IMPACT OF ORGANIZATIONAL CULTURE ON PERFORMANCES OF UNIVERSITIES

BY

AGBOOLA GBENGA MAYOWA

DEPARTMENT OF BUSINESS STUDIES,
SCHOOL OF BUSINESS,
COLLEGE OF DEVELOPMENT STUDIES,
COVENANT UNIVERSITY

gbenga.agboola@covenantuniversitity.edu.ng
08058523404 and 08060340047

ABSTRACT

This study examines the impact of organizational culture on performances of Universities in Ogun State, Nigeria. The objectives of the study were to identify which element of organizational culture has the most contribution in predicting the performances of Universities, and to reveal the relationship that exists between organizational culture and performances of Universities. To determine the impact of organizational culture on performances of Universities, a sample of 300 academic and non-academic staff of Covenant University, Ota, Olabisi Onabanjo University, Ago-Iwoye, University of Agriculture, Abeokuta, all in Ogun State were drawn. The data were analyzed using simple frequency tables, Pearson product moment correlation and multiple regressions. The finding shows that there is no significant contribution of organizational culture in predicting the performances of Universities and some elements of organizational culture contributed predicting the performances of Universities in Ogun State. Finally, the analysis shows that there is no significant relationship between organizational culture and performances of the Universities studied. The general agreement is that positive organizational culture will have a positive impact on performance of any University.

Key words: Organizational Culture, Performance, Impact, Universities and Nigeria

Introduction:

There are different types of organizations which exist to serve different purposes and to satisfy the variety needs of stakeholders of the organization. The type of organization is dependent on its ownership, shapes and sizes. For example, firm of accountants, schools, retail shops, local authorities, airports, vehicle manufacturers, hospitals, hotels and many others. These organizations are categorized into two, that is, public and private organizations.

Whatever type or category an organization is found, it exist to perform certain functions to achieve set objectives and to provide the desired satisfaction of its owners and customers. The set objectives are enabled and require the collective efforts of people to achieve the objectives that cannot be achieved by individuals on their own. Through collective efforts and actions, members and employees of an organization can provide a concerted and synergistic effect.

Gibson, Ivancevich, Donelly, and Konopaske (2005) stated that organizations have distinct personalities and that these personalities are shaped largely by its top executives, for example, a tyrannical and autocratic executive team is able to create a culture that is filled with fear. Therefore, the way a leader or top executives manage his or her employees will determine how the employees will react to work to achieve the goal of the business of profit making.

Management theorists, therefore, over the years have agreed among other variables that corporate culture and organizational performance have a very close relationship. Following Mullins (1999) "…there is a relationship between an organization's culture and its performance." Flamholtz and Kannan-Narasimhan (2005) said "that the impact of organizational culture on the bottom line is of critical importance as a basis for influencing managerial practice and in turn financial performance." McShane and Von Glinow (2005) in line with the above views of the relationship between organizational culture and organizational performance had a little different view, that "can companies with strong cultures have higher performance? Not necessarily! Studies have found only a modestly positive relationship between culture strength and success."

With the above views and statements of management theorists, one could easily conclude that organizational culture has a relationship with job performance of organization and in turn have positive impact on the overall performance of an organization. Researchers who have studied the impact of organizational culture on employees also indicate that it provides and encourages a form of stability.

Gibson et al (2003) identified two major aspects of culture, which are strong culture and weak culture. Gibson stated that strong culture is characterized by employees sharing core values; the more employees share and accept the core values the stronger the culture is and the more influential it is on behavior and the more employees do not share and accept the core values the weaker the culture is and the less influential it is on behavior. Mc Shane et al (2005) also supports the argument of Gibson et al and went further so say that weak culture is when the dominant values are short lived and held mainly by a few people at the top of the organization.

Herb Kelleher cited in Mc Shane et al (2005) founder of Southwest Airlines believes corporate culture makes difference in the company's success (performance) because it serves three important functions:

1. Corporate culture is a deeply embedded form of social control that influences employee decisions and behavior.

2. Corporate culture is the "social glue" that bonds people together and makes them feel part of the organizational experience.

