Managing Effect of Culture on Gender Inequality (Case Study in Nigeria)

Okeke M.N.¹, Onuorah, N. N.², Oboreh, J.C.³ & Ojan Echo⁴

¹Dr. Okeke M.N., ²Dr. Onuorah, N. N., ³Oboreh, J.C. & ⁴Ojan Echo
Department of Business Administration
Chukwuemeka Odemegwu Ojukwu University, Igbariam Campus
Anambra State, Nigeria

Abstract: This study examined the effect of culture on gender inequality in Nigeria. Specifically, it investigated the effect of power distance, individualism, uncertainty avoidance, and masculinity on gender inequality in Nigeria. Relevant conceptual, theoretical, and empirical literature were reviewed. This research was anchored on Hofstede’s model, and survey research method was adopted. The population of study was 350. The entire population figure was used as the sample size. The data generated through questionnaires were analyzed using table and percentage analysis. Multiple Regression analysis was employed in testing the hypotheses. It was found out that power distance had a significant effect on gender inequality in Nigeria. Individualism had a significant influence on gender inequality in Nigeria. Uncertainty avoidance had no significant influence on gender inequality in Nigeria. Individualism has a significant effect on gender inequality in Nigeria and masculinity has no significant effect on gender inequality in Nigeria. The study concluded that culture had a significant effect on gender inequality. The study therefore recommended that power distance in cultural and traditional practices, which may tend to enhance gender inequality in Nigeria should be discouraged at all levels. Governments should promulgate laws against individualism that hinder gender equality at all levels. There should be no rule of masculinity in culture and tradition in all aspects of life in Nigeria. That means ratio of culture and equity should be 50 females to 50 males in all levels and government (federal, state, and local) should promulgate laws against culture and tradition on inequality against uncertainty avoidance.
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1. Introduction
Gender issues have become a household name in many countries today. Violence and inequality especially on women cannot be overemphasized Otu and Nkamare, (2012). Gender inequality in developing countries has been much publicized in the last twenty years. Across the globe, women are
less educated and receive worse treatment than their male counterparts (Quibria 2005; World Bank 2000). Sen (2002) concluded that because of these inequalities, there were 100 million “missing women” worldwide. While some programs have been initiated to try to counteract these problems, recent evidence suggests that the number of missing women has only increased in the last decade (Klasen and Wink 2002). Gender comprises a range of differences between men and women, extending from the biological to the social. It refers to socially constructed and socially learned behaviors and expectations associated with females and males (Parpart, Connelly and Barritteu 2000). All cultures interpret and elaborate the biological difference between women and men into a set of social expectations about what behaviors and activities are appropriate and what rights, resources, and power women and men possess but like race, ethnicity, and class; gender is a social category that largely establishes one’s life chances.

Agbalajobi 2010 postulates that the cultures of many societies are based by subjugating women to men, and undermining their self-esteem. Women are typically associated with domesticity according to Abiola in Lanre (2003) gender inequality remain pervasive in many dimensions of life. The nature and extent of the discrimination vary considerably across countries and regions. In Nigeria, the female are oppressed at all levels, even in families. Consistently, men were trained not to partake in most domestic chores such as cooking, sweeping, fetching water and firewood, which are exclusively left for women. In favor of this, Ihimodu (2005) agrees that women were relegated to the domestic sphere that were not renovated or valued. In line with these, Ogwu (2002) observes that implementation of gender differences is created and sustained by the society through its traditional customs, conventions, norms and regulations. Obikeze (2006) posits that family responsibilities and child bearing make women not to feature in public matters as they are likely to be away on maternity leave and other house hold matters that are likely to take them away from the scene of politics. Anya (2003) asserts that the basis of societal norms relegate women to the background when he explains that the greatest dangers to the practice is the internationalization of these belief systems which make women perceive politics as something out of their spheres. Anya (2003) maintains that the society regards women participation in politics as rebels and prostitutes. This attitude discourage women from participating in politics. Actually, the tradition or cultural beliefs in Nigeria as a typical patriarchal society regard women as properties of their husbands who have moral right to decide the actions which woman will take, whether she will come out to join the active politics is a matter which the man will decide since the tradition has ascribed the headship of the family to the man.

