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ABSTRACT
This study examined the roles of work environment and motivation (extrinsic motivation, intrinsic motivation, and amotivation) in job performance of nurses in Enugu State, Nigeria. Two hundred (200) registered nurses (47% male and 53% female) with the age range of 18 to 60 years (M = 35.54 years, SD = 11.68) were the participants. They were selected using convenience sampling technique based on their availability and willingness to participate in the study. The instruments used in collecting the data were Work Environment Scale -10, Work Motivation Scale, and Task Performance Scale. Hierarchical multiple regression was used to analyze the data using the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) version 20. Result showed that work environment, intrinsic motivation and amotivation did not predict work performance (β = -0.5; β = -0.10, β = -0.2 respectively, while extrinsic motivation predicted job performance (β = .24, p > 0.5). This implies that the more motivated workers are towards motives that are outside of themselves (e.g., such as money, promotions, benefits, good working conditions, recognition from supervisors and co-workers, etc.,) the higher their performance would be.

Keywords: Job performance, Health workers, Motivation, Nurses, Work environment.

Introduction
The World Health Organization (WHO) (2013) predicted that as the world population increases, there will be a short fall of 12.9 million skilled healthcare by 2035 with the greatest shortfall in Africa and Southeast Asia. The report indicated that about 40% of health professionals will leave health employment in the next decade due to low pay and too few incentives and it has serious implication for the world population. Similarly, internal and external migration of health workers exacerbates regional imbalance of health professionals. As a result of advancement in medical technology and the demand for more sophisticated care, the health system requires a more skilled workforce.

Healthcare is a human right- but without health workers, there aren’t health services. And the world is already short more than 7.2 million. While the gap is already felt deeply in the most desperate situation, it is a threat to every country on the planet: Without more health workers, millions of people will go without the attention they need to survive. That’s why training and equipping them is the heart of the Project Hope (Schwartz, 2020). A shortage of health workers is pervasive across most countries- and the worrying aspect is that this gap is increasing. Aggravating the issue is the unmet need for upskilling and reskilling that new disease patterns and emerging technology in healthcare continuously demand. The global health workforce is unevenly and inequitably distributed. The WHO region of the Americas, with 10% of the global burden of disease, has 37% of the world’s health workforce, whereas the African region, with 24% disease burden, has only 3% (Kamineni, 2019).

Nurses have the potential to lead the way in improving health and health care for all, but in order to realize that potential they needed to operate in an environment that is safe, empowering, and satisfying. Just as health care workers have a duty of care to their patients, employers have a fundamental duty of care to their employees – to create a healthy work environment for them. They work in complex situations that embrace utmost professionalism and competency in exhibiting patient-oriented behaviour and providing nursing care. The challenging work environment in hospitals, put a lot of pressure on nurses. The advent of globalization has also injected a new phenomenon where stressful work environment may diminish the nurses’ motivation level. This scenario if left unchecked may cause an adverse impact towards their job performance. Nurses are the cornerstone of the healthcare system and must be provided with the best conditions to enable them to perform their duties in the best way. Optimal nursing performance depends upon the knowledge, competencies, job satisfaction and organizational commitment of individual nurses (Dick, Kuzey, & Stela, 2018).

Job performance is the extent to which a worker does his/her work based on his/her evaluation of individual effort. This is the way I defined it. It is also seen as how effective employees are in accomplishing their tasks and responsibilities related
to patient’s care. Job performance is imperative in any industry as it serves as one of the key indicators of productivity and profitability (Hee & Kamaludin, 2016). According to Janssen and Van Yperen (2004), in-role job performance indicates the actions specified and required by an employee’s job description. It is also meant to be appraised and rewarded by the employing organization and thus contributes towards the organization’s excellent performance. In the organizational context, these sets of procedure make work behaviour predictable so that basic tasks can be accomplished to achieve the organizational goals. Ai-Omari and Okasheh (2017) sees job performance as the result of an employee’s motivation and ability, and how he/she adapts to the situational constraints and the un congenial environment.

