REWARDING WORK OR WORKING FOR REWARD?

A qualitative case study about total rewards and work motivation among white-collar workers in Sweden

Elina Karell & Liisa Widlund

Abstract

Thesis:	Master Thesis 30 hp
Program:	Strategic Human Resource Management and Labour relations
Level:	Second Cycle
Semester/year:	St 2019
Supervisor:	Ylva Ulfsdotter Eriksson
Examiner:	Monica Bäck-Andersson
Keywords:	Compensation and Benefits (C&B), Total Rewards System (TRS), Self-Determination Theory (SDT), Work motivation, Intrinsic motivation, Extrinsic motivation, Two-factor theory

---

Purpose: This thesis aims to study how the different elements of *total rewards system* (TRS) correspond with white-collar workers' motivation in Sweden and how the identified total reward factors correspond to different types of intrinsic and extrinsic motivation.

Theory: This study uses the theoretical framework of TRS, which provides an overview of the various financial and non-financial rewards that the employees are provided and promised with by the employer. The self-determination theory (SDT) enables further analysis with its apt way of looking at how individuals are motivated by intrinsic and various types of extrinsic motivational factors.

Method: This study is based on qualitative research. The empirical data originates from 14 semi-structured interviews with employees from a case company. The interviews were recorded and transcribed verbatim. The transcribed data was coded based on three major themes inspired by the total rewards model of: compensation & benefits, work experience and culture and environment.

Result: The aspects beyond the original research question emerging from the findings were transparency about individual development and professional training opportunities. Autonomy and competence in relation to work itself had a significant impact upon participants' motivation. Several factors of work experience as well as culture and environment were experienced as extrinsically motivating. Compensation and benefits were experienced to a great extent as hygiene factors.

Foreword

The journey of writing a master thesis has truly been a wild one for us with its ups and downs. However, we are humbled by the support and assistance we have received from the University of Gothenburg and our friends and family.

Firstly, we would like to thank the organisation who kindly opened their doors and decided to collaborate with us and all the interviewees who participated.

Ylva Ulfsdotter Eriksson, our supervisor - thank you for going the extra mile and making time for us when we needed it the most. We truly appreciate your expertise, and for having patience with two somewhat stubborn Finns on their journey of mastering the field of C&B. We can't imagine what this process would have looked like without your guidance!

We would also like to thank Simon and Wilma for reviewing the earlier draft. Last but not the least, thank you to our partners Simon and Ludvig for your endless support.

Table of Contents

Introduction

The growing number of organisations that operate in service-centric and knowledge-intensive industries has increased the demand for white-collar workers on the labour market (Boxall & Purcell, 2016). Knowledge-centric employees are important to attract, retain and develop (Hakonen et al. 2005), since they are assumed to have the core competencies that can impact the competitive advantages of organisations (Cegarra-Leiva et al. 2012). In addition, white-collar worker turnover generally involves greater financial investments, the cost of lost knowledge (D'Amato & Herzfeldt, 2008), and their level of motivation, commitment or intention to leave a company influences team performance and business results (Cegarra-Leiva et al. 2012). Changes in industries and workforce have led to new forms of organisations and made some of the traditional regulations more decentralised and individualised. Therefore, generally in the context of employer-employee exchange that covers base pay, benefits and career, the employers' focus has shifted from how the work should be done to what should be achieved. (Allvin & Aronsson, 2003.) Thus, greater freedom for action and increased boundary-less work means that employees have increased responsibility for themselves. These changes in work of white-collar workers further highlight the significant role of human resource management (HRM) in identifying and integrating people's needs and processes of wage policy and career to provide a favourable context to performance. (Taskin & Devos, 2005.)

In these circumstances, it is interesting to study the case of white-collar workers, a selection of both managers and employees at a multinational corporation (MNC) with an office in Sweden. In Sweden there is a generally low power distance (Hofstede, 2019), and one of the highest progressive income taxes on salaries in OECD countries (OECD, 2018), which makes the rewards beyond monetary compensation even more significant. These rewards are a fundamental part of organisations that aim to attract, retain, develop and motivate employees (Werner & Ward, 2004), to achieve desired behaviours. But a typical reason why such organisations fall short with their reward systems is misunderstanding the needs of their employees (Thibault, Schweyer & Whillans, 2017). While salary is the most common way to compensate employees (Furåker, 2005), employees long to be rewarded in a meaningful way (Thibault et al. 2017). This further emphasises that the relationship between pay and motivation is not conclusive (Eriksson, Sverke & Wallenberg, 2002), and points out the main reason why total rewards system has emerged as an alternative to monetary rewards alone (Gross & Friedman, 2004). Thus, the combinations of different financial and non-financial rewards in an organisation that aim to attract, retain, develop and motivate employees are part of the total rewards system (TRS).

Despite extensive literature of intrinsic and extrinsic motivation and differing effects on employee outcomes, there is a lack of qualitative studies about the relationship between the two types of motivation and their respective outcomes of TRS in a Swedish context. Based on many experimental studies, the relationship between intrinsic and extrinsic motivation and rewards has proven to be inconclusive, which is why some scholars suggest that no dramatic generalisations should be made to real world compensation systems (Gagné & Forest, 2008). This research aims to describe and explain how TRS within different elements is interconnected and perceived motivating. The goal is to answer the following research questions: How do the different elements of TRS correspond with white-collar worker motivation in Sweden? The second question is: How do the identified total rewards factors correspond to different types of intrinsic and extrinsic motivation?

In order to answer the research questions, a case study of fourteen interviews with participants from a multinational corporation (MNC) with its headquarters in Sweden was conducted. The following section covers the theoretical propositions by presenting TRS, as well as motivational theories, and is based upon financial rewards within the theory of motivation and ends with some approaches from intrinsic and extrinsic perspectives. The results are presented in three major themes, followed by discussion and conclusion.

Total Rewards and Work Motivation

This chapter provides a theoretical framework of the two main areas of this research: TRS and Employee Motivation. The first section focuses on how employee rewarding has developed as a result of pay itself not being enough of a motivator. The second part presents TRS as a part of the theoretical framework of this study. The third section presents shortly motivational theories in general and the self-determination theory in more detail.

Employee rewarding - before and now

In the 1960s, it was common to work for the same employer for most of your life, and in exchange, the employer was expected to take care of those employees. The main determinants of pay and other rewards were employee relationship and tenure. There was little emphasis on seeing people as value-adding, and employees got paid even if they did not develop their competencies. (Zingheim & Schuster, 2001; Boltanski & Chiapello, 2005.) By the 1990s, a changing landscape, competition and continuous change required people to continue to learn new skills in order to perform more effectively and to secure their jobs (Zingheim & Schuster, 2001). Later, job security was predicted by employability, which was secured by development along with gained work experience (Boltanski & Chiapello, 2005). The employability of individuals was now based on employee competency and flexibility, rather than job security alone. Thus, career paths and development opportunities enabled individuals to manage their own careers and to take responsibility of their own futures (Boltanski & Chiapello, 2005). People found out that they are not only working for money, so continuous development, involvement with business goals, and communication of expectations and feedback became more important (Latham & Locke, 1979; Zingheim & Schuster, 2001). Boltanski and Chiapello (2005) called this the 'liberation' of wage earners. Therefore, companies started to invest in their workforce, and in exchange, people met the companies' requirements by learning new skills and competencies to reach organisational goals.

Problems related to changing organisational forms when moving to more flexible, innovative and competent organisations have been identified within the field of management studies (Boltanski & Chiapello, 2005). The change from industrial society to knowledge society has changed the preconditions of organisations and working life (Allvin et al. 2006). The factors that drove this change were employees having more autonomy, continuous development and fair working conditions (Boltanski & Chiapello, 2005), which seem to be connected to an individualistic attitude, more in common among highly educated professionals (Larsson, et al. 2017). However, according to Boltanski and Chiapello (2005), changing conditions of organisations need more understanding of their employees' motivational functions.

