



The Strategic  
**JOURNAL of Business & Change  
MANAGEMENT**

ISSN 2312-9492 (Online), ISSN 2414-8970 (Print)



[www.strategicjournals.com](http://www.strategicjournals.com)

Volume 6, Issue 4, Article 117

**COLLABORATION STRATEGY AND ORGANIZATIONAL CITIZENSHIP BEHAVIOUR IN OIL AND GAS COMPANIES IN RIVERS STATE, NIGERIA**

Ukwuije, O. A., & Bassey, U. L.,

---

**COLLABORATION STRATEGY AND ORGANIZATIONAL CITIZENSHIP BEHAVIOUR IN OIL AND GAS COMPANIES IN RIVERS STATE, NIGERIA**

**Ukwuije, O. A.,<sup>1</sup> & Bassey, U. L.,<sup>2</sup>**

<sup>1</sup>Department of Management, Faculty of Management Sciences, Rivers, State University [RSU], Nkpolu-Oroworukwo, PMB 5080, Port Harcourt, Nigeria

<sup>2</sup>Department of Management, Faculty of Management Sciences, Rivers, State University [RSU], Nkpolu-Oroworukwo, PMB 5080, Port Harcourt, Nigeria

**Accepted: December 7, 2019**

---

**ABSTRACT**

*This study examined the relationship between collaboration strategy and organizational citizenship behavior in Oil and Gas Companies in Rivers State. The study adopted a cross sectional survey design. Primary data was collected using self-administered structured questionnaire. The population for the study was 245 employees of 7 selected Oil and Gas Companies in Rivers State. The sample size of 152 was determined using the Taro Yamane sample size determination formula. The reliability was achieved using the Cronbach Alpha Coefficient with all items being above the 0.70 acceptance benchmark set by Nunnally (1970). After data cleaning, data for 124 respondents were suitable to be used for data analysis. The Spearman Rank Order Correlation Coefficient was used for testing the hypotheses. The study finding revealed that there is a significant relationship between collaboration strategy and organizational citizenship behaviour in Oil and Gas Companies in Rivers State. The study further revealed collaboration strategy had significant relationship with all the measures of organizational citizenship behaviour-conscientiousness, courtesy and civic virtue. The study thus recommended that top managers of oil and gas industry must try as much as possible to collaborate with employees in order to achieve harmony at work place.*

**Keywords:** *Collaboration, Organizational Citizenship Behaviour, Conscientiousness, Courtesy and Civic Virtue*

---

**CITATION:** Ukwuije, O. A., & Bassey, U. L., (2019). Collaboration strategy and organizational citizenship behaviour in oil and gas companies in Rivers State, Nigeria. *The Strategic Journal of Business & Change Management*, 6 (4), 1575 – 1586.

---

## INTRODUCTION

The need for employees to behave in a manner that would yield a positive impact on the organization has been of great concern to management of various business units and groups. Bateman and organ (1983) were the first to introduce the concept organizational citizenship behaviour (OCB) where they referred to it as an individual behaviour that is discretionary not directly or explicitly recognised by the formal reward system and in aggregate promotes the effective functioning of the organization (Organ, 1988 & Akinyemi, 2012). The implication of the term organizational citizenship behaviour has been an issue that has been well documented in literature. Its implications manifest in forms of organizational effectiveness, efficiency and group performance (Salami, 2009). Other effects of organizational citizenship behaviour could be manifested in higher salary and promotion, higher organizational commitment, lower turnover and intention from leave in organizations. Organ (1988) and Zhang (2011) introduced five categories of organizational citizenship behaviour which includes: altruism, courtesy, conscientiousness, sportsmanship and civic virtue.

Conflict on the other hand is a phenomenon that can never be ruled out in any gathering of more than one person. As long as the number of persons in a group is greater than one, conflict must be anticipated. Conflict can be described as a situation of struggle or competition amongst various person(s) with their opponent(s) (Mughal & Khan, 2013). They further opined that organizational conflict can be regarded as a dispute that occurs when interests, goals or values of different individuals or groups are incompatible with each other. Conflict among employees in an organization is not simply inevitable; rather it is the nature of complex organizations (Putnam & Krone, 2006). However, if managed properly, it can have a positive impact on employee satisfaction and performance (Dana, 2000). Research indicates that

management executives are spending twice as much time settling employees' disputes than they did a decade ago (Accountemps, 2006). If conflicts are managed properly by applying the best course of action, the organization can increase its performance in terms of utilizing the scarce resources and achieving the organizational objectives (Awan & Anjum, 2015).