In this study, job performance is related to how effective nurses perform their duties and responsibilities associated with the direct care of their patients (Dieleman, Toonen, & Tour, 2006). Fritzen (2007) stated that nurses are one of the important inputs to any healthcare system and has strong effect on the performance of the healthcare organization. A major challenge to healthcare centres is how to seek ways to improve their employee’s job performance and increase efficiency in their healthcare interventions. In relation to this, nurses represent the workforce because they are the persons who are connected directly with the patients. Their performance is essential in achieving organizational goals and objectives in a way that is consistent and effective (Mehmet, 2013). Johari and Ong (2013) in their study averred that nurse-patient interface comprises elements of the nurse-patient interaction in the process of co-producing a service. This aspect of interaction has become an important element for nurses to meet the increasing patient’s expectation. Usually, patients can adequately evaluate the medical equipment and technology used in the hospitals but, they tend to focus on social interactions as a measure of evaluation (Yoon, Choi, & Park, 2007). Apparently, nurses expressive and interactive performance was mostly evaluated because patients usually are more sensitive towards the nursing care they receive.

A successful healthcare organization should customize the experience of healthcare around the patients-need and job performance of its staff (Kerfoot, 2000). Excellent job performance will decrease personnel costs, increase organizational profitability and build patient loyalty (Earls, 2004). In contrast, if the nurses job performance declines, it will lead to unwanted consequences such as compromising standard of patient’s care, delay and negligence in work, tardiness, and growing number of patient’s complaints. Job performance among nurses is seriously emphasized by hospitals. Most of the hospitals were using performance evaluation as a means to achieve the goals and objectives of the organizations. According to scholars (Altindis, 2011, Kolawole & Ali, 2013; Mugbo, 2013), one of the factors that influence nurses job performance is their work motivation.

Motivation is a term derived from the Latin word ‘movere’ meaning to move (Baron, Henley, McCarthy, 2012). Motivation is the root from which stems both the progress and the downfall of a company (Dutta, 2020). She went further to define motivation as the attitude employees have towards their work. It is the desire and energy that makes people continually interested and committed to a job. Motivated employees help achieve business goals as well as improve the overall productivity of the organization (Dutta, 2020). Certo (2016) defines motivation as giving people incentives that cause them to act in desired ways. Motivation has been described as the process of arousing and sustaining goal-directed behaviour (Nelson, 2013). Motivation is general defined as the psychological forces that determine the direction of a person’s level of effort, as well as a person’s persistence in the face of obstacles (Stanley, 2012). Industrial psychologists and management practitioners have long been interested in searching for factors which influences motivation and productivity (Chung, 2013).

Stanley (2012) observed that in today’s marketplace where companies seek a competitive edge; motivation is key for talent retention and performance. No matter the economic environment, the goal is to create a workplace that is engaging and motivating; where employees want to stay, grow and contribute. She’s knowledge, experience and expertise. Chung (2013) stated that it is necessary to find the determinants of motivation and performance in industry, industrial psychologists and managerial practitioners have developed a variety of theories of (and approaches to) human motivation. Many psychologists have developed motivational theories in terms of human needs or motives, while most management scholars have developed managerial theories in terms of incentives or inducements (Riggo, 2014). Employees motivation affects productivity and a poorly motivated labour force will be costly to the organization in terms of lower productivity and performance, excessive staff turnover, increased expenses, frequent absenteeism and a negative effect on the morale of colleagues (Jobber & Lee, 2014). Motivation is the of a successful organization to maintain the continuity of the work in a powerful manner and help organizations to survive (Omollo, 2015).

Toode, Routasalo, Helminen and Suominen (2014) identified five subtypes of motivation which occupy and tailored employees’ motivation in any workplace. The five subtypes are Amotivation, Extrinsic motivation, Intrinsic Motivation, Introjected motivation and Identified motivation. I see amotivation as not having the zeal or urge to work towards one’s work or organizational goal due to lack of interest in the job. This may be as a result of low pay in the job, lack of recognition, not having challenging job, lack of control on the job or having that feeling that other people in the team are treated better than oneself. Kirby (2020) looked at amotivation as lack of motivation which may be caused by not doing enough; depression (which makes it difficult for people to get through the normal tasks of daily life); feeling overwhelmed (makes body and mind shuts down); trying to please everyone (one finding it difficult to identify his/her personal needs and wants as result of trying to please everyone); having fixed mindset (this is a situation where one thinks and believes that he/she doesn’t have control over his/her potential); and finally settling for less (which has to do with one thinking that he/she has settled in life or that believe that one is contented with where he or she is in life).