1.1 Statement of the Problems

Gender inequality implies that men and women do not live with equal social standing according to culture (Bah, 2005). The problem of Gender inequality and the quest for gender equality can be dated back to antiquity. Many believe that the rights of women are trampled upon psychologically and socially, while the men are highly valued in the society. Women are relegated to the background and are not given equal opportunities with the men in all spheres of life. It is widely believed that a woman is to be “seen” and not “heard”. She is used as a “beast of burden,” and is seen as a “load” that needs to be offloaded one day, and at such, she is not given priority of special attention anywhere, including government. This attitude has therefore affected the development of women physically, psychologically and otherwise.

Every community or society has its special way of operation, and these cultural practices influence the people’s attitudes, perception, and management of any organization, including other government-related issues they experience (Oleribe & Alasia, 2006).

1.2 Objectives of the study

The major objective of the study is to examine cultural imperative in global business management. The specific objectives include:

a. To examine the effect of power distance on gender inequality in Nigeria
b. To determine the influence of individualism on gender inequality in Nigeria
c. To investigate the effect of masculinity on gender inequality in Nigeria

d. To assess the influence of uncertainty avoidance on gender inequality in Nigeria

1.3 Research question

The following research questions were formulated to guide this study.

a. To what extent does power distance affect gender inequality in Nigeria?

b. To what degree does individualism influence gender inequality in Nigeria?

c. To what extent does masculinity affect gender inequality in Nigeria?

d. To what degree does uncertainty avoidance influence gender inequality in Nigeria?

1.4 Hypothesis

The hypotheses used in this study are in null form and are presented below:

a. Power distance has no significant effect on gender inequality in Nigeria

b. Individualism has no significant influence on gender inequality in Nigeria

c. Masculinity has no significant effect on gender inequality in Nigeria

d. Uncertainty avoidance has no significant influence on gender inequality in Nigeria

1.5 Significance of the Study

This study will make enormous contributions especially to the Nigeria government, policy formulators and students/researchers.

To the Nigeria government, this study will help them in understanding the role of culture on gender inequality. It will also help Nigeria government on gender inequality effectively through the promotion and adoption of cultural dimensions that promote the spirit of capitalism and equity in Nigeria.

To the policy formulators, the study will guide them in their policy formulation by providing them with both theoretical and empirical evidence on the influence of culture in gender inequality, especially as it relates to policy formulation.

The outcome of this study will also serve as a reference material to students/researchers and contribute as material for future research purposes. This will help researchers studying cultural imperativeness on global business management to have theoretical and empirical background for their work.

2. Review of Related Literature

2.1 Conceptual framework

2.1.1 Culture

Several authors have attempted to come up with various definitions based on their experiences, environments as well as their own perceptions. Classical scholars such as Tylor (1871) posit that culture is a multifaceted concept which includes knowledge, belief, art, morals, law, custom and any other capabilities and habits acquired by man as a member of a given society. Culture consists of patterns, explicit and implicit, of and for behavior acquired and transmitted by symbols, constituting the distinctive achievement of human groups, including their embodiment in artifacts. The essential core of culture consists of traditional (historically derived and selected) ideas and especially their attached values. Culture systems may, on the one hand, be considered as products of action, on the other, as conditioning elements of future action (Abimbola, Adekeye, Ajayi & Idowu, 2011).

Shinnar, Giacomin, and Janssen (2012) define culture as “a collective programming of the mind which distinguishes the members of one group or category of people. They assert that cultures exhibit unequal distribution of power, strong hierarchies, control mechanisms and an emphasis to obey those in position of power. The effect of culture on entrepreneurship was early emphasized by Max Weber at the beginning of the century. He argues that Protestantism encouraged a culture that emphasized the importance of cultural influences embedded in religion as a means for understanding the genesis of capitalism. This can be seen in his famous view on individualism, achievement motivation, and
legitimating of entrepreneurial vocations, asceticism, rationality and self-reliance. Culture affects the perception and behavior of people which would invariably affect relationship between one another. In the Muslim world and most of the South East Asian countries, the women are expected to remain indoor according to Hugo, except in extreme cases, and need to be completely covered by hijab if they venture out, this practices is due to religious beliefs, and it has negative tendency for the women entrepreneurs, the practice confines the few that venture into entrepreneurship to the informal sector of the economy.

