

Linking Perceived Workplace Discrimination with Contextual Performance in the Nigerian Higher Educational System

Kolawole Yusuff
University of Reading

Olusoji George
University of Lagos

Abstract

The study seeks to examine the relationship between perceived workplace discrimination and contextual performance. Using the social identity theory and similarity/attraction theory, this paper argues that to foster positive effects of gender, racial, and age diversity while preventing negative effects, organisations should place an emphasis on managing employee perceived discrimination, which the employees may experience while working for a demographically diverse workgroup. Findings suggest that perceived workplace discrimination is negatively correlated with organisational citizenship behaviour.

Keywords: Contextual performance, Nigeria, organisational citizenship behaviour, workplace discrimination

INTRODUCTION

In recent decades, several countries across the globe (including Nigeria) have made profound headways, through various legislations and policies, formulated for ensuring a better work climate that values and treats every employee equitably (George, Owoyemi, & Adegboye, 2013; Mor Barak, 2005). The enactment of anti-discrimination laws and proliferation of affirmative action programs have not only improved the visibility of the so-called minority groups in the workforce, but also improved the overall job performance of employees. For example, more women, members of racial and ethnic minorities, younger and older employees, the differentially abled, and members of other groups that were hitherto discriminated

against, have been assisted to become a functional part of the workforce and high performing employees.

Nonetheless, despite the progress recorded in increasing the representation of diverse groups in workplaces, there are still reports of different cases of discrimination in terms of perceived exclusion and mistreatment. In order words, despite the Federal Character Principle, that encourages various anti-discrimination laws (e.g. constitutional provisions, Affirmative Action), these people are still psychologically excluded from the circles of influence in the organisation. This therefore has the tendency to deter such employees from fully contributing to their organisations, and inhibiting the organisations from benefiting from, employees' active involvement in the workplace (Mor Barak, 2005).

Workforce demographics have changed considerably in Nigeria partly in response to global trends. Factors such as

*Correspondence concerning this article should be addressed to Kolawole Yusuff, University of Reading.
Email: K.M.Yusuff@pgr.reading.ac.uk*

globalization and multiculturalisation (George et al, 2013, 2014a) have accounted for this change in the private and public work settings. In addition, public organisations (e. g. parastatals, government owned institutions) in Nigeria could be described as a ‘melting point’ (George, Owoyemi, & Adegboye, 2014b) that accommodate people of diverse gender, race and ethnicity in compliance with the Federal Character Principle introduced into the Constitution in 1979 to address the diverse nature of the country. Thus, a local and innate factor accounting for the increase in the rate of diversity and multiculturalism in Nigerian organisations is an example of legislations and policies formulated for addressing perception of inequity among different ethnic groups that make up the country. In other words, factors including globalisation, multiculturalism and the Federal Character Principle have spurred the rate of heterogeneity in the Nigerian workplaces.

Broadly viewed, organisations are socially constructed entities, which exist on a relatively permanent basis for a defined purpose and can be business or non-business social institutions. These social constructions are artefacts of humans and their causes are continually advanced by humans. Given the ever-changing nature of contemporary workplaces, members are also drawn from a demographically changing macro environment (the society). Many notable factors have continually accounted for the increasing heterogeneity in the composition of workforce (Williams & O' Reilly, 1998). This is commonly treated in literature as one of the challenges and opportunities faced by managers that stress the relevance of Organisational Behaviour (Robbins, Millet & Waters-Marsh, 2004). The term ‘workforce diversity’ is therefore used to describe this phenomenon. Workforce diversity deals with differences among employees of an organisation. It recognizes the corporate reality that organisations are becoming more

heterogeneous in terms of gender, race, ethnicity, age and abilities. The term advocates for the inclusion and extending fairness and equity to people from diverse backgrounds. Extant literature recognizes workforce diversity as one of the most enduring trends in the global work system (Robbins et al, 2004). The term "diversity" has recently come to be closely associated with organisational life, owing to increasing heterogeneity in the workplace, amplified rate of globalisation and the growing complexity of jobs (Cox, 1991; Williams & O' Reilly, 1998). Cox (1991) defined workforce diversity as the variation in social and cultural identities among people who co-exist in a defined organisational setting (Cox, 1991). Scholars (e.g. Ely & Thomas, 2001) have argued that workforce diversity is better theorised as the varied perspectives and approaches that members of different identity groups bring to work.

On the surface, while workforce diversity seeks to improve work climate and suppress any feeling of subjective discrimination, it may appear counterintuitive for employees to report different forms of discrimination and poor treatment by members of a demographically diverse organisation. Social categorization is therefore an inevitable by-product of diversity; thus, employees either belong to the outgroup or in-group depending on the composition of the workplaces. Although demographic diversity is considered one of the major workforce trends, empirical evidence about its effects is scant and conflicting. Diversity is recognized by many scholars as a double-edged sword, that is, capable of yielding both positive and negative effects (see Milliken & Martins, 1996). Much is documented on the positive implications. However, less is known about the negative consequences of diversity. Notably, one of the negative consequences of diversity is prejudice and discrimination most especially

displayed by in-group members against some out-group members.

