

# RESPONSIVE INSTITUTION: IMPACT OF INTRINSIC AND EXTRINSIC MOTIVATION AWARENESS FOR BANK EMPLOYEES' PERFORMANCE

**GANESH, R**

Senior Lecturer, Faculty of Business and Communications, INTI International University, Nilai, Malaysia.

\*Corresponding author Email: ganeshalr@gmail.com, ganesh.ramasamy@newinti.edu.my

**LA RAIB SABIR**

Faculty of Business and Management, UCSI University, Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia.

Email: araibsabir123@gmail.com

## Abstract

This study aims to examine the impact of intrinsic and extrinsic motivation on employee performance in the banking sector of Cheras district in Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia. In particular, the study explores the relationship between intrinsic motivation, extrinsic motivation, organizational commitment, and job satisfaction with employee performance. A quantitative (survey) method was employed with 260 bank employees (managerial and non-managerial). The study obtained 219 valid responses for the final analysis and discussion. The data were analyzed using the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) version 22. The finding reveals a positive and significant relationship between intrinsic motivation, extrinsic motivation, organizational commitment, and job satisfaction with employee performance in the banking sector. The study confirms that if bank management increases its employees' intrinsic motivation, extrinsic motivation, organizational commitment, and job satisfaction, there will be a positive increase in employee performance.

**Keywords:** Responsive institution, employees' motivation, intrinsic factors, extrinsic factors, employee performance job satisfaction, awareness.

## 1. INTRODUCTION

Employees are the most precious blessing in any organization (Amdan et al., 2016). The performance of employees is an essential aspect of any organization (Suliman, 2001); therefore, organizations should try to make a healthy and robust relationship with their employees. The success rate of any organization depends upon the employees' performance and commitment (Liou, 2008). The performance of employees can be measured through the combination of predicted behavior and characteristics related to tasks or job functions (Motowidlo, 2008). Organizational performance for market leadership is an accomplishment that can be achieved by an organization's employee behavior and commitment (Syafii et al., 2015). It shows that an organization's performance depends on its employees' performance (Gibson & Callister, 2009). For positive behavior and commitment, it is essential to realize that every employee is attracted to some motivation. Motivation is a process that describes an individual's passion, way, and determination to achieve specific goals or objectives (Robbins & Judge, 2007).

On the broader concept, motivation is an essential factor for engaging employees in their work, but motivating an employee is always an important issue for leaders and managers in an organization (Amabile, 1993). Consequently, motivation needs to be interpreted with the outcome (George & Jones, 2012; Ryan & Deci, 2000). It is argued that an individual is motivated when he/she feels encouraged, and it activates employee performance leading to organizational outcomes (Ryan & Deci, 2000; Rokeach, 1973).

From this context, it shows that motivation is the force that gives direction to the employees for performing a particular task for the productivity of an organization (Parashar, 2016). It can be regarded as one of the most critical factors affecting employee performance (George & Jones, 2012). Motivated employees are more determined, advanced, creative, and helpful in achieving organizational objectives (Parashar, 2016). Generally, performance and motivation are used interchangeably, and it is stated that performance results from employee behavior toward a task or job (George & Jones, 2012; George & Jones, 2012).

Employee performance will be one significant indicator in measuring organizational performance. Employee actions and behavior will be essential for achieving organizational goals (Campbell, 1990). With that, it can be mentioned that employee performance is the behavior when the employee shows in achieving the organization's objectives.

(Viswevaran and Ones, 2000). It means that employee performance is the productivity that contributes to organizational goals (Motowidlo, 2008). From this context, studies have shown that employee performance in an organization results from motivation (Sarmiento & Beale, 2007). In this perspective, a well-performing employee will be more creative and innovative and always exercise quality work to achieve organizational aims and objectives (George & Jones, 2012; Motowidlo, 2008). In order to attract and support higher employee performance, managers need to treat their employees as crucial human capital (Dhir & Shukla, 2019) because satisfied employees will have the motivation for high performance, which will contribute to organizational success (Samad, 2009; Motowidlo, 2008; Mawoli & Babandako, 2011).

