

## INTRINSIC REWARD SYSTEM & MOTIVATION: A STUDY OF MANAGEMENT TEACHERS PERSPECTIVE

<sup>1</sup>ATUL KUMAR & <sup>2</sup>VINAYDEEP

<sup>1</sup>Assistant Professor & Head, Department of Management, Siddhant College of Engineering,  
Sudumbare, Taluka- Maval, District- Pune, Maharashtra, (India)

<sup>2</sup>Assistant Professor, Indira School of Business Studies, Pune, Maharashtra, India

### ABSTRACT

The paper presents a study of the intrinsic reward system (IRS) in management institutions/business schools. For the study, a questionnaire containing 10 variables (recognition, respect, encouragement, appreciation, participation in decision-making, job freedom/autonomy, more responsibility & challenges, interesting work & diversity of activities, opportunities for personal growth, and use of valued skills) was constructed. The respondents (n=430) were teachers of different management institutions/business schools selected from Maharashtra state of India and they were asked to rate variables included for the study on Likert five point scales. The validity of scales used in questionnaire was measured through face & content validity method. The reliability of the scales was assessed through the adaption of the research of Copper and Schindler. The internal consistency of reliability was measured by calculating Cronbach's Alfa. Data was analyzed by using One Sample T-test and Chi Square Test of Independence. The survey was conducted during November and December 2011 by using non-probability convenience sampling technique. The study yielded rich research results. Most notably, it depicted that teachers' expectations are very high but actual performance of intrinsic reward system is poor in management institutions/business schools. Results also indicated that intrinsic reward system is responsible to motivate teachers. Furthermore, the findings of the study delineated that motivation has positive relationship with expectations of teachers regarding intrinsic reward system. There is also a relationship found between motivation and performance of intrinsic reward system in management institutions/business schools. The Scope of study is circumscribed within the Maharashtra State of India.

**KEYWORDS:** Intrinsic Rewards, Motivation, Performance, Management Teachers, Maharashtra

### INTRODUCTION

When the word 'reward' comes in our mind, we do recall our childhood, when we used to get the chocolate or some coins or sometimes just appreciation from our elders for performing any task assigned. At that time, we were always in a fix that what word, we should use to describe this chocolate, coins, or appreciation. Now, we can say that was the reward. As Zigon (1998) defines, reward is something that increases the frequency of an employee action. This definition points out an obvious desired result of rewards and recognition to improve performance and support for our understanding of reward. Reward is something given or received in recompense for worthy or strengthen approved or desired behavior and in retribution for evil acts (TFD, 2011; BQ, 2011; ArD, 2011), for service (TFD, 2011; Dic, 2011), for merit, hardship (Dic, 2011), for satisfying return or result and profit (TFD, 2011), regard, respect, consideration (ArD, 2011), the offer of money (ArD, 2011; Dic, 2011).

Reward can be described as financial (extrinsic) and psychological (intrinsic) (FP, 2011). Many organizations believe that people only work for money. However, organizations must remember that an alternative typology for organizational rewards is the distinction between extrinsic and intrinsic rewards (Kreitner *et al.* 1999; RS, 2011).

Extrinsic rewards cover the basic needs of income to survive (Hellriegel *et al.*, 1999; ER, 2011), a feeling of stability and consistency (Hellriegel *et al.*, 1999; ER, 2011), status, and fringe benefits (Hellriegel *et al.*, 1999), financial rewards, material rewards and social rewards (Kreitner *et al.*, 1999). Extrinsic rewards are outcomes of positively valued work that are provided to an individual person or group of person by an organization.

