



COMPONENTS OF REMUNERATION AND EMPLOYEE SATISFACTION: THE IMPACT OF EFFORT REWARDS AND CAREER ADVANCEMENT

Abdelhadi Naji

Université du Québec à Trois-Rivières, Canada

The objective of our research is to examine the relationship between employee satisfaction vis-à-vis the remuneration structure. We draw on a literature survey to elaborate a questionnaire to measure the link among the different dimensions of remuneration, and those that measure employment satisfaction. The questionnaire has been administered to a sample of 200 employees in a Canadian call center. The correlation and regression analyses show different satisfaction levels regarding direct (fixed and variables) and indirect remuneration components. These results can be used as a tool in order to ameliorate employee performance. Moreover, the ensemble of remuneration components exhibit very limited satisfaction levels.

Keywords: Remuneration structure, Job satisfaction, Effort rewards, Career advancement.

Human resources management (HRM) plays a strategic role in today's competitive positioning of companies. This strategic role of HRM is materialized by a set of activities to be complementary and consistent. Among these activities, remuneration is increasingly questioned regarding its role in attracting and mobilizing talents to achieve organizational goals. Remuneration is increasingly considered a source of strategic advantage because of its impact on organizational performance. It is therefore likely to have an impact on the success of the company by aligning employees' behaviors on organizational goals and by enabling employees to perceive the relationship between performance and remuneration system. Increase in productivity, staff commitment, loyalty of customers, which secure the success of the organization, follow immediately. Because of its potential direct and indirect effects on the performance of individuals, groups and organizations remuneration is now considered a strategic activity that is important to the human resources management (Chênevert, 2009).

However, despite the important role of remuneration to attract the most qualified candidates, its impact on employees and the perceived attractiveness of its components remains largely unexplored. Several authors express the need to better understand the impact of remuneration components on employees in order to help attract and retain employees whose personalities and values are compatible with the culture of their employers (St-Onge & Thériault, 2006; Wadhvani and Wall, 1991; Sire & Tremblay, 2000; Saba et al. 2013).

The components of remuneration can play a role in employee satisfaction, which results in a much lower turnover and absenteeism (Lawler, 1983). Individuals who receive an appropriate remuneration that meets their needs may show more job satisfaction and have positive attitudes toward the goals of the organization (Saba & Dolan, 2013).

Several studies underline the high rate of dissatisfaction among employees regarding remuneration components. According to a Statistics Canada survey, cited by Bourgault-Côté (2006), 15% of men who earn less than \$ 20 000 are dissatisfied with their jobs, as against 5% of those whose salary is around \$ 60,000. Another survey by Mercer Human Resource Consulting (2002) with 2,600 employees showed that only 50% believe that their salary is fair (Newsline, 2003). Another study by the group Discovery, with 50,000 manufacturing employees in the United States and Canada, showed that nearly 60% of workers are dissatisfied with their pay. Also, a survey conducted by Watson Wyatt's Work, with 13,000 workers, found that only 41% believe they are well paid compared to their colleagues in similar positions in other organizations (Newsline, 2002).

These findings show that when a remuneration system create injustice or is perceived so, employees can become dissatisfied. Based on these results and because of the characteristics of call centers, we chose to address the issue of remuneration as part of a call center based in New Brunswick. The objective of this research is to understand how the components of remuneration can influence customers' satisfaction and employee's behavior.

Literature Review

In the past, remuneration was limited to general salary. Today, remuneration includes all benefits offered to employees: salary (base salary, incentive remuneration in the short and long term) benefits, which are playing an increasingly important remuneration schemes (health care and retirement program and work-life balance), and career development. Remuneration is one of the most important elements of the company-employee relationship. It can also be seen as a strategic lever and a tool of mobilization (Tremblay et al, 1998).

Since the early 20th century, North America has experienced three major trends in remuneration. With the period of the scientific organization of work, remuneration was based on employment rather than the individual. Thus, the management of remuneration was based on the concept of employment which is assigned a specific value (Thériault & St-Onge, 2000). Subsequently, with the arrival of the movement of the human sciences, we gave importance to the motivation and cooperation. The aim was to encourage workers to increase their efforts. The management of remuneration was concerned with what the influence of the monetary aspect may have on satisfaction and motivation. Typical of this trend, merit pay and incentive schemes are emerging. Today, the scientific literature abounds in terms of strategic management remuneration. The word strategy means that we now focus on the relationship between the organization, its objectives, strategies, culture, values and remuneration management (Thériault 1991). Thériault & St-Onge (2000) address the remuneration synergistically that accounts for the multitude of variables related to people, jobs, organizations and their environment. Wright & McMahan, (1999) use the configurational approach to suggest optimal and contextual solutions. These solutions depend on the category of jobs, the financial position of the organization, the relative importance of remuneration objectives, the life cycle of the business, business strategy, legislation, the industry, etc.

