

## Research Article

# Group Cohesiveness and Organizational Citizenship Behavior of Oil Companies in Nigeria

Ukpong Uwem Johnson<sup>1</sup>, Uzoma EO Akopunwanne<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Akwa Ibom State University.

<sup>2</sup>Department of Management, Faculty of Management Sciences.

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.24321/2582.3280.201907>

## I N F O

**Corresponding Author:**

Ukpong Uwem Johnson, Akwa Ibom State University.

**E-mail Id:**

[uwemjohnson5@gmail.com](mailto:uwemjohnson5@gmail.com)

**Orcid Id:**

<https://orcid.org/0000-0002-7549-4098>

**How to cite this article:**

Johnson UU, Akopunwanne EU. Group Cohesiveness and Organizational Citizenship Behavior of Oil Companies in Nigeria. *J Adv Res Qual Control Mgmt* 2019; 4(1): 44-53.

Date of Submission: 2019-04-20

Date of Acceptance: 2019-05-19

## A B S T R A C T

The study seek to establish an empirical relationship between Group cohesiveness and organizational citizenship behavior of Oil companies in Nigeria, the cross-sectional survey design was used for the research, the population includes 663 employees of the studied oil companies with a sample size of 249, the findings reveals a significant correlation between the empirical referents of group cohesiveness and organizational citizenship behaviour. From the findings we therefore, concludes that the success and achievement of improved organizational citizenship behaviour can be achieved through the effective management of various formal or informal social networking and group processes. And based on the findings the following recommendations are made; that Organisational policies on the management of group activities and cohesiveness should be structured to enable member's growth, support and recognition and Groups and other networking activities within the organization should be structured in such a way that appreciates and recognizes employees for their efforts, contributions as well as prevailing differences both at the individual, group and at the organizational level.

**Keywords:** Group Cohesiveness, Organizational Citizenship Behavior, Altruism, Civic Virtue

## Introduction

The empirical research on organizational performance has assumed multiple stages aimed toward the self development, such as altruism, work satisfaction, civic virtue. The behaviour of workers is an imperative dynamic in the workplace. Hunt (1999) defined organizational citizenship behaviour as individual behavior that is flexible and not directly acknowledged by the formal activities within the workplace and that in the overall it increases the performances of the organization. Organ, The concept has been somewhat difficult, to operationalized the theoretical terms. Scholars were asking whether organizational

citizenship behaviour, was identify by Dennis, Organ which informal behaviour were practices in the organization. To Organ (1997), "he response to criticisms, rates that since original definition, jobs have moved away from a defined set of tasks and responsibilities and have evolved into much more unclear roles". Without a clear stated role, have made the concept very difficult to identify what is extra of that role which required perform. Organ (1997) "stated that organization citizenship behaviour mayat some point encourage some sort of reward, but that these rewards would be indirect, uncertain and not within the contractually guaranteed formal rewards system of management within

an organisation". Also, Organ, explained that empirical research have proved that organizational citizenship behaviour is more likely to lead financial reward than the role they performed. Organ, "have suggested that we eliminate this pattern of thinking when considering the definition of organizational citizenship behaviour". Balabat (2015) stated that he would "prefer to consider organization citizenship behaviour as performance that supports the social and psychological environment in which task performance takes place". Even though, the idea is weak, the concept of organization citizenship behaviour is imperative and considerable in nature. It is impossible for any concept to be perfectly identified. The identification of organization citizenship behaviour was based on the transitory needs of the workplace and thus will most likely to continue and solve issues. However, Melvin (2005) "defined organization citizenship behaviour as the informal, not directly recognized by the formal process and that in the sum total it increases the effective performances of the organization". He found five fundamental dimensions of organization citizenship behaviour which includes: "altruism: which is the helping of an individual co-worker on a task; courtesy: which entails alerting others in the organization about changes that may affect their work; conscientiousness: which involves carrying out one's duties beyond the minimum requirements, sportsmanship: that refraining from complaining about trivial matters and civic virtue: which indicates participating in the governance of the organization". In Podsakoff, et al (2014), they combined the concept of altruism and courtesy and called it as "helping of co-worker in the organisation". And they further research, on how they relate with group cohesiveness, group formation, group task and goals. Although, Hasan (2013), also argued that the "company's criteria for effective performance and success of the entire organization depend on the integration of group dynamics".

