CrossMark
click for updates

EXPLORATION OF SUITABILITY OF SITUATIONAL LEADERSHIP IN THE OIL AND GAS SECTOR

Eberechukwu Ebere[1] --- Evangelia Fragouli[2]†

[1,2]*University of Dundee, UK*

ABSTRACT

The purpose of this study was to investigate whether managers in Nigerian Oil and Gas companies exhibit situational leadership style, flexibility and adjustment to different situations. This study also investigated the validity of the Situational Leadership model, examining the relationship between employee maturity and leaders tolerance for autonomy. To identify a leader's observed leadership style and a follower's preferred leadership style, the Leadership Effectiveness and Adaptability Description (LEAD) – Other Instrument was used. The researcher used secondary sources (literature review) in order to analyze in more depth the data selected. Connections with theory and practice were made through the main theoretical lenses of leadership theory, particularly leadership style theory and situational leadership. Reference was also made to the context and nature of the oil and gas industry, as well as, to the influence of national culture on worker orientation.

Keywords: Situational leadership, Follower, Oil & gas, Culture, Job gratification.

Contribution/ Originality

The present study contributes in the existing literature of leadership investigating whether situational leadership applies in the natural resources sector and specifically in the oil & gas sector. The findings of the empirical study support some fundamental principles of situational leadership theory, as well as, indicate the importance of consideration by the leader of employees' needs, expectations and issues of job gratification that relate to readiness level and willingness to accomplish tasks.

1. INTRODUCTION

The exploitation natural resources are the backbone of the Nigerian economy. The country sits on large reserves of hydrocarbons and is the biggest producer of oil in Africa. Nigeria's economy is extremely dependent on petroleum resources and according to the International Monetary Fund (IMF), over 95 percent of export revenues and about 40 percent of government revenues are earned from the petroleum sector. Despite its vast resources, the country is still

relatively underdeveloped. Some argue that the country's underdevelopment is due to poor national leadership. In fact, leadership is a very hot topic in Nigeria. The focus of this study however is not on Nigeria's political leadership but rather it focuses on Nigeria's organizational leadership, particularly leadership in its oil and gas sector which we have seen is the most crucial sector in the country's economy.

Executives in this industry therefore have to be equipped and able to handle the demands put on them as leaders of organizations in this industry. In the author's views, effective leadership is a very important issue that should be explored in order to get a better understanding of how executives and managers can influence their subordinates in ways that will aid them in realizing organizational objectives. Executives, through leadership, influence the performance of people in an organization. Successful managers would be those who lead their subordinates toward accomplishing the organization's objectives and according to Erven Bernard (2001), most effective managers are also effective leaders. However, some theorists have suggested that leading and managing should be seen as separate roles (Yukl, 1981). As the present study refers to Nigeria, the work of the South African management scholar Mangaliso (2001) should be noted who has conducted a study on management in Sub Saharan Arica and uses Nigeria as well as Namibia, Zambia, Zimbabwe, and South Africa as representative countries in order to give insight into managerial leadership patterns in the region. He suggests that "much of management theory is based on the writings of 20th century Western scholars whose disciplinary orientations were heavily grounded in economics and classical sociology. Their writings depict people as being individualistic, utility maximizing, and transaction-oriented (Mangaliso, 2001)". Management theories grounded on these assumptions often lead to an automatic depiction of human behavior that generally overlooks cultural or regional differences. In actuality, humans are more than just economic beings; "they are also social and communal beings, and are often influenced more by emotions than presumed logic" (Wanasika and Howell, 2011). In other words, several factors can often significantly cause managerial and employee behaviors to differ across cultures. Mangaliso (2001) concluded that by recognizing this, global management dialogue can take a more universal view to theories of management practices and leadership behaviors.

2. HISTORY AND OVERVIEW OF SITUATIONAL LEADERSHIP

2.1. History of the Situational Leadership Model

A substantial amount of leadership literature focuses on the effects of leaders while neglecting the key role that followers play in determining a leader's actions (Hollander, 1993). As a result, there is a gap in knowledge about the follower side of the leadership equation (Ehrhart and Klein, 2001). A number of researchers highlight that leadership is a relationship that is mutually formed between leaders and followers. Shamir and Howell (2000) stated that leadership and followership both play a dynamic role in developing this mutual relationship despite their unequal power in influencing organizational outcomes.

Situational Leadership theory was developed at Ohio University in 1968 by Ken Blanchard and Paul Hersey and became popular in 1969 when they published their classic book *Management*

of Organizational Behavior. Hersey and Blanchard originally presented their Situational Leadership model as "the Life Cycle theory" in an article in *Management and Training* in 1969. Life Cycle theory suggested that effective leadership styles in management are analogous to parenting styles which vary according to their child's maturity Hersey *et al.* (1996). Hersey and Kenneth (1969) stated that the development of this model was influenced by leadership research conducted at the Ohio State University as well as Reddin (1967) 3-D Management model and Blake and Mouton's Managerial Grid theory. Hersey and Blanchard later improved their Life Cycle theory to make it applicable in the workplace. The first improvement came with Situational Leadership after discovering that key aspects of their model could not be validated in practice, and then later Blanchard created Situational Leadership II with the help of his colleagues, Don Carew, Eunice Parisi-Carew, Fred Finch, Patricia Zigarmi, Drea Zigarmi, Margie Blanchard, and Laurie Hawkins. This paper makes use of the Situational Leadership model that is presented in the *Management of Organizational Behavior: Leading Human Resources* (Hersey et al., 2001). Three leadership theories that encouraged Hersey and Blanchard to develop the Situational Leadership model: the Ohio leadership study, theory of Managerial Grid, and the 3D management style.

The aim of the Situational Leadership model is to link the appropriate leadership style with the appropriate development level of an individual for a particular objective or assignment. The goal of Situational Leadership is to determine the suitable leadership style to apply for each of the four development levels. The role of the leader is to provide the individual with the necessary direction and support to move along the development continuum. The leadership style should change as development level of the individual changes. This implies that there is no best leadership style because each individual's development level l varies for each goal and each task. The Situational Leadership model is described as a partnership based on a leader's understanding of the needs (development level) of the individual with whom he/she is working.

