

Motivation and Employee Engagement in the Civil Service: The Nigerian Experience

Anietie Peter Akpan^{1*}, Augustine Brendan Inyang²

¹Department of Business Management, University Of Uyo, Uyo Akwa Ibom State, Nigeria

²Ibom Airport Development Company Limited, Uyo, Akwa Ibom State, Nigeria

***Corresponding author**

Anietie Peter Akpan

Article History

Received: 05.05.2018

Accepted: 11.05.2018

Published: 30.05.2018



Abstract: This study focused on examining the effect of motivation on employee engagement in Nigerian Civil Service. The proxies for the motivation were intrinsic motivation and extrinsic motivation. The population of the study was made up of all the civil servants in the six states that make up the South-South zone of the country. Primary data were collected by the administration of copies of questionnaire to a sample size of 600 respondents who were selected using convenience sampling. Five hundred and eleven (511) copies of the questionnaire were completed and returned to the researchers. The data obtained were analysed using descriptive statistics and simple linear regression. Results show that there is significant relationship between intrinsic motivation, extrinsic motivation and employee engagement. Based on the results, it is concluded that there is significant relationship between motivation and employee engagement in Nigerian Civil Service. Consequently, it is recommended, among other things, that government should look into ways of better motivating their employees.

Keywords: Motivation, Employee engagement, Intrinsic motivation, Extrinsic motivation, Civil service.

INTRODUCTION

Motivation at work has grown to become one of the central issues that organizations and managers are facing worldwide [1]. Psychologists and behavioural scientists have since the early 20th century been drawn to and are interested in the relationship between people and their work, and today the study of motivation at work forms an integral part of vocational and industrial psychology [2].

Motivation is the process that raises, directs, energizes and maintains behaviour and performance. It encourages workers towards the actions which helps them to achieve a preferred task [3]. Posited that motivation is the process that accounts for an individual's intensity, direction and persistence of effort toward attaining a goal. This means that motivation determines how much efforts a person puts in his or her work, the direction to which those efforts are geared and a measure of how long a person can maintain effort [4].

Motivation could be intrinsic or extrinsic. Intrinsic motivation derives from within the person. It refers to the direct relationship between a worker and the task, and is usually self-applied. Examples of intrinsic motivation are achievement, accomplishment,

challenge and competence which are derived from performing one's job well [5]. Extrinsic motivation comes from the work environment, external to the person and his or her work. Good salary, fringe benefits, enabling policies and various forms of supervisions are good examples of this type of motivation [6].

Current notions of employee motivation started to take roots in the 1960s and sought to tailor the work environment and incentive structures to harness as much as possible workers' untapped reserves of skills, ideas and other potential benefits to an organization [4]. Suggested that a motivating job must allow a worker to feel personally responsible for a meaningful portion of the work accomplished. It must also provide outcomes which have intrinsic meaning to the individual and finally it must provide the employee feedback about his or her accomplishment [7].

Beyond motivation, to achieve success in today's highly competitive environment many organizations have identified the need to engage their workforce. An engaged employee is defined as one who is fully absorbed by and enthusiastic about their work such that he or she takes positive action to further the organisation's reputation and interest [1]. If there is the

opportunity to grow and flourish, highly engaged and involved employees are ready to take that opportunity and put forth the maximum effort to achieve it. Engagement becomes even more and more essential in periods of recovery because in such times organizations ask less people to do more and more work. Employee engagement is critical and important for organizations in today's competitive and challenging environment.

Previous studies have demonstrated the positive effects that employee engagement has on the performance of organizations, including aspects such as retention rates, customer satisfaction, profitability, productivity, and overall successful organizational performance. As a result, employee engagement has become an increasingly popular topic for researchers and practitioners in recent years. Simultaneously, there have been findings suggesting that employee engagement is declining and ultimately the global workforce is not engaged.

It has been suggested that a relationship between motivation and employee engagement exists, and, specifically that the development of motivational schemes including both intrinsic and extrinsic motivational factors can improve employee engagement within an organization. Whereas there have been studies researching the concepts of employee engagement and motivation separately, the relationship between motivation and employee engagement has not been researched extensively in the public sector. This study is designed to examine the influence of motivation on employee engagement in Nigerian Civil Service.

Objectives of the Study

The major objective of this study is to examine the relationship between motivation and employee engagement in Nigerian Civil Service. Specific objectives of the study are to:

- Examine the relationship between intrinsic motivation and employee engagement in Nigerian Civil Service.
- Assess the relationship between extrinsic motivation and employee engagement in Nigerian Civil Service.