3. Corporate culture assists the sense-making process.

To buttress the fact that organizational culture has a relationship with the performance of an organization, following Mullins (1999), organizations are seen successful based on their financials. However, he says, "Financials should be a result instead of being a drive" to attain excellence and success as a measure of performance of an organization. It is suggested that "get this right and the financials can take care of themselves," meaning that financials are a result, not necessarily an enabler. Therefore, organizational culture should be considered very important as other variables affecting an organization in order to attain and achieve their desired set objectives.

Another example of an organization that believes solely on corporate culture is the Heineken Company. As studied by Heller cited in Mullins (1999), of Europe's top companies, the importance of culture to effective organizational performance still stands. It was noted that Heineken's superiority in world markets is rested in part on its remarkable corporate culture.

Organizational culture is the pervasive system of values, beliefs, and norms that exists and can encourage and discourage effectiveness (performance); it is important therefore, to note that, it is corporate/organizational culture that makes an organization tops among its competitors, Gibson et al (2005).

In a University environment where lots of people are, ranging from staffs to students, culture is a sensitive issue that utmost attention must be given to. It is therefore important for management of Universities to pay attention to the issue of culture, if not cultural clashes would arise, which in turn affect the performance of the University. The locus of this paper is to examine the impact of organizational culture on the performances of universities in Nigeria.

The objectives considered in this study were:

a. To reveal the relationship that exists between organizational culture and performances of Universities.

b. To examine the significant contribution of organizational culture in predicting the performances of Universities.

c. To recommend strategies for strengthening organizational culture towards enhancing performances of Universities.

Research Questions:

a. Is there any significant relationship between organizational culture and performances of Universities?

b. Is there any significant contribution made by organizational culture in predicting the performances of Universities?

c. Can universities with strong organizational culture have higher performances of Universities?

Research Hypotheses:

The hypotheses set for this study includes:

1. H_0: There is no significant relationship between organizational culture and performances of Universities.

   H_1: There is significant relationship between organizational culture and performance of Universities.

2. H_0: There is no significant contribution of organizational culture in predicting the performances of Universities.

   H_1: There is significant contribution of organizational culture in predicting the performances of Universities.

Research Methods

The method adopted in this study was the Survey Research Design, which is to research on the impact of organizational culture on the performances of Universities in Ogun State using the questionnaire to harvest opinions on the culture and performances of their Universities. The population that was studied cuts across both academic and non-academic staffs of three Universities in Ogun State, Nigeria, which are Covenant University; Olabisi Onabanjo University and University of Agriculture. The hierarchical structure of the study population is made up of three tiers, which include top, middle and lower level staffs. The characteristic of the study population is that it is mixed at every level of the organization irrespective of age, sex, educational background, employment level, salary scale and marriage status.

The sample frame for this study covers both academic staff and non-academic staff at various levels of the three Universities in Ogun State. The sample size (determined judgmentally) used was 100 staff of each of the Universities. The sample technique adopted was a non-probability sampling technique and the sampling instrument used was a structured questionnaire. The staff

required to respond to the questionnaire were selected based on convenience sampling in each of the Universities.

The data collection instrument used in this study was the Questionnaire. The questionnaire had twenty-six questions, which was intended to assess the impact of organizational culture on the performances of three Universities in Ogun State, Nigeria. Six questions were asked to gather biographical data and twenty item questions of a five point Likert Scale ranging from a "Strongly Agree to Strongly Disagree", were asked to get responses on 10 elements of Organizational Culture, which are: culture nurturing, creativity - adaptability, unity in diversity, customer care, collaboration, open communication, code of conduct, role of clarity, quality consciousness and employee concern; and responses on two Performance variables: Perceptions and Effectiveness. The questionnaire was a structured one as the method of data collection and field assistance was used in retrieving the questionnaires from the respondents.

The data from the questionnaires were collected, collated, sorted, analyzed and presented through the use of Pearson product moment correlation coefficient and multiple regressions. For the biographical data, Frequency tables, Mean, Mode, Standard Deviation and Variance was used for analysis. The procedures for processing the data was done through the use of analytical software called the Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS). Tables were used to present the frequencies of the biographical data, while Pearson product moment correlation coefficient and multiple regressions were used finally to analyze the data. All the items in the questionnaire were analyzed.

