The Influence of Corporate Culture on the Choice of Managerial Leadership Style: A Study of First Bank and Sterling Bank

Manji Wapshak Kumdi
M.Sc Research Student in the Department of Business Administration,
Faculty of Management Sciences,
University of Jos,
Nigeria
mwapshak@yahoo.co.uk

Abstract
Founders and subsequent leaders in organizations created corporate culture, but overtime little is known about how the created corporate culture influences managers' choice of a given leadership style. Therefore, this study examined the influence corporate culture has on the choice of managerial leadership styles. Charles Handy's organizational culture questionnaire and Rensis Linkert's leadership style questionnaire were merged to form a single questionnaire that was administered to 180 staff of First Bank plc and Sterling Bank plc within the Jos Business Unit. 163 questionnaires were retrieved and analysed using SPSS version 19.0. Simple Linear Regression was used in testing the four hypotheses and the results showed that there is no significant relationship between: power culture and the choice of exploitative-authoritative; role culture and the choice of benevolent-authoritative; task culture and the choice of consultative leadership style; person culture and participative leadership style in Nigerian banks. The study concludes that there is insignificant relationship between corporate culture and the choice of managerial leadership style in Plateau State. Hence, the study recommended that corporate managers should not choose leadership styles based on their corporate cultures.

Key words: Corporate, Culture, Managerial, Leadership Style

1.1 Background of the Study

It is difficult to name just one extremely successful company, one that is an acknowledged leader in its industry without a unique, easily identifiable corporate culture. For example, successful Japanese and American companies like Toyota, Sony, Coca-Cola, General Electric, Intel, McDonald's, and Microsoft, all have distinctive cultures that are clearly identifiable by employees (Cameron & Quinn, 2006).

Corporate culture represents the norms, values, priorities, and beliefs that guide the conduct of employees in an organisation. It is the unwritten rule that specifies the relationships between employees on one hand and the relationship between the employees and the organisation on the other hand, including those behavious and management styles that prevail in the organisation. All these together, create the climate that influences how people communicate, plan and make decisions (Kondalkar, 2007). This climate differs across banks, giving each bank a unique identity (Kondalkar, 2007) and manifest in ways that the bank relates with its customers, its employees and other key stakeholders.

The most fascinating thing about culture is that it directs us to occurrences that are below the surface, that are powerful in their impact but invisible and to a considerable degree, unconscious (Schein, 2004). Schein (2004) explains that culture is to a group what personality or character is to an individual. Most times, they are forces underneath that cause certain kinds of behaviours that cannot be seen, but the behaviour can be seen. Nonetheless,

just as individual personality and character guide and constrain behaviour, so does culture guides and constrains the behaviour of members of a group through the shared norms that are held in that group.

The culture of an organisation is difficult to measure and define (KPMG, 2016). Corporate culture has been recognized as something more complex, and more than just the collection of shared values and behavious by employees which deals with mindsets. It includes skills and business processes. It is "the habitual ways we go about solving business problems and treating each other" (Childress and The Principia Group, n.d., p.4).

The banking industry is crucial as it plays the role of supplying finance to enterprises in the whole economy. And when ever there is changes in the political or economic environment, the industry is bound to get affected in some ways, especially in recession (Tsai, Tsai, & Wang, 2011). Focusig on the culture in financial service corporations like bank is a priority (McDermott, 2015). It is the driver of individual behaviours which subsequently affects day-to-day practices in organisations and their interaction with customers and other market participants.

In the banking sector, everyone appears to be focusing on regulation as the key strategy for overcoming the present challenge, but other sound avenues such as corporate culture should rather be explored by banks (Childress and The Principia Group, n.d). Agreeing with this position, the legendary and savvy investor of the past three decades in a letter to Berkshire Hathaway shareholder explains that "culture, more than rule books, determines how an organisation behaves" (Childress and The Principia Group, n.d, p.2). Not that following the book is bad, but prudent regulatory practices and good corporate culture could help build a better, stronger, responsive and responsible banking industry.

Explaing the functions of corporate culture, (Schermerhorn, Osborn, Uhl-Bien, & Hunt, 2012) believes that via their collective experience, members of an organisation can solve two extremely important survival issues of external adaptation (what precisely needs to be accomplished, and how to get it done) and internal integration (how members resolve the daily problems associated with living and working together). It is quite tempting to believe that culture and leadership styles are internal issues. But culture directly impacts on how a bank deals with its clients and prospects (Childress & ThePrincipiaGroup).

Organisations are set up with the expectations of effective and efficient performance, including growth in terms of increase in productivity, revenue generation, profit maximization, customer's satisfaction and increase employees' performance. The degree to which this performance and growth objectives are achieved is mostly determined by the type of leadership style used in an organisation which accounts for its efficiency and effectiveness (Mohammed, Yusuf, Sani, Ifeyinwa, Bature and Kazeem, 2014).

Majority of organisational scholars and observers believe that organisational culture has a powerful effect on the performance and long-term effectiveness of organisations. Empirical research findings indicate the importance of culture in enhancing organisational performance (Cameron and Ettington, 1988; Denison, 1990; and Trice and Beyer, 1993).

The interelationship between corporate culture and performance is attained when strategy – structure – culture are properly aligned (Childress and The Principia Group, n.d). The trio of strategy, structure and culture are created by the leadership of the organzation. Therefore, it is a leader who must do the alignment.

Leadership is seen as a process which involves influence that occurs within a group contact, and involves goal attainment. It is where an individual or group of individuals influences another individual or groups of individuals to achieve a common goal. The leader provides inspiration and direction, and possesses the mixed of personality and skills that make others want to follow his or her direction. An effective leader is someone who knows how to inspire and relate to subordinates, knows how to increase the employees' motivation and make employees loyal to the organisation so as to increase their company's bottom lines (Alkahtani, 2016). In business, just as culture, leadership is strongly linked to performance.

Therefore, how a leader goes about achieving these is what we called style. Put differently, style is a way of doing something, especially one, which is typical of a person, group of people or place (Genty, 2014). Leadership style has to do with the approach used in providing direction, implementing plans, and motivating people (Northouse, 2015). It also has to do with the type of method or technique adopted by a leader in a particular situation in order to achieve group goals or objectives (Genty, 2014). Leaders should identify the best leadership style to manage their employees in the organisation.

This is very important because there are consequences associated with the application and usage of wrong style of leadership. Girei (2015) explains that when employees are not satisfied with the leaedership style in an organisation, it manifests in unwholesome activities such as frequent complaints, strikes and high labour turnover. Taking a particular position on Nigerian businesses, Okoh (1998) and Okafor (2005) cited in Girei (2015) associated Nigerian workers with inefficiency, poor achievement of results, shoddy handling of activities and programmes, poor rendering of services, abuse of office, delays, corruption, poor quality of work output, poor commitment, low morale, truancy, lateness to duty, idleness, laxity, indiscipline, poor productivity among other vices all because of poor leadership (Girei, 2015).

What leader-follower relationships have is a psychological contract which implies promises (which may not be explicit) of future behaviour from leaders, dependent on some reciprocal actions of followers (Rousseau, 1990). Rousseau (1990) argues that when followers believe that they are obligated to behave or perform in a certain way and also believe that their leaders have certain obligations towards them, these beliefs constitute a psychological contract. The dominant leadership style in an organisation explains the nature of this psychological contract between leaders and followers (Kuada, 2010).

Denison (1990) cited in (Gray, 1998) believes that management practices are usually embedded in the values of the organisation, and at the same time, values and beliefs are central to the concept of culture. Extent literatures overwhelmingly show that leadership affects organisational form, culture, and practice; and at the same time organisational culture and practices also affect what leaders do (House, Hanges, Ruiz-Quintanilla, Dorfman, Javidan, Dickson, and Gupta, n.d). Using the analogy of the footsteps, it does appear that at one point, organisational culture follows leadership while at another point leadership follows organisational culture. It becomes axiomatic that culture will affect organisational performance through the choices managers make as per the style of leadership. How culture influences the choice of leadership styles in Nigerian banks remains unclear.

