



Organisational Politics and Performance: The Intervening Role of Tribal Diversity in the Hospitality Industry in Ghana

Eunice Aidoo^{1*} and Agnes Odoi¹

¹Department of Human Resource Management, Ghana Baptist University College, Ghana.

Authors' contributions

This work was carried out in collaboration between both authors. Author EA made a substantial contribution to the conception and design and wrote the first draft. Author AO managed the acquisition and analysis of the data. Both authors critically revised the paper for important intellectual content, reviewed the draft manuscripts and approved the final manuscript.

Article Information

DOI: 10.9734/AJEBA/2018/43383

Editor(s):

(1) Atanu Sengupta, Professor, Department of Economics, Burdwan University, West Bengal, India.

Reviewers:

(1) Ukachukwu, Chukwuma, Imo State University, Nigeria.

(2) Arjita Jain, University of Mumbai, India.

(3) Owusu Samuel Mensah, Jingghansang University, China.

Complete Peer review History: <http://www.sciencedomain.org/review-history/26015>

Original Research Article

Received 4th June 2018
Accepted 9th August 2018
Published 27th August 2018

ABSTRACT

Aims: The primary objective of the study is to investigate the effects of tribal diversity in the relationship between organisational politics and performance in the hospitality industry in Ghana.

Methodology: To achieve this a sample of 122 employees from 30 hotels in Ghana were selected using stratified sampling technique. The study used questionnaires for data collection and employed quantitative techniques for the analysis of the data. Means, standard deviations, correlations and regression analysis were used to present the results.

Results: The study revealed that employees perceive organisational politics to be prevailing within their organisations. The relationship between tribal diversity and organisational politics was established to be significant at a level of (0.043) less than the alpha value of (0.05). The study also found a significant relationship between tribal diversity and organisational performance at a significant level of (0.040) less than the alpha value of (0.05). The relationship between organisational performance and organisational politics was found to be a negatively significant

*Corresponding author: E-mail: niceby6@gmail.com;

relationship. The study revealed that organisational politics and organisational performance without the mediating variable (tribal diversity) was significant at ($p=0.001$) but introducing tribal diversity did not change the relationship nor the extent of the relationship. Hence, tribal diversity did not mediate the relationship between organisational politics and organisational performance.

Keywords: Tribal diversity; organisational politics; organisational performance; hospitality industry; Ghana.

1. INTRODUCTION

Holistically, the world is made up of different persons with various individual differences who share common characteristics with others persons. Individual differences are an essential component of diversity [1]. Generally, diversity refers to recognising, understanding and accepting individual differences which comes about as a result of race, gender, age, ethnicity, sexual orientation and many more [2]. In recent years, interactions with different groups of people have been made possible due to some factors including migration and globalisation. According to [2], diversity can be classified into primary and secondary dimensions. The primary dimension shows the main difference between individuals regarding age, gender, tribe and many others which are not subject to change. This study focuses on one aspect of the primary diversity which is tribal diversity.

Ghana has multi-ethnic backgrounds with varying values and belief systems. Within these ethnic groups are found various tribe since no part of the country is ethnically homogenous. Easy geographical and social mobility in the country has scattered people from diverse tribes all over the country [3]. Consequently, these different qualities influence how people interact with each other and relate to the external environment. Social and geographic mobility has made it possible to find various people at different locations within the country. This diverse nature of the country has made its way into the workforce in Ghanaian organisations as well [4].

Organisations consist of different groups of people working together to achieve specific stated objectives and goals. Organizations depend primarily on its workforce whereas these workforce in recent times are ethnically or tribally diverse. The relationship between workers consequently leads to the formation of groups based on common interest and characteristics [5]. In every organisation, there are two main groups; formal and informal groups, whereas the former is a known and identified group, the latter

is based on shared interest which is usually not formally recognised [5]. Organisations are open to politics because of these groups and the various interest that exist in the workplace. Hence, the background of workers and other factors influence the viewpoints and the different interest of individuals or groups, thus, politics in organisations. Consequently, tribal diversity contributes to the various informal groups that are formed within organisations due to the common characteristics individuals of the same organisations may share. Individuals preferably build social relationships or groups with people they share significant socio-demographic and personal characteristics with [6].

Organisational politics is described as “activities that permit people in an organisation to achieve goals without going through the appropriate channels [7]. It is thus inevitable in organisations as it has both positive and negative consequences on the organisation’s performance. A common characteristic of organisational politics is the placement of individual interest ahead of the interest of the organisation. Also, organisational politics has a negative influence on organisational performance through lowering profits and productivity [8]. However, diversity in the workplace has been established by research to have an impact on organisational performance [9] and tribal diversity is seen as a sub-subject of diversity in the workplace. Tribal diversity contributes to the forming of informal groups within organisations which adds to political behaviours within organisations. In this regard, the study focuses on tribal diversity and how it affects organisational politics and performance in the hospitality industry in Ghana.

Tribal diversity among workers is a subject of growing interest among organisations in Ghana due to the various ethnic groups found in the country. According to [4], tribal diversity exists at the workplace as people usually follow issues of diversity by identifying with people from the same background as them. Despite the advantages of having different groups of people from different

tribal backgrounds working together in one organisation, evidence suggests that such people perform either much better or worse than people of the same background [1]. Hence, diversity in the workplace if not adequately managed contributes to politics in organisations.

Organisational politics is considered as a means to attain one's interest or fortune through unofficial advancements [10]. Even though organisational politics has some advantages, the adverse outcomes are more pronounced [11]. Therefore, researchers usually see organisational politics as an enemy of organisations [12]. Consequently, organisational politics ultimately affects organisational performance [13].

Studies on organisational politics have mainly focused on public sector organisations [14], [15]. However, the study organisations in this work have different work orientation and structure as compared to public organisations. According to [16], organisational politics should be studied in a specific context; which suggests that organisational politics should be examined for each business type. As a result, research on organisational politics should be tailored to specific organisational work orientation and structure. Given that, this study will be undertaken within the hospitality industry of Ghana. Furthermore, limited knowledge exists in the literature about how tribal diversity affects these constructs; organisational politics and organisational performance. Studies conducted by other researchers such as [4,17] on workplace diversity have mainly focused on its effects on organisational performance and how diversity could be managed. Therefore, this study focuses on the effects of tribal diversity on organisational politics and ultimately on organisational performance within the hospitality industry in Ghana.