3. THE LINK TO MOTIVATION THEORIES

Hersey *et al.* (2001), use the terms needs and motives interchangeably. They describe a need, as "something within an individual that prompts that person to action." Therefore, managers or leaders who motivate their followers effectively, give followers incentives to fulfill their needs. The Situational Leadership model suggests that each individual's needs differ according to their readiness level and that a suitable leadership style should be applied to meet these diverse needs. The Situational Leadership model's four combinations of readiness level and leadership style were influenced by Maslow's hierarchy of needs, Herzberg's two-factor theory, as well as McClelland's needs theory (Hersey *et al.*, 2001).

3.1. Links between Motivation Theories and Situational Leadership

Hersey *et al.* (2001) point to the connection between these motivation theories and then categorized these into three aspects of fundamental human needs:

1. *"People seek security"* – They suggest that there are particular security needs all humans

possess and if attention is not given to these needs people will focus on job performance therefore providing security is a factor that should not be neglected by

2. "*People seek social systems*" – This can be called a need for affiliation or belongingness and organizations should not disregard the sociability aspect of effective management.

3. "*People seek personal growth*" - Whether labeled the need for achievement or self-actualization, this is a very significant need. The development of people is key for effective organizations In order for leadership to be effective, these three factors must be considered (Hersey *et al.*, 2001).

The principles of Situational Leadership theory's suggestion that effective leadership was a factor of followers' readiness levels is grounded on these traditional motivation theories because of the idea that individuals are at different development levels and therefore have different needs respectively. These differences in needs bring about different outcomes even if individuals are working under the same circumstances, and on the same task.

3.2. Empirical Studies

Up until the early 1990s there was no general agreement regarding the number of studies on Situational Leadership Theory that had been conducted or about the legitimacy of the theory. Vecchio (1987) said examinations of Situational Leadership's theoretical and empirical soundness were rare, and a few years down the line Blank *et al.* (1990) said that Situational Leadership Theory had only gotten limited attention at the time. In 1993 though, Blanchard *et al.* (1993) claimed that more than fifty scholarly papers had been written. Most of these papers however, where unpublished doctoral dissertations that some say had "limited value." Blanchard *et al.* (1993) noted that they "wish there were more research studies besides dissertations being conducted on the model." They conducted a literature review and concluded that there at best five published empirical studies on Situational Leadership Theory that provide any support for the validity of the theory. Hambleton and Gumpert (1982) used an abridged version of the LEAD instrument to test the validity of Situational Leadership Theory and they came to a conclusion that there is evidence for the validity of the model but "no definite causal relationship could be established, because of research design constraints. Hambleton and Gumpert (1982) "A subsequent study by Vecchio (1987) point out methodological discrepancies in the Hambleton and Gumpert study. Vecchio's study got mixed outcomes while trying to validate Situational Leadership Theory. Vecchio (1987) found evidence supporting the theory in employees with "low maturity" but varied support for the two levels of "moderate maturity," and no theoretical support for the expectations of employees with "high maturity." Another study by Norris and Vecchio (1992) resulted in similar conclusions to Vecchio's first study. Other studies during this time period failed to provide any evidence for the strength of Situational Leadership Theory. Goodson *et al.* (1989) conducted a study aimed at testing predictions about the least favorable leadership styles for each level of readiness, but no support was found that aligned with the predictions of Situational Leadership Theory. Blank *et al.* (1990) failed to find support for some of the more complex predictions of the theory. Overall, there appeared to be very weak support for

13

the validity of Situational Leadership Theory during this period. Besides the frequent relabeling of important ideas in various versions of the theory, the key problem challenging all of the versions was lack of a rigorous theoretical basis and clear rationale of the conceptualized relationships between variables in the model. This lack of evidence could be why Hersey and his colleagues (Yukl, 1981) subsequently chose to label their Situational Leadership approach as "a practical model that can be used by managers, salespersons, teachers or parents" instead of a theory. However, it is hard to accept this disclaimer because of their explanation of relationships between variables in the model through the lens of a theory.

Consistency problems are what weaken all versions of Situational Leadership. Practitioners or scholars who try to apply the recommendations of Situational Leadership in the work place might notice contradictory guidelines for principally the same situation, depending on which version specifically of the mentioned model she is referring to. The authors of Situational Leadership had clearly taken note of the ambiguity and confusion caused by multiple versions of Situational Leadership Theory. According to Blanchard *et al.* (1993), to understand the trends in Situation Leadership research, one must know that changes in the model and the tools used to study the model have been made over time and that these variations in the model have the potential to cause confusion and inconclusive results in studies. Blank *et al.* (1990) and Johanson (1990) make references to studies that made use of the LEAD Self instrument to come to conclusions about Situational Leadership Theory, but Blanchard *et al.* (1993) points out weaknesses of the LEAD instrument and says these faults "have been known for some time." They also point out that Blank *et al.* (1990), Johanson (1990), and others have a tendency to refer to Situational Leadership and Situational Leadership II as the same, which is confusing. Blanchard and his colleagues' argument about ambiguity caused by researchers' failure to properly identify changes and/or differences between Situational Leadership and Situational Leadership II also needs to be examined. For instance, the work done by Blank *et al.* (1990) makes reference to just one single study, conducted by Hambleton and Gumpert (1982) that utilized the LEAD instrument. Blanchard *et al.* (1993) suggest that researchers are mainly accountable for the confusion because they, deliberately or inadvertently, test the incorrect model using the LEAD instrument, which according to Blanchard *et al.* (1993) had many weaknesses.

It can be said that Blanchard and his associates in this field are partly responsible for this confusion due to the multiple revisions. In 1985, Blanchard et al. presented a revised version of Situational Leadership Theory called Situational Leadership II in their book titled Leadership and The One Minute Manager. A year later Carew *et al.* (1986) (as cited by Graeff (2002)) used the Situational Leadership II model in their article published in the Training and Development Journal saying that the reason they used Situational Leadership II was "because it includes the latest thinking of the original approach's developers." A couple of years later, Hersey and Blanchard (1988) as cited by Hersey *et al.* (2001), presented modifications to their Situational Leadership model in the fifth edition of Management of Organization Behavior. An evaluation of their 1988 book exposes theoretical arguments and labels that are significantly altered from, and even conflict with, the ones outlining the Situational Leadership II model the way it was

described by Blanchard *et al.* (1985) . Apart from some cosmetic changes in labels, the 1988 version of Situational Leadership Theory is quite similar to the 1982 version.

