The Impact of Pro-Social Behaviours on Workplace Performance and Sustainability of University Administration

Francis Ezieshi Monyei [1], Anthony Aniagboso Igwe [1], Edith Ogoegbunam Onyeanu [2], Lovlyn Ekeowa Kelvin-Iloafu [1] and Wilfred Isioma Ukpere [3,*]

1   Department of Management, Faculty of Business Administration, Enugu Campus, University of Nigeria, Nsukka 410001, Nigeria; monyei_francis@yahoo.com (F.E.M.); anthony.igwe@unn.edu.ng (A.A.I.); lovlyn.kelvin-iloafu@unn.edu.ng (L.E.K.-I.)

2   Department of Accountancy, Faculty of Business Administration, Enugu Campus, University of Nigeria, Nsukka 410001, Nigeria; edith.onyeanu@unn.edu.ng

3   Department of Industrial Psychology and People Management, School of Management, CBE, University of Johannesburg, Johannesburg 2006, South Africa

*   Correspondence: wiukpere@uj.ac.za

Abstract: Taking a leap from the perspective of organizational citizenship behaviour, pro-social behaviour examines how volunteering intentions such as helping or assisting colleagues, to how collaboration tendencies such as selfless or willful participation in workplace functions, events and issues can affect or influence administrative sustainability and longevity. This study examines the impact of pro-social behaviours on workplace performance and sustainability of university administration. Adopting the survey research design, respondents comprised both the academic and non-academic staff of the University of Nigeria, Enugu campus. The data collected were analyzed using the simple linear regression tools of the Statistical Package for Social Sciences, Version 20. Findings revealed that volunteering impacts the longevity development of university administration, while collaboration affects the competitive edge of university administration. The study thus concluded that pro-social behaviours influence the performance and sustainability of university administration.

1. Introduction and Theoretical Background

In organizations where hierarchical structures are either tall or much emphasized, it is of the utmost importance to have an affectionate relationship amongst colleagues. Being helpful, cooperative and supportive of coworkers in a way that aids in the achievement of workplace goals is expressed in the context of pro-social behaviour [1]. LePine et al. [2] observe that the term pro-social behaviour has only recently emerged to describe employees' willful behaviour within various workplace social environments and systems, and it has since grown into a significant field of research, owing to the growing importance of autonomous and team-based work over strict traditional hierarchies [2]. As a result, understanding pro-social behaviour is becoming increasingly important for the long-term survival and sustainability of social networks as well as workplace employee obligations [3–5]. Globally, the phrase pro-social behaviour connotes any positive workforce deeds that support the social and psychological relations of organizational members or the workplace itself. The workforce is becoming increasingly multicultural as a result of globalization, and for workplaces to function effectively, pro-social behaviour must be practiced and present, as it influences both individual and group-level factors such as employee performance, employer branding or compensation strategies, productivity, effectiveness, cost-cutting measures, customer satisfaction and sustainability [6,7]. It is believed that educational institutions are the locus of sustained national development. Consequences of this assertion are evidenced by the growth in academia, specifically in terms

of empirical studies conducted at universities that proffer solutions to societal decadence, while also breeding political, administrative and charismatic leaders. Furthermore, there is the interconnectivity of university/academic and administrative functions facilitated by technological advancement and the need for optimal acquisition and dissemination of knowledge.

Ucho and Atime [8], and Zheng et al. [9] believe that the construct of pro-social behaviour, from its conception, has been considered multidimensional, through volunteering and general compliance [8,9]. These dimensions help to advance workplace performance in different ways. Volunteering entails helping behaviours, while general compliance behaviour serves to profit the workplace. The deconstruction of pro-social behaviour dimensions further resulted in a five-factor model consisting of volunteering, courtesy, collaboration, decision support and sportsmanship [8]. Pro-social behaviours cannot be demanded actively but passively. Employees cannot be compelled but should rather be persuaded to perform or exhibit pro-social behaviours. Similarly, the employees do not or cannot expect any form of formal payments for engaging in pro-social behaviours. However, pro-social behaviours do not go unnoticed [6]. Organ [10], and Tambe and Shanker [11] note that the administrators do often take into cognizance and recognize pro-social behaviours exhibited by their subordinates either directly or indirectly through acts of preferential treatment, performance grading and promotions [10,11]. It has been observed that university administration and education around the globe, particularly in Africa, are unfortunately bisected with a myriad of issues/problems ranging from work overload of academic staff to inadequate funding which diminishes volunteering tendencies/behaviours; career and personal life pressures; an erratic and politicized tenure of administrative positions due to a biased or centralized appointment/election process, that has further mitigated its competitive edge; depleted infrastructure; and techno-stress brought about by information technology (IT). In addition to these inadequacies/deficiencies, these universities are also plagued by the consequences of the COVID-19 pandemic, and social vices such as lockdown of offices, corrupt practices and examination malpractices. In today's increasingly dynamic and competitive business world, workplaces are faced with the challenges of addressing predator-market wants and expectations while also dealing with urbane necessities and technological innovation [12]. The measurement of public sector performance, especially with regards to the provision of services in workplaces such as universities, has become an ambiguous issue. Blanchard [13] argues that successful performance in university administration should result in positive growth. Universities, in particular, are designed to produce a trained workforce, which is a precondition for national progress [13]. They function as national and societal growth, centres for technological and scientific innovation, skill development, the generation of quality entrepreneurial graduates and strategic research [14].

Universities are complex adaptive systems; this adaptive feature of universities is occasioned by the fact that the world is undergoing an unprecedented change due to the increasing level of global interactions especially in academia. Giving credence to this point, Amodu et al. [15] concur that this emerging era and dynamism require the continuous evaluation of the modus operandi of universities, in order to ensure that the decision-making process keeps pace with the dynamic nature of university administration [15]. In recent times, the focus has been on how to align the tangible resources (the administrators) and the physical infrastructure within clearly delineated and assigned jobs to achieve workplace objectives. Despite this, there is an urgency to shift emphasis to the intangible resources; the behavioural assets which enable these tangible/physical resources to perform optimally. Workplace performance is the result of a company's capabilities multiplied by the motivation of its employees [16]. For a variety of reasons, a company's lack of skill may impede good performance. There is an understanding that university administration's performance and sustainability should be improved in accordance with the overall goals of pro-social behaviour. Employees feel ecstatic and content when they observe that they are treated equitably by their employers, and this impacts their pro-social behaviours [17].

Universities are where knowledge acquisition takes place, and employees at these workplaces are generally expected to put in extra-role actions. These employees' voluntary actions are very essential in universities as they are a medium that requires the extra-role behaviours, which are significantly helpful for effective moulding/shaping of the character of young adults/citizens [18]. Therefore, for university administration to return to its core purposes, a conscientious rejuvenation and re-awakening of pro-social behaviours must be inspired and recognized; hence, the looming of its utmost floundering. It is against this backdrop, and in line with the dearth of empirical evidence, that necessitated this study on the impact of pro-social behaviours on workplace performance and sustainability of university administration.

