

**THE NEXUS BETWEEN PERCEIVED ORGANISATIONAL POLITICS IN  
HUMANITARIAN AID WORKERS AND ORGANISATIONAL PERFORMANCE IN  
ADAMAWA STATE NIGERIA**

**<sup>1</sup>ABUBAKAR, Aliyu Dangana**

Department of Business Administration,  
North-Eastern University Gombe,  
Gombe State - Nigeria

**Email:** [abubakar.dangana@neu.edu.ng](mailto:abubakar.dangana@neu.edu.ng)

**<sup>2</sup>EMMANUEL, Stephen Guyuk**

(MSc Student)

Department of Business Administration,  
National Open University of Nigeria,  
Gombe State Study Centre,  
Gombe State - Nigeria

**Email:** [nou212073679@noun.edu.ng](mailto:nou212073679@noun.edu.ng)

**&**

**<sup>3</sup>MOHAMMED, Awwal Mohammed**

(MSc Student)

Department of Business Administration,  
University of Abuja,  
Gwagwalada,  
Abuja - FCT, Nigeria

**Email:** [awwalmohammed13@gmail.com](mailto:awwalmohammed13@gmail.com)

**DOI:** <https://doi.org/10.7118/ajbam-04-2024-76>

***Abstract***

*This study explores the relationship between perceived organizational politics and organizational performance among humanitarian aid workers in Adamawa State, Nigeria. Adopting a descriptive research design, the study targeted a population of 220 employees from humanitarian aid organizations in the region. Both convenience and simple random sampling techniques were used, with the entire population serving as the sample size. Data were collected through a structured questionnaire, and regression analysis was conducted using SPSS version 27.0 to test the hypotheses. The results indicated that perceived manipulation within these organizations significantly influences organizational performance in Adamawa State. The study concludes that perceived manipulation, favoritism, and self-serving behaviors have a considerable impact on organizational performance. Based on these findings, it is recommended that humanitarian aid organizations implement clear and transparent decision-making and resource allocation processes to reduce manipulation and favoritism. This could involve establishing checks and balances to ensure decisions are made based on merit and organizational needs, rather than personal agendas.*

**Keywords:** Perceived Organizational Politics, Organizational Performance

**INTRODUCTION**

Humanitarian aid plays an essential role in alleviating suffering and providing support during crises and conflicts. The effectiveness of aid delivery depends on various factors,

including the internal operations of the organizations providing these services. Among these factors, organizational politics—encompassing behaviors such as manipulation, favoritism, and self-serving actions—

significantly affects organizational dynamics and performance. These political behaviors can undermine decision-making, resource allocation, and collaboration, leading to adverse outcomes such as delayed aid delivery, reduced service quality, and dissatisfaction among beneficiaries (Ferris et al., 2019).

In Africa, humanitarian organizations are pivotal in addressing the needs of communities affected by conflict, natural disasters, and economic instability. However, the presence of organizational politics within these entities often hampers their effectiveness. Actions such as favoritism, self-serving behaviors, and manipulative practices create an environment of mistrust and low morale among staff, resulting in suboptimal performance outcomes (Eisenberger et al., 2020).

In Nigeria, particularly in the northeastern region, humanitarian organizations play a critical role in addressing the challenges faced by displaced populations. Adamawa State is one of the regions most affected by conflict and displacement, requiring substantial humanitarian interventions. However, the effectiveness of these efforts is often hindered by internal challenges. Organizational politics, including manipulation, favoritism, and self-serving actions, can compromise the timeliness and quality of aid delivery, lower beneficiary satisfaction, and result in inefficient resource use (Ogbonna & Harris, 2018).

Manipulative behaviors in organizations often create confusion and conflict among employees, disrupting coordination and delaying service delivery. Such behaviors can directly affect the quality of aid provided to beneficiaries (Vigoda-Gadot & Drory, 2016). Favoritism, characterized by unfair decision-making and resource allocation, undermines merit-based systems. This practice often leads to inefficiencies and poor organizational outcomes, as individuals lacking the necessary qualifications are placed in critical roles, resulting in diminished performance (Kacmar et al., 2019). Similarly, self-serving actions prioritize personal interests over collective organizational goals, leading to resource mismanagement and neglect of beneficiaries' needs. Such practices erode trust within the organization and compromise its effectiveness (Ferris et al., 2019).

The impact of organizational politics is particularly significant in humanitarian contexts, where inefficiencies can lead to severe human suffering due to delayed or inadequate aid. Poor organizational performance in this sector undermines the trust of beneficiaries and stakeholders, further complicating the delivery of essential services.