Research Hypotheses

The following hypotheses were formulated for the study.

- There is no significant relationship between intrinsic motivation and employee engagement in Nigerian Civil Service
- There is no significant relationship between extrinsic motivation and employee engagement in Nigerian Civil Service

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

Concept of Motivation

According to [8] four basic philosophies underlie the various perspectives on work motivation.

These were identified by [9] as rational-economic man, social man, self-actualising man, and complex man. Theorists subscribing to the approach of rational-economic man assume that people are solely motivated by economic considerations, and that they are able to make rational economic decisions. Organisational policies emphasising pay and extrinsic reward structures originate from this view of motivation. In the case of social man, the assumption is that workers are primarily motivated by social needs, which may or may not be met by their work. In practice, proponents of this view would focus on establishing an environment conducive to satisfying and maintaining social interrelationships at work. From the perspective of self-actualising man, people are intrinsically motivated, and take pride in their work, and derive satisfaction from their accomplishments. Within this approach, workplace reward systems are highly performance-oriented. Lastly, the complex man view recognises that people are motivated by a great variation of motives, emotions, experiences and abilities, and that these change over time as new motives are learnt, and new skills change their attitudes towards their jobs. Organisations supporting this perspective offer highly individualised reward structures, and environments and ways in which employees are allowed to perform their duties.

The above-mentioned perspectives on the concept of motivation have inspired many useful and meaningful definitions of the construct [10], for example, regarded motivation as simply the personal and workplace characteristics that explain why people behave the way they do on the job. Expressed a similar view, and stated that motivation is concerned with explaining the variation in behaviour, such as why some people work harder than others. Work characteristics in this regard refer to specific characteristics of a person's job, for example its task variety, whereas personal characteristics include those determined by a person's personality, for example an intrinsic need for achievement [8].

Some authors take a slightly more intrinsically oriented stance, with work characteristics playing a lesser role. Saw motivation as an internal state that induces a person to engage in particular behaviours, and held that motivation may be viewed from two angles [11]. On the one hand, motivation encompasses direction, where a particular behaviour is selected from a choice of behaviours, intensity, referring to the amount of effort put into a task, and persistence, which denotes the person's continuing engagement in the selected behaviour. On the other hand, motivation is also concerned with a desire to achieve a certain goal, which derives from the particular individual's own needs and desires [12]. Also regarded motivation as the forces acting on or within a person to initiate and direct behaviour. It explains differences in intensity of behaviour, and why behaviour occurs in one situation,

but not in another. The concept of motivation is therefore particularly useful in its ability to increase general understanding and prediction of behaviour [13]. Defined motivation as an inner wish or urge that originates with an individual, either consciously or unconsciously, to complete a task successfully because it is enjoyable, and not necessarily for what will be received in return.

For purposes of this study, various elements of the many definitions and descriptions of motivation have been combined to form an eclectic view of the concept. Employee motivation was viewed as an innate force, shaped and maintained by a set of highly individualised factors that may change from time to time, depending on the particular needs and motives of the employee. Environmental forces, such as those related to the job itself and to the organisation, do not have a causal link with motivation, but impact on the level of motivation experienced by the employee. Together, the innate and environmental forces determine an employee's behaviour at work. Motivation was also regarded as a multi-dimensional concept that manifests in behaviours that may be observed, measured and, to some extent at least, predicted.

Intrinsic and Extrinsic Motivation

Two broad classes of motivation, extrinsic and intrinsic motivation, have been defined and researched across a range of contexts throughout the years [14]. Motivation is defined in these two ways for practical purposes, guiding the direction, the intensity, and the persistence of performance behaviours. One of the basic distinctions that can be made between extrinsic and intrinsic motivation is that while extrinsic motivation is driven by forces that are external to an individual, intrinsic motivation is driven by forces that are internal and within that individual. Further, extrinsic motivation is defined as mainly focusing on factors that are goal driven, such as the rewards and benefits of performing a certain task, whereas intrinsic motivation is usually referred to as meaning the pleasure and satisfaction that an employee gets when performing an activity [14]. Generally speaking, intrinsic and extrinsic motivation influence employee intentions regarding activities and behaviours [14].