1.1. Social Exchange Theory (SET)

The social exchange theory's principles underpin the theoretical synergy of workplace performance in general and pro-social behaviour in particular. The most prominent theoretical framework in the study of pro-social behaviour is social exchange theory. Its illustrious beginnings may be traced back to the 1920s when it merged sciences including anthropology, psychology and sociology. Despite the diversity of perspectives on social exchange, scholars agree that it entails a variety of interactions that result in responsibilities [19,20]. These interactions are frequently viewed as interconnected and dependent on the actions of others. Although it only happens in certain circumstances, social exchange theory emphasizes the capacity of these interdependent interactions to form high-quality ties [19,20]. In today's workplaces, the inter-relational corpus as a component of social exchange theory has gotten a lot of attention [21,22]. According to this relationship, most workplace antecedents lead to interpersonal contacts, also known as the social exchange [23]. Social exchange relationships arise when managers look after their employees, which has both positive and bad repercussions. As a result, the social exchange hypothesis is a mediating or intervening variable that promotes a beneficial and equitable transaction between parties, resulting in successful workplace behaviour and favourable employee attitudes [19,20].

1.2. Research Objectives

The broad objective was to investigate the impact pro-social behaviours on workplace performance and sustainability of university administration, while specifically, it sorts to:
- Ascertain the extent at which volunteering impacts longevity development of university administration, and
- Determine the level at which collaboration impacts the competitive edge of the university administration.

2. Review of Related Literature and Hypothesis Development

The review of the related literature and hypothesis development section elucidates the concepts surrounding the discourse, while highlighting the topicalities and gaps across previous studies that have given the basis with which this present study is conducted.

2.1. Pro-Social Behaviour

Almost all definitions agree that pro-social behaviours are acts of positive social behaviour directed at one or more other people [24]. These behaviours are frequently described as promoting or designed to assist the well-being of others; however, this is not always the case. These distinctions are worth noting: first, the definitions differ in terms of who receives welfare, ranging from one or several individuals to organizations or even society as a whole [24]. As a result, pro-social behaviour is thought to be interpersonal; although, other definitions include non-personal entities as potential beneficiaries [25]. Second, the definition of well-being differs significantly among domains, such as fitness benefits [26], psychological welfare [27] and resources or utility [28], to name a few. The purposeful element of pro-social behaviour is emphasized in several conceptualizations. According to Zaki and Mitchell [29] and Cronin [25], pro-social behaviour encompasses a

wide spectrum of actions aimed at benefiting one or more persons other than oneself [29,30]. Rendering to this concept, a behaviour can be deemed pro-social if it is performed with the aim of bringing happiness to others. This concept emphasizes the crucial distinction between characterizing pro-social behaviour based on intention versus the well-being-promoting outcomes. For example, wishing someone good luck entails the purpose to improve the other's well-being and is thus pro-social from an intentionalist standpoint, even though it is unlikely to improve the other's well-being. Acts that are carried out in good faith but have unanticipated negative repercussions are also regarded as pro-social from an intentionalist standpoint. In essence, any activity, deed or behaviour that is deemed pro-social (consciously or unconsciously) counts as such, regardless of the actual outcomes. Some explanations of pro-social behaviour place a greater emphasis on the behaviour's results than on the behaviour's underlying goals and motives. Conferring to Zaki and Mitchell [29], pro-social behaviour is defined as any action that benefits another person. What counts, from a consequentialist perspective, is that the behaviour, whether planned or not, results in the well-being of others [29]. As a result, while wishing someone good luck is not considered pro-social behaviour per se, ingratiating a superior is. In essence, consequentialist thinking considers a behaviour pro-social if it has beneficial repercussions for others [28].

In another perspective, Zhang [1] asserts that pro-social behaviour is any task, function or thing that an employee chooses to do spontaneously and of their free will, which is often separate from their stated contractual tasks and duties, thus making it discretionary [1]. The administrators do not openly and formally recognize or reward this work, function or object through salary increases or promotions. It may, however, be reflected in a positive administrator and coworker rating, as well as improved performance appraisals. Ukpere [27], in a similar vein, claims that the concept is simply "going above and beyond the call of duty," which entails deeds, or gestures that improve and enhance tasks and performances of people [27]. The concept of contextual performance is now regarded to be similar to pro-social behaviour. According to Organ [10], the acts are what promote the social and psychological conditions in which the activity is carried out [10]. In another context, pro-social behavior refers to the "good soldier syndrome," which is the actions of a loyal employee in a company. According to him, this sort of behaviour includes promptness, collaboration, innovation, volunteerism and the tendency to avoid unpleasant activities such as disagreement and fault-finding in coworkers. While pro-social behaviours are tied to the job, they are not linked to any formal reward system; yet, they contribute to the workplace's efficient functioning [11,24].

While pro-social behaviour acknowledges that pro-social deeds are rarely recognized and rewarded in the modern workplace, it is frequently seen as going "the extra mile" or "above and beyond" to help coworkers [31,32]. It is also worth noting that, in recent years, the most frequently accepted aspects for measuring pro-social behaviour have been identified in a five-factor model:

1.　Volunteering: being of assistance;
2.　Courtesy:courtesy and politeness, avoidance of controversy;
3.　Decision support: performing more than the bare minimum, meticulous attention to detail (to avoid/minimize errors);
4.　Collaboration: demonstrating concern for and involvement in the workplace (e.g., staying up to date), defending organizational policies and practices;
5.　Sportsmanship: accepting modifications and fulfilling demands without complaint, enduring less-than-ideal situations [11]. A typical scenario of pro-social behaviour can include offering to assist a recruit to become abreast with his/her tasks or volunteering to switch shifts or working hours. Importantly, pro-social behaviours also include activities taken at work, such as working overtime without (expecting) pay or helping to arrange a company-sponsored event or function [1].

Employees adopt pro-social behaviours depending on how they see their future work life and how they connect with their personal aspirations [33]. They use the words

"equifinality" and "multifinality" to characterize behaviour types in which both immediate and long-term goals can be accomplished by the same action. Employees will learn how their actions are (officially or informally) recognized (or not) and whether or not they will continue to be so [4,5]. Furthermore, this acknowledgment affects an employee's ability to achieve their goals (or lack of them).

2.2. The Benefits of Pro-Social Behaviours

Zhang [1] states that there is support for the generally held assumption that contented employees perform better and that job satisfaction affects some forms of performance, particularly those related to pro-social behaviours. Employees who are cooperative with superiors or coworkers, as well as those who are willing to compromise and make sacrifices, and those who volunteer for small tasks without grumbling (or even offering to do so without being asked) are all examples of pro-social behaviour [1]. Pro-social behaviours have three different effects on performance. Employees that engage in pro-social behaviours, for example, are more likely to receive favourable performance evaluations from their superiors [4,7]. This could be due to basic work-related reasons such as the employers' opinion that pro-social behaviour is important to the workplace's overall performance, or the idea that pro-social behaviour is a form of employee commitment due to its frequency [34]. Second, a higher performance rating is linked to receiving benefits or recognition, such as pay raises, bonuses and promotions [7]. Finally, when the workplace is downsized as part of a business restructuring, these individuals will be less likely to be laid off because they have higher performance ratings and earn more awards and recognition [34]. Going further, a compelling success/effect of pro-social behaviours at both the workforce and workplace levels have been proffered as follow:

- Boost productivity (assisting recruits, collaborating with colleagues to meet deadlines);
- Recruit and retain capable personnel (through fostering a friendly, supportive work atmosphere and a sense of belonging);
- Build social capital (knowledge dissemination and efficiency are improved by better interaction and stronger networks) [34].

Concurring with this, Ehrhart [35] asserts that a study on grocery stores reveals that pro-social behaviours accounted for approximately 20% of the variation of in-store profitability [35]. These benefits of pro-social behaviours have also been associated to lower rates of staff turnover and absenteeism, which translate to higher productivity, competitive advantage and customer satisfaction at the workplace, as well as fewer operational expenses [7].

