

## **Employees Demography and Team-Playing Behaviour of Bank Workers in Ijebu Ode, Ogun State, Nigeria**

OLUDEYI, Olukunle Saheed<sup>1</sup>  
OSUNNUGA, Adedayo Irete<sup>2</sup>

### **Abstract**

*This descriptive survey research investigated the influence of employee demography on bank workers' team-playing behaviour. The population of this study is the entire bank workers in Ijebu Ode Southwest, Nigeria. Participants were selected randomly while an instrument titled "Team-playing Behaviour Questionnaire (TPBQ)" was used for data collection. TPBQ is designed on a five-point rating scale divided into 3 parts. The first part contains participants' demographic data, the second part seeks information about employees' team-playing behaviour. The last part contains items to elicit factors that bring about non-assistive team-playing behaviour at work. TPBQ was examined by experts in Sociology and Measurements for validity. Cronbach alpha method (resulting in 0.79 reliability co-efficient) was used to test the instrument for reliability. The data collected were analysed using descriptive statistics of frequency counts and Pearson Product Moment Correlation (PPMC), Mean and Standard Deviation, and ANOVA. Findings revealed that employee demography (age, sex, years of experience, and job status) have a significant but varied influence on team-playing behaviour of banker workers. There are other non-demographic variables like team's lack of focus, membership laziness, lack of voice in team deliberations, and lack of interest or required*

---

<sup>1</sup> Tai Solarin University of Education, Ijagun, Ogun State, Nigeria;

<sup>2</sup> Tai Solarin University of Education, Ijagun, Ogun State, Nigeria.

Correspondence concerning this article should be addressed to OLUDEYI, Olukunle Saheed, Tai Solarin University of Education, Ijagun, Ogun State, Nigeria. E-mail: oludeyios@tasued.edu.ng.

*skill for the job or task given, all have high tendencies to bring about non-supportive team-playing behaviour among staff. Recommendations are raised upon these findings.*

**Keywords:** assistive or non-assistive team playing behaviour, bank workers, employee demography, teamwork, team playing behaviour.

## 1. Introduction

In the last two decades, as a result of the increasing technological innovation, global competitiveness, and other pressures from multinational corporations, there has been a remarkable transformation in organizational structures and arrangements (Kozlowski & Bell, 2001), especially in banking sector (Anuja & Arulrajah, 2013). Although these transformations were inspired by economic, strategic, and technological forces, the most compelling aspects of them were the shifts from individual to group-based work arrangements (Mullins, 2007). Team-based work arrangements are especially significant in service industries where there is a direct influence on customer satisfaction (Mullins, 2007, p. 521). Usually, banks adopt teaming employees as HRM strategies to strengthen operational activities, maintain a competitive edge, and strive for greater height in business. Banks now place importance on teams to survive in the turbulent and competitive nature of business rivers environment; they adopt strategies, equipment, and incentivising apparatus to enable team spirit and team orientation among workforce (Anuja & Arulrajah, 2013).

This idea of delegating responsibilities to work groups has been to generate new skills, innovations, and approaches in other to build building blocks in storming business times. Hence, the importance of teams and teamwork in organizational operations has been articulated in multiple researches. It has been successfully utilised to build flexibility (Fraser & Hvolby, 2010), job performance (Manzoor, Ullah, Hussain, & Ahmad, 2011), job commitment (Zincirkiran, Emhan, & Yasar, 2015; Palmiano, 2017), innovations (Fay, Shipton, West, & Patterson, 2015) product design and development (Pehlivan, 2007), as well as the overall performance of organizations (Delarue, Hootegem, Procter,

& Burrige, 2008). In essence, the main reason why teamwork has been highly valued for operational success in banking industries is because it pools individual talents and efforts while giving room for individuals to put up minimal effort to work as members of a team compared to when saddled with work to be carried out individually, and this brings about extraordinary results (Palmiano, 2017). This is why bank managers of today's business world continue to rely on teamwork for successful business endeavours.

However, team composition is less important than the team-playing behaviour of employees. Teamwork relies more, not only on the individual skills and competencies to perform in a team but also on members' ability to 'gel' (Mullins, 2007). No matter how well-composed a group of employees is, a poor or non-assistive team-playing behaviour will undermine the team's effectiveness. For organizations to operate successfully with the diverse nature of employees' orientations and backgrounds, they must have employees who are able to conduct themselves, willing, and able to perform better in a team than the routine specific tasks that they undertake individually (Todd, 2003). Indeed, every team in each factory, unit, department, and office operates daily on several acts of selfless cooperation and collaboration, partnership, helpfulness, and other instances that could be considered assistive or supportive team-playing behaviour.

Team playing behaviour (TPB) refers to the aggregate of individual reactions, actions, or inactions towards team activities or tasks as well as the roles they play towards other team members when working towards achieving objectives. The danger in the non-assistive team playing behaviour is that the ever-growing competition in the market which creates pressures that are influencing the emergence of teams in banks and other organisations will be more potent to crush more incrementally (Kozlowski & Bell, 2001). The needed diverse skills, expertise, and experience will be absent, while rapid, flexible, and adaptive responses that teams bring to the organisation will become a dream. Whenever people interact in organisations, many diverse factors come into play: The individual factors (such as, sex, beliefs, traits and other attitudinal dispositions), the task (job characteristics) and the context (i.e., internal and external environment of the place of work), within which team operates, all

these are not without implication for team-playing behaviour and effectiveness.

Ehimare and Ogaga-Oghene (2011), collectivism in diversity among team members is like a sword with two sharpened sides capable of increasing the potentiality for innovation at one side and the tendency for team members' dissatisfaction and reluctance to cooperate with colleagues. Researchers who support the hypothesis of "value-in-diversity" (Cox, Lobel, & McLeod, 1991, p. 827) posit that employees' demographic and ideological heterogeneity are beneficial to organisation while others found it to be major impediments to workplace relationship and especially team effectiveness. The school of thoughts who perceive employee demography to be beneficial to organisations acknowledges the increasing mobility and interaction among employees from divergent backgrounds as advantages to organisation effectiveness and efficiency. To them, diversity attracts a large pool of skilled employees needed for competitive strength in the market (Omori & Basse, 2019; Mitonga-Monga, Flotman, & Cilliers, 2017; Henry & Evans, 2007). Where such diversity is managed with equal opportunity policy in dealing with the employees, it may boost employees' morale and further trigger assistive team-playing behaviour in them. Employees may begin to display acts of cooperation and supports to members of a team when there is an assured organisational arrangement for equal reward and equal punishments for the equal job and equal offenses, respectively, regardless of demographic differences among team members.

