Team-Playing Behavior of Banks Workers in Nigeria: The Influence of Job Characteristics

Olukunle Saheed Oludeyi [1]

Department of Adult Education, Tai Solarin University of Education, P. M. B. 2118, Ijebu Ode, Ogun State, Nigeria

Abstract: The study examined the influence of job characteristics on team-playing behavior of bank workers in Ogun State, Nigeria. The extent to which team members are willing to display helpful team-playing behavior has not previously been quantified. Descriptive design was adopted while accidental and convenience sampling technique was used to select 173 participants from eight banks. The two instruments used for data collection were validated using Cronbach Alpha method yielding 0.81and 0.76 reliability co-efficient, respectively. Pearson Product Moment Correlation, ANOVA, Mean and Standard Deviation and t-test analysis were used for data analyses. There is significant inverse relationship between job characteristics and team-playing behavior. In addition, task significance in the banking job contributes most significantly to their team playing behavior. Bank managers should always know that employees' job characteristics have significant influence on whether or not they will demonstrate armful team-playing behavior at work. Future studies may probe into other job factors that are person-specific. This study did not only further reveal how the characteristics of bank job are related to harmful or helpful team playing behavior of bank officials but also showed the actual team-playing behavior that are harmful to teamwork.

Introduction

The social change from industrial revolution to information revolution is posing serious challenges to people at home, at work, among friends and everywhere. There is no doubt that it has also affected how people conduct themselves in the family, among friends and in the place of work. With regards to the place of work, these challenges are associated with current global trends and the metamorphosis in the conduct, practices, processes, and outcomes of living, working and relating with others as members of a group and as individuals (Oludeyi, 2014:124). The same trend has stiffen labor market operations and regulations, expanded the competition in the product market and enforcing managers of today's organizations to adopt series of strategies to outsmart competitors and gain competitive advantage in the business environment.

Gaining competitive advantage in business operation requires that the people in organizations are organized in a way that the best will be brought out in them at all times. This is the reason why it becomes most fundamental issue of concern to professionals in the field of Human Resources Management and Organizational Behavior that they understand why employees behave the way they do. This is with a view to predicting and controlling/directing their behavior for effective and efficient productivity (Mullins, 2005). As organizations increasingly rely on teams to device strategies for sustaining business operation and success, there has been a surge in research on how these teams should be composed to foster high levels of performance (Kozlowski & Bell, 2003).

According to Agwu (2015), shifting from working alone to working as a member of a team has potentials to improve individual efforts while raising performance of not just the individual but also the team and the entire firm. However, to work effectively as a member of a team require employees to cooperate, share information, confront differences and sublimate personal interests for the utmost benefits of the team. Teams therefore require some occupational attitude or behavior that portrays high

---

[1] Email: oludeyios@tasued.edu.ng

level of motivation to cooperate with others, intention and willingness to support members and high sense of shared purpose (Adair, 1988; Agwu, 2015).

In organizational studies, research have demonstrated that, although employee personal factors (such as, education, sex, orientation, traits among others) contribute most in determining attitude and behavior in a team and in the place of work, it is often influenced and or informed by both physical and atmospheric conditions inherent in and outside the organization. According to Junaida, Mahadir, SitiHajjar, and Afida (2010) the conditions of physical work environment influence employee's functions and determine the wellbeing of organizations. It is not doubtable that the contexts within which teams operate determine or affect employees' team playing behavior or occupational attitude.

In sociological perspective, individual behavior is usually influenced by and directed to something or somebody. It is therefore apt to opine that the workforce are people with feelings, hopes and aspirations that have varying degree of psychological dispositions towards their job. This means that engaging the best collection of human capacity in productive activities may not necessarily be the only determinant of employees' occupational behavior or of organizational success. The ways jobs are designed, according to Wegge, Schmidt, Parkes, and Van Dick (2007), are also found to be major determinant factors. If this is so, what then are the characteristics of a job that make people want to perform to their maximum ability in a team? What aspect of job makes people to display supportive or non-supportive team-playing behavior at work?

Team playing behavior (TPB) is the conglomerations of actions or inactions and reactions of people towards team-based activities or tasks, including the roles that people play towards other members of a team in the course of carrying out team task and attaining team objectives. Should employees in teams attribute a non-supportive team playing behavior, there are tendencies that banks and their operations will be badly crippled (Kozlowski, & Bell, 2001). This is because it may weaken effective display or utilization skills, expertise, and experience that are needed for teams' operational success and goal attainment. The interaction between people and the various characteristics of their job usually form bases for occupational behavior.

With regards to the characteristics of the job, the Job Characteristic Models (JCM) of Richard Hackman and Greg R. Oldham is a widely studied model that has been found useful in explaining task related issues and their outcomes. The JCM model (Hackman & Oldham, 1974; 1980) postulates that certain core features of jobs do evoke psychological reactions to the job thereby, impacting on the work outcomes (Ayanyinka & Pius, 2014; Kumar, Abbas, Ghumro & Latif, 2011; Mount, Ilies, & Johnson, 2006; Renn, & Vandenberg, 1995). In this study, the hypothetical idea is that "the person-job relationship is a factor in understanding both supportive and non-supportive team-playing behavior of bank workers".