4. CULTURE AND ORGANIZATIONS

In 1985, Hofstede conducted a well-known study on value differences among IBM employees in 53 countries and regions. His findings suggest that traditional motivation theories, such as the one's championed by Maslow, Herzberg, and McClelland, were not applicable in all countries because of the impact that culture and values have on personal motivation.

4.1. Cultural Differences between Nigeria and the United States

Leaders from different cultures cultivate certain patterns of life and value systems, which influence their styles of leadership. International business activities have shown how widely these leadership styles differ from culture to culture (Trompenaars, 1993). For a leader to effectively lead in a different culture, she should recognize the social norms, values, and work etiquette of the host country because these are strong determinants of effective leadership behavior (Fatehi, 1996). Fatehi believes that what makes a good leader in one culture does not necessarily make a good leader in other culture. For example, in the United States people have a preference for democratic leaders who seek contribution from subordinates before making decisions (Fatehi, 1996). Another culture might see this as incompetence on the part of the leader and could prefer a leader who takes control of situations without consulting subordinates. Hofstede in his publication "Culture's Consequences: International Differences in Work-Related Values" offered a framework for comparative cross-cultural research on work-related values in different countries. The study included 67 different countries and over 50 different occupations and resulted in Hofstede's identification of four work-related cultural dimensions:

Power Distance: This is "the extent to which the members of a society accept that power in institutions and organizations is distributed equally" (Hofstede, 1985).

Uncertainty Avoidance: This is "the degree to which the members of a society feel uncomfortable with uncertainty and ambiguity which leads them to support beliefs promising certainty and to maintain institutions protecting conformity" (Hofstede, 1985).

Individualism-Collectivism: "Individualism stands for a loosely knit social framework in a society in which individuals are supposed to take care of themselves and their immediate families" (Hofstede, 1985). Collectivism, on the other is a "closely-knit social framework in which individuals can expect their relatives, clan or others in-group to look after them, in exchange for unquestioning loyalty"(Hofstede, 1985).

Masculinity-Femininity Dimension: This is the extent to how socially accepted gender roles are observed in a society. A Masculine society where men are supposed to be assertive, tough, and women are supposed to be more modest, tender, and concerned with the quality of life" (Hofstede, 1996). Feminine society on the other hand describes a society that has "preference for relationships, modesty, caring for the weak and the quality of life" (Hofstede, 1985).

4.2. Nigerian Leadership Behavior

At the time Hofstede was conducting his research, IBM did not have enough employees in Nigeria, Ghana and Sierra Leone so Hofstede (1985) put these countries into one category and called them West Africa. It was discovered that West Africa was characterized by high Power Distance, low Uncertainty Avoidance, low Individualism, and low Masculinity. Hofstede identified the United States as having low Power Distance, low Uncertainty Avoidance, high Individualism, and high Masculinity. Managers from very masculine cultures tend to exhibit an aggressive or assertive leadership style and emphasize material achievement. These leadership characteristics are comparable the Initiating structure that promotes high task performance. In contrast, managers from cultures with low masculinity (feminine) exhibit a compassionate and nurturing style similar to those of Consideration leadership characteristics. Hofstede (1997) ranked the United States higher than Nigeria (West Africa) in terms of Masculinity and Nigeria (West Africa) higher than the U.S in terms of Femininity.

There are certain distinctive leadership behaviors that seem to be linked with some particular cultural backgrounds in Nigeria. For instance, tribalism sometimes plays a role in consideration of a worker's performance (Bass, 1981). Promotions and recommendations for raises are not always entirely based on merit, but instead in favor of those from one's own tribe (Bass, 1981). According to Ahiazu (1989), there are two kinds of work value systems in Nigeria. There is the indigenous value system and the Western organizational value system. Western values came with the importation of industrial technology from the Western World and penetrated native cultures, significantly influencing them. Western values tend to dominate in the industrialized sectors of the economy the, while indigenous work and organizational values dominate in the indigenous work environment (Ahiazu, 1986). The study Ahiazu conducted on Nigerian workers in both industrial and indigenous work environments concluded that that in circumstances where the traditional work values are practiced, the average Nigerian is fully dedicated to their work. Whereas in the industrial setting where Western organizational values dominate, the Nigerian worker is seen to be less committed. Ahiazu also noted that many Nigerian industrial workers worked primarily to save some money that would allow them to start their own businesses and therefore do not plan to keep their jobs for long.

4.3. Cultural Difference and Motivation Theories

Maslow (1970) advocated that there was a universal hierarchy of five needs, but Hofstede (1991) proposed that this was built on western culture and was based on studies of American organizations. Instead, Hofstede suggested that Herzberg *et al.* (1959) two-factor theory with internal "Motivators" and external "Hygiene" factors, better explained worker motivation. Hofstede (1991) also examined the relation between McClelland (1961) three needs (achievement, affiliation, and power) and his theory of cultural dimensions and found a negative relationship between the strengths of need for achievement and uncertainty avoidance.

Hofstede's criticisms suggest that results from studies conducted on Western (American) society may not be applicable to all societies. The Situational Leadership model suggests that

certain leadership styles need to be adopted in order to meet the changing needs or motivations of followers according to their readiness levels and estimated needs. This is based on American motivation theories and the practice however and leadership styles suitable for Nigerian followers' needs may be different from what the Situational Leadership model suggests. Nigerians have different culture and values than Americans, and according to Hofstede (1991) these differences affect peoples' needs and motivations. Therefore, the recommended leadership styles for Nigerians should be different from those recommended for Americans.

5. METHODOLOGY

This chapter presents the research methodology for investigative whether the Situational Leadership model is appropriate for Nigerian Oil and Gas organizations. Two research questions based on the fundamental concepts of the Situational Leadership model emerged.