Even though organisational politics has a negative consequence on organisations, it is needful for the normal functioning of organisations [18] because political behaviours are inevitable within organisations [19]. Also, diversity has become more pronounced in organisations in recent times due to ease of social and geographic mobility. Diversity in the workplace enhances knowledge, skill transfer, creativity and better decisions [12]. However, diversity, when not managed properly, can have negative consequences for organisations. Diversity in organisations contributes to the

formation of various informal groups which leads to destructive behaviours in organisations [20].

Based on this background, the study would become very relevant in the life cycle of present organisations and will contribute to the literature on tribal diversity at the workplace and organisational politics in the hospitality industry that will help promote and ensure long-term organisational performance.

2. LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1 Diversity

Recently, diversity is becoming a growing global concern. However, diversity does not have a universal definition but has various definitions in the literature. Whereas some approach it as a narrow concept, others also approach it as a broad concept. For such reasons, diversity is considered as a complex concept [21]. According to [22], people usually present diversity to relate to only race and ethnicity but the concept far extent more than that. Thus, diversity is defined according to [23] as acknowledging, understanding, accepting and appreciating differences among people concerning age, class, race, ethnicity, gender, disabilities among others. [21] also states that diversity is "a mixture of people with different group identities within the same social system". Additionally, [24] indicated that diversity comprises all the differences amongst individuals including their gender, age, ability, ethnicity, social status and sexual orientation. Thus, [1] asserts that individual differences are a vital component in diversity definition. Therefore, diversity can be understood as sets of conscious efforts that encompasses understanding and appreciating the interdependence of human cultures and the natural environment [25].

Nevertheless, diversity has been viewed by certain authors based on some categories. According to [26], there are two main dimensions, primary and secondary when it comes to diversity. The primary dimensions of diversity refer to characteristics of an individual that is inborn, cannot be changed and have an impact on the early socialisation of a person while the secondary dimensions refer to characteristics that are subject to change within the life period of a person. The primary dimensions relate to age, gender, ethnicity (tribe), and physical features whereas the secondary dimensions refer to things like

income, marital status, religious beliefs and education. In contrast to the dimensions explained by [26,27] explained diversity in four main dimensions even though their explanations were similar to the two dimension of [26]. These four dimensions included personality, internal dimensions, external dimensions and organisational dimensions. Personality dimensions include individual traits and likes. Internal dimensions cover attributes which are outside the control of the individual including, sex, age, ethnicity, race and physical features. External dimensions refer to things within the personal choice of the individual such as religion and education. Organisational dimensions are factors that are put in place in the workplace of an individual that separates him or her from others. These include position, employment location and department [27]. The internal and external dimensions are in sync with the primary and secondary dimensions of [26]. For the scope of this study, ethnicity or tribe which is part of the primary or internal dimension of diversity was used.

2.2 Workforce Diversity

It was noted by [28] that diversity exists in every country and organisation. Globally, organisations have moved toward employing people with different cultural backgrounds [29]. Workforce diversity emerged in literature as a result of legal protection of various demographic characteristics such as age, gender, ethnicity and other human differences. The first global initiative towards workforce diversity was in 1961 which was known as affirmative action [30]. According to [31], workforce diversity is the variations in demographic characteristics of employees that may go a long way to influence approval, performance and progress in an organisation. Thus, workforce diversity is a concept used to describe organisations with employees from different backgrounds. Also, workforce diversity refers to a variety of differences that exist among people in an organisation [32]. However, workforce diversity can be viewed from a narrower or broader perspective. Authors such as [33,34,35] who see workforce diversity as a narrower concept define it as the extent of heterogeneity among employees of an organisation in relation to cultural variables such as age, ethnicity, and gender. Contrary to this, the broader perspective description of workforce diversity looks at acknowledging, understanding, accepting, valuing and celebrating the overall differences that exist among employees of an

organisation which include cultural dimensions, organisational roles and behavioural styles [36]. This study adopted the narrower definition of workforce diversity because of how it fits into the context of the study. However, only one construct which is tribal diversity was studied to examine the nature of diversity among the workforce in the hospitality industry in Ghana.

2.3 Conceptualizing Tribal Diversity

A tribe could be understood as a collection of families or communities linked by blood. People belonging to one tribe live on the same land together. On the other hand, an ethnic group can be viewed as a social group that share common cultural identities [37]. Concerning location, members of a particular ethnic group can live at different geographic locations. An ethnic group is a collection of tribes with similar identities [38]. Thus, studies on diversity at the workplace in Ghana by [4] used ethnic diversity instead of tribal diversity due to its broader scope. Hence, an increase in diversity at the workplace on the grounds of tribal diversity is as a result of an increase in multi-culture in various organisations. Therefore, Tribal diversity refers to people with a different tribal background within an organisation [4].

The definition of tribal diversity could be on a personal level or a relational level depending on the focus of the investigation. By the personal level, a tribe is defined as the demographic characteristic of a person whereas the relational level involves examining the tribe of a person in relation to other demographic characteristics within a social group [39]. Thus this study examined the relational level of the tribes to determine differences among employees within the industry.

2.4 Organizational Politics

Organizational politics is a reality in numerous organisations across the globe [40]. An organisation is a complex entity comprising different department, teams and individuals with different desires and interests which make politics in organisations inevitable. According to [41] organisational politics refers to actions taken by individuals that place their interests ahead of others as well as ignore the wellbeing and goals of the organisation. Similarly, [42] stated that employees take actions to obtain, nurture and utilise power for personal purposes other than those of the organisation's. Thus, [43] define

organisational politics as the influence process which is geared towards maximising self-interest. Hence, following the line of thought relating organisational politics to power; [10] also opines that any unauthorised means of obtaining power can be considered as organisational politics.

