



Working together
www.rcis.ro

Revista de Cercetare si Interventie Sociala

ISSN: 1583-3410 (print), ISSN: 1584-5397 (electronic)

THE RELATIVE INFLUENCE OF TOTAL REWARD ON RETENTION OF HUMAN RESOURCES

Elena-Sabina TURNEA, Adriana PRODAN

Revista de cercetare și intervenție socială, 2020, vol. 69, pp. 79-95

<https://doi.org/10.33788/rcis.69.5>

Published by:
Expert Projects Publishing House



On behalf of:
„Alexandru Ioan Cuza” University,
Department of Sociology and Social Work
and
HoltIS Association

REVISTA DE CERCETARE SI INTERVENTIE SOCIALA
is indexed by Clarivate Analytics (Social Sciences Citation Index),
SCOPUS and CROSSREF

The Relative Influence of Total Reward on Retention of Human Resources

Elena-Sabina TURNEA¹, Adriana PRODAN²

Abstract

After reviewing the literature on the concept of total reward and human resource behaviour desired by organisations, this study suggests a model of total reward for retaining human resources in organisations grounded on the WorldatWork model of the research group at A&M Texas University (Boswell *et al.*, 2011). Study participants were the employees, master and doctoral students from Iasi, Romania. The study was conducted to find out the preferred organisational rewards among respondents in employment interviews (for attraction into organisations), and after employment (for retention into organisations). Also, the questions included in the questionnaire referred only to rewards practised in Romania, which are in compliance with the legislation on force. The designed questionnaire was pre-tested twice: in April and December of 2014 (Hodor, 2015), and was significantly modified. The study results show the fact that the variables that compose total reward – compensation (C), granted benefits (B), personal and professional life balance (WLB), performance and recognition (P & R), career opportunities and development (O & D) – become important after the moment of employment. Also, the study reveals that work-life-balance has the highest importance in human resources' retention. Additionally, the presence of such rewards as remuneration, benefits, performance and recognition influences the decision to remain in the organization. In this paper are also presented other synthetic results of the entire study completed in 2017.

Keywords: remuneration, benefits, work-life balance, performance and recognition, development and career opportunities, attraction, retention

¹ Alexandru Ioan Cuza University of Iași, Department of Management, Marketing and Business Administration, Iași, ROMANIA. E-mail: sabina.turnea@uaic.ro

² Alexandru Ioan Cuza University of Iași, Department of Management, Marketing and Business Administration, Iași, ROMANIA. E-mail: pada@uaic.ro

Introduction

Total reward is a rarely encountered human resource management process in Romanian entrepreneurial practice. The companies utilising this concept are usually registered as joint stock companies with foreign investors. There are always cases when smaller-sized companies provide organisational rewards to employees monitoring the coherence and cohesiveness of these rewards, and making sure that they reach the goals of a total reward. In such companies, company managers apply total reward without understanding it.

In theory, the usefulness of this specialised term and its application to total reward management through various models specific to public and private environment has been proven. The studies though show that to obtain total reward in organisations, each time a complicated methodology is designed that incurs costs both for researchers (in terms of time, transportation, costs related to the distribution of questionnaires in physical format), and also for participating companies (with no employee productivity at the workplace during research stages), and the company may utilise an entire process for such a study using specially equipped rooms, trainers, etc. The literature in the field reports some studies on the classification of organisational rewards but they are not comprehensive. Many of the used terms may be redundant so we believe that this problem is due to wrong understanding of the concepts. Therefore, when we define an organisational reward we focus on its form and content, which is the substance of the used term.

We consider that when total reward is used in an organisation, irrespective of its size, a long-term and mutually beneficial relationship between employers and managers is built. First, the interest for being employed in a specific company increases. Then, people become motivated to reach at least the medium level of performance under the pretext of „proper reward”. The employees will be able to relate to what is on the average offered on the market for various categories of organisational rewards.

