THE INFLUENCE OF INTRINSIC AND EXTRINSIC MOTIVATION FACTORS ON EMPLOYEE'S PERFORMANCE AT PECCA LEATHER SDN. BHD. AS MEDIATED BY JOB SATISFACTION

Abdul Kadir Othman [1] ⓘ **, Mohd Zulkifli Abdullah** [2] ⓘ **, Noor Fadhilah Aziz** [2] ⓘ **, Siti Noraini Mohd Tobi** [1] ⓘ

1 Institute of Business Excellence (IBE), Universiti Teknologi MARA, 40450 Shah Alam, Selangor, Malaysia
2 Faculty of Business and Management, Universiti Teknologi MARA, 43200 Puncak Alam, Selangor, Malaysia
E-mail: m_zulkifli@uitm.edu.my

Abstract
Employee performance has been a topic of interest for researchers and practitioners in the field of industrial or organizational psychology for decades. There is no single solution for the problem related to this topic. The present study is meant to investigate the factors that might contribute to increasing employee performance at Pecca Leather Sdn. Bhd. To further explain the relationship between the predictors and the outcome variable, job satisfaction was included as the mediating variable. The results indicate that task significance and growth, and task execution have significant direct relationship with job performance. Meanwhile, job satisfaction acts as a quasi-mediator on the relationship between task significance and growth and job performance and between task execution and job performance. Top management at the company must consider these two factors in motivating their staff to achieve high job performance. Other implications are discussed in the paper.

Research paper

Scientificia

Introduction

Nowadays, most of organizations work hard to improve the motivation of their employees and related knowledge, skills and abilities to enhance work performance because they believe that the key to the success of a company is not only on technological excellence and the availability of funds, but the human factor should also be considered (Rozi & Sunarsi, 2020; Çetin & Aşkun, 2018). To increase productivity in an organization, motivation is needed to preserve employees' perceptions to be more responsive to the work environment (Niati, Siregar & Prayoga, 2021). Employee performance is always related to the motivational outcome. Employees with low motivation tend to have a low performance as compared to those who have high motivation.

There are numerous factors that could lead to the high performance of employees. However, the motivational impact on employee's performance might be different based on their needs. For example, employees who are not satisfied with their job tasks might not see the rewards as a motivational factor that can boost their performance. Employee motivation can be divided into two which are intrinsic and extrinsic. Intrinsic motivation refers to the activity or role that you are enjoying without being forced by any party. In contrast, extrinsic motivation refers to the desire to perform better to receive positive outcomes or to avoid negative consequences. In an organization, the management must identify motivational factors that could enhance their employees' performance in order to determine the factors that contribute to high performance of employees (Issa, 2021).

According to Rusu and Avasilcai (2013), employees' motivation has a fundamental role in each organization which establishes strategic objectives

for achieving high performance. There is a direct relationship between employees' motivation dimensions and human resources performance obtained at the workplace. In such context, it appears as very significant to managers to identify the motivational factors which lead employees to perform during accomplishing their daily work activities.

Motivation of employees in the workplace still remains one of the sensitive subjects that determine the level of input that employees will put in the organization to achieve outstanding performance. This means that motivation, either intrinsic or extrinsic contributes to employee satisfaction and thus enhances performance and productivity (Kuranchie-Mensah & Amponsah-Tawiah, 2016; Forson et al., 2021) and it is expressed by Lawler (2003) that in the 21st century, treating people right is not an option but a necessity. This was emphasized by Dreher and Dougherty (2002) that the way a company manages its workforce determines its ability to establish and maintain a competitive advantage over other companies. Thus, this study aims to investigate the factors of intrinsic and extrinsic motivation that might contribute to increased employee performance at Pecca Leather Sdn. Bhd.

Literature Review

Intrinsic motivation is perceived as the desire to do something just for the sake of pleasure in doing the activity (Deci, 2009). Moreover, intrinsic motivation has been understood as employees' desire to work based on their own spirit (Qayyum, 2012), and it is also claimed to be very crucial for any organization (Frey & Osterloh, 2002). Intrinsic motivation reflects the positive associations with contingent work performance (Cerasoli, 2014). According to Gagné (2010), intrinsic motivation has led to job satisfaction and

has a negative impact on the turnover rate (Cerasoli, 2014). Furthermore, intrinsic motivation seems to influence the employees to have better performance at work (Hennessey, 2000). Nicklin and Ford (2014) also found that there is a strong relationship between intrinsic motivation and performance. Another study by Pratheepkanth (2011) also found that employees who perform well were driven by non-monetary rewards. Although each individual will have a different desire on what motivates them, the motivation to execute any task will affect performance (Van-Knippenberg, 2000). Thus, intrinsic motivation has shown a positive relationship with employee performance.