2.3. The Potential Pitfalls of Pro-Social Behaviour

The potential pitfalls of pro-social behaviour are:

- Habituation: The constant recognition or reward for pro-social behaviours may raise the level across the workplace over time. Working overtime, which was formerly considered pro-social, has now become an internalized workplace standard, and is no longer voluntary and spontaneous, but rather a cliché. This phenomenon, known as pro-social or citizenship pressure, is still being researched and may become a source of stress for employees [36].
- Organizational justice: When certain employees are rewarded for their pro-social behaviour more than others, a sense of injustice develops among particular groups of employees. This will not only reduce pro-social behaviour among those who are not recognized for it, but it may also have other negative consequences related to perceived injustice, such as an increase in counter-productive behaviours like theft and absenteeism [37].

2.4. Workplace Performance

Workplace performance has been the core of all organizational activities. Moreover, it is the position of Monyei et al. [3] and Yasar et al. [38] that workplace performance has

grown into a major aspect of business entities, which is also gaining momentum in recent empirical research [3,38]. Goal ambiguity and measurement shortcomings, on the other hand, are the most significant restrictions to workplace performance [39]. These challenges have resulted in a wide range of explanations for workplace performance, as well as the difficulty of defining a standard to measure it. Firms can use performance measurements to help them sustain workplace efficiency. Despite this, due to the diversity in goals of organizations, enterprises and corporations, there is no consensus on performance measuring metrics. Amodu et al. [15] posit that the extent of an accomplishment to which an employee achieves the workplace's set objective is referred to as a performance [15]. This performance can be understood from various perspectives. Profitability, market penetration, lifetime development, cost minimization, branch expansion, sustainability and competitive advantage are just a few examples. The degree of achievement of a specific aim or mission that establishes performance bounds defines an employee's work [15].

Nonetheless, in recent years, there has been a shift from performance to sustainability. The COVID-19 epidemic has produced a shift in business objectives and desires [40]. According to Lateef [41], a fresh global crisis and a quick shift in economic policies might make businesses unsustainable, unproductive and moribund [41]. Even the pandemic-prevention measure of remote working has drawbacks, such as decreased opportunities for advancement, information asymmetry, a disintegration of professional connections as well as a rise in professional and personal pressures, all of which can lead to lower workplace productivity [42,43]. It is vital to develop an appropriate work environment for employees on this basis [42]. Employees' emotional and mental health concerns increase as a result of their isolation in the job, affecting their productivity and satisfaction [44]. It causes increased stress levels, which are noticeable during times of crisis or adversity [45], as shown during the epidemic. According to Castro-de-Araujo and Machado [44], high levels of uncertainty and the global crisis may have a substantial impact on people's mental health [44]. As a result, low pro-social bonding can lead to lower employee productivity [45–47]. In general, a stable business terrain and employee interactions are important for productivity [48], and the lack of a support structure when needed leads to increased workplace unhappiness [42].

2.5. Volunteering and Longevity Development

2.5.1. Volunteering

Succinctly put, the term volunteering means helpfulness [10,49]. It refers to assisting colleagues in the workplace with their tasks, for example, gladly supporting new employees, assisting overworked coworkers, assisting absent workers and leading staff to meet targets, to name a few. Volunteering, as stated by Zheng et al. [9], is a voluntary behaviour in which one employee helps a colleague with a specific problem to finish their assignment under unique conditions [9]. Tambe and Shanker [11] have confirmed that volunteering is significantly linked with productivity evaluation and correspondingly, positive affectivity [11]. Yen and Neihoff [50] note that since an employee can use his or her slack time to volunteer on more essential work, supporting colleagues makes the operational structure highly efficient [50]. It also entails interacting with others on job responsibilities, and this behaviour must be helpful to the workplace [51]. A societal approach appears to be the most true to the original meaning of volunteering among the perspectives examined. Originally, volunteering referred to the collectivistic ideology of living one's life for the benefit of others, which is the polar opposite of egoism [6,26]. Volunteering, according to Bykov [52], is a moral standard that entails certain societal expectations of assisting, serving or supporting others in various social circumstances [52]. This description emphasizes that volunteering is about more than just helping others and sacrificing personal gain. Rather, it represents cultural values and a guiding principle of how to behave in society, namely, putting the greater good ahead of personal benefit. Thus, whereas pro-social behaviour refers to behaviour that society values and expects [19], volunteering is more explicit in what is anticipated as well as appreciated and is clearly specified, precisely enhancing the collective well-being.

2.5.2. Longevity Development

Economic growth, business and environmental sustainability, social equality and cultural diversity are all elements that have been associated with the term lifespan development [53]. Similarly, Lelimann et al. [54] suggest that a lifespan development strategy should prioritize addressing people's basic needs while also protecting future generations' quality of life [54]. World Health Organization rendering [55], socio-economic, cultural and environmental developments are all linked pillars of longevity development. Furthermore, the building blocks for achieving lifespan development are recognized as information, integration and engagement. As a result, all employees of a company whose knowledge and skill sets are vital for solving current challenges and preparing for future ones would be considered long-term employees. Rožman et al. [40] assert that any worldwide instability has an impact on employees' professional and personal lives, leading to frustration, paranoia [56], stress and burnout [40]. Furthermore, unpleasant moods might damage employees' work commitment, resulting in poor outputs that can eventually affect a company's capacity to stay in business. Rožman et al. [40] further contend that lockdown conditions harm lifespan development, since employees who work from home are unable to experience the workplace climate at home [40]. Career and personal life stresses occur as a result of frequent interruptions by family members. It is worth noting that some employees working from home lack the necessary tools (ICT and specialized workplace). Most employees are anxious and unhappy as a result of these situations, and they lose concentration on their work, resulting in decreased productivity and a failure to grow longevity [47]. Furthermore, Abdulkareem and Oyeniran [14] state that the well-being of these human capital resources (staff) is crucial in the development of educational longevity [14]. The university administration is to increase and expand its functions and programs in order to build a high-level workforce in the context of a nation's needs [57]. In the absence of this, a workplace's operations must relate to company aims and aspirations if it is to continue. However, the performance of units and departments should be carefully controlled to preserve competitiveness, efficiency and viability. Hence, from the above, the following null and alternate hypotheses are proposed:

H$_0$. *Volunteering does not impact the longevity development of university administration.*

H$_1$. *Volunteering impacts the longevity development of university administration.*

2.6. Collaboration and Competitive Edge

2.6.1. Collaboration

Tambe and Shanker [11] define it as constructive participation in a workplace's political process by contributing to the process through the unbiased expressing of opinions, attending meetings and addressing topics with coworkers that are important to the group's well-being [11]. Collaboration is an individual's active display of diligent participation in things about the workplace's method of functioning. It also denotes a broad amount of interest in, and commitment to, our desire for the organization's operations. It demonstrates a willingness to actively participate in group or business events, watch the workplace environment for risks and opportunities and figure out the best options for optimal work performance. When employees believe and perceive themselves to be a part of the workplace, certain behaviours emerge [58]. This facet of pro-social behaviour (collaboration) is based on Graham [59] results, as quoted by Tambe and Shanker [11], which suggest that employees should be responsible for being good citizens of their group [11,59]. This behaviour/action demonstrates the employees' acceptance of their roles as members of a system and the responsibilities that come with this.

