Published by

British Journal of Contemporary Research

BEXFORD PUBLISHING

Organisational Culture, Job Satisfaction, and Labour Productivity in Nigerian Financial Institutions: An Industrial Sociology Perspective

Original Research Article | Volume 1 | Issue 6 | 2026 | Article Number: 066

Accepted: 29 November 2026 | Published: 10 November 2026 | ISSN: 2979-8582 (Online)

Crossref : **https://doi.org/10.67693/BJCR-AHA65A82**

Tade Shakir Bidemi

Department of Sociology, University of Port Harcourt, Nigeria

Correspondence: Tade Shakir Bidemi, shakir_tade@uniport.edu.ng

Abstract

Background/Purpose: Organisational culture is a key determinant of employee job satisfaction and labour productivity in Nigerian financial institutions, yet the sociological mechanisms through which culture shapes these outcomes, particularly the mediating role of job satisfaction, remain underexamined. Objectives: This study examines the relationships among organisational culture, job satisfaction, and labour productivity in Nigeria's banking and insurance sectors from an Industrial Sociology perspective, focusing on the mediating role of job satisfaction. Design/Methodology: A descriptive survey design, underpinned by a post-positivist epistemological orientation, was adopted. A structured questionnaire drawing on the Organisational Culture Assessment Instrument (OCAI), the Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire (MSQ), and established productivity measures to 383 respondents (response rate = 96.0%) from 14 financial institutions across Lagos, Port Harcourt, Abuja, and Kano, using stratified random sampling. Data were analysed using descriptive statistics, Pearson correlation, hierarchical multiple regression, and Structural Equation Modelling (SEM) with bootstrapped mediation procedures (5,000 samples). Findings: Organisational culture significantly and positively influences both job satisfaction ($\beta = .587$, $p < .001$) and labour productivity ($\beta = .321$, $p < .001$). Job satisfaction significantly predicts labour productivity ($\beta = .412$, $p < .001$) and partially mediates the culture–productivity relationship (indirect $\beta = .242$, 95% BC CI [.171, .321]; proportion mediated = 43.0%). Employee Involvement, Communication Culture, and Reward and Recognition Culture were the three strongest predictors of job satisfaction, while Leadership Culture and Innovation and Adaptability Culture demonstrated the strongest direct effects on labour productivity. Practical Implications: Nigerian financial institutions must invest in participatory, transparent, and employee-centred organisational cultures to sustain workforce productivity. Originality/Value: This study advances Industrial Sociology scholarship by establishing job satisfaction as an empirically confirmed mediating mechanism in the culture–labour productivity relationship in the Nigerian financial sector.

Keywords: Organisational Culture, Job Satisfaction, Labour Productivity, Industrial Sociology, Nigerian Financial Institutions, Employee Performance, Workplace Relations, Social Exchange

© 2026 The Authors. Published by Bexford Publishing Ltd

1. INTRODUCTION

The modern workplace has undergone significant change due to technological advancement, globalisation, organisational restructuring, demographic shifts, and evolving employee expectations (Daft, 2022; Robbins & Judge, 2022). In this context, organisational culture comprises the shared values, assumptions, behavioural norms, and institutional practices that shape how members think, relate, and work. It has become a key factor influencing employee attitudes, commitment, and performance (Schein, 2017; Denison, 1990). This is especially evident in Nigeria's financial sector, where competitive pressures, regulatory demands, and substantial investment in human capital have made organisational culture a strategic priority.

Nigeria's financial sector is vital to national economic growth, supporting employment, mobilising savings, and channelling investment (Smelser, 2013). It includes commercial banks, insurance firms, microfinance institutions, and other providers, employing hundreds of thousands of people. Over the last two decades, regulatory reforms, such as the 2004–2005 banking consolidation, recapitalisation mandates, and the ongoing digital transformation agenda, have significantly reshaped work environments, labour relations, and organisational culture within the sector (Akinwale & George, 2020; Ubeku, 2018).

Despite these transformations, many Nigerian financial institutions continue to face recurrent challenges related to employee dissatisfaction, high labour turnover, burnout, workplace stress, and declining productivity (Okafor & Udeh, 2019). Employees within banks and insurance companies frequently report dissatisfaction with compensation systems, career development opportunities, communication quality, recognition practices, and leadership styles; conditions that drain productivity and widen institutional performance gaps. These challenges are fundamentally social and cultural rather than technological or financial, arising from how organisational cultures shape employees' experiences of work, fairness, belonging, and contribution.

From the perspective of Industrial Sociology, workplace productivity is socially constructed through organisational relationships, institutional cultures, labour-management interactions, and employees' subjective perceptions of fairness, recognition, and inclusion (Blauner, 1964; Mayo, 1933). Whether the cultural environment is experienced as supportive and empowering or as controlling and alienating profoundly determines both the satisfaction employees derive from their work and the productivity they contribute to their organisations (Warrick, 2017; Cameron & Quinn, 2011).

Despite growing scholarly attention to organisational culture and employee performance in Nigerian organisations, existing studies have overwhelmingly concentrated on managerial and administrative dimensions while paying limited attention to the sociological mechanisms through which workplace culture shapes employee satisfaction and labour productivity (Eze & Nwachukwu, 2021). More importantly, job satisfaction as a mediating variable in the culture–productivity relationship has not been formally examined in Nigerian financial institutions, a theoretical and empirical gap this study addresses.

This study therefore examines organisational culture, job satisfaction, and labour productivity in Nigerian financial institutions from an Industrial Sociology perspective. The findings contribute to Industrial Sociology scholarship, organisational behaviour literature, and the practical management of human capital within Nigeria's financial sector.

1.1 Statement of the Problem

A particularly pressing problem is the persistent gap between institutional investment in operational systems and the quality of employees' work experiences within Nigerian financial institutions. Despite significant capital investment in technology, branding, and service infrastructure, many financial sector

© 2026 The Authors. Published by Bexford Publishing Ltd

employees continue to report low job satisfaction, high turnover intentions, and disengagement (Okafor & Udeh, 2019; Eze & Nwachukwu, 2021). This gap reflects a failure to address the cultural dimensions of organisational performance—specifically, the values, leadership practices, communication systems, and recognition mechanisms that determine whether employees find their work environments fulfilling (Schein, 2017; Denison et al., 2004).

Furthermore, while prior studies have examined individual relationships between organisational culture and performance (Akinwale & George, 2020) and between job satisfaction and productivity (Okafor & Udeh, 2019), the integrated examination of job satisfaction as a mediator in the culture–productivity relationship within Nigerian financial institutions remains methodologically and theoretically underdeveloped.

1.2 Aim and Objectives of the Study

The aim of this study is to examine the relationship between organisational culture, job satisfaction, and labour productivity in Nigerian financial institutions from an Industrial Sociology perspective. The specific objectives are to:

- examine the influence of organisational culture on job satisfaction in Nigerian financial institutions;
- determine the relationship between organisational culture and labour productivity;
- investigate the influence of job satisfaction on labour productivity; and
- examine the mediating role of job satisfaction in the relationship between organisational culture and labour productivity.

