

# Handy Cultural Framework: Impact on Employee Engagement in Nigerian Indigenous Oil and Gas Setting

<sup>1</sup>Sharon Chidinma EGONWANNE. M.Sc, <sup>2</sup>Henry OKUNDALAIYE. M.Sc, <sup>3</sup>itohaniyobhebhe. M.Sc

*Middle University Dubai*

*University of Lagos*

*University of Lagos*

Submitted: 05-04-2022

Revised: 17-04-2022

Accepted: 20-04-2022

## ABSTRACT

**Objectives:** The research looked at how Handy (1987) cultural framework impacts employee engagement with emphasis on some selected Nigerian indigenous upstream oil and gas companies.

Descriptive research technique and simple random sampling approach were used in this study. Workers from three (3) indigenous oil and gas firms were selected. Pearson's correlation and regression analysis were used to test the hypothesis of collected data on SPSS. Power, task and person culture all were significantly related to employee engagement. Furthermore, task culture showed significant relationship with vigour and absorption only. It was recommended that indigenous oil and gas firms' performance depends on employee engagement, and this must be taken into account by the company's authorities and policies makers when creating their organizational cultural policy.

**Keywords:** Handy cultural framework, power culture, role culture, task culture, person culture, employee engagement

## I. INTRODUCTION

Nigeria is commonly recognized as a behemoth in the global oil and gas business, being the continent's biggest oil producing nation with 8% of the world's proved crude reserves. That, however, has not been the case. Nigeria's experience since 1956, when oil was discovered in Oloibiri, presently in Bayelsa state, is also notable. Nigeria oil and gas sector is the economy's backbone, contributing for approximately eighty-nine percent of export profits and over eighty percent of federal government income. It also contributed about fourteen percent of GDP and

almost sixty-five of government budgetary income, as well as many employment possibilities (CBN Policy, 2017; Nworu, 2017).

In the workplace, there is a widely held and frequently implicit idea that employee engagement is correlated with productivity. For decades, employee engagement was a catchphrase and has been intensively studied in a wide range of disciplines, including business, education, and government (Nazneen, Miralam & Qazi, 2018). An engaged workforce is essential in today's fast-paced commercial world. In today's market, employee engagement is becoming an increasingly important business engine. When it comes to employee productivity and retention, employee engagement has a major impact. Businesses turn to their employees for strategic expertise to assist them accomplish their objectives. Employees that have a high level of engagement routinely outperform their peers and set higher personal objectives. Employee engagement is essential to the company's success and its ability to shape its culture.

Employees that are engaged put in long hours and are entirely focused on their task (Brenyah & Obuobisa-Darko, 2017). According to Pepra-Mensah and Kyeremeh (2018), employee engagement is an excellent determinant of workplace health in terms of retention, productivity commitment, satisfaction, and creativity. The team and colleague connections, working environment, leadership, compensation program, rules and procedures, workplace health and safety, and training and career development, according to Anitha, (2014) are all crucial considerations. Rewards and recognition, organizational support, job role, training and development, and leadership and planning are all elements that impact employee

engagement (Gujral & Jain, 2013). These engagement aspects, on the other hand, are firmly established in an organization's culture.

Organizational culture might be perceived as either unsupportive or supportive, or even as negative or good, depending on the individual. Cultural differences are defined by Hofstede (2011), who claims that culture is a collective mental programming that separates one group or category from another. Some of the cultural perspectives/models include Cultural Parameters by Deal and Kennedy (2000), cultural model by Cooper (1983), cognitive levels of culture by Schein (2001), and cultural model by Hofstede's (1980) among others. The most often used model is Handy's (1987) cultural framework which is categorized into power, role, task, and people culture.