Conversely, unmanaged conflict negatively impacts both employee satisfaction and performance. Timely management of conflict has the potential of improving employee satisfaction and job performance (Awan & Anjum, 2015). Management should therefore resolve conflicts so that organizational performance can be increased (Song, 2000). Although some people perceive conflict as something devastating, detestable and abnormal yet it could be an instrument of positive change/development if it is properly managed (Edwards, 2002), Hammed & Ayantunji (2002) & Owoseni (2011). Conflict management implies the integration of all factors which can contribute to conflict resolution or its prevention. All conflicts cannot necessarily be resolved but learning how to manage them can decrease the odds of non-productive escalation. Salami (2009) suggested that conflict management has many strategies which include competition, accommodating, avoiding, collaborating and compromising. This study however focused on collaboration conflict management strategy. Therefore the purpose of this study was to examine the relationship between collaboration strategy and organizational citizenship behaviour in Oil and Gas Companies in Rivers State

This study was also guided by the following research questions:

- What is the relationship between collaboration strategy and conscientiousness in Oil and Gas Companies in Rivers State?

- What is the relationship between collaboration strategy and courtesy in Oil and Gas Companies in Rivers State?

- What is the relationship between collaboration strategy and civic virtue in Oil and Gas Companies in Rivers State?



**Figure 1: Conceptual framework for collaboration strategy and organizational citizenship behaviour**  
 Source: Author’s Desk Research, 2019

**LITERATURE REVIEW**

**Collaboration Strategy**

Collaboration is a method of conflict management in which a person tries to work together with the other person (Crystal, 2007). Kofman (2015) cited in Atieno, Kiplagat and Yego (2016) refers to it as constructive collaboration. He asserts that this approach reveals people’s preferences and constraints, and engages everyone in constructing solutions that go way beyond the original alternatives. It maximizes efficiency through cooperation. Yet it is the most unusual because it requires shifting from unilateral control to mutual learning. He further affirms that constructive collaboration allows people to express and understand each other’s needs and create new solutions. It addresses the task through consensual decision-making, the relationships through mutual respect, and each individual’s self-worth through the consideration of his needs and values.

According to Christine, Lucy & Jonathan (2016) cited in Atieno, Kiplagat and Yego (2016), collaboration is assertive or co-operative. They argue that collaboration is a road not often travelled, as it can be long, and requires some skill and effort. They contend that collaboration is about assuming positive intent

and seeing things from all sides, in detail. It entails about acknowledging and accepting differences, and exploring alternative solutions that meet everyone's needs and concerns. As they point out, collaboration is a useful conflict management strategy when the issues are important to everyone, and all sides need to be committed to the solution. It is also recommended where there is need to work through hard feelings or animosity. They however recommend that the best decisions are made by collaboration. If principals apply this strategy, they will be able to listen to the students’ needs, grievances and settle them the best way and keep at bay any form of unrests.

Huan, and Yazdanifard (2012) feels that there are many advantages to using a collaborating strategy to handle interpersonal conflict situations. They posit that collaborating with the other party promotes creative problem solving, and it is a way of fostering mutual respect and rapport. Thus, principals who employ collaboration can communicate freely with the students and know their needs before a conflict ensues and create mechanisms for resolution and avert any negative behavior that would otherwise arise. However, according to Wager (2013),

collaborating takes time, and many conflict situations are either very urgent or too trivial to justify the time it takes to collaborate. But this review indicates that there are many conflict situations that should be handled with one of the other four conflict management strategies rather than collaboration. Good managers are those who are able to understand interpersonal conflict situations and use the appropriate conflict management strategy for each situation. As such, its proper application on students' and teachers' conflict situations will promote discipline in the school and negative behavior culminating into arsons and/or any other forms of unrests will be drastically minimized. Huan & Yazdanifard (2012) argue that those who prefer collaboration style resolve conflicts in the best way which is accepted by all concerned parties. They view the style as one that tackles the conflict issues openly and frankly without taking sides and also communicating with all the parties. According to Huan & Yazdanifard (2012) collaboration promotes task-goal achievement and is related to job satisfaction. This satisfaction results into high achievement for teachers and students alike.

