

## Article

---

### "An Analysis of the Relation between Personality and the Attractiveness of Total Rewards Components"

Christian Vandenberghe, Sylvie St-Onge et Évelyne Robineau

*Relations industrielles / Industrial Relations*, vol. 63, n° 3, 2008, p. 425-453.

Pour citer cet article, utiliser l'information suivante :

URI: <http://id.erudit.org/iderudit/019096ar>

DOI: 10.7202/019096ar

Note : les règles d'écriture des références bibliographiques peuvent varier selon les différents domaines du savoir.

---

Ce document est protégé par la loi sur le droit d'auteur. L'utilisation des services d'Érudit (y compris la reproduction) est assujettie à sa politique d'utilisation que vous pouvez consulter à l'URI <https://apropos.erudit.org/fr/usagers/politique-dutilisation/>

---

Érudit est un consortium interuniversitaire sans but lucratif composé de l'Université de Montréal, l'Université Laval et l'Université du Québec à Montréal. Il a pour mission la promotion et la valorisation de la recherche. Érudit offre des services d'édition numérique de documents scientifiques depuis 1998.

Pour communiquer avec les responsables d'Érudit : [info@erudit.org](mailto:info@erudit.org)

# *An Analysis of the Relation between Personality and the Attractiveness of Total Rewards Components*

CHRISTIAN VANDENBERGHE  
SYLVIE ST-ONGE  
ÉVELYNE ROBINEAU

*This study examines the links between personality and the relative attraction of various total rewards components. A survey approach is adopted, with 967 individuals completing a questionnaire. These individuals are currently employed. Results show that, after controlling for the effects of several demographic variables, “Big-Five” personality traits do affect individuals’ attraction to the following total rewards components: quality of work and of social relationships, development and career opportunities, variable pay, indirect pay, flexibility of working conditions, and prestige. Among Big-Five personality traits, openness to experience best predicts the relative importance employees give to the various total rewards components.*

## **RESEARCH CONTEXT**

Demographic and sociological changes present employers with a major challenge when attracting employees. Since salaries and fringe benefits can be indistinguishable from one firm to the next (Gerhart and Rynes, 2003), employers must increasingly rely on the more intangible components of “total rewards” (e.g., opportunities for advancement, work-family balance, etc.). Such a trend is consistent with a growing number of employers seeking to deploy a “total rewards” strategy (e.g., Long, 2006; Milkovich, Newman,

---

– VANDENBERGHE, C., professor, HEC Montréal, Montréal, christian.vandenberghe@hec.ca

– ST-ONGE, S., professor, HEC Montréal, Montréal, sylvie.st-onge@hec.ca

– ROBINEAU, É., HEC Montréal, Montréal, evelyne.robineau@hec.ca

and Cole, 2005; St-Onge and Thériault, 2006). We use the notion of reward, rather than compensation, since the former is broader and encompasses “everything provided by the company, which satisfies an employee’s needs” (Long, 2006: 6). A survey conducted by Mercer Corporation (2007) shows that 55% of all participating North-American employers adopt a “broad” definition of compensation, including indirect pay, fringe benefits, professional advancement and other intrinsic compensations. Similarly, while potential employees tend to give preference to employment offers which propose the highest salaries, they nevertheless consider other factors when making their choices; these include fringe benefits, variable pay, promotion opportunities, etc. (Barber and Roehling, 1993; Bretz and Judge, 1994; Cable and Judge, 1994).

## ***RESEARCH OBJECTIVE AND CONTRIBUTIONS***

---

### ***Research Objective***

Based on individual dispositions and considerations, this research innovates by exploring the links between individuals’ personalities and the attraction of various total rewards components. Specifically, this research seeks to answer the following question: How do individuals’ personality traits determine the relative importance of various total rewards components when they make employment choices?

According to the individual dispositions perspective, people are predisposed to perceive and assess their environments in a somewhat constructive manner, and to act accordingly (Weiss and Adler, 1984). Personal dispositions are natural tendencies that colour most of an individual’s behaviours and attitudes. According to Bell and Staw (1989), the effects of personal dispositions are more likely to be confirmed in situations where people enjoy a certain degree of latitude in their decisions and behaviours, which seems to be the case when applying for a job and joining an organization. With respect to hiring, the “Attraction/Selection/Attrition” model (Schneider, 1987; Schneider, Goldstein, and Smith, 1995) suggests that candidates will prefer to join organizations and take up positions they believe match their personal characteristics.

Despite the important role of total rewards components in attracting candidates, it appears that no study has examined the impact of personality traits on the perceived attractiveness of such components. However, several authors express the need to better understand individual differences with respect to total rewards components to help employers attract and retain employees whose personalities and values are consistent with the culture of

their employers (e.g., Bartol, 1999; Gerhart and Rynes, 2003; Milkovich, Newman, and Cole, 2005). While knowledge on staff *selection* (how and who to choose among the pool of candidates attracted) has evolved significantly, such is not the case concerning staff *attraction* (how to attract the best candidates) (Barber and Bretz, 2000).

If the *theory of individual dispositions* is applied to the attraction potential of a job, it presumes that different people ascribe different levels of importance to various components of compensation, based on their specific personality traits (Gerhart and Rynes, 2003). Several authors express the need to carry out analyses of how personality traits affect employment characteristics preferences (Barber and Bretz, 2000; Schneider, 1987; Schneider, Goldstein, and Smith, 1995). Consistent with this perspective, our study considers candidates' viewpoints rather than those of organizations (e.g., Bretz, Ash, and Dreher, 1989; Cable and Judge, 1994; Judge and Cable, 1997; Turban and Keon, 1993). More specifically, our study seeks to provide more information on how various compensation components may facilitate or impede the attraction of people with specific personality traits.

This research is also innovative in terms of methodology. In fact, we analyze *real* job choices made by people who are *active* in the labour market, as recommended by several authors (e.g., Barber, 1998; Lawler, 1971; Lievens et al., 2001; Rynes, 1991; Ziegert and Ehrhart, 2004). Most prior research considers the attraction phenomenon among samples of students with little or no work experience (e.g., Aiman-Smith, Bauer, and Cable, 2001; Bretz, Ash, and Dreher, 1989; Bretz and Judge, 1994; Cable and Judge, 1994; Lievens et al., 2001; Trank, Rynes, and Bretz, 2002). In addition, job attractiveness is often assessed by asking participants to talk about a series of job descriptions and/or fictitious organizations (e.g., Cable and Judge, 1994; Feldman and Arnold, 1978; Rynes, Schwab, and Heneman, 1983; Zedeck, 1977).

This method, named *policy capturing*, has various limitations: decision making remains abstract because the choices or preferences have no real effects on the lives of respondents (Rynes, 1991; Schneider, Goldstein, and Smith, 1995); the scenarios considered are not as complete as those taken into account in reality (Turban and Keon, 1993); the participants must assess a large number of opportunities within a limited timeframe, which does not match the reality of a job seeker (Barber, 1998), and finally, a decision may be made to accept a job offer even though the job may not be the individual's first choice (Bretz, Ash, and Dreher, 1989). Furthermore, respondents are often asked to assess and categorize various compensation components or to ascribe each of them a relative weight based on the prominence they give to a component when

choosing a job or an organization (Barber, 1998; Gerhart et Rynes, 2003). This method also has its limitations: a respondent must make decisions that are arbitrary and without a proper context (Barber, 1998; Gerhart and Rynes, 2003), and what he/she categorizes as the preferred choice among various compensation components is not necessarily consistent with his “real” employment decisions or choices (Barber, 1998; Rynes, 1991; Rynes, Schwab, and Heneman, 1983; Schwab, Rynes, and Aldag, 1987; Turban, Eyring, and Campion, 1993). Finally, to date, the very limited number of researchers who have actually investigated the links between personality and employment characteristics have only considered one or two personality traits and/or only one or two compensation components (often, variable pay or salary). Our study is more exhaustive as it explores the relative effect of several personality traits, based on a thoroughly validated model, the *Big Five* model, on the attractiveness of several total rewards components.

### ***REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE***

---

This section summarizes prior research that examines the links between personality traits and the attractiveness of various total rewards components. Given how little has been written on the matter and the exploratory and forward-looking character of this research, we are not presenting any hypotheses.

*Prominence afforded to variable pay and rewards:* Some authors hold that responsiveness to compensation is a central component of extraversion: extroverts would be more attracted to compensations (Gray, 1973; Lucas and Diener, 2001) since they are more risk tolerant (Lindley and Borgen, 2000). Similarly, they would be more motivated to engage in social interactions because they find them gratifying (Lucas et al., 2000). In a coherent fashion, Stewart (1996) establishes that extroverts give special weight to compensated performance indicators. Finally, the study by Cable and Judge (1994) reveals that (a) the more individualistic people are and the greater their sense of self-efficacy, the greater the prominence they ascribe to individualized remuneration; (b) the lesser people’s sense of self-efficacy and the more risks they can tolerate, the greater the prominence they ascribe to jobs with fixed remuneration (not related to performance); and (c) the more *neurotic* people are, the less likely they are to take risks, and the greater the prominence they ascribe to fixed remuneration, since they have a lower sense of self-efficacy (Judge and Bono, 2001).