Meanwhile, extrinsic motivation refers to the desire to do something with the intention to get positive feedback and returns, such as rewards and recognition, while avoiding negative consequences such as punishment (Deci & Ryan, 2000). Motivation can be in terms of extrinsic rewards, for example, financial incentives and status. These types of rewards should compensate for the lack of fulfilment and enjoyment regarding the job done (Thomas, 2009; Hosseini et al., 2022). Extrinsic motivation refers to rewards, salary, benefits, and incentives (Qayyum, 2012; Radovic Markovic et al., 2019; Soleimani et al., 2022). Another researcher highlights extrinsic rewards as referring to external sources or forces such as salary, money, or grades, etc. (Scott & Bruce, 1994). It has been found that employees who are satisfied tend to do work effectively and it motivate them to perform better than anyone else (Mehmod, 2013). In a study by Edirisooriyaa (2014), the findings show that when a reward is offered to employees, there is an equivalent enhancement in employee performance. To conclude, Reio and Callahon (2004) said that both intrinsic and extrinsic rewards motivate employees to increase their productivity.

Besides, extrinsic motivation through recognition is able to motivate the employees to perform the task better, and therefore, organizations must identify employees who tend to be motivated when there is recognition in terms of their work done (Caligiuri et al., 2010; Kumari, Barkat Ali & Abbas, 2021). There are two forms of recognition which are by team and individual. Managers should identify and provide recognition precisely so that it will help to boost the employee's performance. Here, the managers must reward the employees immediately so that they will get motivated due to the feeling of being appreciated when organizations are personalizing the rewards.

Besides rewards and recognition, task significance also injects significant motivation into the employees. It has been reported that tasks with higher significance constantly increase the level of work engagement. The specific task gives meaning to some people and employees who perceived the task's importance will definitely increase effort and persistence (Issa, 2021). In another aspect, it has been said that task significance centers on how essential the task is to the overall efforts of the organization both locally and internationally (Salau et al., 2014). Hence, when task significance is very high, it will serve as a driving force and motivational tool for employees to increase and exert more effort on the job (Lynton & Pareek, 2000). For instance, Grant (2008) demonstrated that employees' commitment increases when they are aware of the significance of the task by putting more effort when working on the task. Effort and persistence always lead to a high level of work engagement (Suzuki, Tamesue, Asahi, & Ishikawa, 2015).

It is essential to study the effect of intrinsic and extrinsic motivation towards employee performance as it explains individuals' behaviors that contribute to the organizational goals (Forson et al., 2021). It is also referring to

the adequate fulfillment of technical requirements and includes task-specific efforts or behavior associated with the execution or completion of a required function or unit of work (Rank et al., 2009). Meanwhile, job satisfaction can be defined as employees' affective reactions to their jobs (Fields, 2002). The relationship between job satisfaction and employee's performance has always been discussed in organizational behavior and human resource management literature, and it is found that satisfied employees have positive attitudes regarding their jobs. Satisfied workers tend to attend to work on time, show loyalty and commitment to the job, tend to improve knowledge, are willing to accept more responsibility, obey rules and regulations, and have less absenteeism in the present job (Abdulwahab, 2016). Hence, this positive attitude in work-related responsibilities will result in favorable employee performance. This study investigates the mediating role of job satisfaction towards the relationship between intrinsic, extrinsic motivations and employee's performance.

Research Methods

A cross-sectional research design was used to examine the relationship between intrinsic and extrinsic motivation on job satisfaction and task performance among employees in Pecca Leather Sdn. Bhd. Pecca Leather Sdn. Bhd. is a manufacturing industry located in Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia. Data were collected through the online survey (Google Forms) that was personally administered to the respective respondents via email. The sampling frame was based on a list of office workers in the said organization. A total of 250 sets of questionnaires were distributed within three months, starting

from April to June 2020. A total of 201 sets of the questionnaire were returned, recording the return rate of 80.4%. The questionnaire was adapted from established questionnaires, and the items were modified in order to be aligned with the research questions of the present study.

The items used to collect the data were adopted from Ryan and Connell (1989) and Yousaf, Yang and Sanders (2015) for rewards and recognition (12 items). Examples of the items are *"the company provides sufficient rewards for outstanding performance"* and *"the rewards provided by the company are worth pursuing"*. Both rewards and recognition scored reliability of 0.61 and 0.80. Meanwhile, task significance and growth consist of 10 items for example, *"the work that I am doing allows me to know my strengths and weaknesses"* and *"the work that I am doing increases my self-esteem"*. The reliability score is 0.91. (Allan et al., 2018). Task execution was adopted from Robert (2002) with 0.80 reliability value consist of 5 items, namely, *"I know what should be done and what should not be done within my job scope"* and *"I have the chance to execute my roles and responsibilities"*. Meanwhile, there are 5 items each respectively for employee performance and job satisfaction. Example of items for job satisfaction are *"I am willing to spend extra time on my work"* and *"My work that I am doing is interesting"*.