Thus, groups are made of individuals who are connected to one another by social relationship. Group can start from three persons to fifty persons. "Very small collectives, such as dyads (two members) and triads (three members) are group, but so are very large collections of people, includes: mob, crowds and congregations" by (Simmel 1902). Also, most groups aim to be relatively small in size, which range from three or two to ten persons in either in the organization or any social group of members in the society.

According to James, (1953) he stated that after when the number of people in informal group are known, then they spontaneously formed a groups' settings reported an average group size of only 25. He stated that groups, such as those created by government or working group included average members of persons. In sometimes situation, larger groups are also set to over emphasize smaller groups.

According to Hare (1976), he stated that "size of a group affects its nature in several ways, for a group with only two or three members possesses many unique characteristics simply because it includes few members". Every large congregation such as "mobs", "crowds", also has unique qualities. "In a very large group, for instances, the chances for each member to be connected to all other members become very small". To Hare, (1976) "as groups increase in size, they tend to become more complex and more formally structured".

Thus, this study will bridge the knowledge gap that exist between group formation and group cohesiveness as means to influence the organizational citizenship behaviour sub-indicator such as altruism and civic virtue.

### Statement of the Problem

Empirical research has recognized that realizing the true potential of effective performance and efficiency required organizational resources, managers and business leaders need relevant and timely information on how organizational citizenship behaviour influences their client, market and products and services which have been merchandized. The fundamental challenge facing every manager in an organization is to integrate group dynamics that can enhance the organizational citizenship behaviour such as altruism and civic virtue. The failure of this integration has led to poor service delivery, low productivity, higher turnover rate and reduction in return of investment and so on. In this, organizations ought to re-structure development of numerous information technological platforms and solutions to focus on group cohesiveness, group formation, toward improving performance that will influence altruism and civic virtue.

And as such, managing organization, particularly a large company such as corporate activities with abundant product/ services and clients to the company, is a multi-dimensional process where the performance of the organization (civic virtue and altruism) is influenced by many numerous factors related to behaviour of the employee such as 'experience, competence and skills' performances. Also to the predictor of group dynamics includes: group cohesiveness, group formation, towards influencing the organizational citizenship behaviour sub-indicators. Thus, this research work covers the possible variables that could solve the base line issues and challenges that engulf the group dynamics and organisational citizenship behaviour of Nigeria oil companies.

The research tends to in addition to building fresh a knowledge area in organizational performance is to examine the relationship between group cohesiveness and organizational citizenship behaviour. The study aimed at looking at the following research questions:

- To what extent does group cohesiveness relate with altruism in the oil industry
- To what extent does group cohesiveness relate with civic virtue in the oil industry

### **The following Hypothesis is Stated for the Study:**

**Ho<sub>1</sub>:** There is no significant relationship between group cohesiveness and altruism.

**Ho<sub>2</sub>:** There is no significant relationship between group cohesiveness and civic virtue.

### **Significance of the Study**

The aim of the study in addition to building fresh knowledge areas in organisational performance is to establish an empirical relationship between group cohesiveness and organizational citizenship behaviour. This research work is vital to the policy makers in the business sector, researchers, business analysts and academicians. Also, it shows where the organizations position in relation to the strategies and policy on business operations, group inter-dependence, group communication and interaction, group systems and structures, group influence, power and conflicts. It is in the light of this that experts within organizations seek to investigate the relationship between group cohesiveness and organizational citizenship behaviour concept prior to improving operations of the organisations, profit margin and civic virtue of any organization. This research work would also be beneficial to stock market, political sector, governmental organization and charismatic sales and marketing managers of the oil industry.

### **Literature Review**

To the Socialist theory, "inter-group convictions arise with the process of comparison between individuals in one group to those of another group". These similarities are not objective. Moreover, it is a process of encouraging individual's self-esteem. In this similarities an individual aims to: according to Van et al, (2008) "favor the group inside than the group outside and over generalize the differences between the group and the outside group to minimize the perception of differences between inside group members and remember more detailed and positive information about the in group and more negative information about the outside group". Even though, they start without any inter group mutual agreement, individuals will still show altruism towards its own group and show negative behaviour towards the out-side group. These convictions might lead to "stereotypes and discrimination of individuals in one group". Inter group confliction can be highly competitive among social groups.