*Prominence afforded to salary:* The study by Cable and Judge (1994) reveals that the more materialistic people are, the greater the prominence they attribute to salary.

*Prominence afforded to development and career opportunities:* Studies have shown that the more conscientious people are, the more they seek out learning opportunities (Colquitt and Simmering, 1998) and the more motivated they are to learn (see the meta-analysis by Colquitt, Lepine, and Noe, 2000). Furthermore, since openness to experience is the hallmark of persons seeking new challenges, flexibility and creativity (James and Mazerolle, 2002), people open to experience are probably likely to seek development and promotion opportunities (Barrick and Mount, 1991).

*Prominence afforded to quality of relationships:* According to some authors, the more conscientious people are, the greater the importance they attach to seeking a work environment characterized by good social relationships and cooperation (Goldberg, 1992; Mount and Barrick, 1995; Piedmont, 1998; Stewart and Barrick, 2004). According to other authors, extraversion and agreeableness apparently have a positive impact on the importance attached to cooperation (Lindley and Borgen, 2000) and a negative impact on a culture of competition (Berings, de Fruyt, and Bouwen, 2004). From an empirical perspective, Judge and Cable (1997) establish that extroverts attach more importance to a team-oriented culture and less importance to an aggressive culture.

*Prominence afforded to challenges:* Given that emotionally unstable persons lack self-confidence (Barrick, Mount, and Gupta, 2003), they would be less driven to seek challenges (Stewart and Barrick, 2004) and to carry out challenging or demanding tasks, because such endeavours carry some risk of failure (Barrick, Mount, and Gupta, 2003; James and Mazerolle, 2002).

## **METHODOLOGY**

### ***Sample and Procedure***

An online survey was conducted in May and June 2006 among a random sample comprising 2,945 subjects, or 50% of the members of the Ordre des conseillers en ressources humaines et en relations industrielles agréés du Québec (Association of Human Resource Management Professionals of the Province of Québec). Attached to this mailing was an invitation to participate signed by the president of the ORHRI. During the three weeks following our first appeal, we twice sent reminders to non-respondents. In total, 967 respondents completed the questionnaire, representing a 33% response rate. However, 49 responses were rejected, as they were incomplete. Table 1 shows the demographic make-up of our sample.

TABLE 1  
**Demographic Characteristics of Study Respondents**

<i>Characteristics</i>	<i>Percentage</i>
Gender:	
Female	64.1%
Age:	
Under 25 years old	2.4%
25–29 years old	17.8 %
30–34 years old	17.9%
35–39 years old	17.0%
40–44 years old	13.0%
45–49 years old	14.8%
50–54 years old	10.2%
55 years or older	6.5%
Not reported	0.4%
Number of dependants:	
None	44.8%
One	19.9%
Two	21.5%
Three	6.6%
Four	2.7%
More than four	3.2%
Not reported	1.3%
Academic attainment:	
Secondary	0.8%
College	1.2%
Certificate	7.8%
Bachelor's	68.1%
Master's	21.1%
Doctorate	0.5%
Not reported	0.5%
Work experience:	
Less than one year	0.2%
1–2 years	2.8%
3–5 years	12.2%
6–9 years	16.7%
10–14 years	15.6%
15–19 years	14.1%
20–24 years	11.7%
25–29 years	12.1%
30 years or longer	12.5%
Not reported	2.1%

TABLE 1 (continued)

<i>Characteristics</i>	<i>Percentage</i>
<b>Organizational seniority:</b>	
Less than one year	15.5%
1–2 years	23.5%
3–5 years	27.9%
6–9 years	14.2%
10–14 years	6.0%
15–19 years	3.7%
20–24 years	3.9%
25–29 years	2.5%
30 years or longer	1.4%
Not reported	1.4%
<b>Annual salary:</b>	
Less than \$30,000	0.5%
\$30,000–\$39,999	7.0%
\$40,000–\$49,999	12.4%
\$50,000–\$59,999	14.2%
\$60,000–\$69,999	16.9%
\$70,000–\$79,999	16.8%
\$80,000–\$89,999	11.0%
\$90,000–\$99,999	18.0%
\$100,000 and above	0.5%
Not reported	2.7%
<b>Organization size:</b>	
Less than 50 employees	12.2%
50–99 employees	6.0%
100–499 employees	31.6%
500–999 employees	13.0%
Over 1,000 employees	36.8%
Not reported	0.4%

### ***Measurement of Variables***

#### ***Total Rewards Components***

Several authors provide lists of total rewards components (e.g., Milkovich, Newman, and Cole, 2005; St-Onge and Thériault, 2006). For example, St-Onge and Thériault (2006) distinguish between extrinsic recognition and intrinsic recognition. The first category is sub-divided into direct compensation—paid in cash to employees (salaries, bonuses and allowances, variable pay)—and indirect pay, which involves all the other non-cash components (fringe benefits and time off, ancillary benefits and



working conditions, such as career and training opportunities). Intrinsic recognition encompasses autonomy, a sense of accomplishment, of security and self-esteem, respect for hierarchy or for co-workers and the opportunity to do exciting and varied work. Similarly, Milkovich, Newman, and Cole (2005) also suggest that total rewards include (a) direct compensation, which includes basic salary, merit wage, financial incentives and cost-of-living adjustments, (b) indirect pay, which includes insurance and pension plans, paid time off and other packages offered by the employer, and (c) a gamut of more intrinsic factors such as work environment, challenges, social interactions, work significance, promotions and job security, etc.

This study attempts to identify the major aspects of total rewards through a factorial analysis of statements aimed at measuring the attraction of 30 rewards components drawn from Milkovich, Newman, and Cole (2005) and St-Onge and Thériault (2006). Respondents were asked the following question: "To what extent did the following factors influence your decision to work for your current employer?" Responses were provided on a scale ranging from 1 (not at all) to 5 (very strongly). The 30 reward components harness the various components comprising the three major types of compensations: (1) direct compensation: attraction bonuses, salary, variable pay based on individual performance, variable pay based on organizational performance; (2) indirect pay: fringe benefits and time off, flexibility of working conditions, job security; (3) psychological recognition (or intrinsic recognition): development opportunities, career opportunities, quality of social relationships, authority and control, autonomy, feedback and recognition, the relevance of the job to others, the relevance of the job to the person, work load, and work variety.

We conducted a principal components analysis using a varimax rotation of the 30 reward component statements to derive primary reward components (see Table 2). The analysis allowed us to extract 8 factors with eigenvalues greater than 1, which, together, account for 74% of the total variance. As Table 2 illustrates, all the items show a main loading greater than .40 and very low cross-loadings. The internal consistency of each of the factors surpasses the .70 threshold:

- Factor 1 relates to *quality of work and of social relationships* and includes eight items relating to social relationships and several intrinsic rewards: autonomy, relationships with superior, senior management and colleagues, work variety, work relevance, authority and supervision, feedback and recognition.
- Factor 2 relates to *variable pay* since it involves items such as stock awards, stock options, collective variable pay, performance bonuses, attraction bonuses and merit-based salary raises.