Primarily, the company should be concerned about remuneration for economic reasons since the payroll of an organization can represent up to 80% of operating costs (Milkovich & Newman, 1999). Because of these high costs, the formulation of a remuneration strategy becomes essential to its survival. However, unlike other factors of production, the company can not accurately calculate the profitability of investing in its staff (Thériault 1991). The challenge of economic efficiency refers to the first principle, recalled by Sire & Tremblay (2000), to the effect that remuneration is essentially an economic act. However, this approach is often criticized for forgetting the individual and focusing on the organization.

Indeed, remuneration can influence employees attitudes and behaviors and this affects the productivity and profitability of firms (Thériault & St-Onge, 2000). The resource-based approach suggests that the extent of congruence between the compensation system and other organizational factors create value by attracting, motivating and retaining the appropriate individuals (Henninger, 2000).

With the aging of the population, pay mode that seems to succeed to the systematic remuneration seniority is the individualization of salaries. This substitution is not justified only by seeking greater control of the evolution of payroll, but also by a need for adaptation resulting from technological and organizational changes (Hatchuel&Sardas, 1994).

Total remuneration includes all payments received by employees for their services or work. (St-Onge et al, 2013). The determination of that remuneration is the business of assessing the contribution of employees to the organization, pecuniary and non-monetary, direct and indirect, in accordance with existing legislation and the financial capacity of the organization (Saba et al, 2013). We can divide the total remuneration into two components: direct remuneration (base salary and remuneration based on performance, known as variable pay) and indirect remuneration (benefits and time off and, secondly, the benefits from additional terms and conditions of work).

In addition, remuneration includes other forms of intrinsic, intangible or psychological recognition that employees may consider when seeking employment. For example, job security, symbols of success, marks for social recognition, personal satisfaction at work, etc..(St-Onge et al. 2013).

Strategic Remuneration Choices

According to Gomez-Mejia & Balkin (1992), strategic choices in terms of wage policies can be grouped into two categories: paid employment (job-based pay) or individual characteristics related to employment (skill-based pay). When the level of analysis is the employment, salary depends on the position held in the organizational structure while in the second case, the salary corresponds to the skills of the worker. This last way is focused on the individual, not on the job. Thus, we would choose to reward individual performance or seniority accumulated within the organization. Performance or behavior can be appreciated individually or collectively. Some choices affect the temporal aspect in measuring performance and distributed, with some bonus systems which are oriented towards the short term while others are long term. For example, a stock purchase plan is the long term commitment of the employees towards the company. Other important issues relate to the decision whether to transfer a some risk to the employees by imposing a variable portion of their salary, the concern for internal and external equity and the option to adopt a single or multiple salary structure.

The grouping proposed by Gomez-Mejia & Balkin (1992) was taken by Chênevert (2009) to develop an analytical choice in terms of pay. He said that if remuneration practices are consistent with the external features and internal organization, then so will be the corporate performance. On one side, the authors present a classification of different forms of remuneration alignment and focus on the relationship between the remuneration system, business strategy and organizational values. On the other side they focus on the adequacy of the remuneration system and the environmental aspects of the organization. This same joint has been stressed by Smith (2009).

Management remuneration has many effects, both organizations as employees (Table 1). With respect to employers, it has an effect on costs and competitiveness of the company, as well as its ability to attract and retain staff. Remuneration management also affects the profile of candidates (for example, needs and expectations) it seeks to attract and retain. Remuneration also affects attitudes, behavior and performance of employees (St-Onge&Thériault, 2006).

