

Re-Testing Hertzberg Hygiene Model on Rural Workers of Local Councils in Rivers State, Nigeria

Dr Patrick N Nwinyokpugi

Department of Office and Information management, Rivers State University of Science and Technology. Port Harcourt, Nigeria

**Corresponding Author: Dr Patrick N Nwinyokpugi, Department of Office and Information management, Rivers State University of Science and Technology. Port Harcourt, Nigeria*

ABSTRACT

This study took an exploratory survey approach on the local government councils in Rivers State. Local council administration have same characteristics across the country in terms of administration, finance and motivation etc, therefore, three councils of Ogu Bolo, Okirika and Ikwere Local Government Areas were conveniently chosen because of proximity and accessibility. The population of this study consists of all staff of the Local Government Councils in Rivers State. The sample size (361) drawn from the total population using YaroYaemini sample determination formula. 361 (100%) questionnaire copies were administered out of which 262 (73%) successful retrieval was made. After a cleaning exercise which was meant to assure the validity of the retrieved instruments, 10 (3%) were rendered invalid and not suitable for use as a result of blank incidences. Therefore, 252 (70%) represents the sample for the study. Findings from the analysis lead to the recommendations that confirm through a high confidence interval the existence of significant relationships between the dimensions of the predictor and the measures of the criterion variable. Therefore, the hygiene factors are strongly recommended as motivational strategies for local council employees' commitment to work in Rivers State, Nigeria.

Keywords: *Hygiene Factors, Salary, Work Environment, Status, Loyalty, Employee Commitment*

INTRODUCTION

Motivation could be seen as that driving force that triggers an individual or individuals into action or doing things ordinarily they would not do. It could also mean anything that provides direction, intensity, and persistence to behavior. (Kanfer, 1990). Motivation explains why people behave the way they do and advise a factor or strategy which when adopted or employed can get the best out of employees in terms of their commitment to work. Nevertheless, due to the complex issues involved in motivating people no two people are motivated same way, thus, it is not always easy in motivating workers to enhance their commitment, responsiveness and loyalty to the organization. Vroom and Deci (1970) put it: "The question of what motivates workers to perform effectively is not an easy one to answer". Indeed, a motive is something, which impels a person to act, a reason for behavior. Much attention has been drawn to how employees in the rural area commit themselves to the organization and their job. It is believed that the local government in Nigeria is an institution for the old and unskilled because they believe that

unmotivated employees constitute the work force. Though these employees are been recognized by the organization, they tend to be promoted when due, the climate of the organization are by a standard favorable, and also there is high rate of achievement and advancement, yet these employees tend not to be committed, loyal and most especially not been responsive to the job. They come to work anytime they deem necessary, they become slow in operation, and even when they do the job, they do it without the zeal to work, and as a result, the productivity of local council tends to be a debatable concern. It is based on this premise that this study beams an empirical lens on local council workforce motivation, looking at it from the first instance assumption of Fredrick Herzberg as it addresses the hygiene model.

TWO FACTOR THEORY

Herzberg conducted a study on the job attitudes for 203 accountants and engineers. The participants were asked to recall when they had felt positive or negative at work and the reasons why. The findings indicated that the job

characteristics were related to what an individual does and to the nature of the work that a person performs. Motivation factors did appear to have the capacity to increase the sense of achievement, competency, personal growth, self-realization and status. However, the absence of such gratifying job characteristics does not appear to lead to de-motivation or dissatisfaction. Instead, dissatisfaction results from unfavorable assessments of such job related factors as job security, status, salary, and the overall working conditions. Unlike the traditional view of dissatisfaction and satisfaction, they are not in a continuum. They are two continua and are independent from each other. Herzberg (1966) identified motivators as factors that drive enthusiasm in employees to do better. When they exist, motivation factors can help to actively create job satisfaction. If they are effective, they can motivate an individual to achieve an above average effort, or performance. Motivators include; challenging and stimulating work, gaining recognition, opportunity for advancement, responsibility, status, a sense of personal achievement, and personal growth in the job. Hygiene factors were identified as factors that prevented job dissatisfaction. The fulfillment of hygiene factors did not make an employee happy or satisfied; it just removed the unhappiness from the work environment. So, if hygiene factors are not satisfaction driven, an employee's commitment will usually decrease. Hygiene factors are based on the need for an organization to avoid unpleasantness within the working environment.