The formation of inter group conviction has been examine in multiple empirical research, according to Sherif, (1961),

who quoted "Robbers Cave Experiment". There have been several strategies that deployed to reduce the tension, bias and misunderstanding within the two groups. This includes "the contact hypothesis, the jigsaw classroom and several categorization-based strategies". Empirical research had been done in relation with prejudice reduction under variations of the contact hypothesis and a meta-analysis review suggests overall support for its efficacy. In certain circumstances, the four optimal contact that have been suggested by Airport, which show prejudices between groups in the organization can also be reduced.

The different models that have been recognized would utilize a super ordinate identity to minimize 'prejudice' in the organization. "By emphasizing this super ordinate identity, individuals in both sub-groups can share a common social identity", "Models utilizing super ordinate identities includes: the common group identity model, the in group projection model, the mutual inter-group differentiation model and the in group identity model" (Crano, 2006).

Davidson, (1970) used Robbers Cave Experiment, to reduce conflict between groups. Elliot et al (1971) also, "uses this strategy of interdependence". "Despite the strong evidence for the effectiveness of the jigsaw classroom, the strategy was not widely adopted, because of strong attitudes existing outside the environment, which still resisted the notion that racial and ethnic minority groups are equal to Whites and, similarly, should be integrated into schools" (Van & Schaller 2008).

### **Group Cohesiveness as a Dimension of Group Dynamic**

According to the social scientists, group cohesiveness is defined as the processes that bind individual members of a social group. Such processes includes: interest, attraction, solidarity, morale which usually keep group cohesiveness. "It is one of the essential characteristics of a social group and has been linked to group effectiveness and efficiencies; inter group conviction and therapeutic change (Miebi, 2014). According to Johnson, et al (2017) group cohesiveness can be defined as the keenness of individuals to stick together and believed that without cohesiveness a group could not exist. Furthermore, Lewin's research quoting Stanley Schachter sees group cohesiveness as the total field of forces which act on members to remain in the group.

This concept was described as the forces acting on individual members to remain in the group, which called interest to the group. Many research have been carry out to understand the studied of "group cohesiveness" which includes: Albert Carron's who cited Van and Schaller (2008) "hierarchical framework and several bi-dimensional

framework, vertical/ horizontal cohesiveness, task/ social cohesiveness, belongingness and morale and personal/ social attraction”.

Group in the organization believed that they are based on how individuals in the group see their other members. Individuals interested to uplift likelihood in group members and change from unlikeable group members, making them a separate member in the group. “This is called the black sheep effect”. An “individual’s beliefs about the group might deviate upon whether they are part of the inside group or outside the group” (Van & Schaller, 2008).

This can only be achieved when they avoid joining an outcast of the group. “Outcasts In a group are those that behave in a way that might conflicting the group tend to be treated more difficulties than the likeable ones in a group, creating a black sheep effect. Old members of a group might, treat the new members harshly, causing the pledges to decide if they have approve the situation and if they will voice their disagreeing opinions about it”.

Every new person in a group must introduce his or her self to the old people in the group for them to be completely integrated into the group. Because old group members in the system have undergoes several social programme and have been already accommodated in the group. “They have more chances than incoming ones, but more responsibility to help the group achieve its goals”. According to Cohen, (2006) Stated “that marginal group members were once old time members but they lost their prestige in the group or choose not to conform to certain acceptable norms”. These groups of people can still join the group, if they can undergo socialization again with the old members in the system. The development of new members attribute about people in the group and people out-side the group in time of recommending is a survey work.

Van and Schiller, (2008) “had noted that individuals within group may share a dissimilar believe and still work together to achieve group goals”.

### **Organizational Citizenship Behaviour**

There has been need for the development of empirical work on the growing concept of organizational citizenship behavior (Johnson *et al* 2017; 2018) from the existing knowledge of this contents, lack of proper literature on the perspective of this concept is notably cleared. ‘The literature review indicates that there are different types of organizational citizenship behaviour and various definitions have been postulated, but there are a lot of overlaps between them’. Several perspectives have been developed such as: Organ model, which is the most acceptable classification of organizational citizenship behavior, this has identified by Johnson *et al* (2018). He has classified organizational citizenship behavior in numerous

perspectives which made up the concept of organizational citizenship behaviour.

