

INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF MULTIDISCIPLINARY: APPLIED BUSINESS AND EDUCATION RESEARCH

2024, Vol. 5, No. 11, 4526 – 4545

<http://dx.doi.org/10.11594/ijmaber.05.11.20>

Research Article

Exploring The Impact of Motivation on Job Performance: A Study of Government Personnel in Public Sector Organizations

John Alvin H. Fabre*, Dyan Krysza Janine G. Liban-Benemerito, Jonafe I. Alejandro, Bernandino P. Malang, Jocelyn DS. Malang

¹World Citi Colleges, Cubao, Quezon City, Philippines

²Bulacan State University, Philippines

Article history:

Submission 31 October 2024

Revised 07 November 2024

Accepted 23 November 2024

*Corresponding author:

E-mail:

johnalvinfabre@gmail.com

ABSTRACT

The study aims to explore the relationship between motivation and job performance among government personnel in public sector organizations. Specifically, it seeks to understand how various motivational factors influence employee productivity and overall performance in the context of public sector work environments. Motivation theories like Maslow's Hierarchy of Needs (1943) which are composed of five levels of human needs for survival, an individual's lower-level needs must be satisfied before they can address their higher-level needs. Intrinsic motivation engages a person in an activity for self-satisfaction while extrinsic motivation drives a person to function due to rewards or punishment. This allows us to foresee the incoming demotivator for the personnel and how it affects the performance of the agency where they work. The study used a quantitative research design through a Likert scale questionnaire research instrument. Descriptive statistics and Multivariate Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) were applied to analyze the data, acknowledging potential biases from personal beliefs, professional background, and participant interaction to enhance the study's reliability. The survey results indicated a balanced gender distribution among respondents, falling in the 26 to 35 age group, and most were identified as permanent government personnel. The overall sentiment toward intrinsic motivation and recognition in the workplace was positive, suggesting a healthy organizational climate and a need for improved recognition practices. Additionally, significant differences in job motivation were noted based on age and length of service, particularly in the areas of career advancement opportunities and job security. Furthermore, the study reveals that career advancement opportunities are the main motivator for government personnel's job performance, with intrinsic motivation recognized as important, while training programs, performance-based bonuses, and team-building activities are effective

How to cite:

Fabre, J. A. H., Liban-Benemerito, D. K. J. G., Alejandro, J. I., Malang, B. P., & Malang, J. D. S. (2024). Exploring The Impact of Motivation on Job Performance: A Study of Government Personnel in Public Sector Organizations. *International Journal of Multidisciplinary: Applied Business and Education Research*. 5(11), 4526 – 4545. doi: 10.11594/ijmaber.05.11.20

strategies for enhancing motivation across diverse demographic profiles.

Keywords: *Government personnel, Motivation, Job performance, Public sector, Philippines*

Introduction

As the Philippines' economy continues to grow at a robust pace of 6.0 percent in the first half of 2024, technological advancements inside government agencies, and by ensuring the government personnel motivation you also ensure their commitment and loyalty. Productivity, efficiency, and work performance increase when employees are highly motivated and completely satisfied with their jobs. However, this does not mean that there are no issues in keeping government employees motivated. One example of this is the hiring of contractors or untenured employees, who only work for a set amount of time depending on their contract. Even though they often do the identical tasks, the difference in job security between contractual and permanent employees may already be demotivating for contractual government personnel.(David, 2023).

Motivation plays a crucial role in influencing job performance, especially within the public sector, where employee engagement directly affects service delivery and organizational effectiveness. In recent years, there has been an increasing focus on understanding the motivational factors that drive government personnel in public sector organizations, as motivated employees tend to exhibit higher productivity and job satisfaction (Engidaw, 2021). A well-motivated workforce is essential for enhancing economic efficiency, given the critical role government agencies play in implementing policies, providing public services, and promoting sustainable development.

Research highlights that motivation is multifaceted, comprising both intrinsic and extrinsic elements, which can significantly impact employee satisfaction and engagement levels (Ryan & Deci, 2000). Intrinsic motivation, which arises from personal satisfaction and a sense of accomplishment, often fosters a deeper commitment to work, while extrinsic motivation—such as financial rewards and

recognition—can reinforce positive behaviors and improve job performance (Hernandez, 2016). For government personnel, balancing these forms of motivation is essential to sustaining high performance in challenging and often resource-limited environments.

Government personnel are motivated by unique factors, including job security, career advancement, and a sense of purpose associated with serving the public (Perry & Wise, 1990). However, in developing countries, public sector organizations often face additional challenges, such as bureaucratic inefficiencies and limited resources, which can hinder employee motivation and overall job performance (Rainey, 2009). Despite these challenges, many government employees are driven by a strong commitment to public service, a phenomenon that scholars refer to as public service motivation (PSM), which has been shown to positively impact job performance in various settings (Vandenabeele, 2008).

From a case study in a local government, an organization needs motivation, whether it comes from intrinsic or extrinsic motivation. An organization that is lacking in motivation will affect the satisfaction which affects their performance due to that they were not able to have their needs that needed to be fulfilled (Rauben, 2023). Therefore, this study determines the significance of both intrinsic and extrinsic motivation in the workplace and how it fosters its government employee motivation and fulfilling their needs.

In the Philippine context, government agencies implement a variety of motivational strategies to enhance employee engagement and performance. These strategies are essential, given the significant role of government personnel in achieving national development goals and addressing societal challenges. However, there is a need to assess whether these strategies are effective in meeting the motivational needs of government personnel, particularly in

terms of providing job satisfaction and promoting productivity. For the Filipino government employee, the intrinsic and extrinsic motives interact as motivators (using the Herzberg model) and are not considered as antagonistic needs. One cannot claim that either because work satisfaction is thought to result from a combination of favorable intrinsic and extrinsic work conditions, these motives are hierarchically rated (Amaryllis-Torres, 1989). This study, therefore, seeks to explore the impact of motivation on job performance among government personnel in public sector organizations in the Philippines in terms of different kinds of motivators.

Organizational culture and leadership also play significant roles in shaping employee motivation and performance within public sector organizations. Transformational leadership, which involves inspiring and empowering employees, has been shown to create a supportive work environment that fosters motivation and enhances job performance (Bass & Riggio, 2006). In contrast, a lack of recognition and poor managerial support can lead to demotivation and reduced job performance, underscoring the importance of effective leadership in sustaining employee motivation (Kahn, 1990). Understanding the impact of organizational culture and leadership on motivation can provide valuable insights into enhancing job performance within government agencies.

Several studies indicate that even though poverty is prevalent in the Philippines, Franco (2008) found that intrinsic motivation is significantly more important than extrinsic motivation wherein that challenge to ability, learning and growth, and enjoyment respectively rank as top three most valued intrinsic however extrinsic motivation like career advancement and money did not fall far from the scores from intrinsic in terms of importance.