The second school of thoughts, especially researchers on 'organisational demography' (Nicholson, 1995) posit that human beings usually find it difficult to work with, and always avoid others whose demographic qualities are different from theirs. The tendencies to put up assistive team-playing behaviour may diminish when in a team with members with diverse demographic qualities. It may become even worse when the differences have to do with age or experience because these two demographic factors may be strong predictors of non-assistive or non-supportive team playing behaviour in individual members of a team. In one recent study, citing Fletchl (2010), Kalia and Bhardwaj (2019), stated that the extent to which employee perform or behave, the number of years they are ready to assist and support the organisation and the

extent to which they demonstrate assistive and supportive team playing behaviour towards firm's objectives heavily depends on the extent to which the organizations take care of the needs that are related to their demographic characteristics (Kalia & Bhardwaj, 2019).

Nigeria workers value the credence of their ethnicity, religiosity, gender, age, and other demographic qualities (Oludeyi & Aborisade, 2018). This may do great damage to team cohesion and effectiveness especially with the trending and the growing awareness of ethnic territorialities among Nigerian workers. This study examines the influence of employee demography on team-playing behaviour of bank workers in Ijebu Ode Southwest Nigeria.

### **1.1 Research Problem**

There are multi-faceted problems inhibiting the operational effectiveness of most Nigerian banks, which bring about scepticism and questions that are pointing to the fact that the system is at operational risks. With the fact that employment and labour relations is necessarily antagonistic and prone to conflict because of the differences in the individuals' ideologies, hopes, and aspirations, among others, team-playing behaviour may not be as assistive and supportive as may be desired. Such acts of cooperation, helpfulness, suggestions, selflessness, and other instances that could aid successful team achievement may be absent completely. Where these occur, banking operations may be crippled while the affected team members may get demoralised, demotivated and turn a nonchalant, non-cooperative team-playing behaviour towards other members of the team. Laxity, mediocrity, and ineptitude may come to play while work philosophy may be that of 'service for personal gains' rather than 'service to help achieving organisational goals'. The problem becomes more worrisome as research endeavours in HRM and Organisational Behaviour have completely ignored these sensitive areas of employee behaviour in the team.

### **1.2 Research Objectives**

This study aims to examine employee demography and team-playing behaviour of bank workers in Ijebu Ode, Ogun State, Nigeria. Specifically it:

1. examines the relationship between employee demography and team playing behaviour in banks
2. determines the relative contribution of employee demography to assistive and non-assistive team-playing behaviour of bank workers.
3. investigates the factors that bring about non-assistive team-playing behaviour among bank workers in Ijebu Ode.

## **2. Literature Review**

Socio-economic background and demography has been defined as a study that deals in understanding the population of people (with regards to how they are composed, how they are distributed across continents and their size), and changing the process of such populations. How a population is composed is described using demographic characteristics features such as sex, ethnicity, age, level of education, religion, or job status, or income level. Workplace demography shows the distinctiveness, in terms of the social, biological, and psychological make-up of the workforce, which distinguishes them from one another (Uche, George, & Abiola, 2017). The analyses about demography can be done on societies as a whole or on small groups of people who are defined by demographic variables like religion, race, or marital status.

These distinctive demographic characteristics in the working population are closely related to the concept of workplace diversity. Diversity can be described as situations where people's differences (such as age, sexual orientation, religious beliefs, racial attributes, and other demographic features) are adequately and peacefully acknowledged, understood, accepted, valued, and celebrated (Hatipoqlu & Inelmen, 2018; Green, López, Wysocki, & Kepner, 2012; Esty, Katharine, Griffin, & Schorr-Hirsh, 1995). It has been documented that the most important aspect of managing people effectively at work is managers' ability to value and manage employee diversity because it has a high potential to improve productivities at work (Hatipoqlu & Inelmen, 2018; Green et al., 2012). Where team membership is formed on demographic line, there are very high tendencies that individuals who perceive themselves as members of an in-group will behave in cooperation and collaboration with others in their in-group and compete with other individuals who are perceived as members of an out-group

(Chatman, Polzer, Barsade, & Neale, 1998) and these have implications for team performance and effectiveness. In summary, demographic heterogeneities or differences have consequences for labour and employment relations (Kalia & Bhardwaj, 2019; Hatipoğlu & Inelmen, 2018; Giuliano, Levine, & Leonard, 2006), including supportive and non-supportive team-playing behaviour.

The extant empirical review of literature on workplace demography revealed stable correlations between workplace relationship and demographic factors like age, sex, qualifications, job status, years of experience, and income levels. Over time, these factors have shaped people's behaviour at work. Several other empirical researches have also demonstrated that these factors are not only strong predictors of job satisfaction (Chirchir, 2016), but also on employee voice and trust in employer (Hatipoğlu & Inelmen, 2018), participation in wellbeing programmes (Baloshi, 2018), task performance (Kalia & Bhardwaj, 2019), job attitudes in general (Ng & Sorensen, 2008) and on organisational citizenship behaviour (Mitonga-Monga, Flotman, & Cilliers, 2017). Employee demography has been found to be a strong predictor of employee counterproductive work behaviours (Uche et al., 2017). Obviously, non-assistive or non-supportive team-playing behaviour is another version of counter productive work behaviour.