Today's globalised and competitive context leads companies to think about how to better so business and find more desirable ways of organising human resource systems. Reward systems usually vary from one organisation to another, since they are often shaped by various external factors, such as laws, collective agreements and country-specific historical context (Nylander & Hakonen, 2015). Reward systems and organisational promises of employability can be used as a competitive tool, as it has been shown that employees highly value individual and professional development. (Hakonen et al., 2005) However, problems may arise if there is a lack of specific outcome-based promises such as competitive wages, work-life balance, training, and meaningful work (Kickul, 2001). An organisation's promises, or perceived promises to employees are called a psychological contract (Rousseau, 1996). Companies need to design reward systems that are embedded in organisational needs and implemented by human resource systems (Heneman & Ledford, 1998), but that also focus on reward systems which maintain employee motivation in order to increase the competitive lead (Milkovich, Newman & Gerhart, 2011). Therefore, it is important to understand what motivates employees, and also to understand the wide variety of human resource systems behind work motivation. One way to make sense of this complexity is TRS.

Organisational Reward Systems - More Than Just Pay

The aim of TRS, which is presented in figure 1, is to take rewards one-step further - to understand the dynamic of the employee-employer exchange. TRS includes all aspects that employees deem valuable in their employment relationship. (Armstrong 2012; World at Work, 2000.) Hence, in addition to necessary financial rewards, employees may find rewarding experiences connected to work itself, work environment, leadership styles, development opportunities and career paths. The reason why TRS is important lies in how it aligns business strategy with people strategy beyond traditional compensation and benefits (C&B), by considering all rewards available at the workplace to maximise motivation, commitment and job satisfaction. (Armstrong, 2012.)

Figure 1. Total Rewards System (TRS)

Compensation	Benefits	Work Experience	Culture and Environment
Base pay	Health and welfare benefits	Work-life balance	Organisational goals & strategies
Variable pay	Free events	Flex-time	Including personnel policy
Fixed pay	Pension and Insurances	Healthcare hour	Engagement
	Company car	Performance management	Status
	Christmas present	Feedback	Leadership and Management
	Coffee, fruit, fika	Recognition	
	Free lunch	Career	
	Parental allowance	Development	
	Personnel discounts		

Reference: Developed from Armstrong (2012) and Larsson et al. (2017)

This study uses a holistic TRS model, which is divided into two main categories of total rewards: financial rewards and non-financial rewards (Armstrong, 2012). Financial rewards (extrinsic rewards) are the ones that have monetary value, such as base pay and benefits, and non-financial rewards (intrinsic rewards) should satisfy psychological and social needs (Bratton & Gold 2017). The financial elements under TRS are compensation and benefits. Compensation includes direct rewards, such as monetary pay and variable pay, e.g. bonuses, while benefits complement regular salary, but are indirect rewards, such as health care, discounts or a company car. The non-financial elements under TRS are work experience and culture and environment. The former includes people's opportunity to enhance and maintain challenging and interesting work, while the latter includes how an organisation

'rewards' their employees in order to engage them with policies, organisational goals and strategies (Larsson et al. 2017). However, the distinction between different rewards can be problematised, since the boundaries may be overlapping and unclear because the elements are affected by each other (Larsson et al. 2017).

It has been shown that compensation is possibly one of the most critical influences on employee effectiveness and behaviour (Gupta & Shaw, 2014), and that money motivates because it is linked to the satisfaction of many needs (Wallace & Szilagyi, 1982). However, several motivation theories downgrade the role of extrinsic rewards as motivators (Maslow, 1954; Herzberg, 1966; Deci & Ryan, 1985), and have empirical support from numerous studies (Kohn, 1998; Ritchie & Martin, 1999). Despite several studies of the relationship between extrinsic rewards and motivation, it has been shown that money is not the only aspect that motivates people, and that there are other aspects that people appreciate more than money (Furnham, 2006; Gerhart & Rynes, 2003). In addition, intrinsic rewards increase creativity while extrinsic rewards limit creativity and tendency to seek development opportunities (Pink, 2009). Pay and promotion can increase motivation, but the duration of the effect is shorter (Whitaker, 2010), while long-lasting motivation can be achieved by intrinsic rewards (Armstrong, 2012).

A study about employee retention and turnover highlights that employees in both the public and the private sector choose to stay with their current employer due to a combination of intrinsic and extrinsic motivational factors. The significant motivational variables were training and development, challenging and interesting work, freedom for innovative thinking, and job security. (Samuel & Chipunza, 2009.) Pay is an important factor that contributes to motivation and performance, but what is probably even more important is the work itself. Different aspects of work climate, like psychological work environment, shape the motivation of employee attitudes and behaviour. (Hellgren et al. 2017.) It is crucial to know how organisations manage reward systems, as it impacts the prospects for organisational success, and because compensation may affect employee success at work and in their personal lives (Milkovich, Gerhart & Hannon 1991). Therefore, it is important to understand employee needs, motivational factors and how they are affected by different rewards.

Motivation Theories

Motivation theories such as content theories, also called need theories, (Maslow, 1954; McClelland 1961; Herzberg 1966), usually investigate what motivates people, while process theories detail how motivation occurs (Vroom, 1964; Deci & Ryan 1985). Since research about process theories studies expectations, equity and goal achievements this information may help leaders to manage their staff (Armstrong, 2012). Reward literature often fails to analyse employee perceptions, because it focuses on organisational issues related to strategy and implementation (Armstrong, 2012).

There has been a heated debate concerning the relationship between motivations in the context of rewards, since the preconditions of monetary rewards have changed over time. For instance, it has been described that a monetary reward motivates when it fulfils the basic needs of an individual such as buying food (Maslow, 1954). Skinner (1957) argued that monetary rewards may be implemented as a reward or punishment to shape desired behavioural outcome. The two-factor theory (Herzberg, 1966; 1987) discusses how hygiene factors like job security, policies, pay and interpersonal relationships, prevent dissatisfaction but do not lead to satisfaction, and that motivation factors provide satisfaction. Motivators that lead job satisfaction are for example: achievement, work itself, and recognition. Thus, monetary reward supposedly does not motivate, but is instead a hygiene factor - meaning that it causes dissatisfaction if it is not equitable. (Herzberg, 1966.) However, this theory has been criticised later for its duality and for the individual differences that satisfiers can also be motivators (House & Wigdor, 1967).

Moreover, satisfaction or dissatisfaction connected to extrinsic rewards depends on the employees' perceptions of fair pay development, working life, and relationships with leaders and colleagues

(Armstrong, 2012). With regards to perceptions of fair pay development, recent research shows that organisational justice is important. In the context of organisations - justice often refers to perceptions of fair pay, equal opportunities for promotion, and personnel selection procedures (Tabibnia et al. 2008). There is evidence from prior studies that benefits influence organisational justice perceptions (Tremblay et al., 2000), which in turn affect a range of employee and organisational outcomes such as job performance, engagement and turnover intentions (Cohen-Charash & Spector, 2001; Colquitt et al., 2001). Colquitt's model (2001) includes interpersonal justice, or the perceived fairness of interpersonal interactions regarding benefits; and informational justice, or the perceived fairness of the rationale provided regarding benefits policies, procedures and outcomes.

In contrast to earlier motivational theories, Vroom (1964) defines motivation as something that guides our behaviour when making conscious choices among alternatives. In this theory, motivation emerges from the assumption that these conscious choices will lead to desired outcomes (Vroom, 1964). Furthermore, many theories of work motivation make a distinction between intrinsic and extrinsic motivation. Intrinsic work motivation proposes that work itself is the way to increase job satisfaction, since it would make jobs more interesting and intrinsically rewarding. It was also believed that by increasing extrinsic rewards such as higher pay or promotion would increase performance. (Porter & Lawler, 1968.)

Cognitive Evaluation Theory (CET) (Deci & Ryan, 1985) tries to explain the effects of extrinsic motivators on intrinsic motivation and claims that extrinsic rewards undermine intrinsic motivation. This theory suggests that social-contextual factors encourage feelings of autonomy, and competence development increase intrinsic motivation (Deci and Ryan, 1985). A sense of autonomy may be decreased by external factors such as financial rewards, deadlines, surveillance, and evaluation (Ryan & Deci, 2000). Further, some scholars and managers have faced a challenge in finding the optimal level of using extrinsic rewards to promote intrinsic motivation. As a result, this struggle lead to the idea that external values can be adopted as the individuals own by internalisation and the formation of self-determination theory (SDT). (Gagné & Deci, 2005.)

