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Abstract

The main purpose of present study is to identify the impact of intrinsic motivation on employee’s job satisfaction. This is basically an empirical study and a scale was developed to find out the impact of four variables namely; job security, achievement, job responsibility and work itself (intrinsic motivation). The questionnaire was distributed among the respondents on the basis of simple random sampling. The findings of this study show a significant positive relationship among four variables and employees job satisfaction. The relationships among job security & job satisfaction, achievement & job satisfaction, job responsibility & job satisfaction and work itself and job satisfaction are significant and positive. This research study highlights the areas in which the organizational manager focuses to increase the individual and organizational performance.
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Objective of the Study:

The main objective of this research is to investigate the impact of intrinsic motivational factors on job satisfaction. Because in Pakistan the study related to intrinsic motivation is not conducted so we are going to investigate this issue.

Research methodology: Data was collected from the different organizations and employees working in different organizations of Pakistan. The survey was completed by 182 employees, 95% responses were observed. The Results were made using Correlation, regression and ANOVA with the available data.

Findings: The results showed that intrinsic motivation and employee’s job satisfaction are reducing the risk. Finding is that employees’ perception diverges significantly during the organizational problems.

1. Introduction

In the last two decades the organization moved globally to capture the international market and when an organization moved globally than it must focus on its employees. that’s why organization used the HR policies such as development of competencies, ethics, attractive work and mostly employers are focus on create jobs and conditions that satisfy the employees (nielspors 2002). There are many factors which are effect on job satisfaction. (Dinham and Scott, 1998) stated three factors that effect on job satisfaction intrinsic factors, operating factors and system level factors. Intrinsic motivation is clearly important types of motivation, most of the activities people do are not, strictly speaking, intrinsically motivated. This is especially the case after early childhood, as the freedom to be intrinsically motivated becomes increasingly curtailed by social demands and roles that require individuals to assume responsibility for non essentially interesting tasks. In schools, for example, it appears that intrinsic motivation becomes weaker with each advancing grade(Ryan and Deci 2000). Most consistent finding to emerge from this body of research is that intrinsic motivation is strongly tied to positive performance outcomes(Abuhamdeh, Csikszentmihalyi et al. 2015).
In 1959 the researcher Frederick Herzberg presents a two factor theory. In this theory he argues that there are some factors which lead to satisfaction and other are that inhibit dissatisfaction. He argued that motivational factors (sense of achievement, advancement opportunities, moral values, job security) lead to employee satisfaction (Herzberg, 1959).

This research is follow the studies (Hancer and George, 2003; Smith et al., 1996; Simons and Enz, 1995) that use distinct intrinsic factors categories to explore job satisfaction. Job satisfaction is a function of the difference between the amount of some outcome provided by a work role and the strength of a related desire or motive on the part of the person”. “Job satisfaction is the whole matrix of job factors that make a person like his work situation and be willing to head for it without distaste at the beginning of his work day (Srinivasan and Ambedkar 2015).

In Pakistan employers focus on extrinsic motivation (cash compensation, incentives,) so industrial employees feel much dissatisfaction on their jobs that’s why they make the decision to turnout from the organization. The objective of present study is to investigate the impact of intrinsic motivation on job satisfaction in Pakistan. What is the impact of intrinsic motivation on job satisfaction? In this study we offer two contributions in a literature. First, we investigate the some confirmation to suggestion that intrinsic motivation may important for employee’s performance (Bonner and Sprinkle, 2002). Second, contribution is investigating the impact of intrinsic motivation on employee’s job satisfaction (Frey, 1997).

2. Literature Review

20th century is the surroundings of global rivalry and in this era mostly organization are focusing to achieve the competitive advantage over others. Now a day’s many researchers giving their attention to representative career because of technical innovation and global trends which created a blustery ecological context (Arthur and Rousseau, 1996; Hall and Moss, 1998; Mirvis and Hall, 1994; Osterman, 1996; Sullivan, 1999). In administration, it’s contended that satisfied workers have higher performance (Alfonso Sousa-Pozza 2000). Today all the assets are replicated except human assets because the specific skills, expertise, experience and knowledge of an individual can’t be copied. So it could be a challenge for an organization how to retain the knowledgeable employees.