On the other hand, intrinsic rewards are outcomes of positively valued work that the individual get directly because of task performance. Intrinsic rewards are the important and comprise probably recognition (Odden, 2000b; Tomlinson, 2000; Kreitner *et al.*, 1999; Thorpe and Homan, 2000; Armstrong and Murlis, 1994), job satisfaction (Kreitner *et al.*, 1999; IR, 2011; BD, 2011), a feeling of accomplishment (Ellis, 1984; Jane, 1982; Odden, 2000b; BD, 2011, Tomlinson, 2000; Schermerhorn *et al.*, 2006; Kreitner *et al.*, 1999; Armstrong and Murlis, 1994; Herzberg, 1964; IR, 2011; Thorpe and Homan, 2000; ENC, 2011; Hellriegel *et al.*, 1999), self-respect (Ellis, 1984), enjoyment and even perhaps the social interactions which arise from the workplace (IR, 2011), freedom and independence (Pastor and Erlandson, 1982), love of or pride in one's work (ENC, 2011), personal growth and opportunities (Odden, 2000b; Tomlinson, 2000; Kreitner *et al.*, 1999; Armstrong and Murlis, 1994; Hellriegel *et al.*, 1999; Thorpe and Homan, 2000), personal challenge (Pastor and Erlandson, 1982; Herzberg, 1964), expression of creativity (Pastor and Erlandson, 1982), increased responsibility (Ellis, 1984; Kreitner *et al.*, 1999; Armstrong and Murlis, 1994; Herzberg, 1964; Thorpe and Homan, 2000), influence (Odden, 2000b; Tomlinson, 2000; Armstrong and Murlis, 1994), use of valued skills (Pastor and Erlandson, 1982), learning new skills, (Pastor and Erlandson, 1982; Tomlinson, 2000; Odden, 2000b), participation in decision-making (Pastor and Erlandson, 1982) and belonging (Herzberg, 1964). According to Kreitner *et al.* (1999), psychic rewards are also intrinsic rewards because they are self-granted.

People join organizations expecting rewards (Aswathappa, 2007). Having the reward system in the organization means, organization is able to cope with the people's expectations. Organizations get the performance they reward, not the performance they want (Kerr, 1975). ***In this study, first attempt is made to identify the expectation level of management teachers regarding intrinsic reward system.*** As Hellriegel *et al.* (1999) say that to be good motivators, rewards must be aligned with the things that people value. If rewards are aligned with employees needs, this could lead to increase in employee motivation, which will in turn lead to improvement in performance, and therefore lead to organizations becoming more competitive (Taljaard 2003). Intrinsic rewards must be integral part of overall reward system because strongest motivators come from inside a person (Armajani, 2009) and intrinsic rewards are generally much stronger than extrinsic ones (Herzberg, 1964). ***Second attempt is made to know how; the intrinsic reward system is responsible to motivate the management teachers.*** Firestone and Pennell (1993) argue that teachers are not motivated by money and evaluation can undermine the intrinsic rewards for teachers therefore, they suggest intrinsic rewards as most important to teachers. Effective Reward systems can be used to attract, motivate and retain the employees (Luthans, 2008; Armstrong and Murlis, 1994; Mcshane *et al.*, 2006; Deeprase, 1994). ***Third attempt is made to appraise the performance of intrinsic reward system in management institutes/business schools.*** Because, only the good performance can make any reward system effective. Study also explores the relationship between motivation and expectations of management teachers

regarding intrinsic rewards. Further, study explains the relationship between motivation and performance of intrinsic rewards in management institutes/business schools.

## LITERATURE REVIEW

Hellriegel *et al.* (1999) say that intrinsic rewards generally can motivate employees because they recognize the employees' intrinsic needs. According to Armstrong and Murlis (1994), rewards and more specifically intrinsic rewards normally drive a person. It is therefore important to look at the payoffs of intrinsic rewards. Reward systems especially intrinsic, motivate individuals to work harder at being creative (Kachelmeier *et al.*, 2008; Kachelmeier and Williamson 2010). Thorpe and Homan (2000) mentioned that intrinsic rewards do not only have payoffs in improvement in performance, but also benefit the workers. Jones and Jones (2001) suggest that intrinsic motivation be used according to each student's needs and "CHAMPs."

