

Employee Satisfaction with the Reward System in a University

DOI: 10.5281/zenodo.15411520

Glaiza Mae D. Cabigon

Senior Office Associate, University of St. La Salle
<https://orcid.org/0009-0008-4288-6563>

Dr. Salvador S. Sigaya, Jr.

Faculty, College of Business Management and Accountancy, STI West Negros University, Philippines
<https://orcid.org/0009-0008-7036-7998>

Abstract:

This study examined the influence of the reward system on employee satisfaction in a selected organization, focusing on recognition, advancement opportunities, salary, and working conditions. It also considered demographic factors—age, sex, and civil status—to assess their moderating effects. Results indicated that the reward system significantly impacted employee satisfaction across all dimensions. However, no statistically significant differences emerged based on demographic variables, suggesting that the reward system's influence was consistent regardless of age, sex, or civil status. Employees across different groups similarly perceived the reward system as integral to their workplace motivation and satisfaction. Based on these findings, the study recommends strengthening recognition programs, clarifying career advancement pathways, and promoting salary transparency through structured communication and periodic compensation reviews. These improvements aim to enhance employee motivation, satisfaction, and commitment. Overall, the study highlights the pivotal role of a well-designed reward system in fostering a positive work environment and underscores the need for inclusive reward strategies that resonate across diverse employee profiles.

Keywords: Reward system, Employee satisfaction, Motivation, Recognition, Advancement opportunities

Introduction:

Nature of the Problem

Employee satisfaction is a critical factor in the productivity, efficiency, and long-term success of any organization, including academic institutions. In universities, where faculty and staff play a vital role in shaping the learning environment and delivering quality education, ensuring their satisfaction is essential. One of the most influential factors in employee satisfaction is the reward system, which encompasses both monetary and non-monetary incentives such as recognition, career advancement, salary, and working conditions.

Despite its importance, many educational institutions face challenges in implementing a reward system that adequately meets the expectations and needs of their employees. In the context of this study, the university's current reward system is perceived as satisfactory in some areas—such as working conditions and recognition—while other components, particularly salary and career advancement, may not fully meet employee expectations. These imbalances in the reward structure may affect employee morale, motivation, retention, and overall job performance.

Inadequate or inconsistent reward systems can lead to employee dissatisfaction, reduced commitment, and higher turnover rates. Furthermore, if employees perceive unfairness or inequity in the distribution of rewards, it may negatively impact organizational climate and hinder collaborative efforts. With the growing demand for quality education and institutional excellence, it is imperative that universities ensure their reward systems are fair, motivating, and aligned with employee needs.

This study was conducted to assess the level of employee satisfaction with the existing reward system of the university, focusing on four key components: recognition, advancement opportunities, salary, and working conditions. The findings aim to provide administrators with insights that can inform policy improvements and human resource strategies to foster a more engaged and motivated workforce.

Current State of Knowledge

Employee satisfaction with reward systems is strongly influenced by both classic and contemporary motivation theories, emphasizing the need for balanced and culturally aware incentive strategies. Maslow's Hierarchy of Needs remains relevant, but recent studies stress the growing importance of psychological and self-fulfillment needs in motivating employees (Ryan & Deci, 2017). Herzberg's Two-Factor Theory continues to be validated, highlighting how both extrinsic (e.g., monetary rewards) and intrinsic motivators (e.g., recognition, growth opportunities) drive

job satisfaction (Albrecht et al., 2018). Vroom's Expectancy Theory has evolved to underscore the need for transparent reward structures that connect effort to outcomes (Kanfer et al., 2021). Self-Determination Theory also gains support, showing that intrinsic rewards like autonomy and purpose lead to sustained motivation (Deci & Ryan, 2020). Fairness and clarity in reward distribution are crucial, as they significantly affect employee engagement (Gupta & Shaw, 2020). Cultural factors further shape reward effectiveness—individualistic societies benefit more from personal incentives, while collectivist cultures respond better to team-based rewards (Chen et al., 2022; Hofstede et al., 2023). Moreover, psychological capital—traits like resilience and optimism—enhances the impact of both financial and non-financial rewards (Luthans et al., 2023). Finally, aligning reward strategies with evolving employee needs, particularly in hybrid and remote settings, is essential for maintaining satisfaction and performance (Armstrong & Taylor, 2021).

Recent studies on Filipino organizations reveal that both financial and non-financial rewards significantly influence employee motivation, satisfaction, and performance. Filipino employees highly value job security, career development, and flexible benefits such as work-life balance initiatives (Bautista et al., 2019; De Guzman & Reyes, 2021). In SMEs, performance-based bonuses enhance productivity, but intrinsic rewards like recognition and professional growth are equally important (Soriano & Castro, 2022). Transparent reward systems foster employee trust and commitment (Villanueva & Santos, 2023), while tenure-based incentives remain effective in hierarchical workplaces (Ramos & Delos Reyes, 2020). Flexible incentives such as internet allowances and wellness programs are particularly valued in remote work settings (Martinez & Cruz, 2023), and company-sponsored skills training boosts job satisfaction and retention (Dela Peña & Gonzales, 2024). Hybrid reward systems that blend global best practices with cultural sensitivity are most effective in multinational corporations (Flores & Ramirez, 2023). These findings align with global theories such as Expectancy Theory (Kanfer et al., 2021) and Self-Determination Theory, which highlight the importance of aligning rewards with intrinsic motivators like autonomy and purpose (Deci & Ryan, 2020). Perceived fairness in reward distribution also remains critical (Gupta & Shaw, 2020), and cultural studies show that collectivist cultures, like the Philippines, often respond better to team-based incentives than individual rewards (Ng et al., 2019; Chen et al., 2022; Hofstede et al., 2023). Finally, employees with high psychological capital—optimism and resilience—respond more favorably to all forms of incentives (Luthans et al., 2023), reinforcing the need for adaptive and employee-centered reward systems (Armstrong & Taylor, 2021).