The objective of this paper is to investigate the link between employees' perception of workforce diversity and the tendency to display extra-role behaviour (generally referred to as contextual performance). Diversity, based on observation from extant studies (e.g, Basset-Jones, 2005; Kossek, & Lobel, 1996; Robbins et al, 2004) if effectively managed can engender innovation and creativity among people in organisations. It is also capable of improving decision-making processes by encouraging divergent and varied perspectives on organisational issues (Kossek & Lobel, 1996). In contrast, an organisation wherein diversity is not properly managed is prone to experience negative work outcomes such as high turnover, miscommunication, interpersonal conflicts, poor wellbeing and withdrawal behaviours (Kossek & Lobel, 1996).

In recent times, there has been an upsurge of research interest in exploring performance-related behaviours that transcend the formally assigned roles and duties of employees. This category of behaviour is termed extra-role or contextual behaviour. Extra role behaviour is broadly divided into two, positive and negative (Miles, Borman, Spector & Fox, 2002). On the bright side, citizenship behaviour (Smith, Organ & Near, 1983) or positive "contextual performance" (Borman & Montowildo, 1993, 1994) is a set of discretionary behaviours that fall outside the purview of job description of employees, which improves co-workers' efficiency and corporate functioning. On the dark side, counterproductive work behaviours (Fox, Spector & Miles, 1999) are voluntary behaviours that go beyond the primary responsibilities which may hamper workmates and organisations. In this paper, we attempt to empirically connect organisational citizenship behaviour with perceived workplace diversity.

Theoretical and empirical evidences suggest that employees who share demographic attributes (e.g. gender, race, ethnicity and age) with the mainstream workforce tend to feel strongly affiliated, motivated, involved in the job and perceive no discrimination. On the other hand, an employee who shares relatively less with other employees (the in-group members) tend to feel less motivated and engaged with the job (Byrne, 1971; Pitts & Jarry, 2007). Studies have steadily shown that diversity is not only beneficial to organisations, but could also be dysfunctional if not well managed (Basset-Jones, 2005). This study hypothesised that employee's creativity and willingness to go beyond tasks and duties enshrined in the formal job description could be hindered by feelings of discrimination in a diverse organisation where diversity is not effectively managed. Thus, feeling of exclusion rather than inclusion, misunderstanding rather than understanding, mistreatment rather than positive treatment, and conforming ideation rather than varied ideation (Larkey, 1996) could limit extra-role behaviours among employees.

Extant literature reveals that OCB is influenced by dispositional and contextual factors (Knonvsky & Organ, 1996) rather than employees' knowledge skill and abilities. Hence, it is increasingly desired by organisations as a measure of contextual performance (Rotundo & Sackett, 2002). Similarly, the dimension of workforce diversity discussed above is yet to receive deserved attention from organisational behaviour researchers. This study therefore seeks to establish the link between perceived workforce diversity and contextual performance. The authors draw on the theories of social identity and categorisation as well as the queer theory to propose a hypothetical relationship between employee's perception of diversity in a demographically diverse organisation and how it enables (or stifles) organisational citizenship behaviours within

the context of higher academic institutions in Nigeria.

Similarly, despite the plethora of works on diversity, the extant literature seems to focus more on what could be considered as notional diversity while perceived diversity is largely neglected. In fact, majority of works treat the two different but related concepts as almost the same. For instance, Cox and Blake (1991) and Jamieson and O'Mara (1991) defined diversity as the differences in race, gender, national origin, ethnicity, ability and geographical origin (Cox and Blake (1991), and Jamieson and O' Mara (1991). It must however be noted that this view of diversity as physically manifesting is a measure of notional diversity (Larkey, 1996b). On the other hand, diversity as perceived by employees is defined by Ting-Toomey (1991) as the differences in global views or based on subjective culture, resulting in behaviour/attitudinal differences among socio-cultural groups.

Human resources constitute a very crucial resource in the life of an organisation. Employees are a dynamic and complex resource made up of motives, interests, needs, expectations, values, emotions, attitudes, behaviours, feelings and perceptions. While behaviour is a very important concept in the study of people at work, perception determines the way an individual employee organizes and interprets the reality in the workplace climate. Social categorisation and schisms are pervasive in a diverse organisation whose members are drawn from a heterogeneous society. Social identity theory makes the phenomenon of in-groups or out-groups an organisational reality as members who share similar demographic attributes tend to seek identification with one another. Consequently, employees with popular social attributes may find it easy to have their views represented, while members of minority

groups may experience feelings of exclusion and discrimination.

An Overview of Workforce Diversity and Workplace Discrimination

In the annals of organisational demography literature, employee feelings have often been examined using measures of discrimination and diversity, with an overlap existing between the two measures. Since the 1980s, diversity has been experiencing a boom in research attentions in the organisational behaviour literature (Cox, 1991). Henceforth, cases have been increasingly made for diversity in business and non-business organisations because of the recognition that diversity portends a wide range of benefits to organisations.

