Intrinsic Rewards and Job Satisfaction: Empirical Evidence from Taif University

By

Dr. Hammad S. Alotaibi

Assistant professor, College of Taraba

Taif University, King Saudi Arabia

hammad@tu.edu.sa

Dr. Hammad S. Alotaibi

Intrinsic Rewards and Job Satisfaction: Empirical Evidence from Taif University

Dr. Hammad S. Alotaibi

Abstract

Purpose: This study aims to investigated the relationship between intrinsic rewards and job satisfaction among university employees at Taif University in Saudi Arabia.

Methodology: Data were collected from 170 employees using a survey questionnaire, and statistical analyses were conducted to evaluate the relationship between job satisfaction and intrinsic rewards factors (Task Autonomy, Task significances, and Task Involvement). The statistical analysis was performed using IBM SPSS version 23 and GraphPad Prism version 8 to evaluate the relationship between the study variables accurately.

Findings: The study found a significant positive correlation between task autonomy and job satisfaction, indicating that employees with more autonomy in their tasks are more likely to have higher job satisfaction. However, there was no significant correlation found between task significance and job satisfaction. The study also found that task involvement may have a negative correlation with job satisfaction, as high task demands and lack of autonomy can impact job satisfaction. Overall, the findings suggest that providing employees with more task autonomy can improve job satisfaction, while high levels of task involvement may lead to decreased job satisfaction.

KEY WORDS: Intrinsic rewards, Job satisfaction, Education.

Introduction

The concern of job satisfaction has been studied by many scholars in the field of human recourses management around the global (Locke, 1986) as it is very crucial for the growth of any organization. Also, measuring the level of the employees' satisfaction could identify the success or failure of any institution due the direct impact of job satisfaction on employees' performance and productivity which could positively or negatively affect institution's outcome

Dr. Hammad S. Alotaibi

(Al-Smadi & Qblan, 2015; Tausif, 2012). Thus, organizations try verity of rewards packages to attract, retain and motivate employees to achieve the efficacy and effectiveness in all its practices and process. According to (Richard, 2006) the organization faces a huge difficulty to anticipate an individual's behavior because different rewards package could attract some employees but not necessary attract others. A study by (Mottaz, 1985) stated that using different reward has a positive link to job satisfaction as if the employees are satisfied of their job that will reflect positively on their work productivity and loyalty to their organization. Also, having a satisfied employees will not only reflects on their outcome but will benefit the organization as all.

According to (Mottaz, The Relative Importance of Intrinsic and Extrinsic Rewards as Determinants of Work Satisfaction, 1985) Time is an important factor that may vary and influence the reward package. Also, workplace environment and government's rules and regulation considered as factors that influence job satisfaction (Tausif, 2012). According to (Chimanikire et al, 2007) creating an efficient rewards program for employees is the most challenging task. Increasing employee satisfaction with rewards is a difficult task and it required from the manager to be aware of their staff motive and expectation in order to provide the right intensive that will increase their satisfaction (Workineh & Shimels, 2010). One of the methods used to inspire employees is to express gratitude for their efforts and acknowledge their hard work. Employee satisfaction can be increased through a number of intrinsic incentives. Some of these incentives could include participation in decision-making processes, job autonomy, task significance and recognition (Tausif, 2012). Those incentives have some advantages to boost and create a satisfied workplace (Puspita & Nurtjahjani, 2021).

In the field of education and universities in particular, academics job satisfaction is crucial factors for development of the higher educational system (Puspita & Nurtjahjani, 2021). Since academics considered as human capital of the educational institution so understanding the elements that increase and contribute to job satisfaction will enhance the knowledge needed to support successful education system (Puspita & Nurtjahjani, 2021; Al-Smadi & Qblan, 2015). Given the significance of human resources for educational system's

success, the current research study will undertake in Taif university and seeks to find the effect of intrinsic rewards (job autonomy, task significance and task involvement) on the academic's job satisfaction.

Literature and Hypotheses Development

Job satisfaction Concept

Job satisfaction is a phrase that is commonly used in management science, particularly in the field of human resource management and it has been defined by many scholars in the field (Szromek and Wolniak, 2020). Job satisfaction is could be defined as employees' affective orientations toward the jobs they are now holding (Vroom, 1964). As determined by an evaluation of a job or work experience, job satisfaction is defined as a sensation of pleasure or good emotion (Luthans, 2011; Puspita and Nurtjahjani, 2021). Job satisfaction is a phrase have a reference to the behavior and emotion people have regarding their work which could be positive indication a job satisfaction or negative indication a job dissatisfaction (Armstrong, 1985; Szromek and Wolniak, 2020). According to (Newsterm and Davis, 1994) job satisfaction defined as "the employee's feeling about his work in an institution, and his attitudes towards the nature of the position occupied, salary received, available promotion opportunities, his interaction with the working group and services offered"

Intrinsic Rewards

Employee incentive refers to the manner in which individuals are compensated in line with their contribution to an organization, and encompasses both financial and non-financial benefits (Armstrong, 2003). For the first time, Herzberg recognized the distinction between intrinsic and extrinsic rewards in the 1950s (Herzberg, Mausner, & Snyderman, 1959; Milikić and Došenović, 2020). He proposed two kinds of incentives. Non- financial rewards (intrinsic rewards) which is related to the work itself such as recognition, achievement and, work progress. Financial rewards (exwards) which is related to elements surrounding the work or established within the working environment such as salary, bonuses, promotions and, work condition (Herzberg, Frederic, Mausner, Bernard, Peterson, Richard andCapwell, Dora, 1957).