Literature Review

Total reward

According to Chisu (2005), the notion of „total reward” is equal to „global reward” defined as a totality of direct and indirect rewards”, social rights and benefits provided to an employee for its work in the organisation” (Chisu, 2005, p. 184). Hijazi *et al.* (2007) include into this category: basic salary, contingent compensation (payment for performance, competencies or significant contributions), variable payment (bonuses), opportunity to buy company’s stock and other cash benefits. The benefits provided to employees are integrated into total compensation, and their aim is to grow the welfare of employees considering: personal security,

financial assistance, specific personal needs, company car provision and other voluntary benefits (Hatice, 2012). Currently, benefits provided by companies at employment has been viewed as being more important than the compensation as such (Jones, 2005).

Armstrong (2009) underlines the holistic nature of total award and puts forwards the idea that there are no compensation mechanisms operating in isolation, quite the opposite, all methods through which people may be compensated for acquiring work satisfaction are taken into account. Basic salary, contingent compensation, non-financial benefits and compensations, the latter including the intrinsic compensation, are all correlated, being part of the same system (Tornikoski, 2011). Total reward includes all that employers consider to be of value inside of the work relations (Kantor & Kao, 2004; Tornikoski, 2011). American consultants Schuster and Zingheim pushed the discussion even further and view the total reward system through „a philosophy, a set of principles, a way of thinking”, rejecting the idea of using a set of principles (Reilly, 2010), and Aksakal & Dağdeviren (2014) explain it by compensation of performance for the desired behaviour.

Petruniak *et al.* (2003) compare total reward with golf game saying that it is necessary that the material elements be in harmony with the non-material ones. „If even one element is outside the line, the entire game suffers” (Petruniak *et al.*, 2003, p. 39). Non-material compensations do not exist physically, and include an intrinsic satisfaction of the rewarded person, and Ante Omazić *et al.* (2011) include into this category: work environment, practising different management styles, involving employees into the decision-making process, management by objectives, flexible working time, organisational culture, professional training, career development and promotion opportunities. Smith *et al.* (2015) correlates total reward with intrinsic and extrinsic motivation, and Fluegge-Woolf (2014) adds that a fun working environment results in increased involvement of employees and higher productivity (Fluegge-Woolf, 2014). Awards related to work environment are relational, and support the main emotional needs which cannot be filled just by financial compensation, an element that makes it more difficult to copying a company from the perspective of competing firms (O’Neal, 2005).

The most studies show that it is recommended that there be an ”optimal mix” of different types of financial and prestige rewards and the rewards specific to work tasks, respectively, aimed to consolidate the awareness towards responsibilities and increase the contribution of employees to the organisation (Zhou *et al.*, 2011). Moreover, it appears that benchmarking has contributed to the creation of mixed rules for rewarding (Chapman & Kelliher, 2011). Still, Deming (1986) believes that correct evaluations in total reward processes are impossible due to prejudices of managers, competition among employees and organisational policies (London & Higgot, 1997, in Deming, 1986).

Zingheim & Schuster (2000) present six principles for the application of total reward in companies: creating a process of rewards naturally with positive

effects; aligning rewards with company objectives to obtain a partnership in which both parties win; broadening the view of employees; integrating total reward; individual reward applied to basic salary; applying variable reward. Specifically, Rotaru & Bostan (2002) refer only to four principles: equal salary for equal work; differentiated salaries depending on work conditions; different salary taking into account each person's qualification; setting salaries depending on the importance of industry and sub-industries of national economy.

Human resource desired behaviours

If the attraction of human resources is a stage that starts with job opening and ends with new employees for the organisation (Turnea, 2017), and motivating is an art of making other do what one wants as that is what one desires, employees' retention is "an effort made by the employer to retain the desired employees with the aim of reaching the organisational goals" (Akhtar *et al.*, 2004, p. 13). Certainly, employees differ by their individual features, and a person may learn to perform or not a specific work (Nita & Serban, 2008). The engagement of employees depends on the individual treatment applied by the organisation (Coyle-Shapiro & Kessler, 2000), and in cases of incompatibility with the nature of work, total reward has no value.

Boswell *et al.* (2003) establish two strategies for consolidating the decision of candidates to accept jobs after interview (therefore, with importance before employment). The first strategy is the identification and improvement of the features of a job opening (for example, increasing the quality of nature of work, increasing the value of the offered salary) or company (for example, creation and promotion of values related to organisational culture at the workplace) (Boswell *et al.*, 2003). The second strategy is the improvement of recruitment and selection practices (for example: choosing competent representatives for company presentation, providing professional training right after employment, improving the way in which interviews are conducted, etc.) (Boswell *et al.*, 2003).