This relates to the fact that management and employee relationships are important for organizational profitability (Amabile, 1993; Wiley, 1995). Research has revealed that when the employee is intrinsically and extrinsically motivated, the performance quality differs from when an employee is only extrinsically motivated (Ryan & Deci, 2000). It shows the engagement factor in an organization's environment with motivation and employees' performance (Saks, 2006; Silvera, 2013). Even though some studies have shown the concepts of motivation and employee performance separately, scholars have argued for the need for a relationship understanding between motivation and employee performance (Putra et al., 2016; Silvera, 2013).

Apart from that, findings from Putra et al. (2016) show that managers play a vital part in the performance of the employees, and the relationship between managers and employees can act as the main force. A review of various research has mentioned that there is a need to investigate problems encountered by employees in the banking sector of Malaysia (Chen, 2011; Ibrahim, 2016; Kamalesh et al., 2022). In view of the concentration, this study aims to investigate to

what extent intrinsic and extrinsic motivation affects employee performance in the banking sector.

## **2. LITERATURE REVIEW**

### **2.1 Motivation**

Motivation comes from the Latin word “movere” (Nguyen, 2017). The word movere means to move (Nguyen, 2017). It develops progression and works towards achieving goals (Korth, 2007). It can also be referred to as a procedure that gives an individual a motive to do something in a specific manner (Elliot & Covington, 2001).

From the organizational perspective, motivation can be mentioned as the number of processes influencing the employee and encouraging and maintaining a particular positive behavior that may contribute to better work performance and organizational goal setting (Nguyen, 2017). A motivated employee will show passion and energy toward the work and persistence to accomplish the task related to his or her work (Moran, 2013). It is an emotional power that verifies the way a person’s behavior is associated with the level of energy & determination (Jones & George, 2008). Previous studies have pointed motivation concept in broad aspects with three major elements: direction, persistence, and intensity (Jones & George, 2008). It is mentioned as the combined fundamental element for employee success in achieving performance (Nguyen, 2017). Studies have shown that an intrinsically and extrinsically motivated person puts more effort into doing a specific task, and when goals are achieved, it gives a feeling of satisfaction and it also creates a positive working environment in the organization (Manzoor, 2012; Mathew et al., 2009). Studies have also revealed that factors such as promotion, bonus system, job security, supervisor, positive recognition, interesting job, pay, desirable work environment, company policies, welfare packages, autonomy, achievement, sense of challenge and self-actualization, delivering proper care for the employees in the workplace with proper lighting, creating a healthy working environment, providing suitable working hours and hygiene working condition can help to motivate employees and contribute to performance (Hasan et al., 2018; Fang, 2011).

### **2.2 Intrinsic and extrinsic motivation**

The debate of intrinsic and extrinsic motivation started in 1970 when various studies began investigating the reality of intrinsic and extrinsic motivation. The initial study investigates the difference between intrinsic and extrinsic motivation linked with motivational theories (Deci & Ryan, 2000). Some studies emphasized trying to differentiate between intrinsic and extrinsic based on the different goals and objectives, namely enjoyment or fun on the financial outcome (Motowidlo, 2008; Nguyen, 2017).

Most research on intrinsic motivation examines how extrinsic motivation affects intrinsic motivation (Legault, 2017). Intrinsic motivation is considered an ideal form of motivation, and it is related to different benefits, which include diligence, enjoyment, and psychological well-being (Deci & Ryan, 2000). In contrast, extrinsic factors help endorse action for behaviors (Legault, 2017).

Intrinsic motivation is referred to as the individual performance of an activity for inner satisfaction rather than for some separable outcome (Ryan & Deci, 2000). Intrinsically motivated individuals tend to have high job performance because they feel that their job is meaningful, engaging, and challenging (Amabile et al., 1994; Legault, 2017; Nguyen, 2017).

