



International Journal of Human Capital
Management
E-ISSN 2580-9164
Vol. 5, No. 1, June 2021, p 80-90

Available online at
<http://journal.unj.ac.id/unj/index.php/ijhcm>

POLITICAL BEHAVIOURS OF INTERNAL AUDITORS IN THE INDONESIAN PUBLIC ORGANISATION

Muhammad Irfan Syaebani

Department of Management, Faculty of Economics and Business,
Universitas Indonesia
Email : syaebani@ui.ac.id

Annisa Putri Lestari Merdekawati

Department of Management, Faculty of Economics and Business,
Universitas Indonesia
Email : niesyaputri@gmail.com

Monica Devina

Department of Management, Faculty of Economics and Business,
Universitas Indonesia
Email : monica.devina92@gmail.com

Dindha Vitri Primadini

Department of Management, Faculty of Economics and Business,
Universitas Indonesia
Email : dindhavitri@gmail.com

ABSTRACT

Political behaviours are common in the workplace, including in a public organisation. However, political behaviours are like a double-edged sword. They could support the management, but on the other hand, they could also turn into a negative side which generates some drawbacks and inhibits the effectiveness of management. The aims of this research is to determine the types, causes, impacts, and solutions of political behaviours in a public organisation. We used the phenomenological methodology and qualitative approach. Interviews were conducted with ten auditors from various backgrounds to ensure the validity of the findings. This research revealed four main conclusions. First, there are two types of political behaviour, namely defensive political behaviour and impressive management. Second, the causes of political behaviour are individual and organisational. Third, political behaviour could impact intrapersonal auditors, interpersonal relationships, and organisation as a whole. Fourth, this research indicates solutions to encounter the problems by improving the human resource system and organisational culture that can deliver fairness and justice, and communicate the policies to employees.

Keywords: *internal auditor, organisational behaviour, political behaviours, public organization.*

Received: 17 December 2020 ;

Accepted: 9 February 2021 ;

Publish; June 2021.

How to Cite:

Syaebani, M.I., Merdekawati, A.P.L., Devina, M., & Primadini, D.V. (2021). Political Behaviours of Internal Auditors in The Indonesian Public Organisation. *International Journal of Human Capital Management*, 5 (1), 80-90 <https://doi.org/10.21009/IJHCM.05.01.7>

INTRODUCTION

In 1980, Gandz and Murray (1980, in Spicer, 1997) revealed that 93.2% of respondents stated that politics in the workplace is common to organisations. Employees see politics in the organisation as a natural thing, difficult to avoid, and exist in any organisation. A decade later, in 1994, the Organisational Public Relations Practitioner through the Public Relations Society of America (PRSA) found the level of perception that politics in the organisation is inevitable reasonably increased from 93.2% to 98.3% (Spicer, 1997). Furthermore, the level of perception that employees must participate in politics to advance their position in the organisation also increased, from 69.8% in Gandz and Murray's study to 89.9% in PRSA study. Therefore, there is an increasing perception that politics in the organisation is a tool to achieve goals (Spicer, 1997). Moreover, many managers acknowledge the benefits of political behaviour in the organisation as long as it is ethical and does not attack anyone directly (Robbins, Judge, and Millett, 2013). On the other hand, political behaviours within an organisation can have negative impacts, such as immodesty in the workplace, showing favouritism, and gossiping about colleagues (Robinson and Bennett, 1995).

Political behaviours have also been linked negatively with individual and organisational performance, as well as have positively affected employees' stress, job dissatisfaction, and turnover (Witt, Andrews, and Kacmar, 2000). Miller, Rutherford, and Kolodinsky (2008) also argued that political behaviours can lead to low performance, such as dissatisfaction and low commitment. Also, the frequency of political behaviour can threaten the organisation's ability to remain effective. However, political behaviours increase if the interests of members are interrelated, such as working in teams, and there is a negative relationship between political behaviour and teamwork (Thanh, 2016).