The first question was whether leadership styles in Nigeria change according to followers' readiness level, as the Situational Leadership model suggests? Then, if yes, are the combinations of leadership style and readiness level that the Situational Leadership model suggests suitable for Nigerian Oil and Gas companies?

Hypothesis 1: The combination of the leadership style and followers readiness level affects work outcomes in Nigerian Oil and Gas organizations.

Hypothesis 2: Results for leaders whose style matches that suggested by Situational Leadership theory will be higher than others. This hypothesis directly tests the applicability of the Situational Leadership model to Nigeria Oil and Gas organizations. If Hypothesis 2 is nullified, hypotheses 3 and 4 will test Hofstede's reasoning regarding the Situational Leadership model.

Hypothesis 3: A follower who is working with a leader whose leadership style matches his preferred leadership style has greater job gratification than a follower who is not.

Hypothesis 4: The style of leadership preferred by a follower differs depending on one's readiness level and the preferred leadership style at each readiness level in Nigeria generally shifts more toward relationship and task behaviors than the Situational Leadership model predicts.

In Hypothesis 2, a "match" in leadership style is when the leadership style observed by a follower is the same as that suggested by the Situational Leadership model, otherwise there is a "mismatch." While in Hypothesis 3, there is a "match" when the leadership style observed by a follower is the same as the leadership style preferred by the follower. If this is not the case there is a "mismatch."

5.1. Variables and Measurements

The study uses two dependent variables. These are the job gratification and contentment with one's manager. Then there are three independent variables used to examine the suitability of the Situational Leadership model in the Nigerian oil and gas sector. They are follower readiness level, observed leadership style, leadership style preferred by the worker.

The measures and scales applied in this study are the same as those Hersey and the Center for

Leadership Studies developed for use with the Situational Leadership model. To determine readiness level of a follower, the Readiness Scale Staff Member was used. To identify a leader's observed leadership style and a follower's preferred leadership style, the Leadership Effectiveness and Adaptability Description (LEAD) - Other instrument was used. Followers' job gratification and contentment with manager, served as the measure of effectiveness.

5.1.1. Readiness Level

Subjects' readiness levels were rated using the Readiness Scale-Staff Rating Scale, which is made up of two components; ability and willingness. Each subject was asked six questions that are rated on a scale of 1 to 8. The original questions were modified to fit the purpose of this study. When the combined results from both components are scored, the subject's readiness level can be identified. Readiness level is categorized from R1 to R4. R1 being low readiness (unable and unwilling), R2 meaning low to moderate readiness (unable but willing), R3 was for high readiness (able but unwilling), then R4 was for those with high readiness and willing (Hersey *et al.*, 2001). For example, if a person scored 10 for ability and 10 for willingness, they would have a readiness level of R1 according to the Readiness Matrix (Best, 2010).

In this study, subjects were asked how they viewed their leader's style of leadership. To rate this, an instrument developed by Hersey *et al.* (2001) called the "Leadership Effectiveness and Adaptability Description (LEAD) -Other" was used. This instrument presents twelve scenarios and then the subject is to select one of four descriptions that indicate how their leader would likely act in each scenario. Then they chose one of four behaviors they would prefer their leader to exhibit in each situation. The leadership style was determined from the twelve answers using the style range table. Leadership styles range from S1-S4 (Hersey *et al.*, 2001).

- Telling (S1)
- Selling (S2)
- Participating (S3)
- Delegating (S4)

5.1.2. Gratification with Job and With Manager

This study used two measures to rate a subject's level of job gratification and contentment with their manager. Job gratification was rated on a five-item scale while contentment with manager rated using a three-item scale. Subjects were asked to either agree or disagree with specific statements on a scale of 1 to 5: 1 being "strongly disagree" to 5 being "strongly agree," and 3 being neutral. Demographics were also collected, specifically, age, gender, length of time with the company and on current job position.

5.2. Subjects and Data Sampling

The subjects of this study were workers in Nigerian Oil and Gas companies. The survey was carried out between March 3, 2013, and June 12, 2013. The questionnaire was given out to approximately two hundred workers by e-mail. The subjects were from Nigerian state owned

companies, international oil companies as well as service companies in order to have a better sample across the industry. Subjects held various occupations including, engineers, geologists, accountants, researchers, human resource personnel, trainees and managers. The respondents were also diverse in age, gender and experience.

5.3. Limitations of This Study

The aim of this study was to examine whether the Situational Leadership model could be an effective management technique in the Nigerian oil and gas sector. But like any other study it has some limitations.

The first limitation of this study was that since subjects were only surveyed once, information about them reflects relationship among leadership style, readiness level, and outcomes etc. at just one point in time. Therefore the results do not show whether a person developed ability for managing the task, increased willingness, or if a subject's preference of leadership style changed. Also the outcomes only revealed relationship, not the causality.

The second limitation of this study was its use of job gratification and contentment with manager as the dependent variables. Results therefore do not reflect other potential measures of effectiveness such as job performance. Another limitation comes from the fact that this study targeted various jobs but did not ask subjects to state their specific job. Therefore, the results could not indicate how certain jobs can affect outcomes. The relationship between leaders and followers could vary due to the job involved. For example engineers may require stronger teamwork than accountants. Limitations exist also as a consequence of the scales used to determine leadership style. The LEAD-Other instrument was created to determine the four styles presented by the Situational Leadership model, therefore it was challenging to show the extent to which a leader really exhibits task and relationship behaviors.

6. ANALYSIS AND RESULTS

The survey was carried out from March 3rd to June 12th in 2013 and the sample data, their reliability and tested hypotheses were analyzed using SPSS.

There were a total of 130 respondents to the survey and all were used to test the hypotheses. Out of the 130 respondents, 20 were female (15.4%). The average participant age was 34.8 years ranging from 20 years old to 53 years old. The average length of time spent with an establishment was 12.6 years. The average tenure with work was 4 years and 3 months. There were a total of 4,600 females out of 38,510 employees in this company (12%).

