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The Equity Sensitivity Instrument (Huseman, Hatfield, & Miles, 1985) has been the primary measure used in equity sensitivity research to date. It appears to suffer from content deficiency and an inappropriate scoring procedure. Because of these problems, this dissertation constructed a new measure, based on systematic item development procedures, that provided thorough coverage of the equity sensitivity construct.

Development of the new measure was based on Huseman, Hatfield, and Miles' (1987) theory of equity sensitivity. Items for the new measure were developed using the traditional approach of developing items that directly inquire about a person's equity sensitivity and a second approach of developing items that indirectly inquire about a person's equity sensitivity. These items were content analyzed to ensure that the item pool assessed the entire equity sensitivity construct. These items were then pretested in two pilot studies. Sixty-four items, representing the four dimensions of indirect entitlement, direct entitlement-benevolence, indirect equity sensitivity and indirect benevolence, survived the two pilot studies. However, only two dimensions, indirect entitlement and direct entitlement-benevolence, were used in constructing the final measure of equity sensitivity because of
conceptual and reliability problems associated with the other two dimensions. The new measure's construct validity was assessed in two separate studies: a discriminant validity assessment and a nomological validity assessment. Finally, the predictive utility of the new measure was assessed in a laboratory study.

Results indicated that the new thirty-two item measure displayed reliabilities that ranged from .89 to .90. Construct validity appeared to be adequate. The correlation between the new measure and the ESI ranged from .31 to .47 suggesting convergent validity. In terms of discriminant validity, the new measure, unexpectedly, had small but significant correlations with locus of control and old-fashionedness. With respect to nomological validity, the new measure of equity sensitivity had a significant correlation with Machiavellianism (r = .44). Results of the laboratory study indicated that the new measure had incremental validity, beyond that provided by the ESI, for predicting pay satisfaction and overall satisfaction with different reward conditions.
CHAPTER ONE
LITERATURE REVIEW

Introduction

What is a "fair" exchange relationship with a work organization? It depends upon who is answering the question. In contrast to traditional equity theory (Adams, 1963a), that assumes that all individuals define "fairness" in an exchange relationship with a work organization in the same manner, Huseman, Hatfield, and Miles (1987) believe that individuals have different notions about what constitutes a "fair" exchange relationship with a work organization. Based on a body of research evidence concerning individual differences in equity theory, Huseman et al. (1987) have proposed the individual difference variable of equity sensitivity to account for these different "fairness" notions. Specifically, Huseman et al. propose that the equity sensitivity construct consists of three types of individuals (Benevolents, Equity Sensitives, and Entitleds) who have different notions of a "fair" exchange relationship. At one end of the equity sensitivity continuum are the Benevolents or "givers" who prefer to give more in inputs than they receive in outcomes when engaging in exchange relationships with work organizations. On the other end of the equity sensitivity continuum are Entitleds or "takers".
who prefer to receive more in outcomes than they give in inputs when engaging in exchange relationships with work organizations. In the middle of the continuum are the Equity Sensitives who represent the traditional view of equity and prefer that their input/outcome ratio be equal when engaging in exchange relationships with work organizations. Whereas the research on equity sensitivity has been generally supportive of its basic tenet that not everyone follows the traditional norm of equity (i.e., an equal inputs/outcomes ratio) when engaging in exchange relationships with work organizations, there are, however, several problems with this line of research such as a faulty measure of the construct that cast some doubt on the validity of its findings. Therefore, it is the purpose of this dissertation to attempt to redress some of these problems by developing and rigorously evaluating a new measure of equity sensitivity, thereby putting this line of research on more solid theoretical and empirical ground.

The objective of Chapter 1 is to review the literature relevant to developing a new equity sensitivity instrument. Major deficiencies and limitations of the current instrument, the Equity Sensitivity Instrument (ESI; Huseman, Hatfield, & Miles, 1985), will be delineated and means for their resolution will be discussed.
The plan of Chapter 1 is as follows:

1. Review the basic tenets of and empirical research concerning equity theory.

2. Indicate the importance of individual difference variables in equity theory research.

3. Examine both the theoretical underpinnings of the equity sensitivity construct and its implications for organizational outcomes.

4. Review the research concerning equity sensitivity.

5. Delineate problems in equity sensitivity research, specifically noting the deficiencies and limitations of the current instrument used to measure equity sensitivity and in the research conducted to validate the instrument.

6. Identify a research plan for evaluating and overcoming the deficiencies and limitations noted in Step 5. The research plan will entail developing and validating a new measure of equity sensitivity.

---

**Equity Theory**

**Basic Tenets**

Equity theory (Adams, 1963a, 1965; Walster, Berscheid, & Walster, 1978) suggests, among other notions, that individuals are concerned with maintaining fairness in their exchange relationships with organizations. According to equity theory, perceptions of equity/inequity are the result of a two-step
process consisting of a social exchange component (Homans, 1950) and a social comparison component (Festinger, 1954). First, individuals assess their exchange with a focal target by examining their ratio of outcomes (0) to inputs (I); e.g., what they get from an organization as compared to what they give to an organization. This assessment represents the social exchange component of the above mentioned two-step process. Second, this 0/1 exchange is then evaluated against the 0/1 exchange of a comparison other to determine its fairness: the social comparison component of the process. Parenthetically, this comparison other can take many forms ranging from an internal standard to a co-worker to a professional/industry standard (Goodman, 1974).

Overall, equity theory has four basic tenets:

1. Individuals strive to create and maintain a state of equity in their relations with organizations. Equity is seen as homeostasis, a tension free state.

2. When individuals perceive an inequitable relationship, it creates tension within the individual which they are motivated to reduce or eliminate. Therefore, equity theory also has a dissonance component (Festinger, 1957).

3. The greater the magnitude of the perceived inequity, the greater the drive to reduce the state of tension. Individuals will act to restore equity in a relationship through various means such as behaviorally altering inputs and outcomes, cognitively
distorting inputs and outcomes, changing the comparison other, or terminating an exchange relationship (e.g., leaving the field).

4. Individuals will perceive an inequity against them more readily than one in their favor and, thus, are more likely to act upon the unfavorable inequity to restore an exchange relationship to equity.

**Empirical Research**

Empirical research in the equity theory area concerning employee reactions to pay has generally indicated that people subscribe to the equity norm. For example, reviews of equity theory research (Carrell & Dittrich, 1978; Goodman, 1977; Mowday, 1983) have demonstrated that studies strongly support predictions from equity theory when individuals experience underpayment inequity. That is, when individuals feel underpaid, they will on average produce fewer goods of poorer quality as compared to those who are equitably paid (e.g., Andrews, 1967; Evans & Simmons, 1969; Griffeth, Vecchio, & Logan, 1989; Homans, 1953; Lawler & O’Gara, 1967; Pritchard, Dunnette, & Jorgenson, 1972).

With respect to overpayment inequity, the research evidence is far less conclusive (e.g., Campbell & Pritchard, 1976; Carrell & Dittrich, 1978; Greenberg, 1982; Mowday, 1983). There are numerous studies that have provided support for the prediction that overpaid subjects will produce higher quantity and/or higher quality than equitably paid subjects (e.g., Adams 1963b; Adams &
Jacobsen, 1964; Adams & Rosenbaum, 1962; Andrews, 1967; Friedman & Goodman, 1967; Goodman & Friedman, 1968, 1969; Lawler, 1968a; Lawler, Koplin, Young, & Fadem, 1968; Pritchard et al., 1972; Weiner, 1970; Wood & Lawler, 1970). However, some of these studies have been flawed in their manipulations of overpayment inequity, making it nearly impossible to draw any meaningful conclusions (Carrell & Dittrich, 1978; Pritchard, 1969).

Specifically, in some studies, inequity is induced in subjects by challenging their job qualifications. However, challenging subjects' qualifications may threaten their self-esteem causing them to work harder to prove themselves worthy. In other words, there is a competing explanation for the findings of some overpayment inequity experiments resulting from a treatment confound. The subjects may perform according to equity theory predictions for reasons related to the experimental treatment (self-esteem induction) rather than the perceived overpayment inequity. Indeed research has supported the explanation that subjects were perceiving devalued self-esteem rather than inequity (Andrews & Valenzi, 1970; Evans & Molinare, 1970; Weiner, 1970).

When only those studies that do not manipulate overpayment inequity by challenging subjects' qualifications (rather they actually change pay rates) are considered, appreciably less support is found for equity theory predictions concerning overpayment inequity (e.g., Andrews, 1967; Evans & Simmons, 1969;
Lawler, 1968b; Pritchard et al., 1972; Valenzi & Andrews, 1971; Weiner, 1970). According to Mowday (1983), in his review of the empirical research on equity theory, the findings concerning overpayment inequity are inconsistent. This inconsistency raises the possibility that not all subjects in an overpayment condition subscribe to the equity norm (Huseman et al., 1987). For example, in some cases, it appears that subjects who are overpaid will adhere to a norm of outcome maximization (Vecchio, 1981). Thus, there may be important exceptions to the equity norm when engaging in exchange relations with organizations.

Importance of Individual Differences in Equity Theory

Although the above research does provide some support for the notion that individuals subscribe to the equity norm in their exchange relations with organizations, there is a body of research on reward allocations and reactions to inequity (e.g., Carrell & Dittrich, 1978; Major & Deaux, 1982) that suggests there are exceptions to the norm of equity in terms of both demographic variables such as gender (e.g., Lane & Messe, 1970; Leventhal & Anderson, 1970; Leventhal & Lane, 1971; Mikula, 1974), chronological age (Hook & Cook, 1979) and nationality (Gergen, Morse, & Gergen, 1980; Weick, Bougon, & Maruyama, 1976), and personality variables such as moral maturity (Vecchio, 1981), Protestant Ethic (Garrett, 1973; Garrett & Bloom, 1975; Greenberg, 1979), Machiavellianism (Blumstein & Weinstein, 1969),
Interpersonal Orientation (Swap & Rubin, 1983), and self-esteem (Brockner, 1985).

With respect to the demographic variable of gender, research suggests that men are more likely to allocate rewards between themselves and their coworkers using the equity norm, whereas women are more likely to employ the equality norm in allocating rewards (e.g., Lane & Masse, 1970; Leventhal & Anderson, 1970; Leventhal & Lane, 1971; Wikula, 1974). As for the demographic variable of age, Hook and Cook (1979) found in their review of reward allocation that individuals from age 3 to adult employ different rules in allocating rewards. Prior to age 6, individuals apply self-interest or equality as the basis for reward allocation. At age 6, individuals typically switch from equality to ordinal equity (rank order) in allocating rewards. Finally, at approximately age 13, individuals switch from ordinal equity to proportional equity (rewards are directly proportional to the work done) in allocating rewards.

Another demographic variable, nationality, also has implications for equity theory (Gergen, Morse, & Gergen, 1980; Weick et al., 1976). Gergen et al. (1980), in their review of cross-cultural justice behavior, concluded that North Americans are more likely to allocate rewards using an equity norm than are Europeans. Gergen et al. (1980) also concluded that Europeans, unlike North Americans, do not work harder when they are overpaid.
than when they are equitably paid. In a study of Dutch and American students, Weick et al. (1976) found that both nationalities preferred a situation of comparison equity (the ratio of inputs to outcomes both high or both low) or other equity (the ratio of inputs to outcomes both high or both low) more than one of own equity (own inputs and outcomes both high or both low). However, there were some differences among the nationalities. Specifically, Dutch students preferred situations with high inputs for self, regardless of the level of outcomes, whereas American students preferred situations of high outcomes for self, regardless of their level of inputs. These differences were primarily explained in terms of cultural differences (e.g., the Calvinistic heritage of the Netherlands) that exist between the Netherlands and the United States.

As for personality variables that affect an individual's adherence to the equity norm, Vecchio (1981) found that the level of moral maturity was positively related to conformity to equity theory predictions for performance levels in an overpayment condition. That is, those individuals who were high on moral maturity produced higher quality yet fewer goods in the piece-rate overpayment condition as compared to those low on moral maturity. Individuals who were high on moral maturity adhered to the equity norm whereas those individuals who were low on moral maturity adhered to an outcome maximizing norm.
Greenberg (1979), in two experiments concerning salary decisions made by male undergraduates for hypothetical workers who differed in terms of their performance quantity and duration, demonstrated that the endorsement of the Protestant Ethic (PE) influences the perceived fairness of using various equity inputs in salary decisions. For example, individuals who scored high on PE reported that it is fairer to base rewards upon performance when the differences in performance are due to factors under the individual's control and are not attributable to external, fortuitous factors, whereas the opposite was found to be the case for individuals who scored low on PE. These findings are consistent with a low PE individual's interest in "getting something for nothing" (Greenberg, 1978). Likewise, Garrett (1973), Garrett and Bloom (1975), and Greenberg (1978) have demonstrated that low PE individuals subscribe to an equality norm rather than an equity norm in allocating rewards to others.

Investigating the relation between Machiavellianism (Mach) and responses to inequitable claims by a partner, Blumstein and Weinstein (1969) found that low Mach individuals endorsed an equity norm when dealing with a partner, whereas high Mach individuals were more likely to take advantage of a partner who had previously benefited them. Thus, low Machs adhere to a norm of equity, whereas high Machs do not. These findings are consistent with a high Mach's hedonistic tendencies to ignore the
norm of reciprocity and to use any opportunistic means to achieve his/her goals (Christie, 1962 [cited in Blumstein & Weinstein, 1969]).

Swap and Rubin (1983) demonstrated that Interpersonal Orientation (IO) affects reward distribution to a partner. Those individuals who scored low on IO allocated rewards based upon an equity norm, whereas those individuals high on IO allocated rewards more in accordance with an equality norm rather than equity norm. This difference was most likely due to the fact that high IOs are more interested and responsive to other people whereas low IOs are less interested and responsive to other people and are more concerned with the economics of a relationship.

Finally, Brockner (1985) found that self-esteem affects reactions to different reward conditions. Specifically, they found that high and medium self-esteem subjects were more productive in an overpayment condition than an equitable payment condition whereas low self-esteem subjects were less productive in an overpayment condition than in an equitable payment condition. These results are consistent with the self-esteem/challenge hypothesis that states that when challenged to perform at high levels (which is implicitly conveyed in overpayment) low self-esteem subjects do not have the confidence to meet the challenge and withdraw psychologically from the task whereas high self-esteem subjects have the confidence to meet the challenge and redouble their efforts on the task.
From the above research, it is apparent that there are many exceptions to the equity norm both in allocating rewards and in reactions to inequity, and that these exceptions are related to various individual difference variables. Both Mowday (1983) and Miner (1980), in their reviews of equity theory, have emphasized the value of investigating the effects individual difference variables have on equity perceptions, as well as reactions to workplace equity. However, an examination of Greenberg's (1990) review of equity theory research reveals that there has been relatively little research conducted concerning individual differences in the 1980's. Mowday (1983) also noted that the impact of individual differences on employee perceptions of and reactions to inequity has received little systematic attention. Major and Deaux (1982) described much of the research on individual difference variables in equity theory as "scattershot" and "opportunistic" (p.44) because it relied so heavily on easily obtained demographic variables. This state of affairs, according to Major and Deaux (1982), is due in part to the absence of a theoretical framework for conceptualizing and understanding individual differences in reactions to equity/inequity.

**The Equity Sensitivity Construct**

**Theoretical Underpinnings**

Recently, Huseman, Hatfield, and Miles (1987) set forth a new construct called equity sensitivity, a purported personality
variable, that may provide a theoretical framework to conceptualize and understand individual differences in reactions to equity/inequity. In contrast to traditional equity theory that holds that individuals universally prefer their outcome/input ratio be equal to that of a comparison other, the equity sensitivity construct proposes that such a preference is not universal and that individuals possess different preferences in terms of their relative outcome/input ratios. The sensitivity to equity construct is depicted in Figure 1.1.

According to Huseman et al.'s (1985; 1987) equity sensitivity construct there are three classes of individuals: (a) Benevolents, who prefer that their outcome/input ratios be less than their comparison others; (b) Equity Sensitives, who, conforming to traditional equity theory predictions, prefer their outcome/input ratios to be equal to those of their comparison others, and (c) Entitleds, who prefer that their outcome/input ratios be greater than their comparison others. The sources of these general equity preferences (i.e., preferences for levels of inputs and levels of outcomes) for each equity sensitivity orientation are listed in Table 1.1.

Benevolents are givers or what Adler (1935) termed the "socially useful type". They think more of giving than receiving. Benevolents, similar to altruists, give while expecting little in return. They experience "guilt" and lowered affectivity when
Figure 1.1
The Equity Sensitivity Continuum

Table 1.1
Sources of General Equity Preferences for the
Three Equity Sensitivity Orientations

Preference for Level of Inputs and Outcomes

1A: Benevolents prefer exchange relationships where they have high inputs as compared to exchange relationships where they have low inputs.
1B: Entitleds prefer exchange relationships where they have high outcomes as compared to exchange relationships where they have low outcomes.

Preference for Relative Levels of Inputs/Outcomes

2A: Benevolents prefer exchange relationships where their inputs exceed their outcomes.
2B: Entitleds prefer exchange relationships where their outcomes exceed their inputs.
2C: Equity Sensitives prefer exchange relationships where their inputs equal their outcomes.

Preference for a Certain Equity Ratio Relative to a Comparison Other

3A: Benevolents prefer their outcomes/inputs ratios to be less than the comparison other’s.
3B: Entitleds prefer their outcomes/inputs ratios to be greater than the comparison other’s.
3C: Equity Sensitives prefer their outcomes/inputs ratios to be equal to that of the comparison other’s.

their outcome/input ratio is equal to (i.e., equitable reward) or greater than (i.e., overreward) the outcome/input ratio of a comparison other. In other words, they are most content when they are underrewarded relative to the comparison other. In addition, they prefer exchange relationships where their inputs exceed their outcomes and where their inputs are high. Generally, they are more concerned with what they contribute to the exchange relationship.

Equity sensitives conform to the traditional equity theory model, and they adhere to the norm of reciprocity. They are neither "givers" nor "takers". They just want a fair shake. They experience "distress" ("guilt") and lowered affectivity when underrewarded (overrewarded). That is, they are most content when their outcome/input ratio is equal to the outcome/input ratio of the comparison other. Additionally, they prefer exchange relationships where their inputs equal their outcomes.

Entitleds are "takers" or what Adler (1935) termed the "getting type". They experience "distress" and lowered affectivity when their outcome/input ratio is equal to or less than the outcome/input ratio of the comparison other. Specifically, they are most content when they are overrewarded relative to the comparison other. In addition, they prefer exchange relationships where their outcomes exceed their inputs and where their outcomes are high. Above all, they are most concerned with what they receive from an exchange relationship.
Implications for Organizational Outcomes

The equity sensitivity construct has implications for various organizational outcomes such as job satisfaction and quantity and quality of work performed. In the case of job satisfaction, traditional equity theory proposes an inverted-U or curvilinear relation between perceptions of equity and job satisfaction. Equity theory predicts that as a result of distress from underreward or guilt from overreward, inequitably rewarded individuals should experience lower levels of job satisfaction relative to equitably rewarded individuals (Adams, 1965; Locke, 1976). Equity theory also holds that the threshold for perceptions of inequity is higher for overreward than underreward because individuals can often explain their overreward away as "good fortune" without experiencing accompanying distress (Adams, 1965). In other words, individuals who are underrewarded will experience significantly lower levels of job satisfaction than individuals who are overrewarded.

Incorporating the equity sensitivity variable into the relation between equity perceptions and job satisfaction, a somewhat different picture emerges from that provided by traditional equity theory. More precisely, three different relations result, one for each equity sensitivity orientation. These relations are depicted in Figure 1.2. As can be seen in Figure 1.2, there should be a negative, linear relation between
Figure 1.2
Predicted Job Satisfaction Levels for Equity Sensitivity Orientations

equity perceptions and job satisfaction for Benevolents. They are most satisfied when they are underrewarded and least satisfied when they are overrewarded. For Equity Sensitives, the traditional equity theory prediction should result. There should be an inverted-U relation between equity perceptions and job satisfaction (see Figure 1.2). They are most satisfied when equitably rewarded. Finally, for Entitleds, there should be a positive, linear relation between perceptions of equity and job satisfaction. Inspection of Figure 1.2 reveals that Entitleds will be most satisfied when they are overrewarded and least satisfied when they are underrewarded.

Similarly, the equity sensitivity variable also has implications for the quantity and quality of work performed under different reward conditions (i.e., overreward, equitable reward, and underreward) and different pay systems (i.e., piece-rate and salary). Predictions based upon previous quality and quantity of work research in this area (e.g., Andrews, 1967; Valenzi & Andrews, 1971) for each equity sensitivity orientation under different reward conditions and different pay systems are depicted in Table 1.2. As can be seen in Table 1.2, if Benevolents, for example, are overrewarded on a piece-rate system they are likely to reduce quantity and to increase quality to a greater extent than when they are equitably rewarded because they are experiencing significantly greater levels of guilt over and
Table 1.2

Predictions for Quality and Quantity of Work Performed as a Function of Reward Condition (i.e., Equity Perception), Pay System, and Equity Sensitivity Orientation.

Piece-Rate System

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>REWARD CONDITION/EQUITY PERCEPTION</th>
<th>UNDERREWARD</th>
<th>EQUITABLE REWARD</th>
<th>OVERREWARD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SO</td>
<td>ER</td>
<td>NI BENEVOLENT</td>
<td>NC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESE</td>
<td>QIN</td>
<td>UTT EQUITY</td>
<td>I QN, i QL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IIA SENSITIVE</td>
<td>TVT</td>
<td>YII ENTITLED</td>
<td>I QN, i QL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QT</td>
<td>YN</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Hourly-Rate System

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>REWARD CONDITION/EQUITY PERCEPTION</th>
<th>UNDERREWARD</th>
<th>EQUITABLE REWARD</th>
<th>OVERREWARD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SO</td>
<td>ER</td>
<td>NI BENEVOLENT</td>
<td>NC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESE</td>
<td>QIN</td>
<td>UTT EQUITY</td>
<td>d QN +/or d QL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IIA SENSITIVE</td>
<td>TVT</td>
<td>YII ENTITLED</td>
<td>D QN +/or D QL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QT</td>
<td>YN</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

QL = Quality of Work Performed  
QN = Quantity of Work Performed  
NC = No Change  
i = Moderate Increase  
I = Large Increase  
d = Moderate Decrease  
D = Large Decrease
dissatisfaction with being overrewarded. Similarly, when Benevolents are equitably rewarded under a piece-rate system as opposed to underrewarded they will reduce their quantity and increase their quality due to their guilt over and dissatisfaction with being "overrewarded". In those cases where there is no change in the quantity and quality performance output for an equity sensitivity orientation this indicates that this reward level is what the equity sensitivity orientation sees as equitable. Since equity is a tension-free state, there is no dissonance and, hence, no drive for the person to change his/her levels of performance. This is exactly what is predicted to happen when a Benevolent is underrewarded.

Huseman et al. (1987) have provided some general examples of predictions for different equity sensitivity orientations under differing reward conditions and different pay systems. These examples are listed below:

1. "On a piece-rate system, Entitleds consistently will produce at a high level, but the quality of their work will be consistently low" (p.230). Under a piece-rate system, the only way to ensure high outcomes for oneself is to produce a lot. Therefore, this high quantity production is consistent with an Entitled's preference for high outcomes.

2. "Under the equitably-rewarded condition on a piece-rate system, Benevolents will produce the highest quality work."
This occurs because Benevolents feel "guilty" since they believe they are being overpaid. As a result, the way to redress the inequity for a Benevolent is to produce higher quality goods without increasing quantity. This high quality production is consistent with a Benevolent's preference for high inputs.

3. "On a salary or wage, Benevolents will produce consistent quality and quantity under all three reward conditions" (p.230). This effect is due primarily to their preference for a smaller outcome/input ratio relative to a comparison other and to their preference for high inputs.

4. "For Benevolents, absenteeism and turnover will be consistent regardless of reward level. Entitleds will have the highest absenteeism and turnover in the equitably-rewarded condition (p.230)."

As can be seen from the above examples and from Figure 2 and Table 2, equity sensitivity is suggested as a moderator of the relation between perceptions of equity and organizational outcomes (Huseman et al., 1987). Moderator variables are typically proposed when there is a weak or inconsistent relation between two variables that were originally thought to be consistently related (Baron & Kenny, 1986). An example of a weak or inconsistent relation is when a relation holds in one setting but not in another (Baron & Kenny, 1986). In the case of equity theory, an excellent example of a weak or inconsistent relation is the one
between overpayment inequity and organizational outcomes. The findings concerning the relation between overpayment inequity and organizational outcomes have been inconsistent (Mowday, 1983). Thus, equity sensitivity has been proposed as a moderator variable to help specify, for example, when traditional equity theory predictions will hold or will not hold in overpayment inequity conditions. As a result, equity sensitivity should help improve the predictive efficacy of equity theory. The empirical research concerning equity sensitivity and its potential as a moderator variable of relations between reward level/equity perceptions and organizational outcomes is reviewed next.

Empirical Research on Equity Sensitivity

The initial study in the equity sensitivity area (Huseman, Hatfield, & Miles, 1985) investigated the relation between equity sensitivity and job satisfaction in different equity conditions (i.e., overreward, underreward, and equitable reward) for 589 managerial and professional employees. In this field study, equity sensitivity was measured by the Equity Sensitivity Instrument, developed by Huseman et al. (1985). As shown in Appendix A, the ESI is a five-item, forced distribution instrument. It is designed to tap an individual's preference for outcomes and inputs in a general work situation. The ESI has been the instrument of choice in all equity sensitivity studies to date (Hartman & Villere, 1990, 1991; King & Miles, 1992; King, Miles, &

The results of the Huseman et al. (1986) study revealed that, as predicted, Benevolents and Entitleds do not subscribe to the equity norm. For both groups the relation between reward level and job satisfaction was positive and linear. This finding runs counter to traditional equity theory predictions of a curvilinear relation between these two variables. Although this finding supports the Entitled portion of equity sensitivity theory, it runs counter to the Benevolent portion of the theory because it was originally proposed that for Benevolents there should be a negative, linear relation between reward level and job satisfaction. On the other hand, consistent with their preference for equity, Equity Sensitives demonstrated a curvilinear relation between reward level and job satisfaction. Comparing levels of global job satisfaction within reward conditions among the three groups, it was found that Benevolents were significantly more satisfied than either Equity Sensitives or Entitleds in the underreward condition. Similarly, in the overreward condition Benevolents were significantly more satisfied than their Equity Sensitive counterparts. This finding does not support the Benevolent portion of equity sensitivity theory as originally proposed since Benevolents are supposed to be less satisfied than Equity Sensitives in the overreward condition. Finally, it was
revealed that equitably rewarded Entitleds were much less satisfied than were equitably rewarded Benevolents or Equity Sensitives.

Overall, the results of Huseman et al. (1985) study provided some general support for the existence of the three equity sensitivity orientations and for the attendant predictions from equity sensitivity theory. There were some notable findings, however, that did not support the construct as originally proposed such as the results for the overreward condition and the results of the analysis of the relation between reward level and job satisfaction. It is noteworthy that both of these exceptions primarily involved the Benevolent portion of the equity sensitivity theory.

In their study of 519 undergraduates, Miles, Hatfield, and Huseman (1989) also found support for the equity sensitivity construct using a methodology involving work scenarios and stated preferences. In this study, Miles et al. (1989) investigated the outcome/input preferences of each equity sensitivity orientation, as well as each orientation's threshold for anger and guilt. There were three major findings from this study. First, Benevolents prefer a lower outcome/input ratio relative to Equity Sensitives and Entitleds. This finding was primarily due to Benevolents' preference for high inputs, which is consistent with the theoretical propositions set forth by Huseman et al. (1987).
Second, preference for outcomes tended to be quite similar across equity sensitivity orientations. That is, there were no statistically significant differences between the three equity sensitivity orientations in terms of what they perceived to be a fair wage or salary. Unlike the finding concerning preference for inputs, this finding runs counter to the theoretical propositions set forth by Huseman et al. (1987). Finally, perhaps the most theoretically interesting finding was that there was no statistically significant difference between Equity Sensitives and Entitleds in terms of their preferences for inputs, outcomes, or equity ratios, although the results generally did fall in the predicted directions.

Building upon Miles et al. (1989), Hartman and Villere (1990), in a study involving 155 undergraduate and graduate students, investigated the relation between equity sensitivity and preferences for different equity scenarios as listed in Huseman et al. (1987). The results of this study revealed that Benevolents generally prefer those situations where their equity ratios are less than their comparison other's ratios and that Entitleds prefer those situations where their equity ratios are greater than the comparison other's ratios. In addition, like the results of Miles et al. (1989) they found that Equity Sensitives were much like Entitleds in their preferences for different equity scenarios. Hartman and Villere (1990), as well as Miles et al.
(1989), suggest the possibility that only two categories of individuals exist rather than the three originally proposed in the equity sensitivity construct (Huseman et al., 1985; 1987). This notion is consistent with Adler (1935) who wrote of two types of individuals—takers and givers. However, it should be noted that Hartman and Villere (1991) were unable to replicate their 1990 findings using a sample of actual employees.

Further support for the notion that equity sensitivity may be helpful in explaining previously inconsistent equity theory findings comes from studies conducted by Patrick and Jackson (1991) and King, Miles, and Day (1989). In a study of both undergraduate students and fast-food workers using underreward/overreward scenarios and stated intentions, Patrick and Jackson (1991) demonstrated that equity sensitivity is related to how individuals chose to react to inequity. He found that Benevolents are more likely to change their comparison others in reaction to underpayment inequity than are Entitleds. In an overreward condition, he found that Benevolents and Equity Sensitives are more likely to take an aggressive reaction to experienced inequity. Furthermore, Patrick and Jackson (1991) discovered that Benevolents and Equity Sensitives are more likely to increase their inputs and decrease their outcomes than Entitleds in response to overpayment inequity. Likewise, King et al. (1989) using a methodology similar to that of Patrick (1987),
found that equity sensitivity had a significant influence on choice of equity restoration strategies within and between different reward conditions (i.e., overreward or underreward) in a sample of 304 undergraduate students.

Miles and King (1991) have identified a boundary condition for the equity sensitivity construct. They investigated the effects of equity sensitivity and type of comparison other on preferences for conditions of overreward and equitable reward. They found that in situations where the comparison other was personal (i.e., an individual with whom one has a personal relationship such as a co-worker who is a close friend), Entitleds preferred situations of overreward more than Equity Sensitives or Benevolents did. Contrary to theoretical prediction, there was no significant difference between Equity Sensitives and Benevolents in terms of their preferences. From this result, the question again is raised concerning whether or not a discrete Equity Sensitive orientation exists. Furthermore, when the comparison other was impersonal (i.e., an individual with whom one does not have a personal relationship such as a composite image of other unknown workers doing similar work), there were no significant differences among the three equity sensitivity groups. Thus, it appears that equity sensitivity only affects preferences for reward conditions when a comparison other is personal.
Finally, King, Miles, and Day (1993) conducted a pair of studies, an experiment and a field study, to test equity sensitivity theory. In the experiment involving 279 undergraduates, King et al. (1993) investigated the effects of equity sensitivity and reward condition (underreward/overreward) on job satisfaction. It was found that Benevolents reported relatively high levels of satisfaction regardless of reward condition. This finding runs counter to theoretical predictions (Huseman et al., 1987) but is consistent with previous findings concerning Benevolents (Huseman et al., 1985). In the underreward condition, Benevolents were more satisfied than Entitleds. Contrary to equity sensitivity theory, there was no statistically significant difference in satisfaction between Benevolents and Equity Sensitives in the underreward condition. In the overreward condition, Benevolents and Entitleds were significantly more satisfied than Equity Sensitives but they did not differ statistically in their reported satisfaction levels. Again, this finding runs counter to equity sensitivity theory as originally proposed by Huseman et al. (1987).

In the field study, 395 bank employees filled out a questionnaire containing the ESI (Huseman et al., 1985), a distributive justice scale, a short form of the JDI (Smith, Kendall, & Hulin, 1969), and the Exchange Ideology Questionnaire (Eisenberger, Huntington, Hutchison, & Sowa, 1986). King et al. 
(1993) demonstrated that there was a positive correlation between perceptions of distributive justice and job satisfaction for all three equity sensitivity orientations, contrary to theoretical predictions set forth by Huseman et al. (1987). It was also revealed that Benevolents significantly differed from Equity Sensitives and Entitleds with regard to exchange ideology. Specifically, Equity Sensitives and Entitleds adhered more to a quid pro quo (i.e., this for that) orientation than did Benevolents. Additionally, it was found that Entitleds and Benevolents differed with regard to which job facet they considered most salient. That is, Entitleds placed more importance on pay whereas Benevolents placed more importance on the work itself. This finding is consistent with equity sensitivity theory (Huseman et al., 1987) because Entitleds are believed to be more outcome-oriented whereas Benevolents are believed to be more input-oriented.

Taken as a whole, the research in the equity sensitivity area supports the notion that not all individuals follow the equity norm in their exchange relationships with organizations. There is also general support for the notion that at least two classes of individuals exist: Benevolents and Entitleds (Miles et al., 1989; Hartman & Villere, 1990). The question remains, however, whether or not an Equity Sensitivity orientation exists. In addition, two results were found that seem to contradict certain aspects of the
equity sensitivity theory. First, no support was found for the prediction that Benevolents would prefer situations with low outcomes (Miles et al., 1989). In fact, no significant differences in terms of preferences for outcomes emerged among the three equity sensitivity orientations. Second, the relation between reward level and job satisfaction for Benevolents was found to be positive and linear rather than negative and linear as predicted (Huseman et al., 1985; King et al., 1993). Finally, there is also evidence that a significant boundary condition exists for equity sensitivity (Miles & King, 1991).

Yet, Greenberg (1990) has some serious reservations about the utility of the equity sensitivity construct in equity theory research. Greenberg (1987 [cited in Greenberg, 1990]; 1990) contends that the most serious problem with the construct is that research (e.g., Deutsch, 1975; Leventhal, 1976) has consistently demonstrated that situational factors (e.g., goals of the reward system) often dictate the appropriateness of norms other than equity such as equality and need gratification. Simply put, Greenberg believes that different norms of justice are followed in different situations (Deutsch, 1975) and that behaving in accordance with these non-equity norms should not be regarded as evidence of the existence of an individual difference variable (i.e., equity sensitivity). The problem, however, with Greenberg’s argument against the existence of equity sensitivity
is that it completely overlooks the within-situation variability in individuals' adherence to a justice norm. In fact, research concerning equity sensitivity (e.g., Huseman et al., 1985; King et al., 1993; Miles et al., 1989) has demonstrated that in an exchange relation with a work organization [where the implicit goal is to maximize productivity through the use of an equity norm (Leventhal, 1976)] there are a number of individuals who do not adhere to a norm of equity. While this author does not dispute Greenberg's (1990) claim that the research (e.g., Deutsch, 1975; Leventhal, 1976) that has demonstrated that different justice norms are followed under different situations cannot be taken as evidence of the existence of equity sensitivity, this author, however, does contend that within situations governed by the equity norm (i.e., exchange relations with work organizations) there is a body of research that suggests there are a number of individuals who do not follow the equity norm and that this body of research can be taken as evidence that the individual difference variable of equity sensitivity does indeed exist.

Problems with the Equity Sensitivity Instrument

The basic problem in equity sensitivity research centers around the instrument used to measure the equity sensitivity construct. Specifically, the Equity Sensitivity Instrument (ESI; Huseman et al., 1985), the instrument used to measure the equity sensitivity construct, appears to suffer from two significant
problems: content deficiency and an inappropriate scoring procedure. This section will examine both problems, in turn.

**Content Deficiency**

The first problem with the ESI is that it suffers from content deficiency. As can be seen from an examination of the propositions in Table 1, the equity sensitivity construct entails preferences for levels of inputs, levels of outcomes, relative levels of inputs to outcomes, and certain equity ratios relative to a comparison other. In contrast, items on the ESI inquire only about preferences of relative levels of inputs to outcomes (see Appendix A). Indeed, the results of a recent factor analysis of the ESI revealed that its structure is unidimensional (King & Miles, 1992). Consequently, it is extremely unlikely that Huseman et al.'s (1985) instrument captures all the variance in the equity sensitivity construct because its operationalization is unidimensional rather than multidimensional (cf. Schwab, 1980). Rather than one dimension, it appears that there are four theoretical dimensions that comprise the equity sensitivity construct. Therefore, the ESI appears to suffer from a common problem encountered in personality/attitude research: the failure of instruments to adequately reflect the constructs of interest which leaves a great deal of information about these constructs and their relationships with other variables uncovered (Buckley, Cote, & Comstock, 1990). The ESI's content deficiency cast major
doubts both on the adequacy of its coverage of the construct and
on its ability to detect theoretically relevant relations.

This content deficiency stems from a lack of systematic item
development procedures being applied in the ESI's construction.
For example, no clearly delineated theoretical definition(s) of
equity sensitivity guided the ESI's item development process.
Items were simply generated that were believed to be indicative of
either benevolence or entitlement (King & Miles, 1994).
Apparently, those generating the ESI items relied on their "own"
theoretical definitions of equity sensitivity. (I use the word
apparently because much of the information concerning the ESI's
development has been lost [Edward Miles, personal communication,
February, 1993].) According to Nunnally (1978), in constructing
measurement instruments, theoretical definitions are essential in
providing a starting point for the generation of items and in
assessing an instrument's content validity. Likewise, Schwab
(1980) referring to construct validation of a measurement
instrument notes that "the [construct] definition should spell out
true variance, and (by implication at the very least) variance to
be regarded as deficient and contaminated." (p. 14). In
determining what is true, deficient, or contaminant variance in a
measurement instrument, it is standard operating procedure in the
instrument development process to have "expert" judges assess the
content validity (true variance) of the intended measurement
instrument (e.g., Churchill, 1979; DeVellis, 1991; Nunnally, 1978). Again, no attempt was made in the ESI's development process to have "expert" judges assess whether or not the ESI provided a content valid measure of the equity sensitivity construct (King & Miles, 1992).

The failure of researchers to invest the necessary time and effort to develop psychometrically sound instruments (e.g., content valid) has resulted in situations where "it is unclear whether substantive findings, or lack of substantive findings, reflect true relationships between variables or simply inadequacies in instrumentation" (Sackett & Larson, 1990, p. 467). The failure of researchers to accord construct validity the same value as substantive validity has lead to erroneous and unwarranted substantive knowledge being derived from instruments that were later found not to measure what they purportedly measured (Schwab, 1980). Therefore, what is needed in this regard is to construct, based upon systematic item development procedures, a new measure of equity sensitivity that provides a multidimensional measure of the construct. Systematic item development procedures (e.g., theoretical definitions and expert analysis of the measure) are necessary to assure that the intended measure possesses content validity (DeVellis, 1991).
Inappropriate Scoring Scheme

A second problem with the ESI centers around the appropriateness of the sample-specific procedure used in its scoring. Prior to examining the scoring procedure's appropriateness, one must first consider the scoring procedure itself. The scoring procedure for the ESI employs a decision rule of $\pm 1/2$ standard deviation from the mean ESI score for the entire sample under investigation to divide the sample into the three ESI groups (King, Miles, & Day, 1994). To illustrate, if the mean ESI score (possible scores range from 0 to 50 on the ESI) for a sample is 29 and the standard deviation is 6, then the breakpoints for the three ESI groups are: 26 ($-1/2 \text{ SD}$ from the mean) and below is an Entitled, 27 to 31 is an Equity Sensitive, and 32 ($+1/2 \text{ SD}$ from the mean) and above is a Benevolent.

According to King et al. (1993), "sample-specific breakpoints are necessary because of the unique characteristics of any particular sample that can influence response to the ESI" (p.10). Among these unique sample characteristics are social desirability, organizational context, and age homogeneity or heterogeneity (King et al., 1993). In essence, the rationale for the sample-specific breakpoints is that these unique sample characteristics are contaminants of ESI scores which are somehow "corrected" for by using the sample-specific scoring procedure.
An initial criticism with respect to the appropriateness of the sample-specific scoring procedure involves the aforementioned rationale for the procedure. The problem with the rationale is that it has little or no supporting evidence. First, there has been neither research cited nor convincing theoretical arguments presented as to why organizational context should be considered a contaminant of ESI scores. Second, the empirical evidence King et al. (1993) do offer as support for their assertion that age and social desirability are contaminants of ESI scores is really no support at all. In the case of age as a contaminant, the correlations between age and ESI scores in various samples have been .01, .03, -.08, .21, and .31 (King & Miles, 1994). Referring to these correlations, King and Miles (1994) affirm that "these correlations reveal no discernable pattern across the five samples." (p.19). To have preliminary evidence of contamination, a "contaminant" variable must correlate significantly with the variable of interest. Since there is no pattern of significant correlation between age and ESI scores (King & Miles, 1994), there is no evidence of contamination of ESI scores by age. With respect to social desirability, King and Miles (1994) have found correlations ranging from .23 to .29 between various measures of social desirability and ESI scores. Although these two variables are significantly correlated (indicative of possible contamination of the ESI scores by socially desirable responding), King and
Miles (1994) do not interpret this correlation as evidence of contamination but rather they interpret it as being evidence of a conceptual relation. Specifically, King and Miles (1994) note "as measured benevolence increases, so does subjects' inclination to manage the impression that others have of them. This finding is logically consistent with the proposed nature of those with high measured benevolence (i.e., a relationship orientation)" (p. 20). In cases where socially desirable responding is conceptually related to the construct of interest, controlling for socially desirable responding is considered inappropriate (Zerbe & Paulhus, 1987). As a result, using the sample-specific breakpoints to control for socially desirable responding on the ESI is inappropriate. From this analysis it appears there is no convincing theoretical or empirical support for regarding social desirability, age, or organizational context as contaminants of ESI scores. Finally, there has been no evidence provided for the implication that sample-specific breakpoints do "correct" for such contaminants even if they did exist. With respect to such statistical adjustments or corrections, Weisberg (1979) notes that it is "possible for the remaining bias after adjustment to be larger in absolute value than the initial bias without any adjustment" (p. 1449). Therefore, there appears to be neither empirical nor theoretical support for the rationale offered by King et al. (1993) for the use of the sample-specific scoring procedure for the ESI.
A second criticism of the sample-specific scoring procedure is that the classifications (i.e., Entitled, Equity Sensitive, and Benevolent) it produces may, in some cases, be incorrect. A direct comparison of the sample-specific scoring procedure with a theoretically consistent scoring procedure will illustrate this problem quite nicely. For comparison purposes, sample-specific breakpoints from two previous studies (Huseman et al., 1985; Miles et al., 1989) will be used as an example of the sample-specific procedure. Using these sample-specific breakpoints, 0-26 is an Entitled, 27-33 is an Equity Sensitive, and 34-50 is a Benevolent. In contrast, the theoretically consistent scoring system (King et al., 1993) is as follows: 0-24 is an Entitled, 25 is an Equity Sensitive, and 26-50 is a Benevolent. As a result of the sample-specific breakpoints, some inconsistencies occur such as labeling individuals who have scored 25 on the ESI as "Entitleds" when they have endorsed statements that are theoretically consistent with an Equity Sensitive position. Such inconsistencies could possibly explain why researchers in this area have been unable to distinguish between Entitleds and Equity Sensitives (because, in some cases, they have been lumped together as one group) or to find more than two groups of individuals, Benevolents and Entitleds.

This misclassification problem is further compounded by the fact that the breakpoints for classification change from sample to
sample. Consequently, one's classification may change as the sample in which one is drawn changes. For example, one who has an ESI score of 30 is a Benevolent in one sample, an Equity Sensitive in a second, and an Entitled in a third (King & Day, 1992). This "floating" scoring scheme makes it unclear what it is being compared between studies. As Schmitt and Klimoski (1991) expressed so well, "unless we understand the meaning of our measures [scoring procedures] we use to collect data, many of the results will appear confusing and inconsistent" (p. 112).

The third criticism of the sample-specific scoring procedure is that it results in findings that are inconsistent with equity sensitivity theory that, in turn, cast doubts on its validity. Using sample-specific breakpoints, Huseman et al. (1985) identified more individuals as Benevolents than Equity Sensitives in their sample of managerial and professional employees. Likewise, King et al. (1993) have identified more Benevolents than Equity Sensitives in an employee sample and more Benevolents than Entitleds in a student sample. These findings run counter to Huseman and Hatfield's (1989) statement that Benevolents make up the smallest group of exceptions to equity sensitivity and cast doubts on the sample-specific scoring procedure's validity and more importantly, on the ESI's construct validity. An alternative explanation for these findings is that Huseman and Hatfield's (1989) statement is incorrect. However, current research on
values, as summarized by Mitchell and Scott (1990), has revealed that values consistent with Entitlement not Benevolence are on the rise in the United States (the site of all previous ESI applications). As such, this alternative explanation lacks empirical support.

A final criticism of the sample-specific breakpoints procedure is that it trichotomizes a continuous variable which results in a considerable loss of measurement information (Cohen, 1983). When a continuous variable is split into subgroups (as in the case of the ESI), individuals in a subgroup such as Entitled, Equity Sensitive, or Benevolent are treated as if they were identical in terms of the attribute in question when in reality this is not the case (Maxwell & Delaney, 1993). The effect of this trichotimization is to dispense with score differences within each of the 3 portions of the distribution, leaving only the distinction between the three (Cohen, 1983). This is akin to adding error of measurement to the variable of interest (Maxwell & Delaney, 1993).

The loss of measurement information is not the only cost of trichotimization. This loss of information leads, in turn, to a reduction in measurement precision, underestimation of the magnitude of bivariate relations, and a lowering of statistical power (Cohen, 1983; Humphreys & Fleishman, 1974; Maxwell, Delaney,
& Dill, 1984). In addition, Maxwell and Delaney (1993) have demonstrated that when multiple continuous predictor variables are dichotomized (as is often the case in a 2 X 2 factorial design) this results in biased (i.e., inflated) estimates of true effects (both main effects and interactions) of underlying continuous variables. This increases the probability of Type I errors. Thus, trichotomizing the ESI makes it difficult to trust the results of our studies as reflecting true population effects because trichotomization can lead to both underestimation and overestimation of population effects. This, in turn, weakens our ability to build a sound knowledge base concerning the ESI and its theoretical relations with other variables.

Conclusion

Given the potential problems with the ESI, it is disconcerting that there appears to be emerging from the preliminary research in this area a movement toward redefining the equity sensitivity construct. For example, recent research (previously reviewed) using the ESI (Hartman & Villere, 1990; Miles et al., 1989) has stated that there may be only two groups of individuals: Benevolents and Entitleds (Equity Sensitives fall in the Entitled group). However, such talk is arguably premature given that the ESI suffers from several different problems including content deficiency, and an inappropriate scoring procedure. In essence, researchers in this area could be making a
mistake by redefining the equity sensitivity construct from a faulty measure of the construct.

The problems with the ESI are merely symptomatic of a much larger problem in the fields of I/O and OB: the failure of researchers to accord construct validity the same deference as substantive validity (Schwab, 1980). Researchers who fail to invest the necessary time and effort to develop psychometrically sound instruments (i.e., construct valid) often face situations in which "it is unclear whether substantive findings, or lack of substantive findings, reflect true relationships between variables or simply inadequacies in instrumentation" (Sackett & Larson, 1990, p. 467). As a matter of fact, the failure to focus on the construct validity of our measures has lead to erroneous or unwarranted substantive knowledge being derived from instruments that were later found to be not construct valid (Schwab, 1980). Entire lines of research have been called into question and many hours of research have been wasted as a result of this highly dysfunctional state of affairs. An excellent example of the costs of this failure is the case of the Need Satisfaction Questionnaire (Porter, 1961). As Carson and Bedelian (1994) point out, the failure to focus on the construct validity of measurement instruments "can lead to in inaccuracies in interpreting findings, drawing inferences, and building a sound knowledge base" (p. 8).
Sackett and Larson (1990) have called attention to the fact that researchers often face situations where there is a "distinct tradeoff" between the ease of using an instrument that is "not fatally flawed," but nevertheless could be substantially improved, and the significant investment in time and effort required to develop a new and better one. In the equity sensitivity area, researchers face a similar situation. Researchers in this area have a measure, the ESI, that is "not fatally flawed" (given that the ESI has relatively good psychometric properties and has demonstrated some utility for predicting reactions to different states of equity), but it is nevertheless less than ideal (because the ESI is deficient in its operationalization of the construct). As a result, equity sensitivity researchers confront the tradeoff between the ease of using the ESI and the significant investment in time and effort required to develop a new and better measure of equity sensitivity. Until now researchers in this area have chosen the convenient option, it is therefore the purpose of this paper to design, develop, and evaluate a new and better measure of equity sensitivity. This measure will be based on systematic item development procedures which are crucial both in the construction of reliable content valid measure of equity sensitivity and in gaining a "clearer" understanding of the nomological network linking an equity sensitivity measure with its theoretically relevant constructs (Carson & Bedelian, 1994).
Research Plan

The purpose of this study is to address the primary problem that characterizes the equity sensitivity area, as delineated in the previous section. Specifically, the primary purpose is to construct, based upon systematic item development procedures, a theoretically based Equity Sensitivity measure that provides thorough coverage of the construct. Once developed, this instrument will be pretested and its factor structure, item characteristics, and reliability will be assessed. Then, a nomological network for the new instrument will be constructed. More precisely, its convergent, discriminant, and nomological validity will be assessed using a number of theoretically and nontheoretically related variables. Finally, the new instrument will be validated using a typical equity theory/equity sensitivity theory laboratory paradigm similar to that used by Austin et al. (1980) and King et al. (1993). In this laboratory study, the predictive utility of the new instrument, as well as the ESI, will be compared using paper and pencil work scenarios depicting underpayment, overpayment, and equitable payment where self-report reactions to the inequity/equity will be measured (i.e., job satisfaction and pay satisfaction).
CHAPTER 2
METHODOLOGY

To facilitate the advancement of equity sensitivity research, it is necessary to develop a measure of equity sensitivity that is both reliable and valid. It is also important that the measure not suffer from response sets such as socially desirable responding. Chapter 2 describes the research methods for developing the proposed measure of equity sensitivity.

Outline of the Phases in Measure Development

The following is an outline of the steps taken in developing a reliable and valid measure of equity sensitivity that was resistant to socially desirable responding. Each of these steps will be described in more detail following the outline.

I. Item Generation and Content Validity

A. Specific definitions of Huseman et al.'s (1987) four dimensions of equity sensitivity were formulated. Within each dimension, the preferences of the three equity sensitivity types were delineated.

B. Items were generated for each type within the dimension using the false consensus effect, the similarity attraction effect, and the similar to me bias. Also, items were constructed using the traditional approach to scale development.
C. To establish content validity, independent judges classified the items into the four dimensions of equity sensitivity and the three types in equity sensitivity theory.

D. Retained items were then randomly combined into a questionnaire.

II. Pretest and Reliability Assessment

A. Data pertaining to developing the measure were collected from undergraduate students at Louisiana State University.

1. After collecting the data, a principal-axes factor analysis with an oblique (promax) rotation was conducted to determine the factor structure of the questionnaire.

2. Frequency distributions were evaluated to determine if individual items suffered from restriction of range.

3. Items were correlated with a measure of socially desirable responding to assess possible biasing effects due to socially desirable responding.

4. Finally, coefficient alphas were calculated for each dimension revealed in the factor analysis.

B. In a second pilot study, data were collected from undergraduate students at Louisiana State University.
These students responded to items retained from the initial pilot study.

1. Again, principal-axes factor analysis was conducted to verify the factor solution revealed in the initial pilot study. An equal number of items loading on each dimension were retained for the final questionnaire.

2. Dimension reliabilities were assessed.

III. Construct Validation Research

A. To construct a nomological network, data were collected from two samples of undergraduate students at Louisiana State University. One sample was used to conduct the discriminant validity assessment. The other sample was used to conduct the nomological validity assessment. Both samples were used to conduct the convergent validity assessment.

1. Convergent Validity Assessment
   a. The new measure of equity sensitivity was correlated with the ESI to determine its convergent validity.

2. Discriminant Validity Assessment
   a. The new measure of equity sensitivity was correlated with measures of other nontheoretically related variables to assess its discriminant validity.
3. Nomological Validity Assessment
   a. The new measure of equity sensitivity was correlated with measures of other theoretically related variables to assess its nomological validity.

IV. Measure Validation Research
   A. To assess the predictive utility of the new measure of equity sensitivity, a laboratory study using a methodology similar to that used in Austin, McGinn, and Susmilch (1980) and King et al. (1993) was conducted. Here, the relation between both measures of equity sensitivity and reactions to different states of equity (underpayment, overpayment, and equitable payment) were examined in a sample of undergraduate students. This laboratory experiment allowed a head-to-head comparison of the predictive utility of both measures.

   Measure Development (Phase I)

   In constructing this new measure of equity sensitivity, special emphasis was placed on developing a measure that more completely measures the equity sensitivity construct and that is more resistant to socially desirable responding. By providing a more comprehensive coverage of the construct and by eliminating or reducing socially desirable responding, it was hypothesized that we would get a better estimate of an individual's "true" equity
sensitivity orientation. Whereas accomplishing the goal of greater construct coverage was relatively straightforward, the goal of eliminating socially desirable responding was a bit more complex. To accomplish this goal, a methodology that assesses the attitude reliably and accurately while, at the same time, avoids the transparency problem that characterizes the ESI had to be located. The methodology arrived at was a perceptual/judgment test of equity sensitivity. Such a methodology does not depend on what individuals know about themselves (i.e., self-awareness) and are willing to relate (i.e., impression management; Nunnally, 1978). This methodology, as hypothesized by Hollenbeck and Whitener (1988), would allow us to reduce socially desirable responding on the measure and as such, would provide us with a measure that possibly has more predictive utility. Three specific psychological phenomena that are consistent with this perceptual/judgment methodology outlined by Nunnally (1978) were identified. These phenomena are described in detail along with the rest of the measure development process next.

