

**WHAT MATTERS TO JOB APPLICANTS?  
AN EMPIRICAL LOOK AT SALARY VERSUS SCHEDULE FLEXIBILITY**

Cynthia K. Bui\*

[October 2009]

\*Cynthia Bui is an undergraduate student in the College of Business Administration Honors Program at California State University, Long Beach, CA 90840. This manuscript serves to fulfill her Honors Thesis requirement. Address correspondence to Cynthia Bui: [cynthiakbui@gmail.com](mailto:cynthiakbui@gmail.com).

## **ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS**

First and foremost, I would like to thank Dr. Pamela Miles Homer. She has offered her patience and expertise to assist me in every step of this research study. This thesis would not be completed if it were not for her willingness to devote so much time to me. I am grateful for the knowledge she has shared with me, as well as the encouragement and motivation she has provided me. I also appreciate comments on an earlier version of this manuscript from Dr. Vicki Schwerin.

I am grateful to the professors that allowed me to take time out of their class to use their students as subjects for my research: Tony Teng, Thang Nguyen, Asela Thomason, and Richard Opland.

Finally, I would like to thank my parents, family, and friends for their support and encouragement throughout this process. Special thanks to Eyad Aljubran, Derek Baldwin, and Ahmed Buholaiqah.

**WHAT MATTERS TO JOB APPLICANTS?  
AN EMPIRICAL LOOK AT SALARY VERSUS SCHEDULE FLEXIBILITY**

**ABSTRACT**

This study focuses on the relative importance of salary and schedule flexibility in the job search process. Past research supports the idea that job-related attitudes are favorably affected by the introduction of a flexible work schedule. This study tests the impact of work schedule flexibility, salary, and temporal focus (short-term versus long-term) on an applicant's job offer acceptance decision. Results indicate that the impact of salary and schedule flexibility on job acceptance is comparable for applicants focused on the short-term. In contrast, while schedule flexibility is directionally more important than salary for those focused on the long-term, neither factor is significant. In addition, data suggest that when given the choice of a high salary/low flexibility or low salary/high schedule flexibility, long-term focused individuals prefer more schedule flexibility over salary whereas short-term focused applicants perceive these trade-offs as equally attractive.

## INTRODUCTION

What do new applicants look for when seeking a job? Specific information in a job description, including compensation and benefit information, can increase applicant interest (Breugh and Starke 2000). It is documented that during the job search process, individuals researching jobs frequently lack information about job and organizational attributes. For example, Maurer, Howe, and Lee (1992) find that engineering students who are job hunting report that they often lack information about such issues as starting salary, how raises are determined, benefits, and the success of new hires. Maurer et al. (1992) show that the amount of information provided about general characteristics of employment offerings (e.g., career opportunities, approximate salary/benefit packages) significantly affects the decision to interview with a given employer. In addition, information provided about compensation/benefits, job/career, and security/success issues impacts job acceptance: e.g., those lacking information about positions are less likely to accept the job offer. Similarly, Barber and Roehling (1993) find that individuals who report having more information about a job and/or organization are more attracted to the hiring organization.

This study focuses on the relative importance of two job offer components: financial compensation and job schedule flexibility. Pay is an important job attribute (Jurgensen 1978) and has significant influence on job attractiveness and the subsequent job choice decision (Rynes, 1987; Rynes, Schwab, and Heneman 1983). Research also suggests that pay is more important in people's actual choices and behaviors than what they claim motivates them (Rynes, Gerhart, and Minette 2004). Furthermore, Rynes et al. (2004) note that pay is more critical to job choice than to decisions to quit, because pay is one of the few characteristics people know with certainty before taking a job.

In addition to compensation, companies are increasingly offering alternative work schedules due to societal changes, increasing numbers of women in the workforce, dual-career households, and work-leisure expectations (Hochschild 1997; Pierce, Newstrom, Dunham, and Barber 1989; Ronen 1984). Schedule flexibility may motivate positive inferences about the employer as applicants manage their job search and make employment choices. For instance, research suggests that flexibility may lead to the inference that the employer values their employees and treats them well (Boswell, Roehling, LePine, and Moynihan 2003).

The relative importance of choice criteria on the job acceptance decision can be influenced by an applicant's temporal focus. Trope and Liberman (2003) argue that people use higher-level construals—characterized as abstract and decontextualized—to represent information about distant future events as compared to information about near future events. Higher versus lower construals compare to the concept of mental focus (short-term versus long-term focus) tested here. A characteristic of high construal features is that changes in these features produce major changes in the meaning of the event whereas changes in low-level construals produce relatively minor changes in the meaning of the event. These major changes can be compared to the changes of a long-term focus and the minor changes can be compared to the short-term changes associated with an applicant's job acceptance decision. For instance, an individual with a short-term focus thinks about what they want from accepting a job (i.e., salary, medical benefits), whereas an individual with a long-term focus thinks about what their position may be within a company in a year or two (i.e., career advancement, job security, leadership responsibilities). I argue that the time that one plans to be with a specific company impacts the relative importance of job-choice criteria.

The primary objective of this study is to explore the relative importance of salary and schedule flexibility on job acceptance, when an applicant's temporal mindset is focused on the

long-term versus the short-term. The moderating role of individual difference variables (e.g., Motivation to Lead (MTL), personality) is also explored in this experimental design.

## **BACKGROUND**

### ***The Importance of Salary/Compensation***

Maslow (1943) introduces human needs theory and suggests that as we interact with our environment and develop specific needs, those needs motivate us to respond to our experiences. Maslow's framework can be used to understand an individual's attitudes towards money. According to Oleson (2004), money plays a special role in our personal and social lives, exerting more power over human lives than any other single commodity. It permeates much of our lives and is an important element in making choices and decisions. Salary/compensation can fulfil human physiological needs as identified in Maslow's hierarchy of needs, including needs for safety, security, and self-actualization (Poduska 1992; Mitchell and Mickel 1999; Oleson 2004). Money is needed to provide the basic necessities such as food, water, rest, shelter, and other necessities that fulfil physiological needs. The accumulation of savings and purchases such as insurance do much to provide security. Individuals can use money for club memberships, as well as for other opportunities for social interaction that then facilitate one's social needs. One's salary can also affect an individual's self-esteem. Individuals generally want to be more than just members of a group: i.e., people have a general need and desire for status, self-respect, self-esteem, and the respect of esteem of others. The satisfaction of esteem needs acquired via a given salary or level of compensation can lead to feelings of power and worth.

An increase in extrinsic rewards increases an individual's attitude towards the task or organization (e.g., Frey 1997; Tang and Gilbert 1995), and salary/compensation is an important factor in the job acceptance process (Jurgensen 1978). Jurgensen (1978) also finds pay to be the most important job factor when respondents are asked what employees other than themselves

look for in a job. Expectancy theory and one literature stream in human resources (the effects of incentive pay) are relevant to our understanding of compensation as a motivator. According to the valence-instrumentality-expectancy theory (VIE), scholars suggest that the way in which pay is distributed influences one's perception of the instrumentality of performing well (Lawler 1981). Occupational choice approaches frequently rely on an expectancy-like model that includes an individual's valence assessment of the pay (Mitchell 1974). Prior to choosing a job, one may feel that pay is more important when evaluating a job than after one is employed and has a boss, co-workers, and tasks (Mitchell and Mickel 1999).

The above rationale is supported by past research that shows a relationship between compensation systems and organizational attractiveness. A firm's compensation system acts as a signal device to job seekers, affecting job and organizational attractiveness by providing information about less visible organizational attributes (Gerhart and Milkovich 1992; Rynes and Miller 1983). McLean, Smits, and Tanner (1996) study of I/S graduates over a four-year period shows that salary level attained by the I/S graduates helps them evaluate their decision to enter the I/S field. The authors suggest that applicants use the tangible nature of salary to evaluate such intangibles as competence, meaning, success, and interest.

### ***Job Schedule Flexibility***

As individuals experience conflicts between their personal lives and the demands of the workplace, flexible scheduling permits a closer alignment between people's work schedules and the timing and the amount of their desire for work and leisure. Alternative work schedules are here defined as schedules that do not fit the fixed 8-hour day, 40-hour week definition (cf. Baltes, Briggs, Huff, and Wright 1999): e.g., flexible working hours ("flextime"), compressed workweek, part time work, and telecommuting). Baltes et al. (1999) find that flexible and compressed workweek schedules have positive effects on several work related criteria: i.e., job

satisfaction, productivity/performance, absenteeism, and satisfaction with work schedule.

However, the level of positive impact associated with either schedule is dependent on the outcome criterion under consideration. For example, an individual who enjoys travelling will be satisfied with their job when it is convenient for them to have a compressed workweek to have more days to travel.