Table 1. Some impacts of remuneration management on organizations and employees
(adapted from St-Onge&Thériault, 2006)

Impacts on the organization	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Competitiveness, productivity and performance - Organizational Change and Development - Rate of turnover and Absenteeism - Presence of union - Respect of laws, ethics and professional standards
------------------------------------	---

<p>Impacts on employees</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - <u>Attitudes</u>: Job satisfaction, work motivation, implication in the work and the organization, etc. - <u>Feelings</u>: fairness, justice, control over one’s life, autonomy, power, prestige, social status, self-fulfillment, success, accomplishment, self-esteem, competence, Recognition, etc.. - <u>Behaviors</u>: Join an organization, remain in the service of an organization, accepting a promotion or transfer, behave as a "Good Corporate Citizens", respect the rules of professional ethics, etc.
------------------------------------	--

Job Satisfaction

The concept of job satisfaction is a very complex phenomenon that has long concerned researchers. This interest dates back to the Hawthorne experiments during the '30s. Locke (1976), Friesen et al. (1984) and Young (1984), reported nearly 3,500 other publications devoted to the appreciation between 1958 and 1976. According to these works, satisfaction results of all the feelings of the employee vis-à-vis the different aspects of his work. This reality is reflected with more or less strength in most of the definitions formulated. Herzberg (1959), states that job satisfaction and job dissatisfaction acted independently. Thus, the opposite of satisfaction is not dissatisfaction but no satisfaction. Vroom (1964) points out that this theory does not take into account the expectations of the individual when he accepted the position. Gruneberg (1976) points out that many studies have shown that the same factors can both be a source of satisfaction and dissatisfaction. Similarly the distinction between contextual factors and content factors of the task that leads people to systematically blame the former and the latter to the only positive source of job satisfaction has been severely criticized.

Research has shown that satisfaction is a multidimensional variable. Louche (2001) describes the work of several researchers and highlights differences in the sources of satisfaction. For several authors (Jonathan & al., 2013; St-Onge& al., 2013) job satisfaction describes the positive or negative attitude of a person in respect of employment and the workplace. In employee satisfaction, this evaluation based on their observations and emotional experiences is quite favorable. In fact, job satisfaction is a set of attitudes towards specific aspects of work (Judge& al., 2012). It thus differs from the commitment to the organization (organizational commitment) and intentions to remain in specific job (Saba & Dolan, 2013).

In short, job satisfaction is the set of feelings that a worker feels towards the different aspects of his job, his company and the fulfillment of their expectations and desires. This design has the advantage of taking into consideration both the emotions that affect the relationship between the individual and the work environment than those related to his personal aspirations.

Call Centre Industry in Canada

The emergence of call centers is a relatively recent phenomenon. They are found in the hotel industry, in financial institutions or insurance organizations in the utilities or telecommunications companies (McPhail, 2002), call centers are an important aspect of the Canadian economy. They are one of the fastest growing areas of employment in Canada, with an estimated growth of about 20 to 25% (Buchanan & Koch-S., 2000). It is useful to establish a definition of a call center. This is not an easy task because there are a variety of typological call centers that are spread across many sectors of the economy and perform different functions in different organizations. The

broadest definition is that provided by Norling (2001) that a call center is a platform where companies provide communications services to customers through a contact at a distance and in real time. Callaghan & Thompson (2001) proposed a similar definition, stating that call centers can be broadly defined as workplaces that integrate telephone and computer technologies. Other authors relate their definition to integrated technologies. For example, Richardson and Belt (2006), stress that call centers specialize in sectors intensively using technology to provide services to clients.

In a study on the analysis of call centers in Canada, Marcoux (2007) points out that there are three main perspectives of study. First, social dominance perspective that considers the organizational structures of call centers represents a neo-Taylorist version of work organization (Arkin, 1997). According to Taylor & Peter (1999) information technology applied in call centers can distribute work among employees, to automate a large part of the control and ex post or real time. Second, the empowerment current, which considers that employees in call center must have a good degree of autonomy to perform their work properly. The application of certain HRM practices, such as coaching or remuneration policies based on performance, employees may develop trust in their employer (Kinnie et al., 2000).

Third, duality current represents an attempt to bring the models of empowerment and social dominance (Marcoux, 2007). This approach attempts to reconcile the two contradictory principles found in the production process of a call center: the standardization of this process and customer orientation (Frenkel & al., 1999, In Marcoux, 2007). For the first principle, managers establish quantitative standards of efficiency in order to shorten the time to appeal. While customer focus is to provide personalized service to customers. The challenge for managers is to reconcile these two principles (Marcoux, 2007).

Research Methodology

To measure the structure of remuneration, we used the items found in the literature review (Kinnear & Sutherland, 2000, Meyer & Smith, 2000; Horwitz et al. 2003, Trabelsi & Le Berre, 2009). The measurement of satisfaction with pay was made by items identified in the literature (Lawler, 1983; Judge, 1993, St-Onge et al, 2013; Ethier, 2002).

