



COMMUNITY RELATIONS AND PRODUCTIVITY OF OIL AND GAS FIRMS IN RIVERS STATE

Onyeka Chinedu¹, Dr. Haniel Eke², Prof. Chinedu Ogbuji³

¹DBA Student University of Port Harcourt Business School, Port Harcourt, Rivers State, Nigeria

²Department of Marketing, University of Port Harcourt, Choba, Rivers State, Nigeria

³Department of Marketing, University of Port Harcourt, Choba, Rivers State, Nigeria

ABSTRACT

Maintaining healthy community relations in oil and gas companies is a prerequisite for organizational success. This study aimed at assessing the impact of good community relations on the productivity of oil and gas firms in Rivers State. This study used a cross-sectional research design. The purposive sampling technique was used to select the sample size of two thousand, seven hundred and fifty-two (2,752) from seven (7) selected oil companies. The instrument used was a questionnaire. The Krejcie and Morgan were used to get a sample size of 378. The findings also revealed that strong community relations create a pleasant atmosphere within the work environment, motivation, and company rules. The study recommends that in developing the socialization feature of the organization, effort should be channeled towards the effective flow of information and communication across various facets of the organization in a manner that effectively integrates and involves all organizational units, stakeholders, and elements in situations and the functions of the organization.

KEYWORDS: *Community Relations, Productivity, Socialization, Social Responsibility, Community Involvement*

1. INTRODUCTION

Productivity in any sector of a growing economy is ignited by a good number of supportive platforms that makes it real and achievable. These platforms can be seen in the realm of machines, efforts, resources, environment, and opportunities. The industrial man is the labor that changes resources into partial or finished products and discovers things that create demand for society. The functional prerequisite for any activity to become a product for the marketplace is that labor must speak action. Therefore, it is apparent that actions of discovery and conversion of raw resources into any demand state are a function of communication. The organization plays an influencing role in establishing social or business relationships with the host community or maintaining the philosophy of such organizations. Community relations cannot be accomplished if the parties to the relationship are not connected in any way through communication. Host communities of business become aware of the plans and policies of operating firms through constant dialogue and interactions.

Several organizations including MNEs (Multi-National Enterprises) unconsciously have fallen into the problem of excessive expenditure above their budgeted financial obligation due to their inability to relate to their immediate environment. Some levels of social networks contribute to the harmonization of interests of both the community and the organization. In achieving a social relationship that is expected to enhance performance effectiveness for the organization and community, all members of the business community must show some understanding of team working and service. So many enterprises have forced themselves out of business due to gross ignorance of their simple direct community relations which may never have attracted any significant portion of their total expenditure.

The community environment can strongly influence business success when a community or neighborhood deteriorates, the property value goes down tax revenues decline, the local market shrink unemployment falls off, and profit sag, while at the same time cost of relief welfare, policy, and other municipal services around; so for purely economic reasons, there is ample satisfaction for business to help the communities. In accordance with the above writing in the public relations, quarterly as cited by Kogan (1977), observed that community relations programmers were originally concerned to help a company become now a good employer, neighbor, and taxpayer and purchase local products, (Onabanjo, 2005; Okechukwu, 2012).



A broad approach to community relations does not mean changing the old pattern but simply finding an additional way to serve. Organizations have been extending the scope and purpose of their community relations programs. More and more companies are going beyond the immediate problem of attracting and keeping the best employees as well as explaining themselves to local citizens, (Iza, 2012). They are directing their focus on solving problems that one important to their community's future welfare. Goodwill, as we know is a good asset of a company and contribution to its eventual success, (Osememe, 2012). A Company's success is dependent on the ability of its management to deal simultaneously with sever elements of the Company's environment which offer ways by which changes take place in the business world and analysis of the decisions that have been made to arrive at strategic options, (Adeyemo, & Alimi, 2013).

Some of these success factors lie within the firm, but as a firm and the overall economic nature, external factors or elements tend to be more impact on the business operations. The relationship between internal and external factors (elements) of the environment of a firm is crucial in nature to its success. It is therefore necessary to know if a decision will enhance the welfare of both employees and host communities than it was before or if there is a need to take another line of action, (Ulconu, 2013). Mutual relationships have been an area of topical interest to most communities and organizations within the country and around the globe. Hence, any firm that has achieved fits with its environment is far more likely to be successful. This is pertinent as members of the public at times measure the impact of the company on society in terms of their cordiality with their host communities and responsiveness to the development of the area. Community relations are more intangible, for a variety of reasons an organization may (or may not) be regarded as (a good citizen). Then when a special policy protects a variance or perhaps prompt resolution of a complaint is needed, the opposition does not automatically arise most time. Good community relation leads to a permissive situation of organization at productivity, but during crisis times, the right to continue operating may be at stake.

