

Group Preference And Organizational Citizenship Behaviour Of Universities In Port Harcourt, Nigeria.

Okwudiri, Okwuchi Catherine¹ and Prof. Edwinah Amah²

¹Kateokwuchi271@gmail.com

Department of Management, Faculty of Management Sciences Ignatius Ajuru University of Education, Port Harcourt, Nigeria

²Edwinah4christ@gmail.com

Department of Management, Faculty of Management Sciences University of Port Harcourt, Nigeria

Abstract: A study involving 344 University employee in Port Harcourt found that in-group and out-group practices significantly influence organizational citizenship behaviors. Group efforts decrease organizational behaviors, negatively impacting the organization's effectiveness. Individual efforts enhance group performance. Recommendations include introducing policies that reward group efforts, enhancing flexibility and resource optimization, facilitating collaboration and teamwork, and demonstrating leadership through effective group programs. A result-oriented approach is suggested to meet organizational needs and reduce cross-functional inefficiencies. A group-friendly culture can encourage effective collaboration and organizational citizenship behaviors.

Keywords: Group Preference, In-Group Practices, Out-Group Practices, and Organizational Citizenship Behavior.

Introduction

Some employees go beyond job description to become good organizational citizens to their organization. This singular behavioural disposition makes organizational citizenship behavior (OCB) have the potential to boost employee morale by increasing work meaningfulness, creates better social interaction between employees, and positively predicts performance and promotes organizational effectiveness by providing a positive social and psychological environment in which task could be seamlessly performed and completed (Eketu, 2019; John *et al.*, 2011 & Kumar, 2014). Kumar (2014) submitted that organizational citizenship behavior enhances social connections that influences the job performance the employees in this social network. Traditionally, organizational citizenship behaviour is centered on the behavioural disposition of an individual employees. Thus, how such an employee uses their discretion to perform extra-role behaviours in favour of their colleagues and by extension the organization (Kumar, 2014). Today, the trend to research has changed as researchers are beginning to get interested in group behaviours (Kumar, 2014). Hence, they now investigate into group behaviours with regards to extra-role behavioural disposition and how this can affect organizational outcome.

More specifically, this trend of research may be interested in in-role behaviour of group members, but is more interested in discretionary group behaviours which are not explicitly recognized by the formal rewards system of the organization, but promotes the effective functioning of the organization (Kumar, 2014). This show that the spontaneous behaviour of group members. Such spontaneous behaviours (extra-role) does, however, contribute to the accomplishment of organizational goals. Hence, organizational citizenship behavior (OCB) may positively influence task performance, thriving at work and organizational impression management motive even in the face of in-group favoritism.

In-group favoritism or group performance can be expressed in the evaluation of others in the fair or unfair allocation of organizational resources, and in several other ways (Aronson *et al.*, 2010). This social psychological phenomenon has been a source of concern to several psychologist who have perceived it to be the cause of group conflict and prejudices (Aronson, *et al.*, 2010; De Dreu, 2012; & Larson *et al.* 1994). As opposed to this submission, Bilali (2013) noted that group preference can sufficiently induce the passion and commitment of employees who are members of the group. For instance, organizational citizenship behavior creates a social network in which employees can depend on themselves for work-related support to advance the course of the organization. This social network allows employees to group themselves and give each other individual support that in turn enhances sustainability, survival, and overall performance of the organization, in this case, the university system in Nigeria.

Formal education in Nigeria owes its transformation to the arrival of British Colonial interests in the 19th century. This transformation spread over to university education in Nigeria in the later part of the 19th century (African Development Fund, 2012). In 1962, the government of Nigeria established the National Universities Commission (NUC) as an advisory agency in the Cabinet Office to promote quality higher education in the country. Available records shows, Nigeria has 170 universities registered by the National Universities Commission (NUC) as at the year 2020. Among which are 43 federal universities, 48 state universities, and 79 private universities (Statista, 2020). The first set of universities were established in the country between 1948 and 1965. These universities

were established based on the recommendation of the Ashby Commission instituted by the then British Colonial Government to ascertain the necessity of university education in Nigeria (Omolewa, 2007). These federal government fully funded universities were established chiefly to meet the need for qualified manpower in the country and set a standard for the requirements of the establishment of a university. The universities include; the University of Nigeria, Nsukka (UNN), University of Lagos, Obafemi Awolowo University (OAU), Ahmadu Bello University (ABU), Zaria, and University of Ibadan (UI). Nevertheless, another set of universities were created between 1970 and 1985 to meet the need of the increasing population to enhance university education and increase the level of literacy among Nigerians. Again, more universities were further established to keep up with the times and address the need for university education in specialized areas like agriculture and technology between 1985 and 1999. As time goes on, pressure from the need of suitably qualified students from each of the states in the federation who could not obtain university admission in federal universities compelled the government to give licenses to states to establish state universities. Subsequently, private individuals and/or organizations were fully licensed to establish private universities following a federal government law in 1993. Lastly, during the 2010 – 2015 Goodluck E. Jonathan Administration, nine more federal universities were created. Today, the university system in Nigeria is a shadow of itself. Adeniyi (2001), and Yetunde (2018) revealed some of the bedeviling factors to include; poor funding, poor governance, lack of responsibility and control, lack of infrastructure, and politicization of education, poor parenting and guidance, and indiscipline, unstable curriculum and subjects, unpreparedness to take education as a major in scholars, lack of good teachers' welfare, unaffordable education due to the high cost of living, scarcity and high-priced cost of books for all levels of education. Again, there has been an unclear structure in Nigerian public Universities. For instance, Adamu (2011) suggested that there is an absence of clearly defined career development profile for academic and support staff, a lack of clear-cut/objective criteria for promotion, and widespread teaching overload beyond one's discipline. Despite all these challenges, some university employees still go out of their way to ensure they put more than their job requirements to contribute to the growth of the university system in Nigeria. This kind of behaviours is what is referred to as organizational citizenship behaviour (OCB).