TABLE 2  
Results of the Principal Components Analysis of Job Attractiveness Items (Varimax Rotation)

30 elements	Eight total rewards factors or facets							
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
Autonomy	.81	.11	.00	.10	.19	.01	-.10	-.01
Relationship with superior	.78	.06	.25	.12	.04	.04	.17	.11
Relationship with management	.77	.02	.03	.20	.04	.15	.25	.16
Relationship with colleagues	.73	.05	.15	.04	-.01	.10	.38	.09
Job variety	.67	.00	.03	.27	.05	.13	-.18	.14
Importance of work	.63	-.04	.26	.06	.14	.25	-.09	-.19
Authority/control	.55	.24	-.07	.26	.10	.08	-.17	-.09
Feedback	.52	.18	.24	.20	.15	.28	.26	.22
Stock awards	.51	.94	.10	.05	.10	.12	.13	-.06
Stock options	.50	.94	.09	.03	.13	.13	.15	-.05
Share purchases	.49	.93	.12	.05	.07	.12	.13	-.07
Variable pay based on organizational performance	.21	.67	-.01	.04	.07	-.13	.01	.35
Bonuses/incentives	.22	.62	.34	.34	.14	-.16	-.02	.25
Attraction bonuses	-.01	.51	-.09	.20	.13	.17	.09	.50
Merit pay	.20	.43	.39	.37	.07	-.06	-.05	.37
Retirement plan	.08	.11	.81	.02	.16	-.01	.22	-.11
Insurance	.21	-.09	.77	.11	.03	.04	.37	.06
Fixed compensation/salary	.13	.23	.62	.17	-.11	.26	-.24	.33
Non-worked paid time	-.00	.14	.59	.05	.13	.08	.24	.41
Employment security	.22	-.06	.51	.09	.27	.37	.04	-.09
Promotion	.23	.13	.07	.81	.10	.13	.11	-.01
Transfers	.25	.03	.07	.79	.02	.09	.02	.00
Development	.27	.14	.14	.64	.28	.18	.16	.03
Workplace flexibility	.16	.23	.08	.17	.86	.11	.11	.06
Schedule flexibility	.16	.19	.20	.13	.84	.09	.11	.17
Status of employment	.16	.13	.06	.22	.05	.81	.10	.07
Importance of the work for others	.35	.08	.14	.07	.14	.79	.03	.11
Services offered	.07	.24	.29	.09	.13	.09	.79	.03
Bonuses	.05	.29	.33	.21	.20	.08	.21	.24
Workload	.26	-.11	.24	-.23	.27	.18	.20	.57
Eigen value	4.88	4.4	3.12	2.49	1.97	1.92	1.84	1.47
% of explained variance	16.27	14.67	10.40	8.30	6.56	6.41	6.20	4.89

- Factor 3 relates to *indirect pay* and includes pension plans, insurance, salaries, paid time off (vacations) and job security.
- Factor 4 refers to *development and career opportunities* and involves two items: development and career.
- Factor 5, *flexibility of working conditions*, involves two items: a flexible workplace and flexible work schedules.
- Factor 6, *work prestige*, involves two items: the status of employees and the importance of their job to others.
- Factor 7, described as *bonuses*, involves two items: one relating to services and the other to bonuses.
- Factor 8 involves only one item, *work load*, which we retain for investigative purposes.

### *Big Five Personality Traits*

Prior research has used the Big Five model as a standard for predicting not only attitudes or behaviours, but also work performance (Barrick and Mount, 1991; Barrick, Stewart, and Piotrowski, 2002; Judge, Heller, and Mount, 2002; Judge and Ilies, 2002; Judge, LePine, and Rich, 2006; Mount et al., 2005). The model allows to describe personality according to 5 basic traits: conscientiousness (as opposed to intuition), extraversion (as opposed to introversion), agreeableness (as opposed to competition), emotional stability (as opposed to neuroticism) and openness to experience or open-mindedness (as opposed to conservatism):

- *Conscientiousness* is the extent to which an individual organizes himself, persists and demonstrates his motivation to adopt behaviours in order to achieve specific goals. Conscientious or meticulous people are often described as cautious, elaborate, methodical, responsible, organized, efficient, orderly, ambitious, unrelenting, dependable, determined achievers and successful (Goldberg, 1992; James and Mazerolle, 2002; Mount and Barrick, 1995; Piedmont, 1998; Spangler, House, and Palrecha, 2004).
- *Extraversion* refers to the need for social relationships. Extroverts are described as sociable, outgoing, confident, spontaneous, adventurous, dynamic, friendly, lively, impulsive, ambitious and imaginative (Goldberg, 1992; James and Mazerolle, 2002; Mount and Barrick, 1995; Piedmont, 1998).
- *Agreeableness* (or *agreeability*) measures the extent to which an individual likes being in the company of others. An individual who is highly agreeable is described as polite, flexible, confident, tolerant,

cooperative, empathic, generous, affectionate, benevolent, malleable, easy-going and selfless (Goldberg, 1992; James and Mazerolle, 2002; Mount and Barrick, 1995; Piedmont, 1998).

- *Emotional stability* is the opposite of neuroticism, which is a characteristic of anxious, depressive, emotional, nervous, fearful persons with frequent mood swings (Goldberg, 1992; James and Mazerolle, 2002; Mount and Barrick, 1995; Piedmont, 1998; Spangler, House, and Palrecha, 2004).
- *Openness to experience* refers to a proactive search for experience and to openness to new ideas (Piedmont, 1998). People who are open to experience are imaginative, curious, innovative, independent, free, autonomous, and with a vivid imagination (Goldberg, 1992; James and Mazerolle, 2002; Mount and Barrick, 1995; Piedmont, 1998; Spangler, House, and Palrecha, 2004).

We used the *Big Five Inventory* (BFI) developed by John, Donahue and Kentle (1991), and validated by Ntalianis (2006). However, as our respondents were francophones, we relied on a French version of the BFI, which was translated by professionals using a translation and back-translation procedure (see Behling and Law, 2000). The 44-item scale comprises: 8 items for extraversion, 9 for agreeableness, 9 for conscientiousness, 8 for neuroticism and 10 items for openness to experience. The items are answered on a 5-point Likert scale, ranging from 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree). In U.S. and Canadian samples, BFI scales obtained internal consistency coefficients ranging from 0.75 to 0.90, with an average 0.80 (Benet-Martinez and John, 1998; John and Srivastava, 1999). These results, and ours, presented hereunder, are consistent with those obtained with another French translation of the BFI (see Plaisant et al., 2005).

A confirmatory factor analysis was used to assess the BFI items' structure through LISREL 8.72, since the structure of the scale was known *a priori*. We used a variance/covariance matrix for this analysis and relied on the maximum likelihood method of estimation. In addition to the  $\chi^2$ , the suitability of the model was measured using the non-normed fit index and the comparative fit index (Bentler, 1990) as measures of incremental fit, the root mean square residual as a measure of absolute fit, and the root mean square error of approximation as a measure of relative fit. It should be noted that given the complexity of the model under evaluation (44 items), we combined the items to create three aggregated indicators for each dimension (see Landis, Beal, and Tesluk, 2000). A confirmatory factor analysis of the items resulted in a reasonably good adjustment to the data,  $\chi^2(80) = 478.12, p = .01, NNFI = .88, CFI = .89, RMR = .04, RMSEA = .08$ . Furthermore, this model had an adjustment that was statistically superior

to that of any more parsimonious model containing three or four factors for representing the data. The latent correlations among factors were low to moderate (ranging from  $-.42$  to  $.37$ ). These results suggest that the Big-Five 5-factor model was the best model.

### *Control Variables*

We controlled for the effect of eight variables likely to influence the preference given to compensation components, including age (Bretz and Judge, 1994; Jurgensen, 1978; Lacy, Bokemeier, and Shepard, 1983; Zedeck, 1977), gender (Jurgensen, 1978; Konrad et al., 2000), work experience (Bretz and Judge, 1994; Feldman and Arnold, 1978; Zedeck, 1977), level of education (Jurgensen, 1978; Lacy, Bokemeier, and Shepard, 1983), organization size (Posner, 1981; Turban and Keon, 1993), salary, number of dependants, and organizational tenure (Lacy, Bokemeier, and Shepard, 1983).

## **RESULTS AND DISCUSSION**

We examined the links between personality traits and the eight total rewards factors using correlation analysis (Table 3) and multiple hierarchical regression analyses which introduced control variables (Step 1) and subsequently, personality traits (Step 2) (see Table 4).

### *Personality and the Prominence Afforded to Quality of Work/ Relationships*

The prominence given to quality of work and of relationships is correlated with the five personality traits, that is, extraversion ( $r = .23$ ,  $p < .01$ ), openness to experience ( $r = .23$ ,  $p < .01$ ), agreeableness ( $r = .19$ ,  $p < .01$ ), conscientiousness ( $r = .12$ ,  $p < .01$ ), and neuroticism ( $r = -.13$ ,  $p < .01$ ) (Table 3).

Table 4 shows the hierarchical regression model is significant ( $F = 11.7$ ,  $p < .001$ ) and explains 16% of the variance in the quality of work and of relationships. Personality traits play a key role in predicting the quality of work and of relationships ( $\Delta R^2 = .07$ ,  $p < .001$ ). More specifically, traits relating to extraversion ( $\beta = .13$ ,  $p < .001$ ), agreeableness ( $\beta = .14$ ,  $p < .001$ ) and openness to experience ( $\beta = .11$ ,  $p < .01$ ) have a significant and positive effect.