If these factors are considered inadequate by an employee, it causes dissatisfaction. Some typical hygiene factors include: company policy and administration, feelings of job security, financial remuneration (salary/wages), and working conditions. With this, conclusion was drawn from these findings that job satisfaction and dissatisfaction are not opposites. According to Herzberg, the factors leading to job satisfaction are separate and distinct from those that lead to job dissatisfaction. Therefore, if you set about eliminating dissatisfying job factors, we may create peace but not necessarily enhance performance instead of motivating them to performance. The characteristics associated with job satisfaction are called Hygiene factors. When these have been adequately addressed, people will not be dissatisfied nor will they be

satisfied. If we want to motivate a team, then you have to focus on satisfying factors like achievement, recognition and advancement etc. The controversy that triggers the research on local council workers in Rivers State is obvious on ideal motivation index that is expected, given the observed high rate of turnover, poor job attitude, not being committed to the job and also high sense of irresponsiveness to work. We have also noted the high presence of those motivators on the second instance assumption of Herzberg, such as recognition, advancement, achievement work climate and also promoting team work, yet we observed that these workers are still not motivated because they still come to work at will, turnover rate is high, and absenteeism is also high.

LITERATURE

Herzberg continued to publish articles supporting the two-factor theory for the two decades following the original publication of his research. In 1965, Herzberg replicated his original study with lower level supervisors in Finland. His findings in this study supported his original findings and provided cross-cultural validation of the two-factor theory. During the same time period, the Sociological Research Laboratory at the University of Leningrad was conducting the first empirical investigation of job motivation in the Soviet Union and Herzberg published two journal articles about this study (Herzberg, 1965). This study sampled 2665 workers in a variety of heavy and light industries. The researchers concluded that the most effective and important attitudinal factor for effective job performance is satisfaction with the kind of work. This conclusion agrees with Herzberg's identification of the work itself as a motivational factor in his original study. Other scholars employed Herzberg's methods in order to test some of the criticisms of the two-factor theory. Their results were similar to Herzberg's and others who had replicated his study, but they found that they could not accurately predict individual responses to favorable and unfavorable sequences by applying the two-factor theory in this way. Due to the complex nature of salary in Herzberg's original findings, Macarov (1972) found value in studying the two-factor theory in an environment in which salary is not and cannot be a factor. In their book, 'Understanding and Managing Organizational Behavior', George and Jones (2005) highlighted on the attention Frederick Herzberg paid to motivator needs and

to work itself, as determinants of job satisfaction. They therefore entreated managers to pay special attention to the important topic of job design and its effect on organizational behavior and employee motivation. They advised managers to concentrate on designing jobs that would create job enlargement and enrichment thereby increasing the number of tasks an employee performs, increasing employee's responsibility and control over the work. By so doing, managers would be serving the motivator needs of employees as postulated by Herzberg. Some behavioral scientists have sought to invalidate Frederick Herzberg's motivation-hygiene, claiming it lack of empirical support. One of those scientists is King (2005). In his book; 'Clarification and Evaluation of the Two-factor Theory' which appeared in the Psychological Bulletin. He sought to explicate and evaluate five distinct versions of the two-factor theory of job satisfaction. He concluded that two of these versions are invalid as they are not supported by any empirical studies. He claimed that the other versions were also invalid as their alleged empirical support merely reflects e-coding biases. Hackman and Oldham (2006) also criticized Herzberg's theory by suggesting that Herzberg's original formulation of the model may have been a methodological artifact. They further explained that the theory does not consider individual differences, conversely predicting all employees will react in an identical manner to changes in motivating-hygiene factors. Furthermore, Hackman and Oldham (2006) raised the concern that Herzberg's theory did not specify how motivation and hygiene factors are to be measured. While some behavioral scientist raised issues with the Critical Incident Technique used by Herzberg in collecting data as inappropriate, others such as Bellot and Tutor (2000) had problems with the type of employees used. This research concerns are that these affirmative studies are done in developed economies where the physiological needs as listed by Maslow are already irrelevant in the motivational index of the people. However, the position on the study within the underdeveloped and developing African work setting is yet to be put to test.