Table-4.1. Distribution of Gender

Gender	Frequency	Percentage (%)
Females	20	15.4
Males	109	83.8
No Answer	1	0.8
Total	130	100

Table-4.2. Demographic Data

	Mean	s.d.	Range
Age (year)	34.8	6.2	20-53
Tenure with Company(year)	12.6	7.2	1.5-34
Tenure with Work (year)	4.2	4.6	0.3(month)-32

Reliability of Scales

Table 4.3 shows the outcomes of the Cronbach reliability test done on the scales. The scales had good enough reliability with alpha values greeter than .75 ($\alpha > 0.75$) except for the Preferred Leadership Style which had a comparatively weaker reliability ($\alpha = 0.628$). The Preferred Leadership Style scale was still used despite its weaker reliability.

Table-4.3. Scale Reliability

Scales	Cronbach's Alpha
Ability (6 items)	0.801
Willingness (6 items)	0.933
Leadership Style (12 items)	0.787
Preferred Leadership Style (12 items)	0.628
Job Gratification (5 items)	0.920
Contentment with Manager (3 items)	0.842

Sample Features

Table 4.4 displays characteristics of the two dependent variables and the two components of readiness level. The distributions of these variables were normal and the modes were marginally greater than the means.

Table-4.4. Mean, Standard Deviation, Range of Four Variables

	Mean	s.d.	Range
Job Gratification	16.3	4.8	5-25
Contentment with Manager	10.6	2.8	3-15
Ability	34.0	6.1	6-48
Willingness	35.6	8.5	6-48

Correlations among Variables

According to the Pearson's rs, job gratification was strongly related to contentment with manager ($r = 0.46$, $p < 0.01$), ability ($r = 0.44$, $p < 0.01$), and willingness ($r = 0.79$, $p < 0.01$). Also, job gratification was moderately related to match-mismatch of leadership style ($r = 0.18$, $p < 0.05$) and age ($r = 0.18$, $p < 0.05$). Contentment with manager was related to ability ($r = 0.32$, p

< 0.01), willingness (r = 0.37, p < 0.01), and preferred leadership style (r = 0.34, p < 0.01). Ability had positive relation with willingness (r = 0.55, p < 0.01), preferred leadership style (r = 0.27, p < 0.01), age (r = 0.33, p < 0.01) and tenure with company (r = 0.30, p < 0.01). Willingness was strongly related to preferred leadership style (r = 0.15, p < 0.01), and age (r=.23, p<.01). Age was strongly related to length of service with company (r = 0.92, p < 0.01) and length of time with work (r = 0.24, p < 0.01).

Table-4.5. Frequency and Percentage of Independent Variables

	Frequency	**Percentage (%)**
Readiness Level	130	100
R1	3	2.3
R2	11	8.5
R3	55	42.3
R4	61	46.9
Leadership Style	130	100
PS1	23	17.7
PS2	38	29.2
PS3	50	38.5
PS4	19	14.6
Preferred Leadership Style	130	100
DS1	12	9.2
DS2	59	45.4
DS3	57	43.8
DS4	2	1.5
Match-Mismatch R-PS	130	100
Match	25	19.2
Mismatch	105	80.8
Match-Mismatch R-DS	130	100
Match	55	42.3
Mismatch	75	57.7

The results point out that the longer people worked for a company, the greater their ability and because experience is a factor of ability to accomplish tasks, this relation was acceptable. "Job gratification" and "contentment with manager" showed correlation with "match-mismatch of preferred leadership style" but not with "match-mismatch of suggested leadership style." This is an indication that some combinations of "leadership style" and "readiness level" effected both "Job gratification" and "contentment with manager". It is not clear though exactly which combinations had an effect. Tests of hypotheses in the following section provide more details of links between these variables.

6.1. Effects of Readiness Level and Observed Leadership Style on Satisfaction

Hypothesis 1 - The combination of the leader's observed leadership style (PS) and a follower's readiness level (R) affects follower's outcomes, which are job gratification and contentment with manager. A two-way ANOVA was used to test this hypothesis. Readiness level and leadership style were tested separately then tested as a combination.

Job Gratification

In tables 4.7 and 4.8 the results of the two-way ANOVA test of Hypothesis 1 are shown. The averages from table 4.7 were used to compute the figures in table 4.8. The amounts of subjects who fell under readiness level one (R1) and two (R2) were too few to test using the two-way ANOVA (R1: n = 3; R2: n = 11), therefore only readiness level three (R3) and four (R4) were examined. Readiness level had a substantial effect on follower's job gratification at the 0.01 level of significance ($F(d.f.) = 37.42(1)$, $p < 0.01$). However, leadership style and the combination of readiness level and leadership style both did not have a substantial effect on follower's job gratification at the 0.05 level of significance ($F(d.f.) = 0.29(3)$, $p = 0.83$; $F(d.f.) = 0.24(3)$, $p = 0.87$). This is an indication that followers' job gratification was linked to their readiness level irrespective of their leader's style. The same trend was observed among those subjects in R1 and R2 even though their statistics were not examined. It can be said that these ANOVA outcomes do not support Hypothesis 1 since the mean for R1 job gratification is less than that of R2, and R2 less than that of R3. In other words, the combination of a follower readiness and leader's style of leadership affected outcomes for job gratification.

Job Gratification, Means of Readiness Level with Observed Leadership Style Readiness Leadership Style

Level	PS1	PS2	PS3	PS4	Total
R1	n/a	7.5	n/a	5.5	6.7
R2	9.5	12.5	17.0	10.5	12.5
R3	14.2	15.2	13.9	14.0	14.5
R4	19.4	19.2	19.3	18.4	19.2
R3 & R4	16.2	17.0	17.4	16.2	16.9
Total	15.6	16.3	17.4	14.4	16.3

Table-4.8. Two-Way ANOVA - Job Gratification

	F	d.f.	Sig.
Readiness	37.42	1	< 0.01
PS	0.29	3	0.83
Readiness* PS	0.24	3	0.87

Contentment with Manager

The effects of readiness level, leadership style, and the combination of the two on contentment with managers were also tested using a two-way ANOVA. Sample sizes for readiness level one (R1) and two (R2) were small therefore only readiness level three (R3) and four (R4) were analyzed. Results show that all three had substantial effects on followers' contentment with managers ($F(d.f.) = 10.63(1)$, $p < 0.01$; $F(d.f.) = 12.108(3)$, $p < 0.01$; $F(d.f.) = 2.74(3)$, $p < 0.05$). Therefore, Hypothesis 1 is supported in this instance.

