



Publisher homepage: [www.universepg.com](http://www.universepg.com), ISSN: 2707-4668 (Online) & 2707-465X (Print)

<https://doi.org/10.34104/ajssls.022.032038>

**Asian Journal of Social Sciences and Legal Studies**

Journal homepage: [www.universepg.com/journal/ajssls](http://www.universepg.com/journal/ajssls)



## Nexus between Motivation and Newly Appointed Employee's Job Performance: A Review on Intrinsic and Extrinsic Incentives

Azizur Rahman<sup>1\*</sup> and Md. Tariqul Islam<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Department of Public Administration and Governance Studies, Jatiya Kabi Kazi Nazrul Islam University (JKKNIU), Trishal, Mymensingh, Bangladesh; and <sup>2</sup>Department of Finance and Banking, Jatiya Kabi Kazi Nazrul Islam University (JKKNIU), Trishal, Mymensingh, Bangladesh.

\*Correspondence: [abir7du@yahoo.com](mailto:abir7du@yahoo.com) (Azizur Rahman, Associate Professor, Department of Public Administration and Governance Studies, JKKNIU, Trishal, Mymensingh, Bangladesh).

### ABSTRACT

Employees' job performance is explicitly influenced by both intrinsic and extrinsic motivation. Intrinsic motivation is defined as behavior motivated by internal rewards while extrinsic motivation is defined as a desire to engage in an activity in order to achieve an external goal, such as receiving praise and acceptance. The principal objective of this study is to explore how intrinsic and extrinsic motivation influences the job performance of newly appointed employees. In so doing, the study undergoes an extensive review of the literature. The study finds that intrinsic incentives have a significant impact on higher job performance. It further claims, that intrinsically motivated employees provide superior organizational output compared to their extrinsically motivated counterparts.

**Keywords:** Organization, Job performance, Intrinsic motivation, Nexus, and Extrinsic motivation.

### INTRODUCTION:

Job performance, job satisfaction, motivation, the working environment, the organization's goal, employee retention, and growth have become a major source of concern and debate over the years, as these factors play a significant role in not only achieving the organization's goal, but also in employee satisfaction and retention. Organizational theories have evolved along three axes: classical, neo-classical, and contemporary. Classical thought emphasizes production at the expense of the human condition and organization. Human beings are seen as machines in classical thought. The expansion of informal human relationships has been seen in neoclassical theory, which places a premium on motivation, communication, and decision-making. Organizations are viewed as open systems in contemporary ideas, emphasizing the significance of developing relationships with the external world. Simultaneously, it promotes decision-making based on need and cir-

cumstance. In today's globalized world, achieving organizational goals in both public and private sectors is highly dependent on a variety of players and circumstances. Nonetheless, building a pleasant work environment has become a significant problem since it is inextricably related to the interests, requirements, and expectations of employees, who are viewed as critical stakeholders in a firm. Job satisfaction, a critical aspect in accomplishing corporate goals, is heavily reliant on an organization's motivating programs.

Job satisfaction eventually results in increased performance, which is why it is critical to maintain a healthy work environment inside the firm. It is worth emphasizing that the authority should place a premium on intrinsic and extrinsic motivation since they have a direct impact on the degree of service quality, which ultimately aids in achieving the aim on a broad scale. Indeed, employees' behaviour in

today's organizations is mostly controlled by incentive variables. Additionally, assessing maximum input from employees for the organization's gradual development is heavily reliant on the aforementioned factors, which aid in developing employees' capacity to the maximum extent possible, performance, and motivation acts as an expanding catalyst in exploring the potentiality of leadership, which is sorely needed for maintaining work-life balance while competing with global challenges. However, the form of motivation that is most useful to a company in the long term warrants further investigation. Taking all of these factors into account, the objective of this study is to determine the most fruitful element of motivation through a comparative review of the current literature on the subject.

### Objectives

- a) To investigate the effect of intrinsic motivation on the job performance of newly hired employees.
- b) To draw a comparison between the inner and extrinsic components of motivation in work performance.