The questionnaire utilized closed-ended questions with a fixed range of possible answers using a 5-point Likert scale with the following values: 1 = strongly disagree, 2 = disagree, 3 = neutral, 4 = agree and 5 = strongly agree to measure all variables. The items were modified in order to get the required responses that would answer the research questions. The collected data were analyzed using the statistical software, SPSS Version 25. The study used both

descriptive statistics (mean and standard deviation) and inferential statistics (multiple regression analysis).

Findings and Discussion

Profile of Respondents

Describing the participants involved in the study, 94 respondents or 46.8% were male and 107 respondents or 53.2% were female. Examining the respondents' age and generation, majority of respondents (143) or 71.1% were Generation Y (Age 24-39), followed by generation X (Age 40-55) with 29 respondents or 14.4% and Generation Z (Age less than 24) with 28 respondents or 13.9% of the total sample while only 1 respondent or 0.5% was from the Baby Boomers generation (Age 55 and above). A total of 96 respondents or 47.8% were married while 94 respondents or 46.8% were single. Additionally, 3 respondents or 3.0% were divorced and 2 respondents or 1.0% were separated.

Regarding the participants' educational level, majority of respondents or 77 individuals (38.3%) had bachelor's degree, followed by those who had diploma (34 respondents or 16.9%) and SPM/ STPM qualification (32 respondents or 15.9%) while 13 respondents or 6.5% had master's degree or higher qualifications. Exploring the sampling distribution for the working experience in their current job position, most respondents or 118 persons had been working for the organization between one and five years (58.7%) followed by those who had been with the organization for less than a year (46 respondents or 22.9%), while 25 individuals or 12.4% have worked for five to ten years in the organization. The remaining groups are those who had working experience between 10 and 15 years (4 respondents or 2.00%), and

those who had been with the organization for more than 20 years (1 respondent or 0.5%).

Factor Analysis

A maximum likelihood factor analysis with varimax rotation was performed to examine the dimensionality of the items measuring the independent variables in the study as outlined by Coakes and Steed (2009). Based on Table 1, a six-factor structure emerged from the analysis explaining 74.83% of the variance in the model. KMO value of .920 indicates that the correlation matrix is sufficient for factor analysis to be performed (Dana et al., 2022). MSA values ranging from .861 to .955 indicate that the sampling is adequate for each item to form the factor structure. The results of factor analysis indicate the existence of four factors.

The first factor consists of nine items measuring two dimensions of extrinsic motivation (advancement and task significance). One item was deleted due to high cross-loading. The loadings range from .794 to .872. The factor was renamed as task significance and growth. The second factor contains five items measuring extrinsic motivation (rewards & recognition). None of the items were deleted. The remaining factor loadings range from .861 to .933 and the name is preserved.

The third factor consists of seven items from two different dimensions of measuring intrinsic motivation (skill variety and task feedback). Three items were removed due to high cross loadings. The remaining factor loadings are in the range between .572 and .781. The name of the factor was changed to task execution. The fourth component contains four items measuring intrinsic motivation (job support). The factor loadings range from .670 to .737.

This factor consisted of four items which reflected employees' perceptions towards support on the job; therefore, the original name of job support was retained for subsequent analysis.

Table 1. Results of Factor Analysis for the Independent Variables (Intrinsic & Extrinsic Motivation) (n=201)

	Component			
	1	2	3	4
Extrinsic Motivation - Task Significance and Growth				
My work provides me with opportunities for career advancement.	.872			
My work provides opportunities for me to move forward.	.837			
My work opens up opportunities for me to achieve my career goal.	.833			
My work provides me with brighter future.	.825			
My job allows me to improve myself.	.818			
Doing my job makes me a better person.	.818			
My work clarifies my career path.	.805			
The work that I am doing enhances my self-worth.	.795			
The work that I am doing allows me to use my skills and abilities.	.794			
Extrinsic Motivation - Rewards and Recognition				
The rewards provided by the company are worth pursuing.		.933		
The recognition I received differentiates me from the rest of other employees.		.922		
The company provides sufficient rewards for outstanding performance.		.912		
The rewards provided by the company are irresistible.		.911		
I received recognition from the supervisor for excellent performance.		.861		
Intrinsic Motivation - Task Execution				
I develop strategies to ensure the achievement of the work goals.			.781	
I have the capability to achieve the performance target.			.766	
I have the chance to execute my roles and responsibilities.			.766	
I have all the necessary skills to do my job well.			.656	
The work that I am doing is challenging.			.619	
My skills improve from time to time when doing my job.			.608	
I know what should be done and what should not be done within my job scope.			.572	
Intrinsic Motivation - Job Support				
I have the required resources for the achievement of the work goals.				.737

I have the support required to ensure the achievement of the performance target.						.698
I have clear job description as guidelines.						.678
I have clear roles and responsibilities.						.670
% variance explained (74.83%)			28.20	17.62	17.23	11.78
Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin Measure of Sampling Adequacy.						.920
Bartlett's Test of Sphericity	Approx. Chi-Square					4835.475
	df					300
	Sig.					.000
MSA						.861-.955

Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis

As can be seen from Table 2, the KMO measure of sampling adequacy for the job satisfaction scale is .888 indicating that the items were interrelated, and they shared common factors. Bartlett's Test of Sphericity shows a significant value (Approx. Chi-Square = 750.909, p < .001) indicating the significance of the correlation matrix and appropriateness for factor analysis (Rahman et al., 2022; Ebrahimi et al., 2022). Moreover, the individual MSA values range from .863 to .929, indicating that the data matrix was suitable to be factor analyzed. Principal components analysis conducted on the five items of job satisfaction (surface acting) resulted in a single factor, explaining 77.25% of the variance in the data. The results of a scree plot test also supported a one-factor solution. This is consistent with the original conceptualization of surface acting which asserted that the construct was unidimensional. Since only one component was extracted, the solution could not be rotated.

Table 2. Results of Factor Analysis for the Mediating Variable (Job Satisfaction) (n=201)

		Component
		1
My heart is always attached to my work.		.908
My work is fun.		.890
My work that I am doing is interesting.		.874
I feel excited when doing my work.		.870
I am willing to spend extra time on my work.		.851
% variance explained		77.25
Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin Measure of Sampling Adequacy.		.888
Bartlett's Test of Sphericity	Approx. Chi-Square	750.909
	df	10
	Sig.	.000
MSA		.863-.929

Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis

As shown in Table 3, a factor structure from the analysis above explains 57.93% of the variance in the model. The KMO value of .812 indicates that the correlation matrix is sufficient for factor analysis to be performed. MSA values ranging from .763 to .866 indicate that the sampling is adequate for each item to form the factor structure. The results of factor analysis indicate the existence of the factor as originally conceptualized. The dependent variable factor consists of five items measuring employees' task performance. The loadings range from .763 to .866. None of the items were deleted therefore, the name of the variable is retained.

Table 3. Results of Factor Analysis for the Dependent Variable (Task Performance) (n=201)

		Component
		1
I was able to set priorities.		.812
I managed my time well.		.793
I was able to carry out my work efficiently.		.767
I managed to plan my work so that I finished it on time.		.715
I kept in mind the work result I needed to achieve.		.713
% variance explained		57.93
Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin Measure of Sampling Adequacy.		.812
Bartlett's Test of Sphericity	Approx. Chi-Square	326.881
	df	10
	Sig.	.000
MSA		.763-.866

Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis

Assumptions for Multivariate Analysis

Normality

To ensure that the distribution of data is normal, skewness and kurtosis were referred to. The values of skewness and kurtosis should be within +/-3 (Cain, Zhang & Yuan, 2017). Based on the below table, all variables have the values of skewness and kurtosis within the range except for two variables that have higher kurtosis values, where the values slightly exceed the threshold values of +/-3. Brown (2006) suggested that the kurtosis values less than +/-10 are still acceptable. Therefore, the data distribution is considered normal. The subsequent analysis was carried out without any transformation because there is no deviation from the suggested values. Therefore, the first assumption of multivariate analysis is met.

Table 4. Normality Analysis (n=201)

Variables	Skewness	Kurtosis
Task Significance & Growth	-1.402	1.792
Rewards & Recognition	.478	-.863
Task Execution	-1.515	5.328
Job Support	-1.068	1.091
Job Satisfaction	-1.155	.994
Task Performance	-1.337	3.463

Table 5. Results of Correlation and Reliability Analysis (n=201)

No	Variables	Mean	SD	1	2	3	4	5	6
1	Task Significance & Growth	3.98	.93	(.964)					
2	Rewards & Recognition	2.76	1.13	.294**	(.954)				
3	Task Execution	4.25	.56	.566**	.088	(.875)			
4	Job Support	4.01	.80	.672**	.167**	.737**	(.894)		
5	Job Satisfaction	3.98	.88	.801**	.270**	.533**	.552**	(.925)	
6	Task Performance	4.25	.61	.713**	.177**	.645**	.565**	.687**	(.815)

Notes: **. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (1-tailed); N=201; Cronbach's alphas in the parentheses along the diagonal

Table 5 illustrates the results of correlation and reliability analysis for this study. Examining the relationship between one independent variable and another independent variable, the lowest correlation is observed between rewards and recognition and task execution (r=.088; p<.01). On the other hand, the highest correlation is observed between task execution and job support (r=.737; p<.01). The results of correlation analysis show that all independent variables are significantly correlated with each other, indicating convergent validity.