Statement of the Problem

Scholarship addressing banks performance, operational efficiencies and effectiveness, as well as their various causalities, have raised a number of areas of concerns. Prominent among these areas are the influence of globalization and global competition (Achimugu, Yunusa & Samson, 2015), the impact of the bank reforms (Olokoyo, 2013), the determinant roles of ICT (Obasan, 2011) with its consequent electronic banking (Abaenewe, Ogbulu, & Ndugbu, 2013), among others. Few other scholars have also added the importance of team and teamwork (Nzewi, Chiekezie & Nnesochi, 2015), team management (Abdul-Azeez, Ibraheem Olawale, &Aworemi, 2009) as well as team briefing (Okpu, & Obiara, 2015) in banking operations, yet the extent to which team members are willing to display supportive or non-supportive team-playing behavior towards other members of the team has not previously been quantified. It is still scanty in the literature how job characteristics and workplace factors influence team-playing behavior of bank workers in Nigeria. It is against this background that this study aims to investigate the influence of job characteristics on team-playing behavior of bank workers in Ado Odo Ota south-western Nigeria.

Research questions
1. Is there a significant relationship between job characteristics and team playing behavior in banks?

2. What are the relative contributions of job characteristics to team-playing behavior of bank workers in Ado Odo Ota?
3. What factors in job characteristics are perceived as bringing about harmful or non-supportive team-playing behavior?
4. What actual team-playing behaviors are perceived as non-supportive or harmful to teamwork?
5. Is there any difference between male and female team-playing behavior by job characteristics?

Literature Review

According to Bergner (2011) till date, the field of Psychology that is described as "the science of behavior" still fails to come up with a cogent or generally accepted definition of "behavior". This problem of concept definition is general to all fields of studies including labor and organizational studies. In organizational studies, the concept of organizational behavior is often mentioned, yet there has not been any generally accepted definition for the phrase. In this study, behavior can be described with its intents towards or with reference to a person, object, events or other phenomenon. UNESCO, (2000), describes it as actions directed to or in reference to the norms of a group of individuals or society or the way in which one treats others or handles objects. It is a directly or indirectly observed response to social phenomenon. It is the aggregate of responses, reactions, approaches that one exhibits towards something or somebody. Behavior is the way an individual acts towards people, society or objects (UNESCO, 2000). Therefore, behavior is demonstrated towards other people in the society whose norms and traditions are expected to guide behavior. This is why behaviors are construed to be good or bad, normal or abnormal, acceptable or unacceptable, desirable or undesirable, helpful or harmful.

The concept of job characteristics explains the features of job arrangement in such a manner that it encourages a person to perform at optimum level. Job characteristics are objective characteristics of jobs, particularly the degree to which jobs are designed so that they enhance the internal work motivation and the job satisfaction of job undertakers (Hadi, &Adil, 2010). Understanding the relationship between employees and their jobs is basic to understanding both organizational productivity and the quality of the employees' work. It is on this notion that Hackman and Oldham (1976) proposed that the psychological state of the employees is important in designing the job task to be assigned to each employee. Hence, the most popular aspects of job characteristics are the five core job features, which are task significance, task variety, task identity, autonomy and feedback, believed to positively correlate with job satisfaction and job performance (Hunter, 2006; Hadi, &Adil, 2010).

Skill variety is ostensible variety and intricacy of skills and talents required by a job to perform it (Buys, Olckers, &Schaap, 2007; Hadi, &Adil, 2010). In other words, skill variety is the extent to which the job provides workers with opportunities to use different skills or talents. Task identity is the extent to which workers feel as though they complete a whole, identifiable product. Task identity requires from a worker to perform all the tasks necessary to complete the job from beginning to the end whereas the worker's feeling that his job is meaningful for himself, his colleagues and organization because of its impact upon them is termed as task significance (Hackman & Oldham, 1976; Hadi, &Adil, 2010). Task significance, in other words, is the extent to which work performed impacts other people in a positive and substantial way. When the job provides the undertaker the freedom and power to exercise his own authority on it while taking the decision, it is the job feature of autonomy (Buys et al., 2007; Hadi, &Adil, 2010). Job autonomy is the extent to which the job offers workers the freedom to determine work schedules or procedures. When employee gets direct and clear information about his performance and effectiveness on his job it is known as feedback characteristic of job (Hunter, 2006; Hadi, &Adil, 2010).

The job characteristic model predicts that if the aforementioned job features are present in a job, the job undertaker will be more likely to have high internal work motivation, high quality and performance, high satisfaction with the work and low absenteeism and turnover (Gomez-Mejia, Balkin, & Cardy, 2005; Hadi, &Adil, 2010). In the same perspective, this study hypothetically state that the way workers perceive the job in terms of these five core job characteristics determines whether or not they exhibit supportive or non-supportive behavior in team work.