1.2 Statement of the Problem

A visit to any bank will clearly show that different banks have different cultures. Looking at the way corporate culture is created (which is internal business process and the behaviours of the leadership team), either by design or by default, it is created by choices made concerning

business processes and leadership styles. In the beginning, founders of organisations create organisational culture, but overtime, subsequent leaders respond to the organisational culture and alter their behaviours and leadership styles (Schein, 2004).

This portrays interplay between culture and leadership styles. In this relationship, leaders are known to have dominant influence on the direction of cultural norms and basic assumptions in institutional settings (Belias & Koustelios, 2014). This is as a result of many studies as observed by Schien (2004) that leadership has been studied in far greater detail than corporate culture. However, there are no empirical studies to show how leadership style is influence by corporate culture.

In a bank, like in most other organizations, Handy (1993) dimensionalised corporate culture into power culture, role culture, task culture, and people culture. Similarly, Likert (1967) systemised leadership styles into Exploitative – authoritative style of leadership, benevolent-authoritative style of leadership, consultative style of leadership and participative –group style of leadership.

Since there is an interplay between leadership and culture, there is a possibility that power culture influence the choice of exploitative leadership style, role culture influence the choice of benevolent-authoritative leadership style, task culture influence the choice of consultative style of leadership and people culture influence the choice of participative-group style of leadership.

1.3 Research Questions
Based on the research topic and problem statement, the following research questions are raised:
i) What is the relationship between power culture and the choice of exploitative-authoritative style of leadership?
ii) What is the relationship between role culture and the choice of benevolent-authoritative style of leadership?
iii) What is the relationship between task culture and the choice of consultative style of leadership?
iv) What is the relationship between people culture and the choice of participative-group style of leadership?

1.4 Objectives of the Study
The overall objective of this study is to examine the influence of corporate culture on the choice of leadership styles. However, the specific objectives are:
i) To evaluate the relationship between power culture and the choice of exploitative-authoritative style of leadership.
ii) To examine the relationship between role culture and the choice of benevolent-authoritative style of leadership.
iii) To assess the relationship between task culture and the choice of consultative style of leadership.
iv) To analyse the relationship between people culture and the choice of participative –group style of leadership.

1.5 Research Hypotheses
The research has the following hypotheses:
H_{01}: There is no significant relationship between power culture and the choice of

exploitative-authoritative style of leadership

H$_{02}$: There is no significant relationship between role culture and the choice of benevolent-authoritative style of leadership.

H$_{03}$: There is no significant relationship between task culture and the choice of consultative style of leadership

H$_{04}$: There is no significant relationship between people culture and the choice of participative-group style of leadership

Literature Review
2.1 Conceptual Review
In this conceptual review, the research reviewed literatures explaining key concepts which include corporate culture, leadership and leadership styles:

2.1.1 Corporate Culture
Several scholars and practioners have made several attempts to describe corporate culture, yet, there is no single universally acceptable definition of the term. In fact, most literatures used the term interchangeable with organisational culture. But Schermerhorn, Osborn, Uhl-Bien and Hunt 2012) clearly explains that the term corporate mangement is used in the business setting. However, in this research the terms are used interchangeably.

The terms entered management literature in the late 70s. According to Belias and Koustelios (2014) Silversweig and Allen (1976) were the early descriptors of organisational culture as a collection of behaviours that are widely supported and expected within the group. Later, organisational culture became "corporate culture", through the work of Peters and Waterman (1982). They argued that the success of a company could be associated to corporate culture which is decisive, customer oriented, empowering, and people oriented. Right from that time, corporate culture has become the subject of numerous research studies, books, and articles (Bauer & Erdogan, 2012).

Taking a broader look, Boak (2007) observed that culture is an idea that organisational theorists have borrowed from anthropologists, which describes the collection of beliefs, norms and values that are shared by a group of people: this may be a community, an ethnic group, a work team, or an organisation.

Schein (2004:17) defined corporate culture as: a pattern of shared basic assumptions that was learned by a group as it solved its problems of external adaptation and internal integration, that has worked well enough to be considered valid and, therefore, to be taught to new members as the correct way to perceive, think, and feel in relation to those problems.

Schein (2004) says that where a group does not have shared assumptions (as will sometimes be the case) the way the new and the old members interact will be a creative process of building culture. However, the moment there is shared assumptions, the culture is sustained through teaching it to new members of the organisation. Agreeing with Schein, Yukl (2002) explains that the underlying beliefs that represent the culture of an organisation are learned responses to the problems of survival in the external environment and problems of internal integration. The basic external problems are the core mission or reason for existence of the organisation, concrete objectives based on this mission, strategies for attaining these objectives and ways to measure success in attaining objectives.

Expanding on Schein's definition, Janićijević (2012) defined organisational culture as "a system of assumptions, values, norms, and attitudes, manifested through symbols which the members of an organisation have developed and adopted through mutual experience and

which help them determine the meaning of the world around them and how to behave in it" p. Malby (2007:624) sees organisational culture "as the shared assumptions, values, and beliefs that guide the actions of its members". To Chatman and Eunyoung (2003), corporate culture refers to a system of shared assumptions, values, and beliefs that show employees what is appropriate and inappropriate behaviour. It is a common perception and shared meaning held by the members of an organisation (Robbins, 2002).

Robbins (2002) opined that on a closer look the shared meaning suggests a set of key characteristics that a corporation values. He reported that there are seven characteristics that capture the essence of corporate culture. They are:

  i.   Innovation and risk taking. The degree to which employees are encouraged to be innovative and take risks.
  ii.   Attention to detail. The degree to which employees are expected to exhibit precision, analysis, and attention to detail.
  iii. Outcome orientation. The degree to which management focuses on results or outcomes rather than on the techniques and processes used to achieve these outcomes.
  iv.   People orientation. The degree to which management decisions take into consideration the effect of outcomes on people within the organisation.
  v.   Team orientation. The degree to which work are activities are organized around teams rather than individuals.
  vi.   Aggressiveness. The degree to which people are aggressive and competitive rather than easygoing.
  vii. Stability. The degree to which organisational activities emphasize maintaining the status quo in contrast to growth.

He notes that each of these characteristics exists on a continuum from low to high. All of these together give a composite picture of the organisation's culture which becomes the basis for feeling of shared understanding, how things are done in it, and how members are supposed to behave.

In relation to the above definition, Arnold (2005, p 625) indicates that "organisational culture is the distinctive norms, beliefs, principles and ways of behaving that combine to give each organisation its distinct character". These two definitions suggest that organisational culture distinguishes one organisation from another organisation. Therefore, organisational culture is to an organisation what personality is to an individual (Johnson, 1990).
Schermerhorn, Osborn, Uhl-Bien, and Hunt (2012) explains that corporate culture has to do with shared actions, values, and beliefs that develops within an organisation and guides the behaviour of its members. Each organisation is different and has its own unique culture. It is liken to individual personality which is rare to see two individuals having the same personalities. But, each organisation has some common cultural elements which give stability and meaning it.

Organisation culture influences the behaviours of the members of an organisation and shapes the components of the organisation and management. This is depended on the values and norms contained in the organisational culture, employees defined their motives and management in turn creates and chose strategy and structure which shape their leadership style. A solid form of the effect of corporate culture on an organisation and management is seen in the fact that components of an organisation and management differ in different kinds or types of corporate culture (Janićijević, 2012).