Dr. Hammad S. Alotaibi

The results of previous studies show that monetary rewards are not necessary in every circumstance. The satisfaction of the workers may also depend on non-monetary benefits (Moynihan and Pandey, 2007). Additionally, Herzberg asserted that only intrinsic rewards can genuinely inspire and fulfill employees. According to Kalleberg (1977) intrinsic rewards or job rewards "refers to those characteristics associated with the task itself-whether it is interesting, allows the worker to develop and use his/her abilities, to be self-directive and whether the worker can see the results of the work. Valuation of this dimension thus reflects the worker's desire to be stimulated and challenged by the job and to be able to exercise acquired skills at work" (p. 128).

As recommended by Clifford Mottaz (1985), who distinguished between three forms of intrinsic rewards, we utilized the following characterization of intrinsic rewards in this paper as it is the main focus of this study: (a) *Task Autonomy* which refers to the level of freedom that given to employees regarding scheduling of their work and the execution of predetermined processes in the workplace (Hackman & Oldham, 1980; Spreitzer, 1996; Tausif, 2012), (b) *Task Significance* which is characterized by the degree to which the employees' work is viewed as making a valuable contribution to the work process (Chelladurai, 2006; Hackman and Oldham, 1980; Brickson, 2005), and (c) *Task Involvement* measures how enjoyable a task is in and how much it is seen as fascinating and challenging (Mottaz, 1985; Rehman, Khan, Ziauddin, & Lashari, 2010).

Intrinsic Rewards and Job Satisfaction

Intrinsic rewards and its effect on job satisfaction has been investigated by many scholars (Mottaz, 1985; Gerald and Dorothee, 2004; Locke E. , 1969; Rehman, Khan, Ziauddin, and Lashari, 2010). Mottaz (1985) in his study found that across all occupational categories, intrinsic rewards, followed by extrinsic social rewards, are significant drivers of satisfaction A study by Nanda and Browne (1977) found that task autonomy has a positive influence on job satisfaction. The opportunity of having more freedom to the employees to schedule their work will increase the satisfaction of the employees. Jeffery (2008) argue intrinsic rewards has an impact on job satisfaction. Finding of Nguyenet al., (2003) also showed that the job autonomy and freedom of the job will increase employee's satisfaction.

Dr. Hammad S. Alotaibi

Furthermore, task significance is another intrinsic reward which could as well increase the job satisfaction. According to Decarlo and Agarwal (1999) task significance has a positive impact on job satisfaction. Furthermore, Rehman et al (2010) utilized incentives like task autonomy, task relevance, and task participation to measure how satisfied the employees were with their jobs in electric supply company in Pakistan. The result revealed strong connection between intrinsic incentives and work satisfaction among employees. (Arokiasamy, 2013) conducted a study in education industry in Malaysia and, results revealed positive relationship between rewards and job satisfaction which will lead to high productivity and high performance. According to Tausif (2012). Providing employees with verity of tasks will boost their level of satisfaction. In addition, task involvement is crucial in enhancing job satisfaction. For example, Employees are more satisfied with their jobs when they are highly engaged in their work, participate in decision-making, receive feedback, and share knowledge. (Moh and Zoghi, 2008). Involving employees in the decision-making process is showing sign of appreciation of their opinion and the value they would add to the team. As a result of that, employee's satisfaction will increased as they feel appreciated.

In the field of education and universities in particular, academics job satisfaction is crucial factors for development of the higher educational system (Puspita and Nurtjahjani, 2021). Since academics considered as human capital of the educational institution so understanding the elements that increase and contribute to job satisfaction will enhance the knowledge needed to support successful education system (Puspita and Nurtjahjani, 2021; Al-Smadi and Qblan, 2015). Given the significance of human resources for educational system's success, the current research study will undertake in Taif university and seeks to understand the effect of intrinsic rewards (job autonomy, task significance and task involvement) on the academic's job satisfaction. On the basis of the literature review, subsequent hypotheses were formulated.

H1: Task autonomy has positive effect on job satisfaction of employees working at Taif University.

H2: Task significance has positive effect on job satisfaction of employees working at Taif university.

H3: Task involvement has a positive effect on job satisfaction of employees working at Taif University.

H4: There is a significant difference regarding preference of intrinsic rewards due to gender, job title and age.

Dr. Hammad S. Alotaibi

Methodology

The study conducted at Taif University in Saudi Arabia and aimed to investigate the relationship between intrinsic rewards and job satisfaction among university employees. The research involved 170 university employees who were selected from different departments and job titles. To collect data, the researchers used a specially designed two-part survey questionnaire. The first part of the survey contained questions related to the demographic factors of the respondents, including their age, gender, and job titles. The second part of the survey contained questions about intrinsic rewards and job satisfaction. The study scale has been adopted from Mottaz (1981) and Clifford (1985) studies to reach the study aims.