Theoretical insight

Social action theory: Action is social by virtue of the subjective meaning attached to it by acting individual" this is the most famous quote about social action theory popularized in 1986 by Marx Weber, a German Sociologist. This theory has been extrapolated to the explanations of actions or inactions existing within the web of tripartite employment relationship among actors (in Dunlopian perspectives) in Industrial Relations. Guided by the idea of Herbert Mead on "Symbolic Interactionism" (Akinbode and Ebeloku, 2010), Weber rejects the idea that social behavior is primarily determined by society, its social structures and institutions, rather he believes that people have a much more proactive role in shaping social life and social behavior (Haralambus, & Holborm, 2006; Ritzer, 2007)

Although individual actors may behave as individuals, they are aware of other people's behavior and attitudes around them and the actions or inactions of these people shape individual thinking and subsequent reaction or behavior (Haralambus, & Holborm, 2006). When other people act or behave in certain ways and in certain social contexts, individuals continue to search for "symbolic behavior" through which an individual is able to gauge how other members of a team interpret his behavior. For instance, others frowning at one is a 'symbolic behavior' that shows social disapproval of one's behavior. In subsequent social relations, one tends to adjust ones behavior so as to achieve social approval. Whereas, this may not always be the case because of individual differences viz-a-viz differences in individual goals, experience, norms, values, attitudes, expectations and situations (Akinbode and Ebeloku, 2010). Should there be a disparity or conflict of interest or of experience or of any other variable mentioned above, individual may not adjust to achieve social approval. In fact the meaning that one reads to social approval itself is subject to the interaction with other actors.

This theory is apt for this study because it explains why employee may or may not display supportive team-playing behavior in a team. It means that team-playing behavior is a reflection of meanings and circumstances attributed to team-playing behavior as demonstrated by other team members. Variables or factors such as experience, values, self-identity and other personal factors are put into consideration in the process of attaching meanings to other members' team-playing behavior. Evidently, studies have demonstrated that demographic factors may predict behavior of employees at work. What is unclear is whether or not the characteristics of job will predict team-playing behavior of employees at work.

Hackman and Oldham's Job Characteristics Model: In order to gain insight in the specific pattern of relationships between job characteristics and team-playing behavior, a clear identification of the features of work is important. Using the Hackman and Oldham's (1976), job Characteristics Model, it is possible to identify job characteristics into categories. Hackman and Oldham's seminal research on job characteristics model (JCM) was designed for job enrichment and is widely studied. It has been found useful in explaining important work outcomes, such as workplace behavior. The JCM model postulates that certain core features of jobs do evoke psychological reactions to the job thereby, impacting on the work outcomes (Ayanyinka& Pius, 2014; Kumar, *et al*, 2011; Mount, Ilies, & Johnson, 2006; Renn, & Vandenberg, 1995). Hackman and Oldham (1980) stated that "the person-job relationship productivity is important in understanding both organizational and the quality of employees' work experiences. They point out four facts about person-job relationships which provide a beginning for this discussion.

1. Many people are underutilised and under challenged at work as they have more to offer employers than the employers ask. Employees have needs and aspirations that cannot be satisfied by the work they do. The conclusion that can be drawn from this observation is that many employees are willing to do more if given the opportunity. As matters exist, there is a poor fit between large numbers of people and the work they do.
2. People are able to adapt to their environment readily, be it a living or work environment.
3. Self-reported job satisfaction is not reliable because workers may delude themselves that they are satisfied in order to justify staying with the same job and not seeking a change. More objective indicators of how satisfied employees are include: productivity, work quality, absence and turnover rates, degrees of utilization of employee talent and overt signs of high commitment among employees.
4. Change will often be resisted even when it is- a good idea. Change poses a threat and can expose to workers their dissatisfaction with a job which is even more threatening than the

change itself. They may be asked to learn new skills or procedures and thus have a comfortable routine upset (pp. 12-19)

Understanding the relationship between employees and their jobs is basic to understanding both organisational productivity and the quality of the employees' work. They posit that the way workers perceive the job in terms of certain five core job characteristics invokes three (3) particular psychological reactions to the job. Many researchers (Ayanyinka & Pius, 2014; Kumar, *et al*, 2011; Mount, Ilies, & Johnson, 2006; Renn, & Vandenberg, 1995) have identified that the reactions which are referred to as "critical psychological states" are: "experienced meaningfulness of the work", "felt responsibility" and "knowledge of results".

In its final theoretical linkage, the model predicts that the critical psychological states are expected to explain variability in five specific work outcomes which include, in addition to these psychological states, "the personal work outcomes" and "the need for professional growth". They believe that workers who obtained the critical psychological states (experienced meaningfulness of work, experienced responsibility for outcomes of the work, and knowledge of the actual results of work activities) would be more internally motivated, perform higher quality work, more satisfied, and miss work less often than those who do not experience these psychological states.

Using this model, it is predictable that the characteristics of the job will evoke some critical psychological state which may inform patterns of team-playing behavior in employees. It is hypothetical that workers who obtained the critical psychological states (experienced meaningfulness of work, experienced responsibility for outcomes of the work, and knowledge of the actual results of work activities) would be more internally motivated to display supportive team-playing behavior and less of non-supportive team-playing behavior than those who do not experience these psychological states.

Methods
This study adopted a descriptive design. The population of the study is all rank and file bank employees in Sango Ota Local Government Area. Accidental and convenience sampling technique was used to select 173 participants for the study. Employees of eight (8) banks (25 from Guarantee Trust Bank; 31 from First Bank of Nigeria; 15 from Union Bank; 18 from First City Monument Bank, 24 from United Bank of Africa, 18 from Stanbic-IBTC Bank, 23 from Skye Bank and 19 from Spring Bank) in Ota Local Government Area participated in the study. Two instruments were used in this study for data collection.

