



Relationship Model of Compensation, Motivation, Job Satisfaction and Employee Performance

Dorothea Wahyu Ariani*

Universitas Mercu Buana Yogyakarta, Indonesia. *Email: ariani1338@gmail.com

Received: 14 March 2023

Accepted: 24 June 2023

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.32479/irmm.14464>

ABSTRACT

Employee performance (EP) is an important variable that can improve company performance. Many studies have examined various factors that influence EP. Compensation, motivation, and job satisfaction (JS) are three important variables that have been shown to have an effect EP. This study aimed to examine the model of the relationship between the four variables. By using 520 government company employees in Yogyakarta, Indonesia, the results of model testing proved that compensation, motivation, and JS were related to EP. The results of the mediation model testing using structural equation modeling (SEM) found that motivation also played a role as a mediating variable for the relationship between financial rewards and EP. In this relationship model, motivation was able to increase JS, but employees who feel satisfied cannot guarantee that they will perform better.

Keywords: Compensation, Motivation, Job Satisfaction, Performance

JEL Classifications: M120, J30

1. INTRODUCTION

EP is always sought to be achieved because high EP can support the achievement of high organizational performance. There are many factors that affect EP, which can be grouped into internal or dispositional and external or situational factors (Robbins and Judge, 2007). Motivation and JS are internal or dispositional factors that influence EP. Meanwhile, awarding or compensation is an external factor that influences EP.

Motivation is an individual's desire to do a particular task or job. High motivation can improve performance (Kori et al., 2016). Motivation is referred to as the mover of organizational behavior because it influences EP and employee productivity (Cerasoli et al., 2014; Fischer et al., 2019). Motivation has indeed been widely researched and proven an effect on EP. Motivation can be caused by external factors such as giving awards or compensation (Ryan and Deci, 2020).

According to Self-Determination Theory (SDT), giving awards will strengthen extrinsic motivation (Kuvaas et al., 2017). Giving awards can also improve EP (Naidu and Satyanarayana, 2018). Kuvaas et al. (2016) found that motivation is related to performance. In addition, giving awards can also improve performance (Cerasoli et al., 2016). Motivation has indeed been shown to improve EP (see for example Cerasoli et al., 2014; Ekundayo, 2018; Girdwichai and Sriviboon, 2020; Lencho, 2020).

Meanwhile, employee JS is an attitude or how satisfied employees are with their work (Parvin and Kabir, 2011). JS has also been shown to improve EP (see for example, Chao et al., 2015; Wolomasi et al., 2019). However, the effect of JS on EP is inconsistent. This is because JS is a variable that has several dimensions (Pang and Lu, 2018). Each dimension has a different effect on performance (Bakan et al., 2014). Bowling et al. (2015) found that in testing the relationship between JS and EP, moderating situational variables

are needed. The purpose of this study was to test the model of the relationship between compensation, motivation, JS and EP.

2. LITERATURE REVIEW AND HYPOTHESIS DEVELOPMENT

Motivation is an enigmatic topic in organizational science (Tremblay et al., 2009). Robbins and Coulter (2014) define motivation as the process by which individuals get energized, directed, and encouraged to achieve goals. Motivation is a psychological process that directs goals and behavior as well as internal strength to satisfy needs (Conrad et al., 2015). Motivation determines individual behavior by influencing direction, goal, and persistence in work. Motivated individuals are an important competitive advantage and become a strategic asset of the organization. In organizational research, motivation is the subject of various theories and topics and is the basis for the formation and effective improvement of theory (Steers et al., 2004).

Motivation arises in employees because there is a drive to achieve certain goals. There are two theories of motivation, namely Content Theory and Process Theory, both of which can explain how individual behavior is activated and directed (Seiler et al., 2012). Motivation is driven by intrinsic factors that come from work and employees, while extrinsic factors come from the reward system (Legault, 2016). Motivation can drive the ability of employees so that employees can perform well. Motivation can almost always be proven to have effect on EP (see for example Cerasoli et al., 2014; Ekundayo, 2018; Girdwichai and Sriviboon, 2020; Lencho, 2020). The relationship between motivation and performance is almost always positive.