2.6.2. Competitive Edge

The concept of competitive edge incorporates the logic of value creation and delivery. An organization's competitive advantage improves its long-term viability. A workplace with a competitive edge creates value in an economic exchange in which the firm captures

more value than its competitors could create [60]. It comprises cost savings across the board, as well as in some of the most essential areas where businesses may save money, such as time, space, effort and energy. Goksoy et al. [12] assert that a company's competitive advantage is its ability to give superior products and services to customers when compared to its competitors' products and services [12]. Furthermore, the ability of a company to innovate is thought to play a role in its competitiveness. Hitt et al. [61] believe that innovation is essential for businesses to compete in both domestic and worldwide markets [61]. As a result, competitiveness is based on invention, because competitors cannot easily copy it. The intensity of rivalry in a business environment determines the level of innovation to be expended into product and service delivery, which can affect a firm's competitive edge, level of occupational stress, lower job satisfaction or mental health issues [60]. Furthermore, businesses with a market leadership position have highly innovative employees who drive productivity, which leads to increased customer satisfaction and, eventually, increased sales and profitability. From a workplace or workforce standpoint, having a competitive edge is critical to productivity. It forecasts employee performance, firm success and the company's financial results, which are all tied to sustainability [62,63]. From the above, the following null and alternate hypotheses are proposed:

H_0. *Collaboration does not impact the competitive edge of university administration.*

H_1. *Collaboration impacts the competitive edge of university administration.*

2.7. Empirical Insight and Critique of Reviewed Related Literature

Omoankhanlen et al. [64] investigated the impact of pro-social behaviour and firm commitment in Rivers state, Nigeria's public sector. The mean and standard deviation statistical tools were used to analyze the data. Findings indicated that pro-social behaviour had a positive effect on commitment. It, therefore, concluded and recommended that pro-social behaviour is essential for a firm commitment, and that there is a need for supervisors to understand the concept of pro-social behaviour and how it influences staff commitment [64]. The study by Omoankhanlen et al. [64] did not delve deep into explaining the various variables of pro-social behaviours, and this has made the concept ambiguous to decipher its role in promoting workplace performance. Hence, this research will advance the findings of Omoankhanlen et al. [64] through its detailed explanation of associated variables, establishment of their relationship and how the recommendations could serve as a game changer in the global competitive market to earn and sustain a firm's competitive edge.

Dávila and Finkelstein [65] analyzed organizational citizenship behaviour and the well-being of educational institutions in Spain. The survey instrument measuring the research inquiries was completed by 144 people from 17 different educational institutions in Spain. Organizational citizenship behaviour and motives were found to be significantly connected with well-being, with altruistic intents having a greater association than egoistic goals. It recommended that the perception of organizational citizenship behaviour must be regarded as in-role because it is associated with well-being [65].

Bülbül [66] studied social work design and pro-social company behaviours in Azerbaijan. The researchers looked into the social components of work design as potential antecedents of pro-social firm behaviour. The survey included 308 workers working in white-collar positions across a variety of businesses. Collaboration and compassionate interactions were found to contribute considerably to pro-social behaviours in offices among the antecedents studied, but interdependence had little effect. It further recommended the continued practice and support of pro-social behaviours by executives and subordinates as they create productive company outcomes [66]. The findings of Bülbül [66] are in tandem with the result of Dávila and Finkelstein [65]. The authors share a similar positive opinion on the significance of adhering and promoting selflessness and voluntary assistance at the workplace. This present study will further proffer its evaluation into a more contemporary concept and its effect on competitiveness.

Yasar et al. [38] analyzed the relationships between sustainable firm performance and organizational citizenship-learning capacity in the Nigeria banking sector. A survey study method with statistical conduct was used. The results of the data analysis demonstrated a substantial positive relationship between organizational citizenship-learning and business performance. The study made practical suggestions on how management might improve the firm's organizational learning in order to improve organizational performance [38].

Margaretha [30] examined the study on motivation, task burnout and the moderating role of organizational citizenship behaviour. Data were gathered from 97 workers from a number of private health centres in Jakarta, Indonesia, through the use of a questionnaire set. The results indicated that motivation (intrinsic and extrinsic) has a significant effect on task burnout. The study thus proffers managerial implications that managers can balance the realization of employee needs that trigger the emergence of intrinsic and extrinsic motivation, which is also expected to avert the occurrence of task burnout on employees [30]. The study of Margaretha [30] did not clearly establish the moderating factors of organizational citizenship behaviour and how it moderates motivation to further avert task burnout. Hence, this study will serve as an expansion of the literature by shedding more light using pro-social behaviour as a surrogate and how it could serve as a motivating factor to further eliminate task burnout and promote conducive interpersonal relationship environments for a workforce.

Pradhan and Jena [67] investigated workplace employee development in Indian industrial and service organizations. The 38-item employee development scale was completed by 361 directors from Indian industrial and service companies. The new scale was designed after an exploratory component analysis revealed three separate factors of employee development: task, adaptive and contextual performance (TAC). It was suggested that the firm's behavioural specialists use the findings from the elements studied to improve and sustain the working environment [67]. In rejoinder to the above study, the findings are somewhat ambiguous in their attempt to implement the suggested policy implication due to vagueness of the relationship between the variables. Following this, this research is deemed to clearly and specifically highlight Pradhan and Jena's [67] study and further suggest a universal acceptable medium of utilizing pro-social behaviour to enhance workplace and employee development.

Masood et al. [68] investigated the role of job complexity and relationship with supervisor on the long-term innovation and competitiveness of firms in Pakistan. Data were acquired using a suitable sample method from banking employees at various branches of seven banks in Multan and analyzed using a correlation statistical tool. There was no clear link between work difficulty and supervisory relationship in the findings. In addition, worker creativity had shown weaker significance with a prolonged competitive benefit for firms [68]. The above study contrasts with those of Yasar et al. [38], which affirmed a negative relationship between the tested variables. However, the divergent views of the authors could be occasioned by environmental factors and different organizational climates. Hence, this present research will serve as a moderator in analyzing these variables altogether to reach a consensus.

Suhag et al. [69] investigated the impact of competitive innovation on firm advantage over other firms in the telecommunication sector in Pakistan. The research adopted the survey method in which the questionnaire was administered to 200 personnel of the telecom industry in Islamabad and Rawalpindi. The data were analyzed using a regression analysis. Product innovation, process innovation and organizational innovation all had a favourable impact on organizational performance, according to the findings [69].

In reviewing the extant literature, it was observed that most of the available literature was on a macrosystem basis involving either an entire nation or an industry [38,70]. In addition, by stressing the country and industry-specific nature of the research findings, their applicability is limited and constrained, in the sense that, what is obtainable in the country or industry does or may not be suited or applicable in another country or industry [71]. Hence, this study seeks to give empirical evidence from a micro or firm basis

and perspective (university administration). Furthermore, there exists a replete of studies on pro-social behaviours about other variables, see: [8,34,35,72]. However, a research dearth/gap exists concerning the variable of workplace performance, and in the industry or sector scope of university administration, see: [30,49]. As such, the research is made justifiable by attempting to bridge the gap in the literature and providing empirical proof of the extent to which pro-social behaviours impact workplace performance and sustainability of university administration.