The coming together in collaboration is a tool that can also predict the behaviour of employees in organizations. The techniques that are employed to promote integrity in work to avoid conflicts, as a whole, is known as collaborative management. Collaborative management style is thus a framework within which all strategies pertaining to conflict management and business development are included. Since it is one of those conflict management strategies, collaborative management aims to integrate solutions for the purpose of building a sound relationship between employers, employees, customers, clients and vendors. Collaboration is the best conflict management strategy according to Robin (2002). This is because it delivers a win-win outcome. According to Ajike et al (2012), it is usually considered the best method to cope with conflict. It is called a

win - win approach. It does not require either side to give up a valued position. Rather, both sides honestly seek new and common higher grounds. This kind of problem-solving requires an atmosphere of trust and mutual respect, the surfacing of hidden agendas, and a genuine willingness on both sides to resolve the conflict. Collaborating is assertive and cooperative. Trying to problem-solve to find a solution that completely satisfies both one's concerns and the other's. Collaboration works by integrating ideas set out by multiple people. The object is to find a creative solution acceptable to everyone. Collaboration, though useful, calls for a significant time commitment not appropriate to all conflicts.

### **Organizational Citizenship Behaviour**

Organizational Citizenship Behaviour is a terminology which encompasses all the positive and constructive actions of employees done out of their volition which supports colleagues and benefit the organization (Zhang, 2011). They are set of discretionary behaviours which goes beyond an employee's job description (Bateman & Organ, 1983). Organizational Citizenship Behaviour enhances organizational efficiency and effectiveness by playing a major role in resource transformation, innovation and environmental adaptability for such jobs regarding ambiguous, complex and team oriented work (Organ, 1988; Akinyemi, 2012).

Organizational citizenship behaviour has become one of the most studied topics in management literature, incorporating an entire set of spontaneous activities that go beyond prescribed role requirements (Salami, 2009). Organizational Citizenship Behaviour has been defined as individual behaviour that promotes the goals of the organization by contributing to its social and psychological environment (Adams, 2011). Bettendorf (2004) further defined a unique domain of Organizational Citizenship Behaviour (OCB) activities as change-oriented OCB, describing innovative and creative actions by employees that are aimed at bringing about constructive change in the

organization (Borman, Penner, Allen & Motowidlo, 2001).

Organizational citizenship behaviour expresses a form of extra-role behaviour exhibited by employees, in which, they perform beyond their formal job requirements without expecting recognition in terms of either explicit or implicit rewards from supervisors. The presence of organizational citizenship behavior is likely to promote a more positive social and working environment, enhancing the performance of a work unit and the core products of the organization (Zhang, 2011). Most studies in organizational citizenship behaviour describe it as a positive and constructive behaviour worthy of encouragement by supervisors (Podsakoff, Mackenzie, Paine & Bachrach, 2000) and very important for clients of the organization. Organizational citizenship behaviour is thus expected to contribute to the improved performance of service-oriented systems.

Studies on organizational citizenship behaviour have frequently distinguished between various internal dimensions of this phenomenon. Organ (1988) suggested taxonomy of five dimensions (altruism, courtesy, conscientiousness, civic virtue, and sportsmanship), whereas Williams and Anderson (1991) distinguished between two aspects of citizenship behaviours directed toward individuals and those directed toward the organization in general. Later studies argued that although organizational citizenship behaviour activities are important, they are not sufficient for ensuring the continued viability of an organization. Therefore, an organization also needs employees who are willing to challenge the present state of operations to bring about constructive change (Bettencourt, 2004; Morrison & Phelps, 2007). This form of work performance is referred today as change-oriented organizational citizenship behaviour.

Some early notions of change-oriented organizational citizenship behaviour can be traced back to a study by Vandyne and Lepine (1998) who

presented empirical support for an expanded, multidimensional conceptualization of extra-role behaviour (helping and voice). They argued that helping is an afflictive-promotion behaviour, whereas voice is an example of challenging promotion behaviour that emphasizes the expression of constructive challenge intended to improve rather than merely criticize. Voice is making innovative suggestions for change and recommending modifications to standard procedures even when others disagree. Given that OCBs are generally regarded as extra-role behaviours, voice, a change-oriented form of extra-role behaviour, can be related to change-oriented organizational citizenship behaviour. Change-oriented organizational citizenship behaviour also means “taking charge” of one’s environment, which entails voluntary and constructive efforts by individual employees to effect organizationally functional how work is executed within the contexts of their jobs, work units, or organizations (Morrison & Phelps, 1999).