Given that extroverts are generally sociable, gregarious and friendly (Goldberg, 1992; James and Mazerolle, 2002; Mount and Barrick, 1995; Piedmont, 1998), it is not surprising that they give prominence to the quality of relationships in making employment decisions. According to

TABLE 3  
Descriptive Statistics and Correlations Among the Study Variables

Variable	M	SD	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21
1. Age	4.39	1.91	-																				
2. Gender	1.36	0.48	.27**	-																			
3. Nb of dependants	2.11	1.30	.23**	.24**	-																		
4. Academic attainment	4.10	0.65	-.05	.05	-.01	-																	
5. Work experience	5.75	2.05	.90**	.23**	.25**	-.11**	-																
6. Salary	5.32	1.90	.63**	.31**	.27**	.07*	.60**	-															
7. Organiz. seniority	3.20	1.83	.45**	.18**	.17**	-.08*	.48**	.32**	-														
8. Organization size	3.56	1.36	-.06	-.04	-.00	.05	-.02	.07*	-.00	-													
9. Quality of work and of relationships	3.91	0.68	.17**	-.02	.02	-.03	.15**	.20**	-.00	-.12**	(.86)												
10. Variable pay	2.79	1.10	.06	.04	.05	-.06	.04	.14**	-.04	-.10**	.35**	(.88)											
11. Indirect pay	3.45	0.83	.11**	.00	.05	-.08*	.14*	.11*	.10**	.09**	.33**	.40**	(.77)										
12. Development/ career opportunities	3.69	0.89	-.07*	-.03	.01	-.01	-.08*	.04	.05	.06	.44**	.30**	.27**	(.77)									
13. Flexibility	3.22	1.25	.07	-.10**	.04	-.01	.07	.01	-.03	-.17**	.36**	.34**	.33**	.31**	(.88)								
14. Prestige	3.12	0.94	.06	-.01	.02	-.06	.06	.11**	.04	-.01	.44**	.26**	.26**	.26**	.22**	(.75)							
15. Bonuses	2.55	1.06	-.02	-.14**	-.02	-.11**	-.02	-.08*	.04	.01	.29**	.44**	.54**	.28**	.43**	.22**	(.82)						
16. Workload	3.29	1.05	-.03	-.10**	.00	-.07*	-.03	-.08*	-.12**	-.07*	.31**	.19**	.34**	.14**	.22**	.31**	-.						
17. Conscientiousness	4.18	0.45	.11**	-.18**	-.03	.01	.11**	.01	.06	.06	.12**	-.01	.12**	.07*	-.02	.05	.06	-.02	(.78)				
18. Extraversion	3.68	0.64	.02	-.03	.01	.01	.00	.12**	-.02	.05	.23**	.11**	.05	.16**	.01	.07*	.06	-.03	.11**	(.80)			
19. Neuroticism	2.19	0.55	-.15**	-.09**	-.08*	.03	-.14**	-.12**	-.05	-.02	-.13**	-.03	-.02	-.06	.04	.04	.02	.04	-.23**	-.13**	(.78)		
20. Agreeableness	4.05	0.40	.09**	-.13**	.05	-.06	.10**	-.00	.00	.03	.19**	.05	.12**	.04	.06	.04	.09*	.07	.22**	.17**	-.30**	(.66)	
21. Openness to experience	3.71	0.53	.24**	.09**	.00	.07*	.21**	.22**	.08*	-.05	.23**	.14**	.05	.17**	.13**	.10**	.06	-.06	.15**	.29**	-.12**	.13**	(.79)

\*p < .05; \*\*p < .01.

TABLE 4  
**Effect of Controls and Personality Traits on the Prominence Afforded to Total Rewards Components (hierarchical regression)**

Step	Variables	Quality of work and of relationships	Variable pay	Indirect pay	Development and career opportunities	Flexibility of working conditions	Work prestige	Bonuses	Workload
1	Age	.04	-.07	-.09	-.11	-.00	-.13	-.00	-.01
	Gender	-.09*	.00	-.04	-.04	-.16***	-.04	-.13***	-.10*
	Nb of dependants	-.02	.01	.02	.03	.06	-.03	.03	.04
	Academic attainment	-.06	-.10*	-.08*	-.04	.00	-.07	-.10**	-.05
	Work experience	.06	-.02	.15	-.10	.13	.08	.01	.08
	Salary	.22***	.21***	.07	.15**	.01	.17***	-.06	-.06
	Organiz. seniority	-.09*	-.07	.06	.11**	-.08	.01	.07	-.14***
	Organization size	-.13***	-.10*	.08*	.03	-.19***	-.02	-.00	-.07
	$\Delta R^2$	.08***	.04***	.04***	.03**	.07***	.03**	.04***	.04***
	Conscientiousness	.06	-.03	.08*	.04	-.06	.03	.01	-.02
2	Extraversion	.13***	.05	.00	.06	-.05	.03	.01	-.02
	Neuroticism	-.03	.02	.06	-.04	.04	.09*	.05	.02
	Agreeableness	.14***	.04	.10**	.01	.05	.05	.06	.06
	Openness to experience	.11**	.13**	-.00	.15***	.16***	.07	.10*	-.05
	$\Delta R^2$	.07***	.02**	.02*	.04***	.02**	.02*	.01	.01
	$R^2$	.16***	.06***	.06***	.07***	.09***	.05***	.05***	.05***

Note: All the values shown, except  $R^2$  values, are standardized regression coefficients. Model statistics are as follows: Quality of work and of work relationships:  $F(13, 824) = 11.71, p < .001$ ; Variable pay:  $F(13, 700) = 3.55, p < .001$ ; Indirect pay:  $F(13, 816) = 3.83, p < .001$ ; Development and career opportunities:  $F(13, 806) = 4.67, p < .001$ ; Flexibility:  $F(13, 667) = 5.35, p < .001$ ; Prestige:  $F(13, 807) = 2.63, p < .001$ ; Bonuses:  $F(13, 693) = 2.86, p < .001$ ; Workload:  $F(13, 788) = 2.88, p < .001$ .

\*  $p < .05$ ; \*\*  $p < .01$ ; \*\*\*  $p < .001$ .

other authors, extraversion and agreeableness have a positive impact on the importance attached to cooperation (Lindley and Borgen, 2000) and a negative impact on a culture of competition (Berings, de Fruyt, and Bouwen, 2004). Our results are equally consistent with those of other researchers who show that extroverts habitually give special weight to social interactions when making employment decisions (Barrick, Mount, and Gupta, 2003; de Fruyt and Mervielde, 1999), and that they are more attracted by a team culture (Judge and Cable, 1997).

The positive effect of agreeableness on the prominence given to quality of social relationships is also consistent with prior research showing that people who are socially conscious prefer working with others (Lindley et Borgen, 2000), are more in need of affiliation (Costa et McCrae, 1988), attach more importance to a team-oriented culture (Judge and Cable, 1997), make more effort towards preventing misunderstandings with others (Barrick, Stewart, and Piotrowski, 2002) and are more oriented towards careers of a social nature (Barrick, Mount, and Gupta, 2003; de Fruyt and Mervielde, 1999; Mount et al., 2005).

Lastly, control variables account for 8% of the variance in the prominence afforded to the quality of work and of relationships ( $p < .001$ ). Four control variables exert a significant influence: salary ( $\beta = 0.22$ ,  $p < .001$ ), organization size ( $\beta = -.13$ ,  $p < .001$ ), gender ( $\beta = -.09$ ,  $p < 0.05$ ) and seniority in the organization ( $\beta = -.09$ ,  $p < .05$ ).

### ***Personality and the Prominence Afforded to Variable Pay***

Table 3 shows that the prominence given to indirect pay positively correlates with openness to experience ( $r = .14$ ,  $p < .01$ ) and extraversion ( $r = .11$ ,  $p < .01$ ). The hierarchical regression analysis (Table 4) is significant ( $F = 3.6$ ,  $p < .001$ ) and accounts for 6% of total variance in the prominence given to variable pay. More specifically, once control variables are taken into consideration, personality traits contribute significantly in explaining total variance ( $\Delta R^2 = .02$ ,  $p < .01$ ). However, only openness to experience ( $\beta = .13$ ,  $p < .01$ ) exerts a significant and positive effect on the attraction of variable pay. Consequently, our results do not validate the statement of authors who hold that the more extroverted people are, the more they are attracted to compensation (Gray, 1973; Lucas and Diener, 2001) since they are more risk tolerant (Lindley and Borgen, 2000).

Control variables alone account for 4% of the variation in the weight put on variable pay ( $p < .001$ ). More specifically, annual salaries exert a significant and positive effect on the attraction of variable pay ( $\beta = .21$ ,  $p < .001$ ) while academic attainment ( $\beta = -.10$ ,  $p < .05$ ) and organization size ( $\beta = -.10$ ,  $p < .05$ ) exert a negative effect.