Many studies have been undertaken to establish the link between company culture and workplace employee engagement (Sarangi & Srivastava, 2012; Tannady, Tannady & Zami, 2019; Fidyah & Setiawati, 2020; Jiony et al., 2015). Having a feeling of belonging, being committed, and working hard are all influenced by an organization's culture. This culture is produced by the way things are done, traditions, and beliefs. High levels of employee involvement are linked to increased productivity, according to Al Mehrzi and Singh (2016). Researchers have shown that a company's culture affects how engaged its workers are (Lockwood, 2007). As long as the work environment is pleasant and encouraging, workers are more likely to be engaged. Organizational culture and employee engagement in the oil and gas business have never been studied before, as far as the researcher knows.

Nigeria's indigenous oil and gas companies have had considerable challenges, which may be traced back to a lack of organizational culture adoption. As a result of their inability to deal with the tough environmental circumstances, several enterprises have lost resources. Every company must guarantee that its personnel are well-versed in the company's regulations and norms. Unfortunately, the organization's placement responsibilities are not well-executed at this time. Work-related attitudes are constantly being monitored by managers. The bulk of the time, these attitudes can be traced back to the company's culture and the level of participation of its employees. What motivates a manager or a supervisor, how jobs are allotted based on workers' talents and specialisations, how employees interact as a team, and the level of control systems in place may also be variables.

There is a heavy emphasis on interpersonal relationships in the Nigerian oil and gas industry, which is characterised by strict regulations, a strict focus on compliance, and an acceptance of hierarchical leadership. Organizational culture and employee engagement in developing countries may be better understood by looking at just one company. The research is an effort to collect empirical evidence on the influence of company culture on employee engagement. Managers, human resource managers, and behavior science researchers would benefit greatly from this study, as it will provide them with a vital tool to help them make more rational judgments. Given that oil and gas companies account for a substantial section of the Nigerian economy, the ramifications of this study's results might be enormous and critical for them. Executives of oil and gas firms may find the results of this study useful in their attempts to develop a better management system and, as a consequence, boost employee engagement.

## II. LITERATURE REVIEW

### 2.1 Theoretical framework - Social Exchange Theory (SET)

Saks (2006) analyzed employee engagement using social exchange theory. This idea explains why employees choose to be more or less engaged at work. Obligations are generated, according to SET, as a consequence of multiple encounters between interdependent individuals. The core assumption of SET is that if the parties follow the norms of exchange, their relationships would eventually grow into mutual commitments, loyalty, and trustworthiness. As a consequence, increasing employee engagement is one of the ways for employees to repay their boss. That is, the benefits employees get from the organization affect their level of engagement.

In exchange for their employer's investment in their well-being, workers become more invested in their work and put in more effort. An absence of these resources increases the likelihood of disengagement among workers. A person's cognitive, emotional, and physical resources are influenced by their employer's resources when they go to work (Kahn, 1990). Employee engagement is described as the emotional and psychological connection between workers and their employer, which results in either good or terrible performance in the organization (AbuKhalifeh & Som, 2013).

### 2.2 Employee Engagement

Employee engagement, as defined by pioneering researcher Kahn (1990), is characterized

by a person's active, full-role performance while simultaneously expressing and employing their "preferred self" in their day-to-day tasks, thereby fostering connections to their work and others as well as their own personal presence (emotional, cognitive, and physical). Since then, the term "employee engagement" has evolved (Macey & Schneider, 2008). According to Saks (2006), it is a unique and distinctive idea with cognitive, emotional, and behavioral components linked to the execution of an individual function.

Organizational success may be directly connected to employee engagement, which is a major issue in today's firms (Brenyah & Obuobisa-Darko, 2017). Increased productivity is a result of engaged employees who are more likely to remain with their employer (Alfes et al, 2013). When it comes to being a good predictor of a company's desired results, employee engagement is an effective way to gauge the health of a business (Rich, Lepine & Crawford, 2010).

Employee engagement refers to the extent to which workers are intellectually and emotionally invested in the vision, organization's duties, and goals (Schmidt, Henges, & Bryson, 2003). In order to help the company, an employee must be totally involved and enthusiastic about their work in order to be considered fully engaged. However, employees who aren't engaged are not only a drain on the company's bottom line, but they also have a negative impact on team performance because of their lack of productivity (Konrad, 2006).