Statement of the Problem

Lack of passion and commitment could be as a result of several factors which may include; (a). Bad organizational leadership, (b). Lack of purpose, drive, conviction, dedication or determination, (c). Organizational politics, (d). Embarrassment e.g. mining and sharing, (e). Lack of career progress, (f). Job insecurity (g). Poor communication, (h). Unpleasant or hostile coworkers, (i). Dispassionate about their job or just doing the job because it pays the bills, (j). Lack of required skillset, (k). Poor relationships with managers and colleagues.

This has manifested negatively in terms of poor performance of these institutions, and practically dragged Nigerian universities into the near-bottom position they currently occupy in global universities ranking as published in periodicals. This is also evident in the quality of teaching and learning, innovation, research and research outcome, as well as quality of graduates produced yearly by the Nigerian university system. Sadly, this has negatively affected the global acceptance of research outcomes conducted by Nigerians.

To bring Nigerian universities up-to-speed with global best practices and regain its lost glory, while adequately fulfilling the increasing demand for university education. This study attempts to introduce group preference to influence the altruism, conscientiousness, civic virtue and general organizational citizenship behaviours of university employees in a bid to help restore their passion and commitment to their job and by extension help the universities maximize its potentials.

Literature Review

Conceptual Review

In an attempt to gain deep insight into to concepts involve in this study, the conceptual review on the concept of group preference and organizational citizenship behaviour alongside their dimensions and measures concerning previous related studies in a bid to demonstrate the gap in the literature and attempt to fill same with the outcome of this study.

Concept of Group Preference

A group represents two or more people who interact with one another, share similar characteristics, and collectively have a sense of unity in pursuit of their interest (Brewer & Caporael, 2006; Maass & Arcuri, 1996). Thus, this people are classified people with a unifying interest. When it comes to classifying other people, it doesn't matter how we think about them, but only that we refer to them in terms of their class membership rather than other, more personal facts about the individual. Stereotypes may also have detrimental effects on those who are stereotyped. When it comes to social categorization, emotional involvement is very significant, and as a result, it influences our attitudes to others in a big way. As a result, it was an evolutionary advantage for our ancestors to see members of other groups as distinct and possibly threatening (Brewer & Caporael, 2006; Navarrete, Kurzban, Fessler, & Kirkpatrick, 2004). An efficient human brain relied on distinguishing "us" from "them" to help keep us safe and disease-free, which resulted in a more efficient brain (Mahajan et al., 2011; Phelps et al., 2000; Van Vugt & Schaller, 2008; Zaraté, Stoeber, MacLin, &

Arms-Chavez, 2008). Because of these naturally existing inclinations, we may have a preference for individuals who are similar to us, and we may wrongly discriminate against members of out-groups.

A noteworthy investigation on the influence of collective self-concern was conducted by Henri Tajfel and his colleagues (Tajfel, Billig, Bundy, & Flament, 1971). In-group favoritism is shown when we react more favorably to persons from our in-groups (i.e., individuals with whom we have close ties) than we do to persons from out-groups (i.e., individuals who are distant to us).

The small groups of high school kids in Tajfel's study purportedly came to his laboratory to take part in a study of their "artistic tastes." When the pupils first saw a series of paintings by two contemporary painters, Paul Klee and Wassily Kandinsky, they found a multitude of concepts they could relate to. Students were supposedly put into two groups based on their appreciation for each art (they were called the X group and the Y group). A group of lads was allocated to one of three groups and each was informed of their respective group assignments. The mothers of all the boys had their group memberships withheld from them.

In-Group Practices

Many individuals see their group in different ways, and as a result, regard them as being kind and amiable. In contrast, they see the group's actions as the deeds of a single person (Maass & Arcuri, 1996; Maass, Ceccarielli, & Rudin, 1996; von Hippel, Sekaquaptewa, & Vargas, 1997). By doing these behaviors, we may help to encourage our organization's beneficial characteristics to all members while also keeping undesirable aspects hidden from the public, thereby protecting the organization's reputation. In addition, individuals will identify with their group as well as others. While it is true that this group-serving bias (also known as the ultimate attribution error) does tend to overemphasize the opposing groups' views on each other, it does not come to the fore until both groups hold beliefs that greatly oversimplify the characteristics of the other group (Hewstone, 1990). When an in-group member behaves well, their group identification is enhanced. Stable negative group characteristics impact these behaviors, whereas unstable negative group characteristics are thought to induce negative acts on the part of the out-group. In contrast, it is possible that ephemeral situational factors, rather than being attributed to the group as a whole, may create the more negative in-group behaviour and the more positive outgroup behaviour.