### Research Questions

- a) How does intrinsic motivation affect employees in general and new employees in particular?
- b) Which aspect of motivation, extrinsic or intrinsic, has a greater beneficial effect on employees in general and new employees in particular?

### Dependent Variable

In this study, comparison of employee's performance is a dependent variable. However, employee performance refers to the notion that determines workers behaviours, capacity of work and dedication to achieve the predetermined goals of the organization. Employee Performance helps the organization to reach its target (Ashley, 2019). Comparison of employee's performance refers to the evaluation of performance between/among the employees who are working to attain the predetermined goals of an organization.

### Independent Variables

In this study, intrinsic & extrinsic motivation and job performance are independent variable. Intrinsic motivation is described as engaging in an activity for its own sake rather than for some external benefit. Particularly, when a person is intrinsically driven, he or she is motivated by the task rather than by

external demands or incentives. Besides, extrinsic motivation includes performing a task or displaying a behaviour for external reasons such as avoiding punishment or getting a reward (Oudeyer and Kaplan, 2009). Correspondingly, the total expected value to the organization of an individual's distinct behavioural episodes is defined as job performance (Motowidlo, 2003)

### METHODOLOGY:

This is a qualitative study which has been conducted based on the secondary data analysis. Particularly, data has been collected from several peer reviewed articles, reports and thesis to explore the effect of intrinsic and extrinsic motivation on newly appointed employee's job performance.

### Literature Review

Numerous elements influence an organization's growth and development. In this ever-changing highly competitive marketplace, organizations are required to have a set of extremely competent workforce with top notch performance (Armstrong, 2009). Job performance is a central construct in industrial/organizational psychology (Campbell, 1990; Schmidt and Hunter, 1992). It refers to scalable actions, behaviours and outcomes that employees engage in or bring about that are linked with and contribute to organizational goals (Campbell, 1990). Much of personnel selection is predicated on the premise of selecting from a pool of applicants those who are likely to perform better on the job (compared to those not selected). Many HR programs are designed to improve job performance (Blum & Kaplan, 2000). However, it is a general assumption that the performances of the new and young employees are supposed to be lesser than those of the experienced ones (Holton III, 1996). Does employees' work performance depend on the length of the service only? Research suggests that the answer is negative. New employees can be as effective and performable as their experienced counterparts (Allen & Meyer, 1990). In fact, any highly motivated and satisfied employees are more likely to perform better than others (Grant, 2008).

Job satisfaction experienced by employees positively affects the quality of service which they render (Fitzgerald *et al.*, 1994). Interestingly, a study (Yousef, 2000) on 202 employees from nine commercial banks in Lebanon indicates that job satisfaction is not independent in all job facts and

that satisfaction with one fact might lead to satisfaction with another. According to Herzberg's two factor theory people's job satisfaction depends on two factors. Those are intrinsic factors for satisfaction (motivators/satisfiers) and extrinsic factors for dissatisfaction (hygiene factors/dis-satisfiers). Respect from the boss, recognitions and appreciations from the organization, love and affection etc. are the factors those tend to motivate new employees intrinsically and to perform better (Rahman, 2021, Fernet & Austin, 2014).

Job performance as well as the organization goal/development is mostly dependent on intrinsic motivation. Generally, all of the behaviours in organizations are very much related with some motivation like intrinsic and extrinsic. But in case of organization's overall prosperity, intrinsic motivation has a huge effect on employee's job performance with the outcome of organizational behaviour (Schmidt and Hunter, 1992). Intrinsically motivated employees can easily be engaged themselves with the tasks through the following: To begin, it enables an individual to actively integrate discoveries and pursue novelties. Second, intrinsic drive enables an individual to freely engage in an activity. Thirdly, intrinsic motivation instils more significance not just in the outcome of the task but also in the period of completion (Deci, 2012). Essentially, intrinsic motivation has a significant effect on employees. It enables individuals to devote additional attention to their jobs, resulting in increased job performance, inventive ideas, and conceptual understanding of their relevant task (Kehr, 2004). It gives employees' independence, willingness to compromise, adaptability to their prescribed work which assist themselves as well as the organization (Hackman, 1980). Through Intrinsic motivation, new employees achieve inquisitiveness, contentment and positivity attitude towards the work which give them reward after the end of the month or the year (Amabile *et al.*, 1996). This reward develops the conditions both employees and organization (Awasthi and Pratt, 1990). According to CET theory, competence and autonomy is grown up in employees' behaviour through this kind of motivation and by these characteristics they gain the original interest of the work (Deci and Ryan, 1985; Spreitzer *et al.*, 1997). In case of taking any action regarding the job, employees want to take any kind of risk because of the satisfaction, which develop organization popu-