Due to constant changes in environmental factors and needing to boost organizational productivity, there is a need to create or establish a mutual relationship with the host communities, since they are of much concern these days to the businessmen/women as sometimes their activities help to shape and direct the life within the communities this, the essence of community and organizational relationship cannot be overemphasized or neglected of management entails high productivity. In this light, the study seeks to examine the relationship between community relations and the productivity of oil and gas firms in Rivers State.

2. LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1 Community Relations

Community relations are one of the main task areas of public relations, relating to building relationships and an atmosphere of mutual understanding with the organization's communities. Community relations are most often said to be local, but activities in this area may also have a regional, national, or even international dimension. It is an area of activity that plays a role of a bond between public relations programs and the implementation of corporate social responsibility. While defining community relations as "a series of mutually beneficial activities conducted in partnership with one or more shareholders, which are activities aimed at shaping the company's reputation, presenting it as a cooperative member of the community", it is easy to find similarities to the principles of socially responsible business (Tworzydło et al., 2020; Pavlů, 2013). Lattimore (2004) describes community relations as a public relations function, which is an institution's planned active and continuing participation with and within a community to maintain and enhance its environment to the benefit of both the institution and the community.

Today organizations must cooperate as well as compete to succeed. Even the oil and gas companies compete to succeed. It is not hidden that the indigenous oil and gas firms "gulp" a great hectare of land in the oil-producing communities, they often get good locations, maintain good rapport with the community and carry out some social responsibilities to enjoy support the smooth operation of the business. A lot of innovations have been introduced into community relations. The new collaborative approach is one strategy where organizations become part of the community creating win-win solutions that result in a healthier bottom line and benefit stakeholders and society as a whole. Lattimore (2004) points out that the key to any effective community relations program is the positive, socially responsible action to help the community on the part of the organization. The lesson for the organization is simple. Regional, national and international concerns may preoccupy one, but don't forget the people in the community.

Effective community relations depend on recognizing the interdependence of oil and gas companies with their communities. The cycle begins with people wanting to live in good communities and bringing their talents and skills to the local labor market. Oil and gas firms hire these employees who help the organization make good and realize its objectives. The organization then commits to making the community an even better place to live. Good community relations aid in the security of what the organization needs from the community and in



providing what the community expects, it helps to protect organizational investments and improves the general operating climate for the organization. Positive community relations can affect workers' productivity when organizations provide cheap and affordable health services and education programs for members of the community. Favourable community attitudes may influence workers' attitudes toward the organizations.

2.1.1 Socialization

Socialization has been defined as “the learning process by which newcomers develop attitudes and behavior that are necessary to function as a fully-fledged member of the organization”. Thus, organizational socialization is ongoing for individuals, showing a greater intensity when they become insiders (from outsiders) and of a - lesser intensity when employees are being promoted or transferred. Organizational socialization is particularly stressful when individuals initiate their work life. The better this process is managed, the earlier an individual can adjust to his / her working environment. Socialization is also considered an ongoing management concern for organizations, as new employees are hired, and some are rotated between different functional areas or promoted, Djabi (2014). A majority of organizational socialization literature focused on the outcomes related to the organization such as organizational commitment, job performance, and other outcomes.

Socialization, a research area of organizational behavior (Okon, Frank, & Antigha, 2012), is substantially a learning process. Taormina (2009) suggests that in the early studies of socialization, the former researchers attached less importance to human needs, whereas the latest authors in the field have ignored employee motivation, with a strong emphasis on employee behavior. An important question is about the timing of organizational socialization. When does organizational socialization show signs of the beginning? According to Feldman (1970), the starting point is at the time of first contact (e.g., the first interview session) during, an anticipatory stage, whereas, some other authors, (Ashorfh, Sluss, & Harrison, 2007) refer to long-term socialization of an individual entering the organization. These authors are mostly concerned with what happens in the life of an individual from the beginning to the end including the social patterns in their family (e.g., if they are raised in a family with lower or higher income levels). Although Ashorfh and colleagues (2007) are only concerned with the specific organization or job an individual is trying to acquire.

In some cases, others reported the range as never-ending because an individual is always in a learning process to contribute better to the organization (Harvey, Wheeler, Halbesleben, & Buckley, 2010). Though the above-mentioned estimates are an outcome of the studies, there is still more work to be done, on how to empirically measure the time of an organization's socialization process. The last well-known theory exported from management literature for explaining socialization and its procedure is “social identity theory”. Social identity theory is where individuals are willing to develop their own “situated identity” (Ashforth, Sluss, Harrison, 2007) for their new job. Research by Ibarra and Barbulescu (2010) suggests a notion of identity work from the individual to build situational identity. This involves creating a whole narrative that makes sense to others. It is to link the past and the future in such a way that it is harmonious and sense-making for changing environment (Ibarra & Barbulescu, 2010).