### **Measures of Organizational Citizenship behaviour**

#### **Conscientiousness**

Various behavioural scientists have got their own way of defining organizational citizenship behaviour. According to (Organ 1988) definition of organizational citizenship behaviour is “individual behaviour that is discretionary, not directly or explicitly recognized by the formal reward system, and that in aggregate, promotes the effective functioning of the organization. (Organ 1988) also noted that defining Organizational Citizenship behaviour as behaviours that are not formally rewarded is actually too broad, as few “in-role behaviours actually guarantee a formal reward. There is no doubt that organizational citizenship behaviour is discretionary behaviour of an employee to provide “Extra” to his organization which is not a part of his defined duty. VanDyne and Lepine (1998) proposed the broader construct of “extra-role behaviour” (ERB), defined as “behaviour which benefits the organization and/or is intended to

benefit the organization, which is discretionary and which goes beyond existing role expectations.” organizational citizenship is function, extra-role, pro-social organizational behaviours directed at individual, groups and organization. These are helping behaviours not form prescribed by the organization and for which there are no direct rewards or punishments. Organizational citizenship behaviour excludes those pro-social behaviours that are prescribed by the organization as performance requirements, and dysfunctional or noncompliant behaviours.

Conscientiousness is a personality construct that is a core determinant of health, positive aging and human capital (Zhang, 2009). A large body of work has contributed to our understanding of this important aspect of personality, but there are multiple conceptual and methodological issues that complicate our understanding of conscientiousness. Conscientiousness is a spectrum of constructs that describe individual differences in the propensity to be self-controlled, responsible to others, hardworking, orderly, and rule abiding. The importance of conscientiousness to organization appears indisputable. Conscientiousness predicts most of the major preventative and risky behaviours for both physical health and mortality. Conscientiousness predicts facts in organizational citizenship behaviour (Morrison & Phelps, 2007).

### **Courtesy**

Courtesy has been identified as an important form of citizenship behaviour by virtually everyone who has worked in this area (Williams & Anderson, 2007). Conceptually, courtesy behaviour involves voluntarily helping others with, or preventing the occurrence of work-related problems. Courtesy means spreading of goodwill and assisting the organization (George & Brief, 2002) and the endorsing, supporting, and defending of organizational objective construct. Preliminary research by (Morvoman , Blackely & Nicheff, 2008) has indicted that this dimension is

distinct from several other forms of citizenship behaviour. Other writers (Williams & Anderson 2008) subsumes all of those fore sightful gestures that help someone else prevent a problem-touching base with before committing to actions that will affect them, providing advance notice to someone who needs to know to schedule work. All of these behaviours share the idea that the employee is going “above and beyond” the call of duty. This dimension is similar to Organ’s (1988) conscientiousness construct. Organ indicated that this form of behaviour is among the most difficult to distinguish from in-role behaviour, because it differs more in degree than in kind.

More than two decade ago, organ and his colleagues (Bateman & Organ 1983; Smith, Organ & Near, 1983) first coined the expression “organizational citizenship behaviours’ (OCB). Later, in a book subtitled “the good soldier syndrome”, (Organ 1988) proposed the following definition for the OCB construct” Individual behaviour that is discretionary, not directly or explicitly recognized by the formal reward system, and in the aggregate promotes the effective functioning of the organization (Organ, 1983). By discretionary, the author meant the type of behaviour that is not enforceable by the organization or a requirement of the role or the job description, but rather a matter of personal choice, such that its omission is not generally understood as punishable.

### **Civic Virtue**

When an employee is concerned about the life of the organization, shows interest, gets involved in activities, keeps up to date with happenings and generally stands up to defend the policies and practices of the organization, such employee is said to exhibit civic virtue (Organ *et al* 2006). It is the commitment to the organization. This also includes exhibiting a behaviour that reflects a person’s recognition of the fact that he is an integral part of the organization, such as engaging in the governance of the organization, attending its meetings, getting involved in debates and expressing opinion about the

administration of the organization. Civic virtue can also be in developing a management attitude in the organization by monitoring the environment for threats and opportunities, adapting to changes and external factors that may affect the organization, develop a safety attitude of reporting fire hazards, unsafe conditions, suspicious movements and ensuring that the environment is free from threats and external aggression (Aquino & Thau, 2009).