### ***Personality and the Prominence Afforded to Indirect Pay***

Table 3 shows that the prominence of indirect pay as an attraction tool positively correlates with conscientiousness ( $r = .12, p < .01$ ) and agreeableness ( $r = .12, p < .01$ ). In Table 4, the regression model is significant ( $F = 3.8, p < .001$ ) and accounts for 6% of the variation in the prominence given to indirect pay. Once the control variables are taken into account, personality traits exert a great influence on predicting the prominence given to indirect pay ( $\Delta R^2 = .02, p < .05$ ). More specifically, agreeableness ( $\beta = .10, p < .01$ ) and conscientiousness ( $\beta = .08, p < .05$ ) exert a significant and positive influence on the attractiveness of this component. In other words, the more agreeable and conscientious people are, the more they acknowledge taking into consideration aspects relating to insurance, pension, salary and job security in choosing their current employment.

Employees in a working environment that offers fringe benefits and provides security are more likely to enjoy pleasant social relationships, an aspect highly appreciated by agreeable people. These results also validate the work of Cable and Judge (1994) who show that persons who take risks, a characteristic related to conscientiousness (Goldberg, 1992), are more attracted to fixed compensations than those who are afraid to take risks. Therefore, organizations that seek to attract skilled employees that are agreeable and conscientious must be competitive with regards to salary, fringe benefits, pension plans, job security and vacations (time away from work). On the other hand, while the dislike for risks is apparently a fundamental characteristic of neuroticism (Clugston, Howell, and Dorfman, 2000), the study does not validate the existence of a link between neuroticism and the importance attached to insurance and safety.

Finally, the control variables account for a significant part of the prominence afforded to indirect pay ( $\Delta R^2 = .04, p < .001$ ). Two control variables exert a significant influence: academic attainment obtained ( $\beta = -.08, p < .05$ ) and organization size ( $\beta = .08, p < .05$ ).

### ***Personality and the Prominence Afforded to Development and Career Opportunities***

Table 3 shows that the prominence given to development and career opportunities correlates with openness to experience ( $r = .17, p < .01$ ), extraversion ( $r = .16, p < .01$ ) and conscientiousness ( $r = .07, p < .05$ ). Table 4 shows that the aggregate regression model is significant ( $F = 4.67, p < .001$ ) and accounts for 7% of the variance in the prominence given to development and career opportunities. Once control variables are taken into consideration, personality traits exert a significant influence overall ( $\Delta R^2 = .04, p < .001$ ). However, only openness to experience exerts a

significant (positive) impact on the importance of development and career opportunities ( $\beta = .15, p < .001$ ). This association is consistent with studies that show that openness to experience is associated with the belief in the value of self-improvement and the need to understand (Costa and McCrae, 1988; Holland et al., 1993).

The control variables account for 3% of the variability in the prominence afforded to development and career opportunities ( $p < .01$ ). Specifically, salary ( $\beta = .15, p < .01$ ) and seniority in the organization ( $\beta = .11, p < .01$ ) significantly and positively impact the prominence given to development and career opportunities.

### ***Personality and the Prominence Afforded to Flexibility of Working Conditions***

Table 3 shows that the prominence given to the flexibility of working conditions correlates only with openness to experience ( $r = .13, p < .01$ ). Table 4 shows that the aggregate regression model is significant ( $F = 5.35, p < .001$ ) and accounts for 9% of the variance in the prominence afforded to the flexibility of working conditions. Once the control variables are taken into consideration, personality traits contribute greatly to the prediction of the prominence afforded to the flexibility of working conditions ( $\Delta R^2 = .02, p < .01$ ). However, only openness to experience exerts a significant (positive) influence on the attractiveness of the flexibility of working conditions ( $\beta = .16, p < .001$ ).

The control variables account for 7% of the variance in the prominence given to the flexibility of working conditions ( $p < .001$ ). Organization size ( $\beta = -.19, p < .001$ ) and gender ( $\beta = -.16, p < .001$ ) are significantly associated with the prominence afforded to the flexibility of working conditions. It is worth noting that women's interest in the flexibility of working conditions is consistent with prior research that shows their sensitivity to work-family balance and their search for flexible working conditions (Tremblay, 2003).

### ***Personality and the Prominence Afforded to Work Prestige***

Table 3 shows that the prominence given to work prestige correlates with openness to experience ( $r = .10, p < .01$ ) and extraversion ( $r = .07, p < .05$ ). Table 4 shows that the aggregate regression model is significant ( $F = 2.63, p < .001$ ) and accounts for 5% of the variance in the prominence given to prestige. Once the control variables are taken into consideration, personality traits relate significantly to the prominence given to work prestige ( $\Delta R^2 = .02, p < .05$ ). However, only neuroticism ( $\beta = .09, p < .05$ ) exerts a significant (positive) influence on this component. In other words,

the more emotionally unstable people are, the greater the prominence they ascribe to work prestige.

The control variables account for 3% of the variance in the prominence given to prestige ( $p < .01$ ). However, only salary significantly impacts the prominence of prestige ( $\beta = .17, p < .001$ ).

### ***Personality and the Prominence Afforded to Bonuses***

Table 3 shows that the prominence given to bonuses correlates only with agreeableness ( $r = .09, p < .05$ ). Table 4 shows that the aggregate regression model is significant ( $F = 2.86, p < .001$ ) and accounts for 5% of the variance in the prominence given to bonuses. However, once the control variables are taken into consideration, personality traits do not significantly account for the variation in this component ( $\Delta R^2 = .01, ns$ ). Nevertheless, openness to experience does exert a significant influence ( $\beta = .10, p < .05$ ). In other words, people who are curious and open to experience tend to ascribe greater prominence to bonuses in their choice of employment.

The control variables account for 4% of the variance in the prominence given to bonuses ( $p < .001$ ). Specifically, gender ( $\beta = -.13, p < .001$ ) and academic attainment ( $\beta = -.10, p < .01$ ) significantly impact this variable. Consequently, women and less educated individuals give greater prominence to bonuses.

### ***Personality and the Prominence Afforded to Work Load***

Table 3 shows that the prominence given to work load does not correlate with any personality trait. Table 4 shows that the aggregate regression model is statistically significant ( $F = 2.88, p < .001$ ) and accounts for 5% of the variance in the prominence given to work load. However, once the control variables are taken into consideration, personality traits do not significantly account for the variation in this component ( $\Delta R^2 = .01, ns$ ), and no personality trait exerts a strong influence.

The control variables account for 4% of the variance in the prominence given to work load ( $p < .001$ ). Specifically, seniority in the organization ( $\beta = -.14, p < .001$ ) and gender ( $\beta = -.10, p < .05$ ) are significantly associated with this variable.

## **CONCLUSION**

### ***Summary of Results and Implications***

Our results show that once the effect of the eight control variables is taken into consideration, personality traits significantly account for

the variability in the prominence given to six of the eight total rewards components studied: work content and social relationships ( $\Delta R^2 = 7\%$ ), development and career opportunities ( $\Delta R^2 = 4\%$ ), variable pay ( $\Delta R^2 = 2\%$ ), indirect pay ( $\Delta R^2 = 2\%$ ), flexibility of working conditions ( $\Delta R^2 = 2\%$ ), and work prestige ( $\Delta R^2 = 2\%$ ).

Contrary to previous research (Digman, 1990), our study shows that openness to experience is positively related to the attraction of a high number of total rewards components, such as the flexibility of working conditions ( $\beta = .16, p < .001$ ), development and career opportunities ( $\beta = .15, p < .001$ ), variable pay ( $\beta = .13, p < .01$ ), work content and social relationships ( $\beta = .11, p < .01$ ) and bonuses ( $\beta = .10, p < .05$ ). Agreeableness as a personality trait is closely associated with the prominence afforded to quality of work and relationships ( $\beta = .14, p < .001$ ) and indirect pay ( $\beta = .10, p < .01$ ). The other three personality traits are each associated only with the prominence given to a single total rewards component: conscientiousness with indirect pay ( $\beta = .08, p < .05$ ), extraversion with quality of work and relationships ( $\beta = .13, p < .001$ ) and neuroticism with prestige ( $\beta = .09, p < .05$ ). Among the control variables, salary, gender and education appear to be more highly associated with the prominence given to total rewards factors. On the other hand, age, number of dependants and work experience are control variables not at all associated with the total rewards components studied.

Our research has some practical implications. Notwithstanding the fact that Big Five personality traits do not exert much of an influence on the attractiveness of job characteristics, some of them deserve to be given particular attention in a staff recruitment context. For example, openness to experience is predictive of 5 of the 8 total rewards dimensions. This indicates that this personality trait should be assessed upon hiring, in view of the range of dimensions on which it operates. However, it is worth noting that personality plays a more significant role on the attractiveness of factors relating to work content and interpersonal relations. We can therefore advise organizations wishing to use this dimension as a means of attracting and motivating employees to resort to a sound selection of entry-level employees based on personality traits (particularly extraversion, agreeableness and openness to experience; see Table 4).