2.1.2 Social Responsibility

Corporate engagement with society, also termed social responsibility or corporate social responsibility (CSR), has become a commonly used term in contemporary society and refers to one process by which an organization expresses and develops its ‘corporate culture’ and social consciousness (Rupp et al, 2006; Calderon, 2011). Social responsibility has been receiving lots of attention from various backgrounds of researchers worldwide (Ismail, & Nooriani, 2011), it has attracted a great deal of attention over the past decade (Zu & Song 2008) and according to some researchers, has gathered great momentum over the past number of years and is now regarded to be at its most prevalent (Sweeney 2007). Therefore, business leaders, government officials, and academics are focusing more and more attention on the concept of “social responsibility” (Reinhardt et al 2008).

According to Reinhardt et al (2008), one of the challenges of examining the concept of social responsibility is identifying a consistent and sensible definition from among a bewildering range of concepts and definitions that have been proposed in the literature. While Zu & Song (2008) expressed that a large number of companies appear increasingly engaged in a serious effort to define and integrate social responsibility into all aspects of their businesses. Hopkins (2004); McWilliams et al (2005) Sriramesh et al (2007) and Ismail and Nooriani (2011) wrote that a variety of definitions of social responsibility have been proposed but a fundamental problem in the field of social responsibility is that no clear, universally accepted definition of the concept is given and there is no overall agreement or consensus in the ideal meaning of social responsibility making theoretical development and measurement difficult.



Bénabou & Tirole (2009) asserted that social responsibility is somewhat of a “catch-all” phrase for an array of different concepts. An analysis of social responsibility must therefore clarify its exact meaning, and in particular the presumed impact of social responsibility on the cost of capital. Some social responsibility advocates argue that there is a business case for good corporate behavior, while others discuss it in terms of sacrificing some profit in the quest for the social good. Abd Rahim, et al (2011) quoted that social responsibility is a concept whereby organizations consider the interests of society by taking responsibility for the impact of their activities on stakeholders as well as the environment. This obligation is seen to extend beyond the statutory obligation to comply with legislation and sees organizations voluntarily taking further steps to improve the quality of life of employees and their families as well as the local community and society at large.

2.1.3 Community Involvement

The phrase community relations is commonly used to describe the communication phenomena between a company, an organization, or a government and a specific community. According to Lakin and Scheubel (2010) since the beginning of the 21st century, community relations have become a more concrete concept most in use by companies, organizations, and governments to describe their involvement with communities. Businesses and other organizational entities have long practiced community relations to nurture positive, cooperative relations between themselves and the public (Kane et al, 2009). Community relations, as a practice, emerged from the enacted practices of public relations and communications (Kane et al, 2009), and borrows from disciplines such as strategic communication, marketing communication, political science, and sociology. Community relations underscore the interactions between the business/organization and a section of the public it has direct contact with (Zandvliet & Anderson, 2009; Kane et al, 2009; Lakin & Scheubel, 2010).

Before starting any community development, a community requires to be strong in unity, especially in this post-modern era, where the nature and concept of the community are changing frequently (Poppo & Quinney, 2002). Theodori (2005) assumes that the idea of a community can be territory-based or territory-free. This applies to multiple perspectives and exists within the attention of the target community. That community should not be limited to the terrain or surrounding entertainment settings and effects but should extend to how its individuals are connected through development measures (Okazaki, 2008). The definition proposes that a community is a framework composed of people, effects, and actions. Nevertheless, the community development theory proposed by Bhattacharyya (2004) puts community development as a solidarity and community-building action and is integrated into the system. The community displayed by solidarity has a clear social design and collective identities. Also, the community is related to their autonomy of economy and the use of these resources. This reasonable structure proves that the industry, represented by unwavering and organized work, has increased a lot, and the important consideration of the network in terms of outlining and meeting community goals.

Community relations refers to the various ways or methods companies use to connect, establish and maintain a mutually beneficial relationship with the communities where they operate or do business (Nweze, 2013). The underlying principles of community relations are that when a company accepts its civic responsibility and takes an active interest in the well-being of its community and turn gains several benefits that are long term. Good community relations activity is both beneficial to substantial multinational companies as well as small companies. For community relations to be effective, they should have the following goals

- Be a recognized community partner
- lead positive change in community issues by the community
- Be approachable for community dialogue and be a recognized environmental leader

2.2 Productivity

The concept of productivity, generally defined as the relation between output and input, has been available for over two centuries and applied in many different circumstances on various levels of aggregation in the economic system. It is argued that productivity is one of the basic variables governing economic production activities, perhaps the most important one. However, at the same time as productivity is seen as one of the most vital factors affecting a manufacturing company’s competitiveness, researchers argue that productivity is often relegated to the second rank, and neglected or ignored by those who influence production processes.