Results

This section of the paper presents the data collected on the "Likert scale," through the use of Pearson-Product Moment Correlation and Multiple Regression. For the biographical data Frequency tables were used for analysis. After the data had been collected, the procedures for the processing of the collected data using Likert scale was through the use of analytical software called the SPSS. Hypothesis one was tested using Pearson Product Moment Correlation and hypothesis two was tested using Multiple Regression.

Table 1: Statistics of Total Respondents from the Three Universities

Universities			Respondents' Sex	Respondents' Age	Respondents' Marital Status	Respondents' Staff Status	Respondents' Educational Background	Respondents' Monthly Salary
Private (CU)	N	Valid	81	81	82	73	82	72
		Missing	1	1	0	9	0	10
State (OOU)	N	Valid	82	82	83	74	84	84
		Missing	2	2	1	10	0	0
Federal (UNAAB)	N	Valid	76	77	74	70	77	74
		Missing	1	0	3	7	0	3

From table 1 above, total numbers of respondents from the three Universities are revealed. It shows that there were 243 respondents in all as against 300, which was expected. A total of 4 were missing from Respondents' Sex, a total of 3 from Respondents' Age, a total of 4 from Respondents' Marital Status, a total of 26 from Respondents' Staff Status, no one from Respondents' Educational Background, and a total of 13 from Respondents' Monthly Salary.

Table 2: Frequency distribution table of respondents by Sex from the Three Universities

Universities			Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Private (CU)	Valid	Male	47	57.3	58.0	58.0
		Female	34	41.5	42.0	100.0
		Total	81	98.8	100.0	
	Missing	System	1	1.2		
	Total		82	100.0		
State (OOU)	Valid	Male	44	52.4	53.7	53.7
		Female	38	45.2	46.3	100.0
		Total	82	97.6	100.0	
	Missing	System	2	2.4		
	Total		84	100.0		
Federal (UNAAB)	Valid	Male	34	44.2	44.7	44.7
		Female	42	54.5	55.3	100.0
		Total	76	98.7	100.0	
	Missing	System	1	1.3		
	Total		77	100.0		

From the table 2 above, total number of respondents' sex and percentages are shown. It shows that from CU, 57.3% were males, 41.5% were females and 1.2% was missing, which represents the total sample size. From OOU, 52.4% were males, 45.2% were females and 2.4% was missing, which represents the total sample size. From UNAAB, 44.2% were males, 54.5% were females and 1.3% was missing, which represents the total sample size.

Table 3   : Frequency distribution table of respondents by Age from the Three Universities

Universities			Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Private (CU)	Valid	18-30 Years	44	53.7	54.3	54.3
		31-40 Years	27	32.9	33.3	87.7
		41-50 Years	8	9.8	9.9	97.5
		51-Above Years	2	2.4	2.5	100.0
		Total	81	98.8	100.0	
	Missing	System	1	1.2		
	Total		82	100.0		
State (OOU)	Valid	18-30 Years	22	26.2	26.8	26.8
		31-40 Years	37	44.0	45.1	72.0
		41-50 Years	23	27.4	28.0	100.0
		Total	82	97.6	100.0	
	Missing	System	2	2.4		
	Total		84	100.0		
Federal (UNAAB)	Valid	18-30 Years	19	24.7	24.7	24.7
		31-40 Years	22	28.6	28.6	53.2
		41-50 Years	23	29.9	29.9	83.1
		51-Above Years	13	16.9	16.9	100.0
		Total	77	100.0	100.0	

Table 3 above, shows the total number of respondents' age and their percentages. It reveals that from CU, 53.7% were between the ages 18 – 30 years, 32.9% were between the ages 31 - 40 years, 9.8% were between the ages 41 – 50 years, 2.4% were between the ages 51 and above years and 1.2% were missing. From OOU, 26.2% were between the ages 18 – 30 years, 44.0% were between the ages 31 - 40 years, 27.4% were between the ages 41 – 50 years, none were between the ages 51 and above years and 2.4% were missing. From UNAAB, 24.7% were between the ages 18 – 30 years, 28.6% were between the ages 31 - 40 years, 29.9% were between the ages 41 – 50 years, 16.9% were between the ages 51 and above years and none were missing.