Job satisfaction as a general attitude towards an individual’s job, and the difference between the amount of reward workers receive and the amount they believe they should receive (Adenuga 2015). Job satisfaction is the match between an individual’s expectations and the perceived reality of the job as a whole (Wang and Tran 2015). Job satisfaction as “the fulfillment acquired by experiencing various job activities and rewards”. It implied that job satisfaction can be understood as an emotional state of human beings that reflects the positive and pleasant feeling of a person when he or she appreciates his or her own job well (Johnson and Sohi 2014). Many tools are used to retain the best employees but job satisfaction is one of the best. Job satisfaction described in many ways and defined contrarily in many researches. Kartzell (1964) said that there is compromise round job satisfaction, which is the verbal expression of an official’s appraisal of his/her job. Locke (1976) describe that job satisfaction is positive feelings which is follow on the assessment of one’s job or job experience. Robbins and Coulter (1996) defined that job satisfaction is a employee general attitude towards job (Herzberg 1968) Present a dual factor theory of job satisfaction which tells us there are two group of factor that can lead the job satisfaction and job dissatisfaction. Job content-related facets (achievement, responsibility, security, moral values) lead to satisfaction. So job satisfaction is the best forecasting tool of overall welfare (Argyle, 1989; Judge and Watanabe 1993).

Job security is explained as one's hope about attaining job situation. It involves relate to over failure of attractive job characteristics such as low chance of advancement opportunities, current working conditions, and long-term career opportunities (Greenhalgh and Rosenblatt, 1984 Jacobson, 1991, Greenhalgh and Sutton, 1991; Borg and Elizur, 1992). There are more than a few causes for the rising literature on this issue. One narrate to the large number of people unwillingly jobless throughout the 1980 4.3 million people were lastingly transfer between 1985 and 1989 alone (Herz, 1991). The significance of job security has enlarged and highlight in the last ten years employees feedback why they change the organization (e Davy et al., 1991; g. Brockner, DeWitt, Grover and Reed, 1990). In these studies, they defined intrinsic job satisfaction lower due to downsizing, mergers, and restructuring as a cause of turnout (e Brockner et al., 1990; g. Davy et al., 1991.). So job security and its result are effect on employee satisfaction. Job security was positively and significantly related with job satisfaction (Oldham, Julik, Stepina and Brand, Ambrose, 1986, e.g. Arnold and Feldman, 1982) and organizational obligation (e.g. Greenhalgh, 1985; Arnold and Feldman, 1982), and negatively connected with purpose to quit (e.g. Ashford et al., 1989; Arnold and Feldman, 1982).
**H1: Job security has a positive effect on job satisfaction**

In this environment organizations are need efficient and effective employees and managers so that organization achieves their objectives. Organizations cannot succeed without their personnel efforts and commitment (A Mohamood & M Hossain, 2006). Than organization considered and used many tools for employee job satisfaction such as: salaries, achievement, job security and workplace flexibility (Koustellios et al., 2003; Navaie-Walisier et al., 2004; Iliés and Judg, 2003; Gigantesco et al., 2003; McNeese-Smith, 1999; Blegen, 1993; De Loach, 2003; Chu et al., 2003; Thyer, 2003). Number of the researches pointed that the teacher self efficacy having a impact on student achievement and success (Moore & Esselman, 1992, 1994; Muijs & Rejnolds, 2001; Ross, 1992, 1998). The opportunities for individual and specialized development and achievement is one of the most excellent predictors of job satisfaction (Lyons et al., 2003; Al-Ahmadi, 2002; Freeborn and Hooker, 1995; Wittig et al., 2003).

**H2: Employees achievement has a positive effect on job satisfaction**

Responsibility generally refers to a personal’s participation with various job-related events and their results because the consequences have implications for their uniqueness (Britt, 1999). The Triangle Model, which was developed by Schlenker, Britt, Pennington, Murphy, and Doherty (1994), and shows the responsibility is usually having a triadic relationships between events, the rules that regulate these events, and the self images persons have in definite situations. According to Britt (1999, p. 696) the “amount of responsibility an individual feels on any given occasion is a direct function of the strength of the links between the elements and the importance of the elements to the individual. (Schlenker et al. 1994) empirically assessed the Triangle Model and concluded that responsibility was indeed higher when all three relationships in the model were strong. Using the principles prescribed by the model, the discrimination and stereotypes (the events), the pay inequity and biased policies (the rules and regulations), and the low self-concept and performance expectations (the identity images) could all synergistically lower women’s perceptions of their own job responsibility.

**H3: Job responsibility has a positive effect on job satisfaction**

Many managers in the organization admit that work situation is a cause of employee attitude in the organization and this the area in which HR is manipulates the organization programs and practices of management. The most critical part of the job situation is the work itself which is normally unnoticed by the researcher when they investigate the job satisfaction. Some researcher belief that the work situation itself is most weighted in job satisfaction that is called “intrinsic job characteristics.” Studies shows that when they asked to employees to evaluate the job features than the mostly weighted the job itself as a high (Judge & Church, 2000; Jurgensen, 1978).

Some managers belief that the pay is important for employees as compare to job attributes (interesting work). But (Kovach, K. A. (1995) state that employees ranked the job attributes as the highest and ranked pays as fifth number. All the major job satisfaction facets the work itself is (challenging work, variety & scope) is the most excellent predictor of overall job satisfaction (Fried & Ferris, 1987; Parisi & Weiner, 1999; Weiner, 2000). All the above arguments leads to the following hypothesis.