larity (Deci and Ryan, 1985). Ethical leadership which is grown up due to intrinsic motivation educates employees to know the original test of their work and also lead to execution their organization goals (Zhu *et al.*, 2004; Piccolo *et al.*, 2010). They know how to lead their work more meaningfully and try to compete with the challenges (Amabile *et al.*, 1996). This kind of behaviour i.e. ethical leadership tends to develop the employee's capability when they execute their organization order which is also develops self-efficacy and competence characteristic (Zhu *et al.*, 2004). Intrinsic motivation also assists employees to become more innovative in their perspective work (Woodman *et al.*, 1993). Employees' interest in their own work develops their mentality to find out the easiest way of doing this which is known as Innovation (Jung *et al.*, 2003). When they understand the value and motivate to gain reward for this, they try to exercise their creativity in the work (Fuller *et al.*, 2006). This leads them less stress and reduces the overload (Bolino and Turnley, 2005). Besides these due to intrinsic motivation whenever the employees face obstacles in their job they overcome the issues easily (Deci and Ryan, 2000; Grant, 2008; Parker *et al.*, 2006), because they know better how to solve these (Deci and Ryan, 2000) with their existing knowledge and innovative idea (Parker *et al.*, 1997). Though extrinsic motivation also creates a great effect on new employee's job performance. But according to self-determination theory, intrinsically motivated employees tend to perform more than their task to accomplish their job properly against different competitors while extrinsically motivated employees lead their job life with pressure, external rewards and other circumstances (Deci and Ryan, 1985). The negative impact of extrinsic motivation is that stress and lower level of well-being sometimes decrease employees focusing on their task. On the other hand, intrinsic motivated people can easily engage themselves in a task (Gagne *et al.*, 2010). According to Ryan and Deci, (2000), rewards and recognition; factors of extrinsic motivation do not assist to create the willingness and interest through the job (Amabile, 1993) which is grown up due to intrinsic motivation (Amabile *et al.*, 1994; Gagne and Deci, 2005). Complexity in work can easily accessible by intrinsic motivation which is ambiguous in extrinsic because of the interest and satisfaction of work (Ariely *et al.*, 2009; Weibel *et al.*, 2010).

Employees who are intrinsically motivated can easily control the work-life balance (Senecal *et al.*, 2001) on the other hand; extrinsically motivated people are less control over their work-life balance (Fernet & Austin, 2014; Lemyre *et al.*, 2007). Besides these innovative ideas, informative knowledge is also the results of intrinsic motivation which is also not present in extrinsic motivation (Deckop *et al.*, 1999). According to the psychology and education, it was noted that rewards were one of the main reasons to decrease intrinsic motivation to perform several activities (Cameron, 2017). But the meta-analysis which was conducted by Cameron and Pierce and concluded that the negative impact of rewards was limited and using several applied settings, it can be easily prevented (Cameron & Pierce, 1994). Measures of Intrinsic motivation do not differ or increase when rewards were given based on the level of performance. The negative impacts were only found when rewards were tangible, offered beforehand (expected) and when loosely connected to the level of performance. When it is closely monitored, it was found that reward contingencies have no prevalent negative effects on intrinsic motivation (Deci *et al.*, 1999). So, finally it is found that employee empowerment, leadership opportunities, competition, curiosity, creativity, job enrichment, work-life balance all of these characteristics are grown up into new employees due to intrinsic motivation (Mishra and Mishra, 2017). It has been clearly established and demonstrated throughout time that motivated personnel perform better than uninspired individuals. However, whether the intrinsic component of motivation has a greater influence on employees, particularly recently hired employees, or not, remains an area of inquiry. The researchers set out to determine the association between intrinsic motivation and the job performance of newly hired employees in this study. Additionally, whether this link is always favorable or whether there is any negative consequence between these two factors is a subject of investigation. Following that, the current literature indicates that there is a research gap regarding whether or not intrinsic motivation influences new employee work performance.