The interplay between motivation and job performance in public sector organizations is complex, involving various intrinsic and extrinsic factors that influence employee productivity. While intrinsic motivation contributes to personal fulfillment and job satisfaction, extrinsic factors like rewards, recognition, and career advancement opportunities also play a significant role in motivating personnel to perform at

their best (Deci & Ryan, 2000). By examining these factors, this study aims to identify key motivational drivers that impact job performance among government personnel, thereby providing insights into effective strategies for enhancing employee engagement in the public sector.

This study will contribute to the existing body of literature by exploring the specific motivational factors that influence job performance among government personnel in the Philippines. By examining both intrinsic and extrinsic motivations and their effects on job satisfaction and productivity, this research seeks to provide a comprehensive understanding of how motivation can be leveraged to improve organizational outcomes in public sector settings. The findings of this study are expected to inform policymakers and government agencies on effective motivational strategies that can enhance employee performance and service delivery.

This research aims to fill a gap in the literature by focusing on the relationship between motivation and job performance within public sector organizations in the Philippines. By examining the motivational factors that drive government personnel and assessing their impact on productivity, this study seeks to provide valuable insights that can support the development of policies and practices aimed at fostering a motivated and efficient public sector workforce. Through this exploration, the research hopes to contribute to a better understanding of how motivation influences job performance and how public sector organizations can implement effective strategies to enhance employee engagement and productivity.

Methodology

Research Design

The researchers used the quantitative method of research to determine the impact of motivation on job performance of government personnel in various public sector organizations. In this study, a research instrument was developed to provide answers to questions of this study and provide quantitative data. Based on the data gathered, this design is formulated at identifying patterns, testing hypotheses, and establishing relationships between variables.

Population and Sampling Respondents of the Study

The research population in this study were all personnel working for public sector organizations of the Philippine government, regardless of type or nature of appointment. This included a diverse group of personnel across various departments and levels of government. The target population comprised individuals engaged in roles that span from entry-level positions to senior management, ensuring a comprehensive representation of the workforce within the public sector.

For the purpose of conducting this study, the researchers used a convenience sampling method in choosing respondents to participate in the research due to constraints related to time, cost, and access to a large and unknown population. According to Etikan, I., Musa, S. A., & Alkassim, R. S. (2016), convenience sampling is a non-probability sampling technique where researchers select participants based on their easy availability and accessibility. The researchers acknowledge the limitations of this sampling method such as potential biases in the results of this study; however, the researchers aimed to maintain the credibility and reliability of the study by diversifying the respondents considering their different backgrounds, locations and demographics.

Research Instrument

The research used a Likert scale questionnaire for the purpose of data gathering for this study. The research instrument has five (5) sections specifically constructed to obtain data for each statement of the problem, such as the demographic profile of respondents, the current level of job motivation among government personnel, key motivational factors that influence job performance among government personnel, impact of different types of motivation (intrinsic vs. extrinsic) on job performance, and strategies public sector organizations can adopt to enhance the motivation of their employees to improve job performance. The demographic profile of the respondents contains information such as sex, age group, years in service, type of employment and public sector organization affiliation. The questions concerning the current level of job motivation, key motivational factors that influence job performance, and impact of different types of motivation (intrinsic vs. extrinsic) on job performance were structured using the 5-point Likert scale format with the following points and interpretation:

Table 1.0 Likert Scale Interpretation

| Point | Range | Interpretation |
|-------|-------------------|-------------------|
| 1 | From 1.00 to 1.80 | Strongly Disagree |
| 2 | Over 1.80 to 2.60 | Disagree |
| 3 | Over 2.60 to 3.40 | Neutral |
| 4 | Over 3.40 to 4.20 | Agree |
| 5 | Over 4.20 to 5.00 | Strongly Agree |

The last section of the research instrument regarding questions on the strategies to enhance the motivation of employees to improve job performance were structured through enumeration of pre-identified strategies, where respondents could select all that apply to them and their organization.

Data Gathering Procedure

After the research instrument was developed, the researchers converted this in a

Google form format, then distributed them to select government personnel who were interested and liberally consented to participate. The researchers then gathered the responses to the research instrument, which were automatically recorded in the database of the Google form used, through the charts, graphs and excel file generated for data and statistical analysis.

Statistical Treatment of Data

The researchers used different statistical methods to determine the impact of motivation on job performance of government personnel in various public sector organizations.

Specifically, this research used descriptive statistics to conduct data analysis on the following statement of the problems:

1. The current level of job motivation among government personnel in public sector organizations in terms of intrinsic motivation (e.g., curiosity, pride, mastery, interest), extrinsic motivation (e.g., money, grades, career, exam), recognition, job satisfaction and work environment;
2. The key motivational factors that influence job performance among government personnel in terms of rewards and recognition, career advancement opportunities, job security, work-life balance, and organizational culture and support;
3. The impact of different types of motivation (intrinsic vs. extrinsic) on job performance in public sector organizations; and
4. The strategies public sector organizations can adopt to enhance the motivation of their employees to improve job performance.

Moreover, this research used Multivariate Analysis of Variance (MANOVA) to test the null hypothesis that there is no significant difference in the job motivation among government personnel across the demographic profiles. Brunner, H. I., & Giannini, E. H. (2011) defines MANOVA as a statistical test used to determine whether there are significant differences between groups on multiple dependent variables simultaneously. It extends the Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) framework by allowing for the analysis of more than one dependent variable at a time, which can provide a more comprehensive understanding of the data (Brunner, H. I., & Giannini, E. H., 2011).

Subjectivity of the Researchers

Subjectivity in research refers to the potential biases and personal influences that a researcher brings to the study, which can affect the interpretation of data and overall findings. In the context of this research on the impact of

motivation on job performance among government personnel, several factors contribute to the subjectivity of the researcher:

1. **Personal Biases and Beliefs:** The researchers may hold preconceived notions about what constitutes effective motivation and how it relates to job performance. These biases can shape the formulation of research questions, the design of the study, and the interpretation of results.
2. **Professional Background:** The researchers' prior experiences within public sector organizations may influence their perspective on government personnel and their motivations. If the researcher has worked in similar environments, their experiences might lead to assumptions about employee behavior and attitudes that could skew their analysis.
3. **Emotional Engagement:** The researchers' emotional connection to the topic can also introduce bias. If the researcher is particularly passionate about improving workplace motivation, this enthusiasm might lead to a more favorable interpretation of findings that support motivational initiatives, potentially overlooking data that suggests less favorable outcomes.
4. **Participant Interaction:** The nature of the researchers' engagement with participants can influence their responses. If participants perceive the researcher as sympathetic or supportive, they may tailor their answers to align with the researcher's perceived expectations, affecting the authenticity of the data collected.

By acknowledging and addressing these subjective influences, the researchers aimed to enhance the credibility and reliability of the study. This awareness not only would foster a more robust research process but also contribute to more valid and meaningful insights into the relationship between motivation and job performance among government personnel.