Table 4: Frequency distribution table of respondents by Marital Status from the Three Universities

Universities			Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Private (CU)	Valid	Single	55	67.1	67.1	67.1
		Married	24	29.3	29.3	96.3
		Divorced	1	1.2	1.2	97.6
		Others	2	2.4	2.4	100.0
		Total	82	100.0	100.0	
State (OOU)	Valid	Single	22	26.2	26.5	26.5
		Married	59	70.2	71.1	97.6
		Divorced	2	2.4	2.4	100.0
		Total	83	98.8	100.0	
	Missing	System	1	1.2		
	Total		84	100.0		
Federal (UNAAB)	Valid	Single	22	28.6	29.7	29.7
		Married	43	55.8	58.1	87.8
		Divorced	9	11.7	12.2	100.0
		Total	74	96.1	100.0	
	Missing	System	3	3.9		
	Total		77	100.0		

Table 4 above, shows the total number of respondents' marital status and their percentages. From CU, 67.1% were single, 29.3% were married, 1.2% was divorced, 2.4% were under others and none were missing. From OOU, 26.2% were single, 70.2% were married, 2.4% were divorced, none were under others and 1.2 was missing. From UNAAB, 28.6% were single, 55.8% were married, 11.7% was divorced, none were under others and none were missing.

Table 5: Frequency distribution table of respondents by Academic and Non-Academic Staff Status from the Three Universities

Universities			Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Private (CU)	Valid	Academic	51	62.2	69.9	69.9
		Non-Academic	22	26.8	30.1	100.0
		Total	73	89.0	100.0	
	Missing	System	9	11.0		
	Total		82	100.0		
State (OOU)	Valid	Academic	22	26.2	29.7	29.7
		Non-Academic	52	61.9	70.3	100.0
		Total	74	88.1	100.0	
	Missing	System	10	11.9		
	Total		84	100.0		
Federal (UNAAB)	Valid	Academic	44	57.1	62.9	62.9
		Non-Academic	25	32.5	35.7	98.6
		8	1	1.3	1.4	100.0
		Total	70	90.9	100.0	
	Missing	System	7	9.1		
	Total		77	100.0		

Table 5 above, shows the total number of respondents' staff status and their percentages. From CU, 62.2% were in academics, 26.8% were in non-academics and 11.0% were missing. From OOU, 26.2% were in academics, 61.9% were in non-academics and 11.9% were missing. From UNAAB, 57.1% were in academics, 32.5% were in non-academics and 11.2% were missing.

Table 6: Frequency distribution table of respondents by Educational Background from the Three Universities

Universities			Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Private (CU)	Valid	Secondary	8	9.8	9.8	9.8
		OND	9	11.0	11.0	20.7
		HND	3	3.7	3.7	24.4
		B. Sc.	31	37.8	37.8	62.2
		M. Sc.	24	29.3	29.3	91.5
		PhD.	3	3.7	3.7	95.1
		Professional	4	4.9	4.9	100.0
		Total	82	100.0	100.0	
State (OOU)	Valid	Primary	1	1.2	1.2	1.2
		Secondary	4	4.8	4.8	6.0
		OND	9	10.7	10.7	16.7
		HND	11	13.1	13.1	29.8
		B. Sc.	36	42.9	42.9	72.6
		M. Sc.	19	22.6	22.6	95.2
		PhD.	4	4.8	4.8	100.0
		Total	84	100.0	100.0	
Federal (UNAAB)	Valid	Primary	1	1.3	1.3	1.3
		Secondary	6	7.8	7.8	9.1
		OND	5	6.5	6.5	15.6
		HND	10	13.0	13.0	28.6
		B. Sc.	15	19.5	19.5	48.1
		M. Sc.	18	23.4	23.4	71.4
		PhD.	15	19.5	19.5	90.9
		Professional	7	9.1	9.1	100.0
		Total	77	100.0	100.0	

Table 6 above, shows the total number of respondents' educational background and their percentages. It reveals that from CU, none had primary education, 9.8% had secondary education, 11.0% had OND, 3.7% had HND, 37.8% had B. Sc., 29.3% had M. Sc., 3.7% had PhD, 4.9% had professional qualifications none were missing. From OOU, 1.2% had primary education, 4.8% had secondary education, 10.7% had OND, 13.1% had HND, 42.9% had B. Sc., 22.6% had M. Sc., 4.8% had PhD, and none had professional qualifications none were missing. From UNAAB, 1.3% had primary education, 7.8% had secondary education, 6.5% had OND, 13.0% had HND, 19.5% had B. Sc., 23.4% had M. Sc., 19.5% had PhD, and 9.1% had professional qualifications none were missing.