Armstrong and Murlis (1994) say that intrinsic rewards can be focused on the needs of the people and these needs include: achievement, recognition, responsibility, influence, personal growth. Thomas and Tymon (2009) explain that there are four intrinsic rewards: sense of meaningfulness, sense of choice, sense of competence, sense of progress. Kreitner *et al.* (1999) express that motivating factors are achievement, recognition, characteristics of the work, responsibility and advancement and they also argued that job satisfaction is frequently associated with these motivating factors. According to Johnson (1986), measures developed to boost teacher motivation are based on three theories of motivation and productivity: Expectancy theory, Equity theory, and Job enrichment theory. By giving more importance to the intrinsic rewards, Herzberg (1964) posited that the motivational value of extrinsic rewards tends to "zero out." That is, if I get used to winning a bonus for my good work, I will come to expect the bonus. It will no longer "satisfy" me. In fact, *not* getting a bonus will dissatisfy me. Deci (1975) explain that injudicious use of extrinsic rewards can undermine intrinsic motivation.

Ellis (1984) said that recent studies have shown conclusively that teachers are motivated more by intrinsic than by extrinsic rewards. Odden (2001) argues too that current teachers can be motivated by intrinsic rewards but it does not mean teachers may not be motivated by financial rewards. Teachers, who are not motivated by financial rewards, can be encouraged with intrinsic rewards (Odden, 2000a). These rewards include the satisfaction from high student achievement, recognition, influence, learning new skills, and personal growth (Tomlinson, 2000; Odden 2000b). New teachers, when interviewed entering teaching in search of intrinsic rewards. Their reasons for choosing teaching over other professions were not salary or financial rewards. Instead, they were talking for value of meaningful work, the appeal of working with children, and the enjoyment of pedagogy and subject matter (Johnson, 1990; Lortie, 1975).

Ellis (1984) describes that teachers are primarily motivated by intrinsic rewards such as self-respect, responsibility, and a sense of accomplishment. Thus, administrators can boost morale and motivate teachers to excel by means of participatory governance, in service education, and systematic, supportive evaluation. Beachy (2008) says that one of my reasons for choosing a career in teaching was to be of service to others. My students have amply rewarded me, and I have never regretted the decision. Jane (1982) found correlation between types of teaching rewards and students' socioeconomic status, length of teaching experience, and teachers' perceptions of challenges and skills.

Maslow (1970) argues that everyone seeks to satisfy two basic levels of needs: lower level needs (physiological, security, the need for love and belonging) and higher level needs (esteem of both self and others and self-actualization or achieving one's full potential). Pastor and Erlandson (1982) conducted a survey that found that teachers perceive their

needs and measure their job satisfaction by factors such as participation in decision-making, use of valued skills, freedom and independence, challenge, expression of creativity, and opportunity for learning. They concluded that high internal motivation, work satisfaction, and high-quality performance depend on three "critical psychological states": experienced meaningfulness, responsibility for outcomes, and knowledge of results. In a survey conducted by Brodinsky and Neill (1983), a majority of school administrators (and teachers) cited three policies that effectively improved morale and motivated their staffs: shared governance, in service education, and systematic, supportive evaluation.

## RESEARCH HYPOTHESIS

Based on literature review and objectives of the study, following hypothesis has been formulated:

**H<sub>1</sub>**- Management teachers have high level of expectations regarding intrinsic reward system.

**H<sub>2</sub>**- The performance of intrinsic reward system is excellent in management institutions/business schools.

**H<sub>3</sub>**- Intrinsic reward system is responsible to motivate management teachers.

**H<sub>4</sub>**- Motivation has positive relationship with expectations of management teachers regarding intrinsic reward system.

**H<sub>5</sub>**- Motivation has a positive relationship with performance of intrinsic reward system in management institutions/business schools.

## METHODOLOGY

As the focus of study was to know the intrinsic reward system in management institutions/business schools, the respondents were teachers of different management institutions and business schools selected from the different cities viz. Pune, Mumbai, Nashik, Jalgaon, Nagpur, Aurangabad, Solapur, and Kolhapur of Maharashtra state of India. Data is collected from both the sources: primary as well as secondary sources. Secondary data is collected from relevant journals/magazines national as well as international pertaining to the topic of the research, books, newspapers and websites. Both Descriptive and exploratory research were used in compiling this study. While exploratory research helped in developing the hypotheses through the analysis of secondary data, descriptive research was used in order to study the management teachers' perspective regarding intrinsic reward system in management institutions/business schools.