Results and Discussion

The sex distribution of respondents revealed a balanced representation with only 1.2% difference between male and female respondents. The age of respondents ranged

from 18 to 65 years. Based on the survey, the majority or 53.5% of respondents fell within the group 26 to 35 years, indicating that a mid-age demographic may influence the study. In terms of salary, the survey shows the monthly salary ranges reported by respondents. A significant portion or 32.4% and 24.7% of respondents have a monthly salary of P 30,000.00 and below. In terms of length of service, there is a notable domination from groups 26 to 35 years and 6 to 15 years with

percentages of 34.5% and 32.7%, respectively. In terms of employment, respondents were identified with the type or nature of their appointment, a significant portion or 69.4% of the respondents were permanent government personnel holding permanent positions. In terms of government office, the respondents were distributed across different government offices, showing a significant domination coming from the National Government Agencies (NGAs) with 66.7% of the total sample size.

Table 1.1 Current level of job motivation in terms of intrinsic motivation

| Intrinsic Motivation | Weighted Mean | Standard Deviation | Verbal Interpretation |
|---|---------------|--------------------|-----------------------|
| 1. I feel a sense of personal accomplishment in my job. | 3.99 | 0.98 | Agree |
| 2. I am motivated by the positive impact my work has on the community. | 4.02 | 1.00 | Agree |
| 3. My job tasks are engaging and intellectually stimulating. | 4.06 | 0.98 | Agree |
| 4. I find my work personally fulfilling, even without external rewards. | 3.96 | 1.07 | Agree |
| 5. I am motivated by the challenges and opportunities to grow professionally. | 4.07 | 0.96 | Agree |
| Average Weighted Mean | 4.02 | | Agree |

The average weighted mean for all statements in Table 1.1 was 4.02, categorizing the overall sentiment as “Agree”. This suggests that government personnel largely experience intrinsic motivation in their roles, indicating a

healthy organizational climate that fosters engagement, personal fulfillment, and a sense of purpose. The relatively low standard deviations suggest consistent agreement across the statements.

Table 1.2 Current level of job motivation in terms of extrinsic motivation

| Extrinsic Motivation | Weighted Mean | Standard Deviation | Verbal Interpretation |
|--|---------------|--------------------|-----------------------|
| 1. The financial rewards and benefits I receive motivate me to work harder. | 3.94 | 0.98 | Agree |
| 2. Career advancement opportunities inspire me to improve my performance. | 4.01 | 0.97 | Agree |
| 3. External recognition from supervisors motivates me to perform at my best. | 3.98 | 1.10 | Agree |
| 4. The possibility of receiving bonuses or incentives keeps me motivated. | 4.10 | 0.98 | Agree |
| 5. Job security motivates me to stay committed to this organization. | 4.18 | 0.96 | Agree |
| Average Weighted Mean | 4.04 | | Agree |

The average weighted mean for all statements in Table 1.2 was 4.04, categorizing the

overall sentiment as “Agree”. This indicates that extrinsic motivation factors play a vital

role in influencing employee performance and commitment of government personnel. Moreover, the relatively low standard deviations

across the statements suggest consistent agreement among the respondents.

Table 1.3 Current level of job motivation in terms of recognition

| Recognition | Weighted Mean | Standard Deviation | Verbal Interpretation |
|---|---------------|--------------------|-----------------------|
| 1. I feel that my efforts are recognized by my supervisors. | 3.87 | 1.07 | Agree |
| 2. I believe my work is valued and appreciated by the organization. | 3.82 | 1.06 | Agree |
| 3. Public acknowledgment of my achievements encourages me to maintain or improve performance. | 3.83 | 1.07 | Agree |
| 4. I receive feedback that helps me understand the importance of my work. | 3.90 | 1.11 | Agree |
| 5. Recognition from my colleagues motivates me to do better in my job. | 4.02 | 1.03 | Agree |
| Average Weighted Mean | 3.89 | | Agree |

The average weighted mean for all statements in Table 1.3 was 3.89, which is interpreted as “Agree” and indicates a general agreement with the recognition received in the workplace. However, it also suggests that there

is potential for improvement in the ways recognition is perceived and enacted by both supervisors and the organization. The relatively low standard deviations suggest consistent opinions among the respondents on the statements.

Table 1.4 Current level of job motivation in terms of job satisfaction

| Job Satisfaction | Weighted Mean | Standard Deviation | Verbal Interpretation |
|--|---------------|--------------------|-----------------------|
| 1. I am satisfied with the overall balance between my work and personal life. | 3.85 | 0.98 | Agree |
| 2. I find my job tasks to be meaningful and fulfilling. | 3.92 | 1.01 | Agree |
| 3. I am satisfied with the level of responsibility I have in my current role. | 3.91 | 0.97 | Agree |
| 4. I believe my current role aligns with my personal and career goals. | 3.79 | 1.06 | Agree |
| 5. I am content with the professional growth opportunities available to me in this organization. | 3.74 | 1.11 | Agree |
| Average Weighted Mean | 3.84 | | Agree |

The average weighted mean for all statements in Table 1.4 was 3.84, indicating a general agreement with job satisfaction among government personnel. However, the slightly lower scores are noted in areas of goal

alignment and professional growth opportunities. The relatively low standard deviations across the statements suggest consistent agreement among respondents regarding job satisfaction.

Table 1.5 Current level of job motivation in terms of work environment

| Work Environment | Weighted Mean | Standard Deviation | Verbal Interpretation |
|---|---------------|--------------------|-----------------------|
| 1. My work environment supports collaboration and teamwork. | 3.93 | 0.98 | Agree |
| 2. The resources provided by the organization are sufficient for me to perform my job well. | 3.72 | 1.05 | Agree |
| 3. I feel supported by my supervisors in completing my tasks. | 3.89 | 1.07 | Agree |
| 4. The working conditions in my organization are conducive to productivity. | 3.79 | 1.05 | Agree |
| 5. The organizational culture fosters motivation and a positive work attitude. | 3.81 | 1.08 | Agree |
| Average Weighted Mean | 3.83 | | Agree |

The average weighted mean for all statements in Table 1.5 was 3.83, indicating a general agreement with the positive aspects of the work environment. However, weighted mean

of resource sufficiency and working conditions have slightly lower scores. The relatively low standard deviations across the statements suggest consistent agreement among respondents.

Table 2.1 Key motivational factors in terms of rewards and recognition

| Rewards and Recognition | Weighted Mean | Standard Deviation | Verbal Interpretation |
|---|---------------|--------------------|-----------------------|
| 1. I am motivated to perform well because I receive appropriate rewards for my efforts. | 3.78 | 1.05 | Agree |
| 2. Receiving public recognition for my achievements improves my job performance. | 3.82 | 1.04 | Agree |
| 3. The financial incentives offered by my organization motivate me to work harder. | 3.89 | 1.01 | Agree |
| 4. Non-monetary rewards (e.g., certificates, commendations) are effective in motivating me. | 3.88 | 1.07 | Agree |
| 5. I am motivated when my supervisor acknowledges my work contributions. | 4.10 | 0.93 | Agree |
| Average Weighted Mean | 3.89 | | Agree |

The overall average weighted mean of 3.89 in Table 2.1 indicates a general agreement on the importance of rewards and recognition in motivating employees to perform better. The table also shows that respondents have a greater value on the recognition they received from their supervisors, among others. This suggests that if supervisors recognize the contri-

butions of their employees to their organization, then this may result in the improvement of job performance.