Honeycutt and Rosen (1997) explore the influence of family-friendly human resource policies, salary levels, and salient identity on an individual's attraction towards a job. Individuals tend to be most attracted to organizations that allow them to behave in ways that support their salient identity. Specifically, individuals with salient family or balance identities are attracted to organizations with flexible and dual career paths and policies, and those individuals with salient career identity are most attracted to organizations with traditional career paths and policies. [The traditional career path is where employees direct their time and effort in moving up the corporate ladder, putting work first in order to advance their careers (Honeycutt and Rosen 1997).] Flexible career paths and policies provide the most support for a balance between work and non-work responsibilities, while dual career paths and policies require employees to make trade-offs and risk negative attributions in order to obtain balance.

The above results indicate that job attraction is influenced by organizational career paths and policies. All categories of participants (i.e., family salient, balance salient, career salient, men, women, parents, and non-parents) examined by Honeycutt and Rosen (1997) show a strong attraction to organizations with flexible career paths and policies. In contrast, the data show that for these individuals or categories of individuals, salary is not significantly related to job attraction. Although previous research on job choice indicates that flexible work schedules and benefits are not as important as other factors such as salary in the job choice decision, Honeycutt

and Rosen's (1997) results support the notion that the changing demographics of the work force include changing values and job-related preferences.

### ***Mental Focus***

In addition to the importance of job schedule flexibility, an individual's temporal mindset (whether they have a long- or short-term focus) is likely to affect job-related judgements (e.g., attraction). Applying the concept of regulatory focus and the two-step model of human decision processing, I argue that an individual's temporal mindset is likely to affect his or her likelihood of accepting a job. Trope et al. (2003) draw a connection between higher versus lower construals with long-term versus short-term foci. Furthermore, Crowe and Higgins (1997) add an additional concept: regulatory focus.

Regulatory focus theory makes a distinction between *promotion focus* (stressing nurturance concerns) and *prevention focus* (stressing security concerns) that also resembles my long-term versus short-term focus concept. An individual with a promotion focus is concerned with advancement, growth, and accomplishment, whereas those who have a prevention focus are concerned with security, safety, responsibility, and non-losses (Crowe and Higgins 1997). A self-regulatory system can have either a desired or an undesired end state functioning as the reference value. The system attempts to move the current actual self-state as close as possible to a desired end state and as far away as possible from an undesired reference point (Crowe and Higgins 1997). For example, an applicant can either desire to start a career and work with a company long-term or they may not desire to stay with a specific company long-term. Forster, Grant, Idson, and Higgins (2000) show that success-related motivation and increased expectancies are more likely to occur when performers are in a promotion rather than a prevention focus. An individual with a long-term focus can be analyzed as a person with the promotion focus and an individual with a short-term focus is the prevention-focused individual. Thus, an individual with

a long-term focus seeks positive outcomes (i.e., career advancement), whereas an individual with a short-term focus lacks this motivation to seek such positive outcomes.

The short-term and long-term foci also serve as frames to interpret a job offer. Bamberg, Kuhnel, and Schmidt (1999) formulate a two-step model of human decision-making. They suggest that frames have an impact on how humans formulate decisions. Bamberg et al. (1999) use the term “frame” to refer to the specific view of the decision problem, in a decision-making situation. Situation-specific cues activate general attitudes toward the decision problem: i.e., activated general attitudes influence perceptions and decision problem interpretations. The notion of attitude frame also resembles our concept of “focus”, suggesting that the importance of salary versus schedule flexibility in making a job acceptance decision varies under short-term (activates attitudes about immediate goals such as salary) and long-term foci (activates attitudes about career advancement and future-oriented goals).

Based on past research and arguments above, I propose that an individual with a long-term focus is more concerned with career advancements within the company. Career advancements can often lead to high authority positions and more responsibilities. The new demands can mean working around others' schedules or simply working more hours to get the task accomplished. Schedule flexibility allows an individual to arrange their schedule where, for example, they work more hours on days that are busy and take days off on days that are slow. In contrast, an individual with a short-term focus places more concern on making money and the salary being offered, and less concern on work schedule flexibility.

H1A: Under a long-term focus, schedule flexibility impacts job acceptance more than salary.

H1B: Under a short-term focus, salary impacts job acceptance more than schedule flexibility.

### ***Moderating Effects***

Individual difference characteristics may moderate the relative effects of *salary* and *schedule flexibility* on job acceptance proposed above. It is natural to expect that some personal characteristics and traits may influence the relative "weights" of these job choice criteria. The current research tests the impact of Motivation to Lead (MTL) and the personality trait, extroversion/introversion. Chan and Drasgow (2001) define MTL as an individual difference construct that affects a leader's or a leader to be decisions to assume leadership training, roles, and responsibilities. MTL exhibits a three-dimensional structure that includes, Affective-identity MTL, Non-calculative MTL, and Social Normative MTL. Affective-identity MTL describes individuals who like to lead and enjoy leading others. Non-calculative MTL describes individuals who do not consider the cost of leading relative to the benefits in their decision. Social Normative MTL describes individuals who have a sense of duty or responsibility to lead. This study focuses on the later two MTL dimensions, non-calculative and social normative.

***Non-Calculative MTL.*** High non-calculative MTL (NCMTL) individuals are those that do not consider the costs of leading relative to the benefits. These characteristics suggest that such individuals are not concerned with the advantages, special benefits, privileges, etc. that may be associated with accepting a leadership role. With benefits of a lesser concern, the next important factor is pay/compensation. These NCMTL individuals want to be rewarded for what they are worth: i.e., to be compensated for their performance and time. Agreeableness and emotional stability are also fairly consistently and significantly related to NCMTL (Chan, Rounds, and Drasgow 2000). For example, a student involved in a group project may take on the role of the leader because no one else is willing to accept the responsibility. This student agrees to take the lead because he/she wants to get the assignment completed and his/her grade is affected by the outcome of this assignment. Similarly, in the workplace, an individual may accept a leadership

role without considering the costs of leading because work needs to be done and they need to get paid. I argue that this relationship between salary and leadership acceptance applies to job acceptance as well. That is:

H2: Those high in NCMTL place more importance on salary versus schedule flexibility: i.e., salary impacts job acceptance more than schedule flexibility.

***Social Normative MTL.*** Individuals high on the Social-Normative MTL dimension (SNMTL) are individuals who feel it is their duty to lead others. They are motivated by a sense of social duty and obligation and are also accepting of social hierarchies (Chan et al., 2000). SNMTL exhibits a positive correlation with vertical collectivism. Vertical collectivists are accepting of social hierarchies and tend to subordinate their goals to the majority or to authorities (Chan and Drasgow 2001). I suggest that individuals high on SNMTL prefer schedule flexibility because it grants them control of their own work schedule, the power of setting their work schedules to accommodate their needs. An individual who feels that they have a responsibility to lead also have other responsibilities, and with those responsibilities come demands. For example, a leader with a family or a leader who is pursuing further education has to satisfy the demands from work and those from home and school. A flexible work schedule can help balance an individual's work and personal demands. Therefore:

H3: Those high in SNMTL place more importance on schedule flexibility versus salary: i.e., schedule flexibility impacts job acceptance more than salary.

***Extroversion/Introversion.*** The Eysenck Personality Questionnaire-Revised (Eysenck 1992) is a 48-item personality questionnaire that measures the three central "supertraits" described as extroversion (versus introversion), neuroticism, and psychoticism. Sato (2005) developed a briefer version of Eysenck's Personality Questionnaire to measure a person's level of extroversion (or introversion). These scales resemble the big-five factors [urgency (or extroversion), agreeableness, conscientiousness (or dependability), emotional stability (versus

neuroticism), and intellect (or culture)] examined by Lewis Goldberg (1992). The current study measures the extroversion/introversion supertrait to further explore if the individual difference impacts decisions about the relative importance of salary and schedule flexibility.

Gainey and Clenney (2006) describe extroverts as friendly, gregarious individuals, “they very much enjoy being around others and crave excitement.” The authors find a significant, positive relationship between extroversion and one’s feelings toward flextime. As a result, flexibility allows individuals, who enjoy the company of others, to schedule their work more effectively around their personal life, while maintaining interpersonal relationships in the workplace.

Empirical evidence shows that extroversion is related to extrinsic career aspects. For instance, extroverts value certain extrinsic aspects in a job, such as opportunities to interact with others and rewards in the form of pay, raises, and benefits (Furnham, Petrides, Jackson, and Cotter 2002). Research also finds that extroversion relates most consistently to career success, exhibiting positive relationships with salary, promotions, and career satisfaction (Seibert and Kraimer 2001). In addition, extroversion relates positively to job and life satisfaction (Furnham and Zacherl 1986; McCrae and Costa 1991; Watson and Slack 1993), aspects of intrinsic career success. Thus, I propose that Extroverts with a long-term career focus value intrinsic values such as achievement and advancement; whereas Extroverts with a short-term career focus value extrinsic factors like salary.

H4A: Under a long-term focus, schedule flexibility impacts job acceptance more than salary for individuals high on extroversion.

H4B: Under a short-term focus, salary impacts job acceptance more than schedule flexibility for individuals high on extroversion.