Several previous studies have found that financial compensation or visible rewards can improve EP (see for example Afriyie et al., 2020; Naidu and Satyanarayana, 2018; Jeni et al., 2020; Seng and Arumugam, 2017; Zaraket and Saber, 2017). Giving visible rewards can improve quantitative performance (Garbers and Konradt, 2014; Cerasoli et al., 2016). Based on SDT, giving compensation can increase extrinsic motivation but damage intrinsic motivation (Kuvaas et al., 2017). These two dimensions of motivation can be independent but can coexist in one person (Deci and Ryan, 2008). These two motivations can also affect EP (Manzoor et al., 2021).

Providing compensation can indeed increase employee motivation and JS which in turn can improve their performance. However, compensation is a form of extrinsic motivation which can also directly affect EP (Zaraket and Saber, 2017). The results of previous research found that awarding or compensation did not directly affect JS in the long run, but was mediated by work motivation (Rasool et al., 2017). In addition, the existing literature always links motivation and JS (Springer, 2011).

JS includes several dimensions, such as satisfaction with the salary they receive, with the leadership, with colleagues, in the work environment, in processes related to human resource management, and so on (Robbins and Judge, 2007). JS can encourage employees

to work diligently because of the joy they feel at work. Previous research has proven that JS is indeed related to and influences performance (see for example, Bowling et al., 2015; Chao et al., 2015; Wolomas et al., 2019). Based on the results of previous studies, the hypothesis proposed is:

H₁: Compensation is positively related to performance

H₂: Motivation is positively related to performance

H₃: JS is positively related to performance.

3. METHODS

This study uses primary data collected by survey using a questionnaire distributed government company employees in Yogyakarta. However, this study used samples taken by the convenience sampling method for 2 months. The number of samples was determined based on multivariate criteria, namely 5 times the number of question items in the questionnaire (Hair et al., 2014). This study uses a questionnaire taken from the results of previous studies. The variable of motivation uses 10 items questionnaire from Siagian's research (2016). Variable JS using research 10 items questionnaire researched by Parwita (2013). Meanwhile, the CP variable uses 10 items questionnaire researched by Simamora (2006), while the EP variable is taken from 10 items questionnaire researched by Poluakan (2016). Therefore, the number of samples suggested by multivariate criteria is at least 200 people.

This study used 520 respondents from 700 questionnaires distributed to employees of government companies in Yogyakarta and its surroundings. The questionnaire was tested for validity and reliability using factor analysis and internal consistency using Cronbach's Alpha (Sekaran and Bougie, 2013). Data testing is done by examining the relationship between research variables using bivariate correlation. Next, testing the relationship model, both directly and mediated models using SEM with AMOS 17 version.

4. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Before testing the model, the measuring instruments used are tested for validity and reliability. Factor analysis was used to test the validity of the questionnaire with a Kaiser-Meyer Olkin (KMO) of 0.5 or more and a loading factor of more than 0.5 (significant criteria according to Hair et al., 2014). Furthermore, internal consistency using Cronbach's Alpha was carried out to test the reliability of the questionnaire (Sekaran and Bougie, 2013). If the Cronbach's Alpha coefficient value is >0.6, then the questionnaire as a measuring tool is considered reliable (Zikmund et al., 2010).

The results of validity testing using factor analysis found that 10 items of EP questions were valid, with a loading factor of 0.626-0.909 and KMO 0.907. Likewise, the 10 motivational question items were declared valid with a loading factor of 0.776-0.887 and KMO 0.860. Furthermore, 10 items of CP questions were declared valid with a loading factor of 0.770-0.929 and KMO 0.918, while 10 items of JS were also declared valid with a loading factor of 0.812-0.915 and KMO 0.876.

Table 1: Correlation and statistic descriptive

Variables	Composite reliability	Mean	Σ	CP	MO	JS	EP
Compensation (CP)	0.967	3.4387	0.6046	1.000	0.620**	0.798**	0.570**
Motivation (MO)	0.954	3.6415	0.5598		1.000	0.786**	0.787**
Job satisfaction (JS)	0.966	3.5363	0.5885			1.000	0.643**
Performance (EP)	0.951	3.5930	0.5447				1.000

**Significant<0.01

Furthermore, the results of the reliability test using internal consistency with Cronbach's Alpha showed that the questionnaires used in this study were reliable. This can be seen from the results of the reliability test showing Cronbach's Alpha 0.951 for EP, 0.954 for motivation, 0.966 for JS, and 0.967 for CP or more than the required size, which is 0.6 (Zikmund et al., 2010). Before testing the effect of compensation, motivation, JS on EP, it is necessary to test the correlation between research variables. The results of testing the reliability and correlation between research variables and statistic descriptive are presented in Table 1.