## **2.1 Concept of Team-Playing Behaviour**

Psychologists like Bergner (2011) have come to the conclusion that although Psychology describes itself as “the science of behaviour,” the discipline has, till today, not arrived at any cogent or generally accepted definition of “behaviour”. This problem is not limited to Psychology alone; it is the same in the disciplines of Sociology, Education, and even the Human Resources Management and Organisational Behaviour. Often time we hear about organisational behaviour, occupational behaviour, yet “behaviour” does not have a globally acceptable definition. However, it is safe to view behaviour with reference to situations/circumstances, objects, or people. It is actions directed to or with reference to the norms of a group of individuals or society or the manner with which individuals address other individuals or the way objects are handled by individuals (UNESCO, 2000). The concept of behaviour is also conceived to mean a directly or

indirectly observed response to social phenomenon. It is the aggregate of responses, reactions, approaches that one exhibits towards something or somebody. Behaviour is individual's habitual way of dealing with people, live in a society or handles objects (UNESCO, 2000). Conceivably therefore, behaviours are demonstrated towards other people in the society whose norms and traditions are expected to guide behaviour. This is why behaviours are construed to be good or bad, normal or abnormal, acceptable or unacceptable, desirable or undesirable, helpful or harmful.

In organisational context, there is a conglomeration of people from different backgrounds who converge together with a different orientation, personalities, and aspirations which make them exhibit diverse behaviours at work. There is a way that each behavioural dispositions impact on individuals who work in different teams and consequently impacting on the organisation as a whole (Rogojan, 2009). Usually, these varying behaviours are incongruent with organisational norm. Whereas it is such expected occupational behaviours, speeches, ideologies, and prognostications that enable the firm's operational activities to run smoothly at a desirable pace. However, certain unexpected or enforceable circumstances or anomalies, occupational behaviour may fall outside the web of acceptable norms and values of organisations (Rogojan, 2009). In this study, the focus is on a team and each member of a team is analogous to a player playing towards achieving the goals of the team. Employees (being a team player) are either motivated to behave in conformity to expected norms in the team thereby displaying assistive team-playing behaviour or become motivated to behaviour in violations to those norms, thus exhibiting non-assistive team-playing behaviour. Where team-playing behaviour is non-assistive, non-supportive, or unhelpful to the team goals and objectives, it becomes hypothetically difficult to achieve team effectiveness. The word hypothetical is important in this discourse because it is not all non-assistive team-playing behaviour that is actually harmful or inimical to team effectiveness.

## **2.2 Theoretical Insight: Social Identity Theory**

Organisational behaviour revolves around interactions among social groups and teams whether these take the form of virtual gatherings among individuals or physical committees, units,



departments or any form of social and interpersonal interactions (Sindic & Condor, 2014). The demographic heterogeneity and homogeneity among these groups and teams are enshrined in Social Identity Theory (SIT) and Self-categorisation theory (SCT) that explains individuals' self-evaluation and reality of being a member of a group as well as the outcomes of such membership. According to Sindic and Condor (2014) SIT originated from a thesis on intergroup processes that focused on the genesis of conflict between social groups, as well as the factors which influence support for, or attempts to change, established social hierarchies. In his words "...Turner (1982) and Turner et al. (1987) later adopted some aspects of this (SIT) approach as the basis for his SCT of group behaviour in general..." These two theories combined are generally referred to as 'the Social Identity approach' or 'the Social Identity tradition' as they share so many key assumptions and propositions (Sindic & Condor, 2014).

Social Identity Tradition, therefore, is an insightful theoretical effort to demystify the social-psychological processes in team membership and subsequent actions and inactions of members towards other members. It describes situations when individuals see themselves as members of a collection of other individuals in a group. It also includes the consequences of such perception that people are in a group (Haslam, 1997). Self-categorisation can be referred to as the way individuals define themselves and their self-concept with regards to being a member of certain social groups. It may be based on circumstances around since people's self-concept and its relevance or salience is determined by personal characteristics and contributions of others who are in the same circumstances (Chatman et al., 1998; Markus & Cross, 1990). These theories provide a solid ground for better understanding of factors, within demographic variables (such as age, sex, education, income, and years of service) that can propel either assistive or non-assistive team-playing behaviours among team members in banks.

### **2.3 Empirical Studies on Staff Demographic Factors and Team-Playing Behaviour**

Scholarship addressing workplace partnership or employment relations in connection with staff demography has been very scanty

because, with regards to employee team-playing behaviour, it is somewhat difficult to directly investigate the influence of demographic heterogeneities or differences between employers and their team of staff (Giuliano et al., 2006, p. 1). However, taking individual demographic factors, a broad range of studies have attempted showing the links between several aspects of workplace relations.

***Studies on Age and Team-Playing Behaviour:*** Recent literature on employee age and workplace relations outcomes demonstrates that a gradual increase in age indicates a conglomeration of age-related processes which have numerous influences on employment relations and the outcomes that follow (Kanfer & Ackerman, 2004). Bedeian, Ferris, and Kacmar (1992) examined the correlation between age and tenure on workers satisfaction and demonstrated that tenure and age depend on each other naturally but other variables which are related to time co-vary with one another because they are different variables that usually lead to varying workplace outcomes. For example, years of service are more stable and persistent, than gradual increase in age, in predicting employees' satisfaction with their job. The relationship between job satisfaction and years of service, of course differ by gender. Younger employees were also found in the study of Lee and Wilbur (1985) to be of low job satisfaction, while employees of older age were of high job satisfaction with their job. This shows that age is a factor in the employment relationship. Although studies of Uche et al. (2017) observed opposing results in Nigeria maritime industry; the age of employees was also found in the study of Mitonga-Monga, Flotman, and Cilliers (2017), to significantly influence the level of organizational citizenship behaviour. This shows that with increasing age, individuals are more likely to lower their needs for achievement and are likely to have a higher need for affiliation than younger individuals do (see page 400). This was also indicated in several other empirical findings that have shown connections between age and other employment relations outcomes such as organisational commitments (Ogba, 2008; Salami, 2008), job performance (Avolio, Waldman, & McDaniel, 1990), work motivation, (Kanfer & Ackerman, 2004), managerial decision making (Rosen & Jerdee, 1976), job attitude (Ng & Feldman, 2010), among others. Perhaps,

what seems unclear is whether age has something to do with building and maintaining supportive or non-supportive team behaviour among bank workers.