Test of Hypotheses:

The hypotheses were tested using the person product moment correlation for hypothesis 1, while multiple regression analysis was used to analyze hypothesis 2. The first test method measured the relationship and strength of the relationship between organizational culture and performance, while the second test method measured the significant contribution of the elements of organizational culture in predicting the performances of the three Universities.

Hypothesis One:

H_0 = There is no significant relationship between organizational culture and performances of Universities.
H_1 = There is significant relationship between organizational culture and performances of Universities.

In order to test the significant relationship between organizational culture and performances of Universities the Pearson product moment correlation was used through the SPSS package.

First of all, the data from Covenant University (CU), Olabisi Onabanjo University (OOU) and University of Agriculture (UNAAB) were combined and analyzed to check the relationship and strength of the relationship between organizational culture and performances of the three Universities on general terms. The analysis is as presented below:

Table 5a: Correlation between Organizational Culture and Performances of the three Universities combined

		Performance	Culture
Performance:	Pearson Correlation	1	-.014
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.830
	N	243	243
Culture:	Pearson Correlation	-.014	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.830	
	N	243	243

From the above table, the relationship between organizational culture and the performances of the three universities were investigated using Pearson product moment correlation. The analysis shows that there is a negative correlation between the two variables, organizational culture and performance (r = - .014; N = 243), meaning that the relationship is inversely related. Where high levels of organizational culture is associated with lower levels of performance or lower levels of organizational culture is associated with higher levels of performance. Also, there is no significant relationship between organizational culture and performances of the three Universities as against the support that there is significant relationship between organizational culture and performance of organizations by researchers.

A further analysis was also done on each of the three Universities to check the relationships that exist between organizational culture and performance. The analysis is as presented below:

Table 5b: Correlation between Organizational Culture and Performance based on the University Categories

Universities			Culture	Performance
Private (CU):	Culture	Pearson Correlation	1	.139
		Sig. (2-tailed)		.213
		N	82	82
	Performance	Pearson Correlation	.139	1
		Sig. (2-tailed)	.213	
		N	82	82
State (OOU):	Culture	Pearson Correlation	1	-.227(*)
		Sig. (2-tailed)		.038
		N	84	84
	Performance	Pearson Correlation	-.227(*)	1
		Sig. (2-tailed)	.038	
		N	84	84
Federal (UNAAB):	Culture	Pearson Correlation	1	-.074
		Sig. (2-tailed)		.524
		N	77	77
	Performance	Pearson Correlation	-.074	1
		Sig. (2-tailed)	.524	
		N	77	77

* Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

Looking at the Universities individually, the relationship between organizational culture and performance in Covenant University shows that there is a positive correlation between organizational culture and performance (r = .139; N = 82), which suggests a small relationship between organizational culture and performance.

In Olabisi Onabanjo University, the analysis shows that there is a negative correlation between organizational culture and performance (r = - .227*; N = 84), also suggesting a small relationship between organizational culture and performance.

The analysis on University of Agriculture shows that there is a negative correlation between organizational culture and performance (r = - .074; N = 77), suggesting that there is no significant relationship between organizational culture and performance.

Table 5c: Correlation between Organizational Culture and Performance in Public Universities

		Performance	Culture
Performance	Pearson Correlation	1	-.030
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.708
	N	161	161
Culture	Pearson Correlation	-.030	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.708	
	N	161	161

Finally, the analysis on Olabisi Onabanjo University and University of Agriculture as public Universities shows that there is a negative correlation between organizational culture and performance (r = - .030; N = 161), suggesting that there is no significant relationship between organizational culture and performance.

Hypothesis Two:

H_0:   There is no significant contribution of organizational culture in predicting the performances of Universities.
H_1:   There is significant contribution of organizational culture in predicting the performances of Universities.

Hypothesis two was analyzed using the multiple regression analysis to measure the contribution of organizational culture in predicting the performances of Universities.