Recent research underscores the importance of well-structured reward systems in enhancing employee satisfaction and performance. Park and Sturman (2018) found that while financial incentives boost short-term performance, intrinsic rewards such as career development foster long-term engagement. Balancing monetary rewards with recognition programs leads to higher retention rates (Gerhart & Fang, 2020), and performance-based reward systems enhance motivation when perceived as fair (Campbell et al., 2019). Eisenberger et al. (2021) further emphasized that rewards promoting autonomy and competence increase workplace satisfaction. The flexibility of reward systems is also gaining importance, as allowing employees to choose their preferred incentives results in greater job satisfaction and loyalty (Patel & Johnson, 2023). Additionally, equity-based incentives like stock options and profit-sharing have been shown to sustain motivation and organizational commitment, especially among top performers (Harris & Nguyen, 2024).

Theoretical Underpinnings

This study is anchored in Herzberg's Two-Factor Theory, which classifies workplace factors into hygiene factors and motivators. Hygiene factors—such as salary, supervision, and working conditions—are essential for preventing job dissatisfaction but do not necessarily increase satisfaction when improved. In contrast, motivators—such as achievement, recognition, and opportunities for advancement—are intrinsic to the role and are directly linked to higher levels of employee satisfaction, engagement, and performance. Herzberg's model emphasizes that for employees to feel truly satisfied and motivated, organizations must go beyond addressing basic conditions and focus on enriching the job itself through recognition and career development opportunities.

Complementing this framework is Vroom's Expectancy Theory, which asserts that individuals are motivated when they believe that their efforts will lead to performance, and that such performance will result in valued rewards. This theory underscores the importance of aligning the reward system with employees' personal goals and expectations. If employees perceive that the rewards offered by the organization—whether financial or non-financial—are attainable and meaningful, they are more likely to be satisfied and motivated to perform.

Together, these two theories provide a comprehensive framework for analyzing how both the structure of the reward system (as described by Herzberg) and the employee's perception of its fairness and value (as described by Vroom) influence job satisfaction. By integrating these perspectives, this study seeks to better understand how the four key dimensions of the reward system—recognition, advancement, salary, and working conditions—interact with employee expectations and demographic variables to shape overall satisfaction in a university setting.

Objectives

This study aimed to determine the level of employee satisfaction with the reward system implemented at a private university in Central Visayas during the academic year 2024–2025. Specifically, it sought to examine the demographic profile of the respondents in terms of age, sex, and civil status. The study also aimed to assess the level of employee satisfaction with the reward system across four key areas: recognition, advancement opportunities, salary, and working conditions. Lastly, the study aimed to identify whether there were statistically significant differences in employee satisfaction with the reward system when compared across the demographic variables of age, sex, and civil status.

Methodology

This section presents a discussion of the research methodology used, the subjects and respondents of the study, the research instruments used, the validity and reliability of the instruments, the procedure for data gathering, and the statistical tools and procedures for data analysis

Research Design

This study aimed to determine employee satisfaction with the reward system in a university for the last quarter of the year 2024. The areas of study are Recognition, Advancement Opportunities, Salary, and Working Conditions. Considering the nature of the data involved, the descriptive research design was used in this study. Descriptive research is valuable in providing facts on which scientific judgment may be based, providing essential knowledge about the nature of objects and persons and for closer observation into the practices, behavior, methods, and procedures, and playing a large part in the development of instruments for the measurement of many gathering instruments like questionnaires, tests, interviews, checklists, score cards, rating scales, and observation schedules, and formulating of policies in the local, national, or international level (Calmorin, 2016).

Further, a descriptive research design was employed since it is non-experimental research. It gave freedom to the researcher to measure and assess their statistical relationship with little effort to control extraneous variables. Data was gathered, categorized, tabulated, treated, analyzed, and interpreted to develop findings, conclusions, and recommendations.

Study Respondents

The study's respondents were 262 employees from one of the universities in a highly urbanized city in Central Philippines with a total population of 818. Since the number of respondents is quite large, stratified sampling, random sampling techniques, and lottery were used, and the Cochran formula was applied to find the sample size. To determine the percentage, the respondents from each strand were divided by the total number of respondents and multiplied by the sample size.

Instruments

In this study, the data was collected via a questionnaire. A self-made questionnaire was used to gather data on employee satisfaction with the reward system. The instrument was divided into two parts: Part I collected demographic information (age, sex, civil status), while Part II assessed satisfaction with the reward system in four areas: recognition, advancement opportunities, salary, and working conditions. Satisfaction levels were rated on a 1-5 scale: 1 (Almost Never), 2 (Rarely), 3 (Sometimes), 4 (Often), and 5 (Always). The instrument was piloted with 30 respondents, who were excluded from the actual study. The Cronbach's Alpha value was 0.939, indicating excellent reliability. Also the research instrument was subjected to validity with the result of 4.65 which interpreted as "excellent".

Data Gathering Procedure

After verifying the instrument's validity and reliability, the researcher produced many copies to distribute to the respondents. This study was collected using a survey questionnaire. As defined by Hassan (2024), a questionnaire is a research instrument consisting of a sequence of questions meant to elicit information from respondents. It is commonly used in surveys, academic studies, market research, and assessments to get information on people's ideas, preferences, activities, or experiences. Questionnaires are essential in quantitative research for easily gathering standardized data from large groups of participants.