## **DISCUSSION:**

According to the majority of prior research, businesses' intrinsic motivation initiatives have a significant impact on the growth, development, and

UniversePG | [www.universepg.com](http://www.universepg.com)

performance of new and young workers. Employee performance is a vast notion that needs much effort. And when any feature or component of the human resources department has a good effect on an employee's performance, the reasons must be numerous. So, what is it about the many components of intrinsic motivation that have ramped up various parts of new workers' job performance throughout the years? Let us examine the writings and beliefs of many authors in detail. The majority of researchers defined motivation as the power that propels an individual toward goal achievement. Their investigations and surveys established that motivation is intrinsically linked to a person's cognitive process and influences his behaviour in a variety of ways. And the most fundamental manner in which motivation influences workers' work in businesses is through their performance. However, motivation is far from a homogeneous occurrence (Deci & Ryan, 2000).

Because human psychology differs, so does the amount and orientation of motivation. However, the majority of writers agreed on two fundamental categories of motivation: intrinsic and extrinsic. When an employee does a work because it is intrinsically engaging or delightful, he or she is said to be intrinsically driven, whereas extrinsic motivation refers to doing something because it results in definable and concrete rewards, such as a pay bonus. Herzberg's two-factor theory elucidates the notion nicely. One of the variables is hygiene factors, which Herzberg defines as external motivators that he believes are necessary to minimize employee dissatisfaction. Pay, position, and physical working circumstances all contribute to an employee's motivation to succeed. However, are these external considerations always sufficient to motivate people to perform better? According to research, employees desire more from their employers than physical prizes for their labor. This is what Herzberg refers to as internal motivating elements. Due to the fact that humans are not robots, corporations cannot always compensate employees for doing better. Employees must have a sense of pride and interest in their job, tasks, and organization as a whole. Even if we analyze Maslow's Hierarchy of Needs theory, we can see that, at some point, individuals desire an internal and more upward sort of motivation that includes internal peace, love, affection, and self-satisfaction. This raises another question: how can companies

foster intrinsic motivation? According to CET theory, the more positive an employee's self-perception of his or her ability, the more intrinsic motivation they feel toward work (Deci & Ryan, 1985). According to CET theory, elements such as autonomy and independence, lack of control, constructive support and feedback all contribute to employees' internal happiness. Vallerand and Reid, (1984) discovered that positive feedback boosted students' perceived competence and intrinsic motivation whereas negative feedback diminished them. Douglas McGregor demonstrated in 1950 in his Theory X and Theory Y that managers who oversee employees with the least amount of control, sanctions, and external rewards are more effective than those who do the reverse. According to this notion, employees who are treated with dignity and respect perform better because they have an internal love and feeling for their supervisors and job. Now, taking into consideration all of these variables what is the relationship between new workers and intrinsic motivation? According to Gallagher & Sias, (2009), the turnover rate for new staff is usually high. Numerous studies indicate that newbie's face greater uncertainty and vulnerability than their seasoned peers. It is noticed that these qualities of new workers are a result of a mix of variables, including their inexperience and lack of knowledge about the work environment. Young employees desire a more personal relationship with their supervisor. They have a tendency to be more emotional and passionate. While compensation increases, positive corporate policies, and a positive work atmosphere all welcome new workers, this new employee desires more warmth, empathy, love, respect, and acknowledgment from the firm. According to studies, these internal components generate more desire and energy in the young worker to continue working for the business and being productive than any other external component.