The data from Covenant University (CU), Olabisi Onabanjo University (OOU) and University of Agriculture (UNAAB) were combined and analyzed to determine the contribution of organizational culture in predicting the performances of the three Universities. The analysis of the three Universities combined is as presented below:

Table 6a: Model Summary for the three Universities (CU, OOU, and UNAAB)

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	.014(a)	.000	-.004	.64452

Table 6b: ANOVA for the three Universities (CU, OOU, and UNAAB)

Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	.019	1	.019	.046	.830(a)
	Residual	100.114	241	.415		
	Total	100.133	242			

Table 6c: Coefficients for the three Universities (CU, OOU, and UNAAB)

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.	Collinearity Statistics	
		B	Std. Error	Beta	Tolerance	VIF	B	Std. Error
1	(Constant)	4.075	.290		14.059	.000		
	Culture	-.020	.095	-.014	-.214	.830	1.000	1.000

In table 6a (model summary), the result shows how much of the variance in the dependent variable (Performance) is explained by the model, which is organizational culture. The value ".000" in the 'R' square column is expressed in percentage. This means that our model

12

(organizational culture) explains 0% of the variance on performances of the three Universities, which is no relationship.

In determining the contribution of organizational culture, table 6c (coefficient table) was used to determine this. In the "Beta" column, the value is considered, that is "-.014" for culture. This means that, organizational culture makes no contribution in explaining the dependent variable (Performance). The "Sig." column of the same table shows, whether this variable is making a statistically significant unique contribution. The decision rule is that if the "Sig." value is less than .05, then the variable is making a statistically significant unique contribution on the dependent variable (Performance). Therefore, organizational culture measuring at value ".830" does not make any statistically significant unique contribution in predicting performances of the three Universities combined as a whole.

A further analysis was also done on each of the three Universities to determine the effect or contribution of the organization cultural elements on performance.

The analysis below is a multiple regression analysis on each of the Universities:

Table 7a: Model Summary for each of the three Universities (CU, OOU, and UNAAB)

Universities	Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
Private (CU)	1	.139(a)	.019	.007	.52455
State (OOU)	1	.227(a)	.052	.040	.67231
Federal (UNAAB)	1	.074(a)	.005	-.008	.56586

Table 7b: ANOVA for each of the three Universities (CU, OOU, and UNAAB)

Universities	Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Private (CU)	1	Regression	.433	1	.433	1.573	.213(a)
		Residual	22.012	80	.275		
		Total	22.445	81			
State (OOU)	1	Regression	2.021	1	2.021	4.471	.038(a)
		Residual	37.064	82	.452		
		Total	39.085	83			
Federal (UNAAB)	1	Regression	.131	1	.131	.410	.524(a)
		Residual	24.015	75	.320		
		Total	24.146	76			

Table 7c: Coefficients for each of the three Universities (CU, OOU, and UNAAB)

Universities Model			Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.	Collinearity Statistics	
			B	Std. Error	Beta	Tolerance	VIF	B	Std. Error
Private (CU)	1	(Constant)	3.519	.469		7.507	.000		
		Culture	.203	.162	.139	1.254	.213	1.000	1.000
State (OOU)	1	(Constant)	4.723	.493		9.577	.000		
		Culture	-.346	.164	-.227	-2.114	.038	1.000	1.000
Federal (UNAAB)	1	(Constant)	4.586	.496		9.245	.000		
		Culture	-.098	.153	-.074	-.640	.524	1.000	1.000

In table 7a (model summary), CU has ".019," OOU has ".052" and UNAAB has ".005" in the 'R' square column, which is expressed in percentage. This means that our model (organizational culture) explains 1.9% for CU; 5.2% for OOU and 0.5% for UNAAB of the variance on performances of each of the three Universities, which are very weak.

In comparing the contribution of organizational culture in each of the three Universities, table 7c (coefficient table) will be used to determine this. In the "Beta" column, the largest value is considered, that is ".227" (ignoring the negative sign) for OOU. This means that, organizational culture in OOU makes the strongest unique contribution in predicting the dependent variable (Performance) compared to CU and UNAAB. The Beta values for the other elements indicate that they made less contribution in predicting performance. The "Sig." column of the same table shows, whether this variable is making a statistically significant unique contribution. The decision rule is that if the "Sig." value is less than .05, then the variable is making a statistically significant unique contribution on the dependent variable (Performance). Therefore, only OOU makes a statistically significant unique contribution on performance compared to the other two Universities.

