

Effect of Organizational Culture in Workplace Environment on Employee's Engagement and Performance in Abuja Tourism Development Board (ATDB), Nigeria

¹Awodi Lawrence Achor, ²Adekunle, O. Binuyo, & ³Eunice Abimbola Adegbola

^{1&3}*Department of Business Administration Faculty of Management Sciences,
National Open University of Nigeria, Jabi Abuja, Nigeria,*

²*Department of Business Administration and Marketing, School of Management Sciences,
Babcock University, Ilishan-Remo Ogun State Nigeria*

Article DOI: 10.48028/ijprds/ijasepsm.v13.i1.19

Abstract

This study explored how organizational culture influences employee engagement and performance at the Abuja Tourism Development Board (ATDB), Nigeria. Using a descriptive survey and documentary research design, data were collected from 400 randomly selected employees out of a 1,200 staff population. Structured questionnaires captured insights on leadership support, recognition practices, and reward systems, while secondary data were sourced from organizational documents. Descriptive statistics and regression analysis were used for data analysis. Results indicated a positive, significant relationship between organizational culture and employee engagement and performance ($p < 0.05$). Leadership support ($\beta = 0.321$, $p = .000$) had the strongest effect, followed by recognition practices ($\beta = 0.254$, $p = .001$) and reward systems ($\beta = 0.187$, $p = .022$). Leadership support emerged as the most critical predictor. The study recommended implementing leadership training programs and formal recognition schemes to enhance motivation and performance, suggesting future research on organizational culture dynamics.

Keywords: *Organizational Culture, Workplace Environment, Employee's Engagement, Performance and Tourism Development*

Corresponding Author: **Awodi Lawrence Achor**

Background to the Study

Organizational culture emerged as a distinct field of inquiry in the mid-twentieth century, with Barnard's (1938) exploration of cooperative behavior and Follett's (1940) analyses of group dynamics laying the groundwork for understanding how shared values and norms shaped employee conduct and organizational cohesion (Barnard, 1938; Follett, 1940). Building on these early insights, Schein (2010) synthesized the field's theoretical foundations into a tripartite model artifacts, espoused values, and underlying assumptions offering researchers and practitioners a robust framework to diagnose and influence workplace culture (Schein, 2010). Throughout the 1980s and 1990s, seminal works by Peters and Waterman (1982) and Cameron and Quinn (1999) in both public and private sectors further solidified culture's strategic significance, demonstrating that companies with strong, adaptive cultures consistently outperformed competitors across multiple performance metrics (Peters & Waterman, 1982; Cameron & Quinn, 1999). Contemporary empirical studies reinforce these findings: Denison (1990) reported that organizations exhibiting high cultural alignment experienced up to 20% greater employee satisfaction and 30% higher profitability, while Kahn's (1990) conceptualization of employee engagement highlighted the psychological conditions through which culture drives individuals' dedication and vigor at work (Denison, 1990; Kahn, 1990).

Global surveys accentuate this strategic imperative: 94% of executives and 88% of employees recognize a distinct workplace culture as vital to organizational resilience and innovation, underscoring the organizational culture in workplace environment as central to human capital agendas worldwide (Deloitte, 2024; Gallup, 2023). In the African context, research in Ghana has shown that organizations with participative and ethically grounded cultures witness a 15% uplift in employee engagement and performance, evidencing culture's moderating effect on top-line outcomes (Adomako & Danso, 2014). Within Nigeria, studies of service firms reveal that collaborative norms and clear value articulation correlate with an 18% increase in productivity and a 26% reduction in turnover, affirming culture's pivotal role in national workplace environments (Osibanjo, Adeniji, & Falola, 2014). Moreover, the Competing Values Framework (Cameron & Quinn, 1999) has been instrumental in operationalizing culture dimensions clan, adhocracy, market, and hierarchy allowing scholars to empirically parse the specific cultural typologies that most strongly predict engagement and performance outcomes in diverse organizational contexts.

Despite this robust evidence base, the rapid evolution of workplace modalities accelerated by the COVID-19 pandemic has introduced new cultural dimensions, including digital collaboration norms and work-life integration values, prompting 78% of multinational corporations to revise culture strategies to sustain employee engagement in hybrid settings (Deloitte, 2024). However, the majority of empirical investigations have focused on manufacturing, finance, and public administration sectors, with scant attention to tourism development boards, particularly within Abuja Tourism Development Board (ATDB), representing a critical knowledge gap given the sector's role in national economic growth and cultural promotion. Recent industry analytics further confirm the Organizational culture's prominence, reporting that global expenditures on culture-transformation programs reached

\$14 billion in 2023 a 12% year-on-year rise an investment that continues to grow amid intensifying competition for talent (Deloitte, 2024). This study, therefore, seeks to examine the "Effect of Organizational Culture in Workplace Environment on employee's Engagement and performance in Abuja Tourism Development Board (ATDB), Nigeria"

Statement of the Problem

Organizational culture has been identified as a critical antecedent to employee engagement and performance outcomes in diverse contexts. A robust organizational culture fosters shared values and norms that motivate employees, leading to improved vigor, dedication, and task performance (Fidyah & Setiawati, 2020; Pham et al., 2024). In environments where culture emphasizes support, recognition, and open communication, engagement levels rise significantly, translating into higher productivity and service quality.

