



Exploring the Impact of Job Security and Recognition on Worker Stability and Output Quality in the Manufacturing Sector

Kehinde Segun¹, Ilogho Simon², Tola Kehinde³

¹Department of Business Management, Covenant University, Nigeria

²Department of Accounting, Covenant University, Nigeria

³Department of International Relations, Redeemers University, Nigeria

ABSTRACT: This research investigates the impact of job security and recognition on worker stability and output quality in the manufacturing sector. Through an exploration of these factors, the study aims to uncover their influence on employee retention and performance. By analyzing data and conducting surveys within manufacturing organizations, the research seeks to provide insights into the intricate relationship between job security, recognition, worker stability, and output quality. The findings offer valuable implications for enhancing employee satisfaction, productivity, and overall organizational effectiveness in the manufacturing sector.

KEY WORDS: Job Security, Worker Stability, Output Quality, Employee Retention, Workplace Culture

INTRODUCTION

In contemporary management discourse, the critical role of a committed and motivated workforce in achieving organizational goals is widely acknowledged. It is recognized that the workforce constitutes the most valuable asset of any organization, providing direction and dynamism necessary for growth and success. However, despite the significance of motivation in driving optimal performance, identifying effective motivational factors remains a challenge, particularly in the context of evolving societal and technological landscapes. Traditional approaches to motivation often prioritize productivity over the well-being and needs of employees. While financial incentives are commonly perceived as primary motivators, studies suggest that monetary rewards alone do not guarantee sustained productivity. In Nigeria, for example, the prevailing job market dynamics underscore the importance of job security as a fundamental driver of employee engagement and performance. However, there is a misconception among employers that job security diminishes employee effort, leading to complacency and decreased productivity. Empirical evidence indicates that job security can indeed influence employee stability, with studies revealing a correlation between job security and absenteeism. Despite this, organizations often neglect the importance of fostering a sense of security and recognition among employees, opting instead for short-term productivity measures. This study aims to explore the impact of job security on worker stability and assess how the perception of recognition influences employee attitudes towards work. The scope of the study is focused on Dangote PLC, specifically targeting lower-level factory workers. By examining the interplay between job security, recognition, and employee performance within this context, the study seeks to provide insights into effective strategies for enhancing workforce motivation and organizational productivity. Ultimately, the findings aim to inform management practices that prioritize employee well-being and engagement, thereby driving sustainable growth and success.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Motivation, a central concept in management theory, has been defined in various ways by scholars. Luthan (1998) characterizes motivation as "a process which starts with a physiological or psychological deficiency or need that activates behavior at a drive that is aimed at a goal incentive." Common elements in these definitions include terms like "desire," "want," "aims," "goals," "needs," and "incentives," highlighting the importance of understanding the relationship among needs, drives, and incentives. According to Minner, Ebrahimi, and Watchel (1995), motivation can be viewed as the interaction of three elements: needs, drives, and incentives. In theory, individuals evaluate behavior options to maximize positive outcomes and minimize negative ones. Initially rooted in philosophy, motivational theory transitioned to empirical science, with a focus on instinct, drive, hedonic, and cognitive theories. Instinct theories, exemplified by McDougall's perspective, attribute human behavior to innate drives directed toward fulfilling needs. Drive theories, on the other hand, emphasize the energizing force behind behavior, with drive serving as the impetus for action. Woodworth introduced the concept of drive as the physiological condition underlying preparatory and consummatory behaviors, such as hunger, thirst, and sex. The notion of drive was later supplanted by the concept of incentives, also known as hedonic theories,

which emphasize the role of rewards and punishments in driving behavior. These theories suggest that behavior varies based on the presence or absence of incentives, with increased drive leading to enhanced activity and consummatory behavior. Cognitive theories of motivation focus on the role of thought processes and perceptions in driving behavior. These theories highlight the importance of individual beliefs, expectations, and attributions in shaping motivation and behavior. In summary, motivation theories offer diverse perspectives on the factors driving human behavior, ranging from innate instincts to cognitive processes. Understanding these theories provides valuable insights into how individuals are motivated and how organizations can effectively harness motivation to enhance performance and achieve goals.