Other definitions of organisational politics in recent years have described it as indulging in activities of influence with the intent of increasing one's or a group's interest [44]. According to [45], organisational politics refers to selfish and manipulative behaviours of people within organisations who use unapproved means to achieve their goals at the expense of others or the organisation. However, the self-interest of people could either be extended or short-term depending on the time or period of their goals. Additionally, [46] explained organisational politics as a social influence process in which organisational members engage in opportunistic behaviours with the purpose of maximising their self-interest. Hence, Organizational politics involve various actions and behaviours of employees with the intention of promoting or protecting the self-interest of a person or a group of people within the organisation. A common component of organisational politics is the placement of self-interest ahead of organisational goals and objectives. Also, not giving attention to organisational protocol and chain of command is another element in organisational politics' definition. Nonetheless, Organizational politics may go against laid down rules and structures in an organisation [8]. As a consequence, Organizational politics has adverse effects on organisations. However, some authors like [47] have asserted a favourable view of organisational politics relating to it as being inevitable in most organisations.

2.5 Organizational Performance

Organizational performance is difficult to define as it refers to different connotations at a particular point in time. There exist no universally accepted explanation of the concept [48]. According to [49], organisational performance is the capability of a firm to accomplish its goals through the utilisation of resources in a properly planned fashion. Similarly, [50] assert that organisational performance is the capability of an enterprise to accomplish its set goals and objectives. Thus, [51] explained organisational performance as a notion that enables organisations to establish agreed-upon goals, assign and place resources in order. Also,

organisational performance can be described as the capacity to achieve anticipated goals or the extent to which the expected results are accomplished [52].

Organizational performance measurements have usually been tailored solely to financial performance but, [53] assert that organisational performance should not be based on solely financial indicators. Therefore, Researchers often view organisational performance from two perspectives, being objective and subjective perspectives. An objective perspective is usually based on substantial evidence such as financial statements whereas subjective perspective is based on respondents' views [54]. Thus, [55] stresses that in human resource management research, organisational performance is categorised into three; financial and market performance, operational performance and employee attitude and behaviour or employee performance. Financial and market performance is based on objective data. The financial performance focuses on return on resources, return on equity, revenue, market share and value. The Operational performance is directly related to productivity. The focus of operational performance is based on the number of products produced, the number of customer complaints and the quantity of new products manufactured. However, employee performance captures the results and conduct of employees [55]. It thus describes the behaviour and actions taken by an individual towards organisational goals [56]. Ultimately, the performance of individuals reflects the performance of the organisation. Hence, for this work, organisational performance was studied in the context of employee performance.

2.6 Effect of Tribal Diversity on Organisational Performance

There are advantages, and disadvantages of diversity to organisations and Researchers have examined the effects of workplace diversity on the performance of organisations. Again, diversity in organisations presents problem-solving talents and creativity in organisations. Nevertheless, no study has been done on tribal diversity and performance since most studies have dwelt on ethnic diversity or cultural diversity. It was realised by [57] that ethnic diversity positively affected employee performance within organisations. Also, [58] revealed that cultural diversity was predictive of team scores through the use of different ethical views of problems. [59] also indicated that

ethnicity leads to innovation and creativity within organisations. Additionally, [60] recorded a positive influence of ethnic diversity on sales, efficiency, market share and creativity. On the contrary, [61] found no link between ethnic diversity and sales, customer gratification and sales productivity. Still, Authors such as [62] emphasise that ethnic diversity lead to rejection among group members and subsequently reduced performance. Thus, [63] asserts that one harmful impact of cultural diversity is the increased propensity of employees to pander to interpersonal conflicts. Hence, the effects of tribal diversity on organisations could be favourable or unfavourable depending on how employees view diversity within the organisation. Based on the above it is therefore hypothesised that:

H1: Tribal diversity will have a significant effect on organisational performance.

2.7 Tribal Diversity, Organizational Politics and Employee Performance

Employees' behaviour is affected by organisational politics which subsequently influence their performance [64]. [13] revealed that organisational politics leads to low interest to work and ultimately affect employee performance. Additionally, [65] confirm that organisational politics affected employee commitment and consequently impacted their performance. Thus, researchers such as [66], [41] have revealed a negative link between employee performance and perceived organisational politics.

As a result, [13] also stated that organisational politics and employee performance had a negative relationship with emotional intelligence mediating the relationship. Also, [64] indicated that organisational politics had a connection with employee performance with the perception of social exchange mediating the relationship fully. Therefore, there is a relationship between organisational politics and employee performance which has been mediated by other variables. On this basis, the study seeks to establish the mediating role of tribal diversity in the relationship between organisational politics and employee performance which culminates in organisational performance. Based on this argument, it can be hypothesised that:

H2: Organisational Politics has a significant effect on organisational performance.

H3: Tribal diversity mediates the relationship between organisational politics and organisational performance.

3. METHODOLOGY

According to [67], descriptive study is preferable when making investigations into current situations and drawing conclusions from the information gathered. This study was conducted to find out the prevailing conditions of tribal diversity, organisational politics and organisational performance in the hospitality industry in Ghana. The study employed quantitative techniques to describe the relationship between organisational politics and organisational performance through the mediating role of tribal diversity. The targeted population for the study included all employees in the hotel industry from which the stratified sampling technique was used to select 122 employees from 30 hotels across the country. The results from the study were then presented in means, standard deviations, correlations and regressions.

3.1 Reliability Statistics

There are several methods for undertaking reliability statistics; however, the Cronbach alpha coefficient is the most widely accepted method [68]. Numerical values of Cronbach alpha ranging from 0.7 to 0.95 are acceptable values [69]. The general reliability of the tribal diversity scale was 0.770 which falls within the acceptable values for the Cronbach alpha coefficient. Organisational politics scale also had a Cronbach alpha coefficient of 0.802 which also falls within the conventional values for analysing the reliability of scales. Organisational performance scale also had 0.752 which also falls within the standard values. This results indicated that the three main scales used in the study were internally consistent and had high reliability.

3.2 Confirmatory Factor Analysis

According to [70] there is a universal, consistent standard for evaluating a model. However much emphasis is placed on CFI, TLI and RMSEA as commonly used fit indexes [71,72,73]. As a result, the following fit statistics (CMIN/DF, IFI, TLI, CFI and RMSEA) were used in this study in consideration of sample sensitivity. According to [74] value of CMIN/DF of up to 5 indicates that the model is statistically fit.