THE CASE OF NIGERIA

Some managers in African organizations particularly Nigeria, perhaps because of societal norms and expectations emphasize bureaucratic practices with total reliance on rules and regulations that workers obey without questioning or offering

constructive criticisms. This culture is prevalent in the Nigerian civil and public sectors. The bureaucratic practice creates an impersonal organizational climate, often not conducive to the achievement of organizational goals. This leads to the employees working as robots and following rules and regulations without taking initiatives of their own. This impersonal and mechanistic environment, according to Kipp (2006), alienates workers from both their jobs and the organizations. Consequently, worker behavior as a result of this is often directed towards meeting their personal needs instead of those of the organization. Furthermore, managers, engaged in these bureaucratic practices, are often more interested in exercising absolute power over their employees than in working towards organizational goals and objectives through their employees. In the assumption of Jaeger and Kanungo (2000), managers have patronizing attitudes towards their employees, criticize them openly, maintain a certain psychological and physical distance from them, and use a legal, rigid and coercive style of management. Employees who work under such organizations or environments are often not motivated to do their work; they feel powerless, reluctant, demeaned and unable to take initiative of their own.

The African worker is often portrayed as content with just having employment of any kind rather than facing the threat of hunger from unemployment. In as much as the African worker and for that matter the Nigerian is much interested in getting employment for survival, it is important for managers in Nigerian organizations to note that employees can be well motivated to work without being perceived as driven purely by the financial benefits that are to be gained because of the work they do. However, this will require an understanding of the needs and strategies that will unleash the total commitment of workers in pursuing organizational objectives. Another issue that affects the Nigerian worker is job security, an example of the hygiene factor. Nigerian employees would normally do everything possible to secure their jobs. As earlier stated, the Nigerian employee is saddled with bread and butter issues and therefore job security means survival to most employees. Furthermore, there is generally the perception that most Nigerian employees

prefer working in the public sector than the private. This is not coincidental because most Nigerian workers hold the view that in the private sector lifetime work is not guaranteed which therefore becomes a threat to job security. Money and job security are two key factors in Frederick Herzberg's two-factor theory and looking at the Nigerian experience, it is not unreasonable to suggest that hygiene factors play a major role in motivating Nigerian workers. It is however worth emphasizing that in as much as it appears, the Nigerian employee is more concerned with wages and job security and hence the hygiene factors, the motivators also play a role in employee motivation, although they may not be the dominant motivator in the Nigerian situation.

SALARY

Salary is a fixed amount of money or compensation paid to an employee by an employer in return for work performed. Salary is paid, most frequently, in a bi-weekly paycheck to an exempt or professional employee, for employees in most contexts, salary is paid monthly. The hourly computation of efforts is spread across the working days of the month. An employee who is paid a salary is expected to complete a whole job in return for the salary. This is different from a non-exempt employee who is paid an hourly rate or by the piece produced. Basic salary is a fixed periodical payment for non-manual employees usually expressed in annual terms, paid per month with generally no additions for productivity. Wage refers to payment to manual workers, always calculated on hourly or piece rates. (Braton & Gold, 2003). Bohan (2004) explains that traditional pay systems were based on the three factors: (i) the job, (ii) maintaining the level of equality in standard pay among employees in the organization, and (iii) to stay competitive. In the traditional pay systems, employees were not encouraged to acquire new skills and were not rewarded if they did. Increase of an employee's pay depended on change on the cost of living and employees regarded the increase in pay as entitlement without accounting for their own performance, or that of the organization. This meant on one hand that an employee's salary increase did not in any way change his or her attitude to work such that he or she could put more effort to influence the total output in order