The research study adopted the definition given by Harrison (1993:11) who defines corporate culture as the "distinctive constellation of beliefs, values, work styles, and relationships that distinguish one organisation from another". In other words, organisational culture includes those qualities of the organisation that give it a particular climate or feel. As a result the distinct qualities of an organisation may manifest through four dimensions, namely power, role, achievement and support (Harrison, 1993).

The Management Study Guide, an online management study guide identified four types of culture which organisations follow. The four cultures were developed by Charles Handy and it is called Charles Handy's model. The model identified power culture, task culture, person culture and role culture. Let us understand them in detail:

1. Power Culture
There are some organisations where the power remains in the hands of only few people and only they are authorized to take decisions. They are the ones who enjoy special privileges at the workplace. They are the most important people at the workplace and are the major decision makers. These individuals further delegate responsibilities to the other employees. In such a culture the subordinates have no option but to strictly follow their superior's instructions. The employees do not have the liberty to express their views or share their ideas on an open forum and have to follow what their superior says. The managers in such a type of culture sometimes can be partial to someone or the other leading to major unrest among others.

2. Task Culture
Organisations where teams are formed to achieve the targets or solve critical problems follow the task culture. In such organisations individuals with common interests and specializations come together to form a team. There are generally four to five members in each team. In such a culture every team member has to contribute equally and accomplish tasks in the most innovative way.

3. Person Culture
There are certain organisations where the employees feel that they are more important than their organisation. Such organisations follow a culture known as person culture. In a person culture, individuals are more concerned about their own self rather than the organisation. The organisation in such a culture takes a back seat and eventually suffers. Employees just come to the office for the sake of money and never get attached to it. They are seldom loyal towards the management and never decide in favour of the organisation. One should always remember that organisation comes first and everything else later.

4. Role culture
Role culture is a culture where every employee is delegated roles and responsibilities according to his specialization, educational qualification and interest to extract the best out of him. In such a culture employees decide what best they can do and willingly accept the challenge. Every individual is accountable for something or the other and has to take ownership of the work assigned to him. Power comes with responsibility in such a work culture.

This research study adopts the Handy's model to understand the cultures in Nigerian banks and how it influences the choice of managerial leadership styles in the banks.

2.1.2 Concept of Leadership

The term leadership means different things to different people. Organisational scholars and practitioners have different views of leadership. Yukl (2002) concur that researchers normally defined leadership according to their individual perspectives and phenomenon of most interest to them. Stogdill (1974: 259, cited in Yukl (2002) concluded that "there are almost as many definitions of leaderships of leadership as there are persons who have attempted to define the concept."

Since Stogdill made his observation, there have been a plethora of definitions in terms of traits, behaviours, influence, interaction patterns, role relationships, and occupation of an administrative position (Yukl, 2002).

As far back as the 50s, Hemphil and Coons (1957, p.7) defined leadership as "the behaviour of an individual…directing the activities of a group toward a shared goal". Katz and Kahn (1978, p.528) sees it as "the influential increment over and above mechanical compliance with the routine directives of the organisation. Burns (1978, p.18) observed that "leadership is exercised when persons…mobilize…institutional, political, psychological, and other resources so as to arouse, engage, and satisfy the motives of followers"

Furthermore, Rauch and Behling (1984, p.46) described leadership as "the process of influencing the activities of an organized group toward goal achievement. Jacobs and Jaques (1990, p.281) said "leadership is a process of giving purpose (meaningful direction) to collective effort, and causing willing effort to be expended to achieve purpose".

Robbins (2002, p.314) defined leadership 'as the ability to influence a group toward the achievement of goals'. Lucey (2005, p.118) defined leadership as 'the ability to influence the behaviour of others…within a working group in order that the group may achieve group tasks or objectives.

Schein (2004) sees leadership as the process of influencing others to understand and agree about what needs to be done and how to do it, and the process of facilitating individual and collective efforts to accomplish shared objectives

Yukl (2002, p.27) defined leadership as '…the process of influencing others to understand and agree about what needs to be done and how it be done effectively, and the process of facilitating individual and collective efforts to accomplish shared objectives.

House, et al (n.d, p.13) reveals that consensus with respect to a universal definition of organisational leadership emerged among GLOBE researchers which is "the ability of an individual to influence, motivate, and enable others to contribute toward the effectiveness and success of the organisations of which they are members." But it should be noted that this is a definition of organisational leadership, not leadership in general. This research adopts this definition.

This many definitions of leadership assumes that it consists of a process whereby deliberate influence is exerted by an individual over other individuals to guide, structure, and facilitate activities, including relationships in a group or organisation ((Yukl, 2002). This suggests that the source of this influence could be formal, which is based on position or possession of managerial rank in organisations. Management positions comes with formally designated authority, a person may assume leadership role simply because of the position he or she holds (Robbins, 2002). On the other hand, the source of influence could be informal or what Robbins (2002) called nonsanctioned leadership which arises outside the formal structure of the organisation.

It should be noted that leadership here is applied in the context of organisation rather than political. The research assumes and believes that management and the ability to lead are

equated, based on the fact that the best performing managers tend to be effective leaders and leadership is one of the fundamental functions of management (Gonos & Gallo, 2013).

2.1.3 Leadership Styles

The style of leadership adopted by management often determines the level of employees' participation and the way an organisation is run administratively (Uchenwangbe, 2013, cited in Longe, 2014). By adopting the appropriate leadership style, management can impact positively on the performance of their organisation.

But as a human resource management skill, leadership skill has constructive as well as disruptive scope in the workplace. Leadership style can serve as a pure incentive in building a performance oriented organisation, and the same time, it can also act as a disincentive which corrodes responsibility for performance in organisations. The ambivalence in the result of leadership style makes it mandatory for management and leadership of organisations to focus on which leadership styles suits best their organisation given an organisational situation and circumstance (Longe, 2014). These circumstances could be out of control of managers and leaders. It could be imbedded in corporate culture. It is clearly that corporate culture influences leadership style, however, it is not clear which of the cultural dimensions influence the choice of leadership styles in Nigerian banks.

Helms (2006, p.442) broadly defined leadership styles "as the manner and approach of providing direction, implementing plans, and motivating people". Genty (2014) describes leadership style as the type of method or technique adopted by a leader in a particular situation in order to achieve group goals or objectives. Leadership behaviour and style is the way in which the functions of leadership are carried out, the way in which managers typically behave towards members of the group, (Onosode, 1988, cited in Igbaekemen, 2014).

Sharifah, et al, (2012, cited in (Ochugudu & Aondoaseer, 2013) identified the following leadership styles, namely: autocratic leadership, bureaucratic leadership, democratic or participative leadership, servant leadership, people or relationship oriented leadership, task oriented leadership, laissez-faire leadership, charismatic leadership, transactional leadership and transformational leadership.

But the GLOBE Study (2014, p.4) synthesized all these leadership styles into six broad styles which include:

i) **The charismatic/value based style:** stresses high standards, decisiveness, and innovation; seeks to inspire people around a vision; creates a passion among them to perform; and does so by firmly holding on to core values. This includes the facets of visionary, inspirational, self-sacrificial, integrity, decisive, and performance-oriented.

ii) **The team-oriented style:** instills pride, loyalty, and collaboration among organisational members; and highly values team cohesiveness and a common purpose or goals. This style includes the facets of collaborative team orientation, team integrator, diplomatic, (reverse scored) malevolent, and administratively competent.

iii) **The participative style**: encourages input from others in decision making and implementation; and emphasizes delegation and equality. This style includes the facets of autocratic and non-participative.

iv) **The humane style:** stresses compassion and generosity; and it is patient, supportive, and concerned with the well-being of others. This style includes the facets of modesty and humane-oriented.

v) **The self-protective**: style emphasizes procedural, status-conscious, and 'facesaving' behaviours; and focuses on the safety and security of the individual and the group.