Table 1 shows that the four variables studied have high reliability, which is more than 0.95 (Zikmund et al., 2010). The mean of each variable was moderate to high (EP mean 3.5930; motivation mean 3.6415; JS mean 0.966; CP mean 3.4387), as well as the standard deviation which is classified as moderate (between 0.5447 and 0.6046). The correlation between the variables studied was significant and quite strong. This shows that compensation, work motivation, and JS related to performance (H_1 , H_2 , and H_3) were supported.

Based on the results of testing the direct influence model of the three independent variables on the dependent variable using SEM with AMOS, it shows that the model is recursive. Recursive is the existence of a unidirectional dependency between exogenous variables so that it must be tested separately, not together (Byrne, 2010). This means that there are independent variables that have a direct effect on the dependent variable and there are variables that have an indirect effect. In other words, there needs to be a mediating variable in the relationship model. Several previous studies have found that motivation and JS are variables mediating the relationship between compensation and performance (see for example, Amanda and Trinanda, 2021; Candradewi and Dewi, 2019; Manzoor et al., 2021). The results of testing the mediation model using SEM are presented in Tables 2 and 3.

The results of the mediation test show that the second model is the best model. This is indicated by the values of the Normed Fit Index (NFI), Incremental Fit Index (IFI), and the Tucker Lewis Index (TLI) which are greater than the first model. The Goodness of Fit Index (GFI) and Comparative Fit Index (CFI) values are also >0.90. According to Byrne (2010), if these values are >0.90, then the model is fit with the data. This shows that the model is fit with the existing data. This model proves that motivation mediates the effect of compensation on EP. Providing financial compensation can increase motivation and JS. Meanwhile, motivation can also increase employee JS. The results of this model mediation test show that JS has no effect on EP. In addition, the provision of financial compensation does not directly affect EP, but through increasing motivation.

The test results using multiple linear regression show that compensation, motivation, and JS are significantly related to

Table 2: Model 1 - results of the motivation mediates the effect of compensation and job satisfaction on performance

Relationship	Beta	Critical ratio
Compensation → Motivation	0.621	7.889
Job Satisfaction → Motivation	0.509	8.271
Motivation → Performance	0.975	13.471

 $\chi^2=58.417$, $\chi^2/df=24.208$, GFI=0.951, CFI=0.969, NFI=0.968, IFI=0.969, TLI=0.908**Table 3: Model 2 - results of the motivation and job satisfaction mediate the effect of compensation on performance**

Relationship	Beta	Critical ratio
Compensation → Motivation	0.645	18.181
Compensation → Job Satisfaction	0.530	17.831
Motivation → Job Satisfaction	0.464	15.448
Motivation → Performance	0.905	27.792
Job satisfaction → Performance	-0.208	-5.521

 $\chi^2=27.929$, $\chi^2/df=27.929$, GFI=0.975, CFI=0.985, NFI=0.985, IFI=0.985, TLI=0.912

EP. Compensation is a form of extrinsic reward that needs to be received by employees so that their performance increases. The results of this study support several previous research results which prove that providing compensation to employees is related to and has effect on EP (see for example, Jean et al., 2017; Jeni et al., 2020; Okwudili and Ogbu, 2017; Seng and Arumugam, 2017).

The results of this study further strengthen previous research that motivation is indeed related to EP. Research on work motivation and performance has been carried out by many researchers before. In line with the results of previous research, the results of this study also found that motivation can improve EP. The results of this study support the research results of Joy et al. (2022), Mohamud et al. (2017), Olusadum and Anulika (2018), Pang and Lu (2018), Shahzadi et al. (2014). Motivation is indeed the variable that has the strongest influence on EP.

Meanwhile, the results of this study prove that JS has an inconsistent effect on EP. In testing the relationship between JS and performance it shows that JS has a significant positive relationship with EP. This is in line with several previous studies (see for example, Alromaihi et al., 2017; Dizgah et al., 2012; Helmi and Abunar, 2021; Platis et al., 2015). Meanwhile, the results of testing the mediation model found that JS has no effect on EP. This is consistent with the research results of Bakan et al. (2014) and the results of research by Bowling et al. (2015).