Attitudes toward the in-group begin to develop between the ages of six and ten, after which their effects on behavior quickly accelerate (Aboud, 2003; Aboud & Amato, 2001). Youngsters who are the same gender or race as their classmates tend to like each other's company more than those of a different gender or race. After the age of three, children gravitate toward their same-sex classmates. A common principle is that we favor our in-groups, and as a result, we should promote those who are friendly to others who demonstrate in-group favor (Castelli & Carraro, 2010). Incredibly, even newborn newborns esteem people based on how they treat others (Hamlin et al., 2013). All over space, at various regions, and in various dimensions (Bennett et al., 2004; Pinter & Greenwald, 2011). Even on measures of character, in-group members are rated as being more upbeat, whilst members of out-groups are seen to be less amiable (Hewstone, 1990). Additionally, in-group members are commended for their in-group members' successes and will recall more positive information about the in-group. Lastly, although outgroup members are held to greater standards, they are held to lower standards by the in-group (Shelton & Richeson, 2005). There are various factors at play that might help foster in-group favoritism. The first place to start is to think about social grouping. When we categorize along with people who we see as similar, it simplifies our environment. We could feel that we are superior to others when we assume "we are better than they are." those who have greater reasons to simplify their settings will demonstrate more in-group bias (Stangor & Leary, 2006).

Out-Group Practices: Organizational Citizenship Behaviors (OCB) are discretionary workplace action that go beyond the basics of a job and are often referred to as behaviors that exceed duty requirements. These behaviors cannot be forced, but must be accepted by choice. It is unethical to force an employee to conduct or demonstrate workplace civic behavior against their will. Managers are aware of and praise indirect and direct examples of organizational citizenship demonstrated by their subordinates, such as preferential treatment, performance ratings, and promotions. Organizational Citizenship Behaviors (OCBs) have a significant impact on organizational performance, with some studies highlighting the importance of furthering the productivity of colleagues, minimizing group conflict, coordinating cross-team activities, improving group cohesion and morale, helping organizations better control outcomes, and enhancing an organization's capacity to adapt to external changes. Organizational Citizenship Behaviors is an effective approach to leveraging human capital for long-term success.

Contextual performance, which is comparable to organizational citizenship behavior, has also been often compared to OCF. This notion originated in response to the awareness that a considerable percentage of the job domain is overlooked if only job-specific work behaviors are accessed. Non task-related work behaviors and activities that support the social and psychological components of the organization are classified as contextual performance. Borman and Motowidlo (1993) identified four components of contextual performance: unwavering excitement, aid to colleagues, complying with and defending the organization's rules and actively defending the organization's goals. Both OCF and contextual performance share content domain sharing, but fundamental disparities

exist. A major part of organizational citizenship behavior is that they are not compensated. Employees may receive benefits from being altruistic in their duties, but it will be an indirect and ambiguous incentive. While contextually applicable performance does not need an activity specific to a job or a job, it does need non-task-oriented activities. Organ (1988) conceptualized the elements of organizational citizenship behavior, which includes qualities such as altruism, courtesy, sportsmanship, conscientiousness, and civic virtue. Farh, Zhong, and Organ (2004) postulated five “extended” aspects of organizational citizenship behavior: self-training, social welfare involvement, safeguarding and preserving the organization’s resources, and interpersonal harmony. A concentric model of corporate citizenship behavior has also been proposed, which applies all emotional types of organizational citizenship behavior identified by previous researchers. Three metrics alone, namely conscientiousness, altruism, and civic virtue, will be used in this project.

Organizational Citizenship Behavoiur (OCB)

Organizational Citizenship Behaviors (OCB) are discretionary workplace actions that go beyond the basics of the job and are often referred to as behaviors that exceed duty requirements. These behaviors cannot be forced, but must be accepted by choice. It is unethical to force an employee to conduct or demonstrate workplace civic behavior against their will. Managers are aware of and praise indirect examples of organizational citizenship demonstrated by the subordinates, such as preferential treatment, performance ratings, and promotions. Organizational Citizenship Behaviors (OCBs) have a significant impact on organizational performance with some studies highlighting the importance of furthering the productivity of colleagues, minimizing group conflict, coordinating cross-team activities, improving group cohesion and morale, helping organizations better control outcomes, and enhancing an organization’s capacity to adapt to external changes. Organizational Citizenship Behavior is an effective approach to leveraging human capital for long term success.

Contextual performance, which is comparable to organizational citizenship behavior, has also been often compared to OCF. This notion originated in response to the awareness that a considerable percentage of the job domain is overlooked if only job-specific work behaviors are accessed. Non-task-related work behaviors and activities that support the social and psychological components of the organization are classified as contextual performance. Borman and Motowidlo (1993) identified four components of contextual performance: unwavering excitement, aid to colleagues, complying with and defending the organization’s rules, and actively defending the organization’s goals. Both OCF and contextual performance share content domain sharing, but fundamental disparities exist. A major part of organizational citizenship behavior is that they are not compensated. Employees may receive benefits from being altruistic in their duties, but it will be an indirect and ambiguous incentive.