Self-determination Theory

SDT (Gagné & Deci, 2005) connects intrinsic and extrinsic motivation by looking at motivation, personality, and optimal functioning (engagement, performance, well-being, and retention) (Deci and Ryan 1985; Gagné and Deci, 2005). SDT suggests that extrinsic rewards can enhance intrinsic motivation, and that employees experience intrinsic motivation when the work is aligned with their identity, personal values and goals, which lead to enjoying what they do. This theory is divided into motivation that is dependent upon extrinsic factors, and motivation that depends on intrinsic factors. The better an individual's needs of autonomy, relatedness and competence are fulfilled, the more the motivation will be intrinsic. (Deci and Ryan, 1985.) This means that individuals mainly driven by external factors are likely to show more external motivation. Individuals with their own initiative can stimulate work tasks and find a greater meaning in their work and are likely to have more internal motivation (Gagné & Deci, 2005; Hellgren et al. 2017). Therefore, SDT suggests that there is one type of intrinsic motivation, four types of extrinsic motivation, and one type of A-motivation (Ryan & Deci, 2000).

Intrinsic motivation is something that occurs when a person experiences the activity or action itself most rewarding instead of using it as a means to achieve another goal. The four types of extrinsic motivation explain how extrinsically motivated behaviour can become autonomous, and they are: external regulation, introjection regulation, identification regulation and integration regulation. Actions or tasks completed only to avoid or receive certain factors, is external regulation-type extrinsic motivation. The second type of extrinsic motivation - introjected regulation - occurs when an action is somewhat instrumental and completed because the regulation is controlling the person and a person may feel pressured to act in a certain way in order to feel valued. (Ryan & Deci, 2000.) Extrinsic motivation can be transformed into intrinsic motivator when an individual internalises a

behavioural regulation and the value associated with it. There are two types of external motivation that fall under internalisation: identification regulation and integration regulation. Identification regulation is described as something that occurs when an individual is autonomously extrinsically motivated and associates strongly with the value of a behaviour to reach own personally set goals. Integrated regulation describes the setting where the extrinsic motivation is truly autonomous, and an individual has fully internalised the behaviour. However, this is still not intrinsic motivation, since the activity serves a specific purpose of self-selected goals, rather than someone being interested in the activity itself. (Ryan & Deci, 2000.)

Method

The purpose of this chapter is to present the research method applied in the study. The chapter starts with presenting which research methods were chosen, defining the unit of analysis, and then testing the design against four criteria.

Methodological Approach

This study explores the perceptions of white-collar workers at an MNC in Sweden about total reward systems, by looking at what elements of TRS motivate and which factors motivate intrinsically and extrinsically. A qualitative research method is the most fitting choice for this study since this is a socially constructed phenomenon. Earlier, we presented a literature review about the highlights of TRS and its connection to motivation to give a holistic view of the matter. Holistic approach means that descriptions about unique events are combined with information about various actors to thoroughly understand their feelings and interactions situations. According to Benbasat et al. (1983), only qualitative research can provide a holistic comprehensive view.

Research design

A case study design was chosen, because it aims to interpret how and why a contemporary social phenomenon works (Yin, 2014). Phrasing questions in that role can be used for exploratory, descriptive or explanatory research (testing theories) (Rowley, 2002). Case studies can provide a unique example of real-life situations by presenting them with abstract theories or principles, meanwhile enabling readers to understand ideas more clearly, or as Yin (2014) presents, to understand how ideas in abstract principles can fit together. In addition, a case study design includes theoretical propositions that give a profound view of the topic and increase understanding about the research question (Yin, 2014). The theoretical propositions were used in a way that increases understanding about the current state of TRS and its connection to motivation theories. The unit of analysis in this case are white-collar workers at an MNC, both managers and employees within the same department. From a broader perspective, the white-collar workers are operating in a competitive and complex industry within Swedish legislative regime, where the companies battle to attract, motivate and retain their talented employees. The study was conducted within specific time boundaries and for that reason a timetable was created (see appendix).

Selection of the participants and data collection

This case study was conducted at a MNC with headquarters in Sweden. The MNC was selected strategically in order to achieve an interesting case study, due to the assumed opportunities the white-collar workers have in relation to building a career within the organisation, with high emphasis on non-financial rewards due to the country-specific institutional restriction such as labour law and taxes, but also because the company offered the employees total rewards (e.g. pay, variable pay, fixed pay, benefits, insurances, individual development opportunities and global dynamic work environment). After a meeting with the HR manager, we planned to conduct the study at one department in an MNC, which was located in Gothenburg. The department had approximately 800 white-collar workers, with different hierarchical levels (junior, strategic, senior employees, and managers) and relatively high employee turnover. Due to that, it was relevant to understand how white-collar workers are motivated by total rewards in a Swedish context. The HR manager gave us a list of 30 employees: 15 randomly chosen employees from different hierarchical levels: junior, strategic and senior employees with non-managerial roles, and 15 randomly chosen managers. The potential participants of the study were approached by an email with an official request to participate in an interview study. This led to seven randomly chosen employees and eight managers. Due to many declines, we sent an email to the rest of the employees, leading to the final empiric data, consisting of 14 participants. All interviews were conducted in March 2019, and ranged between 45 to 70 minutes, and took place at the department the

employees were employed in. All interviews were conducted face to face, except two interviews, which were conducted over Skype, because time ran out during the interviews. After 14 qualitative, semi-structured interviews with the employees and managers, we reached saturation, and did not need any more interviews. The final selection reflects the department as a whole, as the department was male-oriented and middle-aged. However, the final selection showed variation with different gender, age, experience and profession (Table 1).

Table 1. Informants

Age, Years	N	Experience, Years	N	Male/ Female	N	Profession	N
≤35	3	≤10	5	F	3	M	6(1)
36-49	9	11-20	5	M	11	E	8(2)
≥50	2	≥21	4				

Profession: M=Manager, E= Employee, (n)= female

The interview setting created an opportunity for the employees to be more fluent in expressing their thoughts, in contrast to quantitative research. Additionally, interviews enabled us to understand the opinions of employees in a more profound way, e.g. by asking follow-up questions at the interviews, which otherwise would have been missed. The interview guide consisted of three main topics which were 1) TRS, 2) How employees experience that TRS impacts their retention and 3) how employees experience being motivated in the context of TRS (see appendix). The questions for the interviews were formed based on the TRS model and motivation theories. All interviews were recorded, transcribed verbatim, then coded using thematic analysis.

Data analysis

Thematic analysis is a qualitative analytic research tool that organises and describes data, and helps to discover themes and concepts that are embedded in interviews. Thematic analysis can reflect reality and give a better understanding of it. Ultimately, this helps create links between the data that helps in understanding the said data. Thematic analysis enables us to report, analyse and identify thematic meanings in relation to this data (Braun and Clarke, 2006). We chose to conduct thematic analysis because it is a flexible approach that can be applied to qualitative data across a range of epistemologies and ontological positions, as well as our research question. Thematic analysis is a process that develops over time and unveils the repeated patterns of meaning (Braun and Clarke, 2006). Thematic analysis implies searching across the whole data set that consists of coded extracts, and the analysis itself that is produced as a result. (Braun and Clarke, 2006.)

After all the interviews were transcribed, we started to get familiar with the data we collected and generated the initial codes. These initial codes were gathered in an Excel file, and we started to create a thematic map in order to find broader themes. From several initial codes, we found six preliminary themes in which all gathered data was relevant to each theme. After checking if the themes worked through the entire data set, and refinement of preliminary themes, we found some overlapping themes. Eventually, we found a coherent pattern and identified three major themes with two to three sub-themes. After defining and refining, we found the 'essence' of each theme and then analysed these themes.

Reliability and Validity

Any given research design within a logical set of statements can be judged by the quality according to certain logical tests (Yin, 2014). Four tests have been used to establish the quality of this empirical research. First, to increase the construct of validity, multiple sources of evidence were objectively conducted to maintain chain of evidence by interviews with 14 key informants who saturated the

population of one department at the MNC. Secondly, the internal validity has been verified with thematic analysis, and data analytics tactics by finding a coherent pattern throughout the data set. We chose to conduct semi-structured interviews (see appendix), in order to add validity and credibility to the data without manipulating the outcome.