Kroeber and Kluckhohn (2002) describe culture in three basic dimensions; excellence of taste in the fine arts and humanities, an integrated pattern of human knowledge through social learning and a set of shared attitudes, values, goals, and practices that characterise an institution, organization or group. Recently, culture has been defined as a common set of beliefs and values shared by a social group in form of symbols, norms, laws, values, rituals, myths and behaviors that can influence people’s thinking and actions (Bucurean et al, 2011).

Other conceptualization lenses of defining culture are applied using beliefs, (general proposals regarding the functioning of a group) values (principles or qualities people believe in because they think they are important), collective norms (specific rules of conduct applicable to all the members of a group), myths (idealistic stories based on true events and because they represent an explanatory function), and taboos (Bucurean et al, 2011; Lahti, 2003 and Hofstede, 1980). Therefore, through culture, people and groups define themselves, conform to society's shared values, and contribute to society transformation (Eagleton, 2000). Lederach (2005) views culture as the way of life in a given society. The author cites culture as comprising of elements like beliefs, values, norms and it arises out of a configuration of learned behavior and results of behavior whose elements are shared and transmitted to and by the members of a particular society. Williams, (2005) explains how culture is learnt through music, literature, painting, sculpture, theatre and film. This perhaps explains the role of cultural heritage centers and museums and the justification for their role in maintaining societies’ historical evolution.

Culture is the collective programming of mind, which distinguishes the members of one group or category of people from those of others. Hofstede (2001) identifies five values that differ considerably between cultures. These values are: power distance, collectivism, individualism, masculinity, uncertainty, avoidance and long-term/ short-term orientation.

2.2.2 Concept of Gender

Henderson (2006) defines gender as the socially constructed attributes, opportunities and relationships associated with being male and female and which determines what is expected, allowed and valued in a woman or a man in a given context. Awofeso and Odeyemi (2014) perceive it as the way a particular society views and analyses the relationship between male and female, which again are determined by a number of factors, especially, the cultural values of that society. Onwuka 2002 defines gender as the roles, attitudes, behaviours and values ascribed by the society to males and females. She went to say that Gender is socially constructed; learned for specific cultures, and can be changeable. It is based on society’s perception. Gender violence, inequality and discrimination have so much eaten into the marrows and fabrics of our society that it has become a malignant condition like in cancer of the breast which needs an emergency and prompt surgical intervention to free such a woman from such condition before it gets to its terminal stage.

2.2.3 Theoretical Framework

This study adopted Hofstede’s model. The role of national culture on gender inequality has received considerable attention partly because of the seminar work of Hofstede on cultural dimensions. The focus on national culture as a major variable in gender inequality research has been primarily guided and inspired by the now classic work of Hofstede (1980), although there is already a vibrant literature on culture and organizational behavior prior to the popularity of cultural dimensions (Bhagat & McQuaid, 1982). Hofstede identified four major dimensions of culture in his framework: Individualism-collectivism, power distance, uncertainty avoidance, and masculinity-femininity. Hofstede’s study confirms that national
culture has a great influence on the work values (Hofstede2001). His dimensions of national culture, determined for 53 countries and regions of the world was led by the number of quotes and by importance in the field of cross-cultural management (Sondergaard, 1994). The basis of the model is the research conducted among employees of IBM on a sample of 60,000 workers in the period 1967-1969. The inclusion of the results of other authors who have used an identical methodology produced a sample that includes 71 countries and three regions. The extension of the model with the original four-dimensional culture of the society got one extra dimension.

Database eliminates the differences that arise as the impact of corporate policies and procedures because of the impact of various strategies. Therefore any variation between countries can be reliably attributed to national culture. Hofstede also found that employees and managers vary according to the following dimensions of national culture:

- **Power distance** represents the degree of inequality in the distribution of power within societies to be considered socially acceptable, and is derived from the fact that power in institutions and organizations is not evenly distributed (Hofstede, 2001). Societies with high power distance accept large differences in power within the organization, staff show great respect for those who have the power, and the title, rank and status have considerable weight. Countries with high power distance are considered to be Philippines, Venezuela and India. On the other hand, companies with low power distance strive to minimize the inequalities. Denmark, Israel and Austria are very low on the list of the countries with low power distance.