Item Generation (Phases IA and IB)

Huseman et al.'s (1987) theoretical propositions (see Table 1) were used as the theoretical foundation for the proposed Equity Sensitivity measure. Items were generated to tap all four dimensions in the equity sensitivity construct: preference for level of inputs, preference for level of outcomes, preference for
inputs relative to outcomes, and preference for a certain equity ratio relative to a referent other. Within each dimension of equity sensitivity, items were generated to tap each equity sensitivity orientation. This was done to ensure that our operationalization of the construct was not deficient.

Items were generated using two general approaches: the traditional approach of developing items that directly inquire about an individual's standing on the variable of interest and a second approach that involves developing items that indirectly inquire about the individual's standing on the variable of interest. The latter approach is explained in more detail below.

Items that indirectly assess equity sensitivity were generated using a perceptual/judgment variable (Hollenbeck & Whitener, 1988; Nunnally, 1978). The perceptual/judgment variable was to ask the respondent about other people and their sensitivity to equity. Zerbe and Paulhus (1987) have noted that the ratings of others though evaluative and informative do not seem to evoke socially desirable responding. Apparently, this is the case because such questions are not threatening to the respondent's self-esteem or ego (Sudman & Bradburn, 1974) and they do not make a person feel "on the spot".

Three specific psychological phenomena, the false consensus effect, similarity attraction effect, and the similar to me bias, are consistent with the above notion. They were used to assess
equity sensitivity indirectly. The "false consensus" effect (Ross, Greene, & House, 1977) refers to the tendency for individuals "to see their own behavioral choices and judgments as relatively common and appropriate to existing circumstance, while viewing alternative responses as uncommon, deviant, and inappropriate" (Ross et al., 1977, p.280). It is an egocentric bias that causes individuals to overestimate the degree that other people are like them. For example, people who are dishonest (i.e., steal) see theft as being more prevalent than people who are honest (i.e., don't steal; Terris, 1979). The "false consensus" effect is operationally defined as the situation where a person engaging in a given behavior estimates that behavior to be shared by a larger proportion of some reference group than would be estimated by a person engaging in an alternative behavior. That is, the false consensus effect is evidenced by a positive correlation between one's own position and estimates of others' positions across judges within items (Dawes, 1989). The bias in the false consensus effect is relative to the perceptions of those who endorse a different or opposite position. Furthermore, "the false consensus effect has no direct bearing on whether subjects will overestimate, underestimate, or accurately estimate the actual consensus for their own behavior," according to Mullen et al. (1985, p. 263).
In the seminal studies investigating the false consensus effect, Ross et al. (1977) found substantial support for the false consensus effect. In one study, Ross et al. asked experimental participants whether they would be willing to walk around their campus wearing a large sandwich board displaying the message "Eat at Joe's." Of the 80 subjects, 48 (62%) agreed to wear the sign. These subjects believed that most (62%) of their peers would wear such a sign, whereas the subjects who refused to wear the sign estimated that only 33 percent of their peers would wear the sign.

In another study, Ross et al. demonstrated that the false consensus effect holds for political beliefs as well. In this study, students who were supportive of women's liberation judged that 60% of other students were also in support of women's liberation. In contrast, students who were opposed to women's liberation judged that only 49.5% of students were in favor of women's liberation.

Subsequent studies of the false consensus effect (e.g., Gilovich, Jennings, & Jennings, 1983; Goethals, Allison, & Frost, 1979; Range, Neyra, & Goggin, 1988; Sherman, Presson, & Chassin, 1984) have shown this effect to be quite robust. Additional support for this point is provided by a meta-analysis conducted by Mullen, Atkins, Champion, Edwards, Hardy, Story, and Vanderklok (1985). In this meta-analysis of 115 tests of the false consensus effect, it was revealed that the effect is highly reliable and of
a moderate magnitude. Specifically, the average effect size for the false consensus effect corresponds to a correlation of .31. Mullen et al. also found that the magnitude of the effect was unrelated to the actual consensus for a particular position or to the generality of the target population. Also, the effect was greater in magnitude when few, as opposed to many, items were used to assess it in the study and when subjects made their consensus estimates prior to their own self-ratings.

Relatedly, Range, Neyra, and Goggin (1988) demonstrated the false consensus effect for both favorable (intelligence) and unfavorable (psychological disturbance) characteristics and positive (honor) and negative (suicide) events. For example, subjects who viewed themselves as relatively intelligent viewed others as relatively intelligent, whereas subjects who viewed themselves as psychologically disturbed viewed others as relatively disturbed. Thus, the false consensus effect operates for both positive and negative items.

Using this paradigm, people were asked to state their sensitivity to equity. They then were asked to estimate the consensus for their attitude among adult workers (a general target population). For example, subjects were asked "how many employees in a typical organization (i.e., what percent) are takers?". On this type of question, the referent was kept deliberately vague, as compared to questions that directly inquire about one's self,
to encourage the person to add their own feelings, thoughts, and preferences to the question. According to the false consensus effect, people will see their equity sensitivity preference as being more common than individuals who have a different equity sensitivity preference. For example, people who are Entitleds will see entitlement and its preferences as being more prevalent than will individuals who are Benevolents or Equity Sensitives. Extrapolating from Range, Neyra, and Goggin (1988), which revealed that the false consensus effect operates for both positive and negative characteristics, the false consensus effect should operate for estimates of equity sensitivity (positive characteristics), benevolence (positive characteristics), and entitlement (negative characteristic). Therefore, items were constructed for all four dimensions of equity sensitivity employing the false consensus effect.

The similarity attraction effect (e.g., Byrne, 1971; Festinger, 1954) was also employed in constructing questions that avoid the social desirability response set. The similarity attraction effect is one of the most tested and widely accepted proposition in social psychology. It has been demonstrated repeatedly that people are attracted to and associate with others who act and think similarly to themselves. Based upon this effect, questions such as "How many of your friends want something for nothing at work?" were asked. We expected Entitleds
(Benevolents) to have more friends who are Entitleds (Benevolents) than either Benevolents (Entitleds) or Equity Sensitives. This type of question, as stated earlier, is not likely to evoke socially desirable responding because it does not threaten the person's self-esteem or ego when you ask them about other people.

Relatedly, the similar to me bias was also used in constructing questions that indirectly assess an individual's equity sensitivity. The similar to me bias refers to the fact that, generally, people prefer others who share their attitudes, background, and experiences. In a study of personal bias in the employment interview, Baskett (1973) reported that applicant's perceived similarity to the interviewer resulted in higher judgments concerning their competency and recommended salary but no greater likelihood of recommended hiring. Frank and Hackman (1975), in a study of similarity effects in actual college admission interviews conducted by three college officials, found considerable variation in the effect of rater-ratee similarity. In this study, one interviewer showed no similarity effects, one showed positive but weak effects, and one showed strong, positive effects of similarity. Other interview studies (Peters & Torborg, 1975; Rand & Wexley, 1975; Wexley & Nemeroff, 1975) provide additional support for the similar to me bias. In the only study using a performance appraisal setting involving manager-subordinate dyads, Pulakos and Wexley (1983) found that perceived
similarity between the rater and ratee, not actual similarity, resulted in higher ratings than when dissimilarity was perceived. In the area of honesty testing, it has been repeatedly demonstrated that people who steal or who are dishonest will tend to punish people who steal less than will people who do not steal or who are honest (e.g., Cunningham & Ash, 1988; Terris, 1979a). This finding can be taken as indirect evidence that a similarity effect is operating in individual judgments of proper discipline for acts of theft.

Overall, the research on the similar to me bias is mixed but mostly positive. In other words, some people are biased in favor of individuals like themselves, others are not. Also, the similar to me bias affects some decisions such as ratings of competency and salary decisions, but not others such as hiring decisions. However, for the most part the similar to me bias operates for many people and for many different types of decisions. Based on the similar to me bias, questions were constructed for each equity sensitivity orientation. For example, questions such as "How willing would you be to work with a person who is concerned only with getting as much as he/she can from his/her employer?" were asked. We expected a person who is a certain equity sensitivity orientation to give higher ratings to people who have a similar equity sensitivity orientation. Again, because this type of question does not inquire directly about a person's equity
sensitivity orientation it is less likely to elicit socially desirable responding.

Additional support for the usefulness of these three psychological phenomena in assessing attitudes is provided by the area of written, honesty tests. These three psychological phenomena have been successfully used in identifying people who are prone to steal in organizations (e.g., Terris, 1979). Specifically, they have been used in various honesty test, most notably The Reid Report (1986) and The Personnel Selection Inventory (London House, 1988), to measure a job applicant's attitudes and cognitions toward theft. Both the Reid Report and The Personnel Selection Inventory have been shown to be helpful in predicting which prospective employees may steal (e.g., Ash, 1970, 1971, 1975, 1987 [cited in Cunningham & Ash, 1987]; Brown, Jones, Terris, & Steffy, 1987; McDaniel & Jones, 1988; Sackett, Burris, & Callahan, 1989). The Personnel Selection Inventory is the honesty test with the most published research concerning its ability to screen out "theft-prone" applicants. It has also been subjected to the most scientific scrutiny. The PSI and its relevant research will be reviewed in detail here as evidence that these three psychological effects have utility in measuring an attitude (i.e., theft) that is especially prone to socially desirable responding.
In terms of test content, the dishonesty scale of the PSI measures the following psychological constructs (Rafilson & Grant, 1989): (a) tolerance of others who steal (i.e., similar to me bias), (b) estimates about the extent of theft by other people (i.e., false consensus effect), (c) acceptance of common rationalizations for theft, (d) ruminations about theft, and (e) admissions of theft-related activities. Examples of questions for each psychological construct are as follows: (a) Should a person caught taking small merchandise from his company still be given a promotion which was earned and deserved?, (b) How many low paid workers will steal from their employers?, (c) Do you agree that low wages will force honest employees to take money from their employers without authorization?, (d) Do you ever think of doing things which, strictly speaking, are dishonest?, and (e) Have you often taken, without permission, company merchandise or property from your jobs?

The dishonesty scale of the PSI has been shown to accurately predict, for example, theft admissions made in a pre-employment polygraph (Terris, 1979), applicants who are likely to get caught stealing once hired (Jones & Terris, 1981), and applicants who are likely to make theft admissions in an anonymous testing situation (Jones, 1980, 1981; Terris, 1979b). Likewise, Sackett, Burris, and Callahan (1989), reanalyzing McDaniel and Jones' (1988) bare-bones meta-analysis of 23 criterion-related validity studies using
the Personnel Selection Inventory (London House, 1988) and various theft criteria, found a mean validity coefficient of .30 [this is down from the mean validity coefficient of .50 originally found by McDaniel and Jones (1988)]. Additional support for the validity of the dishonesty scale comes from shrinkage and turnover reduction studies. The use of the dishonesty scale of the PSI has been associated with significant shrinkage reductions (Brown, Jones, Terris, & Steffy, 1987; Brown & Pardue, 1985; Terris & Jones, 1982) and significant reductions in terminations due to theft (Brown et al., 1987; Jones & Terris, 1985).

Finally, further support for this honesty test comes from the American Psychological Association (Fuchsberg, 1991). The nation's largest body of psychologists has offered qualified support for written, honesty tests. In fact, they have stated that overall the evidence indicates that some of these tests (e.g., The Reid Report, 1986; Personnel Selection Inventory, 1988) help to predict which applicants may steal on the job. From the totality of the evidence presented previously it appears that honesty, which should be extremely susceptible to socially desirable responding, can be reliably and accurately measured through the use of written, honesty tests. This research on honesty tests and their predictive validity can be taken as indirect evidence that the use of the false consensus effect, similarity-attraction effect, and similar to me bias is helpful in measuring honesty reliably and accurately.
From the empirical evidence presented it has been demonstrated that each of these psychological effects, the false consensus effect, the similarity-attraction effect, and the similar to me bias, is both reliable and robust and have utility for measuring hard to assess attitudes (i.e., theft). Therefore, they were used in constructing items for the new measure of equity sensitivity. Items for each theoretical dimension of equity sensitivity were generated using the three psychological effects. In addition, the four theoretical dimensions were assessed using the traditional approach to scale development (i.e., items will be developed that directly inquire about a person's equity sensitivity orientation and preferences). Item format (i.e., direct and indirect items) for this new measure of equity sensitivity is consistent with the format used in the Personnel Selection Inventory.

The primary source of items for the new measure of equity sensitivity was other theoretically related personality measures. These measures included the Equity Sensitivity Instrument (Huseman et al., 1987), Mach IV scale (Christie & Geis, 1970), the Misanthropy scale (Sullivan & Adelson, 1954), the People in General scale (Banta, 1961), the Philosophies of Human Nature scale (Wrightsman, 1964; 1974), the Protestant Ethic scales (Blood, 1969; Mirels and Garrett, 1971), and the Survey of Work
Values (Wollack, Goodale, Wiltjing, & Smith, 1971). Relevant items from these scales were altered in order to tap the four dimensions of equity sensitivity and their accompanying three types (cf. Gordon, Philpot, Burt, Thompson, & Spiller, 1980).

Whereas it was assumed that these types of questions were relatively free from socially desirable responding, this proposition was tested by correlating each item with the Balanced Inventory of Desirable Responding (Paulhus, 1984, 1988 [cited in Paulhus, 1991]). Specifically, each item was correlated with the two scales comprising the BIDR: the self-deception scale and the impression management scale. Following the advice of Holden and Fekken (1989), if any of the items correlated significantly with this measure of social desirability, they were to be excluded from the instrument. Minimizing the effects of the two social desirability components, self-deception and impression management, helped to ensure that the equity sensitivity construct being measured was uncontaminated by extraneous, stylistic variance (Holden & Fekken, 1989).

Content Validity (Phase 1C)

Content validity involves specifying a focal domain and developing items associated with that domain (Cronbach & Meehl, 1955; Zeller & Carmines, 1980). This type of validity is established by demonstrating the proposed items tap the intended domain of interest (Cronbach & Meehl, 1955). Unfortunately, there are no agreed upon criteria for determining a measure's content
validity (Carmines & Zeller, 1979). Content validity is essentially a judgment call (Nunnally, 1978). The most common way to establish content validity of a measure is to have informed judges assess whether items are representative of the domain being investigated or not (Green, Tull, & Albaum, 1988).

Independent judges with post-masters degree training in I/O psychology or management classified the items from Phase 1 into Huseman et al.'s four theoretical dimensions of equity sensitivity and into Huseman et al.'s three equity sensitivity types. If any of the judges disagreed about the classification of an item, it was thrown out. If the group of items that survived the content validity analysis was deficient in tapping the dimension (Schwab, 1980), item generation for that dimension was repeated and another content validity analysis was conducted.

Scale Construction (Phase 10)

Five-point Likert scales were used to gauge subjects' responses to the items. Whether the specific number of anchors is 4 to 8, research suggests that neither reliability nor the predictive and concurrent validities of a scale are likely to be affected (Bendig, 1954; Komorita, 1963; Matell & Jacoby, 1971, 1972). In a Monte Carlo study, Lissitz and Green (1976) demonstrated that, in terms of reliability, there is relatively little to be gained after 5 scale points. Furthermore, five-point scales do not demonstrate a great deal of overlap between adjacent
anchor judgments (Bass, Cascio, O'Connor, 1974). Therefore, 5-point scales were used in this new measure of equity sensitivity.

Because items were generated using a number of different approaches (i.e., false consensus effect, similarity attraction effect, similar to me bias, and the traditional approach), it was also necessary to use different Likert response formats for each of these different item types. A separate Likert format was used for items generated using the false consensus effect. This Likert response format was used on items designed to tap the individual's perception of other people's sensitivity to equity (i.e., consensus estimates). It consisted of the following five anchors: "0 to 20\%", "21-40\%", "41-60\%", "61-80\%", and "81-100\%".

For the similarity-attraction effect, a single Likert response format was used on items designed to assess the individual's perception of how his/her friends rate on the equity sensitivity dimensions. It consisted of the following five anchors: "many", "some", "few", "very few", and "none". For items generated using either the similar to me bias or the traditional approach, a single Likert response format of "strongly disagree", "disagree", "neither agree nor disagree", "agree", and "strongly agree" anchored the 5-point scale.

Pretest and Reliability Assessment (Phase II)

Hair et al. (1987) indicate that at least 50 observations, and preferably 100 or more, are needed for conducting principal-
axes factor analysis, a statistical technique used in developing this measure. As a general rule, Hair et al. (1987) suggest that the observation to variable ratio should be 4 or 5 to 1. Likewise, Nunnally (1978) suggests that as a rule of thumb there should be 5 to 10 times as many respondents as items. The problem with these rules, as with many others reported in the literature, is that none of them is empirically based (Guadagnoli & Velicer, 1988).

Guadagnoli and Velicer (1988), in a Monte Carlo study, provide an answer to this problem. They demonstrated that the critical determinants in achieving a stable and accurate sample factor pattern are absolute sample size and most importantly, component saturation (i.e., the magnitude of the correlation between the observed variables and the components). To a lesser degree, the number of variables per component (factor) was also important. Contrary to conventional wisdom in this area (e.g., Hair et al., 1987; Nunnally, 1978), rules that require a certain N to p ratio (e.g., 2:1, 5:1, 10:1, and 20:1) were clearly not supported. The concept that to obtain a stable factor pattern more observations are needed as the number of variables increases is clearly incorrect. Indeed, the results of this study revealed an opposite relation: larger variables sets always lead to more stable patterns at any sample size levels, given that the number of observations always exceeds the number of variables.
Therefore, to determine the sample size needed to achieve a stable and accurate sample factor pattern, one must know the number of variables defining a component (factor) and most importantly, component saturation level. For our purposes, we expected to generate at least 4 to 5 variables (items) for each component (dimension of equity sensitivity). As for component saturation, Likert response formats of five or seven points typically yield moderate to high component loadings [.60 range] (Comrey & Montag, 1982; Velicer, DiClemente, & Corriveau, 1984). Given the above information, Guadagnoli and Velicer's (1988) calculations reveal that a stable and accurate factor pattern is achieved when sample size is equal to or greater than 100 observations, given that the number of observations (sample size) always exceeds the number of items. Therefore, the sample size used in these factor analyses was always greater than the number of items being analyzed.

The initial pilot study was conducted with a sample (n>100 and n>\# of items) of undergraduate students at Louisiana State University. The major objective of this initial pilot study was to develop a reliable measure. Measures need to be reliable because reliability sets the upper limit on validity (Cascio, 1987). First, to empirically confirm the four proposed theoretical dimensions of equity sensitivity, a principal-axes or common factor analysis was conducted. There were a number of reasons for using a principal-axes or common factor analysis
rather than a principal components analysis (Gorsuch, 1991). The overriding reason for using common factor analysis was that common factor analysis assumes that variables are measured with error whereas principal components analysis assumes that they are measured without error. Because the variables of interest in this dissertation were measured with error, common factor analysis appeared to be the more appropriate analysis. Three stopping rules were used to determine the number of factors to retain. These stopping rules were Kaiser's (1960) eigenvalue-greater-than-1.0 rule, Cattell's (1966) scree test, and the percentage of explained variance (Hair et al., 1987; Kim & Mueller, 1978; Stevens, 1986).

The eigenvalue-greater-than-1.0 rule is the most widely used criterion among researchers (Hair et al., 1987; Stevens, 1986). This rule retains only those factors that have an eigenvalue greater than 1.0 (Stevens, 1986). There is, however, one problem with this rule. It consistently overestimates the number of factors in a data set (Zwick & Velicer, 1986). The scree test, based on a graph of eigenvalues of the factors, retains all eigenvalues (and hence factors) before the point where the eigenvalues begin to level off and form a straight line with an almost horizontal slope (Kim & Mueller, 1978). However, there are problems associated with interpreting a data set's "break point." For example, there may be more than one "break point" in a data
set or even more problematic, there may be no obvious "break point" in a data set (Zwick & Velicer, 1986).

Given that both stopping rules have weaknesses, the percentage of explained variance was also used in determining the number of factors to be retained (Hair et al., 1987; Kim & Mueller, 1978; Stevens, 1986). According to Stevens (1986), "generally one would want to account for at least 70% of the variance of the total variances (p. 342)." To aid in interpreting the retained factors, an oblique rotation was used to achieve a simple, more meaningful factor solution. An oblique rotation was chosen because it was assumed that the dimensions or factors of equity sensitivity were correlated with one another. Specifically, Huseman et al. (1987) note that each dimension of equity sensitivity builds upon its predecessor. After rotation, factor loadings were examined. Those items loading sufficiently high (.35 or above) on the factors were retained for further measure development (Hair et al., 1987; Stewart, 1981).

Items retained from the factor analysis were to be be deleted if they suffered from range restriction (Hunter & Schmidt, 1990). Range restriction can hide significant construct effects through attenuation. Thus, an examination of the frequency distributions was undertaken to determine if individual items suffered from range restriction. If an item did suffer from range restriction, it was to be deleted (cf. Chao & Kozlowski, 1986). For example,
if it was found that for an individual item that the majority of respondents restrict their ratings to the middle values of the scale and only 5% of the respondents use the extreme rating values, then this item was deleted.

Next, in addition to the equity sensitivity items, Paulhus' (1984, 1988[cited in Paulhus, 1991]) 40-item measure of social desirability, the Balanced Inventory of Desirable Responding (BIDR), was administered to the respondents in the initial pilot study. Retained items from the factor analysis that correlated significantly (greater than +/- .40) with any of the three scales in the BIDR were to be eliminated. Correlations between items and socially desirable responding of +/- .40 and below have been used to demonstrate the absence of biasing due to social desirability (cf. Carson & Bedeian, 1993).

The BIDR appears in Appendix B. It consists of two 20 item scales: a self-deception scale and an impression management scale. Responses to each statement were made on a 5-point scale ranging from not true (1) to very true (5). One point was added for extreme responses (4 or 5). Hence, total scores on both scales can range from 0 to 20. All 40 items were summed to yield an overall measure of socially desirable responding. The scores in this instance can range from 0 to 40. Previous studies have found coefficient alphas ranging from .68 to .80 for the self-deception scale and from .75 to .86 for the impression management scale.

Finally, the reliability of each dimension of equity sensitivity was assessed. For multi-item scales, internal consistency is computed because it conveys important information regarding the reliability of the scale (Carmines & Zeller, 1979). Items lowering the internal consistency of a scale were to be identified in the initial pilot study and eliminated. The standard of reliability that was used in this case was .70. Nunnally (1978) suggests that this level of reliability is appropriate when dealing with the early stages of research.

In the second pilot study, involving a sample (n>100 and n># of items) of undergraduates at Louisiana State University, subjects responded to items retained from the initial pilot study. As in the initial pilot study, a principal-axes or common factor analysis was conducted to confirm the factor structure found in the initial factor analysis. Then, reliabilities for each dimension of equity sensitivity were assessed. If the reliabilities of the four scales were roughly .70 or greater
(Nunnally, 1978), an equal number of items were retained for each factor. However, if the reliabilities were found to be too low (i.e., below .70), then steps in Phase 1 and Phase 2 were to be repeated (Churchill, 1979).

**Construct Validation (Phase III)**

The third phase of this dissertation was primarily concerned with the construct validity of the new measure of equity sensitivity. Construct validity is composed of three general subtypes of validity: (a) convergent validity, (b) discriminant validity, and (c) nomological validity (Campbell & Fiske, 1959; Green et al., 1988). Convergent validity was assessed by measuring the degree of correspondence between the proposed measure of equity sensitivity and the ESI. Discriminant validity was assessed by measuring the degree of relation between the new measure of equity sensitivity and independent (nontheoretically related) measures of different constructs. For example, equity sensitivity should not be too highly correlated with other personality variables such as old-fashionedness (Ray, 1990) or locus of control (Rotter, 1966). With nomological validity, a researcher is concerned with testing the linkages between a construct and theoretically related variables (Schwab, 1980). For example, the new equity sensitivity measure should be significantly correlated with exchange ideology (King & Miles, 1994) and Machiavellianism (King & Miles, 1992).
Sample. Two samples were used in assessing the construct validity of the new measure of equity sensitivity. One sample was used to assess its discriminant validity and the other sample was used to assess its nomological validity. Both samples were used to assess its convergent validity. Each sample consisted of undergraduate students at Louisiana State University who completed a series of measurement instruments.

Using Cohen's (1977) guidelines for establishing appropriate sample sizes, one can arrive at a sample size that will help to minimize Type II errors and that will provide a researcher with sufficient power to detect meaningful relations among variables. In determining the appropriate sample size, one must consider: (a) the level of significance desired, (b) the amount of power desired, and (c) the anticipated effect size, according to Cohen (1977).

Cohen (1977) advises that when using the conventional level of significance of .05, a researcher should also use a power value of .80. As for anticipated effect size, it should be based on the pattern of correlations between equity sensitivity and other variables. King and Miles (1994) reported the following correlations between equity sensitivity and theoretically related variables: positive affect, .31; Machiavellianism, -.22; and Exchange Ideology, -.29. In addition, research has revealed that personality variables accounts for about 10% of the variance.
(r = .32) in behavior (Buckley et al., 1990). Using this information, the desired effect size was set at .20, a small to medium effect size according to Cohen (1977). Given this effect size (.20), a significance level of .05, and a power value of .80, a sample size of 153 was recommended for each sample. Therefore, both samples contained at least 153 subjects.

**Analysis.** A correlation matrix was constructed for all three aspects of construct validation.

**Convergent Validity Assessment (Phase IIIA)**

Convergent validity was assessed by measuring the degree of correspondence between the new measure of equity sensitivity and the ESI. With convergent validity, one would expect high positive correlations between the two equity sensitivity measures. However, given the differences in theoretical development between Huseman et al.'s (1985) measure and the proposed equity sensitivity measure, their correlation should be somewhat less than perfect. Thus, Hypothesis 1 states:

**H1:** There should be a significant positive correlation between the new measure of equity sensitivity and the ESI.

Furthermore, given their contrasting structures (unidimensional versus multidimensional), the two measures were expected to yield different theoretical insights. Specifically, the new multidimensional measure of equity sensitivity was expected to
help reveal theoretically relevant relations previously masked by the ESI's unidimensional structure.

Although convergent validity has been overemphasized in I/O and OB research, it is still useful to know the extent to which two measures of the same construct yield similar results (Schwab, 1980). Schwab (1980) notes:

If two or more measures do not converge and if it is assumed that method variance, if any, adds rather than detracts from the resulting correlation, it can be concluded that at least one of the procedures is not providing construct valid results. Thus, convergence can still be viewed as necessary to construct validity. (pp. 18-19)

**Measures.** To assess convergent validity the two measures of equity sensitivity, the new equity sensitivity measure and the ESI, were administered to each subject.

The ESI (see Appendix A) is a five-item, forced distribution instrument designed to tap an individual's preference for outcomes versus inputs in a general work situation. On each item, two statements are presented: one is an Entitled response and the other is a Benevolent response. Subjects show their agreement by distributing ten points between the two statements. A total Equity Sensitivity score is obtained by summing the points allocated to the Entitled response on each item. Scores on the ESI can range from 0 (most benevolent) to 50 (most entitled).
Previous research on the ESI has found internal consistency coefficients that range from .79 to .88 (King & Day, 1992) and a test-retest reliability of .80 using a three week intertest interval (Miles et al., 1989).

**Discriminant Validity Assessment (Phase IIIB)**

Discriminant validity was assessed by measuring the degree of relation between the new measure of equity sensitivity and independent measures of different constructs. Discriminant validity provides important information regarding the distinctiveness of the construct being measured. For example, equity sensitivity should not be too highly correlated with certain other personality variables such as locus of control (Rotter, 1966) or self-monitoring (Snyder, 1974). Thus, Hypotheses 2, 3, and 4 state:

**H2**: There should be no significant correlation between the new measure of equity sensitivity and locus of control.

**H3**: There should be no significant correlation between the new measure of equity sensitivity and self-monitoring.

**H4**: There should be no significant correlation between the new measure of equity sensitivity and old-fashionedness.
Measures. 1. To assess discriminant validity, measures of locus of control (Rotter, 1966), self-monitoring (Snyder, 1974), and old-fashionedness (Adorno et al., 1950; Ray, 1990) were administered to each subject.

Rotter's (1966) I-E instrument was used to measure locus of control. The I-E instrument (see Appendix C) consists of 23 item statement pairs, using a forced-choice format, plus 6 filler item statement pairs. Internal statements are paired with external statements. One point is given for every external statement selected. Scores on the I-E instrument can range from 0 (most internal) to 23 (most external). Rotter (1966) reported an internal consistency coefficient (Kuder-Richardson) of .70 and a test-retest reliability coefficient (using a one month intertest interval) of .72 for this measure.

Snyder's (1974) self-monitoring instrument was used to measure self-monitoring. The self-monitoring instrument (see Appendix D) consists of 25 items. Responses to each item were made using a dichotomous scale of true/mostly true and false/not usually true. Scores on this instrument can range from 0 (low self-monitor) to 25 (high self-monitor). Snyder (1974) reported an internal consistency coefficient (Kuder-Richardson 20) of .70 and a test-retest reliability coefficient (using a 5 week intertest interval) of .83 for this measure.
Adorno et al.'s (1950) California F scale, Form 40-45, was used to measure old-fashioned orientation (Ray, 1990). The F scale (see Appendix E) consists of 30 items. Responses to each item were made on a scale ranging from disagree strongly (1) to agree strongly (7). Omissions will be given a mid-point value of 4. Scores on this instrument can range from 30 (low old-fashionedness) to 210 (high old-fashionedness). Adorno et al. (1950) reported an average split-half reliability of .90 for Form 40-45 of the California F scale.

Nomological Validity Assessment (Phase IIIIC)

With nomological validity, the researcher is concerned with testing the linkages between a measure and theoretically related variables (Schwab, 1980). Theoretically related variables in this case are those individual difference variables in the past that have shown to influence perceptions of and reactions to different states of equity. For example, the proposed measure of equity sensitivity should be significantly correlated with Interpersonal Orientation (Swap & Rubin, 1983), Machiavellianism (Blumstein & Weinstein, 1969), the Protestant Ethic (Mirels & Garrett, 1971), and Exchange Ideology (King & Miles, 1994). A nomological network that includes these individual difference variables has been constructed below. A nomological network is important in defining the exact nature/meaning of the scores on the proposed measure of the equity sensitivity construct (Cronbach & Meehl, 1955; Kagan, 1988).
Nomological Network. A number of relationships were predicted among the preceding variables and the two measures of equity sensitivity. As for interpersonal orientation (IO), Swap and Rubin (1983) found that individuals high on IO were more people and relationship oriented whereas individuals low on IO were more concerned about the economic aspects of the relationship. Equity Sensitives and Benevolents should score higher on IO whereas Entitleds should score lower on IO. Thus, Hypothesis 5 states:

H5: There should be a negative correlation between the new measure of equity sensitivity and Interpersonal Orientation.

With respect to Machiavellianism, high Machs are more likely to be Entitled because they ignore the norm of reciprocity and use any opportunistic means to achieve their ends. Indeed, Blumstein and Weinstein (1969) demonstrated that high Machs were more likely to take advantage of a partner who had previously benefited them whereas low Machs endorsed an equity norm when dealing with a partner. Likewise, King and Miles (1994) found a correlation of .22 between scores on the ESI (Huseman et al., 1985) and scores on the Mach V instrument (Christie & Geis, 1971). Entitleds scored high on the Mach V instrument whereas Equity Sensitives and Benevolents scored low on the Mach V instrument. Thus, Hypothesis 6 states:
H6: There should be a positive correlation between the new measure of equity sensitivity and Machiavellianism.

In terms of the Protestant Ethic (PE), Equity Sensitives should score high because high PE endorsers have a preference for maintaining an input-outcome correspondence. Likewise, Benevolents should also score relatively high on Protestant Ethic because high PE endorsers value giving or self-sacrificing to one's work as a means of finding personal significance (King & Miles, 1994). This value is consistent with Benevolents' preference for high inputs. On the other hand, Entitleds should score low on the Protestant Ethic because low PE endorsers are interested in getting something for nothing (Greenberg, 1978). Thus, Hypothesis 7 states:

H7: There should be a negative correlation between the new measure of equity sensitivity and the Protestant Ethic.

Finally, King and Miles (1994) found correlations of .08 (student sample) and .29 (bank employee sample) between the ESI and Exchange Ideology. According to King and Miles (1994), this occurred because Benevolents are less focused on the receipt of rewards in exchange relationships with organizations whereas Entitleds are more focused on the receipt of rewards. Thus, Hypothesis 8 states:
H8: There should be a positive correlation between the new measure of equity sensitivity and Exchange Ideology.

In terms of demographic variables, King and Miles (1994) reported no discernable pattern of relations between the ESI and gender, age or educational level. Thus, Hypotheses 9, 10, and 11 state:

H9: There should be no significant correlation between the new measure of equity sensitivity and gender.

H10: There should be no significant correlation between the new measure of equity sensitivity and age.

H11: There should be no significant correlation between the new measure of equity sensitivity and educational level.

Measures. To assess nomological validity, measures of Interpersonal Orientation (Swap & Rubin, 1983), Machiavellianism (Christie & Geis, 1970), the Protestant Ethic (Mirels & Garrett, 1971), and Exchange Ideology (Eisenberger, Huntington, Hutchison, & Sowa, 1986) were administered to each subject.

Interpersonal Orientation was measured using an instrument developed by Swap and Rubin (1983). Swap and Rubin's (1983) Interpersonal Orientation instrument (see Appendix F) consists of 29 items. Responses to each item were made on a 5-point scale
ranging from strongly disagree (1) to strongly agree (5). The instrument provides a possible score of 29 (low interpersonal orientation) to 145 (high interpersonal orientation) for each subject. Swap and Rubin (1983) reported satisfactory internal consistency (coefficient alpha=.79) and satisfactory test-retest reliability (5 week intertest interval, r=.76) for this measure.

Machiavellianism was measured using the Mach IV instrument developed by Christie and Geis (1970). The Mach IV instrument (see Appendix G) consists of 20 items. Responses to each item were made on a scale ranging from -3 (strongly disagree) to +3 (strongly agree) with the zero excluded. For ease of scoring, responses were converted to a seven-point scale by adding a constant of 4 to each item. Adding a constant score of 20 to each score, the instrument provides a possible score of 40 (low Mach) to 160 (high Mach), with 100 being the midpoint. Christie and Geis (1970) reported average item-test correlation of .38 and average split-half reliability of .79 for the Mach IV.

The Protestant Ethic was measured using an instrument developed by Mirels and Garrett (1971). Their Protestant Ethic instrument (see Appendix H) consists of 19 items and 11 filler items. Responses to each item were made on a scale ranging from -3 (strongly disagree) to +3 (strongly agree) with the 0 excluded. For ease of scoring, responses were converted to a seven-point scale by adding a constant of 4 to each item. The instrument
provides a possible score of 19 to 133 for each subject. Mirels and Garrett reported satisfactory internal consistency (Kuder-Richardson reliability of .79) as well as item-test correlations ranging from .24 to .55 for this measure.

Exchange ideology was measured by using an instrument developed by Eisenberger et al. (1986). The Exchange Ideology instrument (see Appendix I) measures the strength of an employee's belief that work effort should depend on how the organization treats the individual (a quid pro quo orientation). The instrument consists of five items. Responses to each item were made on a 7-point Likert scale ranging from strongly disagree (1) to strongly agree (7). The instrument provides a possible score range of 5 (low quid pro quo orientation) to 35 (high quid pro quo orientation). Eisenberger et al. (1986) reported satisfactory internal consistency (coefficient alpha=.80) for this measure.

In addition to these three measures, several demographic variables were collected using self-report for establishing nomological validity. These include gender, chronological age, and years of education.

**Measure Validation (Phase IV)**

In this final phase of the dissertation, the new measure of equity sensitivity was validated using a laboratory paradigm similar to that used in Austin, McGinn, and Susmilch (1980) and King et al. (1993). Specifically, relations between satisfaction
with different reward conditions and each of the two measures of equity sensitivity were investigated. In this phase of the dissertation, the incremental validity of the new equity sensitivity measure in predicting satisfaction with different reward conditions was also assessed.

Using both past equity theory research as well as past equity sensitivity research, a number of hypotheses were formulated for the relations between the independent variables of reward condition and equity sensitivity and the dependent variable of satisfaction, in an hourly payment system.

The first hypothesis deals with the relation between reward condition and job satisfaction. Overall, the research concerning reward condition and job satisfaction (e.g., Andrews, 1967; Evans & Simmons, 1969; Griffeth et al., 1989; Homans, 1953; Lawler & O'Gara, 1967; Pritchard et al., 1972) has generally revealed that underpayment results in significantly lower satisfaction than does equitable payment or overpayment. Findings concerning differences in satisfaction arising from equitable payment as opposed to overpayment (Campbell & Pritchard, 1976; Carrell & Dittrich, 1978; Greenberg, 1982; Mowday, 1983) have been inconsistent. As a result, no significant difference, in terms of satisfaction, is expected between these two reward conditions. Thus, Hypothesis 12 states:
H12: There should be a curvilinear relation between reward condition and satisfaction. As one moves from underpayment to equitable payment, satisfaction should increase. However, there should be no significant difference in satisfaction as one moves from equitable payment to overpayment. (see Figure 2.1)

A second hypothesis concerns equity sensitivity, the purported moderator of the relation between reward condition and job satisfaction. In this hypothesis, equity sensitivity is proposed as a moderator of the relation between reward condition and job satisfaction. Research in the equity sensitivity area (Huseman et al., 1985; King et al., 1993) has been generally supportive of the fact that equity sensitivity moderates the relation between reward condition and job satisfaction. Specifically, it has been found that for both Benevolents and Entitleds there is a positive, linear relation between reward condition and job satisfaction whereas for Equity Sensitives there is a curvilinear relation between reward condition and job satisfaction. Thus, Hypothesis 13 states:

H13: There should be a significant interaction between equity sensitivity and reward condition in predicting job satisfaction.
Figure 2.1
Predicted job satisfaction levels for different reward conditions
For Benevolents and Entitleds, there should be a positive correlation between reward condition and job satisfaction. In contrast, there should be a curvilinear relation for Equity Sensitives. (See Figure 1.2).

Finally, it is predicted that the proposed measure of equity sensitivity, given its theoretical and empirical development, will demonstrate incremental validity in predicting satisfaction with different reward conditions. Thus, Hypothesis 14 states:

H14: The new measure of equity sensitivity will demonstrate incremental validity in predicting satisfaction with the different reward conditions.

Subjects. The sample consisted of at least 160 junior and senior undergraduate students taking management courses at the Louisiana State University.

Experimental Design and Analysis. Individuals were randomly assigned to one of three reward conditions (underreward, equitable reward, or overreward). Because equity sensitivity scores for individuals could not be fixed in advance, a multiple regression analysis was used to investigate main and interaction effects of the independent variables rather than ANOVA.

It was important that the total sample size for this analysis be large enough to avoid Type II errors. Gastonis and Sampson (1989) offer exact sample size and power calculations for multiple
correlation (regression) analysis. To determine the exact sample size needed to avoid Type II error in this multiple regression analysis, a researcher must know (a) the power level desired, (b) the significance level desired, (c) the anticipated effect size, and (d) the number of independent variables in the study. Cohen (1977) recommends using a power value of .8 when using the conventional significance level of .05. The anticipated effect size for this research was .30. This effect size was selected because personality variables have been shown to account for about 10% of the variance in behavior \( R^2 = .32 \) (Buckley et al., 1990). The number of independent variables in this study was 3. Given this information, the exact sample size required to avoid Type II errors in this multiple regression analysis was 113, according to Gastonis and Sampson's (1989) power tables.

**Procedures.** In the initial round of data collection, subjects completed the proposed measure of equity sensitivity, the ESI (Huseman et al., 1985), and a demographic form. To avoid demand characteristics, subjects also completed "filler" personality measures.

Two weeks after completing the proposed measure of equity sensitivity and the ESI, subjects were randomly assigned to one of three reward conditions: underreward, equitable reward, or overreward. Each subject completed a second questionnaire designed to measure perceptions of satisfaction with the assigned
reward condition. The 2 week interval between questionnaire administration was the same time interval used by King et al. (1993).

The questionnaire stimulus items, hypothetical scenarios that are similar to the ones used by Austin et al. (1980) and by King et al. (1993), depicted both the subject and the comparison other (Person B), as very similar in all respects, including the ability of each to perform the necessary work (i.e., coding questionnaires) to receive the prescribed reward (i.e., money). Specifying equal ability for Person B and the subject was done to limit threats to self-esteem common to early equity research (Campbell & Pritchard, 1976).

The scenarios manipulated either the subject's and/or the comparison other's input or outcome to achieve the desired reward condition. Subjects in the underreward and overreward conditions were exposed to a total of two scenarios, one of which produced the desired reward condition by varying inputs and holding outcomes identical to those of the comparison other whereas the other achieved the desired reward condition by varying outcomes and holding inputs identical to those of the comparison other. However, in the equitable reward condition, subjects were exposed to three scenarios. One of which produced the desired reward condition by holding both inputs and outcomes identical to those of the comparison other whereas the other two scenarios achieved
the desired reward condition by varying both outcomes and inputs relative to those of the comparison other. (The equitable reward condition scenarios had to be constructed for this study because Austin et al. (1980) and King et al. (1993) only investigated underreward and overreward conditions.) Subjects' assigned reward condition was maintained across scenarios even though their inputs and outcomes were varied in relationship to the comparison other. In addition, their responses to the scenarios were summed. The two underreward, three equitable reward, and two overreward scenarios are presented in Appendix J.

To avoid increasing the artificiality of the manipulation, different scenarios were needed within reward condition. One scenario described a situation where the person is working for a university professor coding questionnaires whereas the other scenario described a situation where the person is working for a university printing press proofreading manuscripts. The first scenario was the same one used by Austin et al. (1980) and King et al (1993). The second scenario was constructed especially for this study. This scenario appears in Appendix K. In addition, the order in which the scenarios were presented was varied.

Measures. The manipulation check consisted of one item assessing perceived equity of pay (see Appendix L). This item consisted of a 7-point scale assessing the subjects' perception of who was getting a "better deal." The scale options ranged from
(1) "Person B is getting a much better deal than me." to (4) "We are both receiving an equally good... or bad... deal." to (7) "I am getting a much better deal than Person B." The midpoint of the scale indicated equitable reward.

Concluding the scenarios were questions concerning subjects' satisfaction with the reward condition. Subjects' satisfaction with the assigned reward condition was assessed using three different items. These measures are listed in Appendix L. The anchors for each item ranged from (1) very dissatisfied to (4) neither satisfied nor dissatisfied to (7) very satisfied. The first item assessed their satisfaction with the general work situation. The second item assessed their satisfaction with their pay. The third item assessed their satisfaction with the work they were performing. The three items were summed to arrive at a single index of overall satisfaction. In addition, the pay satisfaction was the only satisfaction item to be examined separately in this validation study. This item was examined separately because pay equity is strongly associated with pay satisfaction (Summers and Denisi, 1990). In general, satisfaction was chosen as the dependent variable for two reasons. First, according to equity theory, the tension caused by overreward or underreward should predict satisfaction (e.g., Pritchard, Dunnette, & Jorgenson, 1972). Second, satisfaction was the same dependent variable used in the initial test of the ESI (Huseman et al., 1985).
CHAPTER 3
RESULTS

The current chapter begins by discussing item generation and content validity of the new equity sensitivity instrument. Details of two pilot studies involving principal-axes factor analysis, item analysis, and reliability assessment are described. Next, two construct validity assessments (a discriminant validity assessment and a nomological validity assessment) of the new measure of equity sensitivity are presented. Finally, the results of a laboratory study designed primarily to assess the new measure's incremental validity (i.e., validity beyond that provided by the current measure of equity sensitivity, the ESI) for predicting satisfaction with different reward conditions are discussed.

Phase 1: Item Generation and Content Validity

As previously discussed, the purpose of the present dissertation was to construct, based upon systematic item development procedures, a theoretically based equity sensitivity measure that provides thorough coverage of the construct. To develop this measure, Huseman et al.'s (1987) four theoretical dimensions of equity sensitivity and the accompanying theoretical preferences of the three different equity types were used as the theoretical foundation for the new equity sensitivity measure.
These four theoretical dimensions are: (a) preference for level of inputs; (b) preference for level of outcomes, (c) preference for relative level of inputs/outcomes; and (d) preference for a certain equity ratio relative to a comparison other. Within each of the four theoretical dimensions, the preferences of each equity type (benevolent, equity sensitive, and entitled) were delineated by Huseman et al. (1987).

To assist in establishing a new measure of equity sensitivity that was resistant to socially desirable responding, items were developed using two general approaches: the traditional approach of developing items that directly inquire about an individual's standing on the variable of interest and a second approach that involves developing items that indirectly inquire about an individual's standing on the variable of interest. As previously discussed, the indirect approach used three different techniques to develop items: the false consensus effect, the similarity attraction effect, and the similar to me bias. Exactly 295 direct and indirect items were developed for all three equity types within all four theoretical dimensions of equity sensitivity.

Three judges, who were advanced students in I/O psychology, evaluated these items using a questionnaire format. The items are presented in Appendix M. In the questionnaire, the judges were given a set of general instructions, a brief background on the construct, and a set of specific instructions concerning how to
make their content validity ratings. For reference purposes, the judges were also given a copy of Huseman et al. (1987).

In the initial content validity assessment, the three judges were asked to make two judgments concerning each item. The first judgment involved assigning the item to one or none of the four theoretical dimensions of equity sensitivity. The second judgment involved determining which equity type the item best represents. As in the first judgment, the judges were free to rate the item as not representing any of the three equity types. If any of the three judges did not agree on both judgments for the item, then the item was thrown out of consideration. Exactly 152 items out of 295 items survived the initial content validity analysis.

The results of the initial content validity assessment, classified by theoretical dimension, equity type, and item format, are presented in Table 3.1. A careful analysis of these results revealed a number of deficiencies. The principal deficiency existed for the theoretical dimension of preference for level of outcomes. Only 6 items were retained for this dimension. Within this dimension, a major deficiency was revealed for benevolent items. Only one benevolent item was retained for the level of outcomes dimension. The other major deficiency was revealed for the similar to me item format. There were relatively few and sometimes no items that used the similar to me format across dimensions and equity types. Other minor deficiencies were noted in a number of other areas (see Table 3.1).
Table 3.1
Results for Initial Content Validity Assessment

**Dimension 1: Preference for Level of Inputs**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item Format</th>
<th>FC</th>
<th>SA</th>
<th>SM</th>
<th>TR</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BEN</td>
<td>06 *</td>
<td>02 *</td>
<td>01 **</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>20 Items</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENT</td>
<td>03 *</td>
<td>03 *</td>
<td>01 **</td>
<td>06</td>
<td>13 Items *</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Number of Items Retained: 33 Items *

**Dimension 2: Preference for Level of Outcomes**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item Format</th>
<th>FC</th>
<th>SA</th>
<th>SM</th>
<th>TR</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BEN</td>
<td>00 **</td>
<td>00 **</td>
<td>00 **</td>
<td>01 **</td>
<td>01 Items **</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENT</td>
<td>02 *</td>
<td>00 **</td>
<td>00 **</td>
<td>01 **</td>
<td>03 Items **</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Number of Items Retained: 04 Items **

"(table con'd.)"
**Dimension 3: Preference for Relative Level of Inputs/Outcomes**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item Format</th>
<th>FC</th>
<th>SA</th>
<th>SM</th>
<th>TR</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>E BEN</td>
<td>03</td>
<td>05</td>
<td>01</td>
<td>05</td>
<td>14 Items *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q T EQS</td>
<td>07</td>
<td>07</td>
<td>04</td>
<td>06</td>
<td>24 Items</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I P ENT</td>
<td>05</td>
<td>05</td>
<td>03</td>
<td>05</td>
<td>18 Items</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Number of Items Retained: 56 Items

**Dimension 4: Preference for a Certain Equity ratio Relative to a Comparison Other**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item Format</th>
<th>FC</th>
<th>SA</th>
<th>SM</th>
<th>TR</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>E BEN</td>
<td>06</td>
<td>07</td>
<td>02</td>
<td>08</td>
<td>23 Items</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q T EQS</td>
<td>05*</td>
<td>01 **</td>
<td>01 **</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>17 Items</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I P ENT</td>
<td>09</td>
<td>02 **</td>
<td>00 **</td>
<td>08</td>
<td>19 Items</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Number of Items Retained: 59 Items

Total of All Items Retained: 152 Items

BEN = Benevolent
EQS = Equity Sensitive
ENT = Entitled

FC = False Consensus Format
SA = Similarity Attraction Format
SM = Similar to Me Format
TR = Traditional Format

* = Minor Content Deficiency
** = Major Content Deficiency
Given the results of the first content validity assessment, an additional 141 items were developed to correct the major and minor deficiencies revealed in the initial retained item sample. A follow-up content validity assessment was conducted to determine if the deficiencies of the first retained item sample had been remedied by the second sample of items. Four judges, who were advanced students in I/O psychology and management, evaluated the 141 items using a questionnaire format. These items are presented in Appendix N. The judges made the same theoretical dimension and equity type ratings of each item as they did in the initial content validity assessment. If any of the four judges did not agree on both judgments for the item, then the item was thrown out of consideration. Exactly 111 items out of 145 items survived the follow-up content validity assessment.

The results of the follow-up content validity assessment, classified by theoretical dimension, equity type, and item format, are presented in Table 3.2. Analysis of the results of the follow-up content validity assessment revealed one major deficiency. The deficiency existed for the similar to me item format across the three theoretical dimensions and all equity types. To remedy this deficiency, 7 similar to me items were developed. These items were generated along the lines of the similar to me items retained in the follow-up content validity assessment.
Table 3.2
Results for Follow-Up Content Validity Assessment

Dimension 1: Preference for Level of Inputs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item Format</th>
<th>FC</th>
<th>SA</th>
<th>SM</th>
<th>TR</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>E Q T BEN</td>
<td>03</td>
<td>06</td>
<td>03 *</td>
<td>03</td>
<td>15 Items</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U Y P ENT</td>
<td>06</td>
<td>04</td>
<td>01 *</td>
<td>03</td>
<td>14 Items</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Number of Items Retained: 29 Items

Dimension 2: Preference for Level of Outcomes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item Format</th>
<th>FC</th>
<th>SA</th>
<th>SM</th>
<th>TR</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>E Q T BEN</td>
<td>02</td>
<td>05</td>
<td>00 **</td>
<td>06</td>
<td>13 Items</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U Y P ENT</td>
<td>04</td>
<td>06</td>
<td>02 *</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>28 Items</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Number of Items Retained: 41 Items

"(table con'd.)"
### Dimension 3: Preference for Relative Level of Inputs/Outcomes

Item Format

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FC</th>
<th>SA</th>
<th>SM</th>
<th>TR</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>BEN</td>
<td>05</td>
<td>01</td>
<td>01 *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>02 *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>04</td>
<td>03</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Number of Items Retained: 18 Items

### Dimension 4: Preference for a Certain Equity ratio Relative to a Comparison Other

Item Format

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FC</th>
<th>SA</th>
<th>SM</th>
<th>TR</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>BEN</td>
<td>01</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>01</td>
<td>06</td>
<td>03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>06</td>
<td>03</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Number of Items Retained: 23 Items

Total of All Items Retained: 111 Items

BEN = Benevolent  
EQS = Equity Sensitive  
ENT = Entitled  
FC = False Consensus Format  
SA = Similarity Attraction Format  
SM = Similar to Me Format  
TR = Traditional Format  
* = Minor Content Deficiency  
** = Major Content Deficiency
The overall results of the two content validity assessments are listed in Table 3.3. A total of 270 equity sensitivity items were selected on the basis of correct classification by the expert judges. The results of the two content validity assessments seem to indicate a thorough coverage of the construct by the items retained. The retained items appear to tap the four theoretical dimensions and three equity types involved in the equity sensitivity construct as outlined by Huseman et al. (1987). Finally, the retained items were relatively equally divided among the different item formats.

Phase 2A: Initial Pilot Study

In Phase 2A, an initial pilot study was conducted to assess the 270 equity sensitivity items and to establish reliability.

Questionnaire Administration

Questionnaires were administered to 372 undergraduate students currently enrolled in management and psychology classes at Louisiana State University. Of the 372 undergraduates, 223 were female, 148 were male, and 1 did not report information concerning gender. The average age of subjects in this sample was 21.5 years old, with a range from 17 to 52 years old. In terms of race, 309 subjects classified themselves as white, 23 subjects classified themselves as Asian or Pacific Islanders, 22 subjects classified themselves as black, 4 subjects classified themselves as Hispanic, 2 subjects classified themselves as American Indian,
Table 3.3
Overall Results for Both Content Validity Assessments

Dimension 1: Preference for Level of Inputs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item Format</th>
<th>FC</th>
<th>SA</th>
<th>SM</th>
<th>TR</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>E Q T BEN</td>
<td>09</td>
<td>08</td>
<td>04</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>35 Items</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U Y</td>
<td>02</td>
<td>07</td>
<td>02</td>
<td>09</td>
<td>27 Items</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Number of Items Retained: 62 Items

Dimension 2: Preference for Level of Outcomes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item Format</th>
<th>FC</th>
<th>SA</th>
<th>SM</th>
<th>TR</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>E Q T BEN</td>
<td>02*</td>
<td>05</td>
<td>00 *</td>
<td>07</td>
<td>14 Items</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U Y</td>
<td>06</td>
<td>06</td>
<td>02 *</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>31 Items</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Number of Items Retained: 45 Items

"(table con'd.)"
Dimension 3: Preference for Relative Level of Inputs/Outcomes

**Item Format**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>FC</th>
<th>SA</th>
<th>SM</th>
<th>TR</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>BEN</td>
<td>06</td>
<td>06</td>
<td>02</td>
<td>06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q</td>
<td>T</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>EQS</td>
<td>07</td>
<td>07</td>
<td>07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>ENT</td>
<td>05</td>
<td>09</td>
<td>06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Number of Items Retained: 74 Items

Dimension 4: Preference for a Certain Equity ratio Relative to a Comparison Other

**Item Format**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>FC</th>
<th>SA</th>
<th>SM</th>
<th>TR</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>BEN</td>
<td>07</td>
<td>07</td>
<td>05</td>
<td>08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q</td>
<td>T</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>EQS</td>
<td>06</td>
<td>07</td>
<td>04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>ENT</td>
<td>09</td>
<td>08</td>
<td>03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Number of Items Retained: 82 Items

Total of All Items Retained: 263 Items

BEN = Benevolent
EQS = Equity Sensitive
ENT = Entitled

FC = False Consensus Format
SA = Similarity Attraction Format
SM = Similar to Me Format
TR = Traditional Format

* = Minor Content Deficiency
** = Major Content Deficiency
and 3 subjects gave no classification. The average educational level for subjects in this sample was that of a sophomore in college.