For the job satisfaction, we used the instrument developed by Weiss et al. (1967) under the Minnesota Studies in Vocational Rehabilitation.

The administration of the questionnaire was conducted among 107 employees of a call center in Eastern Canada. Employees in positions of responsibility have not been asked to answer the questionnaire.

Analysis and Interpretation of Results

In our sample, female gender represents 41.7% of all employees, against 58.3% for men., The average age of employees is about 25 years.

To examine the relevance and validity of key variables in our model, we considered three main parts (pay structure, satisfaction with pay, job satisfaction). These factors are divided into different components or that the statistical analysis we have identified. Given the sample size, statistical analyses were carried out separately for each factor. Although this analysis does not cover the entire structure of the questionnaire, it still allows to verify the importance or relevance of each factor considered in our model. The Bartlett test of sphericity and testing of the sample adequacy of Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin (KMO) have first been performed on the data, conditions needed for the application of principal component analysis (Tabachnick & Fidell, 2001).

In terms of remuneration structure, factor analysis with *varimax* rotation has resulted in two main factors accounting for 63.590% of variance explained, with a very good KMO index of about 0.797. Factor 1 consists of four variables. Due to the nature of its variables, we have named it “effort reward and participation to the capital” (ERPC). It represents 36.587% of the total variance explained. Factor 2 named “career evolution” (CEVOL) consists of three items, and represents 27,003% of total variance explained.

Matrix of components after rotation

	Components	
	1	2
I have the opportunity to receive shares for my participation to the company’s capital	,807	
Each season, I have the opportunity to receive financial contributions to profits.	,792	
I feel I am well paid (e) reporting to efforts that I provided in my work.	,675	
Material benefits are sufficient considering the difficulties of my work.	,634	
The system of advancement of the company is long.		-,689
The organization has a system of advancement based on merit (based on competences and performance).		,654
I feel like I'm stuck (e) in the evolution of my career.		-,621

Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis.

Rotation Method: Varimax with Kaiser Normalization.

a. Rotation converged in 3 iterations.

According to the results of descriptive statistical analysis, reward for effort and participation in the capital give an average of 2.4144 (Table 2). It can be concluded that employees are not satisfied with their pay compared to the efforts they provide in their work. Also, according to them, the benefits granted by the company are not adequate in light of difficulties encountered in implementing tasks. They also perceive that we do not promote their stake in the company. Finally, they do not expect to receive financial contributions to profits each year.

Regarding career evolution, we obtained an average of 3.0864 (see Table 3). This means that employees feel compelled to be in the process of career evolution company. We believe that the system of pay adopted by ALPHA is considered long.

Table 2. Descriptive statistics for the reward to effort and participation in the capital.

	N	Range	Minimum	Maximum	Average	Standard deviation	Variance
ERPC	107	4,00	1,00	5,00	2,4144	,94545	,894
N valid (listwise)	107						

Table 3. Descriptive statistics for career evolution.

	N	Range	Minimum	Maximum	Average	Standard deviation	Variance
CEVOL	107	3,00	2,00	5,00	3,0864	,55135	,304
N valid (listwise)	107						

In terms of satisfaction vis-à-vis the remuneration components, factorial analysis identifies two factors explaining 58.110% of the total variance. The index (KMO = 0.832) is excellent.

The first factor is mainly composed of eight variables that reflect the satisfaction of direct remuneration (SDR). It represents 38.262% of the total variance explained. The second factor includes five items representing satisfaction indirect remuneration (SIR). It explains 19.848% of the total variance.

Matrix of components after rotation

	Components	
	1	2
Wage increase depending on seniority.	,817	
The general salary increase.	,799	
Fix remuneration (basic salary).	,798	
The increase of wage regarding individual merit.	,797	
Variable compensations (bonuses, commissions).	,735	
Individual premiums or bonuses.	,730	
Premiums or bonuses to team.	,674	
Non-monetary rewards based on performance (travel, products ...).	,650	
Working conditions (number of hours worked per week, unpaid leave).		,810
Time off (sick leave, maternity, paternity, death or marriage).		,807
Additional benefits (automobile, parking, meals, tuition fees).		,714
Benefits (e.g. life insurance program and health insurance).		,620
Remuneration based on mastered competences.		,498

Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis.

Rotation Method: Varimax with Kaiser Normalization.

a. Rotation converged in 3 iterations.