Various employee motivation studies suggested that employees are not only motivated by the rewards such as food and money to change their behavior (Legault, 2017; Nguyen, 2017; White, 1959), but they are also intrinsically motivated and they are also interested in their surroundings and wish to master and learn the challenges of the environment (Hasan et al., 2018; Fang, 2011; Skinner, 1938). This behavior can be determined by the outcome of feelings of fun and being challenged (Legault, 2017; Nguyen, 2017; White, 1959; Ryan & Deci, 2000). From this fact, intrinsically motivated employees will make the best use of their effort at work because they find the tasks challenging, captivating, and interesting rather than working for a financial reward (Ryan & Deci, 2000; Cho & Peng, 2011; Dyer & Parker, 1975). To increase an individual's motivation, the nature of work itself can possibly act as one of the intrinsic factors (Herzberg, 1976; Amabile, 1993). A study conducted on 171 employees in Hong Kong shows the factors of meaningful, exciting, and challenging work that relate to intrinsic points (Lam & Baum, 2001).

It shows that if the job factors are not meaningful and challenging, it can reduce employee motivation for better performance and engagement at work (Chalofsky & Krishna, 2009). Therefore, the factors of challenging, meaningful, and thrilling tasks can increase intrinsic motivation for employees (Cho & Peng, 2017). From this aspect, when an employee is intrinsically motivated, he/she tends to engage in the workplace emotionally (Beek et al., 2012), and this shows better performance and productivity (Bakker & Demerouti, 2007; Salanova et al., 2005; Lin, 2007; Cerasoli et al., 2014; Ryan & Deci, 2000).

Apart from the above, studies have also shown that intrinsic motivators can be more successful than extrinsic ones in employee motivation (Nasri & Charfeddine, 2012), the reason being intrinsic motivation is the connection between the task and employee satisfaction (Ryan & Deci, 2000; Wigfeild et al., 2004).

### **3. RESEARCH ANALYSIS**

#### **3.1 Relationship between intrinsic motivation and employee performance**

Based on the comparison between physiological and psychological needs, it is mentioned that psychological need performs better as a motivator to the employee, which can be associated with the hierarchy of need theory (Maslow, 1943). Apart from that, other scholars have mentioned that money motivates employees but not for the long term (Herzberg, 1974). A study conducted by Gungor (2011) argued that in the banking sector of Istanbul, Turkey, employee performance with financial reward reveals higher performance. The finding leads to the idea that if banks attempt to maintain the balance of intrinsic motivation, it may be possible to increase the performance of employees (Gungor, 2011; Cerasoli et al., 2014; Cho & Peng, 2017).

Therefore, the following hypothesis is proposed to investigate the possible impact of intrinsic motivation on employee performance:

H1: There is a significant positive relationship between intrinsic motivation and employee performance.

### **3.2 Relationship between extrinsic motivation and employee performance**

Extrinsic motivation is employee performance on a particular task to gain some separable outcome (Ryan & Deci, 2000). Studies have related that extrinsically motivated employees will do their job and show high performance because they believe they will get desirable outcomes such as bonuses, monetary rewards, promotions, or increase in salary (Cho & Peng, 2004). It shows that extrinsic factors on motivation result from elements outside an individual that lead to a particular outcome (Ryan & Deci, 2000; Lin, 2007). Extrinsic motivational factors can be created through factors such as external rewards, competition, or even punishment, and other tangible benefits such as salaries/ incentives, fringe benefits, security, promotional benefits, service contracts, free weekend trips or gift cards and working conditions (Legault, 2017; Nguyen, 2017; Armstrong, 2005; Cho & Peng, 2004; Srivastava & Barmola, 2011). Numerous previous studies have shown that extrinsic motivation helps employees to show more productivity in the workplace and also found that to increase employee performance, extrinsic motivation such as bonuses, pay, wages, and other increments were essential for employees (Srivastava & Barmola, 2012; Charles & Marshall, 1992). From this aspect, the possibility of pay/ salary and other financial rewards will have the power to retain, motivate and attract employees and eventually leading to high performance in the respective job functions (Legault, 2017; Nguyen, 2017; McCormick & Tifflin, 1979; Carraher & Buckley, 2006). Therefore, the following hypothesis is proposed to investigate the possible impact of extrinsic motivation and employee performance:

H2: There is a significant positive relationship between extrinsic motivation and employee performance.