This style includes the facets of self-centered, status-conscious, conflict inducer, face saver, and procedural.

vi) **The autonomous style**: includes only one facet concerned with autonomy. It is characterized by an independent, individualistic, and self-centric approach to leadership.

These leadership styles identified by the GLOBE Study were identified after a study of societal culture. They represent universally endorsed leadership styles based on societal or national cultures

Though organisational culture and societal culture cannot be estranged, societal culture is difficult to change but organisational culture can be change as one move from one organisation to the other. Thus, it will be appropriate to utilized leadership variables identified based on organisational studies. After three decades of research on managerial styles, Likert (196) developed four styles of leadership, developed on the basis of a three-decade research on management styles.

They are referred to as systems and defined as follows:

1. **System 1 (exploitative - authoritative style of leadership):** the leader is highly authoritative and does not trust the subordinates. Decisions are made exclusively at the top of the organisation. Communication takes the form of top-down commands. Managers require harsh discipline and are not interested in initiative and opinions of subordinates. Motivation is encouraged through fear and punishment, while rewards are rarely given.

2. **System 2 (benevolent-authoritative style of leadership):** the authoritative element still dominates, although some decision-making is delegated. It allows downward communication, because the leader is interested in some ideas and opinions of subordinates, thus partially tolerates them. Although some responsibility is delegated, there is still a strict control. Motivation is based on rewards, but also on fear and punishment.

3. **System 3 (consultative style of leadership):** the leader trusts the subordinates to a great extent, but not completely. He or she usually tries to use their thoughts and ideas. The top management has control over general policies and decisions, while specific decisions are delegated to lower organisational levels. Information flow both top-down, as well as bottom-up. Rewards and sometimes punishments are used to motivate subordinates.

4. **System 4 (participative - group style of leadership):** the leader fully or almost fully trusts the subordinates. This is reflected in a more significant level participation in the decision-making processes. Lower organisational levels are given a more extensive autonomy. The two-way communication is promoted and is often used for the joint preparation of important decisions. Participation in joint activities, e.g. setting goals and fulfilling them, is also motivated by financial remuneration.

The research study adopted the Likert model of leadership evaluation based on the aforementioned reasons, including the fact that leadership styles are four and can easily be related with the corporate culture variables adopted for the study.

2.2 Culture and Leadership

When culture and leadership are examined keenly, it can be seen that they are two sides of the same coin; neither can really be understood by itself. One side of the coin shows that cultural norms defined how an organisation perceives leadership: that is who will get promoted, who will get the attention of followers (Schein, 2004). On the other side of the

coin, Schein (2004) argued that the only thing of real importance that leaders do is to create and manage culture; that the unique talent of leaders is their ability to understand and work with culture; and that it is an ultimate act of leadership to destroy culture when it is viewed as dysfunctional. It is in this sense that leadership and culture are conceptually intertwined.

2.3 Theoretical Framework
Environmental Factor Theory
The environmental factor theory holds that the factors that exert pressures on our personality formation are the culture in which we are raised, the norms among our family, friends and social groups and other influences that we experience. The environmental factors play a role in shaping the personality of a child. A careful consideration of the arguments forming either heredity or environment as the primary determinant of personality forces the conclusion that both are important. Heredity provides the child with inborn traits and abilities, but the child full potential will be determined by how well he or she adopts to the demands and requirements of the environment (Robbins, Judge, Millet, Waters-Marsh (2008).

Likewise, every organisation has an environment that is composed of institutions or forces outside the organisation that potentially affect its performance (Robbins, Judge, Millet, Waters-Marsh (2008). Stewart (n.d.) explains that organizational environments are composed of forces or institutions surrounding an organization that affect performance, operations, and resources. It consists of the entities, conditions, events, and factors within the organization that influence choices and activities. Factors that are frequently considered part of the internal environment include the organization's culture and leadership styles. Just like the personality of a child cannot be estranged from the environment that nurtured the child, so also the leadership style of a manager cannot be estranged from the corporate culture he/she rose through.

3.0 Methodology
3.1 Research design and population
The research used explanatory survey design. Asika (1991) explains that explanatory research design is a form of cross sectional research design that is used to explain rather than to describe. According to Saunders, Lewis, and Thornhill (2009) Studies that establish causal relationships between variables may be termed explanatory research. They stressed that the emphasis here is on studying a situation or a problem in order to explain the relationships between variables.

Therefore, the study explained the relationship between the power culture and exploitative-authoritative leadership style; role culture and benevolent-authoritative style of leadership; task culture and consultative style of leadership; and person culture and participative-group style of leadership.
This research design was used because it is a popular and common strategy in business and management research which allows the collection of a large amount of data from a sizeable population in a highly economical way. In addition, the survey strategy is perceived as authoritative by people in general and the data collected using a survey strategy can be used to suggest possible reasons for particular relationships between variables and to produce models of these relationships (Saunders, Lewis, and Thornhill, 2009).
The study used questionnaires developed by Charles Handy for testing organisational culture type which contains options on the four organizational culture type and leadership styles questionnaire for evaluating leadership styles developed by Rensis Likert's which is a five point Likert scales: 5 - strongly agree; 4- agree; 3- neutral; 2- disagree; 1- strongly disagree.

These questionnaires were used because they have been used by the authors in several studies and have been found valid. For ease of administration and coding, the questionnaires were matched together to give a single questionnaire segmented into three sections. The Cronbach's alpha was used to determine the reliability of the questionnaire which was computed with the help of Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS). The reliability statistics gives a value of 0.859, which means that the questionnaire is reliable since it exceeds the 0.7 level as researchers recommend (Kurtinaitiene, 2005).

The questionnaire designed was administered to 180 staff of First Bank PLC (Jos Business Development Area) and Sterling Bank PLC, Jos. The two banks were purposively chosen: First Bank was chosen because it is an old generation bank while Sterling bank is a new generation bank. Based on their period of incorporation, it is generally perceived that these two generations of banks have different cultures and styles of leadership. The participants were selected using simple random sampling technique after which, data were collected through a personal approach and a response rate of 91% was achieved. The data collection approach was chosen because of the limited availability and efficiency of postal and communication services in Nigeria: it is unfavorable for questionnaires to be mailed to our respondents.

3.2 Data analysis

Data was coded, cleaned and analysed using Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS) version 19.0 followed by parametric assumptions diagnostic tests. The results revealed that the parametric assumptions were met. Descriptive statistics were used to determine the sample characteristics. Simple linear regression was used in testing the relationship between the dependent variables and the independent variables, while Spearman's Rank Correlation was used to test the strength of the relationship between the dependent variables and the independent variables.

3.3 The Regression Model

The research study developed and used the model below in testing the four hypotheses of the study.

Model 1: $explds = \beta 0 + \beta 1pwrc + \varepsilon$

Model 2: $benlds = \beta 0 + \beta 1rlc + \varepsilon$

Model 3: $Cnls = \beta 0 + \beta 1tskc + \varepsilon$

Model 1: $Prtgls = \beta 0 + \beta 1pplc + \varepsilon$

Where explds = Exploitative-authoritative leadership style

$\beta 0$ - is a constant

pwrc = Power culture

benauls = Benevolent- authoritative leadership style

rlc = Role culture

cnls = Consultative leadership style

tskc = Task culture

Partgls = Participative-group leadership style

pplc = People culture

ε is the error term

4.0 Results

The results in appendix 1 indicate that in Model 1, the control variables (Power culture) have an insignificant explanatory power of 1%. This implies that the influence of power culture on Exploitative-authoritative leadership style is negligible. The t statistics in the table of coefficient shows a significant value of 0.214, which is greater than α (0.05), as such there is no sufficient reason to reject the null hypothesis which states that there is no significant relationship between power culture and the choice of exploitative-authoritative leadership style. The Spearman rho in appendix 5 indicates a correlation coefficient of − 0.088. This shows a weak negative relationship between power culture and exploitative-authoritative style of leadership in Nigeria. This further confirms that there is a weak negative relationship between power culture and the choice of exploitative-authoritative leadership style in Nigerian banks.