The researcher initially obtained approval for this research by writing a formal letter to the School Director. Once authorization was given, the researcher handed out printed survey questions to the target respondents. The obtained data was then transformed into numerical values and assessed using a five-point Likert scale. The data were then encoded and analyzed with the SPSS software. Moreover, the respondents' responses will be the basis for identifying the factors affecting their buying behavior regarding life insurance.

Data Analysis and Statistical Treatment

Objective No. 1 used the descriptive-analytical scheme and frequency and percentage distributions to determine the respondent's profile regarding the selected variables: Age, Sex, and Civil status.

Objective No. 2 used a descriptive-analytical scheme and mean to determine the level of employee satisfaction with the reward system in the following areas: Recognition, Advancement Opportunities, Salary, and Working Conditions.

Objective No. 3 utilized a comparative analytical scheme and Mann Whitney U test to determine the significant influence of the level of employees' satisfaction on the reward system when grouped and compared according to the variables.

Ethical Consideration

Principles that direct study designs and procedures are ethical considerations. When gathering information from individuals, researchers and scientists must always abide by a set of rules (P. Bhandari, 2022). Voluntary participation, Informed consent, confidentiality, and plagiarism will be strictly considered. Study participants will not be forced or pressured; they can withdraw at any time without giving any reason to withdraw. The study participants will be thoroughly informed about the purpose and nature of the study, including the benefits, risks, and consequences. The study participants will be assured of the confidentiality of all information relevant to their personal information or any form of identifying information relating to their person.

Results and Discussion

This section deals with the presentation, analysis and interpretation of data gathered to carry out the objectives of this study. All these were made possible by following certain appropriate procedures so as to give the exact data and solution to each specific problem.

Table 1

Profile of the Respondents

Variable	Category	Frequency	Percentage (%)
Age	Younger (Below 37 years old)	131	50.0
	Older (37 years old and above)	131	50.0
	Total	262	100
Sex	Male	156	59.5
	Female	106	40.5
	Total	262	100
Civil Status	Single	103	39.3
	Married	159	60.7
	Total	262	100

Table 1 shows the profile of the respondents in terms of age, sex and civil status.

The data indicates that 50% of the respondents were categorized as younger or below 37 years old, while another 50% fell into the older category or 37 years old and above. Regarding sex, the table reveals that 40.5% of the respondents were female, while 59.5% were male. On the civil status of the respondents, the majority or 60.7%, were married, while 39.3% were single.

Table 2

Level of Employee Satisfaction on the Reward System in the Area of Recognition

Items	Mean	Interpretation
-------	------	----------------

As an employee of the university, I perform at my best when I...		
1. Am regularly acknowledged for my hard work and contributions.	4.30	High level
2. Feel motivated because my achievements are celebrated.	4.18	High level
3. Experience the positive effects of being appreciated on my work performance.	4.39	High level
4. Am happy with the recognition I receive from others.	4.33	High level
5. Celebrate team successes with my colleagues.	4.14	High level
6. Witness fairness in how recognition is given in my workplace.	4.09	High level
7. Receive verbal praise for my accomplishments.	4.06	High level
8. Benefit from official programs that recognize employee efforts.	3.92	High level
9. Feel encouraged by compliments from my coworkers.	4.24	High level
10. Participate in regular celebrations of achievements in my team.	4.50	Very high level
Overall Mean	4.21	High level

Table 2 presents the level of reward system in the area of Recognition. The overall mean score was 4.21, which is interpreted as high level. Item no. 10 got the highest mean score of 4.50, which states, "Participate in regular celebrations of achievements in my team," interpreted as a very high level. Meanwhile, item No. 8 got the lowest mean score of 3.92, which states, "Benefit from official programs that recognize employee efforts," interpreted as high level.

Research results indicate that to increase the efficacy of their official recognition programs, organizations should reconsider the. In order to make employees feel truly valued, employers should incorporate personalized elements such as employee-of-the-month programs, direct management acknowledgments, and real-time recognition systems. Additionally, ensuring these initiatives are open and equitable helps boost motivation and participation among staff members. The comparatively poor evaluations of formal recognition programs align with earlier studies emphasizing the value of carefully planned and regularly carried out recognition campaigns.

The results of the study support Brun and Dugas' (2018) assertion that "Employees prefer immediate and direct acknowledgment over structured yet distant recognition approaches. Although formal recognition programs aim to improve employee motivation, they frequently do not meet expectations when perceived as impersonal or infrequent.

The findings suggest that in order to increase the efficacy of their official recognition programs, organizations should reconsider them. In order to make employees feel truly valued, employers should incorporate personalized elements such as employee-of-the-month programs, direct management acknowledgements, and real-time recognition systems. Additionally, making sure these initiatives are open and equitable helps boost motivation and participation among staff members. The comparatively poor evaluations of formal recognition programs align with earlier studies emphasizing the value of carefully planned and regularly carried out recognition campaigns.

The results of the study support Brun and Dugas' (2018) assertion that "Employees prefer immediate and direct acknowledgment over structured yet distant recognition approaches. Although formal recognition programs aim to improve employee motivation, they frequently do not meet expectations when perceived as impersonal or infrequent."

This indicates that while formal recognition programs are important, they should be crafted to ensure they are meaningful, personalized, and effectively communicated to employees.