Humanitarian organizations are vital in addressing the needs of vulnerable populations, particularly in conflict-affected regions such as Adamawa State, Nigeria. However, the effectiveness of these organizations is often compromised by internal political behaviors, including manipulation, favoritism, and self-serving actions. These behaviors negatively affect decision-making, resource allocation, and collaboration, ultimately undermining the performance of these organizations (Ferris et al., 2019).

In Adamawa State, where the need for humanitarian assistance is urgent, the negative effects of organizational politics are evident. Manipulative behaviors among staff disrupt teamwork and create confusion, delaying the timely delivery of aid and reducing its overall quality (Vigoda-Gadot & Drory, 2016). Favoritism, which prioritizes relationships over competence, undermines meritocratic principles and leads to inefficient resource utilization, further impairing organizational effectiveness (Kacmar et al., 2019). Additionally, self-serving behaviors divert resources from critical areas, compounding the challenges faced by vulnerable populations in the region (Ferris et al., 2019).

Despite the significant implications of these issues, limited research has explored the specific impacts of perceived organizational politics on the performance of humanitarian organizations in Adamawa State. This gap in knowledge hinders the development of strategies to address these challenges effectively. Examining the effects of manipulation, favoritism, and self-serving behaviors on organizational performance is crucial for identifying practical solutions to enhance the quality and efficiency of aid delivery.

Addressing organizational politics within humanitarian aid organizations is essential to improve their performance in Adamawa State.

Mitigating these behaviors can lead to better resource management, higher beneficiary satisfaction, and more timely and effective service delivery. By fostering a culture of transparency, fairness, and accountability, these organizations can fulfill their mission more effectively and contribute to alleviating the suffering of affected populations. The general objective of this study is to examine the nexus between perceived organisational politics in humanitarian aid workers and organisational performance in Adamawa State Nigeria.

## **LITERATURE REVIEW**

### **Concept of Organisational Politics**

Organizational politics refers to activities within organizations that individuals or groups undertake to acquire, develop, and utilize power and resources to achieve preferred outcomes, particularly in situations of uncertainty or disagreement. These activities, while sometimes necessary for navigating complex organizational dynamics, are often viewed as self-serving and can impact decision-making processes, resource distribution, and overall organizational performance.

Research has highlighted both the positive and negative implications of organizational politics. On the one hand, studies have linked it to increased job stress and employee turnover. For instance, Jiang et al. (2023) found that perceptions of organizational politics significantly elevate job-related stress, which subsequently heightens employees' intentions to leave their organizations. Such findings suggest that while politics can enable goal achievement, it frequently undermines employee well-being and retention.

Additionally, organizational politics influences employee behaviors and perceptions. Lee and Chang (2022) observed that employees in politically charged environments are more inclined to engage in defensive behaviors, such as withholding information, to safeguard their interests. This defensive posture often disrupts collaboration and innovation, leading to decreased productivity. However, politics can also serve as a catalyst for positive organizational change. Patel and McCarthy (2023) noted that in dynamic settings, political behavior can facilitate adaptation by

empowering leaders to manage interpersonal relationships and use their influence to implement strategic changes effectively.

Leadership plays a crucial role in moderating the effects of organizational politics. Transformational leaders who promote ethical behavior and transparency can mitigate its adverse impacts. According to Kim and Park (2023), such leaders help create an inclusive organizational culture, enhancing employee satisfaction and reducing the negative effects of political maneuvering.

While organizational politics is an intrinsic aspect of organizational life, its outcomes depend on how it is managed. Although it often negatively affects employee morale and turnover, it can also drive organizational adaptability and innovation under the right circumstances. For organizations, the challenge lies in managing political dynamics constructively to foster a positive and productive work environment.

### **Manipulation**

Manipulation in organizations refers to tactics employed by individuals to influence others' perceptions, decisions, or actions, often through deceptive or unethical means, to achieve personal or organizational objectives. While manipulation can occasionally yield short-term advantages, its broader consequences often undermine trust, collaboration, and organizational culture.

The relationship between manipulation and personality traits has been well-documented. Jonason et al. (2023) found that individuals with high levels of Machiavellianism are more likely to employ manipulative strategies to ascend organizational hierarchies, often at the expense of team cohesion and mutual trust. Similarly, manipulation in the workplace has been linked to decreased job satisfaction and heightened stress levels among employees. Smith and Coyle (2022) highlighted that employees who perceive manipulative behaviors in their work environment are more likely to disengage, resulting in lower productivity and increased turnover.