Intrinsic motivation is defined as the performance of an activity for its inherent satisfactions rather than for some separable outcome, reflecting the natural disposition in humans to assimilate and learn [15]. It refers to when employees engage in an activity out of interest, for the sake of the activity, and for the satisfaction that the experience of engaging in that activity will bring to them [14]. Behaviours that are intrinsically motivated are thus engaged in for their own sake, and not for any other outcome [16]. Prior research have indicated that increased intrinsic motivation can be related to employee willingness to create a positive mood, in turn leading to increased learning and

knowledge sharing [14]. Employees are intrinsically motivated for some activities and not for others, and it has been observed that not everyone is motivated by the same activities [15]. Many researchers and theories confirm that intrinsic motivators can be more effective than extrinsic ones in motivating employees [17]. Some previous research that has suggested that intrinsic rewards are superior to extrinsic ones has done so with the reasoning that employees perceive them as a more certain outcome of performing a task than extrinsic outcomes [17, 18].

Because intrinsic motivation exists in the connection between an employee and a task, some researchers have defined intrinsic motivation in terms of the task that is performed by the employee, while others have defined intrinsic motivation in terms of the satisfaction an employee gains from performing the task [15]. An example of intrinsic motivation is how self-fulfilled an employee feels as a result of performing a task well [17, 9]. Write that an employee who looks to learn and grow as a person while working, due to the work itself, is motivated by intrinsic rewards [16]. Further state that when extrinsic motives are weak or absent, intrinsic motivation will become the only functional driver of performance. It has also been suggested that an efficient staff can be obtained by recruiting proactive employees, with high self-esteem and are intrinsically motivated [14].

In contrast to intrinsic motivation, extrinsic motivation on the other hand pertains whenever an activity is performed in order to obtain some separable outcome [15]. There are varied types of extrinsic motivation, some represent active states in employees while others represent impoverished forms of motivation [15]. Extrinsic motivation can vary depending on how autonomous it is; an employee may perform a task because of fear of being punished or fired, or the employee can perform an activity because this activity will lead to a promotion, bonus, or raise in the future ([15]. Both activities include external instrumentalities but vary in autonomy; the first one involves more of an obligation to an external control, whereas the second one also involves personal endorsement and the employee's choice [15]. From the perspective of extrinsic motivation, employee behaviour is driven by the perceived benefits of the action that he or she will perform, or the anticipation of instrumental gain or loss [14, 16]. However, it has also been argued that extrinsic motivation varies considerably and can reflect external control or true self-regulation [15].

The main goal of behaviours from employees who are extrinsically motivated is thus to receive organizational rewards or benefits from the achievement of an organizational goal or task [14]. Extrinsic outcomes are the rewards that are distributed by some external agent in the organization, where an example could be the monetary reward that an

employee receives for putting in extra effort at work, job security, and promotions [15]. This implies that organizational rewards are useful for employees who are extrinsically motivated in order for them to perform desired behaviours [14]. However, previous research has suggested that extrinsic rewards only secure temporary compliance [14]. Further, research has also suggested that when both intrinsic motivation and extrinsic rewards exist, the reason for the employee to engage in a certain activity will be over-justified and in this situation the extrinsic rewards are likely to replace the intrinsic motivation as the main purpose for engaging in the activity, because the extrinsic rewards will be the more salient of the two motivators [20].

Much of the literature conducted on the topic of intrinsic and extrinsic motivation and how it differs in the private and public sectors has suggested that extrinsic motivation is valued higher by employees in the private sector than those in the public sector, and motivational factors of intrinsic nature are valued higher by employees in the public sector than those in the private sector [21-22]. Research has suggested that privately employed individuals are motivated by advancement opportunities, autonomy, high monetary rewards, and status, and are less concerned with the importance and contribution with their work [22]. For public employees on the other hand, research has suggested that motivation is mainly found in job stability, job security, teamwork, and their contribution to society [22]. In the comparative study conducted by [22] on what motivates public and private sector employees some of the proposed differences were supported and some were challenged. While it was found that monetary rewards were of higher importance in the motivation of private sector employees, and that job security was of higher importance in the motivation of public sector employees, it was also found that employees equally valued the desire for teamwork, contribution to society, and advancement opportunities [22].

The Concept of Employee Engagement

Is commonly credited as being the first researcher applying engagement theory to the context of the workplace [21, 8], and many important contributions made to the employee engagement field have been based on his work; including the multi-dimensional approach to employee engagement provided by [22] and the empirical testing of Kahn's model by [13]. In addition to practitioners and researchers, more definitions can be accredited to common folk theory; a general belief that individuals, in this case particularly organizational leaders, have about work motivation [16].