Due to the length of the new measure of equity sensitivity (i.e., LSU Life at Work Survey) and the accompanying Balanced Inventory of Desirable Responding (BIDR), the order in which these surveys were completed was varied. Half the subjects completed the BIDR first and the other half completed the LSU Life at Work Survey first. The demographic form was always completed last. In addition, due to the length of LSU Life at Work Survey and the attendant concerns about subject fatigue, subjects started at four different points in the LSU Life at Work Survey to help keep fatigue constant across the items. The four starting points within the LSU Life at Work Survey were item #1, item #65, item #140, and item #241. Although subjects did start at four different points within the LSU Life at Work Survey, subjects were instructed to complete the entire survey.

Prior to completing the two questionnaires and the demographic form, subjects were given a set of directions (see Appendix 0) outlining the purpose of the study, the subjects' duties, assurance of anonymity and confidentiality, the order in which to complete the two questionnaires, the starting point for the LSU Life at Work Survey, and procedural details concerning the recording of responses to the two questionnaires. These instructions were also read aloud to the subjects.
Questionnaires for First Pilot Study

Prefatory instructions were developed to introduce the new measure of equity sensitivity and to assure the subjects that their responses to the items would be kept in strict confidentiality. These instructions appear in Appendix P.

Given that different scales were used for direct and indirect items, items on the LSU Life at Work Survey were grouped according to the scale that was used. For example, traditional items that used a five-point Likert scale of strongly disagree (1) to strongly agree (5) were grouped together whereas false consensus items that used a five-point Likert scale of 00-20% (1) to 81-100% (5) were grouped together. In total, there were seven groups of items, each with a different five-point Likert scale. The order in which these groups of items were presented was randomized. Within each group of items, the order of items was randomized as well. See Appendix Q for the LSU Life at Work Survey used in the initial pilot study.

In addition, a five-point Likert scale of (5) strongly agree to (1) strongly disagree was used for the 40 items that comprise the Balanced Inventory of Desirable Responding (Paulhus, 1986). The Balanced Inventory of Desirable Responding used in this initial pilot study appears in Appendix B. Finally, a demographic form was used to acquire information from the subjects concerning their age, gender, race, and educational level. The demographic form appears in Appendix R.
Principal-Axes Factor Analysis

The 270 items of equity sensitivity were examined using a principal-axes factor analysis with a promax rotation (see Table 3.4). With the eigenvalue-greater-than-1.0 stopping rule, 77 factors were identified. Eigenvalues for the 77 factors ranged from 25.82 to 1.01. Percentage of variance explained ranged from 25.82 to 1.01. The scree plot revealed a break point after the fourth factor. In addition, factors beyond the fourth factor were indeterminate. Therefore, given the size of the eigenvalues, percentage of variance explained (approximately 60%), the results of the scree plot, and the indeterminancy of the factors beyond the fourth factor, four factors were ultimately extracted. The eigenvalues for the four factors were 25.82, 14.92, 11.87, and 9.96. Percentage of variance explained by each factor was 25.82, 14.92, 11.87, and 9.96, respectively.

Sixty-one items loaded on the factor one. Because of 25 split loadings, 36 items were retained. These items are listed in Table 3.4. Fifty-two items loaded on factor two. Because of 18 split loadings, 34 items were retained. These items are listed in Table 3.4. Thirty-two items loaded on factor three. Because of 9 split loadings, 23 items were retained. These items are listed in Table 3.4. Thirty-three items loaded on factor four. Because of 12 split loadings, 21 items were retained. These items are listed in Table 3.4.
Table 3.4
Principal-Axes Factor Analysis of the New Equity Sensitivity Measure in Pilot Study One

Principal Axes Factor Analysis - New Equity Sensitivity Measure

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Eigenvalue</th>
<th>Pct of Variance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>25.82</td>
<td>25.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>14.92</td>
<td>14.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>11.87</td>
<td>11.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>9.96</td>
<td>9.96</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Promax Rotation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Factor 1</th>
<th>Factor 2</th>
<th>Factor 3</th>
<th>Factor 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Item 210</td>
<td>.68</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>-.11</td>
<td>-.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 226</td>
<td>.66</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 199</td>
<td>.62</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>-.26</td>
<td>-.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 238</td>
<td>.60</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>-.12</td>
<td>-.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 212</td>
<td>.60</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>-.12</td>
<td>.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 235</td>
<td>.62</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>-.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 225</td>
<td>.59</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>-.16</td>
<td>-.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 214</td>
<td>.59</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>-.12</td>
<td>-.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 229</td>
<td>.57</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>-.20</td>
<td>-.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 179</td>
<td>.55</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>-.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 208</td>
<td>.57</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>-.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 183</td>
<td>.58</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>-.13</td>
<td>-.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 220</td>
<td>.52</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 194</td>
<td>.53</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>-.28</td>
<td>.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 171</td>
<td>.51</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 182</td>
<td>.51</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>-.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 170</td>
<td>.49</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.24</td>
<td>-.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 232</td>
<td>.57</td>
<td>.26</td>
<td>-.11</td>
<td>-.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 060</td>
<td>.55</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td>-.17</td>
<td>.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 184</td>
<td>.54</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>-.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 032</td>
<td>.53</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>-.16</td>
<td>.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 031</td>
<td>.53</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>-.16</td>
<td>.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 056</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>-.12</td>
<td>.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 064</td>
<td>.51</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 240</td>
<td>.45</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>-.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 030</td>
<td>.49</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 195</td>
<td>.47</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>-.12</td>
<td>.11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

"(table con'd.)"
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Factor 1</th>
<th>Factor 2</th>
<th>Factor 3</th>
<th>Factor 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Item 173</td>
<td>.47</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>-.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 028</td>
<td>.46</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>-.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 042</td>
<td>.43</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 237</td>
<td>.45</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>-.11</td>
<td>-.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 059</td>
<td>.43</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>-.22</td>
<td>.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 206</td>
<td>.42</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>-.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 205</td>
<td>.37</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>-.24</td>
<td>.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 192</td>
<td>.40</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>-.30</td>
<td>.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 058</td>
<td>.36</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>-.30</td>
<td>.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 095</td>
<td>.44</td>
<td>.33</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 193</td>
<td>.38</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>-.27</td>
<td>.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 014</td>
<td>.42</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>-.21</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 029</td>
<td>.36</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 024</td>
<td>.33</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 217</td>
<td>.34</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 039</td>
<td>.39</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>-.29</td>
<td>.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 035</td>
<td>.27</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 204</td>
<td>.31</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>-.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 006</td>
<td>.36</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>-.26</td>
<td>-.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 007</td>
<td>.33</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>-.25</td>
<td>.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 097</td>
<td>.39</td>
<td>.39</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 076</td>
<td>.39</td>
<td>.37</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 026</td>
<td>.30</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 025</td>
<td>.32</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 099</td>
<td>.38</td>
<td>.34</td>
<td>-.00</td>
<td>.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 049</td>
<td>.28</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>-.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 089</td>
<td>.36</td>
<td>.31</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 004</td>
<td>.29</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>-.28</td>
<td>.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 236</td>
<td>.33</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>-.25</td>
<td>.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 034</td>
<td>.30</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 176</td>
<td>.31</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>-.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 070</td>
<td>.35</td>
<td>.35</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 033</td>
<td>.30</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>-.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 126</td>
<td>.34</td>
<td>.35</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 015</td>
<td>.27</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>-.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 065</td>
<td>.28</td>
<td>.26</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 053</td>
<td>.28</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.29</td>
<td>-.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 078</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>-.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 027</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>-.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 094</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>-.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 175</td>
<td>-.21</td>
<td>-.15</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 198</td>
<td>-.23</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 203</td>
<td>-.37</td>
<td>-.34</td>
<td>.29</td>
<td>.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 132</td>
<td>.34</td>
<td>.89</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 136</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>.82</td>
<td>-.15</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

"(table con'd.)"
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Factor 1</th>
<th>Factor 2</th>
<th>Factor 3</th>
<th>Factor 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Item 138</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>.62</td>
<td>-.25</td>
<td>.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 111</td>
<td>.33</td>
<td>.60</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 141</td>
<td>.26</td>
<td>.58</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 129</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>.56</td>
<td>-.13</td>
<td>.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 100</td>
<td>.32</td>
<td>.61</td>
<td>-.19</td>
<td>.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 122</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>.54</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 106</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>.57</td>
<td>-.18</td>
<td>.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 066</td>
<td>.42</td>
<td>.55</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 087</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>.51</td>
<td>-.11</td>
<td>.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 135</td>
<td>.31</td>
<td>.52</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 097</td>
<td>.41</td>
<td>.54</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 158</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.40</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>-.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 092</td>
<td>.26</td>
<td>.48</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 119</td>
<td>.45</td>
<td>.54</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 115</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.48</td>
<td>-.30</td>
<td>.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 168</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>.43</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>-.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 134</td>
<td>.30</td>
<td>.51</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 167</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.40</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 157</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>.38</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>-.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 133</td>
<td>.38</td>
<td>.49</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 084</td>
<td>.43</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 075</td>
<td>.33</td>
<td>.43</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 110</td>
<td>.41</td>
<td>.47</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 107</td>
<td>.36</td>
<td>.48</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 113</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>.36</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>-.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 071</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>.39</td>
<td>-.18</td>
<td>.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 259</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.32</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 165</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.28</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 120</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>.31</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 169</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>-.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 139</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>-.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 123</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>-.12</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 073</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>-.16</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 083</td>
<td>-.19</td>
<td>-.23</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 127</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>-.16</td>
<td>-.11</td>
<td>.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 116</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>-.21</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>-.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 146</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>-.22</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 155</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>-.26</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>-.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 085</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>-.25</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 156</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>-.28</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>-.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 131</td>
<td>-.20</td>
<td>-.34</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>-.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 103</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>-.28</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td>-.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 069</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>-.27</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>-.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 150</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>-.29</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>-.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 096</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>-.29</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 272</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>-.27</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td>-.05</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

"(table con'd.)"
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Factor 1</th>
<th>Factor 2</th>
<th>Factor 3</th>
<th>Factor 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Item 250</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>-.26</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>-.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 148</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>-.31</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>-.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 152</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>-.34</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>-.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 121</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>-.29</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>-.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 088</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>-.24</td>
<td>-.11</td>
<td>-.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 068</td>
<td>-.26</td>
<td>-.43</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>-.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 077</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>-.37</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>-.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 117</td>
<td>-.12</td>
<td>-.38</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>-.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 153</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>.32</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 145</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>-.27</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 144</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>-.34</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 149</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>-.27</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>-.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 154</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>-.39</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>-.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 141</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>-.38</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 137</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>-.42</td>
<td>.31</td>
<td>-.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 105</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>-.44</td>
<td>.30</td>
<td>-.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 109</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>-.40</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 143</td>
<td>-.20</td>
<td>-.49</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td>-.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 072</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>-.43</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 091</td>
<td>-.22</td>
<td>-.51</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>-.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 147</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>-.39</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 074</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>-.45</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 112</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>-.55</td>
<td>.37</td>
<td>-.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 124</td>
<td>-.11</td>
<td>-.52</td>
<td>.26</td>
<td>.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 104</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>-.49</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 128</td>
<td>-.23</td>
<td>-.57</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>-.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 082</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>-.50</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 125</td>
<td>-.15</td>
<td>-.59</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 222</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>.55</td>
<td>-.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 219</td>
<td>-.34</td>
<td>-.25</td>
<td>.59</td>
<td>-.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 213</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>-.12</td>
<td>.55</td>
<td>-.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 045</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>.54</td>
<td>-.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 202</td>
<td>-.34</td>
<td>-.20</td>
<td>.56</td>
<td>-.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 041</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.51</td>
<td>-.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 061</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>.53</td>
<td>-.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 062</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>.51</td>
<td>.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 054</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td>.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 044</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.49</td>
<td>-.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 181</td>
<td>-.26</td>
<td>-.37</td>
<td>.54</td>
<td>.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 207</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>.49</td>
<td>-.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 230</td>
<td>-.37</td>
<td>-.29</td>
<td>.52</td>
<td>.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 063</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.45</td>
<td>.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 052</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.44</td>
<td>.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 023</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.45</td>
<td>-.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 186</td>
<td>-.23</td>
<td>-.13</td>
<td>.46</td>
<td>-.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 197</td>
<td>-.17</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>.45</td>
<td>.06</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

"(table con'd.)"
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Factor 1</th>
<th>Factor 2</th>
<th>Factor 3</th>
<th>Factor 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Item 046</td>
<td>-.21</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>.43</td>
<td>.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 211</td>
<td>-.20</td>
<td>-.13</td>
<td>.44</td>
<td>-.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 001</td>
<td>-.18</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>.40</td>
<td>.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 020</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.39</td>
<td>-.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 022</td>
<td>-.22</td>
<td>-.14</td>
<td>.41</td>
<td>-.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 002</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.35</td>
<td>.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 093</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>.34</td>
<td>-.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 187</td>
<td>-.17</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>.37</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 200</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>.36</td>
<td>-.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 218</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.34</td>
<td>-.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 048</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.34</td>
<td>-.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 008</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.33</td>
<td>.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 216</td>
<td>-.36</td>
<td>-.22</td>
<td>.37</td>
<td>.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 201</td>
<td>-.19</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>.34</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 130</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>-.15</td>
<td>.34</td>
<td>-.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 108</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>-.12</td>
<td>.34</td>
<td>-.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 174</td>
<td>-.32</td>
<td>-.14</td>
<td>.36</td>
<td>-.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 185</td>
<td>-.35</td>
<td>-.32</td>
<td>.37</td>
<td>.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 142</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>-.14</td>
<td>.33</td>
<td>-.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 053</td>
<td>.28</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.29</td>
<td>-.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 245</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>.31</td>
<td>-.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 269</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>-.12</td>
<td>.32</td>
<td>-.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 114</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>-.27</td>
<td>.33</td>
<td>-.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 098</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>-.21</td>
<td>.31</td>
<td>-.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 190</td>
<td>-.37</td>
<td>-.32</td>
<td>.34</td>
<td>.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 118</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>-.22</td>
<td>.31</td>
<td>-.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 248</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>.28</td>
<td>-.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 196</td>
<td>-.31</td>
<td>-.25</td>
<td>.30</td>
<td>.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 255</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.26</td>
<td>-.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 050</td>
<td>-.21</td>
<td>-.14</td>
<td>.28</td>
<td>.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 243</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>-.19</td>
<td>.27</td>
<td>-.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 287</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>-.25</td>
<td>.28</td>
<td>-.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 180</td>
<td>-.22</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>.26</td>
<td>.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 101</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>-.17</td>
<td>.26</td>
<td>-.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 086</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>-.20</td>
<td>.26</td>
<td>.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 247</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>.24</td>
<td>-.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 102</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 162</td>
<td>-.11</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td>-.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 172</td>
<td>-.13</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>-.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 090</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>-.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 037</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 252</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>-.24</td>
<td>.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 013</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 003</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 012</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 040</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.48</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

"(table con'd.)"
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Factor 1</th>
<th>Factor 2</th>
<th>Factor 3</th>
<th>Factor 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Item 011</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>-.11</td>
<td>.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 057</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 019</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 159</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>-.23</td>
<td>.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 253</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.33</td>
<td>-.22</td>
<td>.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 018</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>-.17</td>
<td>.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 251</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.33</td>
<td>-.22</td>
<td>.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 263</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.26</td>
<td>-.13</td>
<td>.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 262</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.24</td>
<td>-.14</td>
<td>.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 038</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>-.16</td>
<td>.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 188</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 266</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>.31</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 231</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 009</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 010</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 055</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.33</td>
<td>.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 043</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 021</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 016</td>
<td>-.16</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>.30</td>
<td>.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 051</td>
<td>-.15</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>.29</td>
<td>.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 224</td>
<td>-.36</td>
<td>-.26</td>
<td>.27</td>
<td>.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 005</td>
<td>-.13</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 241</td>
<td>-.21</td>
<td>-.22</td>
<td>.24</td>
<td>.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 017</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>-.16</td>
<td>.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 215</td>
<td>-.14</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 234</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>-.22</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 233</td>
<td>-.24</td>
<td>-.18</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 227</td>
<td>-.24</td>
<td>-.23</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 209</td>
<td>-.26</td>
<td>-.14</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td>.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 080</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 223</td>
<td>-.42</td>
<td>-.34</td>
<td>.26</td>
<td>.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 160</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>-.21</td>
<td>.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 047</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>-.29</td>
<td>.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 036</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 257</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.26</td>
<td>-.12</td>
<td>.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 239</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>-.22</td>
<td>.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 161</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 178</td>
<td>-.30</td>
<td>-.27</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 269</td>
<td>-.15</td>
<td>.30</td>
<td>-.16</td>
<td>.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 249</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 221</td>
<td>-.19</td>
<td>-.22</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 166</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>-.24</td>
<td>.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 151</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 244</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 079</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 164</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>-.09</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

"(table con'd.)"
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Factor 1</th>
<th>Factor 2</th>
<th>Factor 3</th>
<th>Factor 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Item 264</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>-.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 255</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>-.16</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>-.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 270</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>-.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 242</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>-.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 260</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>-.12</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>-.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 258</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>-.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 177</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.26</td>
<td>-.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 081</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>-.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 265</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>-.12</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>-.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 087</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>-.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 261</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>-.11</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td>-.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 189</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.26</td>
<td>-.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 191</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>.42</td>
<td>-.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 254</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>-.16</td>
<td>.33</td>
<td>-.45</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Based on these item loadings, the first factor was identified as the indirect entitlement dimension, the second as the direct entitlement-benevolence dimension, the third as the indirect equity sensitivity dimension, and the fourth as the indirect benevolence dimension. Thus, the four factors of the principal-axes factor analysis did not support Huseman et al.'s (1987) four dimensional model of equity sensitivity. However, the factor analysis did reveal that for the indirect format items, especially similarity attraction and false consensus items, there were three factors, one for each equity sensitivity type. For the direct format items, only one factor was revealed and it was comprised of only two of the three equity sensitivity types, entitled and benevolent. Equity sensitive type items failed to load on the direct item factor. The results of this factor analysis suggest that indirect format items may provide another avenue by which to assess equity sensitivity.

**Frequencies and Reliabilities**

Frequency distributions and reliabilities for the retained items in pilot study one are presented in Table 3.6. Means for the 36 items representing the indirect entitlement dimension ranged from 2.03 to 4.15. The standard deviations ranged from .88 to 1.15 with respondents using all anchors on the 5-point scales. The reliability coefficient for this dimension was .93. An examination of the item-total correlations for the items
Table 3.5
Frequencies, Means, Standard Deviations, and Reliabilities for Items Retained in Pilot Study One

Response Response Response Response Response
1  2  3  4  5   M   SD

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>07</th>
<th>79</th>
<th>128</th>
<th>124</th>
<th>33</th>
<th>3.26</th>
<th>0.96</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>#210</td>
<td>07</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>3.36</td>
<td>0.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#226</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>1.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#199</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>3.07</td>
<td>0.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#238</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>3.15</td>
<td>0.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#212</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>3.05</td>
<td>1.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#235</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>3.11</td>
<td>1.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#214</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>3.44</td>
<td>1.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#179</td>
<td>04</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>4.04</td>
<td>0.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#208</td>
<td>08</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>3.37</td>
<td>0.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#183</td>
<td>07</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>3.84</td>
<td>1.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#184</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>3.64</td>
<td>1.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#032</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>2.70</td>
<td>1.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#031</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>2.86</td>
<td>1.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#056</td>
<td>03</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>0.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#044</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>3.01</td>
<td>1.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#195</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>3.13</td>
<td>1.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#173</td>
<td>03</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>4.11</td>
<td>0.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#028</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>3.52</td>
<td>1.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#042</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>3.21</td>
<td>1.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#237</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>3.18</td>
<td>0.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#059</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2.03</td>
<td>1.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#206</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>4.08</td>
<td>0.99</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#014</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>2.52</td>
<td>1.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#029</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>3.09</td>
<td>1.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#055</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>2.69</td>
<td>1.09</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Reliability Coefficient for 36 items = 0.93

"(table con'd.)"
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>#132</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>09</td>
<td>2.75</td>
<td>0.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#136</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>231</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>02</td>
<td>2.20</td>
<td>0.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#138</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>225</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>03</td>
<td>1.97</td>
<td>0.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#111</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>08</td>
<td>2.33</td>
<td>0.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#140</td>
<td>07</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>3.49</td>
<td>0.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#129</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>222</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>04</td>
<td>2.24</td>
<td>0.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#100</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>204</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>04</td>
<td>2.16</td>
<td>0.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#122</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>203</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>07</td>
<td>2.20</td>
<td>0.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#106</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>214</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>03</td>
<td>2.04</td>
<td>0.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#087</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>212</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>01</td>
<td>2.19</td>
<td>0.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#135</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>174</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2.71</td>
<td>0.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#158</td>
<td>05</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#092</td>
<td>07</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>3.62</td>
<td>0.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#168</td>
<td>07</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3.15</td>
<td>0.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#167</td>
<td>07</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>3.19</td>
<td>0.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#157</td>
<td>09</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>3.29</td>
<td>1.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#113</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3.07</td>
<td>0.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#071</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>06</td>
<td>2.11</td>
<td>0.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#077</td>
<td>05</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>196</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>3.92</td>
<td>0.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#117</td>
<td>07</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>194</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>0.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#149</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>189</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>3.53</td>
<td>0.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#154</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>3.51</td>
<td>1.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#141</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>09</td>
<td>2.75</td>
<td>0.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#109</td>
<td>07</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>3.51</td>
<td>0.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#143</td>
<td>03</td>
<td>05</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>189</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>4.29</td>
<td>0.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#072</td>
<td>07</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>186</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>3.51</td>
<td>0.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#147</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>3.16</td>
<td>1.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#091</td>
<td>03</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>188</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>3.99</td>
<td>0.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#074</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>3.51</td>
<td>1.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#124</td>
<td>04</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>196</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>3.65</td>
<td>0.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#128</td>
<td>08</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>177</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>3.44</td>
<td>0.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#104</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>3.68</td>
<td>1.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#082</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>2.94</td>
<td>0.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#125</td>
<td>05</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>187</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>3.73</td>
<td>0.95</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Reliability Coefficient for 34 items = 0.91

"(table con'd.)"
### Indirect Equity Sensitivity Dimension

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>#045</th>
<th>#219</th>
<th>#041</th>
<th>#222</th>
<th>#061</th>
<th>#202</th>
<th>#044</th>
<th>#052</th>
<th>#207</th>
<th>#054</th>
<th>#023</th>
<th>#052</th>
<th>#063</th>
<th>#046</th>
<th>#186</th>
<th>#211</th>
<th>#197</th>
<th>#020</th>
<th>#022</th>
<th>#187</th>
<th>#218</th>
<th>#200</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>07</td>
<td>03</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>01</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>01</td>
<td>04</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>03</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>01</td>
<td>05</td>
<td>02</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>05</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>04</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>49</td>
<td>09</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>124</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>134</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>172</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>155</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>56</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>60</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>4.15</td>
<td>3.42</td>
<td>4.07</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>4.03</td>
<td>3.55</td>
<td>3.17</td>
<td>4.04</td>
<td>3.05</td>
<td>3.21</td>
<td>3.29</td>
<td>3.08</td>
<td>3.02</td>
<td>3.91</td>
<td>3.73</td>
<td>3.58</td>
<td>3.64</td>
<td>3.68</td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td>3.57</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.97</td>
<td>0.82</td>
<td>1.02</td>
<td>0.82</td>
<td>0.97</td>
<td>0.85</td>
<td>0.93</td>
<td>0.94</td>
<td>0.89</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>1.09</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>0.98</td>
<td>1.02</td>
<td>0.89</td>
<td>0.87</td>
<td>0.91</td>
<td>1.10</td>
<td>1.03</td>
<td>0.94</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Reliability Coefficient for 23 items = 0.89**

### Indirect Benevolence Dimension

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>#037</th>
<th>#252</th>
<th>#013</th>
<th>#003</th>
<th>#012</th>
<th>#040</th>
<th>#011</th>
<th>#057</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>142</td>
<td>233</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>209</td>
<td>173</td>
<td>254</td>
<td>157</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>129</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>096</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>094</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>76</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>21</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>02</td>
<td>02</td>
<td>01</td>
<td>05</td>
<td>09</td>
<td>02</td>
<td>05</td>
<td>09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.95</td>
<td>1.53</td>
<td>1.74</td>
<td>1.88</td>
<td>1.71</td>
<td>1.82</td>
<td>1.54</td>
<td>1.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.93</td>
<td>0.84</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>0.98</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.94</td>
<td>0.93</td>
<td>1.06</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

"(table con'd.)"
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>#019</th>
<th>278</th>
<th>62</th>
<th>21</th>
<th>08</th>
<th>01</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>1.36</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>0.71</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Item</td>
<td>#159</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>179</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>01</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>1.67</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>0.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item</td>
<td>#263</td>
<td>261</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>04</td>
<td>04</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>1.40</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>0.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item</td>
<td>#262</td>
<td>231</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>08</td>
<td>02</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>1.49</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>0.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item</td>
<td>#038</td>
<td>298</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>07</td>
<td>03</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>1.33</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>0.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item</td>
<td>#188</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>2.72</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>1.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item</td>
<td>#231</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>2.69</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>1.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item</td>
<td>#009</td>
<td>186</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>07</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>1.84</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>1.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item</td>
<td>#010</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>02</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>2.04</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>0.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item</td>
<td>#043</td>
<td>236</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1.66</td>
<td>1.08</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item</td>
<td>#021</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>03</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item</td>
<td>#005</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>03</td>
<td>1.91</td>
<td>0.89</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item</td>
<td>#018</td>
<td>261</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>03</td>
<td>1.44</td>
<td>0.81</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Reliability Coefficient for 21 items = 0.84
comprising this dimension revealed that none of the items substantially lowered the reliability of this dimension. Variability in responses as well as the high reliability suggested that restriction of range did not present a problem for the indirect entitlement dimension.

Means for the 34 items representing the direct entitlement-benevolence dimension ranged from 1.97 to 4.29. The standard deviations ranged from .72 to 1.11 with respondents using all anchors on the 5-point scales for all items except for one (#149). The reliability coefficient for this dimension was .91. An examination of the item-total correlations for the items comprising this dimension revealed that none of the items lowered the reliability of this dimension. Variability in responses as well as the high reliability suggested that restriction of range did not present a problem for the direct entitlement-benevolence dimension.

Means for the 23 items representing the indirect equity sensitivity dimension ranged from 3.00 to 4.15. The standard deviations ranged from .82 to 1.13 with respondents using all anchors on the five point scales. The reliability coefficient for this dimension was .89. An examination of the item-total correlations for the items comprising this dimension revealed that none of the item lowered the reliability of this dimension. Variability in responses as well as the high reliability suggested
that restriction of range did not present a problem for the indirect equity sensitivity dimension.

Means for the 21 items representing the indirect benevolence dimension ranged from 1.33 to 2.72. The standard deviations ranged from .71 to 1.10 with respondents using all anchors on the five point scales. The reliability coefficient for this dimension was .84. An examination of the item-total correlations for the items comprising this dimension revealed that none of the items lowered the reliability of this dimension. Despite the relatively high reliability of .84, inspection of the frequency distributions as well as the standard deviations revealed a possible restriction of range problem for many of the items, most notably items #021, #169, #275, #274, and #041. A possible explanation for this restriction of range problem is that since the number of benevolents in our society and in our work organizations is so low, any estimate of their numbers will likely be relatively low as well. Therefore, when subjects estimate benevolence in their friends or among employees in a typical organization, it seems unlikely for them to use the upper end of the scale (i.e., many or 81-100%) in their estimates of benevolence.

Correlations with Social Desirability

Item correlations with self-deception, impression management, and overall desirable responding are presented in Table 3.6. The reliabilities for the three scales of socially desirable
Table 3.6
Retained Item Correlations with Self-Deception, Impression Management, and Overall Desirable Responding in Pilot Study One

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>IM</th>
<th>DR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>#210</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>-.26</td>
<td>-.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#226</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>-.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#199</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>-.22</td>
<td>-.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#238</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>-.19</td>
<td>-.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#212</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>-.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#235</td>
<td>-.14</td>
<td>-.24</td>
<td>-.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#225</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>-.15</td>
<td>-.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#214</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>-.17</td>
<td>-.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#229</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>-.16</td>
<td>-.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#179</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>-.17</td>
<td>-.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#208</td>
<td>-.00</td>
<td>-.16</td>
<td>-.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#183</td>
<td>-.17</td>
<td>-.23</td>
<td>-.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#220</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#194</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>-.16</td>
<td>-.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#171</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>-.20</td>
<td>-.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#182</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>-.12</td>
<td>-.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#170</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>-.13</td>
<td>-.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#232</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>-.17</td>
<td>-.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#060</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>-.17</td>
<td>-.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#184</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>-.11</td>
<td>-.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#032</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>-.18</td>
<td>-.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#031</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>-.15</td>
<td>-.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#056</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>-.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#064</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>-.11</td>
<td>-.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#240</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>-.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#030</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>-.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#195</td>
<td>-.11</td>
<td>-.24</td>
<td>-.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#173</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>-.13</td>
<td>-.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#028</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>-.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#042</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>-.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#237</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>-.16</td>
<td>-.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#059</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>-.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#206</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>-.12</td>
<td>-.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#014</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>-.14</td>
<td>-.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#029</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>-.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#035</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>-.21</td>
<td>-.17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

"(table con'd.)"
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>IM</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>DR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>#132</td>
<td>-.14</td>
<td>-.27</td>
<td>-.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#136</td>
<td>-.12</td>
<td>-.23</td>
<td>-.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#138</td>
<td>-.12</td>
<td>-.21</td>
<td>-.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#111</td>
<td>-.14</td>
<td>-.23</td>
<td>-.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#140</td>
<td>-.17</td>
<td>-.24</td>
<td>-.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#129</td>
<td>-.15</td>
<td>-.36</td>
<td>-.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#100</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>-.20</td>
<td>-.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#122</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>-.21</td>
<td>-.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#106</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>-.13</td>
<td>-.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#087</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>-.15</td>
<td>-.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#135</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>-.20</td>
<td>-.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#158</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>-.12</td>
<td>-.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#092</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>-.18</td>
<td>-.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#168</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>-.24</td>
<td>-.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#167</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>-.15</td>
<td>-.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#157</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>-.19</td>
<td>-.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#113</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>-.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#071</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>-.17</td>
<td>-.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#077</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#117</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#149</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#154</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#141</td>
<td>-.11</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>-.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#109</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#143</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#072</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#147</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#091</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td>.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#074</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#124</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.28</td>
<td>.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#128</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#104</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#082</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#125</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.26</td>
<td>.22</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

"(table con'd.)"
## Indirect Equity Sensitivity Dimension

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>IM</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>DR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>#045</td>
<td>-0.00</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#219</td>
<td>-0.02</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>0.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#041</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#222</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>0.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#213</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>0.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#061</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#202</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>0.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#044</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#062</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>0.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#207</td>
<td>-0.03</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#054</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#023</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>-0.02</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#052</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>-0.00</td>
<td>0.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#063</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#046</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#186</td>
<td>-0.02</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>0.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#211</td>
<td>-0.11</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#197</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>0.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#020</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#022</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#187</td>
<td>-0.06</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#218</td>
<td>-0.07</td>
<td>-0.07</td>
<td>-0.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#200</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>0.13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Indirect Benevolence Dimension

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>IM</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>DR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>#037</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>-0.06</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#252</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>-0.06</td>
<td>-0.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#013</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
<td>-0.05</td>
<td>-0.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#003</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#012</td>
<td>-0.04</td>
<td>-0.10</td>
<td>-0.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#040</td>
<td>-0.05</td>
<td>-0.04</td>
<td>-0.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#011</td>
<td>-0.03</td>
<td>-0.06</td>
<td>-0.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#060</td>
<td>-0.03</td>
<td>-0.03</td>
<td>-0.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#019</td>
<td>-0.02</td>
<td>-0.09</td>
<td>-0.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#159</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

"(table con'd.)"
Indirect Benevolence Dimension (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>IM</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>DR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>#263</td>
<td>-.00</td>
<td>-.00</td>
<td>-.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#018</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>-.11</td>
<td>-.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#262</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>-.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#038</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>-.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#229</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#188</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#010</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>-.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#043</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>-.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#009</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>-.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#021</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>-.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#005</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SD = Self-Deception Scale  
IM = Impression Management Scale  
DR = Overall Desirable Responding
responding were .57 for the self-deception scale, .75 for the impression management scale, and .74 for the overall desirable responding scale. Correlations between self-deception and individual items representing indirect entitlement were less than +/- .20, ranging from .00 to -.17. Correlations between impression management and individual items representing indirect entitlement were less than +/- .30, ranging from -.01 to -.26. Correlations between overall desirable responding and individual items representing indirect entitlement were less than +/- .30, ranging from .02 to -.25.

With the direct entitlement-benevolence dimension, correlations between self-deception and individual items were less than +/- .20, ranging from .00 to -.17. Correlations between impression management and individual items representing direct entitlement-benevolence were less than +/- .40, ranging from .01 to -.36. Correlations between overall desirable responding and individual items representing direct entitlement-benevolence were less than +/- .40, ranging from .00 to -.31.

With the indirect equity sensitivity dimension, correlations between self-deception and individual items were less than +/- .20, ranging from .00 to -.11. Correlations between impression management and individual items representing indirect equity sensitivity were less than +/- .20, ranging from .00 to .17. Correlations between overall desirable responding and individual
items representing indirect equity sensitivity were less than +/-.20, ranging from .00 to .14.

With indirect benevolence, correlations between self-deception and individual items were less than +/-.10, ranging from .00 to .06. Correlations between impression management and individual items representing indirect benevolence were less than +/-.20, ranging from .00 to .14. Correlations between overall desirable responding and individual items representing indirect benevolence were less than +/-.10, ranging from .00 to .09.

Overall, correlations between self-deception and items on the four dimensions were less than +/-.20, ranging from .00 to -.17. Correlations between impression management and the items on the four dimensions were less than +/-.40, ranging from .00 to -.36. Correlations between overall desirable responding and the items on the four dimensions were less than +/-.40, ranging from .00 to -.31. Because correlations of +/-.40 and below have been used to demonstrate the absence of biasing due to social desirability (cf. Carson & Bedeian, 1994), self-deception, impression management, and overall desirable responding did not appear to represent a problem for items representing the four dimensions revealed in the initial pilot study.

Retained Items

Of the 114 items retained for the new equity sensitivity measure, 36 items were indirect entitlement, 34 items were direct
entitlement-benevolence items, 23 items were indirect equity sensitivity, and 21 items were indirect benevolence. Of the 36 indirect entitlement items, 24 were similarity-attraction items and 12 were false-consensus items. Of the 34 direct entitlement-benevolence items, 32 were traditional items and 2 were similar to me items. Of the 25 indirect equity sensitivity items, 12 were false-consensus items and 11 were similarity-attraction items. Of the 21 indirect benevolence items, 16 were false-consensus items, 3 were similar to me items, 1 was a similarity-attraction item, and 1 was a traditional item. These retained items are presented in Table 3.7.

Phase 2B: Second Pilot Study

Following the initial pilot study, a second pilot study was conducted to further assess the psychometric properties of the 114 equity sensitivity items.

Questionnaire Administration

Questionnaires were administered to 193 undergraduate students enrolled in management and psychology classes at Louisiana State University. Of the 193 undergraduates, 103 were female and 90 were male. The average age of subjects in this sample was 22 years old, with a range from 18 to 52 years old. In terms of race, 157 subjects classified themselves as white, 13 subjects classified themselves as hispanic, 11 subjects classified themselves as asian or pacific islanders, 9 subjects classified
Table 3.7
Retained Items from Pilot Study One

Indirect Entitlement Dimension

221. How many of your friends try to do less work than they are paid to do?

238. How many of your friends believe that the only things that are important at work are the wages and benefits the employer provides them for their services?

250. How many of your friends, if they were paid a high wage by their employer, would still take it easy on their jobs?

210. How many of your friends try to do as little as possible at work?

224. How many of your friends are satisfied only when the rewards they receive from their employer are greater than the amount of work they perform?

247. How many of your friends would loaf on the job if given the opportunity?

237. How many of your friends are the type of people who won't work hard unless they are forced to do so?

226. How many of your friends, if they had little or nothing to do at work, would be completely satisfied?

193. How many of your friends when at their jobs look for ways to get out of work?

241. How many of your friends want more rewards for their work than they deserve?

219. How many of your friends believe that you must be concerned about taking care of yourself first and that means getting as much as you can from your employer for the work you do?

189. How many of your friends, when making a choice between jobs, would always choose the job which provides them the greatest pay and benefits regardless?

"(table con'd.)"
065. How many employees in a typical organization enjoy doing as little as possible at work?

232. How many of your friends, if they were offered what they considered to be a "fair deal" by their employer for the work they performed, would still try to negotiate with their employer to get a better deal?

205. How many of your friends feel like they should always get something for nothing at work?

061. How many employees in a typical organization believe that the best day at work is one where there is little work for them to do?

035. How many employees in a typical organization, even if they were paid a fair wage relative to similarly qualified coworkers, would still try to get out of work?

034. How many employees in a typical organization believe that the best job is one that requires you to do as little work as possible?

070. How many employees in a typical organization are "takers" rather than "givers"?

192. How many of your friends are concerned about getting the most they can from their employer, in terms of pay, benefits, and the like?

181. How many of your friends believe that a big paycheck and a good benefits package is enough to make them completely satisfied at work?

244. How many of your friends, if they could get away with it, would take it easy on their jobs?

195. How many of your friends believe that if a person is given a choice between jobs which pay the same money, the person should always choose the one which requires less work?

180. How many of your friends would agree that satisfaction for them comes from knowing that they are getting as much as they can from their employer, in terms of pay and benefits?

033. How many employees in a typical organization want more rewards for their work than they work for or deserve?

"(table con'd.)"
030. How many employees in a typical organization would take it easy on the job if they could get away with it?

252. How many of your friends believe that it is extremely important for them to get the best deal possible, in terms of pay and benefits, from their employer?

206. How many of your friends, if they were being paid the same wage as similarly qualified co-workers, would take unauthorized work breaks?

045. How many employees in a typical organization are only concerned about what the job pays them?

183. How many of your friends believe that high wages and good benefits are the most important reasons for working?

249. How many of your friends, if they had to work real hard at a job full time, would think about quitting?

217. How many of your friends, if they were paid the same wage as similarly qualified co-workers but produced less work, would feel no motivation to produce more work in the future?

031. How many employees in a typical organization, if they believed that their employer was not paying them top dollar for their work, would seriously think about quitting?

016. How many employees in a typical organization believe that they should strive to get as much from the organization as they can while giving as little as possible in return?

038. How many employees in a typical organization, if they were being paid the same wage as similarly qualified co-workers for the same amount of work, would still take unauthorized work breaks?

064. How many employees in a typical organization feel like they should always get something for nothing?

Direct Entitlement-Benevolence Dimension

141. If I could get away with it, I would take it easy on the job.

145. An ideal job for me is one with few duties and responsibilities.

"(table con'd.)"
147. The best job I can have is one which permits me to do almost nothing during the work day.

150. If I could get away with it, I would try to work just a little bit slower than the boss expects.

138. When I am at my job, I think of ways to get out of work.

119. My dream is to get ahead in life without having to try too hard to do it.

108. I prefer to do as little as possible at work while getting as much as I can from my employer.

131. I am most satisfied at work when I have to do as little as possible.

114. It is the smart employee who gets as much as he/she can while giving as little as possible in return.

095. Employees who are more concerned about what they can get from their employer rather than what they can give to their employer are the wise ones.

144. I always try to do things the easy way at work.

168. You and your co-worker, who is similar to you in both background and years of experience, are both loafing at work and both of you are given the same high level of rewards. How satisfied would you be given this situation?

100. It is really satisfying to me when I can get something for nothing at work.

177. You and your co-worker, who is similar to you in both background and years of experience, are both loafing at work, but you receive significantly more rewards than does your co-worker. How satisfied would you be given this situation?

121. If I were given low wages and poor benefits by my employer, I would reduce my productivity.

078. If I had to work hard all day at my job, I would probably quit.

126. Even in the face of low wages and poor benefits, I could still be satisfied at work under certain conditions.

"(table con'd.)"
084. I worry about doing the best job I can.

167. You are working significantly less than your co-worker, who is similar to you in both background and years of experience, but you receive significantly more rewards than does your co-worker. How satisfied would you be given this situation?

178. You are working significantly less than your co-worker, who is similar to you in both background and years of experience, but you receive the same level of rewards as your co-worker. How satisfied would you be given this situation?

164. You and your co-worker, who is similar to you in both background and years of experience, are both loafing at work, but you receive significantly less rewards than does your co-worker. How would you respond to this situation, in terms of productivity?

159. You and your co-worker, who is similar to you in both background and years of experience, are both loafing at work but both of you are given the same high level of rewards. How would you respond to this situation, in terms of productivity?

151. It is better to give than to receive.

117. All other things being equal, it is better to have a job with a lot of duties and responsibilities than one with few duties and responsibilities.

079. When I have completed my tasks for the day, I help out other employees who have yet to complete their tasks.

153. I like to do my best at work.

099. A job which requires me to be busy during the day is better than one which allows a lot of loafing.

157. You and your co-worker, who is similar to you in both background and years of experience, are both working equally hard but you are given significantly less rewards than your co-worker. How would you respond to this situation, in terms of productivity?

081. At work, I feel uneasy when there is little for me to do.

112. It drives me crazy when I have nothing to do at work.

"(table con’d.)"
133. At work, my greatest concern is whether or not I am doing the best job I can.

137. Even if I received low wages and poor benefits from my employer, I would still try to do my best at my job.

090. I feel obligated to do more than I am paid to do at work.

134. I would become very dissatisfied with my job if I had little or no work to do.

**Indirect Equity Sensitivity Dimension**

048. How many employees in a typical organization, if they were paid the same wage as similarly qualified co-workers for the same amount of work, would feel satisfied and would continue to do as much work as they have in the past?

231. How many of your friends like to do their best at work?

044. How many employees in a typical organization, if they were paid the same wage as similarly qualified co-workers for the same amount of work, would be completely satisfied?

234. How many of your friends would agree that doing a good job at work and receiving a good paycheck are equally important?

225. How many of your friends feel most comfortable when the amount of work they perform matches the wages they are paid for it?

066. How many employees in a typical organization put in a full day of hard work?

213. How many of your friends try hard to do well at work?

047. How many employees in a typical organization are most comfortable when what they get from their employer matches what they give to their employer?

067. How many employees in a typical organization live by the motto "a fair day's work (no more, no less) for a fair day's wage"?

059. How many employees in a typical organization on any given day put in a full day of hard work?

"(table con'd.)"
218. How many of your friends, if they were paid the same wage as similarly qualified co-workers for the same amount of work, would be completely satisfied?

025. How many employees in a typical organization believe that they should be paid the same amount (no more, no less) as similarly qualified co-workers for the same amount of work?

057. How many employees in a typical organization put in a fair day’s work (no more, no less) for a fair day’s wage?

069. How many employees in a typical organization believe that it’s equally good to give and to receive?

049. How many employees in a typical organization believe that an employee should try to stay busy all day rather than try to find ways to get out of doing work?

197. How many of your friends believe it’s equally good to give and to receive?

222. How many of your friends believe that it’s equally important to watch out for your own good and to help others?

208. How many of your friends are equally concerned about what they can get from their employer and what they can give to their employer?

022. How many employees in a typical organization, if they worked the same amount as other similarly qualified co-workers, would expect to be paid the same amount (no more, no less) as these other similarly qualified co-workers?

230. How many of your friends believe that if they are paid less than other similarly qualified co-workers they should work less than these co-workers and that if they are paid more than other similarly qualified co-workers, they should work more than these co-workers?

198. How many of your friends, if they worked less than other similarly qualified co-workers, would expect to be paid less than these other similarly qualified co-workers?

211. How many of your friends live by the motto "a fair day’s work (no more, no less) for a fair day’s wage"?

"(table con'd.)"
024. How many employees in a typical organization prefer that the amount of work they perform matches the amount they are paid for it?

Indirect Benevolence Dimension

040. How many employees in a typical organization feel like they should do more work even though they have already put in the same amount of work as others doing the same job?

263. How willing would you be, if you were an employer, to hire an applicant who believes that they should be paid more than other similarly qualified co-workers but have to work less than these co-workers?

015. How many employees in a typical organization, if they were paid the same amount as similarly qualified co-workers for the same amount of work, would feel guilty and would increase the amount of work they performed?

003. How many employees in a typical organization believe that if they are paid the same wage as similarly qualified co-workers, they should work harder than these co-workers?

014. How many employees in a typical organization, if similarly qualified co-workers got a better deal from the organization than they did, would not really be bothered by it and would continue to do their best on the job?

043. How many employees in a typical organization shy away from accepting things that they have worked for or deserve because they do not like even the appearance of being indebted others?

013. How many employees in a typical organization, if they were being paid a lower wage than similarly qualified co-workers who performed the same amount of work, would be most satisfied?

062. How many employees in a typical organization prefer that the amount of work they perform always exceeds the amount they are paid for it?

275. How willing would you be, if you were an employer, to hire an applicant who looks for ways to avoid work?

005. How many employees in a typical organization take on extra work for their jobs even though it is not required of them?

"(table con'd.)"
021. How many employees in a typical organization believe that the amount of pay and benefits an employer provides them is really not that important?

169. You and your co-worker, who is similar to you in both background and years of experience, are working equally hard but you are given significantly less rewards than your co-worker. How satisfied would you be given this situation?

020. How many employees in a typical organization, if they were being paid less than similarly qualified co-workers for the same amount of work, would still be satisfied?

274. How willing would you be, if you were an employer, to hire an applicant who believes that he/she should always get something for nothing at work?

041. How many employees in a typical organization, if they worked the same amount as other similarly qualified co-workers, would expect to be paid a lower amount than these other similarly qualified co-workers?

243. How many of your friends are most satisfied when the amount of work they perform outweighs the amount they are paid for it by their employers?

199. How many employees in a typical organization, if the amount of wages they received matched the amount of work they performed, would feel guilty and would increase their productivity?

011. How many employees in a typical organization, even if they received low wages and benefits from their employer, would still try to do their best on the job?

046. How many employees in a typical organization, if they received low wages and benefits from their employer, would not be seriously bothered by it?

009. How many employees in a typical organization are most satisfied when the amount of work they perform is greater than the amount they are paid for it?

023. How many employees in a typical organization, if they were being paid less than similarly qualified co-workers for the same amount of work, would still keep up their productivity?
themselves as black, 2 subjects classified themselves as American Indian, and 1 subject gave no classification. The average educational level for subjects in this sample was that of a junior in college.

As was the case in the initial pilot study, due to the length of the LSU Life at Work Survey and the accompanying Balanced Inventory of Desirable Responding (BIDR), the order in which these surveys were completed was varied. Half the subjects completed the BIDR first and the other half completed the LSU Life at Work Survey first. The demographic form was always completed last.

Prior to completing the two questionnaires and the demographic form, subjects were given a set of directions outlining the purpose of the study, the subjects' duties, assurance of anonymity and confidentiality, the order in which to complete the two questionnaires, and procedural details concerning the recording of responses to the two questionnaires. These instructions were also read aloud to the subjects. These instructions were the same instructions used in the initial pilot study (see Appendix 0).

Questionnaires for Second Pilot Study

Prefatory instructions were developed to introduce the new measure of equity sensitivity and to assure the subjects that their responses to the items were being made anonymously and that their responses to the items would be kept in strict confidentiality. These instructions appear in Appendix P.
Given that different scales were used for direct and indirect items, items on the survey were grouped according to the scale that was used. For example, direct items that used a 5-point Likert scale of strongly disagree (1) to strongly agree (5) were grouped together whereas false consensus items that used a 5-point Likert scale of 00-20% (1) to 81-100% (5) were grouped together. There were four groups of items, each with a different 5-point Likert scale. The order in which the groups of items were presented was randomized. In addition, within each group of items, the order of items was randomized. See Appendix S for the instrument used in the second pilot study.

In addition, a 5-point Likert scale of not true (1) to very true (5) was used for the 40 items that comprise the Balanced Inventory of Desirable Responding (Paulhus, 1986). The BIDR is presented in Appendix B. Finally, a demographic form was used to collect information from the subjects concerning their age, gender, race, and educational level.

Principal-Axes Factor Analysis

The 114 items of equity sensitivity were examined using a principal-axes factor analysis with a promax rotation (see Table 3.8). With the eigenvalue-greater-than-1.0 stopping rule, 30 factors were identified. Eigenvalues for the 30 factors ranged from 17.52 to 1.05. Percentage of variance explained ranged from 17.52 to 1.05. In the scree plot, the breakpoint occurred after
Table 3.8
Principal-Axes Factor Analysis of New Equity Sensitivity Measure in Pilot Study Two

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Eigenvalue</th>
<th>Pct of Variance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>17.52</td>
<td>15.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>6.86</td>
<td>11.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>6.64</td>
<td>6.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>5.91</td>
<td>6.62</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Promax Rotation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Item 018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 032</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 023</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 034</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 022</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 024</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 029</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 030</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 035</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 090</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 087</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 074</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 072</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 108</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

"(table con’d.)"
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Factor 1</th>
<th>Factor 2</th>
<th>Factor 3</th>
<th>Factor 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Item 076</td>
<td>.45</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 016</td>
<td>.39</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>-.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 069</td>
<td>-.45</td>
<td>-.40</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 056</td>
<td>.34</td>
<td>.74</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 047</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 058</td>
<td>.24</td>
<td>.61</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 039</td>
<td>.29</td>
<td>.59</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 040</td>
<td>.36</td>
<td>.62</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 041</td>
<td>.38</td>
<td>.61</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 062</td>
<td>.33</td>
<td>.59</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 046</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.49</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 050</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>.53</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 053</td>
<td>.30</td>
<td>.51</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 059</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>.43</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>-.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 038</td>
<td>.24</td>
<td>.47</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 043</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>.47</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 060</td>
<td>.30</td>
<td>.45</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 064</td>
<td>.38</td>
<td>.47</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 067</td>
<td>.29</td>
<td>.43</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 068</td>
<td>.45</td>
<td>.46</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 066</td>
<td>.33</td>
<td>.40</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 114</td>
<td>-.14</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td>-.13</td>
<td>.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 070</td>
<td>-.23</td>
<td>-.25</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 052</td>
<td>-.17</td>
<td>-.25</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 071</td>
<td>-.28</td>
<td>-.32</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 042</td>
<td>-.18</td>
<td>-.29</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 045</td>
<td>-.29</td>
<td>-.45</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td>.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 054</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>-.40</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>-.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 037</td>
<td>-.25</td>
<td>-.48</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 056</td>
<td>-.15</td>
<td>-.49</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 061</td>
<td>-.14</td>
<td>-.49</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 051</td>
<td>-.33</td>
<td>-.59</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 044</td>
<td>-.14</td>
<td>-.55</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>-.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 057</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>-.54</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>-.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 063</td>
<td>-.13</td>
<td>-.57</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 048</td>
<td>-.18</td>
<td>-.61</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 049</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>-.59</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>-.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 099</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>.64</td>
<td>-.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 094</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.63</td>
<td>-.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 109</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.60</td>
<td>-.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 093</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>.57</td>
<td>-.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 083</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>.57</td>
<td>.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 085</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.57</td>
<td>.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 091</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.57</td>
<td>.16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

"(table con'd.)"
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Factor 1</th>
<th>Factor 2</th>
<th>Factor 3</th>
<th>Factor 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Item 097</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td>-.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 086</td>
<td>-.20</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.62</td>
<td>.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 020</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.49</td>
<td>.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 110</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>.48</td>
<td>.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 028</td>
<td>-.14</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>.48</td>
<td>.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 013</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.47</td>
<td>.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 081</td>
<td>-.14</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>.46</td>
<td>.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 026</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.43</td>
<td>-.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 036</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.40</td>
<td>-.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 031</td>
<td>-.39</td>
<td>-.12</td>
<td>.42</td>
<td>-.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 075</td>
<td>-.14</td>
<td>-.12</td>
<td>.39</td>
<td>-.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 011</td>
<td>-.42</td>
<td>-.24</td>
<td>.39</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 033</td>
<td>-.27</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>.36</td>
<td>.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 025</td>
<td>-.21</td>
<td>-.11</td>
<td>.34</td>
<td>-.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 002</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>-.11</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>-.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 001</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>.24</td>
<td>-.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 092</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 103</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 107</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 077</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 096</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 079</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 082</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 112</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>-.14</td>
<td>.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 080</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 111</td>
<td>.40</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 084</td>
<td>-.25</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 088</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 098</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 105</td>
<td>.45</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 113</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>-.16</td>
<td>.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 101</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>.24</td>
<td>.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 089</td>
<td>-.13</td>
<td>-.13</td>
<td>.27</td>
<td>.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 095</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>-.14</td>
<td>.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 073</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 027</td>
<td>-.18</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>-.13</td>
<td>.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 078</td>
<td>-.12</td>
<td>-.12</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 065</td>
<td>-.20</td>
<td>-.24</td>
<td>-.18</td>
<td>.25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
the fourth factor. In addition, factors beyond the fourth factor were indeterminate. Therefore, based on the size of the eigenvalues, the results of the scree plot, and the indeterminacy of the factors beyond the fourth factor, four factors were ultimately extracted. The eigenvalues for the four factors were 17.52, 6.79, 6.57, and 5.91. Percentage of variance explained by each factor was 17.52, 6.79, 6.57, and 5.91, respectively.