Meanwhile, although not very strong, financial compensation, motivation, JS, and EP are variables that are related to one another. These four variables are indeed very important variables

in influencing the progress of the company. This also happened to government company employees which is a service company that emphasizes EP. Therefore, companies need to pay attention to the provision of appropriate financial compensation for employees. Employee motivation also needs to get attention, and employee JS must continue to be sought. These three variables will greatly affect the improvement of EP.

Furthermore, the results of testing the mediation model found that motivation mediates the effect of compensation on EP. This aligns with previous research results (see for example, Amanda and Trinanda, 2021; Candradewi and Dewi, 2019; Manzoor et al., 2021; Setiawan et al., 2018). In addition, the results of this study found that motivation mediates the effect of compensation on employee JS. The results of this study are in line with the results of research by Rukayah et al. (2019). Although correlated with JS, EP is not necessarily influenced by their JS. This is in line with the research results of Bakan et al. (2014). The results of this study further strengthen the results of previous research that compensation and motivation affect employee JS (Helmi and Abunar, 2021).

5. CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Providing financial compensation to employees cannot be ignored because it can affect their motivation and JS. Motivation is a very important variable to improve EP. Motivated employees will feel the urge to perform better. However, JS does not always improve performance. In addition to examining the direct effect of the independent variable on the dependent variable, this research also tests the mediation model. However, a model that fits the existing data is a mediation model because the direct relationship model is recursive. It can be said that testing the relationship model between variables has been carried out completely.

Although it has been able to provide suggestions for companies, this research is not free from weaknesses. The use of cross-section data can make the mediation model a little disturbed. In addition, the use of self-assessment in this study can cause a beta bounce. A larger number of respondents will also help in generalizing the research results regarding this relationship model.

REFERENCES

- Afriyie, E.O., Twumasi, A., Sarpong, E., Darko, L.O. (2020), The effect of compensation on employees' performance: A case of a Technical University in Ghana. *International Journal of Managerial Studies and Research*, 8(6), 44-54.
- Alromaihi, M.A., Alshomaly, Z.A., George, S. (2017), Job satisfaction and employee performance: A theoretical review of the relationship between two variables. *International Journal of Advanced Research in Management and Social Sciences*, 6(1), 1-20.
- Amanda, P.D., Trinanda, O. (2021), The effect of financial compensation on employee performance with work motivation as a mediating variable. *Human Resources Management Studies*, 1(2), 96-106.
- Bakan, I., Buyukbese, T., Ersahan, B., Sezer, B. (2014), Effects of job satisfaction on job performance and occupational commitment. *International Journal of Management and Information Technology*, 9(1), 1472-1480.
- Bowling, N.A., Khazon, S., Meyer, R.D., Burrus, C.J. (2015), Situational strength as a moderator of the relationship between job satisfaction and job performance: A meta-analytic examination. *Journal of Business and Psychology*, 30(1), 89-104.
- Byrne, B.M. (2010), *Structural Equation Modeling with AMOS: Basic Concepts, Applications, and Programming*, 2nd ed. New York: Routledge, Francis and Taylor Group.
- Candradewi, I., Dewi, I.G.A.M. (2019), Effect of compensation on employee performance towards motivation as mediation variable. *International Research Journal of Management, IT and Social Sciences*, 6(5), 134-143.
- Cerasoli, C.P., Nicklin, J.M., Ford, M.T. (2014), Intrinsic motivation and extrinsic incentives jointly predict performance: A 40-year meta-analysis. *Psychological Bulletin*, 140(4), 980-1008.
- Cerasoli, C.P., Nicklin, J.M., Nassrelrgawi, A.S. (2016), Performance, incentives, and needs for autonomy, competence, and relatedness: A meta-analysis. *Motivation and Emotion*, 40(6), 781-813.
- Chao, M.C., Jou, R.C., Liao, C.C., Kuo, C.W. (2015), Workplace stress, job satisfaction, job performance, and turnover intention of health care workers in rural Taiwan. *Asia-Pacific Journal of Public Health*, 27(2), NP1827-NP1836.
- Conrad, D., Ghosh, A., Isaacson, M. (2015), Employee motivation factors: A comparative study of the perceptions between physicians and physician leaders. *International Journal of Public Leadership*, 11(2), 92-106.
- Deci, E.L., Ryan, A.M. (2008), Facilitating optimal motivation and psychological well-being across life's domains. *Canadian Psychology*, 49(1), 14-23.
- Dizgah, M.R., Chegini, M.G., Bisokhan, R. (2012), Relationship between job satisfaction and employee job performance in Guilan public sector. *Journal of Basic and Applied Scientific Research*, 2(2), 1735-1741.
- Ekundayo, O.A. (2018), The impact of motivation on employee performance in selected insurance companies in Nigeria. *International Journal of African Development*, 5(1), 31-42.
- Fischer, C., Malycha, C.P., Schafmann, E. (2019), The influence of intrinsic motivation and synergistic extrinsic motivators on creativity and innovation. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 10, 137.
- Garbers, Y., Konradt, U. (2014), The effect of financial incentives on performance: A quantitative review of individual and team-based financial incentives. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, 87(1), 102-137.
- Girdwichai, L., Sriviboon, C. (2020), Employee motivation and performance: Do the work environment and the training matter? *Journal of Security and Sustainability*, 9, 42-54.
- Hair, J.F., Black, W.C., Babin, B.J., & Anderson, R.E. (2014). *Multivariate Data Analysis*. 7th edition. New Jersey: Prentice-Hall International Inc.
- Helmi, T., Abunar, M. (2021), The impact of job satisfaction on employee job performance. *PalArch's Journal of Archaeology of Egypt/Egyptology*, 18(14), 510-520.
- Jean, K.N., Ngui, T.K., Robert, A. (2017), Effect of compensation strategies on employee performance: A case study of Mombasa cement limited. *International Journal of Innovative Social Sciences and Humanities Research*, 5(3), 25-42.
- Jeni, F.A., Mutsuddi, P., Das, S., Momotaj. (2020), The impact of rewards on employee performance: A study of commercial banks in Noakhali region. *Journal of Economics, Management and Trade*, 26(9), 28-43.
- Joye, Y., Lange, F., & Fischer, M. (2022). Does beautiful nature motivate to work? Outlining an alternative pathway to nature-induced cognitive performance benefits. *New Ideas in Psychology*, 66, 100946.