According to Schaufeli, Bakker, and Salanova (2006), employee engagement is a pleasant, fulfilling work-related attitude of mind characterized by vigour, dedication, and absorption..

**i. Vigour:**

Vigour is described as a combination of a strong desire to put effort into one's work, as well as the capacity to endure when faced with obstacles at work (Brenyah & Obuobisa-Darko, 2017). Schaufeli and Demerouti (2007) say that a person's readiness and tendency to put in a lot of endeavour and persist in the face of perceived hurdles at work is a sign of vigor at work.

**ii. Dedication:**

Dedication is defined as a feeling of significance, excitement and inspiration here as well as a sense of pride and challenge (Brenyah & Obuobisa-Darko, 2017). Engaged employees are more focused on the work at hand because they feel it is essential to their performance. Dedication, as defined by Schaufeli and Demerouti (2007), is characterized by a strong feeling of personal

accomplishment, as well as a strong sense of self-worth and self-motivation.

**iii. Absorption:**

Absorption This is characterized as being so involved in a task that time flies and it is almost impossible to get out of it (Brenyah & Obuobisa-Darko, 2017). As a result, an employee may feel as though their work has taken over their lives. Being so absorbed on a task can make one loses track of time and find it more difficult to step away from it (Schaufeli & Demerouti, 2007),

**2.4 Organizational Culture**

According to Hofstede (2003), a company's culture is defined as the beliefs and behaviors that distinguish it from its rivals. There is a distinct subculture inside the greater culture in which the organization operates (Osman, 2004). There are several ways in which an organization's culture is produced, but the most common is via the way it interacts with the outside world. This specific group has developed fundamental assumptions that function well enough to teach new members how to cope with challenges emerging from the need to integrate with and adapt to the external environment as well as the internal context, and these assumptions may be passed on to new

According to Hofstede (2003), culture refers to an organization's beliefs and applications that set it apart from others. A company's internal culture is a subculture of the wider external culture (Osman, 2004). When an organization survives and interacts with its surroundings, it develops a culture that is unique to that organization and reflects the organization's history (Martins, 1989). Organizational culture, according to Shahzad et al, (2012), has never been more important. Increasing competition, globalization, mergers and acquisitions, and strategic alliances are all contributing to this trend. Organizational integration and coordination are more important than ever to boost efficiency, process improvement, product and strategy creation, and the ability to efficiently implement new technologies and projects. Looking at a person's work environment might help assess their ability to fit into an organization's culture (Silverthorne, 2004). Workers who think they are intellectual assets are more inclined to participate in intellectual activities, which encourages the generation of new information and the motivation to share it with others (Naicker, 2008). Not only the demands of the firm should be taken into account while creating an organizational culture, but also those of its employees. Differences in organizational and management culture occur both nationally and

worldwide, as Naicker (2008) points out. Organizational culture may help explain why diverse groups of individuals see things differently and act differently. The regulations, operations, and everyday activities of workers are all influenced by the company's culture (Chen, 2004).

#### **Handy (1987) Cultural Framework**

Based on Harrison's research, the Handy (1993) theory proposes four distinct forms of organizational culture. On the other side, four gods represent the varied viewpoints on corporate cultures in the notion of cultural appropriateness. For this notion to work, it must take into account the reality that cultures are influenced by many different things and that these influences may be seen in a wide range of organizational structures and activities. In many cases, organizational problems may be traced back to attempts to impose the wrong structure on a particular culture or to expect a particular culture to flourish in an inappropriate setting (Handy, 1993). Four Greek gods symbolize these cultural variables, for instance Zeus who is god of power (power culture), Apollo who is the god of reason (role culture), Athena who is warrior goddess (task culture), and Dionysus who is god of the self-oriented person (person culture). Despite the fact that diverse cultures might be beneficial, employees tend to be culturally inflexible, leading them to feel that plays out in one company would work in another. More so, a person who thrives in one culture may not always flourish in another, according to Handy (1993). Furthermore, the firm's leadership is in charge of managing all four cultures, as well as recognizing and integrating them inside the corporation (Handy 1993).