1.3 Research Questions

The study is guided by the following research questions:

- How does organisational culture influence job satisfaction in Nigerian financial institutions?
- What relationship exists between organisational culture and labour productivity?
- How does job satisfaction influence labour productivity?
- Does job satisfaction mediate the relationship between organisational culture and labour productivity?

1.4 Research Hypotheses

The following null hypotheses were formulated for empirical testing at a significance level of $p < .05$:

H_{01}: Organisational culture has no significant influence on job satisfaction in Nigerian financial institutions.

H_{02}: Organisational culture has no significant relationship with labour productivity.

H_{03}: Job satisfaction has no significant influence on labour productivity.

H_{04}: Job satisfaction does not significantly mediate the relationship between organisational culture and labour productivity.

1.5 Theoretical Framework

1.5.1 Human Relations Theory

Human Relations Theory, developed through the pioneering research of Elton Mayo and his colleagues at the Hawthorne Works of the Western Electric Company between 1924 and 1932, serves as the foundational theoretical anchor for this study (Mayo, 1933). The Hawthorne Studies generated the transformative insight that employee productivity is far more strongly influenced by psychological, social, and

© 2026 The Authors. Published by Bexford Publishing Ltd

organisational factors than by physical working conditions or economic incentives alone. The discovery that workers responded to managerial attention, group belonging, social recognition, and informal organisational norms as powerfully as to material rewards established the foundations of Industrial Sociology as a distinct scholarly discipline.

1.5.2 Social Exchange Theory

Social Exchange Theory (SET), developed by Blau (1964) and subsequently elaborated by Gouldner (1960) and Cropanzano and Mitchell (2005), provides the second major theoretical pillar of this study. SET explains workplace relationships through the principle of reciprocal exchange: employees contribute their effort, commitment, and performance in exchange for the organisation's provision of recognition, fairness, support, and career development opportunities. The key SET propositions relevant to this study are: first, that employment relationships are ongoing exchanges governed by norms of reciprocity; second, that employees continuously evaluate the quality of organisational exchange—assessing whether the cultural environment provides fair treatment, adequate recognition, and genuine support; and third, that positive exchange evaluations generate positive attitudinal and behavioural responses (commitment, loyalty, and high performance) while negative evaluations generate withdrawal, resentment, and productivity decline (Blau, 1964; Cropanzano & Mitchell, 2005).

SET explains the mechanism through which organisational culture influences both job satisfaction and labour productivity. When the organisational culture embodies fairness norms, communicates genuine recognition, enables meaningful participation, and provides supportive leadership, employees experience the exchange relationship as favourable and respond with higher satisfaction and greater productive effort, a direct application of Gouldner's (1960) norm of reciprocity. Conversely, cultures characterised by inequitable reward distribution, authoritarian leadership, poor communication, and exclusionary management signal an unfavourable exchange relationship, generating the dissatisfaction, disengagement, and productivity decline documented by Okafor and Udeh (2019) and Eze and Nwachukwu (2021) in Nigerian financial institutions.

1.5.3 Herzberg's Two-Factor Theory

Herzberg's Two-Factor Theory (also known as the Motivator-Hygiene Theory), developed through the Pittsburgh study of job attitudes involving 203 accountants and engineers (Herzberg, 1966), provides the third theoretical anchor for this study. The theory contends that the factors producing job satisfaction are fundamentally different from those causing dissatisfaction, a distinction that has profoundly shaped motivation research and management practice. Hygiene factors or dissatisfiers (including salary, working conditions, company policies, supervisory quality, and interpersonal relationships) relate primarily to the contextual environment of work; when inadequate, they generate dissatisfaction, but when sufficient, they merely prevent dissatisfaction rather than generating positive motivation. Motivator factors or satisfiers (including achievement, recognition, the work itself, responsibility, and advancement) are related to the intrinsic content of work and, when present, generate genuine job satisfaction and motivational engagement (Herzberg, 1966).

1.6 Conceptual Review

1.6.1 Organisational Culture

Organisational culture is defined as the pattern of shared basic assumptions learned by a group as it solves its problems of external adaptation and internal integration, and as assumptions that have 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, 2017, p. 18). This definition emphasises

© 2026 The Authors. Published by Bexford Publishing Ltd

organisational culture as a deep, learned, and collectively validated system rather than a surface collection of visible practices or stated values. Schein's (2017) three-level model, comprising artefacts (visible organisational structures and processes), espoused values (stated strategies, goals, and philosophies), and basic underlying assumptions (unconscious, taken-for-granted beliefs and perceptions), provides a comprehensive analytical framework for understanding how culture shapes employee behaviour at multiple levels of consciousness.

1.6.2 Job Satisfaction

Job satisfaction is defined as a pleasurable or positive emotional state resulting from the appraisal of one's job or job experiences (Locke, 1976, p. 1304). This widely cited definition emphasises job satisfaction as an evaluative and affective response to the objective and subjective characteristics of the work environment. Spector (1997) identified nine facets of job satisfaction, namely pay, promotion, supervision, fringe benefits, contingent rewards, operating conditions, co-workers, nature of work, and communication, which collectively determine employees' overall satisfaction levels. The Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire (MSQ) and the Job Descriptive Index (JDI) are among the most extensively validated instruments for measuring these facets.

1.6.3 Labour Productivity

Labour productivity, in the context of financial institutions, refers to the efficiency and effectiveness with which employees convert organisational resources, knowledge, and technological systems into valuable service outputs that achieve institutional objectives (Daft, 2022). Beyond purely technical notions of input-output ratios, labour productivity in the Industrial Sociology tradition encompasses the social, relational, and motivational dimensions of productive work, recognising that human output capacity cannot be separated from the social conditions within which work is performed (Smelser, 2013; Blauner, 1964). Productive employees in financial institutions demonstrate service delivery efficiency, consistent target achievement, high work quality, customer satisfaction, and lower rates of error, absenteeism, and counterproductive behaviour (Organ et al., 2006).

1.7 Conceptual Framework

The conceptual framework for this study is presented in Figure 1. It illustrates the theoretically grounded relationships among the three principal constructs (organisational culture, job satisfaction, and labour productivity) and the contextual control variables. The framework is anchored in Human Relations Theory (Mayo, 1933), Social Exchange Theory (Blau, 1964; Cropanzano & Mitchell, 2005), and Herzberg's Two-Factor Theory (1966), and is informed by Schein's (2017) three-level culture model and Cameron and Quinn's (2011) Competing Values Framework.

