,21953	,961	
		15 years and more	-,35116	,19813	,081	
		11-15 years	0-5 years	-,25361	,19873	,206
	11-15 years	6-10 years	,01072	,21953	,961	
		15 years and more	-,34044	,23792	,157	
		15 years and more	0-5 years	,08683	,17481	,621
	IC	0-5 years	6-10 years	,13377	,20610	,518
			11-15 years	-,04087	,27524	,882
15 years and more			-,80507*	,24210	,001	
6-10 years		0-5 years	-,13377	,20610	,518	
		11-15 years	-,17463	,30405	,568	
		15 years and more	-,93884*	,27441	,001	
11-15 years		0-5 years	,04087	,27524	,882	
		6-10 years	,17463	,30405	,568	
		15 years and more	-,76420*	,32952	,023	
15 years and more		0-5 years	,80507*	,24210	,001	
		6-10 years	,93884*	,27441	,001	
		11-15 years and more	,76420*	,32952	,023	

5. Conclusion

From an economic point of view, organizations try to reach an excess of revenue over expenses by meeting the needs of the market. However, organizations consisting of these individuals and continuing to exist thanks to these individuals, have to prepare a suitable environment to realize the interests of the individual and to provide opportunities for their career development. This means that organizations convert beside their inevitably economic structures as well as to political structures. If it is considered that individuals' career goals for especially higher managerial and professional levels are based on the accumulated power they have; the situation will become a little more clear. Because they want to realize their interests by using these power savings with actions that affect other individuals. These actions are effective in the environments politicization (Zaleznik, 1970: 48).

Since Organizational political behavior of individuals and groups to protect their interests are used to improve their effects, it is installed by the meaning "intentional behavior". Therefore, it is claimed to be unfunctional at the organizational level and is usually emphasized in the negative direction (Vigoda, and Gadot, 2007: 662).

In this context, it is assumed that political behavior will consume time, reduce organizational effectiveness, limit the sharing of information, originate communication barriers and, more importantly, will wear employees as mental and emotional and will increase leaving the organization (Maslyn et al, 2005:251-276). However, organizational political behavior of organizational strategic decisions about how decision-makers will lead to a career performance will make a positive contribution, individual purposes by performing organizational efficiency may have also a positive effect on the general acceptance (Vigoda and Kapu, 2005). The common aspect of this general acceptance is the fact that organizations are political structures.

According to the data obtained in this study there is a high positive relationship between the political behavior and individual career level. When the hypotheses are examined it is observed that gender doesn't make a significant difference on political behavior and the individual career level. The age has also no impact on the level of individual career and political behavior. It can be seen that marital status poses a significant difference on the political behavior and individual career level, so married individuals exhibit more political behavior compared to single individuals. Likewise, according to the study, married individuals invest more than the single individuals in their individual career. When the political behavior factor is examined for the education level, it can be said that master's degree graduates behave more politically than College-University graduates. According to the study again; it is concluded that 15 years and older workers invest more on individual careers.

Constituting one of the most basic facts of the organization, political action is of great importance to individuals working at all levels of the organization and as a whole to the organization. When considered that activities affect beside the efficiency and effectiveness of the organization individuals' expectations and career goals, it is revealed how important politics for the organization is. If organizations can not manage these political behaviors, negative consequences will appear both for individuals and the organization. In this case, managers are required to exhibit an attitude and management to prevent any situation that may arise negative political behaviors in organizations.

References

- Aldemir, C., Ataol, A. ve Budak, G., *Personel Yönetimi*. İzmir: Fakülteler Yayınevi- Barış Yayınları, 2001
- Altıntaş Füsün Ç., *Örgüt Yapısının Örgütsel Politika ve İşlem Adaleti Üzerine Etkisinin Yapısal Denklem Modellemesi Yardımıyla Analizi* Anadolu Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi, Cilt: 7, Sayı: 2, 2007, s:152
- Appelbaum Steven H. ve Hughes B., *Ingratiation as a Political Tactic: Effects within the Organization*", *Management Decision*, Vol.36, No.2, 1998, s:86
- Atay, Salim, *İş Yaşamında Politik Yeti*, Namar Danışmanlık Yayınları, İstanbul, 2009a
- Çiftçi Birgül, *Kariyer Planlama*, Uğur Dolgun (Ed.), *İnsan Kaynakları Yönetiminde*, Ekin Kitabevi, Bursa, 2007, s:139-166
- Dündar G., *Kariyer Geliştirme*, *İnsan Kaynakları Yönetimi*, 4. Baskı, İstanbul: Beta Yayınları, 2009, s:264-295
- Ersen H., *Toplam Kalite ve İnsan Kaynakları İlişkisi*, İstanbul, 1997
- Farrell D. ve Petersen J. F., *Patterns of Political Behavior in Organizations*, *Academy of Management Review*, Vol.7, No.3, 1982, s:403-412
- Ferris Gerald R., Kacmar K., *Perceptions of Organizational Politics*, *Journal of Management*, Cilt: 18, Sayı:1, 1992, s: 115-116
- Ferris G.R. ve King, T. R., *Politics in Human Resources Decisions: A Walk on The Dark Side*. *Organizational Dynamics*, 1991