Prior to the structured cultivation of organizational culture at the Abuja Tourism Development Board (ATDB), staff in Abuja's tourism sector reported low emotional engagement, with less than half expressing vigor and dedication on the job. For example, a survey of 841 hotels in Abuja found that only a minority of employees felt deeply committed to their roles, despite the significant link between engagement and productivity. Similarly, in Nigeria's hospitality and tourism sector, poor supervisor support and unfriendly workplace conditions have been identified as principal drivers of turnover intentions, undermining performance (Chukwudi et al., 2022). If left unaddressed, these issues can exacerbate skill shortages, erode service standards, and diminish stakeholder confidence. However, little is known about which cultural components most effectively mitigate these challenges at ATDB.

It is widely believed that the importance of organizational culture to employee engagement and performance cannot be overstated. However, despite extensive global and regional research, no study has specifically assessed this relationship within ATDB. Empirical investigations such as Fidyah and Setiawati (2020) on job satisfaction and performance, Abbas (2024) on culture's influence on engagement in Indian and Nigerian contexts, Samanta (2021) on corporate culture and engagement in South-East Nigerian firms, Etalong and Chikeleze (2023) on public sector performance in Enugu, and Pham et al. (2024) on culture and performance in logistics enterprises all confirm the critical role of culture yet none focus on Abuja's tourism development board. Consequently, a gap exists regarding ATDB: this study seeks to examine whether organizational culture effects on employee engagement and performance are significant in this unique context.

Based on the above, this study identifies organizational culture as leadership support, recognition practices, and reward system and employee's Engagement and performance in Abuja Tourism Development Board (ATDB), Nigeria are; employee vigor, dedication, absorption, task performance, and contextual performance.

Research objectives

- i. Ascertain the extent to which leadership support has enhanced employee vigor;
- ii. Evaluate the effect of recognition practices on task performance;
- iii. Determine the effect of reward system on contextual performance.

Research Questions

- i. To what extent does leadership support enhance employee vigor?
- ii. How do recognition practices influence task performance?
- iii. What is the effect of reward system on contextual performance?

Research hypotheses

- i. H_{01} : assert that there is no significant effect of leadership support on employee vigor
- ii. H_{02} : recognition practices on task performance
- iii. H_{03} : reward system on contextual performance.

Literature Review

Organizational culture is defined as the pattern of shared basic assumptions, values, and beliefs that a group has learned as it solved its problems of external adaptation and internal integration, which have proven sufficiently effective to be taught to new members as the correct way to perceive, think, and feel in relation to those problems (Schein, 2017). At its most visible level, culture manifests in artifacts—tangible expressions such as organizational structures, ceremonies, language, and symbols—that convey an organization's identity and priorities to both insiders and outsiders (Schein, 2017). Beneath these artifacts lie espoused values, the articulated principles and strategies that organizational members profess, such as mission statements, codes of conduct, and strategic goals; these values serve as guides for decision-making and behavior, though they may not always align perfectly with enacted practices (Schein, 2017). At the deepest level sit basic underlying assumptions: unconscious, taken-for-granted beliefs and perceptions so ingrained that they guide behavior without overt awareness—for example, assumptions about human nature, the organization's relationship with its environment, and the organization's basic orientation toward time and reality (Schein, 2017). These assumptions provide stability and continuity, shaping how members interpret new experiences and respond to challenges, yet they are the most difficult aspect of culture to change (Schein, 2017).

Organizational culture functions both as a control mechanism that constrains member behavior and as a social glue that binds members together through shared experiences and meanings (Schein, 2017). It influences organizational effectiveness by aligning member behaviors with strategic objectives, fostering commitment, and facilitating coordination across functions and levels (Schein, 2017). Culture also shapes how organizations respond to environmental changes, affecting innovation, risk taking, and learning capacity; cultures that emphasize continuous improvement and open communication can accelerate adaptation, while those rooted in rigid hierarchies and risk aversion may resist change and underperform in dynamic contexts (Schein, 2017).

Scholars have emphasized the role of leaders in embedding and transmitting culture through their own exemplification of core values, allocation of rewards, and attention to critical incidents; when leaders consistently signal what is important through what they pay attention to, measure, and reward, they reinforce the underlying assumptions and values that constitute the culture (Schein, 2017). Conversely, misalignment between espoused values and leader

behaviors can breed cynicism and disengagement, undermining cultural coherence (Schein, 2017). Culture is thus both an asset and a liability: while a strong, adaptive culture can drive performance and resilience, an overly insular or rigid culture can inhibit diversity of thought and responsiveness to external pressures (Schein, 2017).

Understanding organizational culture requires both qualitative methods—such as ethnography, storytelling, and interviews—and quantitative surveys that measure shared perceptions of climate and values (Schein, 2017). Interventions to change culture must target all three levels: adjusting artifacts and structures, realigning espoused values through dialogue and training, and surfacing and testing underlying assumptions through reflection and experiential learning (Schein, 2017). In sum, organizational culture is the complex, multilayered system of meaning that shapes how an organization functions and evolves, encompassing visible artifacts, articulated values, and deeply-held assumptions that guide member behavior, interaction, and adaptation (Schein, 2017).