- **Uncertainty avoidance** dimension measures “the extent to which the members of a culture feel threatened by uncertain and unknown situations”. Uncertainty avoidance indicates the extent to which a society feels threatened by ambiguous situations and the extent to which a society tries to avoid these situations by adopting strict codes of behaviour, a belief in the absolute truths, establishing formal rules, and not tolerating deviant ideas and actions. Individuals with high uncertainty avoidance are concerned with security in life, feel a greater need for consensus and written rules, less likely to take risks while individuals in low uncertainty a avoidance societies are less concerned with security, rules, and they are more risk tolerant (Hofstede, 1990).

- **Individualism** refers to societies in which the ties between individuals are poor and individual are expected to look after themselves and their immediate families, while collectivism refers to societies in which people from birth include the strong cohesive groups that are protected throughout their life in exchange for guaranteed loyalty. Hofstede has noted that the degree of individualism in a country complies the wealth of the country (Hofstede, 2001). Rich countries like the U.S., Great Britain, Holland, etc. are very high on the list of individualism, while poor countries like Columbia, Pakistan and Taiwan are highly collectivistic. Similarly, Hofstede has come to another interesting conclusion: countries with a high degree of individualism are more inclined to the Protestant ethic, individual initiative and progress to the market shift. Countries with low level of individualism are less prone to the Protestant ethic, show less individual initiative.

- **Masculinity** refers to a society in which one can clearly observe the social roles by gender (Hofstede, 2001). Men are expected to be assertive, tough and focused on material success, while the women are expected to be modest, gentle and concentrated on quality of life. Femininity refers to a society in which gender roles overlap, and that of the women and men are expected to be humble, gentle, and focused on quality of life (Hofstede, 2005). Hofstede found that Japan was the highest ranking countries in the ranking, while the lowest-ranking were Nordic countries and the Netherlands. Countries that are highly ranked as so-called “male societies” pay attention to making money, status, benefits and challenges. Individuals are encouraged to be independent decision-making, and achievements are measured in terms of the recognition of the status and wealth. Jobs are often characterized as associated with high stress, and a large number of managers believe that their employees do not like job, and therefore must be kept under some degree of control. Countries that ranked low on the scale of “male societies” put a greater weight on the element of cooperation, a friendly atmosphere and the safety of employees. Individuals are encouraged to become full partners in the decision-making group, and achievements are measured in terms of improving the living and working environments. Just position is characterized as a place of low stress
levels, and managers allow employees a greater degree of autonomy for their responsibilities, as well as a greater degree of freedom. Dimensions can be compared using a two-dimensional matrix. The integration of cultural factors in the two-dimensional image helps illustrate the complexity, and explain the impact of culture on behaviour. Unfortunately, the matrix cannot serve as a safe pattern of the behaviour of members of these cultural entities. The fact is that societies with high power distance should be less individualistic and vice versa, but the behaviour of individual members in such a multicultural environment due to the influence of other factors may differ significantly from the behaviour that explain by Hofstede’s matrix.

The fifth dimension of long-term vs. short-term orientation was added later (Hofstede, 1984), and refers to the degree of orientation of the society in the past or the future. Long-term orientation is characterized by the virtues of focusing on future rewards, in particular perseverance and thrift, while the short-term orientation focuses on the past and present, and is characterized by the expectation of quick results, high consumption and low savings (Hofstede 2001).

Numerous studies have employed his framework to examine diverse organizational issues (Kirkman, Lowe, & Gibson, 2006), ranging from the choice of entry mode (Kogut& Singh, 1988), cultural differences in the popularity of internet shopping (Lim, Leung, Sia, & Lee, 2004), the popularity of employee assistance programs (Bhagat, Steverson, & Segovis, 2007), intercultural negotiation (Brett & Okumura, 1998) to foreign-local employee relationships (Ang, Van Dyne, & Begley, 2003).

While Hofstede’s framework is obviously important and influential, there are constant pleads for the development of novel constructs to advance our understanding of culture and gender inequality (Leung, Bhagat, Buchan, Erez, & Gibson, 2005). The objective of this study is to review the development of cultural frameworks in the arena of global management since Hofstede’s (1980) monumental work, explore how the cultural perspective can augment the institutional perspective, a popular approach for understanding firm differences across cultures, and identify fruitful directions for future research on culture and global management.