For the survey, a questionnaire containing 10 variables of intrinsic reward system was constructed. The respondents were asked to rate these variables on three scales: expectation scale, performance scale, and motivation scale. On the expectation scale, respondents were asked to express their expectations regarding the different variables of intrinsic reward system on Likert (1970) five point scale, highly unexpected (1) to highly expected (5) with the middle of scale identified by the response alternative neither unexpected nor expected (3). On the performance scale, respondents were asked to rate the performance of different variables of intrinsic reward system in their respective management institutions/business schools on Likert five point scale, poor (1) to excellent (5) with the middle of scale identified by the response alternative average (3). On the motivation scale, respondents were asked to rate the different variables of intrinsic reward system on Likert five point scale, highly irresponsible to motivate (1) to highly responsible to motivate (5) with the middle of scale identified by the response alternative neither irresponsible nor responsible (3). Originally, a preliminary study was carried out utilizing a host of questions on a small sample of individuals. Taking the insight from the preliminary survey, the questionnaire was modified for the final study.

The face & content validity method is employed to measure the validity of scales used in questionnaire. Face validity is the extent to which a measurement scale seems to measure what is supposed to measure (McDaniel and Gates, 2001). It is identified by the judgment of the researcher, who compiled the questionnaire with various scales, which logically appeared to accurately reflect what they were supposed to measure and to measure the validity of content; researcher firstly defined what exactly required being measure. For this study, key variables were identified through the hypothesis formulated that helped to pinpoint what required being measure. Secondly by extensive review of literature to pinpoint all possible items were determined. Third, opinions were sought from experts on whether certain items should be included or even excluded. The reliability of the scale was assessed through the adaption of the research of Copper and Schindler (2006). The internal consistency of reliability was measured through Croanbach's Alfa. The Alfa value for expectation scale was 0.805, for performance scale 0.791 and for motivation scale 0.823, which is indication of good reliability of the questionnaire.

500 copies of the questionnaires were distributed among respondents. Out of 473 answered questionnaires, only 430 questionnaires were found usable for the analysis. For the present study non-probability convenience sampling was resorted. The survey was conducted during November and December 2011. We carried out the survey personally using face-to-face method. As Sekaran (2003) stated that personally, administered questionnaires can establish rapport and motive respondents whilst at the same time clarify any doubts instantly. The Scope of this study is circumscribed within the Pune city of Maharashtra State (India).

## RESULT AND DISCUSSIONS

Table 1 depicts the demographic profile of the management teachers included for this study. The responses regarding the same have been taken on nominal and ordinal scales. Simple percentage method has been used to analyze the profile.

Table 1: Descriptive Statistics of Respondents Demographic Profile				
S. N.	Variable	Sub-Variable	Frequency*	Percentage (%)
1)	Gender	Male	243	56.51
		Female	187	43.49
2)	Age (Years)	21-30	86	20.00
		31-40	156	36.28
		41-50	121	28.14
		51-60	46	10.70
		Above 60	21	04.88
3)	Education Status	Post Graduate	327	76.05
		Doctorate	98	22.79
		Post Doctorate	5	01.16
4)	Experience (Years)	Fresher	52	12.09
		1-3	258	60.00
		>3 - <5	77	17.91
		>5 - <10	13	03.02
		More than 10	30	06.98
5)	Salary (Annual) in □	> 3 Lakhs	86	20.00
		3 - 5 Lakhs	212	49.30
		More than 5 Lakhs	132	30.70
6)	Designation	Lecturer	235	54.65
		Assistant Professor	152	35.35
		Associate Professor	13	03.02

		Professor	30	06.98
7)	Association with current Institutions/Business Schools (Years)	Less than 1	120	27.91
		1-3	147	34.19
		>3 - <5	103	23.95
		More than 5	60	13.95
*Source: primary data collected from respondents through questionnaire.				