The first is Team-Playing Behavior Questionnaire (TPBQ) which was developed by adapting Employee Satisfaction Survey developed by The State Statistical Office of Republic of Macedonia (2009). This instrument was appropriate for present study in terms of structure and design. Items in the TPBQ were later improved with additional and more relevant items contained in item-bank in the Employee Attitude Survey (EAS) developed by HR-Survey, LLC (2015). The TPBQ was designed such that bank workers could report the extent to which they demonstrate harmful or helpful team-playing behavior to members of their various teams. The instrument was therefore structured into four (4) sections on a five-point rating scale. The first section contains personal data of the respondents while the second section was designed to collect information about workers' team-playing behavior. Third was to collect information about factors that bring about harmful or non-supportive team-playing behavior in team work. Since 'factors bringing about harmful behavior' are not to be perceived as 'actual harmful behavior' in a team, the last section of the instrument gathered information about occupational behaviors that could be categorized as non-supportive or harmful team playing behavior at work. This last section was an open-ended questions on how employee actually behave when they are feeling aggrieved or when they no longer wish to cooperate with team members probably as a result of factors rated in section 3.

The second instrument used for this study is Job Diagnostic Survey (JDS). This is a self-report instrument designed by Hackman and Oldham for managers to use in diagnosing work environment. This 23 items instrument was scaled on a 5 point rating scale and was modified and adapted for the purpose of this study. The instrument was validated using Crombach Alpha method yielding 0.81

reliability co-efficient. 171 out of 173 instruments administered were retrieved and used for data analyses.

The statistical tools that were used to analyze data are Pearson Product Moment Correlation (for the first research question) ANOVA (for second research question) Mean and Standard Deviation (for ranking of factors contributing to, and employee behavior considered as harmful or non-supportive team-playing behavior) and t-test analysis. Simple frequency counts and thematic analyses of respondents' ideas of actual harmful team-playing behavior were carried out for classification and categorization. With thematic analysis, certain sentences, ideas or notions of the participants are grouped into categories and each thematic category was reviewed multiple times until meaningful categorizations of actual harmful or non-supportive team-playing behaviors were derived.

Findings
Findings are presented by research questions

Table 1: Relationship between employee job characteristics and team-playing behavior

Variables	Mean	Std. Deviation	N	r	Sig
Job characteristics	57.20	5.99	170	-.259	0.01 (sig)
team playing behavior	9.42	1.36	170		

The table 1 shows that there was significant inverse relationship between job characteristics and team playing behavior (r= -.26, df = 248, p<.01). The result implies that the more employee perceive job characteristics to be unpalatable, the lesser they are willing to put up assisting team-playing behavior at work.

Table 2: Relative contribution of each job characteristics to team-playing behavior of bank workers in the study area

Dependent Variables	Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate	F	Sig.
Skill variety	1	0.553	0.431	0.421	4.123	131.890	0.00(sig)
Task identity	1	0.311	0.326	0.339	4.311	151.923	0.00(sig)
Task significant	1	0.533	0.511	0.436	4.298	102.402	0.00(sig)
Autonomy	1	0.621	0.336	0.291	4.621	111.364	0.00(sig)
Feedback	1	0.494	0.321	0.376	4.381	98.991	0.00(sig)

Table 2 shows the contribution of each job characteristics to team-playing behavior of bank officials in Ado Odo Ota Local Government Area. While task significance in the banking job contribute most significantly to their team playing behavior with 43% (adjusted R square of 0.436), skill variety has 42% of contribution (adjusted R square of 0.421). Following this is feedback on performance which has 37% of contribution to team-playing behavior of bank officials in Ota. There is also 33% of contribution by task identity to bank workers' team-playing behavior while job autonomy has 29% contribution to team-playing behavior in banks. Therefore each job characteristics contributes to team-playing behavior of bank officials in Ota, Ogun State.

From table 3, the job characteristics that bring about non-supportive team-playing behavior among bank officials in Ado Odo Ota are presented by ranking. The first on the rank is when employees feel that their collective teamwork is not very important to the company's survival (low task significance). This aspect of bank work has a mean score of 5.35 which amount to 76.4% tendency to induce non-supportive team-playing behavior on the job. Following this is another aspect of job clustered under task significance: the situation where team members perceive that teamwork may not flow in the direction that will yield adequate success (task insignificant). This situation rank second on the table. It has a mean score of 4.82 which amount to 68.9% tendency to bring about non-supportive team playing behavior. Following this is a situation where when the demands of my job are highly routine and predictable (low opportunity for skill variety) in other words lack of skill variety is when team task does not give room to apply a number of different skills and talents) and when employee is part of the job but does not have opportunity to make contribution to its final conclusion. With a mean score of 4.75, this scenario has 67.9% tendency to bring about non-supportive team-playing behavior. Other

job characteristics that bring about average level of non-supportive team-playing behavior among bank officials include task insignificance (when the job does not have any impact or does not positively influence the job of other members), this has a mean score of 4.68 (66.9%), low or no task identity (when employees are saddled with a task and allowed to finish completely any work they start) (61.6%). Other job characteristics that have low contributions towards bringing about non-supportive team-playing behavior include low or no job autonomy (when people are not given the autonomy to decide how their job is to be carried out). Next in the rank is feedback which appeared in two folds: first, when the work or the members fail to give constant feedback on how well an employee is doing on the job and second, when supervisors and team members rarely give me feedback on how well I or the entire team is performing on the job.