## METHODOLOGY

### *Subjects and Procedure*

The sample consists of 250 undergraduate business administration students from California State University, Long Beach (50.8% female and 47.6% male, 1.6% were unknown). Each respondent completed the experiment in a classroom setting (random assignment to treatments). Participants were told they the survey was being used in a research study about the job search process. Each was asked to read a scenario that included the experimental manipulations (described below). When all were finished reading the scenario, they were given permission to continue the self-paced questionnaire.

### *Stimuli Development*

Eight job offer scenarios are created in the 2 (short-term/long-term focus) x 2 (low/high salary) x 2 (low/high flexibility) between-subjects factorial design involving a hypothetical situation in which respondents make a decision whether to accept or reject a job. The company description is purposefully general and states: "Arrow Technologies was founded in 1935. Arrow Technologies is among the world's largest IT companies. We are a worldwide maker of computers, PCs, laptops, printers, scanners, software, monitors and more. We help people around the world connect, create and accomplish amazing things." The scenarios also include the job description, position title ("Assistant Manager"), and altered compensation and benefits packages being offered (detailed below). The job description begins with:

"You will be involved in developing and implementing a sales strategy for our hardware, software or services, working closely with relevant staff to ensure the smooth and effective introduction of new products. You'll be involved through the whole product life-cycle... analyzing the competition, positioning the product, segmenting the market, deciding the channel mix/pricing/forecasting. You will be managing a small group of 3-5 associates."

The scenarios are designed to create two levels of each of the manipulated three factors. The first manipulated factor is *focus*. In half of the scenarios, participants are asked to focus on the

long-term career potential within this company (e.g., potential for advancement) and to imagine that they are interested in a long successful career with the company. The other half of the scenarios ask participants to focus on the short-term benefits of the job offer (e.g., current salary) and to imagine that they are only interested in working for the company for a limited time while they look for a better position. The second manipulated factor is *salary/compensation*. Half of the job descriptions offer “Base salary of \$45,000 per year,” and the remaining half offer “Base salary of \$50,000 per year.”

The third manipulation factor is the *work schedule flexibility*. Half of the job descriptions read, “Five day work week, Monday through Friday,” and “9 AM to 5 PM,” and the other half of the job descriptions read, “Flexible Schedules: adjust when you start work and when you leave. For instance, work between 10 AM and 6 PM, 9 AM and 5 PM, or 8 AM and 4 PM,” “Compressed Work week Schedules: be able to work fewer days than a regular five-day work week. For example, employees may work four 10 hour days or three 12 hour days,” and “Telecommuting: alternative work arrangements are allowed in which employees perform work at home or some other location besides the office.”

### ***Measures***

After reading one scenario, respondents answered a number of questions designed to capture the key dependent constructs (all 9-point scales unless indicated otherwise). The first questions assess the likelihood that the respondent would accept/not accept the job offer (3 items;  $\alpha = .90$ ). The second set of measures assess the overall attitude toward the job offer (overall attitude: “positive/negative”, “favorable/unfavorable”, “good/bad”;  $\alpha = .91$ ). Two items capture impressions of the job offer in terms of worthiness (“worthwhile/worthless”, and “meaningful/not meaningful”; Spearman-Brown Reliability Coefficient = .90). Reliable scales also result for overall impressions of the compensation offer (“positive/ negative”,

“favorable/unfavorable”, “good/bad”;  $\alpha = .95$ ), overall impressions of the work schedule (“positive/negative”, “favorable/unfavorable”, “good/bad”;  $\alpha = .96$ ), and overall impressions of the company, Arrow Technologies (“positive/negative”, “favorable/unfavorable”, “good/bad”;  $\alpha = .95$ ).

The next sets of questions evaluate respondents’ general beliefs about the job described. These measures are collapsed into four (summed and averaged) construct scales: *interest* (“interesting/not interesting”, “exciting/not exciting”, “high creativity/low creativity”, “professional/not professional”, “will enhance my resume/career/will not enhance my resume/career”, “a good work environment/not a good work environment”;  $\alpha = .87$ ), *responsibility* (“high job stress/low job stress”, “high responsibility/low responsibility”, “high image/ low image”, “challenging/not challenging”;  $\alpha = .85$ ), *satisfaction* (“high compensation/low compensation”, “high job security/ low job security”, “much potential for advancement/no potential for advancement”, “satisfies my needs/does not satisfy my needs”;  $\alpha = .75$ ), and *fun/flexibility* (“flexible/inflexible” and “fun/not fun” ; Spearman-Brown Reliability Coefficient= .61).

The next 16 items are taken directly from the MTL survey first administered by Chan and Drasgow (2001). These assess the extent to which the respondent agrees or disagrees with the statement about their personality. The Affective-Identity MTL (AIMTL) items measure how much a person strives to be a leader simply because their personality causes them to: e.g., “I am the type of person who likes to be in charge of others,” or reverse-scaled questions like “I am the type who would actively support a leader but prefers not be appointed as leader” (5 items;  $\alpha = .80$ ). NCMTL considers whether a person is motivated to lead based on benefits and rewards: e.g., “I am only interested to lead if there are clear advantages for me” and “I would only agree to be a group leader if I know I can benefit from that role” (5 items;  $\alpha = .73$ ). The final six

questions SNMTL measures that assess whether someone has a sense of responsibility to be a leader. Examples include “I feel that I have a duty to lead other if I am asked” and “I was taught to believe in the value of leading others” (6 items;  $\alpha = .81$ ).

The next group of questions assesses the degree to which a person can be considered an introvert or an extrovert (cf. Sato, 2005). In the Eysenck/Sato battery, factors are presented in a question format. For the sake of the current study, each question is presented as a statement. However, only a minimal number of words are changed and the attributes remain the same. For example, “Are you a talkative person?” became “I am a talkative person” to maintain consistency in using a 9-point agree/disagree scale. This set includes questions such as, “I can usually let myself go and enjoy myself at a lively party”, or reverse-scaled questions like “I am mostly quiet when I am around other people” (12 items;  $\alpha = .80$ ).

In order to confirm that the scenarios conveyed the intended messages to the respondents, it was necessary to include manipulation check assessments. One question asks the respondent to recall the condition of the economy, using a 9-point weak/strong scale. Two other questions ask respondents to identify the salary and work schedule being offered (multiple choice format). Lastly, subjects indicated how familiar they were with the fictitious employing company (Arrow Technologies), and they rated the job being offered via two (9-point) bi-polar adjective scales: “Short-term job benefits”/“Long-term job benefits and “Salary”/“Things other than salary.” The final page asked for basic demographic information: gender, ethnicity, and degree major. [Note: Not all measured constructs described above are relevant to the hypotheses being tested here. Thus, several are not discussed further.]

## **RESULTS**

### ***Manipulation Checks and Potential Covariates***

As desired, those instructed to focus on the long-term reported focusing more on long-term versus short-term benefits compared to those instructed to focus on the short-term ( $F(1,246)=75.59, p=.001, M_{LT}= 7.09$  and  $M_{ST}= 4.50$ ). Of those told that the salary was \$45,000, 93.7% correctly recalled the salary, and 98% of the higher salary group correctly recalled the \$50,000 salary rate ( $\chi^2(3)=241.13, p<.001$ ). In addition, the high salary was judged as “more reasonable” than the low salary offer ( $F(1,241)=17.84, p<.001, M_{HS}=6.22$  and  $M_{LS}=5.37$ ). Subjects in the flexible schedule treatments recalled more of those options (e.g., “flexible scheduling”) than the non-flexible (traditional) schedule groups ( $F(1,248)=346.07, p=.001, M_{FS}=2.96$  and  $M_{TS}=1.29$ ). In contrast, respondents in the non-flexible schedule treatments recalled more of those options (e.g., “9AM to 5AM hours”) than the flexible schedule groups ( $F(1,248)=68.88, p=.001, M_{TS}=.22$  and  $M_{FS}=.88$ ). In summary, the above findings support that the focus, salary, and work schedule flexibility manipulations behaved as intended.

There are no significant differences across treatments for company familiarity, and it has no impact on the regression and ANOVA analyses reported below: thus, it is not discussed further. In order to account for potential variance in individual differences across treatments and to test some hypotheses, MTL and extroversion/introversion are incorporated as covariates in tests of H1A and H1B.

### ***Hypothesis Tests***

***Relative Impact of Salary Versus Schedule Flexibility.*** To test the relative impact of salary versus schedule flexibility on job acceptance, OLS regression equations include the salary manipulation dummy variable (where low coded as “0”, high as “1”), the schedule flexibility manipulation dummy variable (where no flexibility coded as “0”, flexible as “1”), the focus dummy manipulation variable (where short-term coded as “0” and long-term coded as “1”), all the possible 2-way interactions among these three variables, the 3-way interaction term (i.e.,

focus x salary x schedule flexibility), and the three individual difference covariates (SNMTL, NCMTL, extroversion). While the overall model is significant, examination of the individual beta coefficients show that the only significant main or interaction term is the schedule flexibility main effect ( $F(9, 231)=2.02$ ;  $p=.038$ ;  $b_{SF}=.19$ ,  $t=2.15$ ,  $p=.03$ ).