3. Research Methodology

The study employed the survey approach, which focuses on the specific phenomenon, and both academic and non-academic personnel from the University of Nigeria, Enugu Campus were used as sample respondents for the study's data collection and analytics. Data were collected using a well-structured questionnaire set which was designed utilizing the five (5) point Likert scale queries on the study theme and also prepared for easy comprehension to elicit factual and interpretive information. The research population figure was quoted as 1026 (as of January 2022) and was provided by the office of the Deputy Vice-Chancellor (administration) of the university. The selected respondents/staff were purposively chosen based on their involvement in the university administration, responsibilities/duties and job description; while the administration of the questionnaire was completed randomly to co-opt all administrative spheres of the university (faculties/departments, registry, bursary, student affairs, works/maintenance, security and ICT departments). The Bill Godden [73] mathematical formula was used to obtain a sample size of 264, while each stratum of the staff was estimated using the Bowley proportional allocation statistical technique, giving a 102 and 162 for both academic and non-academic staff, respectively [73]. The questionnaire was delivered to the respondents in 264 copies, with 202 copies (or 77%) duly completed and returned, and 62 copies (or 23%) not returned. To ensure that the questionnaire items were correct, content and face validation were used. A reliability test was also executed using Cronbach alpha, which yielded a value of 0.733. This indicates that things are quite dependable. The data collected were analyzed using a simple linear regression of the Statistical Package for Social Sciences, Version 20. We rejected the null hypothesis if the calculated value at the 5% significance level with the appropriate degree of freedom was greater than the table value; otherwise, we did not reject.

3.1. Data Presentation and Analyses

This section captures the responses of respondents to the questionnaire items, which are presented in Tables 1–8.

Table 1. The extent to which volunteering impacts longevity development of university administration.

S/NO	OPTION	SA	A	U	D	SD	Total
1	Helping colleagues with an unfamiliar task improves their competence.	45	106	12	30	9	202
2	Assistance to coworkers in areas where they are having difficulty has an impact on skill and knowledge acquisition.	78	100	12	12	–	202

Source: Authors' fieldwork 2022.

Table 2. Model summary [b].

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate	Durbin–Watson
1	0.808 [a]	0.621	0.820	0.68838	1.531

Source: Authors' fieldwork 2022. [a] Predictors: (Constant), Volunteering; [b] Dependent Variable: Longevity Development.

Table 3. ANOVA [b].

	Model	Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
	Regression	1123.548	1	1123.548	2.371×10^3	0.000 [a]
1	Residual	245.460	200	0.474		
	Total	1369.008	201			

Source: Authors' fieldwork 2022. [a] Predictors: (Constant), Volunteering; [b] Dependent Variable: Longevity Development.

Table 4. Coefficients [a].

	Model	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	T	Sig.
		B	Std. Error	Beta		
1	(Constant)	0.738	0.061		12.104	0.000
	Volunteering	0.950	0.020	0.906	18.600	0.000

Source: Authors' fieldwork 2022. [a] Dependent Variable: Longevity Development.

R = 0.808

R^2 = 0.621

F = 2.371×10^3

T = 18.600

DW = 1. 531

3.2. Discussion

The regression sum of squares (1123.548) is higher than the residual sum of squares (245.460), implying that the model does not account for as much variation in the dependent variable. The significance value of the F statistic (0.000) is less than 0.05, implying that the variation explained by the model is not random. Volunteering and longevity development have a favourable link, according to R, the correlation coefficient, which is 0.808. Changes in volunteering account for 62.1% of the variation in longevity development, according to the R square coefficient of determination. The error of the estimate is modest using the linear regression model, with a value of about 0.68838. There is no autocorrelation, according to the Durbin–Watson statistic of 1.531, which can be estimated to 2. The volunteering coefficient of 0.808 suggests a statistically significant positive link between volunteering and longevity development (t = 18.600). As a result, the null hypothesis that volunteering has no impact on a university administration's longevity development should be rejected, and the alternative hypothesis that volunteering has an impact on a university administration's longevity development should be accepted. This result is in line with the findings of Bykov [52] and Omoankhanlen et al. [64], who found that volunteering had a favourable impact on civil workers' long-term commitment in Rivers state [52,64]. Organizational citizenship behaviour and motives were found to be strongly associated with well-being by Dávila and Finkelstein [65], with altruistic intents having a larger association than egoistic goals [65]. Furthermore, the Rožman et al. [40], Murphy and Ackermann [19] and Bülbül [66] studies asserted collaboration and compassionate exchanges were found to contribute significantly to social exchanges in offices [19,40,66]. Bierhoff and Rohmann [74], and Rachlin [75] observed that pro-social activities are influenced by selfless mind-sets in general and social duty in particular [74,75]. Likewise, they noted that when people are engaged in decision-making, selfless behaviours are prompted. However, they contradict Masood et al.'s [68] position that a direct relationship exists between lower job complexity and adequate supervisory relationship; in addition to the findings that worker creativity has shown weaker significance with a prolonged competitive benefit for firms in the region [68].

Table 5. The level at which collaboration impacts the competitive edge of university administration.

S/NO	OPTION	SA	A	U	D	SD	Total
1	Staff participation in decision-making is consistent in the university.	20	30	27	90	35	202
2	Ceremonies or functions held by the organization help to strengthen the workplace's reputation.	25	67	25	58	27	202

Source: Authors' fieldwork 2022.

Table 6. Model summary [b].

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate	Durbin–Watson
1	0.879 [a]	0.773	0.773	0.54352	1.561

Source: Authors' fieldwork 2022. [a] Predictors: (Constant), Collaboration; [b] Dependent Variable: Competitive Edge.

Table 7. ANOVA [a].

	Model	Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
	Regression	510.381	1	510.381	1727.670	0.000 [b]
1	Residual	149.776	200	0.295		
	Total	660.157	201			

Source: Authors' fieldwork 2022. [a] Dependent Variable: Collaboration; [b] Predictors: (Constant), Competitive Edge.

Table 8. Coefficients [a].

	Model	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
		B	Std. Error	Beta		
1	(Constant)	−0.448	0.059		−7.571	0.000
	Collaboration	1.329	0.032	0.879	41.565	0.000

Source: Authors' fieldwork 2022. [a] Dependent Variable: Competitive Edge.

R = 0.879
R^2 = 0.773
F = 1727.670
T = 41.565
DW = 0.161

3.3. Discussion

The regression sum of squares (510.381) is greater than the residual sum of squares (149.776), implying that the model explains more of the variation in the dependent variable. With a significance value of less than 0.05, the F statistics show that the variation explained by the model is not due to chance. With a value of 0.879, the correlation coefficient, R, demonstrates a favourable relationship between collaboration and competitive advantage. Changes in collaboration account for 77.3% of the fluctuation in the competitive edge, according to the R square coefficient of determination. The error of the estimate is modest with the linear regression model, with a value of about 0.54352. There is no autocorrelation, according to the Durbin–Watson statistic of 1.561, which is approximated to 2. The correlation coefficient of 0.879 suggests a statistically significant positive and substantial link between collaboration and competitive edge (t = 41.565). Therefore, the null hypothesis that collaboration does not impact the competitive edge of university administration is

rejected and the alternative hypothesis that collaboration impacts the competitive edge of university administration is thus accepted. This result is in complete disagreement with the findings of Grönlund et al. [71] which claimed that deliberation, which is a civic virtue characteristic, did not affect the citizen's participation in political affairs [71]. Additionally, Anais [70] asserts that civic virtue exemplifies further the prevalence of the inability, apathy and prejudice of citizens of [70]. Nonetheless, it validates the findings of Margaretha [30] and Podsakoff et al. [58] that motivation, and engagement of work had a significant positive influence on individual level consequences, and firm prolonged viability [30,58]. Pradhan and Jena [67] maintained the position that employee development created an edge in terms of competition and rivalry [67]. Furthermore, it supports Chanana [47], and Yasar et al. [38], who found a positive significant relationship between job engagement, competitiveness, firm-learning and performance [38,47]; and Suhag et al. [69], and Obrenovic et al. [49] who found that knowledge sharing, and process innovation had a positive impact on improved engagement and job satisfaction [49,69].