Table 3: Perceived factors bringing about harmful or non-supportive team-playing behavior by ranking

Factors	N	Min	Max	Mean	SD	Rank	Remark
When my teamwork is not very important to the company's survival	170	1	5	5.35	1.132	1st	High
When teamwork does not flow in the direction that I believe will yield adequate success	170	1	5	4.82	1.383	2nd	High
When the demands of my job are highly routine and predictable	170	1	5	4.75	1.372	3rd	High
When the job I do does not have any impact or does not positively influence the job of other members	170	1	5	4.68	1.357	4th	Average
When I am not opportune to finish the work I started	170	1	5	4.51	1.547	5th	Average
When I am not given the autonomy to decide how my job is to be carried out	170	1	5	4.31	1.646	6th	Average
When the work or the members fail to give me the constant feedback on how well I am doing on the job	170	1	5	3.99	1.391	7th	Low
when supervisors and team members rarely give me feedback on how well I or the entire team is performing on the job	170	1	5	3.98	1.782	8th	Low
When team task does not give me room to apply a number of different skills and talents.	170	1	5	3.94	1.665	9th	Low
When I am part of the job but I do not have opportunity to make contribution to its final conclusion	170	1	5	3.68	1.673	10th	Low
Overall job characteristics	**170**	**29**	**66**	**43.99**	**8.258**		

Table 4: Perceived actual team-playing behaviors that are non-supportive and harmful to teamwork

SN	Harmful team-playing behaviors	N	F	%	Status
1	Unwillingness to open to opinion of others/Disdain for members opposing views	19	16	4.95	8th
2	Inferiority/superiority complex	11	14	4.33	10th
3	Working to rule	32	49	15.17	2nd
4	Social loafing	23	53	16.41	1st
5	Hoarding of useful information or tools	6	12	3.72	11th
6	Withdrawal of supports to leadership	5	11	3.41	12th
7	Leaking or revealing team ideologies, or strategies or plans to opposition groups or persons	7	27	8.36	5th
8	Unhealthy or destructive criticism/fault-finding	9	19	5.88	7th
9	Excessive eye-service	2	5	1.55	14th
10	Outright or gradual withdrawal of membership	30	42	13.	3rd
11	Poor communication	5	22	6.81	6th
12	Lethargy	11	29	8.98	4th
13	Excessive and frequent demands for undue gratification	7	15	4.64	9th
14	Victimisation or unfair treatment of members for failure or inadequacies	3	9	2.79	13th
	Total	170	323	100	

N (total numbers of participants with corresponding ideas/behaviors)
F (number of times ideas/behaviors under each theme were mentioned by the participants)

Since 'factors bringing about harmful behavior' (as perceived in table 3) may not be same as 'actual harmful' team-playing behavior, table 4 shows the occupational behaviors that are harmful or non-supportive to teamwork. Social loafing was highly reported to be one way by which employee actually behave when they are feeling aggrieved or when they no longer wish to cooperate with team members. Social loafing is a behavior in which individual team members reduce their efforts and

contributions to teamwork. An individual may just believe that he does not have to bother himself since others are to get the work done. This is followed by working to rule which means that individual members sticking strictly to the rules and regulations of the work and abide by it as it is documented. Following official working rules, hours, procedures and protocols in order to reduce output and efficiency is another harmful team-playing behavior at work. Third on the rank is outright or gradual withdrawal of membership by individuals.

Table 5: t-test analysis of male and female team-playing behaviour by job characteristics

	Sex	N	Mean	Std. Dev	Std. Error	T	Df	Sig
Skill variety	M	89	43.31	8.325	0.885	-1.277	167	0.203 (NS)
	F	80	44.93	7.996	0.894			
Task significance	M	89	23.20	5.137	0.545	-1.596	167	0.112 (NS)
	F	80	24.54	5.739	0.642			
Task identity	M	89	21.62	5.359	0.568	-1.940	167	0.054 (S)
	F	80	23.39	6.488	0.725			
Job Autonomy	M	89	20.98	4.866	0.516	-1.801	167	0.073 (NS)
	F	80	22.44	5.668	0.634			
Feedback	M	89	20.60	5.002	0.530	-2.451	167	0.015 (S)
	F	80	22.68	6.018	0.673			
Total	**M**	**89**	**43.31**	**8.325**	**0.885**	**-1.277**	**167**	**0.203 (NS)**
	F	**80**	**44.93**	**7.996**	**0.894**			

Table 5 shows that in all the five (5) job characteristics individually and as combined, there is no significant difference between male and female team-playing behavior on three job characteristics (namely: skill variety, task significance, and job autonomy). Therefore both male and female exhibit the same level of team-playing behavior on all other job characteristics except on task identity and feedback. However, on overall job characteristics generally, gender does not matter in the level of team-playing behavior of bank officials in Ado Odo Ota local government, Ogun State, Nigeria.