2.2 Empirical Review

Out and Nkamare (2012) investigated the effect of gender issues on the development of the girl child in community in Port Harcourt Rivers State Nigeria. Descriptive survey research design was employed. A total of a hundred and twenty (120) girls within the age range of 12 – 18 years were randomly selected from a population of over one thousand two hundred girls in Ogbunabali community’. A questionnaire was administered to respondents and responses retrieved. Data collected was presented using pie chart, histogram and graphs and were analyzed using statistical package for social sciences (SPSS). Ninety three percent (93%) of the respondents agreed that gender issues have negative effects on the development of the girl child physically, educationally, politically and psychosocially in the society especially in the Ogbunabali community were a high value is placed on the boy child. Hence formal education of the girl child will go a long way in redution the resolve of gender issues which have a negative effect on the girl child in Ogbunabali community.

Duc and Skitmore (2002) examined the impact of culture on international management in Project Communications in Singapore. This paper provides the results of an exploratory survey of construction industry managers in Singapore to isolate some of the common effects of national and organisational culture, together with the personal characteristics of managers, on the efficacy of project communication. By examination of significant correlation coefficients, the various types of influences are identified. The results of the research suggest that the managers’ attitude and behaviours toward communication may be guided to large extent by their level of competence. The study also provides evidence to suggest that the individuals’ understanding of the communication process and its barriers, the way they behave with other individuals and expect to be treated, varies according to national cultures.

Reus and Lamont (2009) carried out a research on the topic “The Double-Edged Sword of Cultural Distance in International Acquisitions”. They views cultural distance as a mixed blessing, because while it may increase the potential for learning when integration capabilities are in place, it also impedes the development of these integration capabilities. Their findings indicate that the “pro view” of acquisitions,
which emphasizes the role of integration capabilities, is relevant in understanding international acquisition performance. The findings indicate that international acquisition performance is in large part a function of the development and application of understandability, communication, and key employee retention during acquisition integration.

Banu-Gomez (2014) examined the role of culture, language and ethics in global business. The researcher utilize local primary sources and the library’s vast secondary sources. The study found that understanding other countries’ culture, ethics and language are invaluable to creating a successful business internationally. The study noted that these three aspects are the learning foundation of entering a foreign market and without them there will be no way to succeed. It takes time and commitment for a company to learn and understand the culture, ethics, and language of a potential country. The study also noted that businesses need to realize that it takes more than a good speaker or savvy manager to compete in global business. Companies need to successfully understand three important aspects of business before they enter a foreign market.

Hutzschenreuter and Voll (2008) examined the performance effects of “added cultural distance” in the path of international expansion in German multinational enterprises. The results showed that it is not international expansion per se that negatively affects profitability, but rather the complexity arising from added cultural distance. They found out that the irregularity in the level of cultural distance taken on by expansion moves within a given period of time, and has a negative influence on performance. Firms that take on the same amount of additional complexity each period perform better than those with an unbalanced expansion rhythm.

Tihanyi, Griffith and Russell (2005) carried out a meta-analysis of the effect of cultural distance on entry mode choice, international diversification, and MNE performance. They concluded that cultural distance is not directly related to the three key constructs of entry mode choice, international diversification, and MNE performance. There was a strong negative association between cultural distance and entry mode choice for US-based MNEs. The cultural distance-international diversification relationship was negative for high-technology industries, while it was positive for other industries. Cultural distance also had a strong positive effect on MNE performance for developed country investments. A similar, strong positive relationship was found between cultural distance and international diversification in studies with more recent samples.

Diwakar (2012) examined cross-cultural diversity issues and challenges in global organizations. The aim of this study was to find out some effective solutions to manage effectively the cross cultural aspect of human resources for the success of global business. The study found that organizations’ ability to attract, retain, and motivate people from diverse cultural backgrounds, may lead to competitive advantages in cost structures and through maintaining the highest quality human resources. The study noted that multicultural workforce is becoming the norm and to achieve organizational goals and avoid potential risks, the managers should be culturally sensitive and promote creativity and motivation through flexible leadership.

Bjorkman, Günter and Eero (2007) examined the mediating roles of capability complementarity in capacity, cultural differences and capability transfer in cross-border acquisitions. They proposed that cultural differences can be both an asset and a liability. Cultural differences can be beneficial because they may enhance the combination potential, but can also create obstacles to reaping integration benefits by exacerbating social integration problems and diminishing the acquired and acquiring firms’ capacity to absorb capabilities from the other party. Thus the execution of a well-designed integration process that enhances the organizations’ capacity to acquire and assimilate new capabilities, while minimizing interpersonal and intercultural friction is critical to capturing synergies.