According to the descriptive statistical analysis results, employee satisfaction in terms of direct remuneration (SDR) offers an average of 2.4372 (Table 4), which is why the employees of this company are very unhappy with the components of direct remuneration (fixed remuneration (base salary), variable pay (bonuses, commissions), the increase depending on seniority and the related increase in individual merit). Thus they are also less satisfied with the premium or bonus features offered by this company. Therefore, according to the perception of our respondents, we believe that the company did not attribute their rewards linked to performance or their suggestions for improving business operations.

For the satisfaction regarding indirect remuneration (SIR), we obtained an average of 3.1667 (see Table 5). In this case, it is also likely that the employees are very unhappy with the system components of indirect remuneration. In the perception of respondents, the company does not offer sufficient benefits (life insurance program and health insurance), and also there is a lack of planning system requiring period of leave (sickness, maternity, paternity, death or marriage). Compared to the remuneration policy, some employees feel that their social benefits are not granted only and other opportunities related to working conditions.

Table 4. Descriptive statistics of satisfaction with direct remuneration.

	N	Range	Minimum	Maximum	Average	Standard Deviation	Variance
SDR	107	4,00	1,00	5,00	2,4372	,89986	,810
N valid (list wise)	107						

Table 5. Descriptive statistics of satisfaction with the indirect remuneration

	N	Range	Minimum	Maximum	Average	Standard Deviation	Variance
SIR	107	4,00	1,00	5,00	3,1667	,83498	,697
N valid (list wise)	107						

The measure of overall satisfaction has resulted in four factors that explain 68.841% of the total variance and have a good measure of the degree of consistency (KMO = 0.886). Factor 1 reflects the **atmosphere at work** and is composed of eight items that explain the total variance of 24.949. The factor 2 that we named **employee valorization** is composed of five items, representing 18.466% of the overall variance. The third factor, called **relationship with supervisor**, contributes to 15.238% of the total variance explained and includes four items. Finally, factor 4 has two variables and represents 10.188% of the variance; it is designated as involvement in the work.

Descriptive statistics of these four factors show averages between 2.86 and 3.18 (on a Likert scale 1 to 5). This indicates a low satisfaction with working atmosphere, involvement in the work, relationship with supervisor, and employee valorization. This brings the company to study current social domination (Taylor & Bain, 1999; Arkin, 1997).

Multiple Linear Regression Analysis

We were able to identify each factor that has determined a new variable by calculating an index averages of its component variables. This method has yielded the dependent and independent variables that were subsequently used in our models of multiple linear regressions.

Table 6. Comparison of remuneration structure versus overall satisfaction.

Tests of inter-subjects effects							
Source	Dependent variables	Sum of type III squares	Ddl	Squares' Average	D	Sig.	
Effort reward and participation to capital	Satisfaction with direct remuneration	36,995	14	2,642	6,979	,000	
	Satisfaction with indirect remuneration	15,194	14	1,085	1,541	,135	
	Work environment	40,617	14	2,901	6,007	,000	
	Employees valorization	23,597	14	1,686	3,341	,001	
	Relation with supervisor	32,301	14	2,307	3,855	,000	
	Involvement in the work	20,073	14	1,434	1,204	,306	
Career evolution	Satisfaction with direct remuneration	1,381	7	,197	,521	,814	
	Satisfaction with indirect remuneration	3,066	7	,438	,622	,735	
	Atmosphere at work	1,814	7	,259	,537	,802	
	Employees valorization	1,860	7	,266	,527	,810	
	Relationship with supervisor	7,151	7	1,022	1,707	,132	
	Involvement in the work	7,470	7	1,067	,896	,518	
Effort reward and participation	Satisfaction with direct remuneration	11,782	35	,337	,889	,638	
	Satisfaction with indirect remuneration	16,021	35	,458	,650	,905	
	Work environment	15,159	35	,433	,897	,628	

to capital	Employees valorization	20,533	35	,587	1,163	,314
*	Relation with supervisor	24,340	35	,695	1,162	,315
Careerevolution	Involvement in the work	25,505	35	,729	,612	,933

- a. R Two = ,787 (R two adjusted = ,518)
 b. R Two = ,531 (R two adjusted = - ,062)
 c. R Two = ,757 (R two adjusted = ,448)
 d. R Two = ,699 (R two adjusted = ,319)
 e. R Two = ,727 (R two adjusted = ,381)
 f. R Two = ,529 (R two adjusted = - ,068)

According to this analysis, as principal components we have 2 independent variables namely to effort reward and participation in the capital (ERPC) and career evolution (CEVOL). Thus, the 6 dependent variables including satisfaction with the direct compensation (SDR), satisfaction with the indirect compensation (SIR), working atmosphere (WATM), employee valorization (EMPLVAL), supervision (SUPERV) and involvement in the work (INVW).