Contentment with Manager, Means of Readiness Level with Observed Leadership Style

Readiness	Observed Leadership Style				
level	PS1	PS2	PS3	PS4	Total
R1	n/a	11.5	n/a	3.0	8.7
R2	6.0	12.0	15.0	7.5	10.1
R3	9.3	11.2	10.2	6.3	9.8
R4	9.3	11.6	12.3	9.7	11.4
R3 & R4	9.3	11.4	11.5	8.0	10.7
Total	9.0	11.4	11.8	7.6	10.6

Two-Way ANOVA - Contentment with Manager

	F	d.f.	Sig.
Readiness	10.63	1	< 0.01
PS	12.11	3	< 0.01
Readiness* PS	2.74	3	< 0.05

To further examine the results gotten in the first ANOVA test, a multiple-regression analysis was conducted. subjects' job gratification was affected by their readiness level rather than the combination of the readiness level and leadership style. The outcomes of this multiple-regression analysis (not shown), indicates that only the 'willingness' variable was statistically substantial enough to be used as a predictor of job gratification. A strong correlation between job gratification and willingness was discovered ($t = 8.107$, $p < 0.01$). However, the way leadership style affects job gratification within each readiness level can be further investigated in order to identify the most effective leadership style for each particular level of readiness.

The Nigerian oil and gas industry workers' degree of contentment with supervision was substantially influenced by the combination of their readiness level and their leader's style of leadership and this suggests that a leader ought to adjust his/her leadership style according to a follower's readiness level just as the core principle of the Situational Leadership theory argues. On the other hand, the results of the two-way ANOVA did not indicate which combinations influenced contentment with supervision. Hypotheses 2, 3, and 4, were therefore tested in order to precisely see whether the effective combinations of readiness level and leadership style were the same as the Situational Leadership model suggests.

6.2. Relationship between Leadership Style and Satisfaction

Hypothesis 2: Results for leaders whose style matches that suggested by Situational Leadership theory will be higher than others.

In this test, subjects were categorized into four categories of readiness levels based on their answers to the Readiness Scale - Staff Rating Scale. After, subjects were further split into two groups, match and mismatch of the leadership style. The term "match" in this instance means the leadership style observed by a subject is the same as proposed by the Situational Leadership model. If this is not the case, there is a "mismatch." The two-way ANOVA was used here.

Job Gratification

The mean scores of all respondents' job gratification within three readiness levels were compared. The results indicated that job gratification was related to the subjects' readiness level (F (d.f.) = 330.69(1), p < 0.01). There was no substantial difference of between match and mismatch categories in each readiness level (F (d.f.) = 0.74(1), p = 0.39). Also, interactions between readiness level and match or mismatch categories had no influence on subjects' job gratification (F (d.f.) =.003(1), p=.96).

Comparison of Job Gratification

	Match		Mismatch		
	N	Mean	N	Mean	Total
R1	0	n/a	3	6.7	6.7
R2	2	12.5	9	12.4	12.5
R3	16	13.9	39	14.7	14.5
R4	7	18.4	54	19.3	19.2
R3&R4	23	15.3	93	17.3	16.9
Total	25	15.1	105	16.6	16.3

Hypothesis 2 Two-Way ANOVA for Job Gratification

	F	d.f.	Sig.
Readiness	24.96	1	<0.00
Match-Mismatch	0.74	1	0.39
Readiness* Match-Mismatch	<0.00	1	0.96

Contentment with Manager

Results comparing mean scores on contentment with manager between match and mismatch categories indicated contrary results to that of job gratification. Subjects' readiness levels were not linked to contentment with their manager (F(d.f.) = 1.41 (1), p = 0.24). Also, there were no substantial differences in contentment with manager between matched and mismatched categories (F(d.f.) = 1.3(1), p = 0.25). Just as in the case with job gratification, interactions between readiness level and match or mismatch categories had no influence on subjects' contentment with their manager (F(d.f.) = 3.81(1), p = 0.053).

Comparison of Contentment with Manager

	Match		Mismatch		
	N	Mean	N	Mean	Total
R1	0	n/a	3	8.7	8.7
R2	2	12.0	9	9.7	10.1
R3	16	10.2	39	9.7	9.8
R4	7	9.7	54	11.6	11.4
R3 & R4	23	10.0	93	10.8	10.7
Total	25	10.2	105	10.7	10.6

Results for Hypothesis 2 - Contentment with Manager

	F	d.f.	Sig.
Readiness	1.41	1	0.24
Match-Mismatch	1.32	1	0.25
Readiness* Match-Mismatch	3.81	1	0.05

These results show that the followers' job gratification was linked only to their readiness levels. The combination of a leadership style and follower's readiness level proposed by Situational Leadership theory showed no influence on job gratification or contentment with manager.

The next two hypotheses explore the suitable combinations that create satisfied Nigerian oil and gas workers.

6.3. Relationship between Preferred Leadership Style and Satisfaction

Hypothesis 3: A follower who is working with a leader whose leadership style matches their prefer has greater job gratification than a follower who is not

Respondents were grouped into the four readiness levels and then put into two categories, match and mismatch of the leadership style to the style preferred by subjects. In this instance, "match" was defined as the leadership style observed by a subject being similar to the leadership style which the subject preferred. According to Situational Leadership model theory, people feel better when their leaders' leadership style meets their needs. Therefore in Hypothesis 3, those who work in a matched situation should score higher than those who were in a mismatch. A two- way ANOVA structured like that for Hypothesis 2 was used.

Job Gratification

The results of the two-way ANOVA show that there were no differences in job gratification between match and mismatch categories within readiness levels R3 and R4 ($F(d.f.) = 1.01(1)$, $p = 0.32$). Again, the results indicated that respondents' job gratification was linked only to their readiness.