According to Onyishi, 2007 the term civility refers to behaviour between persons and groups that conforms to a social mode as itself being a foundational principle of society and law. In another study, George & Jones (1997) see civic virtue as voluntary acts organizational members engage in to protect or save life and property ranging from reporting hazards, securely locking doors, and reporting suspicious or dangerous activities, to taking the initiative to halt a production process when there is the potential for human injury. On the other hand Graham & Van Dyne, (2006), stated that incivility is a general term for social behaviour lacking in civic virtue or good manners, on a scale from rudeness or lack of respect for elders, to vandalism and hooliganism, through public drunkenness and threatening behaviour .

The organizational citizenship behaviour definition mentioned above has been criticized several researchers because the frontiers between in-role and extra-role behaviour are frequently diluted, and different observers (e.g. supervisors) can have different interpretations of which is mandatory or voluntary. Organ (1988) viewed these criticisms as fair, and argued that “accumulated empirical evidence, some telling, criticisms, and even the most cursory glance at the business” pressed the need to rethink the defining character of organizational citizenship behaviour. In his view, it no longer seems fruitful to regard organizational citizenship behaviour as extra role “beyond the job”, or “unrewarded by the formal system”, and a more tenable position is

one that defines organizational citizenship behaviour as contextual performance: “behaviour (that) do not support the tenable position is one that defines organizational citizenship behaviour as contextual performance: “behaviours (that do not support the technical core itself so much as they support the broader organization, social, and psychological environment in which the technical core must function” (Borman & Motowidlo, 1993).

### **Collaboration Strategy and Organizational Citizenship Behaviour**

Empirical evidence generally indicated that studies on the antecedents of OCB, particularly conflict resolution styles, are scarce and not well established (Podsakoff & Mackenzie, 1994; Podsakoff, Ahearne & MacKenzie, 1997). Few studies that are related to the constructs investigated in this study are reported here. For example, conflict resolution strategies were found to be significantly related to organizational citizenship behaviour (Alotaibi, 2001; Giap, Hackermeier, Jiao & Wagdarikar, 2005). Ogungbamila (2006) found that the forcing strategy had a direct significant relationship with work frustration while confronting, withdrawing, smoothing and compromising strategies did not. Furthermore, (Montoro-Rodriguez and Small 2006) reported that nurses’ job satisfaction, psychological morale and occupational stress were influenced by conflict resolution strategies. Similarly, some studies have linked conflict resolution strategies with work performance or work indicators (Alper, Law & Tjosvold, 2000). Subordinates who are unfairly treated by their supervisors’ use of forcing and withdrawing conflict resolution strategies are likely to withhold their OCB. Organizations top executive often use a combination of conflict management and the various strategies to resolve conflicts in an organization. The consequences of any method adopted would manifest itself in the Citizenship Behaviour of employees in the organization (Adebayo, 2006; Sverke et al, 2006 and Salami, 2009).

In other words, employees who survive after managers have decided to dismiss workers based on an existing conflict would always feel insecure; possess a negative attitude towards work and the organization, etc. This would ultimately affect the OCB of such employee.

From the foregoing arguments, the following hypotheses were stated;

- Ho<sub>1</sub>:** There is no significant relationship between collaboration strategy and conscientiousness in Oil and Gas Companies in Rivers State.
- Ho<sub>2</sub>:** There is no significant relationship between collaboration strategy and courtesy in Oil and Gas Companies in Rivers State.
- Ho<sub>3</sub>:** There is no significant relationship between collaboration strategy and civic virtue in Oil and Gas Companies in Rivers State.

#### METHODOLOGY

The study adopted a cross sectional survey design to solicit responses from employees of seven (7) selected Oil and Gas Companies in Rivers State.

Primary data was collected using structured questionnaire. The population for the study was 245 employees from which a sample size of 152 was determined using the Taro Yamane sample size determination formula. After data cleaning, only data of 124 respondents were finally used for data analysis. The reliability of the instrument was achieved using the Cronbach's Alpha Coefficient. The hypotheses were tested using the Spearman Rank order Correlation with the aid of the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences version 23.0.

#### DATA ANALYSIS AND RESULTS

##### Bivariate Analysis

The hypotheses were tested using the Spearman's rank correlation at a 95% confidence interval. We have based on the statistic of Spearman's rank correlation to carry out the analysis. The level of significance 0.05 was adopted as a criterion for the probability of accepting the null hypothesis in ( $p > 0.05$ ) or rejecting the null hypothesis in ( $p < 0.05$ ).