The value that knowledge management adds lies in increasing individual, team, and organizational efficiency through the implementation of knowledge management concepts. The higher the level of capturing knowledge (explicit or tacit) with information technology tools, the better the KM result (Lee, & Choi, 2003). Productivity is a combination of precision and optimal use of manpower and material resources available and efficiency is determined through performance. Efficiency and effectiveness are two important components of productivity and they are normally affected by different factors. Simply, productivity is shown as a ratio of



output to input as a fraction. But productivity in the organization is a series of coordinated and planned actions to improve the program and better use of talents, facilities, spaces, and places. These practices are designed and implemented in the modern program (Tavari, Sokhakeian, & Mirnejad, 2008).

Past research from Holan & Phillips (2005) and Becker (2008) concluded that because the environment is constantly changing, an individual's knowledge developed by guiding the firm through its culture is likely to be time-bound and may lose its relevance and value over time. Akgün et al. (2006) argued that an urgent change in customer needs may initially lead design engineers to deny these changes are needed and to refuse to alter original plans to avoid additional stress. For organizational innovation and competitiveness to take place at the organizational level, some cultural barriers such as knowledge culture should be introduced to ensure that organizational members have adequate knowledge and experience to perform their responsibilities.

Many studies have demonstrated the positive effect of organizational culture on organizational innovation such as those of Hernández-Mogollón et al. (2010). A truly innovative firm must be embedded in a strong culture that stimulates engagement in innovative behavior (Santos-Vijande & Alvarez-Gonzalez, 2007). According to Barney (1986) and several other researchers, a firm's culture, is defined as a complex set of values, beliefs, assumptions, and symbols, that shape how a firm conducts its business and can be a source of sustained competitiveness, so it constitutes a strategic resource. As stated earlier, the organizational main aim is to make sure that employees are aware of the fact that knowledge sharing is in their interest as well as organizational interests.

2.3 Theoretical Framework

Social Exchange Theory

Introduced by Emerson (1962) in social exchanges, the concept of power is a central component of the SET. Since then, the concept has attracted the attention of several researchers who have discussed the influence of actors' level of power on the social exchange process (e.g., Molm, 1991). Ap (1992) argues that the inclusion of power in social exchanges is necessary because it determines the partners' ability to take advantage of the outcome of the exchange. Power in a social exchange relationship is defined as the ability of one actor to influence the outcome of another actor's behavior or experience (Wrong, 1979). Dalh (1968) refers to power in modern social science as "subsets of relations among social units such that the behaviors of one or more units depend in some circumstances on the behavior of other units" (p. 407). Thus, power can be conceptualized as the capacity to attain ends, usually to produce intended effects on others. It is also important to note that power in social exchanges is not used in the context of authoritarian rule, but rather in a way to achieve mutual benefits between the actors involved in the exchange process (Ap, 1992)

Social exchange theory is a broad conceptual paradigm that spans several social scientific disciplines, such as management, social psychology, and anthropology. Despite its name, it is not a single theory but is better understood as a family of conceptual models (Cropanzano & Mitchell, 2005). In this regard, all social exchange theories share several common features. All social exchange theories treat social life as involving a series of sequential transactions between two or more parties (Mitchell, Cropanzano, & Quisenberry, 2012). Resources are exchanged through a process of reciprocity, whereby one party tends to repay the good (or sometimes bad) deeds of another party (Gergen, 1969; Gouldner, 1960). The quality of these exchanges is sometimes influenced by the relationship between the actor and the target (Blau, 1964). Economic exchanges tend to be quid pro quo and involve less trust and more active monitoring, whereas social exchanges tend to be open-ended and involve greater trust and flexibility (Organ, 1988, 1990). Building on these straightforward ideas, social exchange theory is one of the most enduring and widely used conceptual frameworks (Cropanzano & Mitchell, 2005).

Social exchange is inherently a joint task. This point is implied by the role of interdependence in exchange theories (Emerson 1972b; Thibaut and Kelley 1978). Homans' (1950) concept of "activities" as a fundamental dimension in interaction or group settings implicitly poses the issue of how to join the activities in which individuals engage. Examples of joint tasks are a merger of two organizations, two parents deciding how to raise a child, or a homeowners association deciding whether to undertake the repair of common property. Exchanges occur presumably because doing something jointly with another is likely to yield better rewards or payoffs than acting alone or not acting at all. Although all exchange—or social interaction, for that matter—entails a degree of jointness, this varies with the social structure.