By using a well-designed survey questionnaire and ensuring the anonymity of the respondents, the study aimed to collect accurate data on the relationship between intrinsic rewards and job satisfaction among university employees. The study findings can be beneficial for universities and organizations in understanding the importance of intrinsic rewards and job satisfaction in enhancing employee motivation and performance. The study utilized both descriptive and inferential statistical analyses to evaluate the relationship between job satisfaction, intrinsic rewards, and demographic factors of the participants. Descriptive statistics such as counts, percentages, mean, and standard deviation were used to describe the study variables.

To ensure the reliability of the measurement scales, the Alpha model (Cronbach) was employed, which measures the internal consistency of the items on a scale. The Pearson correlation coefficient was used to determine the correlation between the variables. Additionally, independent t-tests and one-way ANOVA with least significant difference (LSD) were utilized as post hoc tests to compare means between two groups and more than two groups, respectively. If the assumption of normal distribution was not met, the LSD test was used as an alternative to Games-Howell for several groups. The GLM univariate analysis was used to identify significant predictors by taking the main effect as the model. The conventional p-value of <0.05 was used as the criterion for rejecting the null hypothesis. Overall, the statistical analysis was performed using IBM SPSS version 23 and GraphPad Prism version 8 to evaluate the relationship between the study variables accurately.

Results:

The socio-demographic characteristics of the studied population is shown in Table 1. Majority were male (56.5%, n = 96), assistant professor (50.0%, n = 85), and belonged to age range group of 30 – 40 years old (78.2%, n = 133).

Table 1. Socio-demographic characteristics of the studied population (N = 170).		Count	%
Demographics		**Count**	**%**
Total		170	100.0
Gender	Male	96	56.5
	Female	74	43.5
Age	20-30	4	2.4
	30-40	68	40.0
	40-50	65	38.2
	50-60	33	19.4
Job Title	Teaching Assistant	6	3.5
	Lecturer	20	11.8
	Assistant Professor	85	50.0
	Associate Professor	38	22.4
	Professor	21	12.4

Table 2 shows the mean scores for job satisfaction, rewards, and tasks domains of the studied population. The highest mean score of 4.25 ± 0.9 (min = 1, max = 5, N = 170) was observed for task significance "My work is a significant contribution to the successful operation of the organization." item, while the lowest score of 2.48 ± 1.2 (min = 1, max = 5, N = 170) for "I make most work decisions without first consulting my superior" item.

Dr. Hammad S. Alotaibi

Table 2. Mean scores for job satisfaction, rewards, and tasks domains of the studied population (N = 170).

Variables	N	Min	Max	Mean	SD
Job satisfaction	170	1.00	5.00	3.52	1.0
Intrinsic rewards	170	1.67	4.42	3.35	0.4
Task autonomy	170	1.00	4.75	3.05	0.8
Task significance	170	1.00	5.00	3.76	0.6
Task involvement	170	1.50	4.75	3.23	0.5

As shown in Table 3 based on the provided statistics, the measurement instruments used in the study have varying levels of reliability. Job satisfaction has a good reliability with a Cronbach's alpha of 0.796, while intrinsic rewards have a low reliability with a Cronbach's alpha of 0.438. Task autonomy has moderate reliability with a Cronbach's alpha of 0.527, but task significance and task involvement have poor reliability with Cronbach's alphas of 0.227 and -0.465, respectively.

Table 3. Reliability statistics for the job satisfaction, rewards, and tasks domains of the studied population (N = 170).

Reliability Statistics	N of Items	Cronbach's Alpha	95% Confidence Interval
Job satisfaction	3	0.796	0.74-0.84
Intrinsic rewards	12	0.438	0.31-0.56
Task autonomy	4	0.527	0.40-0.63
Task significance	4	0.227	0.02-0.40
Task involvement	4	-0.465	-0.86--0.14

The Table 4 shows the Pearson correlation coefficients, p-values, and sample sizes (N) for five variables: job satisfaction, intrinsic rewards, task autonomy, task significance, and task involvement. The correlation coefficient is a measure of the strength and direction of the linear relationship between two variables, ranging from -1 to 1. The asterisks next to the coefficients indicate the level of statistical significance. The table shows that job satisfaction has significant positive correlations with intrinsic rewards, task autonomy, and task significance, indicating that employees who have more intrinsic rewards, autonomy, and significance in their tasks are more likely to have higher job satisfaction. However, there is a negative correlation between job satisfaction and task involvement, suggesting that employees who are highly involved in their tasks may have lower job satisfaction.

Table 4. Correlations among job satisfaction, rewards, and tasks domains of the studied population.					
Correlations		**Intrinsic rewards**	**Task autonomy**	**Task significance**	**Task involvement**
Job satisfaction	R	0.497**	0.591**	0.449**	-0.119
	p-value	<0.001	<0.001	<0.001	0.123
	N	170	170	170	170
Task autonomy	R			0.429**	0.074
	p-value			<0.001	0.336
	N			170	170
Task significance	R				0.088
	p-value				0.251
	N				170
**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).					

Table 5 shows the association between the socio-demographic characteristics and job satisfaction and intrinsic rewards of the studied population. Results showed significant association between job satisfaction vs age (p < 0.001), intrinsic rewards vs age (p = 0.004), intrinsic awards vs job title (p = 0.009).

Dr. Hammad S. Alotaibi

Table 5. Association between the socio-demographic characteristics and job satisfaction and intrinsic rewards of the studied population (N = 170).