***Studies on Gender and Team-Playing Behaviour:*** Researches have also shown empirical connections, among other factors in demography, to other areas of organisations or workplace relations. For instance, the studies of Giuliano et al. (2006), as well as Sicherman (1996), have indicated that gender has a determinant relationship with how employee perceive and act towards a job and teamwork. In the study of Omori and Bassey (2019), female employees, more than male employees scored higher in their job performance (for further review, see Xie & Shauman, 1998; Dreher, 2003). Empirical studies of Casal, Maneiro, Ardá, and Losada (2020) also found significant gender differences in technical-tactical behaviour in football teams. More recently, the study of Cigarini, Vicens, and Perelló (2020) revealed that, on gender, behavioural differences occur with regards to expectations of cooperation, cooperative behaviours, and their decision time. It is not incorrect to state hypothetically that gender is a predictor of team-playing behaviour.

***Studies on Educational Attainment and Team-Playing Behaviour:*** With regards to educational level and team-playing behaviour, there has been no research report but several findings provide indications that educational attainment may have influence on supportive team-playing attitudes. For example, the meta-analysis in the study of Thomas and Feldman (2009) showed that workers whose education is of a high standard are more creative and display organisational citizenship behaviours than those workers whose level of education are low. In fact, the latter group are less counterproductive in their occupational behaviours. They display low level of such undesirable workplace behaviour as late-coming or absenteeism. A more recent study of Mitonga-Monga, Flotman, and Cilliers (2017) revealed same findings in congruent with studies of Thomas and Feldman (2009). In the study of Uche et al. (2017), it was observed that an increased level of education is not associated with increased tendencies to engage in counter productive work behaviour in Nigeria maritime industry. It is therefore predictable, and testable, that employees' disposition and

behaviour towards members in a team may differ based on their educational level or attainment.

***Studies on Income and Team-Playing Behaviour:*** Pay, Income or rewards system have also been found to be positively correlated with such workplace variables like job satisfaction (Kumar, 2019; Chaudhry, Sabir, Rafi, & Kalyar, 2011; Judge, Piccolo, Podsakoff, Shaw, & Rich, 2010), job commitment (Oludeyi, 2015a; 2015b) staff retention (Osibanjo, Adeniji, Falola, & Heirmsac, 2014), employee creativity (Nigusie & Getachew, 2019), among others. However, no empirical studies have been done to examine the influence of income level of employees on team-playing behaviour or its sister concepts like team social partnership, team members' social pacts, etc.

***Studies on Ethnicity and Team-Playing Behaviour:*** Studies on organisational demography have also focused on racial differences as factor in workplace relationship. Ethnicity is a composition of individual workers who identify with each other based on common language, ancestral, social, and cultural affinities (Tamunomiebi & Ehior, 2019). The study of Giuliano et al. (2006) found racial differences to significantly affect three components of employment outcomes (i.e., rates at which workers quit the job, rates at which workers are dismissed, and rates at which workers misses promotions). The study suggests further that coloured persons who do not like to work for non-coloured bosses usually avoid working for such non-coloured bosses (p. 2). These findings corroborates several others who perceive racial or ethnic differences as having tendencies to either complicate labour relations or cripple the process of building partnership among the workforce (Rowley & Bhopal, 2006; Kloosterboer, 2007). In their study, Tamunomiebi and Ehior (2019) posit that ethnicity being an inherited demographic factor, its diversity among team members who work in relatively homogeneous organizations usually make the teams experience performance deficits. It is predictable therefore that ethnicity may have influence on employee team-playing behaviour.

***Studies on Length of Service and Team-Playing Behaviour:*** With respect to tenure of service, Raghavan and Janardhanan (2019), demonstrated in the ceramic tile manufacturing industry, that employees' tenure has a significant influence on their overall

performance on the job. This is probably the reason why the study of Ng and Sorensen (2008) showed that workers with longer years of service are highly familiar with the roles and responsibilities of their work and have tendencies to attain the peak of their career on that job than workers with shorter years of experience. The study of Mitonga-Monga, Flotman, and Cilliers (2017) also revealed the results showing that late-career and early-career, postgraduate and undergraduate, and more experienced and less experienced participants differ significantly in their levels of organisational citizenship behaviour. Findings of certain other medical research however showed that nurses at a different level of jobs or jobs status are motivated by different incentives to loyal to an organisation. Could length of service influence team-playing behaviour of workers in banking industries?

### **3. Methodology**

This is a descriptive survey research that observed the aspects of independent variables (employee demography) that are capable of causing a change in the dependent variable (team-playing behaviour). The population of this study is the entire bank workers in Ijebu Ode Southwest, Nigeria. The technique adopted in choosing the respondents for this study is a simple random sampling technique. A combination of two standardised instruments was used in developing the pretested “Team-playing Behaviour Questionnaire (TPBQ)” for employees to self-report the extent to which they are willing to show assistive or non-assistive team-playing behaviour at work. It is a five-point rating scale, divided into 3 parts. Part A contains demographic data of the participants while part B seeks information about employees’ team-playing behaviour. The last section (section C) contains items to elicit factors that bring about non-assistive team-playing behaviour at work. The instrument (TPBQ) was examined by experts in Sociology and Measurement from Olabisi Onabanjo University, Ago Iwoye. To test the instrument for reliability, the items were trial tested using 20 bank officials in two banks in Ago Iwoye, who do not form part of the study population but who possess similar characteristics with the focused population. Cronbach alpha method (resulting in 0.79 reliability co-efficient) was used to test the instrument for reliability. Data were analysed

with the use of descriptive statistics and percentage counts as well as Pearson Product Moment Correlation (PPMC). The relationship between employees demography and their team-playing behaviour (RQ1) was examined with the use of PPMB while the contributions of each staff demography to team-playing behaviour of bank officials (RQ2) were determined with the use of Mean and Standard Deviation as well as Analyses of Variance (ANOVA). It was also used to determine the factors that bring about assistive team-playing behaviour and those that do not (RQ3).

#### 4. Results

Findings are reported according to research questions.