Retention of valuable human resources in companies is a challenge, and the openness of employers towards providing attractive organisational rewards based on career development puts a pressure on competing companies to review its employees' retention strategies (Akhtar *et al.*, 2015). Employees' retention for long periods of time means that companies should create an environment, in which employees are not just employed, but also can rely on workplace safety (Akhtar *et al.*, 2015).

Methodology

Research objective and hypothesis

The research objective is to obtain a representative model expressing the relationship between the elements of total reward (remuneration, benefits, work-life balance, performance and recognition, career development and opportunities) and human resources' retention in organisations.

The study has the following hypotheses:

Hypothesis H1: The elements of total reward – compensation (C), granted benefits (B), personal and professional life balance (WLB), performance and recognition (P & R), career opportunities and development (O & D) – are important in the attraction of employees.

Hypothesis H2: The elements of total reward – compensation (C), granted benefits (B), personal and professional life balance (WLB), performance and recognition (P & R), career opportunities and development (O & D) – are important in the retention of employees.

Hypothesis H3: Personal and professional life balance (WLB) is more appreciable for human resources' retention (after employment) than the other variables of total reward – compensation (C), granted benefits (B), performance and recognition (P & R), career opportunities and development (O & D).

Hypothesis H4: It appears a positive and significant link among the satisfaction' level of the elements of total reward – remuneration, benefits, performance and recognition, career development and opportunities – and the attitude towards work.

In this research methodology, the respondents were asked to give scores from 1 (the lowest) and 5 (the highest) to the relevance of organizational rewards for employment interview (to analyse the preferences for human resources' attraction) and after employment (to analyse the preferences for human resources' retention). Every reward element was measured through aggregation of multiple sub-items. Additionally, only the employed respondents were asked to give scores for their satisfaction with the organisational rewards they receive at the workplace.

Study sample

As it is shown in Tables 1 and 2, the sample for developing the total reward retention model comprised 627 respondents: 418 employees and 209 master and doctoral students (who were not employed) from Iasi, Romania:

Table 1. Number of respondents included in the study by organisation from Iasi, Romania

Organisations	Frequency	Percentage (%)
SC Atexis SRL	79	12.6
SC Conest SA	5	0.8
SC Fire Credit SRL	75	12.0
SC Iasicon SA	51	8.1
Cuza Voda Obstetrics and Gynecology Clinical Hospital, Iasi	21	3.3
SC Ness SRL	14	2.2
SC Scc Services SRL	5	0.8
SC Unicredit Business Integrated Solutions SCPA MILANO Bucharest Affiliate –Iasi office	132	21.1
Alexandru-Ioan Cuza University of Iasi	158	25.2
Gheorghe Asachi Technical University of Iasi	87	13.9
Total	627	100.0

Table 2. Total of employed respondents

Type		Employees		Total
		No	Yes	
Multinational companies	Frequency	0	305	305
	%	0.0 %	100.0 %	100.0 %
Romanian companies	Frequency	0	77	77
	%	0.0 %	100.0 %	100.0 %
Master students	Frequency	203	15	218
	%	93.1 %	6.9 %	100.0 %
PhD students	Frequency	6	21	27
	%	22.2 %	77.8 %	100.0 %
Total	Frequency	209	418	627
	%	33.3 %	66.7 %	100.0 %

Respondents completed the questionnaire by hand in Iasi during January and June of 2016, at their workplace or educational institution. To ensure data protection, confidentiality agreements were concluded with most organisations, which stipulate that no result should be linked directly to the participating organisation.

Reliability and validity

The questionnaire was pretested twice: in April 2014 and December 2014, respectively, undergoing significant changes from the start of its pretesting until the development of the final research instrument. Overall, the value of Cronbach alpha coefficient for the used instrument is 0.944 – much over 0.600, the acceptable limit as reported by literature in the field.