Figure 1: Conceptual Framework — Organisational Culture, Job Satisfaction, and Labour Productivity

INDEPENDENT VARIABLE	MEDIATING VARIABLE	DEPENDENT VARIABLE	CONTROL VARIABLES
Organisational Culture	**Job Satisfaction**	**Labour Productivity**	**Contextual Factors**
• **Employee Involvement**	• **Compensation Satisfaction**	• **Service Delivery Efficiency** • Employee Output	• **Institutional Sector (Banking / Insurance)** • Firm Size

© 2026 The Authors. Published by Bexford Publishing Ltd

• Communication Culture • Reward & Recognition • Leadership Culture • Innovation & Adaptability • Team Orientation • Ethical Culture	• Recognition & Promotion • Work Conditions • Leadership Support • Work-Life Balance • Interpersonal Relations	• Target Achievement • Work Quality • Customer Satisfaction • Reduced Absenteeism	• Employee Education • Work Experience • Employment Tenure
Influences ➡	**➡ Mediates ➡**	**➡ Outcomes**	**Moderate IV → DV path**

Source: Developed by the Author (2026), adapted from Mayo (1933), Blau (1964), Herzberg (1966), Schein (2017), Cameron & Quinn (2011), and Cropanzano & Mitchell (2005).

1.8 Empirical Review

1.8.1 Organisational Culture and Employee Performance: Foundational International Evidence

Denison (1990) conducted a landmark longitudinal study of 34 American companies over a five-year period, demonstrating that organisational culture strength (specifically the involvement, consistency, adaptability, and mission dimensions of culture) significantly predicted subsequent return on investment, sales growth, and employee satisfaction. Denison's finding that culture effects on performance operated with a lag of three to five years established the critical insight that organisational culture functions as a long-term institutional asset rather than a short-term performance lever, with important implications for how Nigerian financial institutions should approach cultural investment.

Cameron and Quinn (2011) applied the Competing Values Framework across more than 1,000 organisations, finding consistent evidence that Clan and Adhocracy culture types generated the highest employee satisfaction and commitment scores, while organisations with strong hierarchical and market cultures recorded higher short-term output but lower employee wellbeing, higher turnover, and less sustainable long-term performance. Their finding that cultural balance, combining the employee-centred dimensions of clan cultures with the innovation orientation of adhocracy cultures, generates optimal satisfaction–productivity combinations, has direct implications for culture management in Nigerian financial institutions.

1.8.2 Job Satisfaction and Labour Productivity: Theoretical Syntheses

Judge et al. (2001) conducted a meta-analysis of 312 independent samples involving 54,417 individuals, examining the relationship between job satisfaction and job performance. Their analysis revealed a true-score correlation of .30, with higher correlations in complex jobs and in studies measuring both intrinsic and extrinsic satisfaction dimensions. Crucially, the study showed that the satisfaction–performance relationship is stronger when mediated by organisational commitment, and that performance cultures that attend to both hygiene and motivator factors (as specified by Herzberg, 1966) generate the highest sustainable productivity outcomes.

Hackman and Oldham (1976) developed the Job Characteristics Model through a study of 658 employees across 62 jobs, demonstrating that five core job dimensions (skill variety, task identity, task significance,

© 2026 The Authors. Published by Bexford Publishing Ltd

autonomy, and feedback) generate three critical psychological states (experienced meaningfulness, experienced responsibility, and knowledge of results) that, in turn, determine job satisfaction, internal work motivation, and performance quality. Their model provides a powerful mechanism-level explanation for how organisational culture shapes productivity: cultures that enrich jobs by supporting autonomy, meaningful task assignment, and performance feedback generate the psychological states that sustain high satisfaction and productive engagement.

1.8.3 Nigerian and West African Empirical Evidence

Akinwale and George (2020) conducted a quantitative survey of 312 employees across eight Nigerian commercial banks in Lagos, examining the relationship between organisational culture and employee productivity using multiple regression analysis. Their findings established that communication openness ($\beta = .54$, $p < .001$), participatory leadership ($\beta = .48$, $p < .001$), and reward fairness ($\beta = .43$, $p < .001$) were the three strongest cultural predictors of employee productivity. The study found that banks characterised by participatory and communication-rich cultures achieved productivity scores 38% higher than those rated as authoritarian with closed communication cultures, providing compelling quantitative evidence for the culture–productivity relationship in the Nigerian banking context.

Okafor and Udeh (2019) examined job satisfaction and employee productivity in 15 selected financial institutions across Rivers State and Lagos, Nigeria, using a stratified sample of 280 employees. Their regression analysis demonstrated that job satisfaction significantly predicted employee productivity ($R^2 = .47$, $p < .001$), with reward fairness and career advancement opportunities emerging as the two most powerful predictors of satisfaction. The study established that employees who reported high satisfaction with their organisation's reward and promotion culture demonstrated 45% higher productivity scores than those with low satisfaction ratings, providing direct empirical support for the job satisfaction–productivity relationship central to the present study.

Eze and Nwachukwu (2021) examined organisational culture and employee performance in nine Nigerian commercial banks using a mixed-methods design that combined a survey of 344 employees with qualitative interviews of 28 branch managers. Their multi-level analysis found that team-oriented and innovation-supportive cultures significantly improved employee efficiency, service delivery quality, and customer satisfaction outcomes. The qualitative component revealed that employees in innovative and team-oriented cultures reported stronger identification with organisational goals, greater willingness to exceed minimum performance requirements, and higher intrinsic motivation—findings consistent with both Human Relations Theory and the self-determination literature.

1.8.4 Review of Mediating and Moderating Mechanisms

Organ et al. (2006) examined organisational citizenship behaviour (OCB) (voluntary, extra-role performance contributions not captured in formal job requirements) as a critical mechanism linking job satisfaction to organisational performance. Their meta-analysis of 65 studies showed that job satisfaction was the strongest antecedent of OCB, and that OCB explained a significant proportion of variance in unit-level performance outcomes, including customer satisfaction, productivity, and efficiency. This finding is particularly relevant for Nigerian financial institutions, where the quality of discretionary employee behaviour in customer interactions is a critical competitive differentiator.

Cropanzano and Mitchell (2005) synthesised Social Exchange Theory research across three decades, demonstrating that organisational justice, specifically the perceived fairness of distributions, procedures, and interpersonal treatment, is the most powerful cultural antecedent of both job satisfaction and performance in exchange-based employment relationships. Their analysis found that procedural justice

© 2026 The Authors. Published by Bexford Publishing Ltd

was a stronger predictor of job satisfaction than distributive justice, suggesting that how cultural norms are enacted matters as much as the objective outcomes they produce. This insight directly informs the present study's treatment of communication culture and participatory leadership as critical dimensions of organisational culture in Nigerian financial institutions.

The review provides convergent evidence across contexts, methods, and time periods that organisational culture shapes both job satisfaction and labour productivity, and that job satisfaction mediates this relationship. Nigerian evidence highlights reward fairness, participatory leadership, and communication openness as the most influential cultural dimensions, while the mediation model remains understudied in the sector, establishing the present study's contribution.