4. Conclusions

Pro-social behaviours come in many distinct forms. They are understood and conceptualized as a worker who goes above and beyond the call of duty; an employee who takes initiative and frequently offers to assist others; or a coworker who is knowledgeable, helpful and cooperative. They also refer to a wide range of employee acts that go beyond specified tasks and are generally motivated by personal goals. In the university, employees' support comes through enhancing the performance and well-being of both colleagues and the workplace, and this is reflected in a high workplace reputation and acquisition of 'on-the-job' skills. Based on the tested hypothesis, this study conclusively asserts that these variables (volunteering, collaboration, longevity development and competitive edge) as agreed and strongly agreed by the administrators of the university (research respondents) are a prerequisite and phenomenal indices for the willful and unbiased acts of pro-social behaviours that highlight the viability and sustainability of university administration.

Policy Implication

In line with the stated conclusion, the study posits the following policy implications:

1. Management of universities should ensure that a cordial atmosphere and platform exist that make the willingness for acts of volunteering to thrive and be practiced within the university workplace. This they can achieve by strategically identifying, developing and accessing staff engagement to enable helpful roles, as it leads to the university administration's viability and sustainability.
2. The university administrators must instill and inculcate a high-level organization-wide involvement in university administration and compliance to rules of conduct, by conducting regular employee meetings or programs and functions. This is strongly advised as it coordinates and improves employees' collaborative obligations, and adherence to rules and regulations, which help university administrators to manage people's dynamics, while enhancing workplace performance and sustainability of the university administration.

5. Limitations and Scope for Future Research

Among the most prominent limitations of this study was the paucity of research materials on the subject matter, together with time constraints on the part of the respondents. However, this was addressed by sourcing relevant related literature, both in print and online, which gave significant insight on the discourse. Additionally, the respondents were met at lecture venues or staff meetings, which gave them a collapsed time to address the survey.

Having made our modest contribution, we propose a scope for future research. There are two aspects of importance to this study. The first hinges on the observation that a quantum of studies have been completed on organizational behaviours. While this

has brought about an abundance of literature on the topic, a closer look at these studies shows that there are few-to-no consensuses on what firms should do to mitigate the diminishing tendencies of pro-social behaviours brought about particularly by a lack of financial rewards. A systematic investigation and review must be carried out with emphasis on the methodology, policy and administrative implications of such on the universities. Secondly, more studies must focus on firms in the financial and telecommunications sectors. These sorts of firms are highly complex, dynamic, organically structured and probably more vulnerable to workplace stressors, resulting in them needing as much help as possible. It also makes them the most affected in employee turnover cases, resulting in a dire scarcity of talent, after a competitor firm beckons. Hence, pro-social behaviours as a criterion for recognizing and rewarding employees should become a veritable strategy for organizational sustainability.

References

1. Zhang, J. The dark side of virtual office and job satisfaction. *Int. J. Bus Manag.* **2016**, *11*, 40–46. [CrossRef]
2. LePine, J.; Erez, A.; Johnson, D. The nature and dimensionality of organizational citizenship behaviour: A critical review and meta-analysis. *J. Appl. Psychol.* **2002**, *87*, 52–65. Available online: https://www.researchgate.net/.../11448834_The_Nature_and_Dimensionality_of_Orga (accessed on 14 May 2022). [CrossRef] [PubMed]
3. Monyei, F.E.; Ukpere, W.I.; Agbaeze, E.K.; Omonona, S.; Kelvin-Iloafu, L.E.; Obi-Anike, H.O. The impact of succession management on small and medium enterprises' sustainability in Lagos State, Nigeria. *Sustainability* **2021**, *13*, 13489. [CrossRef]
4. Vieweg, J.C. Pro-social behaviours: Their motivations and impacts on organizational culture. *J. Values-Based Leadersh.* **2018**, *11*, 12. [CrossRef]
5. Pickford, G.C.; Joy, G. Organizational citizenship behaviours; definitions and dimensions. *J. Saïd Bus. Sch.* **2016**, *1*, 31. Available online: www.sbs.oxford.edu/mutuality (accessed on 14 May 2022).
6. Pfattheicher, S.; Nielsen, Y.A.; Thielmann, I. Pro-social behaviour and altruism: A review of concepts and definitions. *Curr. Opin. Psychol.* **2022**, *44*, 124–129. [CrossRef] [PubMed]
7. Podsakoff, N.P.; Whiting, S.W.; Podsakoff, P.M.; Blume, B.D. Individual and organizational-level consequences of organizational citizenship behaviours; a meta-analysis. *J. Appl. Psychol.* **2009**, *94*, 122–141. [CrossRef]
8. Ucho, A.; Atime, E.T. Distributive Justice, Age, and Organizational Citizenship Behaviour among Non-teaching Staff of Benue State University. *Int. J. Psychol. Behav. Sci.* **2013**, *3*, 77–85. [CrossRef]
9. Zheng, W.; Sharan, K.; Wei, J. New development of organizational commitment: A critical review (1960–2009). *Afr. J. Bus. Manag.* **2010**, *4*, 12–20. Available online: www.academicjournals.org/app/webroot/.../article1380698607_WeiBo%20et%20al.p (accessed on 14 May 2022).
10. Organ, D.W. Organizational citizenship behaviour: It's constructed clean-up time. *Hum. Perform.* **1997**, *10*, 85–97. [CrossRef]
11. Tambe, S.; Shanker, M. A study of organizational citizenship behaviour and its dimensions: A literature review. *Int. Res. J. Bus. Manag.* **2014**, *1*, 67–73. Available online: www.irjbm.org/irjbm2013/January/Paper8.pdf (accessed on 14 May 2022).
12. Goksoy, A.; Vayvay, O.; Ergeneli, N. Gaining competitive advantage through innovation strategies: An application in warehouse management processes. *Am. J. Bus. Manag.* **2013**, *2*, 304–321. [CrossRef]

13. Blanchard, O. The economic future of Europe. NBER Working Paper. *J. Econ. Perspect.* **2004**, *18*, 3–26. Available online: www.3economics.ucdavis.edu/people/amtaylor/files/w19414.pdf (accessed on 14 May 2022). [CrossRef]

14. Abdulkareem, A.Y.; Oyeniran, S. Managing the performance of Nigerian universities for sustainable development using data envelopment analysis. *Int. J. Acad. Res. Bus. Soc. Sci.* **2011**, *1*, 1–9. Available online: www.hrmars.com/admin/pics/84.pdf (accessed on 14 May 2022).

15. Amodu, A.A.; Okafor, L.C.; Inyada, S.J. Knowledge management and organizational performance in Kogi State University: Issues and challenges. *Stand. Glob. J. Bus. Manag.* **2014**, *1*, 6–12. Available online: http://www.standardglobaljournals.com/journals/SGJBM (accessed on 14 May 2022).

16. Whetten, D.A.; Cameron, K.S. *Developing Management Skills*; Pearson Prentice-Hall: London, UK, 2008.

17. Wang, G. The study on the relationship between employees' sense of organizational justice and organizational citizenship behaviour in private enterprises. *Energy Procedia* **2011**, *5*, 2030–2034. Available online: https://www.researchgate.net/.../251712449_The_Study_on_Relationship_between_Emp (accessed on 14 May 2022).