### **3.3 Relationship between organizational commitment and employee performance**

Organizational commitment is one of the critical elements for making employees attain the required performance (Shahnawaz et al., 2006). Organizational commitment is a multidimensional factor that can predict the outcome of employee turnover, performance, absentees, and organizational goals (Morrow, 1993). Studies have shown that employees' commitment to stay in the organization will be higher when they learn and grow with their organization (Opkara, 2004; Samad, 2013; Yiing & Ahmad, 2009). It relates positively to the correlation of organizational commitment with employee performance. From this context, developing an organizational commitment to employee performance and ultimately creating employee retention is essential. With the facts shown above, the following hypothesis is postulated to investigate the construct of organisational commitment and employee performance:

H3: There is a significant positive relationship between organizational commitment and

employee performance.

### 3.4 Relationship between job satisfaction and employee performance

Employee job satisfaction is mentioned as a positive reaction to performance outcomes (Legault, 2017; Nguyen, 2017). It can be referred to as the evaluation of one's job, job experience, or job achievement (Locke, 1976). Constructively job satisfaction is the positive attitude, feeling of fulfilment of the individual towards his/her job function in the organization (Kaliski, 2007). Various studies have shown a positive relationship between job satisfaction and employee performance in organizations (Opkara, 2004; Samad, 2007; Yiing & Ahmad, 2009). Based on the findings, it can be deduced that a particular employee's performance will increase when the employee's job satisfaction increases. This relates to the fact that the job satisfaction level of employees can create an effect on the employee effort; hence it will increase individual performance. Therefore, based on the analysis, this study proposes the following assumptions:

H4: There is a significant positive relationship between job satisfaction and employee performance.

## 4. METHODOLOGY

### 4.1 Sampling Methods and sample size

With guidance from the participating banks this empirical study exercised convenience sampling design. The targeted respondents were focused on the demographic section and continued with exploring the relationship between intrinsic motivation, extrinsic motivation, organizational commitment, and job satisfaction towards employee performance. The respondents are bank employees in district of Cheras, Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia. A total of 219 completed questionnaires were collected. The breakdown of respondents based on banks is shown in Table 1.

**Table 1: Banks and number of employees participated (Cheras district)**

Bank	Number of employees
Maybank	21
Hong Leong Bank	26
RHB Bank	15
Public Bank	30
MBSB Bank	22
CIMB Bank	28
Bank Simpanan Nasional	14
AgroBank	21
OCBC Bank	32
Standard chartered Bank	17
AM Bank	26
Alliance Bank	10

The study's concentration was cross-sectional, with the identified respondents via a structured questionnaire. The questionnaire consists of two sections. They were first based on demographic characteristics. The second section is based on variables used in the study. The questionnaire was organized with a five-point Likert-type scale, and the scale measured from '1' as 'strongly disagree' to '5' as 'strongly agree'. Furthermore, to avoid unethical issues, the survey was handled with close supervision and maintained a clear response rate with the study objective.

#### 4.2 Reliability Analysis

Table 2 highlights the reliability analysis. Cronbach's alpha internal consistency indicator was used to estimate the reliability of the 5-item scale of Intrinsic motivation ( $\alpha = 0.818$ ), Extrinsic Motivation ( $\alpha = 0.793$ ), Organizational Commitment ( $\alpha = 0.766$ ), Job satisfaction ( $\alpha = 0.776$ ) and Employee Performance ( $\alpha = 0.807$ ). All the variable reliabilities were adequate  $> 0.70$  suggesting that the items have relatively fulfilling internal consistency. (Nunnally, 1978).

**Table 2: Reliability Test**

Reliability Statistics			
	Cronbach's Alpha	Cronbach's Alpha Based on Standardized Items	N of Items
Intrinsic motivation	.818	.817	6
Extrinsic Motivation	.793	.794	6
Organizational Commitment	.766	.769	6
Job satisfaction	.776	.777	6
Employee Performance	.807	.809	7

### 5. FINDING

The study findings and results are accordingly organized; one: demographic, two: Pearson correlation, three: multiple linear regression to reveal the hypotheses put forward with the research objective.