There are divergent views on workforce diversity. For example, Inyang (2007) defined diversity as the observed differences among members of social unit or a group. Cox (2001) offered a similar view on diversity and defined it as the variation in social and cultural identities among people who co-exist in a defined organisational setting. William and O'Reilly (1998) presented a broader view and defined diversity as the degree of heterogeneity among team members on specified demographic dimensions. This definition is based on the theory that attempts to explain how heterogeneity affects team processes and performance. Ely and Thomas (2001) argued that diversity should be conceptualised as the varied perspectives and approaches that members of different identity groups bring to work. In the same vein, the management of diversity is also perceived differently by different scholars. This is analogous to the view expressed by Nkomo and Stewart (2006) who define diversity as an agglomeration of people with different identities within a single social system.

A slightly different view is put forth by Daft (2003) who sees diversity as a two-dimensional concept made up of primary (basic) dimension and secondary dimensions. The basic dimensions portray innate differences that shape individuals throughout their lifetime; these differences are defined along variables including: gender, race, ethnicity, physical or cognitive ability. These primary dimensions represent the core elements that influence the perspectives or self-image of individuals. On the other hand, the secondary dimensions comprise the qualities acquired by individuals in the course of living, learning and growing. These attributes - beliefs, marital status, languages, socio-economic status, educational level and experience - are described as variable and changeable. More importantly, the secondary dimensions have influence in employee's social identity and approach and they symbolize how such an employee perceives others and is perceived by other employees - colleagues, supervisors, subordinates or customers (Inyang, 2007).

The concept has evolved from a mere creation of just work climate to a more central organisational concern of diversity management. Diversity management involves the recognition that the workforce consists of people with diverse characteristics (visible and non-visible) that account for differences among them. Managing diversity is the process whereby varied skills, knowledge, cultural values of people with different backgrounds are employed to further advance the cause of an organisation and help individual employee maximize their full potentials (Kandola & Fullerton, 1994). The vital implications for human resource management practice is to shift managerial philosophy from the policy of inclusion (Affirmative Action and Equal Employment Opportunities) to recognizing the individual differences and responding to the differences such that performance is maximized while, at

the same time, discrimination is minimized (Shore et al., 2009; Robbins et al, 2004).

Managing diversity has given birth to such other concepts as multiculturalism and multicultural organisation (George et al, 2014b). An organisation is viewed as being multicultural if it values and respects diversity and a range of dissimilar social groups are able to contribute substantially to the accomplishment of corporate goals and core values while maintaining their unique socio-cultural values or other individual differences within a work setting (Cox, 1991). Based on this view, a multicultural organisation is recognisable with four major features, namely: a low level of intergroup conflict; the absence of prejudice and discrimination; presence of informal networks system attracting people from different socio-cultural backgrounds; and fair representation.

Studies reveal that managing diversity in workplaces is very important in organisational life. Diversity offers an organisation the benefits of varied perspectives in problem solving and decision making; creativity and heightened openness to new ideas; improved innovativeness; multiple interpretations of issues and increased flexibility (Cox, 1991; Kossek & Lobel, 1996); as well as reduced employees turnover, improved psychological wellbeing and greater performance (Robbins et al, 2004).

Similarly, perceived diversity refers to differences among members in relation to other groups (Tajfel & Turner, 1986). This view represents the deep-level diversity (Chattopadhyay, Tluchowska, & George, 2004) as opposed to surface level diversity previously espoused. Drawing on Larkey (1996a, 1996b) social-communicative interaction theory the deep-level diversity is conceptualized as a four-dimensional construct comprising: inclusion /exclusion, conforming/ varied ideation, understanding/ misunderstanding and positive/negative

treatment. Managers must acknowledge this variation in perspectives, attitudes and approaches and they must be willing to harness such in order to improve the problem-solving ability and to ensure the overall success of an organisation. Diversity as well as its management is important for two key reasons. First, it acknowledges the individual differences and importance of every organisational member. Second, it encourages multiplicity of ideas and perspectives such that every employee is a decision maker and potential problem solver as everybody is a source of innovation and creativity. Thus, management of diversity creates a platform for mutually beneficial processes and outcomes.

Contextual Performance/Organisational Citizenship Behaviour in Context

Contextual performance is one of the components of overall work performance; the other component is task performance (Borman & Motowidlo, 1997). Contextual performance is a set of activities that contribute to the social and psychological wellbeing, which constitutes an aspect of overall job performance (Borman & Motowidlo, 1994). However, organisational citizenship behaviour is one of the most popular constructs for measuring contextual performance in organisational behaviour (Dalal, 2007). A relatively few topics in the organisational behaviour literature have attracted the attentions of researchers as much as organisational citizenship behaviour, OCB (Podsakoff, MacKenzie, Paine, & Bancharach, 2000). Despite various conceptualisations of OCB, there is a common theme in literature. OCB is a multidimensional construct (Morrison, 1994). From the inception, the research on OCB have been largely shaped by a mutual fortitude to refine and modify the construct to improve and augment its utility and applicability in different organisational contexts (Jahangir, Akbar, & Haq, 2004;

Podsakoff et al, 2000). The divergence that characterizes conceptualization of OCB is due to numerous attentions it gets from scholars. A review of extant literature on OCB reports approximately 30 hypothetically different dimensions or taxonomies (types) of OCB (Podsakoff, et al, 2000). The term ‘organisational citizenship behaviour’, was coined by Bateman and Organ (1983); it was defined as the “key concept that lubricates the social machinery of the organisation” (p. 654). The employees who engage in such behaviours were called “good citizens” or “good soldiers” (Bateman & Organ, 1983). Although, OCB as a term is relatively young, its origin as an act is more appropriately traceable to Bernard (1938), who theorised that for the purpose of pursuing and realizing organisational goals, employees should be willing to contribute efforts to the cooperative system.