Alhakami and Baker (2018) defines amotivation as absence of any motivation, which thus, involves employees not directed to do certain
behaviours or do any action to stop the behaviour. Unmotivated health workers are known to leave their jobs, either leaving rural and remote areas for work in larger cities or migrating to other countries in the pursuit of more appealing job opportunities (Inke & Imhoff, 2006). Some disgruntled health workers have been known to leave the medical field outright.

Intrinsic motivation is the act of being motivated by internal factors such as autonomy, relatedness and competence to perform certain actions and behaviour without neither pressure nor any sort of reward for the actions you (Praveen, 2017). Intrinsic motivation includes, receiving positive recognition, appreciation, a sense of achievement, and meeting challenges. Intrinsic motivation is deep-rooted desires and the wish to fulfill them. The employee has the desire to perform a task because the results match his capabilities (Duttan, 2020). It is the behaviour driven by internal rewards. Psychology says that intrinsic motivation occurs when we act without any obvious external rewards. People simply enjoy the activity or see it as an opportunity to explore, learn, and actualize our potentials (Duttan, 2020). According to Beer and Walton (2014) intrinsic rewards accrue from performing the task itself and may include the satisfaction of accomplishment or a sense of influence. From this, one can say that intrinsic motivation is that drive that pushes one to work towards individuals and organizations goals as a result of challenges, autonomy and ability to use one’s ability and skills towards achieving one’s goal and that of the organization without being pushed by coercion or external benefit or reward that is attached to the work.

Extrinsic motivation from Praveen’s (2017) point of view is the act of an individual performing action or behaviour because the individual is affected by the external factors such as rewards or punishments. He went further to say that what causes extrinsic motivation are money, praise, competition and threat of punishment. Extrinsic motivation on its own has to do with rewards that comes from the organizations such as money, promotions, recognition from supervisors and co-workers. Extrinsic motivation is driven by external rewards. It is most tangible in nature and been motivated by external factors like money, pay raise, fame, praise and other benefits (Duttan, 2020). Beer and Walton (2014) define extrinsic motivation as the behaviour performed, not for its own sake, but for the consequences associated with it. Examples include salary, benefits, and working conditions. Employees are motivated by the combination of both factors at any point in time (Riggio, 2013).

In the healthcare context, intrinsic motivation is operationally defined as self-gratification, pleasure in performing activities at the workplace instead of working towards external rewards. For example, nurses who enjoy performing their job no longer need to be encouraged or instructed to carry out their duties. It is believed that with intrinsic motivation, nurses are expected to progress and develop in their career. Their performance will be generated by self-interest and self-determination. These attributes are created spontaneously by internal stimuli. They usually consist of enthusiasm that leads them to engage in their job without expecting additional rewards. For Deci and Ryan (2000), intrinsically motivated personnel tend to show gains in appearance, resilience, creativity, self-esteem and superiority when compared with extrinsically motivated individuals. Individuals who are extrinsically motivated only act when there is an external reward.

Extrinsic motivation is an external force that leads employees to meet personal and organizational goals. Sutikno (2007) study showed that extrinsic motivation arises from the influence of external activities such as solicitation, instruction or coercion to direct individuals to perform tasks in order to get rewards in return. Types of extrinsic rewards range from benefits, awards, pay, compensation and hours which are given for a good performance (Muogbo, 2013). According to Mankoe (2006), extrinsic motivation can be in the form of good work environment, travelling benefits, additional facilities, attractive salary and various supervisions at the workplace. It guides persons to carry out responsibilities by using coercion or instruction to get rewards in return (Henderson & Tulloch, 2008). Extrinsic motivation consists of awards, bounces, pay and benefits (Haiielslassie, 2014). It can also be in the forms of good relationship between workers, better facilities, good working conditions and high administrators’ quality at the work area (Rachel, Jakiewicz, Dwyer & Tulenko, 2012). Extrinsic motivation in healthcare context leads nurses to achieve work behaviours such as prizes, positions, awards, incentives and numerous fringe benefits which is generated by external stimuli and profit themselves and their organization (Inke &Imhoff, 2006).