Assessing the relationship between the independent variables and the moderating variable, the highest correlation is between task significant and growth and job satisfaction (r=801; p<.01). Besides, the lowest correlation is observed between rewards and recognition and job satisfaction (r=.270;

p<.01). The findings show potential mediating role of job satisfaction on the relationship between extrinsic and intrinsic motivation and job satisfaction. Lastly, the four independent variables have also recorded low to moderate relationship with the dependent variable. The lowest correlation is between rewards and recognition and task performance (r=.177; p<.01) while the highest correlation is recorded between task significance and growth and task performance (r=.713; p<.01). All independent variables are significantly correlated with the dependent variables, indicating concurrent validity.

Table 6. Results of Multiple Regression Analysis (Motivation Factors and Job Satisfaction) (n=201)

Variables	Standardized Beta Coefficients
Task Significance & Growth	.800**
Rewards & Recognition	.022
Task Execution	.134*
Job Support	-.058
R	.849
R^2	.720
Adjusted R^2	.715
F value	124.258
Sig. F value	.000
Durbin Watson	1.968

** Sig. at the 0.01 level; * Sig. at the 0.05 level.

Table 6 present the results of multiple regression analysis between motivation factors and job satisfaction (Pereira et al., 2021; Hameed et al., 2021; Yakubu et al., 2022; Salamzadeh et al., 2022). The R^2 is 0.720 indicating that 72.0% of the variance in the regression model is explained by the independent variables. The regression model is significant (F(4, 193)=124.258; p<.01). Looking at the contribution of each independent variable in explaining the variance in the dependent variable, only two out of four independent variables are the significant predictors. Task significance and

growth is the strongest predictor (β=.800; p<.01), followed by task execution (β=.134; p<.05). Rewards and recognition (β=.022; p>.05) and job support (β=-.058; p>.05) are not the significant predictors of job satisfaction.

Table 7. Results of Mediated Multiple Regression Analysis (Motivation Factors, Job Satisfaction and Task Performance) (n=201)

Variables	Task Performance		Remark
	Standardized Beta Coefficients		
	Without Mediator	**With Mediator**	
Task Significance & Growth	.620**	.335**	Quasi mediation effect
Rewards & Recognition	.015	.008	No mediation effect
Task Execution	.403**	.357**	Quasi mediation effect
Job Support	-.096	-.083	No mediation effect
Job Satisfaction		.360**	Mediator is significant
R	.841	.862	
R²	.708	.743	
Adjusted R²	.701	.736	
R² Change	.708	.035	
F Change	114.371	25.591	
Sig. F Change	.000	.000	
Durbin Watson		1.835	

** Sig. at the 0.01 level; * Sig. at the 0.05 level.

A hierarchical regression analysis was conducted to assess the mediating role of job satisfaction in affecting the relationship between motivation factors and task performance among respondents. Based on the results in Table 7, the first step of the regression model (without a mediator) shows R^2 of .708, indicating that 70.8% of the variance in the model is explained by the independent variables. The F value is significant ($F(4, 201)=114.371$; p<.01). Looking at the regression coefficients, two factors are significant; task significance and growth (β=.620; p<.01) and task execution (β=.403; p<.01). The other two factors are not significant; rewards and recognition (β=.015; p>.05)

and job support (β=.-.096; p>.05). Examining the second step of the hierarchical regression analysis (with a mediator), the results show that there is an increase in R^2 by 0.035, indicating that the inclusion of a mediator increases the explanation of variance by 3.5%. The model is also significant (F(5, 201)=25.591; p<.01), showing an increase of F change of 25.591 and the increment is significant.

The coefficient values in the second step of the hierarchical regression analysis denote the reduction in the standardized beta coefficients for two variables; task significance and growth (β=.335; p<.01) and task execution (β=.357; p<.01). However, the reduction does not reduce the significance level of the two variables. Therefore, it be summarized that there is a quasi-mediation effect of job satisfaction on the link between task significance and growth and task performance and the link between task execution and task performance. There is no mediating effect of job satisfaction on the relationship between rewards and recognition and task performance and the relationship between job support and task performance. Job satisfaction is significant as a mediator (β=.360; p<.01).

Discussion

Based on the results of the study, the first significant finding is task significance and growth significantly influence job satisfaction. Task significance refers to the influence and impact that people's jobs have on other people's lives or work (Morgeson & Humphrey, 2006). This is consistent with the results from previous studies i.e., task significance was positively related to job satisfaction, work motivation, and performance (Humphrey et al., 2007;

Grant, 2008). Besides, task significance often emerges as the strongest predictor, as a study asking participants what makes their work meaningful found that by far the largest categories of responses reflected themes of helping others directly or contributing to the greater good (Allan et al., 2018). Secondly, task execution significantly influences job satisfaction in which when the employees have completed their task, they feel satisfied with their achievement. Next, job satisfaction significantly influences task performance. Job satisfaction can be defined as employees' affective reactions to their jobs ((Issa, 2021), while task performance refers to individuals' behaviors that contribute to organizational goals (Kumari, Barkat Ali & Abbas, 2021). Task performance also refers to the adequate fulfillment of technical requirements and includes task-specific efforts or behavior associated with the execution or completion of a required function or unit of work (Rank et al., 2009).