**H4: Work itself has a positive effect on job satisfaction**

![Figure 1. Theoretical Framework](http://mos.sciedupress.com)
3. Methodology

3.1 Sample

The respondents of this study are the employees of the city of Islamabad, which is capital of Pakistan and familiar as intense and culturally dissimilar city (population of Islamabad are having a different background because they belong to all over the Pakistan). We just describe a universal picture that how different factors effect on the employees satisfaction on the job. We used the convenience sampling technique for collecting the data. The survey questionnaire was filled by respondent for the period of November to December 2012. About 205 questionnaires were floated among respondents, out of which 190 were received and 182 were usable. So the response rate was 88%.

3.2 Variable Measurement

Dependent variable is job satisfaction and independents variables are job security, achievement, work itself and job responsibility and all these items are measured by using the scale of (Patricia Huddleston and Linda K. Good 1999) in which they used eleven questions to measure these variables by using the lickert scale (1 = strongly disagree and 5 = strongly agree) scales have good reliability and these scales are best to get the information about people. The sample of the questionnaire is (Upto what extent you have to receive a chances do something that create your value in organization). The reliability of job satisfaction (.770) job security (.739) achievement (.987) job responsibility (.899) work itself (.903)

3.3 Demographic

Table 1 describe Demographic data of respondents, most of respondents were male 75 percent and 25 percent female. Most of the respondents are below 40 years (93%) of age, 55 percent between the respondents are unmarried.

Table 1. Demographic Characteristics

| Age       | Percent |
|-----------|---------|
| 18-25     | 37      |
| 26-35     | 54      |
| 36-45     | 09      |
| 46 and above | 0     |

| Gender     |         |
|-----------|---------|
| Male      | 75      |
| Female    | 25      |

| Marital status |         |
|----------------|---------|
| Married        | 45      |
| Unmarried      | 55      |

4. Analysis and Results Descriptions

In Table two we calculate the mean, standard deviation and correlation of all variables which are used in hypothesis test. And we show the standard deviation, mean, reliability and correlation of each variable in Table 2. To test the reliability of variables we used the cronbach alpha technique. The values of cronbach alpha for all the variables (job satisfaction 0.770>0.70), security (0.739>0.70), achievement (0.897>0.70), responsibility (0.899>0.70) and work itself (0.903>0.70) we was studied significant at 0.70 level and this level was recommended by (Nunnally, 1978) and this level was also recommended by (Ndubisi, 2006).

Table 2. Mean Standard deviation, Alpha reliability and Correlation.

|          | JS          | Sec         | Ach         | Res         | Sec         | Wr          |
|----------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|
| Mean     | 3.04        | 3.22        | 3.26        | 3.17        | 3.43        |
| SD       | 0.955       | 0.99        | 1.08        | 1.05        | 1.13        |
| JS       | (0.770)     | 0.783**     | 0.794**     | 0.821**     | 0.784**     |
| Res      |             |             | 0.862**     | 0.849**     | 0.856**     |
| Ach      |             |             |             | 0.862**     | 0.819**     |
| Sec      |             |             |             |             | 0.767**     |
| Wr       |             |             |             |             | (0.903)     |

**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).
N=182,
JS=job satisfaction, Sec=Security, Ach=Achievement, Res=Responsibility, Wr=Work itself,
When we analyze the Table 2, than we see the correlation among job satisfaction and responsibility, JS and achievement, and JS and security, JS and work itself are positive correlate at 0.01 level. In my analysis the value of multicolinearity within all the independent variables are less than 0.80, so there is no multicolinearity exists between the independent variables. We found the support of Goldsmith et al., (1999) study related to the multicolinearity.

Regression analysis

Table 3 describes the regression analysis among dependent variable job satisfaction and independent variables responsibility, achievement, security & work itself. The relationship between dependent and all independents variables are significant. The regression equation is

\[ \text{Job satisfaction} = \alpha + \beta_1 \text{(job security)} + \beta_2 \text{(achievement)} + \beta_3 \text{(responsibility)} + \beta_4 \text{(work itself)} \]

| Model | Unstandardized Coefficients | Standardized Coefficients | T | Sig. | R²  |
|-------|-----------------------------|---------------------------|---|------|-----|
|       | B                           | Std. Error                | Beta |    |     |
| 1     | (Constant)                  | 0.339                     | 0.131 | 2.581 | 0.011 | 0.731 |
|       | Sec                         | 0.236                     | 0.073 | 0.244 | 3.248 | 0.001 |
|       | Ach                         | 0.208                     | 0.072 | 0.237 | 2.903 | 0.004 |
|       | Res                         | 0.220                     | 0.093 | 0.242 | 2.367 | 0.019 |
|       | Wr                          | 0.165                     | 0.067 | 0.196 | 2.455 | 0.015 |
| ***   | Dependent Variable: job satisfaction |                       |     |      |     |

The end result of regression table shows that the connection among job Security and JS is positive and significant ($\beta=0.244$, $\rho<0.05$). The beta value of job security describe that if one unit increases or decreased in job security then job satisfaction will increased or decreased by 24 percent. The value is significant because it is lower than 0.05 that's why (H1, job security is positively affects job satisfaction) is accepted. This study confirms the finding of (Arnold and Feld- man, 1982; Oldham, Julik, Ambrose, Stepina and Brand, 1986).