In the healthcare context, extrinsic motivation is perceived as a force that drives nurses to perform a behaviour that will bring or yield benefits to them and the organization. Extrinsic motivation is created from external stimuli and can be gotten through praises, incentives, prizes, awards, grades and other fringe benefits. An extrinsically motivated nurse will deliver exceptional healthcare services in the organization due to extrinsic rewards. In a study, Ong and Johari (2014) found that hospital management is responsible for the effectiveness and performance of their staffs coupled with the best service behaviour to the patients. If the hospital management would put their nurses into action and improve their job performance, extrinsic motivation is one of the factors that can get the best out of them. When there is an increase in extrinsic motivation such as salaries and allowances, there is also a corresponding increase in nurses’ performance. This is proven in the study by Muogbo (2013) where it was discovered that extrinsic motivation is significantly related to employee’s job performance. However, since extrinsic motivation has to do with those things outside the work (such as pay, awards, bounces, better facilities and good working condition, etc.) the researchers deemed it necessary to study how work environment can affect the work performance of nurses in selected hospitals in Enugu State, Nigeria.

Poor or deficient work environment jeopardizes many aspects of health care delivery. There is evidence that unhealthy work environment contributes to increased cost to the organization in terms of increased cases of medical negligence, dissatisfied patients, conflicts, turnover and poor reputation of the hospitals. Unpleasant, demoralizing and unsafe work conditions in the workplace rots the entire system of almost every organization. Hence, creation of healthy work environment is imperative to ensure patient safety, enhance retention of staff and maintain organizational profitability and goodwill. Nursing is the profession most trusted to act honestly.
and ethically (Aditi & Shivani, 2015). Considering the noble services provided by nurses, the contribution of nurses in true spirits in the service to mankind cannot be undervalued and needed to be held in high esteem by the health leaders and the society.

Health leaders share an understanding that an optimistic work environment not only empowers the employees, but it is also beneficial in enhancing patient’s satisfaction and wellbeing of the society. Aditi and Shivani (2015) recognized factors such as valuable communication, decision making, lower attrition level, significant recognition, suitable staffing, occupational safety, and cordial interpersonal relations as very vital for optimum performance of nurses in hospitals since the presence of these factors make work environment very conducive for the nursing practice. The overall aim of this study is the contribution of this work to literature on the role of motivation and work environment on nurse’s job performance.

Theoretical Framework

The theoretical framework in this study is Herzberg (1959) Two-Factor theory. There are two factors that affect the motivation of a person in an organization. They are hygiene and motivator factors. Hygiene factor relates to the job context or extrinsic aspects of the employees where it surrounds the execution of the work. Among the elements of hygiene factor are work conditions, co-worker relations, policies and rules, supervisor quality and basic wage. It is also known as extrinsic motivation. Comparatively, motivator is related to the job content or intrinsic aspects of the employees. Motivator motivates a person to strive for satisfaction and better performance with internal stimuli. Among the elements of motivator are achievement, recognition, responsibility, work itself, advancement and personal growth. Motivator is also labelled as intrinsic motivation. The Two Factor theory arises from the understanding that work must be planned in such a way that hygiene factors (extrinsic motivation) and motivator (intrinsic motivation) of the employees are fulfilled. In order to maintain an organization in good health, more attention must be paid in meeting the needs of individuals in the organization. The justification for adopting this model is that it covers both intrinsic and extrinsic motivation, and work environment falls under the elements of the hygiene factor.

In this study, two hypotheses were postulated and tested.

H1a. Intrinsic motivation will positively predict nurses job performance.
H1b. Extrinsic motivation will positively predict nurses job performance
H3. Amotivation will positively predict job performance of nurses.
H2. Work environment will positively predict nurses job performance

Method

Sample and Procedure

Two hundred (200) registered nurses drawn from seven (7) hospitals in Enugu State, Nigeria, were participants in this study. The hospitals were: University of Nigeria Teaching Hospital Ituku Ozalla; Enugu State University Teaching Hospital, Park Lane; Good Shepherd Hospital; Balm of Gilead Hospital; Morning Star Hospital; and Goodness Maternity and Clinics; all within Enugu metropolis. The highest educational qualifications of the participants were BSc in Nursing Science. The participants consisted of 94 men and 106 women. Seventy-nine of the participants were single, 110 were married, and 11 were widowed. Average age of the participants was 35.54 years (SD = 11.68 years) while their age ranged from 18 -60 years.