##### 4.1 Demographic Data of the Participants

By gender, male participants in this study are 52.4%; by age 31.2% are between the ages of 25 to 35 years while 47.1 are 36 years to 45 years of age, only 4.1% are 55 years and above; 66.5% of the respondents are married while 22.4% are never married, the rest were married but separated. By Educational qualifications, 51.9% have Master's degree while 42.9% have Bachelor's degree and only 4.7% have other qualifications. On number of years in service, 47.1% have spent less than 10 years in service while 44.7% of them have spent between 11 to 20 years in service; only 8.2% have spent between 21 and 30 years while none have spent above 30 years in all.

The mean score of employee demography in Table 1 is 42.88 and the mean score of team playing behaviour is 130.47. Correlation ( $r$ ) is 0.705 which is significant at 0.01. There is, therefore, a high correlation between employee demography and team playing behaviour of banks officials.

**Table 1**

***Relationship between Employee Demography and Team Playing Behaviour***

<b>Variables</b>	<b>Mean</b>	<b>Std. Dev</b>	<b>N</b>	<b>r</b>	<b>Sig</b>
Employee demography	42.88	8.258	170	0.705	0.01(sig)
Team playing behaviour	130.47	31.468	170		

**Table 2*****Contributions of Staff Demographic Factors to Team-Playing Behaviour of Bank Workers in Ijebu Ode***

<b>Dependent Variables</b>	<b>R Square</b>	<b>Adjusted R Square</b>	<b>Std. Error of the Estimate</b>	<b>Sig.</b>
Job Status	0.426	0.423	4.189	0.00
Ethnicity	0.384	0.380	4.688	0.00
Educational qualification	0.376	0.373	4.201	0.00
Number of years in service	0.341	0.337	4.537	0.00
Age	0.482	0.479	4.316	0.00
Marital status	0.277	0.273	6.708	0.00
Gender	0.2111	0.2101	4.501	0.00

In the table 2, the contribution of each demographic factor (age, marital status, educational qualifications, and years of experience, job status, and ethnicity) to team-playing behaviour of bank officials in Ijebu ode is presented. While age differences among bank officials contribute most significantly to their team playing behaviour with 47% (adjusted R square of 0.479) of height, job status has 42% of contribution (adjusted R square of 0.423). This is followed by ethnicity which has 38% of contribution towards determining team-playing behaviour of bank officials in Ijebu ode. There is also 37% of contribution by educational qualifications to staff team-playing behaviour while the number of years in service has 33% contribution to team-playing behaviour in banks. With 27%, marital status contributes the least to the level with which bank workers are willing to display team-playing behaviour towards colleagues. Therefore each demographic factor contributes to team-playing behaviour of bank officials in Ijebu ode, Ogun State.

**Table 3**  
***Factors Bringing about Non-Assistive Team-Playing Behaviour by Ranking***

<b>Factors</b>	<b>N</b>	<b>Min</b>	<b>Max</b>	<b>Mean</b>	<b>SD</b>	<b>Rank</b>	<b>Remark</b>
Answerable and reporting to junior colleagues because they are expert in the job area (Job status)	170	1	5	5.35	1.132	1 <sup>st</sup>	High
Year of experience: being led by inexperienced team leader	170	1	5	4.82	1.383	2 <sup>nd</sup>	High
Lack of focus: when teamwork takes wrong directions	170	1	5	4.75	1.372	3 <sup>rd</sup>	High
Laziness of group members	170	1	5	4.68	1.357	4 <sup>th</sup>	Average
Ethnic/religious differences: working with people of different cultural, or religious belief	170	1	5	4.51	1.547	5 <sup>th</sup>	Average
lack of voice: when my opinion does not count in team deliberations	170	1	5	4.31	1.646	6 <sup>th</sup>	Average
When group reward/punishment is not distributed evenly or equally	170	1	5	3.99	1.391	7 <sup>th</sup>	Low
Gender differences: when I am in a group composed of dominating numbers of opposite sex	170	1	5	3.98	1.782	8 <sup>th</sup>	Low
Lack of interest in the task saddled with the team.	170	1	5	3.94	1.665	9 <sup>th</sup>	Low
When I feel that I have no sufficient skills to be active in carrying out group work or assignment	170	1	5	3.68	1.673	10 <sup>th</sup>	Low
<b>Overall Factors</b>	<b>170</b>	<b>29</b>	<b>66</b>	<b>43.99</b>	<b>8.258</b>		



The Factors that bring about non-assistive team-playing behaviour among bank officials in Ijebu ode is presented by ranking in Table 3. The first on the rank is when a team member is placed to be answerable and reporting to junior colleagues because of the junior's expertise in the job area (job status). This aspect of bank work has a mean score of 5.35 which amount to 76.4% tendency to induce non-assistive team-playing behaviour on the job. This is followed by a situation where group members are led by a team leader whom they consider as inexperience (year of experience). This situation has a mean score of 4.82 which amount to 68.9% tendency to bring about non-assistive team playing behaviour. Following this is the situation where team members perceive that teamwork is taking wrong directions and may lead the team to failure. With a mean score of 4.75, this scenario has 67.9% tendency to bring about non-assistive team-playing behaviour. Other factors that bring about average level of non-assistive team-playing behaviour among bank officials include laziness of group members (when group members place too much burden and responsibilities on some members while the rest takes the simplest task, or fail to attend meetings, or do not want to work at all), this has a mean score of 4.68 (66.9%), ethnic differences (working with people of different cultural, or religious belief) (61.6%), lack of voice (when my opinion does not count in team deliberations), unequal reward or punishment system (When group reward/punishment is not distributed evenly or equally), gender (working in a group composed of dominating numbers of the opposite sex), Lack of interest in the task saddled with the team (when members are given a task in areas of the job that they do not have passion for) and finally, when members feel that they do not have sufficient skills to be active or relevant in carrying out the group work or assignment.

## **5. Discussion of Findings**

Research question one is on relationship between employee demography and team playing behaviour of bank officials in Ijebu Ode, Ogun State. The study revealed that there is a correlation between employee demography and team playing behaviour. While the mean score of employee demography is 42.9, the mean score of team-playing behaviour is 130.47. Correlation ( $r$ ) is 0.703

which is significant at 0.01. Therefore employee demography (sex, age, and years of experience, job status, and educational qualification) has an influence on the team-playing behaviour of bank officials in Ijebu Ode. Although previous studies have not established connections between staff demography and team playing behaviour because there is difficulty in investigating the influence of demographic heterogeneity and differences between employers and their staff members (Giuliano et al., 2006, p. 1). Yet this result is in agreement with previous research that examined connections between individual demographic factors with other workplace behaviours (see Baloshi, 2018; Hatipoqlu & Inelmen, 2018; Kanfer & Ackerman, 2004; Mitonga-Monga, Flotman, & Cilliers, 2017; Uche et al., 2017). The difference however is that none of these findings are about team-playing behaviour of bank officials.