Also, the results in appendix 2 indicate that in Model 2, the control variable (Role culture) have an insignificant explanatory power of 0%. This implies that the influence of Role culture on Benevolent-authoritative leadership style is completely negligible. The t statistics in the table of coefficient shows a significant value of 0.807, which is greater than α (0.05), there is no sufficient reason to reject the null hypothesis which states that there is no significant relationship between role culture and the choice of benevolent-authoritative leadership styles. Spearman rho (appendix 5) also shows a correlation coefficient of -0.037. This means that there is a weak negative relationship between role culture and the choice of benevolent leadership style.

Moreover, the results in appendix 3 indicate that in Model 3, the control variable (Task culture) have an insignificant explanatory power of 1.2%. This implies that the influence of Task culture on Consultative leadership style is negligible. The t statistics in the table of coefficient revealed a significant value of 0.172, which is greater than α (0.05), thus, there is no enough reasons to reject the null hypothesis which states that there is no significant relationship between task culture and the choice of consultative leadership style. The Spearman rho (appendix 5) gives a correlation coefficient of - 0.065. It means that there is a weak negative relationship between task culture and the choice of consultative style of leadership in Nigeria banks. This further explains the fact that task culture has an insignificant influence on the choice of consultative style of leadership.

The results in appendix 4 also indicate that in Model 4, the control variable (People culture) have an insignificant explanatory power of 0.05%. This implies that the influence of Task culture on Consultative leadership style is totally negligible. Since the t statistics in the table of coefficient yield a significant value of 0.351, which is greater than α (0.05), there is no sufficient reason to reject the null hypothesis which states that there is no significant relationship between person culture and choice of participatory style of leadership in Nigeria banks. This means that person culture does not influence the choice of participatory leadership style in Nigerian banks. That is to say that person culture is not a good predictor of the choice of participatory leadership styles in the banks. The spearman rho (appendix 5) gives a correlation coefficient of − 0.059. This means that there is a weak negative relationship between person culture and participatory style of leadership in Nigeria; further confirming the regression result that revealed that there is no significant relationship between person culture and the choice of participatory style of leadership in the banks.

4.3 Discussion

This research study was aimed at evaluating the influence corporate culture has on the choice

of leadership style in banks in Jos. The result of the study shows that there is no significant relationship between power culture and the choice of exploitative-authoritative leadership style in Plateau State. In fact, the study revealed that their relationship is not only insignificant, but it is weak and negative. Which means that the relationship is in opposite direction: when power culture increase in the organisation, exploitative-authoritative leadership style decreases.

The paper also revealed that there is no significant relationship between role culture and the choice of benevolent-authoritative leadership style in Nigeria. This implies that role culture as a typology of corporate culture does not influence the choice of benevolent-authoritative leadership style in banks in Jos. The study indicated that the relationship between the duos is quite weak and negative.

The research study further revealed that there is no significant relationship between task culture and the choice of consultative leadership style in Plateau State. The study also indicated that the relationship between task culture and the choice of consultative leadership style is weak and negative. What this means is that task culture does not influence the choice of consultative leadership style in banks in Jos. Other things may be responsible.

It was discovered that there is no significant relationship between person culture and the choice of participative leadership style in Jos. As a matter of fact, it was found out that there is a weak negative relationship between person culture and the choice of participative leadership style. This implies that people culture does not influence the choice of participative leadership styles by managers in the banks.

Since all the dimensions of cultured studied have insignificant influence on the choice of the various leadership style, the research agrees with Kargas and Varoutas (2015) who found out that in all cases, leadership affects culture more than culture affects leadership and that leadership plays a more significant role to cultural formatting, than the opposite. However, the research study disagrees with Yukl (2006) who explained that in mature, relatively prosperous organizations, culture influences leaders more than leaders influence culture. One expects that in mature and prosperous organizations like banks, corporate culture would influence the leadership styles; however, corporate culture has insignificant influence on the choice of leadership style.

Moreover, the research study found out that there is no single culture operating in the banks. It is a mixed of different cultures. The study very importantly reveals that the dominant cultural typology in the banks is the task culture. This culture perceives an organisation as a tool for problem solving and accomplishing tasks. The hallmarks of this culture are results; competency, creativity, achievement, and change. In this type of culture it is presumed that the power in an organisation must always be distributed relatively evenly among its members. Since an organisation with task or "guided missile" culture is focused on tasks, the drawback of this culture is the fact that relationships and social structure are of secondary importance (Janićijević, 2012).

Equally, the study also discovered that there is exploitative-authoritative leadership style, benevolent-authoritative leadership style, consultative style and participative style of leadership in Nigerian banks.

A significant finding under the leadership styles practice in the banks is the discovery of the dominant leadership style which is the participatory style. The participatory style of leadership is characterized by two-way communication and is often used for the joint preparation of important decisions. Participation in joint activities, for instance, setting goals

and fulfilling them, Lower organisational levels are given a more extensive autonomy in routine schedules. According to Likert (1965) managers who applied the participatory style of leadership to their management had greatest success as leaders and their organisations were found to be most effective in achieving performance goals and were generally more productive.

5.0 Conclusions

Based on the findings of this study, the research concludes that all the dimensions of culture studied (power culture, role culture, task culture, people culture) and leadership styles (exploitative-authoritative leadership style, benevolent-authoritative leadership style, consultative leadership style, and participative leadership style) are present in Nigerian banks and practice by the managers. This agrees with the position of Cacciattolo (2014) who observed that in practice, an organisational culture is not completely 'homogeneous'. In other words, no organisation adopts a single type of culture. As a matter of fact, complex organisations might have sub-cultures that overlap and disagree with each other.

The research concludes that the relationship between power culture and the choice of exploitative-authoritative leadership style is insignificant. This implies that the presence and the choice of exploitative-authoritative leadership style in the banks is not influence by power culture, other factors could be responsible.

Moreover, the research revealed that there is no significant relationship between role culture and the choice of benevolent-authoritative leadership style. Meaning that, role culture does not influence the choice of benevolent leadership style by managers in the banks in Jos.

The research also concludes that task culture does not influence the choice of consultative leadership style by managers in Nigeria. Furthermore, a culture that is people centered does not influence the choice of participative leadership style among managers.

Since all the dimensions of culture do not influence the choice of leadership styles in the banks, the research succinctly agrees with Schien (2004) who observed that leaders influence corporate culture and corporate culture influences leadership. However, the influence of corporate culture on the choice of managerial leadership style is not significant.

Moreover, the study also concludes that there is a dominant cultural dimension and leadership style in banks in Jos. The dominant dimension of culture is the task culture and the dominant leadership style is the participative leadership style.

5.1 Recommendations

The research study recommends that:

i) Since there is no significant relationship between corporate culture and the choice of leadership style, it becomes imperative for managers not to choose their leadership style based on any type of culture in the banks.

ii) Management should make every effort to change any culture or aspect of culture that impedes the achievement of corporate goals and objectives

iii) Though corporate culture has insignificant influence in the choice of leadership style, management in providing leadership must ensures that the choice of style is in tandem with corporate strategy.

5.2 Limitation of the Study

The limitation of this study is the methodology used in collecting data from the respondents. The research study used questionnaire to collect information whose weakness was that the respondents rapidly responded to the questions (without giving much thought to it), due to busy schedules and demands of duties.

Moreover, the findings of this research study arose from a single sector of the economy - the banking sector and the number of banks selected for the study is too small to make generalization. Also, the study relied so much on just one model of cultural dimension and leadership style. Perhaps, other models could yield different results.