### *Research Limitations*

Our study has some limitations. The adoption of a retrospective methodology requires that respondents recall the context that prevailed at the time of their decision, which does not allow us to distinguish between the factors that initially made the job attractive and their perceptions after their entry into the organization, to justify their decision. However, several

authors hold that people easily recall the details surrounding their departure from an organization, since it is a major event in their life (Lee et al., 1999). We believe the same applies in the choice of a new employer. Our results may also have been influenced by social desirability, notwithstanding the fact that personality tests are known to be quite resistant to this type of bias (e.g., Ellingson, Smith, and Sackett, 2001; Viswesvaran, Deller, and Ones, 2007). Nevertheless, the scope of this bias is limited by the fact that our study focused on the prominence given to various total rewards components by a group of real employees—who happen to be thoroughly knowledgeable on the subject, given the positions they occupied—and whom we controlled for the effect of seniority in the organization. Furthermore, some total rewards components studied may appear less visible and salient to potential job seekers (e.g., relations with colleagues, bonuses).

At the same time, given that our sample included only professionals, the possibility of generalizing our results is limited. However, the results of this study are very pertinent owing to the fact that they were obtained from a homogenous group of employees—human resource professionals in the Province of Quebec—who are also most likely to consider all rewards components when choosing an employer.

### *Research Avenues*

The results of this investigation study can serve as a basis for future studies. The fact that the personality traits measured within the context of our study are hardly predictive of the attraction of total rewards components is an important result in itself. This result fuels the debate on the use of personality tests. On the one hand, some authors doubt the practicality of their results in predicting work performance (Morgeson et al., 2007), while others consider them pertinent in that regard (James and Mazerolle, 2001; Rothstein and Goffin, 2006; Schneider and Smith, 2004). On the other hand, future research may be able to examine not only the moderating effects of personality traits on total rewards components, but on their attractiveness as well (Lievens et al., 2001; Turban and Keon, 1993), or as an alternative, measure the incidence of personality traits other than those of the Big Five (e.g., self-esteem, risk aversion). Other individual characteristics may also have a bearing on the allure of total rewards components, particularly values (e.g., individualism vs. collectivism, cooperation vs. competition), needs (e.g., need for achievement), individual skills, or expectations.

In using employed subjects, this study has examined, from an individual perspective, the association between personality and the attraction of total rewards components. Future research may focus on employers and thus give preference to an organizational perspective. Notwithstanding the fact that researchers have demonstrated that decisions employers make regarding

rewards have a bearing not only on the composition of their labour force in terms of skills and personality (Schneider, 1987; Schneider, Goldstein, and Smith, 1995), but also on the departure of their personnel (Lazear, 1999), no researcher seems to have analyzed the factors that influence the prominence employers ascribe to the various total reward components in order to attract and retain their employees. Furthermore, Gerhart and Rynes (2003) recommend that researchers go out into the field to conduct their research, as this will allow them a better understanding of the strategic considerations that influence executives to give higher or lower prominence to certain total rewards components for their staff. Finally, whereas this study adopted the individual dispositions perspective, it would be pertinent to analyze the staff attraction process in the light of other organizational behaviour theories, such as Meyer's (1991) forms of commitment model or the theory of psychological contract.

## ■ REFERENCES

- AIMAN-SMITH, Lynda, Talya N. BAUER and Daniel M. CABLE. 2001. "Are you Attracted? Do you Intend to Pursue? A Recruiting Policy-Capturing Study." *Journal of Business and Psychology*, 16 (2), 219–237.
- BARBER, Alison E. 1998. *Recruiting Employees: Individual and Organizational Perspectives*. Thousand Oaks: Sage.
- BARBER, Alison E. and Mark V. ROEHLING. 1993. "Job Postings and the Decision to Interview: A Verbal Protocol Analysis." *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 78 (5), 845–856.
- BARBER, Alison E. and Robert D. BRETZ JR. 2000. "Compensation, Attraction, and Retention." *Compensation in Organizations*. S. L. Rynes and B. Gerhart, eds. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 32–55.
- BARRICK, Murray R. and Michael K. MOUNT. 1991. "The Big Five Personality Dimensions and Job Performance: A Meta-Analysis." *Personnel Psychology*, 44 (1), 1–26.
- BARRICK, Murray R., Greg L. STEWART and Mike PIOTROWSKI. 2002. "Personality and Job Performance: Test of the Mediating Effects of Motivation among Sales Representatives." *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 87 (1), 43–51.
- BARRICK, Murray R., Michael K. MOUNT and Rashmi GUPTA. 2003. "Meta-Analysis of the Relationship between the Five-Factor Model of Personality and Holland's Occupational Types." *Personnel Psychology*, 56 (1), 45–74.
- BARTOL, Kathryn M. 1999. "Reframing Salesforce Compensation System: An Agency Theory-Based Performance Management Perspective." *Journal of Personal Selling & Sales Management*, 19 (3), 1–16.
- BEHLING, Orlando and Kenneth LAW. 2000. *Translating Questionnaires and other Research Instruments*. Thousand Oaks: Sage.

- BELL, Nancy E. and Barry M. STAW. 1989. "People as Sculptors versus Sculpture: The Roles of Personality and Personal Control in Organizations." *Handbook of Career Theory*. M. B. Arthur, D. T. Hall and B. S. Lawrence, eds. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 232–251.
- BENET-MARTINEZ, Veronica and Oliver P. JOHN. 1998. "Los Cincos Grandes across Cultures and Ethnic Groups: Multitrait-Multimethod Analyses of the Big Five in Spanish and English." *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 75, 729–750.
- BENTLER, Peter M. 1990. "Comparative Fit Indexes in Structural Models." *Psychological Bulletin*, 107 (2), 238–246.
- BERINGS, Dries, Filip DE FRUYT and René BOUWEN. 2004. "Work Values and Personality Traits as Predictors of Enterprising and Social Vocational Interests." *Personality and Individual Differences*, 36, 349–364.
- BRETZ, Robert D., Ronald A. ASH and George F. DREHER. 1989. "Do People Make the Place? An Examination of the Attraction-Selection-Attrition Hypothesis." *Personnel Psychology*, 42 (3), 561–581.
- BRETZ, Robert D. Jr. and Timothy A. JUDGE. 1994. "The Role of Human Resource Systems in Job Applicant Decision Processes." *Journal of Management*, 20 (3), 531–551.
- CABLE, Daniel M. and Timothy A. JUDGE. 1994. "Pay Preferences and Job Search Decisions: A Person-Organization Fit Perspective." *Personnel Psychology*, 47 (2), 317–348.
- CLUGSTON, Michael, Jon P. HOWELL and Peter W. DORFMAN. 2000. "Dispositional Influences on Pay Preferences." *Journal of Business and Psychology*, 15 (2), 311–320.
- COLQUITT, Jason A. and Marcia J. SIMMERING. 1998. "Conscientiousness, Goal Orientation, and Motivation to Learn During the Learning Process: A Longitudinal Study." *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 83 (4), 654–665.
- COLQUITT, Jason A., Jeffrey A. LEPINE and Raymond A. NOE. 2000. "Toward an Integrative Theory of Training Motivation: A Meta-Analytic Path Analysis of 20 Years of Research." *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 85 (5), 678–707.
- COSTA, Paul T. and Robert R. MCCRAE. 1988. "From Catalog to Classification: Murray's Needs and Five-Factor Model." *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 55 (2), 258–265.
- DE FRUYT, Filip and Ivan MERVIELDE. 1999. "RIASEC Types and Big Five Traits as Predictors of Employment Status and Nature of Employment." *Personnel Psychology*, 52 (3), 701–727.
- DIGMAN, John M. 1990. "Personality Structure: Emergence of the Five-Factor Model." *Annual Review of Psychology*, 41, 417–440.
- ELLINGSON, Jill E., D. Brent SMITH and Paul R. SACKETT. 2001. "Investigating the Influence of Social Desirability on Personality Factor Structure." *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 86, 122–133.
- ERMEL, Lauren and Don BOHL. 1997. "Responding to a Tight Labor Market: Using Incentives to Attract and Retain Talented Workers." *Compensation and Benefits Review*, 29 (6), 25–29.