Altruism

To put it simply, altruism is to aid coworkers in doing their jobs. A good example is being willing to help new hires and/or colleagues who are overworked, as well as supporting absent workers and helping them perform challenging jobs (Tambe & Shanker, 2014). It is when an employee voluntarily lends a hand to another person who is having a special challenge and helping him or her achieve their assignment under unique conditions. Researchers Podsakoff, Maddux, and Malhotra (2000) discovered that both altruism and happiness were linked to salary assessments and, conversely, to positive affectivity. The latest experimental data (as detailed by Rousset, 2004) reveals that humans are unique in the animal kingdom in the extent of their altruism. The collaboration of persons who want to benefit others, but are also thinking for themselves, is critical to human collaboration (Kiyonari, Tanida, & Yamagishi, 2000). A few egoists may encourage a significant number of altruists to leave, whereas a handful of altruists may push a majority of selfish personnel to collaborate (Rousset, 2004). An altruistic act done in the real world nearly usually has many motivations. Thus, it is through understanding the unique reasons underlying altruistic actions that solid information about people’s behavior may be developed. Non-selfish motivations that can be shown predictive in many different situations have just lately been theorized. Elaborates concepts of inequality aversion (Rabin, 1993). They claim, for example, that it is in their economic self-interest to defect regardless of what the other player does, even if many prisoners’ dilemma subjects want to cooperate. The predictions offered here are validated by the facts and have significant ramifications. In an assurance game, both mutual defection and mutual collaboration are equilibriums, hence the game is no longer a prisoners’ dilemma (Kiyonari, Tanida, & Yamagishi, 2000).

This is a very important aspect since people will only participate in cooperative activities if they feel their opponent would participate, and so cooperation is the overall equilibrium. Cooperation or mutual defection equilibrium is determined by each player’s views about the other players’ behavior (Falk & Fischbacher, 2001).

Conscientiousness

When it comes to a minimal role responsibility level of the organization, like following laws and regulations, for example, not taking breaks, working long days, or staying late, conscientiousness is an optional behavior that may benefit the company greatly (MacKenzie et al., 1993). Conscientiousness is an example of exceeding minimum standards of attendance, punctuality, and cleanliness by only going above and beyond what is strictly necessary, saving resources, and seeming like a responsible member of the company (Tambe & Shanker, 2014). Indicating strong conscientiousness means that the individual has high levels of accountability and requires less supervision (Podsakoff and MacKenzie, 1997). Because it encompasses so many positive characteristics, conscientiousness substantially predicts individual achievement (Barrick & Mount, 1991). Anyone, no matter their

occupation, would want to recruit a meticulous, methodical, organized, and diligent employee. Will to succeed or Work ethic (Peabody & Goldberg, 1989). Facetiousness may involve carefulness, dependability, thoroughness, responsibility, organization, planned news, tenacity, and persistence (Barrick, Mount, & Strauss, 1993). The description provided by Costa and McCrae (1992) details many aspects of conscientiousness, including being responsible, persevering, dependable, meticulous, well-organized, competent, and goal-oriented. Hogan (1983) claims that conscientiousness is merited since the company's personnel possess exceptional forecasting skills. Yes, academics should seek to understand conscientiousness as a characteristic since conscientious persons do better in various essential life domains (Hogan, 1983).

According to Wiggins, Blackburn, and Hackman (1969), highly conscientious personnel excel in goal formulation, working toward those objectives, and enduring in the face of failures. If a challenging objective cannot be met, they will adjust their expectations to a more manageable level rather than giving up. Because of this, their ambitions are more aligned with the organization's priorities. By being diligent, individuals avoid stress they would otherwise have to deal with. In his research, Barrick and Mount (1991) found that conscientious workers also want to follow rules, conventions, and are usually on time. Generally, employee conscientiousness is examined through self-report questionnaires, although other types of observation and evaluations by peers or third parties may also be used.

Civic Virtue

The civic virtue of political participation involves being involved in the political process of the organization and making contributions to this process by sharing your thoughts, going to meetings, and engaging in conversations with coworkers on matters related to the organization (Organ, 1988). The behaviours of a person show that he or she works hard at the company, helps out, and has an interest in the well-being of the company (Tambe & Shanker, 2014). In the film *Dagger* (1997), the quote emphasized that virtue is a character trait or mindset of character to think or behave in the morally correct manner, towards the appropriate targets, while experiencing the appropriate emotions. Civic virtue, as defined by Burt (1999), may be defined as being related to the employee-state link, as well as being more generalized, including connections between workers and organizations. Civic virtue is the right duty for a decent employee. Burt (1999) claims that civic virtue may be defined as "the inclination to enhance public over private welfare in action and deliberation." the primary focus is on the general public interest, whereas promoting civic virtue can only succeed if it helps the organization as a whole (Dagger, 1997). Virtue is often associated with roles: the courageous soldier demonstrates virtue, the intelligent teacher exhibits excellent judgment, and loyalty in an employee is commendable. Civic virtue is identified with the job of the employee and emphasizes how employees should conduct themselves. Dagger (1997) contended that when an individual's sense of civic virtue is satisfied, they have a stronger connection to and feeling of responsibility for the group they belong to. Based on his behaviors, a good employee places more emphasis on the public instead of private benefit, as seen above. to show, a society with no members except employees that are committed to the national organization would have a population that actively supports the organization, as well as a complete absence of corruption and other public good-impairing activities aside from those which are caused by external factors (Burt, 1999).