On the contribution of staff demography to team-playing behaviour (the second research question), the ANOVA reveals that, on the first instance, age differences among bank officials contribute most significantly to their team-playing behaviour while job status is the second most influential contributor to employee team-playing behaviour. This corroborates finding of previous research carried out by Kanfer and Ackerman (2004) as well as the study of Bedeian et al. (1992). Next is ethnicity and then, educational qualifications, then gender and marital status. The studies of Mitonga-Monga, Flotman, and Cilliers (2017) and Uche et al. (2017) are also in consistent with this finding.

On staff demographic factors that bring about non-assistive team-playing behaviour among bank officials in Ijebu Ode (research question three), the first situation on the rank is job status with 76.4% tendency to bring about non-assistive or non-supportive team-playing behaviour. For instance when employees are answerable or have to report to or take instructions from junior colleagues because of junior colleagues' specialties or expertise in the job area, there is a high tendency for such senior employee to be non-supportive in his/her team-playing behaviour. The next factor that brings non-supportive behaviour among bank workers is years of experience. For instance, where a group is led by someone that other members of the group consider to be of low experience,

this has 68.9% tendency to bring about non-assistive team playing behaviour among bank workers. This is corroborated by previous studies (Kanfer & Ackerman, 2004; Bedeian et al., 1992) that examined the relationship between years of service and age on workers satisfaction with their job revealed that year of service was stable and persistent in predicting workers satisfaction with their job than a gradual increase in age. Findings of Lee and Wilbur (1985) also demonstrated that younger employees were less satisfied with their jobs, while older employees were more satisfied with their job. Findings in the study of Mitonga-Monga, Flotman, and Cilliers (2017) is also in consistence with these findings. With the present findings it is obvious that experience, job status, gender, ethnicity, and age are key factors in employment relationship, especially in team-playing behaviour.

Following this is the analysis of variance (ANOVA) that revealed the relative contributions of other non-demographic factors to employee team-playing behaviour. It was revealed that 'lack of focus' of team members in the banking job contributes significantly to their team playing behaviour. This implies that, for bank officials in Ijebu Ode to display adequate assistive team-playing behaviour, each member of the team should be convinced that the direction that the teamwork is facing will lead to team success. This must be done by way of policy framework because every member is an important element for the company's survival. Following lack of focus is members' laziness, followed by members lacking a voice in group deliberations and planning as well as uneven or unequal distributions of rewards or punishment for members of equal contributions or erring, respectively. The next factor that brings about non-assistive team playing behaviour among team members is a lack of interest or passion for the assignment given to the team. Perceived lack of sufficient and relevant skills to perform the job given to the team may also bring about withdrawal behaviour wish is also referred to as non-assistive team playing behaviour.

## **6. Conclusion**

It is demonstrated in this study that employee demography positively correlated with team-playing behaviour of bank workers in Ijebu Ode. Demographic variables of employee such as age, sex,

years of experience, and job status have significant but varied influences on team-playing behaviour of bankers. Each variable not only correlates to but also determined the degree to which bank workers exhibit assistive or non-assistive team-playing behaviour at work. In fact, job status has highest (76.4%) tendency to bring about non-assistive or non-supportive team-playing behaviour than other non-demographic variables like lack of focus, membership laziness, lack of voice in team deliberations and lack interest or skill for the job or task given all have high tendency to bring about non-supportive team-playing behaviour among staff.

## **7. Recommendations**

Emanating from the findings of this study, the following recommendations are raised:

The managers of banks should bear in mind that demographic compositions of employees (such as age, sex, job status, and experience) affect the level to which they demonstrated assistive and non-assistive team-playing behaviour at work and, as such, should at every point in time put these into consideration when grouping employees in teams.

On this premises that there are other non-demographic factors that influence employees team playing behaviour, managers must study the “skill and interest profile” of each staff and ensure that the task allocated to staff must be incongruent with their skill set and must be something the individual staff is personable about.

Reward or punishment for equal achievement or offence should come equitably, always.

Managers must provide mechanism or policy that will, to a greater extent, ensure that workers or members always have the opportunity to contribute to deliberations on team activities when planning. Team members must have an adequate sense of belongingness and responsibilities on the job.

## **8. Suggestions for Further Study**

This study focused on only demographic factors in team playing behaviour, future studies may probe into other factors that are person-specific. For example, a study may examine the nature of boss-subordinate relationship as they may influence team-playing behaviour at work. Other studies may also investigate other socio-economic and cultural factors of individual workers that can cause assistive or non-

assistive team-playing behaviour in banks and other organisations in general.

This study took sample only from selected banks in Ijebu Ode Ogun State. Other studies can expand the scope and coverage of the study to get a more reliable and larger sample. Future researchers may also want to examine and distinguish between the concept of team-playing behaviour and organisational citizenship behaviour.