Discussion

According to research questions, the first research question is whether or not there is a significant relationship between job characteristics and team-playing behavior of bank officials in Ado Odo, Ogun State. The Pearson Product Moment Correlation analysis revealed that there is significant inverse relationship between job characteristics and team-playing behavior. While the mean score of job characteristics is 57.2, the mean score of team-playing behavior is 9.42. Correlation (r) is -0.259 which is significant at 0.01. This result implies that the more employee perceive job characteristics to be unpalatable or unsatisfactory, the lesser they are willing to put up supporting or helpful team-playing behavior at work. It appears that this is one of the first time that empirical studies establish connections between job characteristics (such as skill variety, task identity, task significance, job autonomy and feedback) and employee team-playing behavior as there are no previous studies in the literature with this attempt. Previous studies have only established the link between job characteristics and such variables like job satisfaction of job undertakers (Hadi, &Adil, 2010), job performance (Hunter, 2006), as well as absenteeism and turnover (Gomez-Mejia, Balkin, &Cardy, 2005). Be that as it may, findings of this study revealed that the way workers perceive the job in terms of the five core job characteristics determines whether or not they exhibit assistive or non-assistive team-playing behavior at work.

On the relative contribution of job characteristics to team-playing behavior (research question two), the analysis of variance (ANOVA) shows that task significance in the banking job contribute most significantly to their team playing behaviour with 43% (adjusted R square of 0.436). This finding is in congruent with findings of previous studies of Kanfer and Ackerman, (2004) as well as the study of Bedeian, Ferris, and Kacmar, (1992). It implies that bank workers consider task significance highly

essential in building helpful and supportive team-playing behavior among members of each team of work. Following task significance, is skill variety emphasizing that workers must have a chance to do a number of different tasks, using a wide variety of different skills and talents and they must be able to use a number of complex skills on the job. Skill variety has 42% of contribution (adjusted R square of 0.421). Following this is feedback on performance which has 37% of contribution to team-playing behavior of bank officials in Ota (see similar findings in Kester & Oludeyi, 2017; Aguinis, Gottfredson, & Joo, 2012). Individuals usually see job task as opportunity to gauge their performance at work, hence this finding implies that when team, the work itself, team leader or supervisor provide members with constant feedback about how well or poor individual is doing, its brings more of supportive or helpful team behavior. There is also 33% of contribution of task identity to bank workers' team-playing behavior while job autonomy has 29% contribution to team-playing behavior in banks. Overall, each job characteristics contributes to team-playing behavior of bank officials in Ijebu ode, Ogun State. This result is consistent with findings of Hadi, &Adil, (2010); Hunter, (2006); and Gomez-Mejia, *et al,*(2005).

With regards to the job characteristics that bring about non-supportive or harmful team-playing behavior among bank officials in Ado Odo Ota (research question three). By ranking, the first one, again, is low or no task significant with a mean score of 5.35 which amount to 76.4% tendency to induce non-supportive team-playing behavior on the job. Following this is another aspect of job clustered under task significance: the situation where team members perceive that teamwork may not flow in the direction that will yield adequate success. The fact that task significant ranked first and second in this study implies that, for bank officials in Ado Odo Ota to display adequate helpful or supportive team-playing behavior, the task allocated to them must positively affect the well-being of other people in very significant ways, must be of high consequences to everyone or most people, and must be important to the company's survival. Unfortunately, there is no previous empirical study on this finding. The next on the rank is, again as in findings on research question two, no or low skill variety: when the demands of job are highly routine and predictable giving no room for utilizing diversified skills, and innovation on the job. Other job aspects are low or no task identity. For example when employees are saddled with a task but not allowed to finish completely any work they start. Also when there is lack of or low job autonomy, it may lead employees to harmful team-playing behavior. For instance when employees do not have the opportunity and or autonomy to decide on how their job is to be carried out. Lack of feedback system in team work is another job aspect that may lead employees to activate harmful tea-playing behavior.

On what actually constitute harmful or non-supportive team-playing behavior (research question four). In other words, the behavior that employees display when they feel aggrieved or when they no longer wish to cooperate with team members. Findings reveal that social loafing is the highest and popular behavior put forward by individuals. This is a behavior in which team members exert less effort in team work than they would if they never had any issues against the team. The next harmful team-playing behavior is working to rule which means that individual members sticking strictly to the rules and regulations of the work and abide by it as it is documented. Following official working rules, hours, procedures and protocols in order to reduce output and efficiency is another harmful team-playing behavior at work. Third on the rank is outright or gradual withdrawal of membership by individuals. Then this is followed by lethargy and the rest.

According to gender (research question five), results indicate that both male and female have same level of team-playing behavior on all other job features except on task identity and feedback. The t-test analysis revealed that there is no significant difference between male and female team-playing behavior on three job characteristics (namely: skill variety, task significance, and job autonomy). However, on overall job characteristics generally, gender does not matter in the level of team-playing behavior of bank officials in Ota. This finding negates the findings of previous studies (Sicherman, 1996; Ely, 1995; Xie, &Shauman, 1998; Dreher, 2003)*that* have indicated that gender differences goes a long way in determining how employee perceive and act towards job and team work. The present study however adds to the exiting body of knowledge that gender does not matter in building and maintaining supportive or non-supportive team-playing behavior among bank workers except on task identity and feedback.