Relationship between group preference and organizational citizenship behaviour (OCB)

The organization's culture is made up of all the elements that provide it with a certain feel or atmosphere. The organization's unique constellation of views, values, work methods, and connections together make up its culture (Harrison and Stokes, 1992). The core of an organization's culture is defined by seven distinct qualities, as discovered by Robbins (2001). Innovation and risk taking: The degree to which workers are encouraged to be inventive and take risks. People Orientation: the degree to which managerial choices take people's needs into mind. Team Orientation: the degree to which work activities are oriented around teams instead of being based on the individual. Passionate: how passionate or how emotionally involved individuals are. Stability: The degree to which actions focus on sustaining the status quo rather than progress. This study claims that individuals develop an overall subjective impression of the company based on many criteria, including the risk tolerance of workers, the level of teamwork, and the encouragement of others. In effect, the organization's culture or personality is a general perception. Employee performance and happiness are affected by positive or negative impressions, and the influence is higher for stronger cultures (Appelbaum et al., 2004). Leaders who feel that an enterprise must give workers challenging and intrinsically satisfying employment emphasize employee happiness (Robbins, 2001). Once the right kind of group preference is in place, organizational citizenship behavior is almost certain to emerge as a consequence of successful corporate culture, which will therefore allow the company to rise to its expectations (Appelbaum et al., 2004).

Empirical Review

More than 200 studies were carried out on the topic of organizational citizenship behavior (OCB) prior to 1999. The thirty different categories are as follows: "individual initiative" "civic virtue," "helping," "sportsmanship," "loyalty to the organization," "compliance with the organization," and "self-development". The study literature has identified more than 40 OCB metrics. Instead of explaining the phenomena itself, the majority of OCB research concentrate on making connections with other factors.

The dependent variable in the study model is organizational Citizenship Behavior (OCB), and the intervening variables are organizational commitment, system-level and interpersonal trust. The desire to reciprocate, allegiance to one's leader, organizational trust, as well as satisfaction, duty, and responsibility, are the most prominent mediators in the antecedents of OCBs. Although several researches indicate it facilitates OCB, organizational commitment was not shown to be a major predictor of OCB.

Certain demographic traits have been identified as potential moderating variables, including job type, tenure, managerial responsibility, gender, minority status, age, degree of education, time spent teaching, and length of time at the institution. According to Barnard's (1938) research, organizations are composed of "cooperative systems" and for employees to collaborate and make autonomous, spontaneous contributions; they must have faith in the company's objectives. Contributing to the development of OCB, Katz (1964) created a fresh analytical framework for examining employees' driving issues inside an organization. Smith, Organ, and Near (1983) first classified organizational citizenship behavior (OCB) into two categories: generic compliance and altruism. Podsakoff et al. (1990), Williams and Anderson (1991), O'Reilly and Chatman (1986), Organ and Konovsky (1989), Organ (1990), Altuntas and Baykal (2010), and Paille et al.

Theoretical Framework

Studies such as these are traditionally supported with an undergirded model. The aim of this is to provide a basis for which the study could be given an explanation as well as a foundation. This study, therefore, adopts the Social Identity Theory, and Self-Identification Theory.

Social Identity Theory

When people identify with a group, they want to pay attention to what they value about it (Tajfel & Turner, 1986). To paraphrase, organizational jargon, feminist ideas, teen colloquialisms, or ethnic accents can be symbolized using communicative symbols in different environments (Giles & Johnson, 2009). The basis of this concept is the idea that asserts that those who identify and demonstrate the group's defining characteristics will be proud to be part of the organization. The theory suggests that individuals would believe they have higher worth when they can display their allegiance with a group.

During the early twentieth century, the basic ideas connected to "social identity theory" began to emerge, but it wasn't until the late 1970s that "social identity theory" reached academic recognition. When it comes to usages, manners, customs, and morals, folkways are, according to Summer's book *Folkways: A Study of the Sociological Importance of Usages, Manners, Customs, Mores, and Morals*, very essential concepts. "Citizenship is the connecting link that holds all the other ideas together. The shared values included in this list include the desire to belong to a group, the willingness to suffer for the group, hatred for outsiders, devotion among the members, and willingness to battle for the group. Our forefathers defeated those of the "they-group" in a fight. No group can achieve anything well alone. Every group maintains its sense of identity and prestige, demonstrates its worth to the people around it, worships its gods, and looks down on anybody who is not part of the group. When other groups practice practices that seem strange to one's group, such traditions are an insult. By the end of the 1920s, collectivism had fallen out of favor as a significant social-psychological method. Later, in the early years of a formal application, Tajfel (1971) offered this assessment of social psychology: "It may be deduced from this that social categorization is an independent variable that cannot be anchored and tends to benefit randomly from the preferences of the spirits. The interconnections are neither formed nor tested, and their extensive usage in routine social actions illustrates their commonness. Categorization has an effect, which means that it influences when, how, and why it is important. In what kind of created social reality can long-term social conflict arise due to mediation by social categorization? A stable social system shifts to an unstable one, for example. Based on the above, it is possible to interpret portions of social identity theory as attempting to return the discipline of social psychology to a more collectivist approach about social identity and social groups.

Hypotheses for the Study

This study is guided by the following hypotheses:

- | | | |
|-----------------------|---|---|
| Ho₁ | There is no significant relationship between in-group practices and | altruism |
| | in Universities in Port Harcourt. | |
| Ho₂ | There is no significant relationship between in-group practices and | conscientiousness |
| | in Universities in Port Harcourt. | |
| Ho₃ | There is no significant relationship between in-group practices and civic | virtue |
| | in Universities in Port Harcourt. | |
| Ho₄ | There is no significant relationship between out-group practices and altruism in Universities in Port Harcourt. | |
| Ho₅ | There is no significant relationship between out-group practices and | conscientiousness in Universities in Port Harcourt. |
| Ho₆ | There is no significant relationship between out-group practices and civic | virtue in Universities in Port Harcourt. |

Ho₇ Corporate culture does not significantly moderate the relationship between group preference and organizational citizenship behaviour in tertiary institutions in Port Harcourt.