For a more simplified test of H1A and H1B, two reduced models are estimated, for each of the focus treatments (short-term and long-term). Thus, all terms involving focus are omitted, leaving the schedule flexibility and salary terms with their interaction and the individual difference covariates. Results indicate that overall, both salary and schedule flexibility contribute to predicting job acceptance ( $F(6,114)= 2.96$ ;  $p=.01$ ;  $b_S=.21$ ,  $t=1.68$ ,  $p<.10$ ;  $b_{SF}=.25$ ,  $t=2.02$ ,  $p<.05$ ) when the applicant has a short-term focus. However, under long-term focus, salary and schedule flexibility do not predict job acceptance ( $F(6,113)=.74$ ;  $p=.62$ ;  $b_{SF}=.14$ ,  $t=1.09$ ,  $p=.28$ ;  $b_S=.04$ ,  $t=0.31$ ,  $p=.76$ ): while the beta for schedule flexibility is greater than that for salary, both are insignificant. One final test determines the incremental contribution of schedule flexibility (Hays 1988). The “reduced” model for the long-term group with salary and the three covariates as independent variables (IVs) yields an  $F(4,115)=0.24$  ( $R^2=.008$ ). Adding the schedule flexibility and the salary x schedule flexibility interaction term to the equation yields an  $F(6,113)=.74$  ( $R^2=.04$ ), confirming that schedule flexibility makes an incremental contribution above and beyond salary (incremental  $F(2,113)=3.77$ ,  $p<.05$ ).

[Insert Table 1 about here.]

A second set of tests examines the relative impact of salary versus schedule flexibility. Replicating the above regression analyses, two-way (salary (low/high) x schedule flexibility (low/high)) ANOVAs indicate that salary ( $F(1,114)=1.54$ ,  $p=.217$ , eta squared=.013) and schedule flexibility ( $F(1,114)=2.00$ ,  $p=.160$ , eta squared=.017) are equally important under a short-term focus. Data show that schedule flexibility ( $F(1,113)= 3.05$ ,  $p=.084$ , eta squared=.026)

has a greater impact than salary ( $F(1,113)=.30, p=.585, \eta^2=.003$ ) under a long-term focus. Common sense suggests that rational applicants will prefer the high salary/high flexibility offer and that the least preferred offer is the low salary/low flexibility offer. To test whether an individual will sacrifice high salary for high schedule flexibility, I compare the high salary/low flexibility and high flexibility/low salary groups. Interestingly, under a short-term focus, there is no difference between whether an individual accepts a job with high salary and low schedule flexibility or a job with low salary and high schedule flexibility ( $M_s= 7.01$  vs.  $7.09$ ). [See Table 2.] Cell means indicate that individuals with a long-term focus are more likely to accept a job with low salary and high flexibility compared to a high salary/low flexibility job ( $M_s= 6.31$  vs.  $6.67$ ).

[Insert Table 2 about here.]

### ***Moderating Effects***

The remaining hypotheses measure the effects of the moderating variables, MTL and extroversion, on a person's preference for salary and schedule flexibility. Two specific factors of MTL are measured, non-calculative and social-normative MTL. To test the relative impact of salary versus job schedule flexibility on job acceptance, OLS regression equations include the NCMTL or SNMTL or EXT dummy variable (where low coded as "0", high as "1" for all three median split variables), the salary manipulation dummy variable (where low coded as "0", high as "1"), the schedule flexibility manipulation dummy variable (where no flexibility coded as "0", flexible as "1"), the focus dummy manipulation variable (where short-term coded as "0" and long-term coded as "1"), all possible 2 way interactions among the four variables, all 3-way interaction terms (e.g., focus x salary x schedule flexibility), and the four-way interaction term (focus x salary x flexibility x moderator dummy).

***Non-Calculative MTL:*** H2 proposes that individuals high in Non-Calculative MTL place more importance on salary when considering a job. For a simplified test of H2, two reduced models are estimated, for each of the NCMTL treatments (low and high). [See Table 3.] Thus, all terms involving NCMTL are omitted, leaving the schedule flexibility, salary, and focus terms with all of their interactions. Results indicate that for high NCMTL, schedule flexibility contributes more to predicting job acceptance than salary ( $F(7,111)=1.76$ ;  $ns$ ;  $b_{SF}=.15$ ,  $t=0.87$ ,  $ns$ ;  $b_S=.02$ ,  $t=.10$ ,  $ns$ ). However, while the beta for schedule flexibility is greater than that for salary, both are insignificant. For low NCMTL, both salary and schedule flexibility predict job acceptance ( $F(7,117)=1.64$ ;  $ns$ ;  $b_{SF}=.32$ ,  $t=1.77$ ,  $p<.10$ ;  $b_S=.38$ ,  $t=1.86$ ,  $p<.10$ ). Note that while the overall model F is insignificant, the beta coefficients for salary and schedule flexibility are comparable and marginally significant ( $p<.10$ ). One final test determines the incremental contribution of schedule flexibility (Hays 1988). The “reduced” model for the high NCMTL group with salary, focus, and their interaction as independent variables (IVs) yields an  $F(3,115)=1.77$  ( $R^2=.044$ ). Adding the schedule flexibility and the three interaction terms involving flexibility to the equation yields an  $F(7,111)=1.76$  ( $R^2=.100$ ), confirming that schedule flexibility makes an incremental contribution above and beyond salary (incremental  $F(4,111)=6.91$ ,  $p<.05$ ).

[Insert Table 3 about here.]

The data are also examined via ANOVA. Results confirm the above regression findings: the relevant NCMTL x salary x schedule flexibility interaction is insignificant ( $F(1,228)=.019$ ,  $ns$ ). Looking at the salary x flexibility interactions separately within each NCMTL level (low versus high), results are also insignificant ( $F(1,121)=.05$ ,  $ns$ ;  $F(1,115)=.002$ ,  $ns$ ). Individuals high in NCMTL are more likely to accept a job offering low salary and high schedule flexibility ( $M=6.65$ ) than the high salary/low flexibility offer ( $M=6.42$ ), counter to the hypothesis that

proposes that salary is preferred over schedule flexibility. Individuals low in NCMTL are also more likely to accept a job offering low salary and high schedule flexibility ( $M_s = 7.08$ ) compared to an offer with high salary and low schedule flexibility ( $M_s = 6.78$ ). Observed power tests show that the impact of salary on job acceptance for individuals with high NCMTL is weaker (observed power = .422; eta squared = .028) than that for schedule flexibility (observed power = .718; eta squared = .056).

[Insert Table 4 about here.]

**Social-Normative MTL:** H3 proposes that individuals high in Social-Normative MTL place more importance on schedule flexibility than salary when accepting a job offer. To test H3, two reduced models are estimated, for each of the SNMTL treatments (low and high). Thus, all terms involving SNMTL are omitted, leaving the schedule flexibility, salary, and focus terms with all of their interactions. Contrary to H3, results in Table 5 indicate that schedule flexibility contributes more to predicting job acceptance than salary for *low* SNMTL ( $F(7,118) = 2.15$ ,  $p < .10$ ;  $b_{SF} = .37$ ,  $t = 2.26$ ,  $p < .10$ ;  $b_S = .32$ ,  $t = 1.94$ ,  $p < .10$ ). In contrast (and also contrary to H3), neither salary nor flexibility predict job acceptance for high SNMTL individuals ( $F(7,113) = 0.55$ ;  $ns$ ;  $b_{SF} = .07$ ,  $t = 0.34$ ,  $ns$ ;  $b_S = .08$ ,  $t = .41$ ,  $ns$ ).

[Insert Table 5 about here.]

The incremental contribution of schedule flexibility is also measured. The “reduced” model for the high SNMTL group with salary, focus, and their interactions as independent variables (IVs) yields an  $F(3,117) = 0.48$  ( $R^2 = .012$ ). Adding the schedule flexibility and three schedule flexibility interaction terms to the equation yields an  $F(7,113) = 0.55$  ( $R^2 = .033$ ), confirming that schedule flexibility makes an incremental contribution above salary (incremental  $F(4,113) = 2.45$ ,  $p = .05$ ).

ANOVA results confirm the above regression findings: the relevant SNMTL x salary x schedule flexibility interaction is insignificant ( $F(1,231)=1.86, ns$ ). Looking at the salary x flexibility interactions separately within each SNMTL level (low versus high), results are also insignificant ( $F(1,122)=1.53, ns$ ;  $F(1,117)=.49, ns$ ). Cell means offer some directional support for H3 (see Table 6): individuals high in SNMTL are more likely to accept a job with low salary and high schedule flexibility compared to an offer with high salary and low schedule flexibility ( $M_s= 6.78$  vs.  $M_s= 6.70$ ). Observed power tests show that the impact of salary for high SNMTL individuals is weaker (observed power=.410; eta squared=.025) than that associated with schedule flexibility (observed power=.818; eta squared=.066).