5.3 Suggestions for Further Research

As a result of the shortcomings of this study, the research suggests that similar research should be carried out in different sectors of the economy to validate or invalidate the findings as the case may be. Future research could be carried out using other typologies of culture and leadership style to evaluate the influence of corporate culture on the choice of leadership style in Nigeria.

References

Adewale, O. O., & Anthonia, A. A. (2013). Impact of Organisational Culture on Human Resource Practices: A Study of Selected Nigerian Private Universities. *Journal of Competitiveness, 5*(4), 115-133. doi:10.7441/joc.2013.04.07

Alkahtani, A. H. (2016). The Influence of Leadership Styles on Organisational Commitment: The Moderating Effect of Emotional Intelligence. *Business and Management Studies, 2*(1), 23-34. doi:doi:10.11114/bms.v2i1.1091

Argyris, C., & Schon, D. (1978). *Organisational Learning: A Theory of Action Perspective*. Reading: Addison-Wesley

Asika, N. (1991). *Research methodology in the behavioural sciences.*Lagos: Learn Africa PLC

Bauer, T., & Erdogan, B. (2012). *An introduction to organisational behaviour.* Portland: Unnamed Publisher.

Belias, D., & Koustelios, A. (2014). The Impact of Leadership and Change Management Strategy on Organisational Culture. *European Scientific Journal, 10*(7), 450-470.

Boak, G. (2007). *Organisational cultures workbook.* Retrieved June 19, 2016, from www.Organisational%20cultures%20workbook.pdf

Bolman, L. G., & Deal, T. E. (1991). Leadership and Management Effectiveness: A Multi-Frame, Multi-Sector Analysis. Human Resource Management, 30(4), 509-534.

Bös, B., Dauber, D., & Springnagel, M. (2011). Measuring organisational culture: An empirical assessment of the Hofstede questionnaire in an Austrian setting. *IACCM*, 1-19.

Blake, R. R., & Mouton, J. S. (1964). *The managerial grid.* Houston: Gulf Publishing.

Brown, A. (1998). *Organisational Culture*. Essex: Pitman Publishing

Burns, J. M. (1978). *Leadership.* New York: Harper & Row.

Cacciattolo, K. (2014). Understanding Oganizational Cultures. *European Scientific Journal, 2*(Special), 1-7.

Cameron, K. S., & Ettington, D. R. (1988). *The Conceptual Foundations of Organizational Culture.* In John C. Smart (ed.), *Higher Education: Handbook of Theory and Research*,Vol. 4. Norwell, Mass.: Kluwer.

Cameron, K. S., & Quinn, R. E. (2006). *Diagnosing and Changing Organisational Culture: Based on the Competing Values Framework* . San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Centre For Creative Leadership. (2014). *Leader Effectiveness and Culture: The GLOBE Study.* Pennsylvania: Centre For Creative Leadership.

Childress, J. R., & ThePrincipiaGroup. (n.d.). *Why banks should focus on culture, now more than ever.* Wordpress.com.

Cooke, R.A., (1988). Behavioral norms and expectations: A quantitative approach to the assessment of organizational culture. Group and Organization Studies, 13, 245-273.

Correlation (Pearson, Kendall, Spearman). Retrieved on October 6, 2016 from http://www.statisticssolutions.com/correlation-pearson-kendall-spearman

Deal, T. A., & Kennedy, A. A. (1982). *Corporate culture.* Addison: Wesley Readings.

Dele, A. O., Nanle, M., & Abimbola, O. S. (2015). Impact of Leadership Style on Organisational Climate in the Nigerian Insurance Industry. *International Journal of Business and Industrial Marketing, 1*(3), 45-52.

Delobbe, N., Haccoun, R. R., & Vandenberghe, C. (n.d.). Measuring Core Dimensions of Organisational Culture: A Review of Research and Development of a New Instrument. *Running head: CORE DIMENSIONS OF ORGANISATIONAL CULTURE*, 1-23.

Denison, D. R. (1990). *Corporate culture and organizational effectiveness*. New York: Wiley.

Duze, C. O. (2012). Leadership Styles of Principals and Job Performance of Staff in Secondary Schools in Delta State of Nigeria. *AFRREV IJAH An International Journal of Arts and Humanities, 1*(2), 224-245.

Erdogan, B., Liden, R. C., & Kraimer, M. L. (2006). Justice and leader-member exchange: The moderating role of organizational culture. *Academy of Management Journal* , 49 , 395–406

Ekaterini, G. (2010). The Impact of Leadership Styles on Four Variables of Executives Workforce. *International Journal of Business and Management, 5*(6), 3-16.

Essien, E. A., Adekunle, O. A., & Mukaila, O.-B. A. (2013). Managerial Style and Staff Turnover in Nigerian Banks: A Comparative Analysis. *American International Journal of Social Science, 2*(6), 79-93.

Faghihi, A., & Allameh, S. M. (2012). Investigating the Influence of Employee Attitude toward Change and Leadership Style on Change Readiness by SEM (Case Study: Isfahan Municipality). *International Journal of Academic Research in Business and Social Sciences, 2*(11), 215-227.

Feldman, A., & Msibi, S. (2014). Influence of cross-cultural leadership on organisational culture: Arcelormittal, Newcastle, a South African perspective. *African Journal of Hospitality, Tourism and Leisure, 3*(1). Retrieved from Open Access- Online @ http//: www.ajhtl.com

Felix, C. O., Ahmad, A. H., & Arshad, R. B. (2015). Individualism and Collectivism as Moderators of Moral Reasoning and Transformational Leadership Style in the Nigerian Public Sector. *Journal of US-China Public Administration, 12*(7), 568-577. doi:10.17265/1548-6591/2015.07.007

GLOBE, G. L. (2014). Leadership Effectiveness and Culture: The GLOBE Study. *Center for Creative Leadership*.

Genty, K. I. (2014). Leadership Styles and There Implication For Prosperous Industrial Relations in Nigeria. *European Scientific Journal, 1*(1), 560-574.

Girei, A. A. (2015). Perceived Effects Of Leadership Styles On Workers' Performance In Package Water Producing Industry In Adamawa State, Nigeria. *International Journal for Innovation Education and Research, 3*(12), 101-110.

Gonos, J., & Gallo, P. (2013). Model for leadership style evaluation. *Management, 18*(2), 157-168.

Gray, R. (1998). *Organisational Culture and the psychological contract: A review of the Literature.* Kumpania Consulting. Retrieved from www.kumpania.co.uk

Hampton-Turner, C. (1990). *Corporate Culture For Competitive Edge A User's Guide.* London, The Economist Publications

Hampden – Turner C., Trompenaars F. (2003). *Building cross – cultural Competence: How to create wealth from conflicting values*. - Yale University Press

Handy, C. (1993). *Understanding Organizations*. London: Penguin Books

Harrison, R. (1993). *Diagnosing Organizational Culture A Trainers Manual*. Amsterdam: Pfeiffer & Company.

Helms, M. M. (2006). *Encyclopedia of Management, 5th ed.* Farmington Hills: Thomson Gale.

Hendel, T., Fish, M., & Galon, V. (2005). Leadership style and choice of strategy in conflict management among Israeli nurse managers in general hospitals. *Journal of Nursing Management, 13*, 137–146.

Hofstede, G. (2011). Dimensionalising culture: The Hofsede Model in Context. *Online Readings in Psychology and Culture, 2*(1), 1-26. doi:http://dx.doi.org/10.9707/2307-0919.101

Hofstede, G. (n.d.). *Nationa Cultures, Organisational Cultures and the Role of Management.*

Hofstede, G., 2001, Culture Consequences: Comparing Values, Behaviours, Institutions and Organizations Across Nations. California: SAGE

Hofstede, G., 1991, Cultures and Organizations: Software of the mind. Callifornia: Sage

Hollway, W. (1991). *Work psychology and organizational behaviour.* California: Sage

Hemphill, J. K., & Coons, A. E. (1957). Development of the Leader Behaviour Description Questionnaire. In Stogdill, R. M., & Coons, A. E. (Eds.), Leadership Behaviour: Its Description and Measurement. Columbus, OH: The Ohio State University, Bureau of Business Research.