**Table 1: Correlation Matrix for collaborating strategy and measures of OCB**

		Collaborating Strategy	Conscientiousness	Courtesy	Civic Virtue
Spearman's rho	Collaborating Strategy	1.000	.678**	.891**	.812**
			.000	.000	.000
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.	.000	.000	.000
	N	124	124	124	124
Conscientiousness	Collaborating Strategy	.678**	1.000	.627**	.510**
		.000	.	.000	.000
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.	.000	.000
	N	124	124	124	124
Courtesy	Collaborating Strategy	.891**	.627**	1.000	.564**
		.000	.000	.	.000
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000	.	.000
	N	124	124	124	124
Civic Virtue	Collaborating Strategy	.812**	.510**	.564**	1.000
		.000	.000	.000	.
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000	.000	.
	N	124	124	124	124

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

Source: SPSS 23.0 data Output, 2019

**Ho<sub>1</sub>: There is no significant relationship between collaboration strategy and conscientiousness in Oil and Gas Companies in Rivers State.**

From the result in the table above, the correlation coefficient ( $\rho$ ) shows that there is a significant relationship between collaboration strategy and conscientiousness. The  $\rho$  value 0.678 confirms the magnitude and strength of this relationship and it is significant at  $p < 0.000 < 0.01$ . The correlation coefficient indicates a strong relationship between the variables. Therefore, based on empirical findings the null hypothesis earlier stated is hereby rejected and the alternate upheld. Thus, there is a significant relationship between collaboration strategy and conscientiousness in Oil and Gas Companies Rivers State.

**Ho<sub>2</sub>: There is no significant relationship between collaboration strategy and courtesy in Oil and Gas Companies in Rivers State.**

From the result in the table above, the correlation coefficient ( $\rho$ ) shows that there is a significant relationship between collaboration strategy and courtesy. The  $\rho$  value 0.891 confirms the magnitude and strength of this relationship and it is significant at  $p < 0.000 < 0.01$ . The correlation coefficient represents a very strong relationship between the variables. Therefore, based on empirical findings the null hypothesis earlier stated is hereby rejected and the alternate upheld. Thus, there is a significant relationship between collaboration strategy and courtesy in Oil and Gas Companies Rivers State.

**Ho<sub>3</sub>: There is no significant relationship between collaboration strategy and civic virtue in Oil and Gas Companies in Rivers State.**

From the result in the table above, the correlation coefficient ( $\rho$ ) shows that there is a significant relationship between collaboration strategy and civic virtue. The  $\rho$  value 0.812 confirms the magnitude and strength of this relationship and it is significant at  $p < 0.000 < 0.01$ . The correlation coefficient represents a very strong relationship between the variables.

Therefore, based on empirical findings the null hypothesis earlier stated is hereby rejected and the alternate upheld. Thus, there is a significant relationship between collaboration strategy and civic virtue in Oil and Gas Companies Rivers State.

## **DISCUSSION OF FINDINGS**

The study examined the relationship between collaboration strategy and organizational citizenship behaviour in Oil and Gas Companies Rivers State. The study findings revealed that there is a significant relationship between collaboration strategy and organizational citizenship behaviour in Oil and Gas Companies in River State. This finding is in line with the views of (Alotaibi, 2001; Alper et al. 2000; Giap, Hackermeier, Jiao & Wagdarikar, 2005; Meyer, 2004; Montoro-Rodriguez & Small, 2006; Omoluabi, 2001). An explanation of these results could be that some subordinates in this study felt that they had the opportunity to share and exchange information on the issue in conflict through their union leaders during conflict resolution with their management and they were able to negotiate adequately. This might have assisted them in developing high level of OCB.

## **CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATION**

This study examined the relationship between collaboration strategy and organizational citizenship behaviour of Oil and Gas Companies in Rivers State. From the data generated and analyzed, it was empirically discovered that there is a significant relationship between collaboration strategy and organizational citizenship behaviour of Oil and Gas Companies in Rivers State. Therefore, the study concluded that collaboration strategy and organizational citizenship behaviour of Oil and Gas Companies in Rivers State.

The study recommended that top managers within the oil and gas industry must try as much as possible to collaborate with employees in order to achieve harmony at work place. Since it has been revealed that collaboration have a positive and significant

relationship with workers conscientiousness, courtesy as well as compromise. There should be that conscious effort to partner with the minds of employees and contractors while trying to achieve organizational objective. Collaboration is not just a sign of weakness but also a sign of strength.