Table 1. Model fit for confirmatory factor analysis

Model	CMIN/DF	RMR	RMSEA	IFI	TLI	CFI	GFI	AGFI
	2.115	.045	.019	.975	.922	.974	.975	.873

Source: Author's Construct, 2018

Table 2. Confirmatory factor analysis

	CMIN/DF (χ^2/df)	CFI	RMSEA	AVE	CR
Tribal diversity	.276	1.000	.000	0.413	0.760043
Organizational politics	3.708	.729	.185	0.337333	0.71
Organizational performance	1.276	.940	.300	0.576117	0.8669

Source: Author's Construct, 2018

Additionally, [75,76] state that RMSEA of less than 0.08 indicates a good fit. Also, Goodness of Fit and Adjusted Goodness of Fit index values closer to 1 is more acceptable. The value of relative chi-square is 2.115 which indicates that the model is a good fit. The comparative fit index and the Goodness of Fit are within the acceptable range. The Root Mean Square Error of Approximation value is less 0.08 which shows a good fit. Overall the model could be accepted.

The study went a step further to evaluate the Average Variance Extracted and Construct Reliability. According to [77] the AVE should be at least 0.50 to be seen as adequate for convergent validity.

4. RESULTS

4.1 Nature of Tribal Diversity

The study analysed the nature of diversity among the tribes found in the organisations by using a 20 items scale. The analyses were conducted to ascertain the extent to which respondents strongly agree or disagree to issues relating to tribal diversity. Descriptive statistics were used to analyse the various dimension of tribal diversity among employees. The score on the scale started from 1 to 5, and if the mean for a statement is more than half (2.5) of the scale, it means the respondents agreed to the statement whereas a mean less than half shows vice versa.

Generally, the mean for all tribal diversity items was 3.2 which indicates that employees expressed positive views about tribal diversity issues within their organisations.

The tribal diversity questions captured specific dimensions including whether people from certain tribes are excluded from activities within their organisations. Questions 1 to 6 was used to identify whether people from various tribes are included or excluded from activities within

organisations. All the statements measuring exclusiveness indicated a mean value of 2.9 which shows that employees did not agree with the statements. These statements were however used to find out if employees excluded other employees from different tribes in their organisations. The mean score, therefore, indicated that all the tribes are generally included in tribal issues. With regards to this statement "If someone who is not included from one's tribe tries to get information or make a request, others refrain from helping in subtle ways" had a mean of 2.4 which explains that tribes are not excluded. It was also noted that employees learn from each other within the organisations. Thus, the study revealed that (65%) of the employees agreed that they learn from each other from different tribes within the organisations. Additionally with regards to the evaluation of tribes, (55%) of employees agreed and strongly agreed that tribal diversity was viewed as positive in organisations.

The detailed results are presented in Table 3 with frequencies for Strongly Disagree (SD), Disagree (D), Neutral (N), Agree (A), Strongly Agree (SA), mean (M) and Standard Deviation (SD).

4.2 The Relationship among Tribes Regarding the Time They Spend with Each Other

The study found out how employees from various tribes spend time with employees from other tribes within the organisations. Employees were asked to respond to the extent to which they agreed or disagreed with this statement "Employees from the same tribe spend time with each other more than with those outside their tribes". (44%) of the Asantes did not agree that they spend more time with other Asantes than with other tribes. (37%) employees who were Ewes strongly disagreed that they spend more time with other Ewes within their organisations.

In general, (45%) of employees disagreed with the fact that they spend more time with persons from the same tribe while (35%) consented to the statement. Table 4 shows a cross-tabulation of tribes and the time they spend with each other.

4.3 Organisational Politics

Organisational politics was measured with a 15 point scale capturing three dimensions of organisational politics being; general political behaviour, go along to get ahead and pay and promotion policies. Respondents were asked to express the extent to which they agreed or

disagreed with the statements measuring organisational politics. A scale of 1 to 5 ranging from strongly disagree to strongly agree was used. Where the mean for a statement is more than half (2.5) of the scale, it indicates the extent to which the respondents agree with the statement while a mean less than half shows vice versa. The mean value for organisational politics was recorded at 2.6 which explains that employees perceived their working environment to be political but not to a large extent. The various frequencies and mean values for different statements were used in measuring organisational politics.

Table 3. Nature of tribal diversity

Statements	SD	D	N	A	SA	M	Sd
1. Employees of the same tribe spend time with each other more than with those outside their tribe	32	4	16	16	12	2.65	1.5
2. Employee share their knowledge or expertise with other employees regardless of their tribe	0	0	24	28	28	4.05	0.8
3. I sometimes feel certain tribes are protected or given an advantage in my organisation	12	12	16	16	20	3.26	1.4
4. If someone who is not included in one's tribe tries to get information or make a request, others refrain from helping in subtle ways	20	20	32	4	4	2.40	1.0
5. People with same tribal background look out for each other	8	12	24	24	12	3.25	1.18
6. I have to prove myself more and work a lot harder to get into next positions because of my tribe	6	23	48	21	2	2.35	1.39
7. People of different tribes are hard to talk to sometimes	20	36	20	4	0	2.10	0.83
8. I am careful not to joke around tribal difference with people who take it personally	16	0	20	16	24	3.42	1.47
9. Members of a particular tribal group have a unique way of acting in with my organisation	16	8	32	12	12	2.95	1.29
10. People find it difficult to accept ideas when offered by people of different tribes	20	16	24	16	4	2.60	1.20
11. Differences in tribes help us to find better ways to do things	4	12	32	20	4	4.78	0.37
12. When I work with people of different tribes, more quality solutions are produced	8	8	24	20	12	3.28	1.2
13. We all seem to learn from tribal differences	4	0	8	32	20	5.06	2.37
14. When people who are tribally different work together, there is always some amount of miscommunication	8	32	20	12	0	2.50	0.90
15. Whenever I have confronted someone for giving me a hard time because of my tribe, they have denied the problem	12	20	28	4	4	2.53	1.04
16. People try to understand each other from their tribal point of view	4	16	20	28	4	3.17	1.02
17. People of other tribes are consider less competent or smart	16	36	8	4	4	3.28	2.68
18. It seems that people do not trust people from other tribes	16	16	24	12	4	2.61	1.17
19. You can feel a difference in the way some people are treated or talked to because they are of a different tribe	8	16	16	20	8	4.72	0.07
20. Differences in tribes are usually viewed as positive in our organisations	8	4	16	20	24	3.67	1.3