Ivete and Roberto (2013) examined the cultural challenges of managing global project teams using Brazilian multinationals. The study aims to determine how Brazilian multinationals manage project teams before the global cultural impact. The study also sought to understand in the light of cultural diversity, the process of managing global project teams in Brazilian multinationals in the context of high and low cultural distance. To achieve the objective of this study, qualitative data obtained from interviews with managers of six global projects were used. The data analysis methods employed include individual
analysis of each case; analysis of the cross-cases; literal replication and theoretical replication. The data presented indicate that there is still little concrete concern with the issue of multiculturalism. Although the project managers recognize, even intuitively, that the cultural characteristics of individuals can affect performance. Thus, intercultural knowledge is not internalized by the organization, depending on the experience of executives who are predisposed to work abroad.

3. Methodology
The research adopts the survey method. This approach is a research method that studies people or objects, their attitudes, belief system, opinions and other behavioral manifestations. The population of the study was 350. The entire population was used sample size (350). The instrument for data collection was the questionnaire. Face and content validity were used. The reliability instrument (questionnaires) was used for data collection.

The need to enhance easy comprehension and analysis prompted the use of the frequency distribution table to present the data gathered. The tools used in analyzing the data collected include simple percentages, descriptive statistics and correlation analysis. The study also employed Multiple Regression Analysis (MRA) method to determine managing culture on gender inequality. The regression model is represented as:

\[ Y = \alpha + \beta_1X_1 + \beta_2X_2 + \beta_3X_3 + \beta_nX_n + \epsilon \]

Where:
- \( Y \) = Gender Inequality (GBM)
- \( \alpha \) = Constant Term
- \( \beta \) = Beta coefficients
- \( X_1 \) = Power Distance (PD)
- \( X_2 \) = Uncertainty Avoidance (UA)
- \( X_3 \) = Degree of Individualism (DI)
- \( X_4 \) = Degree of Masculinity (DM)
- \( \epsilon \) = Error Term

4. Data Presentation and Analysis
The data generated from the employees of the sampled multinational companies were presented, analyzed and interpreted in this chapter. A total of three hundred and fifty copies of the questionnaires were distributed to the respondents, out of which three hundred and eleven were properly filled and found relevant to the study. Therefore, the analysis in this chapter was based on the three hundred and eleven relevant copies.

4.1 Descriptive Analysis
This section presents the descriptive statistics on culture and gender inequality. The aim of the analysis is to examine the performance of the culture variables in relation to gender inequality. The analysis of the individual characteristics of these variables is presented in the table below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender Inequality</td>
<td>20.28</td>
<td>3.330</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Power Distance</td>
<td>17.82</td>
<td>4.255</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uncertainty Avoidance</td>
<td>17.86</td>
<td>3.697</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Degree of Individualism</td>
<td>18.27</td>
<td>4.109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Degree of Masculinity</td>
<td>18.78</td>
<td>4.264</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Author’s Compilation From SPSS Version 21.0
This table presents the summary of statistics used in the analysis. It provides information about the mean and standard deviation of the variables used in the study. The mean value for gender inequality is 20.28 while the standard deviation is 3.330. Power distance and Uncertainty avoidance recorded mean values of 17.82 and 17.86 with a standard deviation of 4.255 and 43.697 respectively. Degree of individualism and degree of masculinity have mean values of 18.27 and 18.78 with standard deviation of 4.109 and 4.264 respectively.

4.2 Correlation Analysis

Here, Pearson’s correlation was employed to measure the strength and relationship between independent variables. The Pearson’s product moment correlation coefficient is a measure of the strength of a linear association between two variables and is denoted by r. Table 4.3 below depicts a summary of the correlation coefficient.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>GIN</th>
<th>PD</th>
<th>UA</th>
<th>DM</th>
<th>DI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gender Inequality</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.141*</td>
<td>.049</td>
<td>.216**</td>
<td>.290**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td></td>
<td>.013</td>
<td>.388</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>311</td>
<td>311</td>
<td>311</td>
<td>311</td>
<td>311</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Power Distance</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>.141*</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-.247**</td>
<td>-.049</td>
<td>.024</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.013</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.394</td>
<td>.672</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>311</td>
<td>311</td>
<td>311</td>
<td>311</td>
<td>311</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Uncertainty Avoidance</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>.049</td>
<td>-.247**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-.020</td>
<td>-.075</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.388</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.728</td>
<td>.189</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>311</td>
<td>311</td>
<td>311</td>
<td>311</td>
<td>311</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Degree of Masculinity</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>.216**</td>
<td>-.049</td>
<td>-.020</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.075</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.394</td>
<td>.728</td>
<td>.189</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>311</td>
<td>311</td>
<td>311</td>
<td>311</td>
<td>311</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Degree of Individuality</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>.290**</td>
<td>.024</td>
<td>-.075</td>
<td>.075</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.114</td>
<td>.672</td>
<td>.189</td>
<td>.189</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>311</td>
<td>311</td>
<td>311</td>
<td>311</td>
<td>311</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*. Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).
**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