Fourty-two items loaded on the first factor (i.e., indirect entitlement dimension). Because of 10 split loadings, 32 items were retained. These items are presented in Table 3.8. Thirty seven items loaded on the second factor (i.e., direct entitlement-benevolence dimension). Because of 14 split loadings, 23 items were retained. These items are presented in Table 3.8. Twenty-two items loaded on the third factor (i.e., indirect equity sensitivity dimension). Because of 6 split loadings, 16 items were retained. These items are presented in Table 3.8. Twenty one items loaded on the fourth factor (i.e., indirect benevolence dimension). Because of 4 split loadings, 17 items were retained. These items are presented in Table 3.8.

The first factor consisted of items representing the indirect entitlement dimension, the second factor consisted of items representing the direct entitlement-benevolence dimension, the third factor consisted of items representing the indirect equity sensitivity dimension, and the fourth factor consisted of items
representing the indirect benevolence dimension. Thus, the factor structure found in the initial pilot study was replicated in the second pilot study and again, it failed to support Huseman et al.’s (1987) four dimensional model of equity sensitivity. However, as was pointed out in the results for the initial pilot study, this factor structure may provide some preliminary support for the utility of indirect items as a measure of the equity sensitivity construct.

Frequencies and Reliabilities

Frequency distributions and reliabilities for the retained items in pilot study two are presented in Table 3.9. Means for the 32 items representing the indirect entitlement dimension ranged from 2.04 to 4.56. The standard deviations ranged from .67 to 1.17 with respondents using all anchors on the 5-point scales. The reliability coefficient for this dimension was .94. An examination of the item-total correlations for each of the items comprising this dimension revealed that none of the items lowered the reliability of this dimension. Variability in responses as well as the high reliability suggested that restriction of range did not present a problem for the indirect entitlement dimension.

Means for the 23 items representing the direct entitlement-benevolence dimension ranged from 1.69 to 4.22. The standard deviations ranged from .75 to 1.02 with respondents using all anchors on the 5-point scales. The reliability coefficient for
Table 3.9  
Frequencies, Means, Standard Deviations, and Reliabilities for Items Retained in Pilot Study Two

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>#018</td>
<td>02</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>3.72</td>
<td>1.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#032</td>
<td>07</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>3.49</td>
<td>1.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#006</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>2.75</td>
<td>1.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#021</td>
<td>07</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>3.73</td>
<td>1.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#023</td>
<td>09</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>3.47</td>
<td>1.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#034</td>
<td>07</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>3.25</td>
<td>1.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#017</td>
<td>01</td>
<td>07</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>4.21</td>
<td>0.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#022</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>3.01</td>
<td>1.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#005</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>3.07</td>
<td>1.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#024</td>
<td>08</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>3.63</td>
<td>1.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#029</td>
<td>06</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>3.20</td>
<td>0.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#019</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>3.09</td>
<td>1.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#007</td>
<td>04</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>4.32</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#003</td>
<td>06</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>3.64</td>
<td>1.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#014</td>
<td>01</td>
<td>02</td>
<td>07</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>4.56</td>
<td>0.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#010</td>
<td>08</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>3.30</td>
<td>1.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#015</td>
<td>04</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>3.78</td>
<td>0.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#008</td>
<td>03</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>4.05</td>
<td>1.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#012</td>
<td>02</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>3.92</td>
<td>0.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#102</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>02</td>
<td>2.28</td>
<td>0.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#100</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>04</td>
<td>2.04</td>
<td>1.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#030</td>
<td>02</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>4.01</td>
<td>0.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#035</td>
<td>04</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>3.18</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#105</td>
<td>09</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>3.21</td>
<td>1.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#090</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>05</td>
<td>2.32</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#087</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>02</td>
<td>2.31</td>
<td>0.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#104</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>07</td>
<td>2.95</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#074</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>3.49</td>
<td>1.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#072</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3.06</td>
<td>1.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#108</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>2.99</td>
<td>1.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#076</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>07</td>
<td>2.46</td>
<td>1.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#016</td>
<td>08</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>3.31</td>
<td>0.99</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Reliability Coefficient for 32 items = 0.94

"(table con'd.)"
### Direct Entitlement-Benevolence Dimension

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>#056</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>07</td>
<td>05</td>
<td>2.03</td>
<td>0.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#047</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>05</td>
<td>03</td>
<td>1.94</td>
<td>0.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#058</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>09</td>
<td>01</td>
<td>1.94</td>
<td>0.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#039</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>05</td>
<td>02</td>
<td>1.69</td>
<td>0.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#040</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>08</td>
<td>2.13</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#041</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>01</td>
<td>2.61</td>
<td>0.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#062</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>2.16</td>
<td>0.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#046</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>2.31</td>
<td>0.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#050</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>06</td>
<td>2.63</td>
<td>0.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#053</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>05</td>
<td>02</td>
<td>1.92</td>
<td>0.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#059</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>06</td>
<td>2.81</td>
<td>0.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#038</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>05</td>
<td>1.95</td>
<td>0.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#043</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>09</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>2.09</td>
<td>0.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#054</td>
<td>03</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>3.69</td>
<td>0.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#037</td>
<td>03</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>3.76</td>
<td>1.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#055</td>
<td>02</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>3.89</td>
<td>0.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#061</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>08</td>
<td>2.83</td>
<td>0.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#051</td>
<td>02</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>3.81</td>
<td>0.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#044</td>
<td>02</td>
<td>06</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>4.22</td>
<td>0.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#057</td>
<td>01</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>3.84</td>
<td>0.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#063</td>
<td>01</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>4.02</td>
<td>0.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#048</td>
<td>01</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>4.14</td>
<td>0.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#049</td>
<td>01</td>
<td>09</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>4.02</td>
<td>0.80</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Reliability Coefficient for 23 items = 0.90

### Indirect Equity Sensitivity Dimension

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>#099</td>
<td>06</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>3.62</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#094</td>
<td>01</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>3.77</td>
<td>0.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#109</td>
<td>04</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>3.73</td>
<td>0.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#093</td>
<td>06</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>3.91</td>
<td>0.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#083</td>
<td>04</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3.27</td>
<td>0.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#085</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>3.01</td>
<td>1.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#091</td>
<td>07</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3.17</td>
<td>0.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#097</td>
<td>01</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>4.02</td>
<td>0.90</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

"(table con'd.)"
### Indirect Equity Sensitivity Dimension (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>#086</td>
<td>07</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>08</td>
<td>3.16</td>
<td>0.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#020</td>
<td>04</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>3.55</td>
<td>0.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#110</td>
<td>09</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>04</td>
<td>2.96</td>
<td>0.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#028</td>
<td>01</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>3.97</td>
<td>0.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#013</td>
<td>07</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>3.66</td>
<td>1.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#026</td>
<td>05</td>
<td>07</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>3.99</td>
<td>0.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#036</td>
<td>07</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>3.64</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#075</td>
<td>08</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>3.52</td>
<td>1.13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Reliability Coefficient for 16 items = 0.84

### Indirect Benevolence Dimension

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>#092</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>05</td>
<td>1.80</td>
<td>1.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#103</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>07</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>1.66</td>
<td>0.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#107</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>06</td>
<td>03</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>0.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#077</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>08</td>
<td>01</td>
<td>1.68</td>
<td>0.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#096</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>03</td>
<td>1.91</td>
<td>1.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#079</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>04</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>1.26</td>
<td>0.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#082</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>09</td>
<td>09</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>1.47</td>
<td>0.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#112</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>08</td>
<td>03</td>
<td>01</td>
<td>1.36</td>
<td>0.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#080</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>1.94</td>
<td>0.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#084</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>08</td>
<td>03</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>1.30</td>
<td>0.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#088</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>01</td>
<td>1.66</td>
<td>0.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#098</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>07</td>
<td>07</td>
<td>1.67</td>
<td>1.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#113</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>06</td>
<td>01</td>
<td>01</td>
<td>1.28</td>
<td>0.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#101</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>2.17</td>
<td>0.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#095</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>07</td>
<td>01</td>
<td>1.82</td>
<td>0.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#073</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>06</td>
<td>1.75</td>
<td>1.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#027</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>08</td>
<td>2.14</td>
<td>1.10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Reliability Coefficient for 17 items = 0.82
this dimension was .90. An examination of the item-total correlations for each of the items comprising this dimension revealed that none of the items lowered the reliability of the dimension. Variability in responses as well as the high reliability suggested that restriction of range did not present a problem for the direct entitlement-benevolence dimension.

Means for the 16 items representing the indirect equity sensitivity dimension ranged from 2.96 to 4.07. The standard deviations ranged from .88 to 1.13 with respondents using all anchors on the 5-point scales for all but one item (I013). The reliability coefficient for this dimension was .82. An examination of the item-total correlations for each of the items revealed that none of the items lowered the dimension's reliability. Variability in responses as well as the high reliability suggested that restriction of range did not present a problem for the indirect equity sensitivity dimension.

Means for the 17 items representing the indirect benevolence dimension ranged from 1.26 to 2.17. The standard deviations ranged from .62 to 1.12 with respondents using all anchors on the five point scale for all but six items (I03, I079, I082, I080, I084, & I101). The reliability coefficient for this dimension was .82. An examination of the item-total correlations for each item comprising this dimension revealed that none of the items lowered the reliability of this dimension. Despite the relatively high
reliability of this dimension, some of the items do seem to suffer from range restriction. For six of the items, the respondents failed to use all anchors on the 5-point scales. Inspection of the standard deviations for the items on this dimension also revealed four items (#079, #112, #084, & #113) with low standard deviations ($SD < .70$) relative to the other items on this and the other three dimensions. Thus, after reviewing the frequency distributions as well as the standard deviations, it appears that a number of items on this dimension may suffer from a restriction of range problem. The most notable are items #079, #082, #084, #112, and #114. As was stated in the results section for the initial pilot study, a possible explanation for this restriction of range problem is the low number of benevolents in our society and in our work organizations. Given these low numbers, any estimates of their numbers in friends or typical organizations will likely be low. Therefore, when subjects estimate benevolence in their friends or among employees in a typical organization, it seems unlikely for them to use the upper end of the scale (i.e., many or 81-100%) in their estimates of benevolence.

Correlations with Social Desirability

Item correlations with self-deception, impression management, and overall desirable responding are presented in Table 3.10. The reliabilities for the three scales of the BIDR were .58 for the self-deception scale, .76 for the impression management scale, and
Table 3.10
Retained Item Correlations with Self-Deception, Impression Management, and Overall Desirable Responding in Pilot Study Two

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>IM</th>
<th>DR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>#018</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>-0.29</td>
<td>-0.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#032</td>
<td>-0.11</td>
<td>-0.27</td>
<td>-0.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#006</td>
<td>-0.03</td>
<td>-0.24</td>
<td>-0.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#021</td>
<td>-0.07</td>
<td>-0.14</td>
<td>-0.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#023</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
<td>-0.13</td>
<td>-0.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#034</td>
<td>-0.08</td>
<td>-0.28</td>
<td>-0.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#017</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>-0.17</td>
<td>-0.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#022</td>
<td>-0.03</td>
<td>-0.31</td>
<td>-0.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#005</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
<td>-0.27</td>
<td>-0.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#024</td>
<td>-0.02</td>
<td>-0.19</td>
<td>-0.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#029</td>
<td>-0.09</td>
<td>-0.30</td>
<td>-0.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#019</td>
<td>-0.07</td>
<td>-0.21</td>
<td>-0.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#007</td>
<td>-0.10</td>
<td>-0.24</td>
<td>-0.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#003</td>
<td>-0.12</td>
<td>-0.32</td>
<td>-0.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#014</td>
<td>-0.12</td>
<td>-0.33</td>
<td>-0.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#010</td>
<td>-0.02</td>
<td>-0.17</td>
<td>-0.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#015</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>-0.22</td>
<td>-0.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#008</td>
<td>-0.00</td>
<td>-0.20</td>
<td>-0.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#012</td>
<td>-0.03</td>
<td>-0.21</td>
<td>-0.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#102</td>
<td>-0.00</td>
<td>-0.12</td>
<td>-0.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#100</td>
<td>-0.02</td>
<td>-0.15</td>
<td>-0.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#030</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
<td>-0.20</td>
<td>-0.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#035</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>-0.22</td>
<td>-0.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#105</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>-0.05</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#090</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>-0.00</td>
<td>-0.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#087</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
<td>-0.03</td>
<td>-0.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#104</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>-0.15</td>
<td>-0.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#074</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>-0.21</td>
<td>-0.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#072</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>-0.07</td>
<td>-0.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#108</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>-0.11</td>
<td>-0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#076</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>-0.09</td>
<td>-0.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#016</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>-0.19</td>
<td>-0.13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

"(table con'd.)"
### Direct Entitlement-Benevolence Dimension

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>IM</th>
<th>DR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>#056</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>-.25</td>
<td>-.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#047</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>-.12</td>
<td>-.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#058</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>-.21</td>
<td>-.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#039</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>-.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#040</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>-.20</td>
<td>-.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#041</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>-.14</td>
<td>-.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#062</td>
<td>-.14</td>
<td>-.20</td>
<td>-.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#046</td>
<td>-.20</td>
<td>-.22</td>
<td>-.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#050</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>-.21</td>
<td>-.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#053</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>-.11</td>
<td>-.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#059</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>-.15</td>
<td>-.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#038</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>-.12</td>
<td>-.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#043</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>-.22</td>
<td>-.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#054</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>-.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#037</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>-.19</td>
<td>-.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#055</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>-.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#061</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>-.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#051</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>-.14</td>
<td>-.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#044</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>-.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#057</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>-.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#063</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#048</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>-.14</td>
<td>-.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#049</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>-.01</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Indirect Equity Sensitivity Dimension

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>IM</th>
<th>DR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>#099</td>
<td>-.11</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>-.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#094</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>-.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#109</td>
<td>-.14</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>-.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#093</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#083</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>-.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#085</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>-.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#091</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#097</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#086</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#020</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

"(table con'd.)"
Indirect Equity Sensitivity Dimension (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>IM</th>
<th>DR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>#110</td>
<td>-.00</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>-.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#028</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#013</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>-.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#026</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>-.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#036</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>-.14</td>
<td>-.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#075</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Indirect Benevolence Dimension

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>IM</th>
<th>DR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>#092</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#103</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#107</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>-.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#077</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#096</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#079</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>-.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#082</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#112</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>-.14</td>
<td>-.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#080</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>-.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#084</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#088</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#098</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#113</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#101</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>-.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#095</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#073</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>-.00</td>
<td>-.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#027</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.09</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SD = Self-Deception Scale
IM = Impression Management Scale
DR = Overall Desirable Responding Scale
.73 for the overall desirable responding scale. Correlations between self-deception and individual items representing indirect entitlement were less than +/- .20, ranging from .00 to .13. Correlations between impression management and individual items representing indirect entitlement were less than +/- .40, ranging from .00 to -.33. Correlations between overall desirable responding and individual items representing indirect entitlement were less than +/- .40, ranging from -.01 to -.31.

With the direct entitlement-benevolence dimension, correlations between self-deception and individual items were less than +/- .30, ranging from .00 to -.20. Correlations between impression management and individual items representing direct entitlement-benevolence were less than +/- .30, ranging from .01 to -.25. Correlations between overall desirable responding and individual items representing direct entitlement-benevolence were less than +/- .30, ranging from .00 to -.27.

With the indirect equity sensitivity dimension, correlations between self-deception and individual items were less than +/- .20, ranging from .00 to -.11. Correlations between impression management and individual items representing indirect equity sensitivity were less than +/- .20, ranging from .00 to -.14. Correlations between overall desirable responding and individual items representing indirect equity sensitivity were less than +/- .20, ranging from .00 to .17.
With indirect benevolence, correlations between self-deception and individual items were less than +/- .20, ranging from .00 to .18. Correlations between impression management and individual items representing indirect benevolence were less than +/- .20, ranging from .00 to .15. Correlations between overall desirable responding and individual items representing indirect benevolence were less than +/- .30, ranging from .00 to .20.

Overall, correlations between self-deception and items on the four dimensions were less than +/- .30, ranging from .00 to -.20. Correlations between impression management and the items on the four dimensions were less than +/- .40, ranging from .00 to -.33. Correlations between overall desirable responding and the items on the four dimensions were less than +/- .40, ranging from .00 to -.31. Because correlations of +/- .40 and below have been used to demonstrate the absence of biasing due to social desirability (cf. Carson & Bedeian, 1994), self-deception, impression management, and overall desirable responding did not appear to represent a problem for items representing the four dimensions revealed in the second pilot study.

Retained Items

Of the 88 items retained for the new equity sensitivity measure, 32 were indirect entitlement, 23 were direct entitlement-benevolence, 16 were indirect equity sensitivity, and 17 were indirect benevolence. Of the 32 indirect entitlement, 22 were
similarity attraction items and 10 were false consensus items. Of the 23 direct entitlement-benevolence items, 21 were traditional items and 2 were similar to me items. Of the 16 indirect equity sensitivity items, 13 were false-consensus items and 3 were similarity attraction items. Of the 17 indirect benevolence items, 14 were false-consensus items, 2 were similarity attraction items, and 1 was a similar to me item. These retained items are presented in Table 3.11.

From the retained items, sixteen item scales were constructed for each dimension (see Table 3.11). For one of the dimensions, indirect equity sensitivity, all retained items were used in constructing the sixteen item scales. For the other three dimensions, two criteria were used to select among the more than 16 items. The first criterion was to have a wide variety of items that represented all aspects of the dimension and the second criterion was to avoid redundancy in the items. In addition, for the direct entitlement-benevolence dimension, an equal number of entitled and benevolent items were selected for inclusion into the scale. The reliabilities for the four 16 item scales ranged from .88 to .82.

The four 16 item scales were then used to construct the new measure of equity sensitivity. In this new measure, items were grouped according to scale used. In total, there were 5 groups of items. The order in which the groups of items were presented was
Table 3.11
Retained Items from Pilot Study Two

Indirect Entitlement Dimension

018. How many of your friends, if they could get away with it, would take it easy on their jobs?

*032. How many of your friends want more rewards for their work than they deserve?

*006. How many of your friends feel like they should always get something for nothing at work?

021. How many of your friends believe that you must be concerned about taking care of yourself first and that means getting as much as you can from your employer for the work you do?

023. How many of your friends believe that the only things that are important at work are the wages and benefits the employer provides them for their services?

034. How many of your friends when at their jobs look for ways to get out of work?

017. How many of your friends are concerned about getting the most they can from their employer, in terms of pay, benefits, and the like?

*022. How many of your friends try to do as little as possible at work?

*005. How many of your friends, if they were being paid the same wage as similarly qualified co-workers, would take unauthorized work breaks?

*024. How many of your friends would agree that satisfaction for them comes from knowing that they are getting as much as they can from their employer, in terms of pay and benefits?

*029. How many of your friends, if they were paid a high wage by their employer, would still take it easy on their jobs?

*019. How many of your friends are the type of people who won't work hard unless they are forced to do so?

"(table con'd.)"
*007. How many of your friends believe that high wages and good benefits are the most important reasons for working?

003. How many of your friends try to do less work than they are paid to do?

*014. How many of your friends believe that it is extremely important for them to get the best deal possible, in terms of pay and benefits, from their employer?

010. How many of your friends are satisfied only when the rewards they receive from their employer are greater than the amount of work they perform?

*015. How many of your friends would loaf on the job if given the opportunity?

*008. How many of your friends believe that if a person is given a choice between jobs which pay the same money, the person should always choose the one which requires less work?

*012. How many of your friends believe that a big paycheck and a good benefits package is enough to make them completely satisfied at work?

102. How many employees in a typical organization, even if they were paid a fair wage relative to similarly qualified co-workers, would still try to get out of work?

100. How many employees in a typical organization feel like they should always get something for nothing?

*030. How many of your friends, when making a choice between jobs, would always choose the job which provides them the greatest pay and benefits regardless?

035. How many of your friends, if they were paid the same wage as similarly qualified co-workers but produced less work, would feel no motivation to produce more work in the future?

105. How many employees in a typical organization are only concerned about what the job pays them?

090. How many employees in a typical organization believe that the best day at work is one where there is little work for them to do?

"(table con'd.)"
How many employees in a typical organization, if they were being paid the same wage as similarly qualified co-workers for the same amount of work, would still take unauthorized work breaks?

How many employees in a typical organization are "takers" rather than "givers"?

How many employees in a typical organization want more rewards for their work than they work for or deserve?

How many employees in a typical organization would take it easy on the job if they could get away with it?

How many employees in a typical organization, if they believed that their employer was not paying them top dollar for their work, would seriously think about quitting?

How many employees in a typical organization enjoy doing as little as possible at work?

How many of your friends, if they were offered what they considered to be a "fair deal" by their employer for the work they performed, would still try to negotiate with their employer to get a better deal?

Direct Entitlement-Benevolence Dimension

If I had to work hard all day at my job, I would probably quit.

I prefer to do as little as possible at work while getting as much as I can from my employer.

I am most satisfied at work when I have to do as little as possible.

The best job I can have is one which permits me to do almost nothing during the work day.

My dream is to get ahead in life without having to try too hard to do it.

If I could get away with it, I would take it easy on the job.

When I am at my job, I think of ways to get out of work.

"(table con'd.)"
#046. If I could get away with it, I would try to work just a little bit slower than the boss expects.

#050. It is really satisfying to me when I can get something for nothing at work.

#053. It is the smart employee who gets as much as he/she can while giving as little as possible in return.

#059. If I were given low wages and poor benefits by my employer, I would reduce my productivity.

#038. An ideal job for me is one with few duties and responsibilities.

#043. Employees who are more concerned about what they can get from their employer rather than what they can give to their employer are the wise ones.

#054. When I have completed my tasks for the day, I help out other employees who have yet to complete their tasks.

#037. Even if I received low wages and poor benefits from my employer, I would still try to do my best at my job.

#055. I worry about doing the best job I can.

#061. I feel obligated to do more than I am paid to do at work.

#051. At work, my greatest concern is whether or not I am doing the best job I can.

#044. A job which requires me to be busy during the day is better than a job which allows me a lot of loafing.

#057. At work, I feel uneasy when there is little work for me to do.

#063. It drives me crazy when I have nothing to do at work.

#048. I would become very dissatisfied with my job if I had little or no work to do.

#049. All other things being equal, it is better to have a job with a lot of duties and responsibilities than one with few duties and responsibilities.

"(table con'd.)"
Indirect Equity Sensitivity Dimension

*059. How many employees in a typical organization, if they were paid the same wage as similarly qualified co-workers for the same amount of work, would be completely satisfied?

*094. How many employees in a typical organization are most comfortable when what they get from their employer matches what they give to their employer?

*109. How many employees in a typical organization, if they were paid the same wage as similarly qualified co-workers for the same amount of work, would feel satisfied and would continue to do as much work as they have in the past?

*093. How many employees in a typical organization, if they worked the same amount as other similarly qualified co-workers, would expect to be paid a lower amount than these other similarly qualified co-workers?

*083. How many employees in a typical organization put in a fair day's work (no more, no less) for a fair day's wage?

*085. How many employees in a typical organization live by the motto "a fair day's work (no more, no less) for a fair day's wage"?

*091. How many employees in a typical organization on any given day put in a full day of hard work?

*110. How many employees in a typical organization believe that they should be paid the same amount (no more, no less) as similarly qualified co-workers for the same amount of work?

*086. How many employees in a typical organization put in a full day of hard work, on a given day?

*020. How many of your friends are equally concerned about what they can get from their employer and what they can give to their employer?

*028. How many employees in a typical organization believe that it's equally good to give and to receive?

*013. How many of your friends believe that it's equally important to watch out for your own good and to help others?

"(table con'd.)"
*110. How many employees in a typical organization believe that an employee should try to stay busy all day rather than try to find ways to get out of doing work?

*026. How many of your friends, if they were paid the same wage as similarly qualified co-workers for the same amount of work, would be completely satisfied?

*036. How many of your friends believe that if they are paid less than other similarly qualified co-workers they should work less than these co-workers and that if they are paid more than other similarly qualified co-workers, they should work more than these co-workers?

*075. How many employees in a typical organization prefer that the amount of work they perform matches the amount they are paid for it?

**Indirect Benevolence Dimension**

*092. How many employees in a typical organization prefer that the amount of work they perform always exceeds the amount they are paid for it?

*104. How many employees in a typical organization, if they were paid the same amount as similarly qualified co-workers for the same amount of work, would feel guilty and would increase the amount of work they performed?

*107. How many employees in a typical organization, if they were being paid a lower wage than similarly qualified co-workers who performed the same amount of work, would be most satisfied?

*077. How many employees in a typical organization believe that if they are paid the same wage as similarly qualified co-workers, they should work harder than these co-workers?

*096. How many employees in a typical organization, if similarly qualified co-workers got a better deal from the organization than they did, would not really be bothered by it and would continue to do their best on the job?

*079. How many employees in a typical organization, if they worked the same amount as other similarly qualified co-workers, would expect to be paid a lower amount than these other similarly qualified co-workers?

"(table con'd.)"
*082. How many employees in a typical organization, if they were being paid less than similarly qualified co-workers for the same amount of work, would still be satisfied?

*112. How willing would you be, if you were an employer, to hire an applicant who believes that they should be paid more than other similarly qualified co-workers but have to work less than these co-workers?

*080. How many employees in a typical organization feel like they should do more work even though they have already put in the same amount of work as others doing the same job?

*084. How many employees in a typical organization believe that the amount of pay and benefits an employer provides them is really not that important?

*088. How many employees in a typical organization are most satisfied when the amount of work they perform is greater than the amount they are paid for it?

*098. How many employees in a typical organization, if they received low wages and benefits from their employer, would not be seriously bothered by it?

*113. How willing would you be, if you were an employer, to hire an applicant who looks for ways to avoid work?

*101. How many employees in a typical organization take on extra work for their jobs even though it is not required of them?

*095. How many employees in a typical organization shy away from accepting things that they have worked for or deserve because they do not like even the appearance of being indebted others?

*073. How many employees in a typical organization, if the amount of wages they received matched the amount of work they performed, would feel guilty and would increase their productivity?

027. How many of your friends are most satisfied when the amount of work they do outweighs the amount they are paid for it by their employers?

* = Item Selected for Final Instrument
randomly determined. Within each group of items, the order in which the items were presented was randomized as well. The new measure of equity sensitivity to be used in the construct validity assessment and the measure validation study is presented in Appendix T.

**Phase 3: Construct Validation**

Objectives of this phase of the dissertation included examining the psychometric properties and establishing the construct validity of the new measure of equity sensitivity. Specifically, the convergent, discriminant, and nomological validity of the new equity sensitivity measure were assessed. The construct validity assessment was conducted in two parts: a discriminant validity assessment and a nomological validity assessment. Convergent validity was assessed in both parts of the construct validity assessment.

**Questionnaire Administration for Discriminant Validity Assessment**

Questionnaires were administered to 269 undergraduate students enrolled in management and psychology courses at Louisiana State University. Of the 269 undergraduates, 173 were female and 96 were male. The average age of subjects in this sample was 20.45 years old, with a range from 17 to 53 years old. In terms of race, 218 subjects classified themselves as white, 21 classified themselves as asian or pacific islander, 20 classified themselves as black, 3 classified themselves as hispanic, and 1
subject gave no classification. The average educational level for subjects in this sample was that of a junior in college.

Prior to the subjects completing the series of questionnaires and the demographic form, a set of instructions, outlining the purposes of the study, the subjects duties, assurance of anonymity and confidentiality, and procedural details regarding the recording of responses, were read aloud to the subjects. The order in which the questionnaires were completed by the subjects was varied. However, the demographic form was always completed last.

**Questionnaires for the Discriminant Validity Assessment**

The questionnaires for the discriminant validity study consisted of the new measure of equity sensitivity (see Appendix A), the ESI (Huseman et al., 1985), Rotter's I-E (locus of control) instrument (Rotter, 1966), Snyder's self-monitoring instrument (Snyder, 1974), and Adorno et al.'s California F scale (Adorno et al., 1950). The latter three measures were combined into one questionnaire for this study. A demographic form was used to collect information regarding the subjects age, gender, race, and educational level. The demographic form appears in Appendix R.

**Frequencies and Reliabilities for the New Measure of Equity Sensitivity in the Discriminant Validity Assessment**

Frequency distributions and reliabilities for the new measure of equity sensitivity are presented in Table 3.12. Means for the
Table 3.12
Frequencies, Means, Standard Deviations, and Reliabilities of the New Measure of Equity Sensitivity in the Discriminant Validity Assessment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>#06</th>
<th>#14</th>
<th>#22</th>
<th>#24</th>
<th>#25</th>
<th>#27</th>
<th>#32</th>
<th>#34</th>
<th>#35</th>
<th>#37</th>
<th>#38</th>
<th>#39</th>
<th>#40</th>
<th>#41</th>
<th>#42</th>
<th>#46</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>07</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>05</td>
<td>03</td>
<td>07</td>
<td>04</td>
<td>06</td>
<td>05</td>
<td>09</td>
<td>04</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>31</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>61</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>92</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>08</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>04</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>90</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>2.71</td>
<td>2.87</td>
<td>3.38</td>
<td>2.98</td>
<td>3.09</td>
<td>2.14</td>
<td>4.22</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>3.28</td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td>3.43</td>
<td>3.43</td>
<td>3.39</td>
<td>3.47</td>
<td>3.28</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD</td>
<td>1.06</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.91</td>
<td>1.14</td>
<td>1.05</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>1.04</td>
<td>0.98</td>
<td>1.07</td>
<td>1.07</td>
<td>1.08</td>
<td>1.14</td>
<td>1.04</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Reliability coefficient for 16 items = 0.86

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>#49</th>
<th>#50</th>
<th>#51</th>
<th>#52</th>
<th>#53</th>
<th>#54</th>
<th>#55</th>
<th>#56</th>
<th>#57</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>04</td>
<td>04</td>
<td>08</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>05</td>
<td>04</td>
<td>04</td>
<td>07</td>
<td>02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>2.35</td>
<td>1.93</td>
<td>2.10</td>
<td>2.31</td>
<td>2.21</td>
<td>2.06</td>
<td>2.21</td>
<td>2.73</td>
<td>2.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD</td>
<td>0.85</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>1.05</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>0.86</td>
<td>0.89</td>
<td>1.03</td>
<td>0.93</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

"(table con'd.)"
### Direct Entitlement-Benevolence Dimension (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>#58</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>04</td>
<td>2.23</td>
<td>0.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#59</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>07</td>
<td>2.58</td>
<td>1.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#60</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>03</td>
<td>2.03</td>
<td>0.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#61</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2.51</td>
<td>1.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#62</td>
<td>06</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>3.36</td>
<td>0.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#63</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2.38</td>
<td>1.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#64</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>07</td>
<td>2.39</td>
<td>0.99</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Reliability coefficient for 16 items = 0.88**

### Indirect Equity Sensitivity Dimension

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>#02</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>3.42</td>
<td>1.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#10</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>3.24</td>
<td>1.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#12</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>3.48</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#13</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>3.29</td>
<td>0.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#15</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>3.32</td>
<td>1.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#17</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>3.13</td>
<td>1.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#18</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>1.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#20</td>
<td>09</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>4.05</td>
<td>1.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#23</td>
<td>04</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>09</td>
<td>3.22</td>
<td>0.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#29</td>
<td>09</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>05</td>
<td>3.07</td>
<td>0.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#31</td>
<td>09</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>3.87</td>
<td>1.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#33</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>4.17</td>
<td>0.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#36</td>
<td>05</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>3.90</td>
<td>0.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#43</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>4.02</td>
<td>0.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#44</td>
<td>02</td>
<td>06</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>4.17</td>
<td>0.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#45</td>
<td>04</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>3.54</td>
<td>0.87</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Reliability coefficient for 16 items = 0.78**

"(table con'd.)"
### Indirect Benevolence Dimension

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>#01</th>
<th>#03</th>
<th>#04</th>
<th>#05</th>
<th>#07</th>
<th>#08</th>
<th>#09</th>
<th>#11</th>
<th>#16</th>
<th>#19</th>
<th>#21</th>
<th>#26</th>
<th>#28</th>
<th>#30</th>
<th>#47</th>
<th>#48</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>95</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>234</td>
<td>236</td>
<td>232</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>239</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>227</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>219</td>
<td>204</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>85</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>52</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>06</td>
<td>06</td>
<td>03</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>06</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>05</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>04</td>
<td>08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>31</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>03</td>
<td>08</td>
<td>04</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>02</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>09</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>07</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>01</td>
<td>02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>06</td>
<td>05</td>
<td>03</td>
<td>09</td>
<td>01</td>
<td>06</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>01</td>
<td>01</td>
<td>03</td>
<td>09</td>
<td>01</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>09</td>
<td>01</td>
<td>01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>2.14</td>
<td>1.97</td>
<td>1.83</td>
<td>1.93</td>
<td>1.92</td>
<td>1.27</td>
<td>1.18</td>
<td>1.92</td>
<td>1.17</td>
<td>1.71</td>
<td>1.72</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>1.35</td>
<td>1.87</td>
<td>1.22</td>
<td>1.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD</td>
<td>1.09</td>
<td>1.02</td>
<td>0.97</td>
<td>1.24</td>
<td>0.85</td>
<td>0.83</td>
<td>0.51</td>
<td>0.85</td>
<td>0.57</td>
<td>0.91</td>
<td>1.01</td>
<td>0.89</td>
<td>0.96</td>
<td>0.86</td>
<td>0.52</td>
<td>0.60</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Reliability coefficient for 16 items = 0.72
16 items representing indirect entitlement ranged from 2.14 to 4.61. Standard deviations ranged from .69 to 1.14 with subjects using all five anchors on all but one of the items (#32). Inspection of item 32's standard deviation (SD = .92) revealed no major of restriction of range problem for this item. However, item #34, given its low standard deviation (SD = .69), does appear to suffer from some range restriction. The reliability coefficient for this dimension was .86. An examination of the item-total correlations for the items comprising this dimension revealed that none of the items lowered the reliability of this dimension. As a result, when the two items that suffered from a slight restriction of range problem were eliminated from the dimension, reliability did not improve. Fortunately, this slight restriction of range problem did not appear to lower the reliability for this dimension.

Means for the 16 items representing the direct entitlement-benevolence dimension ranged from 1.93 to 3.36. Standard deviations ranged from .84 to 1.05 with subjects using all 5 anchors. The reliability for this dimension was .88. An examination of the item-total correlations for the items comprising this dimension revealed that none of the items lowered the reliability of this dimension.

Means for the 16 items representing indirect equity sensitivity ranged from 3.00 to 4.17. Standard deviations ranged
from .78 to 1.17 with subjects using all five anchors on all but two of the items (item #33 and item #43). Inspection of the standard deviations for item #33 (SD = .83) and item #43 (SD = .89) revealed no major restriction of range problem. The reliability for this dimension was .78. An examination of the item-total correlations for the items comprising this dimension revealed that none of the items lowered the reliability of this dimension. As a result, when the two items that suffered from a slight restriction of range problem were eliminated from this dimension, reliability did not improve. Therefore, this slight restriction of range problem did not appear to lower the reliability for this dimension.

Means for the 16 items representing indirect benevolence ranged from 1.17 to 2.25. The standard deviations ranged from .51 to 1.24 with subjects using all five anchors on all but one of the items (#09). An inspection of the standard deviations for the items representing this dimension revealed a restriction of range problem for a number of items. Specifically, items #07, #09, #16, #47, and #48 have standard deviations that are less than or equal to .60. Reliability for this dimension was .72. An examination of the item-total correlations for the items comprising this dimension revealed that none of the items lowered the reliability of this dimension. However, this dimension does seem to suffer from a restriction of range problem. Again, this restriction of
range problem is probably due, in part, to the low number of
benevolents that comprise our society and our work organizations.
Therefore, any estimates of their numbers will be relatively low
as well, thus restricting range. Range restriction is important
because it can hide significant construct effects through
attenuation. Therefore, this may possibly explain the lack of
significant relationships found for this dimension.

Descriptive Statistics and Reliabilities for the Measures in the
Convergent and Discriminant Validity Assessment

Descriptive statistics and reliabilities for each measure
used in the discriminant validity assessment are presented in
Table 3.13. The indirect entitlement scale had a mean of 53.69
with a standard deviation of 9.30. The direct entitlement-
benevolence scale had a mean of 37.67 with a standard deviation of
9.04. The indirect equity sensitivity scale had a mean of 56.89
with a standard deviation of 7.57. The indirect benevolence scale
had a mean of 25.95 with a standard deviation of 6.02.

Two scales of the new measure of equity sensitivity were
combined to form the new composite measure of equity sensitivity
to be validated in this phase of the dissertation. Specifically,
the indirect entitlement and direct entitlement-benevolence scales
were combined to form one scale called the overall entitlement
scale. These scales were combined because they were considered,
conceptually, alternate methods of assessing entitlement and they
Table 3.13
Means, Standard Deviations, and Reliabilities for the Measures in the Discriminant Validity Assessment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Reliability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EQ1</td>
<td>53.69</td>
<td>9.30</td>
<td>.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EQ2</td>
<td>37.67</td>
<td>9.04</td>
<td>.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EQ3</td>
<td>56.89</td>
<td>7.57</td>
<td>.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EQ4</td>
<td>25.95</td>
<td>6.02</td>
<td>.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EQ5</td>
<td>91.36</td>
<td>15.22</td>
<td>.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESI</td>
<td>26.99</td>
<td>6.10</td>
<td>.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOC</td>
<td>10.79</td>
<td>4.35</td>
<td>.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEM</td>
<td>11.97</td>
<td>4.07</td>
<td>.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OLD</td>
<td>115.85</td>
<td>15.88</td>
<td>.81</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

EQ1 = Indirect Entitlement Dimension
EQ2 = Direct Entitlement-Benevolence Dimension
EQ3 = Indirect Equity Sensitivity Dimension
EQ4 = Indirect Benevolence Dimension
EQ5 = New Composite Measure of Equity Sensitivity (Overall Entitlement Scale)
ESI = Equity Sensitivity Instrument
LOC = Locus of Control (I-E) Instrument
SEM = Self-Monitoring Instrument
OLD = Old-Fashionedness Instrument (California F scale)
were moderately correlated \( r = .41 \). The overall entitlement scale had a mean of 91.36 and a standard deviation of 15.22. The reliability for the overall entitlement scale was .90. The indirect equity sensitivity scale was excluded from the composite measure because equity sensitivity represents the midpoint of these other scales. As a result, there are conceptual and mathematical problems associated with combining the three scales. As for the indirect benevolence scale, it was excluded from the new composite measure of equity sensitivity because of its extremely low correlations with the other two scales comprising the composite measure \( r = .01 \) and \( r = -.02 \) and its relatively low reliability.

The ESI (Huseman et al., 1985) had a mean of 26.99 with a standard deviation of 6.10. The reliability of the ESI was .81. The I-E instrument (Rotter, 1966) had a mean 10.79 with a standard deviation of 4.35. The reliability for the I-E instrument was .77. The self-monitoring instrument had a mean of 11.97 with a standard deviation of 4.07. The reliability for the self-monitoring instrument was .70. The California F scale (Adorno et al., 1950) had a mean of 115.85 with a standard deviation of 15.88. The reliability of the California F scale was .81.

**Correlation Matrix**

A triangular disclosure matrix for the measures in the discriminant and convergent validity analyses is presented in
Table 3.14. To assess convergent validity, the new measure of equity sensitivity was correlated with the ESI (Huseman et al., 1985). Correspondence between the four dimensions of the new equity sensitivity measure and the ESI ranged from .06 to .35. For one of the dimensions of the new equity sensitivity measure, direct entitlement-benevolence, there was a significant positive correlation with the ESI ($r = .35$). In addition, the composite measure of equity sensitivity was significantly correlated with the ESI ($r = .31$). These results provide partial support for Hypothesis 1 which states that there should be a positive correlation between the new equity sensitivity measure and the ESI. However, the correlations between the new measure of equity sensitivity and the ESI are low to moderate in magnitude. Given the relatively low level of correspondence between the new equity sensitivity measure and the ESI, it may be concluded that the new measures of equity sensitivity and the ESI may be measuring different concepts or different parts of the same construct.

To assess discriminant validity, the new equity sensitivity measure was correlated with measures of locus of control (Rotter, 1966), self-monitoring (Snyder, 1974), and old-fashionedness (Ray, 1990). The correlations between the four dimensions of the new equity sensitivity measure and locus of control ranged from .01 to .20. Two of the dimensions, indirect entitlement and direct entitlement-benevolence, had significant correlations (both $r = \ldots$
Table 3.14
Triangular Disclosure Matrix for the Discriminant Validity Assessment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>EQ1</th>
<th>EQ2</th>
<th>EQ3</th>
<th>EQ4</th>
<th>EQ5</th>
<th>ESI</th>
<th>LOC</th>
<th>SEM</th>
<th>OLD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EQ1</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>.41*</td>
<td>-.18*</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.84*</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>.20*</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>-.27*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EQ2</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>-.12</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>.84*</td>
<td>.35*</td>
<td>.20*</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EQ3</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>-.12</td>
<td>-.18*</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EQ4</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>-.15</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>-.14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EQ5</td>
<td></td>
<td>.31*</td>
<td>.24*</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td></td>
<td>-.16*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESI</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>-.13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEM</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OLD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*-significant at .05

EQ1 = Indirect Entitlement Dimension
EQ2 = Direct Entitlement-Benevolence Dimension
EQ3 = Indirect Equity Sensitivity Dimension
EQ4 = Indirect Benevolence Dimension
EQ5 = New Composite Measure of Equity Sensitivity (Overall Entitlement Scale)
ESI = Equity Sensitivity Instrument
LOC = Locus of Control (I-E) Instrument
SEM = Self-Monitoring Instrument
OLD = Old-Fashionedness Instrument (California F scale)
.20) with locus of control. Likewise, the new composite measure of equity sensitivity was also significantly correlated with locus of control ($r = .24$). Thus, it appears that those individuals estimating more entitlement and reporting more entitlement also report a greater external locus of control. This finding is consistent with Huseman's et al. (1987) proposition that benevolents are more focused on what they can give to an exchange relationship whereas entitleds are more concerned with what they can get from an exchange relationship. Giving is an internally controlled outcome because you alone decide how much to give whereas getting is an externally controlled outcome (i.e., external locus of control) because what you get is often dependent on what others are willing to give you (King & Miles, 1994). In general, these results do not support Hypothesis 2 which states that there should be no significant correlation between the new equity sensitivity measure and locus of control. Even though two of the four dimensions of the new equity sensitivity measure were significantly correlated with locus of control, the magnitude of these correlations suggests that the two measures still had a relatively low level of correspondence.

The correlations between the four dimensions of equity sensitivity and self-monitoring ranged from .04 to -.13. None of these correlation was significant. Furthermore, there was no significant correlation ($r = .14$) between the new composite
measure of equity sensitivity and self-monitoring. Overall, these results provide support for Hypothesis 3 which states that there should be no significant correlation between the new equity sensitivity measure and self-monitoring.

The correlations between the four dimensions of the new equity sensitivity measure and old-fashionedness ranged from -.01 to -.27. Only one of the four dimensions, indirect entitlement, had a significant correlation with old-fashionedness \( (r = -.27) \). Similarly, the new composite measure of equity sensitivity also had a significant correlation with old-fashionedness \( (r = -.16) \). Individuals reporting lower levels of entitlement (i.e., benevolence) also reported higher levels of old-fashionedness. This finding provides some support for the indirect item format. Given Ray's (1990) definition of an old-fashioned individual as someone who is conscientious, conservative, nice to others, and inclined to perfectionism with good self-control, it would make sense, using the similarity attraction effect, for these people to have more friends who were benevolent and fewer friends who were entitled. Likewise, using the false-consensus effect, old-fashioned individuals would be more likely to estimate greater numbers of benevolents and fewer numbers of entitleds relative to individuals who were not old-fashioned. In general, these results do not support Hypothesis 4 which states that there should be no significant correlation between the equity sensitivity measure and
old-fashionedness. However, even though two of the five correlations between the new equity sensitivity measure and old-fashionedness were statistically significant, the magnitude of these correlations suggests a relatively low level of correspondence between the two measures.

Overall, the results of the discriminant validity assessment revealed that the four dimensions of the new equity sensitivity measure and the new composite measure of equity sensitivity had relatively small correlations, if any, with locus of control, self-monitoring, or old-fashionedness. Therefore, the new measure of equity sensitivity appears to be relatively independent of these three measures.

**Questionnaire Administration for Nomological Validity Assessment**

Questionnaires were administered to 174 undergraduate students enrolled in management and psychology courses at Louisiana State University. Of the 174 undergraduates, 130 were female and 44 were male. The average age of subjects in this sample was 21.22 years old, with a range from 17 to 61 years old. In terms of race, 128 subjects classified themselves as white, 29 classified themselves as black, 9 classified themselves as Asian or Pacific Islander, 2 classified themselves as Hispanic, 2 classified themselves as American Indian, and 4 subjects gave no classification. The average educational level for subjects in this sample was that of a junior in college.
Prior to the subjects completing the series of questionnaires and the demographic form, a set of instructions, outlining the purposes of the study, the subjects duties, assurance of anonymity and confidentiality, and procedural details regarding the recording of responses, were read aloud to the subjects. The order in which the questionnaires were completed by the subjects was varied. However, the demographic form was always completed last.

**Questionnaires for the Nomological Validity Assessment**

The questionnaires for the nomological validity assessment consisted of the new measure of equity sensitivity (see Appendix A), the ESI (Huseman et al., 1985), Swap and Rubin's (1983) Interpersonal Orientation instrument, Christie and Geis' (1970) Mach IV instrument, Mirels and Garrett's (1971) Protestant Ethic instrument, and Eisenberger's et al. (1986) Exchange Ideology instrument. The latter four measures were combined into one questionnaire for this study. A demographic form (see Appendix R) was used to collect information regarding the subjects age, gender, race, and educational level.

**Frequencies and Reliabilities for the New Measure of Equity Sensitivity in the Nomological Validity Assessment**

Frequency distributions and reliabilities for the new measure of equity sensitivity are presented in Table 3.15. Means for the 16 items representing indirect entitlement ranged from 2.09 to
Table 13.15
Frequencies, Means, Standard Deviations, and Reliabilities of the New Measure of Equity Sensitivity in the Nomological Validity Assessment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>#06</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>09</td>
<td>2.68</td>
<td>1.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#14</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>07</td>
<td>2.73</td>
<td>1.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#22</td>
<td>06</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>3.39</td>
<td>0.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#24</td>
<td>08</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>04</td>
<td>2.94</td>
<td>0.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#25</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>3.10</td>
<td>1.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#27</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>05</td>
<td>2.09</td>
<td>0.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#32</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>4.16</td>
<td>0.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#34</td>
<td>01</td>
<td>03</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>4.52</td>
<td>0.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#35</td>
<td>02</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>3.51</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#37</td>
<td>05</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>3.28</td>
<td>1.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#38</td>
<td>02</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>3.83</td>
<td>0.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#39</td>
<td>05</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>3.45</td>
<td>1.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#40</td>
<td>05</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>3.28</td>
<td>1.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#41</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>3.44</td>
<td>1.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#42</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>3.06</td>
<td>1.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#46</td>
<td>07</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>3.51</td>
<td>1.09</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Reliability coefficient for 16 items = 0.84

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>#49</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>01</td>
<td>2.22</td>
<td>0.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#50</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>06</td>
<td>01</td>
<td>2.85</td>
<td>0.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#51</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>04</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>1.94</td>
<td>0.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#52</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>03</td>
<td>2.36</td>
<td>0.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#53</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>01</td>
<td>2.14</td>
<td>0.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#54</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>01</td>
<td>2.03</td>
<td>0.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#55</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>01</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>0.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#56</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>09</td>
<td>2.71</td>
<td>1.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#57</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>03</td>
<td>2.32</td>
<td>0.88</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

"(table con'd.)"
Direct Entitlement-Benevolence Dimension (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>#58</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#59</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#60</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#61</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#62</td>
<td>03</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#63</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#64</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Reliability coefficient for 16 items = 0.88

Indirect Equity Sensitivity Dimension

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>#02</td>
<td>06</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#10</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#12</td>
<td>09</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#13</td>
<td>05</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#15</td>
<td>05</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#17</td>
<td>09</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#18</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#20</td>
<td>06</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#23</td>
<td>05</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#29</td>
<td>06</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#31</td>
<td>03</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#33</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#36</td>
<td>01</td>
<td>07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#43</td>
<td>01</td>
<td>09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#44</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#45</td>
<td>04</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Reliability coefficient for 16 items = 0.78

"(table con'd.)"
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>#01</th>
<th>64</th>
<th>44</th>
<th>40</th>
<th>23</th>
<th>03</th>
<th>2.18</th>
<th>1.12</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>#03</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>1.84</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#04</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>07</td>
<td>02</td>
<td>1.70</td>
<td>0.91</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#05</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1.98</td>
<td>1.31</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#07</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>04</td>
<td>01</td>
<td>01</td>
<td>1.17</td>
<td>0.54</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#08</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>07</td>
<td>01</td>
<td>02</td>
<td>1.21</td>
<td>0.65</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#09</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>06</td>
<td>04</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>1.22</td>
<td>0.62</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#11</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>06</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>1.93</td>
<td>0.79</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#16</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>09</td>
<td>08</td>
<td>02</td>
<td>01</td>
<td>1.20</td>
<td>0.63</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#19</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>06</td>
<td>02</td>
<td>1.55</td>
<td>0.87</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#21</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>06</td>
<td>1.71</td>
<td>1.07</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#26</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>02</td>
<td>2.20</td>
<td>0.88</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#28</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>01</td>
<td>04</td>
<td>05</td>
<td>1.27</td>
<td>0.83</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#30</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>08</td>
<td>01</td>
<td>1.83</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#47</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>05</td>
<td>01</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>1.24</td>
<td>0.56</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#48</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>04</td>
<td>02</td>
<td>02</td>
<td>1.33</td>
<td>0.69</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Reliability coefficient for 16 items = 0.71
4.52. Standard deviations ranged from .77 to 1.16 with subjects using all five anchors on all but one of the items (#32). Inspection of item #32's standard deviation (SD = .92) revealed no major of restriction of range problem for this item. However, item #34, given its low standard deviation (SD = .77), does appear to suffer from some range restriction. The reliability coefficient for this dimension was .84. An examination of the item-total correlations for the items comprising this scale revealed that none of the items lowered the reliability of this dimension. As a result, when the two items that suffered from a slight restriction of range problem were eliminated from the dimension, reliability did not improve. Therefore, this slight restriction of range problem did not appear to lower the reliability for this dimension.

Means for the 16 items representing the direct entitlement-benevolence dimension ranged from 1.85 to 3.19. Standard deviations ranged from .75 to 1.04 with subjects using all five anchors for all items except one (#51). Inspection of the item #51's standard deviation (SD = .75) revealed a slight restriction of range problem. The reliability for this dimension was .88. An examination of the item-total correlations for the items comprising this scale revealed that none of the items lowered the reliability of this dimension. In fact, when item #53 was removed from this dimension, the dimension's reliability was substantially
lowered. Therefore, this slight restriction of range problem did not appear to represent a problem for the reliability of this dimension.

Means for the 16 items representing indirect equity sensitivity ranged from 2.93 to 4.29. Standard deviations ranged from .74 to 1.18 with subjects using all five anchors on all but two of the items (#33 and #44). Inspection of the standard deviations for these two items revealed a slight restriction of range problem only for item #44 (SD = .74). The reliability for this dimension was .78. An examination of the item-total correlations for the items comprising this scale revealed that none of the items lowered the reliability of this dimension. In fact, when item #44 was eliminated from this dimension, reliability was substantially lower. Therefore, this slight restriction of range problem did not appear to present a problem for the reliability of this dimension.

Means for the 16 items representing indirect benevolence ranged from 1.17 to 2.20. The standard deviations ranged from .56 to 1.31 with subjects using all five anchors on all but four of the items (#03, #09, #11, and #47). An inspection of the standard deviations for these four items as well as others representing this dimension revealed a restriction of range problem for a number of items. Specifically, items #07, #08, #09, #16, #47, and #48 have standard deviations that are less than or equal to .70.
Reliability for this dimension was .72. An examination of the item-total correlations for the items comprising this scale revealed that none of the items lowered the reliability of this dimension. This dimension, relative to the other three dimensions, does appear to suffer from the most severe restriction of range problem. Again, this restriction of range problem is probably due, in part, to the low number of benevolents that comprise our society and our work organizations. Therefore, any estimates of their numbers will be relatively low as well, thus restricting range. This restriction of range may account, in part, for the lack of significant relationships found for this dimension.

**Descriptive Statistics and Reliabilities for the Measures in the Nomological Validity Assessment**

Descriptive statistics and reliabilities for each measure used in the nomological validity assessment are presented in Table 3.16. The indirect entitlement scale had a mean of 52.96 with a standard deviation of 8.86. The direct entitlement-benevolence scale had a mean of 36.65 with a standard deviation of 8.72. The indirect equity sensitivity scale had a mean of 57.53 with a standard deviation of 7.67. The indirect benevolence scale had a mean of 25.56 with a standard deviation of 5.93.