Generally these definitions consider work engagement as a concept that is a desirable condition, has an organizational purpose, and connotes involvement, commitment, passion, enthusiasm,

focused effort, and energy, so it has both attitudinal and behavioural components [13]. Further, [16] explain that the conditions under which employees work are the antecedents of those attitudinal and behavioural components, and the consequences of the employee engagement they lead to are commonly thought of as organizational effectiveness.

Since [21] was the one to conceptualize the term of employee engagement, and many researchers that incorporate the concept of employee engagement in their studies have utilized it, it is the definition of employee engagement that we will use in our study. According to [21], employee engagement is the harnessing of organization members' selves to their work roles; in engagement, people employ and express themselves physically, cognitively, and emotionally during role performances. In addition to being one of the more widely accepted definitions of employee engagement, this psychology based definition is suitable for our study as we aim to explore and develop a deeper understanding of managers' perceptions of how various motivational factors influence employee engagement. We thus argue that the definition provided by [21] is more relevant to our study.

In his study, [21] aiming to find general psychological conditions of engagement that were powerful enough to go beyond individual differences of employees, the researcher found three psychological factors that were related to employee engagement; meaningfulness, safety, and availability. Psychological meaningfulness is an employee's feeling that he or she is receiving a return on his or her work for the organization in form of physical, cognitive, or emotional energy, often experienced when an employee feels valuable and useful to the organization [21]. In the study it was shown that psychological meaningfulness was specifically related to task characteristics, role characteristics, and work interactions; meaning employees feel higher levels of meaningfulness when they are faced with challenging, varied, and creative tasks, when their work roles were in line with how they saw or wanted to see themselves and the roles included an amount of status and influence, and when they partake in meaningful interaction with co-workers and clients and build relationships [21].

Psychological safety is defined by [21] as "feeling able to show and employ one's self without fear of negative consequences to self-image, status, or career". In other words, employees felt psychological safety in situations where they felt as though they would not suffer negative consequences for their engagement; that they had trusting relationships where they felt comfortable with expressing themselves [21]. The findings of the study suggested that employees felt a higher degree of psychological safety when they had trusting and supportive interpersonal relationships at work, good group and intergroup dynamics,

management that was supportive, flexible, and clear, and role performances that were in line with the organizational norms [21].

The last factor found in the study that was related to employee engagement was psychological availability. In the study it is defined as the sense of having the physical, emotional, or psychological resources to personally engage at a particular moment. It measures how ready people are to engage, given the distractions they experience as members of social systems [21]. Thus, an employee was able to engage his or herself in work depending on how this employee coped with the varying demands of work and personal life. Physical and emotional energy highly influenced psychological availability, as well as an employee's personal security or insecurity in particular work roles, and finally employees' personal lives outside of work [21]. It was argued that collectively the three conditions of meaningfulness, safety, and availability determine how employees inhabit their work roles; their psychological presence or absence [21].

Theoretical Framework

This study based on the Herzberg Motivator - Hygiene theory [19]. Gives a modified version of Abraham Maslow's principles, which they refer to as the "Two Factor" theory of motivation. This theory comprised what we call the "HYGIENE" or "MAINTENANCE" and "MOTIVATORS" or "SATISFIERS" or the Non-hygiene factors.

The hygiene factors are related to the content of the job. The factors help to reduce dissatisfaction and turn over but they do not necessarily motivate the employees.

These factors include: company policy and administration; interpersonal relation; supervision; and working condition. The non-hygiene factors are related to the job content. They were equated with satisfaction and are classified as "Motivators". The factors that make up the satisfiers or motivators: achievement; responsibility; recognition; work itself; and advancement (growth).

The above theory rests on the assumption that motivation and employee engagement may only be achieved through the above mentioned factors. But the presence of the hygiene factors only help to prevent job dissatisfaction and their total absence will promote dissatisfaction. Job satisfaction and dissatisfaction are two separate phenomena because their effects on the employee differ [22].

Herzberg maintains that what motivate people is the challenge and pleasure they get out of the job itself, the sense of achievement they get from doing their work, the recognition for a job well done, a feeling of responsibility and the desire for advancement.