Discussion

Hypothesis H1: The elements of total reward – C, B, WLB, P & R, O & D – are important in employees' attraction, has been partially validated.

Table 3. H1 hypothesis testing. One-Sample Statistics

Categories of rewards	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Remuneration_BE	627	3.8499	0.80447	0.03213
Benefits_BE	627	3.7008	0.77563	0.03098
Work life balance_BE	627	3.7180	0.89254	0.03564
Development and career opportunities_BE	627	3.9413	0.79171	0.03162
Performance and recognition_BE	627	3.8285	0.88090	0.03518

Note: BE = before employment

In accordance with Likert scale (1 = minimum, 5 = maximum), an important level for a variable corresponds to arithmetic mean of 4 of 5, with a level of satisfaction of 80 % ($4/5 \times 100 = 80\%$). The mean of all corresponding variables of the entire sample in the attraction of employees is 3.81, with a level of satisfaction of 76.2 % ($3.81/5 \times 100 = 76.2\%$).

Table 4. H1 hypothesis testing. One-Sample Test

Categories of rewards	Test Value = 4					
	t	df	p values (Sig.)	Mean Difference	95 % C. I.	
Remuneration_BE	- 4.671	626	0.000	-0.15005	-0.2131	-0.0870
Benefits_BE	-9.659	626	0.000	-0.29919	-0.3600	-0.2384
Work life balance_BE	-7.910	626	0.000	-0.28195	-0.3519	-0.2120
Development and career opportunities_BE	-1.858	626	0.064	-0.05875	-0.1208	0.0033
Performance and recognition_BE	-4.874	Employees	Total	-.017145	-0.2405	-0.1024

Note: BE = before employment

Comparing the test value 4 with the means of all corresponding values of the entire sample before employment, the resulting Sig is significant (a value ≥ 0.05) only for career development and opportunities (0.064). Considering the fact that the means of variables are close to 4 (3.85; 3.70; 3.72; 3.94; 3.83), the hypothesis has been partially validated. The t Test was applied with the test value of 4, in accordance with the Likert scale, the „important” value of a variable corresponds with an arithmetical mean of 4 of 5, with a level of satisfaction of 80%.

Hypothesis H2: The elements of total reward – C, B, WLB, P & R, O & D – are important in employees’ retention, has been validated.

Table 5. H2 hypothesis testing

Reward category	Nr. of responses	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Remuneration_PE	627	4.1814	0.67347	0.02690
Benefits_PE	627	3.9148	0.68223	0.02725
Work life balance_PE	627	3.9352	0.77616	0.03100
Development and career opportunities_PE	627	4.1673	0.71563	0.02858
Performance and recognition_PE	627	4.0627	0.78245	0.03125

Note: PE = post employment

In accordance with Likert scale, an important level of a variable corresponds to arithmetic mean of 4 of 5, with a level of satisfaction of 80 %. The mean of all corresponding variables of the entire post-employment sample is 4.05, with a level of satisfaction of 81 %.

Table 6. H2 hypothesis testing. One-Sample Test

Categories of rewards	Test Value = 4					
	t	df	p values (Sig.)	Mean Difference	95 % C. I.	
Remuneration_PE	6.745	626	0.000	0.18142	0.1286	0.2342
Benefits_PE	-3.125	626	0.002	-0.08516	-0.1387	-0.0317
Work life balance_PE	-2.090	626	0.037	-0.06478	-0.1257	-0.0039
Development and career opportunities_PE	5.855	626	0.000	0.16733	0.1112	0.2235
Performance and recognition_PE	2.008	626	0.045	0.06273	0.0014	0.1241

Note: PE = post employment

Comparing the test value 4 with the means of all corresponding values of the entire sample after employment, the resulting Sig is close to 0.05 for two variables: WLB and P & R. Taking into account the means of variables which are close to 4 (4.18; 3.91; 3.94; 4.17; 4.06), the hypothesis has been validated. The t

Test was applied with the test value of 4, in accordance with the Likert scale, the „important” value of a variable corresponds with an arithmetical mean of 4 of 5, with a level of satisfaction of 80 %.

H3 hypothesis: Work-life balance is more important for human resources’ retention (after employment) that the other variables of total reward – C, B, P & R, O & D, has been validated.