The current study also revealed that task significance and growth significantly influence task performance. Most of the organizations may want to increase employees' perceived task significance, for example, through leadership highlighting the meaningfulness of work tasks and job roles, or by sharing stories about the positive effects of employee's work tasks on the lives and jobs of others (Forson et al., 2021). This would likely lead to increased job performance. Next, task execution significantly influences task performance as employees will feel motivated when the task is executed properly. Interestingly, this study proved that job satisfaction mediates the relationship between task significance and growth and task performance as employees with high levels of task significance are more engaged in their work. Previous studies have linked personal resources to outcomes through work engagement, such as the research by Karatepe and Karadas (2015), which showed

that job engagement acted as a partial mediator of the effect of positive psychological capital (i.e., self-efficacy, hope, optimism, and resilience) on job satisfaction. Lastly, job satisfaction mediates the relationship between task execution and task performance.

There are two non-significant findings from the research. Firstly, rewards and recognition does not significantly influence job satisfaction. Although previous studies have demonstrated that recognition and reward are the key motivational tools that significantly contribute to job satisfaction, reduce stress and increase organizational effectiveness (Browne, 2000), surprisingly, the current study does not prove it. These factors might be due to the unattractive rewards and inconsistent recognition shown by the employer. Secondly, job support does not significantly influence job satisfaction. It seems that job satisfaction among employees is not influenced by the job support such as 'clear job description as guidelines' and 'clear roles and responsibilities. Majority of the respondents in this study have worked for at least a year in the said organization, they are supposedly familiar with the job description and responsibilities, therefore, it is not a contribution factor to their job satisfaction.

Implications of the Study

According to the findings of this study, it can be easily observed that extrinsic as well as intrinsic motivation are equally important, and employers need to design reward schemes matching the magnitude of the task and hard work that employees put in place. From the results, it is also observed that both factors have their own value and employers should provide employees with extrinsic motivation as well as intrinsic motivation. The findings of this

study suggest that well-motivated employees are more committed, efficient and effective. Consequently, if motivation factors are being ignored by employers, employees might show poor performance, get demotivated, show less commitment, as well as show an increase in turnover and absenteeism. From this study, it is noticed that employees must be given clear tasks and responsibilities, from the beginning until the end in order to ensure that they can perform well. Besides, employees must be shown possible career paths so that they are motivated and aware of the expectations from the employer.

The theoretical implications of the study are that the findings add to the existing body of knowledge in terms of the link between job satisfaction and task performance. Besides, the findings show the importance of job satisfaction as a mediator in the link between extrinsic and intrinsic factors in task performance. The findings open up the opportunity for future researchers to explore the link between job satisfaction and other work and organizational outcomes. Lastly, future researchers are encouraged to develop questionnaire surveys that can accurately measure the factors under the study scope and that can gauge true or honest feedback from respondents.

Conclusion

Every organization intends to achieve high performance, and this is possible when employees can collectively contribute to reaching the goal. The present study was conducted among employees at one private company in order to investigate the factors that motivate employees to achieve high job performance. Among the four factors investigated in this study, namely: task significance and growth, rewards and recognition, task execution and job sup-

port, only two factors were found to affect job performance directly and indirectly through job satisfaction. Task significance and growth, and task execution must be the central focus of the top management if they want the employees to stay motivated and contribute to the achievement of the organizational goals. Assigning employees with identifiable tasks from the beginning till the end, ensuring their personal and career development and equipping employees with skills and competencies will most likely drive them to exhibit high job performance

References

1. Abdulwahab S. Bin Shmailan (2016). The relationship between job satisfaction, job performance and employee engagement: An explorative study. Issues in Business Management and Economics, 4(1), 1-8.

2. Allan, B. A., Duffy, R. D., & Collisson, B. (2018). Task significance and performance: Meaningfulness as a mediator. Journal of Career Assessment, 26(1), 172-182.

3. Caligiuri P., Lepak D. & Bonache J. (2010). Global Dimensions of Human Resources Management: Managing the Global Workforce. Hoboken, NJ: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.

4. Cerasoli, C. P., Nicklin, J. M., & Ford, M. T. (2014). Intrinsic motivation and extrinsic incentives jointly predict performance: A 40-year meta-analysis. Psychol. Bull. 140, 980–1008.

5. Çetin, F., & Aşkun, D. (2018). The effect of occupational self-efficacy on work performance through intrinsic work motivation. Management Research Review, 41(2), 186-201.

6. Dana, L. P., Salamzadeh, A., Hadizadeh, M., Heydari, G., & Shamsoddin, S. (2022). Urban Entrepreneurship and Sustainable Businesses in Smart Cities: Exploring the Role of Digital Technologies. Sustainable Technology and Entrepreneurship, 100016.