### **Altruism as a Measure of Organizational Citizenship Behaviour:**

Altruism can be defined as the effective behaviors or character such as helping colleague, showing sympathy and compassion between the colleagues that directly or indirectly helps the employees involved in a situation under working, for instance, helping who have several of works. According to Graham (1989), he defined altruism has “interpersonal assistants offered to colleagues within an organisation”. Helping behavior includes: “all types of voluntary actions of workmen displayed to help the fellow workmen in performing their work and overcoming problems within the organization” by (Organ, 1988; Podsakoff, 2000). Such attitude include: “helping new workers in get adopted into the work environment, sharing the work burden of colleagues, helping other in the organization to solve problems, training fellow workers on utilization of new equipment, helping fellow workers to works within the scope of the deadlines and obtaining the materials and equipment which is needed by fellow workmen” (Podsakoff, 2000). According to Organ, (1988), Podsakoff, (2000), the “helping behavior is not confined only to fellow workmen; it can be displayed also to the customers, vendors and the others working in procurement”.

### **Civic Virtue as a Measure of Organizational Citizenship Behaviour**

Civic virtue practices in the organization is a behaviors of individuals carrying out extraordinary duties in the organization, “when this presence is not required, supporting the presented development and changes made by the organization managers and tendency to studying the book, magazine and increasing general information and paying attention to the hanging poster and notice in the organization for the others’ information”. The word civic virtue in the organization is simply means “high level interest in and high level loyalty to the organization”. According to Organ, (1988), he stated that “the involvement of workers in the decision making, in order to show interest in policies of the organization and to make contributions and deliver opinions for the strategies of the organization, to cope with the changes and challenges in organizational, to observe the environment for avoiding any hazard to the organization, to report any unusual incidence in the workplace, to be ready against any risk are some of the instances of this civic virtue behavior in the organization”. “This view of organizational citizenship behavior is in line with the study of Graham (1989) and the study and protection of organizational benefits in the model of Fareh *et al* (1997) and organizational loyalty and civic behavior in model” of Podsak off (2000).



## Group Cohesiveness and Organizational Citizenship Behaviour

The study's results show that participant working in group cohesiveness have a significant positive relationship with organizational performance base on cooperative system. These result in line with the conclusion of Mullen and Cooper (1994) and according to Loughhead and Carron (2004) they stated that "group cohesiveness is more likely to influence performance of workers in the organization". To Hoegl and Proserpio (2004) stated that "if people are closed to one another, it will strengthen by closer proximity that in turn, facilitates better performance in the organization". However, "it is importance to encourage organizations not only to obtain stronger learning capability, but also to have working organization that will characterized group cohesion, since these are some of the main objectives to generate a total improvement in organizational performance". The reason is that group cohesiveness can be related to performance that which was not amazing. The Meta analysis of the cohesion performance relationship, according to Carron, Alfred (2008), they stated that "group cohesiveness have a moderate relationship with organization performance". And as such, it is significant that strong relationship have a high level of group performance. To Paul (2010) they suggested that "members who work in the cohesive group believed that organization performance was the principal focus at any situation".

## Research Methodology

### Research Design

Baridam (2008) described research design as the more fundamental question of how the study will be brought into and how they will be employed within the research setting to obtain the required data. It is a framework that is used to collect valid and reliable data to test the hypotheses stated in the research work. From the foregoing, the cross-sectional survey design was used for the research. This was examined appropriate for the study because of the following. The study involves the description of the dimensions of group cohesiveness that influence the organizational citizenship behavior of oil companies in Nigeria. Also, according to Lewis and Thornhill (2007), he indicated that "the survey strategy is perceived as authoritative by people in general and is both comparatively easy to explain and to understand".

### Population of the Study

Baridam (2008) opined that the population of a study identifies the total items within which a researcher wishes to study. The researcher therefore, stated that the target population is the entire population to which the findings are applicable or can be made generalization. The target population of the study is 663 employees of the oil companies, Rivers state.