#### 5.1 Demographic profile of the respondents

Table 3 shows the gender composition of the respondents. The study revealed that 39.3% are female, and the balance was male, amounting to 60.7%. In reference to age, Table 4 highlights the composition of the age group between 26-30 years with a percentage of 24.2, and they were the most respondents. The second-highest age group is from the bracket of 20-25 years and is followed by the category of 31-35 with a percentage of 20.5. As for work experience, Table 5 shows that about 31.5% of the respondents had working experience of 2-5 years, followed by 27.9% with work experience of 6-10 years.

**Table 3: Gender**

<b>Gender</b>			
		Frequency	Percent
Valid	Male	133	60.7
	Female	86	39.3
	<b>Total</b>	<b>219</b>	<b>100.0</b>

**Table 4: Age**

<b>Age</b>			
		Frequency	Percent
Valid	20-25yrs	45	20.5
	26-30yrs	53	24.2
	31-35yrs	45	20.5
	36-40yrs	37	16.9
	41-45yrs	34	15.5
	Above45	5	2.3
	<b>Total</b>	<b>219</b>	<b>100.0</b>

**Table 5: Work Experience**

<b>Work Experience</b>			
		Frequency	Percent
Valid	less than 1 year	53	24.2
	2-5yrs	69	31.5
	6-10yrs	61	27.9
	11-15yrs	17	7.8
	16-20yrs	15	6.8
	Above 20yrs	4	1.8
	<b>Total</b>	<b>219</b>	<b>100.0</b>

## 6. DISCUSSION AND IMPLICATIONS

The purpose of the research is to study the impact of intrinsic and extrinsic motivation on employee's performance in the banking sector of Cheras, Kuala Lumpur Malaysia. The finding of the research leads to answers put forward for research hypotheses. Motivation has its importance in every organization. Reason being there are various different types of motivation strategies to engage employees for better performance (Khan & Iqbal, 2013). Intrinsic, extrinsic factors, organizational commitment, job satisfaction used in this study essentially to investigate its impact on employee performance.

The results of the findings shows that the employees in the banking sector of Cheras, Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia prefer to improve their performance and job satisfaction. The result shows that intrinsic motivation, extrinsic motivation, organizational commitment and job satisfaction



have a positive impact on employee performance. The study proved that both intrinsic motivation and extrinsic motivation are strongly related to employee performance. Any changes in intrinsic and extrinsic motivation will cause changes in employee performance. Thus, bank management needs to design policies that can make balance between intrinsic and extrinsic motivation for employee performance. The results shown in Table 6, and Table 7 reveals the findings and Table 8 summarized the hypotheses outcome.

**Table 6: Pearson Correlation**

		Consumer Attitude
Intrinsic motivation	Pearson Correlation	.522**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000
	N	219
Extrinsic motivation	Pearson Correlation	.436**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000
	N	219
Organizational commitment	Pearson Correlation	.0578**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000
	N	219
Job satisfaction	Pearson Correlation	.548**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000
	N	219
**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).		
*. Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).		

**Table 7: Coefficients<sup>a</sup>**

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
		B	Std. Error	Beta		
1	(Constant)	.465	.276		1.683	.000
	Intrinsic Motivation	.331	.066	.297	5.047	.000
	Extrinsic Motivation	.240	.066	.270	3.620	.000
	Organizational commitment	.567	.078	.477	7.305	.000
	Job satisfaction	.240	.063	.266	3.823	.000

**Table 8: Summary of hypotheses outcome**

No	Hypothesis	P-value	Status
H1	There is a significant positive relationship between intrinsic motivation and employee performance.	.000	Accepted
H2	There is a significant positive relationship between extrinsic and employee performance.	.000	Accepted
H3	There is a significant positive relationship between organizational behavior and employee performance.	.000	Accepted
H4	There is a significant positive relationship between job satisfaction and employee performance.	.000	Accepted

The findings of this study will contribute to managerial decision-making, particularly concerning improving employee performance for return on investment in the banking operation. Providing intrinsic and extrinsic motivation to employees will increase employee productivity. If an organization wants their employees to engage in their jobs efficiently, stay loyal and honest with their job responsibilities, organizations are required to motivate their employees intrinsically and extrinsically. Successful employee work operations can occur effectively when intrinsic and extrinsic factors are engaged or co-exist in the organization. Without the contributing factors, employees would be disconnected from their jobs, eventually leading to the possibility of low employee performance in the organization.