## REFERENCES

- Adams, J. S. (2011). *Inquiry in Social Exchange*. New York: Academic press.
- Adebayo, D.O. (2006). The moderating effect of self-efficacy on job insecurity and organizational commitment among Nigerian public servants. *Journal of Psychology in Africa* 43(2), 66-75.
- Ajila, C. & Abiola, A. (2004). Influence of rewards on workers performance in an organization. *Journal of Social Sciences*, 8(1), 7–12.
- Akintayo D.I. (2010). Work-family role conflict and organizational commitment among industrial workers in Nigeria. *Journal of Psychology and Counselling*, 2(1), 1-8.
- Akinyemi, B. (2012). The influence of affective commitment on citizenship behavior and intention to quit among commercial banks' employees in Nigeria. *Journal of Management and Sustainability*, 67(3), 23-31.
- Alper, L. & Tjosvold, E. (2000). Job satisfactory and organizational commitment as predictors of organizational citizenship and in-role behaviours. *Journal of Management*, 34, 132-143.
- Alotaibi, A.G. (2001) Antecedents of organizational citizenship behaviour: A study of public personnel in Kuwait. *Public Personnel Management*, 12(5), 87-96.
- Awan, A.G. & Anjum, K. (2015). Cost of High Employess turnover Rate in Oil industry of Pakistan. *Information and Knowledge Management*, 5(2), 92-102.
- Bateman, T. S. & Organ, D. W. (1983). Job Satisfaction and the Good Soldier: The Relationship between Affect and Employee Citizenship. *Academic and Management Journal*, 26, 587-595. <http://dx.doi.org/10.2307/255908>
- Bettencourt, L.A. (2004). Change-oriented organizational citizenship behaviors: The direct and moderating influence of goal orientation. *Journal of Retailing*, 80, 165-180.
- Bettendorf, R. (2004). *The chrysanthemum and the sword: Patterns of Japanese culture*. Boston: Houghton-Mifflin.
- Borman, W., Penner, L., Allen, D. & Motowidlo, S. (2001). Personality predictors of citizenship performance. *International Journal of Solution and Assessment*, 45, 167-178
- Borman, W.C. & Motowidlo, S.J. (1993) Expanding the Criterion Domain to Include Elements of Contextual Performance. In: Schmitt, N. and Borman, W.C., Eds., *Personnel Selection in Organization*, Jossey Bass, San Francisco, 71- 78
- Chen, Y. L. (2004). Examining the effect of organization culture and leadership behaviours on organizational commitment, job satisfaction and job performance at small and middle firms of Taiwan. *The Journal of American Academy of Business*, 5(2-2), 432-438
- Crystal T. (2007). *Conflict management styles*. University of Maryland Extension. National Ag Risk Library

- Edward, P.K. (2000). Industrial conflict. In poole M & Warner M (eds). *the handbook of human resources management*. London: International Business Press
- Farris Paul, W., Neil Bendle, T., Phillip Pfeifer, E. & David Reibstein, J. (2010). *Marketing Metrics: The Definitive Guide to Measuring Marketing Performance*. (2nd ed.). New Jersey: Pearson Education. 1-432.
- George, J. M. & Jones, G. R. (2008). *Understanding and managing organizational behaviour*. New Jersey: Pearson Prentice Hall.
- Giap, B.N., Hackermeier, I., Jiao, X. & Wagdarikar, S.P. (2005). *Organizational citizenship behaviour and perception of organizational justice in student's jobs*. Munich: Ludwig Maximillans University.
- Graham, J. W. & Van Dyne, L. (2006). Gathering information and exercising influence: Two forms of civic virtue organizational citizenship behavior. *Employee Responsibilities and Rights Journal*, 18(2), 89-109
- Hammed, T.A . & Ayantunji, O.A (2002). the effect of six thinking hats in enhancing the conflict – handling behavior of selected trade union leaders in Lagos state. *Nigeria Journal of Applied Psychology*, 7 (1) 96 – 106.
- Huan. J.L & Yazdanifard, R. (2012). The difference of conflict management styles and conflict resolution in workplace. *Business and Entrepreneurship Journal*, Scienpress Ltd. London. U.K
- Looy, B.V., Gemmel, P. & Van Dierdonck, R. (2003). *Service Management : An integrated approach*. (2nd ed.). Singapore: McGraw-Hill.
- Loui, K. (1995). Understanding employee commitment in the public organization: A study of the juvenile detention center. *International Journal of Public Administration*, 18(8), 1269- 1295.
- Meyer, J. & Allen N. (2001). A three-component conceptualization of organizational commitment. *Human Resources Management Review*, 1, 61-89
- Mowday, R. T., Porter, L. W., & Steers, R. M. (1982). *Employee-organization linkages. The psychology of commitment, absenteeism and turnover*. New York: Academic Press.
- Morrison, E.W. & Phelps, C.C. (1999). Taking charge at work: Extra-role efforts to initiate workplace change. *Academy of Management Journal*, 42, 403-419.
- Morvoman, W., Blackely, B. & Nicheff, C. (2008). The economics and psychology of public good. *Journal of Psychology*.
- Mughal, M.R. & Khan, M. (2013). Impact of conflict and conflict management on organizational performance. *International Journal of Modern Business Issues of Global Market*, 69(2), 431-444
- Negin, O. & Memari, M. (2013). The impact of Organizational Commitment on Employees Job Performance. *Interdisciplinary Journal of Contemporary Research in Business*, 5, 1-8. 41.
- Ogungbamila, B. (2006). Relational conflict resolution strategies and workplace frustration. *Journal of Business & Society*, 16(2), 167-181.
- Organ, D. W., Podsakoff, P. M. & Mackenzie, S. B. (2006). *Organizational citizenship behaviour : Its nature, antecedents, and consequences*. London: Sage publications.