Manipulation frequently intersects with organizational politics, serving as a tool for individuals to gain power or influence. Zhang

et al. (2023) observed that in politically charged environments, manipulation is commonly used to secure advantageous positions or resources. However, some studies suggest that manipulation, when applied subtly and ethically, may help leaders navigate complex relationships and achieve organizational goals. For example, Jones and Harris (2023) argued that strategic manipulation could facilitate decision-making in high-stakes situations, though they acknowledged its controversial nature.

Leadership also plays a pivotal role in addressing workplace manipulation. Williams and Green (2023) emphasized that transformational leaders, who value transparency and ethical decision-making, can counteract the negative effects of manipulative practices, fostering trust and a healthier organizational culture.

Although manipulation is a prevalent and often detrimental phenomenon, its outcomes depend on the context and ethical considerations. To minimize its negative impacts, organizations must promote transparency, accountability, and ethical leadership.

### **Favoritism**

Favoritism in the workplace involves granting preferential treatment to certain employees based on non-performance-related factors, such as personal relationships or shared characteristics. This practice undermines fairness, affects employee morale, and compromises organizational effectiveness.

Research has consistently demonstrated the adverse effects of favoritism. Smith and Johnson (2023) reported that employees who perceive favoritism in their workplace often experience reduced job satisfaction and feelings of injustice, leading to disengagement and higher turnover rates. Similarly, Lee and Kim (2022) found that favoritism erodes trust in leadership and the organization, discouraging high-performing employees from striving for excellence due to the perception that rewards and promotions are not merit-based.

Favoritism also disrupts team dynamics and hinders organizational performance. Garcia and Martinez (2022) observed that favoritism fosters competition rather than collaboration

within teams, reducing cohesion and impeding problem-solving and innovation. Addressing favoritism requires implementing transparent policies and objective criteria for evaluations and promotions. Tran and Williams (2023) suggested that organizations with clear performance metrics and equitable processes create a more motivating and inclusive work environment.

Leadership is crucial in mitigating favoritism. Patel and Ahmed (2023) highlighted that leaders who prioritize fairness and impartiality build trust and integrity, contributing to employee satisfaction and organizational success. Organizations must therefore foster a culture of fairness and transparency to mitigate the negative effects of favoritism.

### **Self-Serving Actions**

Self-serving actions refer to behaviors where individuals prioritize personal interests over organizational goals, often undermining collaboration and ethical standards. Such actions, while occasionally advantageous in competitive environments, frequently harm workplace cohesion and productivity.

Research by Brown and Lee (2023) demonstrated that employees engaging in self-serving behaviors often seek to secure job security or career advancement, sometimes at the expense of colleagues. This fosters an environment of mistrust and competition, negatively affecting teamwork and collaboration. Nguyen et al. (2022) found that perceptions of organizational politics exacerbate self-serving behaviors, creating a feedback loop that reduces productivity and increases workplace conflict.

Self-serving actions are particularly detrimental when exhibited by leaders. Johnson and Wang (2023) observed that self-serving leadership erodes employee trust, resulting in higher turnover and reduced organizational performance. Conversely, some studies, such as Miller and Davis (2022), have argued that self-serving behaviors can drive individual performance in competitive industries, though they cautioned against the long-term instability such behaviors can create.

A strong ethical culture can mitigate self-serving behaviors. Kim and Taylor (2023)

noted that organizations promoting transparency, accountability, and mutual respect effectively reduce such actions, fostering a supportive and cohesive work environment.

While self-serving actions may offer short-term benefits in certain contexts, their long-term implications are often detrimental. Organizations must prioritize ethical leadership and a strong value-driven culture to counteract self-serving behaviors and promote collective success.

### **Organizational Performance**

Organizational performance is a multifaceted concept encompassing how effectively an organization achieves its goals and objectives. It includes various dimensions such as financial performance, operational efficiency, customer satisfaction, and employee engagement. Understanding and evaluating organizational performance is vital for managers and stakeholders, as it provides critical insights into the effectiveness of strategies and practices.

Recent studies emphasize the importance of adopting a holistic approach to evaluating organizational performance. Smith and Jones (2023) argue that relying solely on financial metrics is insufficient to capture an organization's overall success. They advocate for the inclusion of non-financial measures like customer satisfaction and employee engagement to provide a comprehensive assessment. This broader perspective enables organizations to identify gaps and align their strategies with diverse objectives.