2. METHODOLOGY

2.1 Research Design and Epistemological Orientation

This study adopts a descriptive survey design underpinned by a post-positivist epistemological orientation. Post-positivism is appropriate for a study seeking to identify theoretically specified relationships among social variables in real-world institutional settings, while acknowledging the probabilistic and context-dependent nature of social science findings (Robbins & Judge, 2022). The descriptive survey design enables systematic data collection from a representative sample of the target population using standardised instruments, yielding quantitative data suitable for the correlational, regression, and structural equation analyses required to test the study's four hypotheses (Daft, 2022).

2.2 Population and Sampling

The target population comprises employees of CBN-licensed commercial banks and NAICOM-registered insurance companies operating in Nigeria. Fourteen institutions were purposively selected to ensure sectoral representation (eight commercial banks, six insurance companies) and geographic spread across the major financial centres of Lagos, Abuja, Port Harcourt, and Kano, which together account for the preponderance of formal financial sector employment in Nigeria. The selected institutions are: Access Bank Plc, Guaranty Trust Bank Plc, Zenith Bank Plc, First Bank of Nigeria Plc, United Bank for Africa Plc, Polaris Bank Limited, FCMB Group Plc, and Sterling Bank Plc (banking sector); AIICO Insurance Plc, Leadway Assurance Company Limited, AXA Mansard Insurance Plc, Custodian Investment Plc, Prestige Assurance Plc, and Sovereign Trust Insurance Plc (insurance sector).

Based on Central Bank of Nigeria (2023) workforce data and National Insurance Commission (NAICOM) employment estimates, the combined accessible population of employees within these 14 institutions is estimated at approximately 140,000 (banking: 95,000; insurance: 45,000). The Taro Yamane (1967) formula was applied with a 5% margin of error to yield a minimum sample size of 399:

$$n = N / (1 + Ne^2) = 140{,}000 / (1 + 140{,}000 \times 0.0025) = 140{,}000 / 351 \approx 399$$

Stratified random sampling was employed to ensure proportional representation across sectors (banking: n = 241, 60.4%; insurance: n = 158, 39.6%) and across four organisational levels (junior staff, supervisory, middle management, and senior management) within each institution. Geographic coverage: Lagos (n = 148, 38.6%), Port Harcourt (n = 112, 29.2%), Abuja (n = 87, 22.7%), and Kano (n = 36, 9.4%).

Inclusion criteria: all permanent or contract employees with at least six months' service within the selected institutions. Exclusion criteria: temporary or casual staff, employees on extended leave, and interns. Of 399 questionnaires distributed, 383 were returned and found usable, yielding a response rate of 96.0%. Sixteen questionnaires were excluded (nine returned blank; seven had more than 10% missing items). Non-response analysis comparing early and late respondents on key demographic variables revealed no

© 2026 The Authors. Published by Bexford Publishing Ltd

significant differences (all $\chi^2 < 3.5$, $p > .05$), indicating that non-response bias does not pose a significant threat to the validity of the findings.

2.3 Research Instrument

Data were collected using a structured questionnaire comprising four sections. Section A captured demographic and organisational characteristics including sector, organisational level, gender, age, educational qualification, years of experience, and employment tenure. Section B measured Organisational Culture through 35 Likert-scale items (1 = Strongly Disagree to 5 = Strongly Agree) distributed across seven sub-scales: Employee Involvement (5 items, adapted from Denison, 1990), Communication Culture (5 items), Reward and Recognition Culture (5 items, adapted from Herzberg, 1966), Leadership Culture (5 items), Innovation and Adaptability Culture (5 items, adapted from Cameron & Quinn, 2011), Team Orientation (5 items), and Ethical Culture (5 items, adapted from Schein, 2017). Section C measured Job Satisfaction through 20 items across six dimensions adapted from the Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire (MSQ) and Spector's (1997) Job Satisfaction Survey. Section D measured Labour Productivity through 24 items across six dimensions measuring service delivery efficiency, employee output, target achievement, work quality, customer satisfaction, and absenteeism reduction.

2.4 Validity and Reliability

Content validity was confirmed through a systematic review panel consisting of three Sociology academics with expertise in organisational behaviour and three experienced financial sector practitioners, who assessed all items for representativeness, clarity, and relevance. Construct validity was evaluated via exploratory factor analysis (EFA) using principal axis factoring with oblimin rotation; all items had factor loadings above .50 on their respective constructs, with eigenvalues over 1.0. Discriminant validity was established by ensuring that the average variance extracted (AVE) values surpassed the squared inter-construct correlations for all pairs of constructs (Fornell & Larcker, 1981). Internal consistency reliability was measured with Cronbach's alpha: Organisational Culture ($\alpha = .91$), Job Satisfaction ($\alpha = .87$), and Labour Productivity ($\alpha = .88$), all exceeding the typical .70 standard (Spector, 1997).

2.5 Data Analysis

Quantitative data were processed using SPSS version 26.0 for descriptive statistics, correlation analysis, and multiple regression, and AMOS version 24.0 for Structural Equation Modelling. The analysis followed these steps: (1) descriptive statistics to outline the sample and variable distributions; (2) Pearson correlation to assess bivariate relationships; (3) hierarchical multiple regression to examine the direct impacts of organisational culture on job satisfaction (H_{01}) and labour productivity (H_{02}), as well as the influence of job satisfaction on labour productivity (H_{03}), while controlling for demographic factors; and (4) SEM-based mediation analysis with 5,000 bootstrap samples and 95% bias-corrected confidence intervals to evaluate job satisfaction as a mediator (H_{04}), following Preacher and Hayes (2008) guidelines.

3. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

3.1 Results

3.1.1 Respondent Profile and Response Rate

Of the 399 questionnaires distributed across the 14 institutions, 383 were usable (response rate = 96.0%). Table 1 shows the full demographic profile. The sample was divided between the banking sector (60.3%) and the insurance sector (39.7%), aligning with the stratification ratio specified in the sampling plan. Males made up 58.5% of the participants, consistent with the gender distribution reported by CBN (2023) for Nigeria's banking workforce. The predominant organisational level was junior staff at 34.5%, followed

© 2026 The Authors. Published by Bexford Publishing Ltd

by supervisory staff (31.6%), middle management (24.3%), and senior management (9.7%).

Table 1 ***Demographic Profile of Respondents (N = 383)***

Variable	Category	n	% of Total
Institutional Sector	Banking	231	60.3%
	Insurance	152	39.7%
Gender	Male	224	58.5%
	Female	159	41.5%
Organisational Level	Junior Staff	132	34.5%
	Supervisory	121	31.6%
	Middle Management	93	24.3%
	Senior Management	37	9.7%
Age Group	25–34 years	142	37.1%
	35–44 years	168	43.9%
	45–54 years	60	15.7%
	55+ years	13	3.4%
Educational Level	BSc / HND	206	53.8%
	MSc / MBA	142	37.1%
	PhD / Other Professional	35	9.1%
Total (Usable Responses)	—	**383**	Response Rate = 96.0%

3.1.2 Descriptive Statistics and Reliability

Table 2 presents descriptive statistics and reliability coefficients for all variables. The overall mean for Organisational Culture (M = 3.61, SD = 0.72) suggests respondents generally viewed the cultural environment as moderately positive. Job Satisfaction (M = 3.48, SD = 0.69) and Labour Productivity (M = 3.56, SD = 0.66) also indicate moderate to positive levels. Within OC sub-scales, Team Orientation (M = 3.74) and Innovation and Adaptability (M = 3.72) had the highest means, while Reward and Recognition Culture (M = 3.43) scored lowest, pointing to a potential weakness in compensation and recognition

© 2026 The Authors. Published by Bexford Publishing Ltd

practices across the sampled institutions. All Cronbach's alpha values were above .77, and all composite reliability scores exceeded .89, confirming good internal consistency.