### **CONCLUSION:**

The study finds that intrinsic motivation has a significant influence on job performance. Employees that are genuinely driven are more inclined to participate in tasks, which leads to improved performance. Intrinsically motivated personnel have the impression that they are working in a safer setting. It is further observed that using applicable parameters, negative effects on intrinsic motivation could be minimised. Noteworthy finding of this study is, self-  
UniversePG | [www.universepg.com](http://www.universepg.com)

motivation is not affected by reward conditions. Young workers are more engaged and energetic in their job, and they are more productive as a result. New staffs with their additional new ideas are more open to bring changes to the organisational process. Due to their voluntary involvement, newbies are more committed to the institution's objectives.

### **ACKNOWLEDGEMENT:**

This study was conducted by joint work. I acknowledge the contribution of Dr. Md. Tariqul Islam, Associate Professor, Dept. of Finance and Banking, Jatiya Kabi Kazi Nazrul Islam University, Trishal, Mymensingh to conduct this study as co-author. As well, I also acknowledge the contribution of Tanjil Ahmed (Lecturer, Department of Public Administration and Governance Studies).

### **CONFLICTS OF INTEREST:**

The authors declare that this study, authorship, and publishing of this article do not include any conflicts of interest.

### **REFERENCES:**

- 1) Allen, N., & Meyer, J. (1990). Organizational socialization tactics: A longitudinal analysis of links to newcomers' commitment and role orientation. *Academy of Management Journal*, **33**, 847-885.
- 2) Amabile, T. M. (1993). Motivational synergy: Toward new conceptualizations of intrinsic and extrinsic motivation in the workplace, *Human Resource Management Rev.*, **3**(3), pp. 185-201
- 3) Amabile, T.M., Hill, K.G., & Tighe, E. (1994). The work preference inventory: Assessing intrinsic and extrinsic motivational orientations, *J. of Person. & Social Psychol.*, **66**(5), 950-967. <https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/8014837/>
- 4) Amabile, T. M., Conti, R., Coon, H., Lazenby, J., & Herron, M. (1996). Assessing the work environment for creativity, *Academy of Management Journal*, **39**(5), pp. 1154-1184.
- 5) Ariely, D., Gneezy, U., & Mazar, N. (2009). Large stakes and big mistakes, *Review of Economic Studies*, **76**(2), pp. 451-469.
- 6) Armstrong, M. (2009). Armstrong's Handbook of Human Resource Management Practice. 11<sup>th</sup> ed. London: Kogan Page Limited
- 7) Ashley, D. (2019). *Employee Performance Definition*. Retrieved from Bizfluent: <https://bizfluent.com/facts-7218608-employee-performance-definition.html>