The lack of management attention to political deviance is a factor that motivates the researcher to conduct a research on this topic. The researcher choose a public organisation since it is expected to give the best service to its stakeholders, which excellence could be reflected by its employee's behaviours. Internal auditor team is chosen as the respondent because the work needs a higher attachment and interaction between members and also it often be considered as a role model for another employee in the organisation. Furthermore, this study will focus on the detrimental effect of political behaviour on both employees and the organisation as a whole. It is expected to obtain adequate descriptions of the political behaviours in the work environment. The purpose of this research is to explore the types, causes, impacts, and solutions of political behaviours of Internal Auditors in the public organisation to avoid a toxic environment caused by negative political behaviours, through formulating correct solutions straight to the core of problems. This exploration above leads to the research questions of what are the types, causes, impacts, and solutions of political behaviours in an organisation.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Definition of Political Behaviour

According to Kacmar and Baron (1999), political behaviour in organisations is an act involving self-interest regardless of the justice or welfare of others or organisations. George and Jones (2002) argued that beneficial political behaviour is a political behaviour that enhances the achievement of organisational goals and does not harm the organisation, for instance; a coalition among co-workers who share a common interest in organising an organisation's strategy. Meanwhile, according to Williams and Dutton (1999), a negative political behaviour is an act perpetrated by individuals that produce harmful results for members and organisation.

Types of Political Behaviour

Many experts in organisational behaviour already classified some types of political behaviours. However, there are no single criteria as a base for classification. Thus, every scholar has their classification. For example, Kacmar and Baron (1999) identified four types of political behaviours, such as influence attempts, power tactics, informal behaviour, and concealing one motive. Furthermore, Robinson and Bennett (1995) already classified political behaviours as deviant workplace behaviours since they encourage employees to conduct counterproductive behaviours. Robbins, Judge, and Millett (2013) divided political behaviour into two types, namely Defensive Behaviours and Impressive Management. Defensive behaviour is a political behaviour aimed at protecting oneself by avoiding action, error, or change. Employees see politics as a threat. Thus they often respond with defensive behaviours. This behaviour is often associated with negative feelings towards work and work environment (Valle and Perrewé, 2000 in Robbins, Judge, and Millett, 2013). Meanwhile, Impression Management is an individual process of trying to control the impression of others through making up their image. It shows a proactive behaviour (Robbins, Judge, and Millett, 2013). This research adapts typology of political behaviour according to Robbins, Judge, and Millett (2013) since it was developed from deviant workplace typology formulated by Robinson and Bennett (1995) who considered as pioneers in building the theory of workplace deviance.

Causes of Political Behaviour

Robbins, Judge, and Millett (2013) identified some causes that drive a person to exercise political behaviours and divided them into two factors, individual and organisational factors. Regarding individual factors, there are certain traits about the nature of personality, needs, and other factors that are related to political behaviours, as follows: (1) High Self-Monitors, (2) Internal Locus of Control, (3) High Machiavellian Personality, (4) Individual Investment in Organisations, (5) Perceived Job Alternative, (6) Expectations of Success. Furthermore, the organisation as employee's social environment brings considerable influences to employee behaviours. Employees see, observe, and feel their surrounding in the organisation and react to their behaviours. Robbins, Judge, and Millett (2013) identified elements in organisations that encourage employees to behave politically, namely (1) Reallocation of Resources, (2) Promotion Opportunities, (3) Low Trust, (4) Role Ambiguity, (5) Unclear Performance Evaluation System, (6) Zero-Sum Reward Practices, (7) Democratic Decision Making, (8) High Performance Pressures, and (9) Self-Serving Senior Managers.

Impacts of Political Behaviour

Previous studies showed that political behaviours have impacts on members as well as the organisation. First, political behaviours have impacts on interpersonal relations. Hantula (1992, in Williams and Dutton 1999) stated that political behaviours could lead to conflict, unfair feelings, high absenteeism also decreased motivation and organisational effectiveness. Moreover, Ladebo (2006, in Goltz 2003) stated that political behaviours are a source of stress and conflict in the workplace. Another impact of political behaviours is decreasing employee attitudes on engagement and job satisfaction because they expect that it could harm their welfare (Cropanzano, Howes, Grandey, and Toth, 1997). Cropanzano and Li (2006, in Williams and Dutton, 1999) also argued that political behaviours will have significant impacts on lower-level employees' pressure, anxiety, and stress.