This culture can be represented in a grid-form; y-axis represents power distribution, ranging from low to high, while x-axis represents degree of cooperation, also ranging from low to high (Mulder, 2018). Distribution of power is a term used to describe a company's senior leaders' capacity to work both from the bottom up and from the top down. According to the bottom-up method, employees are held responsible and given the freedom to choose their own responsibilities and make their own choices, contrasting to a top-down strategy that does not distribute authority. The degree of collaboration refers to how successfully various departments and employees collaborate. A low level of collaboration means that everyone works independently and seldom requires co-worker help, while a high level of cooperation means that co-workers collaborate closely and mutually benefit.

- **Power culture:**

In this culture, authority is distributed rather evenly, and there is a high degree of collaboration. It has to do with how much a major figure in the company (a leader) supports their subordinates. In micro and small enterprises, power dynamics are widespread. Reduced regulation and bureaucracy may be achieved when a corporation embraces a power culture. Similar to the political nature of these groups, their decisions are made by persuasion rather than bureaucracy or argument (Handy, 1993).

H<sub>1</sub>: Power culture will not be significantly related with employee engagement

- **Role culture:**

Those who work for this well-run organization may expect to be given specific responsibilities and security and predictability (Handy 1993). Since it is founded on logic and reasoning, Handy (1993) calls this kind of organization's structure a "Greek temple". A lack of collaboration and a lack of power distribution characterize this culture. Having a strong role culture is all about how work is structured and how tasks are completed. Employees are discouraged from taking initiative in the workplace because of this kind of culture. Many of these organizations have hierarchical bureaucracies in which power is based on position rather than skill or competence, according to Handy (1993). As a result, firms with role cultures are reluctant to acknowledge the need for change, and even if they do, the process of implementing change may take a long time (Handy 1993).

H<sub>2</sub>: Role culture will not be significantly related with employee engagement

- **Task culture:**

This is job-related, and it occurs in companies where people work together and power is granted only when necessary and solely on the basis of knowledge (Handy 1993). In this culture, collaboration and power distribution are high. Getting the job done is all that matters to the task culture, thus it tries to assemble all the required resources and individuals, as well as let them to put their heads down and get to work (Handy 1993). For intermediate and first-level managers, this is the most prevalent working setting.

H<sub>3</sub>: Task culture will not be significantly related with employee engagement

- **People culture:**

This culture is defined by a high-power distribution and a low degree of collaboration. Managerial hierarchies and control systems cannot function in these cultures without mutual approval. Expert-based power is common, implying that people do what they are excellent at and are given



priority over critical issues (Handy 1993). Individuals in this culture are difficult to manage, according to Handy (1993), and minimal influence can be imparted to them in order for them to endure.

H<sub>4</sub>: Power culture will not be significantly related with employee engagement

### III. METHODOLOGY

Descriptive research approach was used. A sample size of 167 was drawn from It is possible to gather information from Lekoil Limited, First Hydrocarbon Nigeria Limited, and Savannah Petroleum Plc. The research was conducted at Nigerian indigenous oil and gas businesses. These indigenous oil and gas firms all have their headquarters in Lagos, Nigeria. Simple random sampling technique was adopted for data collection. Questionnaire was used to gather data. Items from previous research that were relevant to this issue were included in the questionnaire.