to cater for the increase, and on the other hand increase of pay boosted the worker's economic freedom while negating the need to increase the organization's volume of production. It also meant that a worker was likely to increase his skills of the job but the skills accumulated slowly such that skills to be acquired were limited thereby leading to redundancy and monotony of work. Shields (2007) views basic pay as an important part of total pay that is fixed and mainly time-based, rather than performance-based. Basic pay is the largest fraction of the total pay for non-executive employees. It also acts as a benchmark for other cash incentives such as profit sharing, which is expressed as a percentage of basic pay. Basic pay helps to attract and retain employees. Employees use basic pay to compare their job offers instead of using intrinsic rewards and other rewards not captured in the formal organizational framework up to including job security. In a competitive market, organizations pay above the market rates to retain their employees. Pay indicates the value that the employer puts on the work performed by its employees. Employees are fixed into believing that this the reward of their efforts called work and are contented with getting them in exchange for their efforts. Employees are paid depending on the skills and competencies that they possess, and not what the job is worth. It is employees who have market value, and not jobs. Skills based pay is a payment method in which pay progression is linked to the number and depth of skills that individuals develop and use. It is paying for horizontal acquisition of skills and the vertical development of skills needed to operate at a higher level by undertaking a wider range of tasks. The emphasis on skills development is necessitated by rapid developments in technology and changing manufacturing methods that require flexibility (Stuart, 2011).

JOB SECURITY

Job security can be defined as protection against job loss. This is and will probably be a big concern for the individual. One of the reasons that individuals join the organization is precisely this moment. Job security often implies security of a job within a particular organization and job security related to an individual's career. Researches have shown that job security induces organizational commitment of workers. Davy, Kinicki and Scheck (1997) discovered that job

security is significantly related to employee commitment. Lambert (1991) views job security as an extrinsic comfort that has a positive relation with workers' commitment and performance. Iverson (1996) reported that job security has a significant impact on organizational commitment. However, Rosenblatt and Ruvio (1996) reported in their study that organizational commitment and job performance negatively correlate with job insecurity. These positions are in agreement with the research by Guest (2004) who posited that low job security and working conditions had adverse effect on employees' commitment and job satisfaction. However, Khan, Nawaz, Aleem and Hamed (2012) in their studies found that job safety and security significantly relate to commitment and performance. This finding was supported by the research finding of Abdullah and Ramay (2012) who, in their study reported a significant positive relationship between job security and organizational commitment of employees. This certifies that job security induces employee commitment in any work situation. In other words, employees who perceive threat of job security may become less committed to the organization they are working for and may decide to quit the job. Thus, satisfaction with job security is positively correlated with both organizational commitment and job performance (Yousef, 1998). Researches has also proved that employees loyalty and responsiveness is a predictor of organizational commitment Although, Kalleberg and Mastekaasa (2002) reported a non-significant relationship between job satisfaction and commitment, Tett and Meyer (1993) showed that a satisfaction-to-commitment model assumes that satisfaction is a cause of commitment. This assumption is supported by the work of Bull (2005) who reported a significant relationship between job satisfaction and organizational commitment. Employee job satisfaction can be categorized into intrinsic and extrinsic satisfaction. Intrinsic satisfaction is related to job content and include tools like, work itself, recognition, achievement and promotion (Akpan, 2007). Extrinsic satisfaction originates from outside the job and is related to the job environment and includes pay, allowances, working conditions etc. Aryee (1994) reported that job satisfaction enhances job involvement because job satisfaction stimulates greater involvement with the job and as such satisfaction with the job enhances the importance of work identity. However, care must be taken on the internal triggers because no one can just be satisfied without some hidden indicators.

STATUS

Status is a key issue emphasized by research, especially in recent years, it is the extent to which employees perceive they are able to achieve the right balance between home and work. Organizations are beginning to recognize this, and are making more concerted efforts to introduce a host of programmes intended to ease employees' burdens. These include initiative such as: flexible work arrangements; child care; time off policies; elderly care; healthcare; information and counseling; and convenience services to name but a few. Status in the workplace affects their turnover decisions. The evidence suggests that workers have different preferences for status depending on reference group. When compared with co-workers in the same occupation, workers positively value their status. However, when compared with workers in other occupations in the same firm, workers negatively value their status. Workers seem to give up absolute wage increase for higher status within occupation, which suggests that preference for status stems from status' social value, not from its instrumental value for future income. One of the most basic social phenomena is that people compare their circumstances and attributes with those of others. For example, they may compare their wage, authority, or beauty, with that of co-workers, neighbors, and friends. The perceived relative standings, called status, can lead to frustration or satisfaction, which in turn can affect job performance and turnovers. Early social scientists were quite willing to see status as an intrinsically valued social resource (Veblen 1899; Weber 1964). Similarly, Emerson (1962, 1972) viewed status recognition as an "ego-reward," a highly valued (emotional) good that could be given by a lower-powered partner in an exchange to increase the higher-powered partner's "emotional investment" and make the power balance more equal.