Table 7. H3 hypothesis testing (1)

Reward category	Nr. of responses	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Work life balance_ PE	627	3.9352	0.77616	0.03100

Note: PE = post employment

Table 8. H3 hypothesis testing (2)

Reward category	Test Value = 3.9					
	t	df	p values (Sig.)	Mean Difference	95 % C. I.	
Work life balance_ PE	1.136	626	0.256	0.03522	-0.0257	0.0961

Note: PE = post employment

At the time of analysis of variables and the elements of total reward, the variable work-life balance resulted in mean importance of 3.94 of 5, with a level of satisfaction of 78.8 %. With a Sig significance of 0.256, the work-life balance proved to be more important than the others for human resources’ retention (resulting in: 4.18; 3.91; 4.17; 4.06). The t Test was applied with the test value of 3.90, the minimum level of all other means for post-employment being 3.91.

Hypothesis H4: It appears a positive and significant link among the satisfaction’ level of the elements of total reward – C, B, P & R, O & D – and the attitude towards work, has been validated.

The levels of satisfaction for the elements of organisational reward - remuneration, benefits, performance and recognition, career development and opportunities, were calculated by aggregating the arithmetic mean of the scores for the items (from 1 - the lowest and 5 - the highest) only based on the responses of the employed respondents (N = 418). All resulted correlations, using the Spearman coefficient

(since the distribution is not normal we used this coefficient), are statistically significant. Underlining the relations between the satisfaction for each variable and the attitude towards work, the following statements have been accepted: (1) Satisfaction related to remuneration is positively and weakly correlated with the attitude towards work, with a correlation coefficient of 0.270; (2) Satisfaction related to received benefits is positively and weakly correlated with the attitude towards work, with a correlation coefficient of 0.199; (3) Satisfaction related to work-life balance is positively and weakly correlated with the attitude towards work, with a correlation coefficient of 0.216; (4) Satisfaction related to career development and opportunities is positively and weakly correlated with the attitude towards work, with a correlation coefficient of 0.298; (5) Satisfaction related to performance and recognition is positively and weakly correlated with the attitude towards work, with a correlation of 0.345.

As it results from the data presented above, the relations of these variables are statistically significant with a positive weak correlation.

Multiple Regression

The “backward” method was selected for multiple linear regression which starts the model by including all predictors. After eliminating the first non-significant variable, the model was adjusted. This last procedure was used until the optimal model was achieved.

Table 9. Selection of the best model for human resources’ retention

Nr.	R	R ²	R ² adjusted	Std. Error
1	0.468(a)	0.219	0.212	0.45408
2	0.467(b)	0.218	0.213	0.45380
3	0.465(c)	0.216	0.213	0.45399

a Predictors: (Constant), Performance and recognition_PE, Remuneration_PE, Work life balance_PE, Development and career opportunities_PE, Benefits_PE
 b Predictors: (Constant), Performance and recognition_PE, Remuneration_PE, Development and career opportunities_PE, Benefits_PE
 c Predictors: (Constant), Performance and recognition_PE, Remuneration_PE, Benefits_PE

Note: PE = post employment

If the first version of the model comprises all five suggested predictors, after using the „backward” method, the final model has just three independent variables for the employment interview: performance and recognition, remuneration and benefits. In descriptive analysis, after employment, work-life balance resulted in medium importance of 3.94 of 5, and career development and opportunities

resulted in medium importance of 4.17 of 5. This version of the model excludes the significance of two variables only statistically. The arguments are: the distribution is not normal due to the fact that most respondents tend to give importance closer to the highest score (5) to all elements of reward after employment.

Also, the ANOVA analysis showed for all versions of the model Sig = 0.000 so that, the dependent variable is explained by the action of independent variables. The third version of the model is the best as R² is adjusted by 0.213 and the estimated standard error is 0.45399.