- 8) Awasthi, V. & Pratt, J. (1990). The effects of monetary incentives on effort and decision performance: The role of cognitive characteristics, *Accounting Rev.*, **65**(4), pp. 797–811.
- 9) Blum, R., & Kaplan, J. M. (2000). Network professionals' job satisfaction. Lucent Technologies Network Care.
- 10) Bolino, M. C. & Turnley, W. H. (2005). The personal costs of citizenship behaviour: The relationship between individual initiative and role overload, job stress and work-family conflict, *J. of Appl. Psychol.*, **90**(4), pp. 740–748.  
<https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.90.4.740>
- 11) Cameron, J. and Pierce, W.D., (1994). Reinforcement, reward, and intrinsic motivation: A meta-analysis. *Review of Educational Research*, **64**(3), pp.363-423.
- 12) Cameron, J., Banko, K.M. and Pierce, W.D., (2001). Pervasive negative effects of rewards on intrinsic motivation: The myth continues. *The Behaviour Analyst*, **24**(1), pp.1-44.
- 13) Campbell, J. P. (1990). Modeling Job Performance in a Population of Jobs. *Personnel Psychology*, **43**, 313-575.  
<https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1744-6570.1990.tb01561.x>
- 14) Darwish A. Yousef, (2000). "Organizational commitment: a mediator of the relationships of leadership behaviour with job satisfaction and performance in a non-western country", *J. of Managerial Psychology*, **15**(1); pp. 6-24
- 15) Deci, E.L., Koestner, R. and Ryan, R.M., (1999). A meta-analytic review of experiments examining the effects of extrinsic rewards on intrinsic motivation. *Psychological bulletin*, **125**(6), pp.627.  
<https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/10589297/>
- 16) Deci, E. L., (2012). *Intrinsic Motivation and Self-Determination in Human Behaviour*. Boston, MA, Springer US.
- 17) Deci, E. L. & Ryan, R. M. (1985). Intrinsic motivation and self-determination in human behaviour, *New York: Plenum*.
- 18) Deci, E. L. & Ryan, R. M. (2000). The 'what' and 'why' of goal pursuits: human needs and the self-determination of behaviour, *Psychological Inquiry*, **11**, pp. 227–268.  
[https://doi.org/10.1207/S15327965PLI1104\\_01](https://doi.org/10.1207/S15327965PLI1104_01)
- 19) Deckop, J.R., Mangel, R. & Cirka, C.C. (1999). Getting more than you pay for: Organizational citizenship behaviour and pay-for-performance plans, *Aca.of Manag. J.*, **42**(4), pp. 420–428.
- 20) Erin B. Gallagher & Patricia M. Sias, (2009). The New Employee as a Source of Uncertainty: Veteran Employee Information Seeking about New Hires, *West. J. of Commun.*, **73**: 1, 23-46.  
<https://doi.org/10.1080/10570310802636326>
- 21) Fernet, C. & Austin, S. (2014). Self-determination and job stress, In M. Gagné (Ed.), *The Oxford handbook of work engagement, motivation and self-determination theory*, 231–244.
- 22) Fitzgerald, L. F., Hulin, C., & Drasgow, F. (1994). The antecedents and consequences of sexual harassment in organizations: An integrated model. In G. P. Keita & J. J. Hurell (Eds.) *Job stress in a changing workforce: Investigating gender, diversity, and family issues* (pp. 55–73). Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.
- 23) Fuller, J. B., Marler, L. E. & Hester, K. (2006). Promoting felt responsibility for constructive change and proactive behaviour: Exploring aspects of an elaborated model of work design, *J. of Organi. Behav.*, **27**(8), pp. 1089–1120.  
<https://www.jstor.org/stable/4093904>
- 24) Gagné, M., Forest, J., Gilbert, M.-H., Aubé, C., Morin, E. & Malorni, A. (2010). The motivation at work scale: Validation evidence in two languages, *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, **70**(4), pp. 628–646.
- 25) Gagne, M. & Deci, E. L. (2005). Self-determination theory and work motivation, *J. of Organizational Behaviour*, **26**(4), pp. 331–362.
- 26) Grant, A. (2008). Does intrinsic motivation fuels the prosocial fire? Motivational synergy in predicting persistence, performance, and productivity, *J. of Appl. Psychol.*, **93**(1), 48-58.
- 27) Hackman, J. R. (1980). Work redesign and motivation, *Profes. Psychol.*, **11**(3), 445-455.  
<https://psycnet.apa.org/record/1981-24572-001>
- 28) Holton, III (1996). New Employee Development: A Review and Reconceptualization Human Resource Development quarterly, **7**(3), Fall 1996 Q Joswy-Bass Publisher.
- 29) Jung, D. I., Chow, C. & Wu, A. (2003). The role of transformational leadership in enhancing organizational innovation: Hypotheses & some preliminary findings, *Leadership Quarterly*, **14**(4–5), pp. 525–544.  
[https://doi.org/10.1016/S1048-9843\(03\)00050-X](https://doi.org/10.1016/S1048-9843(03)00050-X)