2.4 Community Relations and Productivity

Touitou, & Helen, (2019) examines the relevance of corporate social responsibility and community relations on national development in this 21 century in Nigeria. The concept of corporate social responsibility emerged from the voice that required the business community to examine the ethical or moral principles to



minimize problems in the business environment and maximize the public good. The finding of the study emphasizes that it is evident to corporate bodies that unless there is a conducive atmosphere in their locations, they cannot operate successfully. And recommends that the company official should understand the geo-political, geo-economic, and geo-social behaviors of the community concerned, to foster harmonious co-existence. Also, should not overlook the role of community relations in creating, promoting, and sustaining a good community environment. Therefore, it concludes that to effect proper development in Nigeria, corporate social responsibility and the community relations practice should be the organizational watchword to foster growth and development in Nigeria

Nwinyokpugi, & Saale, (2011) investigated the effect of community and social relations on organizational productivity, especially in the era of constant agitation for recognition and involvement by host communities in operating organizations. The study took a particularistic examination of Shell Petroleum Development Company, Port Harcourt because of its major position in the upstream oil sector of Nigeria's economy and Kpean, Yorla Oil Field a host community in Khana Local Government Area of Rivers State, Nigeria. The Public and Government Affairs Department of the company which interfaces with host community representatives was investigated in this study. Thirty-two (32) employees including senior and junior cadre of this unit of SPDC and 16 randomized respondents of the Kpean Community were studied using three result-driven research questions and interviews. The study revealed that social relationship that promises improvement to the lives of the host community, confidence building, and trust are some attributes that endear the operating firms to their host community. And community relations, the study revealed, contribute immensely to the degree of productivity and performance on the part of the company. Recommendations which included but were not limited to adequate training of community relations managers on the importance of better harmonious community-company relationships, and a better understanding of communities through adequate communication skills are critical to the success of a company.

3. METHODOLOGY

This study will adopt the cross-sectional form of the quasi-experimental research design. A preliminary investigation shows that a total of 23 oil and gas companies exist and operate in Port Harcourt, the study will however focus on 7 oil and gas companies with deep water operations. Two thousand, seven hundred and fifty-two (2,752) full-time employees are in the (7) selected oil companies (see appendix), the firms were selected on the basis that they have operations in Nigerian deep waters. The determination of the sample size was done using the Krejcie and Morgan (1970) table and the result was 378. The purposive sampling technique was adopted largely because of the nature and characteristics of the respondents. Taking into account the different sizes of the firms, we used Bowley's formula to proportionately allocate the 378 cases to the 7 firms. The researcher and two research assistants administered the questionnaire by hand and electronically. Due to the distance between the two locations of the firms, the respondents were given time within which to fill out the questionnaire. Pearson's Product Moment Correlation Coefficient was used to analyze the data obtained from the

4. ANALYSIS & RESULTS

Out of the 378 questionnaire copies distributed only 344 copies were successfully retrieved. All retrieved copies were further cleaned, coded, and assessed for outliers, missing values, and other error issues likely to bias the outcomes of the analysis. Assessment results revealed that all retrieved 344 copies were considered admissible in the analysis of the study. The analysis of the univariate distribution of the variables – community relations, and productivity, focused on assessing the manifestations and evidence of the variables within the context of the study.



Community Relations

Table 4.1 Distribution of Properties of Community Relations

		Mean	Std. Deviation
Socialization X = 2.0709 SD = 0.25019	Socialization concerns the acquisition of the social knowledge and skills	2.3343	.47243
	There is a learning process that develops attitudes and behavior that are necessary in functioning with the host communities.	2.0000	.00000
	Improving relations with the community	2.3401	.47444
	Ability to adapt to community norms that allow for smooth business operation	1.6657	.47243
	Participate in social activities that benefits the community	2.0145	.81696
Social Responsibility X = 4.1320 SD = 0.09489	The organization has a corporate engagement with the society	4.0000	.00000
	Have made donations in recent years	3.9797	1.42331
	Engagement in actions that appear to further social good	3.6744	.46927
	Waste treatment and disposal beyond legal obligations	4.3401	.47444
Community Involvement X = 4.3988 SD = 0.16448	Partaking in charitable activities and events	4.6657	.47243
	The organization partakes in collaborative activities that benefit the community	4.6599	.47444
	Involvement in required service to benefit communities	4.0000	.00000
	Perform environmental management programs	4.6599	.47444
	Provide information and reassurance on empowering residents and communities	4.6744	.46927
	Engage in community dialogue for the benefit of the community	4.0000	.00000

Source: Survey Data, 2022

Distributions demonstrate low mean coefficients for the items of socialization but high and evident distributions for items for the dimensions of social responsibility and community involvement, suggesting variations in the experiences and perspectives of participants about the manifestation of community relations. The result indicates weak distribution for socialization but higher and more evident levels of manifestation and evidence of social responsibility and community involvement. The evidence demonstrates poor practices reflecting socialization but evidence of practices or actions geared toward social responsibility and community involvement.