## References

- Anuja, A., & Arulrajah, A. A. (2013). Team working practices and team orientation of employee: A comparative study between the state and private banks in Sri Lanka. *Sri Lankan Journal of Human Resource Management*, 4(1), 49-61.
- Avolio, B. J., Waldman, D. A., & McDaniel, M. A. (1990). Age and work performance in nonmanagerial jobs: The effects of experience and occupational type. *Academy of Management Journal*, 33(2), 407-422.
- Baloshi, M. B. (2018). Demographic factor that affect employees participation in wellbeing program in Bahrain. *Int. J. Youth Eco*, 2(2), 145-164.
- Bedeian, A. G., Ferris, G. R., & Kacmar, K. M. (1992). Age, tenure, and job satisfaction: A tale of two perspectives. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 40(1), 33-48.
- Bergner, R. M. (2011). What is behaviour? And so what? *New Ideas in Psychology*, 29(2), 147-155.
- Casal, C. A., Maneiro, R., Ardá, A., & Losada, J. L. (2020). Gender differences in technical-tactical behaviour of Laliga Spanish football teams. *Journal of Human Sport and Exercise*, 16(1).
- Chatman, J. A., Polzer, J. T., Barsade, S. G., & Neale, M. A. (1998). Being different yet feeling similar: The influence of demographic composition and organizational culture on work processes and outcomes. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 43(4) 749-780.
- Chirchir, R. (2016). Demographic factors and job satisfaction: A case of teachers in public primary schools in Bomet County, Kenya. *Journal of Education and Practice*, 7(13), 152-158.
- Chaudhry, M. S., Sabir, H. M., Rafi, N., & Kalyar, M. N. (2011). Exploring the relationship between salary satisfaction and job satisfaction: A comparison of public and private sector organizations. *The Journal of Commerce (22206043)*, 3(4), 1-14.

- Cigarini, A., Vicens, J., & Perelló, J. (2020). Gender-based pairings influence cooperative expectations and behaviours. *Scientific Report*, *10*(1), 1-10.
- Cox, T. H. Lobel, S. A., & McLeod, M. L. (1991). Effects of ethnic group cultural differences on cooperative and competitive behavior on a group task. *The Academy of Management Journal*, *34*(4), 827-847.
- Delarue, A. Hootegem, G. V., Procter, S., & Burridge, M. (2008). Team working and organisational performance: A review of survey-based research. *International Journal of Management Reviews*, *10*(2), 127-148.
- Dreher, G. F. (2003). Breaking the glass ceiling: The effects of sex ratios and work-life programs on female leadership at the top. *Human Relations*, *56*(5), 541-562.
- Ehimare, O. A., & Ogaga-oghene, J. O. (2011). The impact of workforce diversity on organizational effectiveness: A study of a Nigerian bank. *Annals of the University of Petroșani, Economics*, *11*(3), 93-110.
- Esty, K., Griffin, R., & Schorr-Hirsh, M. (1995). *Workplace diversity: A manager's guide to solving problems and turning diversity into a competitive advantage*. Avon, MA: Adams Media Corporation.
- Fay, D., Shipton, H., West, M. A., & Patterson, M. (2015). Teamwork and organisational innovation: The moderating role of the hrm context. *Creativity and Innovation Management*, *24*(2), 261-277.
- Fletchl, V. (2010). *Work life balance - A comparative study of women in senior management positions in Austria, Denmark and Great Britain*. Norderstedt: GRIN Verlag.
- Fraser, K., & Hvolby, H. (2010). Effective team-working: Can functional flexibility act as an enhancing factor? An Australian case study". *Team Performance Management: An International Journal*, *16*(2), 74-94.
- Giuliano, L., Levine, D. I., & Leonard, J. (2006). *Do race, age, and gender differences affect manager-employee relations? An analysis of quits, dismissals, and promotions at a large retail firm*. Retrieved from <https://escholarship.org/content/qt9tc8n5j7/qt9tc8n5j7.pdf>

- Green, K. A., López, M., Wysocki, A., & Kepner, K. (2012). Diversity in the workplace: Benefits, challenges, and the required managerial tools. *University of Florida*, 1(4), 1-3.
- Haslam, S. A. (1997). Stereotyping and social influence: Foundations of stereotype consensus. In R. Spears, P. J. Oakes, N. Ellemers, & S. A. Haslam (Eds.), *The social psychology of stereotyping and group life* (pp. 119 – 143). Oxford: Blackwell. Retrieved from <https://psycnet.apa.org/record/1997-97264-005>
- Hatipoğlu, B., & Inelmen, K. (2018). Demographic diversity in the workplace and its impact on employee voice: The role of trust in the employer. *The International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 29(5), 970-994.
- Henry, O., & Evans, A. J. (2007). Critical review of literature on workforce diversity. *African Journal of Business Management*, 1(4), 072-076.
- Judge, T. A., Piccolo, R. F., Podsakoff, N. P. Shaw, J. C., & Rich, B. L. (2010). The relationship between pay and job satisfaction: A meta-analysis of the literature. *Journal of Vocational Behaviour*, 77(2), 157-167.
- Kalia, N., & Bhardwaj, B. (2019). "Contextual and task performance: Do demographic and organizational variables matter?" *Rajagiri Management Journal*, 13(2), 30-42.
- Kanfer, R., & Ackerman, P. L. (2004). Aging, adult development, and work motivation. *Academy of Management Review*, 29(3), 440-458.
- Kloosterboer, D. (2007). *Innovative trade union strategies*. Stichting FNV Pers.
- Kozlowski, S. W. J., & Bell, B. F. (2001). Work groups and teams in organizations. *Handbook of Psychology, Second Edition*, 12.
- Kumar, A. S. P. (2019). *The impact of reward systems on employee performance across different work environments – A management perspective: A case study on Murugappa group (TIDC)* (A Master's Dissertation, Department Business Administration, Dublin Business School). Retrieved from <https://pdfs.semanticscholar.org/bed0/50df6ec389b76d97edc04166a5ef784245b0.pdf>



- Lee, R., & Wilbur, E. R. (1985). Age, education, job tenure, salary, job characteristics, and job satisfaction: A multivariate analysis. *Human Relations*, 38(8), 781-791.
- Manzoor, S. R., Ullah, H., Hussain, M., & Ahmad, Z. M. (2011). Effect of teamwork on employee performance. *International Journal of Learning and Development*, 1(1), 110-126.
- Markus, H. R., & Cross, S. (1990). "The interpersonal self." In L. A. Pervin (ed.), *Handbook of personality: Theory and research* (pp. 576-608). New York: Guilford Press.
- Mitonga-Monga, J., Flotman, A., & Cilliers, F. V. N. (2017). Organisational citizenship behaviour among railway employees in a developing country: Effects of age, education and tenure. *Southern African Business Review*, 21(1), 385-406.
- Mullins, L. J. (2007). *Management and organisational behaviour*, 7th ed. Edinburgh Gate, Harlow England: Pearson Education Limited.
- Ng, T. W., & Feldman, D. C. (2010). The relationships of age with job attitudes: A meta-analysis. *Personnel Psychology*, 63(3), 677-718.
- Ng, T. W., & Sorensen, K. L. (2008). Toward a further understanding of the relationships between perceptions of support and work attitudes: A meta-analysis. *Group & Organization Management*, 33(3), 243-268.
- Nicholson, N. (1995). Organizational demography. In N. Nicholson (Ed.), *Blackwell encyclopedic dictionary of organizational behavior* (pp. 833-834). Malden, MA: Blackwell.
- Nigusie, G. T., & Getachew, H. (2019). The effect of reward system on employee creativity. *Journal of Higher Education Service Science and Management (JoHESSM)*, 2(1), 1-20.
- Ogba, I. E. (2008). Commitment in the workplace: The impact of income and age on employee commitment in Nigerian banking sector. *Management Research News*, 31(11), 867-878.