Two scales of the new measure of equity sensitivity were combined to form the new composite measure of equity sensitivity
Table 3.16  
Means, Standard Deviations, and Reliabilities for the Measures in the Nomological Validity Assessment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>reliability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EQ1</td>
<td>52.96</td>
<td>8.86</td>
<td>.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EQ2</td>
<td>36.65</td>
<td>8.72</td>
<td>.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EQ3</td>
<td>57.53</td>
<td>7.67</td>
<td>.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EQ4</td>
<td>25.56</td>
<td>5.93</td>
<td>.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EQ5</td>
<td>89.61</td>
<td>14.48</td>
<td>.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESI</td>
<td>27.12</td>
<td>6.52</td>
<td>.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAC</td>
<td>70.99</td>
<td>14.67</td>
<td>.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IO</td>
<td>102.71</td>
<td>9.17</td>
<td>.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EI</td>
<td>23.02</td>
<td>4.58</td>
<td>.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PE</td>
<td>92.88</td>
<td>10.12</td>
<td>.59</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

EQ1 = Indirect Entitlement Dimension  
EQ2 = Direct Entitlement-Benevolence Dimension  
EQ3 = Indirect Equity Sensitivity Dimension  
EQ4 = Indirect Benevolence Dimension  
EQ5 = New Composite Measure of Equity Sensitivity (Overall Entitlement Scale)  
ESI = Equity Sensitivity Instrument  
MAC = Machiavellianism (Mach IV) Instrument  
IO = Interpersonal Orientation Instrument  
EI = Exchange Ideology Instrument (California F scale)  
PE = Protestant Ethic Instrument
to be validated in this phase of the dissertation. Specifically, the indirect entitlement and direct entitlement-benevolence scales were combined to form one scale called the overall entitlement scale. These two scales were combined because they were considered, conceptually, alternate methods of assessing entitlement and they were moderately correlated ($r = .38$). The overall entitlement scale had a mean of 89.61 with a standard deviation of 14.48. The reliability of this scale was .89. Indirect equity sensitivity was excluded from the composite measure because equity sensitivity represents the midpoint of these other scales. As a result, there are conceptual and mathematical problems associated with combining these three scales. As for the indirect benevolence scale, it was excluded from the new composite measure of equity sensitivity because of its extremely low correlations ($r = -.07$ and $r = -.14$) with the two scales comprising the new composite measure and its relatively low reliability of .72.

The ESI (Huseman et al., 1985) had a mean of 27.12 with a standard deviation of 6.52. The reliability of the ESI was .84. The Interpersonal Orientation instrument (Swap & Rubin, 1983) had a mean 102.71 with a standard deviation of 9.17. The reliability of the Interpersonal Orientation Instrument was .65. The Mach IV instrument (Christie & Geis, 1970) had a mean of 70.99 with a standard deviation of 14.67. The reliability for the Mach IV
instrument was .76. The Protestant Ethic instrument (Mirels & Garrett, 1971) had a mean of 92.88 with a standard deviation of 10.12. The reliability of the Protestant Ethic scale was .59. The Exchange Ideology Instrument (Eisenberger et al., 1986) had a mean of 23.02 with a standard deviation of 4.58. The reliability for the Exchange Ideology Instrument was .63.

Correlation Matrix

A triangular disclosure matrix for the measures in the nomological and convergent validity analyses is presented in Table 3.17. To assess convergent validity, the new measure of equity sensitivity was correlated with the ESI (Huseman et al., 1985). Correspondence between the four dimensions of the new equity sensitivity measure and the ESI ranged from .03 to .48. For two of the dimensions of the new equity sensitivity measure, indirect entitlement and direct entitlement-benevolence, there were significant positive correlations with the ESI ($r = .29$ and $r = .48$, respectively). The new composite measure of equity sensitivity was also significantly correlated with the ESI ($r = .44$). These results provide support for Hypothesis 1 which states that there should be a positive correlation between the new equity sensitivity measure and the ESI. However, these correlation are moderate in magnitude. Given the moderate level of correspondence between the new equity sensitivity measure and the ESI, it may be concluded that the new measure of equity sensitivity and the ESI
Table 3.17
Triangular Disclosure Matrix for the Nomological Validity Assessment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>EQ1</th>
<th>EQ2</th>
<th>EQ3</th>
<th>EQ4</th>
<th>EQ5</th>
<th>ESI</th>
<th>MAC</th>
<th>IO</th>
<th>EI</th>
<th>PE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EQ1</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>.38*</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>.83*</td>
<td>.29*</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EQ2</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>-.22*</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>.84*</td>
<td>.48*</td>
<td>.39*</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>-.27*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EQ3</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>-.19</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>-.21*</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EQ4</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>-.12</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>-.39*</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EQ5</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>.47*</td>
<td>.44*</td>
<td>-.11</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>-.11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESI</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>.29*</td>
<td>-.17</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAC</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>-.18</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>-.15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IO</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EI</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PE</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*significant at .05

EQ1 = Indirect Entitlement Dimension
EQ2 = Direct Entitlement-Benevolence Dimension
EQ3 = Indirect Equity Sensitivity Dimension
EQ4 = Indirect Benevolence Dimension
EQ5 = New Composite Measure of Equity Sensitivity (Overall Entitlement Scale)
ESI = Equity Sensitivity Instrument
MAC = Machiavellianism (Mach IV) Instrument
IO = Interpersonal Orientation Instrument
EI = Exchange Ideology Instrument (California F scale)
PE = Protestant Ethic Instrument
may be measuring different constructs or different parts of the same construct.

To assess nomological validity, the new equity sensitivity measure was correlated with measures of constructs believed to be conceptually related to equity sensitivity. Specifically, the new measure of equity sensitivity was correlated with Interpersonal Orientation (Swap & Rubin, 1983), Machiavellianism (Christie & Geis, 1970), the Protestant Ethic (Mirels & Garrett, 1971), and Exchange Ideology (Eisenberger et al., 1986). In addition, the relationships between the new measure of equity sensitivity and a variety of demographic variables were examined.

The correlations between the four dimensions of the new equity sensitivity measure and Interpersonal Orientation ranged from -.03 to .18. None of these correlations was significant. In addition, the new composite measure of equity sensitivity was not significantly correlated with Interpersonal Orientation ($r = -.11$). However, this correlation was in the predicted direction. As a whole, these findings do not support Hypothesis 5 which states that there should be a negative correlation between the new equity sensitivity measure and Interpersonal Orientation.

The correlations between the four dimensions of equity sensitivity and Machiavellianism ranged from -.05 to -.39. Three of the four dimensions of the new equity sensitivity measure had significant correlations with Machiavellianism. Indirect
entitlement, direct entitlement-benevolence, and indirect equity sensitivity had correlations with Machiavellianism of .32, .39, and -.21, respectively. Furthermore, the new composite measure of equity sensitivity was also significantly correlated with Machiavellianism ($r = .44$). As individuals estimated more entitlement or reported more entitlement, they also reported more machiavellian tendencies. In contrast, individuals who estimated more equity sensitivity reported fewer machiavellian tendencies. These findings are consistent with research on high Machs and exchange relationships. Specifically, Blumstein and Weinstein (1969) found that high Machs endorsed an outcome maximization norm (i.e., entitled) in an exchange relationship with a partner whereas low Machs endorsed an equity norm. Overall, these results support Hypothesis 6 which states that there should be a positive correlation between the new equity sensitivity measure and Machiavellianism.

The correlations between the four dimensions of the new equity sensitivity measure and the Protestant Ethic ranged from .02 to -.27. One of the four dimensions, direct entitlement-benevolence, had a significant correlation ($r = -.27$) with the Protestant Ethic. That is, individuals who reported higher levels of entitlement also reported lower levels of the Protestant Ethic. Individuals who are high on the Protestant Ethic value hard work, condemn laziness, and are willing to delay gratification (Mirels & Garrett, 1971). Given this, entitleds, who believe in getting
something for nothing, would be expected to score low on the Protestant Ethic. As for the new composite measure of equity sensitivity, it was not significantly correlated with the Protestant Ethic ($r = -0.11$). However, this correlation was in the predicted direction. Therefore, the results for all four dimensions and the new composite measure provide only limited support for Hypothesis 6 which states that there should be a negative correlation between the new measure of equity sensitivity and the Protestant Ethic.

The correlations between the four dimensions of the new measure of equity sensitivity and Exchange Ideology ranged from 0.04 to -0.12. None of the four dimensions had a significant correlation with Exchange Ideology. Likewise, the new composite measure of equity sensitivity was not significantly correlated with Exchange Ideology ($r = 0.01$). These results did not support Hypothesis 7 which states that there should be a positive correlation between the new measure of equity sensitivity and Exchange Ideology.

Finally, the relationships between the new equity sensitivity measure and the demographic variables of gender, age, and educational level were examined using both samples of the construct validity assessment (i.e., the nomological validity sample and the discriminant validity sample). For gender, t-tests were used to examine the relationship between the new measure of equity sensitivity and gender. Correlations were used to examine
the relationships between the new equity sensitivity measure and both age and educational level.

Differences in scores on the four dimensions of the new equity sensitivity measure as a result of gender were tested with multiple t-tests. Given that five t-tests were performed for each sample (nomological and discriminant), alpha of .05 was divided by 5. Thus, the significance level for these t-tests was set at .01 for both samples. In both the nomological validity sample and the discriminant validity sample, the five t-tests (see Table 3.18) revealed no significant differences between females and males on any of the four dimensions of the new equity sensitivity measure or the new composite equity sensitivity measure. Therefore, these results appear to support Hypothesis 9 which states that there should be no significant differences between males and females on the new equity sensitivity measure.

In the nomological validity sample, age was significantly correlated with one dimension of the new measure of equity sensitivity, indirect entitlement ($r = -.22$), and the new composite measure of equity sensitivity ($r = -.23$). Similar results were found in the discriminant validity sample. Age was significantly correlated with indirect entitlement and direct entitlement-benevolence. The correlations were $-.22$ and $-.26$, respectively. In the discriminant validity sample, age was also significantly correlated ($r = -.30$) with the new composite measure of equity
Table 3.18
Multiple t-tests for Differences by Gender on the Four Scales of the New Equity Sensitivity Measure and the New Composite Measure of Equity Sensitivity

**Discriminant Validity Assessment Sample**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Female</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Male</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>t</td>
<td>df</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EQ1</td>
<td>173</td>
<td>53.39</td>
<td>9.66</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>54.31</td>
<td>8.52</td>
<td>-0.78</td>
<td>265 ns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EQ2</td>
<td>171</td>
<td>37.45</td>
<td>9.26</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>38.11</td>
<td>8.69</td>
<td>-0.56</td>
<td>263 ns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EQ3</td>
<td>173</td>
<td>57.41</td>
<td>7.60</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>55.96</td>
<td>7.53</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>265 ns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EQ4</td>
<td>172</td>
<td>25.72</td>
<td>5.74</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>26.43</td>
<td>6.56</td>
<td>-0.92</td>
<td>264 ns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EQ5</td>
<td>171</td>
<td>90.84</td>
<td>15.71</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>92.42</td>
<td>14.16</td>
<td>-0.80</td>
<td>263 ns</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Nomological Validity Assessment Sample**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Female</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Male</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>t</td>
<td>df</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EQ1</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>52.41</td>
<td>9.12</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>54.77</td>
<td>7.94</td>
<td>-1.51</td>
<td>170 ns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EQ2</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>35.80</td>
<td>8.70</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>39.33</td>
<td>8.38</td>
<td>-2.30</td>
<td>166 ns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EQ3</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>57.43</td>
<td>7.73</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>57.58</td>
<td>7.53</td>
<td>-0.11</td>
<td>170 ns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EQ4</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>25.09</td>
<td>5.71</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>27.14</td>
<td>6.34</td>
<td>-1.98</td>
<td>171 ns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EQ5</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>84.17</td>
<td>14.28</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>88.59</td>
<td>14.41</td>
<td>-1.71</td>
<td>162 ns</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

EQ1 = Indirect Entitlement Dimension
EQ2 = Direct Entitlement-Benevolence Dimension
EQ3 = Indirect Equity Sensitivity Dimension
EQ4 = Indirect Benevolence Dimension
EQ5 = New Composite Measure of Equity Sensitivity (Overall Entitlement Scale)
sensitivity. Taken as a whole the results suggest that as age increases, individuals estimate less entitlement and report less entitlement. Therefore, these results do not support Hypothesis 10 which states that there should be no significant correlation between the new measure of equity sensitivity and age.

As for educational level, it was not significantly correlated with any of the four dimensions of the new measure of equity sensitivity or with the new composite measure of equity sensitivity in the nomological validity sample. However, in the discriminant validity sample, educational level was significantly correlated ($r = -.28$) with one of the four dimensions of the new equity sensitivity measure, direct entitlement—benevolence. Similarly, educational level was also significantly correlated ($r = -.24$) with the new composite measure of equity sensitivity, in the discriminant validity sample. These results, due both to the relatively small magnitude of the significant correlations found and to the inconsistency in finding significant correlations between educational level and the new measure of equity sensitivity, suggest that differences in scores on the four dimensions of the new measure and on the new composite measure of equity sensitivity cannot be readily accounted for by educational level. Therefore, these results appear to provide, at least, partial support for Hypothesis 11 which states that there should be no significant correlation between the new measure of equity sensitivity and educational level.
Phase 4: Measure Validation

Objectives of this phase of the dissertation included examining the psychometric properties and establishing the predictive validity of the new measure of equity sensitivity. Specifically, the relations between satisfaction with different reward conditions (i.e., states of equity/inequity) and each of the two measures of equity sensitivity (i.e., the new measure of equity sensitivity and the ESI) were examined. The measure validation was conducted using a laboratory paradigm similar to that used by Austin et al. (1980) and King et al. (1993).

Questionnaire Administration for Measure Validation Study

Two sets of questionnaires were administered at two separate times to 186 undergraduate students enrolled in management courses at Louisiana State University. Of the 186 undergraduates, 84 were female and 102 were male. The average age of subjects in this sample was 21.54 years old, with a range from 18 to 53 years old. In terms of race, 162 subjects classified themselves as white, 9 classified themselves as black, 9 classified themselves as Asian or Pacific Islander, and 6 classified themselves as Hispanic. The average educational level for subjects in this sample was that of a junior in college.

In the first questionnaire administration, subjects completed the new measure of equity sensitivity, the ESI, a series of "filler" personality measures, and a demographic form. The order
in which the measures were completed by the subjects was varied. However, the demographic form was always completed last. Prior to the subjects completing these items, a set of instructions, outlining the purposes of the study, the subjects duties, assurance of anonymity and confidentiality, and procedural details regarding the recording of responses, were read aloud to the subjects.

In the second questionnaire administration two weeks later, subjects were asked to read a series of scenarios depicting different reward conditions at work (i.e., underreward, overreward, and equitable reward). After reading each scenario, subjects were then asked to respond to a series of questions concerning their reactions to (i.e., satisfaction with) the scenario. Prior to the subjects completing the scenarios, they were provided with a set of instructions (see Appendix U). These instructions were also read aloud to the subjects.

**Questionnaires for the Measure Validation Study**

The first set of questionnaires for the measure validation study consisted of the new measure of equity sensitivity (see Appendix A), the ESI (Huseman et al., 1985), Rotter's I-E (locus of control) instrument (Rotter, 1966), Snyder's self-monitoring instrument (Snyder, 1974), and Adorno et al.'s California F scale (Adorno et al., 1950). The latter three measures were combined into one questionnaire for this study and were used as "filler"
personality measures in order to avoid demand characteristics. A demographic form was used to collect information regarding the subjects age, gender, race, and educational level. The demographic form appears in Appendix R.

The content (i.e., reward condition) of the second set of questionnaires was varied across subjects. One set of questionnaires consisted of two scenarios depicting underreward at work. Another set of questionnaires consisted of three scenarios depicting equitable reward at work. A third set consisted of two scenarios depicting overreward at work. In each of the three sets of questionnaires, each scenario was followed by a series of questions designed to assess subject satisfaction with the reward condition depicted in the scenario. The scenarios and their accompanying questions are presented in Appendices J and L, respectively.

Frequencies and Reliabilities for the New Measure of Equity Sensitivity in the Measure Validation Study

Frequency distributions and reliabilities for the new measure of equity sensitivity are presented in Table 3.19. Means for the 16 items representing indirect entitlement ranged from 2.13 to 4.59. Standard deviations ranged from .68 to 1.13 with subjects using all five anchors on all but three of the items (#32, #34, and #35). Inspection of the standard deviations for these items revealed no major restriction of range problem for items #32 (SD =
Table 3.19
Frequencies, Means, Standard Deviations, and Reliabilities of the New Measure of Equity Sensitivity in the Measure Validation Study

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>#06</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>09</td>
<td>2.74</td>
<td>1.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#14</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2.76</td>
<td>1.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#22</td>
<td>07</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>3.33</td>
<td>1.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#24</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>06</td>
<td>3.07</td>
<td>0.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#25</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>3.02</td>
<td>1.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#27</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>02</td>
<td>2.13</td>
<td>1.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#32</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>4.03</td>
<td>1.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#34</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>04</td>
<td>08</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>4.59</td>
<td>0.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#35</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>3.45</td>
<td>0.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#37</td>
<td>04</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>3.27</td>
<td>1.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#38</td>
<td>03</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>3.67</td>
<td>1.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#39</td>
<td>05</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>3.29</td>
<td>1.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#40</td>
<td>07</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>3.20</td>
<td>1.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#41</td>
<td>08</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>3.38</td>
<td>1.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#42</td>
<td>07</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>3.26</td>
<td>1.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#46</td>
<td>04</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>3.41</td>
<td>0.98</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Reliability coefficient for 16 items = 0.86

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>#49</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>2.26</td>
<td>0.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#50</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>03</td>
<td>1.87</td>
<td>0.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#51</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>01</td>
<td>03</td>
<td>1.93</td>
<td>0.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#52</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>05</td>
<td>2.08</td>
<td>0.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#53</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>01</td>
<td>2.18</td>
<td>0.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#54</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>08</td>
<td>01</td>
<td>1.87</td>
<td>0.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#55</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>08</td>
<td>02</td>
<td>2.13</td>
<td>0.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#56</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>06</td>
<td>2.61</td>
<td>1.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#57</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>2.01</td>
<td>0.84</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

"(table con'd.)"
### Direct Entitlement-Benevolence Dimension (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>#58</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#59</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#60</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#61</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#62</td>
<td>07</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#63</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#64</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Reliability coefficient for 16 items = 0.86

### Indirect Equity Sensitivity Dimension

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>#02</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#10</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#12</td>
<td>08</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#13</td>
<td>04</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#15</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#17</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#18</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#20</td>
<td>03</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#23</td>
<td>03</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#29</td>
<td>05</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#31</td>
<td>03</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#33</td>
<td>01</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#36</td>
<td>05</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#43</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#44</td>
<td>02</td>
<td>06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#45</td>
<td>03</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Reliability coefficient for 16 items = 0.78

"(table con’d.)"
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>#01</th>
<th>#03</th>
<th>#04</th>
<th>#05</th>
<th>#07</th>
<th>#08</th>
<th>#09</th>
<th>#11</th>
<th>#16</th>
<th>#19</th>
<th>#21</th>
<th>#26</th>
<th>#28</th>
<th>#30</th>
<th>#47</th>
<th>#48</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>72</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>65</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>09</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>09</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>26</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>03</td>
<td>02</td>
<td>02</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>07</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>02</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>08</td>
<td>01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>20</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>08</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>04</td>
<td>03</td>
<td>02</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>01</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>05</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>02</td>
<td>01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>02</td>
<td>01</td>
<td>03</td>
<td>05</td>
<td>02</td>
<td>04</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>01</td>
<td>01</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>01</td>
<td>01</td>
<td>09</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>01</td>
<td>00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>1.90</td>
<td>1.80</td>
<td>1.75</td>
<td>1.75</td>
<td>1.87</td>
<td>1.90</td>
<td>1.70</td>
<td>1.16</td>
<td>1.70</td>
<td>1.78</td>
<td>2.19</td>
<td>1.82</td>
<td>1.26</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.03</td>
<td>0.91</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>1.11</td>
<td>1.11</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>0.56</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>1.06</td>
<td>0.87</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.89</td>
<td>0.60</td>
<td>0.55</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Reliability coefficient for 18 items = 0.73**
1.01) and #35 ($SD = .99$). However, item #34, given its low standard deviation ($SD = .68$), does appear to suffer from some range restriction. The reliability coefficient for this dimension was .86. An examination of the item-total correlations for the items comprising this dimension revealed that none of the items lowered the reliability of this dimension. As such, when item #34 was eliminated from the dimension, reliability for this dimension did not improve. Fortunately, this slight restriction of range problem did not appear to lower the reliability for this dimension.

Means for the sixteen items representing the direct entitlement-benevolence dimension ranged from 1.87 to 3.13. Standard deviations ranged from .70 to 1.06 with subjects using all five anchors on all but three of the items (#49, #57, and #60). Inspection of the standard deviations for these items and others representing direct entitlement-benevolence revealed a restriction of range problem for items #49 ($SD = .78$), #51 ($SD = .75$), and #60 ($SD = .70$). The reliability for this dimension was .86. An examination of the item-total correlations for the items comprising this dimension revealed that none of the items lowered the reliability of this dimension. In fact, when the items that suffered from slight range restriction were removed from the dimension, the reliability for this dimension actually decreased. Fortunately, it appears that range restriction was not a major problem for this dimension, in terms of its reliability.
Means for the sixteen items representing indirect equity sensitivity ranged from 2.94 to 4.15. Standard deviations ranged from .81 to 1.16 with subjects using all five anchors on all but one of the items (#43). Inspection of the standard deviation for item #43 (SD = .92) revealed no major restriction of range problem. The reliability for this dimension was .78. An examination of the item-total correlations for the items comprising this dimension revealed that none of the items lowered the reliability of this dimension. Also, when item #43 was eliminated from this dimension, the reliability of this dimension was lowered. Therefore, this slight restriction of range problem for item #43 did not appear to substantially affect the reliability for this dimension.

Means for the sixteen items representing indirect benevolence ranged from 1.13 to 2.19. The standard deviations ranged from .45 to 1.11 with subjects using all five anchors on all but four of the items (#09, #19, #30, and #48). An inspection of the standard deviations for these four items as well as for the other items representing this dimension revealed a restriction of range problem for a number of items. Specifically, items #07, #08, #09, #16, #47, and #48 had standard deviations that were less than or equal to .75. Reliability for this dimension was .73. An examination of the item-total correlations for the items comprising this dimension revealed that none of the items lowered
the reliability of this dimension. This dimension, relative to
the other three dimensions, does seem to suffer from the most
severe restriction of range problem. Again, this restriction of
range problem is probably due, in part, to the low number of
benevolents that comprise our society and our work organizations.
As such, any estimates of their numbers will be relatively low as
well, thus restricting range. Range restriction is important
because it can hide significant construct effects through
attenuation. This may possibly explain the lack of significant
relationships found for this dimension.

Descriptive Statistics and Reliabilities for the Measures in the
Measure Validation Study

Descriptive statistics and reliabilities for each measure
used in the measure validation study are presented in Table 3.20.
The indirect entitlement scale had a mean of 52.59 with a standard
deviation of 9.48. The direct entitlement-benevolence scale had a
mean of 35.14 with a standard deviation of 8.01. The indirect
equity sensitivity scale had a mean of 56.57 with a standard
deviation of 7.62. The indirect benevolence scale had a mean of
26.35 with a standard deviation of 6.05. Finally, the ESI
(Huseman et al., 1985) had a mean of 26.73 with a standard
deviation of 6.13. The reliability of the ESI was .79. A
triangular disclosure matrix, listing the correlations between the
four scales of the new measure of equity sensitivity and the ESI,
is presented in Table 3.21.
Table 3.20
Means, Standard Deviations, and Reliabilities for the
Measures in the Measure Validation Study

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>reliability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EQ1</td>
<td>52.59</td>
<td>9.48</td>
<td>.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EQ2</td>
<td>35.14</td>
<td>8.01</td>
<td>.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EQ3</td>
<td>56.57</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EQ4</td>
<td>25.35</td>
<td>6.05</td>
<td>.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EQ5</td>
<td>89.67</td>
<td>15.04</td>
<td>.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESI</td>
<td>26.73</td>
<td>6.13</td>
<td>.78</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

EQ1 = Indirect Entitlement Dimension
EQ2 = Direct Entitlement-Benevolence Dimension
EQ3 = Indirect Equity Sensitivity Dimension
EQ4 = Indirect Benevolence Dimension
EQ5 = New Composite Measure of Equity Sensitivity Scale
(Overall Entitlement Scale)
ESI = Equity Sensitivity Instrument
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>EQ1</th>
<th>EQ2</th>
<th>EQ3</th>
<th>EQ4</th>
<th>EQ5</th>
<th>ESI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EQ1</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>.48*</td>
<td>-.21*</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>.88*</td>
<td>.29*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EQ2</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>-.19*</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>.84*</td>
<td>.31*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EQ3</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>-.23*</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EQ4</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>-.12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EQ5</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.34*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESI</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*-significant at .05

EQ1 = Indirect Entitlement Dimension  
EQ2 = Direct Entitlement-Benevolence Dimension  
EQ3 = Indirect Equity Sensitivity Dimension  
EQ4 = Indirect Benevolence Dimension  
EQ5 = New Composite Measure of Equity Sensitivity (Overall Entitlement Scale)  
ESI = Equity Sensitivity Instrument
Two scales of the new equity sensitivity measure were combined to form the new measure of equity sensitivity to be validated in this phase of the dissertation. Specifically, the indirect entitlement and the direct entitlement-benevolence scales were combined to form one scale called the overall entitlement scale. These two scales were combined because they were considered, conceptually, alternate methods of assessing entitlement and they have a moderately high correlation of .48. The overall entitlement scale had a mean of 87.73 with a standard deviation of 15.04. The reliability of this scale was .90.

Indirect equity sensitivity was not combined with these two scales because equity sensitivity represents the midpoint of these other scales. As such, it is both conceptually and mathematically inconsistent to combine the indirect equity sensitivity scale with the other scales. In addition, the indirect benevolence scale was excluded from the new scale because of both its extremely low correlations with the two scales of the composite measure ($r = -0.06$ and $r = -0.02$) and its relatively low reliability.

Results for Measure Validation Study

Manipulation Check

A one-way analysis of variance was conducted to determine the effectiveness of the reward condition manipulation. The results of this analysis of variance revealed that reward condition had a significant effect on perceptions of whose was getting a "better deal" ($F = 428.35$, $df = 166$, $p < .0001$). Furthermore, the means
for each reward condition are all in the anticipated direction with each condition yielding different responses. Specifically, subjects perceived Person B as getting a "better deal" in the underreward condition ($M = 2.23$) whereas in the overreward condition ($M = 6.01$) the subjects perceived themselves as getting a "better deal" than Person B. In the equitable reward condition ($M = 4.09$) subjects perceived an "equally good deal" for themselves and Person B. The differences between the reward conditions were also examined using a Tukey-HSD post-hoc comparison procedure. The results of this analysis revealed significant differences ($p < .05$) in equity/inequity perceptions between the underreward and equitable reward conditions, the equitable reward and overreward conditions, and the underreward and overreward conditions. Overall, these results indicate that the manipulation of the independent variable, reward condition, was effective.

In addition, two hierarchical moderated multiple regression analyses (one for each measure of equity sensitivity) were conducted using the manipulation check as the dependent variable to test the primary proposition of equity sensitivity theory. Although not a specific hypothesis in this dissertation, the primary proposition of equity sensitivity theory (Huseman et al., 1987) is that benevolents and entitleds perceive different states of inequity as equity. Specifically, benevolents perceive
unfavorable inequity as equity whereas entitleds perceive favorable inequity as equity. Therefore, there should be an interaction between reward condition and equity sensitivity in predicting perceptions of equity/inequity (i.e., the manipulation check).

In order to test for the moderating effect of equity sensitivity on perceptions of equity, hierarchical moderated multiple regression analyses were performed with the main effects of reward condition and equity sensitivity entered first and then their interaction entered last. Following the advice of Cohen and Cohen (1983), the significance of the incremental R Square caused by the addition of the interaction term was assessed.

For the ESI, the hierarchical moderated multiple regression analysis, using the manipulation check as the dependent variable (see Table 3.22), revealed that the increment in R Square accompanied by the addition of the interaction term (Reward Condition X ESI) was not significant (full model R Square = .843, \( F = 289.01, df = 161, p < .0001; \Delta R^2 = .000, F = 0.01, df = 161, ns \)). Likewise, for the new composite measure of equity sensitivity the hierarchical moderated multiple regression analysis, using the manipulation check as the dependent variable (see Table 3.22), revealed that the increment in R Square accompanied by the addition of the interaction term (Reward Condition X New Measure of Equity Sensitivity) was not significant
Table 3.22
Summary of the Hierarchical Moderated Multiple Regression Analyses for Reward Condition, the ESI, and the New Measure of Equity Sensitivity Predicting Manipulation Check

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>SE B</th>
<th>β</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Model One (ESI)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reward Condition</td>
<td>1.89</td>
<td>.0640</td>
<td>.918****</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reward Condition</td>
<td>1.89</td>
<td>.1002</td>
<td>.917****</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equity Sensitivity Instrument (ESI)</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>.0085</td>
<td>.013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reward Condition</td>
<td>1.92</td>
<td>.2949</td>
<td>.929****</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESI</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
<td>.0220</td>
<td>-.019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reward Condition X ESI</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>.0108</td>
<td>.013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Model Two (New Measure of Equity Sensitivity)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reward Condition</td>
<td>1.89</td>
<td>.0640</td>
<td>.918****</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reward Condition</td>
<td>1.88</td>
<td>.0640</td>
<td>.910****</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Measure of Equity Sensitivity (NM)</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
<td>.0036</td>
<td>-.060</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reward Condition</td>
<td>1.34</td>
<td>.3699</td>
<td>.649***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NM</td>
<td>-0.02</td>
<td>.0097</td>
<td>-.177*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reward Condition X NM</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>.0044</td>
<td>.275</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. R Square for Model One = .918 for Step 1 (p < .0001); Δ R Square for Model One = .000 for Step 2 (ns); Δ R Square for Model One = .000 for Step 3 (ns). R Square for Model Two = .918 for Step 1 (p < .0001); Δ R Square for Model Two = .004 for Step 2 (ns); Δ R Square for Model Two = .002 for Step 3 (ns).

*p<.05; **p<.01; ***p<.001; ****p<.0001
(full model $R^2 = .849$, $F = 301.34$, $df = 161$, $p < .0001$; $\Delta R^2 = .002$, $F = 2.19$, $df = 161$, ns). Therefore, these results do not support the equity sensitivity theory's main proposition that benevolents and entitleds have different perceptions of what is equitable.

**Test of Hypotheses**

Hypotheses 12 to 14 were examined using multiple regression analyses. Hypothesis 12 predicted that there should be a curvilinear relation between reward condition and satisfaction. Specifically, Hypothesis 12 states that there should be a significant difference in reported satisfaction between the underreward and equitable reward conditions. However, there should be no significant difference in reported satisfaction between equitable reward and overreward conditions. Two types of satisfaction, pay satisfaction and overall satisfaction, were measured within each reward condition. Therefore, two multiple regression analyses were performed, one for each type of satisfaction.

The first multiple regression analysis, using pay satisfaction as the dependent variable, revealed that reward condition was significantly related to pay satisfaction ($Multiple R = .706$, $R^2 = .495$, $F = 167.52$, $df = 169$, $p < .0001$). Inspection of the means for pay satisfaction across reward conditions revealed that individuals were most dissatisfied with
their pay in the underreward condition (\( M = 2.89 \)) and were most satisfied with their pay in the overreward condition (\( M = 5.47 \)). Individuals in the equitable reward condition were less satisfied with their pay (\( M = 4.97 \)) than individuals in the overreward condition but were more satisfied with their pay than individuals in the underreward condition. A Tukey-HSD post hoc comparison procedure was conducted to analyze the differences in pay satisfaction across reward conditions. The results of this analysis revealed that the differences between the three reward conditions were all significant (\( p < .05 \)). Therefore, these results provide only partial support for Hypothesis 12 because it was predicted that there would be no significant difference in pay satisfaction between the equitable reward and overreward conditions.

The second multiple regression analysis, using overall satisfaction as the dependent variable, revealed that reward condition also had a significant effect on overall satisfaction (Multiple \( R = .495 \), \( R^2 = .245 \), \( F = 18.03 \), \( df = 169 \), \( p < .0001 \)). Inspection of the means revealed that individuals were most dissatisfied in the underreward condition (\( M = 3.78 \)) and were most satisfied in the overreward condition (\( M = 4.94 \)). Individuals in the equitable reward condition were less satisfied (\( M = 4.93 \)) than individuals in the overreward condition but more satisfied than individuals in the underreward condition. A Tukey-
HSD post hoc comparison procedure was conducted to analyze the differences in overall satisfaction across the reward conditions. The results of this analysis revealed significant differences ($p < .05$) in overall satisfaction between the underreward condition and the equitable reward condition and the underreward and overreward condition. The difference in overall satisfaction between the equitable reward condition and the overreward condition was not significant. The results for overall satisfaction provide support for Hypothesis 12.

Hypothesis 13 predicted that there should be a significant interaction between equity sensitivity and reward condition in predicting satisfaction. Again, two types of satisfaction were assessed, pay satisfaction and overall satisfaction. Likewise, two measures of equity sensitivity, the ESI and the new measure of equity sensitivity, were used to assess a person's equity sensitivity. Therefore, two multiple regression analyses, one for each type of satisfaction, were conducted for each measure of equity sensitivity.

In order to test for the moderating effect of equity sensitivity, hierarchical moderated multiple regression analyses were performed with the main effects of reward condition and equity sensitivity entered first and then their interaction entered last. Following the advice of Cohen and Cohen (1983), the significance of the incremental $R$ Square caused by the addition of
the interaction term was assessed. This procedure was repeated for both pay satisfaction and overall satisfaction.

For the ESI, the hierarchical moderated multiple regression analysis, using pay satisfaction as the dependent variable (see Table 3.23), revealed that the increment in R Square accompanied by the addition of the interaction term (Reward Condition X ESI) was not significant (full model $R^2 = 0.526$, $F = 61.63$, df = 163, $p < 0.0001$; $\Delta R^2 = 0.004$, $F = 1.50$, df = 163, $ns$). Likewise, the hierarchical moderated multiple regression analysis, using overall satisfaction as the dependent variable (see Table 3.23), revealed that the increment in R Square accompanied by the addition of the interaction term (Reward Condition X ESI) was not significant (full model $R^2 = 0.317$, $F = 24.96$, df = 161, $p < 0.0001$; $\Delta R^2 = 0.014$, $F = 3.39$, df = 161, $ns$). Therefore, these results do not support Hypothesis 13.

For the new measure of equity sensitivity, the hierarchical moderated multiple regression analysis, using pay satisfaction as the dependent variable (see Table 3.24), revealed that the increment in R Square accompanied by the addition of the interaction term (Reward Condition X New Measure of Equity Sensitivity) was not significant (full model $R^2 = 0.555$, $F = 69.09$, df = 161, $p < 0.0001$; $\Delta R^2 = 0.00$, $F = 0.08$, $ns$). Likewise, the hierarchical moderated multiple regression analysis, using overall satisfaction as the dependent variable (see Table
Table 3.23
Summary of the Hierarchical Moderated Multiple Regression Analyses for Reward Condition and the ESI Predicting Pay Satisfaction and Overall Satisfaction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>SE B</th>
<th>β</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Model One (Pay Satisfaction)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reward Condition</td>
<td>1.33</td>
<td>.1012</td>
<td>.717****</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reward Condition</td>
<td>1.31</td>
<td>.1002</td>
<td>.708****</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equity Sensitivity Instrument (ESI)</td>
<td>-0.03</td>
<td>.0132</td>
<td>-.125*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reward Condition</td>
<td>1.86</td>
<td>.4570</td>
<td>1.002****</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESI</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>.0341</td>
<td>.281*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reward Condition X ESI</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>.0167</td>
<td>.351</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Model Two (Overall Satisfaction)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reward Condition</td>
<td>0.61</td>
<td>.0783</td>
<td>.522****</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reward Condition</td>
<td>0.60</td>
<td>.0771</td>
<td>.508****</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equity Sensitivity Instrument (ESI)</td>
<td>-0.03</td>
<td>.0102</td>
<td>-.175**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reward Condition</td>
<td>1.22</td>
<td>.3497</td>
<td>1.044***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESI</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>.0261</td>
<td>.460**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reward Condition X ESI</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>.0128</td>
<td>.638</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. $R^2$ for Model One = .511 for Step 1 ($p < .0001$); $\Delta R^2$ for Model One = .015 for Step 2 ($p < .05$); $\Delta R^2$ for Model One = .004 for Step 3 (ns). $R^2$ for Model Two = .268 for Step 1 ($p < .0001$); $\Delta R^2$ for Model Two = .030 for Step 2 ($p < .01$); $\Delta R^2$ for Model Two = .014 for Step 3 (ns).

*p<.05; **p<.01; ***p<.001; ****p<.0001
Table 3.24
Summary of the Hierarchical Moderated Multiple Regression Analyses for Reward Condition and the New Measure of Equity Sensitivity Predicting Pay Satisfaction and Overall Satisfaction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>SE B</th>
<th>β</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Model One (Pay Satisfaction)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reward Condition</td>
<td>1.33</td>
<td>.1012</td>
<td>.717****</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reward Condition</td>
<td>1.27</td>
<td>.0973</td>
<td>.687****</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Measure of Equity Sensitivity (NM)</td>
<td>-0.02</td>
<td>.0054</td>
<td>-.221****</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reward Condition</td>
<td>1.11</td>
<td>.5654</td>
<td>.601</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NM</td>
<td>-0.03</td>
<td>.0149</td>
<td>-.259</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reward Condition X NM</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>.0066</td>
<td>.091</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Model Two (Overall Satisfaction)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reward Condition</td>
<td>0.61</td>
<td>.0783</td>
<td>.522****</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reward Condition</td>
<td>0.58</td>
<td>.0773</td>
<td>.496****</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Measure of Equity Sensitivity (NM)</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
<td>.0043</td>
<td>-.193**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reward Condition</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td>.4484</td>
<td>.228</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NM</td>
<td>-0.02</td>
<td>.0118</td>
<td>-.313</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reward Condition X NM</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>.0053</td>
<td>.282</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. R Square for Model One = .511 for Step 1 (p < .0001); Δ R Square for Model One = .048 for Step 2 (p < .0001); Δ R Square for Model One = .000 for Step 3 (ns). R Square for Model Two = .268 for Step 1 (p < .0001); Δ R Square for Model Two = .037 for Step 2 (p < .0001); Δ R Square for Model Two = .000 for Step 3 (ns).

*p<.05; **p<.01; ***p<.001; ****p<.0001
revealed that the increment in R Square accompanied by the addition of the interaction term (Reward Condition X New Measure of Equity Sensitivity) was not significant (full model $R^2 = .299$, $F = 24.28$, $df = 161$, $p < .0001$; $\Delta R^2 = .002$, $F = .50$, $df = 161$, ns). Therefore, these results also do not support Hypothesis 13.

Two additional hierarchical moderated multiple regression analyses (one using pay satisfaction as the dependent variable and the other using overall satisfaction as the dependent variable) were performed for each of the four scales of the new equity sensitivity measure. In all, eight additional hierarchical moderated multiple regression analyses were performed. Given that four additional analyses were performed for each dependent variable, the alpha level of .05 was divided by four. Thus, the significance level for these additional analyses was set at .0125. The results of the four hierarchical moderated multiple regression analyses, using pay satisfaction as the dependent variable (see Table 3.25, revealed that the increment in R Square accompanied by the addition of the interaction term (Reward Condition X Scale of New Measure of Equity Sensitivity) was not significant for any of the four scales of the new equity sensitivity measure. Similarly, the results of the four hierarchical moderated multiple regression analyses, using overall satisfaction as the dependent variable (see Table 3.26), revealed that the increment in R Square
Table 3.25
Summary of the Hierarchical Moderated Multiple Regression Analyses for Each of the Four Scales of the New Measure of Equity Sensitivity and Reward Condition Predicting Pay Satisfaction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>SE B</th>
<th>β</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Model One (Indirect Entitlement Scale: EQ1)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reward Condition</td>
<td>1.31</td>
<td>.1010</td>
<td>.706****</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reward Condition</td>
<td>1.24</td>
<td>.0986</td>
<td>.669****</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indirect Entitlement Scale (EQ1)</td>
<td>-0.03</td>
<td>.0086</td>
<td>-.208***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reward Condition</td>
<td>1.32</td>
<td>.5401</td>
<td>.709</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EQ1</td>
<td>-0.03</td>
<td>.0240</td>
<td>-.187</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reward Condition X EQ1</td>
<td>-0.00</td>
<td>.0109</td>
<td>-.042</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Model Two (Direct Entitlement-Benevolence Scale: EQ2)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reward Condition</td>
<td>1.30</td>
<td>.1022</td>
<td>.705****</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reward Condition</td>
<td>1.29</td>
<td>.0983</td>
<td>.699****</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct Entitlement-Benevolence Scale (EQ2)</td>
<td>-0.04</td>
<td>.0101</td>
<td>-.202***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reward Condition</td>
<td>1.13</td>
<td>.4496</td>
<td>.613</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EQ2</td>
<td>-0.05</td>
<td>.0284</td>
<td>-.252</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reward Condition X EQ2</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>.0124</td>
<td>.099</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. $R^2$ for Model One = .498 for Step 1 ($p < .0001$); $\Delta R^2$ for Model Two = .497 for Step 1 ($p < .0001$); $\Delta R^2$ for Model One = .000 for Step 3 (ns). $R^2$ for Model Two = .041 for Step 2 ($p < .001$); $\Delta R^2$ for Model Two = .000 for Step 3 (ns).

*p < .05; **p < .01; ***p < .001; ****p < .0001

"(table con'd.)"
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>SE B</th>
<th>B</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Model Three (Indirect Equity Sensitivity Scale: EQ3)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reward Condition</td>
<td>1.31</td>
<td>.1010</td>
<td>.706****</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reward Condition</td>
<td>1.30</td>
<td>.1005</td>
<td>.701****</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indirect Equity Sensitivity Scale (EQ3)</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>.0108</td>
<td>.098</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reward Condition</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>.7740</td>
<td>.488****</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EQ3</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>.0287</td>
<td>.029</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reward Condition X EQ3</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>.0136</td>
<td>.228</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Model Four (Indirect Benevolence Scale: EQ4)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reward Condition</td>
<td>1.31</td>
<td>.1017</td>
<td>.706****</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reward Condition</td>
<td>1.32</td>
<td>.0999</td>
<td>.708****</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indirect Benevolence Scale (EQ4)</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>.0137</td>
<td>.142*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reward Condition</td>
<td>1.37</td>
<td>.4818</td>
<td>.740*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EQ4</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>.0354</td>
<td>.158</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reward Condition X EQ4</td>
<td>-0.00</td>
<td>.0188</td>
<td>-.037</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. R Square for Model Three = .498 for Step 1 (p < .0001); ΔR Square for Model Three = .010 for Step 2 (ns); ΔR Square for Model Three = .001 for Step 3 (ns). R Square for Model Four = .499 for Step 1 (p < .0001); ΔR Square for Model Four = .020 for Step 2 (p < .05); ΔR Square for Model Four = .000 for Step 3 (ns).  
*p<.05; **p<.01; ***p<.001; ****p<.0001
Table 3.26
Summary of the Hierarchical Moderated Multiple Regression Analyses for Each of the Four Scales of the New Measure of Equity Sensitivity and Reward Condition Predicting Overall Satisfaction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>SE B</th>
<th>β</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Model One (Indirect Entitlement Scale: EQ1)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 1</td>
<td>Reward Condition</td>
<td>0.59</td>
<td>0.0796</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 2</td>
<td>Reward Condition</td>
<td>0.55</td>
<td>0.0788</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Indirect Entitlement Scale (EQ1)</td>
<td>-0.02</td>
<td>0.0069</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 3</td>
<td>Reward Condition</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>0.4310</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>EQ1</td>
<td>-0.03</td>
<td>0.0192</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reward Condition X EQ1</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.0087</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Model Two (Direct Entitlement-Benevolence Scale: EQ2)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 1</td>
<td>Reward Condition</td>
<td>0.59</td>
<td>0.0796</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 2</td>
<td>Reward Condition</td>
<td>0.58</td>
<td>0.0784</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Direct Entitlement-Benevolence Scale (EQ2)</td>
<td>-0.02</td>
<td>0.0081</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 3</td>
<td>Reward Condition</td>
<td>0.44</td>
<td>0.3588</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>EQ2</td>
<td>-0.03</td>
<td>0.0226</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reward Condition X EQ2</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.0098</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. R\(^2\) for Model One = 0.245 for Step 1 (p < 0.0001); ΔR\(^2\) for Model One = 0.043 for Step 2 (p < 0.01); ΔR\(^2\) for Model One = 0.001 for Step 3 (ns). R\(^2\) for Model Two = 0.249 for Step 1 (p < 0.0001); ΔR\(^2\) for Model Two = 0.027 for Step 2 (ns); ΔR\(^2\) for Model Two = 0.000 for Step 3 (ns).

*p < 0.05; **p < 0.01; ***p < 0.001; ****p < 0.0001

"(table con'd.)"
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>SE B</th>
<th>β</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Model Three (Indirect Equity Sensitivity Scale: EQ3)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Step 1</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reward Condition</td>
<td>0.59</td>
<td>.0796</td>
<td>.495****</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Step 2</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reward Condition</td>
<td>0.58</td>
<td>.0793</td>
<td>.490****</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indirect Equity Sensitivity Scale (EQ3)</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>.0085</td>
<td>.112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Step 3</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reward Condition</td>
<td>1.86</td>
<td>.6026</td>
<td>1.569****</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EQ3</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>.0224</td>
<td>.459*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reward Condition X EQ3</td>
<td>-0.02</td>
<td>.0106</td>
<td>-1.151</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model Four (Indirect Benevolence Scale: EQ4)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Step 1</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reward Condition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Step 2</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reward Condition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indirect Benevolence Scale (EQ4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Step 3</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reward Condition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EQ4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reward Condition X EQ4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. R² for Model Three = .245 for Step 1 (p < .0001); Δ R² for Model Three = .013 for Step 2 (ns); Δ R² for Model Three = .020 for Step 3 (ns). R² for Model Four = .248 for Step 1 (p < .0001); Δ R² for Model Four = .016 for Step 2 (ns); Δ R² for Model Four = .000 for Step 3 (ns).

*p<.05; **p<.01; ***p<.001; ****p<.0001
accompanied by the addition of the interaction term (Reward Condition X Scale of New Measure of Equity Sensitivity) was not significant for any of the four scales of the new equity sensitivity measure. Therefore, these results also do not support Hypothesis 13.

Taken together, the results of the hierarchical moderator multiple regression analyses for both the ESI and the new measure of equity sensitivity would seem to indicate that equity sensitivity does not seem to moderate satisfaction with different reward conditions. However, both measures of equity sensitivity did have significant main effects for both pay satisfaction and overall satisfaction in each of their respective regression analyses. The ESI had a significant main effect on pay satisfaction beyond that accounted for by reward condition (full model $R^2 = .53, F = 91.43, df = 162, p < .0001; \Delta R^2 = .015, F = 5.31, p < .05$) and a significant main effect on overall satisfaction beyond that accounted for by reward condition (full model $R^2 = .295, F = 35.23, df = 162, p < .0001; \Delta R^2 = .03, F = 7.05, p < .01$). Likewise, the new measure of equity sensitivity also had a significant main effect on pay satisfaction beyond that accounted for by reward condition (full model $R^2 = .56, F = 104.19, df = 162, p < .0001; \Delta R^2 = .048, F = 17.71, df = 162, p < .0001$) and a significant main effect on overall satisfaction beyond that accounted for by reward condition.
(full model $R^2 = .30$, $F = 36.29$, $df = 162$, $p < .0001$; $\Delta R^2 = .04$, $F = 8.58$, $df = 162$, $p < .01$). Therefore, equity sensitivity appears to operate as an additive variable rather than a moderator variable.

An inspection of the beta weights for both the ESI and the new measure of equity sensitivity revealed that the ESI was negatively related to both pay satisfaction ($\beta = -0.125$) and overall satisfaction ($\beta = -0.175$). Similarly, new measure of equity sensitivity was also negatively related to both pay satisfaction ($\beta = -0.221$) and overall satisfaction ($\beta = -0.193$). In other words, those scoring high on the ESI or the new measure of equity sensitivity (i.e., greater entitlement) reported generally lower levels of pay and overall satisfaction across all reward conditions than did those individuals scoring low on the ESI or the new measure of equity sensitivity (i.e., greater benevolence).

Finally, Hypothesis 14 states that the new measure of equity sensitivity will have utility in predicting satisfaction with different reward conditions above and beyond that provided by the ESI. That is, the new measure of equity will have incremental validity for predicting satisfaction with different reward conditions. Initially, this hypothesis was tested using two hierarchical multiple regression analyses, one for pay satisfaction and the other for overall satisfaction. In these
hierarchical multiple regression analyses, reward condition was entered first, the ESI was entered second, and the new measure of equity sensitivity was entered last. Interaction terms were not entered into the regression equation because they were found to be statistically non-significant in previous regression analyses.

The results of these hierarchical multiple regression analyses are shown in Tables 3.27 and 3.28. For pay satisfaction (see Table 3.27, Model One), the new measure of equity sensitivity explained a significant amount of variance in pay satisfaction beyond that explained by reward condition and the ESI (full model $R^2 = .56$, $F = 70.00$, $df = 161$, $p < .0001$; $\Delta R^2 = .04$, $F = 13.30$, $df = 161$, $p < .001$). For overall satisfaction (see Table 3.28, Model One), the new measure of equity sensitivity also explained a significant amount of variance in overall satisfaction beyond that explained by reward condition and the ESI (full model $R^2 = .31$, $F = 25.70$, $df = 161$, $p < .0001$; $\Delta R^2 = .02$, $F = 4.93$, $df = 161$, $p < .05$). The new measure of equity sensitivity appears to have incremental validity for predicting both pay satisfaction and overall satisfaction beyond that predicted by reward condition and the ESI. Therefore, these results support Hypothesis 14.

Two additional hierarchical multiple regression analyses were conducted to further test Hypothesis 14. These analyses were identical to the two previous hierarchical multiple regression
Table 3.27
Summary of the Hierarchical Multiple Regression Analyses for Reward Condition, the ESI, and the New Measure of Equity Sensitivity Predicting Pay Satisfaction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>SE B</th>
<th>β</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Model One (New Measure of Equity Sensitivity Entered Last)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reward Condition</td>
<td>1.33</td>
<td>.1012</td>
<td>.717****</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reward Condition</td>
<td>1.31</td>
<td>.1002</td>
<td>.708****</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equity Sensitivity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instrument (ESI)</td>
<td>-0.03</td>
<td>.0132</td>
<td>-.125*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reward Condition</td>
<td>1.27</td>
<td>.0973</td>
<td>.685****</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESI</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>.0135</td>
<td>.062</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Measure of Equity Sensitivity</td>
<td>-0.02</td>
<td>.0057</td>
<td>-.201***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Model Two (The ESI entered last)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reward Condition</td>
<td>0.61</td>
<td>.0783</td>
<td>.522****</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reward Condition</td>
<td>1.27</td>
<td>.0972</td>
<td>.687****</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Measure of Equity Sensitivity</td>
<td>-0.02</td>
<td>.0054</td>
<td>-.221****</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reward Condition</td>
<td>1.27</td>
<td>.0973</td>
<td>.685****</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Measure of Equity Sensitivity</td>
<td>-0.02</td>
<td>.0057</td>
<td>-.201***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESI</td>
<td>-0.02</td>
<td>.0135</td>
<td>-.062</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. R² for Model One = .511 for Step 1 (p < .0001); ΔR² for Model One = .015 for Step 2 (p < .05); ΔR² for Model One = .036 for Step 3 (p < .001). R² for Model Two = .511 for Step 1 (p < .0001); ΔR² for Model Two = .048 for Step 2 (p < .01); ΔR² for Model Two = .003 for Step 3 (ns).

*p<.05; **p<.01; ***p<.001; ****p<.0001
Table 3.28
Summary of the Hierarchical Multiple Regression Analyses for Reward Condition, the ESI, and the New Measure of Equity Sensitivity Predicting Overall Satisfaction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>SE B</th>
<th>β</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Model One (New Measure of Equity Sensitivity Entered Last)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reward Condition</td>
<td>0.61</td>
<td>.0783</td>
<td>.522****</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reward Condition</td>
<td>0.60</td>
<td>.0771</td>
<td>.508****</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equity Sensitivity Instrument (ESI)</td>
<td>-0.03</td>
<td>.0102</td>
<td>-.175**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reward Condition</td>
<td>0.58</td>
<td>.0767</td>
<td>.491****</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESI</td>
<td>-0.02</td>
<td>.0106</td>
<td>-.127</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Measure of Equity Sensitivity</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
<td>.0045</td>
<td>-.153*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Model Two (The ESI entered last)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reward Condition</td>
<td>0.61</td>
<td>.0783</td>
<td>.522****</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reward Condition</td>
<td>0.58</td>
<td>.0773</td>
<td>.496****</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Measure of Equity Sensitivity</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
<td>.0043</td>
<td>-.193**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reward Condition</td>
<td>0.58</td>
<td>.0767</td>
<td>.491***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Measure of Equity Sensitivity</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
<td>.0045</td>
<td>-.153*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESI</td>
<td>-0.02</td>
<td>.0106</td>
<td>-.127</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. $R^2$ Square for Model One = .268 for Step 1 ($p < .0001$); $\Delta R^2$ Square for Model One = .030 for Step 2 ($p < .01$); $\Delta R^2$ Square for Model One = .021 for Step 3 ($p < .05$). $R^2$ Square for Model Two = .268 for Step 1 ($p < .0001$); $\Delta R^2$ Square for Model Two = .037 for Step 2 ($p < .01$); $\Delta R^2$ Square for Model Two = .014 for Step 3 (ns).