For organizational culture, Organizational Culture Assessment Tool (OCAT) by Harrison (1972), which was later Harrison and Stoke (1992) improved was adopted. Power culture ( $\alpha = 0.73$ ), role culture ( $\alpha = 0.68$ ), task culture ( $\alpha = 0.71$ ), and people culture ( $\alpha = 0.76$ ) are the four subscales that made up the scale. Each subscale had four (4) items which gave a total of sixteen (16) items. Sample of items used will be “Employees are expected to be hard-working, compliant, obedient, and loyal to the interests of those to whom they report” (power culture), “People who do well in the organization tend to be those who plays by the rules, work within the system, and strive to do things” (role culture), “People who do well in the organization tend to be those who is

technically competent and effective, with a strong commitment to getting the job done” (task), and “Employees are expected to be good team workers, supportive and cooperative, who get along well with others” (people). On a five-point Likert scale, the scale ranged from 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree).

For employee engagement, Utrecht Work Engagement Scale (UWES) by Schaufeli, Bakker, and Salanova (2006) was adopted for this study. The scale was made up of three subscales, which are vigour ( $\alpha = 0.88$ ), dedication ( $\alpha = 0.90$ ), and absorption ( $\alpha = 0.85$ ). Vigour, dedication, and absorption were made up of six (6), five (5), and six (6) items respectively. On a study of internal reliability, the subscales - vigour, dedication, and absorption - returned. Sample of items used were “At my job, I feel strong and vigorous” (vigour), “I am proud of the work that I do” (dedication), “I get carried away when I am working” (absorption). On a 7-point Likert scale, the responses vary from Never, Almost Never, Rarely, Sometimes, Often, Very Often, and Always.

### IV. RESEARCH RESULTS

One hundred and sixty-seven (167) workers from the three firms chosen for the research were given the questionnaire, and one hundred and forty-two (142) employees took part in the survey. Majority of the respondents are men between the ages of 31 and 40. Furthermore, the majority of respondents had a bachelor's degree and have worked for the company for more than a year, indicating that they have adequate and trustworthy knowledge regarding the company's organizational culture and employee engagement.

Table 1: Test of Hypotheses

		Vigour	Absorption	Dedication	Employee Engagement
Power culture	Pearson Correlation	.293**	.303**	.293**	.319**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.001	.000	.001	.000
Role culture	Pearson Correlation	.189*	.050	.235*	.198*
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.024	.556	.024	.018
Task culture	Pearson Correlation	.214*	.188*	.214*	.243**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.010	.025	.010	.004
Person culture	Pearson Correlation	.197*	.174*	.197*	.188*

Sig. (2-tailed)	.019	.039	.019	.025
-----------------	------	------	------	------

Hypothesis one showed that power culture is significantly related to vigour ( $r = .293^{**}$ ), dedication ( $r = .303^{**}$ ), and absorption ( $r = .150$ ). For hypothesis two, role culture is significantly related to vigour ( $r = .189^*$ ) and absorption ( $r = .235^{**}$ ). For hypothesis three, task culture is

significantly related to vigour ( $r = .214^*$ ), dedication ( $r = .188^*$ ), and absorption ( $r = .172^*$ ). More so, for hypothesis four, person culture is significantly related to vigour ( $r = .197^*$ ), dedication ( $r = .174^*$ ), and absorption ( $r = .197^*$ ).

**Table 2: ANOVA<sup>a</sup>**

Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.	R	R Square
1	Regression	.559	4	.140	7.024	.000 <sup>b</sup>	.413 <sup>a</sup>	.170
	Residual	2.725	137	.020				
	Total	3.284	141					

a. Dependent Variable: Employee Engagement

b. Predictors: (Constant), Power culture; Role culture; Task culture; Person culture

**Table 3: Coefficients**

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
		B	Std. Error	Beta		
1	(Constant)	.472	.409		1.153	.251
	Power culture	.266	.076	.283	3.499	.001
	Role culture	.073	.071	.086	1.034	.303
	Task culture	.199	.079	.207	2.536	.012
	Person culture	.064	.078	.069	.818	.415

a. Dependent Variable: Employee Engagement

Handy cultural framework accounted for around 17.0 percent of the total systematic variability in employee engagement, according to the model summary's R square value of 0.170. This means that the estimate model's stochastic error factor captures 83.0 percent of the total systematic fluctuations in employee engagement that are unaccounted for. The total model's measure of significance ( $F = 7.024$ ;  $Sig. = 0.000$ ) is less than the significant threshold ( $p < 0.05$ ), suggesting that the model is statistically significant, according to the ANOVA table. The model also indicated that a 1% rise in power, role, task, and person culture would result in 0.266, 0.073, 0.199, and 0.064 increases in employee engagement respectively.