**Table 1.Reverse side of note (Rs.2000) matched against its template**

S. NO.	MTN	Staff Strength
1.	Desicon	195
2.	Agip	145
3.	Deltic Energy	132
4.	Saipem	191
	<b>Total</b>	<b>663</b>

Source: Field work, 2019

## Sample Size/ Sampling Procedure

According to Obioma (1987), sampling is the process by which a sub-set of persons or observations from a large set is drawn and studied in order to make inferences about the characteristics of a larger group. A sample occurs when a number of sampling units fewer than the total which draw from a population and examined in some detail. Since the population is finite, a sample size that can be feasibly covered is acquired. The sample size was obtained using the Kjecie and Morgan (1970) table for determining minimum returned sample size for a given population. However, the sample size is 249 and was used for the study. This can also be determined by using the Taro Yamene's formula for finite population given as:

$$n = \frac{N}{1 + N(e)^2}$$

Where n = sample size

N = Population size

e = level of significance (0.05)

Computation, the sample size for this study is given by

$$n = \frac{663}{1 + 663(0.05)^2}$$

$$n = \frac{663}{2.6575}$$

$$n = 249$$

## Demographic Analysis

In this study the output of the demographic analysis are presented. These presentations would further enable the understanding of demographic distribution of the sample population.

From table 2, it observed that 40(19.6) of the respondents were under 25 years, 70 representing (34.3%) of the respondents were within the range of 26-35 years, also, 81 respondents representing (39.7%) were within the 36-45 years age bracket. 13 of the respondents representing (6.4%) were within the range of 46-55 years age bracket.

Table 3, indicated that 76 of the respondents indicating (37.3%) of the respondents were single while 128 of the respondents indicating (62.7%) indicated that they were married.

**Table 2.Age Bracket of the Respondents**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Under 25 years	40	19.6	19.6	19.6
	Btw 26-35 years	70	34.3	34.3	53.9
	Btw 36-45 years	81	39.7	39.7	93.6
	Btw 46-55 years	13	6.4	6.4	100.0
	Total	204	100.0	100.0	

Source: SPSS output 22.0, 2019

**Table 3.Marital Status Distribution of the Respondents**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Single	76	37.3	37.3	37.3
	Married	128	62.7	62.7	100.0
	Total	204	100.0	100.0	

Source: SPSS 22.0 Output, 2019

**Inferential Statistic (Univariate Data Analysis)**

This section would analyze the primary data obtained from the questionnaires. Analyses were carried out on individual variables and measures. Mean scores and standard deviations are also illustrated. The presentation begins with the independent variable which is Group dynamic with its dimension: Group Formation and Group Cohesiveness, it then proceeds to the dependent variable, whose measures are Altruism and Civic Virtue. It ended with the moderating variable which is corporate culture. These are all scaled on the five (5) point Likert scale.

Table 4, indicates the response rates and frequency for group formation which measured on a 4-item instrument and scaled on a 5-point Likert scale. The first question item the group participates in decision making in this outlet shows a mean score of 3.95 which is on the agree range of the scale. The 2<sup>nd</sup>, 3<sup>rd</sup> and 4<sup>th</sup> question items with 4.08, 3.85 and 4.21 mean scores respectively also means that the respondents are more inclined to the agree range of the scale used in measurement. In all, the response distribution shows largely that group formation is a strong dimension among the group dynamics.

**Table 4.Response Rates for Group Formation**

Group Formation	SD	D	N	A	SA	X	Std
The group participates in decision making in this outlet.	11	15	5	115	58	3.95	1.045
The group here takes decision in the matters that concerns their welfare.	20	5	13	67	99	4.08	1.237
The social group is a critical source of information about individual identity	-	20	12	78	94	3.85	1.183
Staff members' opinions/ views are regarded here.	10	20	40	55	82	4.21	.935

Source: Survey Data, 2019

**Table 5.Response Rates for Group Cohesiveness**

Group Cohesiveness	SD	D	N	A	SA	X	Std
Group 'fight' for their right here.	30	15	5	79	72	3.74	1.423
Management listens to group here concerning their health and safety.	5	30	-	93	73	4.00	1.090
There is always peaceful settlement of grievances and disputes in this place.	1	4	39	89	68	4.08	1.312
A member may not personally agree with something the group does, but to avoid the black sheep effect	20	9	20	40	115	4.10	.809

Source: Survey Data, 2019

Table 5, showed the response rates and frequency for Group cohesiveness measured on a 4-item instrument and scaled on a 5-point Likert scale. The first question, group 'fight' for their right here shows a mean score of 3.74 which is on the agree range of the scale. The 2<sup>nd</sup>, 3<sup>rd</sup> and 4<sup>th</sup> question items with 4.00, 4.08 and 4.10 mean scores respectively indicates that the respondents are more inclined to the agree range of the scale used in measurement whose indicates that group cohesiveness is a strong dimension of group dynamic.