Innovation has emerged as a key factor in enhancing organizational performance. Research by Martinez and Gomez (2022) suggests that organizations fostering a culture of innovation achieve superior long-term results. Their findings indicate that innovation not only contributes to financial growth but also improves operational efficiency and customer satisfaction. Organizations that encourage creativity and experimentation are better positioned to adapt to changing market dynamics and maintain a competitive edge.

Employee engagement also significantly impacts organizational performance. According to Chen et al. (2023), there is a

strong positive relationship between employee engagement and organizational outcomes. Engaged employees tend to be more productive, exhibit higher levels of job satisfaction, and demonstrate greater organizational loyalty. These factors collectively enhance performance metrics, including profitability and customer satisfaction. As such, prioritizing employee engagement initiatives is critical for achieving sustainable success.

Operational efficiency is another essential component of organizational performance. Lee and Park (2022) highlight that efficient operations lead to optimal resource utilization, cost reduction, and improved service delivery. Their study shows that organizations implementing streamlined processes and lean management practices consistently achieve better outcomes, both financially and non-financially. This underscores the importance of focusing on efficiency to boost organizational performance.

Leadership, particularly transformational leadership, also plays a pivotal role in shaping performance outcomes. Kim and Lee (2023) assert that transformational leaders foster a positive work environment, inspire employees, and drive innovation. Their research associates this leadership style with enhanced employee morale, increased productivity, and improved organizational performance. Effective leadership is therefore essential for achieving sustained success.

Organizational performance is a complex and multidimensional concept that requires an integrated evaluation approach. While financial indicators remain important, incorporating non-financial metrics such as customer satisfaction, employee engagement, and operational efficiency provides a more accurate assessment. Key drivers of performance include innovation, employee engagement, operational efficiency, and transformational leadership. By addressing these factors, organizations can enhance their performance and achieve long-term success.

### **Theoretical Framework Social Exchange Theory**

The Social Exchange Theory (SET), originally introduced by Blau (1964) and later expanded



upon by Emerson (1976), explains social behavior as being guided by an exchange process where individuals aim to maximize benefits while minimizing costs. This theory suggests that social interactions are influenced by the perceived balance between rewards and penalties, fostering reciprocal relationships. SET is particularly useful for examining organizational politics as it highlights how power dynamics and reciprocity shape employee behaviors and organizational outcomes.

In humanitarian organizations, where resource constraints and competition for resources are common, SET provides a framework for understanding political behaviors. For instance, when employees perceive that engaging in political actions is essential to securing vital resources for their departments or projects, they may adopt both constructive and detrimental political strategies. Constructive behaviors, such as collaboration and resource-sharing, can enhance organizational performance by improving teamwork and efficiency (Cropanzano & Mitchell, 2005). Conversely, harmful political actions, such as favoritism, manipulation, or undermining colleagues, can erode trust and cooperation, negatively impacting team dynamics and reducing the effectiveness of aid delivery (Eisenhardt, 1989).

For example, research on non-profit organizations by Lee and Allen (2022) demonstrated that perceived organizational politics adversely affected employee trust and job satisfaction, which in turn diminished performance and commitment. Their findings underscored the potential for political behaviors to increase turnover rates and weaken organizational effectiveness, particularly in environments with limited resources.

Although SET offers valuable perspectives on organizational politics, it has its limitations. One major drawback is its primary focus on individual-level exchanges, often neglecting larger organizational or systemic factors that influence political behavior (Blau, 1964). Furthermore, the theory does not fully address the impact of external elements, such as cultural norms or economic conditions, which can shape political factions within humanitarian settings (Emerson, 1976). In contexts where resources

are scarce, the emphasis on reciprocity and exchange may not fully capture the complexities of organizational politics, including the role of power imbalances and structural inequalities (Treadway et al., 2013).

### **Empirical Literature**

Zhang et al. (2023) conducted a study titled "The Impact of Perceived Organizational Politics on Employee Creativity: The Mediating Role of Psychological Safety." Using a quantitative cross-sectional design, the study targeted employees from various organizations in China. A convenience sample of 312 participants was surveyed through self-reported questionnaires administered both online and in person. Data were analyzed using structural equation modeling (SEM). The results showed that perceived organizational politics negatively influenced employee creativity, with psychological safety acting as a mediator in this relationship. However, the study faced limitations, including its cross-sectional design, which restricted causal inferences, potential common method bias from self-reported data, and the cultural specificity of the sample, which could affect generalizability to other contexts.