Second, Madison, Allen, Potter, Renwick, and Mayes (1980) stated that political behaviour could affect the lack of employees' focus toward organisational goals. Employees who engage in political behaviour will focus on achieving self-interest and neglect organisational goals. Eisendhart and Bourgeois (1988) also found that political behaviours hinder the flow of information and lower the decision-making speed. This can be due to the desire to control information, and the weak division of labour. Robinson and Bennett (1995) also stated that employees' perceptions of their responsibilities to the organisation could decline significantly due to organisational failure to enforce commitments. Pfeffer (1992) emphasised that political behaviours within an organisation created unfair competitive climates. High-performance employees who do not participate in political behaviours could feel uncomfortable with the working climate that ultimately affects the decision to leave the company. Moreover, the greater impacts were proposed by Mintzberg (1991) who stated that politically dominated organisations would lose control, core objectives, integrated ideology, efficiency, ability, and innovation.

RESEARCH METHOD

This study employed qualitative research method, a study that builds knowledge statements based on constructive perspectives (e.g. meanings derived from individual experience, social and historical value to construct a particular theory or pattern of knowledge) or based on participatory perspective (e.g. orientation toward politics, issues, collaboration, or change) (Creswell, 2003). Sugiyono (2005) explained that researchers are key instruments in the qualitative study. The qualitative study has several methodologies, such as symbolic interactionism, semiotics, phenomenology, constructivism, and critical theory. This research adopted phenomenology. Phenomenology method is an approach that seeks to understand society's way of thinking and tries to describe life experience from research subjects about a phenomenon and concept. In the phenomenology method, researchers grasp subjective view from participants and interpret the meaning from participants' point of view. The phenomenology method roots in the philosophy of Husserl, Heidegger, Sartre, and Merleau-Ponty.

The scope of this research was limited to the auditors who work in the Indonesian Public Organisation. In this study, researchers tried to get a comprehensive picture of how the political behaviours are interpreted by the Auditors (especially from the 2nd or 3rd person perspectives) who saw, observed, and perceived it. This study used personal, direct, and unstructured interviews with respondents to investigate backgrounds, motivations, beliefs, attitudes, and feelings. The stages of data analysis include data reduction, data understanding, and data interpretation. Data reduction refers to omit unnecessary data gather from the interview process by organising or categorising interview result into specific themes based on the similarity. Data understanding relates to comprehend interview details and to reflect the meaning of data without separate it from the phenomenon. Data interpretation refers to the process of linking data to the existing theory to

find out whether the data support the current theory or reveal the distinctiveness. Furthermore, we conducted series to examine validity, namely credibility, transferability, dependability, and confirmability test.

RESULT AND DISCUSSION

In qualitative research, the rule of thumb of sample size is unavailable, and the researcher will stop to add more participants once the data are saturated which means new information is unattainable. Specifically, data saturation was attained with ten participants. Participants in this study consisted of five junior-level auditors (Participant 1, 2, 3, 6, and 7), three auditors of Echelon IV level or Head of Sub-Division (Participant 4, 5, and 8), and two senior auditors of Echelon III level or Section Head (Participant 9 and 10). Regarding gender, participants consisted of five women and five men. The age range was 24-50 years old. Research findings showed that participants see, observe, and feel the political behaviours in the workplace. The political behaviours are including Defensive Behaviours and Impressive Management as developed by Robbins, Judge, and Millett (2013), as well as other behaviours. The findings of political behaviours are depicted in Table 1.