Demographics		Total	Job satisfaction	Intrinsic rewards
Gender	Male	96	3.55 ± 1.0	3.36 ± 0.4
	Female	74	3.48 ± 1.0	3.34 ± 0.4
p-value			*0.651*	*0.754*
Age	20-30	4	3.25 ± 1.4^A	3.23 ± 0.3^{AB}
	30-40	68	3.22 ± 0.9^A	3.23 ± 0.4^A
	40-50	65	3.46 ± 1.0^A	3.38 ± 0.4^B
	50-60	33	4.30 ± 0.8^B	3.54 ± 0.4^B
p-value			*<0.001[a,b]*	*0.004[a,b]*
Job Title	Teaching Assistant	6	3.11 ± 1.2	3.21 ± 0.3^{AB}
	Lecturer	20	3.07 ± 0.8	3.16 ± 0.4^A
	Assistant Professor	85	3.64 ± 1.0	3.41 ± 0.4^B
	Associate Professor	38	3.49 ± 1.1	3.24 ± 0.5^A
	Professor	21	3.67 ± 0.8	3.54 ± 0.3^B
p-value			*0.148*	*0.009[a,b]*

[a]-significant using One-Way ANOVA Test at <0.05 level.

[b]-Post-Hoc Test = LSD.

*CAPITAL letters indicate post-Hoc multiple pairing summary indicator. Having the same letter means the same measure statistically.

Table 6 shows the tests of between-subjects effects for job satisfaction as dependent variable. Jos satisfaction was significantly associated with age ($p < 0.001$).

Table 6. Tests of Between-Subjects Effects for job satisfaction as dependent variable.

Dependent Variable: Job satisfaction					
Source	Type III Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	p-value
Corrected Model	27.044[a]	3	9.015	10.618	<0.001
Intercept	652.398	1	652.398	768.440	<0.001
Age	27.044	3	9.015	10.618	<0.001
Error	140.932	166	0.849		
Total	2276.222	170			
Corrected Total	167.976	169			
[a]-R Squared = 0.161 (Adjusted R Squared = 0.146)					

Table 7 shows the parameter estimates for job satisfaction as dependent variable. Age was found to be a significantly negative predictor of job satisfaction ($p < 0.001$), primarily the age range of 30 – 40 years old (B = -1.087, S.E. = 0.195, 95% C.I. = -1.473- -0.701), followed by the 20 – 30 years old (B = -1.053, S.E. = 0.488, 95% C.I. = -2.016 - -0.0.90), and 40 -50 years old age range (B = -0.841, S.E. = 0.197, 95% C.I. = -1.230 - -0.453).

Table 7. Parameter Estimates for job satisfaction as dependent variable.

Dependent Variable: Job satisfaction					
Parameter	B	S.E.	95% Confidence Interval		p-value
			Lower Bound	Upper Bound	
Intercept	4.303	0.160	3.986	4.620	<0.001[a]
Age					
20-30	-1.053	0.488	-2.016	-0.090	0.032[a]
30-40	-1.087	0.195	-1.473	-0.701	<0.001[a]
40-50	-0.841	0.197	-1.230	-0.453	<0.001[a]
[a]-significant using General Linear Model at <0.05 level.					

Dr. Hammad S. Alotaibi

Table 8 shows the tests of Between-Subjects Effects for intrinsic rewards as dependent variable. Age was found to be significantly associated with intrinsic rewards.

Table 8. Tests of Between-Subjects Effects for intrinsic rewards as dependent variable.					
Dependent Variable: Intrinsic rewards					
Source	**Type III Sum of Squares**	**df**	**Mean Square**	**F**	**p-value**
Corrected Model	3.681[a]	7	0.526	3.185	0.003
Intercept	542.467	1	542.467	3284.824	<0.001
Age	1.318	3	0.439	2.661	0.050
Job Title	1.376	4	0.344	2.083	0.085
Error	26.753	162	0.165		
Total	1937.701	170			
Corrected Total	30.435	169			
[a]-R Squared = 0.121 (Adjusted R Squared = 0.083)					

Table 9 shows the parameter estimates for intrinsic rewards as dependent variable. Age was found to be a significantly negative predictor of job satisfaction (p = 0.007), particularly the age range of 30 – 40 years old (B = -0.257, S.E. = 0.095, 95% C.I. = -0.444 - -0.071), followed by the associate professor as job title (B = -0.240, S.E. = 0.114, 95% C.I. = -0.464 - -0.016).

Dr. Hammad S. Alotaibi

Table 9. Parameter Estimates for intrinsic rewards as dependent variable.					
Dependent Variable: Intrinsic rewards					
Parameter	**B**	**S.E.**	**95% Confidence Interval**		**p-value**
			Lower Bound	**Upper Bound**	
Intercept	3.602	0.102	3.400	3.804	<0.001[a]
Age					
20-30	-0.167	0.274	-0.707	0.374	0.544
30-40	-0.257	0.095	-0.444	-0.071	0.007[a]
40-50	-0.102	0.089	-0.277	0.074	0.254
Job Title					
Teaching Assistant	-0.207	0.235	-0.672	0.257	0.379
Lecturer	-0.202	0.144	-0.486	0.082	0.162
Assistant Professor	-0.044	0.105	-0.251	0.164	0.678
Associate Professor	-0.240	0.114	-0.464	-0.016	0.036[a]
[a]-significant using General Linear Model at <0.05 level.					