Table 10. Results of regression: C, B, WLB, P & R, O & D for human resources' retention

Variables	Coefficients				p values (Sig.)
	Unstandardized		Standardized	t	
	B	Std. Error	Beta		
1 (Constant)	2.893	0.136		21.279	0.000
Remuneration_PE	0.119	0.032	0.157	3.720	0.000
Benefits_PE	0.116	0.040	0.155	2.913	0.004
Work life balance_PE	-0.014	0.031	-0.022	-0.464	0.643
Development and career opportunities_PE	0.046	0.035	0.064	1.298	0.195
Performance and recognition_PE	0.144	0.032	0.221	4.451	0.000
2 (Constant)	2.888	0.135		21.330	0.000
Remuneration_PE	0.117	0.032	0.154	3.694	0.000
Benefits_PE	0.110	0.038	0.147	2.929	0.004
Development and career opportunities_PE	0.044	0.035	0.061	1.243	0.214
Performance and recognition_PE	0.142	0.032	0.218	4.431	0.000
3 (Constant)	2.934	0.130		22.522	0.000
Remuneration_PE	0.119	0.032	0.157	3.781	0.000
Benefits_PE	0.125	0.036	0.166	3.469	0.001
Performance and recognition_PE	0.159	0.029	0.244	5.477	0.000
Dependent variable: human resources' retention (post employment)					

Note: PE = post employment

If in the first model, Sig coefficients for WLB and O & D are statistically insignificant ($0.643 > 0.05$; $0.195 > 0.05$), in the second model, work-life balance is excluded, and in the third model, the significance levels for the remained variables are lower than 0.05 (0.000; 0.000; 0.001; 0.000).

The model of the studies sample (N = 627) for human resources' retention in companies using organisational rewards is:

$$\text{Human resources' retention}_{PE} = 2.934 + 0.119 * \text{Remuneration}_{PE} + 0.125 * \text{Benefits}_{PE} + \text{pers} + 0.159 * \text{Performance and recognition}_{PE}$$

Human resources' retention results in a score of 2.934 (of 5) when importance for remuneration, benefits and performance and recognition is null. Human resources' retention increases by 0.403 when importance for remuneration, benefits and performance and recognition increase by 1 unit. In other words, the more importance the respondents give to the three independent variables of the model, after employment, higher increases their retention in the organisation.

Conclusion

The literature on total reward it is not focused, but dispersed and redundant. There are cases when bad translations lead to superficial understanding of organisational rewards. Also, there are cultural and even legislative barriers preventing the understanding of all rewards (Hodor, 2016). So, the content of literature review was limited to cultural specificity of the Romanian context and legislation in force. We have not presented the reward types that are not used in our country, or that are not provided for by the national legislation.

We agree with the view of Armstrong si Brown (2001), and believe that the implementation of a total reward strategy in companies may be done only by means of a detailed planning ahead. To start a process of total reward, two questions may be used: (1) Which are the individual and group behaviours that the organization needs? (2) How willing is the company to offer rewards to employees in order to obtain the wanted behaviours? We support the statement of Armstrong (2007), according to which, total reward strategies are vertically integrated into the general strategy of an organisation and horizontally into human resource strategies" (Armstrong, 2007, p. 32). We believe that organisations in most cases do not follow the traditional path when they initiate such actions, as most times the implementation of such strategies is being questioned due to the budget allocated for such an initiative (Armstrong & Murlis, 2007).

This study stemmed from the study „The relative influence of Total Rewards Elements on Attraction, Motivation and Retention" started in January 2006 and ended in May 2009 (Boswell *et al.*, 2011). Although the main variables of the study are similar to those of the WorldatWorkmodel, the items used for their aggregation

as to measure them differ being specific to Romania. Also, the multiple linear model obtained through regression analysis is specific to the Iasi city in Romania.

Or the empirical study, 627 questionnaires were collected, of which: 305 from multinational companies (48.6 %), 77 from Romanian companies (12.3 %), and 245 (39.1 %) form master and doctoral students in universities. The entire research was built on five issues: significance of organizational reward strategy prior and post employment; attraction of rewards for employment/ retention in the company; satisfaction with total reward strategy. For each of the five constructs, the following variables were used, which in turn had sub-items through which they had been developed: compensation (C), granted benefits (B), personal and professional life balance (WLB), career opportunities and development (O & D), performance and recognition (P & R). Also, other variables were considered, but also dependent on research constructs.