- FELDMAN, Daniel C. and Hugh J. ARNOLD. 1978. "Position Choice: Comparing the Importance of Organizational and Job Factors." *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 63 (6), 706–710.
- FOOTE, Daniel. 1998. "Non-Cash Rewards and Incentives: Secret Weapons in the High-Tech Worker Staffing War." *ACA Journal*, 7 (4).
- GERHART, Barry and George T. MILKOVICH. 1992. "Employee Compensation: Research and Practice." *Handbook of Industrial and Organizational Psychology*. 2<sup>nd</sup> ed. M. D. Dunnette and L. M. Hough, eds. Palo Alto: Consulting Psychologists Press, vol. 3, 481–570.
- GERHART, Barry and Sara L. RYNES. 2003. *Compensation: Theory, Evidence, and Strategic Implications*. Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications.
- GOLDBERG, Lewis R. 1992. "The Development of Markers for the Big-Five Factor Structure." *Psychological Assessment*, 4 (1), 26–42.
- GRAY, Jeffrey A. 1973. "Causal Theories of Personality and How to Test Them." *Multivariate Analysis and Psychological Theory*. J. R. ROYCE, ed. New York: Academic Press, 409–464.
- HOLLAND, John L., Joseph A. JOHNSTON, Francis N. ASAMA and Suzanne M. POLYS. 1993. "Validation and Using the Career Beliefs Inventory." *Journal of Career Development*, 19 (4), 233–244.
- IPSOS-REID. 2000. "Money is Not Enough: University Students Personify New Economic of 'The Canadian Dream.'" December 8.
- JAMES, Lawrence R. and Michelle D. MAZEROLLE. 2002. *Personality in Work Organizations*. Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications.
- JOHN, Oliver P. and Sanjay SRIVASTAVA. 1999. "The Big Five Trait Taxonomy: History, Measurement, and Theoretical Perspectives." *Handbook of Personality: Theory and Research*. L. A. Pervin and O. P. John, eds. New York: Guilford, 102–138.
- JOHN, Oliver P., Eileen M. DONAHUE and Robert J. KENTLE. 1991. "The Big Five Inventory – Versions 4a and 5a." Berkeley: University of California, Institute of Personality and Social Research.
- JUDGE, Timothy A. and Daniel M. CABLE. 1997. "Applicant Personality, Organization Culture, and Organizational Attraction." *Personnel Psychology*, 50 (2), 359–394.
- JUDGE, Timothy A. and Joyce E. BONO. 2001. "Are Self-Esteem, Generalized Self-Efficacy, Neuroticism, and Locus of Control Indicators of a Common Construct?" *Personality Psychology in the Workplace*. Roberts and Hogan, eds. Washington: American Psychological Association.
- JUDGE, Timothy A. and Remus ILIES. 2002. "Relationship of Personality to Performance Motivation: A Meta-Analytic Review." *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 87 (4), 797–807.
- JUDGE, Timothy A., Daniel HELLER and Michael K. MOUNT. 2002. "Five-Factor Model of Personality and Job Satisfaction: A Meta-Analysis." *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 87 (3), 530–541.
- JUDGE, Timothy A., Jeffrey A. LEPINE and Bruce L. RICH. 2006. "Loving Yourself Abundantly: Relationship of the Narcissistic Personality to Self-



- and Other Perceptions of Workplace Deviance, Leadership, and Task and Contextual Performance.” *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 91 (4), 762–776.
- JURGENSEN, Clifford E. 1978. “Job Preferences: What Makes a Job Good or Bad?” *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 63 (3), 267–276.
- KONRAD, Alison M., Elizabeth CORRIGALL, Pamela LIEB and J. Edgar RITCHIE JR. 2000. “Sex Differences in Job Attribute Preferences among Managers and Business Students.” *Group & Organization Management*, 25 (2), 108–131.
- LACY, William B., Janet L. BOKEMEIER and Jon M. SHEPARD. 1983. “Job Attribute and Work Commitment of Men and Women in the United States.” *Personnel Psychology*, 36 (2), 315–329.
- LANDIS, Ronald S., Daniel J. BEAL and Paul E. TESLUK. 2000. “A Comparison of Approaches to Forming Composite Measures in Structural Equations Models.” *Organizational Research Methods*, 3 (1), 186–207.
- LAWLER III, Edward E. 1971. *Pay and Organizational Effectiveness: A Psychological View*. New York: McGraw Hill.
- LAZEAR, E. P. 1999. “Personnel Economics: Past Lessons and Future Directions.” *Journal of Labor Economics*, 17, 199–236.
- LEE, Thomas W., Terence R. MITCHELL, Brooks C. HOLTOM, Linda S. McDANIEL and John W. HILL. 1999. “The Unfolding Model of Voluntary Turnover: A Replication and Extension.” *Academy of Management Journal*, 42 (4), 450–462.
- LIEVENS, Filip, Christoph DECAESTEKER, Pol COETSIER and Jo GEIRNAERT. 2001. “Organizational Attractiveness for Prospective Applicants: A Person-Organisation Fit Perspective.” *Applied Psychology: An International Review*, 51 (1), 30–51.
- LINDLEY, Lori D. and Fred H. BORGAN. 2000. “Personality Style Scale of the Strong Interests Inventory: Linking Personality and Interests.” *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 57, 22–41.
- LONG, Richard J. 2006. *Strategic Compensation in Canada*. 3<sup>rd</sup> ed. Toronto: Thomson Nelson.
- LUCAS, Richard E. and Ed DIENER. 2001. “Understanding Extraverts’ Enjoyment of Social Situations: The Importance of Pleasantness.” *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 81 (2), 343–356.
- LUCAS, Richard E., Ed DIENER, Alexander GROB, Eunkook SUH, and Liang SHAO. 2000. “Cross-Cultural Evidence for the Fundamental Features of Extraversion.” *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 79 (3), 452–468.
- MERCER Consultants. 2007. *Mercer SnapShort Survey, Total Rewards – 2007*. North America.
- MEYER, John P. and Natalie J. ALLEN. 1991. “A Three-Component Conceptualization of Organizational Commitment.” *Human Resource Management Review*, 1, 61–89.
- MILKOVICH, George T., Jerry M. NEWMAN and Nina COLE. 2005. *Compensation*, 1<sup>st</sup> Canadian ed. Toronto: McGraw-Hill Ryerson.

- MORGESON, Frederick P., Michael A. CAMPION, Robert L. DIPBOYE, John R. HOLLENBECK, Kevin R. MURPHY and Neal SCHMIT. 2007. "Reconsidering the Use of Personality Tests in Personnel Selection Contexts." *Personnel Psychology*, 60 (3), 683–729.
- MOUNT, Michael K. and Murray R. BARRICK. 1995. "The Big Five Personality Dimensions: Implications for Research and Practice in Human Resources Management." *Research in Personnel and Human Resources Management*. G. R. FERRIS, ed. Greenwich: JAI Press, 13, 153–200.
- MOUNT, Michael K., Murray R. BARRICK, Steve M. SCULLEN and James ROUNDS. 2005. "Higher-Order Dimensions of the Big Five Personality Traits and the Big Six Vocational Interest Types." *Personnel Psychology*, 58 (2), 447–478.
- NTALIANIS, Filotheos. 2006. "Employment Relationships in Small Firms." Doctoral Thesis in Administration, John Molson Business School, Concordia University, Montréal.
- PIEDMONT, Ralph L. 1998. *The Revised NEO Personality Inventory: Clinical and Research Applications*. New York: Plenum Press.
- PLAISANT, Odile, Sanjay SRIVASTAVA, Gerald A. MENDELSON, Quentin DEBRAY and Oliver P. JOHN. 2005. "Relations entre le Big-Five Inventory français et le manuel diagnostique des troubles mentaux dans un échantillon clinique français." *Annales Médico-Psychologiques*, 163, 161–167.
- POSNER, Barry Z. 1981. "Comparing Recruiter, Student, and Faculty Perceptions of Important Applicant and Job Characteristics." *Personnel Psychology*, 34 (2), 329–339.
- ROTHSTEIN, Mitchell G. and Rick D. GOFFIN. 2006. "The Use of Personality Measures in Personnel Selection: What does Current Research Support?" *Human Resource Management Review*, 16, 155–180.
- RYNES, Sara L. 1991. "Recruitment, Job Choice, and Post-Hire Consequences: A Call for New Research." *Handbook of Industrial and Organizational Psychology*. 2<sup>nd</sup> ed. M. D. Dunnette and L. M. Hough, eds. Palo Alto: Consulting Psychologists Press, vol. 2, 399–444.
- RYNES, Sara L., Donald P. SCHWAB and Herbert G. HENEMAN III. 1983. "The Role of Pay and Market Pay Variability in Job Application Decisions." *Organizational Behavior and Human Performance*, 31 (3), 353–364.
- SCHNEIDER, Benjamin. 1987. "The People Make the Place." *Personnel Psychology*, 40 (3), 437–453.
- SCHNEIDER, Benjamin and D. Brent SMITH. 2004. "Personality and Organizations." New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- SCHNEIDER, Benjamin, Harold W. GOLDSTEIN and D. Brent SMITH. 1995. "The ASA Framework: An Update." *Personnel Psychology*, 48 (4), 747–773.
- SCHWAB, Donald P., Sara L. RYNES and Ramon J. ALDAG. 1987. "Theories and Research on Job Search and Choice." *Research in Personnel and Human Resources Management*. K. M. Rowland and G. R. Ferris, eds. Greenwich, CT: JAI Press, vol. 5, 129–166.