Table 4. Different tribes and the time they spend with each other

Tribe	SD	D	N	A	SA
Asante	17	4	7	13	6
Ewe	3	0	3	3	2
Fante	4	0	5	0	0
Ga	4	0	0	0	0
Builsa	0	0	0	0	4
Bono	2	0	0	0	0
Grusi	1	0	0	0	0
Nzema	0	0	1	0	0
Sefwi	1	0	0	0	0
Total	32	4	16	16	12

Source: Author's Construct, 2018

The findings of the study revealed that (65%) of employees disagreed with the fact that employees build up themselves by tearing others down. With regards to general political behaviour, a mean of 2.5 was recorded indicating that employees were neutral. Employees did not agree or disagree with the fact that other employees developed political behaviour in the absence of rules and policies in the organisation. 'Go along to get ahead' was also measured in the organisational politics scale. It is explained as the refusal of employees to retaliate to attempts made by other employees to influence or interfere with their political behaviours. The study revealed that go along to get ahead had a mean of 3.7 indicating that employees do not take actions to interfere with the political behaviours of other employees to advance their interest. The last dimension of organisational politics has to do with pay and promotion policies. The study revealed that pay and promotion policies had a mean score of 2.7 which explains that employees disagreed that pay and promotion policies did not determine pay and promotions in the organisations but (50%) of the employees were indifferent in regards to whether the stated pay and promotion policies have nothing to do with how pay raises and promotions are determined. This view explains that even though employees accepted that pay raises and promotions are determined by the policies they, however, retained the perception that this could also take place without going according to the policies for which reason they could neither agree nor disagree to the statements.

4.4 Organisational Performance

From the study, (55%) of employees disagreed with the statement that employees are not able to achieve their goals. The statements had a mean of 2.3 which confirms that employees disagreed with organisations not being able to achieve its

goals. The mean of the statement "Tribal diversity affects organisations positively" was 3.4 which explains that tribal diversity was highly seen as positive in the organisations. It confirms the findings that were revealed under tribal diversity.

4.5 Effects of Tribal Diversity on Organisational Politics

A regression analysis was used to analyse the relationship between tribal diversity and organisational politics. Tribal diversity served as the independent variable whereas organisational politics served as the dependent variable. Tables 7 and 8 show the results of the regression analysis between tribal diversity and organisational politics.

An R square of (0.009) indicates that other unexplained factors influence organisational politics but (0.9%) of the variation is explained by tribal diversity within organisations. The regression analysis between tribal diversity and organisational politics had a P-value of (0.043) indicating that there is a significant relationship between tribal diversity and organisational politics in the organisations. The significant level (.043) is less than the alpha value (.05) which implies that there is a significant relationship between tribal diversity and organisational politics. Thus, the H1 which states that *Tribal diversity will have a significant effect on organisational performance* was fully confirmed by the regression analysis.

4.6 Effects of Tribal Diversity on Organisational Performance

A regression analysis was used to test the relationship between tribal diversity and organisational performance. The significant level for the relationship was (0.040) which is lesser

than the alpha value of (0.05). It implies that there is a significant relationship between tribal diversity and organisational performance. It is worth noting that the relationship between these two variables is positive indicating that an increase in tribal diversity will increase organisational performance. The R square value of (0.062) suggests that there are other unexplained factors (93.8%) that contribute to organisational performance. Table 9 and Table 10 presents the results of the regression analysis.

4.7 The Effect of Tribal Diversity in the Relationship between Organisational Politics and Organisational Performance

The study sought to find out if tribal diversity mediated the relationship between organisational politics and organisational performance. The first step was to establish the link between

organisational politics and organisational performance. The significant level was (0.00) which confirmed that there is a significant relationship between organisational politics and organisational performance. Thus, the H2 which states that *Organisational Politics has a significant effect on organisational performance* was, therefore, accepted. However, there was a negative correlation between organisational politics and performance which signifies that an increase in organisational politics will reduce organisational performance. This is presented in Table 10a.

Having established the relationship between organisational politics and organisational performance, the last objective of the study was to find out if tribal diversity mediated the relationship between the two variables. Model 1, organisational politics and organisational performance without the mediating variable is Significant

Table 5. Organisational politics

Statements	SD	D	N	A	SA	M	Sd
1. People in my organisation attempt to build themselves up by tearing others down.	24	28	8	8	4	2.17	1.17
2. There has always been an influential group in my organisation that no one ever crosses.	16	16	12	20	8	2.83	1.35
3. Employees are encouraged to speak out frankly even when they are critical of well-established ideas.	4	12	24	20	12	3.33	1.11
4. There is no place for yes-men around here; good ideas are desired even if it means disagreeing with superiors.	8	12	32	16	4	2.94	1.03
5. Agreeing with powerful others is the best alternative in this organisation.	4	20	24	20	0	2.88	0.91
6. It is best not to rock the boat in this organisation.	12	16	24	8	12	2.89	1.29
7. Sometimes it is easier to remain quiet than to fight the system.	12	8	28	0	24	3.22	1.44
8. Telling others what they want to hear is sometimes better than telling the truth.	12	20	16	20	4	2.78	1.18
9. It is safer to think what you are told than to make up your mind.	12	24	20	12	4	2.61	1.12
10. Since I have worked in this organisation, I have never seen the pay and promotion policies applied politically.	16	32	8	8	8	2.44	1.26
11. I cannot remember when a person received a pay increase or promotion that was inconsistent with the published policies.	16	0	28	20	8	3.06	1.2
12. None of the raises I have received is consistent with the policies on how raises should be determined.	12	24	20	4	8	2.59	1.20
13. The stated pay and promotion policies have nothing to do with how pay raises and promotions are determined.	4	12	40	12	4	3.00	0.88
14. When it comes to pay raise and promotion decisions, policies are irrelevant.	4	20	32	12	4	2.89	0.94
15. Promotions around here are not valued much because how they are determined is so political.	16	16	28	12	12	2.50	1.02