Table 10 shows the results of a study on task autonomy, task significance, and task involvement across different demographic groups. The table shows the total number of participants in each group, followed by the mean and standard deviation for each of the three measures (task autonomy, task significance, and task involvement). The first demographic variable is gender, with male and female participants. The results suggest that there were no significant gender differences in task autonomy or task involvement, but there was a trend toward significance for task significance ($p = 0.057$).

The second demographic variable is age, with participants grouped into four categories: 20–30, 30–40, 40–50, and 50–60. The results show that there were significant differences across age groups for task autonomy (p 0.001) and task significance ($p = 0.001$), but not for task involvement ($p = 0.069$). Post-hoc tests indicate that the 50–60 age group had significantly higher task autonomy and task significance than the other age groups, while the 30–40 age group had the lowest scores for both measures.

The third demographic variable is a job title, with participants grouped into five categories: teaching assistant, lecturer, assistant professor, associate professor, and professor. The results show that there were significant differences across job titles for task autonomy ($p = 0.036$) and task

significance (p = 0.020), but not for task involvement (p = 0.473). Post-hoc tests indicate that teaching assistants and lecturers had significantly lower task autonomy and task significance than assistant professors, associate professors, and professors. In summary, the study found that age and job title were significant predictors of task autonomy and task significance, while gender was not. The findings suggest that older individuals and those with higher job titles have greater autonomy and perceive their tasks as more significant.

Table 10. Association between the socio-demographic characteristics and task characteristics of the studied population (N = 170).

Demographics		Total	Task autonomy	Task significance	Task involvement
Gender	Male	96	3.15 ± 0.7	3.74 ± 0.5	3.18 ± 0.5
	Female	74	2.93 ± 0.8	3.78 ± 0.6	3.30 ± 0.5
p-value			*0.057*	*0.679*	*0.125*
Age	20-30	4	3.00 ± 0.7^{ABC}	3.88 ± 0.3^{ABC}	2.81 ± 0.4
	30-40	68	2.79 ± 0.8^{A}	3.58 ± 0.6^{A}	3.32 ± 0.5
	40-50	65	3.10 ± 0.7^{B}	3.80 ± 0.5^{B}	3.25 ± 0.5
	50-60	33	3.50 ± 0.6^{C}	4.04 ± 0.4^{C}	3.08 ± 0.6
p-value			*<0.001^{a,b}*	*0.001^{a,b}*	*0.069*
Job Title	Teaching Assistant	6	2.79 ± 0.6^{AB}	3.71 ± 0.4^{AB}	3.13 ± 0.5
	Lecturer	20	2.69 ± 0.8^{B}	$3.49 \pm 0.5B$	3.31 ± 0.5
	Assistant Professor	85	3.12 ± 0.7^{A}	3.85 ± 0.4^{AB}	3.25 ± 0.6
	Associate Professor	38	2.97 ± 0.9^{AB}	3.62 ± 0.8^{AB}	3.12 ± 0.5
	Professor	21	3.37 ± 0.7^{A}	3.92 ± 0.4^{A}	3.35 ± 0.5
p-value			*0.036^{a,b}*	*0.020^{a,c}*	*0.473*

a-significant using One-Way ANOVA Test at <0.05 level.

b-Post-Hoc Test = LSD.

b-Post-Hoc Test = Games-Howell.

*CAPITAL letters indicates post-Hoc multiple pairing summary indicator. Having the same letter means the same measure statistically.

Tables 11 and 12 present the results of linear regression analysis with task autonomy as the dependent variable. The model examines the relationship between age, and job title as independent variables. The corrected model, which includes age and job title as predictors, is statistically significant (F= 3.701, p = 0.001), indicating that the model as a whole explains a significant amount of variance in task autonomy. The adjusted R-squared value of 0.101 suggests that 10.1% of the variance in task autonomy can be explained by the model.

Looking at the parameter estimates, we can see that the intercept (i.e., the expected task autonomy score for someone who is not in any of the age or job title categories) is 3.563 with a standard error of 0.180 (p 0.001). The coefficients for the age categories suggest that being in the 30–40 age range is associated with lower task autonomy (B = -0.621, p 0.001), while being in the 40–50 age range is associated with even lower task autonomy (B = -0.339, p = 0.032), compared to the 20–30 age range. None of the job titles are significantly associated with task autonomy.

Table 11. Tests of Between-Subjects Effects for task autonomy as dependent variable.					
Dependent Variable: Task autonomy					
Source	**Type III Sum of Squares**	**df**	**Mean Square**	**F**	**p-value**
Corrected Model	13.277[a]	7	1.897	3.701	0.001
Intercept	463.400	1	463.400	904.120	<0.001
Age	7.504	3	2.501	4.880	0.003
Job Title	1.947	4	0.487	0.950	0.437
Error	83.032	162	0.513		
Total	1682.313	170			
Corrected Total	96.309	169			
[a]-R Squared = 0.138 (Adjusted R Squared = 0.101)					

Dr. Hammad S. Alotaibi

Table 12. Parameter Estimates for task autonomy as dependent variable.					
Dependent Variable: Task autonomy					
Parameter	**B**	**S.E.**	**95% Confidence Interval**		**p-value**
			Lower Bound	**Upper Bound**	
Intercept	3.563	0.180	3.207	3.919	<0.001[a]
Age					
20-30	-0.169	0.482	-1.122	0.783	0.726
30-40	-0.621	0.167	-0.950	-0.292	<0.001[a]
40-50	-0.339	0.157	-0.649	-0.030	0.032[a]
Job Title					
Teaching Assistant	-0.423	0.414	-1.241	0.395	0.308
Lecturer	-0.305	0.253	-0.806	0.195	0.230
Assistant Professor	-0.049	0.185	-0.415	0.316	0.790
Associate Professor	-0.228	0.200	-0.623	0.167	0.256
[a]-significant using General Linear Model at <0.05 level.					