### Hypothesis Testing

To test the hypothesis  $H_1$ ,  $H_2$  and  $H_3$ , one sample t-test has been employed. Table 2, 3 and 4 depicts the t-test results for each variable of intrinsic reward system included for this study on expectation scale, performance scale and motivation scale respectively. The degree of freedom (df) is 429. The mean of the scale ( $\mu$ ) is 3, which is also known as test value. 5% Level of significance ( $\alpha=0.05$ ), the critical value of  $t=1.645$  for 429 degree of freedom. Table 2 shows that calculated value of  $t$  is greater than the critical value of  $t$  in the case of all variables (included for the study) on expectation scale except participation in decision-making and job freedom/autonomy. From table 3, it is inferred that calculated value of  $t$  is greater than the critical value of  $t$  in the case of only one variables on performance scale i.e. more responsibility and challenges. From table 4, it is inferred that calculated value of  $t$  is greater than the critical value of  $t$  in the case of all variables on motivation scale except job freedom/autonomy.

Table 2: Statistics of the Variables on Expectation Scale					
S.N.	Variables	Mean Scores*	Std. Deviation*	Mean Difference	$t_{\text{calculated}}$
Over all Intrinsic Reward System		3.902	6.005	0.902	3.115
1	Recognition	4.330	8.990	1.330	3.068
2	Respect	4.326	9.715	1.326	2.830
3	Encouragement	4.314	8.999	1.314	3.028
4	Appreciation	4.353	8.944	1.353	3.137
5	Participation in Decision Making	3.437	8.998	0.437	1.007
6	Job Freedom/Autonomy	3.135	7.101	0.135	0.394
7	More Responsibility & Challenges	3.888	6.198	0.888	2.971
8	Interesting Work & Diversity of Activities	4.130	7.672	1.130	3.054
9	Opportunities for Personal Growth	4.663	11.022	1.663	3.129
10	Use of Valued Skills	3.747	7.195	0.747	2.153
*Source: primary data collected from respondents through questionnaire.					

Table 3: Statistics of the Variables on Performance Scale					
S.N.	Variables	Mean Scores*	Std. Deviation*	Mean Difference	$t_{\text{calculated}}$
Over all Intrinsic Reward System		2.514	4.745	-0.486	-2.124
1	Recognition	2.707	2.560	-0.293	-2.373
2	Respect	3.026	3.587	0.026	0.150
3	Encouragement	3.181	3.568	0.181	1.052
4	Appreciation	2.895	2.509	-0.105	-0.868

5	Participation in Decision Making	2.714	6.218	-0.286	-0.954
6	Job Freedom/Autonomy	2.312	8.450	-0.688	-1.688
7	More Responsibility & Challenges	3.767	7.633	0.767	2.087
8	Interesting Work & Diversity of Activities	3.063	5.326	0.063	0.245
9	Opportunities for Personal Growth	2.593	6.946	-0.407	-1.215
10	Use of Valued Skills	2.947	4.935	-0.053	-0.223
*Source: primary data collected from respondents through questionnaire.					

<b>Table 4: Statistics of the Variables on Motivation Scale</b>					
S.N.	Variables	Mean Scores*	Std. Deviation*	Mean Difference	t <sub>calculated</sub>
Over all Intrinsic Reward System		4.281	9.302	1.281	2.856
1	Recognition	4.388	9.561	1.388	3.010
2	Respect	4.342	8.494	1.342	3.276
3	Encouragement	4.326	8.192	1.326	3.357
4	Appreciation	4.328	8.411	1.328	3.274
5	Participation in Decision Making	3.947	10.914	0.947	1.799
6	Job Freedom/Autonomy	3.233	6.367	0.233	0.759
7	More Responsibility & Challenges	3.421	4.561	0.421	1.914
8	Interesting Work & Diversity of Activities	3.923	5.637	0.923	3.395
9	Opportunities for Personal Growth	4.653	10.881	1.653	3.150
10	Use of Valued Skills	4.340	8.358	1.340	3.325
*Source: primary data collected from respondents through questionnaire.					

Hence, the hypothesis H<sub>1</sub> is accepted in the case of all variables included for this study except participation in decision-making and job freedom/autonomy. The hypothesis H<sub>2</sub> is rejected in the case of all variables included for this study except more responsibility and challenges. Moreover, the hypothesis H<sub>3</sub> is accepted in the case of all variables included for this study except job freedom/autonomy.