The relatively low standard deviations across the statements suggest that respondents consistently perceive these factors as significant motivators, with less variability in opinions.

Table 2.2 Key motivational factors in terms of career advancement opportunities

| Career Advancement Opportunities | Weighted Mean | Standard Deviation | Verbal Interpretation |
|---|---------------|--------------------|-----------------------|
| 1. Opportunities for career progression motivate me to improve my job performance. | 4.01 | 1.04 | Agree |
| 2. I feel motivated to work harder when there is a clear path for promotion in my organization. | 4.11 | 0.97 | Agree |
| 3. Professional development programs in the organization motivate me to enhance my skills. | 4.10 | 0.98 | Agree |
| 4. Access to training and learning opportunities positively impacts my job performance. | 4.12 | 0.98 | Agree |
| 5. I am more motivated to perform well when I see others in my organization advance in their careers. | 4.06 | 0.99 | Agree |
| Average Weighted Mean | 4.08 | | Agree |

Table 2.2 shows the overall average weighted mean of 4.08, which indicates a strong consensus on the importance of career advancement opportunities as motivating factors that influence job performance. Specifically, this shows that job performance of employees may be improved by having a clear

path for promotion, and an access to professional development programs and training and learning opportunities. The relatively low standard deviations across the statements suggest consistent agreement among respondents regarding the significance of these opportunities.

Table 2.3 Key motivational factors in terms of job security

| Job Security | Weighted Mean | Standard Deviation | Verbal Interpretation |
|---|---------------|--------------------|-----------------------|
| 1. The sense of job security in my current role motivates me to perform better. | 4.08 | 0.91 | Agree |
| 2. I am motivated by the stability that my job in the government sector provides. | 4.05 | 0.91 | Agree |
| 3. Knowing that my job is secure gives me the confidence to take on new challenges. | 4.09 | 0.91 | Agree |
| 4. Job security motivates me to meet the performance expectations of my role. | 4.13 | 0.88 | Agree |
| 5. Fear of losing my job motivates me to work harder. | 3.81 | 1.10 | Agree |
| Average Weighted Mean | 4.03 | | Agree |

The overall average weighted mean of 4.03 in Table 2.3 signifies a strong agreement among respondents on the importance of job security as a motivating factor influencing job performance. Importance of job security of employees implies that they perform better (e.g., taking on new challenges) knowing that their jobs are secure.

agreement regarding the significance of job security. However, it is noted that fear of losing a job in statement 5 has the lowest weighted mean with slightly larger standard deviation as compared to the other statements. This reveals that opinions of employees vary in terms of job security due to personal reasons and employment status of respondents.

The relatively low standard deviations across the statements suggest consistent

Table 2.4 Key motivational factors in terms of work life balance

| Work-Life Balance | Weighted Mean | Standard Deviation | Verbal Interpretation |
|---|---------------|--------------------|-----------------------|
| 1. I am motivated to perform well because my organization supports a healthy work-life balance. | 3.76 | 1.07 | Agree |
| 2. Flexible work arrangements help me stay motivated in my job. | 3.87 | 1.09 | Agree |
| 3. Maintaining a good balance between work and personal life improves my job performance. | 4.08 | 0.98 | Agree |
| 4. My motivation to work increases when I have enough time to spend with my family and friends. | 4.29 | 0.91 | Strongly Agree |
| 5. The organization's support for work-life balance positively impacts my job motivation. | 4.02 | 1.02 | Agree |
| Average Weighted Mean | 4.00 | | Agree |

The overall average weighted mean in Table 2.4 is 4.00, which indicates a consensus among respondents regarding the importance of work-life balance as a motivating factor that influences job performance. Employees recognize that their relationship nurtured by quality time with their family and friends positively impacts their job performance.

The relatively low standard deviations suggest consistent agreement across the statements. However, it is worth noting that a healthy work-life balance with weighted mean of 3.76 and flexible work arrangements with weighted mean of 3.87 may not be available to some government offices, as shown by a slightly higher standard deviation as compared to the other statements.

Table 2.5 Key motivational factors in terms of organizational culture and support

| Organizational Culture and Support | Weighted Mean | Standard Deviation | Verbal Interpretation |
|--|---------------|--------------------|-----------------------|
| 1. A positive organizational culture motivates me to improve my job performance. | 4.10 | 0.94 | Agree |
| 2. The support I receive from my colleagues helps me stay motivated at work. | 4.11 | 0.91 | Agree |
| 3. My supervisor's leadership style encourages me to be more productive in my role. | 3.88 | 1.08 | Agree |
| 4. The organization's commitment to employee well-being motivates me to perform at a high level. | 3.99 | 0.99 | Agree |
| 5. I am motivated when the organization encourages open communication and feedback. | 4.05 | 0.97 | Agree |
| Average Weighted Mean | 4.03 | | Agree |

Table 2.5 shows the overall average weighted mean of 4.03, signifying a general agreement among respondents on the importance of organizational culture and support as motivational factors influencing job performance and the relatively low standard deviations indicate consistent agreement across the

statements, except for the leadership style or statement 3 with slightly lower weighted mean and higher standard deviation. This implies that employees also are motivated to improve their job performance through the positive culture and support they are getting from their organization.

Table 3.1 Multivariate Analysis of Variance (MANOVA) in terms of sex, age group and employment status (Multivariate Tests)

| Multivariate Tests | | value | F | df1 | df2 | p |
|-------------------------------------|----------------------|-------|-------|-----|-----|-------|
| Sex | Wilks' Lambda | 0.956 | 1.274 | 5 | 138 | 0.279 |
| Age Group | Wilks' Lambda | 0.789 | 1.696 | 20 | 459 | 0.031 |
| Employment | Wilks' Lambda | 0.859 | 1.441 | 15 | 381 | 0.125 |
| Sex * Age Group | Wilks' Lambda | 0.846 | 1.188 | 20 | 459 | 0.260 |
| Sex * Employment | Wilks' Lambda | 0.909 | 0.889 | 15 | 381 | 0.577 |
| Age Group * Employment | Wilks' Lambda | 0.635 | 1.473 | 45 | 620 | 0.026 |
| Sex * Age Group * Employment | Wilks' Lambda | 0.904 | 0.951 | 15 | 381 | 0.507 |

Table 3.1 shows that the demographic profiles sex and employment have calculated p-values higher than 0.05, which suggests that there is no significant difference in the job motivation among government personnel. Age group, on the other hand, has a p-value (p = 0.031) lower than 0.05, which indicates that there is a significant difference in the job motivation in terms of this demographic profile. The significant difference suggests that organizations should tailor motivational strategies to meet the diverse needs of employees at different ages. Understanding these differences can enhance employee engagement and overall productivity. For example, the human resource department may adopt programs such as health and wellness initiatives, where younger employees might appreciate access to mental health resources, while older employees may benefit from fitness programs focused on mobility and chronic disease management.