Sun et al. (2022) carried out a study titled "Perceived Organizational Politics, Employee Well-being, and Organizational Citizenship Behavior: A Multilevel Study." This research employed a quantitative multilevel approach and included employees and supervisors from several Chinese organizations. The sample comprised 415 employee-supervisor pairs obtained through stratified random sampling. Data were gathered using separate questionnaires for employees and supervisors, distributed online and in person. Hierarchical linear modeling (HLM) was used for analysis. The findings indicated that perceived organizational politics negatively affected employee well-being, which subsequently reduced organizational citizenship behavior. Limitations of the study included its cross-sectional design, which limited causal inference, potential common method bias despite supervisor ratings for certain measures, and the focus on Chinese organizations, which could reduce generalizability to other cultural contexts.

Li et al. (2021) explored "The Influence of Perceived Organizational Politics on Employee Voice: The Mediating Role of Psychological Empowerment." This quantitative longitudinal study examined employees from multiple companies in China, using purposive sampling to obtain 286 participants. Data were collected through self-reported questionnaires at three separate time points. Analysis involved structural equation modeling (SEM) and bootstrapping techniques. The results revealed a negative effect of perceived organizational politics on employee voice behavior, mediated by psychological empowerment. The study faced limitations, including the potential for common method bias despite the time-lagged design, the cultural focus on Chinese organizations, which might limit broader applicability, and the reliance on self-reported voice behavior data, which could introduce social desirability bias.

Chen and Chen (2020) examined "Perceived Organizational Politics and Employee Turnover Intention: The Moderating Role of Organizational Justice." This study used a quantitative cross-sectional design, involving employees from various industries in Taiwan. Stratified random sampling was employed to select 412 participants. Data were collected using self-reported questionnaires distributed online and in person, and hierarchical multiple regression analysis was applied. Findings showed a positive relationship between perceived organizational politics and turnover intention, moderated by organizational justice. Specifically, higher levels of organizational justice weakened the link between politics and turnover intention. The study's limitations included its cross-sectional design, potential common method bias, cultural specificity to Taiwanese organizations, and the omission of other potential moderators or mediators influencing the relationship.

Wang et al. (2022) conducted a study titled "The Impact of Perceived Organizational Politics on Employee Job Satisfaction: The Mediating Role of Work-Life Balance." Using a quantitative time-lagged design, the study included full-time employees from diverse Chinese organizations, with a convenience sample of 356 participants. Data were gathered at two time points via online self-reported questionnaires. Analysis employed structural

equation modeling (SEM) and bootstrapping techniques. The study found that perceived organizational politics negatively affected job satisfaction through diminished work-life balance. However, limitations included the potential for common method bias, reliance on self-reported data subject to social desirability bias, and a cultural focus on Chinese organizations, limiting generalizability. The study also overlooked potential moderating variables that might affect the relationships examined.

Wu et al. (2021) investigated "Perceived Organizational Politics and Employee Performance: The Moderating Role of Organizational Support." This quantitative multi-source study involved employees and supervisors from various companies in China, with a sample of 389 employee-supervisor pairs selected via stratified random sampling. Data were collected using separate questionnaires for employees and supervisors, administered online and in person. Hierarchical multiple regression analysis was used for data analysis. Results indicated that perceived organizational politics negatively impacted employee performance, with organizational support moderating this effect. Higher levels of organizational support mitigated the negative impact of politics on performance. Study limitations included its cross-sectional nature, potential common method bias for some variables despite supervisor performance ratings, and the cultural specificity to Chinese organizations, which may restrict broader applicability. The study also did not explore mediating mechanisms that might clarify the observed relationships.

### **Literature Gap**

A wealth of research, both domestic and international, has investigated the connection between perceived organizational politics and organizational performance, as seen in studies by Zhang et al. (2023), Sun et al. (2022), Li et al. (2021), Chen and Chen (2020), Wang et al. (2022), and Wu et al. (2021). While these studies have highlighted the significant influence of organizational politics on aspects like employee creativity, they have largely neglected critical performance metrics such as the quality and timeliness of aid delivery and beneficiary satisfaction. This study takes a

novel approach by concentrating on humanitarian aid workers in Adamawa State, exploring how specific elements of organizational politics—manipulation, favoritism, and self-serving behaviors—impact organizational performance. By addressing these gaps, the study provides a deeper understanding of the effects of organizational politics on performance within the humanitarian sector.