[Insert Table 6 about here.]

**Extroversion.** H4A proposes that schedule flexibility impacts job acceptance more than salary for individuals high on extroversion, under a long-term focus. In contrast, H4B proposes that salary impacts job acceptance more than flexibility for individuals high on extroversion, under a short-term focus. Four reduced models are estimated for each of the EXT treatments (low and high) by focus treatments (short-term and long-term). Thus, all terms involving EXT and focus are omitted, leaving schedule flexibility and salary terms with all of their interactions. Results (see Table 7) indicate that for high EXT under a short-term focus, salary contributes more to predicting job acceptance than schedule flexibility ( $F(3,56)=1.22; p=.31; b_s=.38, t=1.90, p=.063; b_{SF}=.14, t=0.81, ns$ ). Results indicate that for high EXT under a long-term focus, neither schedule flexibility nor salary contribute to predicting job acceptance ( $F(3,63)=0.48; ns; b_s=-.01, t=-0.02, ns; b_{SF}=.09, t=0.46, ns$ ).

[Insert Table 7 about here.]

Testing the incremental contribution of schedule flexibility, the “reduced” model for the high EXT and short-term focus group with salary as an independent variable (IV) yields an

$F(1,58)=1.39$  ( $R^2=.023$ ). Adding schedule flexibility and the salary x schedule flexibility interaction terms to the equation yields an  $F(3,56)=1.22$  ( $R^2=.061$ ), supporting that schedule flexibility does not make an incremental contribution above salary ( $F(2,56)=2.27$ , *ns*). The “reduced” model for the high EXT and long-term focus group with salary as an independent variable (IV) yields an  $F(1,65)=.105$  ( $R^2=.002$ ). Adding the schedule flexibility and the salary x flexibility interaction terms to the equation yields an  $F(3,63)=.48$  ( $R^2=.022$ ), showing that schedule flexibility does not make an incremental contribution above salary ( $F(2,63)= 1.29$ , *ns*).

The data are also examined via ANOVA (see Table 8). Results again confirm the above regression findings: the relevant EXT x salary x schedule flexibility x focus interaction is insignificant ( $F(1,227)=0.02$ , *ns*). Looking at the salary x flexibility interactions separately within each EXT level (low versus high), results are also insignificant ( $F(1,112)=0.02$ , *ns*;  $F(1,123)=.094$ , *ns*). Cell means are also explored to determine if salary is preferred over flexibility. Individuals high in EXT with a long-term focus do not express a preference for either option: i.e., both are rated similarly ( $M_s= 6.65$  vs.  $6.36$ ). However, directional support suggests that individuals high in EXT, with a short-term focus, desire jobs with a high salary versus high flexibility ( $M_s= 7.91$  vs.  $7.11$  for the high salary/low flexibility and low salary/high flexibility groups, respectively) (H4B). Observed power tests show that the impact of salary on individuals with high EXT is slightly stronger (observed power=.182;  $\eta^2=.009$ ) than schedule flexibility (observed power=.092;  $\eta^2=.003$ ).

[Insert Table 8 about here.]

***Results Summary***

In summary, data show only very weak support for H1A that under a long-term focus, schedule flexibility impacts job acceptance more than salary. Unfortunately, data show that schedule flexibility and salary are equally important for short-term focused individuals, contrary to H1B. Interestingly, data suggest that when given the choice of a high salary/low flexibility or high schedule flexibility/low salary, long-term focused individuals prefer more schedule flexibility whereas short-term focused applicants perceive these trade-offs as equally attractive.

There is no statistical support for H2. Individual beta coefficients and cell means for high NCMTL show that schedule flexibility has a greater impact than salary, counter to the proposed hypothesis. Individuals high in NCMTL are more likely to accept a job offering low salary/high schedule flexibility over a position with high salary/low schedule flexibility.

Results show that schedule flexibility contributes more to predicting job acceptance for those individuals low and high in SNMTL. Contrary to H3, individuals high in SNMTL express more concern for schedule flexibility versus salary. Those high in SNMTL show no preference for salary or schedule flexibility when given the option of high salary/low schedule flexibility versus low salary/high schedule flexibility.

Long-term focused individuals high in EXT do not show a preference for schedule flexibility or salary when accepting a job (H4A), and salary contributes to job acceptance for short-term focused high EXT applicants. There is also directional support for H4B that short-term focused individuals high in EXT are more likely to accept a job offering high salary/low schedule flexibility over an offer with low salary/high schedule flexibility.

## DISCUSSION

The intent of this study is to provide insight into understanding the relative importance of various job choice criteria, most notably, salary and schedule flexibility. During the job search process, applicants start to analyze the different job attributes offered by various employers and specific ones can be seen as more appealing than others. Pay has a significant influence on job attractiveness and subsequent job choice decisions (e.g., Rynes 1987; Rynes, Schwab and Heneman, 1983); and due to societal changes, alternative work schedules are becoming increasingly popular within many companies.

Surprising are some of the salary effects. While past research confirms that salary matters, the data suggest that salary's impact is qualified by one's mind set (i.e., mental focus). Analyses suggest that salary and schedule flexibility do contribute to the prediction of job acceptance for short-term focused individuals. Surprisingly, salary shows virtually no impact for long-term focused individuals. Rather, while schedule flexibility is more important, neither factor is a significant predictor of job acceptance for long-term focused applicants. One plausible explanation for these findings is that the salary and/or schedule flexibility manipulations were ineffective. Although the two salaries are rated as different, both are in the acceptable/middle range (not sufficiently different). Effects may have been stronger had the two salaries been perceived as more different. In addition, the long-term focus manipulation may have diverted attention away from the current salary offer and work schedule options: i.e., both of those attributes may have been processed as short-term characteristics. [Recall that subjects were instructed to focus on the long-term factors such as career potential or on short-term factors.] Further elaboration is provided below.

This study also explores the qualifying impact of one's temporal mindset. Data show that, in terms of magnitude, schedule flexibility has a (directionally) greater impact than salary for

individuals under a long-term focus (H1A) (beta coefficients are insignificant, however).

Schedule flexibility can be important to applicants who are planning for the future. As a result, the option of schedule flexibility is convenient for individuals who have other needs and demands aside from work. Schedule flexibility can also be seen as a great benefit for those individuals who plan to have a family in the future or those who simply enjoy taking part in other activities outside of work. Contrary to expectations, salary and schedule flexibility have comparable (and significant) effects on the job acceptance decision under a short-term focus (H1B). Individuals with a short-term focus may not have a specific preference for salary or schedule flexibility, rather both impact acceptance.

Another objective is to distinguish whether individuals will choose between a high salary versus low schedule flexibility and low salary for high schedule flexibility. Cell means indicate that individuals with long-term focus are more likely to accept a job with low salary and high flexibility compared to high salary and low schedule flexibility. This may be a result of how they value time versus money. Perhaps long-term focused individuals consider time as a scarce resource (Leclerc, Schmitt, and Dube 1995) and thus, they appreciate the ability to control their work schedules to make time for other needs/activities. As noted above regarding the nature of the salary manipulation, it is possible that the salary offered is not as valuable as schedule flexibility. Conceivably, time and money can be exchanged in return for the other: i.e., a person may work a certain number of hours and days in return for a sum of money, or a person may take a couple days off of work without any pay. Time and money are also similar in a sense that many people feel that they never have enough of either: they are always wanting more hours within a day, or to earn more money and raises. Although these two variables can be viewed as exchangeable, time can never be replaced (Okada and Hoch 2004). As a result of irreplaceable time, schedule flexibility can be viewed as having more value than a lump sum of money.

Results for H2 are interesting: tests that applicants high in NCMTL prefer salary over schedule flexibility are unsupported. Contrary to expectations, those high in NCMTL are more likely to accept a job offering low salary and high schedule flexibility compared to high salary and low schedule flexibility, and schedule flexibility contributes more than salary to predicting job acceptance. As noted above, this may be a result of the ineffective and relatively weaker salary manipulation. Non-calculative individuals do not care about the cost of leading in their decision, but this does not mean they do not consider control concerns.