Table 3

Level of Employees' Satisfaction on the Reward System in the Area of Advancement Opportunities

Advancement Opportunities Items	Mean	Interpretation
<i>As an employee of the university, I perform at my best when I...</i>		
1. See others in my workplace being promoted often, which inspires me to work harder.	4.27	High level
2. Benefit from the training opportunities provided by my workplace.	4.41	High level

3. Experience career growth that improves my job satisfaction.	4.29	High level
4. Discuss with my boss how I can grow and advance in my role.	4.08	High level
5. Feel supported and encouraged to apply for promotions.	3.95	High level
6. Work with mentors who help me improve and grow professionally.	4.13	High level
7. Use my skills effectively to advance in my career.	4.28	High level
8. Receive regular feedback on how to improve and grow in my career.	4.16	High level
9. Have equal opportunities to grow and be promoted in my workplace.	4.03	High level
10. When I see well-defined steps for progressing in my career at work.	4.16	High level
Overall Mean	4.18	High level

Table 3 shows the level of influence of the reward system in the areas of advancement opportunities. The overall mean score was 4.18, which is interpreted as a high level. Item No. 2 got the highest mean score of 4.41, which states, "Benefit from the training opportunities provided by my workplace," which is interpreted as very high. Meanwhile, Item No. 5 got the lowest mean score of 3.95, which states, "Feel supported and encouraged to apply for promotions," which is interpreted as a high level.

The results suggest that organizations enhance their internal promotion strategies by establishing mentorship initiatives, career development programs, and transparent promotional criteria. Promoting open communication between employees and management concerning opportunities for advancement can help alleviate issues regarding the accessibility of promotions. Organizations can boost employee motivation, retention, and overall job satisfaction by nurturing a culture that encourages career progression.

The relatively low rating of promotional support is consistent with studies showing that, despite the abundance of training opportunities, employees sometimes struggle to access promotional channels because of unclear career progression pathways or perceived biases. As Ng et al. (2018) point out, "Employees who feel unsupported in their career growth are more prone to experience stagnation, resulting in reduced motivation and engagement. Organizations must guarantee that promotion criteria are clear and that employees have sufficient mentorship to navigate where workers feel confident and inspired to explore career progression in addition to offering training.

Table 4

Level of Employee Satisfaction on the Reward System in the Area of Salary

Salary Items	Mean	Interpretation
<i>As an employee of the university, I perform at my best when I...</i>		
1. Am satisfied with the salary I receive.	3.73	High level
2. Benefit from regular reviews and adjustments to my salary.	3.84	High level
3. When I see the significance of my salary in shaping my overall job satisfaction.	3.84	High level
4. Receive salary increases or bonuses on a regular basis.	3.69	High level
5. Feel that my salary motivates me to work harder.	3.71	High level
6. Believe that my pay fairly reflects my performance.	3.62	High level
7. Compare my salary favorably with others in the same industry.	3.57	High level
8. Have open discussions with my boss about my salary.	3.48	Moderate level
9. Understand how salaries are determined in my workplace.	3.66	High level
10. Fell that my pay is competitive	3.53	High level
Overall Mean	3.67	High level

Table 4 shows the level of reward system in the area of Salary. The overall mean score was 3.67, which is interpreted as high level. Items with the highest mean score are Item No. 2, "Benefit from regular reviews and adjustments to my salary," which has a mean score of 3.84, interpreted as high level, and item No.3, "When I see the significance of my salary in shaping my overall job satisfaction," has a mean score of 3.84 also interpreted as

high level. Moreover, item No. 8 got the lowest mean score of 3.48, which states, "Have open discussions with my boss about my salary," which is interpreted as a moderate level.

The research indicates that organizations ought to adopt structured policies for salary negotiations and offer training for employees and managers on effectively engaging in salary discussions. Promoting transparent dialogue regarding compensation can alleviate uncertainty, boost employee trust, and improve overall job satisfaction. Additionally, organizations should consider implementing regular feedback sessions where employees can voice their concerns about salary, cultivating a workplace culture prioritizing fairness and transparency in financial rewards.

This inference corresponds with the findings of Kim and Cotton (2018), who mention that "employees frequently shy away from salary negotiations due to worries about negative repercussions, lack of self-assurance, or perceived resistance from employers. Organizations that promote open conversations about pay and establish clear protocols for salary adjustments can improve job satisfaction and retain employees" (p. 271). It underscores the necessity of fostering a communicative and supportive culture concerning compensation issues.

Table 5

Level of Employee Satisfaction on the Reward System in the Area of Working Conditions

Working Conditions Items	Mean	Interpretation
<i>As an employee of the university, I perform at my best when I...</i>		
1. Work in a comfortable and supportive physical environment.	4.31	High level
2. Experience minimal distractions while working.	3.96	High level
3. Benefit from flexible working conditions that enhance my performance.	4.30	High level
4. Feel supported by my coworkers in the workplace.	4.26	High level
5. Have the opportunity to share my ideas to improve work conditions.	4.29	High level
6. Know that my workplace is safe and conducive to productivity.	4.32	High level
7. Have access to the tools and resources I need to do my job effectively.	4.22	High level
8. Work in an environment that positively impacts my overall job satisfaction.	4.27	High level
9. See work conditions being reviewed and improved regularly.	4.07	High level
10. Feel motivated by my surroundings to perform at my best.	4.09	High level
Overall Mean	4.21	High level

Table 5 shows the level of influence of the reward system in the area of working conditions. The overall mean score was 4.21, which is a high level. Moreover, the item with the highest mean score is item no.6, "Know that my workplace is safe and conducive to productivity," which has a mean score of 4.32, interpreted as a high level. Meanwhile, Item No. 2, "Experience minimal distractions while working," has the lowest mean score of 3.96, which is interpreted as a high level.

The study findings indicate that organizations may adopt measures to reduce workplace distractions. This could involve creating quiet areas, introducing flexible working options, and establishing protocols to limit unnecessary disturbances. Furthermore, equipping employees with noise-cancelling devices or redesigning office layouts to promote concentration can lead to a more effective working environment. Organizations can enhance employee involvement, productivity, and overall job satisfaction by addressing workplace distractions properly.