Hedonic as the name implies mean devoted to pleasure and there was talk of positive and negative incentives. Incentives were thought to have two functions: -

- i. Instigating Approach or Avoidance: Incentives are designed to elicit a response in individuals, prompting them to either approach or avoid a particular stimulus. This implies that incentives can act as motivating factors that guide individuals toward or away from certain actions or goals.
- ii. Eliciting Arousal: Incentives have the capacity to evoke a state of arousal in individuals. This arousal is a heightened state of responsiveness or engagement, motivating individuals to take action. Unlike drive theory, where arousal is associated with conditions of deprivation, incentives trigger arousal directly by presenting a desirable or undesirable stimulus.

In this context, arousal refers to the state of alertness, excitement, or readiness to respond, and it is evoked by the incentive itself. The anticipation of a reward or the avoidance of a negative consequence can create a state of heightened arousal, influencing an individual's motivation to approach or withdraw from the incentive. By emphasizing the role of incentives in motivating behavior, this perspective provides a nuanced understanding of how external stimuli can shape and guide human actions. It suggests that the prospect of rewards or punishments, inherent in incentives, can serve as powerful motivators, influencing the choices individuals make in various contexts.

According to McClelland, all motives are learned, and motivated behavior can be categorized as either appetite-driven or adapted ability-driven. Motivated behavior typically manifests as either approach to a situation or withdrawal from stimuli. A motive is defined as a "strong affective association characterized by an anticipatory goal reaction and based on past association of certain cues with pleasure or pain." McClelland and his associates viewed affective processes as fundamental to motivation and emphasized that the primary function of motivation is to provide direction to behavior, rather than simply arousing it.

In comparison to incentive theory, McClelland's perspective emphasizes the role of learned motives in guiding behavior. In this view, performance standards are clearly established, and improvement is expected to result from frequent positive feedback and recognition for satisfactory behavior. Negative feedback is avoided, and it is assumed that employees' desire for the rewards of positive feedback and recognition will motivate them to perform satisfactorily in anticipation of such rewards.

In summary, motivational concepts serve two major functions in influencing behavior:

- a. Energizing Response: Motivation serves to energize responses, controlling their vigor and efficiency, either generally or specifically.
- b. Guiding Behavior: Motivation guides behavior toward specific ends, providing direction and purpose to actions.

Studies by Sharbrough (2006) and Kellerman (2007) further highlight the importance of leadership behavior in influencing employee motivation and job satisfaction. Sharbrough's study suggests a significant correlation between a leader's use of motivating language and employee job satisfaction, while Kellerman's work introduces the concept of employee engagement levels, enabling leaders to tailor their approaches to maximize motivation and commitment among their team members.

The Concept of Productivity

Productivity, as defined by various sources, encompasses the efficiency and effectiveness of utilizing resources to produce goods or services. Rollison (2002) emphasizes the relationship between inputs and outputs, highlighting the quantity of outputs obtained from a given level of inputs. This definition underscores the importance of skills, characteristics, and attitudes of individuals in influencing productivity, including factors like motivation levels, initiative, teamwork, attention to detail, communication skills, and work ethic. Saari (2006) provides a more specific perspective, defining productivity as a measure of output from a production process per unit of input. In the context of labor productivity, it is often measured as output per labor-hour, reflecting the efficiency of labor in generating output. Considering the agricultural context, productivity can be understood as the effectiveness of utilizing resources, including labor, in producing agricultural goods such as food. In this context, productivity may be measured by the number of man-hours spent by extension officers with farmers and the resulting increase in on-farm food production. This definition aligns with the broader understanding of productivity as the efficient use of resources to achieve desired outcomes.

Effects of Motivation on Productivity

The factors influencing labor productivity are multifaceted and encompass various aspects of an individual's well-being and work environment. Heizer and Render (1999) highlight the significance of basic education, diet, and social infrastructure such as transportation and sanitation in affecting labor productivity. These factors contribute to the overall health, well-being, and readiness of the labor force to engage in productive activities. Motivation, team building, training, and job security are also crucial

determinants of labor productivity. Robbins and DeCenzo (Supervision Today) emphasize that motivation stems from the willingness of individuals to act in ways that satisfy their needs. While money is often considered a primary motivator, it is essential for managers to recognize that different employees are motivated by different factors. Understanding individual differences and tailoring motivational approaches accordingly is key to enhancing employee performance. Beyond monetary incentives, effective motivation involves creating a work environment that acknowledges and responds to the diverse needs and preferences of employees. By fostering a culture of appreciation, recognition, and support, managers can cultivate a motivated workforce that is committed to achieving organizational goals. Ultimately, investing in various motivational techniques tailored to individual employees can lead to improved performance and productivity across the organization.