Relationship between achievement and JS is significant ($\beta=0.237$, $\rho<0.05$) it describe that if one unit increase in achievement then job satisfaction will be increased by 23.7 percent; (H2, achievement positively affects job satisfaction) is accepted. Our findings provide the same results as with previous studies of (Lyons et al., 2003; Al-Ahmadi, 2002; Freeborn and Hooker, 1995; Wittig et al., 2003).

The relationship between responsibility and JS is significant ($\beta=0.242$, $\rho<0.05$) it describe that one unit increase in responsibility than job satisfaction will be increased by 24.2 percent. These findings support (H3, which was proposed that responsibility has positive effect on job satisfaction). This study confirms the findings of Schlenker et al., (1994)

Similarly work itself and JS is significant ($\beta=0.196$, $\rho<0.05$) it describe that one unit increase in work itself than job satisfaction will be increased by 19.6 percent. These findings support (H4, which was proposed that work itself has positive effect on job satisfaction).This study confirms the findings of (Hochschild, 1979, 1983).

The value of R² value is ($R^2=0.731$) it shows fitness of good of model. And the explanatory power of our model means that 73.1 percent of the model is explained.

5. Discussion and Conclusion

The purpose of this study is to investigate the effect of intrinsic motivational factors (job security, achievement, responsibility and work itself) on job satisfaction. The results show that intrinsic motivational factors are significantly related to employee’s job satisfaction.

According to the (Lam et al., 2001) work itself plays a key role in employee job satisfaction. Employee creativity enhances the company ability for gaining competitive advantage. This study reflects that in order to use the creativity of the employees the company must provide them challenging, competitive environments, and variety of tasks. It will also enable the employees to enjoy their job and have a sense of pride about it. Employees feel motivated after getting variety of task on same job and they appreciate their freedom.

Employee’s places job security at a high level for behavioral and psychological attachment to an organization (Arnold and Feld- man, 1982). Employees are the key asset for any organization to get sustained competitive
advantage. This study reflects that employees having job security will increase their loyalty, commitment, attachment and less intention to quit. By providing job security to employee organization retains its high intellectual capital within the organization and gets fruitful results by using their skills.

This study indicates more consistent and stronger relationship between job responsibility and job satisfaction which was reported in past studies (Schlenker et al., 1994). This study reflects that higher job responsibility will engage employees in large number of and diverse tasks and encourage their active participation in problem solving. The organizations focusing on continuous learning, more job responsibility, and problem solving activities for employees will led to decrease in setup times and increase employees involvement for process improvements. Which ultimately expand employee abilities, knowledge and skills to increase production of complex products.

Feelings of achievement have large effect on employee job satisfaction (Hochschild, 1979). This study indicates that employees having low feeling of achievements have more intention to quit. Whereas high feelings of achievements will increase employee satisfaction and performance and less likely to quit, organization can do this at a low cost.

5.1 Limitations and Suggestions for Future Research

As there is always room for development, this study comprises the views regarding impact of intrinsic motivation of employee job satisfaction by utilizing convenience sampling, analyzing the views from short sample size and conducted in capital city of Pakistan Islamabad. Surveys were distributed and filled mainly from teachers from different universities. Thus a more comprehensive study needs to be examined with more generalizability by increasing sample size.

Studies on intrinsic motivation should be added with diverse tools and approaches which might demonstrates addition to this field. Moreover, other dimensions such as organizational innovational, risk attitude or characteristics of R&D employees should be incorporated in future studies model to examine their effects. Furthermore, demographic characteristics of employees may be providing new direction for future studies such as gender, employees occupation sector (Govt or private).

5.2 Implications for Managers

These results could have implications for the manager’s practice of intrinsic motivation strategies. The structure of employee job will have the opportunity to express their need for autonomy, competitiveness and social association to fulfill intrinsic needs. Therefore, employees need to choose to take part and to experience a sense of accomplishment, and have plentiful opportunity to experience with their peers.

This study provides helpful insights for manager to identify the importance of intrinsic motivation for their subordinate’s job, as well as increase in intrinsic motivation will be increase the employee performance. The contribution of employee will lead the organization to achieve its strategic objective in a competitive environment.
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