Workplace Environment is defined as all of the physical, psychological, and social conditions under which employees perform their work, encompassing tangible elements—such as workspace design, ergonomic features, lighting, temperature, noise levels, and safety provisions—and intangible elements—such as organizational climate, interpersonal relationships, leadership support, and cultural norms—that jointly influence employee well-being, motivation, and productivity (Raziq & Maulabakhsh, 2015). The physical dimension includes workspace layout, equipment quality, and environmental comfort, which can enhance or hinder concentration, collaboration, and health; ergonomically designed furniture, adequate lighting, and controlled noise levels have been linked to reduced musculoskeletal complaints and higher task performance (Raziq & Maulabakhsh, 2015). The psychological dimension refers to employees' perceptions of autonomy, role clarity, workload, and the fairness of policies and procedures; clear expectations, manageable workloads, and perceived procedural justice foster a sense of control and reduce stress, thereby enhancing engagement and performance (Raziq & Maulabakhsh, 2015). The social dimension encompasses the quality of relationships among colleagues, supervisors, and subordinates, including support, trust, and open communication; supportive interpersonal networks serve as resources for problem-solving, emotional comfort, and knowledge sharing, which positively affect job satisfaction and retention (Raziq & Maulabakhsh, 2015).

A positive workplace environment integrates these dimensions to create a context where employees feel safe, valued, and empowered, facilitating both individual well-being and organizational outcomes; conversely, environments characterized by high noise, poor safety, ambiguous roles, excessive workload, and low support can provoke stress, errors, absenteeism, and turnover (Raziq & Maulabakhsh, 2015). Researchers have further highlighted the mediating role of employee commitment and achievement-striving ability in the relationship between workplace environment and performance, showing that supportive environments boost commitment and drive employees to exceed role requirements (Hafeez et al., 2019). Practically, organizations enhance their workplace environment through ergonomic assessments, wellness programs, transparent communication channels, fairness audits, and

team-building initiatives, reflecting an understanding that environmental factors are not mere backdrops but active determinants of employee experience and organizational success (Raziq & Maulabakhsh, 2015; Hafeez et al., 2019).

Employee Engagement is defined as a positive, fulfilling, work-related state of mind characterized by vigor (high levels of energy and mental resilience while working), dedication (a sense of significance, enthusiasm, inspiration, pride, and challenge), and absorption (being fully concentrated and happily engrossed in one's work, whereby time passes quickly and detachment from work is difficult) (Schaufeli & Bakker, 2014). Engagement reflects employees' emotional and cognitive investment in their roles, going beyond mere job satisfaction to encompass a proactive orientation toward work that manifests in discretionary effort and persistence under challenging circumstances (Schaufeli & Bakker, 2014). Engaged employees exhibit high levels of intrinsic motivation, display creativity, and proactively seek solutions, contributing to innovation and organizational performance (Schaufeli & Bakker, 2014).

Gallup's global survey defines engagement as being highly involved in and enthusiastic about one's work and workplace; engaged workers act as psychological owners, driving high performance, innovation, and organizational progress (Gallup, 2021). Gallup identifies key engagement drivers including clarity of expectations, access to necessary materials, opportunities for development, recognition, supportive relationships, and a strong sense of purpose—that collectively shape employees' emotional and cognitive attachment to their work (Gallup, 2021). Meta-analyses confirm that engagement is positively correlated with performance, customer satisfaction, and profitability, and negatively correlated with turnover, absenteeism, and safety incidents (Schaufeli & Bakker, 2014; Gallup, 2021). Engagement emerges from the interplay of personal resources (self-efficacy, optimism, resilience), job resources (autonomy, feedback, social support), and organizational resources (leadership, culture, rewards); fostering engagement thus requires holistic strategies that align individual needs with contextual enablers (Schaufeli & Bakker, 2014; Gallup, 2021).

Employee Performance is defined as the degree to which an employee successfully carries out the behaviors and tasks that align with organizational goals and standards, encompassing both task performance (activities directly related to producing goods or services) and contextual performance (discretionary behaviors that support organizational, social, and psychological processes) (Limon & Sezgin-Nartgün, 2020). Task performance involves proficiency in job-specific duties, adherence to technical standards, and efficient use of resources, whereas contextual performance includes voluntary behaviors—such as helping colleagues, following organizational rules, and endorsing organizational objectives—that facilitate the broader work environment (Limon & Sezgin-Nartgün, 2020).

Job Performance is measured through objective metrics (e.g., output quantity, error rates, sales figures) and subjective evaluations (e.g., supervisor ratings, 360-degree feedback), reflecting both the quality and quantity of contributions within a specified time frame (Limon & Sezgin-Nartgün, 2020). Performance is influenced by individual factors—such as knowledge, skills,

abilities, and motivation—and contextual factors—such as leadership, culture, and workplace environment—making comprehensive performance management a multi-faceted endeavor involving clear goal setting, continuous feedback, training, and rewards (Limon & Sezgin-Nartgün, 2020).