Table 3.1 also shows interaction between demographic profiles. Interaction between sex and age group, sex and employment, and sex, age group and employment have calculated p-values higher than 0.05, noting that their interactions have no significant difference in the job motivation of government personnel. Interaction between age group and employment has a p-value of 0.026, which suggests that this interaction has significant difference in the job motivation among government personnel. By recognizing that different age groups may respond differently to status of employment, organizations can implement strategies that enhance engagement and productivity, ultimately leading to a more satisfied and effective workforce. Development of a recognition and rewards system may be adopted which acknowledges the contributions of employees in ways that resonate with their age groups and employment status.

Table 3.2 Multivariate Analysis of Variance (MANOVA) in terms of sex, age group and employment status (Univariate Tests)

| Univariate Tests | | | | | | |
|------------------|--------------------------------|-----------------------|-----------|--------------------|----------|----------|
| | Dependent Variable | Sum of Squares | df | Mean Square | F | p |
| Sex | Rewards and Recognition | 0.35945 | 1 | 0.35945 | 0.48519 | 0.487 |

| | | | | | | |
|-------------------------|---|---------|---|---------|---------|-------|
| | Career Advancement Opportunities | 2.26877 | 1 | 2.26877 | 2.99825 | 0.086 |
| | Job Security | 0.00317 | 1 | 0.00317 | 0.00479 | 0.945 |
| | Work-Life Balance | 1.39397 | 1 | 1.39397 | 1.74304 | 0.189 |
| | Organizational Culture and Support | 1.01779 | 1 | 1.01779 | 1.28787 | 0.258 |
| Age Group | Rewards and Recognition | 2.45748 | 4 | 0.61437 | 0.82930 | 0.509 |
| | Career Advancement Opportunities | 6.53202 | 4 | 1.63301 | 2.15807 | 0.077 |
| | Job Security | 3.87694 | 4 | 0.96924 | 1.46373 | 0.216 |
| | Work-Life Balance | 1.08369 | 4 | 0.27092 | 0.33876 | 0.851 |
| | Organizational Culture and Support | 2.40602 | 4 | 0.60150 | 0.76112 | 0.552 |
| Employment | Rewards and Recognition | 1.62276 | 3 | 0.54092 | 0.73015 | 0.536 |
| | Career Advancement Opportunities | 4.01744 | 3 | 1.33915 | 1.76973 | 0.156 |
| | Job Security | 3.45376 | 3 | 1.15125 | 1.73862 | 0.162 |
| | Work-Life Balance | 1.32485 | 3 | 0.44162 | 0.55220 | 0.647 |
| | Organizational Culture and Support | 0.99681 | 3 | 0.33227 | 0.42044 | 0.739 |
| Sex * Age Group | Rewards and Recognition | 4.23266 | 4 | 1.05817 | 1.42835 | 0.228 |
| | Career Advancement Opportunities | 2.43195 | 4 | 0.60799 | 0.80348 | 0.525 |
| | Job Security | 3.22052 | 4 | 0.80513 | 1.21590 | 0.307 |
| | Work-Life Balance | 2.49119 | 4 | 0.62280 | 0.77875 | 0.541 |
| | Organizational Culture and Support | 2.05473 | 4 | 0.51368 | 0.65000 | 0.628 |
| Sex * Employment | Rewards and Recognition | 2.00381 | 3 | 0.66794 | 0.90160 | 0.442 |
| | Career Advancement Opportunities | 2.47707 | 3 | 0.82569 | 1.09118 | 0.355 |
| | Job Security | 1.50363 | 3 | 0.50121 | 0.75693 | 0.520 |
| | Work-Life Balance | 1.00570 | 3 | 0.33523 | 0.41918 | 0.740 |

| | | | | | | |
|-------------------------------------|---|-----------|-----|---------|---------|-------|
| | Organizational Culture and Support | 1.02553 | 3 | 0.34184 | 0.43255 | 0.730 |
| Age Group * Employment | Rewards and Recognition | 9.45438 | 9 | 1.05049 | 1.41798 | 0.186 |
| | Career Advancement Opportunities | 11.27116 | 9 | 1.25235 | 1.65502 | 0.105 |
| | Job Security | 7.27399 | 9 | 0.80822 | 1.22057 | 0.287 |
| | Work-Life Balance | 8.18605 | 9 | 0.90956 | 1.13733 | 0.340 |
| | Organizational Culture and Support | 6.46184 | 9 | 0.71798 | 0.90851 | 0.520 |
| Sex * Age Group * Employment | Rewards and Recognition | 0.59981 | 3 | 0.19994 | 0.26988 | 0.847 |
| | Career Advancement Opportunities | 3.75043 | 3 | 1.25014 | 1.65210 | 0.180 |
| | Job Security | 2.85590 | 3 | 0.95197 | 1.43765 | 0.234 |
| | Work-Life Balance | 0.75000 | 3 | 0.25000 | 0.31260 | 0.816 |
| | Organizational Culture and Support | 2.68226 | 3 | 0.89409 | 1.13134 | 0.339 |
| Residuals | Rewards and Recognition | 105.19813 | 142 | 0.74083 | | |
| | Career Advancement Opportunities | 107.45093 | 142 | 0.75670 | | |
| | Job Security | 94.02761 | 142 | 0.66217 | | |
| | Work-Life Balance | 113.56244 | 142 | 0.79974 | | |
| | Organizational Culture and Support | 112.22090 | 142 | 0.79029 | | |

Tables 3.2 presents analysis of variance in terms of each job motivational factor. The only dependent variable with marginal significance is "Career Advancement Opportunities" concerning both sex and age group with p-values of 0.086 and 0.077, respectively, suggesting that these demographic profiles may influence job motivation in terms of career advancement

opportunities. Organizations should consider implementing targeted initiatives that address the unique career advancement needs and aspirations of different demographic groups. By doing so, they can enhance employee motivation and retention, fostering a more inclusive and supportive workplace environment.