Thirdly, the external validity deals with the issues of analytic generalisation, which is secured by identification of appropriate theory and research questions relying on different themes. The theoretical propositions can be used to develop and understand differences in employee motivation, such as how to enhance and maintain intrinsic motivation and to identify and develop the processes and structures that demotivate employees. Finally, the research validity is secured using a case study protocol, and a well-created case study database. If the same study would be conducted again, the investigator would arrive to the same findings and conclusions.

Ethical Considerations

Since the study is part of a social science context and contemporary phenomena within the real-world context, we need to protect the subjects (Yin, 2014). Compensation and benefits include several sensitive topics, e.g. knowledge about corporate financial reward strategies, salaries and bonuses, leadership style as well as internal training programs. These practices and strategies are often confidential, and part of the corporation's competitive advantage as well as its overall strategy. Therefore, due to the ethical guidelines for social science research, it was important to remain transparent about the aim of our research, inform all parties involved about the background of the research and provide confidentiality and anonymity to both the corporation and the interviewees.

Thus, all participants were informed in the beginning of the interviews both in oral and written form of the ethical guidelines of the research, such as the purpose of the study, voluntary participation, and the confidentiality and anonymity of the respondents. The participants were informed that the study was carried out at the University of Gothenburg and that the research would be published in Gothenburg University Publications Electronic Archive (GUPEA). All interview participants signed a participant consent form. Because the study concerns sensitivity information of the organisation the company requested full anonymity. Since we got the list from the HR manager, we secured anonymity by using only whether the interviewees were an employee or manager and did not use other details that may identify the participants.

Findings

The analysis of the results led to three main themes inspired by the TRS. Within each major theme, several sub-themes were identified. The main themes are compensation & benefits, work experience and culture & environment. In the final section, the main findings are gathered and categorised according to Ryan and Deci's (2000) dimensions of human motivation.

Compensation and Benefits

The first theme, compensation and benefits, revealed two sub-themes, which are Direct financial, such as monetary pay, variable pay and pay development and indirect financial, such as benefits.

Direct Financial: Monetary pay, Variable pay and Pay development

> My wage is not something that motivates me, it is more of a hygiene factor, ... clearly when you are good at what you do it can affect your long-term wage development. (Manager 2)

In general, employees and managers experience monetary rewards as hygiene factors, which is in line with Herzberg's two-factor theory (1966). It is noteworthy that monetary pay is experienced as satisfying as long as there is transparency about the wage development. Furthermore, employees and managers seem to be unsure who is responsible in communicating this transparency about monetary pay:

> I assume it is my manager's responsibility to tell me how and what for I am rewarded... there is also information online, but I think it is difficult and time-consuming to find the relevant information. I feel that I need to prioritise operational tasks instead of investing in my own knowledge about available compensations and benefits. (Employee 13)

> … It is a hygiene factor to take care of yourself and to read up about what resources one has access to and that is also the kind of relationship I have with my leader… (Manager 4)

Variable pay such as a bonus is described as satisfying, assuming that the process of variable pay is transparent and regularly communicated. Since a bonus is the result of the organisation reaching business goals, it not experienced satisfying or motivating and is therefore a hygiene factor (Herzberg, 1966).

Participants generally perceive their current salary as satisfying, since there is some communication about what kind of performance is rewarded. All participants mention the existence of wage negotiation meetings, but only employee nr 12 refers to these meetings as 'critically important' and as an opportunity that gives a clear understanding about how and why salary is granted and how a higher salary may be achieved. On the other hand, when there is a significant delay or failure to reward indicated performance, employees experience this as very dissatisfying. In other words, employees interpret what the organisation's promises to reward, and what is actually rewarded as a reflection of how highly they are valued. This is related to the question of informational transparency (Colquitt, 2001), since there are uncommunicated expectations about rewarded performance.

> ...It is important that my salary reflects how difficult and complex my work is… and if it doesn't, I feel that I am not valued by my employer. (Employee 13)

The interviewees also believe that all alike performance should be rewarded equally, which confirms Armstrong's (2012) claim about the significance of fair pay development. Employees even compare to what degree their performance is rewarded to employees with same or similar position in other

organisations. One of the interviewees says that the salary needs to be competitive on the market and at least the same or even better compared to others with a similar profession (Manager 2).

The employees interpret pay development as recognition for their performance, which is in line with Vroom's (1964) expectancy theory, implying that there is a clear link between higher performance leading to expected desired reward. One respondent argued 'if you do a good job, the salary will follow you' (Employee 9). Thus, pay development is experienced as recognition for a job well done, and is a type of external motivation through introjected regulation (Ryan & Deci, 2000), because it contributes to higher performance and ego-enhancement.

The structural ambiguity of pay development creates some specific tension, since the financial reward system is based on individual pay that is determined by salary boxes. These salary boxes have a salary range with different positions and stages. When an employee pursues a career path within the organisation, he or she risks landing in a different salary box. In practice, the salary boxes discourage internal mobility since employees are afraid of losing their amount of salary and access to certain position-specific benefits. The interviewees expressed that these salary boxes are neglecting their work experience, competencies and years in the company:

> … The salary boxes are not always based on how good you are or how long you have been here, it is based on what box you belong to, and within that box 'your worth' can vary based on your performance or on your manager's budget. (Employee 13)

> You should be able to take new opportunities inside the company without thinking how you will get rewarded. (Manager 2)

In line with Colquitt (2001) and Armstrong (2012), interviewees experience injustice in relation to fair pay development associated with different starting salaries. Some employees who have been longer in the company feel it is unfair that new employees with less experience in the position have a higher starting salary (Manager 2). According to Vroom (1964), it is important to give employees information on what is expected to achieve those expectations. If people feel that their pay development is going in line with their performance, it creates satisfaction and fulfils the basic psychological needs for competence.

> But injustice related to salary you start within the organisation, if you fail to negotiate a high starting salary and end up at a low level, it is hard to work it up. (Employee 13)

Indirect financial: Benefits

In this study, benefits refer to the rewards that have a financial value for the employees and managers but are not directly part of their pay check. For instance, some indirect monetary rewards are pension, health-care and insurances. According to the interviewees, benefits are something one 'expects' to receive and not something that motivates. Thus, indirect financial rewards are a hygiene factor (Herzberg, 1966). The interviewees also seem to have a lack of knowledge about their benefits:

> Benefits seem as a complex tool you can use, but you don't, because you usually need to put a lot of effort to really know and use all of the opportunities. (Employee 13)

Some interviewees experience injustice when it comes to benefits. This is because some benefits, such as a company car, are currently granted only to people with a certain job positions within the organisation, yet some employees whose position does not entitle them to a company car do still possess one, since they have been in the organisation for a longer time.

The Work Experience

The second theme, work experiences, revealed three sub-themes, which are training and development, career path, the work itself, and performance management.

Training and development

The sub theme of training is related to internal and external education opportunities. All interviewees had mostly positive associations with training since it improves performance and develop their competencies, and therefore are an extrinsic motivation in the form of integration regulation (Ryan & Deci, 2000). Thus, the results do not support Herzberg's (1966) two-factor model. Training was depicted demotivating when it did not develop the participant's competencies and lacked professional guidance and expert knowledge. The external courses were seen as attractive, yet due to the high participation cost the organisation cannot afford sending everyone to take part of the certain trainings at once. The interviewees also highlighted the struggle having to prioritise between operational tasks and participating in training:

> … I am tired of taking education that doesn't develop me, it feels like a waste of time…. this also means that courses are to be held by the right people [..] it would like to manage my personal development, but I don't have time for it. If you end up in a job where you have a lot to do you prioritise operational tasks. (Employee 13)

All interviewees stated the importance of individual growth, that is the desire to develop competence or increase performance, thus supporting Ryan and Deci's (2000) dimension of intrinsic motivation. Development in this context is associated with individual development either as the planned outcome or situational consequence:

> I want to develop all the time [..] I had an opportunity to work with additional tasks beyond my original job responsibilities, received external training on behalf of the organisation and I also got a coach and a mentor. This is what I have received, and I have developed a lot. (Manager 4)

Purely intrinsic motivation (Ryan & Deci 2000) appeared several times when the respondents experienced individual growth rewarding by itself. Nearly all interviewees described the fact that their employer organisation is an MNC an attractive feature:

> … This is a global company and I get to work with people from all over the world… when I worked with China for several years, I also had the opportunity to grow as an individual. I took this opportunity to change something in my life. And that is my greatest take away from that experience. (Manager 4)

Career path

All participants agreed that career paths were experienced highly motivating. The career paths are experienced in line with individual and professional development, and if they are not going forward, they are experienced as demotivating:

> … If you do not feel that you are moving forward, it means that you have missed out on something, and you need to fix it in order to move forward... (Employee 13)

In fact, the development opportunities and career paths are valued more than monetary pay. In this case career moves are used as an instrument to reach the desired monetary reward (Vroom, 1964). Two managers describe changing careers as the only way to reach a higher salary: 'If you want to get better paid, you have to change your job' (Manager 4), and: 'the system does not fit for people who want to quickly move towards a higher salary' (Manager 2).