Table 13 and 14 show the statistical analysis of the relationship between task significance and age and job title. The results show that the model is significant (F=3.758, p=0.001), indicating that the independent variables (age and job title) are related to task significance. The adjusted R squared value of 0.103 indicates that only 10.3% of the variance in task significance can be accounted for by the independent variables in the model after adjusting for the degrees of freedom. The parameter estimates for age show that only the 30-40 age group has a significant effect on task significance, while the job title variable as a whole is 0.078, suggesting a possible trend. Overall, these results suggest that age is a more important predictor of task significance than job title in this study.

Table 13. Tests of Between-Subjects Effects for task significance as dependent variable.

Dependent Variable: Task significance

Source	Type III Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	p-value
Corrected Model	7.253[a]	7	1.036	3.758	0.001
Intercept	701.644	1	701.644	2544.784	<0.001
Age	3.741	3	1.247	4.522	0.004
Job Title	2.366	4	0.592	2.146	0.078
Error	44.666	162	0.276		
Total	2455.688	170			
Corrected Total	51.919	169			
[a]-R Squared = 0.140 (Adjusted R Squared = 0.103)					

Table 14. Parameter Estimates for task significance as dependent variable.

Dependent Variable: Task significance

Parameter	B	S.E.	95% Confidence Interval		p-value
			Lower Bound	Upper Bound	
Intercept	4.016	0.132	3.756	4.277	<0.001[a]
Age					
20-30	0.003	0.354	-0.695	0.702	0.992
30-40	-0.419	0.122	-0.660	-0.177	0.001[a]
40-50	-0.175	0.115	-0.401	0.052	0.131
Job Title					
Teaching Assistant	-0.141	0.304	-0.741	0.459	0.643
Lecturer	-0.156	0.186	-0.523	0.211	0.403
Assistant Professor	0.087	0.136	-0.181	0.355	0.523
Associate Professor	-0.189	0.147	-0.478	0.101	0.200
[a]-significant using General Linear Model at <0.05 level.					

Discussion

The current study sought to investigate if intrinsic rewards have a positive association with the employees of Taif University. Based on the results above, specifically Table 5, we can answer the three hypotheses.

The first hypothesis of the current study was task autonomy is significantly associated with job satisfaction, with a correlation coefficient of 0.591 and a p-value of 0.001. This suggests that employees who have more autonomy in their tasks are more likely to have higher job satisfaction. Therefore, it can be assumed that task autonomy would have a significant and positive effect on the job satisfaction of employees working at Taif University. Our findings align with the conclusions drawn by Belachew and Yimam (2014) in their study in South Ethiopia. They identified several key predictors of overall satisfaction, including autonomy, the quality of leadership relationships, opportunities for promotion, the working environment, group cohesion, access to professional training, recognition at work, and perceived employment opportunities. Our study differs from Tuama et al. (2019), who evaluated the hypothesis that autonomy moderates the connection between job satisfaction and employee performance in a selected group of Iraq manufacturing companies. According to the findings of their investigation, the moderating influence of job autonomy does support the theory.

The second hypothesis of the current study was Task significance, on the other hand, does not show a significant correlation with job satisfaction, with a correlation coefficient of 0.449** and a p-value of 0.251. Therefore, it cannot be assumed that task significance as rewards would show a significant and positive effect on the job satisfaction of employees working at Taif University. Our study similarly from Mire's (2005) research on police officers indicated that job satisfaction is not exclusively determined by the features of the job, but it is also affected by both individual personality traits (e.g., openness, neuroticism, and extraversion) and organizational variables such as skill variety, task identity, feedback, autonomy, and task significance. Thus, it can be inferred that the combination of personal and organizational factors plays a crucial role in shaping job satisfaction among police officers.

The third hypothesis of the current study was task involvement have negative correlation between job satisfaction and task involvement, suggesting that employees who are highly involved in their tasks may have lower job satisfaction. This is in contrast with the study of Rehman et al. (2010) conducted research on the relationship between intrinsic rewards and job satisfaction and found that there is a direct and significant correlation between these two factors. Specifically, the study found that when employees are provided with intrinsic rewards such as the ability to take on meaningful tasks, autonomy in their work, and feeling engaged with their work, they are more likely to experience job satisfaction. Also, the study of Tausif (2012) conducted research in the private banking sector and found that employees who received intrinsic rewards such as recognition, task significance, task involvement, and task autonomy were more likely to report higher levels of job satisfaction. These findings suggest that providing employees with opportunities for meaningful work, autonomy, and recognition can contribute to higher levels of job satisfaction, which can lead to improved performance and productivity in the workplace.