Two hundred and fifty (250) questionnaires were printed and distributed to the nurses in their wards in different hospitals to fill at their convenient time. The questionnaires were distributed to the nurses with the aid of seven nurses from the different hospitals who assisted the researchers in the sharing and collection of the questionnaires after completion. Out of the 250 questionnaire that were distributed, 226 were retrieved, and 200 were correctly filled and was used for the study. The questionnaires were handed to participants with covering letter concerning the purpose of study. Anonymity and confidentiality of the data was emphasized in the letter.

Measures

Demographics: A section of the form asks about the demographic information of the participants such as gender, age, religion, marital status, highest educational qualifications and years of work experience.

Work Environment Scale: The work environmental scale is a10 item scale developed by Rossberg, Eirings and Friss (2004). The items were scored on a five-point Likert scale format. Items 1, 2, 3, 6, 7, and 8 were scored in this format 1= Not at all, 2 = to a small extent, 3 = to some extent, 4 = to a large extent, 5 = to a very large extent; items 4, 5, and 10 were rated as: 1 = very often, 2 = often, 3 = occasionally, 4 = rarely, 5 = never; and item 9 was scored using 1= far too few, 2 = too few, 3 = sufficient, 4 = too many, 5 = far too many. The items were scored directly. Rossberg, Eirings and Friss (2004) reported a Cronbach alpha coefficient of .76. For the reliability and validity of this instrument for this study, a pretest was carried out with 50 participants drawn from Bishop Shawna ham hospital and Mt. Araphat hospital Nsukka. The data collected reported Cronbach alpha coefficient of .74.

Motivational scale: The motivational scale is an 18-item scale developed by Tremblay, Blanchard, Taylor, Pelletier and Villeneve (2009) to measure intrinsic and extrinsic motivation of the nurses. Each item was scored on a seven (7) point Likert scale format. 1-3 = does not correspond at all, 4 – 5 = correspond moderately, 6 – 7 = correspond exactly. Three items measure intrinsic motivation; 12 items measure extrinsic motivation; while three items measure amotivation. The items were measured directly. Tremblay et al. (2009) reported a Cronbach alpha coefficient of .80, .74, .64 respectively. The pretest of this study reported Cronbach alpha coefficient of .65, .73, .62 respectively.

Job Performance scale: The employee job performance scale is a 21-item scale developed by Williams and Anderson (1991) to measure employees’ task performance. Each item was scored based on a seven-point Likert scale format of 1-3 = disagree, 4 = neutral, 5 - 7 = agree. All items were
scored directly except items negatively worded items which were scored in the reverse order. Williams and Anderson (1991) reported a Cronbach’s alpha of .91. For this study, the pretest study reported reliability and validity Cronbach alpha coefficient of .82

**Statistical analyses**

Pearson’s correlation was used to establish the relationships between the variables. Hierarchical multiple regression analysis was conducted to test the hypotheses. At the first step of the analysis age, gender, educational status, years of work experience were entered in order to control for the impact of demographic variables on the predictor variables. All analyses were conducted using the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences.

### Results

Correlation analysis was carried out to test the relationships of control variables (age, gender, educational status and years of working experience), work environment, motivation and job performance. Older age was associated with higher educational status, greater number of years of work, intrinsic motivation, job performance, and lower amotivation. Educational status also showed positive relationship with years of work experience and job performance but had a negative correlation with extrinsic motivation. Years of work experience had a positive relationship with job performance, while work environment had a positive relationship with extrinsic motivation and amotivation. Intrinsic motivation showed a positive with intrinsic motivation and amotivation while the relationship between intrinsic and amotivation was not significant.