Increasingly, it is argued that constructive and cooperative behaviours outside traditional formal role requirements are crucial for a social institution to function effectively and efficiently (Katz, 1964; Katz & Kahn (1966). Katz (1964) proposed three classes of behaviours that are necessary for an organisation to function effectively and sustainably. This set of behaviours obviously go beyond the jobholders’ role specifications but the purpose is to accomplish organisational mission. Innovative and spontaneous behaviours are also needed to cope and manage situations such as change in organisational climate, multiplicity of operational conditions as well as the diversity of human resources, which organisations may not be able to pre-empt and respond to.

Organ (1988) reviewed various definitions of OCB and posited that it is an individual behaviour that is discretionary, not directly recognized by the formal reward system and that taken together, promotes the effective functioning of the organisation. The

term “discretionary”, underscores that the behaviours are not clearly specified in the employment terms of the employees. By implication, the staff’s decision to display or not to display them is typically a personal choice such that its execution or omission is not formally and generally reinforced. However, according to Organ (1988) a consistent display of a variety of OCB by an employee can create an impression on the part of the supervisor or on co-workers and therefore such impression may sequentially lead to the suggestion by the boss for incentives such as salary increase or promotion.

OCB is therefore an all-encompassing act that transcends in-role behaviour and task performance. It includes any behaviour displayed or performed by an employee that is discretionary, not contractually guaranteed, not formally enforceable, not directly and formally rewarded, and not implicitly covered by job description, and yet essentially required for smooth functioning of organisations. Therefore, what constitutes citizenship behaviour may vary from organisation to organisation or industry to industry. For example, citizenship behaviour among the higher education instructors (i.e. lecturers) generally include altruism, civic virtue, conscientiousness, sportsmanship, general compliance and courtesy.

However, these behaviours may manifest in terms of mentoring students and junior colleagues, coaching that complements the scheduled period, helping colleagues who for one reason or the other could not perform their tasks, promoting the image of the institutions, and commitment to meeting tight deadlines. According to Williams and Anderson (1991), these behaviours could be directed either towards individuals (students or colleagues) or towards the institution.

Social Identity/Self-Categorization Theory

The link between perceived workforce diversity and contextual performance is primarily anchored on the theory of social identity/self-categorization. The theory describes the social-psychological processes through which perceptions are formed and reactions arise in a social group (Chatman & O’Reilly, 2004; Stewart & Garcia-Pareto, 2008). The theory analyses why individuals classify themselves into some groups, but not others in a diverse work group. The social categorization holds that individuals tend to use social category and identity (attributes) which they possess to define themselves; there are two distinct purposes of social identification: to segment and order the social environment through one’s cognitive processes and to enable each individual to visualize and define themselves within a social context (Norman, Avvey, Nimnicht, Pigeon, 2008; Stewart & Garcia-Pareto, 2008; Tajfel & Turner, 1986; Turner, Hogg, Oakes, Reicher, & Wetherell, 1987).

The categorisation or specification that occurs in groups evokes not only a sense of self as a member of a group, but also it arouses perceptions of members of other groups as belonging to an out-group (Larkey, 1996). This observation acknowledges individual differences and holds that individual employees differ in terms of the extent to which they are identified with cultural knowledge and communication patterns as they may also differ in their expression of this identity on the context of interaction (Larkey, 1996; Ting-Tomey, 1991).

Similarity/Attraction Theory

The similarity/attraction theory holds that people who share similar demographic attributes tend to appeal to one another and they tend to work and socialize together, while others who have less in common with the in-

group member feel excluded and neglected (and the similarity-attraction paradigm (Byrne, 1971; Pitts & Jarry, 2007). It is thus argued that diversity may have negative effects on organisational performance via such processes as increased conflict and reduced cohesiveness (Byrne, 1971). Therefore, employees with similar backgrounds are likely to share common interests, which make them more comfortable with one another while working towards a common goal and this bears positive implications on their performance. Furthermore, such employees from the in-group may choose to interact within the group and they are also more likely reinforce their in-group member's ideas and performance. Thus, the similarity/attraction theory posits that discrimination, exclusion and mistreatment are the unlikely, unwarranted, and usually neglected outcomes in diverse workgroups (Pitts & Jarry, 2007).