Table 1
Findings of Internal Auditors' Political Behaviours

Types	Theory of Robbins, Judge, and Millet	Research Findings similar to Theory of Robbins, Judge, and Millet	Research Findings other than Theory of Robbins, Judge, and Millet
Defensive Behaviours	Overconforming Buck Passing Playing Dumb Stretching Stalling Playing Safe Scapegoating Misrepresenting Prevention Self-protection	Buck Passing Playing Dumb Stretching Playing Safe Scapegoating Stalling Prevention	Gossiping Mocking
Impressive Management	Conformity Favours Excuses Apologies Self-promotion Enhancement Flattery Exemplification	Conformity Excuses Self-promotion	Insincerity Claim others' work Stealing ideas Superiority

Types of Political Behaviour

This research confirmed two types of political behaviours, namely defensive behaviour and impressive management behaviour. The results revealed there are eight behaviours related to defensive behaviours, such as buck-passing (7 participants), playing safe (4 participants), and other behaviours are conducted by one participant, namely playing dumb, stretching, scapegoating, stalling, preventing, self-protection, gossiping, and mocking. Furthermore, seven behaviours related to impressive management are conducted by participants, such as conformity (5

participants), self-promotion (3 participants), insincerity and superiority (2 participants), and excuses, claim others' work, and stealing ideas (1 participant).

Defensive behaviour refers to reactive and protective behaviour to avoid action, blame, or change (Ashforth and Lee, 1990). **(1) Buck passing (avoiding responsibilities)** often happens to employees who have an unequal position by transferring tasks to other employees who have lower levels than them, for instance; team leaders to team members, superordinates to subordinates, seniors to juniors. Participant 1 stated that the team leader often gives responsibility to subordinates, although it is written in the job description that the job has to be done by the team leader. From interviews with participants 3 and 5, avoidance behaviour is ranged from easy to difficult tasks. It could happen due to the opportunity to transfer assignments and the absence of strict provisions regarding job description as stated by Participant 8. **(2) Playing dumb** behaviour aims to avoid challenging work.

According to Participant 5, it is difficult to distinguish whether the employees play dumb or they have no idea about the job. **(3) Stretching** is a behaviour that slows down / postpones the completion of work. There are many things that encourage employees to delay work completion, and one of which is to avoid new tasks. Employees will also pretend to be busy so the job will finish later. Participant 9 stated that stretching behaviour gives a more negative impact on teamwork rather than individual work since it hampers the whole team performance. **(4) Playing safe** is a behaviour to avoid situations that may reflect poor results. For example, some employees only take a project with a high probability of success or take a neutral position in the conflict. Participant 5 stated that playing safe is carried out because it does not bear many risks. **(5) Scapegoating** is a behaviour of blaming others for their faults. Participant 6 stated that the political behaviour of scapegoating caused by unfair competition. This is done to strengthen someone's position. The scapegoating is done by blaming friends in front of the same level peers or their superordinate. **(6) Stalling or prevention** is a political behaviour when employees block or prevent threatening changes. Participant 3 revealed that employees usually hinder assignments that require more effort, such as policy audits that need rules or conditions to be analysed. He also stated that employees typically provide reasons that can convince the supervisor to avoid a certain audit. For example, they explain that they do not need to audit particular reports because the risk is low.

This study also found two behaviours other than Robbins, Judge, and Millett (2013) theory, namely gossiping and mocking, as seventh and eighth defensive behaviours. **(7) Gossiping** behaviour is done by talking about other employees. The research finding revealed that when employees who become the target of conversation approach the employees who are gossiping, the employee immediately changes the topic of discussion. Participant 10 stated that **(8) mocking colleagues** is usually conducted in front of other co-workers, for example; underrated others' opinion at the meeting.

The second type of political behaviour is **impressive management behaviour**. It refers to a political behaviour when individuals try to control the impression of others through manipulating their behaviours. There are seven types of behaviours of impression management. **(1) Conformity** refers to a behaviour of stealing the heart of others or behaviour as we strive to appeal others before making a request. Participants 5 and 7 stated that stealing people's heart can be done by giving excessive praise to smooth the way in getting desired assignments. Participant 4 observed that conformity behaviour is performed by middle-level employees to top management, which affects low-level employees' workloads. Participants 3 and 8 stated that conformity at work could be seen from both positive and negative sides. Conformity for personal interest, such as to get leave and promotion, is not favourable, but conformity to avoid unreasonable tasks, such as unnecessary auditing, is acceptable. **(2) Excuses** behaviour is done by giving reasons to the superiors for the failure of the audit report. Participant 8 stated that giving reasons for failure is normal. Participants also stated that teamwork success or failure depends on many things, including external conditions that are beyond their control. **(3) Self-promotion** is one of the political behaviours in the workplace

that are often encountered by participants. This research found that self-promotion could elevate the position of selves, but it could also increase self-esteem by degrading others. Participant 1 stated that this behaviour is usually supported by excessive showing-up one's skills, for instance; employees do not understand the topics, but they acclaim themselves to be looked understanding.