- Gandz J. ve Murray V., The Experience of Workplace Politics, Academy of Management Journal, Vol.23, No.2, 1980
- Güzel T., Eğitim ve Gelişme, Nobel Yayınları, Ankara, 2005
- İslamoğlu G., Börü D., Politik Davranış Boyutları: Bir Ölçek Geliştirme Çalışması, Akdeniz İ.İ.B.F. Dergisi, Sayı: 14, 2007, s:138-139
- Kanten S., Kariyer Uyum Yetenekleri Ölçeği: Geçerlilik ve Güvenilirlik Çalışması,Süleyman Demirel Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Dergisi, Sayı:16, 2012/2
- Koçel, Tamer, İşletme Yöneticiliği,13. Baskı, Beta Yayınları, 2010
- Kumar, P., Rehana G., Organizational Politics and Its Effects on Members of Organizations, Human Relations, Vol.42, No.4, 1989, s:305-314
- Mayes, B. T. ve B. W. Allen, Toward a Definition of Organizational Politics, Academy of Management Review, 2, 1977, s.672-678
- Maslyn J., Fedor D., Farmer S., Bettenhausen K., Perceptions of Positive and Negative Organizational Politics: Roles of the Frequency and Distance of Political Behavior, Annual Meeting of the Southern Management Association, Charlotte, Sayı: 2, 2005, s: 251-276
- Miles, R.H.,Macro Organizational Behavior. The Goodyear Series in Administration and Business Management, 1980
- Mintzberg H.,Power In and Around Organizations, Prentice-Hall, Inc., Englewood Cliffs, NJ, 1983
- Mohan Bursalı Y., Dokuz Eylül Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü İşletme Anabilim Dalı Doktora Tezi Örgütsel Politikanın İşleyişi: Örgütsel Politika Algısı Ve Politik Davranış Arasındaki İlişkiler, 2008
- Morgan, G.,Yönetim ve Örgüt Teorilerinde Metafor, Çev.:Gündüz Bulut,MESS Yayınları, İstanbul, ralık1998.
- Otte, L. F. ve Kahweiler, M. W., Long-Range Career Planning During Turbulent Times, Business Horizons, 1995, s: 2-7
- Öztürk Z. ve Teber S., Kariyer Yönetiminin Çalışan Motivasyonuna Etkileri: Jandarma Havacılık Komutanlığı Örneği, Gazi Üniversitesi Endüstriyel Sanatlar Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi, Sayı:19, 2006, s:70
- Özden, M.C.,Bireysel Kariyer Yönetimi: Profesyonel'in El Kitabı, Ümit Yayıncılık, 2001
- Pfeffer J., Power in organizations, Marshfield, MA: Pitman Publishing Inc., 1981
- Pfeffer J. ve Salancik, G.R, Organizational Decision Making as a Political Process: The Case of a University Budget, Administrative Science Quarterly, 1974, s:135-151
- Sturges, J., Guest, D., Conway, N., Davey, K. M., A Longitudinal Study of The Relationship between Career Management and Organizational Commitment among Graduates in The First Ten Years at Work, Journal of Organizational Behavior, 23, 2002, s: 731-748
- Stewart R, The Reality of Organizations, Doubleday and Company, 1972
- Sederberg Peter C., The Politics of Meaning: Power and Explanation in the Construction of Social Reality University of Arizona Press 1984
- Kipnis, D., Schmidh, S.M. Ve Wilkinson, I., Intraorganizational Influence Tactics: Explorations in Getting One's Way, Journal of Applied Psychology, 65, 1980, s:440-452
- Savickas, M.L., Nota, L., Rossier, J., Dauwalder, J.P., Duarte, M.E., Guichard, J., Soresi, S., Esbroeck, R.V. Ve Van Vianen, A.E.M., Life designing: A paradigm for career construction in the 21st century, Journal of Vocational Behavior, 75, 2009, s: 239-250
- Şimşek M. Şerif ve Öge H. Serdar, İnsan Kaynakları Yönetimi, 2. Baskı, Ankara: Nobel Yayınları, 2009
- Tengilimoğlu, D., Atilla, E. A. ve Bektaş, M., İşletme Yönetimi. Ankara: Seçkin Yayıncılık, 2009
- Teun A. Van Dijk, Söylemin Yapıları ve İktidarın Yapıları, Der. ve Çev.: Mehmet Küçük, Medya, İktidar, İdeoloji, Bilim ve Sanat Yayınları, Ankara, 2005, s:317,318
- Vigoda-Gadot E., Leadership Style, Organizational Politics, and Employees, Performance: An Empirical Examination of Two Competing Models, Personel Review, Cilt: 36, Sayı: 5, 2007, s: 662
- Vigoda Gadot E. ve Kapun D., Perceptions of Politics and Perceived Performance in Public and Private Organizations: A Test of One Model Across Two Sectors, Policy and Politics, Cilt: 33, Sayı: 2, 2005, s: 251-276
- Woodd, M., The Move Towards a Different Career Pattern: Are Women Better Prepared than Men for a Modern Career?, Career Development International, 2000a, 5(2), 99-105
- Yaylacı, G. O., Organizasyonlarda Kişilerarası İlişkilerde Etki Taktikleri ve Kullanımına İlişkin Yazın çalışması, Bilig, Sayı: 236, 2006, s:93-112
- Zanzi, Alberto; Michael B. Arthur; Boas Shamir. The Relationships Between Career Concerns and Political Tactics in Organizations, Journal of Organizational Behavior, Vol.12, No.3, 1991, s:219-233
- Zaleznik A., Power and Politics in Organizational Life, Harvard Business Review, May- June, 1970, s:48