### Table 1: Descriptive statistics for age and the study variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Range</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>18 – 60</td>
<td>35.54</td>
<td>11.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work environment</td>
<td>14 – 40</td>
<td>28.35</td>
<td>5.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extrinsic motivation</td>
<td>25 – 77</td>
<td>52.22</td>
<td>7.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intrinsic motivation</td>
<td>10 – 28</td>
<td>19.14</td>
<td>3.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amotivation</td>
<td>4 – 21</td>
<td>10.99</td>
<td>3.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job performance</td>
<td>64 – 118</td>
<td>95.68</td>
<td>14.56</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 2: Correlations of demographic variables, work environment, work motivation and job performance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Educational status</td>
<td>.49***</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Years of experience</td>
<td>.68***</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.24**</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work environment</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>.15*</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extrinsic motivation</td>
<td>-.13</td>
<td>-.13</td>
<td>-.26***</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.20**</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intrinsic motivation</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>-.17*</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.57***</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amotivation</td>
<td>-.14*</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>-.17*</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.20**</td>
<td>.30***</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job performance</td>
<td>.19**</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>.17*</td>
<td>.36***</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>.24**</td>
<td>.26</td>
<td>.04</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: ***p<.001; **p<.01; *p<.05; Gender (0 = male; 1 = female); Educational status (1=First School leaving Certificate, 2 = SSCE, 3 = Registered, 4 = Bachelor’s degree, 5 = Master’s degree).

### Table 3: Hierarchical multiple regression predicting job performance by work environment and work motivation, with age, education and years of work experience as control variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Predictors</th>
<th>Step 1</th>
<th>Step 2</th>
<th>Step 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>-.25</td>
<td>-.21</td>
<td>-.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational status</td>
<td>2.37</td>
<td>1.51</td>
<td>2.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Years of experience</td>
<td>1.76</td>
<td>.46</td>
<td>1.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work environment</td>
<td>-.13</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>-.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extrinsic motivation</td>
<td>-.13</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>-.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intrinsic motivation</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amotivation</td>
<td>-.14*</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.20**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R²</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ΔR²</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>11.57(3, 196)***</td>
<td>8.78(4, 195)***</td>
<td>8.43(7, 192)***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ΔF</td>
<td>11.57(3, 196)***</td>
<td>8.78(4, 195)***</td>
<td>8.43(7, 192)***</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p<.05; **p<.01; ***p<.001; ΔR² = Change in R²; Change in F; B = Unstandardized regression coefficient; β = Standardized regression coefficient.

Hierarchical multiple regression analysis used in testing the hypotheses in Table 3 showed that in Step 1 of the regression model, age did not significantly predict job performance, β = -.20, t(200) = -1.97. Educational status positively predicted job performance at β = .15, t(200) = 1.99, p<.05. Years of work experience positively predicted job performance β = .46, t(200) = 5.01, p<.001. Work environment
did not significantly predict job performance $\beta - .05$, $t(200) = -.72$. Amongst the three dimensions of motivation, extrinsic motivation positively predicted job performance $\beta = .24$, $t(200) = 2.67$, $p < .05$; Intrinsic motivation and amotivation negatively did not predict job performance, $\beta = .10$, $t(200) = 1.18$, $\beta = -.02$, $t(200) = -.26$, $p < .001$ respectively.

### Discussion

This study examined the role of work environment and motivation on nurses’ job performance. Result showed that it was only one dimension of motivation (extrinsic) that positively predicted job performance; while work environment and other two dimensions of motivation did not predict job performance among nurses respectively. This result indicated that work environment negatively did not predict job performance, thus the hypothesis that stated that work environment will positively predict job performance was not confirmed. This showed that there was no association between the work environment and the job performance of nurses among the sampled population of nurses. Nur Zainie and Narehan (2015) study found weak association between work environment and job performance. However, Khawar and Aqueel’s finding (2017) is not in agreement with the present finding. Their findings showed a positive relationship between work environment factor and employee performance at an Indian manufacturing firm.

Gitonga and Gachunga’s (2015) study also contradicted the present finding. They found a positive relationship between work environment and organizational performance in government ministries in Kenya. The finding of this study showed that work environment did not predict job performance. This may be because the study took place in an underdeveloped place where meeting up with the basic needs of life is priority. What motivates people to work is the incentives and rewards attached to the job and the punishment they get when they failed to meet up with the organizational goals. People work to get paid to enable them cater for their needs and that of their family members. What matters to the person is the money that comes from the job and not how comfortable the environment is so long as the pay they get from the job is commensurate with what other people in the same job and cadre gets as their take home elsewhere.