## METHODOLOGY

The study adopted a descriptive survey design, utilizing a structured questionnaire to collect data effectively. This approach enabled a detailed examination of the traits of a large population and ensured accurate representation for meaningful conclusions. The study targeted 220 selected employees of humanitarian aid organizations in Adamawa State, using convenience and simple random sampling to enhance feasibility and ensure fairness. Data collection involved a structured, close-ended questionnaire divided into sections for demographic details and the relationship between organizational politics and performance, with responses measured on a five-point Likert scale. Data analysis employed descriptive and inferential statistics, including multiple regression, with SPSS version 27.0

### Testing of hypothesis one

**H<sub>01</sub>:** Perceived manipulation within humanitarian aid organizations has no significant effect on organisational performance in Adamawa State.

### Model 1

$$Op = \alpha + \beta_1(MA) + \beta_2(FA) + \beta_3(SS) + \epsilon \dots \dots \dots 1$$

**Table 1 Model Summary**

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	.966 <sup>a</sup>	.933	.932	.13322

a. Predictors: (Constant), SS, MA, FA

**Source:** SPSS Output Version 27.0.1

Table 1 provides a model summary indicating the strength of the relationship between the predictors (Self-Serving Actions [SS], Manipulation [MA], and Favoritism [FA]) and the dependent variable. The R value of 0.966 suggests a very strong positive correlation between the predictors and the outcome variable. The R Square value of 0.933 indicates that 93.3% of the variance in the dependent

facilitating data entry and processing. The study's independent variables, manipulation, favoritism, and self-serving behavior were analyzed in relation to organizational performance as the dependent variable. A multiple regression model was specified to examine these relationships. Instrument validity was confirmed through a pilot study, and reliability was assessed using Cronbach's alpha, revealing high internal consistency for all constructs, with alpha values exceeding 0.70, demonstrating robust reliability.

## RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONS

A total of 241 questionnaires were distributed to the employees of Nigeria Bottling Company, Abuja. Remarkably, 220 questionnaires were successfully retrieved, yielding an impressive response rate of 91%. The analysis conducted in this study relies on the data obtained from these 220 questionnaires that were adequately filled and returned. The outstanding 9% non-response rate indicates that only a small fraction of the distributed questionnaires was not returned. This high response rate enhances the reliability of the analysis, ensuring that it is founded on a substantial and representative sample of the employees' perspectives. However, to substantiate explicitly the analysis given so far above, the regression result or outputs obtained are presented thus below:

variable is explained by the combined effect of SS, MA, and FA. The Adjusted R Square, slightly lower at 0.932, accounts for the number of predictors in the model, maintaining the robustness of the explanatory power. With a standard error of the estimate at 0.13322, the model's predictions are reasonably precise. According to the decision rule, this high R Square value implies a strong fit of the model



to the data, indicating that SS, MA, and FA are highly predictive of the dependent variable in this context.

**Table 2 ANOVA<sup>a</sup>**

Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	53.076	3	17.692	996.924	.000 <sup>b</sup>
	Residual	3.833	216	.018		
	Total	56.909	219			

a. Dependent Variable: OP

b. Predictors: (Constant), SS, MA, FA

**Source:** SPSS Output Version 27.0.1

Table 2 presents the ANOVA results, assessing the overall significance of the regression model, where the dependent variable is Organizational Performance (OP) and the predictors are Self-Serving Actions (SS), Manipulation (MA), and Favoritism (FA). The regression sum of squares (53.076) is much larger than the residual sum of squares (3.833), indicating that a substantial portion of the variance in OP is explained by

the model. The F-value of 996.924, with a significance level of 0.000, indicates that the model is highly significant. According to the decision rule (typically, if  $p < 0.05$ , the model is significant), this  $p$ -value supports the conclusion that SS, MA, and FA significantly contribute to predicting OP. Thus, the model is statistically robust in explaining variations in organizational performance.

**Table 3 Coefficients<sup>a</sup>**

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
		B	Std. Error	Beta		
1	(Constant)	.108	.073		1.465	.144
	MA	.123	.027	.128	4.487	.000
	FA	.110	.025	.127	4.406	.000
	SS	.750	.035	.758	21.475	.000

a. Dependent Variable: OP

**Source:** SPSS Output Version 27.0.1

Table 3 provides the coefficients for the regression model predicting Organizational Performance (OP) using Manipulation (MA), Favoritism (FA), and Self-Serving Actions (SS) as independent variables. The constant has a coefficient of 0.108, though its  $p$ -value (0.144) indicates it is not statistically significant. All predictors—MA, FA, and SS—show significant contributions to the model with  $p$ -values of 0.000 (meeting the decision rule of  $p < 0.05$  for significance). SS has the largest unstandardized coefficient ( $B = 0.750$ ) and standardized coefficient ( $Beta = 0.758$ ), indicating it has the strongest influence on OP. MA and FA have smaller but significant effects, with unstandardized coefficients of 0.123 and 0.110, and standardized coefficients ( $Beta$ ) of 0.128 and 0.127, respectively. This

analysis indicates that while all three factors significantly predict OP, self-serving actions have the greatest impact.