House, R. J., Hanges, P. J., Ruiz-Quintanilla, S. A., Dorfman, P. W., Javidan, M., Dickson, M., & Gupta, V. (n.d.). *Cultural Influences on Leadership and Organisation: Project GLOBE.* Running Head: Project GLOBE.

Igbaekemen, G. O. (2014). Impact of Leadership Style on Organisation Performance: A Srategic Literature Review. *Public Policy and Administration Research, 4*(9), 126-136.

Janićijević, N. (2012). The Influence of Organisational Culture on Organisational Preferences Towards the Choice of Organisational Change Strategies. *Economic Annals, , LVII,* (193), 25-52. doi:DOI:10.2298/EKA1293025J

Kargas, A. D., & Varoutas, D. (2015). On the relation between organisational culture and leadership: An empirical analysis. *Cogent Business & Management*, 1-18. doi:doi.org/10.1080/23311975.2015.1055953

Katz, D., & St. Kahn, R. L. (1978). *The social psychology of organization (2nd ed.)*. New York:Wiley.

Kawatra, S., & Krishnan, V. R. (2004). Impact of Gender and Transformational Leadership on Organisational Culture. *NMIMS Management Review, 16*(1), 1-6.

Kondalkar, V. G. (2007). *Organisational Bhaviour.* New Delhi: New Age International (P) Ltd.

Kothari, C., & Garg, G. (2004). *Research methodology: Methods and techniques*. New Delhi: New Age International Publishers.

Kotur, B. R., & Anbazhagan, S. (2014). The Influence of Age and Gender on the Leadership Styles. *IOSR Journal of Business and Management (IOSR-JBM), 16*(1), 30-36.

KPMG. (2016). *Evolving banking regulation: culture and conduct.* Swiss: KPMG International.

Kuada, J. (2010). Culture and leadership in Africa: a conceptual model and research agenda. *African Journal of Economic and Management Studies*, 9-24.

Kurtinaitiene, J. (2005). Marketing orientation in the European Union mobile telecommunication market. Marketing Intelligence & Planning, 23, 104–113.

Lawa, A. A., Ajonbadi, H. A., & Otokiti, B. O. (2014). Leadership and organisational performance in the Nigeria small and medium enterprises (SMEs). *American Journal*

of Business, Economics and Management, 2(5), 121-127.

Likert, R. (1967). *The Human Organisation.* New York: McGraw Hill Book Co

Longe, O. J. (2014). Leadership Style Paradigm Shift and Organisational Performance: A Case of the Nigerian Cement Industry. *African Research Review An International Multidisciplinary Journal, 8*(4), 68-83. doi:http://dx.doi.org/10.4314/afrrev.v8i4.6

Longe, O. J. (2014, September 15). Leadership Style Paradigm Shift and Organisational Performance: A Case of the Nigerian Cement Industry. *African Research Review, 8*(4), 68-83. doi:http://dx.doi.org/10.4314/afrrev.v8i4.6

Lucey, T. (2005). *Management information systems, 9th ed.* London: Thompson Learning.

MacDonald, S., Headlam, N., & CLES. (n.d.). *Research Methods Handbook: Introductory guide to research methods for social research.* Manchester: Centre for Local Economic Strategies.

Majeed, K., Bhatti, A. M., Nemati, A. R., Rehman, I. U., & Rizwan, A. (2010). Can Cultural Change with Different Leadership Styles Enhance the Organisational Performance? *Research Journal of International Studies*, 102-132.

Malby, B. (2007). How Does Leadership Make a Difference to Organisational Culture and Effectiveness? - An Overview of the Public Sector. *Northern Leadership Academy*, 1-18.

McDermott, T. (2015). *Culture in banking.* London: Financial Conduct Authority.

Meindl, J. R., Ehrlich, S. B., Dukerich., J. M. (1985). The romance of leadership. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 30(1), 78-103.

Merton, R. K. (1957). *Social theory and social structure(Rev. ed.).* New York: Free Press.

Mohammed, U. D., Yusuf, M. O., Sanni, I. M., Ifeyinwa, T. N., Bature, N. U., & Kazeem, A. O. (2014). The Relationship between Leadership Styles and Employees' Performance in Organisations (A Study of Selected Business Organisations in Federal Capital Territory, Abuja Nigeria). *European Journal of Business and Management, 6*(22), 1-11.

Monahan, M., Shah, A., Bao, Y., & Rana, J. (2015). Does the field of study influence the choice of leadership? A cross cultural comparison of business vs non-business majors. *Research in Higher Education Journal, 28*, 1-19.

Mugenda, O., & Mugenda, A. (2003). *Research methods: Quantitative and qualitative approaches,* 2nd. Rev. Ed. Nairobi: Act press.

Nachmias, C. F., & Nachmias, D. (2008). *Research methods in the social sciences.* New York: St. Martin's Press

Nanjundeswaraswamy, T. S., & Swamy, D. (2014). Leadership styles. *Advances In Management, 7*(2), 57-63.

Nazarian, A., & Atkinson, P. (2013). Impact of Culture on Leadership Style: The Case of Iranian Organisations. *World Applied Sciences Journal 28 (6)*, 770-777.

Nikčević, G. (2014). The Influence of National Culture on Certain types of Organisational Culture. *FACTA UNIVERSITATIS Series: Economics and Organisation, 11*(2), 149 - 162. doi:316.722: 005.32

Nohria,N., Joyce, W., & Roberson, B. (2003) What really works. *Harvard Business Review.* Retrieved on 4th October, 2016 from https://hbr.org/2003/07/what-really-works.

Northouse, P. G. (2015). Leadership: Theory and practice. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage publications.

Nwokocha, I., & Iheriohanma, E. (2015). Nexus Between Leadership Styles, Employee Retention and Performance in Organisations in Nigeria. *European Scientific Journal, 11*(13), 185-209.

Obiwuru, T. C., Okwu, A. T., Akpa, V. O., & Nwankwere, I. A. (2011). EFFECTS OF LEADERSHIP STYLE ON ORGANISATIONAL PERFORMANCE:. *Australian*

Journal of Business and Management Research, 100-111.

Ochugudu, A. I., & Aondoaseer, A. F. (2013). Leadership styles as recipes for transformation. *International Journal of Business and Management Review*, 35-53.

Okafor, E. E. (2013). Leadersip and Productivity in Nigeria: Implicatins For Work Organisations and National Development. *JORIND, 11*(1), 284-295.

Okoh, A.O. (1998). *Personnel and Human Resources Management in Nigeria.* Lagos: Amfitop, in Girei, A. A. (2015). Perceived Effects Of Leadership Styles On Workers' Performance In Package Water Producing Industry In Adamawa State, Nigeria. *International Journal for Innovation Education and Research, 3*(12), 101-110.

O'Reilly, C. A., III, Chatman, J. A., & Caldwell, D. F. (1991). People and organisational culture: A profile comparison approach to assessing person-organisation fit. Academy of Management Journal, 34, 487–516.

Owolabi, A. B. (2015). Impact of Organisational Culture and Leadership Style on Quality of Work Life Among Nigeria Employees. *African Journal For The Psychological Study of Social Issues, 18*(1), 109-121.

Patton, G. S. (1944). *The Famous Patton Speech, Somewhere in England.* Recorded by Charles M. Province, George S. Patton Historical Society [http://www.pattonhq.com

Peters, T., & Waterman, R. (1982). *In Search of Excellence.* New York: Harper and Row.