THEORETICAL REVIEW

Herzberg and his Two-Factor Theory

Fredrick Herzberg's Two-factor theory, also known as the motivation-hygiene theory, provides insights into the factors that influence job satisfaction and dissatisfaction. In contrast to Maslow's hierarchy of needs, which focuses on the broad spectrum of human needs, Herzberg's theory specifically addresses the factors that affect satisfaction and dissatisfaction in the workplace. According to Herzberg, there are two sets of factors: dissatisfiers and satisfiers. Dissatisfiers, also known as hygiene factors, are aspects of the work environment that, when absent, lead to dissatisfaction among employees. These factors include elements like salary, working conditions, company policies, and interpersonal relationships. Their presence does not necessarily motivate employees, but their absence can result in dissatisfaction and decreased productivity.

On the other hand, satisfiers, or motivators, are factors that contribute to job satisfaction and intrinsic motivation. These factors are related to the content of the job itself and include aspects such as achievement, recognition, challenging tasks, and opportunities for growth and advancement. Herzberg believed that these factors are crucial for enhancing job satisfaction and motivating employees to perform at their best. Herzberg's research involved asking individuals to recall specific instances of satisfaction or dissatisfaction at work, known as "satisfying experiences" and "dissatisfying experiences," respectively. Through this approach, Herzberg and his colleagues identified patterns in the factors that contributed to each type of experience, shedding light on the key determinants of job satisfaction and dissatisfaction. Overall, Herzberg's Two-factor theory emphasizes the importance of both hygiene factors and motivators in influencing employee attitudes and behaviors in the workplace. By addressing both sets of factors, organizations can create a work environment that fosters satisfaction, motivation, and productivity among employees. They are:

	Description	Satisfied %	
1	Company policy and Administration	4	36
2	Supervision	4	19
3	Relation with superior	6	10
4	Work condition	2	10
5	Salary	6	8
6	Relations with peers	4	6
7	Personal Factors	1	4
8	Relations with subordinate	4	4
9	Status	2	3
10	Security	1	2

Categorizing the factors as either satisfiers or dissatisfies must be treated with caution. It will be noted that the three main satisfiers are also important dissatisfies

	Satisfied %	Dissatisfied %
Achievement	42	10
Recognition	30	9
Work itself	22	13

Comparison of Herzberg’s satisfier and dissatisfiers.

Herzberg's Two-factor theory, with its distinction between hygiene factors and motivators, has been both influential and subject to criticism in the field of organizational psychology. The hygiene factors, which include company policy, administration, and supervision among others, are associated with the work environment rather than the inherent nature of the work itself. Their absence can lead to dissatisfaction among employees, but their presence alone does not necessarily lead to increased motivation or satisfaction. On the other hand, the motivators, such as achievement, recognition, and challenging work, are intrinsic to the job

content and have the potential to positively influence employee motivation and satisfaction. According to Herzberg, addressing motivators is key to enhancing job satisfaction and intrinsic motivation among employees. However, Herzberg's theory has faced criticism, with some scholars arguing that it oversimplifies the complexities of human motivation in the workplace. Critics have raised concerns about the methodology used in Herzberg's research, suggesting that the questionnaires may have biased the responses and led to skewed results. Despite these criticisms, Herzberg's Two-factor theory remains a valuable framework for understanding the factors that contribute to employee motivation and satisfaction. Organizations can use insights from this theory to design work environments that foster motivation, engagement, and overall job satisfaction among employees.

METHODOLOGY

Population of the study

A population encompasses all individuals or entities possessing a specific characteristic that researchers aim to comprehend, whether tangible or intangible. Trochim (2006) simplifies this concept by defining population as the group from which researchers intend to select a sample to draw generalizations. In the context of the Dangote Ibafo branch, the total population of workers amounts to 736 individuals, serving as the foundation for determining the sample size.