A lot of criticisms have been launched against Herzberg's theory. But not all have dismissed it completely [22]. Argues that the two factor theory is a mutual consequence of Herzberg's two factor approach, and that it is a predictable human trait to attribute to ourselves circumstances that make us feel good while reserving blame for others when circumstances are less favourable.

Also argues that Herzberg's motivators are closely linked to organisational status being often scarcely relevant at shop floor level, but increasing in potency as one rises through the organisational hierarchy. Most writers agree that though Herzberg over-emphasised the importance of some factors, he directed the attention of employees as well as researchers to an awareness of the possibilities of intrinsic motivation [20].

The dichotomy put forward by Herzberg motivator -hygiene theory sit well with this study. This is so because the extrinsic factors can be likened to the hygiene factors and the motivators can be likened to the extrinsic factors.

Empirical Framework

Based their study on the ethnographic work of and tested the theoretical framework he developed, researching the relationship between engagement at work and the psychological conditions of meaningfulness, safety, and availability [15, 21]]. The results of the study showed that all three psychological conditions had a significant relationship with employee engagement. She further argue that managers must take into consideration these relationships and attempt to foster the psychological conditions among their employees. Managers can enhance psychological meaningfulness through learning more about the personal aspirations of their employees, and subsequently provide them with appropriate work roles and job design. The employees' perceptions of psychological safety can be achieved through building trusting, supportive relationships, for example through letting them participate in decision making, develop new skills, use open communication, fair treatment, and be consistent in their actions. Lastly, she states that managers must design jobs that "minimize the cognitive, emotional, and physical strain experienced by employees". In other words, managers should avoid overloading their employees with work related demands in order to improve employees' perceptions of psychological availability.

In her study, [11] aimed to consolidate several factors that contributed to the development of Kahn's three psychological factors of employee engagement by looking and drawing from what previous studies had indicated. In the study, seven factors that facilitate the psychological factors were identified, empirically tested, and found to be relevant determinants of

engagement among employees. The significant determining factors were work environment, leadership, team and co-worker relationships, training and career development, compensation or remuneration, organizational policies and procedures, and workplace wellbeing.

Conducted their survey of what drives employee engagement of 90000 employees globally [10]. While they could conclude that drivers behind employee engagement vary between countries, as well as other demographic factors like age, they were able to compile a list of the top employee engagement drivers globally. The fundamental findings of the survey were that employee engagement is largely influenced by the work environment and the nature of the work experience; effective leaders will over time create unique intangibles within an organization by treating employees well, but also by expressing interest in delivering value to customers, communities, and other stakeholders. The top five global factors that employees find drives their engagement were management interest in employee wellbeing, opportunities to improve skills and capabilities, the organization’s reputation, an employee’s ability to input into decision making, and ability to provide consumer satisfaction.

Also conducted an extensive survey with the aim of distinguishing the main drivers behind employee engagement. The most significant driver of employee engagement was identified as a feeling of being valued and involved at work [6]. In turn, the authors identified several factors that strongly contributed to this feeling, including the perceived concern for employees’

wellbeing in the organization, employees’ involvement in decision making, opportunities for career development, work relationships, and performance and appraisal.

METHODOLOGY

The study was conducted in the six states of the South-South Zone of the Federal Republic of Nigeria. The states are Akwa Ibom, Bayelsa, Cross River, Delta, Edo and Rivers. The target population of the study comprised all the civil servants in these six states both in the ministries, parastatals and agencies. From the target population, a convenient sample of 100 respondents per state was selected, giving a total sample size of 600 respondents. The scale to measure motivation was adapted from a questionnaire earlier used by [22]. The researchers’ adapted questionnaire was subjected to face and content validity. The instruments were trial-tested through pilot study using 30 civil servants. The pilot study helped in fine-tuning the items in the questionnaire and enhanced the validation process. Cronbach Alpha reliability statistics was adopted to test the reliability of the instrument. The instrument had a reliability coefficient of 0.766. The validated questionnaire was then used in collecting data from the respondents. Copies of the questionnaire were administered to the respondents at their place of work during official hours. 511 copies of the questionnaire representing 85.2% were completed and returned. Descriptive statistics (simple percentages and frequencies) and simple linear regression analysis were used to analyse the data.