Table 2 ***Descriptive Statistics and Reliability Coefficients for Study Variables***

Variable / Sub-scale	M	SD	Range	α	CR
Organisational Culture (composite)	3.61	0.72	1–5	**.91**	**.92**
Employee Involvement	3.54	0.81	1–5	.82	—
Communication Culture	3.67	0.76	1–5	.80	—
Reward & Recognition Culture	3.43	0.86	1–5	.83	—
Leadership Culture	3.68	0.79	1–5	.81	—
Innovation & Adaptability Culture	3.72	0.74	1–5	.78	—
Team Orientation	3.74	0.71	1–5	.77	—
Ethical Organisational Culture	3.59	0.78	1–5	.79	—
Job Satisfaction (composite)	3.48	0.69	1–5	**.87**	**.89**
Labour Productivity (composite)	3.56	0.66	1–5	**.88**	**.90**

Note. M = Mean; SD = Standard Deviation; α = Cronbach's Alpha; CR = Composite Reliability. All α values exceed the .70 threshold (Spector, 1997). N = 383.

3.1.3 Correlation Analysis and Discriminant Validity

Table 3 shows the correlation matrix among the constructs and evaluates discriminant validity. The three key constructs exhibited moderate to strong positive correlations: OC–JS ($r = .629$, $p < .001$), OC–LP ($r = .574$, $p < .001$), and JS–LP ($r = .591$, $p < .001$), aligning with theoretical expectations. Discriminant validity was verified using the Fornell-Larcker criterion: the square root of each construct's AVE (OC = .735, JS = .714, LP = .721) was greater than all corresponding inter-construct correlations, indicating that the constructs are empirically distinct (Fornell & Larcker, 1981). Additionally, control variables showed mostly modest correlations with the main constructs (ranging from .063 to .143), suggesting that demographic differences do not significantly confound the primary relationships examined.

Table 3 ***Inter-Construct Correlation Matrix and Discriminant Validity***

Variable	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	√AVE
1. Organisational Culture (OC)	**.735**								.735
2. Job Satisfaction (JS)	.629**	**.714**							.714

© 2026 The Authors. Published by Bexford Publishing Ltd

3. Labour Productivity (LP)	.574**	.591**	**.721**						.721
4. Gender	.072	.081	.063	—					—
5. Age	.094*	.102*	.088	.048	—				—
6. Education	.118*	.109*	.121*	.037	.241**	—			—
7. Work Experience	.136**	.128**	.143**	.052	.518**	.312**	—		—
8. Institutional Sector	.143**	.137**	.131**	.041	.073	.085	.094	—	—

*Note. ** p < .01; * p < .05 (two-tailed). Bold diagonal values = √AVE. AVE values: OC = .54, JS = .51, LP = .52. All √AVE values exceed the largest inter-construct correlation in their respective rows/columns, confirming discriminant validity (Fornell & Larcker, 1981).*

3.1.4 Measurement Model Assessment (CFA)

A confirmatory factor analysis was performed with AMOS 24.0 using maximum likelihood estimation to evaluate the three-factor measurement model. As shown in Table 4, the model fit was excellent: $\chi^2(312) = 498.73$, $p < .001$, $\chi^2/df = 1.60$, CFI = .964, TLI = .958, RMSEA = .039 (90% CI [.032, .046]), SRMR = .048, all within acceptable limits (Hu & Bentler, 1999). All standardised factor loadings were significant ($p < .001$), ranging from .61 to .79, surpassing the .50 rule-of-thumb for indicator reliability (Hair et al., 2019). The AVE values for OC (.54), JS (.51), and LP (.52) exceeded .50, indicating good convergent validity.

Table 4 ***Measurement Model (CFA) and Structural Model (SEM) Fit Statistics***

Fit Statistic	Recommended Threshold	Measurement Model (CFA)	Structural Model (SEM)	Assessment
χ^2 (df)	—	498.73 (312)	507.91 (315)	—
χ^2/df	≤ 3.0	1.60	1.61	**Acceptable**
CFI	≥ .95	.964	.962	**Acceptable**
TLI	≥ .95	.958	.956	**Acceptable**
RMSEA	≤ .06	.039	.040	**Acceptable**
RMSEA 90% CI	Upper bound ≤ .08	[.032, .046]	[.033, .047]	**Acceptable**
SRMR	≤ .08	.048	.051	**Acceptable**

Note. $\chi^2/df \leq 3.0$; CFI/TLI ≥ .95 (Hu & Bentler, 1999); RMSEA ≤ .06 and SRMR ≤ .08 (Hu & Bentler, 1999). Factor loadings (standardised): OC items range .61–.78; JS items .62–.77; LP items .64–.79.

© 2026 The Authors. Published by Bexford Publishing Ltd

3.1.5 Regression Analysis

Hierarchical multiple regression was conducted to examine the direct effects of organisational culture sub-scales on job satisfaction (H_{01}), organisational culture on labour productivity (H_{02}), and job satisfaction dimensions on labour productivity (H_{03}).

Table 5 ***Hierarchical Multiple Regression: Organisational Culture Predicting Job Satisfaction (H_{01})***

Predictor	B	SE	β	t	p	95% CI [LL, UL]
Model 1: Control Variables Only						
Gender	.042	.071	.031	0.59	.554	[−.098, .182]
Age	.063	.048	.074	1.31	.191	[−.031, .157]
Education	.081	.052	.083	1.56	.120	[−.021, .183]
Work Experience	.058	.049	.066	1.18	.238	[−.039, .155]
Institutional Sector	.097	.062	.082	1.56	.119	[−.025, .219]
Model 2: Adding OC Sub-scales (H_{01})						
Employee Involvement	.218	.045	.283	**4.84*** **	**<.001**	[.130, .306]
Communication Culture	.189	.047	.237	**4.02*** **	**<.001**	[.097, .281]
Reward & Recognition Culture	.173	.046	.219	**3.76*** **	**<.001**	[.083, .263]
Leadership Culture	.141	.047	.179	**3.00** **	.003	[.049, .233]
Innovation & Adaptability Culture	.092	.048	.115	1.92	.056	[−.002, .186]
Team Orientation	.068	.049	.082	1.39	.165	[−.028, .164]

© 2026 The Authors. Published by Bexford Publishing Ltd

Ethical Organisational Culture	.085	.047	.105	1.81	.072	[−.007, .177]
*Model 1: R^2 = .047; Adj. R^2 = .034; F(5, 377) = 3.73, p = .003 | Model 2: R^2 = .418; ΔR^2 = .371; $\Delta F(7, 370)$ = 33.64, p < .001; Adj. R^2 = .401. *** p < .001; ** p < .01; * p < .05.*						

*Note. N = 383. Standardised coefficients (β) are reported. 95% CI = Confidence Interval; LL = Lower Limit; UL = Upper Limit. *** p < .001; ** p < .01; * p < .05 (two-tailed).*

As shown in Table 5, the OC sub-scales collectively explained 37.1% of variance in job satisfaction beyond the control variables (R^2 = .418, ΔR^2 = .371, $\Delta F[7, 370]$ = 33.64, p < .001). Employee Involvement (β = .283, p < .001), Communication Culture (β = .237, p < .001), and Reward and Recognition Culture (β = .219, p < .001) emerged as the three strongest predictors, followed by Leadership Culture (β = .179, p = .003).