#### 4.1 Discussion of Findings

The influence of power culture on vigour was shown to be significant. Thus, the more motivated and resilient the employees are to put in extra effort at work, the more inspired and

encouraged they would be by their bosses. A substantial favourable relationship between power culture and dedication was also found. This means that the more the leader or main person inspires or motivates the workers, the more excited, inspired, a feeling of pride and worth, and driven by their job the employees feel, and vice versa. Furthermore, the relationship between power culture and absorption is non-significant. This means that whether or not the leader or main person inspires or encourages the workers has no effect on the employees being so enamoured with their work that they find it difficult to leave. The results demonstrated that power culture has a strong beneficial influence on employee engagement, Cooke and Lafferty (2007), on the other hand, found a strong, although unfavourable, link between power culture and employee engagement. This is understandable since Nigeria is a high-powered culture nation (Hofstede, 2011), and workers are used to it.

The impact of role culture on vigour was not significant. Work structure and processes have little impact on a person's motivation to exert greater effort and cognitive resilience at their job. Similarly, there was no link between role culture and dedication. This means that whether work is organized and processes are followed to complete tasks has little impact on employees' sentiments of inspiration, passion, pride, and worth, as well as their desire to complete tasks. Furthermore, role culture and absorption have a strong beneficial relationship. This indicates that the more structured the work and the methods for performing tasks are, the more individuals get enamored with their jobs and find it difficult to leave, and vice versa. Employee engagement was shown to be influenced by role culture. However, according to Brenyah and Obuobisa-Darko (2017), role culture is not strongly associated to employee engagement.

The relationship between task culture and vigour was shown to be significant. This suggests that the more the emphasis on getting the job done by assembling the necessary resources, the greater the desire to put up more effort and cognitive resilience at work, and vice versa. A substantial favorable relationship between task culture and dedication was also found. This means that the more emphasis is put on getting the job done by assembling the necessary resources, the more excited, inspired, a feeling of pride and worth, and driven by their work people would feel, and vice versa. Furthermore, task culture and absorption have a considerable favorable relationship. This indicates that when more focus is placed on completing the job by gathering the required resources, more individuals get enamoured with their work and find it difficult to quit it, and vice versa. The conclusion was that task culture has a strong beneficial influence on employee engagement.

The influence of person culture on vigour was significant. This indicates that employees' incentive to put in more effort or their cognitive resilience at work suffers when they feel they are superior than the organization. There was relationship between person culture and dedication. This means that workers' feelings of inspiration, passion, pride, value, and drive are affected by whether they believe they are superior to the business or not. Furthermore, there is no relationship between a person's culture and absorption. This means that whether workers believe they are superior to the company or not has no effect on whether they like their work and find it tough to leave. The outcome revealed that employee is affected by person culture.

## V. CONCLUSION

The study showed evidence on how Handy cultural framework affects employee engagement in a group of Nigerian indigenous upstream oil and gas enterprises, based on the statistical techniques and analyses employed for the research. It was seen that organizational culture, or the set of values held and implemented by the firm, has a positive and substantial influence on employee engagement. In conclusion, it is vital to maintain a set of values or a pattern of basic assumptions in order to foster an environment in which employees are completely engaged in their jobs and by their companies, especially when authority is distributed from a focal point and employees function as a team.