Sample Size Determination

In order to have a more effective sampling, the Yards formula would be adopted in determining the accurate sample size. A normal approximation with a confidence level of 95% and a margin of error 5% would be used.

The general formula is
$$[n = \frac{N}{1 + N_e^2}]$$

Where: n = the sample size

N = population

e = error margin

Therefore, n =
$$\frac{736}{1+736(0.05)^2}$$

 =
$$\frac{736}{1+736(0.0025)}$$

 =
$$\frac{736}{2.5}$$

 = 260

A sample size of two hundred and sixty (260) employees out of the seven hundred and twenty six (726) employee population of the ibafo branch of dangote PLC were administered questionnaire to.

DATA PRESENTATION, ANALYSIS, AND INTERPRETATION

The research questionnaire was distributed to a sample size of three hundred (260) employees, representing the study population of Dangote PLC. Out of this sample, two hundred and fifty-six (235) questionnaires, accounting for 90.4%, were returned, while twenty-five (25) questionnaires, comprising 9.6%, were not returned. Below is a summary of these details:

- ✓ Distributed Questionnaires: 260
- ✓ Returned Questionnaires: 235 (90.4%)
- ✓ Unreturned Questionnaires: 25 (9.6%)

Test of Hypotheses and Discussion of Results

Hypothesis 1

Hypothesis o₁: Job security does not influence stability of workforce

Hypothesis a₁: Job security influences stability of workforce

Model Summary

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	.442 ^a	.195	.191	.41114

a. Predictors: (Constant), JOB SECURITY

ANOVA

Model		Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	9.538	1	9.538	56.423	.000 ^b
	Residual	39.385	233	.169		
	Total	48.923	234			

a. Dependent Variable: STABLE WORKFORCE (SWF)

b. Predictors: (Constant), JOB SECURITY (JB)

Interpretation of Results

The results from the model summary table above revealed that the extent to which the variance in stable workforce can be explained by Job Security is 19.5% i.e (R square = 0.195). The ANOVA table shows the Fcal 56.423 at 0.0001 significance level. Job security influences the stability of workforce

Coefficients

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	T	Sig.
		B	Std. Error	Beta		
1	(Constant)	1.126	.108		10.379	.000
	JOB SECURITY	.351	.047	.442	7.512	.000

a. Dependent Variable: STABLE WORKFORCE

The coefficient table above shows the simple model that expresses how Job security influences the stability of workforce. The model is shown mathematically as follows; $Y = a + bx$ where y is stable workforce and x is Job Security, a is a constant factor and b is the value of coefficient. From this table therefore, Stable Workforce (SWF) = 1.126 + 0.351JB. This means that for every 100% change in stable workforce, job security contributed 35.1%

Decision: The significance level below 0.01 implies a statistical confidence of above 99%. This implies that Job security influences the stability. Thus, the decision would be to reject the null hypothesis (H_0), and accept the alternative hypothesis (H_1).

Hypothesis 2

Hypothesis o₂: Feeling of recognition does not affect quality of output of workers

Hypothesis a₂: Feeling of recognition affects the quality of output of workers

Model Summary

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	.159 ^a	.025	.021	.52726

a. Predictors: (Constant), EMPLOYEE RECOGNITION

ANOVA

Model		Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	1.675	1	1.675	6.025	.015 ^b
	Residual	64.775	233	.278		
	Total	66.449	234			

a. Dependent Variable: IMPROVED PRODUCT QUALITY

b. Predictors: (Constant), EMPLOYEE RECOGNITION (ER)

Interpretation of Results

The results from the model summary table above revealed that the extent to which the variance in improved product quality can be explained by Employee Recognition is 2.5% i.e (R square = 0.025). The ANOVA table shows the Fcal 6.025 at 0.0001significance level. Feeling of recognition affects the quality of workers' output.