WORK CONDITION

Many scholars have attempted conceptualizing the working environment. Perhaps it may be defined in its simplest form as the settings, situations, conditions and circumstances under which people work. It is further elaborated by Briner, (2000) as a very broad category that encompasses the physical setting (e.g. heat, equipment's etc.), characteristics of the job itself (e.g. workload, task complexity), broader organizational features (e.g. culture, history) and even aspects of the extra organizational setting (e.g. local labor market conditions, industry

sector, work-home relationships). It means that work environment is the sum of the interrelationship that exists among the employees and the employers and the environment in which the employees work which includes the technical, the human and the organizational environment. Opperman (2002) was quoted in Yusuf and Metiboba, (2012), to have defined workplace environment as composition of three major sub-environments which include the technical environment, the human environment and the organisational environment. According to them technical environment refers to tools, equipment, technological infrastructure and other physical or technical elements of the workplace. The human environment includes the peers, others with whom employees relate, team and work groups, interactional issues, the leadership and management. The human environment can be interpreted as the network of formal and informal interactions among colleagues; teams as well as boss-subordinate relationship that exist within the framework of organizations. Such interactions, especially the informal interactions, presumably provide avenues for dissemination of information and knowledge as well as cross-fertilization of ideas among employees. Of course, it has been established in previous studies that workers' interpersonal relations at workplace tend to influence their morale (Clement, 2000; Stanley, 2003). Hypothetically, whatever affects morale on the job is likely to affect job commitment. Accordingly the third type of work environment which is organizational includes systems, procedures, practices, values and philosophies which operate under the control of management. In the words of Akintayo (2012) organizational environment refers to the immediate task and national environment where an organization

draws its inputs, processes it and returns the outputs in form of products or services for public consumption. It is dynamic and changes with the working experiences in the organization environment.

METHOD

This study took an exploratory survey approach on the local government councils in Rivers State. Specifically, Local council administration have same characteristics across the country in terms of administration, finance and motivation etc, therefore, three related councils of Ogu Bolo, Okirika and Ikwere Local Government Area were conveniently chosen because of proximity and accessibility. The population of this study consists of the staffs of all the Local Government Councils in Rivers State. The sample size is determined from the total population size using the Yaro Yamane formula for selection of a sample from a finite population. The sources of data gathered were both primary and secondary. The primary data were gathered from the respondents through the use of self-constructed questionnaire while the secondary data were gathered from textbooks, journals, articles and websites. Primary data were collected from the respondents using well-structured five -point Likert-point scale questionnaire.

DATA ANALYSIS

The data collected were analyzed using descriptive statistical tools namely: Tables, Frequencies, Simple Percentage and Mean Score. The formulated hypotheses are analyzed using Pearson Correlation statistic. Below is a Cronbach Alpha analysis of the instruments reliability.

Table1: Reliability Test Result

Variables	Construct	Items	Cronbach (α)
Hygiene Factors	Salary	4	.865
	Job Security	4	.810
	Status	4	.791
	Work Condition	4	.818
Rural Workers Commitment	Loyalty	4	.702
	Responsiveness	4	.766

Source: Data output, 2017.

As a result of the sample size (361) drawn from the total population using YaroYaemeni statistic, 361 (100%) questionnaire copies were administered out of which 262 (73%) successful retrieval was made. After a cleaning exercise

which was meant to assure the validity of the retrieved instruments, 10 (3%) were rendered invalid and not suitable for use as a result of blank incidences. Therefore, 252 (70%) represents the sample for the study.

DATA ANALYSIS

Primary data analysis is done based on average response rates and standard deviation values which are presented using contingency tables.

The independent variable is measured on Job Security, Work Condition, Salary and status while the dependent variable on the other hand is measured on employees' loyalty and responsiveness.

Table2. Showing measures of study predictor

	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
Salary	252	0.99	5.06	4.4011	.7692
Job Security	252	1.00	4.99	4.0813	.7631
Status	252	1.00	5.10	4.2033	.7703
Work Condition	252	1.00	4.79	4.2154	.7807
Valid N (listwise)	252				

Source: Data Output, 2017.