Several respondents highlighted that visible career path, internal mobility as well as job rotation boosted motivation, especially when leaders had a transparent communication in relation to career paths, for example by coaching. Once again, the employees and managers seem to be unsure about the roles and responsibilities of not only setting wages but also building career and getting more responsibility:

> I think it is important to give clear descriptions about what it means to build a career here [..] as a manager you should be able to help employees set these kind of long-term goals from the beginning during onboarding. (Employee 8)

> You are responsible for your own development, it is not the company that needs to ask you, you need to ask for more responsibility and with that come opportunities... (Employee 14)

Work itself

Flexible working arrangements as well as challenging and interesting work were highly valued and experienced as a motivator and at times a reward itself which supports Ryan and Deci's (2000) claim about people striving for autonomy and competence in their work. Flexibility is illustrated as 'freedom under responsibility, that gives flexibility in the life puzzle' (Manager 1), but also as 'freedom with trust': 'if you get the trust, you do it better' (Employee 11). A number of respondents experienced some policies, requirements and a lack of autonomy to do their own work ineffective and demotivating. In some situations, flexibility was also experienced contradictory, since they organisation encourages having flexibility whilst also having slow and complex decision-making processes.

All respondents experienced problem solving highly motivating, describing it inspiring and a catalyst for making one extra motivated (Manager 4 & Employee 11). Problem solving together in a team with likeminded colleagues was also motivating (Employee 10). Thus, having autonomy over work tasks, relatedness to other colleagues and developing through challenging work made work itself reward and supports Ryan & Deci's (2000) description of intrinsic motivation:

> I'm really motivated when my work contributes to the industry as a whole [..] you feel satisfied when you feel you have done something important, that it means something. (Manager 4)

> When I see that I make a difference - it motivates me. I think it's fun to push things forward in a way that you become better at what you do. (Manager 3)

Performance management

Performance management is a sub-theme to work experiences that includes employees' experiences of recognition, feedback and goal setting. Recognition from the organisation is related to performance and trust. Interviewees depict recognition as 'a receipt' for a job well done. When the employees and managers experience their leaders as micromanaging and controlling, they interpret this kind of behaviour as a lack of trust and therefore demotivating (Employees 12 & 13; Manager 2). Positive recognition is experienced as 'reward by itself' (employee 10; Manager 4) and as a motivating factor that is in line with Herzberg's claim (1966). By recognition the interviewees mean both monetary and non-financial recognition. Non-financial recognition, such as 'tap on the shoulder' or feedback is experienced 'to motivate more than money' (Employee 13), because feedback for one's work can enhance the feeling of relatedness and belonging, as well as enhance self-esteem. Thus, intrinsic rewards, such as feedback, may have long-lasting effects on motivation (Armstrong, 2012):

> Reward for me means getting appreciation from my managers and my employees. It's really important to me. I would put them at the top of my priority list… it makes me

feel appreciated and needed at the company [...] recognition is much more important than salary. (Manager 4)

The interviewees described goal setting as a medium to build career paths and a key to higher performance. Lack of transparency and clarity about goal setting raised strong feelings of frustration. The results hint how the interviewees are longing to as well as struggling with internalizing these global business goals:

> The department must make clear why we do what we do and what is our common goal. Then the common goals should be brought down to my level to help me relate to it. (Employee 13)

Culture and Environment

The third theme, Culture and Environment includes interviewees' experiences of an organisational climate. The analysis revealed sub-themes of product and brand, the work environment, and leadership and management.

Product and Brand

The product and brand focus on interviewees experiences of relatedness to the company by brand and product and whether these are motivational factors. A strong employer brand serves as a prerequisite for brand promise because it gives a brand promise, which serves as a psychological contract (Rousseau, 1996) for employees even before they start working at the organisation. The word 'responsible businesses was mentioned several times as well as 'changing working style', 'inspiring technology' and how this impacts the future of the industry: 'it's a really attractive brand, we have cool products [..] we are not here for money we are here to deliver and being appreciated for that '(Manager4). Two respondents did not like the products, but instead they were intrinsically interested about the processes and changing world behind them.

> Larger company, larger processes, and then you get more proper base. You are a small part of the whole cake. But it happens a lot in the industry and that is exciting. I don't even like the product, but I like to learn new things and I can learn everything. (Employee 11)

Work environment

Work environment gathers interviewees' experiences of social and physical work environment and organisational culture related initativities. The data supports Ryan and Deci's (2000) suggestion about the link between social environment and motivation, as colleagues, teams and managers may facilitate intrinsic motivation by supporting the needs for autonomy, competence and relatedness. All interviewees have a consensus about a good team being crucial to their performance and general well-being: 'We support each other, colleagues, managers and HR, it is a really good system' (Manager 5).

Several respondents underlined how they experience team building activities and events highly motivating and believe that this is something that increases team cohesion, however, the interviewees do not see it as highly prioritised in the organisation's budget. One respondent stated that the company should inspire more of its employees by organising knowledge sharing activities:

> I think we are bad at inspiring each other, we could have had much more internal lectures about fun projects, women who have succeeded, people who have lived somewhere else. Because people like that. (Employee 11)

Modern work environment that inspires and possesses all fundamental resources, equipment and space is experienced as a hygiene factor (Employee 11). However, if the physical work environment is not functioning, it is experienced demotivating as it is experienced as a basic demand for well-being:

'Working environment can be both mental and physical. If you have a poor physical work environment it impacts your health' (Employee 12). Several interviewees stated how the change to modern work environment boosted their motivation. Thus, the work environment is a motivational factor and part of introjection regulation, because the employees and managers cannot impact the equipment, but good functioning equipment enhances their performance in order to do work tasks.

It was common for interviewees with managerial position to experience the development of their team rewarding and therefore motivating. The fact that all interviewees were operating in an international environment with people from different cultures was experienced as motivating: 'We need people from different nationalities who bring different things to the table, it is super important that we keep our culture open and take responsibility of our actions' (Manager 5). The respondents had only positive association with the core values of the organisation. One respondent stated that with time, the company values are becoming more important, because it is aligned with personal behaviour and attitudes: 'Knowing the core values of the business helps me to make difficult decisions in my daily work and explain my actions to colleagues' (Employee 13).

The headquarters of the case company is based in Sweden, which also impacts the culture of the department. Several respondents highlighted their appreciation to having Swedish working culture as it is flatter, and allows for more open discussions with management:

> I have worked in different countries and here it is special - there is not that much hierarchy - it's flatter and you can influence the decisions made. (Employee 13)

Leadership and management

All respondents experienced managers that are present and open to dialogue significant. Leadership and management is a motivation factor, and a good manager can affect employee's motivation and likelihood to stay in the company. Thus, the results do not support Herzberg's (1966) two-factor model. A manager who supports and gives recognition is experienced to 'inspire performance' (Employee 11; Manager 4). Lack of feedback from top management and managers is demotivating: 'I experience that a bad manager is the one who does not give feedback at all, and the one does not know what to do better - it is very demotivating' (Manager 4).