The analysis below is a multiple regression analysis on Public University:

Table 8a: Model Summary for Public Universities (OOU and UNAAB)

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	.030(a)	.001	-.005	.69429

Table 8b: ANOVA for Public Universities (OOU and UNAAB)

Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	.068	1	.068	.141	.708(a)
	Residual	76.643	159	.482		
	Total	76.711	160			

14

Table 8c: Coefficients for Public Universities (OOU and UNAAB)

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.	Collinearity Statistics	
		B	Std. Error	Beta	Tolerance	VIF	B	Std. Error
1	(Constant)	4.109	.378		10.870	.000		
	Culture	-.045	.121	-.030	-.375	.708	1.000	1.000

Table 8a (model summary), the result shows how much of the variance in the dependent variable (Performance) is explained by the model, which is organizational culture. The value ".001" in the 'R' square column is expressed in percentage. This means that our model (organizational culture) explains 0.1% of the variance on performances of Public Universities, which is no relationship.

In determining the contribution of organizational culture in Public Universities, table 8c (coefficient table) was used to determine this. In the "Beta" column, the value was considered, that is "-.030" for culture. This means that, organizational culture makes no significant contribution in explaining the dependent variable (Performance). The "Sig." column of the same table shows, whether this variable is making a statistically significant unique contribution. Therefore, organizational culture measuring at value ".708" does not make any statistically significant unique contribution in predicting performances of Public Universities.

Comparing these results, the analysis shows that organizational culture has more significant contribution in predicting performances in Covenant University than Olabisi Onabanjo University and University of Agriculture combined together.

Based on the analysis above, we shall not reject the null hypothesis stating that "There is no significant contribution of organizational culture in predicting the performances of Universities."

Conclusions:

The result of this research study indicates that the culture of the various Universities studied is very low, therefore having a negative impact on their performances. It is therefore important to understand the environment of the University in order to define the cultural norms, values and beliefs to adopt. It is needful too, to recruit staffs with beliefs and values that are compatible with the University's culture and also encourage socialization and integration of individual staff goals with the University's goals and objectives to sustain the University's culture. Management should adopt the process of communicating the culture through the use of explicit statements of purpose, core values and cultural norms. Overtime, management should measure culture as this will help the University to manage their cultures and take necessary actions to sustain them.

A University's culture can be best protected and improved if effective network of cultural transmission is put in place. University management should take advantage of cultural network so as for them to be able to share their own stories and creating opportunities to demonstrate

shared meaning. The University's magazines and other forms of media can be used to strengthen University's culture by communicating cultural values and beliefs more efficiently.

While the results of this research project cannot be generalized in its current form to different Universities, they provide statistically significant evidence of the impact and importance of certain cultural elements over others in influencing the performance of Universities. We therefore believe that the results in this research project are significant and open for further research.

In sum, this research has revealed insights regarding on the impacts of organizational culture on performances of Universities. The general agreement is that positive organizational culture will have a positive impact on performance of any University. The Universities studied, Covenant University (CU), Olabisi Onabanjo University (OOU) and University of Agriculture (UNAAB) need to work on their cultural elements as to further improve the University's performance.

Suggestion for Further Readings:

Apart from Organizational culture, there are other factors one must take into cognizance that also impacts positively or negatively on a University's performance such as organizational conflicts, organizational politics, organizational climate and motivation. Also, organizational behavior and organizational development could be studied to further help in improving performance growth of Universities.

Management should treat and solve every cultural conflict as it affects Universities in order to reduce labor turnover of Universities and friction between University management and staffs.

References:

Flamholtz, E. G. and Kannan-Narasimhan, R. (2005). "Differential Impact of Cultural Elements on Financial Performance," European Management Journal, Vol. 23; 1, pp. 50-64, Elsevier Ltd. Publications.

Gibson, J. L., Ivancevich, J. M., Donelly Jr., J. H. and Konopaske, R. (2003). Organizations: Behaviour, Structure, Processes, USA, McGraw Hill Irwin, (11th Edition)

McShane, S. L. and Von Glinow M. A. (2005) Organizational Behaviour, Boston, McGraw Hill/Irwin, (3rd Edition)

Mullins L. J. (1999) Management and Organizational Behaviour, Harlow, Pearson education, (5th Edition)