Individuals have tasks and assignments to fulfil in their everyday lives, which can be managed more easily with schedule flexibility. Self-determination theory (Deci and Ryan 1985; Ryan and Deci 2000) proposes that individuals have three innate, psychological needs (i.e., competence, autonomy, and relatedness). The relative importance of schedule flexibility for high and low NCMTL individuals can be explained by comparing the needs that arise in the workplace when deadlines are set for tasks and assignments. Whether tasks are work-related or family-related, individuals need to effectively manage time to balance them all. Competence deals with succeeding at optimally challenging tasks and being able to attain desired outcomes (e.g., Skinner 1995; White 1959). An individual motivated by challenging tasks and obtaining desired outcomes needs to have flexible work hours to achieve such desired outcomes. For instance, a person with a long-term goal must do whatever they can to accomplish their assignment because they eventually want to advance in their work or career. The psychological need that almost every individual can relate to is autonomy: i.e., the need to experience choice and the feeling of being the initiator of one's own actions (DeCharms 1968; Deci 1975). A person with control over their work schedule can determine how many hours within a day or week they must work in order to accomplish a task or project. This ability to set one's own schedule can be rewarding because these decisions are self-made and not mandated by others.

The need for relatedness involves establishing a sense of mutual respect and reliance with others (Baumesiter and Leary 1995; Harlow 1958), for example, when individuals modify their schedules to work with another employee(s) on a specific task. As a result, individuals who are high or low in NCMTL are more likely to choose a job offering low salary and high schedule flexibility because they have a need to control what it takes to get the job done relative to the benefits being offered. Deci and Ryan's (1985) perspective argues that these control needs (i.e., competence, autonomy, and relatedness) are critical in every individual's life, thus allowing schedule flexibility to be important factor.

The data suggest that applicants who score high in SNMTL are more likely to accept a job that offers low salary and high schedule flexibility. SNMTL individuals may not consider the monetary reward (i.e., salary) because they already feel that it is their duty or responsibility to lead. With this mindset, money does not matter. However, the ability to have a flexible work schedule allows these leaders to set aside time, or to make arrangements with their subordinates at work and others outside of work. Individuals who feel responsible and possess leadership qualities are most likely leaders at home as well.

Data do not support H4A, that individuals high in EXT with a long-term focus prefer schedule flexibility versus salary. This is interesting because extroverts are very social and outgoing, and it is reasonable that they would also enjoy having control over their time. Results also indicate that salary and schedule flexibility do not contribute to predicting job acceptance. Research indicates that extraverts have shorter tenures with companies and engage in more non-permitted work absences (Cooper and Payne 1976). Some of those who scored high in EXT were asked to assume they had a long-term focus; which may have caused those applicants to lose interest in the job offer. That is, the long-term focus manipulation may have "conflicted" with these individuals' enduring extravert nature (i.e., acted as a sort of experimental confound).

Results for H4B are supported. Salary contributes to predicting job acceptance for individuals high in EXT with a short-term focus. There is also directional support for the preference of high salary over schedule flexibility. Those with a short-term focus have nothing to lose in the long run, and thus the flexible schedule may be ignored because they are more concerned with the money being paid.

By manipulating only two job criteria, a host of potentially important alternative criteria are neglected and not accounted for in the analyses, as indicated by the seemingly low regression model  $R^2$ s. Individuals form decisions based on numerous criteria (i.e., outcomes and weight of decisions). Construal-level theory articulates how psychological distance alters the mental representation of inputs and the effective weight given to “high-level” and “low-level” criteria (Trope, Liberman, and Wakslak 2007). The decision outcome is most directly influenced by the selectivity in which few of many possible inputs (e.g., salary, schedule flexibility) are used in an evaluation (Alba, Hutchinson, and Lynch 1991). The psychological distance between short-term (event in the near future) versus long-term (event in the distant future) foci can alter the representation of salary and schedule flexibility creating weight differences between the two inputs. For short-term focused applicants, salary and schedule flexibility are here both perceived as (comparable) “high-level” or salient criteria. However, the data seem to suggest that long-term focused individuals may consider schedule flexibility and salary as “low-level” criteria, because in the event of the distant future, while schedule flexibility contributes to job acceptance more than salary (based on the magnitude of the beta coefficients), both terms are insignificant. The insignificant beta coefficient for schedule flexibility is unexpected, and suggests that current salary and schedule options were both processed as short-term characteristics. Theoretically, I proposed that long-term focused applicants perceive that schedule flexibility is a higher level criterion compared to salary. Future research is required to resolve these contradictions.

Compensatory models allow trade-offs among attributes such that a good value on one attribute can make up for poor values on others (Kahn and Baron 1995). Decisions are made based on personal experiences, circumstances, situations, etc. Trade-offs are often accompanied by a list of pros and cons that help an individual process the variety forms of information given. Understanding an individual's attitude towards these rules may help predict their reactions to various decisions. As noted above, the job offer may have overlooked a variety of choice criteria important to the participating subjects. This is an area worthy of future exploration.

In addition to the above theoretical contributions, my findings are important from a managerial perspective. For example, human resource management should consider offering more schedule flexibility options in job descriptions to attract applicants. These applicants likely judge a company's value and culture by observing how the company cares for its' employees. If a company stresses the importance of work-family and work-life balance through the options of schedule flexibility, this may attract more qualified applicants. If a company establishes a reputation for treating its' employees well, employee satisfaction will rise, the number of qualified applicants will increase, and employee turnover should also decrease. For example, *Google*, *Costco*, and *SAS* are known for taking care of their employees, and as a result, they are over-run with job applications and have impressively low turnover rates.

Schedule flexibility and salary should be emphasized to new professional workforce applicants interested in working temporarily. Data reported here suggest that individuals who plan to work for a short period of time are interested in both schedule flexibility and salary when deciding on a job offer. In contrast, employers should stress career advancement-oriented factors when negotiating with prospective employees who plan to stay with the company long-term.

Companies with defined leadership structures or those that offer leadership development programs should also emphasize schedule flexibility because individuals who are motivated to

accept leadership roles respond favorably to schedule flexibility options. Furthermore, flexible work schedules can facilitate task accomplishment and leadership effectiveness.

### ***Limitations and Future Research***

A clear limitation is the sample of respondents used in this study. College students taking undergraduate business classes may very likely have different attitudes towards a job and a career, compared to those with work experience. They also have less experience and knowledge about the entire job search and job offer negotiation process. Student samples typically do not yield sufficient variance for many individual difference constructs such as MTL and extroversion/introversion, thereby limiting the ability to detect significant differences. Note that scale means for SNMTL and EXT suggest that the two groups represent moderate versus high ( $M_s=5.37$  vs.  $7.45$  for SNMTL;  $M_s=5.30$  vs.  $7.01$  for EXT), and not low versus high.

Another possible confound is the present state of the economy. This study was conducted during a time where the economy was at a very low point and the media were bombarded with frequent negative economic reminders. This may motivate student subjects to accept any job being offered regardless of the salary or schedule flexibility options being offered. Subjects were instructed to assume it was a “strong” economy, but those statements may have been overpowered by the mindset of a weak economy and related media exposure.

There are many ways to expand upon this study by altering the situational context. As mentioned above, the focus and salary manipulations are limited by their design and thus, future studies testing more varied salary levels and different focus manipulations are warranted. Other situational factors that could be important to people might be company size, location, industry, and overall work environment. Any one of these may affect a person’s job choice decision. Salary and schedule flexibility are not perceived as long-term/career advancement factors here.

Thus, academic researchers and managers should work to identify career advancement types of job choice criteria. Future research should also explore a comprehensive set of decision rules.

## REFERENCES

- Alba, Joseph W., J. Wesley Hutchinson, and John G. Lynch, Jr. (1991), "Memory and Decision Making," *Handbook of Consumer Theory and Research*, Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall, 1-49.
- Baltes, Boris B., Thomas E. Briggs, Joseph W. Huff, Julie A. Wright, and George A. Neuman (1999), "Flexible and Compressed Workweek Schedules: A Meta-Analysis of Their Effects on Work-Related Criteria," *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 84(4), 496-513.
- Bamberg, Sebastian, Steffen M. Kuhnle, and Peter Schmidt (1999), "The Impact of General Attitude on Decisions: A Framing Approach," *Rationality and Society*, 11, 5-24.
- Barber, Alison E., and Mark V. Roehling (1993), "Job Posting and the Decision to Interview: A Verbal Protocol Analysis," *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 78, 845-856.
- Baumeister, Roy F., and Mark R. Leary (1995), "The Need to Belong: Desire for Interpersonal Attachments as a Fundamental Human Motivation," *Psychological Bulletin*, 117, 497-529.
- Boswell, Wendy R., Mark V. Roehling, Marcie A. LePine, and Lisa M. Moynihan (2003), "Individual Job-Choice Decisions and the Impact of Job Attributes and Recruitment Practices: A Longitudinal Field Study," *Human Resource Management*, 42(1), 23-37.
- Breaugh, James A., and Mary Starke (2000), "Research on Employee Recruitment: So Many Studies, So Many Remaining Questions," *Journal of Management*, 26(3), 405-434.
- Chan, Kim-Yin, and Drasgow Fritz (2001), "Toward a Theory of Individual Differences and Leadership: Understanding the Motivation to Lead," *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 86 (3), 481-98.
- Chan, Kim-Yin, James Rounds, and Fritz Drasgow (2000), "The Relation Between Vocational Interests and the Motivation to Lead," *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 57, 226-245.
- Cooper, Robert, and Roy Payne (1967), "Extraversion and Some Aspects of Work Behavior," *Personnel Psychology*, 20, 45-57.
- Crowe, Ellen, and Tory E. Higgins (1997), "Regulatory Focus and Strategic Inclinations: Promotion and Prevention in Decision-Making," *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 69(2), 117-132.
- DeCharms, Richard (1968), *Personal Causation: The Internal Affective Determinants of Behavior*, New York, NY: Academic Press.
- Deci, Edward, L. (1975), *Intrinsic Motivation*, New York, NY: Plenum.
- Deci, Edward, L., and Richard M. Ryan (1985), *Intrinsic Motivation and Self-Determination in Human Behavior*, New York, NY: Plenum.