Previous Research

A considerable number of studies have been conducted focusing on the relationship between workforce diversity and organisational outcomes (Jehn & Bezrukova, 2004; Mannix & Neal, 2005). The impact of workforce diversity has been examined on organisational performance in terms of improvement in problem solving through creativity and innovation (Mamman, Kamochi & Bakuwa, 2011). Researchers have claimed that effective management of diversity can encourage desirable behaviours among members of the workforce. Such desirable behaviours among the workforce may manifest in the form of job satisfaction, organisational commitment and job engagement as well as other positive dispositions displayed by employees. However, to the best of our knowledge, little has been done on the relationship between employee's perception of workforce diversity and OCB. The scanty studies on this theme do not specifically focus on the relationship between perceived diversity and OCB. For

instance, Mamman et al (2012) merely provides a theoretical framework for investigating the relationship between diversity, organisational and OCB.

Study Hypotheses

From the forgoing theoretical and empirical analyses, it is therefore hypothesized that:

Hypothesis 1:

Perceived discrimination in a diverse/multicultural workplace will be negatively related to contextual performance/OCBs.

Based on this broad hypothesis formulated above, two specific operational hypotheses are thus formulated:

Hypothesis 1b: Perceived social exclusion in a multicultural workplace will be negatively associated with OCBs.

Hypothesis 1c: Perceived mistreatment in a diverse workplace will be negatively correlated with contextual performance.

RESEARCH METHOD

This study adopted a cross-sectional survey. The choice of this quantitative research design is based on the nature of this research, which involves examining the relationship between specific variables. The data were collected through administering of a highly structured self-report questionnaire.

Participants and Sampling Procedures

Participants were drawn from a convenience sample of 400 academic staff of three government owned higher institutions in

Lagos State (University, Polytechnic and College of Education). Notable ethical measures were observed. This includes briefing the respondents on the rationale behind the survey, guaranteeing them the anonymity of their responses and informing them of their freedom to partake or not to partake and even liberty to discontinue in the course of the survey. This yielded 280 valid responses which is considerably good response rate based on Tabachnick and Fidell's (2001) recommendation. The sample socio-demographic statistics shows that 64.3% were male; 65% were between the age of 36 and 55 years; 64.3% hold doctorate degree being the minimum statutorily qualification required to function as an independent lecturer; 55.3% were Christians while other were Muslims; 86.4% were married while 13.6% were single; 54% were in the Senior lectureship cadre and above; 61.4% have spent not less than 6 years on the job; the vast majority (72.1%) of the participants were of Yoruba tribe, being the major ethnic group in Lagos where the three institutions under focus are situated.

Measures

Standardized scales were adopted for all the three variables. While contextual performance was measured using a 16-item OCB scale originally developed by Organ (2000), employee perceived discrimination consist of two dimensions, namely: perceived exclusion and mistreatment. Perceived exclusion scale consists of 4 items while perceived mistreatment is made up of three items. Both scales were adapted from the Workforce Diversity Questionnaire (PWQ) developed by (Larkey, 1996a, 1996b) which was used to measure interaction and possible discrimination within diverse workgroups.

The three scales used in this study were measured on a 4-point Likert anchors

ranging from *strongly disagree* to *strong agree*. The choice of a 4-point anchor was borne out of the need to avoid a "neutral" response which would encourage respondents to sit on the fence while answering some of the questions which might have appeared sensitive and might be evaded.

Statistical Analysis

Both descriptive and inferential statistical analyses were performed on the data obtained. Means, standard deviations and correlation coefficients were computed to describe each of the constructs as well as confirming the associations between the variables. In addition, regression analysis was used to present the contribution of the perceived workforce diversity on organisational citizenship behaviour.

RESULTS

Table 1 presents a summary of means, standard deviations, zero-order intercorrelations and alpha coefficients the study constructs. The reliability of the scales was confirmed based on the Cronbach alpha coefficients with none of the scales has an alpha value less than .7 (ranging from .745 to .950) (see Nunnally, 1978).

The results of the descriptive statistics computed and shown in Table 1 revealed that the mean perceived social exclusion was 2.48 ($SD=.607$) which was above the mid value. It therefore implies that respondents feel excluded from the circles of influences in the organisations under study. In addition, the mean value of perceived mistreatment, the second component of perceived discrimination was also above the mid value ($M=2.58$, $SD=.557$). Therefore, it means that participants express a feeling of perceived mistreatment. More importantly, the mean value overall perceived discrimination was

also higher than the mid value ($M=2.49$, $SD=.293$). Finally, the respondents also reported a high degree of contextual performance as the mean value of OCB is significantly higher than the mid value ($M=3.12$, $SD=.245$).

Table 1: Summary of Descriptive Statistics, Intercorrelations and Reliability Statistics

Variable	M	SD	1	2	3	4
1. PWD	2.49	.293	(.950)			
2. EXC	2.48	.607	.887**	(.916)		
3. MIST	2.58	.557	.644**	.622**	(.865)	
4. OCB	3.12	.245	-.272*	-.195*	-.123*	(.819)

Source: Field Survey, 2015

Notes: **Correlation is significant ($p<.01$), *Correlation is significant ($p<.05$), 1-tailed
 PWD=Perceived Workplace Discrimination, EXC=Exclusion, TRE=MISTreatment, OCB=Organisational Citizenship Behaviour, $n=280$. Coefficient alphas for each scale are shown in parentheses on the diagonal ($n=30$).