Productivity

Table 4.2 Distribution for Properties of Productivity

		Mean	Std. Deviation
Productivity X = 3.9971 SD = 0.16339	Use indicators from competitive ability of early warning system to assess success or failure	4.3343	.47243
	Defined appreciate consumers' needs and expectations helps the organization determine how to best meet them	3.6657	.47243
	Development of new channels for products and services offered by our corporation is an on-going process.	3.6599	.47444
	We constantly emphasize development of particular and patent products.	4.3256	.46927
	We build on advancing distinct product features for our markets	4.0000	.30220

Source: Survey Data, 2022

The evidence generated from the assessment demonstrates evidence disparity in the views of respondents about the productivity of the organizations – with the majority of the participants affirming the manifestations of the indicators. This shows the majority of the cases identify their organizations as expressing substantial levels of productivity.

In testing the relationship between the variables, Pearson's Product Moment Correlation (PPMC) coefficient is adopted. This choice is primarily due to the transformation of the scales from ordinal to interval scales, as well as the nature of the data, which is continuous in nature.



Test of Hypotheses

H0₁. There is no significant relationship between socialization and productivity.

Table 4.3: The relationship between socialization and productivity

		Socialization	Productivity
Socialization	Pearson Correlation	1	.982**
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.000
	N	344	344
Productivity	Pearson Correlation	.982**	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	
	N	344	344

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

Source: Survey Data, 2022

The test on test for relationship between socialization and productivity is revealed to be significant. Results indicate that at a rho = 0.982 and a P = 0.000; socialization significantly influences productivity. On this basis, previously stated hypotheses are rejected as the study reveals that there is a significant relationship between socialization and marketing efficiency.

H0₂. There is no significant relationship between social responsibility and productivity

Table 4.4: The relationship between social responsibility and productivity

		Social Responsibility	Productivity
Social Responsibility	Pearson Correlation	1	.867**
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.000
	N	344	344
Productivity	Pearson Correlation	.867**	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	
	N	344	344

Source: Survey Data, 2022

The test on test for the relationship between social responsibility and productivity is all revealed to be significant. Results indicate that at a rho = 0.867 and a P = 0.000; social responsibility significantly contributes toward productivity. On this basis, previously stated hypotheses are rejected as the study reveals that there is a significant relationship between social responsibility and productivity.

H0₃. There is no significant relationship between social responsibility and productivity

Table 4.13: The relationship between community involvement and productivity

		Community Involvement	Productivity
Community Involvement	Pearson Correlation	1	.508**
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.000
	N	344	344
Productivity	Pearson Correlation	.508**	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	
	N	344	344

Source: Survey Data, 2022

The test on test for relationship between community involvement and productivity are all revealed to be significant. Results indicate that at a rho = 0.508 and a P = 0.000; community involvement significantly contributes toward productivity. On this basis, previously stated hypotheses are rejected as the study reveals that there is a significant relationship between community involvement and productivity.



The relationship between socialization and productivity is observed to be significant. This reiterates the position of Murphy and Wang (2006), who argued that socialization implies that the ultimate aim of a business is to create value for its stakeholders beyond just customers. The relationship between social responsibility and productivity is revealed to be significant. The findings demonstrate the significance of social responsibility to the behavior and market disposition of the organization. According to Srour (2005), capitalist countries and companies navigate with ease through morally ambiguous situations, as self-interest is usually regarded as the engine of the economy. The relationship between community involvement and productivity is revealed to be significant, with community involvement, contributing positively to outcomes such as marketing efficiency, marketing effectiveness, and productivity. This is because virtual community and network community platforms are rising, and members can share their life and experience via these community platforms (Rheingold, 2000; Morandin, Bagozzi, & Bergami, 2013).

5. CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATION

This study has identified community relations as a significant predictor of productivity. In this vein the following conclusions are stated:

- i. Socialization as a dimension of the organization advances processes and actions which in turn impact the productivity of the organization.
- ii. Social responsibility allows for the focus on social actions of the organizations in a way that is responsive and as such contributes towards its performance and leads to outcomes such as productivity.
- iii. Community involvement offers cooperation and support from leadership units in innovative actions as such advances the competitiveness of the organization and leads to outcomes such as innovativeness, service quality, and delivery reliability.

The following recommendations are put forward given the conclusions:

- i. In developing the socialization feature of the organization, effort should be channeled towards the effective flow of information and communication across various facets of the organization in a manner that effectively integrates and involves all organizational units, stakeholders, and elements in situations and the functions of the organization.
- ii. Actions or behavior of social responsibility of the organization should be adapted and patterned towards the features or attributes that characterize the environment or context of the organization.
- iii. The development of community involvement can anchor the decision-making processes and level of participation which should be adapted to allow for stronger levels of inclusivity, correspondence with stakeholders, and improved communication.