- Forster, Jens, Heidi Grant, Lorraine C. Idson, and Edward Higgins (2001), "Success/Failure Feedback, Expectancies, and Approach/Avoidance Motivation: How Regulatory Focus Moderate Classic Relations," *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 37, 253-260.
- Frey, Bruno S (1997), "On The Relationship Between Intrinsic and Extrinsic Work Motivation," *International Journal of Industrial Organization*, 15 (4), 427-439.
- Furnham, Adrian and Marion Zacherl (1986), "Personality and Job Satisfaction," *Personality and Individual Differences*, 7(4), 453-459.
- Furnham, Adrian, K.V. Petrides, Chris J. Jackson, and Tim Cotter (2002), "Do Personality Factors Predict Job Satisfaction?" *Personality and Individual Differences*, 33(8), 1325-1342.
- Gainey, Thomas W., and Beth F. Clenney, (2006), "Flextime and Telecommuting: Examining Individual Perceptions," *Southern Business Review*, 32(1), 13-21.
- Goldberg, Lewis R. (1992), "The Development of Markers for the Big-Five Factor Structure," *Psychological Assessment*, 4(1), 26-42.
- Harlow, Harry F. (1958), "The Nature of Love," *American Psychologist*, 13, 673-685.
- Hays, William L. (1988), *Statistics*, 4<sup>th</sup> Edition, NY: Holt, Rinehart, & Winston, Inc.
- Hochschild, Arlie R. (1997), *The Time Bind: When Work Becomes Home and Home Becomes Work*. New York: Metropolitan Books.
- Honeycutt, Tracey L., and Benson Rosen (1997), "Family Friendly Human Resource Policies, Salary and Salient Identity as Predictors of Organizational Attraction," *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 50, 271-290.
- Jurgensen, Clifford E. (1978), "Job Preferences (What Makes a Job Good or Bad?)" *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 63(3), 267-276.
- Kahn, Barbara E. And Jonathan Baron (1995), "An Exploratory Study of Choice Rules Favored for High-Stakes Decisions," *Journal of Consumer Psychology*, 4(4), 305-328/
- Lawler, Edward E. III (1981), *Pay and Organization Development*, Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.
- Leclerc, France, Bernd H. Schmitt, and Laurette Dube (1995), "Waiting Time and Decision Making: Is Time Like Money?" *Journal of Consumer Research*, 22(1), 110-119.
- Maslow, Abraham (1943), "A Theory of Human Motivation," *Psychological Review*, 50, 370-396.
- Maurer, Steven D., Vince Howe, and Thomas W. Lee (1992), "Organizational Recruiting as Marketing Management: An Interdisciplinary Study of Engineering Graduates," *Personnel Psychology*, 45(4), 807-833.

- McCrae, Robert, R. and Paul T. Costa (1991), "The NEO Personality Inventory: Using the Five-Factor Model in Counseling," *Journal of Counseling & Development*, 69(4), 367-372.
- McLean, Ephraim R., Stanley J. Smits, and John R. Tanner (1996), "The Importance of Salary on Job and Career Attitudes of Information System Professionals," *Information and Management*, 30(6), 291-299.
- Mitchell, Terence R., and Amy E. Mickel (1999), "The Meaning of Money: An Individual-Difference Perspective," *Academy of Management Review*, 24(3), 568-578.
- Okada, Erica Mina, and Stephen J. Hoch (2004), "Spending Time Versus Spending Money," *Journal of Consumer Research*, 31 (September), 313-323.
- Oleson, Mark (2004), "Exploring the Relationship Between Money Attitudes and Maslow's Hierarchy of Needs," *International Journal of Consumer Studies*, 28(1), 83-92.
- Pierce, Jon L., and John W. Newstrom (1983), "The Design of Flexible Work Schedules and Employee Responses: Relationships and Process," *Journal of Occupational Behaviour*, 4 (4), 247-262.
- Pierce, Jon L., J. W. Newstrom, Randall B. Dunham, and Alison E. Barber (1989), *Alternative Work Schedules*, Needham Heights, MA: Allyn and Bacon.
- Poduska, Bernard (1992), "Money, Marriage, and Maslow's Hierarchy of Needs," *American Behavioral Scientist*, 35, 756-770.
- Ronen, Simcha (1984), *Alternative Work Schedules*, Homewood, IL: Dow Jones-Irwin.
- Ryan, Richard M., and Edward L. Deci (2000), "Self Determination Theory and the Facilitation of Intrinsic Motivation, Social Development, and Well-being," *American Psychologist*, 55, 68-78.
- Rynes, Sara L. (1987), "Compensation Strategies for Recruiting," *Topics in Total Compensation*, 2, 185-196.
- Rynes, Sara L., Barry Gerhart, and Kathleen A. Minette (2004), "The Importance of Pay in Employee Motivation: Discrepancies Between What People Say and What They Do," *Human Resource Management*, 43(4), 381-394.
- Rynes, Sara L., Donald P. Schwab, and Herbert G. Heneman (1983), "The Role of Pay and Market Pay Variability in Job Application Decisions," *Organizational Behavior and Human Performance*, 31, 353-364.
- Sato, Toru (2005), "The Eysenck Personality Questionnaire Brief Version: Factor Structure and Reliability," *The Journal of Psychology*, 139 (6), 545-552.
- Seibert, Scott E., and Maria L. Kraimer (2001), "The Five-Factor Model of Personality and Career Success," *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 58, 1-21.

Skinner, Ellen A. (1995), *Perceived Control, Motivation, and Coping*, Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Tang, Thomas Li-Ping, and Pamela R. Gilbert (1995), "Attitudes Toward Money as Related to Intrinsic and Extrinsic Job Satisfaction, Stress, and Work-Related Attitudes," *Personality and Individual Differences*, 19 (3), 327-332.

Trope, Yaacov and Nira Lieberman (2003), "Temporal Construal," *Psychological Review*, 110, 403-421.

Trope, Yaacov, Nira Lieberman, and Cheryl Wakslak (2007), "Construal Levels and Psychological Distance: Effects on Representation, Prediction, Evaluation, and Behavior," *Journal of Consumer Psychology*, 17(2), 83-95.

Watson, David, and Ann K. Slack (1993), "General Factors of Affective Temperament and Their Relation to Job Satisfaction Over Time," *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 54(2), 181-202.

White, Robert W. (1959), "Motivation Reconsidered: The Concept of Competence," *Psychological Review*, 66, 297-333.

**TABLE 1**  
**INCREMENTAL EFFECTS OF FLEXIBILITY & SALARY ON JOB ACCEPTANCE<sup>1</sup>**

<b>R<sup>2</sup> (d.f.)</b>	<b>F</b>	<b>Flexibility Dummy</b>	<b>Salary Dummy</b>	<b>Flexibility x Salary Interaction</b>	<b>Non- Calculative MTL</b>	<b>Social- Normative MTL</b>	<b>Extroversion</b>
<i>Short-Term Focus</i>							
.135 (6,114)	2.96	.25 (2.02)	.21 (1.68)	-.14 (-.94)	-.23 (-2.56)	.08 (0.85)	.15 (1.60)
.113 (4,116)	3.68	.17 (1.94)			-.24 (-2.72)	.09 (0.99)	.13 (1.46)
.101 (4,116)	3.24		.13 (1.46)		-.24 (-2.67)	.08 (0.91)	.18 (1.93)
<i>Long-Term Focus</i>							
.038 (6, 113)	0.74	.14 (1.09)	.04 (0.31)	.05 (0.32)	-.03 (-.26)	.06 (0.63)	-.03 (-0.34)
.032 (4,115)	0.95	.17 (1.81)			-.03 (-.29)	.07 (0.70)	-.02 (-0.22)
.008 (4,115)	0.24		.06 (.67)		-.04 (-.43)	.05 (0.54)	-.02 (-0.24)

<sup>1</sup> Standardized coefficients (*t* statistics); In the interest of space and parsimony, insignificant effects are omitted.