Source: Author' construct, 2018

Table 6. Organisational performance

Statements	SD	D	N	A	SA	M	Sd
My organization is not able to meet the goals it sets.	20	24	12	16	0	2.33	1.11
My organization achieves its stated goals.	8	12	16	32	4	3.17	1.12
Work in this organization is easier because of tribal diversity	4	16	20	20	12	3.28	1.15
Each person understands the role they play in achieving organizational goals	4	0	20	36	8	3.65	0.91
Resources needed for the proper functioning of my organisation are always available.	12	12	20	24	4	2.94	1.18
The organization has enough human capital to accomplish its goals	4	12	20	24	12	3.39	1.12
My expectations about my organization are always met.	12	16	32	8	4	2.67	1.06
Tribal diversity affects an organization's profitability	8	12	28	12	12	3.11	1.21
Tribal diversity affects my organisation positively	28	0	12	20	12	3.44	0.94
Tribal diversity affects my organization negatively	16	16	16	20	4	2.72	1.24

Source: Author's Construct, 2018

Table 7. Regression analysis of tribal diversity and organisational politics

Model		Unstandardized coefficients		Standardized coefficients	t	Sig.
		B	Std. error	Beta		
1	(Constant)	3.309	.421		7.852	.000
	Tribal diversity	-.088	.111	-.097	-.791	.432

a. Dependent Variable: Organizational Politics

Table 8. Model summary for tribal diversity and organisational politics

Model	R	R square	Adjusted R square	Std. error of the estimate
1	.097 ^a	.009	-.006	1.297

a. Predictors: (Constant), Tribal diversity

Table 9. Model summary for tribal diversity and organisational performance

Model summary				
Model	R	R square	Adjusted R square	Std. error of the estimate
1	.249 ^a	.062	.048	1.115

a. Predictors: (Constant), Tribal Diversity

Source: Author's Construct, 2018

Table 10. Regression analysis of tribal diversity and organisational performance

Model	Coefficients ^a				t	Sig.
	Unstandardized coefficients		Standardized coefficients			
	B	Std. error	Beta			
1 (Constant)	1.649	.363			4.550	.000
	Tribal diversity	.199	.095	.249	2.091	.040

a. Dependent Variable: Organization is not able to meet the goals it set

(p=.001). However, in Model 2, organisational politics and organisational performance with the introduction of the mediating variable (tribal Diversity) was still significant (p=.001), meaning there was a no mediation. Thus, tribal diversity does not fully

mediate organisational politics and organisational performance. Therefore H3 which states that *tribal diversity mediates the relationship between organisational politics and organisational performance* could not be accepted.

Table 10 a. The relationship among tribal diversity, organisational politics and performance

		Correlations		
		OP	O performance	TD
Organizational Politics	Pearson Correlation	1	-.409**	-.097
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.000	.432
	N	72	72	68
Organizational Performance	Pearson Correlation	-.409**	1	.249*
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000		.040
	N	72	72	68
Tribal diversity	Pearson Correlation	-.097	.249*	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.432	.040	
	N	68	68	76

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

* . Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

Source: Author's Construct, 2018

Table 11. Regression analysis of tribal diversity, organisational politics and performance

		Coefficients ^a				
Model		Unstandardized coefficients		Standardized coefficients	t	Sig.
		B	Std. error	Beta		
1	(Constant)	3.424	.325		10.543	.000
	OP*OPef	-.357	.100	-.404	-3.588	.001
2	(Constant)	2.771	.467		5.935	.000
	OP*OPe*TD	-.339	.098	-.383	-3.457	.001
	TD	.170	.089	.212	1.913	.060

a. Dependent Variable: Organizational Performance

Table 12. Hypotheses of the study

Hypotheses	Statement	Conclusion
H1	Tribal diversity will have a significant effect on organisational performance	Supported
H2	Organizational Politics has a significant effect on organizational performance	Supported
H3	Tribal diversity mediates the relationship between organisational politics and organisational performance	Not supported

Source: Author's Construct, 2018

5. DISCUSSION OF FINDINGS

The findings from the study revealed that tribal diversity and organisational politics had a P-value of (0.043) indicating that there is a significant relationship between tribal diversity and organisational politics in the organisations. The significant level (.043) is less than the alpha value (.05) which explains that there is a significant relationship between tribal diversity and organisational politics.

Furthermore, based on the analysis it was revealed that tribal diversity has a positive and significant relationship with employee

performance. The significant level for the relationship is (0.040) which is lesser than the alpha value of (0.05). Also, the relationship is positive because the coefficient or the beta value is positive ($\beta=.199$). This results, however, contradicts the findings of [17] in Singapore where ethnic diversity did not have a relationship with performance. Nevertheless, it is similar to the findings of [57] who stated that ethnic diversity positively affected employee performance within organisations

Again, the study revealed a significant relationship between organisational politics and performance. The findings of [78] support this

result that organisational politics affect organisational performance as a whole. Also, the findings revealed a significant relationship among all the three variables at a significant level of (0.00). It, therefore, satisfies the first stage of the mediating analysis where all the variables under the analysis are supposed to have a significant relationship.

Notwithstanding this result, the analysis showed a significant relationship between organisational politics and performance without the introduction of the mediating variable (tribal diversity), but with the introduction of the mediating variable, the relationship was still significant which explains that tribal diversity did not mediate the relationship between organisational politics and organisational performance. Table 12 shows a summary of the hypothesis used for the study.

6. CONCLUSION

The study found that employees perceived organisational politics and tribal diversity to be prevailing in their organisations. It can thus be inferred from the data gathered that the organisations were filled with individuals from various tribes across the country. Still, with this level of diversity comes politics amongst employees in the various hotels at different levels due primarily to the differences among them because of their tribes. Hence, the study discovered a relationship between tribal diversity and organisational politics even though; other unexplained factors could contribute to organisational politics. Therefore, Management in the hospitality industry should develop activities that promote good relationship among tribes since it adds to organisational performance. Also, tribal diversity affected performance within the various hotels, and it also emerged that even though organisational politics existed in the various organisations, tribal diversity did not mediate the relationship between organisational politics and performance. However, the relationship between organisational politics and organisational performance was negative which implied that when organisational politics increases the performance of employees within organisations reduces and vice versa. Hence, management should put in place measures to minimise organisational politics within organisations otherwise an increase in organisational politics will negatively affect the performance of the organisation as a whole.