Table 6 ***Hierarchical Multiple Regression: Organisational Culture Predicting Labour Productivity (H_{02})***

Predictor	B	SE	β	t	p	95% CI [LL, UL]
Leadership Culture	.211	.046	.270	**4.59*** **	**<.001**	[.121, .301]
Innovation & Adaptability Culture	.186	.047	.240	**3.96*** **	**<.001**	[.094, .278]
Communication Culture	.162	.047	.211	**3.45*** **	**<.001**	[.070, .254]
Employee Involvement	.138	.048	.178	**2.88** **	.004	[.044, .232]
Reward & Recognition Culture	.114	.047	.148	**2.43** **	.016	[.022, .206]
Team Orientation	.097	.048	.124	2.02*	.044	[.003, .191]
Ethical Organisational Culture	.076	.047	.097	1.62	.106	[−.016, .168]
*R^2 = .382; ΔR^2 = .339; $\Delta F(7, 370)$ = 29.58, p < .001; Adj. R^2 = .364. Controls included in all models (not shown; all p > .10). *** p < .001; ** p < .01; * p < .05.*						

*Note. N = 383. Standardised coefficients (β) are reported. Controls included in all models (all p > .10). *** p < .001; ** p < .01; * p < .05 (two-tailed).*

Table 6 shows that Leadership Culture (β = .270, p < .001) and Innovation and Adaptability Culture (β = .240, p < .001) were the strongest direct predictors of labour productivity, followed by Communication Culture (β = .211, p < .001) and Employee Involvement (β = .178, p = .004). OC sub-scales collectively explained 33.9% of variance in labour productivity beyond controls (R^2 = .382, ΔR^2 = .339, $\Delta F[7, 370]$ = 29.58, p < .001).

Table 7 ***Hierarchical Multiple Regression: Job Satisfaction Predicting Labour Productivity (H_{03})***

© 2026 The Authors. Published by Bexford Publishing Ltd

Predictor	B	SE	β	t	p	95% CI [LL, UL]
Recognition & Promotion	.241	.047	.310	**5.13*** **	**<.001**	[.149, .333]
Work Conditions	.183	.048	.236	**3.81*** **	**<.001**	[.089, .277]
Leadership Support	.168	.048	.216	**3.50*** **	**<.001**	[.074, .262]
Compensation Satisfaction	.128	.048	.163	**2.67** **	.008	[.034, .222]
Work–Life Balance	.098	.048	.124	2.04*	.042	[.004, .192]
Interpersonal Relations	.074	.048	.093	1.54	.124	[−.020, .168]
*$R^2 = .361$; $\Delta R^2 = .320$; $\Delta F(6, 376) = 31.37$, $p < .001$; Adj. $R^2 = .349$. *** $p < .001$; ** $p < .01$; * $p < .05$.*						

*Note. N = 383. Standardised coefficients (β) are reported. *** p < .001; ** p < .01; * p < .05 (two-tailed).*

Table 7 demonstrates that Recognition and Promotion (β = .310, p < .001) and Work Conditions (β = .236, p < .001) were the strongest JS predictors of labour productivity, with JS dimensions collectively explaining 32.0% of variance in productivity beyond controls ($R^2 = .361$, $\Delta R^2 = .320$, $\Delta F[6, 376] = 31.37$, p < .001).

3.1.6 Structural Equation Modelling and Mediation Analysis

Following measurement model confirmation, the structural model was tested in AMOS 24.0. The structural model fit (Table 4) was acceptable: $\chi^2/df = 1.61$, CFI = .962, TLI = .956, RMSEA = .040, SRMR = .051. Table 8 presents the standardised path coefficients and bootstrapped mediation results for H_{04}.

Table 8 ***SEM Standardised Path Coefficients and Bootstrapped Mediation Results***

Pathway	β	SE	z	p	Effect Type	95% BC CI [LL, UL]
OC → Job Satisfaction (H_{01})	.587	.048	12.23	**<.001**	*Direct*	[.493, .681]
OC → Labour Productivity (H_{02})	.321	.054	5.94	**<.001**	*Direct*	[.215, .427]
JS → Labour Productivity (H_{03})	.412	.057	7.23	**<.001**	*Direct*	[.300, .524]
OC → JS → LP (H_{04}, indirect)	.242	.038	6.37	**<.001**	*Indirect*	[.171, .321]

© 2026 The Authors. Published by Bexford Publishing Ltd

OC → LP (Total Effect)	.563	.049	11.49	**<.001**	*Total*	[.467, .658]
Bootstrap samples = 5,000; BC = Bias-corrected. OC = Organisational Culture; JS = Job Satisfaction; LP = Labour Productivity. Proportion of total effect mediated = .242 / .563 = 43.0%. Partial mediation confirmed (both direct and indirect effects significant).						

Note. Bootstrap samples = 5,000; BC = Bias-corrected. OC = Organisational Culture; JS = Job Satisfaction; LP = Labour Productivity. All p values < .001. Proportion of total effect mediated = .242 / .563 = 43.0%.

3.1.7 Hypothesis Testing Summary

Table 9 summarises the outcomes of all four null hypothesis tests. All four null hypotheses are rejected at $p < .001$.

Table 9 ***Hypothesis Testing Summary***

H_0	Null Hypothesis Statement	Key Statistical Evidence	p	Decision
H_{01}	OC has no significant influence on Job Satisfaction	β = .587 (SEM path)	<.001	**Rejected**
H_{02}	OC has no significant relationship with Labour Productivity	β = .321 (SEM direct effect)	<.001	**Rejected**
H_{03}	Job Satisfaction has no significant influence on Labour Productivity	β = .412 (SEM path)	<.001	**Rejected**
H_{04}	JS does not significantly mediate the OC–LP relationship	Indirect β = .242; 95% BC CI [.171, .321]	<.001	**Rejected (Partial Mediation)**

Note. All hypotheses tested at $\alpha = .05$. H_{01}–H_{03} tested via SEM path coefficients; H_{04} via bootstrapped indirect effects (5,000 samples, bias-corrected). OC = Organisational Culture; JS = Job Satisfaction; LP = Labour Productivity.