A 'good' leader is described as someone who coaches individuals and enables them to understand development opportunities (Employee 9, Employee 11 & Employee 10). However, leaders understand and grant flexibility and autonomy differently as one employee experienced that the leaders have different images of what flexibility means (Employee 13). This came up in another interview, were the respondent stated that the employee had flexibility to work from home, but at the same time, the manager expects the employee to work at the office.

Over half of the respondents highlighted the importance of having a trust-based relationship with their leader. Several interviewees recognised that to some extent they are responsible for themselves, but how they define that responsibility varies. For example, several employees experienced that development opportunities, career paths and one's motivation depends on the manager. Several respondents brought up the challenge about people in managerial roles lacking people and leadership skills, which lead to unjust treatment.

> ...How professional the manager is, it can't be built on chemistry it needs to be grounded on facts, too often people are promoted to a leadership position simply because there is no other career step available. I'm tired of this quick fix - instead more broader job descriptions should be available. (Manager 4)

> Now, there is a group manager who jumps in, and in the long term they should go on these training courses, but they are often delayed, or leaders avoid training due doing more of operational tasks. (Employee 12)

Discussion

The following section presents a synthesis of some of the main findings and conclusions. First part presents a summary of the main results that are presented through Ryan and Deci's (2000) types of motivation. The second part discusses the main findings, and the third part concludes the study.

The aim of this study was to describe and explain how the TRS within different elements are interconnected and perceived motivating, and how the identified total rewards factors correspond to different types of intrinsic and extrinsic motivation. While previous studies have downgraded the role of extrinsic rewards as motivating factor alone (Furnham, 2006; Hellgren, 2017), there is a lack of knowledge about the connection between the holistic TRS and how the different factors are connected to extrinsic and intrinsic motivation. Thus, the present study shows that there are several layers to extrinsic and intrinsic motivation in relation to TRS from the perspective of white-collar workers. In table 2 below, we show a summary of the main findings, in the light of extrinsic and intrinsic motivation connected to TRS. It is important to notice that not all of the motivational factors can be applied to all interviewees.

Table 2. TRS through dimensions of human motivation (Ryan & Deci, 2000)

TRS model	TRS factor	Hygiene factor	Type of motivation according Ryan & Deci (2000)	
			Extrinsic	Intrinsic
Compensation	Monetary pay	+		
Compensation	Pay development		Introjection	
Compensation	Variable pay/bonus	+		
Benefits	All benefits	+		
Work Experience	Training (courses, program)		Integration	
Work Experience	Development (individual)			+
Work Experience	Career		Integration	
Work Experience	Performance Management: credit for a job well done		Introjection	
Work Experience	Work itself: Autonomy and flexibility in relation to work			+

Work Experience	Work itself: Challenging and interesting work	+
Work Experience	Performance management: Goal setting	Identification
Culture & Environment	Leadership & management	Introjection
Culture & Environment	Brand identity	Identification
Culture & Environment	Product	Identification
Culture & Environment	Social environment	Identification
Culture & Environment	Physical environment	External Regulation
Culture & Environment	Culture	Identification

The empiric data shows that all TRS factors under the theme of compensation and benefits, except pay development, are interpreted as hygiene factors, meaning that they do not motivate, but when absent lead to feelings of dissatisfaction. This result supports Herzberg's (1966) two-factor theory. This is most likely because of the privileges that white-collar workers have when working in a welfare state such as Sweden, which has progressive tax on salaries, relatively high GDP, and high standards of living (OECD, 2018).

The TRS factor of work experience revealed both extrinsically and intrinsically motivating dimensions. Intrinsically motivating factors were identified with the work itself. What most of them have in common is being part of work experience and fulfilling the need of autonomy and feelings of competence, while completing work-related tasks (e.g. intrinsically interesting product, processes and systems). Moreover, when the values and goals of the activity itself were aligned with personal values, or to the activity of solving problems together with a team, this created feelings of belonging (Ryan & Deci, 2000). In contrast, if an individual experiences lack of autonomy, competence or not enjoying the activity itself, the act is caused by instrumental value and thus extrinsic motivation.

The last theme - culture and environment - was experienced extrinsically motivating. Most of identification regulation of extrinsic motivation was related to the theme of culture and environment. This is most likely because individuals have somewhat identified with working conditions, goal setting, brand identity, product, social environment and culture to reach their personally set goals. All integrated type of extrinsic motivation was found under the theme of work experience and is related to professional development. Some factors of introjection regulation were common to all themes; pay

development, performance management, recognition for a job well done and leadership and management. What these factors all have in common is the focus on approval on self or others, such as recognition. Physical environment was the only element identified as an external regulation since the respondents are not able to influence this factor and are to comply with it. None of the findings included A-motivation (Ryan & Deci, 2000).

Criticism of theories

The two-factor theory creates a good basic framework to understand what factors are essential for employees. Seeing that the empiric of this research paper contradicts Herzberg's (1966) two-factor theory, this shows that another more nuanced theoretical tool is needed. As an example, to illustrate this mismatch between Herzberg's model (1966) and empiric, one may consider looking at the data of this research paper in relation to training and development, career, leadership experience as well as social environment, physical environment and culture that were not identified as hygiene factors. One of the reasons for this mismatch may be the fact that the two-factor model was created nearly 60 years ago and in a different cultural context, which means that the way white-collar workers experience motivation and hygiene factors has most likely changed. We find it interesting that some of the hygiene factors such as status and employment security were not part of empiric at all - probably due to low power distance that exists in Sweden, meaning that status is not that important, and employment security is relatively high for white-collar workers (Hofstede, 2019). The empirical findings of monetary rewards and variable pay do not support SDT (Gagne & Deci, 2005) to a certain extent because the extrinsic rewards, in a Swedish context, are experienced as a hygiene factor. The results show that pay development has a motivating effect if it is experienced to be in line with performance (Vroom, 1964), and as recognition for a job well done (Ryan & Deci 2000).

The findings are in line with previous research on the factors that contribute to motivation and performance (Hellgren et al. 2017), and the needs of autonomy, competence and relatedness (Deci & Ryan, 1985), in order to experience different types of motivation. White-collar workers experienced the importance of fair pay development, working life and relations to their leaders and colleagues, which is in line with Armstrong (2012). However, SDT suggests that intrinsic motivation comes from intrinsic interest (Ryan & Deci, 2000), without considering the significance of transparency and organisational justice. Hence, we argue that the lack of transparency within the different factors causes dissatisfaction and demotivation. The participants long for autonomy, and display discontent about the lack of transparency and communication about the definition and distribution of flexibility and autonomy at all levels of the organisation. This tension supports previous research on how increased autonomy has changed the role of HRM from being an intermediate to a source, which offers a set of tools (career development, competency management, work organization, etc.) for performance management. This means that more autonomy for the individuals puts more responsibility on the employees with regards to their present and future situation, which as shown in this study needs to be clearly communicated. The increased desire for employee autonomy has also changed the role of management that is in line with Taskin & Devos (2005) research.

A need for transparency

Literature about pay transparency that looks at openness and communication of pay information highlights how, in the context of benefits, insufficient communication may impact pay satisfaction and other types of employee reasoning about organisational justice (Marasi and Bennett, 2016). Another study about employee benefits and organisational justice suggests that the practical way of enhancing employee fairness perceptions lays in the hands of supervisors and in the way how effectively the usability and management of benefits is communicated (Laundon et al., 2019). Thus, previous research on transparency of compensation and benefits confirms the empiric of this study that the employees experience lack of transparency from leadership and management demotivating.

The lack of transparency in this organization may be the effect of too heavy of a workload. It is common for leaders in this organisation to have dual roles of being in charge of operational tasks, while also supposedly leading other people. Interviewees also highlight their frustration with many leaders lacking people skills, which support findings from a previous study called 'Project Oxygen' at Google, which indicates how managers' technical skills were much less valued by employees than their people skills (Bryant, 2011). Coaching skills are something the interviewees want to have more of, since they believe that a coaching leader enables them to understand development opportunities, supported by a previous study about agile coaches at Spotify (Bäcklander, 2019), which highlights how one of the main tasks of a coach is to leverage learning. A common way to foster learning is by giving feedback - which the employees also lack. Furthermore, this knowledge is crucial for HR professionals, including coaching as an intervention strategy, which should be integrated in learning and development programs (Aziz, 2019). In a similar manner, it is important to invest in management training, as our findings show that leadership and management is experienced as a motivational factor, especially by employees receiving feedback and recognition.