Addressing the fourth hypothesis, in summary the study found that age and job title were significant predictors of task autonomy and task significance, while gender was not. The findings suggest that older individuals and those with higher job titles have greater autonomy and perceive their tasks as more significant. This finding supported by the study of Janet (1987) and Douglas (1991) which indicates that older employees are most likely to be satisfied with intrinsic rewards than extrinsic rewards.

Conclusion

Based on the findings, it can be concluded that intrinsic rewards, task autonomy, and task significance are important factors that contribute to job satisfaction in the workplace. Employers who wish to improve job satisfaction and task involvement among employees should focus on providing opportunities for employees to feel that their work is significant and meaningful, and offer them greater autonomy in their tasks. Additionally, it is important to recognize and reward employees for their work, as this can increase their sense of intrinsic rewards and further enhance job satisfaction. By implementing these strategies, employers can create a more satisfying and engaged workforce, leading to increased productivity and overall success for the organization.

References

Agezegn, A., Belachew, T., & Yimam, E. (2014) Factors influencing job satisfaction and anticipated turnover among nurses in Sidama zone public health facilities, South Ethiopia. Nursing Research and Practice, 909768.

Al-Smadi, M., & Qblan, Y. (2015). Assessment of Job Satisfaction among Faculty Members and its Relationship with Some Variables in Najran University. *Journal of Education and Practice*, 117-123.

Armstrong, M. (1985). A Handbook of Human Resource Management Practice. London, UK: Kogan Page.

Armstrong. (2003). Employee reward. New York: Beekman Books Inc.

Arokiasamy, A. H. (2013). The Effects of Reward System and Motivation on Job Satisfaction: Evidence from the Education Industry in Malaysia. *World Applied Sciences Journal*, 1597-1604.

Edrak, B., Yin-Fah, B., Gharleghi, B., & Seng, T. (2013). The Effectiveness of Intrinsic and Extrinsic Motivations: A Study of Malaysian Amway Company's Direct Sales Forces. Int J Bus Soc Sci, 4, 96-103.

Bednarska, M. (2015). Moderators of Job Characteristics – Job Satisfaction Relationship in the Tourism Industry. Ekon Probl Tur, 31. https://doi.org/10.18276/ept.2015.3.31-01.

Brickson, S. (2005). Organisational identity orientation: forging a link between organisational identity and organisations relations with stakeholders. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 576–609.

Browne, J., & Nanda, R. (1977). Hours of Work, Job Satisfaction and Productivity. *Public Productivity Review*, 46-56.

Clifford, JM. (1985). The Relative Importance of Intrinsic and Extrinsic Rewards as Determinants of Work Satisfaction. *Soc. Quart*, 26(3):365-385.

Chelladurai, P. (2006). Human Resource Management in Sport and Recreation. USA: Human Kinetics.

Chimanikire1, P., Mutandwa, E., Gadzirayi3, C. T., Muzondoand, N., & Mutandwa, B. (2007). Factors affecting job satisfaction among academic professionals in tertiary institutions in Zimbabwe. *African Journal of Business Management*, 166-175.

Decarlo, T., & Agarwal, S. (1999). Influence of managerial behaviours and job autonomy on job satisfaction of industrial salespersons. *Industrial Marketing Management*, 51–62.

Gerald, M., & Dorothee, L. (2004). Relationship of professionalism, rewards,market orientation and job satisfaction among medical professionals; The case of Certified Nurse–Midwives. *Journal of Business Research*, 1042-1053.

George D. Mallery P. SPSS for Windows step by step: A simple guide and reference. 11.0 update 4th edition, Allyn & Bacon, Boston. 2003.

Janet L, Bokemeier JL, Bokeimer WBL (1987). "Job Values, Rewards, and Work Conditions as Factors in Job Satisfaction among Men and Women", Soc. Quart., 28(2): 189-204.

Hackman, R., & Oldham, G. (1980). Work redesign. Addison-Wesley, Reading, Mass.

Herzberg, F., Mausner, B., & Snyderman, B. (1959). The motivation to work. New York: John Wiley & Sons.

Herzberg, Frederic, Mausner, Bernard, Peterson, Richard &Capwell, Dora. (1957). Job attitudes: review of research and opinion. Pittsburg: Psychological Service of Pittsburg.

Kalleberg, A. (1977). Work values and job rewards: a theory of job satisfaction. American Sociological Review, 124-143.

Kanungo, R., & Hartwick, J. (1987). An alternative to the intrinsic-extrinsic dichotomy of work rewards. *Journal of Management*, 751-756.

Locke. (1986). What is Job Satisfaction. *Organization Behavior Human Performance*, 309-336.

Luthans, F. (2011). Organizational Behavior: An Evidence-Based Approach. Boston: McGraw-Hill.

Milikić, B. B., & Došenović, D. (2020). Moderators of the relationship between intrinsic rewards and job satisfaction: The evidence from the republic of Srpska. *Sociologija*, 417-437.

Mire, S.M. (2005). Correlates of job satisfaction among police officers. The Faculty of the College of Criminal Justice, Sam Houston State University. Available at:
https://www.proquest.com/docview/305363646/abstract.

Moh, R., & Zoghi, C. (2008). High-Involvement Work Design and Job Satisfaction. *Journal of Industrial and Labor Relations Review*, 275-296.