This study also found four behaviours other than Robbins, Judge, and Millett (2013) theory. **(4) Insincerity** is the behaviour of someone who displays a good impression in front and a bad impression behind, for example; some employees praised us on the audit analysis, but they bad-mouthed or scolded the audit findings behind us. Participant 1 stated that insincere behaviour was not only the participant's own experience but also experienced by others. **(5) Claim others' work as our work** occurs by admitting the work of junior auditors by senior auditors. Participant 3 stated that participants observed employees who acknowledging other people's work and it is usually associated with building an image. **(6) Stealing an idea.** This behaviour is done by acknowledging the idea of others as his/her idea. **(7) Superiority** refers to over-confident feelings, so they feel superior although they do not have a higher position than others. In this study, superiority occurs by directing other employees who have the same level while he has no disposition to coordinate. Participant 2 also described another form of superiority which is taking control of tasks without giving an opportunity to other employees.

Causes of Political Behaviour

Although the reasons for political behaviour by employees vary, there are two main factors namely **(1) individual and (2) organisational factors**. The research finding showed that the **individual elements** are divided into **(1a) personality and (1b) motivation factors**. **Personality** refers to the overall way an individual reacts and interacts with other individuals. **First, the nature and attitude** of the internal auditor. When joining the organisation, employees already brought their characteristics. Some of the employees have a high tendency to take part in political behaviours because of their nature. **Second, excessive stress and anxiety** can trigger internal auditors to engage in political behaviours and it is usually caused by some factors such as income. **Third, a low sense of engagement** becomes the basis for a person to transfer his/her job responsibilities. Kahn (1990) stated that employee engagement affects employee performance. The results are confirmed that personality as a factor that encourages employees to conduct political behaviour and it aligns with the concept of Robbins, Judge, and Millett (2013).

As the second type of individual factors, **(1b) motivation factor** consists of four elements. **First, the desire to be liked.** McClelland (1958, in Moore, Grabsch, and Rotter, 2010) in Theory of Needs explained that one factor which motivates a person is Need for Affiliation. These individuals need/require a friendly environment and support from other individuals who perform efficiently in a team. Participant 7 stated employees want to be liked by others, primarily by superiors since performance appraisal is conducted solely by the Director and their immediate superiors. The appraisal would be a basis to set bonuses and promotional opportunities. **Second, monotonous work** and the absence of challenges trigger internal auditors to engage in political behaviours. The cause expressed by participants 10 is related to a value of work theory which stated that an exciting and challenging job, including the value of intrinsic work, can motivate a person in doing their job. **Third, injustice/unfairness** refers to an imbalance between effort spent and rewards earned. Injustice/unfairness is related to the equity theory which explained that individuals compare their efforts and work with others', and then respond to eliminate injustice (Kaur, Aggrawal, and Khaitan, 2014). **Fourth, other specific intentions** related to the view in comparing ourselves to other employees of the same age but they have a higher level of positions.

The causes of **(2) organisational factors** could be classified into five types. **(2a) Promotional opportunities** are likely to be the primary cause of political behaviour which is stated by Participant 3. Participant 7 noted that political behaviour supports the career interests of employees. It is aligned with the study of Luthans, Hodgetts, and Rosenkrantz (1988) which found