3.2 Discussion of Findings

Organisational Culture and Job Satisfaction (H_{01})

The SEM analysis confirmed a significant, positive direct effect of organisational culture on job satisfaction (β = .587, SE = .048, z = 12.23, $p < .001$; 95% BC CI [.493, .681]), explaining approximately 34% of variance in job satisfaction, providing grounds to reject H_{01}. The hierarchical regression analysis (Table 5) further decomposed this effect across OC sub-scales: Employee Involvement (β = .283, $p < .001$), Communication Culture (β = .237, $p < .001$), and Reward and Recognition Culture (β = .219, $p < .001$) emerged as the three strongest predictors of job satisfaction. This finding is consistent with prior Nigerian evidence from Akinwale and George (2020) and Okafor and Udeh (2019), and aligns with the broader international literature demonstrating culture as a primary antecedent of satisfaction (Denison, 1990; Cameron & Quinn, 2011).

Organisational Culture and Labour Productivity (H_{02})

© 2026 The Authors. Published by Bexford Publishing Ltd

The structural model confirmed that organisational culture directly influences labour productivity (β = .321, SE = .054, z = 5.94, p < .001; 95% BC CI [.215, .427]), allowing us to reject H_{02}. The regression analysis (Table 6) identified Leadership Culture (β = .270, p < .001) and Innovation and Adaptability Culture (β = .240, p < .001) as the main cultural factors impacting productivity. This aligns with Eze and Nwachukwu's (2021) findings that innovative, team-focused banking cultures lead to higher service quality and efficiency. Additionally, Communication Culture (β = .211, p < .001) and Employee Involvement (β = .178, p = .004) also showed significant direct effects.

Job Satisfaction and Labour Productivity (H_{03})

A strong direct impact of job satisfaction on labour productivity was confirmed (β = .412, SE = .057, z = 7.23, p < .001; 95% BC CI [.300, .524]), supporting the rejection of H_{03}. The regression results (see Table 7) show that satisfaction with Recognition and Promotion (β = .310, p < .001) and Work Conditions (β = .236, p < .001) are the two main predictors of productivity, aligning with Herzberg's (1966) Two-Factor Theory. This theory suggests that motivators like recognition and advancement foster intrinsic motivation for high performance, while poor hygiene factors such as inadequate work conditions directly reduce productivity. These findings are in line with Judge et al.'s (2001) meta-analysis and Okafor and Udeh's (2019) research, which found that satisfaction with reward fairness and career growth explained 42% of the variation in productivity among Nigerian banking staff. Organ et al.'s (2006) view of Organisational Citizenship Behaviour (OCB) as the process through which satisfaction enhances performance is especially relevant. In Nigerian financial institutions, where service quality is vital for competitive advantage, extra-role behaviours such as helping colleagues, showing initiative, and contributing to institutional improvement are precisely what satisfied employees are more likely to perform.

Mediating Role of Job Satisfaction (H_{04})

The bootstrapped SEM mediation analysis (5,000 samples, bias-corrected) found a significant indirect effect of organisational culture on labour productivity through job satisfaction (indirect β = .242, SE = .038, p < .001; 95% BC CI [.171, .321]), with the confidence interval excluding zero, confirming mediation. The direct effect of OC on LP remained significant after accounting for job satisfaction (β = .321, p < .001), indicating partial mediation rather than full. The indirect effect accounts for about 43.0% of the total OC–LP effect (total β = .563; proportion mediated = .242/.563 = .430), allowing rejection of H_{04}.

Sociological Implications

This study, rooted in the perspective of Industrial Sociology, confirms that workplace productivity in Nigerian financial institutions is primarily a social phenomenon—shaped by organisational relationships, cultural contexts, reciprocal exchanges, and employees' perceptions of fairness, recognition, and purpose—rather than solely a technical or administrative outcome (Blauner, 1964; Smelser, 2013). The persistent gap between institutional investment in systems and employee satisfaction signals a cultural rather than a technological or capital shortfall. Overcoming this requires a strong institutional commitment to participatory management, fairness in recognition, authentic communication, and employee-focused leadership—principles identified by Human Relations Theory, Social Exchange Theory, and Herzberg's framework as vital for sustainable workplace performance.

4. CONCLUSION

This research explored organisational culture, job satisfaction, and labour productivity within Nigerian financial institutions, utilising an Industrial Sociology approach anchored in Human Relations Theory, Social Exchange Theory, and Herzberg's Two-Factor Theory. Through systematic empirical review and

© 2026 The Authors. Published by Bexford Publishing Ltd

SEM analysis of data from 383 employees across 14 institutions, it was found that organisational culture significantly impacts both job satisfaction and productivity. Job satisfaction partially mediates the connection between culture and productivity.

The bootstrapped mediation test (5,000 samples; indirect $\beta = .242$, 95% BC CI [.171, .321]) confirms this partial mediation, accounting for about 43% of the total effect (total $\beta = .563$). Results suggest two pathways: a direct effect where culture influences work systems, communication, and support ($\beta = .321$, $p < .001$); and an indirect effect where culture fosters employee satisfaction, which in turn boosts effort and motivation. These findings are probabilistic due to the cross-sectional design, which cannot prove causality, but support the mediation model.

They highlight that sustainable productivity in Nigerian financial institutions depends not only on technological or operational changes but also on cultivating organisational cultures emphasising involvement, authentic communication, fairness, participative leadership, innovation, and ethics. Such cultural investments support long-term growth through a more satisfied, engaged workforce.

Theoretically, this study positions job satisfaction as an empirically validated mediator in the culture–productivity link and reaffirms the relevance of Human Relations, Social Exchange, and Herzberg's theories in Nigeria's financial sector. Methodologically, it advances Nigerian financial sector research by employing SEM-based bootstrapped mediation analysis, addressing previous theoretical fragmentation and methodological limitations.

4.1 Recommendations

Based on this study's results, the following evidence-based recommendations are proposed for institutional management, regulators, and policymakers:

- Nigerian financial institutions should regularly audit their organisational culture using validated tools like the OCAI or Denison Culture Survey. This will help identify gaps between declared and actual cultural values, allowing targeted interventions in areas linked to satisfaction and productivity issues.
- Management should establish participatory decision-making structures, such as departmental employee forums, joint management-employee committees, and open leadership communication sessions. These should provide authentic opportunities for employee involvement in organisational governance, rather than mere performative gestures.
- Financial institutions should revamp reward and recognition systems to improve fairness, ensuring timely, transparent, and consistent performance acknowledgment that employees perceive as genuinely reflecting their contributions.
- Organisations should invest in leadership development programmes that foster interpersonal, communication, and motivational skills among managers at all levels, supporting the creation of high-satisfaction, high-productivity teams aligned with Human Relations and Social Exchange principles.
- Financial institutions should develop dedicated employee wellbeing programmes, including work-life balance policies, psychological support services, career development frameworks, and anti-bullying protocols. These should address hygiene factors strongly linked to job dissatisfaction and reduced productivity.
- Regulatory agencies like the Central Bank of Nigeria and NAICOM should include organisational culture standards and employee satisfaction metrics in their supervisory frameworks. Recognising workforce wellbeing and cultural health as systemic risks underlines their importance beyond management concerns.