Methodology

A research design ensures that every stage of data production is in line with the goal of the study, providing a rational framework for examining a social phenomena. With a research population of 3501, the study uses a cross-sectional, descriptive, quasi-experimental survey approach. Using a basic random sampling approach and the Krejcie and Morgan table, the sample size is established. A standardized questionnaire evaluating business culture, organizational citizenship behavior, entrepreneurial resourcefulness, and demographics will be used to gather data. The Spearman's Rank Order Correlation Coefficient will be used for data analysis, mean and standard deviations will be evaluated in univariate analysis and the Statistical Package for Social Science version 21 will be used to construct multivariate inferential statistics. To make sure the survey instrument measures what it should, it will be adjusted and tested using both face and content validity. The constancy of a measurement made with the same instrument is known as reliability.

Data Analysis

The Spearman's Rank Order Correlation Coefficient is used to analyze the first six proposed hypothesis with the aid of Statistical package for social science (SPSS version 21.0) after the confirmation by test for normality. Six bivariate hypotheses were tested.

The decision rule is:

- Accept the null hypothesis where $p > 0.05$ significant level
- Reject the null hypothesis where $p < 0.05$ significant level

Table 1: In-group and Altruism

Correlations			In-group	Altruism
Spearman's rho	In-Group	Correlation Coefficient	1.000	.415
		Sig. (2-tailed)	.	.006
		N	270	270
	Altruism	Correlation Coefficient	.415	1.000
		Sig. (2-tailed)	.006	.
		N	270	270

Source: SPSS Output, 2025 - SPSS version 21 output extracts

Ho₁ There is no significant relationship between in-group practices and altruism of universities in Port Harcourt.

Data in table 1 reveal that there is a significant relationship between in-group practices and altruism ($p = .006$ and $\rho = 0.415$) hence we find that In-group is associated with Altruism and based on the decision rule of $p < 0.05$ for null rejection; we therefore reject the null hypothesis and restate that *there is a significant relationship between in-group practices and altruism*.

Table 2: In-group and conscientiousness

Correlations			In-Group	Conscientiousness
Spearman's rho	In-Group	Correlation Coefficient	1.000	.336
		Sig. (2-tailed)	.	.000
		N	270	270
	Conscientiousness	Correlation Coefficient	.336	1.000

	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.
	N	270	270

Source: SPSS Output, 2025 - SPSS version 21 output extracts

H₀₂ There is no significant relationship between in-group practices and conscientiousness of universities in Port Harcourt. Data in table 2 reveal that there is a significant relationship between in-group practices and conscientiousness ($p = .000$ and $\rho = 0.336$) hence we find that In-group is associated with conscientiousness and based on the decision rule of $p < 0.05$ for null rejection; we therefore reject the null hypothesis and restate that *there is a significant relationship between in-group practices and conscientiousness*.

Table 3 In-group practices and Civic virtue

Correlations			In-Group	Civic Virtue
Spearman's rho	In-Group	Correlation Coefficient	1.000	.276
		Sig. (2-tailed)	.	.000
		N	270	270
	Civic Virtue	Correlation Coefficient	.276	1.000
		Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.
		N	270	270

Source: SPSS Output, 2025 - SPSS version 21 output extracts

H₀₃ There is no significant relationship between in-group practices and civic virtue of Universities in Port Harcourt.

Data in table 3 reveal that there is a significant relationship between in-group practices and civic virtue ($p = .000$ and $\rho = 0.276$) hence we find that In-group is associated with civic virtue and based on the decision rule of $p < 0.05$ for null rejection; we therefore reject the null hypothesis and restate that *there is a significant relationship between in-group practices and civic virtue*.

Table 4: Out-group practices and Altruism

Correlations			Out-group Practices	Altruism
Spearman's rho	Out-Group practices	Correlation Coefficient	1.000	.303
		Sig. (2-tailed)	.	.009
		N	270	270
	Altruism	Correlation Coefficient	.303	1.000
		Sig. (2-tailed)	.009	.
		N	270	270

Source: SPSS Output, 2021 - SPSS version 21 output extracts

H₀₄ There is no significant relationship between out-group practices and altruism of Universities in Port Harcourt.

Data in table 4 reveal that there is a significant relationship between out-group practices and Altruism ($p = .009$ and $\rho = 0.303$) hence we find that Out-group is associated with Altruism and based on the decision rule of $p < 0.05$ for null rejection; we therefore reject the null hypothesis and restate that *there is a significant relationship between out-group practices and altruism*.

Table 5: Out-group practices and Conscientiousness

Correlations			Out-Group Practices	Conscientiousness

Spearman's rho	Out-Group Practices	Correlation Coefficient	1.000	.470
		Sig. (2-tailed)	.	.004
		N	270	270
	Conscientiousness	Correlation Coefficient	.470	1.000
		Sig. (2-tailed)	.004	.
		N	270	270

Source: SPSS Output, 2021 - SPSS version 21 output extracts

Ho₅ There is no significant relationship between out-group practices and conscientiousness of Universities in Port Harcourt.