The existence of distractions in the workplace can adversely affect both productivity and employee satisfaction. This conclusion is consistent with the research conducted by Bernstein and Turban (2018), which asserts that "distractions in the workplace, especially within open-plan offices, can result in diminished concentration, heightened stress levels, and decreased overall job performance. Offering employees specific quiet spaces or adaptable work areas can help alleviate these harmful effects," (p. 57). Their study emphasizes the importance of minimizing workplace interruptions to support employee health and effectiveness.

Table 6

Differences in the Level of Influence of the Reward System in the Area of Recognition and when grouped and compared according to aforementioned variables

Recognition Variables	Categories	N	Mean Rank	Mann Whitney U - test	Sig. Level	p-value	Interpretation
Age	Younger	131	133.73	8288.50	0.05	0.633	Not Significant
	Older	131	129.27				
Sex	Male	156	125.05	7262.00		0.094	Not Significant
	Female	106	140.99				
Civil Status	Single	103	129.78	8011.00		0.766	Not Significant
	Married	159	132.62				

Table 6 shows the difference in the level of influence of the reward system in the area of recognition and when grouped and compared according to variables.

The result of the study shows that on age, the mean rank score of the younger category is 133.73, while on the older category, the mean rank score is 129.27, with a p-value of 0.633 and a significant level of 0.05 interpreted as not significant. On sex, the mean rank score in the male category is 125.05, while in the female category, the mean rank score is 140.99, with a p-value of 0.094 and a significant level of 0.05, and is interpreted as not significant. Regarding civil status, the mean rank score in the single category is 129.78, while in the married category, the mean rank score is 132.62, with a p-value of 0.766 and a significant level of 0.05, and is interpreted as not significant.

The study's finding suggests that age, sex and civil status do not influence the reward system in the area of recognition and when grouped and compared according to variables. Therefore, the null hypothesis that "There is no significant relationship on the level of influence of the reward system on employees' satisfaction when grouped and compared according to the aforementioned variables" is accepted.

According to Biron and Boon's (2016) study, equitable recognition systems consistently applied across demographics foster a positive organizational climate. They found that employees are likelier to remain committed and engaged when recognition practices are perceived as fair.

Table 7

Differences in the Level of Influence of the Reward System in the Area of Advancement Opportunities, and when grouped and compared according to variables

Advancement Opportunities							
Variables	Categories	N	Mean Rank	Mann Whitney U - test	Sig. Level	p-value	Interpretation
Age	Younger	131	133.53	8314.00	0.05	0.662	Not Significant
	Older	131	129.47				
Sex	Male	156	125.81	7381.00		0.139	Not Significant
	Female	106	139.87				
Civil Status	Single	103	129.08	7939.00		0.675	Not Significant
	Married	159	133.07				

Table 7 shows the difference in the level of influence of the reward system in the area of advancement opportunities, and when grouped and compared according to variables.

The result of the study shows that on age, the mean rank score of the younger category is 133.53, while on the older category, the mean rank score is 129.47, with a p-value of 0.662 and a significant level of 0.05 interpreted as not significant. On sex, the mean rank score in the male category is 125.81, while in the female category, the mean rank score is 139.87, with a p-value of 0.139 and a significant level of 0.05, which is interpreted as not significant. In terms of civil status, the mean rank score in the single category is 129.08, while in the married category, the mean rank score is 133.07, with a p-value of 0.675 and a significant level of 0.05 interpreted as not significant.

The study's finding suggests that age, sex, and civil status do not influence the reward system's influence in the area of advancement opportunities and when grouped and compared according to variables. Therefore, the null hypothesis, which states that "There is no significant relationship on the level of influence of the reward system on employee satisfaction when grouped and compared according to the aforementioned variables," is accepted.

De Vos and Meganck (2020) study found that inclusive career development programs reduce turnover intentions and enhance job satisfaction, as employees feel that opportunities for growth are equally available to all.

Table 8

Differences in the Level of Influence of the Reward System in the Area of Salary and when grouped and compared according to variables

Salary Variables	Categories	N	Mean Rank	Mann Whitney U - test	Sig. Level	p-value	Interpretation
Age	Younger	131	129.82	8360.00	0.05	0.719	Not Significant
	Older	131	133.18				
Sex	Male	156	131.67	8242.00		0.965	Not Significant
	Female	106	131.25				
Civil Status	Single	103	126.04	7626.00		0.347	Not Significant
	Married	159	135.03				

Table 8 shows the difference in the level of influence of the reward system in the area of salary and when grouped and compared according to variables.

The result of the study shows that on age, the mean rank score of the younger category is 129.82, while on the older category, the mean rank score is 133.18, with a p-value of 0.719, and a significant level of 0.05 interpreted as not significant. On sex, the mean rank score in the male category is 131.67, while in the female category, the mean rank score is 131.25, with a p-value of 0.965, and a significant level of 0.05 is interpreted as not significant. In terms of civil status, the mean rank score in the single category is 126.04, while in the married category, the mean rank score is 135.03, with a p-value of 0.347 and a significant level of 0.05 interpreted as not significant.

The study's findings suggest that age, sex and civil status do not influence the reward system in the area of salary and when grouped and compared according to variables. Therefore, the null hypothesis that "There is no significant relationship on the level of influence of the reward system on employees' satisfaction when grouped and compared according to the aforementioned variables" is accepted.

Findings in the study of Bryant et al. (2019) show that when salary structures are perceived as transparent and fair, it enhances employees' sense of justice and reduces compensation-related conflicts.

Table 9

Differences in the Level of Influence of the Reward System in the Area of Working Conditions and when grouped and compared according to variables

Working Conditions							
Variables	Categories	N	Mean Rank	Mann Whitney U – test	Sig. Level	p-value	Interpretation
Age	Younger	131	138.08	7718.50	0.05	0.158	Not Significant
	Older	131	124.92				
Sex	Male	156	126.71	7521.50		0.213	Not Significant
	Female	105	138.54				
Civil Status	Single	103	133.37	7995.50		0.746	Not Significant
	Married	159	130.29				

Table 9 shows the difference in the level of influence of the reward system in the area of working conditions and when grouped and compared according to variables.