The first model will explain the variable using the NCEP dependent variables corresponding to the determinants of satisfaction with pay and job satisfaction.

We note that the variable NCEP has a significant impact on the variable SDR (Table 5.3.a) because $P = 0.000 < 0.05$. The same model shows that NCEP does not have a significant impact on SIR with a $P = 0.135 > 0.05$. For the third variable WATM, It is found that NCEP has a significant impact on this variable, because it gives us a $P = 0.000 < 0.05$. Then we note that NCEP affects significantly the EMPVAL giving a $P = 0.001 < 0.05$. Subsequently, we find that the variable NCEP has further significant impact on SUPERV with a P-value of $0.000 < 0.05$. However, at the end of the analysis of our first model, we see that the variable does not significantly affect NCEP variable GITE since $P = 0.306 > 0.05$.

In conclusion, we can say that the variables SDR, WATM, EMPVAL, SUPERV and tests have significant correlation with the variable NCEP. Compared to the other two variables and SIR GITE, the variable NCEP has no significant impact on them.

The second model attempts to explain the impact of the variable on the dependent variables CEVOL based on overall satisfaction. As can be seen in table 5.3.a, the correlation tests do not show a significant correlation between the variable CVOL and other defined variables where the P-Value is everywhere greater than 0.05.

After an analysis on the determination of correlation tests between the 2 independent variables and six dependent variables, we found that NCEP has a significant impact on variables related to overall satisfaction, while the variable CEVOL does not determine a significant relationship on the same variables.

So we can say without risk of being wrong, that our first hypothesis (the components of remuneration have a significant impact on employee satisfaction) was tested.

Interpreting Search Results

The link between the structure of remuneration and satisfaction with pay is tested through the influence of two factors of the structure of remuneration (reward effort and participation in the capital, and career development) on both factors of satisfaction with remuneration (direct and indirect). The results of this research showed that:

- The effort reward and participation in the capital positively influence satisfaction in direct remuneration. This was expected since many authors as (St-Onge et al. 2013; Jonathan & al. 2013) emphasized the existence of a link between the structure of remuneration and satisfaction with remuneration.

- The effort reward and participation in the capital had no effect on satisfaction regarding indirect remuneration. This unpredictable result may be explained by various reasons including the nature of the indirect remuneration (e.g.: social benefits, time off, additional benefits...), and effort reward and participation in the capital structure is a direct remuneration.
- Career evolution does not impact on the two major components of satisfaction with pay. This result can be explained by the nature of jobs within the company to study (high employee turnover and lack of permanence at work). For employees, career evolution is not a determining factor for their satisfaction.

Link Between the Structure of Remuneration and Job Satisfaction

The link between the structure of remuneration and job satisfaction is tested through the influence of two factors of the structure of remuneration (reward effort and participation in the capital, and career development) on four factors of job satisfaction (working atmosphere, employee valorization, supervision and involvement in the work).

The results of this research showed that:

- The effort reward and participation in the capital positively influence the atmosphere in the workplace, employee appreciation, the relationship with the supervisor. This was expected since many authors such as St-Onge&Thériault, 2006; Saba & Dolan, 2013; St-Onge& al., 2013) have highlighted the existence of a link between the structure of remuneration and job satisfaction.
- The effort reward and participation in the capital had no effect on job involvement. This unpredictable result may be explained by various reasons including employees have opportunities to work alone in their jobs, and these employees are able to keep busy all the time.
- Career evolution does not impact on the four factors of job satisfaction.

Discussion of Research Findings

Factor analysis identified a pay structure with two factors (effort reward and participation in the capital, career advancement). For the first factor, the employees seem unhappy with the reward system of the company. Indeed, they may think that the company does not provide opportunities for encouragement and for sharing a stake in the company. In such a situation, the company could put more emphasis on the willingness and commitment of employees to make the maximum effort and to put their skills into organizational goals. It will also help influence the sense of justice in connection with the performance and efforts by employees as part of their work.

Relative to career evolution, employees perceive that there are constraints in the process of advancement within the company. A reorganization of positions within the company can be useful to encourage involvement through opportunities for advancement that are well structured and visible to all employees. It is a huge effort and very time consuming to engage in this restructuring, but the sustainability of the company in the longer term could be better prepared by taking such a turn. This reality is answered in the industry of call centers and a deep reform is needed to ensure genuine social peace within the industry. The development of HRM practices such as job turnover, promotion based on merit and performance becomes an emergency.