High employee performance is associated with organizational success through increased productivity, innovation, and customer satisfaction; conversely, performance deficits can signal mismatches in job design, skills gaps, or motivational barriers, necessitating targeted interventions in training, coaching, and work design (Limon & Sezgin-Nartgün, 2020).

Recognition Practices are defined as systematic organizational processes—both formal (e.g., awards programs, performance appraisals, public acknowledgments) and informal (e.g., verbal praise, handwritten notes, peer-to-peer appreciations)—designed to acknowledge and reinforce employee behaviors and contributions that align with organizational values, goals, and performance standards (Xu, Cao, & Kim, 2022). Recognition serves as constructive feedback, signaling to employees that their efforts are noticed and valued, which fosters motivation, commitment, and discretionary effort (Xu et al., 2022).

Studies show that effective recognition practices characterized by timeliness, specificity, sincerity, and alignment with organizational priorities enhance task performance, organizational citizenship behaviors, and employee well-being, while poorly designed recognition can breed perceptions of unfairness and favoritism (Xu et al., 2022). Recognition practices may encompass existential recognition (acknowledging employees' voices and influence), work practice recognition (rewarding proficiency and innovation), job dedication recognition (honoring commitment and teamwork), and results recognition (celebrating outcomes and achievements) (Xu et al., 2022). Implemented consistently across formal and informal channels, recognition practices reinforce desired behaviors, transmit cultural values, and establish role models for others, thus serving as a low-cost, high-impact mechanism for sustaining performance and engagement (Xu et al., 2022).

Reward system is defined as the structured framework of monetary (e.g., salary, bonuses, profit-sharing) and non-monetary (e.g., recognition, career development opportunities, flexible work arrangements) incentives designed to influence employee motivation and behavior by linking compensation and benefits to individual, team, and organizational performance objectives (Armstrong & Brown, 2020). A well-designed reward system aligns employees' needs and preferences with organizational strategy, providing a clear line of sight between performance and rewards, thereby enhancing motivation, retention, and discretionary effort (Armstrong & Brown, 2020).

Key components of reward systems include base pay, variable pay, benefits, recognition programs, and developmental rewards, each serving distinct motivational functions; while financial rewards address extrinsic motivation and transactional exchanges, non-financial rewards cultivate intrinsic motivation, identity, and loyalty (Armstrong & Brown, 2020). Effective reward systems are perceived as fair and transparent, incorporating principles of

equity (internal and external), consistency, and performance linkage; they are regularly reviewed to ensure competitiveness, relevance, and alignment with evolving business goals and workforce demographics (Armstrong & Brown, 2020).

In sum, reward systems integrate financial and non-financial mechanisms to reinforce desirable behaviors and outcomes, playing a pivotal role in performance management, employee engagement, and organizational effectiveness (Armstrong & Brown, 2020).

Theoretical Framework

The study adopts Edgar H. Schein's Organizational Culture Model as its theoretical framework. The theory was propounded by Edgar H. Schein in the year 1985. The reason for adopting this study is that Schein's model offers a multilayered lens through which one can diagnose and interpret the hidden and visible elements of organizational culture, making it particularly suitable for examining how the workplace environment at the Abuja Tourism Development Board (ATDB) shapes employee engagement and performance (Schein, 1985). The theory states that organizational culture operates at three interrelated levels—artifacts, espoused values, and basic underlying assumptions—and that these levels collectively influence behaviors, attitudes, and performance outcomes. Basic assumptions of this theory are that: (1) culture is learned and transmitted through socialization; (2) leaders play a pivotal role in embedding and reinforcing cultural norms; and (3) culture provides a cognitive framework that shapes how members perceive, think, and feel about their work and environment (Schein, 2010). The theory was criticized for being overly descriptive and anthropological, lacking clear measurement constructs, and for emphasizing top-down leadership influence at the expense of grassroots cultural dynamics (Alvesson, 2012). The theory is relevant to the study because it offers a structured diagnostic tool to uncover how different layers of culture within ATDB influence the degree to which employees feel engaged, supported, and motivated to perform (Denison, 1990).

At the artifacts level, Schein's model highlights the visible and tangible elements of culture—such as office layouts, symbols, rituals, and dress codes—that employees encounter daily (Schein, 1985). Espoused values, the second level, consist of the stated strategies, goals, and philosophies that the organization publicly endorses, including mission statements, codes of conduct, and stated commitments to employee wellbeing. Finally, basic underlying assumptions represent unconscious, taken-for-granted beliefs that truly drive behavior within the organization (Schein, 2010). By examining artifacts in ATDB—such as the décor of tourism offices in Abuja, formal recognition ceremonies for outstanding staff, or the presence of open versus closed workspaces—researchers can infer the espoused values and then probe deeper into interview data to reveal the basic assumptions guiding staff engagement. This three-tier framework allows for a nuanced dissection of how cultural elements align (or misalign) with employees' intrinsic motivations and performance drivers (Johnson & Scholes, 2008). Understanding these layers is indispensable for diagnosing why certain cultural attributes may bolster engagement—such as transparent communication rituals—while others may inadvertently stifle initiative, such as rigid hierarchical norms.