*p<.05; **p<.01; ***p<.001; ****p<.0001
analyses except that the order in which the two measures were entered was reversed. The results of these hierarchical multiple regression analyses are also shown in Tables 3.27 and 3.28. For pay satisfaction (see Table 3.27, Model Two), the ESI did not explain a significant amount of variance in pay satisfaction beyond that explained by reward condition and the new measure of equity sensitivity (full model $R^2 = .56$, $F = 70.00$, $df = 161$, $p < .0001$; $\Delta R^2 = .003$, $F = 1.27$, $df = 161$, ns). Likewise, for overall satisfaction (see Table 3.28, Model Two), the ESI did not explain a significant amount of variance in overall satisfaction beyond that explained by reward condition and the new measure of equity sensitivity (full model $R^2 = .31$, $F = 25.70$, $df = 161$, $p < .0001$; $\Delta R^2 = .014$, $F = 3.43$, $df = 161$, ns). In both of these cases, the ESI did not demonstrate incremental validity for predicting pay satisfaction and overall satisfaction, beyond that predicted by reward condition and the new measure of equity sensitivity. Taken together, the results of these four hierarchical multiple regression analyses would seem to indicate that the new measure of equity sensitivity is more predictive of (i.e., explains more variance in) pay satisfaction and overall satisfaction with different reward conditions than is the ESI. However, whether or not this difference is statistically significant is not testable given this analysis.
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Chapter Four begins with a review of the psychometric properties and the validity of the new measure of equity sensitivity. Next, areas of concern in equity sensitivity research are examined. Then, a discussion of the outcomes associated with equity sensitivity is presented. The chapter ends with a discussion of the current dissertation’s limitations.

**The New Equity Sensitivity Measure**

The primary objective of the dissertation was to construct, based on systematic item development procedures, a theoretically based equity sensitivity measure that provided thorough coverage of the construct. Once the new measure of equity sensitivity was developed, its factor structure, item characteristics, and reliability were assessed in two pilot studies with 565 undergraduate students. Then, a nomological network for the new measure was constructed. Specifically, the new measure's convergent, discriminant, and nomological validity were examined in two separate construct validity assessments involving 443 undergraduate students. Finally, the new measure's incremental validity for predicting satisfaction with different reward conditions was assessed using a typical equity theory/equity sensitivity theory laboratory paradigm similar to that used by
Austin et al. (1980) and King et al. (1993). In this laboratory study involving 186 undergraduate students, the incremental validity of the new measure of equity sensitivity for predicting satisfaction with different reward conditions was investigated.

**Factor Structure**

Principal-axes factor analyses conducted in the two pilot studies yielded a four factor solution for the new measure of equity sensitivity. The four factors were identified as indirect entitlement, direct entitlement-benevolence, indirect equity sensitivity, and indirect benevolence. This factor structure does not support Huseman et al.’s (1987) four dimension model of equity sensitivity. Rather it appears that the dimensionality of the construct depends on the way in which the construct is assessed. When equity sensitivity is measured directly, it appears that its factor structure is unidimensional. The second factor, direct entitlement-benevolence, is the only factor that directly inquires about an individual's own preferences relating to equity sensitivity. Similar results (King & Miles, 1994) have been found for the ESI (Huseman, 1985) which also directly inquires about an individual's equity sensitivity. King and Miles (1994), using a principal components analysis, found that the ESI was unidimensional. The dimension of the ESI was labeled benevolence. This dimension is very similar to the direct entitlement-benevolence dimension of the new equity sensitivity measure in
that it is anchored by benevolence on one end and entitlement on the other end. Therefore, there appears to be some support for the belief that when measured directly equity sensitivity is a unidimensional construct with entitlement anchoring one end of the construct and benevolence anchoring the other end.

On the other hand, when measured indirectly equity sensitivity appears to be multidimensional. Three factors, one for each type (entitled, equity sensitive, and benevolent) in equity sensitivity theory, were identified that measured equity sensitivity indirectly. The possibility exists that these three factors are merely method factors (i.e., different ways of assessing the construct) and as such make no significant theoretical contribution to our understanding of the equity sensitivity construct. Another explanation is that when asked about others at work or their friends, individuals will categorize people into one of three types: entitleds, benevolents, or equity sensitives.

**Psychometric Properties**

Sixteen items representing each of the four dimensions of the new measure of equity sensitivity were analyzed in the two construct validity studies and the laboratory study. Reliabilities for the four dimensions ranged from .71 to .86 in all three studies. One dimension, indirect benevolence, suffered from a severe range restriction problem in many of its items.
This problem may account for this dimension's lack of significant relationships with other variables of interest. Two of the other three dimensions, indirect entitlement and direct entitlement-benevolence, suffered from a minor range restriction problem as well. However, for these two dimensions, range restriction did not appear to pose a significant problem. Finally, two of the dimensions, indirect entitlement and direct entitlement-benevolence, were used to construct the final measure of equity sensitivity used in both construct validity studies and the laboratory study. Overall reliability for this 32 item measure ranged from .89 to .90.

Psychometrically, the new measure of equity sensitivity appears to be sound. The new measure of equity sensitivity consistently yielded acceptable reliabilities in the two construct validity studies as well as the laboratory study. In addition, the reliability of the new measure of equity sensitivity compares favorably to the ESI's reliability which has been found to range from .78 to .88 (King & Miles, 1994). Therefore, the reliability of the new measure of equity appears to be well established.

Validity

In addition to examining the psychometric properties of the new measure of equity sensitivity, the construct validity and predictive validity of the new measure were investigated. Construct validity of the new measure of equity sensitivity
consists of three types: (a) convergent validity, correspondence between the new measure of equity sensitivity and the ESI, (b) discriminant validity, lack of correspondence between the new measure of equity sensitivity and measures of other non-theoretically related variables, and (c) nomological validity, correspondence among the new equity sensitivity measure and measures of other theoretically related variables (Campbell & Fiske, 1959; Schwab, 1980).

Results of the correlation analyses for the two construct validity studies revealed that the new measure of equity sensitivity had adequate construct validity. Hypothesis 1, which stated that there should be a positive correlation between the new measure of equity sensitivity and the ESI, was supported. High positive correlations (r = .47 and r = .31, p < .05) between the new composite measure of equity sensitivity and the ESI suggest convergent validity. However, given these correlations, there is just a 9% to 22% overlap between the two measures of equity sensitivity. Therefore, it may be concluded that the two measures of equity sensitivity may be measuring different constructs or different aspects of the same construct. This conclusion is not unexpected given the new measure's more systematic item development process and more thorough coverage of the equity sensitivity construct.
In terms of discriminant validity, the new measure of equity sensitivity, quite unexpectedly, had significant correlations with two supposedly non-theoretically related variables. Hypothesis 2, which stated that there should be no significant correlation between the new measure of equity sensitivity and locus of control, was not supported. There was a significant positive correlation ($r = .23, p < .05$) between the new measure of equity sensitivity and locus of control. The more entitlement an individual reports, the more external is his/her locus of control. This finding is consistent with Huseman's et al. (1987) proposition that entitleds are more focused on what they can get from an exchange (an externally controlled outcome) whereas benevolents are more concerned with what they can give to an exchange (an internally controlled outcome).

In addition, Hypothesis 4, which stated that there should be no significant correlation between the new measure of equity sensitivity and old-fashionedness, was not supported. There was a significant negative correlation between the new measure of equity sensitivity and old-fashionedness ($r = -.16, p < .05$). Those individuals who are more benevolent are also more old-fashioned. This finding is consistent with Ray's (1990) definition of an old-fashioned individual as someone who is conscientious, conservative, nice to others, and prone to perfectionism with good self-control. Benevolents, with the importance they place on
inputs (i.e., giving) in an exchange relationship, appear to fit this definition better than entitleds.

Finally, Hypothesis 3, which stated that there should be no significant correlation between the new measure of equity sensitivity and self-monitoring, was supported. There was no significant correlation ($r = .13, \text{ns}$) between the new measure and self-monitoring. Although the new equity sensitivity measure was significantly correlated with both locus of control and old-fashionedness, these correlations were small in magnitude. The magnitude of the correlations between the new measure of equity sensitivity and these two personality variables is insufficient to raise concerns that the new measure of equity sensitivity and either of these two measures are assessing the same construct.

As for the new measure's nomological validity, two sets of hypotheses were examined. The first set of hypotheses concerned the relations between the new measure of equity sensitivity and theoretically related personality/cognitive variables. The second set of hypotheses concerned the relations between the new measure of equity sensitivity and the demographic variables of gender, age, and educational level. The results for each set of hypotheses will be discussed, in turn.

In the first set of nomological validity hypotheses, only Hypothesis 6, which stated that there should be a positive correlation between the new measure of equity sensitivity and
machaiavellianism, was supported. There was a significant positive correlation ($r = .44, p < .05$) between the new measure of equity sensitivity and machiavellianism. That is, entitleds report more machiavellian tendencies than do benevolents. This finding is consistent with the research on machiavellianism (Blumstein & Weinstein, 1969) that found that high Machs endorsed an outcome maximization norm in an exchange relationship with a partner whereas low Machs endorsed an equity norm. The high Mach endorsement of an outcome maximization norm in an exchange relationship with a partner is consistent with the importance placed on outcomes by entitleds in exchange relations with organizations (King et al., 1993).

Hypothesis 5, which stated that there should be a negative correlation between the new measure of equity sensitivity and interpersonal orientation, was not supported. Similarly, Hypothesis 7, which stated that there should be a negative correlation between the new equity sensitivity measure and the protestant ethic, was not supported. However, for both Hypothesis 5 and Hypothesis 7, the correlations were in the predicted direction but were not significant (both $r = -.11$, ns). Finally, Hypothesis 8, which stated that there should be a positive correlation between the new measure of equity sensitivity and exchange ideology, was also not supported. In fact, there was almost no correlation between the two measures ($r = .01$, ns).
This finding was quite surprising given that both measures are supposedly assessing similar concepts (i.e., preferences for certain exchange relations with organizations). A possible explanation for the lack of significant correlations between the new measure of equity sensitivity and the measures of interpersonal orientation, protestant ethic, and exchange ideology is that the latter three measures had very low reliabilities, .65, .59, and .63, respectively. Unreliability in a set of measures can serve to reduce the correlations between the measures (Cascio, 1987). As a result, the low reliabilities in these measures may be obscuring the "true" relations between the new measure of equity sensitivity and these three constructs.

In the second set of nomological validity hypotheses, three hypotheses were tested. First, Hypothesis 9, which stated that there should be no significant difference between males and females on the new measure and equity sensitivity, was supported. No significant differences between males and females on the new measure of equity sensitivity were found. Second, Hypothesis 10, which stated that there should be no significant relationship between the new measure of equity sensitivity and age, was not supported. The new measure of equity sensitivity was significantly correlated with age ($r = -.23$ and $r = -.30$, $p < .05$). Third, Hypothesis 11, which stated that there should be no significant correlation between the new measure of equity...
sensitivity and educational level, was only partially supported. The new measure of equity sensitivity was significantly correlated with educational level ($r = -0.24, p < 0.05$) in the discriminant validity assessment sample but not significantly correlated with educational level ($r = -0.15, ns$) in the nomological validity assessment sample.

Overall, the magnitude of the correlations between the new measure of equity sensitivity and other demographic, personality, and cognitive constructs in the construct validity assessment is insufficient to raise concerns that the new measure of equity sensitivity and any of the other measures are assessing the same construct. For example, the largest of the correlations for any one study was $0.47$ (the ESI in the nomological validity assessment). Given this, the largest of correlations reported, there is still less than a 25% overlap between the two measures.

Next, two hypotheses, Hypotheses 13 and 14, were examined in the laboratory study. Hypothesis 13, which stated that there should be a significant interaction between equity sensitivity and reward condition in predicting job satisfaction, was not supported. The results of the hierarchical moderated multiple regression analysis revealed that the increment in $R$ Square accompanied by the addition of the interaction term (Reward Condition $\times$ New Measure of Equity Sensitivity) was not significant for the dependent variables of pay satisfaction and overall
satisfaction. (Similar results were found in this dissertation when using the ESI as the measure of equity sensitivity.) Therefore, it appears that equity sensitivity does not moderate satisfaction with different reward conditions as suggested by Huseman et al. (1987).

Finding a non-significant Reward Condition X Equity Sensitivity interaction term is consistent with the results of previous equity sensitivity studies (e.g., Huseman et al., 1985; King et al., 1993). However, how the interaction term was interpreted in this dissertation differs from the way it in which it has been interpreted in previous studies. Although the interaction term was not significant in previous studies (e.g., Huseman et al., 1985; King et al., 1993), post-hoc comparisons of the reactions (e.g., satisfaction) of the three equity types within different reward conditions were still conducted and interpreted. In other words, even though a moderator interpretation of equity sensitivity was not supported, the authors of these studies still interpreted the results from the post-hoc comparisons as evidence that equity sensitivity moderates satisfaction with different reward conditions.

According to Cohen and Cohen (1983), if the interaction term, representing the moderating variable, is not significant then a moderator variable interpretation is not supported. Hence, the previous studies in the equity sensitivity area have conducted
inappropriate analyses and have, as a result, formed inappropriate conclusions. The proper interpretation of this dissertation's results as well as the results of previous studies in the equity sensitivity area is that equity sensitivity appears to operate as an additive variable, rather than a moderator variable, given its significant main effect on satisfaction.

The utility of the new measure of equity sensitivity for predicting satisfaction with different reward conditions beyond that provided by the ESI was also examined in the laboratory study. Hypothesis 14, which stated that the new measure of equity sensitivity will demonstrate incremental validity in predicting satisfaction with different reward conditions, was supported. Specifically, the results of the hierarchical multiple regression analyses revealed that the new measure of equity sensitivity possessed incremental validity for predicting both pay satisfaction and overall satisfaction with different reward conditions.

Furthermore, when the order in which the two measures of equity sensitivity were entered into the hierarchical multiple regression analyses was reversed (i.e., the new measure entered first and the ESI entered last), the ESI did not possess incremental validity for predicting both pay satisfaction and overall satisfaction with different reward conditions. This finding can be taken as preliminary evidence that the new measure
of equity sensitivity may be more predictive of satisfaction with different reward conditions than the ESI. However, whether or not this difference in predictive validity is statistically significant could not be tested given the analyses performed.

In general, the new measure of equity sensitivity appears to be reliable and have adequate construct validity. It also seems to be useful for predicting both pay satisfaction and overall satisfaction with different reward conditions. These preliminary results demonstrate that the new measure's reliability and predictive validity are as good as or may be even better than the ESI's reliability and predictive validity. Therefore, it appears that the new measure of equity sensitivity will prove to be an acceptable alternative measure of equity sensitivity.

Areas of Concern in Equity Sensitivity Research

The current dissertation raises as many questions as it answers concerning the equity sensitivity construct. As a result, there are number of areas in equity sensitivity research that need to be more fully examined. Among these areas are the appropriateness of the outcome/dependent variables used in the research to date, the definition of the construct, and the incremental utility of the construct. Each of these three areas will be addressed, in turn.

The Appropriateness of the Dependent Variables

The first area of concern in equity sensitivity research is the appropriateness of the outcome/dependent variables used to
test the construct. To date, most of the research in this area (Huseman et al., 1985; King et al., 1993; Miles et al., 1994; Patrick & Jackson, 1991) has used satisfaction as the dependent variable of interest. However, an examination of the four basic postulates of equity theory (Adams, 1965) reveals no mention of satisfaction as the main dependent variable. Rather, tension is the primary dependent variable mentioned in the postulates. Therefore, we may have been examining the equity sensitivity construct using a somewhat less than optimal or less appropriate outcome/dependent variable. In light of the equity theory postulates, a more appropriate test of the equity sensitivity construct would entail using tension as the main dependent variable. It is possible, using tension as the dependent variable, that we may find that equity sensitivity moderates reactions to different reward conditions. Future research in the equity sensitivity area should use tension as a dependent variable, in order to more fully explicate the construct.

The Definition of the Construct

The second area of concern centers around the exact nature of the equity sensitivity construct. The original equity sensitivity construct as defined by Huseman et al. (1987) referred to an individual’s preference for a certain equity ratio (i.e., unfavorable inequity, equity, or favorable inequity) relative to a comparison other. In other words, the original definition of the construct states that benevolents will perceive unfavorable
inequity as equity relative to a comparison other whereas entitleds will perceive favorable inequity relative to a comparison other as equity. Meanwhile, equity sensitives will perceive equity relative to a comparison other as equity. In other words, both benevolents and entitleds are insensitive to (i.e., do not prefer) actual equity relative to a comparison other. However, the results of the hierarchical moderated multiple regression analyses using the manipulation check as the dependent variable revealed that the Reward Condition X Equity Sensitivity interaction had no significant effect on perceptions of equity/inequity. Contrary to the original equity sensitivity construct, benevolents and entitleds did not differ in their perceptions of what was equitable and/or inequitable. Therefore, the equity sensitivity construct appears not to represent a person's sensitivity or insensitivity to equity.

Furthermore, the original definition of the equity sensitivity construct also stated that equity sensitivity should moderate satisfaction with different reward conditions (Huseman et al., 1987). For example, for benevolents there should be a negative, linear relationship between reward condition and satisfaction whereas for entitleds there should be a positive, linear relationship between reward condition and satisfaction. However, the results of the hierarchical moderated multiple regression analyses in this dissertation revealed that the Reward
Condition X Equity Sensitivity interaction did not significantly affect pay satisfaction or overall satisfaction. Therefore, equity sensitivity did not seem to moderate satisfaction with different reward conditions. Equity sensitivity, given its significant main effect on pay satisfaction and overall satisfaction, appeared to operate as an additive variable. That is, benevolents reported greater pay satisfaction and overall satisfaction across all reward conditions than did entitleds. For both benevolents and entitleds, a positive, linear relationship was found between reward condition and satisfaction, contrary to the predictions of the original equity sensitivity construct (Huseman et al., 1987).

Recently, the equity sensitivity construct has been redefined (King & Hinson, 1994; King et al., 1993; Miles et al., 1994), based on previous research in the equity sensitivity area (e.g., Huseman et al., 1985; King et al., 1993; Miles et al., 1989; Miles et al., 1994; Patrick & Jackson, 1991), as representing an individual's cognitive orientation (i.e., input vs. outcome) toward exchange relationships with work organizations. That is, entitleds are more focused on outcomes (i.e., what they receive) in an exchange relationship with an employer whereas benevolents are more focused on inputs (i.e., what they give) in an exchange relationship with an employer. In addition, this redefinition includes a restatement of the relationship between reward condition and satisfaction for benevolents. Specifically, this
redefinition proposes that there is a positive, linear relationship between reward condition and satisfaction for both entitleds and benevolents. This redefinition still assumes that equity sensitivity moderates reactions to (i.e., satisfaction with) different reward conditions.

The results of the current dissertation provide some support for the redefinition of equity sensitivity proposed by King et al. (1993), King and Hinson (1994), and Miles et al. (1994). However, further modifications may need to be made to the equity sensitivity construct such as equity sensitivity being considered an additive variable rather than a moderator variable when predicting satisfaction with different reward conditions. However, such modifications should be based on more than the results of one study (i.e., this dissertation). Future research in the equity sensitivity should test whether or not equity sensitivity moderates satisfaction with different reward conditions, using actual employees reacting to actual equity/inequity situations. This would provide a more definitive test of whether or not equity sensitivity moderates satisfaction with different reward conditions.

The Incremental Utility of the Construct

Finally, the incremental utility of the equity sensitivity construct should be examined. The results of equity sensitivity research (e.g., the finding that equity sensitivity is significantly and positively related to satisfaction) closely
parallel other lines of research (e.g., Arvey, Bouchard, Segal, & Abraham, 1989; Bouchard, Arvey, Keller, & Segal, 1992; Keller, Bouchard, Arvey, Segal, & Dawls, 1992; Staw, 1986; Staw, Bell, & Clausen, 1985; Staw & Ross, 1985) that have found that dispositional variables account for a significant amount of variance in job satisfaction (e.g., 30%; Arvey et al., 1989).

Consistent with the research on disposition and job satisfaction, benevolents appear to be prone to be more satisfied with their jobs whereas entitleds appear to be prone to be less satisfied with their jobs (e.g., King et al., 1993; Miles et al., 1989). An central question for the equity sensitivity construct is whether or not equity sensitivity accounts for a significant amount of variance in job satisfaction beyond that accounted for by other dispositional variables that affect satisfaction. One such dispositional variable that affects satisfaction is positive affectivity. Positive affectivity (e.g., George, 1989; Watson, Clark, & Carey, 1988; Watson & Pennebaker, 1989) is an individual's tendency to experience positive affect (e.g., satisfaction) across situations. Positive affectivity has been found to be positively related to satisfaction (Clark & Watson, 1988; Watson, 1988). An interesting test of the incremental utility of the equity sensitivity construct would be to examine if equity sensitivity has incremental validity for predicting satisfaction with different reward conditions, beyond that provided by positive affectivity.
Equity Sensitivity and Organizational Outcomes

Numerous job-related outcomes are suggested for employees with varying levels of equity sensitivity. Thus, the new measure of equity sensitivity along with the ESI provide increased research opportunities for organizational researchers. Areas of potential research are discussed in the following subsections. Finally, the relationship between equity sensitivity theory and referent cognitions theory is discussed.

Quantity/Quality Performance

Equity sensitivity has implications for both quantity and quality performance. Miles et al. (1989) found that Benevolents prefer higher inputs for their jobs than Entitleds. This result is further supported by King et al. (1994) and Miles, Huseman, and Hatfield (1994) who revealed that Benevolents place greater importance on the work itself whereas Entitleds place greater importance on pay (i.e., outcomes). Given these results and the results of the current dissertation which showed that Benevolents are more satisfied with their jobs than Entitleds regardless of the reward condition, Benevolents should have higher quantity and quality performance across all reward conditions than Entitleds. However, whether or not there will be a significant difference in performance between the two groups is open to some debate given the research on job satisfaction and performance. Previous research in the job satisfaction area has revealed that job
satisfaction and performance are only slightly correlated ($r = .146$; Iaffaldano & Muchinsky, 1985). That is, even though Benevolents may be more satisfied than Entitleds, this greater level of satisfaction may not translate into higher quantity and/or quality performance. A field study and/or laboratory study needs to be conducted to examine the relation between equity sensitivity and quantity/quality performance across different reward conditions in an hourly wage system and a piece-rate system.

Organizational Citizenship Behavior

Organ (1988a) developed a construct labeled organizational citizenship behavior. Organizational citizenship behaviors (OCB's) are defined by Brief and Motowildo (1986, p.71) as behaviors that are (a) performed by an employee of the organization; (b) directed toward an individual, group, or organization with whom he/she interacts while carrying out his/her organizational role; and (c) performed to promote the welfare of the individual, group, or organization toward which it is directed. Organizational citizenship behaviors are also performed voluntarily and without regard for direct rewards (Organ, 1988a). They are, in essence, prosocial behaviors that are performed by an employee in addition to his/her formal duties. Organ (1988a) identified the components of organizational citizenship behavior as conscientiousness, courtesy, sportsmanship, and altruistic
behaviors. Examples of organizational citizenship behaviors are "cooperation, supportiveness of the supervisor, helping behaviors, and gestures that enhance the reputation of the work unit internal and external to the organization (Organ, 1988b, p. 548)."

The research in this area has primarily focused on the relation between satisfaction and organizational citizenship behavior (e.g., Bateman & Organ, 1983; Puffer, 1987; Scholl, Cooper, & McKenna, 1987; Smith, Organ, & Near, 1983). For example, Puffer (1987) found a significant correlation of .27 between satisfaction with material rewards and prosocial behaviors (i.e., OCB's). Overall, the research in this area has revealed that job satisfaction and organizational citizenship behaviors are significantly correlated with most of the correlations ranging from the high twenties to the low thirties (Organ, 1988b).

Given the satisfaction-OCB relationship and the current dissertation's finding that Benevolents are more satisfied across reward conditions than are Entitleds, it would seem that Benevolents are more likely to exhibit organizational citizenship behaviors than are Entitleds. In fact, engaging in extra-role behaviors or OCBs would seem to be consistent with the Benevolent's preference for high inputs (Miles et al., 1989) and the importance Benevolent's place on work and its intrinsic outcomes (e.g., self-fulfillment or a sense of achievement) (Miles et al., 1994). Future research should examine the relationship
between equity sensitivity and organizational citizenship behaviors in a field study.

Theft

Greenberg (1990) found that workers in a manufacturing plant who had their pay cut temporarily by 15 percent reported feeling underpaid and stole over twice as much as they did when they felt equitably paid. Two explanations were provided by Greenberg (1990) for this finding. The first explanation was that stealing from one's employer was an attempt to redress the underpayment inequity by increasing one's outcomes. The second explanation was that the acts of theft were merely a reaction to feeling mistreated by the organization. That is, the pay reduction led to feelings of resentment and hostility toward the employer which, in turn, motivated the aggressive acts of theft. Consistent with both explanations for employee theft, Mars (1974) found that employees did not view theft as inappropriate rather they viewed it as entitlement due from exploiting employers (p.224).

Greenberg's (1990) study has implications for the equity sensitivity area. The current dissertation found that Entitleds reacted more negatively to (i.e., were more dissatisfied with) underreward than did Benevolents. As such, it appears that Entitleds would have greater motivation to reduce the underpayment inequity and/or would have greater resentment toward their employer. Following Greenberg's logic, Entitleds would appear
more prone to steal from their employer than Benevolents either as a way to redress their inequity or demonstrate their hostility toward their employer. Stealing from one's employer is also consistent with the importance Entitleds place on pay (i.e., an outcome; King et al., 1994; Miles et al., 1994). Future research should investigate the relationship between equity sensitivity and employee theft in a field study similar to that conducted by Greenberg (1990). Another interesting avenue of research would be to examine the relation between the two measures of equity sensitivity and an honesty test such as the Personnel Selection Inventory (London House, 1986).

Relationship with Referent Cognitions Theory

Referent cognitions theory (Cropanzano & Folger, 1989, 1991; Folger, 1987) is a two component model of justice that combines both distributive justice and procedural justice concerns. The first component in the model centers around distributive justice concerns. Specifically, it involves the individual's perceptions of distributive inequity (i.e., having received an unfavorable or inequitable outcome). The second component of the model centers around procedural justice concerns. More precisely, it involves an individual's perceptions of procedural equity (i.e., how the outcome was determined).

According to this model, the perception of distributive inequity or an unfavorable outcome energizes behavior. For
example, when people receive unfavorable outcomes that they do not want, they are motivated to rectify the situation. The model also states that how people choose to rectify the situation (i.e., constructively or destructively) depends on how the outcome was determined (i.e., procedural fairness). If the procedures used for allocating outcomes are perceived as fair by the employee, then the organization in which the employee works is also perceived as fair. In this case, an unfavorable outcome would lead to a constructive action such as employees increasing their productivity and engaging in organizational citizenship behaviors. On the other hand, if the procedures for allocating outcomes are perceived as unfair by the employee, then the organization for which the employee works will also be perceived as unfair. Here, the unfavorable outcome would lead to destructive actions taken toward the organization such as employee theft and sabotage.

Therefore, according to referent cognitions theory, distributive inequity provides the motivational force for behavior whereas procedural equity/inequity determines the direction the behavior will take.

Equity sensitivity theory has several implications for referent cognitions theory. First, entitleds would appear to have the greatest motivation to rectify an inequity because they perceive their outcomes less favorably than do benevolents. In this dissertation, entitleds reported the lowest level of pay and
overall satisfaction across all reward conditions. Second, research has shown that perceptions of outcome favorability influence perceptions of procedural fairness (e.g., Ambrose, Harland, & Kulik, 1991; Lind & Tyler, 1988; Slim & Hong, 1988). That is, procedural fairness judgments are higher following a favorable outcome than an unfavorable outcome (Lind & Tyler, 1988). Thus, it can be hypothesized that entitleds who perceive their outcomes less favorably than benevolents will as a result perceive less procedural fairness. According to referent cognitions theory, entitleds would, therefore, be more likely to redress the inequity they perceive in a destructive manner than benevolents. For example, following an unfavorable outcome (i.e., lack of a pay raise or a pay cut) that was determined in either a procedurally fair or unfair manner, entitleds would be more likely to redress the inequity by stealing from an employer than would benevolents. This theory provides additional rationale for the relations between equity sensitivity and various organizational outcomes previously discussed in this section.

Future research on referent cognitions theory should incorporate individual difference variables such as equity sensitivity. One interesting research question with regard to individual differences and referent cognitions theory is whether or not equity sensitivity influences perceptions of procedural fairness beyond that accounted for by outcome favorability.
Specifically, the question becomes one of whether or not individuals define procedural fairness in the same way.

Study Limitations

Common method variance, use of Likert scales, and generalizability of the findings are potential limitations of the current dissertation.

Common Method Variance

Common method variance is both a potential source of bias and a potential threat to the validity of a study's findings when a researcher employs only one data collection method. Significant correlations found by a researcher using a mono-method approach may be due to the measurement method rather than to the variables of interest (Cook & Campbell, 1979). This problem is a common one in the social and behavioral sciences (Fiske, 1982) where researchers often use self-report measures to gather data on their variables of interest. Because only questionnaires were used to collect the data for this dissertation, common method variance is a potential problem.

However, there are several aspects of the current dissertation that lessen the common method problem. First, none of the items in the new equity sensitivity measure were highly correlated with social desirability (Paulhus, 1984; Paulhus, 1988 [cited in Paulhus, 1991]), a primary source of common method variance (Spector, 1987). In addition, subjects in this
dissertation responded to the questionnaires under conditions of anonymity which reduce socially desirable responding (Zerbe & Paulhus, 1987). Second, both direct and indirect items were used to measure equity sensitivity. The use of direct and indirect item formats should help reduce mono-method bias because they are alternate methods of assessing the construct. Along similar lines, both positively (i.e., benevolent) and negatively (i.e., entitled) worded items were used in the new measure of equity sensitivity. Use of positive and negative items lessens the mono-method bias by varying the presentation of items to the respondents. Third, in the laboratory study, the two questionnaires were administered at two different times. Varying in any way the context (e.g., time, place, or experimenter) in which the questionnaires were completed reduces common method variance (Fiske, 1982).

Use of Likert Scales

The use of discrete, Likert scales (i.e., 7-point) to measure satisfaction with different reward conditions in the laboratory study may provide an alternative explanation for the lack of a significant moderator effect for equity sensitivity found in this dissertation. Russell and Bobko (1992) demonstrated that the use of such relatively coarse Likert response scales (e.g., 5-point scales) causes information loss that greatly reduces the chances of detecting a true interaction effect in a hierarchical moderated
multiple regression analysis. In fact, these authors found that the use of a continuous, dependent response scale (e.g., Arnold's (1981) 150 millimeter line segment) instead of a discrete, Likert scale caused moderator effect sizes to increase an average of 93%. Therefore, the way in which satisfaction was measured in this dissertation may have precluded us from finding a significant moderator effect for equity sensitivity. To provide a more definitive test of whether or not equity sensitivity is a moderator of satisfaction with different reward conditions, future research should focus on measuring satisfaction with a continuous response scale such as Arnold's (1981) fine line segment rather than with a discrete, Likert scale.

Generalizability of the Findings

The new measure of equity sensitivity was developed and validated using undergraduate students. Whereas such samples are appropriate when examining certain psychological processes such as perceptions of fairness in this case, there is a need to examine how well the new measure and its attendant findings hold up in actual work settings. The use of student samples in this dissertation limits the generalizability of the new measure of equity sensitivity and its findings to the broad population of organizational employees. Thus, the generalizability of the new measure to organizational employees remains to be determined. Future research needs to be conducted with actual employees across
a variety of organizations to further assess the new measure's psychometric properties and validity.

In addition to only using undergraduate students to develop and validate the new measure, the current dissertation used a laboratory study to assess its predictive validity. This methodology could also limit the generalizability of the current dissertation's findings concerning the new measure's predictive validity. The problem with the laboratory study is that reading a written vignette describing a certain reward condition and actually experiencing a certain reward condition may be different. As a result, the reactions taken to the reward condition in the laboratory study may be a lot different than the actual reactions taken. A more definitive test of the new measure's predictive validity would take the form of a field study and/or laboratory using actual underpayment/overpayment situations where the subject's actual reactions are measured. This field study and/or laboratory study would improve the generalizability of the new measure.

**Summary**

Despite the limitations of the current dissertation, the new measure of equity sensitivity appears to be both a psychometrically sound and useful measure for advancing research in the equity sensitivity area. The new measure’s reliability ranged from .89 to .90 in three studies. These reliabilities are
acceptable and compare favorably to the reliabilities reported for the ESI which range from .79 to .88 (King & Miles, 1994). The new measure of equity sensitivity also appears to possess adequate convergent, discriminant, and nomological validity. The new measure of equity sensitivity had a number of significant correlations with a range of demographic, personality, and cognitive constructs. However, the magnitude of these significant correlations is such that it is highly unlikely that the new measure of equity sensitivity and any of these other measures are measuring the same construct. For example, the largest correlations found between the new equity sensitivity measure and measures of other constructs are .44 (Machiavellianism) and .47 (ESI in the nomological validity sample). Even the largest correlations account for less than 25% of the common variance between the constructs. The new measure of equity sensitivity also demonstrated incremental validity (i.e., validity beyond that provided by the ESI) in predicting both pay satisfaction and overall satisfaction with different reward conditions in a laboratory study. There was also preliminary evidence that the new measure of equity sensitivity may be more predictive of satisfaction with different reward conditions than the ESI. Taken as a whole, it appears as if the new measure of equity sensitivity may be prove to be an acceptable alternative measure of equity sensitivity.
In addition, there were a number of suggestions made for future research concerning the new measure of equity sensitivity and the equity sensitivity area in general. First, the nomological network surrounding the new equity sensitivity measure may be expanded by future attention to various organizational outcomes such as quantity and quality performance, organizational citizenship behavior, and theft. In addition, the value of including equity sensitivity as an individual difference variable in referent cognitions theory should be investigated. Next, in order to provide a more definitive test of whether or not equity sensitivity is a moderator variable, continuous Likert scales should be used to measure the dependent variable of satisfaction in future equity sensitivity research. Finally, the psychometric properties and the predictive validity of the new measure of equity sensitivity need to be examined in field and/or laboratory studies using actual employees who are reacting to actual equity/inequity situations. This line of research will provide a better estimate of the practical utility of the new measure of equity sensitivity.
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APPENDIX A: THE EQUITY SENSITIVITY INSTRUMENT
The questions on this inventory ask what you'd like for your relationship to be with any organization for which you might work. On each question, divide 10 points between the two answers (A and B) by giving the most points to the answer that is most like you and the fewest points to the answer that is least like you. You can, if you'd like, give the same number of points to both answers. And you can use zeros if you'd like. Just be sure to use all ten points on each question. Place your points into the blank next to each letter.

IN ANY ORGANIZATION I MIGHT WORK FOR:

1. It would be more important for me to:
   ..... A. Get from the organization
   ..... B. Give to the organization

2. It would be more important for me to:
   ..... A. Help others
   ..... B. Watch out for my own good.

3. I would be more concerned about:
   ..... A. What I received from the organization.
   ..... B. What I contributed to the organization.

4. The hard work I would do should:
   ..... A. Benefit the organization.
   ..... B. Benefit me.

5. My personal philosophy in dealing with the organization would be:
   ..... A. If you don't look out for yourself, nobody else will.
   ..... B. It's better to give than receive.
APPENDIX B: THE BALANCED INVENTORY OF DESIRABLE RESPONDING
Using the scale below as a guide, write a number beside each statement to indicate how much you agree with it.

1-----------------------------2-----------------------------3-----------------------------4-----------------------------5
NOT SOMETHAT TRUE TRUE TRUE

1. My first impressions of people usually turn out to be right.
2. It would be hard for me to break any of my bad habits.
3. I don't care to know what other people really think of me.
4. I have not always been honest with myself.
5. I always know why I like things.
6. When my emotions are aroused, it biases my thinking.
7. Once I've made my mind, other people can seldom change my opinion.
8. I am not a safe driver when I exceed the speed limit.
9. I am fully in control of my own fate.
10. It's hard for me to shut off a disturbing thought.
11. I never regret my decisions.
12. I sometimes lose out on things because I can't make up my mind soon enough.
13. The reason I vote is because my vote can make a difference.
14. My parents were not always fair when they punished me.
15. I am a completely rational person.
16. I rarely appreciate criticism.
17. I am very confident of my judgments.
18. I have sometimes doubted my ability as a lover.
19. It's all right with me if some people happen to dislike me.
20. I don't always know the reasons why I do the things I do.
21. I sometimes tell lies if I have to.
22. I never cover up my mistakes.
23. There have been occasions when I have taken advantage of someone.
24. I never swear.
25. I sometimes try to get even rather than forgive and forget.
26. I always obey laws, even if I'm unlikely to get caught.
27. I have said something bad about a friend behind his or her back.
28. When I hear people talking privately, I avoid listening.
29. I have received too much change from a salesperson without telling him or her.
30. I always declare everything at customs.
31. When I was young I sometimes stole things.
32. I have never dropped litter on the street.
33. I sometimes drive faster than the speed limit.
34. I never read sexy books or magazines.
35. I have done things that I don't tell other people about.
36. I never take things that don't belong to me.
37. I have taken sick-leave from work or school even though I wasn't really sick.
38. I have never damaged a library book or store merchandise without reporting it.

39. I have some pretty awful habits.

40. I don't gossip about other people's business.
APPENDIX C: THE I-E INSTRUMENT
I-E SCALE

Circle the alternative that best represents the way you feel. Please answer all the items.

1. a. Children get into trouble because their parents punish them too much.
   b. The trouble with most children nowadays is that their parents are too easy with them.

2. a. Many of the unhappy things in people's lives are partly due to bad luck.
   b. People's misfortunes results from the mistakes they make.

3. a. One of the major reasons why we have wars is because people don't take enough interest in politics.
   b. There will always be wars, no matter how hard people try to prevent them.

4. a. In the long run people get the respect they deserve in this world.
   b. Unfortunately, an individual's worth often passes unrecognized no matter how hard he tries.

5. a. The idea that teachers are unfair to students is nonsense.
   b. Most students don't realize the extent to which their grades are influenced by accidental happenings.

6. a. Without the right breaks one cannot be an effective leader.
   b. Capable people who fail to become leaders have not taken advantage of their opportunities.

7. a. No matter how hard you try some people just don't like you.
   b. People who can't get others to like them don't understand how to get along with others.

8. a. Heredity plays the major role in determining one's personality.
   b. It is one's experiences in life which determine what one is like.

9. a. I have often found that what is going to happen will happen.
   b. Trusting to fate has never turned out as well for me as making a decision to take a definite course of action.
10. a. In the case of the well-prepared student there is rarely if ever such a thing as an unfair test. 
   b. Many times exam questions tend to be so unrelated to course work that studying is really useless.

11. a. Becoming a success is a matter of hard work, luck has little or nothing to do with it. 
   b. Getting a good job depends mainly on being in the right place at the right time.

12. a. The average citizen can have an influence in government decisions. 
   b. This world is run by the few people in power, and there is not much the little guy can do about it.

13. a. When I make plans, I am almost certain that I can make them work. 
   b. It is not always wise to plan too far ahead because many things turn out to be a matter of good or bad fortune anyhow.

14. a. There are certain people who are just no good. 
   b. There is some good in everybody.

15. a. In my case getting what I want has little or nothing to do with luck. 
   b. Many times we might just as well decide what to do by flipping a coin.

16. a. Who gets to be the boss often depends on who was lucky enough to be in the right place first. 
   b. Getting people to do the right thing depends upon ability, luck has little or nothing to do with it.

17. a. As far as world affairs are concerned, most of us are the victims of forces we can neither understand nor control. 
   b. By taking an active part in political and social affairs, the people can control world events.

18. a. Most people don't realize the extent to which their lives are controlled by accidental happenings. 
   b. There really is no such thing as "luck."

19. a. One should always be willing to admit mistakes. 
   b. It is usually best to cover up one's mistakes.
20. a. It is hard to know whether or not a person really likes you.
   b. How many friends you have depends on how nice a person you are.

21. a. In the long run the bad things that happen to us are balanced by the good ones.
   b. Most misfortunes are the result of lack of ability, ignorance, laziness, or all three.

22. a. With enough effort we can wipe out political corruption.
   b. It is difficult for people to have much control over the things politicians do in office.

23. a. Sometimes I can't understand how teachers arrive at the grades they give.
   b. There is a direct connection between how hard I study and the grades I get.

24. a. A good leader expects people to decide for themselves what they should do.
   b. A good leader makes it clear to everybody what their jobs are.

25. a. Many times I feel that I have little influence over the things that happen to me.
   b. It is impossible for me to believe that chance or luck plays an important role in my life.

26. a. People are lonely because they don't try to be friendly.
   b. There's not much use in trying too hard to please people, if they like you, they like you.

27. a. There is too much emphasis on athletics in high school.
   b. Team sports are an excellent way to build character.

28. a. What happens to me is my own doing.
   b. Sometimes I feel that I don't have enough control over the direction my life is taking.

29. a. Most of the time I can't understand why politicians behave the way they do.
   b. In the long run the people are responsible for bad government on a national as well as on a local level.
APPENDIX D: THE SELF-MONITORING INSTRUMENT
Personal Reactions Inventory

The statements on the following pages concern your personal reactions to a number of different situations. No two statements are alike, so consider each statement carefully before answering. If a statement is TRUE or MOSTLY TRUE as applied to you, circle the T next to the statement. If a statement is FALSE or NOT USUALLY TRUE as applied to you, circle the F next to the statement.

It is important that you answer as frankly and honestly as you can. Your answers will be kept in the strictest confidence.

T or F 1. I find it hard to imitate the behavior of other people.

T or F 2. My behavior is usually an expression of my true inner feelings, attitudes, and beliefs.

T or F 3. At parties and social gatherings, I do not attempt to do or say things that others will like.

T or F 4. I can only argue for ideas which I already believe.

T or F 5. I can make impromptu speeches even on topics about which I have almost no information.

T or F 6. I guess I put on a show to impress or entertain certain people.

T or F 7. When I am uncertain how to act in a social situation, I look to the behavior of others for cues.

T or F 8. I would probably make a good actor.

T or F 9. I rarely need the advice of my friends to choose movies, books, or music.

T or F 10. I sometimes appear to others to be experiencing deeper emotions than I actually am.

T or F 11. I laugh more when I watch comedy with others than when alone.

T or F 12. In a group of people I am rarely the center of attention.
T or F 13. In different situations and with different people, I often act like very different persons.

T or F 14. I am not particularly good at making other people like me.

T or F 15. Even if I am not enjoying myself, I often pretend to be having a good time.

T or F 16. I'm not always the person I appear to be.

T or F 17. I would not change my opinions (or the way I do things) in order to please someone else or win their favor.

T or F 18. I have considered being an entertainer.

T or F 19. In order to get along and be liked, I tend to be what people expect me to be rather than anything else.

T or F 20. I have never been good at games like charades or improvisational acting.

T or F 21. I have trouble changing my behavior to suit different people and different situations.

T or F 22. At a party I let others keep the jokes and stories going.

T or F 23. I feel a bit awkward in company and do not show up quite as well as I should.

T or F 24. I can look anyone in the eye and tell a lie with a straight face (if for the right end).

T or F 25. I may deceive people by being friendly when I really dislike them.
APPENDIX E: THE CALIFORNIA F SCALE
1. Obedience and respect for authority are the most important virtues children should learn.

DISAGREE DISAGREE DISAGREE AGREE AGREE AGREE
STRONGLY SOMEWHAT SLIGHTLY SLIGHTLY SOMEWHAT STRONGLY

2. No weakness or difficulty can hold us back if we have enough will power.

DISAGREE DISAGREE DISAGREE AGREE AGREE AGREE
STRONGLY SOMEWHAT SLIGHTLY SLIGHTLY SOMEWHAT STRONGLY

3. Science has its place but there are many important things that can never be understood by the human mind.

DISAGREE DISAGREE DISAGREE AGREE AGREE AGREE
STRONGLY SOMEWHAT SLIGHTLY SLIGHTLY SOMEWHAT STRONGLY

4. Human nature being what it is, there will always be war and conflict.

DISAGREE DISAGREE DISAGREE AGREE AGREE AGREE
STRONGLY SOMEWHAT SLIGHTLY SLIGHTLY SOMEWHAT STRONGLY

5. Every person should have complete faith in some supernatural power whose decision he obeys without question.

DISAGREE DISAGREE DISAGREE AGREE AGREE AGREE
STRONGLY SOMEWHAT SLIGHTLY SLIGHTLY SOMEWHAT STRONGLY

6. When a person has a problem or worry, it is best for him not to think about it, but keep busy with more cheerful things.

DISAGREE DISAGREE DISAGREE AGREE AGREE AGREE
STRONGLY SOMEWHAT SLIGHTLY SLIGHTLY SOMEWHAT STRONGLY

7. A person who has bad manners, habits, and breeding can hardly be expected to get along with decent people.

DISAGREE DISAGREE DISAGREE AGREE AGREE AGREE
STRONGLY SOMEWHAT SLIGHTLY SLIGHTLY SOMEWHAT STRONGLY

8. What the youth need most is strict discipline, rugged determination, and the will to work and fight for your family and country.

DISAGREE DISAGREE DISAGREE AGREE AGREE AGREE
STRONGLY SOMEWHAT SLIGHTLY SLIGHTLY SOMEWHAT STRONGLY
9. Some people are born with an urge to jump from high places.

DISAGREE DISAGREE DISAGREE AGREE AGREE AGREE
STRONGLY SOMEWHAT SLIGHTLY SLIGHTLY SOMEWHAT STRONGLY

10. Nowadays when so many different kinds of people move around
and mix together so much, a person has to protect himself
especially carefully against catching an infection or disease
from them.

DISAGREE DISAGREE DISAGREE AGREE AGREE AGREE
STRONGLY SOMEWHAT SLIGHTLY SLIGHTLY SOMEWHAT STRONGLY

11. An insult to our honor should always be punished.

DISAGREE DISAGREE DISAGREE AGREE AGREE AGREE
STRONGLY SOMEWHAT SLIGHTLY SLIGHTLY SOMEWHAT STRONGLY

12. Young people sometimes get rebellious ideas but as they grow
up they ought to get over them.

DISAGREE DISAGREE DISAGREE AGREE AGREE AGREE
STRONGLY SOMEWHAT SLIGHTLY SLIGHTLY SOMEWHAT STRONGLY

13. It is best to use some prewar authorities in Germany to keep
order and prevent chaos.

DISAGREE DISAGREE DISAGREE AGREE AGREE AGREE
STRONGLY SOMEWHAT SLIGHTLY SLIGHTLY SOMEWHAT STRONGLY

14. What this country needs most, more than laws and political
programs, is a few courageous, tireless leaders in whom the
people can put their faith.

DISAGREE DISAGREE DISAGREE AGREE AGREE AGREE
STRONGLY SOMEWHAT SLIGHTLY SLIGHTLY SOMEWHAT STRONGLY

15. Sex crimes, such as rape and attacks on children, deserve more
than mere imprisonment: such criminals ought to be publicly
whipped, or worse.

DISAGREE DISAGREE DISAGREE AGREE AGREE AGREE
STRONGLY SOMEWHAT SLIGHTLY SLIGHTLY SOMEWHAT STRONGLY

16. People can be divided into two distinct classes: the weak and
the strong.

DISAGREE DISAGREE DISAGREE AGREE AGREE AGREE
STRONGLY SOMEWHAT SLIGHTLY SLIGHTLY SOMEWHAT STRONGLY
17. There is hardly anything lower than a person who does not feel a great love, gratitude, and respect for his parents.

DISAGREE DISAGREE DISAGREE AGREE AGREE AGREE
STRONGLY SOMEWHAT SLIGHTLY SLIGHTLY SOMEWHAT STRONGLY

18. Some day it will probably be shown that astrology can explain a lot of things.

DISAGREE DISAGREE DISAGREE AGREE AGREE AGREE AGREE
STRONGLY SOMEWHAT SLIGHTLY SLIGHTLY SOMEWHAT STRONGLY

19. America is getting so far from the true American way of life that force may be necessary to restore it.

DISAGREE DISAGREE DISAGREE AGREE AGREE AGREE AGREE
STRONGLY SOMEWHAT SLIGHTLY SLIGHTLY SOMEWHAT STRONGLY

20. Nowadays more and more people are prying into the matters that should remain personal and private.

DISAGREE DISAGREE DISAGREE AGREE AGREE AGREE AGREE
STRONGLY SOMEWHAT SLIGHTLY SLIGHTLY SOMEWHAT STRONGLY

21. Wars and social troubles may someday be ended by an earthquake or flood that will destroy the whole world.

DISAGREE DISAGREE DISAGREE AGREE AGREE AGREE AGREE
STRONGLY SOMEWHAT SLIGHTLY SLIGHTLY SOMEWHAT STRONGLY

22. Most of our social problems could be solved if we could somehow get rid of the immoral, crooked, and feebleminded people.

DISAGREE DISAGREE DISAGREE AGREE AGREE AGREE AGREE
STRONGLY SOMEWHAT SLIGHTLY SLIGHTLY SOMEWHAT STRONGLY

23. The wild sex life of the old Greeks and Romans was tame compared to some of the goings-on in this country, even in places where people might least expect it.

DISAGREE DISAGREE DISAGREE AGREE AGREE AGREE AGREE
STRONGLY SOMEWHAT SLIGHTLY SLIGHTLY SOMEWHAT STRONGLY

24. If people would talk less and work more, everybody would be better off.

DISAGREE DISAGREE DISAGREE AGREE AGREE AGREE AGREE
STRONGLY SOMEWHAT SLIGHTLY SLIGHTLY SOMEWHAT STRONGLY
25. Most people don't realize how much our lives are controlled by plots hatched in secret places.

DISAGREE DISAGREE DISAGREE AGREE AGREE AGREE
STRONGLY SOMewhat SLIGHTLY SLIGHTLY SOMEWHAT STRONGLY

26. Homosexuals are hardly better than criminals and ought to be severely punished.

DISAGREE DISAGREE DISAGREE AGREE AGREE AGREE
STRONGLY SOMEWHAT SLIGHTLY SLIGHTLY SOMEWHAT STRONGLY

27. The businessman and the manufacturer are much more important to society than the artist and the professor.

DISAGREE DISAGREE DISAGREE AGREE AGREE AGREE
STRONGLY SOMEWHAT SLIGHTLY SLIGHTLY SOMEWHAT STRONGLY

28. No sane, normal, decent person could ever think of hurting a close friend or relative.

DISAGREE DISAGREE DISAGREE AGREE AGREE AGREE
STRONGLY SOMEWHAT SLIGHTLY SLIGHTLY SOMEWHAT STRONGLY

29. Familiarity breeds contempt.

DISAGREE DISAGREE DISAGREE AGREE AGREE AGREE
STRONGLY SOMEWHAT SLIGHTLY SLIGHTLY SOMEWHAT STRONGLY

30. Nobody ever learned anything really important except through suffering.

DISAGREE DISAGREE DISAGREE AGREE AGREE AGREE
STRONGLY SOMEWHAT SLIGHTLY SLIGHTLY SOMEWHAT STRONGLY
APPENDIX F: THE INTERPERSONAL ORIENTATION INSTRUMENT
1. I would rather think about a personal problem by myself than discuss it with others.

   1  2  3  4  5
   STRONGLY DISAGREE UNDECIDED AGREE STRONGLY DISAGREE AGREE

2. I consider myself a forgiving person.

   1  2  3  4  5
   STRONGLY DISAGREE UNDECIDED AGREE STRONGLY DISAGREE AGREE

3. Other people are the source of my greatest pleasure and pain.

   1  2  3  4  5
   STRONGLY DISAGREE UNDECIDED AGREE STRONGLY DISAGREE AGREE

4. I am interested in knowing what makes people tick.

   1  2  3  4  5
   STRONGLY DISAGREE UNDECIDED AGREE STRONGLY DISAGREE AGREE

5. When I receive a gift, I find myself thinking about how much it must be worth.

   1  2  3  4  5
   STRONGLY DISAGREE UNDECIDED AGREE STRONGLY DISAGREE AGREE

6. Under no circumstances would I but something I suspected had been stolen.

   1  2  3  4  5
   STRONGLY DISAGREE UNDECIDED AGREE STRONGLY DISAGREE AGREE

7. I am greatly influenced by the moods of the people I am with.

   1  2  3  4  5
   STRONGLY DISAGREE UNDECIDED AGREE STRONGLY DISAGREE AGREE
8. Sometimes the most considerate thing one person can do for another is to hide a bit of the truth.

1  2  3  4  5  
STRONGLY DISAGREE UNDECIDED AGREE STRONGLY AGREE
DISAGREE

9. Sometimes simply talking aloud about things that bother me makes me feel better—regardless of who, if anyone, hears these thoughts.