Mottaz, C. (1985). The relative importance of intrinsic and extrinsic rewards as determinants of work satisfaction. *The Sociological Quarterly*, 365–385.

Mottaz, C. (1985). The Relative Importance of Intrinsic and Extrinsic Rewards as Determinants of Work Satisfaction. *The Sociological Quarterly*, 365-385.

Mottaz, C. (1981). Some determinants of work alienation, *Sociol Quarterly*, 22: 515-529.

Moynihan, D., & Pandey, S. (2007). Finding Workable Levers over Work Motivation: Comparing Job Satisfaction, Job Involvement and Organizational Commitment. Administration & Society, 803–832.

Newsterm, W., & Davis. (1994). " K Organizational Behavior". MC- Grow-Hill.

Nguyen, A., Taylor, J., & Bradley, S. (2003). Job autonomy and job satisfaction: new evidence. Lancaster University Management School, Economics Department.

Noko, E., & Nwuzor, J. (2021). Employee and Organizational Performance: Employees Perception of Intrinsic and Extrinsic Rewards System. *Applied Journal of Economics, Management and Social Sciences*, 2(1), 26-32. https://doi.org/10.53790/ajmss.v2i1.5.

Oriarewo, G., Agbim, K., & Owutuamor, Z. (2013). Job Rewards as Correlates of Job Satisfaction: Empirical Evidence from the Nigerian Banking Sector. *Int J Eng Sci*, 2, 62-68.

Puspita, A., & Nurtjahjani, F. (2021). Job Satisfaction in Higher Education (Study at Universities in Indonesia). *International Conference on*

Applied Science and Technology on Social Science (pp. 442-445). Atlantis Press SARL.

Rehman, M., Khan, M., Ziauddin, & Lashari, J. (2010). Effect of job rewards on job satisfaction, moderating role of age differences: An empirical evidence from Pakistan. *African Journal of Business Management*, 1131-1139.

Richard, H. (2006). Compensation Management in a Knowledge Based World (10 ed.). Pearson Education Inc.

Rosenthal, J. (2008). Intrinsic Job Rewards in the United States; Annual Meetings of the American Sociological Association. Boston: Sheraton Boston, Boston Marriott Copley Place, Hilton Boston Back Bay,and Hynes Convention Center.

Spreitzer, G. (1996). Social structural characteristics of psychological empowerment. *Academy of Management Journal*, 483–504.

Szromek, A. R., & Wolniak, R. (2020). Job Satisfaction and Problems among Academic Staff in Higher Education. *Sustainability*, 1-38.

Tausif, M. (2012). Relationship between intrinsic rewards and job satisfaction: A comparative study of public and private organization. *International Journal of Research in Commerce, IT & Management*,33-42.

Tuama, S.A., & Kourdi T.A., (2014). The impact of job satisfaction and job motivation on

 employees' performance: Moderating effect of job autonomy. Revista Aus, 145-153.

Tufail, M. S., Muneer, S., & Manzoor, M. (2017). How organizational rewards and organizational justice affect the organizational citizenship behavior and counterproductive work behavior: analysis of Pakistan service industries. *City University Research Journal*, 171-182.

Vroom, V. (1964). Work and Motivation. New York, NY, USA: John Wiley and Sons.

Workineh, B., & Shimels, Z. (2010). Academic Staff Reward System: A Case of Jimma University. *Ethiopian Journal of Education and Sciences*, 13-27.

Dr. Hammad S. Alotaibi

المكافآت الجوهرية والرضا الوظيفي: دراسة تجريبية من جامعة الطائف

د. حماد صالح العتيبي

الهدف: تهدف هذه الدراسة إلى معرفة العلاقة بين المكافآت الجوهرية والرضا الوظيفي لدى موظفي الجامعة في جامعة الطائف في المملكة العربية السعودية.

المنهجية: تم جمع البيانات من ١٧٠ موظفًا باستخدام المسح الاستبيان، وأجريت تحليلات إحصائية لتقييم العلاقة بين الرضا الوظيفي وعوامل المكافآت الجوهرية (استقلالية المهام، ودلالات المهمة، واشتراك المهمة). تم إجراء التحليل الإحصائي باستخدام IBM SPSS الإصدار ٢٣ و GraphPad Prism الإصدار ٨ لتقييم العلاقة بين متغيرات الدراسة بدقة.

النتائج: وجدت الدراسة علاقة إيجابية مهمة بين استقلالية المهام والرضا الوظيفي، مما يشير إلى أن الموظفين الذين يتمتعون بمزيد من الاستقلالية في مهامهم من المرجح أن يكون لديهم رضا وظيفي أعلى. ومع ذلك، لم يتم العثور على ارتباط كبير بين أهمية المهمة والرضا الوظيفي. وجدت الدراسة أيضًا أن المشاركة في المهام قد يكون لها علاقة سلبية بالرضا الوظيفي، حيث يمكن أن تؤثر متطلبات المهام العالية والافتقار إلى الاستقلالية على الرضا الوظيفي. بشكل عام، تشير النتائج إلى أن تزويد الموظفين بمزيد من استقلالية المهام يمكن أن يحسن الرضا الوظيفي، في حين أن المستويات العالية من المشاركة في المهام قد تؤدي إلى انخفاض الرضا الوظيفي.

الكلمات الافتتاحية: المكافآت الجوهرية، الرضا الوظيفي، التعليم.