One of the primary reasons for adopting Schein's model in this study is its robust explanatory power in linking culture to organizational outcomes. First, the emphasis on leadership as cultural architect resonates with ATDB's structure, where department heads and the Managing Director exert strong influence over staff norms and behaviors. Second, Schein's theory posits that shifting basic underlying assumptions is essential for sustainable change—a notion critical if ATDB aims to foster higher engagement and performance through cultural interventions (Schein, 1985; Schein, 2010). Basic assumptions of the model further assert that organizational culture emerges unconsciously through collective learning and that these shared perceptions become so deeply embedded that they are rarely questioned. Third, by framing culture as both an explanatory and normative construct, the model enables researchers to not only describe ATDB's existing cultural profile but also prescribe targeted strategies—such as leadership development or the introduction of new rituals—to realign culture with desired engagement outcomes (Denison, 1990). Thus, Schein's theory supplies both the diagnostic vocabulary and the prescriptive roadmap essential for this study's aims.

Despite its widespread adoption, Schein's Organizational Culture Model has drawn several criticisms. Scholars have argued that the theory's three-level framework, while conceptually appealing, is difficult to operationalize in empirical research due to a lack of standardized measures for espoused values and underlying assumptions (Alvesson, 2012). Critics also contend that by privileging leadership as the principal driver of culture, Schein underestimates the role of peer networks, subcultures, and emergent grassroots practices in shaping daily experiences (Barley & Kunda, 1992). Moreover, some organizational theorists point out that Schein's model is static, offering limited guidance on the dynamic processes through which culture evolves over time or how external environmental factors—such as regulatory changes or global tourism trends—interact with internal cultural forces (Smircich, 1983). The theory was criticized for being overly focused on qualitative, interpretive methods, which can lead to subjective bias and challenges in replicability (Alvesson, 2012). Nonetheless, these critiques also point to avenues for methodological triangulation—combining survey instruments, ethnography, and archival analysis—to strengthen the rigor of cultural assessments within ATDB (Johnson & Scholes, 2008).

The theory is relevant to the study because it establishes a clear linkage between organizational culture and employee engagement and performance, allowing for targeted interventions at ATDB. By mapping ATDB's artifacts, espoused values, and underlying assumptions, researchers can identify specific cultural strengths—such as a strong service orientation toward tourists—and areas needing change—such as limited upward feedback channels—that directly impact employees' psychological attachment and productivity (Denison, 1990). For example, if the research uncovers that the prevailing assumption within ATDB is that hierarchical deference is more valued than innovative input, interventions might include structured forums where frontline staff share feedback without fear of reprisal. Furthermore, the model's emphasis on leadership embedding mechanisms—such as role modeling, communication, and resource allocation—provides practical levers for ATDB's senior management to realign culture toward fostering higher engagement (Schein, 2010). Ultimately, Schein's Organizational Culture Model offers a coherent and actionable

theoretical foundation for understanding and enhancing the workplace culture at ATDB, thereby improving employee engagement and organizational performance.

Empirical Review

A study by Pham, Phan, & Nguyen (2024) examined “The Impact of Organizational Culture on Employee Performance: A Case Study at Foreign-Invested Logistics Service Enterprises Approaching Sustainability Development”; the study adopted a cross-sectional quantitative design and explored the influence of culture dimensions on employee performance from a sustainability perspective. Primary data were collected via structured questionnaires administered to managers and staff from 162 foreign-invested logistics service enterprises in Vietnam. Data were analysed using multiple linear regression to test three research hypotheses concerning the impact of five cultural factors (employees' beliefs; corporate focus on human life; leadership style and authority division; corporate values; and relationship with the business environment) on employee performance. Findings indicated that these cultural factors significantly and positively influenced performance, while factors such as language and slogans, corporate architecture, equipment, and organizational knowledge were insignificant. The authors recommended that enterprises strengthen effective cultural dimensions and integrate sustainability principles into culture development to enhance performance and long-term viability. MDPI.

A study by Hasan (2023) assessed “Effect of organizational culture on organizational learning, employee engagement, and employee performance: Study of banking employees in Indonesia”; it employed a quantitative cross-sectional design, gathering data via structured questionnaires from 215 banking employees (cashiers, customer service staff, and security guards) across Indonesian banks. Data were analysed for direct and indirect effects using Partial Least Squares Structural Equation Modeling (PLS-SEM). Results showed that organizational culture significantly influences organizational learning, employee engagement, and performance (all $p < 0.05$), with organizational learning and engagement partially mediating the culture–performance relationship. Recommendations included tailoring cultural initiatives to generational differences and fostering a learning-oriented culture to boost engagement and performance. businessperspectives.org.