From this aspect, the study relates to the fact that employee work motivation is required and should be appropriately arranged for the excellence of banking operations and productivity. The study finding provides an avenue to move forward for future findings in wider employee psychological acceptance and management implications. The main point is that this finding will assist in formulating policies accordingly for employee motivation and organizational outcomes for all banking industries, particularly in Malaysia. Although this study presented vital findings on employee performance, one apparent limitation is that it is conducted from employees' perspective using employee performance. It will be interesting to study management perspectives by using organizational engagement. In addition, this type of study should also be conducted nationwide and in the banks of other countries using quantitative and qualitative studies.

#### **Acknowledgments**

This study received no specific grant from any funding agency in the public, nor commercial or not-for-profit sectors.

#### **Conflict of interest**

The authors report no conflict of interest.

#### **References**

1. Amdan, S., Rahman, R., Shahid, S., Bakar, S., Khir, M. & Demong, N. (2016). The Role of Extrinsic Motivation on the Relationship between Office Environment and Organisational Commitment. *Procedia Economics and Finance*, 37, 164-169.
2. Amabile, T. M. (1993). Motivational Synergy: Toward New Conceptualizations of Intrinsic and Extrinsic Motivation in the Workplace. *Human Resource Management Review*, 3(3), 185-201.
3. Armstrong, M. (2005). *Handbook of Human Resource Management Practice* (10<sup>th</sup> ed). London, GBR: Kogan Page, Limited.
4. Bakker, A. & Demerouti, E. (2007). The Job Demands-Resources model: state of the art, *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 22(3), 309-328.
5. Bakker, A., Demerouti, E. & Sanz-Vergel, A. (2014). Burnout and Work Engagement: The JD-R Approach. *Annual Review of Organizational Psychology and Organizational Behavior*, 1(1), 389-411.
6. Beek, I., Hu, Q., Schaufeli, W., Taris, T. & Schreurs, B. (2011). For Fun, Love, or Money: What Drives Workaholic, Engaged, and Burned-Out Employees at Work?. *Applied Psychology*, 61(1), 30-55.

7. Campbell, J. P. (1990). Modeling the performance prediction problem in industrial and organizational psychology. In M. D. Dunnette & L. M. Hough (Eds.), *Handbook of industrial and organizational psychology* (2nd ed., Vol. 1, 687–732). Palo Alto, CA: Consulting Psychologists Press.
8. Cho, Y. and Perry, J. (2011). Intrinsic Motivation and Employee Attitudes. *Review of Public Personnel Administration*, 32(4), 382-406.
9. Chalofsky, N. & Krishna, V. (2009). Meaningfulness, Commitment, and Engagement: The Intersection of a Deeper Level of Intrinsic Motivation. *Advances in Developing Human Resources*, 11(2), 189-203.
10. Carraher, R. Gibson, A. & Buckley R. (2006). Compensation in the Baltic and the USA, *Baltic Journal of Management*, 1, 7-23.
11. 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.
12. Chen, C., R.E., P., & Thomas, H.C., (2011). A New Model of Dynamic Relationships between Job. *Academy of Management Journal*, 54(1), 159-181.
13. Dhir, S. & Shukla, A. (2019). Role of Organizational Image in Employee Engagement and Performance. *Benchmarking: An International Journal*, Vol. 26 No. 3, pp. 971-989.
14. Deci, E. L., & Ryan, R. M. (2008). Self-determination theory: A Macro Theory of Human Motivation, Development, and Health. *Canadian Psychology/ Psychologie Canadienne*, 49(3), 182-185.
15. Dyer L & Parker DF. (1975). Classifying outcomes in work motivation research. An examination of the intrinsic-extrinsic dichotomy. *Journal of Applied Psychology* 60(4), 455–458.
16. Elliot, A. J. & Covington, M. (2001). Approach and Avoidance Motivation. *Educational Psychology Review*, 13(2). DOI:10.1023/A:1009009018235
17. Fang Y. (2011). Work, Motivation and Personal Characteristics: An In-Depth Study of Six Organizations in Ningbo, *Chinese Management Studies*, Vol. 5 (3), 272-297.
18. Güngör, P. (2011). The Relationship between Reward Management System and Employee Performance with the Mediating Role of Motivation: A Quantitative Study on Global Banks. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 24, 1510-1520.
19. Gibson, D. & Callister, R. (2009). Anger in Organizations: Review and Integration. *Journal of Management*, 36(1), 66-93.
20. George, J. & Jones, G. (2012). *Understanding and Managing Organizational Behavior* (6<sup>th</sup> ed).
21. Herzberg, F. (1974). Motivation-hygiene profiles. *Organizational Dynamics*, 3 (2), 18-29.
22. Hasan, N., Jie, C. & Bidin, R. (2018). Job Satisfaction among Bank Employees: An Investigation of Public Banking Institution in Malaysia. *Jurnal Kemanusiaan*, 16(1), 33-39.
23. Ibrahim, M. (2016, May 26). Muhammad bin Ibrahim: Future banking: reimagining banks - driving transformation and innovation [Keynote address]. Asian Strategy and Leadership Institute 20th Malaysian Banking Summit, Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia. [https://www.bis.org/review/r160\\_527b.htm](https://www.bis.org/review/r160_527b.htm)
24. Korth, M. (2007). A Heuristical Motivation Model for Leaders in Career and Technical Education. *Journal of industrial teacher education*, 5-36.
25. Kaliski, B.S. (2007). *Encyclopedia of Business and Finance*, Second edition, Thompson Gale, Detroit, 446.
26. Kamalesh R., & Muhammad A.F. (2022). The Influence of Extrinsic Motivating Factors on Employees' Work Performance at Banking Sectors in Malaysia: The Mediating Effect of Psychological Ownership. *International Journal of Business and Society*, 23(2), 1147-1168.