Source: Author’s Compilation From SPSS Version 21.0

The table above shows the extent of association between the dependent and independent variables used in the study. The correlation coefficient between power distance and Gender inequality shows the value of 0.141 which is statistically significant at 0.01 level of significance. This indicates that power distance has a positive moderate relationship with gender inequality. Uncertainty avoidance recorded a correlation coefficient of 0.049 with gender inequality and this is statistically insignificant. This shows that uncertainty avoidance has weak relationship with gender inequality.

Furthermore, the correlation between degree of masculinity and gender inequality recorded a correlation coefficient of 0.216 which is statistically significant at 0.05 level of significance. This indicates that degree of masculinity has a strong relationship with gender Inequality. Also, degree of individuality recorded a
correlation coefficient of -0.290 with gender inequality. This shows that degree of individuality has a strong relationship with gender inequality.

4.3 Multiple Regression Analysis

Multiple regression result was employed to test the imperativeness of culture on gender inequality. The result of the multiple regression analysis is presented in the tables below.

**Table 4.4 Summary of the Regression Result**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>R Square</th>
<th>Adjusted R Square</th>
<th>Std. Error of the Estimate</th>
<th>Durbin-Watson</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>.286&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>.682</td>
<td>.570</td>
<td>3.212</td>
<td>1.767</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Predictors: (Constant), Degree of Masculinity, Uncertainty Avoidance, Degree of Individuality, Power Distance

b. Dependent Variable: Gender Inequality

Source: SPSS Version 21.0

Table 4.4 shows that $R^2$ which measures the strength of the effect of independent variable on the dependent variable has a value of 0.682. This implies that 68% of the variation in gender inequality is explained by variations in degree of masculinity, uncertainty avoidance, degree of individuality, power distance. This is supported by adjusted $R^2$ of 0.570.

In order to check for autocorrelation in the model, Durbin-Watson statistics was employed. Durbin-Watson statistics of 1.767 in table 4.4 shows that the variables in the model are not autocorrelated and that the model is reliable for predcitions.

**Table 4.5: ANOVA Result**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Regression</td>
<td>281.805</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>70.451</td>
<td>6.830</td>
<td>.000&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Residual</td>
<td>306</td>
<td>10.315</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>3438.219</td>
<td>310</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Dependent Variable: Gender Inequality

b. Predictors: (Constant), Degree of Masculinity, Uncertainty Avoidance, Degree of Individuality, Power Distance

Source: SPSS Version 21.0

The f-statistics value of 6.830 in table 4.5 with f-statistics probability of 0.000 shows that the independent variables has significant relationship with the dependent variable. This shows that degree of masculinity, uncertainty avoidance, degree of individuality, power distance can collectively explain the variations in Gender inequalityin the selected multinational companies.
Table 4.6 Coefficients of the Model

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Unstandardized Coefficients</th>
<th>Standardized Coefficients</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Std. Error</td>
<td>Beta</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>18.325</td>
<td>1.834</td>
<td></td>
<td>9.994</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Power Distance</td>
<td>.118</td>
<td>.044</td>
<td>.151</td>
<td>2.660</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uncertainty Avoidance</td>
<td>.081</td>
<td>.051</td>
<td>.090</td>
<td>1.591</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Degree of Individuality</td>
<td>.091</td>
<td>.046</td>
<td>.109</td>
<td>2.980</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Degree of Masculinity</td>
<td>.174</td>
<td>.045</td>
<td>.215</td>
<td>3.908</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Dependent Variable: Gender Inequality
Source: SPSS Version 21.0

Table 4.6 shows the coefficient of the individual variables and their probability values. Power distance has regression coefficient of 0.118 with a probability value of 0.008. This implies that Power distance is imperative in Gender Inequality in Nigeria. Uncertainty avoidance has a regression coefficient of 0.081 with a probability value of 0.113 implying that the level of uncertainty avoidance does not affect Gender Inequality in Nigeria.