Data in table 5 reveal that there is a significant relationship between out-group practices and Conscientiousness ($p = .004$ and $\rho = 0.470$) hence we find that Out-group is associated with Conscientiousness and based on the decision rule of $p < 0.05$ for null rejection; we therefore reject the null hypothesis and restate that *there is a significant relationship between out-group practices and conscientiousness*.

Table 6: Out-group Practices and Civic virtue

Correlations			Out-group Practices	Civic virtue
Spearman's rho	Out-Group Practices	Correlation Coefficient	1.000	.430
		Sig. (2-tailed)	.	.008
		N	270	270
	Civic virtue	Correlation Coefficient	.430	1.000
		Sig. (2-tailed)	.008	.
		N	270	270

Source: SPSS Output, 2021 - SPSS version 21 output extracts

Ho₆ There is no significant relationship between out-group practices and civic virtue of Universities in Port Harcourt.

Data in table 6 reveal that there is no significant relationship between out-group practices and civic virtue ($p = .008$ and $\rho = 0.430$) hence we find that Out-group is associated with civic virtue and based on the decision rule of $p < 0.05$ for null rejection; we therefore reject the null hypothesis and state that *there is a significant relationship between out-group practices and civic virtue*.

This section is presented with analysis based on the partial correlation technique in examining the moderating role of corporate culture on the relationship between group preference and organizational citizenship behaviour. The decision rule is to accept the null hypothesis where $p > 0.05$ significant level and reject the null hypothesis where $p < 0.05$ significant level

Table 7: Corporate culture and the relationship between group preference and organizational citizenship behaviour

Correlations			Group Preference	Organizational Citizenship Behaviour
-none-a	Group Preference	Correlation	1.000	.516
		Significance (2-tailed)	.	.005
		Df	0	268
	Organizational Citizenship Behaviour	Correlation	.516	1.000
		Significance (2-tailed)	.005	.
		Df	268	0

ORGANISATIONAL CULTURE	Group Preference	Correlation	1.000	.493
		Significance (2-tailed)	.	.001
		Df	0	267
	Organizational Citizenship Behaviour	Correlation	.493	1.000
		Significance (2-tailed)	.001	.
		Df	267	0

a. Cells contain zero-order (Pearson) correlations.

Source: SPSS Output, 2021 - SPSS version 21 output extracts

H₀₇Corporate culture does not significantly moderate the relationship between Group preference and Organizational Citizenship Behaviour of Universities in Port Harcourt.

Table 7 shows that Group preference and Organizational Citizenship Behaviour correlate at 0.516 when the p-value is $0.005 < 0.05$ level of significance. This implies that there is a significant and strong positive relationship between group preference and organizational citizenship behaviour. Thus, the study concludes that there is strong correlation between the two variables which is at 0.516 with no moderating variable.

Conclusion

Conclusively, when group member hold their efforts, organizational citizenship behaviours decreases exponentially and adversely affect the effectiveness of the organization. Contrary to this, when group members provide much individual efforts organizational citizenship behaviour enhances the overall performance of the groups. Hence, higher levels of performance are reached by the group who are able to learn more about organizational citizenship behaviour.

Recommendations

Based on the result of the analysis, findings, and the conclusion above, the following recommendations have been drafted for education sector in this regard:

- The management of these universities should introduce work policies that would rewards group efforts and fosters continuous improvement to meet employee altruism. This will encourage employees to cultivate attributes of organizational citizenship behaviour.
- The management of these universities should ensure these policies introduced will enhance flexibility and resource optimization to address issues of lack of organizational citizenship behaviour on the part of employees.
- The management of these universities should utilize these policies to facilitate collaboration and teamwork, and help employees work together effectively in a bid to address work needs.
- The management of these universities should demonstrate leadership by creating effective group programmes to achieve speedy group project implementation and completion. As employees will be willing to help themselves to pull through this process.
- The management of these universities should adopt a result-oriented approach to meet organizational needs effectively by institutionalizing the reduction of cross-functional inefficiencies in addressing the lack of organizational citizenship behaviour.
- The management of these universities should induce civic virtues by adopting leadership behaviours that will motivate employee groups to help them achieve their full potential.
- The management of these universities should adopt a caring culture that will allow a group friendly environment that will help individual collaborate effectively as this will encourage organizational citizenship behaviours.

References

- About, F. E. (2003). The formation of in-group favoritism and out-group prejudice in young children: Are they distinct attitudes? *Developmental Psychology*, 39(1), 48–60.
- About, F. E., & Amato, M. (2001). *Developmental and socialization influences on intergroup bias*. Blackwell.
- Adamu, A.U., (2011). Motionless points in chaos: Education reforms, innovations and the challenges for higher education in Nigeria. In *Africa-Asia University Dialogue for Educational Development: Report of the International Experience sharing seminar*, 87-107.