7. Dana, L. P., Salamzadeh, A., Mortazavi, S., & Hadizadeh, M. (2022). Investigating the impact of international markets and new digital technologies on business innovation in emerging markets. Sustainability, 14(2), 983.

8. Dana, L. P., Salamzadeh, A., Mortazavi, S., Hadizadeh, M., & Zolfaghari, M. (2022). Strategic futures studies and entrepreneurial resiliency: a focus on digital technology trends and emerging markets. Tec Empresarial, 16(1), 87-100.

9. Deci, E. L. & Ryan, R. M., (2000). Self-determination theory and the facilitation of intrinsic motivation, social development, and well-being. American Psychologist, 55(1), 68–78.

10. Deci, E. L., Koestner, R., & Ryan, R. M. (1999). A meta-analytic review of experiments examining the effects of extrinsic rewards on intrinsic motivation. Psychol. Bull. 125, 627–668.

11. Dreher, G.F., & Dougherty, T.W. (2002). Human Resource Strategy: A behavioural perspective for the general manager. Irwin, San Francisco: McGraw-Hill.

12. Ebrahimi, P., Salamzadeh, A., Gholampour, A., & Fekete-Farkas, M. (2021). Social networks marketingand Hungarian online consumer purchase behavior: the microeconomics strategic view based on IPMA matrix. Academy of Strategic Management Journal, 20(4), 1-7.

13. Ebrahimi, P., Salamzadeh, A., Soleimani, M., Khansari, S. M., Zarea, H., & Fekete-Farkas, M. (2022). Startups and Consumer Purchase Behavior: Application of Support Vector Machine Algorithm. Big Data and Cognitive Computing, 6(2), 34.

14. Edirisooriya, W. A. (2014, February). Impact of rewards on employee performance: With special reference to ElectriCo. In Proceedings of the 3rd International Conference on Management and Economics, 26(1), 311-318.

15. Forson, J. A., Ofosu-Dwamena, E., Opoku, R. A., & Adjavon, S. E. (2021). Employee motivation and job performance: a study of basic school teachers in Ghana. Future Business Journal, 7(1), 1-12.

16. Frey, B. & Osterloh, M. (2002). Successful management by motivation: balancing intrinsic and extrinsic motivation. Springer, Berlin.

17. Gagné, M., Forest, J., Gilbert, M.-H., Aubé, C., Morin, E., & Malorni, A. (2010). The motivation at work scale: Validation evidence in two languages. Educational and Psychological Measurement, 70, 628–646.

18. Hameed, N. S. S., Salamzadeh, Y., Rahim, N. F. A., & Salamzadeh, A. (2021). The impact of business process reengineering on organizational performance during the coronavirus pandemic: moderating role of strategic thinking. foresight.

19. Hosseini, E., Ardekani, S. S., Sabokro, M., & Salamzadeh, A. (2022). The study of knowledge employee voice among the knowledge-based companies: the case of an emerging economy. Revista de Gestão.

20. Hosseini, E., Tajpour, M., Salamzadeh, A., & Ahmadi, A. (2022). Team Performance and the Development of Iranian Digital Start-ups: The Mediating Role of Employee Voice. In Managing Human Resources in SMEs and Start-ups: International Challenges and Solutions (pp. 109-140).

21. Humphrey, S. E., Nahrgang, J. D., & Morgeson, F. P. (2007). Integrating motivational, social, and contextual work design features: a meta-analytic summary and theoretical extension of the work design literature. Journal of Applied Psychology, 92(5), 1332.

22. Issa, A. O. (2021). Effects of motivation on staff performance and job satisfaction in the University of Ilorin Library. Insaniyat: Journal of Islam and Humanities, 5(2), 91-104.

23. Karatepe, O. M. & Karadas, G. (2015). Do psychological capital and work engagement foster frontline employees' satisfaction? A study in the hotel industry. International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management, 27(6), 1254-1278.

24. Kumari, K., Barkat Ali, S., & Abbas, J. (2021). Examining the role of motivation and reward in employees' job performance through mediating effect of job satisfaction: an empirical evidence. International Journal of Organizational Leadership, 10(4), 401-420.

25. Kuranchie-Mensah, E. B., & Amponsah-Tawiah, K. (2016). Employee motivation and work performance: A comparative study of mining companies in Ghana. Journal of Industrial Engineering and Management (JIEM), 9(2), 255-309.

26. Lawler, E.E. (2003). Treat people right. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Inc. McGraw- Hill Irwin.

27. Morgeson, F. P., & Humphrey, S. E. (2006). The work design questionnaire (WDQ): developing and validating a comprehensive measure for assessing job design and the nature of work. Journal of Applied Psychology, 91(6), 1321.

28. Niati, D. R., Siregar, Z. M. E., & Prayoga, Y. (2021). The effect of training on work performance and career development: The role of motivation as intervening variable. Budapest International Research and Critics Institute (BIRCI-Journal): Humanities and Social Sciences, 4(2), 2385-2393.