Table 3.3 Multivariate Analysis of Variance (MANOVA) in terms of salary, length of service and government office (Multivariate Tests)

| Multivariate Tests | | value | F | df1 | df2 | p |
|-------------------------------------|---------------|-------|-------|-----|-----|-------|
| Salary | Wilks' Lambda | 0.844 | 1.090 | 20 | 416 | 0.357 |
| Length of Service | Wilks' Lambda | 0.788 | 2.082 | 15 | 345 | 0.010 |
| Office | Wilks' Lambda | 0.880 | 0.819 | 20 | 416 | 0.691 |
| Salary * Length of Service | Wilks' Lambda | 0.656 | 1.112 | 50 | 573 | 0.283 |
| Salary * Office | Wilks' Lambda | 0.663 | 1.083 | 50 | 573 | 0.329 |
| Length of Service * Office | Wilks' Lambda | 0.720 | 2.165 | 20 | 416 | 0.003 |
| Salary * Length of Service * Office | Wilks' Lambda | 0.843 | 0.874 | 25 | 466 | 0.643 |

Table 3.3 shows that the demographic profiles salary and government office have calculated p-values higher than 0.05, which suggests that there is no significant difference in the job motivation among government personnel. Length of service, on the other hand, has a p-value (p = 0.010) lower than 0.05, which indicates that there is a significant difference in the job motivation in terms of this demographic profile. Organizations should consider developing tailored motivational strategies such as offering career development opportunities, recognition programs, and engagement initiatives that specifically address the preferences and aspirations of employees based on their lengths of service. This approach can help improve overall job satisfaction and retention rates.

Table 3.3 also shows interaction between demographic profiles. Interaction between sal-

ary and length of service, salary and government office, and salary, length of service and government office have calculated p-values higher than 0.05, noting that their interactions have no significant difference in the job motivation of government personnel. Interaction between length of service and government office has a p-value of 0.003, which suggests that this interaction has significant difference in the job motivation among government personnel. This finding suggests that government organizations should adopt motivational strategies that take into account both the length of service and the unique characteristics of their offices. By doing so, they can create more effective and engaging work environments that align with the diverse needs of their employees and organizational culture, ultimately enhancing job satisfaction and performance.

Table 3.4 Multivariate Analysis of Variance (MANOVA) in terms of sex, age group and employment status (Univariate Tests)

| Univariate Tests | | Sum of Squares | df | Mean Square | F | p |
|------------------|----------------------------------|----------------|----|-------------|--------|-------|
| Salary | Rewards and Recognition | 1.558 | 4 | 0.3895 | 0.5107 | 0.728 |
| | Career Advancement Opportunities | 4.137 | 4 | 1.0342 | 1.3868 | 0.242 |
| | Job Security | 0.475 | 4 | 0.1189 | 0.1687 | 0.954 |

| | | | | | | |
|--|---|--------|----|--------|--------|-------|
| | Work-Life Balance | 1.147 | 4 | 0.2866 | 0.3678 | 0.831 |
| | Organizational Culture and Support | 1.080 | 4 | 0.2700 | 0.3389 | 0.851 |
| Length of Service | Rewards and Recognition | 5.370 | 3 | 1.7899 | 2.3466 | 0.076 |
| | Career Advancement Opportunities | 7.317 | 3 | 2.4389 | 3.2707 | 0.023 |
| | Job Security | 6.190 | 3 | 2.0634 | 2.9295 | 0.036 |
| | Work-Life Balance | 3.004 | 3 | 1.0014 | 1.2849 | 0.282 |
| | Organizational Culture and Support | 3.746 | 3 | 1.2487 | 1.5675 | 0.200 |
| Office | Rewards and Recognition | 2.444 | 4 | 0.6111 | 0.8012 | 0.527 |
| | Career Advancement Opportunities | 2.521 | 4 | 0.6304 | 0.8453 | 0.499 |
| | Job Security | 2.590 | 4 | 0.6476 | 0.9194 | 0.455 |
| | Work-Life Balance | 3.115 | 4 | 0.7787 | 0.9992 | 0.411 |
| | Organizational Culture and Support | 4.281 | 4 | 1.0702 | 1.3435 | 0.257 |
| Salary * Length of Service | Rewards and Recognition | 7.955 | 10 | 0.7955 | 1.0429 | 0.412 |
| | Career Advancement Opportunities | 12.349 | 10 | 1.2349 | 1.6560 | 0.098 |
| | Job Security | 9.591 | 10 | 0.9591 | 1.3617 | 0.205 |
| | Work-Life Balance | 14.647 | 10 | 1.4647 | 1.8795 | 0.054 |
| | Organizational Culture and Support | 9.625 | 10 | 0.9625 | 1.2082 | 0.292 |
| Salary * Office | Rewards and Recognition | 5.498 | 10 | 0.5498 | 0.7208 | 0.704 |
| | Career Advancement Opportunities | 4.665 | 10 | 0.4665 | 0.6256 | 0.790 |
| | Job Security | 2.548 | 10 | 0.2548 | 0.3617 | 0.961 |
| | Work-Life Balance | 5.331 | 10 | 0.5331 | 0.6841 | 0.738 |
| | Organizational Culture and Support | 1.990 | 10 | 0.1990 | 0.2498 | 0.990 |
| Length of Service * Office | Rewards and Recognition | 2.892 | 4 | 0.7229 | 0.9477 | 0.439 |
| | Career Advancement Opportunities | 8.537 | 4 | 2.1343 | 2.8621 | 0.026 |
| | Job Security | 0.845 | 4 | 0.2114 | 0.3001 | 0.877 |
| | Work-Life Balance | 0.196 | 4 | 0.0489 | 0.0628 | 0.993 |
| | Organizational Culture and Support | 0.278 | 4 | 0.0694 | 0.0871 | 0.986 |
| Salary * Length of Service * Office | Rewards and Recognition | 1.820 | 5 | 0.3640 | 0.4772 | 0.793 |
| | Career Advancement Opportunities | 4.478 | 5 | 0.8957 | 1.2011 | 0.312 |
| | Job Security | 3.116 | 5 | 0.6232 | 0.8848 | 0.493 |
| | Work-Life Balance | 1.825 | 5 | 0.3650 | 0.4684 | 0.799 |

| | | | | | | |
|------------------|---|---------|-----|--------|--------|-------|
| | Organizational Culture and Support | 5.105 | 5 | 1.0211 | 1.2818 | 0.276 |
| Residuals | Rewards and Recognition | 98.393 | 129 | 0.7627 | | |
| | Career Advancement Opportunities | 96.195 | 129 | 0.7457 | | |
| | Job Security | 90.859 | 129 | 0.7043 | | |
| | Work-Life Balance | 100.533 | 129 | 0.7793 | | |
| | Organizational Culture and Support | 102.762 | 129 | 0.7966 | | |

Tables 3.2 presents analysis of variance in terms of each job motivational factor. While most of the tests show no significant difference, length of service has a significant impact on career advancement opportunities and job security with p-values of 0.023 and 0.036, respectively. The interaction between length of service and office is also significant for career advancement opportunities with a p-value of 0.026. Some variables like rewards and

recognition related to length of service show marginal significance, indicating p-value (0.076) close to 0.05.

Organizations should consider implementing targeted development programs and transparent communication strategies that address the specific career advancement needs and job security concerns of employees in consideration of their length of service.