The results of the zero order correlations revealed that perceived exclusion was negatively correlated with organisational citizenship behaviour ($r = -.195$, $p<.01$), and perceived mistreatment was also inversely related with organisational citizenship

behaviour ($r = -.123$, $p<.01$). There is a negative relationship between total perceived workplace discrimination and organisational citizenship behaviour ($r = -.272$, $p<.01$).

Table 2: Simple Regression Analyses

Variables	β	T	P	R	R ²	F
Model 1						
PWD & OCB	-.272*	31.534	.000	.138	.018	2.438

Source: Field Survey, 2015

Table 2 showed that the model demonstrates a moderate fitness at R value of .138, R² of .018. The regression results showed ($t= 31.534$), which is significant at 0.000, with about 1.8% of the variation in organisational citizenship behaviour or contextual performance explained by perceived workforce diversity. The results of the simple regression analyses revealed that the independent variable (i.e. perceived workplace discrimination) accounted for 1.8% of the variance in the criterion variable (i.e.

organisational citizenship behavior /contextual performance). The results therefore further reinforced the results obtained from the correlational coefficient previously presented. The regression equation model showed that

perceived workplace discrimination is significantly and negatively correlated with contextual performance ($F= 2.438$, $\beta =$, $p <.01$).

DISCUSSION OF FINDINGS

The primary motive for conducting this study was to examine the relationship between perceived workplace discrimination and contextual performance. This assertion was tested by one main hypothesis with two ancillary hypotheses, and findings establish that perceived workplace discrimination as well as the two measures of workplace discrimination, namely: perceived exclusion and perceived mistreatment are negatively related to contextual performance. This therefore led to the acceptance of the three hypotheses formulated. Findings of this study corroborate with the previous studies that workplace discrimination is negatively associated with different measures of employee performance (Ng & Feldman, 2008; Pitts & Jarry, 2007; Sanchez & Brocks, 1998; Stewart & Garcia-Pareto, 2008; Tajfel & Turner, 1986). Specifically, perceived workplace discrimination is negatively correlated with contextual performance or organisational citizenship behaviour. Hence, this study seems to agree with previous studies that organisations whose employees perceive discrimination and inequity tend to experience low extra or citizenship behavior, and therefore contextual performance among its workforce.

MANAGERIAL IMPLICATIONS

Given that it has been established that perceived workplace discrimination is negatively correlated to contextual performance, it might be relevant to improve organisational climate with a view to discouraging any form of discrimination as well as encouraging diversity such that each employee is treated equitably and given to contribute and partake in the decision making process of the organisation. The study generally implies that perceived workplace discrimination and organisational citizenship behaviour (a measure of contextual

performance) is negatively related. It therefore implies that higher education lecturers have tendency to engage in academic citizenship behaviour and achieve contextual performance if they have favourable perception about the work climate in terms of equity and fairness in the entire system. Therefore, perception of inclusion and positive treatment will engender prosocial behaviour among the academic staff.

The management of the institutions and other similar organisations are hereby advised to revisit their policies and procedures for distribution of outcomes such that negative effects of diversity (discrimination, exclusion, and negative treatment) could be minimized. This is particularly important in academic institutions (as well as business sectors) in order to ensure effective functioning of the system by encouraging extra-role behaviour and performance. The following specific recommendations are thus offered:

- i. Managers must make work climate socially and culturally diverse whereby every employee, irrespective of gender, race, socio-cultural affiliation, age, physical ability/disability must be able to perform the required in-role duties and extra/discretionary duties without any feeling of discrimination, exclusion and negative treatment.
- ii. A clear and objective policy toolkit must be designed to ensure that there is a standardised set of criteria and procedures for dealing with, and sharing of benefits among the staff.
- iii. Extra-role or citizenship behaviour such as altruism, volunteering, courtesy, harmony, discipline, civic virtue, coaching and mentoring can be encouraged among academic staff by linking their performance with some indirect perks and benefits (honorarium) as well as promotion.

- iv. Performance standards must be clearly and objectively set and communicated to the employees, such that a clear delineation will exist between what constitutes in-role behaviour and performance and extra-role behaviour and performance.

LIMITATIONS AND DIRECTIONS FOR FUTURE STUDIES

One of the limitations of the study is the fact that data were collected using a cross sectional survey based on self-report questionnaire. Therefore, the incidence of social desirability biases could not be completely repressed. Thus, qualitative research approach (e.g. focus groups) could be employed by future researchers to complement social surveys. In addition, future studies on contextual performance/citizenship behaviour should be carried out within the context of other non-profit making organisations in order to establish whether the phenomenon is as prevalent and important as it is in the profit-oriented organisations.

CONCLUSIONS

The study concludes that there is a negative relationship between perceived workplace discrimination and organisational citizenship behaviour or contextual performance among higher education lecturers. Perceived workplace discrimination is another possible determinant of contextual performance. Put together, it is imperative to manage the actual diversity in multicultural or culturally diverse organisations in order to minimise negative implications of the perceived workplace discrimination and introduce a fair and equitable working climate. This will lead to the display of extra-role or citizenship behaviour, which constitutes a core component of employee contextual performance.