1  2  3  4  5  
STRONGLY DISAGREE UNDECIDED AGREE STRONGLY AGREE
DISAGREE

10. My friends and I seem to share the same musical interests.

1  2  3  4  5  
STRONGLY DISAGREE UNDECIDED AGREE STRONGLY AGREE
DISAGREE

11. I am reluctant to talk about my personal life with people I do not know well.

1  2  3  4  5  
STRONGLY DISAGREE UNDECIDED AGREE STRONGLY AGREE
DISAGREE

12. I generally view myself as a person who is not terribly interested in what other people are really like.

1  2  3  4  5  
STRONGLY DISAGREE UNDECIDED AGREE STRONGLY AGREE
DISAGREE

13. Sometimes I think I take things other people say to me too personally.

1  2  3  4  5  
STRONGLY DISAGREE UNDECIDED AGREE STRONGLY AGREE
DISAGREE
14. It's important for me to work with people with whom I get along well, even if that means I get less done.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>STRONGLY DISAGREE</td>
<td>UNDECIDED</td>
<td>AGREE</td>
<td>STRONGLY DISAGREE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>DISAGREE</td>
<td>UNDECIDED</td>
<td>AGREE</td>
<td>STRONGLY AGREE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

15. I often find myself wondering what my professors are really like.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>STRONGLY DISAGREE</td>
<td>UNDECIDED</td>
<td>AGREE</td>
<td>STRONGLY DISAGREE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>DISAGREE</td>
<td>UNDECIDED</td>
<td>AGREE</td>
<td>STRONGLY AGREE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

16. If I were to share an apartment with somebody, I would want to find out about the person's family background, hobbies, and so forth.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>STRONGLY DISAGREE</td>
<td>UNDECIDED</td>
<td>AGREE</td>
<td>STRONGLY DISAGREE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>DISAGREE</td>
<td>UNDECIDED</td>
<td>AGREE</td>
<td>STRONGLY AGREE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

17. I would prefer to do poorly on an exam that is machine scored rather than do equally poorly on one that is graded by the instructor.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>STRONGLY DISAGREE</td>
<td>UNDECIDED</td>
<td>AGREE</td>
<td>STRONGLY DISAGREE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>DISAGREE</td>
<td>UNDECIDED</td>
<td>AGREE</td>
<td>STRONGLY AGREE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

18. I tend to like people who are good looking.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>STRONGLY DISAGREE</td>
<td>UNDECIDED</td>
<td>AGREE</td>
<td>STRONGLY DISAGREE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>DISAGREE</td>
<td>UNDECIDED</td>
<td>AGREE</td>
<td>STRONGLY AGREE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

19. What others think about my actions is of little or no consequence to me.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>STRONGLY DISAGREE</td>
<td>UNDECIDED</td>
<td>AGREE</td>
<td>STRONGLY DISAGREE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>DISAGREE</td>
<td>UNDECIDED</td>
<td>AGREE</td>
<td>STRONGLY AGREE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
20. The more other people reveal about themselves the more inclined I feel to reveal things about myself.

1  2  3  4  5
STRONGLY DISAGREE UNDECIDED AGREE STRONGLY
DISAGREE AGREE

21. When someone does me a favor I don’t usually feel compelled to return it.

1  2  3  4  5
STRONGLY DISAGREE UNDECIDED AGREE STRONGLY
DISAGREE AGREE

22. Sitting on a bus or a subway, I sometimes imagine what the person sitting next to me does for a living.

1  2  3  4  5
STRONGLY DISAGREE UNDECIDED AGREE STRONGLY
DISAGREE AGREE

23. The more I am with others, the more I tend to like them.

1  2  3  4  5
STRONGLY DISAGREE UNDECIDED AGREE STRONGLY
DISAGREE AGREE

24. I would rather be given a simple and thoughtful gift than a more extravagant one that involved less thought and care.

1  2  3  4  5
STRONGLY DISAGREE UNDECIDED AGREE STRONGLY
DISAGREE AGREE

25. I am very sensitive to criticism.

1  2  3  4  5
STRONGLY DISAGREE UNDECIDED AGREE STRONGLY
DISAGREE AGREE

26. When people tell me personal things about themselves, I find myself feeling close to them.

1  2  3  4  5
STRONGLY DISAGREE UNDECIDED AGREE STRONGLY
DISAGREE AGREE
27. One good turn does not necessarily deserve another.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>STRONGLY DISAGREE</strong></td>
<td><strong>DISAGREE</strong></td>
<td><strong>UNDECIDED</strong></td>
<td><strong>AGREE</strong></td>
<td><strong>STRONGLY AGREE</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

28. I can be strongly affected by someone smiling or frowning.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>STRONGLY DISAGREE</strong></td>
<td><strong>DISAGREE</strong></td>
<td><strong>UNDECIDED</strong></td>
<td><strong>AGREE</strong></td>
<td><strong>STRONGLY AGREE</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

29. I find myself wondering what telephone operators are really like.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>STRONGLY DISAGREE</strong></td>
<td><strong>DISAGREE</strong></td>
<td><strong>UNDECIDED</strong></td>
<td><strong>AGREE</strong></td>
<td><strong>STRONGLY AGREE</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Listed below are a number of statements. Each represents a commonly held opinion and there are no right or wrong answers. You will probably disagree with some items and agree with others. We are interested in the extent to which you agree or disagree with such matters of opinion.

Read each statement carefully. Then indicate the extent to which you agree or disagree by circling the number in front of each statement. The numbers and their meaning are indicated below.

If you agree strongly, circle +3.
If you agree somewhat, circle +2.
If you agree slightly, circle +1.
If you disagree slightly, circle -1.
If you disagree somewhat, circle -2.
If you disagree strongly, circle -3.

First impressions are usually best in such matters. Read each statement, decide if you agree or disagree and the strength of your opinion, and then circle the appropriate number below the statement. Give your opinion on every statement.

If you find that the numbers to be used in answering do not adequately indicate your own opinion, use the one which is closest to the way you feel.

1. Never tell anyone the real reason you did something unless it is useful to do so.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>+3</th>
<th>+2</th>
<th>+1</th>
<th>-1</th>
<th>-2</th>
<th>-3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AGREE</td>
<td>AGREE</td>
<td>AGREE</td>
<td>DISAGREE</td>
<td>DISAGREE</td>
<td>DISAGREE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STRONGLY</td>
<td>SOMewhat</td>
<td>SLIGHTLY</td>
<td>SLIGHTLY</td>
<td>SOMewhat</td>
<td>STRONGLY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. The best way to handle people is to tell them what they want to hear.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>+3</th>
<th>+2</th>
<th>+1</th>
<th>-1</th>
<th>-2</th>
<th>-3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AGREE</td>
<td>AGREE</td>
<td>AGREE</td>
<td>DISAGREE</td>
<td>DISAGREE</td>
<td>DISAGREE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STRONGLY</td>
<td>SOMewhat</td>
<td>SLIGHTLY</td>
<td>SLIGHTLY</td>
<td>SOMewhat</td>
<td>STRONGLY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3. One should take action only when sure it is morally right.

AGREE AGREE AGREE DISAGREE DISAGREE DISAGREE
STRONGLY SOMEWHAT SLIGHTLY SLIGHTLY SOMEWHAT STRONGLY

4. Most people are basically good and kind.

AGREE AGREE AGREE DISAGREE DISAGREE DISAGREE
STRONGLY SOMEWHAT SLIGHTLY SLIGHTLY SOMEWHAT STRONGLY

5. It is safest to assume that all people have a vicious streak and it will come out when they are given the chance.

AGREE AGREE AGREE DISAGREE DISAGREE DISAGREE
STRONGLY SOMEWHAT SLIGHTLY SLIGHTLY SOMEWHAT STRONGLY

6. Honesty is the best policy in all cases.

AGREE AGREE AGREE DISAGREE DISAGREE DISAGREE
STRONGLY SOMEWHAT SLIGHTLY SLIGHTLY SOMEWHAT STRONGLY

7. There is no excuse for lying to someone else.

AGREE AGREE AGREE DISAGREE DISAGREE DISAGREE
STRONGLY SOMEWHAT SLIGHTLY SLIGHTLY SOMEWHAT STRONGLY

8. Generally speaking, men won't work hard unless they're forced to do so.

AGREE AGREE AGREE DISAGREE DISAGREE DISAGREE
STRONGLY SOMEWHAT SLIGHTLY SLIGHTLY SOMEWHAT STRONGLY

9. All in all, it is better to be humble and honest than to be important and dishonest.

AGREE AGREE AGREE DISAGREE DISAGREE DISAGREE
STRONGLY SOMEWHAT SLIGHTLY SLIGHTLY SOMEWHAT STRONGLY
10. When you ask someone to do something for you, it is best to give the real reason for wanting it rather than giving reasons which carry more weight.

+3  +2  +1  -1  -2  -3
AGREE  AGREE  AGREE  DISAGREE  DISAGREE  DISAGREE
STRONGLY  SOMEWHAT  SLIGHTLY  SLIGHTLY  SOMEWHAT  STRONGLY

11. Most of the people who get ahead in this world lead clean, moral lives.

+3  +2  +1  -1  -2  -3
AGREE  AGREE  AGREE  DISAGREE  DISAGREE  DISAGREE
STRONGLY  SOMEWHAT  SLIGHTLY  SLIGHTLY  SOMEWHAT  STRONGLY

12. Anyone who completely trusts anyone else is asking for trouble.

+3  +2  +1  -1  -2  -3
AGREE  AGREE  AGREE  DISAGREE  DISAGREE  DISAGREE
STRONGLY  SOMEWHAT  SLIGHTLY  SLIGHTLY  SOMEWHAT  STRONGLY

13. The biggest difference between most criminals and other people is that the criminals are stupid enough to get caught.

+3  +2  +1  -1  -2  -3
AGREE  AGREE  AGREE  DISAGREE  DISAGREE  DISAGREE
STRONGLY  SOMEWHAT  SLIGHTLY  SLIGHTLY  SOMEWHAT  STRONGLY

14. Most men are brave.

+3  +2  +1  -1  -2  -3
AGREE  AGREE  AGREE  DISAGREE  DISAGREE  DISAGREE
STRONGLY  SOMEWHAT  SLIGHTLY  SLIGHTLY  SOMEWHAT  STRONGLY

15. It is wise to flatter important people.

+3  +2  +1  -1  -2  -3
AGREE  AGREE  AGREE  DISAGREE  DISAGREE  DISAGREE
STRONGLY  SOMEWHAT  SLIGHTLY  SLIGHTLY  SOMEWHAT  STRONGLY

16. It is possible to be good in all respects.

+3  +2  +1  -1  -2  -3
AGREE  AGREE  AGREE  DISAGREE  DISAGREE  DISAGREE
STRONGLY  SOMEWHAT  SLIGHTLY  SLIGHTLY  SOMEWHAT  STRONGLY
17. Barnum was wrong when he said that there's a sucker born every minute.

<p>| | | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>+3</td>
<td>+2</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>-3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

AGREE AGREE AGREE DISAGREE DISAGREE DISAGREE
STRONGLY SOMEWHAT SLIGHTLY SLIGHTLY SOMEWHAT STRONGLY

18. It is hard to get ahead without cutting corners here and there.

<p>| | | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>+3</td>
<td>+2</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>-3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

AGREE AGREE AGREE DISAGREE DISAGREE DISAGREE
STRONGLY SOMEWHAT SLIGHTLY SLIGHTLY SOMEWHAT STRONGLY

19. People suffering from incurable diseases should have the choice of being put painlessly to death.

<p>| | | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>+3</td>
<td>+2</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>-3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

AGREE AGREE AGREE DISAGREE DISAGREE DISAGREE
STRONGLY SOMEWHAT SLIGHTLY SLIGHTLY SOMEWHAT STRONGLY

20. Most men forget more easily the death of their father than the loss of their property.

<p>| | | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>+3</td>
<td>+2</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>-3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

AGREE AGREE AGREE DISAGREE DISAGREE DISAGREE
STRONGLY SOMEWHAT SLIGHTLY SLIGHTLY SOMEWHAT STRONGLY
APPENDIX H: THE PROTESTANT ETHIC INSTRUMENT
This is a study of the way people think and feel about work, education, and other issues. Below you will find a number of statements which express certain attitudes about these issues. You might agree with some of these statements and disagree with others. There are no "right" or "wrong" answers. Please circle the statement, below the item, according to how you agree or disagree with it.

+1 I AGREE SLIGHTLY -1 I DISAGREE SLIGHTLY
+2 I AGREE SOMEWHAT -2 I DISAGREE SOMEWHAT
+3 I AGREE STRONGLY -3 I DISAGREE STRONGLY

1. Charitable services for those in need should be left to private volunteer groups.

I AGREE I AGREE I AGREE I DISAGREE I DISAGREE I DISAGREE
STRONGLY SOMEWHAT SLIGHTLY SLIGHTLY SOMEWHAT STRONGLY

2. I like to experience novelty and change in my daily routine.

I AGREE I AGREE I AGREE I DISAGREE I DISAGREE I DISAGREE
STRONGLY SOMEWHAT SLIGHTLY SLIGHTLY SOMEWHAT STRONGLY

3. Money acquired easily (e.g., through gambling or speculation) is usually spent unwisely.

I AGREE I AGREE I AGREE I DISAGREE I DISAGREE I DISAGREE
STRONGLY SOMEWHAT SLIGHTLY SLIGHTLY SOMEWHAT STRONGLY

4. There are few satisfactions equal to the realization that one has done his best at a job.

I AGREE I AGREE I AGREE I DISAGREE I DISAGREE I DISAGREE
STRONGLY SOMEWHAT SLIGHTLY SLIGHTLY SOMEWHAT STRONGLY

5. When a rich man dies most of his property should go to the state.

I AGREE I AGREE I AGREE I DISAGREE I DISAGREE I DISAGREE
STRONGLY SOMEWHAT SLIGHTLY SLIGHTLY SOMEWHAT STRONGLY
6. The most difficult college courses are usually turn out to be the most rewarding.

+3 +2 +1 -1 -2 -3
I AGREE I AGREE I AGREE I DISAGREE I DISAGREE I DISAGREE
STRONGLY SOMEWHAT SLIGHTLY SLIGHTLY SOMEWHAT STRONGLY

7. I work most efficiently when I am alone.

+3 +2 +1 -1 -2 -3
I AGREE I AGREE I AGREE I DISAGREE I DISAGREE I DISAGREE
STRONGLY SOMEWHAT SLIGHTLY SLIGHTLY SOMEWHAT STRONGLY

8. The self-made man is likely to be more ethical than the man born to wealth.

+3 +2 +1 -1 -2 -3
I AGREE I AGREE I AGREE I DISAGREE I DISAGREE I DISAGREE
STRONGLY SOMEWHAT SLIGHTLY SLIGHTLY SOMEWHAT STRONGLY

9. The money a person wins by gambling should not be taxed.

+3 +2 +1 -1 -2 -3
I AGREE I AGREE I AGREE I DISAGREE I DISAGREE I DISAGREE
STRONGLY SOMEWHAT SLIGHTLY SLIGHTLY SOMEWHAT STRONGLY

10. People should have more leisure time to spend in relaxation.

+3 +2 +1 -1 -2 -3
I AGREE I AGREE I AGREE I DISAGREE I DISAGREE I DISAGREE
STRONGLY SOMEWHAT SLIGHTLY SLIGHTLY SOMEWHAT STRONGLY

11. Elementary school children should be grouped according to intelligence.

+3 +2 +1 -1 -2 -3
I AGREE I AGREE I AGREE I DISAGREE I DISAGREE I DISAGREE
STRONGLY SOMEWHAT SLIGHTLY SLIGHTLY SOMEWHAT STRONGLY

12. Any man who is able and willing to work hard has a good chance of succeeding.

+3 +2 +1 -1 -2 -3
I AGREE I AGREE I AGREE I DISAGREE I DISAGREE I DISAGREE
STRONGLY SOMEWHAT SLIGHTLY SLIGHTLY SOMEWHAT STRONGLY
13. It is the steady worker who usually gets the most done.

\[+3 +2 +1 -1 -2 -3\]

I AGREE I AGREE I AGREE I DISAGREE I DISAGREE I DISAGREE
STRONGLY SOMEWHAT SLIGHTLY SLIGHTLY SOMEWHAT STRONGLY

14. Life would have very little meaning if we never had to suffer.

\[+3 +2 +1 -1 -2 -3\]

I AGREE I AGREE I AGREE I DISAGREE I DISAGREE I DISAGREE
STRONGLY SOMEWHAT SLIGHTLY SLIGHTLY SOMEWHAT STRONGLY

15. Most high school courses are too impractical.

\[+3 +2 +1 -1 -2 -3\]

I AGREE I AGREE I AGREE I DISAGREE I DISAGREE I DISAGREE
STRONGLY SOMEWHAT SLIGHTLY SLIGHTLY SOMEWHAT STRONGLY


\[+3 +2 +1 -1 -2 -3\]

I AGREE I AGREE I AGREE I DISAGREE I DISAGREE I DISAGREE
STRONGLY SOMEWHAT SLIGHTLY SLIGHTLY SOMEWHAT STRONGLY

17. The credit card is a ticket to careless spending.

\[+3 +2 +1 -1 -2 -3\]

I AGREE I AGREE I AGREE I DISAGREE I DISAGREE I DISAGREE
STRONGLY SOMEWHAT SLIGHTLY SLIGHTLY SOMEWHAT STRONGLY

18. Many poverty stricken people could not better their condition even if they were willing to work harder.

\[+3 +2 +1 -1 -2 -3\]

I AGREE I AGREE I AGREE I DISAGREE I DISAGREE I DISAGREE
STRONGLY SOMEWHAT SLIGHTLY SLIGHTLY SOMEWHAT STRONGLY

19. I enjoy a race or a game more when I bet on it.

\[+3 +2 +1 -1 -2 -3\]

I AGREE I AGREE I AGREE I DISAGREE I DISAGREE I DISAGREE
STRONGLY SOMEWHAT SLIGHTLY SLIGHTLY SOMEWHAT STRONGLY
20. If one works hard enough he is likely to make a good life for himself.

+3  +2  +1  -1  -2  -3
I AGREE  I AGREE  I AGREE  I DISAGREE  I DISAGREE  I DISAGREE
STRONGLY  SOMEWHAT  SLIGHTLY  SLIGHTLY  SOMEWHAT  STRONGLY

21. I feel uneasy when there is little work for me to do.

+3  +2  +1  -1  -2  -3
I AGREE  I AGREE  I AGREE  I DISAGREE  I DISAGREE  I DISAGREE
STRONGLY  SOMEWHAT  SLIGHTLY  SLIGHTLY  SOMEWHAT  STRONGLY

22. All high school teachers should be required to have a master's degree.

+3  +2  +1  -1  -2  -3
I AGREE  I AGREE  I AGREE  I DISAGREE  I DISAGREE  I DISAGREE
STRONGLY  SOMEWHAT  SLIGHTLY  SLIGHTLY  SOMEWHAT  STRONGLY

23. Most people spend too much time in unprofitable amusements.

+3  +2  +1  -1  -2  -3
I AGREE  I AGREE  I AGREE  I DISAGREE  I DISAGREE  I DISAGREE
STRONGLY  SOMEWHAT  SLIGHTLY  SLIGHTLY  SOMEWHAT  STRONGLY

24. Our society would have fewer problems if people had less leisure time.

+3  +2  +1  -1  -2  -3
I AGREE  I AGREE  I AGREE  I DISAGREE  I DISAGREE  I DISAGREE
STRONGLY  SOMEWHAT  SLIGHTLY  SLIGHTLY  SOMEWHAT  STRONGLY

25. Most people who don't succeed in life are just plain lazy.

+3  +2  +1  -1  -2  -3
I AGREE  I AGREE  I AGREE  I DISAGREE  I DISAGREE  I DISAGREE
STRONGLY  SOMEWHAT  SLIGHTLY  SLIGHTLY  SOMEWHAT  STRONGLY

26. I often feel I would be more successful if I sacrificed certain pleasures.

+3  +2  +1  -1  -2  -3
I AGREE  I AGREE  I AGREE  I DISAGREE  I DISAGREE  I DISAGREE
STRONGLY  SOMEWHAT  SLIGHTLY  SLIGHTLY  SOMEWHAT  STRONGLY
27. People who fail at a job have usually not tried hard enough.

+3 +2 +1 -1 -2 -3
I AGREE I AGREE I AGREE I DISAGREE I DISAGREE I DISAGREE
STRONGLY SOMEWHAT SLIGHTLY SLIGHTLY SOMEWHAT STRONGLY

28. Life would be more meaningful if we had more leisure time.

+3 +2 +1 -1 -2 -3
I AGREE I AGREE I AGREE I DISAGREE I DISAGREE I DISAGREE
STRONGLY SOMEWHAT SLIGHTLY SLIGHTLY SOMEWHAT STRONGLY

29. The man who can approach an unpleasant task with enthusiasm is the man who can get ahead.

+3 +2 +1 -1 -2 -3
I AGREE I AGREE I AGREE I DISAGREE I DISAGREE I DISAGREE
STRONGLY SOMEWHAT SLIGHTLY SLIGHTLY SOMEWHAT STRONGLY

30. A distaste for hard work usually reflects a weakness of character.

+3 +2 +1 -1 -2 -3
I AGREE I AGREE I AGREE I DISAGREE I DISAGREE I DISAGREE
STRONGLY SOMEWHAT SLIGHTLY SLIGHTLY SOMEWHAT STRONGLY
APPENDIX I: THE EXCHANGE IDEOLOGY INSTRUMENT
1. An employee’s work effort should depend partly on how well the organization deals with his or her desires and concerns.

   1--------2--------3--------4--------5--------6--------7
   STRONGLY SOMEWHAT SLIGHTLY NEITHER SLIGHTLY SOMEWHAT STRONGLY
   DISAGREE DISAGREE DISAGREE AGREE AGREE AGREE AGREE NOR
   DISAGREE

2. An employee who is treated badly by an organization should lower his or her work effort.

   1--------2--------3--------4--------5--------6--------7
   STRONGLY SOMEWHAT SLIGHTLY NEITHER SLIGHTLY SOMEWHAT STRONGLY
   DISAGREE DISAGREE DISAGREE AGREE AGREE AGREE AGREE NOR
   DISAGREE

3. How hard an employee works should not be affected by how well the organization treats him or her.

   1--------2--------3--------4--------5--------6--------7
   STRONGLY SOMEWHAT SLIGHTLY NEITHER SLIGHTLY SOMEWHAT STRONGLY
   DISAGREE DISAGREE DISAGREE AGREE AGREE AGREE AGREE NOR
   DISAGREE

4. An employee’s work effort should have nothing to do with the fairness of his or her pay.

   1--------2--------3--------4--------5--------6--------7
   STRONGLY SOMEWHAT SLIGHTLY NEITHER SLIGHTLY SOMEWHAT STRONGLY
   DISAGREE DISAGREE DISAGREE AGREE AGREE AGREE AGREE NOR
   DISAGREE

5. The failure of the organization to appreciate an employee’s contribution should not affect how hard he or she works.

   1--------2--------3--------4--------5--------6--------7
   STRONGLY SOMEWHAT SLIGHTLY NEITHER SLIGHTLY SOMEWHAT STRONGLY
   DISAGREE DISAGREE DISAGREE AGREE AGREE AGREE AGREE NOR
   DISAGREE
APPENDIX J: REWARD SCENARIOS FOR THE MEASURE VALIDATION STUDY
UNDERREWARD SCENARIO ONE

You and Person B are both undergraduates. Both of you are juniors, excellent students, and anxious to earn extra money to support yourselves while attending college. Both of you have been working at the university's printing press where you have performed various jobs. Both of you have worked for two semesters at $4.25 (U.S.) per hour and have performed adequately. Your manager, Robin Lawrence, assigns both of you to a new job, proofreading manuscripts.

You and Person B both proofread about ten pages per hour. The assistant manager, responsible for proofreaders, told both of you Wednesday that you both were doing well and seemed to be quite equal in terms of error detection and speed of proofreading.

At 5:00 p.m. on Friday, you and Person B go to your manager's secretary to pick up your checks. The secretary hands you and Person B your pay envelopes. You open yours and see that you are being paid $4.25 per hour. Person B opens the pay envelope and says, "Hey, I got $4.75 per hour. How much did you get?"
UNDEREWARD SCENARIO TWO

You and Person B are both undergraduates. Both of you are juniors, excellent students, and anxious to earn extra money to support yourselves while attending college. Both of you have been working under a Work-Study program doing various jobs for various professors. Both of you have worked for two semesters at $4.25 (U.S.) per hour and have performed adequately. Professor Martin, a sociologist, hires you and Person B to do some coding of questionnaires. The data come from a natural sample so there is plenty of work to do.

You code about ten questionnaires per hour and Person B codes about eight questionnaires per hour. Professor Martin's graduate assistant told you Wednesday that you were performing better than Person B in terms of accuracy and speed.

At 5:00 p.m. on Friday, Professor Martin's secretary comes in and gives you and Person B your pay envelopes. You open yours and see that Professor Martin is paying you $4.25 per hour. Person B opens the pay envelope and says, "Hey, I got $4.25 per hour. How much did you get?"
You and Person B are both undergraduates. Both of you are juniors, excellent students, and anxious to earn extra money to support yourselves while attending college. Both of you have been working at the university's printing press where you have performed various jobs. Both of you have worked for two semesters at $4.25 (U.S.) per hour and have performed adequately. Your manager, Robin Lawrence, assigns both of you to a new job, proofreading manuscripts.

You proofread about ten pages per hour and Person B proofreads about twelve pages per hour. The assistant manager, responsible for proofreaders, told you Wednesday that Person B was performing better than you in terms of error detection and speed of proofreading.

At 5:00 p.m. on Friday, you and Person B go to your manager's secretary to pick up your checks. The secretary hands you and Person B your pay envelopes. You open yours and see that you are being paid $4.25 per hour. Person B opens the pay envelope and says, "Hey, I got $4.25 per hour. How much did you get?"
OVERREWARD SCENARIO TWO

You and Person B are both undergraduates. Both of you are juniors, excellent students, and anxious to earn extra money to support yourselves while attending college. Both of you have been working under a Work-Study program doing various jobs for various professors. Both of you have worked for two semesters at $4.00 (U.S.) per hour and have performed adequately. Professor Martin, a sociologist, hires you and Person B to do some coding of questionnaires. The data come from a natural sample so there is plenty of work to do.

You and Person B both code about eight questionnaires per hour. Professor Martin's graduate assistant told both of you Wednesday that you both were doing well and seemed to be quite equal in terms of accuracy and speed.

At 5:00 p.m. on Friday, Professor Martin's secretary comes in and gives you and Person B your pay envelopes. You open yours and see that Professor Martin is paying you $4.75 per hour. Person B opens the pay envelope and says, "Hey, I got $4.25 per hour. How much did you get?"
EQUITABLE REWARD SCENARIO ONE

You and Person B are both undergraduates. Both of you are juniors, excellent students, and anxious to earn extra money to support yourselves while attending college. Both of you have been working under a Work-Study program doing various jobs for various professors. Both of you have worked for two semesters at $4.25 (U.S.) per hour and have performed adequately. Professor Martin, a sociologist, hires you and Person B to do some coding of questionnaires. The data come from a natural sample so there is plenty of work to do.

You code about ten questionnaires per hour and Person B codes about eight questionnaires per hour. Professor Martin's graduate assistant told you Wednesday that you were performing better than Person B in terms of accuracy and speed.

At 5:00 p.m. on Friday, Professor Martin's secretary comes in and gives you and Person B your pay envelopes. You open yours and see that Professor Martin is paying you $4.75 per hour. Person B opens the pay envelope and says, "Hey, I got $4.25 per hour. How much did you get?"
EQUITABLE REWARD SCENARIO TWO

You and Person B are both undergraduates. Both of you are juniors, excellent students, and anxious to earn extra money to support yourselves while attending college. Both of you have been working at the university's printing press where you have performed various jobs. Both of you have worked for two semesters at $4.25 (U.S.) per hour and have performed adequately. Your manager, Robin Lawrence, assigns both of you to a new job, proofreading manuscripts.

You and Person B both proofread about ten pages per hour. The assistant manager, responsible for proofreaders, told you Wednesday that you both were doing well and seemed to be quite equal in terms of error detection and speed of proofreading.

At 5:00 p.m. on Friday, you and Person B go to your manager's secretary to pick up your checks. The secretary hands you and Person B your pay envelopes. You open yours and see that you are being paid $4.25 per hour. Person B opens the pay envelope and says, "Hey, I got $4.25 per hour. How much did you get?"
You and Person B are both undergraduates. Both of you are juniors, excellent students, and anxious to earn extra money to support yourselves while attending college. Both of you have been working under a Work-Study program doing various jobs for various professors. Both of you have worked for two semesters at $4.25 (U.S.) per hour and have performed adequately. Professor Martin, a sociologist, hires you and Person B to do some coding of questionnaires. The data come from a natural sample so there is plenty of work to do.

You code about eight questionnaires per hour and Person B codes about ten questionnaires per hour. Professor Martin’s graduate assistant told you Wednesday that Person B was performing better than you in terms of accuracy and speed.

At 5:00 p.m. on Friday, Professor Martin’s secretary comes in and gives you and Person B your pay envelopes. You open yours and see that Professor Martin is paying you $4.25 per hour. Person B opens the pay envelope and says, "Hey, I got $4.75 per hour. How much did you get?"
APPENDIX K: REWARD SCENARIO SPECIFICALLY DEVELOPED FOR THE MEASURE VALIDATION STUDY
UNDERREWARD SCENARIO

You and Person B are both undergraduates. Both of you are juniors, excellent students, and anxious to earn extra money to support yourselves while attending college. Both of you have been working at the university’s printing press where you have performed various jobs. Both of you have worked for two semesters at $4.25 (U.S.) per hour and have performed adequately. Your manager, Robin Lawrence, assigns both of you to a new job, proofreading manuscripts.

You and Person B both proofread about ten pages per hour. The assistant manager, responsible for proofreaders, told both of you Wednesday that you both were doing well and seemed to be quite equal in terms of error detection and speed of proofreading.

At 5:00 p.m. on Friday, you and Person B go to your manager’s secretary to pick up your checks. The secretary hands you and Person B your pay envelopes. You open yours and see that you are being paid $4.25 per hour. Person B opens the pay envelope and says, “Hey, I got $4.75 per hour. How much did you get?”
OVERREWARD SCENARIO

You and Person B are both undergraduates. Both of you are juniors, excellent students, and anxious to earn extra money to support yourselves while attending college. Both of you have been working at the university's printing press where you have performed various jobs. Both of you have worked for two semesters at $4.25 (U.S.) per hour and have performed adequately. Your manager, Robin Lawrence, assigns both of you to a new job, proofreading manuscripts.

You proofread about ten pages per hour and Person B proofreads about twelve pages per hour. The assistant manager, responsible for proofreaders, told you Wednesday that Person B was performing better than you in terms of error detection and speed of proofreading.

At 5:00 p.m. on Friday, you and Person B go to your manager's secretary to pick up your checks. The secretary hands you and Person B your pay envelopes. You open yours and see that you are being paid $4.25 per hour. Person B opens the pay envelope and says, "Hey, I got $4.25 per hour. How much did you get?"
EQUITABLE REWARD SCENARIO

You and Person B are both undergraduates. Both of you are juniors, excellent students, and anxious to earn extra money to support yourselves while attending college. Both of you have been working at the university's printing press where you have performed various jobs. Both of you have worked for two semesters at $4.25 (U.S.) per hour and have performed adequately. Your manager, Robin Lawrence, assigns both of you to a new job, proofreading manuscripts.

You and Person B both proofread about ten pages per hour. The assistant manager, responsible for proofreaders, told you Wednesday that you both were doing well and seemed to be quite equal in terms of error detection and speed of proofreading.

At 5:00 p.m. on Friday, you and Person B go to your manager's secretary to pick up your checks. The secretary hands you and Person B your pay envelopes. You open yours and see that you are being paid $4.25 per hour. Person B opens the pay envelope and says, "Hey, I got $4.25 per hour. How much did you get?"
APPENDIX L: SATISFACTION MEASURES AND MANIPULATION CHECK FOR THE MEASURE VALIDATION STUDY
Given the previous work situation, please answer the following questions concerning your reactions to this situation. Check or circle the response that best represents the way you feel.

1. How satisfied are you with this work situation, in general?

   1-------2-------3-------4-------5-------6-------7
   Very    Neither    Very
   Dissatisfied  Satisfied  Satisfied
                   Nor      Dissatisfied

2. How satisfied are you with your pay in this work situation?

   1-------2-------3-------4-------5-------6-------7
   Very    Neither    Very
   Dissatisfied  Satisfied  Satisfied
                   Nor      Dissatisfied

3. How satisfied are you with the work you are performing in this work situation?

   1-------2-------3-------4-------5-------6-------7
   Very    Neither    Very
   Dissatisfied  Satisfied  Satisfied
                   Nor      Dissatisfied

4. Who is getting a better deal in this situation?

   1-------2-------3-------4-------5-------6-------7
   Person B    We are both    I am getting
   is getting   receiving an   a better deal
   a much better equally good than Person B. deal than me.
   deal.
CONTENT VALIDITY ASSESSMENT QUESTIONNAIRE: NEW EQUITY SENSITIVITY MEASURE

GENERAL INSTRUCTIONS: Please read the background section before completing the content validity assessment. It is extremely important that you thoroughly understand the equity sensitivity construct and its composition before beginning your content validity assessment. This content validity assessment is an integral part of my dissertation. As a content validity expert, you are playing a very important role in developing my new measure of equity sensitivity. Your efforts here will have a significant impact on determining the final content of my new and improved measure of equity sensitivity.

I very much appreciate all your effort and hard work in performing this assessment and I look forward to receiving the results of your content validity assessment in the near future. Good luck and God speed!

BACKGROUND:

Before you begin the content validity assessment, let me provide you with some background information on the equity sensitivity construct. The equity sensitivity construct, proposed by Huseman, Hatfield, and Miles (1987), relates directly to equity theory and suggests that individuals react in consistent but individually different ways to both perceived equity and inequity because they have different preferences for equity. Specifically, this construct proposes that there are three types of individuals: (a) Benevolents, who prefer that their outcome/input ratios be less than their comparison other's; (b) Equity Sensitives, who prefer that outcome/input ratios be equal to that of their comparison other's; and (c) Entitleds, who prefer that their outcome to input ratios be greater than their comparison other's.

The equity sensitivity construct, as originally formulated by Huseman et al. (1987), is also multidimensional. There are four general dimensions that comprise the equity sensitivity construct.

The FIRST DIMENSION is PREFERENCE FOR LEVEL OF INPUTS. For example, Benevolents prefer situations that allow them to give high levels of inputs. The SECOND DIMENSION is PREFERENCE FOR LEVEL OF OUTPUTS. For example, Entitleds prefer situations that allow them to receive high levels of outcomes. The THIRD DIMENSION is PREFERENCE FOR RELATIVE LEVEL OF INPUTS TO OUTCOMES. Here, Benevolents prefer their inputs to exceed their outcomes; Equity Sensitives prefer their inputs equal their outcomes; and Entitleds prefer that their outcomes exceed their inputs.
The FOURTH and final DIMENSION is the PREFERENCE FOR A CERTAIN EQUITY RATIO RELATIVE TO A COMPARISON OTHER. Here, Benevolents prefer that their outcome/input ratios be less than that of the comparison other's; Equity Sensitives prefer that their outcome/input ratios be equal to that of the comparison other's; and Entitleds prefer that their outcome/input ratios exceed that of the comparison other's.

NOTE: I have attached a copy of the Huseman et al. (1987) article if you would like additional information about the construct before conducting your content validity assessment.

CONTENT VALIDITY ASSESSMENT INSTRUCTIONS:

In this content validity assessment, you will be asked to make two judgments for each item. In the first judgment, you will be asked to determine the dimension of equity sensitivity that the item best represents. For example, if you decide that the item best represents the dimension of preference for level of inputs, then you will mark the option labeled "level of inputs". However, if you believe that the item does not represent one of the dimensions of equity sensitivity, you will mark the category labeled "NONE".

In the second judgment, you will be asked to decide which type of individual (i.e., Benevolent, Equity Sensitive, or Entitled) the item best represents. For example, if you believe that item best represents the Benevolent type of individual, then you will mark the option labeled "Benevolent." However, if you believe that the item does not represent one of the three types of individuals, then you will mark the category labeled "NONE". Please note that if the item was classified in the "NONE" category in the first judgment, the second judgment will not be necessary.

SAMPLE ITEM:

"I prefer those situations where my equity ratio is less than my comparison other's equity ratio."

SAMPLE CLASSIFICATIONS:

( ) LEVEL OF INPUTS ( ) RELATIVE LEVEL OF INPUTS TO OUTCOMES ( ) LEVEL OF OUTCOMES (X) CERTAIN EQUITY RATIO

(X) BENEVOLENT ( ) EQUITY SENSITIVE ( ) ENTITLED ( ) NONE

In the first judgment, the item was classified as best representing the dimension of preference for a certain equity ratio relative to a comparison other. In the second judgment, the item was classified as best representing the Benevolent type of individual.
1. How many employees in a typical organization believe that satisfaction comes from getting the most one can from an employer for the work one performs?

( ) LEVEL OF INPUTS ( ) RELATIVE LEVEL OF INPUTS TO OUTCOMES
( ) LEVEL OF OUTCOMES ( ) CERTAIN EQUITY RATIO ( ) NONE
( ) BENEVOLENT ( ) EQUITY SENSITIVE ( ) ENTITLED ( ) NONE

2. How many of your friends do you consider to be “givers” rather than “takers”?

( ) LEVEL OF INPUTS ( ) RELATIVE LEVEL OF INPUTS TO OUTCOMES
( ) LEVEL OF OUTCOMES ( ) CERTAIN EQUITY RATIO ( ) NONE
( ) BENEVOLENT ( ) EQUITY SENSITIVE ( ) ENTITLED ( ) NONE

3. How many employees in a typical organization, if they were being paid more than similarly qualified co-workers by an employer for the same amount of work, would feel guilty and as a result, would try to increase their productivity?

( ) LEVEL OF INPUTS ( ) RELATIVE LEVEL OF INPUTS TO OUTCOMES
( ) LEVEL OF OUTCOMES ( ) CERTAIN EQUITY RATIO ( ) NONE
( ) BENEVOLENT ( ) EQUITY SENSITIVE ( ) ENTITLED ( ) NONE

4. Employees who like to tackle new and difficult problems at work get bored easily and do not make good employees.

( ) LEVEL OF INPUTS ( ) RELATIVE LEVEL OF INPUTS TO OUTCOMES
( ) LEVEL OF OUTCOMES ( ) CERTAIN EQUITY RATIO ( ) NONE
( ) BENEVOLENT ( ) EQUITY SENSITIVE ( ) ENTITLED ( ) NONE

5. How many of your friends watch out for their own good more than they help others?

( ) LEVEL OF INPUTS ( ) RELATIVE LEVEL OF INPUTS TO OUTCOMES
( ) LEVEL OF OUTCOMES ( ) CERTAIN EQUITY RATIO ( ) NONE
( ) BENEVOLENT ( ) EQUITY SENSITIVE ( ) ENTITLED ( ) NONE

6. I have at times taken unauthorized work breaks.

( ) LEVEL OF INPUTS ( ) RELATIVE LEVEL OF INPUTS TO OUTCOMES
( ) LEVEL OF OUTCOMES ( ) CERTAIN EQUITY RATIO ( ) NONE
( ) BENEVOLENT ( ) EQUITY SENSITIVE ( ) ENTITLED ( ) NONE
7. Employees who believe in the motto "it's better to give than to receive" are going through life with their eyes closed to reality.

( ) LEVEL OF INPUTS  ( ) RELATIVE LEVEL OF INPUTS TO OUTCOMES
( ) LEVEL OF OUTCOMES  ( ) CERTAIN EQUITY RATIO  ( ) NONE
( ) BENEVOLENT  ( ) EQUITY SENSITIVE  ( ) ENTITLED  ( ) NONE

8. I prefer work situations where I know the work I am contributing is worth more than what my employer is paying me for it.

( ) LEVEL OF INPUTS  ( ) RELATIVE LEVEL OF INPUTS TO OUTCOMES
( ) LEVEL OF OUTCOMES  ( ) CERTAIN EQUITY RATIO  ( ) NONE
( ) BENEVOLENT  ( ) EQUITY SENSITIVE  ( ) ENTITLED  ( ) NONE

9. Employees who are not overly concerned about getting the best deal from their employers for the work they perform are the ones that turn out to be good employees.

( ) LEVEL OF INPUTS  ( ) RELATIVE LEVEL OF INPUTS TO OUTCOMES
( ) LEVEL OF OUTCOMES  ( ) CERTAIN EQUITY RATIO  ( ) NONE
( ) BENEVOLENT  ( ) EQUITY SENSITIVE  ( ) ENTITLED  ( ) NONE

10. How many of your friends would like to work for an employer where there is a constant pressure to complete a task in a short period of time and then become involved with another task?

( ) LEVEL OF INPUTS  ( ) RELATIVE LEVEL OF INPUTS TO OUTCOMES
( ) LEVEL OF OUTCOMES  ( ) CERTAIN EQUITY RATIO  ( ) NONE
( ) BENEVOLENT  ( ) EQUITY SENSITIVE  ( ) ENTITLED  ( ) NONE

11. It is really satisfying to me when I can get something for nothing at work.

( ) LEVEL OF INPUTS  ( ) RELATIVE LEVEL OF INPUTS TO OUTCOMES
( ) LEVEL OF OUTCOMES  ( ) CERTAIN EQUITY RATIO  ( ) NONE
( ) BENEVOLENT  ( ) EQUITY SENSITIVE  ( ) ENTITLED  ( ) NONE

12. I care about finding ways to improve my performance on the job.

( ) LEVEL OF INPUTS  ( ) RELATIVE LEVEL OF INPUTS TO OUTCOMES
( ) LEVEL OF OUTCOMES  ( ) CERTAIN EQUITY RATIO  ( ) NONE
( ) BENEVOLENT  ( ) EQUITY SENSITIVE  ( ) ENTITLED  ( ) NONE
13. How many of your friends believe it's equally good to give and to receive?

( ) LEVEL OF INPUTS ( ) RELATIVE LEVEL OF INPUTS TO OUTCOMES
( ) LEVEL OF OUTCOMES ( ) CERTAIN EQUITY RATIO ( ) NONE

( ) BENEVOLENT ( ) EQUITY SENSITIVE ( ) ENTITLED ( ) NONE

14. I always try to get the best deal possible from my employer even if this means that someone else has to suffer.

( ) LEVEL OF INPUTS ( ) RELATIVE LEVEL OF INPUTS TO OUTCOMES
( ) LEVEL OF OUTCOMES ( ) CERTAIN EQUITY RATIO ( ) NONE

( ) BENEVOLENT ( ) EQUITY SENSITIVE ( ) ENTITLED ( ) NONE

15. If people were more interested in what they could do for their employers and less interested in what their employers could do for them, this country would be a better and more productive place.

( ) LEVEL OF INPUTS ( ) RELATIVE LEVEL OF INPUTS TO OUTCOMES
( ) LEVEL OF OUTCOMES ( ) CERTAIN EQUITY RATIO ( ) NONE

( ) BENEVOLENT ( ) EQUITY SENSITIVE ( ) ENTITLED ( ) NONE

16. You and your co-worker, who is similar to you in both background and years of experience, are both loafing at work but both of you are given the same high level of rewards. How would you respond to this situation, in terms of productivity?

( ) LEVEL OF INPUTS ( ) RELATIVE LEVEL OF INPUTS TO OUTCOMES
( ) LEVEL OF OUTCOMES ( ) CERTAIN EQUITY RATIO ( ) NONE

( ) BENEVOLENT ( ) EQUITY SENSITIVE ( ) ENTITLED ( ) NONE

17. It is equally good to give and to receive.

( ) LEVEL OF INPUTS ( ) RELATIVE LEVEL OF INPUTS TO OUTCOMES
( ) LEVEL OF OUTCOMES ( ) CERTAIN EQUITY RATIO ( ) NONE

( ) BENEVOLENT ( ) EQUITY SENSITIVE ( ) ENTITLED ( ) NONE

18. Employees who work hard even when they are paid less than similarly qualified co-workers for the same amount of work are foolish.

( ) LEVEL OF INPUTS ( ) RELATIVE LEVEL OF INPUTS TO OUTCOMES
( ) LEVEL OF OUTCOMES ( ) CERTAIN EQUITY RATIO ( ) NONE

( ) BENEVOLENT ( ) EQUITY SENSITIVE ( ) ENTITLED ( ) NONE
19. When it comes to work, I am equally concerned about what I can give to my employer and what I can get from my employer.

( ) LEVEL OF INPUTS ( ) RELATIVE LEVEL OF INPUTS TO OUTCOMES
( ) LEVEL OF OUTCOMES ( ) CERTAIN EQUITY RATIO ( ) NONE

( ) BENEVOLENT ( ) EQUITY SENSITIVE ( ) ENTITLED ( ) NONE

20. How many employees in a typical organization could be considered loafers?

( ) LEVEL OF INPUTS ( ) RELATIVE LEVEL OF INPUTS TO OUTCOMES
( ) LEVEL OF OUTCOMES ( ) CERTAIN EQUITY RATIO ( ) NONE

( ) BENEVOLENT ( ) EQUITY SENSITIVE ( ) ENTITLED ( ) NONE

21. How many employees in a typical organization always strive to do their best at work regardless?

( ) LEVEL OF INPUTS ( ) RELATIVE LEVEL OF INPUTS TO OUTCOMES
( ) LEVEL OF OUTCOMES ( ) CERTAIN EQUITY RATIO ( ) NONE

( ) BENEVOLENT ( ) EQUITY SENSITIVE ( ) ENTITLED ( ) NONE

22. Employees who are more concerned about themselves than their employers are not worth having as employees?

( ) LEVEL OF INPUTS ( ) RELATIVE LEVEL OF INPUTS TO OUTCOMES
( ) LEVEL OF OUTCOMES ( ) CERTAIN EQUITY RATIO ( ) NONE

( ) BENEVOLENT ( ) EQUITY SENSITIVE ( ) ENTITLED ( ) NONE

23. I at times do more than my fair share at work so I know for sure that I have pulled my own weight.

( ) LEVEL OF INPUTS ( ) RELATIVE LEVEL OF INPUTS TO OUTCOMES
( ) LEVEL OF OUTCOMES ( ) CERTAIN EQUITY RATIO ( ) NONE

( ) BENEVOLENT ( ) EQUITY SENSITIVE ( ) ENTITLED ( ) NONE

24. Whenever possible I try to relax and accept life as it is, rather than always striving to do my best at my job.

( ) LEVEL OF INPUTS ( ) RELATIVE LEVEL OF INPUTS TO OUTCOMES
( ) LEVEL OF OUTCOMES ( ) CERTAIN EQUITY RATIO ( ) NONE

( ) BENEVOLENT ( ) EQUITY SENSITIVE ( ) ENTITLED ( ) NONE
25. As a manager, I would not hire people who want the wages they are paid to match the amount of work they do.

( ) LEVEL OF INPUTS ( ) RELATIVE LEVEL OF INPUTS TO OUTCOMES
( ) LEVEL OF OUTCOMES ( ) CERTAIN EQUITY RATIO ( ) NONE
( ) BENEVOLENT ( ) EQUITY SENSITIVE ( ) ENTITLED ( ) NONE

26. How many employees in a typical organization believe that if they are paid the same wage as similarly qualified co-workers, they still should work harder than their co-workers?

( ) LEVEL OF INPUTS ( ) RELATIVE LEVEL OF INPUTS TO OUTCOMES
( ) LEVEL OF OUTCOMES ( ) CERTAIN EQUITY RATIO ( ) NONE
( ) BENEVOLENT ( ) EQUITY SENSITIVE ( ) ENTITLED ( ) NONE

27. How many of your friends feel like that they should always get something for nothing at work?

( ) LEVEL OF INPUTS ( ) RELATIVE LEVEL OF INPUTS TO OUTCOMES
( ) LEVEL OF OUTCOMES ( ) CERTAIN EQUITY RATIO ( ) NONE
( ) BENEVOLENT ( ) EQUITY SENSITIVE ( ) ENTITLED ( ) NONE

28. Employees who say that they are equally concerned about helping others and helping themselves really mean that they don’t care about anything including themselves.

( ) LEVEL OF INPUTS ( ) RELATIVE LEVEL OF INPUTS TO OUTCOMES
( ) LEVEL OF OUTCOMES ( ) CERTAIN EQUITY RATIO ( ) NONE
( ) BENEVOLENT ( ) EQUITY SENSITIVE ( ) ENTITLED ( ) NONE

29. How many employees in a typical organization would still be dissatisfied even if they were paid the same wage as similarly qualified co-workers for the same amount of work?

( ) LEVEL OF INPUTS ( ) RELATIVE LEVEL OF INPUTS TO OUTCOMES
( ) LEVEL OF OUTCOMES ( ) CERTAIN EQUITY RATIO ( ) NONE
( ) BENEVOLENT ( ) EQUITY SENSITIVE ( ) ENTITLED ( ) NONE

30. People who don’t like to do their best at a job are probably unhappy.

( ) LEVEL OF INPUTS ( ) RELATIVE LEVEL OF INPUTS TO OUTCOMES
( ) LEVEL OF OUTCOMES ( ) CERTAIN EQUITY RATIO ( ) NONE
( ) BENEVOLENT ( ) EQUITY SENSITIVE ( ) ENTITLED ( ) NONE
31. An employee who takes long rest pauses is probably a poor employee.

( ) LEVEL OF INPUTS ( ) RELATIVE LEVEL OF INPUTS TO OUTCOMES
( ) LEVEL OF OUTCOMES ( ) CERTAIN EQUITY RATIO ( ) NONE

( ) BENEVOLENT ( ) EQUITY SENSITIVE ( ) ENTITLED ( ) NONE

32. Employees who believe that it's equally good to give and to receive are the most well-adjusted employees.

( ) LEVEL OF INPUTS ( ) RELATIVE LEVEL OF INPUTS TO OUTCOMES
( ) LEVEL OF OUTCOMES ( ) CERTAIN EQUITY RATIO ( ) NONE

( ) BENEVOLENT ( ) EQUITY SENSITIVE ( ) ENTITLED ( ) NONE

33. How many of your friends, if their co-workers got a better deal from the employer than they did, would be seriously bothered by it and would significantly decrease their productivity on the job?

( ) LEVEL OF INPUTS ( ) RELATIVE LEVEL OF INPUTS TO OUTCOMES
( ) LEVEL OF OUTCOMES ( ) CERTAIN EQUITY RATIO ( ) NONE

( ) BENEVOLENT ( ) EQUITY SENSITIVE ( ) ENTITLED ( ) NONE

34. How many of your friends believe it's better to give than to receive?

( ) LEVEL OF INPUTS ( ) RELATIVE LEVEL OF INPUTS TO OUTCOMES
( ) LEVEL OF OUTCOMES ( ) CERTAIN EQUITY RATIO ( ) NONE

( ) BENEVOLENT ( ) EQUITY SENSITIVE ( ) ENTITLED ( ) NONE

35. How many of your friends feel most comfortable when the work they perform matches the wages they are paid for it?

( ) LEVEL OF INPUTS ( ) RELATIVE LEVEL OF INPUTS TO OUTCOMES
( ) LEVEL OF OUTCOMES ( ) CERTAIN EQUITY RATIO ( ) NONE

( ) BENEVOLENT ( ) EQUITY SENSITIVE ( ) ENTITLED ( ) NONE

36. How many employees in a typical organization are equally concerned about what they get from the employer and what they give to the employer?

( ) LEVEL OF INPUTS ( ) RELATIVE LEVEL OF INPUTS TO OUTCOMES
( ) LEVEL OF OUTCOMES ( ) CERTAIN EQUITY RATIO ( ) NONE

( ) BENEVOLENT ( ) EQUITY SENSITIVE ( ) ENTITLED ( ) NONE
37. You work significantly harder than your co-worker, who is similar to you in both background and years of experience, but you are given significantly less rewards than your co-worker. How satisfied would you be given this situation?

( ) LEVEL OF INPUTS ( ) RELATIVE LEVEL OF INPUTS TO OUTCOMES
( ) LEVEL OF OUTCOMES ( ) CERTAIN EQUITY RATIO ( ) NONE

( ) BENEVOLENT ( ) EQUITY SENSITIVE ( ) ENTITLED ( ) NONE

38. I would be unwilling to work as part of a team with an employee who prefers to do as little as possible on the job.

( ) LEVEL OF INPUTS ( ) RELATIVE LEVEL OF INPUTS TO OUTCOMES
( ) LEVEL OF OUTCOMES ( ) CERTAIN EQUITY RATIO ( ) NONE

( ) BENEVOLENT ( ) EQUITY SENSITIVE ( ) ENTITLED ( ) NONE

39. How many employees in a typical organization, if they were paid the same amount as similarly qualified co-workers for the same amount of work, would feel "guilty" and increase the amount of work they performed?

( ) LEVEL OF INPUTS ( ) RELATIVE LEVEL OF INPUTS TO OUTCOMES
( ) LEVEL OF OUTCOMES ( ) CERTAIN EQUITY RATIO ( ) NONE

( ) BENEVOLENT ( ) EQUITY SENSITIVE ( ) ENTITLED ( ) NONE

40. You and your co-worker, who is similar to you in both background and years of experience, are both working hard and both of you are given the same high level of rewards. How would you respond to this situation, in terms of productivity?

( ) LEVEL OF INPUTS ( ) RELATIVE LEVEL OF INPUTS TO OUTCOMES
( ) LEVEL OF OUTCOMES ( ) CERTAIN EQUITY RATIO ( ) NONE

( ) BENEVOLENT ( ) EQUITY SENSITIVE ( ) ENTITLED ( ) NONE

41. I would be willing to work with employees who are more concerned about what they can get from the employer than what they can give to the employer.

( ) LEVEL OF INPUTS ( ) RELATIVE LEVEL OF INPUTS TO OUTCOMES
( ) LEVEL OF OUTCOMES ( ) CERTAIN EQUITY RATIO ( ) NONE

( ) BENEVOLENT ( ) EQUITY SENSITIVE ( ) ENTITLED ( ) NONE
42. You and your co-worker, who is similar to you in both background and years of experience, are working equally hard but you are given significantly less rewards than your co-worker. How satisfied would you be given this situation?