- SPANGLER, William D., Robert J. HOUSE and Rita PALRECHA. 2004. "Personality and Leadership." *Personality and Organizations*. B. Schneider and D. B. Smith, eds. Mahwah: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- ST-ONGE, Sylvie and Roland THÉRIAULT. 2006. *Gestion de la rémunération: théorie et pratique*. 2<sup>nd</sup> ed. Montréal: Gaëtan Morin.
- STEWART, Greg L. 1996. "Reward Structure as a Moderator of the Relationship between Extraversion and Sales Performance." *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 81 (6), 619–627.
- STEWART, Greg L. and Murray R. BARRICK. 2004. "Four Lessons Learned from the Person–Situation Debate: A Review and Research Agenda." *Personality and Organization*. B. Schneider and D. B. Smith, eds. Mahwah: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- TRANK, Christine Q., Sara L. RYNES and Robert D. BRETZ JR. 2002. "Attracting Applicants in the War for Talent: Differences in Work Preferences among High Achievers." *Journal of Business and Psychology*, 16 (3), 331–345.
- TREMBLAY, Diane Gabrielle. 2003. "Articulation emploi-famille: les usages du temps chez les pères et les mères." *Nouvelles pratiques sociales*, 16 (1), <<http://www.erudit.org/revue/nps/2003/v16/n1/009628ar.pdf>>.
- TURBAN, Daniel B. and Thomas L. KEON. 1993. "Organizational Attractiveness: An Interactionist Perspective." *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 78 (2), 184–193.
- TURBAN, Daniel B., Alison R. EYRING and James E. CAMPION. 1993. "Job Attributes: Preferences compared with Reasons given for Accepting and Rejecting Job Offers." *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, 66 (1), 71–81.
- VISWESVARAN, Chockalingam, Jurgen DELLER and Deniz S. ONES. 2007. "Personality Measures in Personnel Selection: Some New Contributions." *International Journal of Selection and Assessment*, 15, 354–358.
- WEISS, Howard M. and Seymour ADLER. 1984. "Personality and Organizational Behaviour." *Research in Organizational Behaviour*. B. M. Staw and L. L. Cummings, eds. Greenwich, CT: JAI Press, vol. 6, 1–50.
- ZEDECK, Sheldon. 1977. "An Information Processing Model and Approach to the Study of Motivation." *Organizational Behavior and Human Performance*, 18 (1), 47–77.
- ZIEGERT, Jonathan C. and Karen HOLCOMBE EHRHART. 2004. "A Theoretical Framework and Guide for Future Research on Applicant Attraction." *Proceedings of the 64<sup>th</sup> Annual Meeting of the Academy of Management*, Academy of Management Best Conference Paper.

## RÉSUMÉ

### **Une analyse des liens entre la personnalité et l'attrait des composantes de la rémunération totale**

L'attraction du personnel représente un défi croissant pour les employeurs en raison des multiples changements environnementaux. Dans un tel contexte de concurrence sur le marché de l'emploi, la gestion de la rémunération constitue un levier important d'attraction des employés (Ermel et Bohl, 1997). En effet, pour mieux concurrencer sur le marché de l'emploi, les employeurs doivent proposer des conditions de travail plus compétitives, plus distinctives et plus susceptibles de répondre aux attentes du personnel recherché. Pour relever le défi de l'attraction du personnel, un nombre croissant d'employeurs cherchent à identifier, déployer et communiquer une stratégie ou une philosophie de « rémunération totale » (*total rewards*) prenant en considération une diversité de composantes comme le salaire, les avantages sociaux, les possibilités de formation et de carrière, les aménagements flexibles, etc. (Mercer, 2007). Du côté des employés, des enquêtes confirment que les personnes prennent leurs décisions d'emploi en considérant diverses composantes de la rémunération totale : salaire, défis, développement des compétences, conciliation travail-famille, contenu du travail, avantages sociaux, climat de travail, qualité de supervision, etc. (p. ex., Feldman et Arnold, 1978; Foote, 1998; IPSOS-Reid, 2000).

S'appuyant sur la perspective des dispositions personnelles, la présente recherche innove en explorant les liens entre la personnalité et l'attrait de diverses composantes de la rémunération totale. Plus précisément, cette recherche a pour objectif de répondre à la question de recherche suivante : Comment les traits de personnalité des individus influencent-ils l'importance qu'ils accordent à diverses composantes de la rémunération totale lors du choix d'un emploi ? Au cours des dernières années, les études ont confirmé des liens entre les traits de personnalité des employés et leurs attitudes et comportements, particulièrement la performance au travail (Mount et Barrick, 1995). Ainsi, et tel qu'exprimé par Barber et Bretz (2000), étant donné l'importance de cibler les différences individuelles qui ont un effet sur les organisations, il apparaît approprié d'en savoir plus sur la manière dont différentes composantes de la rémunération peuvent faciliter ou empêcher l'attraction de personnes ayant des traits de personnalité particuliers. Plusieurs auteurs ont précisément exprimé le besoin d'analyser l'incidence des traits de personnalité sur les préférences à l'égard des caractéristiques des emplois (p. ex., Schneider, 1987; Schneider, Goldstein et Smith, 1995).

Une enquête en ligne comprenant les items de l'étude a eu lieu en mai et juin 2006 auprès d'un échantillon aléatoire représentant 50 %

des affiliés de l'Ordre des conseillers en ressources humaines et en relations industrielles agréés du Québec, soit 2 945 personnes. Au total, 967 personnes ont complété le questionnaire, soit un taux de réponse de 32,84 %. Les participants étaient invités à indiquer jusqu'à quel point les différentes caractéristiques présentées avaient joué un rôle dans leur décision d'accepter l'emploi qu'ils occupaient actuellement. Une analyse factorielle sur l'importance accordée à 30 composantes de la rémunération a permis de regrouper ces dernières en huit grands facteurs : la qualité du travail et des relations, la rémunération variable, la rémunération indirecte, les possibilités de développement et de carrière, la flexibilité des conditions de travail, le prestige de l'emploi, les gratifications et la charge de travail. Le modèle du *Big-Five* a été utilisé pour mesurer les cinq traits de personnalité fondamentaux : méticulosité (*conscientiousness*), extraversion, conscience des autres (*agreeableness*), équilibre émotionnel (*emotional stability*) vs. névrotisme, et ouverture à l'expérience (*openness to experience*).

Nos résultats montrent qu'une fois l'effet des huit variables de contrôle pris en compte (âge, sexe, nombre de personnes à charge, expérience de travail, le niveau de scolarité ou le dernier diplôme, salaire, ancienneté dans l'organisation, taille de l'organisation), les traits de personnalité des individus contribuent à expliquer une partie significative supplémentaire de la variance de l'importance accordée à six des huit composantes de la rémunération totale étudiées et ce, dans les proportions suivantes : le contenu du travail et les relations interpersonnelles ( $\Delta R^2 = 7\%$ ), les possibilités de développement et de carrière ( $\Delta R^2 = 4\%$ ), la rémunération variable ( $\Delta R^2 = 2\%$ ), la rémunération indirecte ( $\Delta R^2 = 2\%$ ), la flexibilité des conditions de travail ( $\Delta R^2 = 2\%$ ), et le prestige ( $\Delta R^2 = 2\%$ ).

Notre étude montre que l'ouverture à l'expérience est le trait de personnalité le plus (positivement) lié à l'importance accordée aux diverses composantes de la rémunération totale, soit la flexibilité des conditions de travail, les possibilités de développement et de carrière, la rémunération variable, le contenu du travail et les relations interpersonnelles, et les gratifications. La « conscience des autres » comme trait de personnalité est significativement liée à l'importance accordée à deux composantes de la rémunération totale : la qualité du travail et des relations et la rémunération indirecte. Les trois autres traits de personnalité ne sont liés chacun qu'à l'importance d'une seule composante de la rémunération totale : la « méticulosité » avec la rémunération indirecte, l'« extraversion » avec la qualité du travail et des relations et le « névrotisme » avec le prestige de l'emploi.

Finalement, la faible contribution des traits de personnalité à l'attractivité perçue des composantes de la rémunération totale alimente le débat actuel sur l'usage des tests de personnalité, certains auteurs doutant de leurs

---

retombées pratiques dans la prédiction de la performance au travail, alors que d'autres persistent à les considérer pertinents à cette fin. Après avoir traité des limites de l'étude, des avenues de recherche sont proposées aux chercheurs désireux de mieux comprendre l'attrait envers les composantes de la rémunération totale ou encore, de mieux gérer les composantes de la rémunération pour attirer les meilleurs talents.