Comparison of Job Gratification

	Match		Mismatch		
	N	Mean	N	Mean	Total
R1	1	9.0	2	5.5	6.7
R2	1	19.0	10	11.8	12.5
R3	24	15.0	31	14.0	14.5
R4	30	19.4	31	19.0	19.2
R3 & R4	54	17.4	62	16.5	16.9
Total	56	17.3	74	15.6	16.3

Results for Hypothesis 3 - Job Gratification

	F	d.f.	Sig.
Readiness	46.97	1	< 0.00
Match-Mismatch	1.01	1	0.32
Readiness* Match-Mismatch	0.18	1	0.68

Contentment with Manager

The same test was used to examine whether subjects' contentment with manager was greater when the observed leadership style of his or her leader matches preferred leadership style. There was a substantial difference in the subjects' contentment with their manager between the match and mismatch categories $(F(d.f.) = 13.22(1), p < 0.01)$. Respondents' readiness levels also influenced contentment with managers $(F(d.f.) = 11.22(1), p < 0.01)$, while interaction between readiness level and match - mismatch categories had no influence on contentment with manager $(F(d.f.) = 0.02(1), p = 0.88)$.

Comparison of Contentment with Manager

	Match		Mismatch		
	N	Mean	N	Mean	Total
R1	1	11.0	2	7.5	8.4
R2	1	15.0	10	9.6	10.1
R3	24	10.7	31	9.2	9.8
R4	30	12.3	31	10.6	11.4
R3 & R4	54	11.6	62	9.8	10.7
Total	56	11.6	74	9.8	10.6

Results for Hypothesis 3 -Contentment with Manager

	F	d.f.	Sig.
Readiness	11.22	1	< 0.00
Match-Mismatch	13.22	1	< 0.00
Readiness* Match-Mismatch	0.02	1	0.88

Consistent outcomes for tests of Hypotheses imply at least that workers' contentment with their managers when working with their preferred leadership style are higher than those who are not, as the principles of Situational Leadership theory suggest. However, contrary to what the Situational Leadership model suggests, these three hypotheses suggest that the combination of leadership style and readiness level have an influence on subjects' contentment with their manager. Respondents felt more content when working with a manager whose leadership style matched his or her preferred style. Therefore, the key to identifying the most effective leadership style or the leadership style with the greatest likelihood of making a follower satisfied in the Nigerian oil and gas industry is to understand which leadership style is preferred most at the each readiness level.

6.4. Leadership Style Preferred by Followers

Hypothesis 4: The style of leadership preferred by a follower differs depending on one's readiness level and the preferred leadership style at each readiness level in Nigeria generally shifts more toward relationship and task behaviors than the Situational Leadership model predicts.

To test Hypothesis 4, subjects were split into four categories of readiness levels according to their scores on the Readiness Scale. The leadership styles which they prefer were measured by the scores of LEAD Other Scale. Frequencies of preferred leadership styles in each readiness level were evaluated using a χ^2 test.

Results indicated that there was not a substantial difference in preferred leadership styles at Low (R1) and Low to Moderate (R2) levels of Readiness. Also there was no substantial evidence about which leadership style would most likely give respondents of Low and Low to Moderate readiness contentment with their managers, conclusions about the most effective leadership style are merely speculative but Selling style might be effective for individuals at a Low Readiness level.

None of the respondents from any category preferred a Telling style leader (S1). Most of respondents at a Moderate to High level (R3) of readiness preferred having a leader with a Selling style (S2). Most of the respondents with High Readiness (R4) preferred having a Participating leader (S3).

Five key conclusions stemmed from this data analysis:

- Subjects' job gratification was related solely to their level of readiness.
- The combination of leader's style and follower's level of readiness is linked to Contentment with managers.
- The combination of leader's style and follower's level of readiness where individuals felt great contentment with their manager differed from what the Situational Leadership model proposes.
- Those who perceived that their leaders needed them, felt higher contentment just as the Situational Leadership model suggests.
- Nigerian oil industry workers wanted their leader to display more relationship behavior and more task behavior than the Situational Leadership model suggests.

7. CONCLUSION

The outcomes of this study partially support the main principles of Situational Leadership in regards to the idea that there is no one best leadership style and that a leader has to adjust leadership style according to a follower's readiness level. This was the case when it came to satisfaction with one's manager but in the case of job gratification, the results suggested that leaders had to take followers' willingness to accomplish their tasks into consideration because this factor was related to their job gratification.

The Situational Leadership model emphasizes the needs of followers. Hersey *et al.* (2001) argued that individuals produce better results when their needs were met, therefore in order to have greater productivity and quality in their work, leaders should satisfy followers' needs.

Furthermore, they believed that individuals' needs altered as their abilities (knowledge, experience, skills, motivation etc.) developed.

However, Hofstede (1991) argued that conclusions from studies conducted on American society did not necessarily apply to all societies because of differences in culture and values. According to Hofstede (1991) research on IBM employees around the globe, the Nigerian (West African) society had different culture and values from American. These differences affect people's needs and motivations therefore, the leadership style recommended for the Nigerian managers to meet their followers' needs should be different than for those in America.

Based on these assumptions, this study looked at whether the ideologies of Situational Leadership were applicable to Nigerian petroleum industry and also whether the American understanding of the Situational Leadership model principles (suggested effective combinations of leadership style and readiness level) were suitable.

Four conclusions were drawn from this study:

- Nigerian oil and gas industry workers felt high contentment with their managers when their manager's actions satisfied their needs.

- The leadership style that made Nigerian oil and gas industry workers content with their manager changed in accordance to their growth in confidence, motivation, and commitment to their work.

- The leadership style that led the Nigerian oil and gas industry workers to be content with their manager had somewhat more relationship and task behavior compared to an American.

- Nigerian oil and gas industry workers' job gratification was correlated to their readiness level, especially when it comes to willingness. This implies that higher job gratification was achieved when higher levels of responsibility, commitment, and confidence were felt.

The first conclusion supports the fundamental principle of Situational Leadership theory that says leaders ought to understand what followers need so that they can make efforts to satisfy those needs.