Table 4.1 Impact of different types of motivation

| Statement | Weighted Mean | Standard Deviation | Verbal Interpretation |
|---|---------------|--------------------|-----------------------|
| 1. Personal satisfaction from my work has a greater impact on my job performance than external rewards. | 4.11 | 0.96 | Agree |
| 2. Financial incentives are important, but opportunities for personal growth have a more lasting effect on my job performance. | 4.17 | 0.95 | Agree |
| 3. My job performance improves significantly when I experience both intrinsic motivation and external rewards. | 4.28 | 0.89 | Strongly Agree |
| 4. I perform best when I am motivated by both a sense of accomplishment and financial bonuses. | 4.36 | 0.81 | Strongly Agree |
| 5. Intrinsic motivation, such as achieving personal goals, is more effective for long-term job performance than external rewards. | 4.16 | 0.95 | Agree |
| 6. The presence of career advancement opportunities is more motivating for me than receiving regular salary increases. | 4.08 | 1.02 | Agree |
| 7. I am more engaged in my job when I am recognized for my contributions than when I receive financial bonuses. | 3.94 | 1.09 | Agree |
| 8. Job satisfaction driven by personal achievement has a stronger influence on my productivity than external incentives. | 4.05 | 1.00 | Agree |

| Statement | Weighted Mean | Standard Deviation | Verbal Interpretation |
|---|---------------|--------------------|-----------------------|
| 9. I value autonomy in my work more than performance-based incentives. | 3.96 | 0.94 | Agree |
| 10. My motivation to excel at my job increases when I see the direct impact of my work on personal and professional development. | 4.23 | 0.90 | Strongly Agree |
| 11. Intrinsic rewards, such as mastering new skills, significantly enhance my job performance compared to extrinsic rewards. | 4.08 | 0.97 | Agree |
| 12. Public recognition and awards have a more immediate effect on my motivation than long-term personal goals. | 3.89 | 1.02 | Agree |
| 13. The opportunity to contribute to meaningful projects is more motivating than receiving performance bonuses. | 3.96 | 1.07 | Agree |
| 14. My job performance benefits more from intrinsic motivators, such as personal growth, than from external rewards like commissions. | 4.01 | 1.02 | Agree |
| 15. The combination of feeling personally fulfilled and receiving external rewards leads to the highest level of job performance. | 4.30 | 0.87 | Strongly Agree |
| Average Weighted Mean | 4.11 | | Agree |

Table 4.1 shows the impact of different types of motivation (intrinsic vs. extrinsic) on job performance in public sector organizations. The average weighted mean of 4.11 across all statements indicates a general agreement among respondents regarding the importance of intrinsic motivation in enhancing job performance. The standard deviations, mostly around 1.00, suggest consistent responses across demographic profiles, with lower variability in opinions regarding the influence of different motivators. However, it is also noted that the respondents recognize the importance of both intrinsic and extrinsic motivation as shown in

the responses from statements 3, 4 and 15 with weighted mean of 4.28, 4.36 and 4.30, respectively and verbal interpretation of “Strongly Agree”.

Public sector organizations should prioritize strategies that foster intrinsic motivation, such as opportunities for personal growth and meaningful work, while also recognizing the role of extrinsic motivators, like recognition and rewards. By integrating both types of motivation into their performance management practices, organizations can enhance overall job performance, employee engagement, and satisfaction.

Table 5.1 Strategies to enhance motivation

| Statement | Frequency | Percentage |
|--|-----------|------------|
| Training programs and workshops are regularly offered. | 107 | 4.66% |
| Performance-based bonuses or incentives are provided. | 94 | 4.10% |
| Team-building activities and events are organized to strengthen relationships. | 90 | 3.92% |
| Opportunities for skill development and training are available. | 78 | 3.40% |
| Clear pathways for career growth and promotions are provided. | 75 | 3.27% |
| There are formal programs for recognizing and rewarding outstanding performance. | 74 | 3.23% |

| Statement | Frequency | Percentage |
|---|-----------|------------|
| Employees are assigned tasks that engage their skills and interests. | 71 | 3.10% |
| Salaries and benefits are competitive and reviewed regularly. | 70 | 3.05% |
| Regular acknowledgment of employee achievements is practiced. | 67 | 2.92% |
| Mentorship programs are available for professional development. | 65 | 2.83% |
| A supportive and inclusive work culture is actively promoted. | 64 | 2.79% |
| Flexible working hours are available. | 63 | 2.75% |
| Employees are encouraged to participate in decision-making processes. | 63 | 2.75% |
| Performance reviews are conducted to discuss strengths and areas for improvement. | 63 | 2.75% |
| Flexible leave options and family support programs are available. | 63 | 2.75% |
| Feedback and suggestions from employees are actively sought and valued. | 61 | 2.66% |
| Team achievements are celebrated and rewarded. | 60 | 2.62% |
| Performance evaluations are conducted fairly and transparently. | 59 | 2.57% |
| Regular goal-setting meetings are conducted to review progress. | 56 | 2.44% |
| Employees are encouraged to explore different roles within the organization. | 56 | 2.44% |
| Regular and constructive feedback is provided to employees. | 54 | 2.35% |
| Opportunities for involvement in high-impact projects are provided. | 53 | 2.31% |
| A positive organizational culture supported by strong leadership is maintained. | 53 | 2.31% |
| Efforts are made to create an engaging and motivating work environment. | 53 | 2.31% |
| Regular salary reviews and adjustments based on performance are conducted. | 52 | 2.27% |
| Policies and practices support a healthy work-life balance. | 51 | 2.22% |
| Wellness programs focusing on mental and physical health are offered. | 50 | 2.18% |
| Clear and achievable performance goals are set for employees. | 48 | 2.09% |
| Educational reimbursement or support for further education is available. | 45 | 1.96% |
| Clear criteria and feedback are used for performance assessments. | 45 | 1.96% |
| Necessary resources and tools are provided to employees for job performance. | 44 | 1.92% |
| Performance-linked financial incentives are offered. | 44 | 1.92% |
| Cross-training opportunities are offered to develop diverse skills. | 42 | 1.83% |
| Employees have clear career paths and understand their potential for growth. | 41 | 1.79% |
| Opportunities for job rotation and diverse responsibilities are provided. | 39 | 1.70% |
| Remote work options are offered where feasible. | 38 | 1.66% |
| Investments are made in up-to-date technology and equipment. | 38 | 1.66% |
| Group-based incentives are provided to encourage teamwork. | 37 | 1.61% |
| Regular career development discussions are held with employees. | 35 | 1.53% |
| Access to counseling and support services is provided. | 33 | 1.44% |

Table 5.1 shows which strategies public sector organizations can adopt to enhance employee motivation. It is identified that training programs and workshops, performance-based

bonuses or incentives and team-building activities and events are among the strategies with the highest frequency and percentage. Public sector organizations should prioritize

the implementation of these strategies to create an environment that fosters professional growth and teamwork. By investing in training programs, organizations can enhance employees' skills and confidence, while performance-based incentives can drive engagement and add productivity. Additionally, team-building activities can strengthen interpersonal relationships and collaboration among staff. Overall, adopting these strategies can lead to improved employee motivation, job satisfaction, and performance, contributing to a more effective and cohesive workforce.