29. Pereira, J., Braga, V., Correia, A., & Salamzadeh, A. (2021). Unboxing organisational complexity: how does it affect business performance during the COVID-19 pandemic?. Journal of Entrepreneurship and Public Policy.

30. Pratheepkanth, P. (2011). Reward system and its impact on employee motivation in commercial bank of Sri Lanka plc, in Jaffna district. Global Journal of management and business research, 11(4), 1-10.

31. Qayyum, A. (2012). An empirical analysis of employee motivation and the role of demographics: The banking industry of Pakistan. Global Business & Management Research, 4(1), 1-14.

32. Radović-Marković, M., Salamzadeh, A., & Vujičić, S. (2019). Selection of organization models and creation of competences of the employed people for the sake of competitiveness growth in global business environment. International Review, (1-2), 64-71.

33. Rahman, M. M., Tabash, M. I., Salamzadeh, A., Abduli, S., & Rahaman, M. S. (2022). Sampling techniques (probability) for quantitative social science researchers: a conceptual guidelines with examples. Seeu Review, 17(1), 42-51.

34. Reio, G. T., & Callahon, J. L. (2004). Affect, curiosity, and socialization-related learning: A path analysis of antecedents to job performance. Journal of Business and Psychology, 1(19), 3-22.

35. Rozi, A., & Sunarsi, D. (2020). The influence of motivation and work experience on employee performance at PT. Yamaha Saka Motor in South Tangerang. Jurnal Office, 5(2), 65-74.

36. Rusu, G., & Avasilcai, S. (2013). Human resources motivation: an organizational performance perspective. Annals of the Oradea University. Fascicle of Management and Technological Engineering, 22(12), 331-334.

37. Ryan, R. M., & Connell, J. P. (1989). Perceived locus of causality and internalization: examining reasons for acting in two domains. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 57, 749–761.

38. Salamzadeh, A., Ebrahimi, P., Soleimani, M., & Fekete-Farkas, M. (2022). Grocery Apps and Consumer Purchase Behavior: Application of Gaussian Mixture Model and Multi-Layer Perceptron Algorithm. Journal of Risk and Financial Management, 15(10), 424.

39. Scott, S. G., & Bruce, R. A. (1994). Determinants of innovative behavior: A path model of individual innovation in the workplace. Academy of Management Journal, 37(3), 580–607.

40. Soleimani, M., Dana, L. P., Salamzadeh, A., Bouzari, P., & Ebrahimi, P. (2022). The effect of internal branding on organisational financial performance and brand loyalty: mediating role of psychological empowerment. Journal of Asian Business and Economic Studies.

41. Suzuki, Y., Tamesue, D., Asahi, K., & Ishikawa, Y. (2015). Grit and work engagement: A cross-sectional study. PloS one, 10(9), e0137501.

42. Van Knippenberg, D. (2000). Work motivation and performance: A social identity perspective. Applied Psychology: An International Review, 49(3), 357–371.

43. Yakubu, B. N., Salamzadeh, A., Bouzari, P., Ebrahimi, P., & Fekete-Farkas, M. (2022). Identifying the key factors of sustainable entrepreneurship in the Nigerian food industry: The role of media availability. Entrepreneurial Business and Economics Review, 10(2), 147-162.

44. Yousaf, A., Yang, H., & Sanders, K. (2015). Effects of intrinsic and extrinsic motivation on task and contextual performance of Pakistani professionals: The mediating role of commitment foci. Journal of Managerial Psychology, 30(2), 133-150.

Othman, A. K., Abdullah, M. Z., Aziz, N. F., & Tobi, S. N. M. 2022. The Influence of Intrinsic and Extrinsic Motivation Factors on Employee's Performance at Pecca Leather Sdn. Bhd. as Me-diated by Job Satisfaction

Abdul Kadir Othman is currently an associate professor at the Faculty of Business and Management (FBM), UiTM Shah Alam, Malaysia. His academic qualifications are Diploma in Public Administration, Bachelor Degree in Corporate Administration and PhD in Administrative Science. His research interest includes human resource management, service management, marketing and knowledge management.

Mohd Zulkifli Abdullah is a senior lecturer in the Department of International Business and Management Studies, Faculty of Business and Management, Universiti Teknologi MARA Puncak Alam. He holds a Ph.D in Health Management in 2015. His primary areas of interest in study are management, workplace psychology, health management and quality of life.

Noor Fadhilah Aziz is a graduate of the Faculty of Business and Management, UiTM Shah Alam, with a master's degree in office systems management. She is currently employed by Pecca Leather as an executive.

Siti Noraini Mohd Tobi is a Senior Lecturer in the Business and Management Faculty from Universiti Teknologi MARA. She holds a PhD in Health Management from Universiti Teknologi Malaysia in 2017. Her research interest is Health Services Management, Health Promotion, and Quality of Life studies.