### Recommendations

- i. To develop power-oriented cultures, improvement in systems for rewarding compliance and withholding incentives or penalizing individuals who do not comply should be made by management.
- ii. Initiatives like as games and competitions, training and social events for employees, and recognition programs for those who go above and beyond the call of duty, should be encouraged by management to develop trust and collaboration among workers in role culture. These activities will aid in the development of a positive corporate culture.
- iii. Instead of rewarding individual employees, management should recognize and reward groups of employees who meet defined performance goals.
- iv. Indigenous oil and gas firms' performance depends on employee engagement, and this must be taken into account by the company's authorities and policies makers when creating or developing their organizational cultural policy.

### Practical Implication

- i. Policymakers in upstream oil and gas sector, particularly those in indigenous communities, will find this study quite helpful since it explains how culture affects employee engagement. Consequently, they will be able to focus on cultural aspects while creating the organization's policy manuals.
- ii. For future research on the issue, the study serves as a valuable resource for other researchers.

- iii. Managers need to be aware of the influence that culture has on their own work and personal values. As a result, they will be able to customize their performance to the level of organizational effectiveness that they are capable of attaining.

### Contribution to Knowledge

Only a few academics, particularly in poor countries like Nigeria, have studied the impact of organizational cultures on employee engagement. As a result, this research addressed this gap in the literature, as well as personnel from Nigeria's indigenous upstream oil and gas industries. The findings will improve knowledge on Handy cultural framework and understanding on how organizational culture and employee engagement may influence organization's effectiveness. More importantly, the outcomes of this study will aid firms in evaluating the performance of employee engagement methods.

### Suggestions for Further Studies

- i. Future studies should include more workers in both the upstream and downstream oil and gas sectors, both locally and globally, since the current study only focused on a few indigenous oil and gas companies in Nigeria.
- ii. In addition, comparison research on the influence of Handy cultural framework on employee engagement might be conducted across multiple industries or countries. More so, other models such as Schein, Hofstede, and Deal and Kennedy should be considered.
- iii. Quantitative analysis was the only method employed in the study. This method's shortcomings might be mitigated in future studies by combining it with a qualitative approach or a mix of both approaches, which could help researchers better comprehend and accept their results by including emotional and human components.

### REFERENCES

- [1]. AbuKhalifeh, A. N., & Som, A. P. M. (2013). The antecedents affecting employee engagement and organizational performance. *Asian Social Science*, 9(7), 41-46.
- [2]. Al Mehrzi, N., & Singh, S. K. (2016). Competing through employee engagement: A proposed framework. *International Journal of Productivity and Performance Management*, 65(6), 831-843
- [3]. Alfes, K., Truss, C., Soane, E. C., Rees, C., & Gatenby, M. (2013). The relationship between line manager behavior, perceived HRM practices, and individual performance: Examining the mediating role of engagement. *Human Resource Management*, 52(6), 839-859
- [4]. Anitha, J. (2014). Determinants of employee engagement and their impact on employee performance. *International Journal of Productivity and Performance Management*, 63(3), 308-323
- [5]. Bakker, A. B., & Demerouti, E. (2008). Towards a model of work engagement. *Career Development International*, 13(3), 209-223.
- [6]. Brenyah, R. S., & Obuobisa-Darko, T. (2017). Organisational culture and employee engagement within the Ghanaian public sector. *Review of Public Administration and Management*, 5(3), 1-7
- [7]. Central Bank of Nigeria (CBN). (2017). Fiscal policy at a glance. Retrieved from <https://www.cbn.gov.ng/Out/2017/CCD/FISCAL%20POLICY%20AT%20A%20GLANCE.pdf>
- [8]. Cooper, C. L. (1983). *Culture's consequences: International differences in work related values*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage Publications, USA.
- [9]. Department of Petroleum Resources (DPR). (2021). Indigenous firms contribute 30% to Nigeria's gas reserves, 33% to crude oil reserves – DPR. Retrieved from <https://www.dpr.gov.ng/indigenous-firms-contribute-30-to-nigerias-gas-reserves-33-to-crude-oil-reserves-dpr/>
- [10]. Fidyah, D. N., & Setiawati, T. (2020). Influence of organizational culture and employee engagement on employee performance: Job satisfaction as intervening variable. *Review of Integrative Business and Economics Research*, 9(4), 64-81.
- [11]. Gujral, H. K., & Jain, I. (2013). Determinants and outcomes of employee engagement: A comparative study in information technology (IT) sector. *International Journal of Advanced Research in Management and Social Sciences*, 2(5), 207-220
- [12]. Handy, C. B. (1987). *Understanding organizations* (3rd edition). Penguin Books Ltd: London-UK
- [13]. Handy, C. (1993). *Understanding organizations* (4th edition). Penguin Books Ltd: London-UK