Chi Square Test of Independence is applied to test the hypothesis H<sub>4</sub> and H<sub>5</sub>. Table 5 and 6 delineate that chi square calculated at 16 degree of freedom is greater than tabulated value. Therefore, hypothesis H<sub>4</sub> and H<sub>5</sub> are accepted at 5% level of significance.

<b>Table 5: Cross tabulation of Motivation and Expectations of Management Teachers regarding Intrinsic Reward System</b>							
<b>Scales</b>		<b>Expectation Scale</b>					<b>Total*</b>
		<b>Highly Expected</b>	<b>Partially Expected</b>	<b>Neither Expected Nor Unexpected</b>	<b>Partially Unexpected</b>	<b>Highly Unexpected</b>	
<b>Motivation Scale</b>	<b>Highly Responsible to Motivate</b>	67	54	44	17	01	183
	<b>Partially Responsible to Motivate</b>	82	67	42	07	00	198
	<b>Neither Responsible Nor Irresponsible to Motivate</b>	03	06	10	17	01	37
	<b>Partially Irresponsible to Motivate</b>	01	03	06	01	00	11
	<b>Highly Irresponsible to Motivate</b>	00	00	00	00	01	01
	<b>Total</b>	153	130	102	42	03	430
<b>Chi Square Calculated</b>		<b>df</b>	<b>Level of significance</b>		<b>Chi Square Tabulated</b>		
223.407		16	5%		26.296		
*Source: primary data collected from respondents through questionnaire.							

<b>Table 6: Cross tabulation of Motivation and Performance of Intrinsic Reward System in Management Institutions/Business Schools</b>							
<b>Scales</b>		<b>Expectation Scale</b>					<b>Total*</b>
		<b>Excellent</b>	<b>Good</b>	<b>Average</b>	<b>Below Average</b>	<b>Poor</b>	
<b>Motivation Scale</b>	<b>Highly Responsible to Motivate</b>	04	21	82	65	11	183
	<b>Partially Responsible to Motivate</b>	09	20	58	49	62	198
	<b>Neither Responsible Nor Irresponsible to Motivate</b>	09	05	04	04	15	37
	<b>Partially Irresponsible to Motivate</b>	03	02	00	01	05	11
	<b>Highly Irresponsible to Motivate</b>	00	00	00	00	01	01
	<b>Total</b>	25	48	144	119	94	430
<b>Chi Square Calculated</b>		<b>df</b>	<b>Level of significance</b>		<b>Chi Square Tabulated</b>		
104.441		16	1%		26.296		
*Source: primary data collected from respondents through questionnaire.							

## CONCLUSIONS

Mostly teachers working in management institutions/business schools were youth, postgraduates, having 1-3 years of experience, getting good salary, working on the post of lecturer and associated with the current institute/school since less than 3 years. The results of the study depict that management teachers have high level of expectations regarding intrinsic reward system in case of the variables viz. recognition, respect, encouragement, appreciation, more responsibility & challenges, interesting work & diversity of activities, opportunities for personal growth, use of valued skills. The results also show that performance of intrinsic reward system is poor in management institutions/business schools in case of the



variables viz. recognition, respect, encouragement, appreciation, interesting work & diversity of activities, opportunities for personal growth, use of valued skills, participation in decision making, job freedom/autonomy. Furthermore study also indicates that intrinsic reward system is responsible to motivate management teachers in case of the variables viz. recognition, respect, encouragement, appreciation, interesting work & diversity of activities, opportunities for personal growth, use of valued skills, participation in decision making, more responsibility & challenges. The findings of the study delineates that motivation has positive relationship with expectations of teachers regarding intrinsic reward system. Furthermore, motivation has also positive relationship with performance of intrinsic reward system in management institutions/business schools.