## 4.5 Discussion of Findings

The study found that perceived manipulation within humanitarian aid organizations significantly affects organizational performance in Adamawa State. When employees or senior staff engage in manipulative practices, such as influencing decisions for personal gain or allocating resources based on favoritism instead of actual needs, it hampers the organization's

effectiveness. Such manipulation can undermine the quality and timeliness of aid delivery, lower employee morale, and reduce overall efficiency. Addressing these manipulative behaviors could improve organizational performance, resulting in better outcomes for beneficiaries and enhanced operational effectiveness. This aligns with the findings of Zhang et al. (2023) and Sun et al. (2022), which demonstrated that perceived organizational politics negatively impacted employee creativity, with psychological safety playing a mediating role, and that perceived organizational politics also had a detrimental effect on employee well-being, which in turn harmed organizational citizenship behavior.

The study also highlighted that favoritism within humanitarian aid organizations significantly affects organizational performance in Adamawa State. When certain employees or groups are given preferential treatment, whether in resource allocation or decision-making, it creates an unequal and unfair work environment. Favoritism can demoralize employees who feel neglected, reduce collaboration, and lower job satisfaction. These factors can weaken the quality and effectiveness of aid delivery, disrupt organizational unity, and ultimately harm performance. Favoritism can also lead to inefficiencies as resources may be allocated based on personal relationships or biases rather than need or merit. Addressing favoritism and fostering an environment of fairness and meritocracy is crucial for improving organizational performance and achieving better outcomes for beneficiaries. This finding is consistent with Li et al. (2021) and Chen & Chen (2020), whose studies showed that perceived organizational politics negatively influenced employee voice behavior, with psychological empowerment acting as a mediator, and revealed a positive link between perceived organizational politics and employee turnover intention, with organizational justice moderating the relationship.

Lastly, the study indicated that self-serving actions among humanitarian aid workers have a notable impact on organizational performance in Adamawa State. When employees prioritize personal interests over organizational goals, it disrupts decision-making, affects resource allocation, and hinders team collaboration.

Self-serving behaviors, such as using organizational resources for personal benefit or making decisions that favor individual interests over collective ones, lead to inefficiencies, decreased productivity, and lower-quality aid delivery. These actions negatively affect overall organizational performance, causing delays, wasting resources, and reducing employee morale. To mitigate these issues, it is vital to foster a work culture that encourages integrity, selflessness, and alignment with organizational goals. This is in line with Wang et al. (2022) and Wu et al. (2021), whose findings revealed that perceived organizational politics negatively impacted employee job satisfaction, with work-life balance mediating this relationship, and showed a negative connection between perceived organizational politics and employee performance, moderated by organizational support.

## **CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATION**

The study demonstrated that perceived manipulation, favoritism, and self-serving behaviors within humanitarian aid organizations in Adamawa State significantly impact organizational performance. Manipulative behaviors and favoritism undermine decision-making processes, resource allocation, teamwork, and overall collaboration, resulting in a toxic work environment that compromises employee morale, productivity, and the quality of aid delivery. Self-serving actions, driven by personal interests, further exacerbate these challenges by hindering collective decision-making and resource efficiency. These behaviors collectively lead to inefficiencies, reduced organizational effectiveness, and poor service delivery to beneficiaries. The findings highlight the urgent need for reforms that promote transparency, fairness, accountability, and merit-based decision-making to enhance organizational outcomes and foster equitable and efficient service delivery.

Based on the findings, the study proposes the following recommendations:

1. Humanitarian aid organizations should establish clear and transparent processes for decision-making and resource allocation to minimize opportunities for manipulation and

favoritism. This could involve implementing checks and balances to ensure decisions are based on merit and organizational needs, rather than personal interests.

2. Humanitarian aid organizations should develop and enforce clear, transparent policies that ensure fair treatment of all employees, especially in decision-making and resource allocation. These policies should explicitly prohibit favoritism and outline consequences for unethical behavior, promoting an environment where all employees feel valued and treated equitably.
3. Humanitarian organizations should implement strong ethical guidelines that emphasize the importance of acting in the best interest of the organization and its beneficiaries. Clear codes of conduct should be established and communicated to all employees, with regular training on integrity, accountability, and ethical decision-making.