- [14]. Hofstede, G. (2011). Dimensionalizing cultures: The Hofstede model in context. *Online Readings in Psychology and Culture*, 2(1), 2307-0919
- [15]. Jiony, M. M., Tanakinjal, G. H., Gom, D., & Siganul, R. S. (2015). Understanding the effect of organizational culture and employee engagement on organizational performance using organizational communication as mediator: a conceptual framework. *American Journal of Economics*, 5(2), 128-134.
- [16]. Lockwood, B. (2007). Kenya's competitiveness in the floriculture industry: A test of porters competitive advantage organizations and the boundary less career. *Journal of Vocational Behaviour*, 2(8), 112-129.
- [17]. Macey, W. H., & Schneider, B. (2008). The meaning of employee engagement. *Industrial and Organizational Psychology*, 1(1), 3-30
- [18]. Martins, N. (1989). Organisasiekultuur in 'n finansiële instelling (Organisational culture in a financial institution) (Unpublished doctoral thesis). Pretoria, University of Pretoria.
- [19]. Mulder, P. (2018). Handy model of organisational culture. Retrieved from <https://www.toolshero.com/management/handy-model/>
- [20]. Nazneen, A., Miralam, M. S., & Qazi, S. (2018). Impact of employee engagement and organizational culture in high performing accredited university of Saudi Arabia. *International Journal of Accounting and Financial Reporting*, 8(4), 180-196.
- [21]. NNPC. (2014). Annual statistics bulletin. Retrieved from <https://www.nnpcgroup.com/NNPCDocuments/Annual%20Statistics%20Bulletin%E2%80%8B/2014%20ASB%202nd%20Edition.pdf>
- [22]. Nworu, O. (2017). Export: Improving Nigerian government revenue base and economic diversification. *Human Resource Management Research*, 7(1), 65-73.
- [23]. Pepra-Mensah, J., & Kyeremeh, E. A. (2018). Organisational culture: A catalyst for employee engagement in the Ghanaian public sector. *Global Journal of Human Resource Management*, 6(3), 11-28
- [24]. Saks, A. M. (2006). Antecedents and consequences of employee engagement. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 21(7), 600-619.
- [25]. Sarangi, S., & Srivastava, R. K. (2012). Impact of organizational culture and communication on employee engagement: An investigation of Indian private banks. *South Asian Journal of Management*, 19(3), 18
- [26]. Schein, E. H. (1985). How culture forms, develops, and changes. *Gaining control of the Corporate Culture*, 17-43
- [27]. Schmidt, B., Henges, M. & Bryson, A. (2003). A critical review of health-related productivity measures. *Journal of Business and Psychology*, 5(6), 535-536.
- [28]. Shahzad, F., Luqman, R., Khan, A., & Shabbir, L. (2012). Impact of organizational culture on organizational performance: An overview. *Interdisciplinary Journal of Contemporary Research in Business*, 3, 975-985.
- [29]. Suharti, L., & Suliyanto, D. (2012). The effects of organizational culture and leadership style toward employee engagement and their impacts toward employee loyalty. *World Review of Business Research*, 2(5), 128-139.
- [30]. Tannady, H., Tannady, H., & Zami, A. (2019). The effect of organizational culture and employee engagement on job performance of healthcare industry in province of Jakarta, Indonesia. *Calitatea*, 20(169), 18-22