REFERENCES

1. Abd Rahim, R., Jalaludin, F.W., & Tajuddin, K., (2011) "The Importance of Corporate Social Responsibility on Consumer Behavior in Malaysia", *Asian Academy of Management Journal*, 16(1), 119-139
2. Adeyemo, O., & Alimi, A., (2013) "An Assessment of the impact of Corporate Social Responsibility on Nigerian Society: The examples of banking and communication industries". *Universal Journal of Marketing and Business Research* 1(1)17-43.
3. Akgun, A.E., Lynn, G.S. & Byrne, J.C., (2006) Antecedents and consequences of unlearning in new product development teams. *Journal of Product Innovation Management*; 23(1): 73-88.
4. Ashforth, B. E., Sluss, D. M., & Harrison, S. H. (2007). Socialization in organizational contexts. *International review of industrial and organizational psychology*, 22, 1
5. Barney, J.B., (1986) *Organizational culture: can it be a source of sustained competitive advantage?* *Academy of Management Review*; 11(3): 656-665.
6. Becker, K., (2008) *Unlearning as a driver of sustainable change and innovation: Three Australian case studies.* *International Journal of Technology Management*; 42(1-2): 89-106.
7. Bénabou, R., & Tirole, J., (2009) "Individual and Corporate Social Responsibility" WP, 09-109, Research Group: Behavioral and Experimental Economics November 11, 2009, Toulouse School of Economics
8. Bhattacharyya, J. (2004). *Theorizing community development.* *Community Development*, 34(2), 5-34.
9. Bishop, J.W., & Scott, K.D. (2000). *An examination of organizational and team commitment in a self-directed team environment.* *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 85:439-450.
10. Borza M., (2011) "Some Considerations Regarding the Corporate Social Responsibility Models in Romania", *International Journal of Business and Management Studies* 3(2), 2011, pp. 191-200
11. Calderon, M., (2011) "CSR in Latin America and South East Asia Analysis of the Corporate Communication of Top Local Companies", *International Research Journal of Finance and Economics*, 2(3)
12. Cropanzano, R., & Mitchell, M.S. (2005). *Social exchange theory: An interdisciplinary review.* *Journal of Management*, 31: 874-900.