## REFERENCES

- Blau, P. M. (1964). *Exchange and Power in Social Life*. Wiley.
- Brown, P., & Lee, J. (2023). *Impact of self-serving behaviors on teamwork in organizations*. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 45(3), 345-360.
- Chen, J., & Chen, T. (2020). Perceived organizational politics and turnover intention. *Asia Pacific Journal of Management*, 37(3), 611-629.
- Chen, Y., Zhao, L., & Huang, X. (2023). The impact of employee engagement on organizational outcomes. *Journal of Human Resource Management*, 45(3), 234-251.
- Cropanzano, R., & Mitchell, M. S. (2005). Social exchange theory: An interdisciplinary review. *Journal of Management*, 31(6), 874-900.
- Eisenberger, R., Malone, G. P., & Presson, W. D. (2020). Organizational politics and employee well-being: An examination of the role of trust. *Human Relations*, 73(2), 213-231.
- Eisenhardt, K. M. (1989). Agency theory: An assessment and review. *Academy of Management Review*, 14(1), 57-74.
- Emerson, R. M. (1976). Social exchange theory. *Annual Review of Sociology*, 2(1), 335-362.
- Ferris, G. R., Harrell-Cook, G., & Dulebohn, J. H. (2019). Political skill at work: Impact on job performance, work attitudes, and career success. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 118(2), 25-35.
- Garcia, L., & Martinez, R. (2022). *Favoritism and its effects on team dynamics*. *Human Resource Management Review*, 32(2), 214-227.
- Jiang, L., et al. (2023). *Perceived organizational politics and employee turnover*. *International Journal of Business Studies*, 40(4), 587-601.
- Jonason, P. K., et al. (2023). *Dark triad traits and manipulative workplace behaviors*. *Personality and Social Psychology Review*, 27(1), 45-62.
- Kacmar, K. M., Andrews, M. C., Harris, K. J., & Tepper, B. J. (2019). The politics of workplace politics: The impact of political skill on work outcomes. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 40(4), 542-556.
- Kim, S., & Lee, J. (2023). Transformational leadership and its influence on organizational performance. *Leadership Studies Quarterly*, 12(2), 102-118.
- Kim, S., & Park, H. (2023). *The moderating role of transformational leadership in organizational politics*. *Leadership Quarterly*, 34(1), 119-137.
- Lee, C., & Chang, D. (2022). *Defensive behaviors in politically charged work environments*. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 108(2), 239-251.

- Lee, H., & Park, J. (2022). Operational efficiency as a driver of organizational success. *Operations Management Journal*, 39(1), 56–73.
- Li, X., et al. (2021). The influence of perceived organizational politics on employee voice. *International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 32(8), 1635–1654.
- Martinez, R., & Gomez, F. (2022). The role of innovation in enhancing organizational performance. *Innovative Practices Journal*, 25(4), 198–210.
- Ogbonna, E., & Harris, L. C. (2018). Leadership, organizational politics, and organizational performance. *Management Decision*, 56(2), 412–429.
- Patel, M., & McCarthy, E. (2023). *Navigating organizational politics for strategic change*. *Organizational Dynamics*, 50(1), 1-13.
- Smith, A., & Jones, B. (2023). A multidimensional approach to evaluating organizational performance. *Strategic Management Review*, 48(1), 12–30.
- Smith, J., & Johnson, K. (2023). *The impact of favoritism on employee morale*. *Journal of Workplace Ethics*, 18(3), 112-128.
- Sun, Y., et al. (2022). Perceived organizational politics and employee well-being. *Human Resource Management Journal*, 32(4), 768–785.
- Treadway, D. C., Ferris, G. R., Hochwarter, W. A., et al. (2013). Political skill in organizations. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 34(S1), S143–S159.
- Vigoda-Gadot, E., & Drory, A. (2016). *Handbook of Organizational Politics: Looking Back and to the Future*. Edward Elgar Publishing.
- Wang, Y., et al. (2022). The impact of perceived organizational politics on job satisfaction. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 43(2), 240–258.
- Williams, R., & Green, T. (2023). *Ethical leadership as a counter to workplace manipulation*. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 168(2), 345-367.
- Wu, H., et al. (2021). Perceived organizational politics and employee performance. *Management Research Review*, 44(5), 672–689.
- Zhang, H., et al. (2023). *Manipulation in politically charged organizations*. *Organizational Studies*, 29(4), 601-620.
- Zhang, L., et al. (2023). The impact of perceived organizational politics on employee creativity. *Journal of Business Research*, 141, 45–55.