Intrinsic rewards must be integral part of the reward system, because they not only expected by the management teachers but also highly responsible to motivate them. Therefore, management institutions/business schools have to have an effective intrinsic reward system in order to meet the expectation of the management teachers because a strongest motivator comes from inside a person. To be representing themselves as the good motivators, management institutions/business schools must aligned the rewards with the things that teacher value. If rewards are aligned with teachers' needs, this could lead to increase in teachers motivation, which will in turn lead to improvement in performance, and therefore lead to institute/school becoming more competitive. Appraising the effectiveness of the intrinsic rewards has paramount importance and effectiveness of the intrinsic reward system can be measured in terms of the performance of the intrinsic rewards. The Performance of intrinsic rewards is inversely related to the motivation of the management teachers. Therefore, an effective intrinsic reward system is today's demand for the motivation of the management teachers because intrinsic rewards cannot only be good motivator of the management teachers but also relatively inexpensive.

## REFERENCES

1. ArD (2011). Reward. Accurate & Reliable Dictionary- A Free English-English Online Dictionary. Retrieved from <http://ardictionary.com/Reward/5904>
2. Armajani, B. (2009). The Power of Intrinsic Rewards. Retrieved from <http://www.governing.com/columns/mgmt-insights/The-Power-of-Intrinsic.html>
3. Armstrong, M. & Murlis, H. (1994). Reward Management: A Handbook of Remuneration Strategy and Practice. London: Kogan Page Ltd.
4. Aswathappa, K. (2007). Organization Behaviour: Text Cases Game. India: Himalaya Publishing House
5. Banerjee, S. & Roy, R. (2008). Fundamentals of Research Methodology. Allahabad: Kitab Mahal Publications
6. BD (2011). Intrinsic Reward. Business Dictionary. Retrieved from <http://www.businessdictionary.com/definition/intrinsic-reward.html>
7. Beachy, J. A. (2008). The Intrinsic Rewards of Teaching. Retrieved from <http://www.tommcmahon.net/2008/01/the-intrinsic-r.html>
8. BQ (2011). Reward. Brainy Quote. Retrieved from <http://www.brainyquote.com/words/re/reward213184.html>

9. Brodinsky, B. & Neill, S. B. (1983). *Building Morale. Motivating Staff: Problems and Solutions*. AASA Critical Issues Report No. 12. Sacramento, CA: Education News Service, 227-549
10. Copper, D. & Schindler, P. S. (2006). *Marketing Research: Concept & Case*. Delhi: Tata McGraw Hill Publishing Co. Ltd.
11. Deci, E. L. (1975). *Intrinsic Motivation*. New York: Plenum Press
12. Deeprase, D. (1994). *How to recognize and reward employees*. New York: AMACOM
13. Dic (2011). *Reward*. Dictionary. Retrieved from <http://dictionary.reference.com/browse/reward>
14. Ellis, T. I. (1984). *Motivating Teachers for Excellence*. ERIC Clearinghouse on Educational Management: ERIC Digest, Number 6
15. ENC (2011). *Intrinsic Reward*. Encyclopedia. Retrieved from <http://www.encyclopedia.com/doc/1O18-intrinsicreward.html>
16. ER (2011). *Reward System*. Retrieved from [www.koalacat.com](http://www.koalacat.com).
17. Firestone, W. & Pennell, J. (1993). *Teacher Commitment, Working Conditions, and Differential Incentive Policies*. *Review of Educational Research*, 63 (4), 89-525
18. FP (2011). *Reward System*. Retrieved from [www.koalacat.com](http://www.koalacat.com).
19. Hellriegel, D.; Jackson, S. E. & Slocum, J. W. Jr. (1999). *Management*. Ohio: South-Western College Publishing
20. Herzberg, F. (1964). *The Motivation-Hygiene Concept and Problems of Manpower*. *Personnel Administration*, 27 (January-February), 3-7
21. IR (2011). *Reward System*. Retrieved from [www.koalacat.com](http://www.koalacat.com).
22. Jane, P. (1982). *Types of Intrinsic Rewards of Teaching and their Relation to Teacher Characteristics and Variables in the Work Setting*. Retrieved from [http://www.eric.ed.gov/ERICWebPortal/search/detailmini.jsp?\\_nfpb=true&\\_ERICExtSearch\\_SearchValue\\_0=ED215978&ERICExtSearch\\_SearchType\\_0=no&accno=ED215978](http://www.eric.ed.gov/ERICWebPortal/search/detailmini.jsp?_nfpb=true&_ERICExtSearch_SearchValue_0=ED215978&ERICExtSearch_SearchType_0=no&accno=ED215978)
23. Johnson, S. M. (1990). *Teachers at work: Achieving success in our schools*. New York: Basic Books
24. Johnson, S. M. (1986). *Incentives for Teachers: What Motivates, What Matters?* *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 22 (3) (Summer), 54-79
25. Jones, L. & Jones, V. (2001). *Comprehensive Classroom Management: Creating Communities of Support and Solving Problems*. Boston: Allyn and Bacon
26. Kachelmeier, S. J. & Williamson, M. G. (2010). *Attracting Creativity: The Initial and Aggregate Effects of Contract Section on Creativity-Weighted Productivity*. *The Accounting Review*, forthcoming
27. Kachelmeier, S. J.; Reichert, B. E. and Williamson, M. G. (2008). *Measuring and motivating quantity, creativity, or both*. *Journal of Accounting Research*, 46 (2), 341-73
28. Kerr, S. (1975). *On the folly of rewarding A, while hoping for B*. *Academy of Management Journal*, 18, 769-783