A study by Rožman, Tominc, & Milfelner (2023) examined “Maximizing employee engagement through artificial intelligent organizational culture in the context of leadership and training of employees: Testing linear and non-linear relationships.” Employing a cross-sectional quantitative design, the researchers surveyed leaders and staff in large and medium-sized Slovenian companies using a structured questionnaire. Data were analysed via Structural Equation Modeling (testing both linear and non-linear relationships) to evaluate five constructs—organizational culture, AI-supported leadership, AI-supported training, team performance, and employee engagement. Findings revealed that AI-enhanced cultural practices and leadership significantly predict both team effectiveness and employee engagement, with non-linear effects observed at higher levels of AI support. The authors recommended integrating AI tools to reinforce cultural values and leadership training for sustained engagement and performance gains. EconStor .A study by Abdullahi, Raman, &

Solarin (2021) explored “Effect of organizational culture on employee performance: A mediating role of employee engagement in Malaysia educational sector.” Using a cross-sectional quantitative design, data were collected via questionnaire from academic staff of Malaysian private universities. Hypotheses were tested using PLS-SEM. Results confirmed that organizational culture has a significant direct effect on employee performance and that employee engagement partially mediates this relationship. The authors advised university management to cultivate a strong culture and invest in engagement initiatives to achieve sustainable performance improvements. pure.kfupm.edu.sa

A study by Fidyah, & Setiawati (2020) investigated “Influence of organizational culture and employee engagement on employee performance: Job satisfaction as intervening variable.” Employing a cross-sectional survey design with a stratified random sample of 52 employees, data were gathered via a structured questionnaire. Analyses included t-tests, F-tests, multiple linear regression, and path analysis. Findings indicated that organizational culture and employee engagement both positively and significantly affect job satisfaction and performance, with job satisfaction mediating the culture–performance and engagement–performance relationships. Recommendations included fostering a supportive culture and engagement strategies to boost satisfaction and performance. RIBER.

While these above studies Pham et al. (2024) on foreign-invested logistics enterprises; Hasan (2023) on Indonesian banks; Rožman et al. (2023) on AI-supported culture in Slovenian firms; Abdullahi et al. (2021) on Malaysian universities; and Fidyah & Setiawati (2020) on a general employee sample were conducted as cross-sectional quantitative designs and used advanced techniques such as multiple linear regression, PLS-SEM, and SEM (linear and non-linear), they do not fully address the specific context of the Abuja Tourism Development Board (ATDB), Nigeria. None of these studies investigated organizational culture within a tourism development board or in the Nigerian public sector, leaving a geographic and sectoral gap. Methodologically, while they employed SEM-based approaches and path analysis, the current study at ATDB will utilize correlation analysis and multiple linear regression to test hypothesized relationships, offering more straightforward interpretability for policymakers. Moreover, proxies for organizational culture, engagement, and performance differ: past studies focused on culture dimensions such as employees' beliefs or AI-support, engagement metrics like vigor and absorption, and performance outcomes like productivity in logistics or academic settings. In contrast, the current study will operationalize culture through dimensions of involvement, consistency, adaptability, and mission; engagement via behavioral, emotional, and cognitive components; and performance through service quality, innovation, and stakeholder satisfaction—aligned with ATDB's strategic objectives. These distinctions in setting, sampling, analytical techniques, and variable operationalization underscore the unique contribution of the present research.

Research Methods

The study was conducted at the Abuja Tourism Development Board (ATDB), Nigeria, a government agency responsible for promoting tourism and cultural activities in the Federal Capital Territory. The research focused on examining how organizational culture influenced

employee engagement and performance within the workplace environment. The choice of ATDB was based on its strategic role in Nigeria's tourism sector and the need to assess how workplace culture impacts employee productivity and commitment in a public-sector organization.

A mixed-methods research design was adopted, combining descriptive survey and documentary analysis to provide a comprehensive understanding of the research problem. The descriptive survey design allowed for the collection of quantitative data from employees, while the documentary design facilitated the analysis of existing organizational reports, policy documents, and performance records. The mixed-methods approach was chosen because it enhanced data triangulation, ensuring both numerical and contextual insights were captured.

Population of the Study

The target population consisted of all permanent employees of ATDB, totaling 1,200 staff (source: ATDB Human Resource Department, 2023). The choice of this population was justified because permanent employees had long-term exposure to the organizational culture, making them suitable respondents for assessing its impact on engagement and performance.

Sample Size Determination

The sample size was determined using Taro Yamane's formula:

$$n = \frac{N}{1 + N(e)^2}$$

Where:

n = sample size

N = total population (1,200)

e = margin of error (5% or 0.05)

Substituting the values:

$$n = \frac{1200}{1 + 1200(0.05)^2} = \frac{1200}{1 + 3} = 300$$

Sampling Technique

A stratified random sampling technique was used to ensure proportional representation across different departments (e.g., administration, marketing, operations). This method was chosen because it minimized bias and ensured that all employee categories were adequately represented.

Primary Data Collection: A structured questionnaire with Likert-scale items was administered to assess organizational culture, employee engagement, and performance.

Secondary Data Collection: Performance appraisal reports, HR policies, and annual reports were reviewed. Published studies: Existing literature on organizational culture and employee performance was analyzed.

Multiple linear regression was conducted to examine the relationship between organizational culture (independent variable) and employee engagement/performance (dependent

variables). The regression model was specified as:

$$Y = \beta_0 + \beta_1 X_1 + \beta_2 X_2 + \beta_3 X_3 + \epsilon$$

Where:

Y = Employee Engagement and Performance

X₁ X₂ X₃ = Organizational Culture

ε = Error term

The analysis was performed at a 5% significance level using SPSS (Version 27). Thematic Analysis: Key themes from open-ended survey responses and documentary sources were identified. Content Analysis: Organizational documents were systematically reviewed to extract relevant cultural and performance indicators. Validity: The research instruments were validated through expert review and pilot testing with 30 ATDB staff (not included in the main study).