The second conclusion gives insight as to what followers expect of leaders. Nigerian oil and gas industry workers who had less confidence in their job and less responsibility were more comfortable with their managers making the decisions regarding their work and preferred following their leader's direction but still wished to participate in discussions. On the other hand, workers with great confidence, commitment, and responsibility wanted managers to engage them in discussion but wanted autonomy to make decisions regarding their work. These tendencies were not correlated to workers' levels of experience, knowledge, and skills therefore suggesting that managers should engage followers in discussions about tasks then decide whether or not to allow followers to make their own decisions based on how eager they are to do their work.

Finally, this study concludes with suggestions for future research considering the limitations of this study.

Test further at readiness level one and two

• The sample sizes of R1 and R2 were too small to test the hypotheses and therefore were utilized solely for identifying tendencies of outcomes. For that reason, further studies using bigger samples are necessary for investigating the applicability of the Situational Leadership model for Nigerian oil and gas industry workers if an empirical method of investigation is preferred.

Examine subjects over an extended period of time.

• Since the study was conducted over a short period of time it was not able to observe whether subjects' needs changed according to their level of growth. To overcome this, subjects need to be examined for a lengthier period of time in order to get a better look into the validity of the Situational Leadership model.

Investigate the effects of demographics.

• This study did not examine on the effects of subject demographics such as age, sex or job occupation. This aspect is important as the relationship between leaders and followers may change as age, sex, and job occupations change.

REFERENCES

Ahiazu, A.I., 1986. The African thought system and the work behavior of the African industrial man. International Studies of Management and ,Organization, 16(2): 6-27.

Ahiazu, A.I., 1989. The theory a system of work organization for the modern African workplace. International Studies of Management and Organization, 19(1): 6-27.

Bass, B.M., 1981. Bass & stogdill's handbook of leadership: Theory, research and management applications. New York: Free Press.

Best, C., 2010. Assessing leadership readiness using developmental personality style: A tool for leadership coaching. International Journal of Evidence Based Coaching and Mentoring, 8(1): 22-33.

Blanchard, K., D. Zigarmi and B. Nelson, 1993. Situational leadership after 25 years: A retrospective. The Journal of Leadership Studies, 1(1): 22-36.

Blanchard, K., P. Zigarmi and D.Z. Igarmi, 1985. Leadership and the one minute manager. New York: Morrow.

Blank, W., J. Weitzel and S.G. Green, 1990. A test of the situational leadership theory. Personnel Psychology, 43(3): 579-597.

Ehrhart, M.G. and K.J. Klein, 2001. Predicting followers' preferences for charismatic leadership: The influence of follower values and personality. Leadership Quarterly, 12: 153–180.

Erven Bernard, L., 2001. Becoming an effective leader through situational leadership department of agricultural, environmental and development economics. Ohio State University Extension.

Fatehi, K., 1996. International management: A cross-cultural and functional perspective. New Jersey: Prentice Hall.

Goodson, J.R., W.M. Gail and F.C. James, 1989. Situational leadership theory. Group & Organization Studies, 14(4): 446-461.

Graeff, C.L., 2002. Evolution of situational leadership theory: A critical review. Leadership Quarterly, 8(2): 153-170.

Hambleton, B.C. and R. Gumpert, 1982. The validity of hersey and Blanchard's theory of leader effectiveness. Group and Organization Studies, 7(2): 225-242.

Hersey, P. and H.B. Kenneth, 1969. Life cycle theory of leadership. Training and Development Journal, 23(5): 16-23.

Hersey, P., H.B. Kenneth and E.J. Dewey, 1996. Management of organizational behavior: Utilizing human resources. 7th Edn., Upper Saddle River, New Jersey: Prentice Hall.

Hersey, P., H.B. Kenneth and E.J. Dewey, 2001. Management of organizational behavior: Leading human resources. 8th Edn., Upper Saddle River, New Jersey: Prentice Hall.

Herzberg, F., B. Mausner and B. Snyderman, 1959. The motivation to work. New York: Willey.

Hofstede, G., 1996. Difference and danger: Cultural profiles of nations and limits to tolerance. Higher Education in Europe, 21(1): 73-94.

Hofstede, G., 1997. Cultures and organizations: Software of the mind. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Hofstede, G.H., 1985. The interaction between national and organizational value systems. The Journal of Management Studies, 22(4): 347-358.

Hofstede, G.H., 1991. Cultures and organizations: Software of the mind. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Hollander, E.P., 1993. Legitimacy, power, and influence: A perspective on relational features of leadership. In M. M. Chemers, & R. Ayman (Eds.). Leadership theory and research: Perspectives and directions. San Diego, CA: Academic Press. pp: 29–47.

Johanson, B.P., 1990. Situation leadership: A review of the research. Human Resource Development Quarterly, 1(1): 73-05.

Mangaliso, M.P., 2001. Building competitive advantage from ubuntu: Management lessons from South Africa. The Academy of Management Executive, 15(3): 23-33.

Maslow, A.H., 1970. Motivation and personality. New York: Harper & Row.

McClelland, D.C., 1961. The achieving society. New Jersey: D. Van Nostrand Company.

Norris, W.R. and R.P. Vecchio, 1992. Situational leadership theory: A replication. Group and Organization Management, 1(7): 331-342.

Reddin, W.J., 1967. The 3-D management style theory. Training and Development Journal, 21(4): 8-17.

Shamir, B. and J.M. Howell, 2000. The role of followers in the charismatic leadership process: Susceptibility, social construction, and leader empowerment. Paper Presented at the Academy of Management Annual Meeting, Toronto.

Trompenaars, F., 1993. Riding the waves of culture: Understanding cultural diversity in business. London: Nicholas Brealey Publishing.

Vecchio, R.P., 1987. Situational leadership theory: An evaluation of a prescriptive theory. Journal of Applied Psychology, 72(1): 444–451.

Wanasika, I. and J.P. Howell, 2011. Romie littrell, peter dorfman, managerial leadership and culture in Sub-Saharan Africa. Journal of World Business, 46(2): 234-241.

Yukl, G.A., 1981. Leadership in organizations. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.