- Oludeyi, O. S., & Aborisade, R. A. (2018). The applicability of the Hackman and Oldham's job characteristics model to assembly line manufacturing organisations in Nigeria. *UNIUYO Journal of Humanities*, 22(2), 277-289.
- Oludeyi, O. S. (2015a). *Workplace factors as determinants of job commitment among senior non-teaching staff of Olabisi Onabanjo University, Ogun State Nigeria* (Unpublished M.Ed. Thesis, Department of Adult Education, University of Ibadan, Ibadan, Nigeria).
- Oludeyi, O. S. (2015b). A review of literature on work environment and work commitment: Implication for future research in citadels of learning. *Journal of Human Resources Management*, 19(2), 32-46.
- Omori, A. E., & Bassey, P. U. (2019). Demographic characteristics and workers' performance in public service in Nigeria. *International Journal of Research and Innovation in Social Science*, 3(2), 141-146. Retrieved from <https://www.rsisinternational.org/virtual-library/papers/demographic-characteristics-and-workers-performance-in-public-service/>
- Osibanjo, O. A., Adeniji, A. A., Falola, H. A., & Heirsmac, P. T. (2014). Compensation packages: A strategic tool for employees' performance and retention. *Leonardo Journal of Sciences*, 25, 65-84.
- Palmiano, D. A. (2017, January). Teamwork Atmosphere and Employees' Organisational Commitment. Paper presented at the 2017 CEBU International Conference on Studies in Arts, Social Sciences and Humanities (SASSH-17), 26-27, Cebu (Philippines). Retrieved from <http://uruae.org/siteadmin/upload/8335UH0117425.pdf>.
- Pehlivan, G. (2007). *Teamwork effectiveness for successful product development: Relationship between engineers and industrial designers* (Doctoral dissertation, Middle East Technical University).
- Raghavan, S., & Janardhanan, S. (2019). Investigating employees' tenure and performance among middle managers: The moderating role of psychological empowerment.

*International Journal of Academic Research in Business and Social Sciences*, 9(6), 548–559.

- Rogojan, P. (2009). Deviant workplace behaviour in organisations: Antecedents, influences, and remedies “*Diplomarbeit*”. Retrieved from [http://othes.univie.ac.at/6623/1/2009-08-28\\_9848220.pdf](http://othes.univie.ac.at/6623/1/2009-08-28_9848220.pdf)
- Rosen, B., & Jerdee, T. H. (1976). The influence of age stereotypes on managerial decisions. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 61(4), 428-432.
- Rowley, C., & Bhopal, M. (2006). The ethnic factor in state-labour relations: The case of Malaysia. *Capital and Class*, 30(1), 87-115.
- Salami, S. O. (2008). Demographic and psychological factors predicting organizational commitment among industrial workers. *Anthropologist*, 10(1), 31-38.
- Sicherman, N. (1996). Gender differences in departures from a large firm. *ILR Review*, 49(3), 484-505.
- Sindic, D., & Condor, S. (2014). Social identity theory and self-categorisation theory. In Nesbitt-Larking P., Kinnvall C., Capelos T., & Dekker H. (Ed.), *The palgrave handbook of global political psychology*. Palgrave Studies in Political Psychology Series. London: Palgrave, Macmillan.
- Tamunomiebi, M. D., & Ehior, I. E. (2019). Diversity and ethical issues in the organizations. *International Journal of Academic Research in Business and Social Sciences*, 9(2), 839–864.
- Thomas, W. H., & Feldman, D. C. (2009). How broadly does education contribute to job performance? *Personnel Psychology*, 62(1), 89–134.
- Todd, S. Y. (2003). *A causal model depicting the influence of selected task and employee variables on organisational citizenship behaviour*, electronic (PhD Thesis of the Florida State University Libraries). Retrieved from [http://diginole.lib.fsu.edu/islandora/object/fsu:175834/datas\\_tream/PDF/view](http://diginole.lib.fsu.edu/islandora/object/fsu:175834/datas_tream/PDF/view)

- Turner, J. C., Hogg, M. A., Oakes, P. J., Reicher, S. D., & Wetherell, M. S. (1987). *Rediscovering the social group: A self-categorization theory*. Basil Blackwell.
- Turner, J. C. (1982). Towards a cognitive redefinition of the social group. In H. Tajfel (Ed.), *Social identity and intergroup relations* (pp. 15–40). Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Uche, I., George, O., & Abiola, W. (2017). Counterproductive work behaviors: A socio-demographic characteristic-based study among employees in the nigerian maritime sector. *Acta Universitatis Sapientiae, Economics and Business*, 5(1), 117-138.
- UNESCO, (2000). *Module 4. Behaviour modification*, regional training seminar on guidance and counselling. Retrieved on 29/05/2017 from [http://www.unesco.org/education/mebam/module\\_4.pdf](http://www.unesco.org/education/mebam/module_4.pdf)
- Xie, Y., & Shauman, K. A. (1998). Sex differences in research productivity: New evidence about an old puzzle. *American Sociological Review*, 63(6), 847-870.
- Zincirkiran, M., Emhan, A., & Yasar, M. F. (2015). Analysis of teamwork, organisational commitment and organisational performance: A study of health sector in turkey. *Asian Journal of Business and Management* 2(3), 173-182.