© 2026 The Authors. Published by Bexford Publishing Ltd

4.2 Contribution to Knowledge

This study makes the following contributions to existing scholarship:

- The study provides a sociological analysis of the culture–satisfaction–productivity relationship in Nigerian financial institutions, integrating three complementary theoretical frameworks into a unified explanatory model.
- The study formally establishes job satisfaction as a theoretically grounded and empirically confirmed mediating variable in the culture–productivity relationship (indirect β = .242, proportion mediated = 43.0%), advancing beyond prior Nigerian studies that examined these relationships independently.
- The study identifies the specific cultural dimensions (Employee Involvement, Communication Culture, and Reward and Recognition Culture) with the greatest influence on satisfaction and productivity, providing more actionable insights than prior studies examining undifferentiated culture constructs.
- Methodologically, the application of SEM-based bootstrapped mediation analysis represents a significant advancement over the simple regression and correlation methods that have characterised prior Nigerian financial sector culture research.

4.3 Directions for Further Research

The following areas merit further scholarly investigation:

- Longitudinal studies examining how deliberate organisational culture change programmes affect job satisfaction and labour productivity trajectories in Nigerian financial institutions over extended periods.
- Comparative studies examining cultural dynamics and their productivity implications across banking and insurance sectors, and between domestic Nigerian institutions and internationally owned financial organisations.
- Qualitative and mixed-method studies exploring the subjective experience of organisational culture from employees' perspectives, capturing the lived realities of satisfaction and dissatisfaction that quantitative instruments may inadequately represent.
- Examination of gender, generational, and ethnic dimensions of organisational culture experience and their differential effects on satisfaction and productivity within Nigeria's diverse financial sector workforce.

References

Akinwale, O. E., & George, O. J. (2020). Organisational culture and employee productivity in Nigerian banks: A quantitative analysis of 312 employees across eight commercial banks in Lagos. *African Journal of Management Studies, 12*(3), 45–60. https://doi.org/10.4314/ajms.v12i3.4

Blau, P. M. (1964). *Exchange and power in social life*. Wiley.

Blauner, R. (1964). *Alienation and freedom: The factory worker and his industry*. University of Chicago Press.

Cameron, K. S., & Quinn, R. E. (2011). *Diagnosing and changing organizational culture: Based on the competing values framework* (3rd ed.). Jossey-Bass.

© 2026 The Authors. Published by Bexford Publishing Ltd

Central Bank of Nigeria. (2023). *Annual report 2023*. CBN. https://www.cbn.gov.ng

Cropanzano, R., & Mitchell, M. S. (2005). Social exchange theory: An interdisciplinary review. *Journal of Management, 31*(6), 874–900. https://doi.org/10.1177/0149206305279602

Daft, R. L. (2022). *Organization theory and design* (14th ed.). Cengage Learning.

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

Denison, D. R., Haaland, S., & Goelzer, P. (2004). Corporate culture and organizational effectiveness: Is Asia different from the rest of the world? *Organizational Dynamics, 33*(1), 98–109. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.orgdyn.2003.11.008

Eze, C. U., & Nwachukwu, C. C. (2021). Organisational culture and employee performance in the Nigerian banking sector. *International Journal of Business and Management Review, 9*(4), 34–49. https://doi.org/10.37745/ijbmr.2013/vol9n43449

Fornell, C., & Larcker, D. F. (1981). Evaluating structural equation models with unobservable variables and measurement error. *Journal of Marketing Research, 18*(1), 39–50. https://doi.org/10.2307/3151312

Gouldner, A. W. (1960). The norm of reciprocity: A preliminary statement. *American Sociological Review, 25*(2), 161–178. https://doi.org/10.2307/2092623

Hackman, J. R., & Oldham, G. R. (1976). Motivation through the design of work: Test of a theory. *Organizational Behavior and Human Performance, 16*(2), 250–279. https://doi.org/10.1016/0030-5073(76)90016-7

Hair, J. F., Risher, J. J., Sarstedt, M., & Ringle, C. M. (2019). When to use and how to report the results of PLS-SEM. *European Business Review, 31*(1), 2–24. https://doi.org/10.1108/EBR-11-2018-0203

Herzberg, F. (1966). *Work and the nature of man*. World Publishing.

Hu, L., & Bentler, P. M. (1999). Cutoff criteria for fit indexes in covariance structure analysis: Conventional criteria versus new alternatives. *Structural Equation Modeling, 6*(1), 1–55. https://doi.org/10.1080/10705519909540118

Judge, T. A., Thoresen, C. J., Bono, J. E., & Patton, G. K. (2001). The job satisfaction–job performance relationship: A qualitative and quantitative review. *Psychological Bulletin, 127*(3), 376–407. https://doi.org/10.1037/0033-2909.127.3.376

Locke, E. A. (1976). The nature and causes of job satisfaction. In M. D. Dunnette (Ed.), *Handbook of industrial and organizational psychology* (pp. 1297–1349). Rand McNally.

Mayo, E. (1933). *The human problems of an industrial civilization*. Macmillan.

Okafor, R. O., & Udeh, F. N. (2019). Job satisfaction and employee productivity in financial institutions in Nigeria. *Nigerian Journal of Industrial Relations, 8*(2), 88–101. ISSN: 2360-9877.

Organ, D. W., Podsakoff, P. M., & MacKenzie, S. B. (2006). *Organizational citizenship behavior: Its nature, antecedents, and consequences*. SAGE.

Preacher, K. J., & Hayes, A. F. (2008). Asymptotic and resampling strategies for assessing and comparing indirect effects in multiple mediator models. *Behavior Research Methods, 40*(3), 879–891. https://doi.org/10.3758/BRM.40.3.879

Robbins, S. P., & Judge, T. A. (2022). *Organizational behavior* (19th ed.). Pearson.

© 2026 The Authors. Published by Bexford Publishing Ltd

Schein, E. H. (2017). *Organizational culture and leadership* (5th ed.). Wiley.

Smelser, N. J. (2013). *Sociology of economic life* (3rd ed.). Prentice Hall.

Spector, P. E. (1997). *Job satisfaction: Application, assessment, causes, and consequences*. SAGE.

Ubeku, A. K. (2018). *Personnel management in Nigeria*. Benin City Publishing.

Warrick, D. D. (2017). What leaders need to know about organizational culture. *Business Horizons, 60*(3), 395–404. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.bushor.2017.01.011

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



© 2026 by the authors. Submitted for possible open access publication under the terms and conditions of the **Creative Commons Attribution (CC BY 4.0) licence** (https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/)