In our study, H1 hypothesis has been partially validated, and H2, H3, H4 hypotheses were validated. The results show that the total reward variables (C, B, WLB, P & R, O & D) are relevant post employment in the company, while the work-life balance is more important for employees' retention (after employment) than all other variables of total reward. In accordance with the multiple linear model obtained after the regression analysis, the more human resources appreciate remuneration, benefits, performance and recognition, and these are provided as reward for their remaining in the company, the more is strengthened their decision to stay in the company. Satisfaction (effective satisfaction at the workplace) with: received compensation, granted benefits, personal and professional life balance, career opportunities and development, performance and recognition, are positively correlated with the attitude towards work.

The limitations of the study included: (1) Employers do not wish to create expectations regarding reward practices among employees during research stages, thus managers accept quite difficult to distribute questionnaires in companies; (2) Employees interrupt work, and first-line managers wish to decrease the amount of work required for completing the questionnaires; (3) Employees are afraid to express their demands regarding total rewards as management might change its behaviour after finding out the results, or they may be held responsible during regular periodical evaluations.

Recommendations

Considering the results of this paper, several suggestions are presented in the following:

1. The organizational rewards should be adapted to the countries' institutional and legislative particularities. Basically, managers have to know the financial possibilities of the companies they lead, and after, the rewards have to be adapted to each state in which organizations are present. This suggestion is useful especially for corporations.

2. Most often, employees tick all the organizational rewards at least at the “very important” level. This fact appears even if the means obtained for the variables of total reward are calculated based also on the extreme scores. As not all employees can be satisfied with a set of rewarding elements, in order to maintain them, a mix of organizational rewards is required.

3. The mix of organizational rewards can also be realized individual, based on employees’ choices. For example, employees that have children can be attracted of rewards which include kindergarten facilities, while the others can choose vacation benefits.

Acknowledgements

This work was co-financed from the European Social Fund through Operational Programme Human Capital 2014-2020, project number POCU/380/6/13/125015 ”Development of entrepreneurial skills for doctoral students and postdoctoral researchers in the field of economic sciences”.

References

- Akhtar, S.A., Aamir, A., Khurshid, M.A., Abro, M.M.Q., Hussain, J. (2015). Total Rewards and Retention: Case Study of Higher Education Institutions in Pakistan, *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 210, 251-259. DOI: 10.1016/j.sbspro.2015.11.365
- Aksakal, E., Dağdeviren, M. (2014). Analyzing Reward Management Framework with Multi Criteria Decision Making Methods, *Social and Behavioral Sciences Journal*, 147, 147-152. DOI: 10.1016/j.sbspro.2014.07.131
- Ante O., Mislav, V., Rebeka D., Klindžić, M. (2011). The Role Of Material And Non-Material Rewards In Reducing Barriers To Change Acceptance, *IPEDR*, 2, 10-14. Retrieved from <http://www.ipedr.com/vol2/3-P00005.pdf>
- Armstrong, M. (2007). *The fundamentals of reward management*, London: Kogan Page.
- Armstrong, M. (2009). *Managementul resurselor umane: manual de practica*, București: Codex.
- Armstrong, M., Brown, D. (2001). *New dimensions in pay management*, London: Paperweight.
- Armstrong, M., Murlis, H. (2007). *Reward Management*, London and Philadelphia: Kogan Page.
- Boswell, W.R., Cook, A.L., Horner, M.T., Payne, S.C., Shaub, M.K. (2011). The relative influence of Total Rewards Elements on Attraction, Motivation and Retention, *WorldatWork Journal*, 20, 1-45. Retrieved from <https://www.worldatwork.org/docs/research-and-surveys/worldatwork-sponsored-research/research-report-the-relative-influence-of-total-rewards-elements-on-attraction-motivation-and-retention.pdf>
- Boswell, W.R., Roehling, M.V., LePine, M.A., Moynihan, L.M. (2003). Individual job-choice decisions and the impact of job attributes and recruitment practices: a longitudinal field study, *Human Resource Management*, 42, 23-37. DOI: 10.1002/hrm.10062