Conclusions and Recommendations

There is high positive correlation between job characteristics and team-playing behavior of bank workers in Ado Odo Ota Local Government. Among the five core characteristics of the job, task significance in the banking job contributes most significantly to workers team playing behavior, followed by skill variety and then feedback. These imply that the more employee perceive job characteristics to be unpalatable, the lesser they are willing to put up assisting team-playing behavior at work. In the light of these findings, the following recommendations are made.

1. The managers of banks should always take cognizance of the fact that employees job characteristics have significant influence on the whether or not they will demonstrate demonstrated armful or helpful team-playing behavior at work and, as such, should at every point in time put these, especially task significance, into consideration when grouping employees in teams.

2. Among the characteristics of job, 'task significance' contributes most significantly to workers' team playing behavior. On this premises managers must ensure that the task allocated to staff must affect the well-being of other people in very significant ways. The task must also be designed such that it is of high consequences to everyone or most people at work or and in general society. It must also be important to the company's survival.

3. Managers must also ensure that workers always have that opportunity to do a number of different tasks on the job. They must be free to use a wide variety of different and complex skills and talents on the job.

4. It is also important that supervisors and members of all teams be urged to always provide each other with constant feedback about how a member is doing. Most employees want to have adequate feedback on how well or poor they are performing so as to braze up where adjustment is necessary.

5. It is also necessary for managers to ensure that task allocated to teams allow members of the team to take almost complete responsibility for deciding how and when the work is to be done. This is because where employees have very little freedom in deciding how the team work is to be done; they may put up a non-assistive team playing behavior which is dangerous for group mission and objectives. Members of each group must be encouraged to always give considerable freedom to employers on how to do the teamwork.

References

Abaenewe, Z C., Ogbulu, O. M., and Ndugbu, M. O. (2013) Electronic banking and bank performance in Nigeria *West African Journal of Industrial & Academic Research, 6(1): 171-181*

Abdul-Azeez, Ibraheem A. O., Olawale, I. and Aworemi J. R (2009) Appraisal of the impact of team management on business performance: Study of metro mass transit limited, Ghana. *African Journal of Business Management* 3 (9):390-395 retrieved on 8/05/2017 from http://www.academicjournals.org/article/article1380549495_ABDUL-AZEEZ%20et%20al.pdf

Achimugu, A., Yunusa, A. and Samson, A. J. (2015) the effect of globalization on banking operations in Nigeria.*International Journal of Public Administration and Management Research (IJPAMR), 3(1):67-79*

Aguinis, H,Gottfredson, R. K., & Joo, H (2012) Delivering effective performance feedback: The strengths-based approach. *Human Performance* 55: 105-111 retrieved on 15/09/2019 from http://www.hermanaguinis.com/BH2012.pdf

Agwu, M. O. (2015) Teamwork and Employee Performance in The bonny Nigeria Liquefied Natural Gas Plant *Strategic Management Quarterly* 3 (4): 39-60 DOI: 10.15640/smq.v3n4a3

Akinbode, J. O, & Ebeloku, A. I, (2010) Understanding Industrial Relations System in Nigeria National Library of Nigeria, Cataloguing in Publishing Data: Offer, Kwara State, Nigeria. Available from: https://www.researchgate.net/publication/275960842_Historical_Appraisal_of_Military_and_Civilian_Governments_Intervention_and_Contributions_to_the_Growth_of_Industrial_Relations_in_Nigeria [accessed Sep 28 2019].

Ayanyinka, A. I. and Pius, N. M. (2014) Hackman and Oldham Job Characteristics Model (JCM) and AkwaIbom State Civil Servants' Performance, *Canadian Social Sciences, 10(2)*: 89-97 DOI: 10.3968/4272

Bedeian, A. G., Ferris, G. R., and Kacmar, K. M. (1992) Age, tenure, and job satisfaction: A tale of two perspectives. *Journal of Vocational behavior*, *40*(1), 33-48 abstract accessed on 10-05- 2015 from http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/0001879192900452

Bergner, R. M. (2011), what is behavior? And so what? *New Ideas in Psychology 29*: 147–155 retrieved on 29/05/2017 from http://www.sdp.org/publications/papers/WhatIsBehavior.pdf

Buys, M.A., Olckers, C., and Schaap, P. (2007), the construct validity of the revised job diagnostic survey. *South African Journal of Business Management*, 38: 33-40

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. Available at http://hum.sagepub.com/content/56/5/541.full.pdf+html

Ely, R. J. (1995). The power in demography: Women's social constructions of gender identity at work. *Academy of Management journal*, *38*(3), 589-634. Accessed on 10-05-2015 from http://amj.aom.org/content/38/3/589.full.pdf+html

Gomez-Mejia, R. L., Balkin, B. D. and Cardy L. R. (2005), *Management* (2nd ed.). New York: McGraw-Hill Irwin.

Hackman, J. R. & Oldham, G. R. (1974) *the job diagnostic survey: An instrument for the diagnosis of jobs and the evaluation of job redesign projects*. Department of Administrative Sciences: Yale University.