In a fast-changing global industry, where flexibility is required, and individuals are expected to become more self-determined, it is important that HRM identify individuals' needs of autonomy and responsibility, but also to standardise individuals towards flexibility, autonomy, self-management and responsibility. As it has been shown, money is not a motivation factor, and white-collar workers are looking more at the higher order needs that can be met with rewards of work experience and work environment. Thus, a holistic TRS is a good strategic tool in the process of understanding the specific reward needs and preferences among white-collar workers and to optimise reward offerings that endorse employee motivation. The advantage of TRS, as indicated in this study, has identified and explained intrinsic and extrinsic rewards that relate to individuals' needs of autonomy, competence and relatedness, and thus, different types of motivation. Financial rewards are not motivational factors and for that reason, intrinsic rewards are factors that enhance and maintain individuals' intrinsic motivation and therefore become more meaningful. Moreover, intrinsic rewards can increase creativity that may lead to innovation and will encourage employees to take initiative to seize opportunities (Pink, 2009). Thus, it is important that the organization invests in the TRS factors that have a connection to intrinsic rewards (individual development, work itself and culture and environment), in the context of white-collar workers in a knowledge-intensive industry.

It is important that the HRM department addresses the relationship between non-financial rewards and different types of motivation in order to enhance employees' intrinsic motivation. Moreover, our contribution to research about C&B and intrinsic and extrinsic motivation is about how intrinsic rewards have the potential to enhance different types of motivational factors. The study therefore further extends SDT (Gagné & Deci, 2005) by suggesting that transparency has a significant impact upon enhancing all motivational factors of the TRS. For example, participants find transparency in relation to TRS management, individual development and professional development important which is also considered beneficial for organisations. On the other hand, the lack of employee knowledge about TRS in general and the lack of open and direct communication between leaders and employees about the need for transparency about TRS adds further complexity to the question of TRS and employee motivation. This also shows that neither the individuals nor the organisation sets TRS management and work motivation as a priority.

Conclusion

In the field of research about HRM, the main contribution of this study is that the interconnected relationship between reward and motivation is not conclusive. In addition, organisations may strategically reward employees in a way that will motivate them from within in a sustainable and long-lasting way, which in turn will benefit the wellbeing of employees and potentially lead to higher performances. Intrinsic rewards, such as factors of work experience, culture and environment, and individual development together with educational training has therefore become a separate dimension

within TRS due to the increased need for autonomy and continuous competence development. The interviewees also expressed a growing need for autonomy, competence and transparency.

One of the limitations of this study is the absence of a comparative analysis, since the organisation requested to be granted full anonymity of the interviewees. We encourage that future research about TRS and motivation proposition would look at differences between generations, gender, professions and countries, to better understand why individuals value different elements of TRS differently.

Reference list

Allvin, M., & Aronsson, G. (2003). The future of work environment reforms: Does the concept of work environment apply within the new economy?. *International Journal of Health Services*, 33(1), 99-111.

Allvin, M., Aronsson, G., Hagström, T., Johansson, G., & Lundberg, U. (2006). *Gränslöst arbete.: Socialpsykologiska perspektiv på det nya arbetslivet*. Malmö: Liber.

Armstrong, M. (2012). *Armstrong's handbook of reward management practice: Improving performance through reward*. Philadelphia, PA: Kogan Page Publisher. Available at: https://ebookcentral-proquest-com.ezproxy.ub.gu.se [Accessed 15 May 2019].

Aziz, K. (2019). Why is humility so relevant for leaders and can it be developed through coaching?. *Strategic HR Review*, 18(1), 30-33.

Benbasat, I., Goldstein, D. K., & Mead, M. (1987). The case research strategy in studies of information systems. *MIS Quarterly*, 11(3), 369-386.

Boltanski, L., & Chiapello, E. (2005). The new spirit of capitalism. *International Journal of Politics, Culture, and Society*, 18(3-4), 161-188.

Boxall, P., & Purcell, J. (2016). *Strategy and human resource management*. London: Palgrave.

Bratton, J., & Gold, J. (2017). *Human resource management: theory and practice*. London: Palgrave.

Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2006). Using thematic analysis in psychology. *Qualitative Research in Psychology*, 3(2), 77-101.

Bryant, A. (2011). Google's Quest to Build a Better Boss. *New York Times*, 12. Retrieved from: https://www.nytimes.com/2011/03/13/business/13hire.html

Bäcklander, G. (2019). Doing complexity leadership theory: How agile coaches at Spotify practise enabling leadership. *Creativity and Innovation Management*, 28(1), 42-60.

Cegarra-Leiva, D., Sánchez-Vidal, M. E., & Cegarra-Navarro, J. G. (2012). Work life balance and the retention of managers in Spanish SMEs. *The International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 23(1), 91-108.

Cohen-Charash, Y., & Spector, P. E. (2001). The role of justice in organizations: A meta-analysis. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 86(2), 278-321.

Colquitt, J. A., Conlon, D. E., Wesson, M. J., Porter, C. O. & Ng, K. Y. (2001). Justice at the millennium: a meta-analytic review of 25 years of organizational justice research. *Journal of Applied Psychology,* 86(3), 425-445.

Colquitt, J. A. (2001). On the dimensionality of organizational justice: A construct validation of a measure. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 86(3), 386-400.

D'Amato, A., & Herzfeldt, R. (2008). Learning orientation, organizational commitment and talent retention across generations: A study of European managers. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 23(8), 929-953.

Deci, E. L., & Ryan, R. M. (1985). Cognitive Evaluation Theory. In: *Intrinsic Motivation and Self-Determination in Human Behaviour* (pp. 48-85). Boston, MA: Springer.

Eriksson, A., Sverke, M., Hellgren, J., & Wallenberg, J. (2002). Lön som styrmedel. *Konsekvenser för kommunanställdas attityder och prestation «, Arbetsmarknad & Arbetsliv*, 8(3), 205-217.

Furnham, A. (2006). Pouring money down the drain?. *Manager*, 26-27.

Furåker, B. (2005). *Sociological perspectives on labor markets*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

Gagné, M., & Deci, E. L. (2005). Self-determination theory and work motivation. *Journal of Organizational behaviour*, 26(4), 331-362.

Gagné, M., & Forest, J. (2008). The study of compensation systems through the lens of self-determination theory: Reconciling 35 years of debate. *Canadian Psychology*, 49(3), 225-232.

Gerhart, B. and Rynes, S. (2003). *Compensation: Theory, evidence and strategic implications*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Gross, S. E., & Friedman, H. M. (2004). Creating an effective total reward strategy: Holistic approach better supports business success. *Benefits Quarterly*, 20(3), 7-12.

Gupta, N., & Shaw, J. D. (2014). Employee compensation: The neglected area of HRM research. *Human Resource Management Review*, 24(1), 1-4.

Hakonen, N., Hakonen, A., Hulkko, K., & Ylikorkala, A. (2005). *Palkitse taitavasti–Palkitsemistavat johtamisen välineenä* [Reward Proficiently – Reward systems as a management tool] Helsinki: WSOY.

House, R. J., & Wigdor, L. A. (1967). Herzberg's dual-factor theory of job satisfaction and motivation: A review of the evidence and a criticism. *Personnel Psychology*, 20(4), 369-390.

Nylander, M., & Hakonen, A. (2015). *Palkitseminen ihmisten johtamisessa* [Rewarding in people management]. Jyväskylä: PS-kustannus.

Heneman, R. L., & Ledford, G. E. (1998). Competency pay for professionals and managers in business: A review and implications for teachers. *Journal of Personnel Evaluation in Education*, 12(2), 103-121.

Hellgren, J., Falkenberg, H., Malmrud, S., Eriksson, A., & Sverke, M. (2017). *Lön, motivation och prestation: Psykologiska perspektiv på verksamhetsnära lönesättning*. Stockholm: Svensk näringsliv.

Hofstede. (2019). Hofstede Insights. [ONLINE] Available at: https://www.hofstede-insights.com/country-comparison/sweden/ . [Accessed 15 May 2019].