The components of direct remuneration are a poor source of satisfaction for employees. They feel that their basic salary is less advantageous compared to others in same position (external equity). Such a problem of external equity may cause a negative impact on employee performance. Indirect remuneration is also a barrier to employee satisfaction as it does not offer sufficient benefits for the development of employees. Specifically, we noted the absence of programs that contribute to different kinds of leave (sickness, maternity, death or marriage). The ultimate involvement of employees for the proper

functioning of an organization requires a fair and favorable consideration on direct and indirect remuneration.

On four factors that compose the job satisfaction (the working atmosphere, valuing employees, the supervision relationship and involvement in the work), employees of the Company ALPHA find that their workplace does not create a friendly atmosphere to perform their job adequately. Working conditions do not provide opportunities for creativity to better perform their tasks. Within the company, employees feel they have the necessary opportunities to express their expertise. In addition, employees perceive as inadequate the relationships between them and their supervisors. We also found that the management structure of the company does not leave much room for autonomy at work and the development of employees. These elements are the basis of employee satisfaction, and solutions must be sought to improve these elements. The whole performance of the company depends as was stressed in many writings on the subject. Supervisors can play a crucial role in this effort to establish sound industrial relations taking into account the needs of employees.

This research has put forward a lived reality of employees of call centers has been extensively discussed by the authors (current social domination). However, its main limitation is that it cannot claim to reflect the full reality of call centers as it has investigated only one located in eastern Canada. Future research should be conducted to question the various facets of the employment relationship in this industry. Employment status and profile of employees can offer many variables that can be explored to further clarify the relationship between the structure of remuneration and employee satisfaction.

Bibliography

1. Arkin, A. (1997). Hold the production line. *People Management*, vol.3, no.3, p. 22-28.
2. Buchanan, R. & Koch-Schulte, S. (2000). *Gender on the Line: Technology, Restructuring and the Reorganization of Work in the Call Centre Industry*. Ottawa: Status of Women Canada.
3. Chenevert, D. (2009). Qu'est ce que la rémunération stratégique? , *Le portail de l'ordre des Conseillers en Ressources Humaines Agréés*, vol. 12, no 5, p. 1-11.
4. Ethier, S. (2002). *Le rôle des statuts d'emplois dans la détermination des politiques de rémunération*. Thèses de Maîtrise, Université de Québec à Montréal, Québec.
5. Friesen, D., Holdaway, E.A., & Rice, A.W. (1984). Factors contributing to the job satisfaction of school principals, in *The Alberta Journal of Educational Research*, vol. XXX, no 3, p. 157-170.
6. Gomez-Meija, L.R., & Balkin, D.B. (1992). *Compensation, organizational, strategy, and firm performance*. South-Western series in Human Resources Management.
7. Gruneberg, M.M. (1976). *Job satisfaction - A Reader*. New York: Wiley Éditions.
8. Hatchuel, A., & Sardas, J.C. (1994). In *Les nouvelles rationalisations de la production*. Cepadues édition, collection automatisation et production, p. 1-15.
9. Henninger, M.C. (2000). Nouvelles perspectives théoriques en management des rémunérations, (chap. 16), tiré de Peretti & Roussel (Sous la Dir.) « Les rémunérations, Politiques et pratiques pour les années 2000 ». Institut Vital Roux,
10. Herzberg, F. (1959). *The motivation to work*. New York: Wiley Éditions.
11. Jonathan B.S. & al. (2013) Regulation of remuneration policy in the financial sector: Evaluation of recent reforms in Europe *Qualitative Research in Financial Markets* Vol. 5, n°3 , pp. 256-269.
12. Judge, T. & al. (2012) Genetic influences on core self-evaluations, job satisfaction, and work stress: A behavioral genetics mediated model, *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, vol. 117, n°1 p. 208.
13. Judge, T.A. (1993). Does affective disposition moderate the relationship between job satisfaction and voluntary turn over? *Journal of Applied Psychology*, vol. 78, p. 395-401.
14. Kinnie, N., Hutchinson, S., & Purcell, J. (2000). « Fun and surveillance: the paradox of high commitment management in call centres ». *The International Journal of Human Resource Management*, vol. 11, no.5, p. 967-985.