**Ho<sub>3</sub>:** There is no significant relationship between Group Cohesiveness and Civic Virtue.

is accepted, this implies that there is a strong positive significant relationship between Group cohesiveness and altruism in the oil companies in port-Harcourt. Therefore, from this empirical result is show that workers in these selected companies are willing at all times to help others with related work and also help specific persons to complete their role in the organization.

## Discussion of findings

### Group Cohesiveness and Organizational Citizenship Behaviour

The result of the study showed that Group Cohesiveness

**Table 6. Correlation result for Group Cohesiveness and Civic Virtue**

			Civic virtue	Group Cohesiveness
Spearman's rho	Civic virtue	Correlation Coefficient	1.000	-.491**
		Sig. (2-tailed)	.	.000
	Group Cohesiveness	Correlation Coefficient	-.491**	1.000
		Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.
**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).				
b. List wise N = 204				

Source: SPSS 22.0 data output, 2019

Table 6, above, with a *rho* value = -0.491, means that a negative relationship exist between group cohesiveness and civic virtue. The relationship is not significant at  $p = -0.491 < 0.01$  significance level. This means that the stated null hypothesis is rejected. This implies that there is a negative significant relationship between Group cohesiveness and Civic virtue.

### Test of Hypothesis Four

**Ho<sub>2</sub>:** There is no significant relationship between Group Cohesiveness and Altruism.

relates positively and significantly with Organizational Citizenship Behaviour specifically altruism as a measure. The results demonstrated that participants working in group cohesiveness do have a significant relationship with organizational citizenship behaviour in the sense of cooperative organisation. The results collaborate with the conclusions of Mastin (2012) and Harcourt, et al (2014) that group cohesiveness to a greater extends influence performance.

Also, the result in line with the findings of Johnson et al.

**Table 7. Correlation result for Group Cohesiveness and Altruism**

			Group Cohesiveness	Altruism
Spearman's rho	Group Cohesiveness	Correlation Coefficient	1.000	.836**
		Sig. (2-tailed)	.	.000
	Altruism	Correlation Coefficient	.836**	1.000
		Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.
**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).				
b. List wise N = 204				

Source: SPSS 22.0 data output, 2019

Table 7, above, with *rho* value = 0.836, means that a strong significant relationship exist between group cohesiveness and altruism. This relationship is significant at  $p = 0.836 < 0.01$  significance level. This means that the previously stated null hypotheses is hereby rejected and the alternate

(2017) they found that "individual cordiality within the work organization strengthened their bond and aid in workers achievement or operation achievement". Therefore, it is imperative to encourage organizations not only to obtain stronger learning capability, but also to have work

environments characterized by group cohesion, since these are some of the main routes to generating a total improvement in organizational performance. The fact that group cohesiveness would be associated with performance was not discouraging. In their Meta analysis of the cohesion performance relationship, Carron, Colman, Wheeler and Stevens (2002) found that "group cohesiveness had a moderate relationship with performance".

Finally, George, et al (2014) and Podsakoff, et al (1995) also found that "less highly formalized organizations created an environment of group cohesiveness that encouraged employees to engage in organizational citizenship behavior" and as such, 'in a bureaucratically structured organizations created an environment of employee alienation that inhibited organizational citizenship behaviour'.

### Summary of Findings

Therefore, from the findings it is been established that there is a significant positive relationship between the predictor and criterion variables of the study (group cohesiveness and altruism as well as between group cohesiveness and civic virtue).

### Conclusion

The aim of this study was to examine the empirical examination of the relationship between group cohesiveness and organizational citizenship behaviour; with findings revealing significant correlation between the empirical referents of group cohesiveness and organizational citizenship behaviour. From the findings we therefore, conclude that the success and achievement of improved organizational citizenship behaviour can be achieved through the effective management of various formal or informal social networking and group processes. From the findings of the study, the following conclusions are made:

- Groups should be cohesive enough to seek out unifying activities and functions which further facilitate cooperation and collaboration on task initiatives.
- Policies and other cultural arti-facts should be formulated to guide and manage group activities within the organizations such that goals are in line with the general objectives of the organization.