COMPETING INTERESTS

Authors have declared that no competing interests exist.

REFERENCES

1. Mullins L. Management and organizational behaviour (9th Ed). Prentice Hall, Financial Times, London; 2010.
2. Dike P. The impact of workplace diversity on organisations; 2013.
3. Asante R, Gyimah-Boadi E. Ethnic structure, inequality and governance of the public sector in Ghana. United Nations Research Institute for Social Development; 2004.
4. Baafa MJ, Taylor-Abdulai H. Making ethnic differences count at the workplace: A new paradigm shift for managing diversity in Ghana. *European Journal of Business and Management*. 2014;6(27):159–165.
5. Sule OE, Amuni SI, Ashiru TA, Ariyo OO. Organisational politics– causes and effects on organisation and employees. *International Journal of Business, Economics and Management*. 2015;2(9): 204–208.
6. Simons SM, Rowland KN. Management & innovation diversity and its impact on organizational performance: The influence of diversity constructions on expectations and outcomes. *Journal of Technology Management & Innovation*. 2011;6(3).
7. Gull S, Zaidi AA. Impact of organizational politics on employees' job satisfaction in the health sector of Lahore Pakistan. *Interdisciplinary Journal of Contemporary Research in Business*. 2012;156–170.
8. Schneider RC. Understanding and Managing organizational politics. *International Journal of Recent Advances in Organizational Behaviour and Decision Sciences (IJRAOB)*. 2016;697–709.
9. Iqbal HS, Shah FM. Impact of workforce diversity on organizational performance in the education sector of Karachi Pakistan. *International Journal of Scientific and Engineering Research*. 2015;6(10):1258–1273.
10. Dubrin A. 2001 *Winning at office politics*. New York: Van Nostrand-Reinhold; 1978.
11. Vigoda E. Organizational politics, job attitudes, and work outcomes: Exploration and implications for the public sector. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*. 2000;57: 326–347.

12. Amaram DI. Cultural diversity: Implications for workplace management. *Journal of Diversity Management*. 2007;2(4):1–6.
13. Saeed MA, Aaqifa SB, Azam N. Effects of organizational politics, organizational commitment, organizational communication and task delegation on the individual project team member's performance. In *International Conference on Safety, Construction Engineering and Project Management Issues, Challenges and Opportunities in Developing Countries*. 2014;0–8.
14. Drory A. Political climate and job attitudes. *Organisation Studies*. 1993;14:57-71
15. Vigoda-Gadot E, Vinarski-Peretz H, Ben-Zion E. Politics and Image in the Organizational landscape: An empirical examination among public sector employees. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*. 2003;18:764–787.
16. Perry JL, Rainey HG. The public-private distinction in organisation theory: A critique and research strategy. *Academy of Management Review*. 1988;13:182–201.
17. Darwin JR, Selvaraj PC. The effect of workforce diversity on employee performance in Singapore organisations. *International Journal of Business Administration*. 2015;6(2):17-29
18. Vigoda-Gadot E. *Developments in organisational politics*. Cheltenham: Edward Elgar Publications; 2003.
19. Bodla AM, Danish QR, Nawaz MM. Mediating role of perceived organizational politics relating job characteristics to morale. *African Journal of Business Management*. 2012;6(15): 5185–5192.
20. Joseph DRDJ, Selvaraj PC. The effects of work force diversity on employee performance in Singapore organisations. *International Journal of Business Administration*; 2016.
21. Nkomo SM, Taylor CJ. Diverse identities in organisations, in Clegg SR, Hardy C, Nord WR. *Managing organisations, current issues*, London: Sage Publications. 1999; 88-106.
22. Stevens R, Ogunji E. preparing business students for the multi-cultural work environment of the future: A Teaching Agenda. *International Journal of Management*. 2011;28(2):528–544.
23. Esty K, Griffin R, Schorr-Hirsh M. *Workplace diversity. A manager's guide to solving problems and turning diversity into a competitive advantage*. Avon, MA: Adams Media Corporation; 1995.
24. Nelson M. A Close look at conflictual supervisory relationships: The trainee's perspective. *Journal of Counselling Psychology*. 2001;48(4):384–395.
25. Patrick HA, Kumar VR. *Managing workplace diversity: Issues and Challenges*. Sage Open. 2012;2(2).
26. Loden M, Rosener BJ. *Workforce America! Managing employee diversity as a vital resource*. Homewood IL: Business One Irwin; 1991.
27. Gardenswartz L, Rowe A. *Diverse teams at work*. Chicago: Irwin; 1994.
28. Parvis L. Diversity and effective leadership in multicultural workplaces. *Journal of Environmental Health*. 2003;65(7):37–65.
29. Saxena A. Workforce diversity: A key to improving productivity. *Procedia Economics and Finance*. 2014;3(11):76–85.
30. Kruse KM, Tuck S. *Fog of war: The second world war and the civil rights movement*. Oxford University Press; 2011.
31. Hays-Thomas R. Why now? The contemporary focus on managing diversity. In MS. Stockdale & FJ. Crosby (Eds.), *The psychology and management of workplace diversity* Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishing. 2004;3-30.
32. Patrick HA, Kumar VR. *Managing workplace diversity: Issues and challenges*. Sage Open. 2012;2(2).
33. Ehimare OA, Ogaga-Oghene JO. The impact of workforce diversity on organisational effectiveness: A study of a Nigerian bank. *Annals of the University of Petrosani, Economics*. 2011;11(3):93–110.
34. Lee K, Gilbert B. Embedding the graduate education diversity internship (GEDI) program within a larger system. *New Directions for Evaluation*. 2014;143:97–108.
35. Veldsman DM. *Perceptions of diversity management in a public sector*. Doctoral Dissertation, University of the Western Cape, South Africa; 2013.
36. Barak MEM. *Managing diversity: Toward a globally inclusive workplace*. London, UK: Sage Publications; 2016.
37. David EJ. Ethnicity, Culture, and the past. *Michigan Quarterly Review*. 1997; XXXVI(4).
38. Fearon JD. Ethnic and cultural diversity by country. *Journal of Economic Growth*. 2003;8(2):195–222.