Hackman, J. R., & Oldham, G. R. (1976) Motivation through the design of work: Test of a theory. *Journal of Organizational behavior and Human Performance*, *16*(10), 250-279

Hackman, J. R., & Oldham, G. R. (1980) *Work design: Reading* (pp.114-217). Massachusetts: Addison-Wesley.

Hadi, R and Adil, A (2010) Job Characteristics as Predictors of Work Motivation and Job Satisfaction of Bank Employees *Journal of the Indian Academy of Applied Psychology, 36(2), 294-299*. Retrieved on 29/05/2017 from http://medind.nic.in/jak/t10/i2/jakt10i2p294.pdf

Haralambus, M. &Holborm, M. (2006) *Sociology: themes and perspectives.* London: Harper-Collins

Hunter E. P. (2006), *Viability of the job characteristics model in a team environment: Prediction of job satisfaction and potential moderators*. Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation of the University of North Texas, Texas

Junaida I. Mahadir L. SitiHajjar M. and Afida A. (2010) The Influence of physical workplace environment on the productivity of civil servants: the case of the Ministry of Youth and Sports, Putrajaya, Malaysia. *Voice of Academia* 5.1: 21-37

Kanfer, R., & Ackerman, P. L. (2004). Aging, adult development, and work motivation. *Academy of management review*, *29*(3), 440-458. Accessed on 10-05-2015 from http://amr.aom.org/content/29/3/440.full

Kester. K. O. & Oludeyi, O. S. (2017) the importance of feedback system in training program: empirical investigation *International Journal of Social Sciences and Conflict Management 2(4): 121-141*A publication of the Rivers State University of Science and Technology, Port Harcourt, Nigeria

Kozlowski, S. W. J. & Bell, B. F. (2001). Work groups and teams in organizations. Retrieved 26/09/2019 from Cornell University, ILR School site: http://digitalcommons.ilr.cornell.edu/articles/389/

Kumar, A., Abbas, O., Ghumro, I. A., and Latif, S. A. (2011) Job Characteristics as Predictors of Job Satisfaction and Motivation, *Asian Journal of Business and Management Sciences 1 (4)*: 206-216. Retrieved online on 28-07-2016 from http://www.ajbms.org/articlepdf/ajbms_2011_1423.pdf

Mount, M., Ilies, R., & Johnson, E. (2006). Relationship between personality traits and counterproductive work behaviors: The mediating effects of job satisfaction personnel psychology. *Personnel Psychology*, *10*(59), 591-622.

Mullins, L. J. (2005). *Management and Organizational Behavior*. London: FT Pitman

Nzewi, H. N., Chiekezie, O M. and Nnesochi, I. M. (2015) Teamwork and Performance of Selected Transport Companies in Anambra State. *International Journal of Managerial Studies and Research* 3(9): 124-132 retrieved on 8/05/2017 from https://www.arcjournals.org/pdfs/ijmsr/v3-i9/11.pdf

Obasan K. A. (2011) Information and communication technology and banks profitability in Nigeria. *Australian Journal of Business and Management Research 1(4):102-107* retrieved on 8/05/2017 from http://www.ajbmr.com/articlepdf/ajbmrv01n0411.pdf

Okpu, T and Obiara, J. N. (2015) Team briefing and workers commitments in Nigerian banking industries, African Journal of Business Management, 9(3):67-75 retrieved on 8/05/2017 from http://www.academicjournals.org/journal/AJBM/article-full-text-pdf/FB8FB7050512

Olokoyo, F. O. (2013), Bank reforms and performance of banks in Nigeria. International Journal of Education and Research, 1 (9): 1-10 retrieved on 8/05/2017 from http://eprints.covenantuniversity.edu.ng/7607/1/Bank%20Reforms%20and.pdf

Oludeyi, O. S. (2014) Emerging actors in employment relations: evidence of multipartism between the Nigerian Federal Government and the Academic Staff Union of Universities. *South African Journal of Labour Relations* 38 (2): 121-141 Abstract available at http://reference.sabinet.co.za/sa_epublication_article/labour_v38_n2_a9

Renn, R. W., and Vandenberg, R. J. (1995) the Critical Psychological States: An Underrepresented Component in Job Characteristics Model Research, *Journal of Management, 21(2):* 279-303. Retrieved online on 28-07-2016 from https://www.tamu.edu/faculty/bergman/renn1995.pdf

Ritzer, G. (2007) *Sociological Theory* New York: McGraw Hills

UNESCO, (2000) *Module 4. Behavior Modification*, Regional Training Seminar on Guidance and Counselling. Retrieved on 29/05/2017 from http://www.unesco.org/education/mebam/module_4.pdf

Wegge, J., Schmidt, K., Parkes, C., & Van Dick, K. (2007) Taking a sickie: Job satisfaction and job involvement as interactive predictors of absenteeism in a public organization *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, *80*(15), 77-89

Xie, Y., &Shauman, K. A. (1998) Sex differences in research productivity: New evidence about an old puzzle. *American Sociological Review*, 847-870.

Sicherman, N. (1996) Gender Differences in Departures from a Large Firm. *ILR Review* 49(3) 484-505 accessed on 10-05-105 from http://ilr.sagepub.com/content/49/3/484.full.pdf+html