15. Lawler, E.E. (1983). Pay and organization development, Reading. Addison-Wesley-Organization Development Series.
16. Locke, E.A. (1968). Toward a theory of task motivation and incentives, *Organizational Behavior and Human Performance*, vol. 3, no. 2, p. 157-189.
17. Louche, C. (2001). *Psychologie sociale des organisations*. Paris : Aramnd Colin Éditeur.
18. Marcoux, G. (2007). *Engagement Organisationnel et Distanciation sociale. Analyse interprétative de la situation expérimentée par des agents de service en centre d'appel*. Thèses de Doctorat, Université Laval, Québec.
19. McPhail, B. (2002). *Ce qui est sur la ligne dans les études du centre d'appels? : Un examen des questions clés dans la littérature académique*. Toronto : Faculté de sciences de l'information. Université de Toronto.
20. Milkovich, G.T., & Newman, J.M. (1999). *Compensation*, 6^{ème} édition. Boston: Irwin McGraw-Hill.
21. Newslin (2002). Majority of employees believe other companies offer higher pay. (En ligne). Disponible: <http://resourcepro.worldatwork.org>, 17 octobre. (Consulté le 10 avril 2013)
22. Newslin (2003). Survey suggests problems with design, delivery of pay programs. (En ligne). Disponible: <http://resourcepro.worldatwork.org>, 20 mars. (Consulté le 10 avril 2013)
23. Richardson, R., & Belt, V. (2006). Saved by the Bell? Call centres and economic development in less favoured regions. *Economic and Industrial Democracy* vol. 22, no. 1, p. 67-98.
24. Saba, T. & Dolan, S., (2013). *La gestion des ressources humaines. Tendances, enjeux et pratiques actuelles*, 5^{ème} édition. Québec : Éditions du renouveau pédagogique Inc. 757 p.
25. Sire, B., & Tremblay, M. (2000). Contraintes et objectifs d'une politique de rémunération. *Les rémunérations*, Institut Vital Roux, p. 15-33.
26. Smith, P.C., Kendall, L.M., & Hulin, C.L. (1969). *The measurement of satisfaction in work and retirement*. Chicago: Rand McNally.
27. St-Onge, S. & al. (2013). *Relever les défis de la gestion des ressources humaines*, 4^{ème} édition. Montréal: Gaëtan Morin Éditeur, 462 p.
28. St-Onge, S., & Theriault, R. (2006). *Gestion de la rémunération. Théorie et pratique*. Montréal : Gaëtan Morin Éditeur.
29. Tabachnick, B., & Fidell, L. (2001): *Using Multivariate Statistics*, 4th édition. Harper Collins College Publishers, New York.
30. Taylor, F.W., & Peter, B. (1999). An Assembly Line in the Head: Work and Employee Relations in the Call Centre. *Industrial Relations Journal*, vol. 30, no. 2, p. 101-117.
31. Thériault, R. (1991). *Guide Mercer sur la gestion de la rémunération. Théorie et pratique*. Montréal: Gaëtan Morin Éditeur.
32. Thériault, R., & St-Onge, S. (2000). *Gestion de la rémunération. Théorie et pratique*. Montréal : Gaëtan Morin Éditeur.
33. Trabelsi, Y., & Le Berre, M. (2009). L'impact des rémunérations perçues sur l'engagement organisationnel tridimensionnel des « KnowledgeWorkers ». *Revue de gestion des ressources humaines*, no. 73, p. 37-70.
34. Tremblay, Michel, Rondeau, Alain & Lemelin, Maurice. (1998). L'influence des pratiques innovatrices en milieu de travail sur la mobilisation des cols bleus. *École des Hautes Études Commerciale*, p. 1-25.
35. Vroom, V. (1964). *Work and motivation*. New York: Wiley Edition.
36. Wadhvani, S.B., & Wall, M. (1991). A direct test of the efficiency wage model using UK micro-data. *Oxford Economic Papers*, vol. 43, p. 529-548.
37. Weiss, D.J., Dawis, R.V., England, G.W., & Lofquist, L.H. (1967). Manual for the Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire. *Minnesota Studies in Vocational Rehabilitation* (Whole No. XXII).
38. Wright, P.M., & McMahan, G.C. (1999). Theoretical perspectives for strategic human resource management. *Journal of Management*, vol. 18, p. 295-320.
39. Young, P. (1984). An examination of job satisfaction for female and male public school superintendents, *Planning and Changing*, vol. XV, no 2, p. 115-125.