29. Kreitner, R.; Kinicki, A. & Buelens, M. (1999). *Organisational Behaviour*. Berkshire: McGraw-Hill Publishing Company
30. Likert, R. (1970). A Technique for the Measurement of Attitude. In Gene F. summer ed., *Attitude Measurement*. Chicago: Rand McNally
31. Lortie, D. C. (1975). *Schoolteacher: A sociological study*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press
32. Luthans, F. (2008). *Organizational Behaviour*. New Delhi: McGrawHill
33. Maslow, A. H. (1970). *Motivation and Personality*. New York: Harper and Row
34. McDaniel, C. D. & Gates, R. H. (2001). *Marketing Research Essential*. Thomson South-Western
35. Mcshane, St. L.; Glinor, M. A. V. & Sharma, R. R. (2006). *Organization Behaviour*. New Delhi: Tata McGraw Hill publication Ltd.
36. Odden, A. (2000a). New and better forms of teacher compensation are possible. *Phi Delta Kappan*, 81 (5), 361-66
37. Odden, A. (2000b). Paying Teachers for Performance. *School Business Affairs*, June, 28-31
38. Odden, A. (2001). Defining Merit. *Education Matters*, 1 (1), 16-24
39. Pastor, M. C. & Erlandson (1982). A Study of Higher Order Need Strength and Job Satisfaction in Secondary Public School Teachers. *Journal of Educational Administration*, 20 (Summer), 172-183
40. RS (2011), Reward System. Retrieved from [www.koalacat.com](http://www.koalacat.com).
41. Schermerhorn, J. R. Jr.; Hunt, J. G. & Osborn, R. N. (2006). *Organization Behaviour*. New York: John Wiley & Sons Inc.
42. Sekaran, U. (2003). *Research Methods for Business: A Skill Building Approach*. New York: John Wiley & Sons Inc.
43. Taljaard, J. J. (2003). Improving job performance by using non-monetary reward systems to motivate low-skilled workers in the automotive component industry. Retrieved from <http://www.nmmu.ac.za/documents/theses/TaljaardJJ.pdf> (January)
44. TFD (2011). Rewards. The Free Dictionary. Retrieved from <http://www.thefreedictionary.com/rewards>
45. Thomas, K. & Tymon, W. Jr. (2009). *Work Engagement Profile*. CPP Inc.
46. Thorpe, R. & Homan, G. (2000). *Strategic Reward Systems*. Essex: Pearson Education Ltd.
47. Tomlinson, H. (2000). Proposals for Performance Related Pay in English Schools. *School Leadership and Management*, 20 (3), 281-298
48. Zigon, J. (1998). Rewards and Performance Incentives. Retrieved from <http://zigonperf.com>.