- Kori, K., Pedaste, M., Leijen, A., Tonisson, E. (2016), The role of programming experience in ICT students' learning motivation and academic achievement. *International Journal of Information and Education Technology*, 6(5), 331-337.
- Kuvaas, B., Buch, R., Weibel, A., Dysvik, A., Nerstad, C.G.L. (2017), Do intrinsic and extrinsic motivation relate differently to employee outcomes? *Journal of Economy Psychology*, 61, 244-258.
- Kuvaas, B., Busch, R., Gagne, M., Dysvik, A., Forest, J. (2016), Do you get what you pay for? Sales incentives and implications for motivation and changes in turnover intention work effort. *Motivation and Emotion*, 40(5), 667-680.
- Legault, L. (2016), Intrinsic and extrinsic motivation. In: Zeigler-Hill, V., Shackelford, T.K., editors. *Encyclopedia of Personality and Individual Differences*. Germany: Springer.
- Lencho, D.M. (2020), Effect of employee motivation on job performance: In case of Fiche General Hospital. *International Journal of Commerce and Finance*, 6(1), 81-101.
- Manzoor, F., Wei, L., Asif, M. (2021), Intrinsic rewards and employee's performance with the mediating mechanism of employee's motivation. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 12, 563070.
- Mohamud, S.A., Ibrahim, A.A., Hussein, J.H. (2017), The effect of motivation on employee performance: Case study in Hormuud Company in Mogadishu Somalia. *International Journal of Development Research*, 7(11), 17009-17016.
- Naidu, A.A., Satyanarayana, G. (2018), Impact of compensation on employee performance. *Intercontinental Journal of Human Resource Research Review*, 6(4), 1-7.
- Okwudili, B.E., Ogbu, E.F. (2017), The effect of compensation on employee performance in Nigeria civil service: A study of Rivers State board of international revenue service. *Journal of Strategic Human Resource Management*, 6(2), 8-16.
- Olusadum, N.J., Anulika, N.J. (2018), Impact of motivation on employee performance: A study of Alvan Ikoku Federal college of education. *Journal of Management and Strategy*, 9(1), 53-65.
- Pang, K., Lu, C.S. (2018), Organizational motivation, employee job satisfaction and organizational performance: An empirical study of container shipping companies in Taiwan. *Maritime Business Review*, 3(1), 36-52.
- Parvin, M.M., Kabir, M.M.N. (2011), Factors affecting employee job satisfaction of pharmaceutical sector. *Australian Journal of Business and Management Research*, 1(9), 113-123.
- Parwita, G.B.S. (2013), Pengaruh Kepuasan Kerja terhadap Komitmen Organisasi terhadap Disiplin Kerja (Studi Pada Dosen Yayasan Universitas Mahasarawati Denpasar), Tesis. Program Magister. Program Studi Manajemen Program Pascasarjana Universitas Udayana Denpasar.
- Platis, C., Reklitis, P., Zimeras, S. (2014), Relation between job satisfaction and job performance in healthcare services. *Procedia Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 175, 480-487.
- Poluakan, F.A. (2016), Pengaruh perubahan dan pengembangan organisasi terhadap kinerja karyawan PT. Sinar Galesong Prima Manado. *Jurnal Ekonomi Manajemen Bisnis dan Akuntansi*, 4(3), 1057-1067.