Coefficients

Model	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
	B	Std. Error	Beta		
1 (Constant)	1.605	.148		10.877	.000
EMPLOYEE RECOGNITION	.197	.080	.159	2.454	.015

a. Dependent Variable: IMPROVED PRODUCT QUALITY

The coefficient table above shows the simple model that expresses how feeling of recognition affects the quality of the output of workers. The model is shown mathematically as follows; $Y = a+bx$ where y is Improved product quality and x is Employee recognition, a is a constant factor and b is the value of coefficient. From this table therefore, Improved Product Quality = 1.605 +0.197ER. This means that for every 100% change in improved product quality, Employee Recognition contributed 19.7% Decision: The significance level below 0.01 implies a statistical confidence of above 99%. This implies that feeling of recognition affects quality of workers’ output (product). Thus, the decision would be to reject the null hypothesis (H_0), and accept the alternative hypothesis (H_1).

SUMMARY, CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The research conducted by Engellandt and Riphahn (2004) suggests that temporary workers may exert more effort, including working unpaid overtime, compared to permanent employees. This finding challenges the conventional notion that job security is the primary motivator for employees. Instead, it implies that other factors, such as the nature of the work or the terms of employment, may influence employees' levels of effort and dedication. Job security, while important, should not be viewed as confining employees to a "life sentence" but rather as providing them with stability and assurance as long as they adhere to the organization's expectations and policies. Research by Davy et al. (1991) supports this idea, indicating that job dissatisfaction often stems from feelings of insecurity among employees. Therefore, ensuring a sense of security in employment can contribute to the stability of a qualified and experienced workforce, ultimately leading to increased productivity.

Furthermore, it is crucial for managers to recognize that employees have diverse needs and motivations. Each individual may respond differently to various incentives and forms of recognition. Therefore, a personalized approach to motivation, as advocated by Robbins (1998), is essential. This approach involves understanding the unique preferences and expectations of each employee and tailoring incentives, involvement levels, and rewards accordingly. Recognition plays a significant role in motivating employees and can take various forms, ranging from simple expressions of gratitude to more formal awards. As Kelly (2010) suggests, even a sincere "thank you" can have a profound impact on employee morale and motivation. Wiscombe (2002) emphasizes that the value of recognition lies in the attention and appreciation that employees receive, highlighting the importance of acknowledging their contributions and efforts. In summary, while job security is an important factor in employee motivation, other elements such as the nature of the work, individual preferences, and recognition also play significant roles. Managers should strive to understand and address these diverse motivations to foster a motivated and engaged workforce.

Recommendations

Based on the findings of the study, the following recommendations can be proposed:

1. Address Worker Exploitation: Efforts should be directed towards addressing the exploitation of workers, particularly in organizations that take advantage of high unemployment rates. Companies should prioritize treating workers fairly and ethically, considering their well-being and stability in the workplace.
2. Ensure Job Stability: Organizations should prioritize job stability for employees by minimizing the use of temporary or contract-based employment. While retaining recruitment and selection principles, companies should avoid outsourcing these processes to contractors who may not prioritize employee welfare.
3. Improve Working Conditions: Management should take steps to improve working conditions and create a supportive work environment for employees. This includes ensuring fair compensation, providing opportunities for career growth and development, and promoting a culture of respect and recognition.
4. Address Recruitment Practices: Companies should review their recruitment practices to ensure transparency and fairness. Avoiding discriminatory practices and providing equal opportunities for all applicants can contribute to a more positive work environment and employee satisfaction.
5. Promote Employee Engagement: Encouraging employee engagement and involvement in decision-making processes can foster a sense of ownership and commitment among workers. Management should seek feedback from employees and involve them in discussions regarding workplace policies and practices.

6. Provide Training and Development: Investing in employee training and development can enhance skills, competencies, and job satisfaction. Offering opportunities for continuous learning and advancement can motivate employees and contribute to their long-term success within the organization.
7. Monitor Contractor Practices: Management should actively monitor the practices of contractors and hold them accountable for the treatment of workers. Implementing oversight mechanisms and conducting regular evaluations can help ensure that contractors adhere to ethical standards and promote a positive work environment.

By implementing these recommendations, organizations can strive to create a work environment that prioritizes employee well-being, job stability, and fair treatment, ultimately leading to increased employee satisfaction, productivity, and organizational success.