RESULTS AND INTERPRETATION

Table-1: Respondents’ Profile

Item	Sample Characteristics	Number of Respondents (n = 511)	Respondents (%)
1	Sex		
	Male	279	54.6
	Female	232	45.4
2	Age		
	20-30	63	12.3
	31-40	179	35.2
	41-50	211	41.2
	Above 50	58	11.3
3	Education		
	FSLC	18	3.5
	SSCE	69	13.5
	ND/HND	140	27.4
	Bachelor’s Degree.	198	38.7
	Master’s Degree	63	12.3
	Other Qualification	23	4.6

Source: Field survey 2018

Information generated by the survey as shown in Table 1 revealed that male and female respondents constituted 56.7% and 43.3% respectively. Those between the ages of 20-30 constituted 12.3% of the population, 35.2% were between 31-40 years, 41.2%

were those of 41-50 years while 11.3% were those above 50 years. In terms of highest academic qualification, 3.5% were holders of First School Leaving Certificate (FSLC), 13% were holders of SSCE, while holders of ND/NCE were 27.4.0%.

Furthermore holders of Bachelor’s degree were 38.7% while holders of Master’s degree and other qualifications were 12.3% and 4.6% of the total population respectively.

Ho₁: There is no significant relationship between intrinsic motivation and employee engagement in Nigerian Civil Service.

Table-2: Regression analysis between intrinsic motivation and employee engagement

Model Summary						
Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate		
1	.652 ^a	.425	.425	.73723		
Predictors: (Constant), intrin_mot						
ANOVA ^a						
Model		Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	39.872	1	39.872	44.106	.000 ^b
	Residual	460.149	509	0.904		
	Total	500.021	510			
a. Dependent Variable: empl_engage						
b. Predictors: (Constant), intrin_mot						
Coefficients ^a						
Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	T	Sig.
		B	Std. Error	Beta		
1	(Constant)	1.840	.096		19.253	.000
	intrin_mot	.550	.023	.652	24.306	.000
a. Dependent Variable: empl_engage						

Table-2 shows the result of the data analysis on the relationship between intrinsic motivation and employee engagement. As shown from the table, the overall regression model explained 42.5% (R square) of the variance in the dependent variable and the F-value of 44.106 is significant at 5% level of significance (F=44.106, p = 0.00), therefore, the null hypothesis one (Ho₁) is rejected. This means that there is a significant relationship between intrinsic motivation and employee engagement in in the Nigerian Civil Service. Also, the

unstandardized coefficient for intrinsic motivation is 0.550, this means that holding other independents variables constant, a unit increase in intrinsic motivation by government will yield 0.550 increase in terms of employee engagement in the Nigerian Civil Service.

Ho₂: There is no significant relationship between extrinsic motivation and employee engagement in Nigerian Civil Service.

Table-3: Regression analysis between extrinsic motivation and employee engagement

Model Summary						
Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate		
1	.877 ^a	.769	.765	1.43233		
Predictors: (Constant), extrin_mot						
ANOVA ^a						
Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	88.178	1	88.178	108.996	.000 ^b
	Residual	411.843	509	0.809		
	Total	500.021	510			
a. Dependent Variable: empl_engage						
b. Predictors: (Constant), extrin_mot						
Coefficients ^a						
Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	T	Sig.
		B	Std. Error	Beta		
1	(Constant)	1.798	.276		6.521	.000
	extrin_mot	.977	.0068	.877	8.532	.000
a. Dependent Variable: empl_engage						

Table-3 shows the result of the data analysis on the relationship between extrinsic motivation and employee engagement. As shown from the table, the overall regression model explained 76.9% (R square) of

the variance in the dependent variable and the F-value of 108.996 is significant at 5% level of significance (F=108.996, p = 0.00), therefore, the null hypothesis two (Ho₂) is rejected. This means that there is a

significant relationship between extrinsic motivation and employee engagement in the Nigerian Civil Service. Also, the unstandardized coefficient for extrinsic motivation is 0.977, this means that holding other independent variables constant, a unit increase in extrinsic motivation by government will yield 0.977 increase in terms of employee engagement in the Nigerian Civil Service.

DISCUSSION OF FINDINGS

This study set out to examine the relationship between motivation and employee engagement in the Nigerian Civil Service. Proxies for the independent variable, motivation, were intrinsic motivation and extrinsic motivation. Empirical evidence from this study shows that there is significant relationship between intrinsic motivation, extrinsic motivation and employee engagement in the Nigerian Civil Service. This result is in line with the findings of [7, 16, 21], who opined that there is a direct relationship between intrinsic motivation, extrinsic motivation and employee engagement.