Herzberg, F. (1966). *Work and the Nature of Man*. Cleveland: World Pub. Co.

Herzberg, F. (1987). One more time: How do you motivate employees? *Harvard Business Review*, 65(5), 102-120.

Kickul, J. (2001). Promises made, promises broken: An exploration of employee attraction and retention practices in small business. *Journal of Small Business Management*, 39(4), 320-335.

Kohn, A. (1998). Challenging behaviourist dogma: Myths about money and motivation. *Compensation & Benefits Review*, 30(2), 27-37.

Laundon, M., Cathcart, A., & McDonald, P. (2019). Just benefits? Employee benefits and organizational justice. *Employee Relations: The International Journal*, 41(4), 708-723.

Latham, G. P. and Locke, E. A. (1979). Goal Setting – a motivational technique that works, *Organizational Dynamics*, 8(2), 68-80.

Larsson, B., Ulfsdotter Eriksson, Y., & Adolfsson, P. (2017). *Personalvetenskapliga perspektiv på lön och belöning.* Stockholm: Liber

Maslow, A. (1954). *Motivation and Personality*. New York: Harper and Row.

McClelland, D. C. (1961). *The Achieving Society*. Princeton, New Jersey: Van Nostrand.

Marasi, S., & Bennett, R. J. (2016). Pay communication: Where do we go from here?. *Human Resource Management Review*, 26(1), 50-58.

Milkovich, G. T., Gerhart, B., & Hannon, J. (1991). The effects of research and development intensity on managerial compensation in large organizations. *The Journal of High Technology Management Research*, 2(1), 133-150.

Milkovich, G. T., Newman, J. M., & Gerhart, B. (2011). *Compensation* (10th ed.). New York: McGraw-Hill.

OECD. (2019). Revenue Statistics 2018 - Sweden. [ONLINE] Available at: http://www.oecd.org/tax/revenue-statistics-sweden.pdf. [Accessed 15 May 2019].

Pink, D. H. (2009). *Drive: The surprising truth about what motivates us*. New York: Riverhead Books.

Porter, L. W. and Lawler, E. E. (1968) *Managerial Attitudes and Performance*. Homewood, IL: Irwin-Dorsey

Ritchie, S. and Martin, P. (1999) *Motivation Management*. Aldershot: Gower.

Rousseau, D. (1996). Changing the deal while keeping people. *Academy of Management Perspectives* 10(1), 50-59.

Rowley, J. (2002). Using Case Studies in Research. *Management Research News*, 25(1), 16-27.

Ryan, R. M., & Deci, E. L. (2000). Intrinsic and extrinsic motivations: Classic definitions and new directions. *Contemporary Educational Psychology*, 25(1), 54-67.

Ryan, R. M. (1982). Control and information in the intrapersonal sphere: An extension of cognitive evaluation theory. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 43(3), 450.

Samuel, M. O., & Chipunza, C. (2009). Employee retention and turnover: Using motivational variables as a panacea. *African Journal of Business Management*, 3(9), 410-415.

Skinner, B. F. (1957). *Verbal behaviour*. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts.

Tabibnia, G., Satpute, A. B., & Lieberman, M. D. (2008). The sunny side of fairness: preference for fairness activates reward circuitry (and disregarding unfairness activates self-control circuitry). *Psychological Science*, 19(4), 339-347.

Taskin, L., & Devos, V. (2005). Paradoxes from the individualization of human resource management: The case of telework. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 62(1), 13-24.

Thibault Landry, A., Gagné, M., Forest, J., Guerrero, S., Séguin, M., & Papachristopoulos, K. (2017). The relation between financial incentives, motivation, and performance: An integrative SDT-based investigation. *Journal of Personnel Psychology*, 16(2), 61-76.

Thibault Landry, A., Schweyer, A., & Whillans, A. (2017). Winning the War for Talent: Modern Motivational Methods for Attracting and Retaining Employees. *Compensation & Benefits Review*, 49(4), 230-246.

Tremblay, M., Sire, B., & Balkin, D. B. (2000). The role of organizational justice in pay and employee benefit satisfaction, and its effects on work attitudes. *Group & Organization Management*, 25(3), 269-290.

Vroom, V. H. (1964). *Work and motivation* (Vol. 54). New York: Wiley.

Wahba, M. A., & Bridwell, L. G. (1976). Maslow reconsidered: A review of research on the need hierarchy theory. *Organizational behaviour and Human Performance*, 15(2), 212-240.

Wallace, M. J. and Szilagyi, A. D. (1982) *Managing Behaviour in Organizations*, Illinois: Scott, Foreman & Company.

Werner, S., & Ward, S. G. (2004). Recent compensation research: An eclectic review. *Human Resource Management Review*, 14(2), 201-227.

Whitaker, P. (2010). What non-financial rewards are successful motivators? Leading industry experts answer your strategic queries. *Strategic HR Review*, 9(1), 43-44.

WorldatWork (2000). *Total Rewards: From strategy to implementation*, Scottsdale, AZ, WorldatWork

Yin, R. K. (2014). *Case study research: design and methods* (5th ed.) Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications.

Zingheim, P. K., & Schuster, J. R. (2001). Winning the talent game: Total rewards and the better workforce deal!. *Compensation and Benefits Management*, 17(3), 33-39.

Appendix 1

Interview guide

In the beginning of every interview: *Tape recorders conduct ethical guidelines - anonymity / confidentiality, consent, information and purpose*

Interview guide is structured around 3 comprehensive themes: 1) TRS 2) how the employees see rewards affecting their retention 3) how the employee feels motivated with Total Rewards

Background
Interview number
Date
Gender
Profession and responsibility
Years in profession
Years in organization
Why did you choose this profession and this company?

TRS

1) How do you get rewarded?

   a) Is there anything else beyond compensation and benefits that you can experience rewarding?

2) What does compensation and benefit mean for you?

3) Do you experience any justice / injustice between employees?

4) How do you feel that the organization's rewards meet your needs?

Retention

1) Describe how you feel that your company does to attract and retain employees?

   a) What role do you think rewards have in this?

2) Could you describe the importance of having access to education and development opportunities?

3) What is most important for you to stay in a workplace?

4) Would you be able to describe what is important for your performance?

Motivation

1) What is motivation?

   a) Could you give an example? What does it mean to you?

   b) Can you describe what motivates you? What makes you demotivated?

   c) How does it feel when you are motivated?

2) Do you feel that your motivation has changed since you started this organization? How?

3) What significance does rewards have for your work motivation?

     a) What significance does work environment and culture have?

4) What do you find valuable in your work?

     a) Competence? Recognition/ Feedback? Autonomy? Colleagues/Managers/Social relations? Rewarding? Flexibility?

5) If you would be able to change something in your work, what would it be?

6) Do you think your job is meaningful and appreciated? How?

7) How should it be in the future to be an attractive employer?

Is there anything we have not asked or forgotten to ask?

Appendix 2

Time table

Activity	Week	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21	22	23
Master thesis Course starts		▓																			
Seminar		▓																			
Seminar		▓																			
Contact companies		▓																			
Meeting in person or by phone			▓			▓															
Reading about Background		▓	▓	▓	▓	▓	▓	▓	▓	▓	▓	▓	▓	▓	▓	▓					
Reading about Previous Studies		▓	▓	▓	▓	▓	▓	▓	▓	▓	▓	▓	▓	▓	▓	▓					
Reading about Theories		▓	▓	▓	▓	▓	▓	▓	▓	▓	▓	▓	▓	▓	▓	▓					
Writing about BG, PS and T			▓	▓	▓	▓	▓	▓	▓	▓	▓	▓	▓	▓	▓	▓					
Create An Interview guide			▓	▓																	
Pilot Interview						▓															
Update Interview guide					▓																
Collect Data with Interviews						▓	▓	▓	▓												
Transcribe and code					▓	▓	▓	▓	▓	▓	▓										
Analyze data													▓	▓	▓	▓					
Writing conclusions and results																	▓	▓			
DL 4th Mars								▓													
DL 10th April													▓								
Deadline for Draft 15th of May																		▓			
Seminar																			▓		
Review and adjust																			▓	▓	▓
Submission of final report 5th of June																					▓
Presentation and Opposition 5th of June																					▓