Reliability: A Cronbach's Alpha coefficient of 0.87 was obtained, indicating high internal consistency. Informed Consent: Respondents were briefed on the study's purpose, and participation was voluntary. Confidentiality: Anonymity was maintained in data reporting.

Approval: Ethical clearance was obtained from ATDB management. Limitations of the Methodology: Some employees may have provided socially desirable answers. Findings may not apply to private-sector organizations. Some organizational records were incomplete.

Result and Discussion

The model summary table provides an overview of the regression model's goodness-of-fit.

Table 1: Model Summary

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate	Durbin-Watson
1	.782	.612	.598	1.245	1.876

Predictors (Independent Variables): Leadership Support, Recognition Practices, Reward System

Dependent Variable: Employee Engagement & Performance

Interpretation:

R (0.782) indicates a strong correlation between predictors and the dependent variable. R² (0.612) suggests that 61.2% of the variance in employee engagement & performance is explained by the predictors. Adjusted R² (0.598) adjusts for the number of predictors, confirming model robustness. Durbin-Watson (1.876) indicates no significant autocorrelation (acceptable range: 1.5–2.5).

ANOVA (Analysis of Variance)

The ANOVA table tests the overall significance of the regression model.

Table 2: ANOVA

Model	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Regression	245.672	3	81.891	52.784	.000
Residual	155.328	96	1.618		
Total	401.000	99			

F-statistic (52.784, $p = .000$) confirms the model is statistically significant. The predictors collectively influence employee engagement & performance.

Coefficients Analysis

The coefficients table examines the individual impact of each predictor.

Table 3: Coefficients

	Model	Unstandardized Coefficients	Standardized Coefficients (Beta)	t	Sig.
	B	Std. Error			
(Constant)	2.145	0.543	-	3.951	.000
Leadership Support	0.372	0.092	0.321	4.043	.000
Recognition Practices	0.285	0.078	0.254	3.654	.001
Reward System	0.198	0.085	0.187	2.329	.022

Dependent Variable: Employee Engagement & Performance

Leadership Support ($\beta = 0.321$, $p = .000$) demonstrates a statistically significant positive effect on Employee Engagement & Performance, aligning with transformational leadership theory (Bass & Riggio, 2006), which posits that supportive leaders foster motivation and discretionary effort. The robust beta coefficient suggests that leadership interventions may yield high returns in organizational performance metrics. Recognition Practices ($\beta = 0.254$, $p = .001$) further significantly enhance performance, corroborating social exchange theory (Blau, 1964); when employees perceive equitable acknowledgment, their intrinsic motivation and productivity increase. Meanwhile, the Reward System ($\beta = 0.187$, $p = .022$) exhibits a moderate yet significant impact, consistent with expectancy theory (Vroom, 1964), wherein tangible rewards reinforce desired behaviors. Notably, the explained variance (R^2) and effect sizes suggest that while all three predictors are significant, leadership support may be the most critical lever for engagement. Future research could explore moderators (e.g., organizational culture) or longitudinal designs to assess sustainability.

Conclusion

The study concluded that organizational culture factors including; leadership support, recognition practices, and reward systems exert a statistically significant influence on

employee engagement and performance at ATDB. These findings align with extant literature on organizational behavior, which posits that a positive workplace culture enhances motivation, job satisfaction, and productivity. Leadership support, as a key determinant, fosters psychological safety and reinforces employees' intrinsic motivation, thereby improving discretionary effort. Recognition practices, when consistently implemented, contribute to a reinforcement-based work environment, heightening perceived organizational justice. Furthermore, structured reward systems serve as extrinsic motivators, directly correlating with enhanced task performance and goal attainment.

The research employed a mixed-methods approach, integrating quantitative survey data with qualitative interviews to triangulate findings. Regression analysis confirmed a robust predictive relationship ($p < 0.05$) between these cultural dimensions and engagement metrics. Additionally, thematic analysis revealed that employees perceive these factors as critical mediators of workplace commitment. These insights underscore the imperative for organizational leaders to institutionalize culture-centric interventions to sustain competitive advantage. Future research could explore longitudinal effects and industry-specific moderators.

Recommendations

Enhance Leadership Support:

1. ATDB should implement leadership training programs to foster employee motivation.
2. ATDB should strengthen Recognition Practices such as introduce formal recognition schemes (e.g., "Employee of the Month").
3. ATDB should improve Reward Systems such as align rewards with performance metrics (monetary & non-monetary incentives).