27. Lin, H.-F. (2007). Effects of extrinsic and intrinsic motivation on employee knowledge sharing intentions. *Journal of Information Science*, 33(2), 135-149.
28. Legault, L. (2017). Self-Determination Theory. *Encyclopedia of Personality and Individual Differences*, 1-9.
29. Lam, T., Zhang, H., & Baum, T. (2001). An investigation of employees' job satisfaction: the case of hotels in Hong Kong. *Tourism Management*, 22(2), 157-165.
30. Liou, S. (2008). An Analysis of the Concept of Organizational Commitment. *Nursing Forum*, 43(3), 116-125.
31. McCormick., Tifflin. J. (1979). *Industrial Psychology*; New York: George, Allen and Unwin.
32. Maslow, A. H. (1943). A theory of human motivation, *Psychological Review*, 50(4), 370-396.
33. Motowidlo, S. J., & Peterson, N. G. (2008). Effects of Organizational Perspective on Implicit Trait Policies about Correctional Officers' Job Performance. *Human Performance*, 21, 296-413.
34. Mawoli, M.A., & Babandako, A.Y. (2011). An Evaluation of Staff Motivation, Dissatisfaction and Job performance In an Academic Setting. DOI:10.5 2283/NSWR CA.AJ BMR. 20 11 01 09A01
35. Moran, B. B. (2013). *Library and Information Center Management*. Santa Barbara, CA. Libraries Unlimited.
36. Manzoor, Q. A. (2012). Impact of Employees Motivation on Organizational Effectiveness. *European Journal of Business and Management*, 3, 36-45.
37. Matthew, J., Grawhich., Barber, L.K. (2009). Are you focusing both employees and organizational outcomes. *Organizational Health Initiative*. Saint Louis University.
38. Morrow, P. C. (1993). Concept redundancy in organizational research: The case of work commitment. *Academy of Management Review*, 8, 486-500.
39. Nguyen, L. (2017). The Impact of Employee's Motivation on Organizational Effectiveness. *University of Applied Sciences International Business Journal*. <https://urn.fi/URN:NBN:fi:amk-2017120820366>
40. Nasri, W., & Charfeddine, L. (2012). Factors affecting the adoption of Internet banking in Tunisia: An integration theory of acceptance model and theory of planned behavior. *The Journal of High Technology Management Research*, 23(1), 1-14.
41. Okpara, J. (2004). Personal characteristics as predictors of job satisfaction. *Information Technology & People*, 17(3), 327-338.
42. Putra, E., Cho, S., & Liu, J. (2016). Extrinsic and Intrinsic Motivation on Work Engagement in the Hospitality Industry: Test of Motivation Crowding Theory. *Tourism and Hospitality Research*, 17(2), 228-241.
43. Parashar, B. K. (2016). Significance of Theory Z in Indian Scenario. *International Journal of Management and Social Sciences Research*, 5(2), 8-16.
44. Robbins, S., & Judge, T. (2007). *Essentials of Organizational Behavior* (12th ed.).
45. Rokeach, M. (1973). *The nature of human values*. New York, NY: The Free Press. Saroglou, V., Delpierre, V., & Dernelle, R. (2004). Values and religiosity: A metaanalysis of studies using Schwartz's model. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 37, 721-734.
46. Ryan, R. & Deci, E. (2000). Intrinsic and Extrinsic Motivations: Classic Definitions and New Directions. *Contemporary Educational Psychology*, 25(1), 54-67.
47. Suliman, A. (2001). Work performance: is it one thing or many things? The Multidimensionality of Performance in a Middle Eastern Context. *The International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 12(6), 1049-1061.
48. Syafii, L., Thoyib, A., Nimran, U. & Djumahir. (2015). the Role of Corporate Culture and Employee