### Recommendations

Based on the findings and conclusions the following recommendations are made:

- Organisational policies on the management of group activities and cohesiveness should be structured in a way that enable's group members support and recognition
- Groups and other networking activities within the organization should be structured in such a way that appreciates and recognizes employees for their efforts,

contributions as well as prevailing differences both at the individual, group and at the organizational level.

### References

1. Anderson RE. Personal selling and sales management in the new millennium. *Journal of personal selling and sales management* 1996; 16(4): 17-32.
2. Ashtiani A. Coordinating expertise among emergent groups: responding to disasters. *Organization science journal*, 2009; 6(2): 18-147.
3. Backstrom L, Kleinberg J, Lan X. Group formation in large social networks: proceedings of the (12<sup>th</sup>ed.). *International conference on knowledge discovery and data mining* 2006; 5(6): 44.
4. Baridam DM. Research methods in administrative sciences. Port Harcourt: Sherbrooke Associates. 2001.
5. Bartunek JM, Moch MK. First order, second order and third order change and organizational development interventions: a cognitive approach. *Journal of Applied Behavioral Science* 1987; 23(6): 483-500.
6. Borman D, Motowidlo E. Insult: aggression and the southern culture of honor. *An experimental ethnography journal of personality and social psychology* 2001; 70(5): 945-959.
7. Borman C, Motowidlo J. *Expanding the criterion domain to include elements of contextual performance*. In N. Schmitt: W.C. Borman and associates. 2001.
8. Bowler WM, Brass DJ. Relational correlates of interpersonal citizenship behavior: a social network perspective. *Journal of applied psychology*, 2006; 91(1): 70-82.
9. Brewer MB. The social self on being the same and different at the same time. *Personality and social psychology bulletin*, 1991; 17(5): 475.
10. Brief AP. Pro-social organizational behaviour. *Academy of management review* 1986; 2(11): 710-725.
11. Brown D. Organizational citizenship behavior: its construct cleanup time. *Human performance journal* 2000; 10(2): 85-97.
12. Bullino DW, Podsakoff PM. Organizational citizenship behaviour: its nature, antecedents and consequences. London: Sage publications. 2001.
13. Carron AV, Brawley LR. Cohesion: conceptual and measurement issue. *Journal of small group research* 2000; 4(31): 89.
14. Chen W, Ryan K. A meta analytic review of attitudinal and dispositional predictors of organizational citizenship behavior. *Journal personal psychology* 2001; 48(4): 775-802.
15. Colquitt JA, Conlon DE, Porter CO et al. Justice at the millennium: a meta analytic review of 25 years of organizational justice research. *Journal of applied psychology* 2001; 86(54): 425-457.
16. Carless SA. The measurement of cohesion in work