REFERENCES

1. Adams, J.S. (1965). Inequity in social exchange: *Advances in Experimental Social Psychology*, 1, 1-63.
2. Adeyemo, D.A. (1999). Relative influence of gender and working experience on job satisfaction of primary school teachers: *The Primary School Educators*, 1, 1, 86-89.
3. Akindele, O.A. (2013). Craftsmen and Labour Productivity in the Swaziland.
4. Akintoye, I.R. (2000). The Place of Financial Management in Personal Psychology: University of Ibadan, Nigeria, 2000
5. Aluko, M.A (2000); Employee Motivation: An Effective Tool for enhancing Worker's productivity. *Business and Management Journal*.
6. Armstrong, M. (2006). A Hand Book of Human Resource Management Practice: 7th Edition. Kogan Page Limited London N1 9JN, UK.
7. Arnold, U. (2000). New dimensions of outsourcing: a combination of transaction cost
8. Asika, N. (1991). Research methodology in the Behavioral sciences, Lagos: Longman Nigeria Plc.
9. Eldin, N.N. & Egger, S. (1990). Productivity improvement mechanism: *Journal of Construction Management and Economics*, 10(1), 100-110.
10. Engellandt, A. & Riphahn, R.T. (2005). Temporary contracts and employee effort: *Labour Engineering and Management*, 116 (1), 100-110.
11. Gantt, H. L. (1913). Work, wages, and profits: New York. Engineering Magazine Company.
12. Herzberg, F. (1959). The Motivation to Work: New York, John Wiley and Sons, 1959
13. Isaac, S. K., Moses, C., Taiye, B., Chikodi, M., Agarana, F. E., Moyosoluwa, D. D., & Nifemi, O. (2023). Minimizing Smes Problems in Nigeria for Economy Sustainability Using Quantitative Technique. *International Journal of Economic, Finance and Business Statistics (IJEFB)*, 1(1), 69-80.
14. Isaac, K. S., Ibidunni, A., Kehinde, O. J., Elizabeth, K. B., Oyo-Ita, D., Mathias, C. M., & Boluwatife, O. F. (2020). Covid-19: Impact on Global Economy, Steps Taken and Way Forward. *Journal of Management Information and Decision Sciences*, 23(5), 612-618.
15. Ichino, A. & Riphahn, R.T.(2005). The effect of employment protection on worker effort: Absenteeism during and after probation. *Journal of the European Economic Association*, 3 (1):120-143, 2005.
16. Kehinde, S. I., Moses, C., Borishade, T., Busola, S. I., Adubor, N., Obembe, N., & Asemota, F. (2023). Evolution and innovation of hedge fund strategies: a systematic review of literature and framework for future research. *Acta Innovations*.
17. Kehinde, S., Moses, C., Taiye, B., Oladele, K., Obembe, N., & Simon-Ilogho, Busola. (2023). Effect Of Financial Inclusion On Gender Equality And Social Empowerment. *Remittances Review*, 8(3).
18. McGregor, D. (1960). The Human Side of Enterprise: McGraw Hill Professional, 1960-135
19. McKenzie, R. & Lee, D. (1998). Managing Through Incentives: Oxford University Press, September 24, 1998.
20. Mullins, L.J. (2015). Management and Organizational Behaviour: Prentice hall. UK 7th Ed. pp. 88; 431, 1052-1058.
21. Osaeze, B. E. & Izedonmi, O.I. (2000). Guidelines for Writing Thesis and Dissertation for Post Graduate Students in Africa: London, Day Company Limited.
22. Schumpeter, J.A. (1934). *The Theory of Economic Development*: Harvard University Press, Cambridge, MA.100
23. Sharbrough, W. (2006). Motivating Language in Industry: Business Source Premier Database, January 2006.
24. Sheen, G. & Tai, C. (2016). A Study on Decision Factors and Third Party Selection
25. Trochim, W.M. (2016). *Research Methods Knowledge Base*: Retrieved March 2011, from <http://www.socialresearchmethods.net/kb/design.php>
26. Whiteling, I. (2017). A Message from the Frontline: Business Source Premier Database, 2007
27. Williams, W.S. (2016). Supporting the Growth of Small and Medium Enterprises: WIPO Magazine, Starting a new Company: Consider Franchising as an Option, Nov – Dec,2003.pp.14, http://www.wipo.int/sme/en/documents/wipo_magazine/11_2003pdf.