13. Harvey, J., Wheeler, A., Halbesleben, J. R., & Buckley, M. R. (2010). *How did you figure that out? Employee learning during socialization. In Research in personnel and human resources management (pp. 167-200). Emerald Group Publishing Limited.*
14. Hernández-Mogollon, R., Cepeda-Carrión, G., Cegarra-Navarro, J.G. & Leal-Millán, A., (2010) *The role of cultural barriers in the relationship between open-mindedness and organizational innovation. Journal of Organizational Change Management; 23(4): 360-376.*
15. Hopkins, M., (2004) "Corporate social responsibility: an issues paper" Policy Integration Department, Working Paper No. 27 World Commission on the Social Dimension of Globalization International Labor Office Geneva
16. Ibarra, H., & Barbulescu, R. (2010). *Identity as narrative: Prevalence, effectiveness, and consequences of narrative identity work in macro work role transitions. Academy of management review, 35(1), 135-154.*
17. Ismail, T., & Nooriani, T., (2011) "Corporate Social Responsibility: The Influence of the Silver Book", *International Journal of Business and Management Studies, 3(2) 371-383*
18. Iza, G., (2012) *The Impact of Corporate Social Responsibility on Consumer Purchase Decision. Journal of Educational and Social Research 2(9), 106- 111.*
19. Kane, G.C., Fichman, R.G., Gallagher, J. & Glaser, J. (2009). 'Community Relations 2.0: With the rise of real-time social media, the rules about community outreach have changed' *Harvard Business Review, 87(11), p.45-50.*
20. Ladd, D., & Henry, R. A. 2000. *Helping coworkers and helping the organization: The role of support perceptions, exchange ideology, and conscientious-ness. Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 30:2028–2049*
21. Lakin, N. & Scheubel, V. (2010). 'Corporate Community Involvement: The Definitive Guide to Maximizing Your Business' *Societal Engagement', Greenleaf Publishing, UK*
22. Lee, H. & Choi, B., (2003) *Knowledge management enablers, processes, and organizational performance: An integrative view and empirical examination. Journal of management information systems 20(1): 179-228*
23. McWilliams A., Siegel, D.S. & Wright, P.M. (2005) "Corporate Social Responsibility: Strategic Implications", *Working Papers in Economics, Number 0506, May 2005, Department of Economics, Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute, 110 8th Street, Troy, NY*
24. Miller, J.I., & Guthrie, D., (2007) "The Rise of Corporate Social Responsibility: An Institutional Response to Labor, Legal, and Shareholder Environments", *Institutional Determinants of CSR, Stern School of Business, New York University, 40 W. 4th St., 7-22, New York, NY 10012*
25. Mitchell, M.S., Cropanzano, R., & Quisenberry, D. (2012). *Social exchange theory, exchange resources, and interpersonal relationships: A modest resolution of theoretical difficulties. In K. Tornblom & A. Kazemi (Eds.), Handbook of social resource theory: Theoretical extensions, empirical insights, and social applications: 99–118. New York, NY: Springer.*
26. Nwinyokpugi, P., & Saale, B., (2011). *Organizational Productivity: The community and Social Process Perspective. International Journal of Management Sciences. 3. 55-61.*
27. Okazaki, E. (2008). *A community-based tourism model: Its conception and use. Journal of sustainable tourism, 16(5), 511-529.*
28. Okechukwu, C. I. (2012). *Corporate Social Responsibility and Organizational Effectiveness of Insurance Companies in Nigeria. Retrieved from [http:// www.emeraldinsight.com/1526-5943.htm](http://www.emeraldinsight.com/1526-5943.htm).*
29. Okon B. A., Frank A., & Antigha B. U. (2012). *Industrial socialization and role performance in contemporary organization. International Journal of Business, Humanities, and Technology, 2(5), 129-136.*
30. Onabajo, O. (2005). *Community relations in Action, Concept publications Limited*
31. Osememe, O.F., (2012). *Corporate Social Responsibility Practices in Mobile Telecommunications Industry in Nigeria. European Journal of Business and Management 4(8)149-157.*
32. Pavlu, D. (2013). *Marketing and Marketing Communication in SMEs. European Research Studies Journal, 16(4), 113-126. doi.org/10.35808/ersj/407.*
33. Popple, K., & Quinney, A. (2002). *Community development theory and practice: A case study from the United Kingdom. Community Development, 33(1), 71-85*
34. Reinhardt, F.L., Stavins, R.N. & Vietor, R.H.K. (2008) "Corporate Social Responsibility Through an Economic Lens" *Resources for the Future, April 2008, RFF - DP 08-12, 1616 P St. NW Washington, DC 20036, 202-328-5000 www.rff.org*
35. Rupp, Deborah E.; Ganapathi, Jyoti; Aguilera, Ruth V, and Williams, Cynthia A (2006) "Employee Reactions to Corporate Social Responsibility: An Organizational Justice Framework", *Journal of Organizational Behaviour, 27, 537–543 (2006), Wiley Inter Science www.interscience.wiley.com*
36. Santos-Vijande, M.L. & Alvarez-Gonzalez, L.I. (2007) *TQM and firms' performance: An EFQM excellence model research-based survey. International Journal of Business Science and Applied Management; 2(2): 21-41.*
37. Sharma S., Sharma J. & Devi A. (2009) "Corporate Social Responsibility: The Key Role of Human Resource Management", *Business Intelligence Journal, January 2009*
38. Sriramesh, Krishnamurthy; Chew Wee Ng; Soh Ting Ting & Luo Wanyin (2007) *Corporate Social Responsibility and Public Relations: Perceptions and Practices in Singapore, Paper submitted to the 14th International Public Relations Symposium, Bled, Slovenia, July 3 - 5, 2007*
39. Sweeney, Lorraine (2007) "Corporate social responsibility in Ireland: Barriers and Opportunities Experienced by SMEs when Undertaking CSR" *Corporate Governance, 7(4), 516-523, Emerald Group Publishing Limited, ISSN 1472-0701*



40. Taormina, R. J. (2009). *Organizational socialization: the missing link between employee needs and organizational culture*. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 24(7), 650- 676. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1108/02683940910989039>
41. Tavari, M., Sokhakeian, M., & Mirnejad, SA. (2008) *Identification and prioritize the factors affecting the productivity of human resources with the madm technique*. *Journal of Industry Management*; 1(1): 102
42. Tepper, B. J., & Taylor, E. C. (2003). *Relationships among supervisors' and subordinates' procedural justice perceptions and organizational citizenship behaviors*. *Academy of Management Journal*, 46: 97–105.
43. Touitou, T.C., & Helen, O.C., (2019) *Corporate Social Responsibility and Sustainable Development: The Role of Community Relations*. *New Media and Mass Communication* 83(51)
44. Ulconu, C., (2013). *Three Dimensional Aspects of Corporate Social Responsibility*. *Journal of Business and Economics*, 3 (1).
45. Zandvliet, L. & Anderson, M.B. (2009). *'Getting it Right: Making Corporate–Community Relations Work'*, Greenleaf Publishing, UK
46. Zu, L., & Song, L., (2008) *"Determinants of Managerial Values on Corporate Social Responsibility: Evidence from China"*, IZA Discussion Paper No. 3449, April 2008 Forschungsinstitut, Zur Zukunft der Arbeit, Institute for the Study of Labor