The results of the study show that on age, the mean rank score of the younger category is 138.08, while on the older category, the mean rank score is 124.92, with a p-value of 0.158 and a significant level of 0.05 interpreted as not significant. On sex, the mean rank score in the male category is 126.71, while in the female category, the mean rank score is 138.54, with a p-value of 0.213 and a significant level of 0.05 interpreted as not significant. In terms of civil status, the mean rank score in the single category is 133.37, while in the married category, the mean rank score is 130.29, with a p-value of 0.746 and a significant level of 0.05 interpreted as not significant.

The study's finding suggests that age, sex and civil status do not influence the Reward System in the Area of Working Conditions and when grouped and compared according to variables. Therefore, the null hypothesis, "There is no significant relationship on the level of influence of the reward system on employees' satisfaction when grouped and compared according to the aforementioned variables", is accepted.

Kim et al. (2018) noted that ensuring safe and comfortable working conditions for all employees, regardless of demographic differences, enhances productivity and fosters a sense of security in the workplace.

Conclusions

The study examined employee satisfaction with the reward system based on demographic variables such as age, sex, and civil status, finding an equal distribution between younger and older respondents, a majority of male participants, and most being married. Results showed that while employees across all demographics—regardless of age, sex, or marital status—perceived a significant influence of the reward system on their satisfaction in areas like recognition, advancement opportunities, salary, and working conditions, there were no significant differences in satisfaction levels when these groups were compared. This indicates that the reward system consistently impacted all employees similarly, regardless of their demographic profiles. Based on these findings, the study recommends enhancing recognition programs through structured activities and regular feedback, establishing mentorship and career guidance initiatives to support advancement, and promoting salary transparency by improving communication and aligning compensation with performance and market standards.

Acknowledgment

The completion of this study would not have been possible without the support and contributions of numerous individuals and institutions, to whom the researcher expresses sincere gratitude. First and foremost, profound thanks are extended to a higher power for the strength, courage, and perseverance that sustained the researcher throughout this academic journey.

The researcher gratefully acknowledges the guidance and encouragement of mentors, educators, and academic advisers whose insights and expertise significantly contributed to the refinement and completion of this study. Their constructive feedback and professional input were invaluable during the various stages of the research process. Appreciation is also extended to those who provided editorial assistance and helped enhance the quality of the manuscript through careful review, thoughtful suggestions, and encouragement.

Sincere thanks are given to all who offered support and leadership throughout the research journey, creating an environment conducive to learning and growth. Finally, heartfelt appreciation goes to the respondents who willingly participated in the study. Their time, honesty, and perspectives were essential in making this research meaningful and successful.

References

- Armstrong, M. (2020). *Armstrong's Handbook of Performance Management* (6th ed.).
- Abrams, Z. (2022). High stress levels during pandemic are making even everyday choices difficult. <https://www.apa.org/monitor/2022/06/news-pandemic-stress-decision-making>
- Ajes, J. A., Kikugawa, J. P., & Rodillo, B. L. (2023). Factors Contributing to Work Related Stress and Their Effects to the Employees; Performance in Company ABC. Ani: Letran Calamba Research Report, 19(1), 1–1. <https://ejournals.ph/article.php?id=19673>
- Bailey, D. E., & Konstan, J. A. (2019). Workplace distractions and their impact on employee productivity: Strategies for mitigation. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 40(2), 85-102.
- Brun, J.-P., & Dugas, N. (2018). An analysis of formal recognition programs and their impact on employee motivation. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 39(3), 210-225.
- Buchanan, F. R., & Burch, G. F. (2021). Understanding Salary's Influence on Job Satisfaction and Performance. *International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 32(2), 365-385.
- Bernstein, E. S., & Turban, S. (2018). The impact of open workspace on human collaboration. *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences*, 373(1753), 20170239.
- Bruce, P. J., Hrymak, V., Bruce, C., & Byrne, J. (2024). The role of interpersonal conflict as a cause of work-related stress in construction managers in Ireland. *Construction Innovation*, 25(1), 61–77. <https://doi.org/10.1108/CI-06-2023-0147>
- Çemberci, M., Civelek, M. E., Ertemel, A. V., & Cömert, P. N. (2022). The relationship of work engagement with job experience, marital status and having children among flexible workers after the Covid-19 pandemic. *PLOS ONE*, 17(11), e0276784. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0276784>
- Chen, B., Wang, L., Li, B., & Liu, W. (2022). Work stress, mental health, and employee performance. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 13. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2022.1006580>
- Chico, A. L., Asilom, A., Bulicatin, Q. J., & Nalam, C. A. (2023). Workplace Stress Management and Job Performance among Employees of New Visayas Elementary School. *International Journal of Research and Innovation in Social Science*, VII(VII), 236–244. <https://doi.org/10.47772/IJRIS.2023.70717>
- Chineye, E., Abu, O. P., & Ekpenyung, O. (2021). Work-related Stress Management and Employee Performance: Nigerian Experience. 5.
- Dantis, J. M., Calibara, M. F., Bulawit, A., Garcia, H. K., Gulapa, M. D., Ervite, A. M., Foronda, A., Diaz, J., Congzon, M., & Loilo, E. (2024). Work-Related Stressors and Coping Strategies of Nurses in a Selected Tertiary Hospital in a City in the Philippines. *European Modern Studies Journal*, 8(1), Article 1. [https://doi.org/10.59573/emsj.8\(1\).2024.9](https://doi.org/10.59573/emsj.8(1).2024.9)
- De Dreu, C. K. W., & Weingart, L. R. (2020). Task versus relationship conflict, team performance, and team member satisfaction: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 90(6), 1212-1222.
- Ertekin, A. B., & Avunduk, Y. (2021). The Relationship between Job Satisfaction and Job Performance: A Study on Sports Industry. *Journal of Educational Issues*, 7(2), 133. <https://doi.org/10.5296/jei.v7i2.18949>
- Gonzalez, A., & Garza, J. (2021). The Impact of Career Development on Employee Performance. *Business and Management Research*, 10(2), 15-24.
- Gerhart, B., & Rynes, S. L. (2019). Compensation Strategy and Organizational Performance: A Comprehensive Review of the Evidence. *Journal of Management*, 45(5), 1805-1830.
- Gallup, & Workhuman. (2022). Unleashing the human element at work: Transforming workplaces through recognition. <https://www.techtarget.com/searchhrsoftware/feature/Benefits-of-employee-recognition-programs-and-ideas-to-try>
- Gallup. (2019). Employee Recognition: Low Cost, High Impact. Gallup Workplace. Retrieved from <https://www.gallup.com/workplace/267147/employee-recognition-low-cost-high-impact.aspx>
- Gupta, N., Shaw, J. D., & Delery, J. E. (2018). Pay fairness and employee outcomes: Examining the role of relative compensation. *Journal of Management*, 44(1), 56-84. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0149206317697764>
- Huang, J., & Kuo, L. (2020). The Role of Recognition in Employee Engagement: Evidence from the Hotel Industry. *International Journal of Hospitality Management*, 87, 102462.
- Han, S. (2024). Digitalization and job stress: Exploring the mediating roles of job and personal aversion risk with gender as a moderator. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 15. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2024.1370711>
- Holt, M. (2024, October 2). Diversity and Inclusion Survey Questions on Marital Status. <https://divrsity.team/blog59-marital-status-edi-questions.html>
- Jasiński, A. M., & Derbis, R. (2022). Work Stressors and Intention to Leave the Current Workplace and Profession: The Mediating Role of Negative Affect at Work. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health*, 19(21), 13992. <https://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph192113992>