Conclusion

The study's findings become evident that career advancement opportunities emerge as the predominant motivator for government personnel, transcending sex, age group, salary, and government office. The findings from the assessment of each respondent indicate that, while the majority of the tests show no significant difference, length of service has a significant impact on career advancement opportunities and job security. The findings between length of service and office is also important for career progression prospects. Some variables, such as rewards and recognition related to length of service, have little significance.

It is clear that respondents' value both intrinsic and extrinsic motivation in improving government personnel engagement and job performance whether they are from local or national government agencies. Understanding that the respondents from different sectors from Philippine government agencies valued both intrinsic and extrinsic motivation provide the idea that these motives are neither hierarchically scaled and both are working as good motivators for the government personnel.

The study also highlights the efficacy of different tactics used by Philippine government organizations to boost employee engagement and job performance. Team-building exercises, performance-based bonuses, incentives, and training programs are recognized as commonly used and effective tactics. This highlights how important government organization implements targeted initiatives to create a motivated and effective government personnel in public sector organizations.

Acknowledgement

First and foremost, praise and appreciation to God, the Almighty, for showering us with blessings during our research, allowing us to accomplish it successfully. We would also like to express our heartfelt gratitude to our Research Methods Professors and Research Advisers, Dr. Bernardino P. Malang and Dr. Jocelyn DS. Malang, of World Citi Colleges, for their guidance, suggestions, and ideas which significantly improved our research writing and to the whole research. Finally, we would like to express our appreciation to each member of our group for the collective efforts in completing this research, as well as our fellow government workers who participated in our research and assisted us in achieving the study's results despite their busy schedule. This research would not have been possible without their cooperation.

References

- Amaryllis-Torres, R. (1989). *Motivational factors among government employees*. Manila: University Press.
- Bass, B. M., & Riggio, R. E. (2006). *Transformational leadership* (2nd ed.). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Bass, B. M., & Riggio, R. E. (2006). *Transformational leadership*. Psychology Press.
- Brunner, H. I., & Giannini, E. H. (2011). *Textbook of pediatric rheumatology* (6th ed., pp. 127-156). Elsevier. DOI 10.1016/B978-1-4160-6581-4.10007-X.
- David, M. P. (2023). Motivation and Job Satisfaction among Untenured employees in the Municipality of Concepcion, Tarlac. *International Journal of Creative Research Thoughts*.
- Deci, E. L., & Ryan, R. M. (2000). *Intrinsic and extrinsic motivations: Classic definitions and new directions*. *Contemporary Educational Psychology*, 25(1), 54-67.
- Deci, E. L., & Ryan, R. M. (2000). The "what" and "why" of goal pursuits: Human needs and the self-determination of behavior. *Psychological Inquiry*, 11(4), 227-268. DOI 10.1207/S15327965PLI1104_01.
- Engidaw, A. E. (2021). The effect of motivation on employee engagement in public sectors: in the case of North Wollo zone.

- Journal of Innovation and Entrepreneurship*
- Engidaw, A. E. (2021). *The effects of intrinsic and extrinsic motivation on employee performance in the firm*. *Journal of Business Research*.
- Etikan, I., Musa, S. A., & Alkassim, R. S. (2016). Comparison of convenience sampling and purposive sampling. *American Journal of Theoretical and Applied Statistics*, 5(1), 1-4. DOI 10.11648/j.ajtas.20160501.11.
- Hernandez, M. (2016). Motivation and job performance in the public sector. *Public Administration Review*, 76(2), 245-256. DOI 10.1111/puar.12412.
- Hernandez, S. A. (2016). *The impact of extrinsic motivation on productivity*. *Employee Relations*, 38(2), 275-294.
- Hilario, G. J. E. (2018). Towards Motivated Government Civilian Employees: An Assessment of the Job Satisfaction and Job Performance of the Philippine National Police - Quezon City Police District's Non-Uniformed Personnel.
- Kahn, W. A. (1990). *Psychological conditions of personal engagement and disengagement at work*. *Academy of Management Journal*, 33(4), 692-724.
- Kahn, W. A. (1990). Psychological conditions of personal engagement and disengagement at work. *Academy of Management Journal*, 33(4), 692-724. DOI 10.5465/256287.
- Legault, L. (2016) *Intrinsic and Extrinsic Motivation*. Springer International Publishing AG 2016. DOI 10.1007/978-3-319-28099-8_1139-1.
- Maniragaba Rauben (2023). Influence of Intrinsic and Extrinsic Motivation and Employees' Job Satisfaction in the Local Government: A Case of Kamwenge District, Uganda.
- Narag, A. M. (2018). Motivational Factors Affecting the Job Performance of Employees of Cagayan State University Lallo Campus. *International Journal of Advanced Research in Management and Social Sciences*.
- Nini, M. (2019). *Job performance: Why task and contextual performance matter from an Evidence-based Management perspective*. Retrieved on October 8, 2024 from <https://www.ckju.net/en/dossier/job-performance-evidence-based-management-perspective-why-task-and-contextual-performance-matters/1258>.
- Pangan, F., Hechanova, M. R., Franco, E. P., Mercado, R. H., & Lopez, C.V. (2008). In R. Hechanova & E. Franco (Eds.), *Leading Philippine organizations in a changing world* (pp. 49-60).
- Perry, J. L., & Wise, L. R. (1990). *The motivational bases of public service*. *Public Administration Review*, 50(3), 367-373.
- Perry, J. L., & Wise, L. R. (1990). The motivational bases of public service. *Public Administration Review*, 50(3), 367-373. DOI 10.2307/976618
- Rainey, H. G. (2009). *Understanding and managing public organizations*. John Wiley & Sons.
- Rainey, H. G. (2009). *Understanding and managing public organizations* (4th ed.). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Ryan, R. M., & Deci, E. L. (2000). *Self-determination theory and the facilitation of intrinsic motivation, social development, and well-being*. *American Psychologist*, 55(1), 68.
- Ryan, R. M., & Deci, E. L. (2000). Self-determination theory and the facilitation of intrinsic motivation, social development, and well-being. *American Psychologist*, 55(1), 68-78. DOI 10.1037/0003-066X.55.1.68.
- Tiglaio-Torres, A. (1989). Work Motivation and productivity of government workers. *Philippine Journal of Psychology*.
- Vandenabeele, W. (2008). *Government calling: Public service motivation as an element in selecting government as an employer of choice*. *Public Administration*, 86(4), 1089-1105.
- Vandenabeele, W. (2008). Government's responsibility: What motivates public service? *Public Management Review*, 10(1), 1-19. DOI 10.1080/14719030701861834.
- Wright, P. M., & Nishii, L. H. (2013). Strategic HRM and organizational behavior: Integrating multiple levels of analysis. *The Academy of Management Annals*, 7(1), 361-401. DOI 10.1080/19416520.2013.773400.