References

- Abbas, S. M. S. (2024). Influence of organizational culture on employee engagement: An investigation of Indian and Nigerian workforce. *Global Business and Management Research*, 16(1).
- Abdullahi, M. S., Raman, K., & Solarin, S. A. (2021). Effect of organizational culture on employee performance: A mediating role of employee engagement in Malaysia educational sector. *International Journal of Supply and Operations Management*, 8(3), 232–246.
- Adomako, S., & Danso, A. (2014). The moderating role of organizational culture on the relationship between corporate social responsibility and employee performance in the Ghanaian banking sector, *African Journal of Economic and Management Studies*, 5(2), 200–217.
- Alvesson, M. (2012). *Understanding organizational culture* (2nd ed.). SAGE Publications.

- Armstrong, M., & Brown, D. (2020). *Armstrong's handbook of reward management practice* (7th ed.). Kogan Page.
- Atolagbe, E. B., Abdullahi, F., Ibrahim, W. U., Filani, P. A., & Gambo, N. (2024). Employee engagement and organizational productivity of hospitality sector in Abuja, *International Journal of Business and Management Review*, 12(6), 57–79.
- Barnard, C. I. (1938). *The functions of the executive*. Harvard University Press.
- Barley, S. R., & Kunda, G. (1992). Design and devotion: Surges of rational and normative ideologies of control in managerial discourse, *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 37(3), 363–399.
- Cameron, K. S., & Quinn, R. E. (1999). *Diagnosing and changing organizational culture: Based on the competing values framework*. Addison-Wesley.
- Chukwudi, B. I., Yetunde, G., & Aniekan, G. O. (2022). Hospitality and tourism employee turnover intentions and performance of the hospitality and tourism sector in Nigeria, *African Journal of Emerging Issues*, 4(3), 1–10.
- Deloitte. (2024). *2024 global human capital trends*. Deloitte Insights.
- Denison, D. R. (1990). *Corporate culture and organizational effectiveness*. John Wiley & Sons.
- Etalong, T. A., & Chikeleze, F. O. (2023). Effect of organizational culture on employee performance: A survey of selected public sector organizations in Enugu, *European Journal of Business and Innovation Research*, 11(7).
- Fidyah, D. N., & Setiawati, T. (2020). Influence of organizational culture and employee engagement on employee performance: Job satisfaction as intervening variable, *Review of Integrative Business and Economics Research*, 9(4), 64–81.
- Follett, M. P. (1940). *Dynamic administration*, Harper & Brothers.
- Gallup. (2021). *State of the global workplace: 2021 report*, Gallup Press.
- Gallup. (2023). *State of the global workplace*, Gallup.
- Hafeez, I., Yingjun, Z., Hafeez, S., Mansoor, R., & Cheema, K. (2019). Impact of workplace environment on employee performance: Mediating role of employee health. *Business Management and Education*, 17(1), 173–193. <https://doi.org/10.3846/bme.2019.10379>
- Hasan, H. (2023). Effect of organizational culture on organizational learning, employee engagement, and employee performance: Study of banking employees in Indonesia, *Problems and Perspectives in Management*, 21(3), 471–482.

- Johnson, G., & Scholes, K. (2008). *Exploring corporate strategy: Text and cases (8th ed.)*, Pearson Education.
- Kahn, W. A. (1990). Psychological conditions of personal engagement and disengagement at work. *Academy of Management Journal*, 33(4), 692–724.
- Limon, İ., & Sezgin-Nartgün, Ş. (2020). Development of teacher job performance scale and determining teachers' job performance level. *Kuramsal Eğitim Bilim Dergisi [Journal of Theoretical Educational Science]*, 13(3), 564–590.
- Osibanjo, O. A., Adeniji, A. A., & Falola, H. O. (2014). Impact of organizational culture on employee performance: A case of Nigerian service firms. *International Business Research*, 7(3), 126–139.
- Peters, T. J., & Waterman, R. H. (1982). *In search of excellence: Lessons from America's best-run companies*. Harper & Row.
- Pham, V. K., Vu, T. N. Q., Phan, T. T., & Nguyen, N. A. (2024). The impact of organizational culture on employee performance: A case study at foreign-invested logistics service enterprises approaching sustainability development, *Sustainability*, 16(15), 6366. <https://doi.org/10.3390/su16156366>
- Rožman, M., Tominc, P., & Milfelner, B. (2023). Maximizing employee engagement through artificial intelligent organizational culture in the context of leadership and training of employees: Testing linear and non-linear relationships, *Cogent Business & Management*, 10(2).
- Samanta, A. K. (2021). Organizational culture and employee engagement: A review of selected studies. *Asian Journal of Management*, 12(2), 201–204.
- Schein, E. H. (1985). *Organizational culture and leadership*. Jossey-Bass.
- Schein, E. H. (2010). *Organizational culture and leadership* (4th ed.), Jossey-Bass.
- Schein, E. H. (2017). *Organizational culture and leadership* (5th ed.), John Wiley & Sons.
- Schaufeli, W. B., & Bakker, A. B. (2014). A model of work engagement. In A. B. Bakker (Ed.), *Work engagement: A handbook of essential theory and research* (pp. 15–36). Psychology Press.
- Smircich, L. (1983). Concepts of culture and organizational analysis, *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 28(3), 339–358. <https://doi.org/10.2307/2392246>
- Xu, J., Cao, Y., & Kim, T. (2022). Employee recognition, task performance, and organizational citizenship behavior, *Sustainability*, 14(3), 1631.