that only 10% of successful high-performing managers get promoted in a relatively quick time. Moreover, Goltz (2003) also stated that managers who get promoted quickly spend more time doing politics in social relationships. **(2b) Inadequate performance appraisal system**, the organisation implements Individual Performance Indicators which is not sufficient to measure employee achievement. Therefore, it encourages political behaviours. Participant 5 confirmed that the performance is appraised solely by the Director and immediate supervisors. Thus, superiors will not notice their employees' performance unless employees have a good communication skill. Ferris and Judge (1991) revealed that political behaviours influenced not only on promotion but also on personal decisions and actions such as performance appraisals. **(2c) Lack of recognition**. Participant 10 stated that *"lack of recognition and reward, no one is paying attention to the work, no one is giving praise so it can drive them to be unproductive employees"* (Participant 10). **(2d) Unsuitable job positions**, *"Wrong place for the right man. He has good ability but maybe less suitable in that place"* (Participant 4). **(2e) The role of the leader** is also important. Participant 5 stated that some managers do not blend with their subordinates and it creates distance, and they do not know subordinates' performance. *"My boss does not pay attention to our performance, it seems that I should have a trick, so he knows what I do, and he can give a higher mark into my performance appraisal report"* (Participant 5).

Another factor that causes political behaviour is organisational culture. It is divided into three types. **(1) Work culture**, Participant 1 stated *"in organisations like this, if people do not engage in political behaviours, it is hard to move up. Most of them still hold that principle"* (Participant 1). The phrase "organisation like this" refers to the culture that exists within the organisation. **(2) The level of competition** is quite high to encourage employees to conduct political behaviour. On the one hand, competition can encourage employees to perform their best, but if all employees produce the same performance, then a political approach is needed. *"The environment is quite competitive, so he expects a big chance to get a promotion, so he did political behaviours"* (Participant 4). **(3) The organisational expectation**, Participant 6 stated that the causes of conducting political behaviour are that employees have to adapt and make an improvement quickly. Participant 5 stated, *"the organisation has a high expectation. If we only work, it seems that we are not very appreciated. So we must have a trick to do with the work we do so that they can pay attention to our work"* (Participant 5).

Impacts of Political Behaviour

There are various impacts of political behaviours on both individual and organisation. The effect on **individuals** is classified into intrapersonal and interpersonal. Furthermore, there are three intrapersonal aspects of employees that could encourage them to take political behaviours. **First, demotivation** is defined as the decline of someone's motivation to do something. *"Some employees want to take a rest because they consider that although they work hard, they will get the same mark on the appraisal"* (Participant 2). **Second, stress** will be felt by the 'victims' of the political behaviour. Participants feel that avoidance of responsibilities could be wasteful, unkempt, and stressful for the lowest-level employees who received the jobs. Participant 3 expressed his experience, *"the boredom tolerance of people is different. Sometimes, the boss does not want to read using the computer, all requested in print, and all jobs are given to the lowest staff. So it is tiring for the low-level employees"* (Participant 3). **Third, limited opportunities**, participant 4 stated that superiors would build trust in employees who conduct political behaviours, but non-political employees are not selected even though the employees have good performance. *"The opportunity to gain information or trust from superiors is so little for non-political employees"* (Participant 4). Participant 10 also stated that *"as a result of stealing ideas, other employees who have the original idea do not dare to express their opinions again"* (Participant 10).

Moreover, **interpersonal employees** could result in inharmonious relationships among employees. This is one of the immediate impacts. Participant 3 revealed, *"it causes bad friendship,*

and affect work effectiveness" (Participant 3). Moreover, "an organisation needs good cooperation to achieve goals. If there are people who only focus on their interest, there could be quarrels and anger inside the organisation."

Besides the impact on the individuals, political behaviours also have six impacts on the organisation. **First, unfair working climate**, Participant 7 stated that he is reluctant to deal with people who engage in political behaviours. "Sometimes I am unwilling to deal with a person who talks differently in front of me and behind me" (Participant 7). **Second, decreasing employee performance**, for instance, Participants 3 expressed that employees who conduct a financial audit for three months should receive higher compensation because they deal with more difficult and complicated problems rather than others who audit only for two weeks. However, the current appraisals are based on the number of audits. **Third, high workloads for low-level employees**, Participant 3 stated that "political behaviour, especially the avoidance of responsibilities, will have an impact on the accumulated work of low-level employees" (Participant 3). **Fourth, unable to maximise organisational performance**, if individual performance is not maximal, the organisational performance could also decline. Participant 5 illustrated "the potential achievement of the organisation is 110, but leaders cannot manage the job properly, it causes the condition falls to 90" (Participant 5). **Fifth, efficiency and effectiveness are not achieved**, the organisation has analysed employee workload on a job description for each position. Therefore, when political behaviours occur, such as avoiding responsibility, the existing workload changed so that efficiency and effectiveness became unattainable. **Sixth, the organisation loses the big picture of problems**; it is because the senior who has experience in auditing did not participate in providing direction to conduct the job. "They already know the way to finish the job. Meanwhile, young employees still need guidance. If they apply such political culture, the organisation's main goal cannot be achieved" (Participant 3).