- Rasool, A., Jundong, H., Sohail, M.T. (2017), Relationship of intrinsic and extrinsic rewards on job motivation and job satisfaction of expatriates in China. *Journal of Applied Sciences*, 17(3), 116-125.
- Robbins, S.P., Coulter, M. (2014), *Management*. 12th ed. Boston: Pearson.
- Robbins, S.P., Judge, T.A. (2007), *Organizational Behavior*. 12th ed. New Jersey: Pearson Education, Inc.
- Rukayah, Musnadi, S., Majid, M.S.A. (2019), How important are motivation and job satisfaction in mediating the effects of compensation and organizational culture on employee performance? *East African Scholars Journal of Economics, Business and Management*, 2(6), 318-325.
- Ryan, R.M., Deci, E.L. (2020), Intrinsic and extrinsic motivation from a self-determination theory perspective: Definitions, theory, practices, and future directions. *Contemporary Educational Psychology*, 61, 101860.
- Seiler, S., Lent, B., Pinkowska, M., Pinazza, M. (2012), An integrated model of factors influencing project managers' motivation-findings from a Swiss survey. *International Journal of Project Management*, 30(1), 60-72.
- Sekaran, U., Bougie, R. (2013), *Research Methods for Business: A Skill-building Approach*, 6th ed. UK: John Wiley and Sons Ltd.
- Seng, N.L., Arumugam, T. (2017), Financial reward and motivation toward employee job performance in the hospitality industry in Klang Valley. *Electronic Journal of Business and Management*, 2(1), 51-60.
- Setiawan, S., Sutarlan, S., Sumarno, N. (2018), The role of work motivation as effect intervening variable of intrinsic reward, supervision of work and satisfaction of compensation on employee performance (A study at cooperatives in the city of Pekalongan). *International Review of Management and Marketing*, 8(4), 65-70.
- Shahzadi, I., Javed, A., Pirzada, S.S., Nasreen, S., Khanam, F. (2014), Impact of employee motivation on employee performance. *European Journal of Business and Management*, 6(23), 159-166.
- Siagian, S.P. (2016), *Manajemen Sumber Daya Manusia*. Jakarta: Bumi Aksara.
- Simamora, H. (2006), *Manajemen Sumber Daya Manusia*. 2nd ed. Yogyakarta: STIE YPKN.
- Springer, G.J. (2011), A study of job motivation, satisfaction, and performance among bank employees. *Journal of Global Business Issues*, 5(1), 29-42.
- Steers, R.M., Mowday, R.T., Shapiro, D.L. (2004), Introduction to special topic forum: The future of work motivation theory. *The Academy of Management Review*, 29(3), 379-387.
- Tremblay, M.A., Blanchard, C.M., Taylor, S., Pelletier, L.G., Villeneuve, M. (2009), Work extrinsic and intrinsic motivation scale: Its value for organizational psychology research. *Canadian Journal of Behavioural Science*, 41(4), 213-226.
- Wolomasi, A.K., Asaloei, S.I., Werang, B.R. (2019), Job satisfaction and performance of elementary school teachers. *International Journal of Evaluation and Research in Education*, 8(4), 575-580.
- Zaraket, W.S., Saber, F. (2017), The impact of financial reward on job satisfaction and performance: Implications for blue collar employees. *China-USA Business Review*, 16(8), 369-378.
- Zikmund, W.G., Babin, B.J., Carr, J.C., Griffin, M. (2010), *Business Research Methods*. 8th ed. Singapore: South-Western Cengage Learning.