**TABLE 2**  
**SUMMARY OF TREATMENT CELL STATISTICS<sup>1</sup>**

	<i>High Salary &amp; High Flex</i>	<i>High Salary &amp; Low Flex</i>	<i>Low Salary &amp; High Flex</i>	<i>Low Salary &amp; Low Flex</i>
Short-Term Focus	7.22 (1.47)	7.01 (1.48)	7.09 (1.37)	6.28 (1.65)
Long-Term Focus	7.06 (1.81)	6.31 (1.87)	6.67 (1.21)	6.27 (2.35)

<sup>1</sup>Means and standard deviations in parentheses.

**TABLE 3**  
**INCREMENTAL EFFECTS OF FLEXIBILITY & SALARY ON JOB ACCEPTANCE FOR LOW/HIGH NCMTL<sup>1</sup>**

<b>R<sup>2</sup> (d.f.)</b>	<b>F</b>	<b>NCMTL Dummy</b>	<b>Salary Dummy</b>	<b>Flexibility Dummy</b>	<b>Salary x Flexibility</b>	<b>Salary x NCMTL Dummy</b>	<b>Flexibility x NCMTL Dummy</b>	<b>Salary x Flexibility x NCMTL</b>
<i>Short-Term Focus</i>								
.118 (7,114)	2.19	-.05 (-0.27)	.36 (2.10)	.36 (2.00)	-.28 (-1.29)	-.30 (-1.36)	-.17 (-0.78)	.27 (1.08)
.082 (3,118)	3.51	-.24 (-1.94)		.17 (1.36)			.03 (0.16)	
.069 (3,118)	2.90	-.16 (-1.28)	.19 (1.50)			-.10 (-0.63)		
<i>Long-Term Focus</i>								
.083 (7,114)	1.47	-.39 (-2.07)	-.27 (-1.37)	-.10 (-0.51)	.26 (1.03)	.42 (1.96)	.29 (1.38)	-.16 (-0.71)
.039 (3,118)	1.58	-.13 (-0.99)		.06 (0.48)			.17 (1.17)	
.042 (3,118)	1.71	-.22 (-1.74)	-.22 (-0.94)			.31 (2.11)		
<i>Low NCMTL<sup>2</sup></i>								
.089 (7,117)	1.64		.38 (1.86)	.32 (1.77)	-.25 (-1.14)			
.045 (3,121)	1.91			.15 (1.20)				
.054 (3,121)	2.29		.17 (1.34)					
<i>High NCMTL<sup>2</sup></i>								
.100 (7,111)	1.76		.02 (0.10)	.15 (0.87)	.05 (0.23)			
.062 (3,115)	2.53			.19 (1.46)				
.044 (3,115)	1.77		.07 (0.55)					

<sup>1</sup> Standardized coefficients (*t* statistics).

<sup>2</sup> Focus effects (all insignificant) are omitted for simplicity.

**TABLE 4**  
**SUMMARY OF TREATMENT MEANS FOR NCMTL<sup>1</sup>**

	<i>High Salary &amp; High Flex</i>	<i>High Salary &amp; Low Flex</i>	<i>Low Salary &amp; High Flex</i>	<i>Low Salary &amp; Low Flex</i>
Low NCMTL	7.13 (1.69)	6.78 (1.95)	7.08 (1.40)	6.71 (1.79)
High NCMTL	7.23 (1.40)	6.42 (1.32)	6.65 (1.15)	5.94 (2.11)

<sup>1</sup> Means and standard deviations in parentheses.

**TABLE 5**  
**INCREMENTAL EFFECTS OF FLEXIBILITY & SALARY ON JOB ACCEPTANCE FOR LOW/HIGH SNMTL<sup>1</sup>**

R <sup>2</sup> (d.f.)	F	SNMTL Dummy	Salary Dummy	Flexibility Dummy	Salary x Flexibility	Salary x SNMTL Dummy	Flexibility x SNMTL Dummy	Salary x Flexibility x SNMTL
<i>Short-Term Focus</i>								
.081 (7,115)	1.46	.30 (1.63)	.33 (1.98)	.39 (2.30)	-.22 (-1.06)	-.20 (-0.91)	-.27 (-1.22)	.13 (0.53)
.047 (3,119)	1.96	.19 (1.52)		.26 (2.16)			-.20 (-1.25)	
.034 (3,119)	1.38	.16 (1.28)	.21 (1.69)			-.13 (-0.84)		
<i>Long-Term Focus</i>								
.056 (7,116)	0.98	.29 (1.57)	.19 (0.96)	.31 (1.73)	-.15 (-0.64)	-.27 (-1.15)	-.32 (-1.45)	0.34 (1.33)
.035 (3,120)	1.44	.14 (1.08)		.22 (1.70)			-.10 (-0.61)	
.009 (3,120)	.345	.08 (0.59)	.07 (0.50)			-.01 (-0.08)		
<i>Low SNMTL<sup>2</sup></i>								
.113 (7,118)	2.15		.32(1.94)	.37 (2.26)	-.21 (-1.04)			
.074 (3,122)	3.25			.26 (2.11)				
.034 (3,122)	1.41		.20 (1.63)					
<i>High SNMTL<sup>2</sup></i>								
.033 (7,113)	.549		.08 (0.41)	.07 (0.34)	-.05 (-0.22)			
.017 (3,117)	.666			.03 (0.25)				
.012 (3,117)	.475		.05 (0.36)					

<sup>1</sup> Standardized coefficients (*t* statistics).

<sup>2</sup> Focus effects (all insignificant) are omitted for simplicity.

**TABLE 6**  
**SUMMARY OF TREATMENT MEANS FOR SNMTL<sup>1</sup>**

	<i>High Salary &amp; High Flex</i>	<i>High Salary &amp; Low Flex</i>	<i>Low Salary &amp; High Flex</i>	<i>Low Salary &amp; Low Flex</i>
Low SNMTL	7.08 (1.25)	6.63 (1.52)	6.94 (1.17)	5.80 (2.00)
High SNMTL	7.18 (1.75)	6.70 (1.90)	6.78 (1.47)	6.77 (1.96)

<sup>1</sup> Means and standard deviations in parentheses.

**TABLE 7**  
**INCREMENTAL EFFECTS OF FLEXIBILITY & SALARY ON JOB ACCEPTANCE FOR LOW/HIGH EXT<sup>1</sup>**

<b>R<sup>2</sup> (d.f.)</b>	<b>F</b>	<b>EXT Dummy</b>	<b>Salary Dummy</b>	<b>Flexibility Dummy</b>	<b>Salary x Flexibility</b>	<b>Salary x EXT Dummy</b>	<b>Flexibility x EXT Dummy</b>	<b>Salary x Flexibility x EXT</b>
<i>Long-Term Focus</i>								
.041 (7,113)	.687	.06 (0.34)	.07 (0.36)	.17 (0.97)	.10 (0.41)	-.07 (-0.27)	-.07 (-0.29)	-.02 (-.07)
<i>Long-Term, High EXT</i>								
.022 (3,63)	0.48		-.01 (-0.02)	.09 (0.46)	.08 (0.34)			
<i>Long-Term, High EXT</i>								
.002 (1,65)	.105		.04 (0.32)					
<i>Long-Term, Low EXT</i>								
.071 (3,50)	1.26		.07 (0.39)	.18 (1.06)	.10 (0.45)			
<i>Long-Term, Low EXT</i>								
.015 (1,52)	.767		.47 (0.12)					
<i>Short-Term Focus</i>								
.121 (7,114)	2.23	.28 (1.59)	.24 (1.49)	.48 (2.54)	-.19 (-0.88)	.08 (0.36)	-.32 (-1.40)	-.08 (-0.32)
<i>Short-Term, High EXT</i>								
.061 (3,56)	1.22		.38 (1.90)	.14 (0.81)	-.35 (-1.49)			
<i>Short-Term, High EXT</i>								
.023 (1,58)	1.39		.15 (1.18)					
<i>Short-Term, Low EXT</i>								
.129 (3,58)	2.86		.22 (1.36)	.43 (2.32)	-.17 (-0.80)			
<i>Short-Term, Low EXT</i>								
.020 (1,60)	1.21		.14 (1.10)					

<sup>1</sup> Standardized coefficients (*t* statistics).

**TABLE 8**  
**SUMMARY OF TREATMENT MEANS FOR EXT<sup>1</sup>**

	<i>High Salary &amp; High Flex</i>	<i>High Salary &amp; Low Flex</i>	<i>Low Salary &amp; High Flex</i>	<i>Low Salary &amp; Low Flex</i>
<b><i>Long-Term Focus</i></b>				
High EXT	6.87 (1.92)	6.36 (2.18)	6.65 (0.83)	6.27 (2.54)
Low EXT	7.44 (0.89)	6.47 (1.30)	6.60 (1.52)	6.01 (2.24)
<b><i>Short-Term Focus</i></b>				
High EXT	7.11 (1.58)	7.91 (0.98)	7.11 (1.43)	6.73 (0.88)
Low EXT	7.38 (1.38)	6.62 (1.58)	7.42 (0.95)	6.15 (2.04)

<sup>1</sup> Means and standard deviations in parentheses.