- Adeniyi, E. O. (2001). *The situation in Nigeria: The problem of Nigeria education system*. In R. Pillai (Ed). *Strategies for Introducing New Curricula in West Africa*. Final Report of the Seminar/Workshop held in Lagos, Nigeria, 12–16.
- African Development Fund (2012). *Brief history of education in Nigeria*. International Standing Conference for the History of Education.
- Aronson, E., Wilson, T. D. & Akert, R. (2010). *Social psychology* (7th eds). Prentice Hall.
- Bilali, R. (2013). National narrative and social psychological influences in Turks, Denial of the mass killings of Americans as Genocide: Understanding, denial. *Journal of Social Issues*, 69(1), 16-33 10.1111/josi.2001.
- Billig, M., & Tajfel, H. (1973). Social categorization and similarity in intergroup behavior. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, 3, 27–52.
- Brewer, M. B. (1979). In-group bias in the minimal intergroup situation: A cognitive-motivational analysis. *Psychological Bulletin*, 86, 307–324.
- Brewer, M. B., & Caporael, L. R. (2006). An evolutionary perspective on social identity: Revisiting groups. In M. Schaller, J. A. Simpson, & D. T. Kenrick (Eds.), *Evolution and social psychology*. 143–161. Psychology Press.
- Burt, S. (1999). *The good employee's psyche: On the psychology of civic virtue*. Polity.
- Castelli, L., & Carraro, L. (2010). Striving for difference: On the spontaneous preference for in-group members who maximize in-group positive distinctiveness. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, 40(6), 881–890.
- De Dreu, C. K. W. (2010). Oxytocin moderates cooperation within and completion between groups: An integrative review and research agenda. *Hormones and Behaviour*, 61(3), 419-428.
- Eketu, C. A. (2019). Contextualizing organizational behavior in anthropological diversity management for sustainable national development in Nigeria. *Informational Journal of Multidisciplinary Research and development*, 6(5), 83-86.
- Hamlin, J. K., Mahajan, N., Liberman, Z., & Wynn, K. (2013). Not like me = bad: Infants prefer those who harm dissimilar others. *Psychological Science*, 24(4), 589-594.
- Hewstone, M. (1990). The “ultimate attribution error”? A review of the literature on intergroup causal attribution. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, 20(4), 311–335.
- John, F., Edwards-Jones, G. & Jones, J. P. G. (2011). Conservation and human behavior: *Lessons Form Social Psychology*, 37(8), 658-667.
- Kirkpatrick, S. A., (2004). *Visionary leadership theory: Encyclopedia of leadership*. Sage Publication.
- Kothari, C. R., & Garg, G. (2014). *Research methodology: Methods and techniques*(3rd eds.). New Age International Limited Publishers.
- Kumar, S. (2014). Establishing linkages between emotional intelligence and transformational leadership. *Industrial Psychology Journal*, 23(1), 1-3.
- Maass, A., & Arcuri, L. (1996). *Language and stereotyping*. Guilford Press.
- Maass, A., Ceccarielli, R., & Rudin, S. (1996). Linguistic intergroup bias: Evidence for in-group-protective motivation. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 71(3), 512–526.
- Mahajan, N., Martinez, M. A., Gutierrez, N. L., Diesendruck, G., Banaji, M. R., & Santos, L. R. (2011). The evolution of intergroup bias: Perceptions and attitudes in rhesus macaques. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 100(3), 387–405.
- Navarrete, C. D., Kurzban, R., Fessler, D. M. T., & Kirkpatrick, L. A. (2004). Anxiety and intergroup bias: Terror management or coalitional psychology? *Group Processes & Intergroup Relations*, 7(4), 370–397.

- Omolewa, M. (2007). Traditional African modes of education: Their relevance in the modern world. *International Review of Education*, 53(5/6), 593–612.
- Organ, D. W. (1997). Organizational citizenship behaviour: It's construct clean-up time. *Human Performance*, 10, 85–98.
- Organ, D. W. (1988). *Organizational citizenship behaviour. The good soldier syndrome*. Lexington MA. Lexington Books.
- Organ D.W., & Ryan, K. (1995). A meta-analytic review of attitudinal and dispositional predictors of organizational citizenship behaviour. *Personnel Psychology*, 48(4), 775-802.
- Op, O. E. (2008). *Challenges facing Nigerian Universities*. Baltimore.
- Phelps, E. A., O'Connor, K. J., Cunningham, W. A., Funayama, E. S., Gatenby, J. C., Gore, J. C Banaji, M. R. (2000). Performance on indirect measures of race evaluation predicts amygdala activation. *Journal of Cognitive Neuroscience*, 12(5), 729–738.
- Pinter, B., & Greenwald, A. G. (2011). A comparison of minimal group induction procedures. *Group Processes and Intergroup Relations*, 14(1), 81–98.
- Podsakoff, N.P., Whiting, S.W., Podsakoff, P.M., & Blume, B.D. (2009). Individual and organizational-level consequences of organizational citizenship behaviours: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 94, 122-141.
- Shelton, J. N., & Richeson, J. A. (2005). Intergroup contact and pluralistic ignorance. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 88(1), 91–107.
- Stangor, C., & Leary, S. (2006). Intergroup beliefs: Investigations from the social side. *Advances in Experimental Social Psychology*, 38, 243–283.
- Statista (2020). *Number of universities in Nigeria as of 2020, by ownership*. Statista. Retrieved from <https://www.statista.com>
- Tajfel, H. (1970). Experiments in intergroup discrimination. *Scientific American*, 223, 96–102.
- Tajfel, H., Billig, M., Bundy, R., & Flament, C. (1971). Social categorization and intergroup behavior. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, 1, 149–178.
- Van Vugt, M., & Schaller, M. (2008). Evolutionary approaches to group dynamics: An introduction. *Group Dynamics: Theory, Research, and Practice*, 12(1), 1– 6.
- von Hippel, W., Sekaquaptewa, D., & Vargas, P. (1997). The linguistic intergroup bias as an implicit indicator of prejudice. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 33(5), 490–509.