- 30) Kehr, H.M. (2004). Integrating implicit motives, explicit motives, and perceived abilities: The compensatory model of work motivation and volition, *Aca. of Manag. Rev.*, **29**(3), pp. 479–499. <https://doi.org/10.2307/20159055>
- 31) Langfred, C.W., & Moye, N.A. (2004). Effects of task autonomy on performance: An extended model considering motivational, informational, and structural mechanisms. *J. of Applied Psychology*, **89**(6), 934–945.
- 32) Lemyre, P. N., Roberts, G. C. & Stray-Gundersen, J. (2007). Motivation, overtraining, and burnout: Can self-determined motivation predict overtraining and burnout in elite athletes? *European J. of Sport Sci.*, **7**(2), pp. 115–126.
- 33) Mishra, S. & Mishra, S. (2017). Impact of Intrinsic Motivational Factors on Employee Retention among Gen Y: A Qualitative Perspective, *Parikalpana- KIIT Journal of Management*, **13**(1), pp. 31-42.
- 34) Motowidlo, S. J. (2003). ‘Job Performance’, in *Handbook of Psychology*. John Wiley & Sons, Ltd, pp. 39–53. <https://doi.org/10.1002/0471264385.wei1203>
- 35) Oudeyer, P. Y. and Kaplan, F. (2009). ‘What is intrinsic motivation? A typology of computational approaches’, *Frontiers in Neurobotics*, **3**, p. 6. <https://doi.org/10.3389/neuro.12.006.2007>
- 36) Parker, S. K., Williams, H. M., & Turner, N. (2006). Modeling the antecedents of proactive behaviour at work. *J. of Applied Psychology*, **91**(3), pp. 636–652.
- 37) Parker, S. K., Wall, T. D. & Jackson, P. R. (1997). “That is not my job”: Developing flexible employee work orientations, *Academy of Management Journal*, **40**(4), pp. 899–929.
- 38) Piccolo, R., Den Hartog, D. & Folger, R. (2010). The relationship between ethical leadership and core job characteristics, *J. of Organizational Behaviour*, **31**(2–3), pp. 259–278.
- 39) Schmidt, F. L., & Hunter, J. E. (1992). Development of causal models of processes determining job performance. *Current Directions in Psychological Science*, **1**, 89-92.
- 40) Senécal, C., Vallerand, R. J. & Guay, F. (2001). Antecedents and outcomes of work-family conflict: Toward a motivational model, *Personal. and Soc. Psychol. Bull.*, **27**(2), 176–186.
- 41) Shin, J. and Grant, A.M., (2019). Bored by Interest: How Intrinsic Motivation in One Task Can Reduce Performance on Other Tasks. *Academy of Management J.*, **62**(2), pp.415-436.
- 42) Spreitzer, G. M., Kizilos, M., & Nason, S. (1997). A dimensional analysis of the relationship between psychological empowerment and effectiveness, satisfaction, and strain, *J. of Management*, **23**(5), pp. 679-704.
- 43) Swanson, R.A., & Holton, E.F. (2009). *Foundations of human resource development* (2<sup>nd</sup> ed.). San Francisco, CA: Berrett-Koehler.
- 44) Thomas, K. W. (2009). *Intrinsic Motivation at Work: What Really Drives Employees Engagement*.
- 45) Rahman M. (2021). Impact of socio-economic factors on undergraduate students’ academic performance in Bangladesh: a case study at social science faculty, University of Dhaka, *Asian J. Soc. Sci. Leg. Stud.*, **3**(4), 147-157. <https://doi.org/10.34104/ajssls.021.01470157>
- 46) Woodman, R. W., Sawyer, J. E. & Griffen, R. W. (1993). Toward a theory of organizational creativity, *Aca. of Manag. Journal*, **18**(2), 293–321. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/258761>
- 47) Weibel, A., Rost, K. & Osterloh, M. (2010). Pay for performance in the public sector: Benefits and costs, *J. of Public Administration Research and Theory*, **20**(2), pp. 387–412.
- 48) Weinberger, L. A. (1998). Commonly held theories of human resource development. *Human Res. Develop. Internat.*, **1**(1), 75–93.
- 49) Zhu, W., May, D. R. & Avolio, B. J. (2004). The impact of ethical leadership behaviour on employee outcomes: The roles of psychological empowerment and authenticity, *J. of Leadership & Organizational Stud.*, **11**(1), pp. 16–26. <https://doi.org/10.1177/107179190401100104>

**Citation:** Rahman A., and Islam MT. (2022). Nexus between motivation and newly appointed employee’s job performance: a review on intrinsic and extrinsic incentives, *Asian J. Soc. Sci. Leg. Stud.*, **4**(2), 32-38. <https://doi.org/10.34104/ajssls.022.032038> 