Presented in the table 2 above is the output for the analysis on the four measures of the predictor variable. The measure of this variable each carry mean scores higher than $x = 3.0$ which serve as

the base for moderate agreement levels. Where $X > 3.0$ represents a substantial agreement level while $x < 3.0$ represents poor or inadequate agreement levels.

Table3. Showing Measures of Study Criterion

	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
Loyalty	252	1.00	5.00	4.0009	.8113
Responsiveness	252	1.10	4.99	4.1650	.8032
Valid N (listwise)	252				

Source: Data Output, 2017.

Presented in the table 3 above is the output for the analysis on the two measures of the dependent variable of the study. The variables each carry mean scores higher than $x = 3.0$ which serve as

the base for moderate agreement levels. Where $X > 3.0$ represents a substantial agreement level while $x < 3.0$ represents poor or inadequate agreement levels.

Table4. Showing the Dependent and the Independent Variables

	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
Hygiene Factors	252	1.33	4.89	3.9910	.7042
Employee Commitment	252	1.17	4.83	4.3018	.8511
Valid N (listwise)	252				

Source: Data Output, 2016.

Presented in the table above is the output for the analysis on the study variables; Hertzberg Hygiene Factors (the independent) and Implications on Rural Workers (the dependent). The Table above is a summary of the descriptive statistics on each variable; hence the figures show high affirmations with respect to the variables as presented on the instrument.

HYPOTHESES TESTING

Analysis is at a 95% confidence interval and using the Person Correlation Coefficient, the significance level (0.05) is used as a criterion for the acceptance or rejection of each null hypothesis relative to the P-value.

Table5. Showing the Tests for Hypotheses [1]

		Salary	Job security	Status	Work condition	
PEARSON (R)	Loyalty	Correlation Coefficient	.591	.441	.529	.384
		Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000	.000	.000
		N	252	252	252	252

Source: Data output, 2017.

Table6. Showing the tests for hypotheses [2]

		Salary	Job security	Status	Work condition	
PEARSON (R)	Responsiveness	Correlation Coefficient	.622	.491	.520	.444
		Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000	.000	.000
		N	252	252	252	252

Source: Data output, 2017.

From table 6 above, the test of relationship between the four dimensions of Herzberg's Hygiene factors and Loyalty as a measure of the criterion variable of employees' commitment showed significant relationship at confidence interval of 95% and above with $r=.591$; $r=.441$; $r=.529$ and $r=.384$ respectively. These imply that their null hypotheses of no significant relationships will be rejected and statement of significant relationships restated showing correlations coefficient between the tested measure and dimensions of predictor variable. Also, in table 6, where the p-values stood at $0.000(p<0.005)$, the correlation coefficients of the tested dimensions with responsiveness as a measure of commitment shows significant relationships at $r=.622$; $r=.491$; $r=.520$ and $r=.444$ respectively. These imply that the null hypotheses that assumed no relationship is rejected and significant relationships restated.

CONCLUSION

The findings of this study revealed the research conclusion that significant relationship is observed between Hygiene factors and Local council workers commitment in Rivers State, Nigeria. These factors were identified as salary, job security, status and work condition. The outcome of the analysis shows that there is a significant relationship between the study variables. This agrees with Lynch (2000) assumption that salary indicates the value that the employer puts on the work performed by its employees and it serves as a way to motivate them. He stated further salary helps to attract and retain employees and in a competitive market, organizations pay above the market rates to retain their employees. This is simply because employee gets more committed when they are well paid.

Job security is significantly associated with workers commitment: The significant relationship between job security and workers commitment is consistent with the findings of Herzberg (1986) who stated that secured job opportunities enhance employee motivation. It is not a secret that when workers are motivated they are more committed.

Status is significantly associated with workers commitment. Work condition is significantly associated with workers commitment: There is a significant relationship between work condition and workers commitment. This is supported by the work of Roca (2006) who found that there is a significant correlation between ergonomic

workstation and job satisfaction factor in the multinational organizations he studied.. The strong point of departure from the study revealed that situations where workers find themselves determine whether the motivators or hygiene factors as listed by Frederick Herzberg triggers motivation experiences on the focus group. In this study, rural workers showed more expectation on the index of the hygiene factors.