- teams. *Small group research* 2001; 31(1): 71-88.
17. Cohen J, Cohen P, Aiken L. *Applied multiple regression: correlation analysis for the behavioral sciences* (3<sup>rd</sup> ed.). Lawrence Erlbaum, Hillsdale, NJ. 2003.
  18. Cohen D. Culture: social organization and patterns of violence. *Journal of personality and social psychology* 1986; 75(2): 408-439.
  19. Crano WD. Milestones in the psychological analysis of social influence: group dynamics. *Theory: research and practice* 2000; 8(4): 61-68.]
  20. Cropanzano R, Bobocel DR, Rupp D et al. Mor virtues: fairness heuristics, social entities and other denizens of organizational justice. *Journal of vocational behavior*, 2003; 58(23): 164 209.
  21. Dalal RS. A meta analysis of the relationship between organizational citizenship behavior and counter-productive work behavior. *Journal of applied psychology* 2005; 90(6): 1241-1255.
  22. Day C. The product life cycle: analysis and applications issues. *Journal of marketing* 1981; 7(45): 60-67.
  23. Deaux K, Mizrahi K, Ethier KA. Parameters of social identity. *Journal of personality and social psychology* 1995; 68(2): 280.
  24. Dion KL. Group cohesiveness: from field of forces to multidimensional construct and group dynamics. *Theory: research and practice journal* 2002; 4(3): 7-21.
  25. Dovidio JF, Piliavin JA, Schroeder DA. The social psychology of pro-social behavior. Mahwah: NJ. Erlbaum. 2006.
  26. Driedger L. Multi-ethnic Canada: identities and inequalities. Toronto New York: Oxford University Press. 1996.
  27. Erdogan B, Kraimer ML. Justice and leader member exchange: the moderating role of organizational culture. *Academy of management journal* 2006; 49(7): 395-406.
  28. Ehrhart MG, Naumann SE. Organizational citizenship behavior in work groups: a group norms approach. *Journal of applied psychology* 2004; 6(89): 960-974.
  29. Folger R. Workplace justice and employee worth: Social Justice Research. 1994; 225-41.
  30. Folger R. Justice: motivation and performance beyond role requirements. *Employee responsibilities and rights journal* 1993; 6(7): 239-248.
  31. Fischer MD, Ferlie E. Resisting hybridisation between modes of clinical risk management: contradiction; contest; and the production of intractable conflict. *Accounting: organizations and society* 2013; 38(1): 30-49.
  32. Gaetner SL, Houlette M, Johnson KM et al. Reducing inter-group conflict: from super ordinate goals to de-categorization, re-categorization and mutual differentiation, group dynamism. *Theory: research and practice* 2006; 7(4): 98.
  33. George JM, Bettenhausen K. Understanding pro-social behavior; sales performance; and turnover: a group level analysis in a service context. *Journal of Applied Psychology* 1990; 75(7): 698-709.
  34. Guidry M. Marketing concepts that win: save time, money and work by crafting concept right time. Austin: TX. Live Oak Book Company. 2011.
  35. Gully SM, Whitney DJ. A meta analysis of cohesion and performance: effects of level of analysis and task independence. *Small group Research*, 1995; 26(4): 497.
  36. Harkman JR. *Leading Teams: setting the stage for great performances*. Harvest Business press. 2002.
  37. Hasan NP, Blume BD, Whiting SW. Individual and organizational level consequences of organization citizenship behaviours: a meta analysis. *Journal of applied psychology* 2013; 94(1): 122-141.
  38. Harris SG. Organizational culture and individual sense making: a schema based perspective. *Organization science* 1994; 5(7): 309-21
  39. Hogg HA, Williams KD. Social identify and the collective self, group dynamics: theory. *Research and practice journal* 2000; 4(3): 81-90.
  40. Hofstede G. *Consequences: Comparing Values, Behaviors, Institutions, and Organizations across Nations*. Sage: Thousand Oaks, CA. 2001.
  41. Hoegl M, Proserpio L. Team member proximity and teamwork in innovative projects. *Research policy* 2004; 33(8): 1153-1165.
  42. Hornsey MJ, Hogg MA. Subgroup relations: a comparison of inter-group identity model of prejudice reduction. *Personality social psychology bulletin* 2000; 26(2): 242.
  43. Johnson UU, Ignatius O, Emeka MC. Strategic Implementation and Service Quality of Insurance Companies in Port Harcourt. *Journal of Advanced in Accounting & Financial Management* 2018; 4(3&4): 33-42.
  44. Johnson UU, Nissi K, Ignatius OO. Resilience and Operational Sustainability of Oil Companies in Port Harcourt. *Journal of Advanced Research in Petroleum Technology & Management* 2018; 3(3&4): 28-35.
  45. Johnson UU, Okparaji, Gomba PW et al. Workplace Humour Styles and Subordinate Work Attitudes of Telecommunication Companies. *Journal of Advanced Research in HR Organisational Management* 2018; 5(4): 17-25.
  46. Johnson UU. Uchechukwu O, Sibbo MT. Self-Efficacy and Operational Sustainability of Oil Companies in Port Harcourt. *Journal of Advanced Research in Operational and Marketing Management* 2018; 4(3): 1-10.
  47. Johnson UU, Nissi K. Job Rotation and Quality of Work-life of Manufacturing Companies. *Journal of Advanced Research in Operational and Marketing Management* 2018; 4(4): 1-10.

48. Johnson UU, Uchechukwu O, Sibo MT. Job Design and Quality of Work-life in Telecommunication sector in Port Harcourt. *Journal of Advanced Research in HR & organizational Management* 2018; 5(3): 9-18.
49. Johnson UU, Emmanuel HS, Emeka MC et al. Efficiency Assessment and Corporate Sustainability of Banks in Port Harcourt. *Journal of Advanced Research in Economic & Business Management* 2019; 6(1): 10-26.