Solutions of Political Behaviour

There are three ways to solve the negative political behaviours. **First, setting the objective of performance assessment**, the political behaviour of stealing the hearts of superiors is caused by a single appraisal system in this organisation, namely the performance appraisal by the Director. It has a high degree of subjectivity. The assessment could be applied by those who are in the same, above, or below the level of the employees. **Second, distributing job assignments and controlling the implementation**, "it is necessary to distribute the assignments following responsibility and authority, and those must be controlled and given feedbacks" (Participant 9). **Third, improvement of existing policies**, Participant 8 stated that "clear, no multi-interpretation rules, appropriate rewards, and punishments are needed" (Participant 8). Internal auditors engage in political behaviours because existing human resource regulations have multiple interpretations, for instance; a rule explains that to get faster promotion opportunities employees have to attain a high category on performance appraisal, but it is not described in detail the criteria for each category.

Changing the culture could be a solution, which is divided into four ways. **First, increasing the socialisation and internalisation of cultural values**, Participant 1 considered that "I believe in the values of this organisation, with all the regulations of this organisation". These values will be a control in political behaviours within the organisation. **Second, increasing the participation of employees to manage the assignments**, "involving all auditors in the assignments, so there is an engagement to the job" (Participant 9). **Third, leadership roles** could be a solution to overcome deviant political behaviour. "Ideally leaders focus on how to make good management so that all tasks are done smoothly. There should be tools which help the leaders to know whether subordinates has completed their tasks or not" (Participant 5). Also, participant 6 also stated that leaders are role models for their employees and are expected to provide examples. "The superiors should not just give orders, but if there is a problem, they should create win-win solutions"

(Participant 6). **Fourth, counselling or mentoring**, Participant 3 stated that there is a need for a facility to convey problems which happen in the workplace. The facilities or media are expected to enable employees to voice their complaints and to protect complaining employees.

The findings confirm that political behaviours more likely result in adverse consequences thus the perspectives of Robinson and Bennett (1995) and Robbins, Judge, and Millet (2013) can be accepted. Moreover, Vardi and Weitz (2004) stated behaviour is considered as deviant if it inflicts damage or destructive and political behaviours if not managed wisely can be damaging. Responding to this issue, Syaebani and Sobri (2011) found in their research that formulating good human resource system is necessary. The proper human resource system is defined as policies which consider fairness and justice as a basis for managing people.

CONCLUSION

This research confirmed two types of political behaviour, namely defensive political behaviour and impressive management. The causes of political behaviour are individual employees and organisation. Moreover, the political behaviours could impact intrapersonal auditors, interpersonal relationships, and organisation as a whole. Lastly, this research indicates solutions to encounter the problems by improving the human resource system and organisational culture. Political behaviours can be regarded as a deviant behaviour if it results in negative consequences aligned with Vardi and Weitz's (2004) study.

This research also showed that political behaviours are prevalent in the organisation where the study took place, and it proves Spicer's conclusion (1997) that political behaviours are inevitable in organisation dynamics. Thus, management needs to respond to this issue adequately through formulating human resource policies that can deliver fairness and justice, and communicate the policies to employees. These efforts should be taken since Robbins, Judge, and Millet (2013) stated that political behaviours are the results of ambiguity, low trust, and unclear system in the organisation. The limitation of this research is unable to draw a rigour cause-effect relationship, for instance, the relationship between the antecedents of political behaviours and its manifestations. Furthermore, this research is also less likely to identify the pattern of political behaviours based on specific criteria, such as position level and age. Therefore, future research may conduct another approach that is different from qualitative research.