REFERENCES

- Bassett-Jones, N. (2005). The Paradox of Diversity Management, Creativity and Innovation. *Diversity Management and Innovation*, 14(2), 169-175.
- Bateman, T. S., & Organ, D. W. (1983). Job satisfaction and the good soldier: The relationship between affect and employee citizenship. *Academy of Management Journal*, 26, 587-595.
- Bernard, C. I. (1938). *The functions of the executive*, Harvard: Harvard University Press.
- Borman, W. C., & Motowidlo, S. I. (1993). Expanding the criterion domain to include elements of contextual performance. In N. Schmitt, W. C. Borman, & Associates (Eds.), *Personnel selection in organisations*, San Francisco: Jossey- Bass.
- Borman, W. C., & Motowidlo, S. I. (1994). Evidence that task performance should be distinguished from contextual performance. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 79(4), 475-480
- Borman, W. C., & Motowidlo, S. I. (1997). Task performance and contextual performance: The meaning of personnel selection research. *Human Performance*, 10(2), 99-109.
- Byrne, D. (1971). The Attraction Paradigm. In V. G., Girish, (2015). Diversity and Organisational Justice: The Mediating Role of Diversity Management. *American International Journal of Social Science*, 4 (1), 64-72.
- Chattopadhyay. P., Tluchowska, M., & George, E., (2004). Identifying the in-group: A closer look at the influence of demographic dissimilarity on employee

- social identity. *Academy of Management Review*, 29(2) 180-202.
- Cox, J.R., T. (1991). The multicultural organisation. *Academy of Management Executive*, 5(2), 34-47.
- Cox, T. H. & Blake, S. (1991). Managing cultural diversity: Implications for organisational competitiveness. *Academy of Management Executive*, 5(3), 45-56.
- Cox, T., Jr. (1991). The multicultural organisation. *Academy of Management Executive*, 5, 34-47.
- Daft, R. L. (2003). *Management* (6th ed.). London: Thomas Learning.
- Dalal, R. S. (2007). Contextual performance/prosocial behaviour/organisational citizenship behaviour. In S. G. Rogelberg (Ed.), *Encyclopedia of industrial/organisational psychology* (Vol. 1, pp. 103-106). Thousand Oaks: CA: Sage.
- Ely, R. J., & Thomas, D. A. (2001). Cultural diversity at work: The effects of diversity perspectives on work group processes and outcomes. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 46, 229-273.
- Ely, R. J., & Thomas, D. A. (2001). Cultural diversity at work: The effects of diversity perspectives on work group processes and outcomes. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 46, 229-273.
- Fox, S., & Spector, P. E. (1999). A model of work frustration-aggression. *Journal of Organisational Behaviour*, 20, 915-931.
- George, O., Owoyemi, O., & Adegboye, M. (2013). Multinationalisation, globalisation and internationalisation breed diversity: The Nigerian experience. *International Journal of Academic Research in Business and Social Sciences*, 3(12), 1-10.
- George, O., Owoyemi, O., & Adegboye, M. (2014a). Crude oil the forerunner of internationalization, and grandparent of diversity management: The Nigerian experience. *British Journal of Economics, Management & Trade*, 4(2), p. 319-332.
- George, O., Owoyemi, O., & Adegboye, M. (2014b). Meritocracy-0 versus mediocrity-1: and mediocrity won: the case of the Nigerian federal character principle (FCP). *International Review of Social Sciences and Humanities*, 7(1), 46-51.
- Inyang, B. (2007). Managing workforce diversity and inclusiveness in the public service: Going beyond the Nigerian Federal Character Principle (FCP). *South African Journal of Labour Relations*, 31(2), 85-101.
- Jahangir, N. Akbar, M. M. & Haq, N. (2004). Organisational citizenship behaviour: Its nature and antecedents. *BRAC University Journal*, 1(2), 75-85.
- Jamieson, D., & O'Mara, J. (1991). *Managing workforce 2000: Gaining the diversity edge*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Jehn, K., and Bezrukova, K. (2004). A field study of group diversity, workgroup context and performance. *Journal of Organisational Behaviour*, 25, 703-729.
- Kandola, R., & Fullerton, J. (1994). *Diversity in action: Managing the mosaic (Developing strategies)*. UK: CIPD.
- Katz, D. (1964). The motivational basis of organisational behaviour. *Behavioural Science*, 9, 131-146.