The hypotheses that stated that intrinsic motivation and amotivation will positively predict job performance were not confirmed since the two results showed no significant relationship between amotivation, intrinsic motivation and job performance of workers. Herzberg’s (1959) two factor theory identified two factors that affect motivation of workers in an organization, the motivator, and the hygiene factors. The elements of motivator are achievement, recognition, responsibility, work itself, advancement, and personal growth. Motivator is also labelled as intrinsic motivation. According to this theory, presence of these elements motivates or drives a person to work harder towards the actualization of his goal and that of the organization without any external force or coercion or reward. Abbas (2016) study did not support this find, rather he found a positive relationship between effective training, intrinsic motivation, and job performance among local government staff in northern Nigeria.

The finding of this study have a contrary view to that of Deci (2010) which emphasized the importance of intrinsic reward in influencing worker’s performance. He is of the opinion that workers do not like to feel that they are performing their task for money. Kofi, Odoom and Opoku (2016) reported a positive relationship between intrinsic motivation (such as logistic provision, job satisfaction and an enabling work environment) and job performance. Intrinsic motivation may not predict job performance because what drives intrinsically motivated worker comes from within the individual and not the society or what the person gets from the job in terms of reward or benefits. Intrinsically motivated worker works not to get money to satisfy their needs or demands of their family but works because of the satisfaction gotten from the challenges of the job which they feel gives them opportunity to utilize their skills, abilities and potentials thereby making them develop sense of accomplishment and self fulfilment thus, makes them marketable in the society. However, amotivation (lack of motivation) did not predict job performance because it has to do with being not motivated at all. The result is not surprising because without motivation, nobody will be eager to work since motivation is the drive that pushes one to work towards a target.

The hypothesis which stated that extrinsic motivation will positively predict performance was confirmed. This implies that the higher the employees are extrinsically motivated, the higher their job performance will be. This may be because what motivates them to work is not the challenges or their interest in the work but rather the pay, promotions, incentives and bonuses that are attached to the work. People who are extrinsically motivated work as a result of coercion and the pay that is attached to the job. According to Sutikno (2007), extrinsic motivation arises from the influence of external activities such as solicitation, instruction or coercion to direct individuals to perform tasks in order to get rewards in return. Types of extrinsic rewards range from benefits, awards, pay, compensation and hours of which are given for a good performance (Muogbo, 2013). Muogbo’s (2013) study found that extrinsic motivation was significantly related to employee’s job performance. Extrinsic motivation is a dominating factor for motivation of employees (Nabi, Islam, Dip, & Hossain, 2017).

Among the elements of hygiene factor in Herzberg’s (1959) two factor theory are work conditions, co-worker relations, policies and rules, supervisor quality and basic wage. Comparatively, motivator is related to the job content or intrinsic aspects of the employees. The two-factor theory arises from the understanding that work must be planned in such a way that hygiene factors (extrinsic motivation) and motivator (intrinsic motivation) of the employees is fulfilled. It is a fact that to maintain an organization in good health, more attention must be paid in meeting the needs of individuals in the organization. It is suggested that government and managers of hospitals understand the importance of work motivation on the performance of the nurses with the intention of enhancing nurses job performance. The findings will also help in providing hospital managements information that will enable them to understand the nurses’ needs and offer solutions to increase their performance. Better performance can be attained if the employees are motivated both intrinsically and
extrinsically.

The major limitation of this study is the sample size which is not enough to make a generalization about this issue. The study was conducted only in seven hospitals in Enugu State out of so many hospitals in the state. Convenience sampling method was also used in this study which did not give every registered nurse in the seven hospitals equal chance of participating in the study. The study was also a cross sectional survey. It is suggested that future researchers should include a larger sample of registered nurses in the government and private hospitals in Enugu State and where possible in Nigeria for a better generalization. Future researchers should also do a longitudinal study to know how consistent the result will be over a period of time.
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