Probst, S. and Raisch: 2005, Ô Organizational Crisis: The Logic of Failure Õ , Academy of Management Executive 19 (1), 90–105

Rauch, C.F., & Behling, O. (1984). *Functionalism: basis for an alternative approach to the study of leadership*. In Hunt, J. G., Hosking, D. M., Schriesheim, C. A., & Stewart, R., Leaders and managers: *International perspectives on managerial behaviour and leadership*. New York: Pergamon Press

Robbins, S. P. (2002). *Organisational behaviour, 9th ed.* New Delhi: Prentice Hall India.

Robbins, S. P.; Judge, T. A.; Millet, B.; & Waters-Marsh, T. (2008). *Organisational Behaviour*. Sydney: Pearson

Rousseau, D. M. (1990). *Assessing Organisational Culture: The Case for Multiple Methods' in Schneider, B.(ed.) Organisational Climate and Culture*, Ch.5, Oxford: JosseyBass.

Saunders, M., Lewis, P., & Thornhill, A. (2009). *Research methods for business students (5th ed.).* Harlow: Pearson Education Ltd

Schein, E. H. (2004). *Organisational Culture and Leadership Third Edition.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Schermerhorn, J. R., Osborn, R. N., Uhl-Bien, M., & Hunt, J. G. (2012). *Organisational Behaviour, (12th ed).* New Jessey: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.

Silversweig, S., & Allen, R. (1976). Changing Corporate Culture, *Sloan Management Review*, 17(3),33-49.

Stewart, W. (n.d). What is an Organizational Environment? - Definition & Theory. Retrieved on May 2, 2017, from http://study.com/academy/lesson/what-is-an-organizational-environment-definition-theory-quiz.html

Stogdill, R. M. (1974). *Handbook of leadership: A survey of the literature.* New York: Free Press

Trice, H. M., & Beyer, J. M. (1993). *The cultures of work organizations*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall

Tsai, M.-T., Tsai, C.-L., & Wang, Y.-C. (2011). Astudy on the relationship between leadership style, emotional intelligence, self-efficacy and organisational commitment: A case study of th banking industry in Taiwan. *African Journal of Business Mangement, 5*(13), 5319-5329.

Uchewamgbe, B. (2013). Effects of Leadership Styles on Organisational Performance in Small and Medium Scale Enterprises (SMEs) in Nigeria. *European Journal of*

Business and Management, 3(23), 53-73.

Weick, K. (1995). *Sense making in organizations.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage, in Schein, E. H. (2004). *Organisational Culture and Leadership Third Edition.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Yamane, T. (1967). *Statistics: an introductory analysis, 2nd ed.* New York: Harper and Row.

Yukl, G. (2002). *Leadership in organisations* (5 ed.). Delhi: Pearson Education.

APPENDIX 1
Regression Results for Hypothesis 1
Regression

Model Summary

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	.098[a]	.010	.003	4.68638

a. Predictors: (Constant), Power Culture

ANOVA[b]

Model		Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	34.137	1	34.137	1.554	.214[a]
	Residual	3535.913	161	21.962		
	Total	3570.049	162			

a. Predictors: (Constant), Power Culture
b. Dependent Variable: exploit

Coefficients[a]

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients		
		B	Std. Error	Beta	t	Sig.
1	(Constant)	16.707	1.247		13.395	.000
	Power Culture	-.380	.305	-.098	-1.247	.214

a. Dependent Variable: exploit

Appendix 2
Regression Results for Hypothesis 2
Regression

Model Summary

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	.019[a]	.000	-.006	4.64257

a. Predictors: (Constant), Role Culture

ANOVA[b]

Model		Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	1.287	1	1.287	.060	.807[a]
	Residual	3470.100	161	21.553		
	Total	3471.387	162			

ANOVA[b]

Model		Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	1.287	1	1.287	.060	.807[a]
	Residual	3470.100	161	21.553		
	Total	3471.387	162			

a. Predictors: (Constant), Role Culture
b. Dependent Variable: benvllst

Coefficients[a]

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
		B	Std. Error	Beta		
1	(Constant)	18.243	1.297		14.060	.000
	Role Culture	-.076	.311	-.019	-.244	.807

a. Dependent Variable: benvllst

Appendix 3
Regression Results for Hypothesis 3

Regression

Model Summary

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	.108[a]	.012	.005	4.52511

a. Predictors: (Constant), Task Culture

ANOVA[b]

Model		Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	38.625	1	38.625	1.886	.172[a]
	Residual	3296.737	161	20.477		
	Total	3335.362	162			

a. Predictors: (Constant), Task Culture
b. Dependent Variable: consulst

Coefficients[a]

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
		B	Std. Error	Beta		
1	(Constant)	20.885	2.594		8.051	.000
	Task Culture	-.748	.545	-.108	-1.373	.172

ANOVA[b]

Model		Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	38.625	1	38.625	1.886	.172[a]
	Residual	3296.737	161	20.477		
	Total	3335.362	162			

a. Dependent Variable: consulst

Appendix 4
Regression Results for Hypothesis 4

Model Summary

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	.073[a]	.005	-.001	4.57793

a. Predictors: (Constant), Person Culture

Regression

ANOVA[b]

Model		Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	18.319	1	18.319	.874	.351[a]
	Residual	3374.147	161	20.957		
	Total	3392.466	162			

a. Predictors: (Constant), Person Culture
b. Dependent Variable: partptvls

Coefficients[a]

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
		B	Std. Error	Beta		
1	(Constant)	19.227	1.209		15.902	.000
	Person Culture	-.281	.301	-.073	-.935	.351

a. Dependent Variable: partptvls

APPENDIX 5
Correlations

			Power Culture	Role Culture	Task Culture	Person Culture	exploit	benvllst	consulst	Partptvls
Spearman's rho	Power Culture	Correlation Coefficient	1.000	.662**	-.040	.590**	-.088	.027	.023	-.015
		Sig. (2-tailed)	.	.000	.615	.000	.265	.729	.774	.852
		N	163	163	163	163	163	163	163	163
	Role Culture	Correlation Coefficient	.662**	1.000	-.013	.650**	-.032	-.037	-.053	.001
		Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.	.873	.000	.687	.641	.499	.987
		N	163	163	163	163	163	163	163	163
	Task Culture	Correlation Coefficient	-.040	-.013	1.000	-.043	-.055	-.116	-.065	.011
		Sig. (2-tailed)	.615	.873	.	.590	.485	.141	.407	.894
		N	163	163	163	163	163	163	163	163
	Person Culture	Correlation Coefficient	.590**	.650**	-.043	1.000	-.033	.042	.012	-.059
		Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000	.590	.	.679	.595	.878	.456
		N	163	163	163	163	163	163	163	163
	Exploit	Correlation Coefficient	-.088	-.032	-.055	-.033	1.000	.303**	.397**	.203**
		Sig. (2-tailed)	.265	.687	.485	.679	.	.000	.000	.009
		N	163	163	163	163	163	163	163	163
	Benvllst	Correlation Coefficient	.027	-.037	-.116	.042	.303**	1.000	.799**	.451**
		Sig. (2-tailed)	.729	.641	.141	.595	.000	.	.000	.000
		N	163	163	163	163	163	163	163	163
	Consulst	Correlation Coefficient	.023	-.053	-.065	.012	.397**	.799**	1.000	.473**
		Sig. (2-tailed)	.774	.499	.407	.878	.000	.000	.	.000
		N	163	163	163	163	163	163	163	163
	Partptvls	Correlation Coefficient	-.015	.001	.011	-.059	.203**	.451**	.473**	1.000
		Sig. (2-tailed)	.852	.987	.894	.456	.009	.000	.000	.
		N	163	163	163	163	163	163	163	163

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

Source: Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS), Version 19.0