REFERENCES

- Ashforth, B.E., & Lee, R.T. (1990). *Defensive Behaviour in Organizations: A preliminary model*. Human Relations, 43, 621-648.
- Creswell, J.W. (2003). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approach*. California: SAGE Publications, Inc.
- Cropanzo, R., Howes, J. C., Grandey, A. A., & Toth, P. (1997). The relationship of organizational politics and support to work behaviours, attitudes, and stress. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 18, 159-180.
- Eisenhardt, K.M., & Bourgeois, L. J., III. (1988). Politics of strategic decision making in high-velocity environment: Toward a midrange theory. *Academy of Management Journal*, 34, 737-770.
- Ferris, G.R., & Judge, T.A. (1991). Personnel/human resources management: A political influence perspective. *Journal of Management*, 17, 447-488.
- George, J.M., & Jones, G.R. (2002). *Organizational behavior Third edition*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson Education.
- Goltz, S.M. (2003). *Considering political behavior in organizations*. The Behavior Analyst Today, 4 (3), 355-366.

- Kacmar, K.M., & Baron, R.A. (1999). *Organizational politics: The state of the field, links to related processes, and an agenda for future research*. *Research in Personnel and Human Resources Management*, 17, 1-39.
- Kahn, W. A. (1990). Psychological Conditions of Personal Engagement and Disengagement at Work. *Academy of Management Journal*, 33(4), 692-724.
- Kaur, R., Aggrawal, P., & Khaitan, N. (2014). Equity sensitivity. *The International Journal of Business & Management*, 62, 230-233.
- Luthans, F., Hodgetts, R.M., and Rosenkrantz, S. (1988). *Real Managers*. Cambridge, MA: Ballinger.
- Madison, D. L., Allen, R. W., Potter, L. W., Renwick, P. A., & Mayes, B. T. (1980). *Organizational politics: An exploration of managers' perceptions*. *Human Relations*, 33(2), 79-100.
- Miller, B. K., Rutherford, M. A., & Kolodinsky, R. W. (2008). Perceptions of organizational politics: A meta-analysis of outcomes. *Journal of Business and Psychology*, 22(3), 209-222.
- Mintzberg, H. (1991). *The effectiveness organization: Forces and forms*. *Sloan Management Review*, 22, 54-67.
- Moore, L.L, Grabsch, D.K, & Rotter, C. (2010). Using Achievement Motivation Theory to Explain Student Participation in a Residential Leadership Learning Community. *Journal of Leadership Education*, 9(2), 22-34.
- Pfeffer, J. (1992). *Managing with Power: Politics and Influence in Organizations*. Boston: Harvard Business School Press.
- Robbins, S., Judge, T.A., & Millett, B. (2013). *Organizational behaviour 15th ed*. New Jersey: Pearson Education.
- Robinson, S.L., & Bennett, R.J. (1995). A Typology of Deviant Workplace Behaviors: A Multidimensional Scaling Study. *The Academy of Management Journal*, 38(2), 555-572.
- Spicer, C. (1997). *Organizational public relations: A political perspective*. Mahwah: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Sugiyono. (2005). *Memahami penelitian kualitatif*. Bandung: Alfabeta.
- Syaebani, M. I. & Sobri, R. R. (2011). Relationship between Organizational Justice Perception and Engagement in Deviant Workplace Behavior. *The South East Asian Journal of Management*. 5(1), 37-49.
- Thanh, T. (2016). *The Relationship between Political Behavior and Team Effectiveness in Management Teams*. Thesis. Departement of Psychology. University of Oslo.
- Vardi, Y., & Weitz, Y. (2004). *Misbehavior in Organizations: Theory, Research, and Management*. New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc.
- Williams, M., & Dutton, J.E (1999). *Corrosive political climates: The heavy toll of negative political behavior in organization*. In R.E. Quinn, R.M. O'Neill, and L. St. Clair Ed. *The pressing problems of modern organizations: Transforming the agenda for research and practice*. pp. 3-30. New York: American Management Association.
- Witt, L.A., Andrews, M.C., and Kacmar, K.M. (2000). *The role of participation in decision making in the organizational politics—job satisfaction relationship*. *Human Relations*, 53, 341-358.