- Organ, D. W. (1988). *Organizational citizenship behaviour: The good soldier syndrome*. Lexington, MA: Lexington Books.
- O'Sullivan, A., & Steven, M. S. (2003). *Economics: Principles in action*. Upper Saddle River, New Jersey: Pearson Prentice Hall. 57, 310.
- Onyishi, I.E. (2007). Development and validation of organizational citizenship behaviour scale in Nigeria. *ESUT Journal of Psychological Studies*, 2(1), 55-78.
- Posdsakoff, P., Mackenzie, S., Paine, J. & Bachrach, D. (2000). Organizational citizenship behavior: A critical review of theoretical and empirical literature and suggestions for future research. *International Journal of Management*, 32(5), 34-46
- Popoola, O. E., Bisi-Johnson M. A. Abiodun A. & Ibeh, O. S. (2013). Heavy metal content and antimicrobial activities of some naturally occurring facial cosmetics in Nigeria. *Ife Journal of Science*, 15(3), 134-143.
- Putnam, L., & Krone, K. J. (2006). *Organizational communication*. Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE
- Salami, S. O. (2009). Conflict resolution strategies and organizational citizenship behaviour: The moderating role of trait emotional intelligence. *Academy of Management Review*, 11(4), 801-814.
- Siegel, P.A., Post, C., Brockner, J., Fishman, A.Y. & Garden, C. (2005). The Moderating influence of procedural fairness on the relationship between work-life conflict and organizational commitment. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 90, 13– 24.
- Smith, A., Organ D. W. & Near J. (1983). Organizational citizenship behaviour: its nature and antecedents. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 68(4), 653-663.
- Suliman, A. M., & Iles, P. A. 1999. The multi-dimensional nature of organizational commitment in a non-western context. *Journal of Management Development*, 19, 71-82
- Sverke, M., Hellgren, J. & Naswell, K. (2006). Job insecurity: A literature review. Retrieved from [http://ebib.arbetslivsinstitutet.se/saltsa/2006\\_01.pdf](http://ebib.arbetslivsinstitutet.se/saltsa/2006_01.pdf).
- Tumwesigye G. (2010). The relationship between perceived organizational support and turnover intentions in a developing country: The mediating role of organizational commitment. *African Journal of Business Management*, 4(6), 942-952.
- Van Dyne, L., & LePine, J. A. (1998). Helping and voice extra-role behaviors: Evidence of construct and predictive validity. *Academy of Management Journal*, 41, 108-119. <http://dx.doi.org/10.2307/256902>
- Wager S. (2013). Child abuse and violence: exposure to domestic violence and others, neglect and abuse. Published online
- Williams, L. & Anderson, S. (1991). Job satisfaction and organizational commitment as predictors of organizational citizenship and in-role behaviors. *Journal of Management*, 23(4), 231-132
- Zhang, D. (2011). Organizational citizenship behavior. *Auckland*: <https://cdn.auckland.ac.nz>.
- Zheng, W. Sharan, K. & Wei, J. (2010). New development of organizational commitment: a critical review (1960-2009). *African Journal of Business Management*, 4(1), 12-20.