39. Oerlemans W. Ethnic diversity at the workplace: About interpersonal relations, well-being and performance in ethnically diverse organisations; 2009.
40. Gandz J, Murray VV. The experience of workplace politics. *Academy of Management Journal*. 1980;23:237–251.
41. Kacmar K, Bozeman DP, Carlson DS, Anthony WP. An examination of the perceptions of organisational politics model: Replication and extension. *Human Relations*. 1999;52:383–416.
42. Pfeffer J. *Power in organisations*. Boston, MA: Pitman; 1981.
43. Ferris GR, Russ GS, Fandt PM. Politics in organisations. In R.A.), *impression management in the organisation*. (Giacalone). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum; 1989.
44. Rosen CC, Harris KJ, Kacmar KM. The emotional implications of organisational politics: A process model. *Human Relations*. 2009;62(1):27–57.
45. Gallaghe, VG, Laird MD. The interaction of political skill and political decision-making on job satisfaction. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*. 2008;38:2336–2360.
46. Zhonghua G, Chen Z. Does organizational politics at the workplace harm employees' job performance? A person-organization fit perspective. *Acta Psychologica Sinica*. 2014;46(8):11–24.
47. Martin J. *Organizational behavior*. (2nd edition). New York: Thomson Learning Publication; 2001.
48. Maduanyi S, Oke AO, Fadeyi O, Ajagbe AM. Impact of organisational structure on organisational performance. In *international conference on African development issues: Social and Economic Models for Development Track*. 2015; 354–358.
49. Daft L. *Organizational theory and design* (7th Edition). U.S.A: South-Western College Publishing, Thomson Learning; 2000.
50. Ricardo R, Wade D. *Corporate performance management: How to build a better organization through measurement driven strategies alignment*. Butterworth Heinemann; 2001.
51. Amaratunga D, Baldry D. Moving from Performance Measurement to Performance Management. *Facilities*. 2002;20(5/6):217-223.
52. Stefan T. Improving the performance of a performance measure. *Measuring Business Excellence*. 2005;9(2):4-11.
53. Hernaus T, Škerlavaj M, Dimovski V. Relationship between organisational learning and organisational performance: the case of Croatia. *Transformations in Business & Economics*. 2008;7(2):32–48.
54. Wall TD, Wood SJ. On the validity of subjective measures of company performance. *Personnel Psychology*. 2004; 57:95–118.
55. Byremo C. *Human resource management and organisational performance do HRM lead to improved organisational*. University of Oslo; 2015.
56. Rotundo M, Sackett PR. The relative importance of task, citizenship, and counterproductive performance to global ratings of job performance: A policy-capturing approach. *Journal of Applied Psychology*. 2002;87(1):66–80.
57. Erasmus L. *The management of workforce diversity and the implications for leadership at financial asset services*. Business Management, University of Johannesburg; 2007.
58. Watson WE, Johnson L, Zgourides GD. The influence of ethnic diversity on leadership, group process, and performance: An examination of learning teams. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*. 2002;26(1):1–16.
59. Ozgen C, Nijkamp P, Poot J. The impact of cultural diversity on innovation: Evidence from Dutch RM-level data.
60. Gupta R. Workforce diversity and organisational performance. *International Journal of Business and Management Invention*. 2011; 2(6):36–41.
61. Ely RJ. A field study of group diversity, participation in diversity education programs, and performance. *Journal of Organizational Behaviour*. 2004;25: 755–780.
62. De Drew CKW, Bechthold MN, Nijstad BA. Diversity and the creative capacity of organisations and teams. Position Article Research Task 3.2 on Sustainable Development in a Diverse World. University of Amsterdam, the Netherlands; 2009.
63. Martin GC. The effects of cultural diversity in the workplace. *Journal of Diversity Management*. 2014;9(2):89–92.
64. Bodla MA, Afza T, Danish RQ. Relationship between organizational

- politics perceptions and employees' performance. Pakistan Journal of Commerce and Social Sciences. 2014; 8(2):426-444.
65. Rahman S, Hussain B, Haque A. Organizational politics on employee performance: An exploratory study on readymade garments employees in Bangladesh. Business Strategy Series. 2011;12(3):146-155.
66. Witt LA. Enhancing organisational goal congruence: A solution to organisational politics. Journal of Applied Psychology. 1998;83:666-674
67. Kothari CR. Research methodology: Methods and techniques. New Age International Publishers; 2004 .
68. Gurbuz S, Mert IS. Validity and reliability tests of organisational justice scale: An empirical study in a public organisation. TODAIE's Review of Public Administration. 2009;3(3):137-162
69. Tavakol T, Dennick R. Making sense of Cronbach's alpha. International Journal of Medical Education. 2011;2:53-55.
70. Kenny DA, McCoach DB. Effect of the number of variables on measures of fit in structural equation modelling. Structural equation modelling: A Multidisciplinary Journal. 2003;10(3):333- 351.
71. Cangur S, Ercan I. Comparison of model fit indices used in structural equation modelling under multivariate normality. Journal of Modern Applied Statistical Methods. 2015;14(1):152-167.
72. Cheung GW, Rensvold RB. Evaluating goodness-of-fit indexes for testing measurement invariance. Structural Equation Modeling. 2002; 9(2):233-255.
73. Hu L, Bentler PM. Fit indices in covariance structure modelling: Sensitivity to underparameterized model misspecification. Psychological Methods. 1998;3(4): 424-453
74. Schumacker R, Lomax R. A beginner's guide to structural equation modelling 2nd Ed Mahwah NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum; 2004.
75. Steiger JH. Understanding the limitations of global fit assessment in structural equation modelling. Personality and Individual Differences. 2007;42(5):893-898.
76. Hooper D, Coughlan J, Mullen MR. Structural equation modelling: Guidelines for determining model fit. Electronic Journal of Business Research Methods. 2008;6(1):53-60.
77. Fornell C, Larcker DF. Evaluating structural equation models with unobservable variables and measurement error. Journal of Marketing Research. 1981;18(1):39-50
78. Vigoda-Gadot E. Leadership style, organisational politics, and employees' performance: An empirical examination of two competing models. Personal Review. 2007;36(5):661-683.

© 2018 Aidoo and Odoi; This is an Open Access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0>), which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited.

Peer-review history:

The peer review history for this paper can be accessed here:
<http://www.sciencedomain.org/review-history/26015>