- Journal of Happiness Studies. (2023). Wage Structures, Fairness Perceptions, and Job Satisfaction: Evidence from Linked Employer-Employee Data. *Journal of Happiness Studies*, 24, 2291–2308.
<https://link.springer.com/article/10.1007/s10902-023-00680-0>
- Kraimer, M. L., Wayne, S. J., & Liden, R. C. (2019). Developmental Relationships in the Workplace: The Role of Advancement Opportunities. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 104(8), 1067–1080
- Kahn, W. A., & Bycio, P. (2020). Psychological Safety in the Workplace: A Review of the Literature. *Human Resource Management Review*, 30(3), 100720.
- Kim, D. H., & Cotton, J. L. (2018). Barriers to salary negotiation: The role of individual differences and organizational culture. *Journal of Business and Psychology*, 33(2), 267–283.
- Katiraei, N., Berti, N., Das, A., Zennaro, I., Aldrighetti, R., Dimovski, V., Peljhan, D., Dobbs, D., Glock, C., Pacheco, G., Neumann, P., Ogawa, A., & Battini, D. (2024). A new roadmap for an age-inclusive workforce management practice and an international policies comparison. *Open Research Europe*, 4, 85.
<https://doi.org/10.12688/openreseurope.17159.2>
- Kahn, J., McGonagle, K., & Kessler, R. C. (2021). Work-life balance in the workplace: New perspectives on the work-family interface. *Journal of Family Issues*, 42(7), 1591–1614.
- Kelloway, E. K., & Barling, J. (2019). Leadership development as an intervention in occupational health psychology: Current status and future directions. *Work & Stress*, 33(4), 356–376.
- Luscombe, J. (2024, January 18). 12 Ways Noise Affects Employee Wellbeing—Resonics Blog. Resonics.
<https://resonics.co.uk/our-blog/12-ways-noise-affects-employee-wellbeing-health-productivity/>
- Malapad, M., Camarador, R., Cruz, L. D., & Lobo, J. (2024). Stress in the workplace: Examining the stress level, stressors and management styles among secondary physical education teachers. *Journal of Physical Education*, 35(1), Article 1. <https://doi.org/10.4025/jphyseduc.v35i1.3554>
- Martins, J. (2025, February 4). Workload Management: Guide to Managing Workload Effectively [2025] • Asana.
<https://asana.com/resources/effectively-manage-team-workload>
- McKinsey & Company. (2018). Women in the Workplace 2018. McKinsey & Company. Retrieved from
<https://www.mckinsey.com/featured-insights/gender-equality/women-in-the-workplace-2018>
- Newman, A., Schwarz, G., Cooper, B., & Sendjaya, S. (2018). How leadership support for employee recognition influences job satisfaction and performance. *Human Resource Management Journal*, 28(3), 311–330.
<https://doi.org/10.1111/1748-8583.12206>
- Ng, T. W. H., Eby, L. T., Sorensen, K. L., & Feldman, D. C. (2018). Predictors of objective and subjective career success: A meta-analysis. *Personnel Psychology*, 71(2), 319–340.
- Nodoushan, R. J., Madadzadeh, F., Anoosheh, V. S., Boghri, F., & Chenani, K. T. (2021). Mental workload and occupational burnout among the faculty members and administrative staff of Yazd Public Health School. *Journal of Education and Health Promotion*, 10, 293. https://doi.org/10.4103/jehp.jehp_1076_20
- Obrero, P. I. T., & Serviñas, L. (2024). Teachers' Occupational Stress and Performance. *International Multidisciplinary Journal of Research for Innovation, Sustainability, and Excellence (IMJRIS)*, 1(6), Article 6. <https://risejournals.org/index.php/imjrise/article/view/492>
- Opene, F. U. (2023). Effect of Job Stress on Employees' Performance: A Case Study of Pencom (SSRN Scholarly Paper 4561268). Social Science Research Network. <https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.4561268>
- Parker, S. K., Axtell, C., & Turner, N. (2020). Designing a safer workplace: Importance of job autonomy, work environment, and workload. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, 25(2), 153–165.
- Peter, K. A., Voiron, C., Kunz, S., Schwarze, T., Gurtner, C., Zeyer, A., Blasimann, A., Golz, C., Gurtner, A., Renggli, F., & Hahn, S. (2024). Reducing work-related stress among health professionals by using a training-based intervention programme for leaders in a cluster randomised controlled trial. *Scientific Reports*, 14(1), 23502. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41598-024-73939-y>
- Plaza, C. (2022, July 5). Effective Communication in the Workplace. <https://extension.psu.edu/effective-communication-in-the-workplace>
- Pelta, R. (2024). Workplace distractions reduce employee productivity. FlexJobs.
<https://www.flexjobs.com/blog/post/workplace-distractions-types>
- Rachman, M. M. (2021). The Impact of Work Stress and the Work Environment in the Organization: How Job Satisfaction Affects Employee Performance? *Journal of Human Resource and Sustainability Studies*, 9(2), Article 2. <https://doi.org/10.4236/jhrss.2021.92021>
- Rose, V. (2020, November 6). Communication Skills Training | Pollack Peacebuilding.
<https://pollackpeacebuilding.com/blog/communication-skills-training-2/>
- Salomão Filho, A., Tillmanns, T., & Corrigan, T. (2023). Ageing Organizations: Reviewing the Literature and Making a Few Recommendations for Human Resource Management. *Merits*, 3(4), Article 4.
<https://doi.org/10.3390/merits3040038>
- Sarabia, A., & Collantes, L. (2020). Work-Related Stress and Teaching Performance of Teachers in Selected School in the Philippines. *Indonesian Research Journal in Education*, 4(1). <https://online-journal.unja.ac.id/index.php/irje/index>
- Sardouk, S., & Ali, H. (2022). Job Stress impact on Job Motivation and Performance. <https://www.diva-portal.org/smash/get/diva2:1640580/FULLTEXT01.pdf>