18. Yilmaz, K; Bokeoglu, O.C. Organizational citizenship behaviours and organizational commitment in Turkish primary schools. *World Appl. Sci.* **2008**, *3*, 775–780. Available online: https://grdspublishing.org/index.php/people/article/view/122 (accessed on 14 May 2022).

19. Murphy, R.O.; Ackermann, K.A. Social value orientation: Theoretical and measurement issues in the study of social preferences. *Pers. Soc. Psychol. Rev.* **2014**, *18*, 13–41. [CrossRef]

20. Cropanzano, R.; Mitchell, R.S. Social exchange theory, an interdisciplinary review. *J. Manag.* **2005**, *31*, 874–900. [CrossRef]

21. Shore, L.M.; Tetrick, L.E.; Taylor, M.S.; Coyle-Shapiro, J.; Liden, R.C.; McLean-Parks, J. The employee-organization relationship: A timely concept in a period of transition. In *Researchin Personnel and Human Resources Management*; Martocchio, J.J., Ed.; Elsevier: Amsterdam, The Netherlands, 2004; Volume 23, pp. 291–370. Available online: https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/10.1177/1059601114525851 (accessed on 14 May 2022).

22. Shore, L.M.; Tetrick, L.E.; Barksdale, K. Measurement of transactional and exchange relationships. In Proceedings of the Annual Meeting of the Society for Industrial and Organizational Psychology, Atlanta, GA, USA, 15 April 1999.

23. Cropanzano, R.; Byrne, Z.S.; Bobocel, D.R.; Rupp, D.E. Moral virtues, fairness heuristics, social entities, and other denizens of organizational justice. *J. Vocat. Behav.* **2001**, *58*, 164–209. Available online: https://www.scirp.org/(S(351jmbntvnsjt1aadkposzje))/../ReferencesPapers.aspx? (accessed on 14 May 2022). [CrossRef]

24. Schroeder, D.A.; Graziano, W.G. The field of pro-social behaviour. In *The Oxford Handbook of Prosocial Behavior*; Schroeder, D.A., Graziano, W.G., Eds.; Oxford University Press: Oxford, UK, 2015. [CrossRef]

25. Cronin, K.A. Pro-social behaviour in animals: The influence of social relationships, communication and rewards. *Anim. Behav.* **2012**, *84*, 1085–1093. [CrossRef]

26. West, S.A.; Griffin, A.S.; Gardner, A. Social semantics: Altruism, cooperation, mutualism, strong reciprocity and group selection. *J. Evol. Biol.* **2007**, *20*, 415–432. [CrossRef] [PubMed]

27. Ukpere, W.I. Industrial Psychology: A Strategy for People Management. In Proceedings of the A Public Lecture for Doctoral Candidates on the Imperatives of Globalization at the University of Nigeria, Enugu Campus, Nsukka, Nigeria, 13 October 2018.

28. Fehr, E.; Fischbacher, U. The nature of human altruism. *Nature* **2003**, *425*, 785–791. [CrossRef]

29. Zaki, J.; Mitchell, J.P. Intuitive pro-sociality. *Curr. Dir. Psychol. Sci.* **2013**, *22*, 466–470. [CrossRef]

30. Margaretha, M. Motivation and Job Burnout: The Mediating Role of Organizational Citizenship Behavior. *Int. J. Manag. Sci. Bus. Adm.* **2019**, *5*, 27–33. [CrossRef]

31. Van Scotter, J.R.; Motowidlo, S.J.; Cross, T.C. Effects of task performance and contextual performance on systemic rewards. *J. Appl. Psychol.* **2000**, *85*, 526–535. [CrossRef] [PubMed]

32. Werner, J.M. Dimensions that make a difference: Examining the impact of in-role and extra-role behaviours on supervisory ratings. *J. Appl. Psychol.* **1994**, *79*, 98–107. Available online: https://psycnet.apa.org/record/1994-31626-001 (accessed on 14 May 2022). [CrossRef]

33. Halbesleben, J.; Bellairs, T. What Are the Motives for Employees to Exhibit Citizenship Behaviour? Oxford Handbooks Online. Available online: www.oxfordhandbooks.com/view/10.../oxfordhb/.../oxfordhb-9780190219000-e-16 (accessed on 14 May 2022).

34. Organ, D.W.; Podsakoff, P.M.; MacKenzie, S.B. *Organizational Citizenship Behaviour: Its Nature, Antecedents, and Consequences*; Sage Publications, Inc.: Newbury Park, CA, USA, 2006. Available online: https://cdn.auckland.ac.nz/.../Deww%20Zhang%20-%20Organisational%20Citizenship (accessed on 14 May 2022).

35. Ehrhart, M.G. Leadership and procedural justice climate as antecedents of unit-level organizational citizenship behaviour. *Pers. Psychol.* **2004**, *57*, 61–94. Available online: https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/abs/10.1111/j.1744-6570.2004.tb02484.x (accessed on 14 May 2022). [CrossRef]

36. Bolino, M.C.; Turnley, W.H.; Gilstrap, J.B.; Suazo, M.M. Citizenship under pressure: What's a "good soldier" to do? *J. Organ.* **2010**, *31*, 835–855. [CrossRef]

37. Marcus, B.; Schuler, H. Antecedents of counterproductive behaviour at work: A general perspective. *J. Appl. Psychol.* **2004**, *89*, 647–660. [CrossRef]

38. Yasar, M.F.; Ahmed, A.; Emhan, A. Analysing the relationships between sustainable firm performance and organisational citizenship-learning capacity: A case study of the banking sector in Nigeria. *Arab. J. Bus. Manag. Rev.* **2014**, *2*, 1–10. [CrossRef]

39. Chun, Y.H.; Rainey, H.G. Goal ambiguity and organizational performance in US federal agencies. *J. Public Adm. Res. Theory* **2005**, *15*, 529–557. [CrossRef]

40. Rožman, M.; Peša, A.; Rajko, M.; Štrukelj, T. Building organisational sustainability during the Covid-19 pandemic with an inspiring work environment. *Sustainability* **2021**, *13*, 11747. [CrossRef]

41. Lateef, F. Face to face with corona-virus disease 19: Maintaining motivation, psychological safety, and wellness. *J. Emerge Trauma Shock.* **2020**, *13*, 116–123. [CrossRef] [PubMed]

42. Toscano, F.; Zappalà, S. Social Isolation and Stress as Predictors of Productivity Perception and Remote Work Satisfaction during the COVID-19 Pandemic: The Role of Concern about the Virus in a Moderated Double Mediation. *Sustainability* **2020**, *12*, 9804. [CrossRef]

43. Allen, T.D.; Golden, T.D.; Shockley, K.M. How effective is telecommuting? Assessing the status of our scientific findings. *Psychol. Sci. Public Interest* **2015**, *16*, 40–68. [CrossRef]

44. Castro-de-Araujo, L.F.S.; Machado, D.B. Impact of COVID-19 on mental health in a low and middle-income country. *Cienc. Saude Coletiva* **2020**, *25*, 2457–2460. [CrossRef]

45. Madero Gómez, S.; Ortiz Mendoza, O.E.; Ramírez, J.; Olivas-Luján, M.R. Stress and myths related to the COVID-19 pandemic's effects on remote work. *J. Manag. Res.* **2020**, *18*, 401–420. [CrossRef]

46. Jamal, M.T.; Anwar, I.; Khan, N.A.; Saleem, I. Work during COVID-19: Assessing the influence of job demands and resources on practical and psychological outcomes for employees. *Asia-Pac. J. Bus. Adm.* **2021**, *13*, 1757–4323. [CrossRef]