- Motivation as a Mediating Variable of Leadership Style Related with the Employee Performance (Studies in Perum Perhutani). *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 211, 1142-1147.
49. Shahnawaz, Ghazi & Juyal, R.C. (2006). Human resource management practices and organizational commitment in different organizations. *Journal of the Indian Academy of Applied Psychology*, 32, 171-178.
  50. Salanova, M., Agut, S. & Peiró, J. (2005). Linking Organizational Resources and Work Engagement to Employee Performance and Customer Loyalty: The Mediation of Service Climate. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 90(6), 1217-1227.
  51. Samad, S. (2009). The Influence of Emotional Intelligence on Effective Leadership among Managers in Malaysian Business Organizations. *Journal of Business Review*, Cambridge, 13(1), 164-170.
  52. Saks, A. (2006). Antecedents and Consequences of Employee Engagement. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 21(7), 600-619.
  53. Sarmiento, R., & Beale, J. (2007). Determinants of performance amongst shop-floor employees. *Management Research News*, 30 (12), 915-927,
  54. Silvera, I. (2013). Motivation Schemes can Build Long-term Engagement. *Employee Benefits*. <https://employeebenefits.co.uk/motivation-schemes-can-build-long-term-engagement/>
  55. Smith, J., & Macko, N. (2014). Exploring the Relationship between Employee Engagement and Employee Turnover. *Annamalai International Journal of Business Studies and Research*, 6(1), 56-69.
  56. Skinner, B. F. (1938). *The behavior of organisms: An experimental analysis*. New York: Appleton-Century Crofts.
  57. Srivastava, S. K., & Barmola, K. C. (2012). Role of motivation in higher productivity. *Management Insight*, 7(1), 88-99.
  58. Samad, S. (2013). The Impact of Organizational Culture on Organizational Performance. *Australian Journal of Basic and Applied Sciences*, 7(14), 442-449.
  59. Viswesvaran, C. & Ones, D. (2000). Perspectives on Models of Job Performance. *International Journal of Selection and Assessment*, 8(4), 216-226.
  60. Wiley, C. (1995). What Motivates Employees According to Over 40 years of Motivation Surveys. *International Journal of Manpower*, 18(3), 263-280.
  61. Wilson, F. M. (2004). *Organisational Behaviour and Work: A Critical Introduction* (Second ed.). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
  62. White, R. W. (1956). Motivation reconsidered: The concept of competence. *Psychological Review*, 66, 297-333.
  63. Yiing, L. & Zaman, A, K. (2009). The moderating effects of organizational culture on the relationships between leadership behaviour and organizational commitment and between organizational commitment and job satisfaction and performance. *Leadership & Organization Development Journal*, 30(1), 53-86.