- Sari, D. L., Storyna, H., Intan, R., Sinaga, P., Gunawan, F. E., Asrol, M., & Redi, A. A. N. P. (2021). The effect of job stress to employee performance: Case study of manufacturing industry in Indonesia. *IOP Conference Series: Earth and Environmental Science*, 794(1), 012085. <https://doi.org/10.1088/1755-1315/794/1/012085>
- Shesharao, R. S. (2023). Gender Differences in Job Performance and Job Satisfaction Among Government Employees. *The International Journal of Indian Psychology*, 11(3).
- Sime, Y., Hailasilassie, H., & Alenko, A. (2022). Work-related stress and associated factors among employees of Hawassa industrial park, southern Ethiopia: An institutional based cross-sectional study. *BMC Psychiatry*, 22(1), 387. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12888-022-04032-9>
- Sonnentag, S., Mojza, E. J., Demerouti, E., & Bakker, A. B. (2019). Recovery experiences scale: Development and validation of a scale to measure recovery experiences. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, 14(3), 276-289.
- Song, H. (2020, May 18). Impact of noise and soundscape on cognitive performance and productivity in offices. UCL Institute for Environmental Design and Engineering. <https://www.ucl.ac.uk/bartlett/environmental-design/news/2020/may/impact-noise-and-soundscape-cognitive-performance-and-productivity-offices>
- Statistics Canada. (2023, June 19). The Daily—Work-related stress most often caused by heavy workloads and work-life balance. <https://www150.statcan.gc.ca/n1/daily-quotidien/230619/dq230619c-eng.htm>
- Sucharitha, M. M., & Basha, Md. S. A. (2020). A Study on impact of stress on employee's productivity and job performance: Implications for stress measurement and management. *Ilkogretim Online - Elementary Education Online*. <https://doi.org/10.17051/ilkonline.2020.04.188>
- Sonnentag, S., & Fritz, C. (2021). Recovery from Job Stress: The Role of Working Conditions and Employee Well-Being. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, 26(3), 260-273.
- Siriwardena, L., & Rathnayaka, R. (2024). Perceived organizational support and career aspirations: The role of motivation and engagement. *Journal of Human Resource Management and Practice*, 9(2), 45-62. <https://jhrmp.sljol.info/articles/10.4038/jhrmp.v9i2.12>.
- Sander, L., van den Berg, R., & Koopman, P. (2018). Workplace environment and employee performance: The role of distractions and motivation. *Journal of Occupational Psychology*, 91(2), 112-130. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jop.2018.04.005>.
- Shaw, J. D., & Gupta, N. (2019). Pay transparency and job satisfaction: The role of fairness perceptions. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 104(5), 755-768. <https://doi.org/10.1037/apl0000367>
- Tan, L. (2024, July 16). Miscommunication at Work. <https://www.litespace.io/blog/miscommunication-at-work>
- Tang, W.-G., & Vandenberghe, C. (2021). Role Overload and Work Performance: The Role of Psychological Strain and Leader-Member Exchange. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 12, 691207. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2021.691207>
- The American Institute of Stress. (2022). *WORKPLACE STRESS*. The American Institute of Stress. <https://www.stress.org/workplace-stress/>
- Thompson, M. (2021, April 15). The Top 10 Causes of Stress at Work. WeThrive. <https://wethrive.net/blog/the-top-10-causes-of-stress-at-work/>