47. Chanana, N.S. Employee engagement practices during COVID-19 lockdown. *J. Public Aff.* **2020**, *1*, e2508. [CrossRef]

48. Khan, A.A.; Abbasi, S.O.B.H.; Waseem, R.M.; Ayaz, M.; Ijaz, M. Impact of training and development of employees on employee performance through job satisfaction: A study of telecom sector of Pakistan. *Strateg. Manag. J.* **2016**, *7*, 29–46. [CrossRef]

49. Obrenovic, B.; Du, J.; Godinić, D.; Tsoy, D. Personality trait of conscientiousness impact on tacit knowledge sharing: The mediating effect of eagerness and subjective norm. *J. Knowl. Manag.* **2021**, *26*, 1124–1163. [CrossRef]

50. Yen, H.; Neihoff, B. Organizational citizenship behaviour and organizational effectiveness: Finding relationship in Taiwanese banks. *J. Appl. Soc. Psychol.* **2004**, *34*, 1617–1637. Available online: https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/abs/10.1111/j.1559-1816.2004.tb02790.x (accessed on 14 May 2022). [CrossRef]

51. Redman, T.; Snap, E.I. To We: The role of consciousness transformation in compassion and altruism. *J. Manag. Stud.* **2005**, *42*, 915–932. Available online: https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/abs/10.1111/j.1467-9744.2006.00788.x (accessed on 14 May 2022).

52. Bykov, A. Altruism: New perspectives of research on a classical theme in sociology of morality. *Curr Sociol.* **2017**, *65*, 797–813. [CrossRef]

53. Ogunyemi, B. Mainstreaming sustainable development into Africa school curriculum: Issue for Nigeria. *Curr. Issues Comp. Educ.* **2005**, *7*, 94–103. Available online: www.tc.columbia.edu/cice/archieve/7.2/72ogunyemi.Pdf (accessed on 14 May 2022).

54. Lelimann, M.; Christensen, P.; Hansen, J.A. *Public-Private Partnership and the Roles of Universities in Sustainable Development*; Mimeo: Aalborg, Denmark, 2007; Available online: www.vbn.aau.dk/files/16535918/PPP_SRIS.pdf (accessed on 14 May 2022).

55. World Health Organisation. International Health Regulations. 2005. Available online: https://www.who.int/health-topics/international-health-regulations#tab=tab_1 (accessed on 14 May 2022).

56. Monyei, E.F.; Agbaeze, K.E.; Isichei, E.E. Organisational paranoia and employees' commitment: Mediating effect of human resources policies. *Int. J. Sci. Technol. Res.* **2020**, *9*, 2277–8616.

57. Federal Republic of Nigeria. *National Policy on Education*; Nigerian Educational Research and Development Council: Lagos, Nigeria, 2004. Available online: www.wbgfiles.worldbank.org/.../Nigeria/.../National%Policy%20on%29Education.pdf (accessed on 14 May 2022).

58. Podsakoff, P.M.; MacKenzie, S.B.; Paine, J.B.; Bachrach, D.G. Organizational citizenship behaviours: A critical review of the theoretical and empirical literature and suggestions for future research. *J. Manag.* **2000**, *26*, 513–563. Available online: https://www.scirp.org/(S(351jmbntvnsjt1aadkposzje))/.../ReferencesPapers.aspx? (accessed on 14 May 2022).

59. Graham, J.W. An Essay on Organizational Citizenship Behavior. *Empl. Responsib. Rights J.* **1991**, *4*, 249–270. [CrossRef]

60. Sahni, J. Impact of COVID-19 on Employee Behavior: Stress and Coping Mechanism during WFH (Work from Home) Among Service Industry Employees. *J. Oper. Manag.* **2020**, *1*, 35–48. [CrossRef]

61. Hitt, M.A.; Ireland, R.D.; Camp, M.S.; Sexton, D.L. Guest editors' introduction to the special issue strategic entrepreneurship: Entrepreneurial Strategies for wealth creation. *Strateg. Manag. J.* **2001**, *22*, 479–491. Available online: https://pdfs.semanticscholar.org/2072/a370d3de103ceaaf35be1bc25c9fbf49365e.pdf (accessed on 14 May 2022). [CrossRef]

62. Kumar, P.; Kumar, N.; Aggarwal, P.; Yeap, J.A.L. Working in lockdown: The relationship between COVID-19 induced work stressors, job performance, distress, and life satisfaction. *Curr. Psychol.* **2001**, *22*, 479–491. [CrossRef] [PubMed]

63. Feng, Z.; Savani, K. COVID-19 created a gender gap in perceived work productivity and job satisfaction: Implications for dual-career parents working from home. *Gend. Manag.* **2020**, *35*, 719–736. [CrossRef]

64. Omoankhanlen, J.A.; Osagie, N.G.; Akhator, P.A.; Itoya, J.; Aiegoba, L.A. Pro-social behaviour and firm commitment in the River state Public Sector. *J. Emerg. Trends Econ. Manag. Sci.* **2014**, *5*, 154–165.

65. Dávila, M.C.; Finkelstein, M.A. Organisational citizenship behaviour and well-being: Preliminary results. *Int. J. Appl. Psychol.* **2013**, *3*, 45–51. [CrossRef]

66. Bülbül, A. Social work design and pro-social company behaviours. *Univers. J. Psychol.* **2014**, *2*, 47–58. [CrossRef]

67. Pradhan, R.K.; Jena, L.K. Employee development at the workplace: Conceptual model and empirical validation. *Bus. Perspect. Res.* **2016**, *5*, 69–85. [CrossRef]

68. Masood, U.H.; Ayaz, A.M.; Amna, H.; Muhammad, F.F.; Javaria, A. Measuring the role of job complexity and its impact on long-term innovation and competitiveness of firms in Pakistan. *World Appl. Sci. J.* **2013**, *24*. [CrossRef]

69. Suhag, A.K.; Solangi, S.R.; Larik, R.S.A.; Lakho, M.K.; Tagar, A.H. The relationship of competitive innovation on firm advantage. *Int. J. Res.-Granthaalayah* **2017**, *5*, 292–306. [CrossRef]

70. Anais, W.S. Continuation of crippled citizenship: Civic virtues are for social responsibility or political participation. *Educ. Res. J.* **2007**, *22*, 2. Available online: http://hkier.fed.cuhk.edu.hk/journal/wp-content/uploads/2010/06/erj_v22n2_201-228.pdf (accessed on 14 May 2022).

71. Grönlund, K.; Setälä, M.; Herne, K. Deliberation and Civic Virtue—Lessons from a Citizen Deliberation Experiment. *Eur. Political Sci. Rev.* **2010**, *2*, 95–117. [CrossRef]

72. Green, J.A.; O'Connor, D.B.; Gartland, N.; Roberts, B.W. The Chernyshenko Conscientiousness Scales. *Assessment* **2015**, *23*, 374–385. [CrossRef] [PubMed]

73. Godden, B. Sample Size Determination Formulas. 2004. Available online: www.williamgodden.com/samplesizeformula.pdf (accessed on 14 May 2022).

74. Bierhoff, H.; Rohmann, E. Altruistic personality in the context of the empathy-altruism hypothesis. *Eur. J. Personal.* **2004**, *18*, 351–365. [CrossRef]

75. Rachlin, H. Altruism and selfishness. *Behav. Brain Sci.* **2002**, *25*, 239–250. [CrossRef] [PubMed]