- Katz, D., & Kahn, R. L. (1966). *The social psychology of organisations*. New York: Wiley.
- Konovsky, M. A., & Organ, D. W. (1996). Dispositional and contextual determinants of organisational citizenship behaviour. *Journal of Organisational Behaviour*, 17, 253-266.
- Kossek, E. E., & Lobel, S. A. (eds.) (1996). *Managing diversity: human resource strategies for transforming the workplace*. MA, Cambridge: Blackwell.
- Larkey, L. K. (1996a). Toward a theory of communicative interactions in culturally diverse workgroups. *Academy of Management Review*, 21(2), 463-491.
- Larkey, L. K. (1996b). The development and validation of the Workforce Diversity Questionnaire: An instrument to assess interactions in diverse workgroups. *Management Communication Quarterly*, 9(3), 296-338.
- Mamman, A. Kamoche, K., & Bakuwa, R. (2012). Diversity, organisational commitment and organisational citizenship behaviour: An organising framework. *Human Resource Management Review*, 22, 285-302.
- Mannix, E. & Neale, M. (2005). What differences make a difference? The promise and reality of diverse teams in organisations. *Psychological Science in the Public Interest*, 6(2), 31-55.
- Miles, D. E., Borman, W. E., Spector, P. E., & Fox, S. (2002). Building an integrative model of extra role work behaviours: A comparison of counterproductive work behaviour with organisational citizenship behaviour. *International Journal of Selection and Assessment*, 10(1/2), 51-57.
- Milliken, F. J., & Martins, L. L. (1996). Searching for common threads: Understanding the multiple effects of diversity in organisational groups. *Academy of Management Review*, 21, 402-433.
- Mor Barak, M. E. (2005). *Managing diversity: Toward a globally inclusive workplace*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Ng, T. W. H., & Feldman, D. C. (2008). The relationship of age to ten dimensions of job performance. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 93(2), 392-423.
- Nkomo, S. M., & Stewart, M. S. (2006). Diversity entities in organisations. In S. R. Clegg, W. R. Nord & C. Hardy, (Eds) (1996), *Handbook of organisational studies* (2nd ed.), London: Sage.
- Norman, S. M., Avey, J. B., Nimnicht, J. L., Pigeon, N. G. (2009). The interactive effects of psychological capital and organisational identity on employee organisational citizenship and deviance behaviours. *Journal of Leadership & Organisational Studies*, 17(4), 380-391.
- Organ, D. W. (1988). *Organisational Citizenship Behaviour: The Good Soldier Syndrome*. Lexington, MA: Lexington Books.
- Pitts, D., & Jarry, E. (2007). Ethnic diversity and organisational performance: Assessing diversity effects at the managerial and street levels. *International Public Management Journal*, 10(2), 233-254.
- Podsakoff, P. M., & MacKenzie, S. B. (1994). Organisational citizenship behaviours and sales unit effectiveness. *Journal of Marketing Research*, 3, 351-363.

- Robbins, S. P., Millet, P., & Waters-Marsh, T. (2004). *Organisational behaviour* (4th ed.). Australia: Pearson Education.
- Rotundo, M., & Sackett, P. R. (2002). The relative importance of task, citizenship, and counterproductive performance to global ratings of job performance: A policy-capturing approach. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 87(1), 66-80.
- Shore, L. M., & Shore, T. H. (1995). Perceived organisational support and organisational justice. In Cropanzano, R. and Kacamar, K. M. (Eds.), *Organisational politics, justice, and support: managing the social climate of the workplaces*, Quorum books, Westport, CT, 149-154.
- Shore, L. M., & Wyne, S. J. (1993). Commitment and employee behaviour: Comparison of affective and continuance commitment with perceived organisational support. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 78, 774-780.
- Stewart, M. M., & Garcia-Prieto, P. (2008). A relational demography model of workgroup identification: Testing the effects of race, Race dissimilarity, racial identification, and communication behaviour. *Journal of Organisational Behaviour*, 29(5), 657-680.
- Tabachnick, B. G., & Fidell, L. S. (2001). Using multivariate statistics (4th ed.). In J. Pallant, (2007), *SPSS Survival Manual: A step by step guide to data analysis using for Windows* (3rd ed.). US, NY: McGraw-Hill.
- Tajfel, H., & Turner, J. (1986). The social identity theory of inter-group behaviour. In S. Worchel, & W. Austin, (Eds.), *Psychology of inter-group relations* (pp. 7-24). Chicago: Nelson-Hall.
- Ting-Toomey, S. (1993). Communication resourcefulness: An identity negotiation perspective. In R. L. Wiseman & J. Koester (Eds.), *Intercultural communication competence* (72-111), Newbury Park, CA: Sage
- Turner, T. C., Hogg, M. A., Oakes, P. J., Reicher, S. D., & Wetherell, M. C. (1987). Rediscovering the social group: A self-categorization theory. New York: Basil Blackwell Inc.
- Williams, K. Y., & O'Reilly, C. A., III. (1998). Demography and diversity in organisations: A review of 40 years of research. In B. M. Staw & L. L. Cummings (Eds.) (1998), *Research in organisational behaviour* (pp. 77-140). Greenwich, CT: JAI.

Kolawole M. Yusuff is a doctoral researcher at the University of Reading, United Kingdom. He holds an MSc in Organisational Behaviour from University of Lagos. His research interests include leadership dark side, corporate governance, the common good, organisational wellbeing, and workforce diversity.
Email: K.M.Yusuff@pgr.reading.ac.uk

Olusoji J. George is a Senior Lecturer at the Department of Business Administration, University of Lagos. He received his PhD from University of Bradford, United Kingdom. His research interests include culture, employment relations, workforce diversity and organisational politics. Email: golusoji@unilag.edu.ng