RECOMMENDATIONS

There is no debate as to the irrelevance of the motivators as demonstrated in the theory's postulation; however, this study raised the more relevance of Salary as critical for motivating this cluster of the workforce. Local Government Administrators therefore, should see financial incentives such as salary which is a hygiene component as having motivating impulse on the local council rural workforce.

Job Security seemed to be a major comfort to the rural workers because they expect successful retirement which attracts financial take-home monthly. Local Government administrators should encourage the workforce by assuring that there work life is secured. This can increase their commitment level to the work.

Council workers are more interested in their status at work. Their ego is boosted when they noticed a growth move in their work status and they use it as an issue of pride among their peers. The status of rural workers should be seen to be boosted to give them a place of social recognition. This can be achieved through promotion and training.

The rural workers are more concerned about the environment where they work. They love good offices, good physical environment that gives them respect when their friends visit. They get carried away by the aesthetics of the environment and can do more to maintain their job. Favourable work environment is recommended to attract employees to work and as well increase their willingness to stay on the job. Environment of work provides work comfort, work happiness and good social interface amongst the workforce and this lead to continuous commitment to work.

REFERENCES

- [1] Akintayo I. D. & Babalola S.S,(2012), Impact of emotional Intelligence on Workers' Behaviour in Industrial Organisations. Journal of Humanities and Social Sciences, 4(2), 83-90.

- [2] Bratton, J. & Gold J., (2012), Human Resource Management: Theory and Practice. 5th Ed Basingstoke, Palgrave Macmillan.
- [3] Chitiris, L. (2008). Herzberg's proposals and their applicability to the hotel industry. Hospitality Education and Research Journal, 12(1), 67 – 79.
- [4] George, J. M. & Jones, G. R. (2005), "Understanding and managing organisational behavior", (4th ed.). Upper Saddle River, NJ, Pearson Prentice, New York: McGraw-Hill.
- [5] Guest D., (2002), Human Resource Management, Corporate Performance and Employee Wellbeing, Building the workers into HRM. Journal of Industrial Relations, 44(3), 335-338.
- [6] Hackman, J. R. & Oldham G. R. (2006), "Motivation through design of work", Organisational behavior and human performance, 16, pp. 250–79.
- [7] Herzberg, F. (2006). The managerial choice: To be efficient and to be human. Homewood, IL: Dow Jones-Irwin.
- [8] Herzberg, F.I. (2007), "One more time: How do you motivate employees?" Harvard Business Review, 65(5), 109-120.
- [9] Jaeger, M & Kanungo, R. N. (1990), "Management in developing countries", London: Routledge.
- [10] Shields J.,(2007, Managing Employee Performance and Reward: Concepts, Practices, Strategies. Asia pacific Journal of Human Resources.46(1) 46.52
- [11] Kanfer R. (1990), Motivation Theory and Industrial/ Organisational Psychology.In M. D. Dunnette and L. Hugh (Eds) handbook of Industrial and Organisational Psychology. Palo Alto, CA, Consulting Press.
- [12] Kanungo, R. N. & Jaeger, A. M. (1990), "Introduction: The need for indigenous management in developing Countries", London, Routledge.
- [13] Khan, M.M, Rehman A., Muhammad, W.A.(2012, Impact of Employee Commitment on employee satisfaction role of Employee Performance as a Moderating Variable. Singaporean Journal of Business Economics and management Studeies.1 (2), 68-78.
- [14] King, N. (2000), "Clarification and Evaluation of the Two-Factor Theory of Job Satisfaction", Psychological Bulletin, 74(1), 18-31.
- [15] Kippis, A. (2006), "Association/Royal Historical Society", Clarendon Press, Oxford, London.
- [16] Vroom, V. & Deci, E. (2000), "Management and Motivation". Organizational Behavior and Human Resource Performance, 8(2),217-229.

Citation: Patrick N, Nwinyokpugi. "Re-Testing Herzberg Hygiene Model on Rural Workers of Local Councils in Rivers State, Nigeria." *International Journal of Research in Business Studies and Management*, vol 4, no. 11, 2017, pp. 19-27.

Copyright: © 2017 Patrick N, Nwinyokpugi.. This is an open-access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License, which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original author and source are credited.