- Chapman, J., Kelliher, C. (2011). Influences on reward mix determination: reward consultants' perspectives, *Employee Relations Journal*, 33(2), 121-139. DOI: 10.1108/01425451111096677
- Chisu, V.A. (2005). *Posturi, salarii și...beneficii*, București: Irecson.
- Coyle-Shapiro, J., & Kessler, I. (2000). Consequences of the psychological contract for the employment relationship: a large scale survey, *Journal of Management Studies*, 37(7), 903-930. DOI: 10.1111/1467-6486.00210
- Fluegge-Woolf, E.R. (2014). Play hard, work hard. Fun at work and job performance, *Management Research Review Journal*, 37(8), 682-705. DOI: 10.1108/MRR-11-2012-0252
- Hatice, Ö. (2012). The Influence of intrinsic and extrinsic Rewards on Employee Results: an empirical analysis in Turkish Manufacturing Industry, *Business and Economics Research Journal*, 3(3), 29-48. Retrieved from <https://www.questia.com/library/journal/1P3-273117711/the-influence-of-intrinsic-and-extrinsic-rewards-on>
- Hijazi, S.T., Adeel, A., Mehboob, S.A.A. (2007). Impact of non-financial rewards on employee motivation, *The Business Review, Cambridge*, 7(2), 272-277.
- Hodor, E.-S. (2015). A pre-test on Total Rewards Model for business consulting romanian companies, *Logos, Universality, Mentality, Education, Novelty, Section: Social Sciences*, 4(1), 123-131. DOI: 10.18662/lumenss.2015.0401.11
- Hodor, E.-S. (2016). Direct versus indirect rewards for the attraction of the employees, *Logos, Universality, Mentality, Education, Novelty, Section: Social Sciences*, 5(1), 19-27. DOI: 10.18662/lumenss.2016.0501.02
- Jones, E. (2005). An overview of employee benefits, *Occupational Outlook Quarterly*, 49(2), 12-21. Retrieved from <https://www.bls.gov/careeroutlook/2005/summer/art02.pdf>
- Kantor, R., Kao, T. (2004). Total Rewards, *WorldatWork Journal*, 13(3), 7-14.
- London, C., Higgot, K. (1997). An employee reward and recognition process, *The TQM Magazine*, 19(5), 328-335. Retrieved from <https://www.deepdyve.com/lp/emerald-publishing/an-employee-reward-and-recognition-process-5MAN2YTdsC>
- Nita, D., Serban, A.C. (2008). *Munca: esenta, forme, structurii și finalitate*, București: ASE.
- O'Neal, S. (2005). Total Rewards and the future of Work, *Workspan Journal*, 48(1), 18-26.
- Petruniak, J., Watson W., Canada, S., Peter W. (2003). The total rewards sweet spot, *WorldatWork Journal*, 46(8), 38-41.
- Prodan, A. (1999). *Managementul de succes*, Iași: Polirom.
- Reilly, P. (2010). Total reward is a capital idea, *Strategic HR Review Journal*, 9(1). DOI: 10.1108/shr.2010.37209aab.007
- Rotaru, A., Bostan, I. (2002). *Sisteme de salarizare*, Iași: Sedcom Libris.
- Smith, E., Joubert, P., Karodia, A.M. (2015). The impact of intrinsic and extrinsic rewards on employee motivation at a medical devices company in South Africa, *Arabian Journal of Business and Management Review*, 5(1), 39-87. DOI: 10.12816/0019006

- Tornikoski, C. (2011). Fostering expatriate affective commitment: a total reward perspective, *Cross Cultural Management: An International Journal*, 18(2), 214-235. DOI: 10.1108/13527601111126030
- Turnea, E.-S. (2017). *Teoria și practica recompenselor organizationale*, Iași: Tehnopress.
- Zhou, Y., Zhang, Y., Montoro-Sánchez, Á. (2011). Utilitarianism or romanticism: the effect of rewards on employees' innovative behaviour, *International Journal of Manpower*, 32(1), 81-98. DOI: 10.1108/01437721111121242
- Zingheim, P.K., Schuster, J.R. (2000). Pay People Right!, *WorldatWork Journal*, 9(2), 42-50.