Further, the result of the study shows that extrinsic motivation with an r-square value of 76.9% contribute more to employee engagement than intrinsic motivation with 42.5%. This finding confirms the findings [17, 18, 8] who found in their study that employees in public organisations prefer extrinsic motivation to intrinsic motivation.

CONCLUSION

Based on the findings of this study, it is concluded that motivation have significant influence on employee engagement in the Nigerian Civil Service.

RECOMMENDATION

Based on the findings and conclusion of the study, the following recommendation were made:

- The government should look into ways to better motivate their employees.
- Since the study has shown that extrinsic motivation contributes more to employee engagement, government should take this type of motivation seriously and innovate ways of motivating their employees extrinsically

REFERENCES

1. Amabile, T. M. (1993). Motivational synergy: Toward new conceptualizations of intrinsic and extrinsic motivation in the workplace. *Human resource management review*, 3(3), 185-201.
2. Wiley, C. (1997). What motivates employees according to over 40 years of motivation surveys. *International Journal of Manpower*, 18(3), 263-280.
3. Affu-Broni, L. R. (2004). Perceived Organizational Support: A Review of the Literature. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 87(4), 698-714.
4. Cerasoli, C. P., Nicklin, J. M., & Ford, M. T. (2014). Intrinsic motivation and extrinsic incentives jointly predict performance: A 40-year meta-analysis. *Psychological bulletin*, 140(4), 980.
5. Giancola, F. L. (2014). Should HR Professionals Devote More Time to Intrinsic Rewards?. *Compensation & Benefits Review*, 46(1), 25-31.
6. Nasri, W., & Charfeddine, L. (2012). Motivating salespeople to contribute to marketing intelligence activities: An expectancy theory approach. *International Journal of Marketing Studies*, 4(1), 168.
7. Renko, M., Kroeck, K. G., & Bullough, A. (2012). Expectancy theory and nascent entrepreneurship. *Small Business Economics*, 39(3), 667-684.
8. Lin, H. F. (2007). Effects of extrinsic and intrinsic motivation on employee knowledge sharing intentions. *Journal of information science*, 33(2), 135-149.
9. Urdan, T. (2003). Book review: Intrinsic motivation, extrinsic rewards, and divergent views of reality. *Educational Psychology Review*, 15(3), 311-325.
10. Shuck, B. (2011). Four Emerging Perspectives of Employee Engagement: An Integrative Literature Review. *Human Resource Development Review*, 10(3), 304-328.
11. Ryan, R. M. & Deci, E. L. (2000). Intrinsic and Extrinsic Motivations: Classic Definitions and New Directions. *Contemporary Educational Psychology*, 2000(25), 54-67.
12. Macey, W. H. & Schneider, B. (2008). The Meaning of Employee Engagement. *Industrial and Organizational Psychology*, 1(2008), 3-30.
13. Saks, A. M. (2006). Antecedents and consequences of employee engagement. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 21 (7), 600-619.
14. Houston, D. J. (2000). Public-Service Motivation: A Multivariate Test. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*, 10(4), 713-727.
15. May, D. R. (2004). The psychological conditions of meaningfulness, safety, and availability and the engagement of the human spirit at work. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, 2004(77), 11-37.
16. Jurkiewicz, C. L. (1998). Motivation in Public and Private Organizations: A Comparative Study. *Public Productivity & Management Review*, 21(3), 230-250.
17. Kahn, W. A. (1990). Psychological conditions of personal engagement and disengagement at work. *Academy of Management Journal*, 33(4), 692-724.
18. Herzberg, F. (1972) *Work and the Nature of Man*, Cleveland: World Publishing Company.
19. Sinha, K. & Trivedi, S. (2014). Employee Engagement with Special Reference to Herzberg

- Two Factor and LMX Theories: A Study of I.T Sector. *SIES Journal of Management*, 10(1), 22-35.
20. Buelens, M. & Van den Broeck, H. (2007). An Analysis of Differences in Work Motivation between Public and Private Sector Organizations. *Public Administration Review*, 67(1), 65-74
21. Towers, F. R., & Perrin, H. T. (2008). *Closing the Engagement Gap: A Road Map for Driving Superior Business Performance. Towers Perrin Global Workforce Study 2007-2008.*
22. Saleem, R., Mahmood, A., & Mahmood, A. (2010). Effect of work motivation on job satisfaction in mobile telecommunication service organizations of Pakistan. *International journal of business and management*, 5(11), 213.