Furthermore, degree of individuality has a regression coefficient of 0.091 with a probability value of 0.049. This implies that the level of individualism is not imperative in Gender Inequality in Nigeria. On a similar note, degree of masculinity has a coefficient value of 0.174 and a probability value of 0.000. This shows that the degree of masculinity affects gender inequality in Nigeria.

4.4 Test of Hypotheses

Here, the four hypotheses formulated in chapter one were tested using t-statistics and significance value of the individual variables in the regression result. The essence of this is to ascertain the significance of the effect of individual independent or explanatory variables on the dependent variables. The summary of the result is presented in the table below.

Table 4.7 T-Statistics and Probability Value from the Regression Result

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Independent Variables</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>9.994</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Power Distance</td>
<td>2.660</td>
<td>.008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uncertainty Avoidance</td>
<td>1.591</td>
<td>.113</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Degree of Individuality</td>
<td>2.980</td>
<td>.041</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Degree of Masculinity</td>
<td>3.908</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.4.1 Test of Hypothesis One
Ho: Power distance has no significant effect on gender inequality in Nigeria.
Hi: Power distance has a significant effect on gender inequality in Nigeria.
In testing this hypothesis, the t-statistics and probability value in Table 4.7 was used. Power distance has a t-statistics of 2.980 and a probability value of 0.041 which is statistically significant. Therefore, we reject the null hypothesis and accept the alternative hypothesis which states that power distance has a significant effect on gender inequality in Nigeria.

4.4.2 Test of Hypothesis Two
Ho: Uncertainty avoidance has no significant influence on gender inequality in Nigeria.
Hi: The level of uncertainty avoidance has a significant influence on gender inequality in Nigeria.
Level of uncertainty avoidance has a t-statistics of 1.591 and a probability value of 0.113 which is statistically insignificant. Therefore, we accept the null hypothesis and reject the alternative hypotheses which state that the level of uncertainty avoidance has no significant influence on gender inequality in Nigeria.

4.4.3 Test of Hypothesis Three
Ho: Individualism has no significant influence on gender inequality in Nigeria.
Hi: Individualism has a significant influence on gender inequality in Nigeria.
Individualism has a t-statistics of 2.980 and a probability value of 0.041 which is statistically significant. Therefore, we reject the null hypothesis and accept the alternative hypothesis which states that the degree of individualism has a significant influence on gender inequality in Nigeria.

4.4.4 Test of Hypothesis Four
Ho: Masculinity has no significant effect on gender inequality in Nigeria.
Hi: Masculinity has a significant effect on gender inequality in Nigeria.
Masculinity has a t-statistics of 3.908 and a probability value of 0.000 which is statistically significant. Therefore, we reject the null hypothesis and accept the alternative hypothesis and conclude that masculinity has no significant influence on gender inequality in Nigeria.

5. Summary of Findings
a. Power distance has a significant effect on Gender inequality in Nigeria
b. Individualism has a significant influence on gender inequality in Nigeria.
c. Uncertainty avoidance has no significant influence on gender inequality in Nigeria.
d. Individualism has a significant effect on Gender inequality in Nigeria
e. Masculinity has no significant effect on Gender inequality in Nigeria

6. Conclusion
This study examined the effect of culture on gender inequality in Nigeria. The study found that power distance and individualism have a significant effect on gender inequality in Nigeria. While uncertainty avoidance and masculinity have no significant influence on gender inequality in Nigeria. Therefore, the study concludes that in Nigeria.
7. Recommendations
The study therefore recommends that
a. Power distance in cultural and traditional practices, which may tend to enhance gender inequality in Nigeria should be discouraged at all levels.

b. The government should promulgate law against Individualism that hinder the gender equality at all levels.
c. There should be no rule of masculinity in culture and tradition in all aspects of life in Nigeria. This implies that the ratio of culture to equity should be 50 females to 50 males at all levels.
d. Government (federal, state and local) should promulgate laws against culture and tradition on inequality against uncertainty avoidance.
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