( ) LEVEL OF INPUTS ( ) RELATIVE LEVEL OF INPUTS TO OUTCOMES
( ) LEVEL OF OUTCOMES ( ) CERTAIN EQUITY RATIO ( ) NONE

( ) BENEVOLENT ( ) EQUITY SENSITIVE ( ) ENTITLED ( ) NONE

43. How many of your friends believe that money is the most important consideration when looking for a new job?

( ) LEVEL OF INPUTS ( ) RELATIVE LEVEL OF INPUTS TO OUTCOMES
( ) LEVEL OF OUTCOMES ( ) CERTAIN EQUITY RATIO ( ) NONE

( ) BENEVOLENT ( ) EQUITY SENSITIVE ( ) ENTITLED ( ) NONE

44. How many of your friends are very concerned about getting top wages, benefits, and the like from their employers for the work they do?

( ) LEVEL OF INPUTS ( ) RELATIVE LEVEL OF INPUTS TO OUTCOMES
( ) LEVEL OF OUTCOMES ( ) CERTAIN EQUITY RATIO ( ) NONE

( ) BENEVOLENT ( ) EQUITY SENSITIVE ( ) ENTITLED ( ) NONE

45. A person who believes that if people would just work harder everybody would be better off is misguided.

( ) LEVEL OF INPUTS ( ) RELATIVE LEVEL OF INPUTS TO OUTCOMES
( ) LEVEL OF OUTCOMES ( ) CERTAIN EQUITY RATIO ( ) NONE

( ) BENEVOLENT ( ) EQUITY SENSITIVE ( ) ENTITLED ( ) NONE

46. Wasting time on the job is worse than wasting money.

( ) LEVEL OF INPUTS ( ) RELATIVE LEVEL OF INPUTS TO OUTCOMES
( ) LEVEL OF OUTCOMES ( ) CERTAIN EQUITY RATIO ( ) NONE

( ) BENEVOLENT ( ) EQUITY SENSITIVE ( ) ENTITLED ( ) NONE

47. People who believe that the most challenging tasks on the job are the most rewarding are speaking the truth.

( ) LEVEL OF INPUTS ( ) RELATIVE LEVEL OF INPUTS TO OUTCOMES
( ) LEVEL OF OUTCOMES ( ) CERTAIN EQUITY RATIO ( ) NONE

( ) BENEVOLENT ( ) EQUITY SENSITIVE ( ) ENTITLED ( ) NONE
48. How many of your friends believe that if a person is given a choice between jobs which pay the same money, the person should choose the one which requires less work?

( ) LEVEL OF INPUTS ( ) RELATIVE LEVEL OF INPUTS TO OUTCOMES
( ) LEVEL OF OUTCOMES ( ) CERTAIN EQUITY RATIO ( ) NONE

( ) BENEVOLENT ( ) EQUITY SENSITIVE ( ) ENTITLED ( ) NONE

49. How many employees in a typical organization are really not that concerned about getting the most they can from an employer for the work they perform?

( ) LEVEL OF INPUTS ( ) RELATIVE LEVEL OF INPUTS TO OUTCOMES
( ) LEVEL OF OUTCOMES ( ) CERTAIN EQUITY RATIO ( ) NONE

( ) BENEVOLENT ( ) EQUITY SENSITIVE ( ) ENTITLED ( ) NONE

50. Employees who are more concerned about what they can contribute to an employer rather than what they can get from an employer are fools.

( ) LEVEL OF INPUTS ( ) RELATIVE LEVEL OF INPUTS TO OUTCOMES
( ) LEVEL OF OUTCOMES ( ) CERTAIN EQUITY RATIO ( ) NONE

( ) BENEVOLENT ( ) EQUITY SENSITIVE ( ) ENTITLED ( ) NONE

51. You and your co-worker, who is similar to you in both background and years of experience, are working equally hard but you are given significantly less rewards than your co-worker. How would you respond to this situation, in terms of productivity?

( ) LEVEL OF INPUTS ( ) RELATIVE LEVEL OF INPUTS TO OUTCOMES
( ) LEVEL OF OUTCOMES ( ) CERTAIN EQUITY RATIO ( ) NONE

( ) BENEVOLENT ( ) EQUITY SENSITIVE ( ) ENTITLED ( ) NONE

52. How many of your friends would loaf on the job if given the opportunity?

( ) LEVEL OF INPUTS ( ) RELATIVE LEVEL OF INPUTS TO OUTCOMES
( ) LEVEL OF OUTCOMES ( ) CERTAIN EQUITY RATIO ( ) NONE

( ) BENEVOLENT ( ) EQUITY SENSITIVE ( ) ENTITLED ( ) NONE
53. How many employees in a typical organization put in a fair day's work (no more, no less) for a fair day's wage?

( ) LEVEL OF INPUTS ( ) RELATIVE LEVEL OF INPUTS TO OUTCOMES
( ) LEVEL OF OUTCOMES ( ) CERTAIN EQUITY RATIO ( ) NONE
( ) BENEVOLENT ( ) EQUITY SENSITIVE ( ) ENTITLED ( ) NONE

54. You are working significantly less than your co-worker, who is similar to you in both background and years of experience, and you receive significantly less rewards than your co-worker. How satisfied would you be given this situation?

( ) LEVEL OF INPUTS ( ) RELATIVE LEVEL OF INPUTS TO OUTCOMES
( ) LEVEL OF OUTCOMES ( ) CERTAIN EQUITY RATIO ( ) NONE
( ) BENEVOLENT ( ) EQUITY SENSITIVE ( ) ENTITLED ( ) NONE

55. How many employees in a typical organization believe that it's equally good to give and to receive?

( ) LEVEL OF INPUTS ( ) RELATIVE LEVEL OF INPUTS TO OUTCOMES
( ) LEVEL OF OUTCOMES ( ) CERTAIN EQUITY RATIO ( ) NONE
( ) BENEVOLENT ( ) EQUITY SENSITIVE ( ) ENTITLED ( ) NONE

56. I am inclined to look out for myself as well as others equally.

( ) LEVEL OF INPUTS ( ) RELATIVE LEVEL OF INPUTS TO OUTCOMES
( ) LEVEL OF OUTCOMES ( ) CERTAIN EQUITY RATIO ( ) NONE
( ) BENEVOLENT ( ) EQUITY SENSITIVE ( ) ENTITLED ( ) NONE

57. How many employees in a typical organization, if they were paid the same wage as similarly qualified co-workers for the same amount of work, would feel satisfied and would continue to do as much work as they have in the past?

( ) LEVEL OF INPUTS ( ) RELATIVE LEVEL OF INPUTS TO OUTCOMES
( ) LEVEL OF OUTCOMES ( ) CERTAIN EQUITY RATIO ( ) NONE
( ) BENEVOLENT ( ) EQUITY SENSITIVE ( ) ENTITLED ( ) NONE

58. How many of your friends are the type of people who won't work hard unless they are forced to do so?

( ) LEVEL OF INPUTS ( ) RELATIVE LEVEL OF INPUTS TO OUTCOMES
( ) LEVEL OF OUTCOMES ( ) CERTAIN EQUITY RATIO ( ) NONE
( ) BENEVOLENT ( ) EQUITY SENSITIVE ( ) ENTITLED ( ) NONE
59. It is really satisfying to me when at the end of the work day I know I carried more than my fair share of the workload.

(  ) LEVEL OF INPUTS (  ) RELATIVE LEVEL OF INPUTS TO OUTCOMES
(  ) LEVEL OF OUTCOMES (  ) CERTAIN EQUITY RATIO (  ) NONE
(  ) BENEVOLENT (  ) EQUITY SENSITIVE (  ) ENTITLED (  ) NONE

60. How many employees in a typical organization work less than other people doing the same type of work?

(  ) LEVEL OF INPUTS (  ) RELATIVE LEVEL OF INPUTS TO OUTCOMES
(  ) LEVEL OF OUTCOMES (  ) CERTAIN EQUITY RATIO (  ) NONE
(  ) BENEVOLENT (  ) EQUITY SENSITIVE (  ) ENTITLED (  ) NONE

61. How many of your friends really try hard to do well at work?

(  ) LEVEL OF INPUTS (  ) RELATIVE LEVEL OF INPUTS TO OUTCOMES
(  ) LEVEL OF OUTCOMES (  ) CERTAIN EQUITY RATIO (  ) NONE
(  ) BENEVOLENT (  ) EQUITY SENSITIVE (  ) ENTITLED (  ) NONE

62. How many of your friends believe it's most important for them to get the best deal possible for the work they do from their employer, in terms of salary, promotions, and benefits?

(  ) LEVEL OF INPUTS (  ) RELATIVE LEVEL OF INPUTS TO OUTCOMES
(  ) LEVEL OF OUTCOMES (  ) CERTAIN EQUITY RATIO (  ) NONE
(  ) BENEVOLENT (  ) EQUITY SENSITIVE (  ) ENTITLED (  ) NONE

63. I feel bad when I do my job poorly even if it does not affect my raises, promotions, etc.

(  ) LEVEL OF INPUTS (  ) RELATIVE LEVEL OF INPUTS TO OUTCOMES
(  ) LEVEL OF OUTCOMES (  ) CERTAIN EQUITY RATIO (  ) NONE
(  ) BENEVOLENT (  ) EQUITY SENSITIVE (  ) ENTITLED (  ) NONE

64. You are working significantly less than your co-worker, who is similar to you in both background and years of experience, but you receive the same level of rewards as your co-worker. How would you respond to this situation in terms of productivity?

(  ) LEVEL OF INPUTS (  ) RELATIVE LEVEL OF INPUTS TO OUTCOMES
(  ) LEVEL OF OUTCOMES (  ) CERTAIN EQUITY RATIO (  ) NONE
(  ) BENEVOLENT (  ) EQUITY SENSITIVE (  ) ENTITLED (  ) NONE
65. How many employees in a typical organization, if they were paid a higher wage than similarly qualified co-workers for the same amount of work, would be most satisfied?

( ) LEVEL OF INPUTS ( ) RELATIVE LEVEL OF INPUTS TO OUTCOMES
( ) LEVEL OF OUTCOMES ( ) CERTAIN EQUITY RATIO ( ) NONE
( ) BENEVOLENT ( ) EQUITY SENSITIVE ( ) ENTITLED ( ) NONE

66. If I were a manager, if an employee was occasionally late for work I would probably just ignore it and let it pass.

( ) LEVEL OF INPUTS ( ) RELATIVE LEVEL OF INPUTS TO OUTCOMES
( ) LEVEL OF OUTCOMES ( ) CERTAIN EQUITY RATIO ( ) NONE
( ) BENEVOLENT ( ) EQUITY SENSITIVE ( ) ENTITLED ( ) NONE

67. How many employees in a typical organization always try to get the best deal possible for the work they do from their employer even if this means someone else will have to suffer?

( ) LEVEL OF INPUTS ( ) RELATIVE LEVEL OF INPUTS TO OUTCOMES
( ) LEVEL OF OUTCOMES ( ) CERTAIN EQUITY RATIO ( ) NONE
( ) BENEVOLENT ( ) EQUITY SENSITIVE ( ) ENTITLED ( ) NONE

68. How many of your friends only do as much as they have to in order to survive at work?

( ) LEVEL OF INPUTS ( ) RELATIVE LEVEL OF INPUTS TO OUTCOMES
( ) LEVEL OF OUTCOMES ( ) CERTAIN EQUITY RATIO ( ) NONE
( ) BENEVOLENT ( ) EQUITY SENSITIVE ( ) ENTITLED ( ) NONE

69. I would become very dissatisfied with my job if I had little or no work to do.

( ) LEVEL OF INPUTS ( ) RELATIVE LEVEL OF INPUTS TO OUTCOMES
( ) LEVEL OF OUTCOMES ( ) CERTAIN EQUITY RATIO ( ) NONE
( ) BENEVOLENT ( ) EQUITY SENSITIVE ( ) ENTITLED ( ) NONE

70. How many employees in a typical organization would choose the job which pays the most?

( ) LEVEL OF INPUTS ( ) RELATIVE LEVEL OF INPUTS TO OUTCOMES
( ) LEVEL OF OUTCOMES ( ) CERTAIN EQUITY RATIO ( ) NONE
( ) BENEVOLENT ( ) EQUITY SENSITIVE ( ) ENTITLED ( ) NONE
71. How many employees in a typical organization believe that an employee should try to stay busy all day rather than try to find ways to get out of doing work?

( ) LEVEL OF INPUTS ( ) RELATIVE LEVEL OF INPUTS TO OUTCOMES
( ) LEVEL OF OUTCOMES ( ) CERTAIN EQUITY RATIO ( ) NONE

( ) BENEVOLENT ( ) EQUITY SENSITIVE ( ) ENTITLED ( ) NONE

72. I always try to do things the easy way at work.

( ) LEVEL OF INPUTS ( ) RELATIVE LEVEL OF INPUTS TO OUTCOMES
( ) LEVEL OF OUTCOMES ( ) CERTAIN EQUITY RATIO ( ) NONE

( ) BENEVOLENT ( ) EQUITY SENSITIVE ( ) ENTITLED ( ) NONE

73. Employees who believe in the motto "if you don't look out for yourself nobody else will" are really just selfish.

( ) LEVEL OF INPUTS ( ) RELATIVE LEVEL OF INPUTS TO OUTCOMES
( ) LEVEL OF OUTCOMES ( ) CERTAIN EQUITY RATIO ( ) NONE

( ) BENEVOLENT ( ) EQUITY SENSITIVE ( ) ENTITLED ( ) NONE

74. How many of your friends believe that if you don't look out for yourself nobody else will?

( ) LEVEL OF INPUTS ( ) RELATIVE LEVEL OF INPUTS TO OUTCOMES
( ) LEVEL OF OUTCOMES ( ) CERTAIN EQUITY RATIO ( ) NONE

( ) BENEVOLENT ( ) EQUITY SENSITIVE ( ) ENTITLED ( ) NONE

75. Employees who only want those rewards that they deserve or work for are playing right into the hands of greedy employers.

( ) LEVEL OF INPUTS ( ) RELATIVE LEVEL OF INPUTS TO OUTCOMES
( ) LEVEL OF OUTCOMES ( ) CERTAIN EQUITY RATIO ( ) NONE

( ) BENEVOLENT ( ) EQUITY SENSITIVE ( ) ENTITLED ( ) NONE

76. You and your co-worker, who is similar to you in both background and years of experience, are both working hard and both of you receive the same low level of rewards. How satisfied would you be given this situation?

( ) LEVEL OF INPUTS ( ) RELATIVE LEVEL OF INPUTS TO OUTCOMES
( ) LEVEL OF OUTCOMES ( ) CERTAIN EQUITY RATIO ( ) NONE

( ) BENEVOLENT ( ) EQUITY SENSITIVE ( ) ENTITLED ( ) NONE
77. Employees who say that they don't work for the money are just plain liars.

( ) LEVEL OF INPUTS ( ) RELATIVE LEVEL OF INPUTS TO OUTCOMES
( ) LEVEL OF OUTCOMES ( ) CERTAIN EQUITY RATIO ( ) NONE
( ) BENEVOLENT ( ) EQUITY SENSITIVE ( ) ENTITLED ( ) NONE

78. I am most satisfied when the rewards I receive from my employer matches the amount of work I perform.

( ) LEVEL OF INPUTS ( ) RELATIVE LEVEL OF INPUTS TO OUTCOMES
( ) LEVEL OF OUTCOMES ( ) CERTAIN EQUITY RATIO ( ) NONE
( ) BENEVOLENT ( ) EQUITY SENSITIVE ( ) ENTITLED ( ) NONE

79. How many employees in a typical organization, if they were being paid less than similarly qualified co-workers for the same amount of work, would still keep up their productivity?

( ) LEVEL OF INPUTS ( ) RELATIVE LEVEL OF INPUTS TO OUTCOMES
( ) LEVEL OF OUTCOMES ( ) CERTAIN EQUITY RATIO ( ) NONE
( ) BENEVOLENT ( ) EQUITY SENSITIVE ( ) ENTITLED ( ) NONE

80. Employees who want to be paid the same wage as similarly qualified co-workers for the same amount of work are not getting as much as they possibly could from their employers.

( ) LEVEL OF INPUTS ( ) RELATIVE LEVEL OF INPUTS TO OUTCOMES
( ) LEVEL OF OUTCOMES ( ) CERTAIN EQUITY RATIO ( ) NONE
( ) BENEVOLENT ( ) EQUITY SENSITIVE ( ) ENTITLED ( ) NONE

81. I usually show up for work a little early to get things ready.

( ) LEVEL OF INPUTS ( ) RELATIVE LEVEL OF INPUTS TO OUTCOMES
( ) LEVEL OF OUTCOMES ( ) CERTAIN EQUITY RATIO ( ) NONE
( ) BENEVOLENT ( ) EQUITY SENSITIVE ( ) ENTITLED ( ) NONE

82. You and your co-worker, who is similar to you in both background and experience, are both working equally hard and both of you are given the same high level of rewards. How satisfied would you be given this situation?

( ) LEVEL OF INPUTS ( ) RELATIVE LEVEL OF INPUTS TO OUTCOMES
( ) LEVEL OF OUTCOMES ( ) CERTAIN EQUITY RATIO ( ) NONE
( ) BENEVOLENT ( ) EQUITY SENSITIVE ( ) ENTITLED ( ) NONE
83. Employees who are equally concerned about themselves and their employers make the best employees.

LEVEL OF INPUTS ( ) RELATIVE LEVEL OF INPUTS TO OUTCOMES
LEVEL OF OUTCOMES ( ) CERTAIN EQUITY RATIO ( ) NONE

BENEVOLENT ( ) EQUITY SENSITIVE ( ) ENTITLED ( ) NONE

84. When it comes to my employer, I am equally concerned about what I can give to my employer and what I can get from my employer.

LEVEL OF INPUTS ( ) RELATIVE LEVEL OF INPUTS TO OUTCOMES
LEVEL OF OUTCOMES ( ) CERTAIN EQUITY RATIO ( ) NONE

BENEVOLENT ( ) EQUITY SENSITIVE ( ) ENTITLED ( ) NONE

85. If I were a manager, I would definitely hire someone who is concerned about "a fair day's work for a fair day's wage".

LEVEL OF INPUTS ( ) RELATIVE LEVEL OF INPUTS TO OUTCOMES
LEVEL OF OUTCOMES ( ) CERTAIN EQUITY RATIO ( ) NONE

BENEVOLENT ( ) EQUITY SENSITIVE ( ) ENTITLED ( ) NONE

86. How many of your friends, if they were being paid the same wage as similarly qualified co-workers for the same amount of work, would volunteer for extra work?

LEVEL OF INPUTS ( ) RELATIVE LEVEL OF INPUTS TO OUTCOMES
LEVEL OF OUTCOMES ( ) CERTAIN EQUITY RATIO ( ) NONE

BENEVOLENT ( ) EQUITY SENSITIVE ( ) ENTITLED ( ) NONE

87. How many employees in a typical organization, if they were paid the same wage as similarly qualified co-workers for the same amount of work, would be completely satisfied?

LEVEL OF INPUTS ( ) RELATIVE LEVEL OF INPUTS TO OUTCOMES
LEVEL OF OUTCOMES ( ) CERTAIN EQUITY RATIO ( ) NONE

BENEVOLENT ( ) EQUITY SENSITIVE ( ) ENTITLED ( ) NONE

88. Because I do not like feeling indebted to people, I will often times shy away from accepting things that I have worked for or rightfully deserve.

LEVEL OF INPUTS ( ) RELATIVE LEVEL OF INPUTS TO OUTCOMES
LEVEL OF OUTCOMES ( ) CERTAIN EQUITY RATIO ( ) NONE

BENEVOLENT ( ) EQUITY SENSITIVE ( ) ENTITLED ( ) NONE
89. Employees who do things the easy way are the ones that get ahead at work.

LEVEL OF INPUTS
LEVEL OF OUTCOMES
CERTAIN EQUITY RATIO
BENEVOLENT
EQUITY SENSITIVE
ENTITLED
NONE

90. How many employees in a typical organization believe that they should be paid the same amount (no more, no less) as similarly qualified co-workers for the same amount of work?

LEVEL OF INPUTS
LEVEL OF OUTCOMES
CERTAIN EQUITY RATIO
BENEVOLENT
EQUITY SENSITIVE
ENTITLED
NONE

91. How many of your friends, if they were offered what they considered to be a "fair deal" by an employer for the work they performed, would still try to negotiate with the employer to get a better deal?

LEVEL OF INPUTS
LEVEL OF OUTCOMES
CERTAIN EQUITY RATIO
BENEVOLENT
EQUITY SENSITIVE
ENTITLED
NONE

92. How many of your friends are really not that concerned with getting the most they can for the work they perform from their employers?

LEVEL OF INPUTS
LEVEL OF OUTCOMES
CERTAIN EQUITY RATIO
BENEVOLENT
EQUITY SENSITIVE
ENTITLED
NONE

93. How many of your friends would probably keep on working even if they did not need the money?

LEVEL OF INPUTS
LEVEL OF OUTCOMES
CERTAIN EQUITY RATIO
BENEVOLENT
EQUITY SENSITIVE
ENTITLED
NONE

94. How many of your friends try to do more than they are paid to do at work?

LEVEL OF INPUTS
LEVEL OF OUTCOMES
CERTAIN EQUITY RATIO
BENEVOLENT
EQUITY SENSITIVE
ENTITLED
NONE
95. How many employees in a typical organization are more concerned about what they can give to their employer rather than what they can get from their employer?

( ) LEVEL OF INPUTS  ( ) RELATIVE LEVEL OF INPUTS TO OUTCOMES  ( ) CERTAIN EQUITY RATIO  ( ) NONE

( ) BENEVOLENT ( ) EQUITY SENSITIVE ( ) ENTITLED ( ) NONE

96. You and your co-worker, who is similar to you in both work background and experience, are both loafing but you receive significantly more rewards than does your co-worker. How satisfied would you be given this situation?

( ) LEVEL OF INPUTS  ( ) RELATIVE LEVEL OF INPUTS TO OUTCOMES  ( ) CERTAIN EQUITY RATIO  ( ) NONE

( ) BENEVOLENT ( ) EQUITY SENSITIVE ( ) ENTITLED ( ) NONE

97. How many employees in a typical organization, if they were paid the same wage as similarly qualified co-workers for the same amount of work, would still take paid sick leave even though they were not sick?

( ) LEVEL OF INPUTS  ( ) RELATIVE LEVEL OF INPUTS TO OUTCOMES  ( ) CERTAIN EQUITY RATIO  ( ) NONE

( ) BENEVOLENT ( ) EQUITY SENSITIVE ( ) ENTITLED ( ) NONE

98. How many of your friends are most satisfied when what they get from their employers matches what they give to their employers?

( ) LEVEL OF INPUTS  ( ) RELATIVE LEVEL OF INPUTS TO OUTCOMES  ( ) CERTAIN EQUITY RATIO  ( ) NONE

( ) BENEVOLENT ( ) EQUITY SENSITIVE ( ) ENTITLED ( ) NONE

99. How many of your friends would like to work for an organization that allows its employees to do interesting work, although it cannot pay as much as other organizations providing less interesting work?

( ) LEVEL OF INPUTS  ( ) RELATIVE LEVEL OF INPUTS TO OUTCOMES  ( ) CERTAIN EQUITY RATIO  ( ) NONE

( ) BENEVOLENT ( ) EQUITY SENSITIVE ( ) ENTITLED ( ) NONE
100. How many employees in a typical organization would try to get out of work even if they were paid the same wage as similarly qualified co-workers?

( ) LEVEL OF INPUTS  ( ) RELATIVE LEVEL OF INPUTS TO OUTCOMES  
( ) LEVEL OF OUTCOMES  ( ) CERTAIN EQUITY RATIO  ( ) NONE

( ) BENEVOLENT  ( ) EQUITY SENSITIVE  ( ) ENTITLED  ( ) NONE

101. It is the smart employee who gets as much as they can from an employer while giving as little as possible in return.

( ) LEVEL OF INPUTS  ( ) RELATIVE LEVEL OF INPUTS TO OUTCOMES  
( ) LEVEL OF OUTCOMES  ( ) CERTAIN EQUITY RATIO  ( ) NONE

( ) BENEVOLENT  ( ) EQUITY SENSITIVE  ( ) ENTITLED  ( ) NONE

102. My dream is to get ahead at work without having to try to hard to do it.

( ) LEVEL OF INPUTS  ( ) RELATIVE LEVEL OF INPUTS TO OUTCOMES  
( ) LEVEL OF OUTCOMES  ( ) CERTAIN EQUITY RATIO  ( ) NONE

( ) BENEVOLENT  ( ) EQUITY SENSITIVE  ( ) ENTITLED  ( ) NONE

103. How many employees in a typical organization are loyal to their employer first and themselves second?

( ) LEVEL OF INPUTS  ( ) RELATIVE LEVEL OF INPUTS TO OUTCOMES  
( ) LEVEL OF OUTCOMES  ( ) CERTAIN EQUITY RATIO  ( ) NONE

( ) BENEVOLENT  ( ) EQUITY SENSITIVE  ( ) ENTITLED  ( ) NONE

104. Employees who help others more than watch out for their own good are often more of nuisance than a help.

( ) LEVEL OF INPUTS  ( ) RELATIVE LEVEL OF INPUTS TO OUTCOMES  
( ) LEVEL OF OUTCOMES  ( ) CERTAIN EQUITY RATIO  ( ) NONE

( ) BENEVOLENT  ( ) EQUITY SENSITIVE  ( ) ENTITLED  ( ) NONE

105. I would like to work for an organization that provides better pay and benefits than other organizations although the work for this organization is much less interesting than the work in these other organizations.

( ) LEVEL OF INPUTS  ( ) RELATIVE LEVEL OF INPUTS TO OUTCOMES  
( ) LEVEL OF OUTCOMES  ( ) CERTAIN EQUITY RATIO  ( ) NONE

( ) BENEVOLENT  ( ) EQUITY SENSITIVE  ( ) ENTITLED  ( ) NONE
106. People who try to get by with doing as little as possible at work are just selfish and lazy.

( ) LEVEL OF INPUTS ( ) RELATIVE LEVEL OF INPUTS TO OUTCOMES
( ) LEVEL OF OUTCOMES ( ) CERTAIN EQUITY RATIO ( ) NONE
( ) BENEVOLENT ( ) EQUITY SENSITIVE ( ) ENTITLED ( ) NONE

107. How many employees in a typical organization believe it's better to give than to receive?

( ) LEVEL OF INPUTS ( ) RELATIVE LEVEL OF INPUTS TO OUTCOMES
( ) LEVEL OF OUTCOMES ( ) CERTAIN EQUITY RATIO ( ) NONE
( ) BENEVOLENT ( ) EQUITY SENSITIVE ( ) ENTITLED ( ) NONE

108. If I were a manager, I would probably hire applicants who are more concerned about what they can get from their employer than what they can give to their employer.

( ) LEVEL OF INPUTS ( ) RELATIVE LEVEL OF INPUTS TO OUTCOMES
( ) LEVEL OF OUTCOMES ( ) CERTAIN EQUITY RATIO ( ) NONE
( ) BENEVOLENT ( ) EQUITY SENSITIVE ( ) ENTITLED ( ) NONE

109. When it comes to work, I worry more about what I can get than what I can give.

( ) LEVEL OF INPUTS ( ) RELATIVE LEVEL OF INPUTS TO OUTCOMES
( ) LEVEL OF OUTCOMES ( ) CERTAIN EQUITY RATIO ( ) NONE
( ) BENEVOLENT ( ) EQUITY SENSITIVE ( ) ENTITLED ( ) NONE

110. How many employees in a typical organization dislike plain hard work?

( ) LEVEL OF INPUTS ( ) RELATIVE LEVEL OF INPUTS TO OUTCOMES
( ) LEVEL OF OUTCOMES ( ) CERTAIN EQUITY RATIO ( ) NONE
( ) BENEVOLENT ( ) EQUITY SENSITIVE ( ) ENTITLED ( ) NONE

111. How many of your friends believe that a job that provides you less than top dollar for your work is not a job worth having?

( ) LEVEL OF INPUTS ( ) RELATIVE LEVEL OF INPUTS TO OUTCOMES
( ) LEVEL OF OUTCOMES ( ) CERTAIN EQUITY RATIO ( ) NONE
( ) BENEVOLENT ( ) EQUITY SENSITIVE ( ) ENTITLED ( ) NONE
112. Employees who only want those rewards that they have worked for or deserve are really stupid.

( ) LEVEL OF INPUTS ( ) RELATIVE LEVEL OF INPUTS TO OUTCOMES
( ) LEVEL OF OUTCOMES ( ) CERTAIN EQUITY RATIO ( ) NONE

( ) BENEVOLENT ( ) EQUITY SENSITIVE ( ) ENTITLED ( ) NONE

113. When I take a job I am more concerned about how I will benefit the organization rather than how the organization will benefit me.

( ) LEVEL OF INPUTS ( ) RELATIVE LEVEL OF INPUTS TO OUTCOMES
( ) LEVEL OF OUTCOMES ( ) CERTAIN EQUITY RATIO ( ) NONE

( ) BENEVOLENT ( ) EQUITY SENSITIVE ( ) ENTITLED ( ) NONE

114. How many employees in a typical organization believe that if they are paid the same wage as similarly qualified co-workers, they should work only as much as these co-workers do?

( ) LEVEL OF INPUTS ( ) RELATIVE LEVEL OF INPUTS TO OUTCOMES
( ) LEVEL OF OUTCOMES ( ) CERTAIN EQUITY RATIO ( ) NONE

( ) BENEVOLENT ( ) EQUITY SENSITIVE ( ) ENTITLED ( ) NONE

115. How many of your friends, if their co-workers got a better deal from the employer than they did, would still be satisfied and would continue to work as hard as they have in the past?

( ) LEVEL OF INPUTS ( ) RELATIVE LEVEL OF INPUTS TO OUTCOMES
( ) LEVEL OF OUTCOMES ( ) CERTAIN EQUITY RATIO ( ) NONE

( ) BENEVOLENT ( ) EQUITY SENSITIVE ( ) ENTITLED ( ) NONE

116. Satisfaction for me comes from getting as much as I can from my employer for the work I do.

( ) LEVEL OF INPUTS ( ) RELATIVE LEVEL OF INPUTS TO OUTCOMES
( ) LEVEL OF OUTCOMES ( ) CERTAIN EQUITY RATIO ( ) NONE

( ) BENEVOLENT ( ) EQUITY SENSITIVE ( ) ENTITLED ( ) NONE
117. A person receives one of the greatest satisfactions in life when they realize that they have done their best at a job.

( ) LEVEL OF INPUTS ( ) RELATIVE LEVEL OF INPUTS TO OUTCOMES
( ) LEVEL OF OUTCOMES ( ) CERTAIN EQUITY RATIO ( ) NONE
( ) BENEVOLENT ( ) EQUITY SENSITIVE ( ) ENTITLED ( ) NONE

118. Employees who don't work hard even when they are paid a fair wage should be fired.

( ) LEVEL OF INPUTS ( ) RELATIVE LEVEL OF INPUTS TO OUTCOMES
( ) LEVEL OF OUTCOMES ( ) CERTAIN EQUITY RATIO ( ) NONE
( ) BENEVOLENT ( ) EQUITY SENSITIVE ( ) ENTITLED ( ) NONE

119. How many employees in a typical organization only want those rewards that they work for or deserve?

( ) LEVEL OF INPUTS ( ) RELATIVE LEVEL OF INPUTS TO OUTCOMES
( ) LEVEL OF OUTCOMES ( ) CERTAIN EQUITY RATIO ( ) NONE
( ) BENEVOLENT ( ) EQUITY SENSITIVE ( ) ENTITLED ( ) NONE

120. How many of your friends, if they got a better deal from the organization than their co-workers did, would not really be bothered by it and would continue to do as much work as they have in the past?

( ) LEVEL OF INPUTS ( ) RELATIVE LEVEL OF INPUTS TO OUTCOMES
( ) LEVEL OF OUTCOMES ( ) CERTAIN EQUITY RATIO ( ) NONE
( ) BENEVOLENT ( ) EQUITY SENSITIVE ( ) ENTITLED ( ) NONE

121. The only things in life that are worth having are the things for which you have worked hard.

( ) LEVEL OF INPUTS ( ) RELATIVE LEVEL OF INPUTS TO OUTCOMES
( ) LEVEL OF OUTCOMES ( ) CERTAIN EQUITY RATIO ( ) NONE
( ) BENEVOLENT ( ) EQUITY SENSITIVE ( ) ENTITLED ( ) NONE

122. You work significantly harder than your co-worker, who is similar to you in both background and years of experience, but you are given significantly less rewards than your co-worker. How would you respond to this situation, in terms of productivity?

( ) LEVEL OF INPUTS ( ) RELATIVE LEVEL OF INPUTS TO OUTCOMES
( ) LEVEL OF OUTCOMES ( ) CERTAIN EQUITY RATIO ( ) NONE
( ) BENEVOLENT ( ) EQUITY SENSITIVE ( ) ENTITLED ( ) NONE
123. How many of your friends want more rewards for their work than they deserve?

( ) LEVEL OF INPUTS ( ) RELATIVE LEVEL OF INPUTS TO OUTCOMES
( ) LEVEL OF OUTCOMES ( ) CERTAIN EQUITY RATIO ( ) NONE
( ) BENEVOLENT ( ) EQUITY SENSITIVE ( ) ENTITLED ( ) NONE

124. How many of your friends always try to get the best deal possible even if this means someone else will have to suffer?

( ) LEVEL OF INPUTS ( ) RELATIVE LEVEL OF INPUTS TO OUTCOMES
( ) LEVEL OF OUTCOMES ( ) CERTAIN EQUITY RATIO ( ) NONE
( ) BENEVOLENT ( ) EQUITY SENSITIVE ( ) ENTITLED ( ) NONE

125. How many of your friends, if their co-workers got a better deal from the organization than they did, would still be satisfied and would continue to produce as much as they have in the past?

( ) LEVEL OF INPUTS ( ) RELATIVE LEVEL OF INPUTS TO OUTCOMES
( ) LEVEL OF OUTCOMES ( ) CERTAIN EQUITY RATIO ( ) NONE
( ) BENEVOLENT ( ) EQUITY SENSITIVE ( ) ENTITLED ( ) NONE

126. If I could get away with it, I would take it easy on the job.

( ) LEVEL OF INPUTS ( ) RELATIVE LEVEL OF INPUTS TO OUTCOMES
( ) LEVEL OF OUTCOMES ( ) CERTAIN EQUITY RATIO ( ) NONE
( ) BENEVOLENT ( ) EQUITY SENSITIVE ( ) ENTITLED ( ) NONE

127. A job that provides me with less than top dollar for my work is not a job worth keeping.

( ) LEVEL OF INPUTS ( ) RELATIVE LEVEL OF INPUTS TO OUTCOMES
( ) LEVEL OF OUTCOMES ( ) CERTAIN EQUITY RATIO ( ) NONE
( ) BENEVOLENT ( ) EQUITY SENSITIVE ( ) ENTITLED ( ) NONE

128. If you don't watch out for yourself, people will take advantage of you.

( ) LEVEL OF INPUTS ( ) RELATIVE LEVEL OF INPUTS TO OUTCOMES
( ) LEVEL OF OUTCOMES ( ) CERTAIN EQUITY RATIO ( ) NONE
( ) BENEVOLENT ( ) EQUITY SENSITIVE ( ) ENTITLED ( ) NONE
129. I am extremely concerned about what I receive from an organization for the work I perform.

( ) LEVEL OF INPUTS  ( ) RELATIVE LEVEL OF INPUTS TO OUTCOMES
( ) LEVEL OF OUTCOMES  ( ) CERTAIN EQUITY RATIO  ( ) NONE

( ) BENEVOLENT  ( ) EQUITY SENSITIVE  ( ) ENTITLED  ( ) NONE

130. How many employees in a typical organization prefer that the work they perform always exceeds the wages they are paid for it?

( ) LEVEL OF INPUTS  ( ) RELATIVE LEVEL OF INPUTS TO OUTCOMES
( ) LEVEL OF OUTCOMES  ( ) CERTAIN EQUITY RATIO  ( ) NONE

( ) BENEVOLENT  ( ) EQUITY SENSITIVE  ( ) ENTITLED  ( ) NONE

131. Employees who feel no responsibility to do more even though they are paid more than similarly qualified co-workers should be let go.

( ) LEVEL OF INPUTS  ( ) RELATIVE LEVEL OF INPUTS TO OUTCOMES
( ) LEVEL OF OUTCOMES  ( ) CERTAIN EQUITY RATIO  ( ) NONE

( ) BENEVOLENT  ( ) EQUITY SENSITIVE  ( ) ENTITLED  ( ) NONE

132. How many employees in a typical organization arrive a little late for work on any given day?

( ) LEVEL OF INPUTS  ( ) RELATIVE LEVEL OF INPUTS TO OUTCOMES
( ) LEVEL OF OUTCOMES  ( ) CERTAIN EQUITY RATIO  ( ) NONE

( ) BENEVOLENT  ( ) EQUITY SENSITIVE  ( ) ENTITLED  ( ) NONE

133. How many of your friends believe it's equally important to watch out for your own good and to help others?

( ) LEVEL OF INPUTS  ( ) RELATIVE LEVEL OF INPUTS TO OUTCOMES
( ) LEVEL OF OUTCOMES  ( ) CERTAIN EQUITY RATIO  ( ) NONE

( ) BENEVOLENT  ( ) EQUITY SENSITIVE  ( ) ENTITLED  ( ) NONE

134. Employees who are more concerned about what they can get from an organization rather than what they can contribute to it are the wise ones.

( ) LEVEL OF INPUTS  ( ) RELATIVE LEVEL OF INPUTS TO OUTCOMES
( ) LEVEL OF OUTCOMES  ( ) CERTAIN EQUITY RATIO  ( ) NONE

( ) BENEVOLENT  ( ) EQUITY SENSITIVE  ( ) ENTITLED  ( ) NONE
135. How many of your friends would be completely satisfied if they were paid the same wage as similarly qualified co-workers for the same amount of work?

( ) LEVEL OF INPUTS ( ) RELATIVE LEVEL OF INPUTS TO OUTCOMES
( ) LEVEL OF OUTCOMES ( ) CERTAIN EQUITY RATIO ( ) NONE
( ) BENEVOLENT ( ) EQUITY SENSITIVE ( ) ENTITLED ( ) NONE

136. How many of your friends believe that it is very important for them to get as much as they can from an organization for the work they perform?

( ) LEVEL OF INPUTS ( ) RELATIVE LEVEL OF INPUTS TO OUTCOMES
( ) LEVEL OF OUTCOMES ( ) CERTAIN EQUITY RATIO ( ) NONE
( ) BENEVOLENT ( ) EQUITY SENSITIVE ( ) ENTITLED ( ) NONE

137. How many employees in a typical organization are more inclined to help others than look out for themselves?

( ) LEVEL OF INPUTS ( ) RELATIVE LEVEL OF INPUTS TO OUTCOMES
( ) LEVEL OF OUTCOMES ( ) CERTAIN EQUITY RATIO ( ) NONE
( ) BENEVOLENT ( ) EQUITY SENSITIVE ( ) ENTITLED ( ) NONE

138. I have a responsibility to the organization for which I work to do the best job I can.

( ) LEVEL OF INPUTS ( ) RELATIVE LEVEL OF INPUTS TO OUTCOMES
( ) LEVEL OF OUTCOMES ( ) CERTAIN EQUITY RATIO ( ) NONE
( ) BENEVOLENT ( ) EQUITY SENSITIVE ( ) ENTITLED ( ) NONE

139. I am more inclined to look out for myself than to help others.

( ) LEVEL OF INPUTS ( ) RELATIVE LEVEL OF INPUTS TO OUTCOMES
( ) LEVEL OF OUTCOMES ( ) CERTAIN EQUITY RATIO ( ) NONE
( ) BENEVOLENT ( ) EQUITY SENSITIVE ( ) ENTITLED ( ) NONE

140. I would like to work for an organization that allows employees to do interesting and challenging work, although it cannot pay as much as other organizations offering less interesting and less challenging work.

( ) LEVEL OF INPUTS ( ) RELATIVE LEVEL OF INPUTS TO OUTCOMES
( ) LEVEL OF OUTCOMES ( ) CERTAIN EQUITY RATIO ( ) NONE
( ) BENEVOLENT ( ) EQUITY SENSITIVE ( ) ENTITLED ( ) NONE
141. If I were a manager, I would be reluctant to hire a person whose goal is to get the most they can from an organization for the work they perform.

( ) LEVEL OF INPUTS  ( ) RELATIVE LEVEL OF INPUTS TO OUTCOMES
( ) LEVEL OF OUTCOMES  ( ) CERTAIN EQUITY RATIO  ( ) NONE

( ) BENEVOLENT  ( ) EQUITY SENSITIVE  ( ) ENTITLED  ( ) NONE

142. How many of your friends try to do less work than they are paid to do in an organization?

( ) LEVEL OF INPUTS  ( ) RELATIVE LEVEL OF INPUTS TO OUTCOMES
( ) LEVEL OF OUTCOMES  ( ) CERTAIN EQUITY RATIO  ( ) NONE

( ) BENEVOLENT  ( ) EQUITY SENSITIVE  ( ) ENTITLED  ( ) NONE

143. Employees who want top dollar for their work are usually worth it.

( ) LEVEL OF INPUTS  ( ) RELATIVE LEVEL OF INPUTS TO OUTCOMES
( ) LEVEL OF OUTCOMES  ( ) CERTAIN EQUITY RATIO  ( ) NONE

( ) BENEVOLENT  ( ) EQUITY SENSITIVE  ( ) ENTITLED  ( ) NONE

144. You are working significantly less than your co-worker, who is similar to you in both background and years of experience, but you receive significantly more rewards than does your co-worker. How would respond to this situation, in terms of productivity?

( ) LEVEL OF INPUTS  ( ) RELATIVE LEVEL OF INPUTS TO OUTCOMES
( ) LEVEL OF OUTCOMES  ( ) CERTAIN EQUITY RATIO  ( ) NONE

( ) BENEVOLENT  ( ) EQUITY SENSITIVE  ( ) ENTITLED  ( ) NONE

145. How many of your friends, if they were being paid the same wage as similarly qualified co-workers for the same amount of work, would take on extra duties and responsibilities?

( ) LEVEL OF INPUTS  ( ) RELATIVE LEVEL OF INPUTS TO OUTCOMES
( ) LEVEL OF OUTCOMES  ( ) CERTAIN EQUITY RATIO  ( ) NONE

( ) BENEVOLENT  ( ) EQUITY SENSITIVE  ( ) ENTITLED  ( ) NONE

146. How many employees in a typical organization avoid taking on extra duties and responsibilities?

( ) LEVEL OF INPUTS  ( ) RELATIVE LEVEL OF INPUTS TO OUTCOMES
( ) LEVEL OF OUTCOMES  ( ) CERTAIN EQUITY RATIO  ( ) NONE

( ) BENEVOLENT  ( ) EQUITY SENSITIVE  ( ) ENTITLED  ( ) NONE
147. If I were a manager, most employees who want top dollar for their work don't deserve it.

( ) LEVEL OF INPUTS ( ) RELATIVE LEVEL OF INPUTS TO OUTCOMES
( ) LEVEL OF OUTCOMES ( ) CERTAIN EQUITY RATIO ( ) NONE

( ) BENEVOLENT ( ) EQUITY SENSITIVE ( ) ENTITLED ( ) NONE

148. How many employees in a typical organization are "takers" rather than "givers"?

( ) LEVEL OF INPUTS ( ) RELATIVE LEVEL OF INPUTS TO OUTCOMES
( ) LEVEL OF OUTCOMES ( ) CERTAIN EQUITY RATIO ( ) NONE

( ) BENEVOLENT ( ) EQUITY SENSITIVE ( ) ENTITLED ( ) NONE

149. How many of your friends are equally concerned about what they can get from an organization and what they can give to an organization?

( ) LEVEL OF INPUTS ( ) RELATIVE LEVEL OF INPUTS TO OUTCOMES
( ) LEVEL OF OUTCOMES ( ) CERTAIN EQUITY RATIO ( ) NONE

( ) BENEVOLENT ( ) EQUITY SENSITIVE ( ) ENTITLED ( ) NONE

150. You are working significantly less than your co-worker, who is similar to you in both background and years of experience, and you receive significantly less rewards than your co-worker. How would you respond to this situation, in terms of productivity?

( ) LEVEL OF INPUTS ( ) RELATIVE LEVEL OF INPUTS TO OUTCOMES
( ) LEVEL OF OUTCOMES ( ) CERTAIN EQUITY RATIO ( ) NONE

( ) BENEVOLENT ( ) EQUITY SENSITIVE ( ) ENTITLED ( ) NONE

151. How many of your friends, if their co-workers got a better deal from the organization than they did, would be bothered by it and would decrease their productivity on the job?

( ) LEVEL OF INPUTS ( ) RELATIVE LEVEL OF INPUTS TO OUTCOMES
( ) LEVEL OF OUTCOMES ( ) CERTAIN EQUITY RATIO ( ) NONE

( ) BENEVOLENT ( ) EQUITY SENSITIVE ( ) ENTITLED ( ) NONE

152. How many employees in a typical organization are equally concerned about themselves and their work organization?

( ) LEVEL OF INPUTS ( ) RELATIVE LEVEL OF INPUTS TO OUTCOMES
( ) LEVEL OF OUTCOMES ( ) CERTAIN EQUITY RATIO ( ) NONE

( ) BENEVOLENT ( ) EQUITY SENSITIVE ( ) ENTITLED ( ) NONE
153. Only fools worry about doing their best at their jobs.

( ) LEVEL OF INPUTS ( ) RELATIVE LEVEL OF INPUTS TO OUTCOMES
( ) LEVEL OF OUTCOMES ( ) CERTAIN EQUITY RATIO ( ) NONE
( ) BENEVOLENT ( ) EQUITY SENSITIVE ( ) ENTITLED ( ) NONE

154. Hard work is its own reward.

( ) LEVEL OF INPUTS ( ) RELATIVE LEVEL OF INPUTS TO OUTCOMES
( ) LEVEL OF OUTCOMES ( ) CERTAIN EQUITY RATIO ( ) NONE
( ) BENEVOLENT ( ) EQUITY SENSITIVE ( ) ENTITLED ( ) NONE

155. Employees who try to do as little as possible without getting fired at work should, in fact, be fired.

( ) LEVEL OF INPUTS ( ) RELATIVE LEVEL OF INPUTS TO OUTCOMES
( ) LEVEL OF OUTCOMES ( ) CERTAIN EQUITY RATIO ( ) NONE
( ) BENEVOLENT ( ) EQUITY SENSITIVE ( ) ENTITLED ( ) NONE

156. How many employees in a typical organization believe that they should be paid more than similarly qualified co-workers but have to work less?

( ) LEVEL OF INPUTS ( ) RELATIVE LEVEL OF INPUTS TO OUTCOMES
( ) LEVEL OF OUTCOMES ( ) CERTAIN EQUITY RATIO ( ) NONE
( ) BENEVOLENT ( ) EQUITY SENSITIVE ( ) ENTITLED ( ) NONE

157. I believe that if I do a good job, I should be rewarded well, but if I do a poor job, I should be rewarded poorly.

( ) LEVEL OF INPUTS ( ) RELATIVE LEVEL OF INPUTS TO OUTCOMES
( ) LEVEL OF OUTCOMES ( ) CERTAIN EQUITY RATIO ( ) NONE
( ) BENEVOLENT ( ) EQUITY SENSITIVE ( ) ENTITLED ( ) NONE

158. How many of your friends would be dissatisfied even if they were paid the same wage as similarly qualified co-workers for the same amount of work?

( ) LEVEL OF INPUTS ( ) RELATIVE LEVEL OF INPUTS TO OUTCOMES
( ) LEVEL OF OUTCOMES ( ) CERTAIN EQUITY RATIO ( ) NONE
( ) BENEVOLENT ( ) EQUITY SENSITIVE ( ) ENTITLED ( ) NONE
159. I admire people who get ahead in life by working hard.

( ) LEVEL OF INPUTS ( ) RELATIVE LEVEL OF INPUTS TO OUTCOMES
( ) LEVEL OF OUTCOMES ( ) CERTAIN EQUITY RATIO ( ) NONE

( ) BENEVOLENT ( ) EQUITY SENSITIVE ( ) ENTITLED ( ) NONE

160. A person who believes that if people would just work harder everybody would be better off is misguided.

( ) LEVEL OF INPUTS ( ) RELATIVE LEVEL OF INPUTS TO OUTCOMES
( ) LEVEL OF OUTCOMES ( ) CERTAIN EQUITY RATIO ( ) NONE

( ) BENEVOLENT ( ) EQUITY SENSITIVE ( ) ENTITLED ( ) NONE

161. How many of your friends, if they got a better deal from the organization than their co-workers did, would not feel guilty at all and would continue to do as much work as they have in the past?

( ) LEVEL OF INPUTS ( ) RELATIVE LEVEL OF INPUTS TO OUTCOMES
( ) LEVEL OF OUTCOMES ( ) CERTAIN EQUITY RATIO ( ) NONE

( ) BENEVOLENT ( ) EQUITY SENSITIVE ( ) ENTITLED ( ) NONE

162. You and your co-worker, who is similar to you in both work background and experience, are loafing equally hard but you receive significantly more rewards than does your co-worker. How would you respond to this situation, in terms of productivity?

( ) LEVEL OF INPUTS ( ) RELATIVE LEVEL OF INPUTS TO OUTCOMES
( ) LEVEL OF OUTCOMES ( ) CERTAIN EQUITY RATIO ( ) NONE

( ) BENEVOLENT ( ) EQUITY SENSITIVE ( ) ENTITLED ( ) NONE

163. I would not like working for an organization where it is emphasized that "work comes first", therefore afterwork pleasures should take secondary importance.

( ) LEVEL OF INPUTS ( ) RELATIVE LEVEL OF INPUTS TO OUTCOMES
( ) LEVEL OF OUTCOMES ( ) CERTAIN EQUITY RATIO ( ) NONE

( ) BENEVOLENT ( ) EQUITY SENSITIVE ( ) ENTITLED ( ) NONE

164. Unselfish people in today's world are pathetic because so many people take advantage of them.

( ) LEVEL OF INPUTS ( ) RELATIVE LEVEL OF INPUTS TO OUTCOMES
( ) LEVEL OF OUTCOMES ( ) CERTAIN EQUITY RATIO ( ) NONE

( ) BENEVOLENT ( ) EQUITY SENSITIVE ( ) ENTITLED ( ) NONE
165. Employees who are completely satisfied when they receive the same rewards as similarly qualified co-workers for the same amount of work are stupid.

( ) LEVEL OF INPUTS ( ) RELATIVE LEVEL OF INPUTS TO OUTCOMES
( ) LEVEL OF OUTCOMES ( ) CERTAIN EQUITY RATIO ( ) NONE

( ) BENEVOLENT ( ) EQUITY SENSITIVE ( ) ENTITLED ( ) NONE

166. How many of your friends often work harder than other people doing the same type of work?

( ) LEVEL OF INPUTS ( ) RELATIVE LEVEL OF INPUTS TO OUTCOMES
( ) LEVEL OF OUTCOMES ( ) CERTAIN EQUITY RATIO ( ) NONE

( ) BENEVOLENT ( ) EQUITY SENSITIVE ( ) ENTITLED ( ) NONE

167. How many employees in a typical organization do less than they are paid to do?

( ) LEVEL OF INPUTS ( ) RELATIVE LEVEL OF INPUTS TO OUTCOMES
( ) LEVEL OF OUTCOMES ( ) CERTAIN EQUITY RATIO ( ) NONE

( ) BENEVOLENT ( ) EQUITY SENSITIVE ( ) ENTITLED ( ) NONE

168. How many employees in a typical organization live by the motto "a fair day's work (no more, no less) for a fair day's wage"?

( ) LEVEL OF INPUTS ( ) RELATIVE LEVEL OF INPUTS TO OUTCOMES
( ) LEVEL OF OUTCOMES ( ) CERTAIN EQUITY RATIO ( ) NONE

( ) BENEVOLENT ( ) EQUITY SENSITIVE ( ) ENTITLED ( ) NONE

169. If I were offered what I considered to be a "fair deal" by an employer for the work I performed, I would still try to negotiate with the employer to get a better deal.

( ) LEVEL OF INPUTS ( ) RELATIVE LEVEL OF INPUTS TO OUTCOMES
( ) LEVEL OF OUTCOMES ( ) CERTAIN EQUITY RATIO ( ) NONE

( ) BENEVOLENT ( ) EQUITY SENSITIVE ( ) ENTITLED ( ) NONE

170. How many employees in a typical organization, if they were being paid the same wage as similarly qualified co-workers for the same amount of work, would still take unauthorized work breaks?

( ) LEVEL OF INPUTS ( ) RELATIVE LEVEL OF INPUTS TO OUTCOMES
( ) LEVEL OF OUTCOMES ( ) CERTAIN EQUITY RATIO ( ) NONE

( ) BENEVOLENT ( ) EQUITY SENSITIVE ( ) ENTITLED ( ) NONE
171. At my job, I would work hard even if I was not paid to do so.

( ) LEVEL OF INPUTS ( ) RELATIVE LEVEL OF INPUTS TO OUTCOMES
( ) LEVEL OF OUTCOMES ( ) CERTAIN EQUITY RATIO ( ) NONE

( ) BENEVOLENT ( ) EQUITY SENSITIVE ( ) ENTITLED ( ) NONE

172. Employees who are concerned that their rewards match their work efforts make lousy co-workers.

( ) LEVEL OF INPUTS ( ) RELATIVE LEVEL OF INPUTS TO OUTCOMES
( ) LEVEL OF OUTCOMES ( ) CERTAIN EQUITY RATIO ( ) NONE

( ) BENEVOLENT ( ) EQUITY SENSITIVE ( ) ENTITLED ( ) NONE

173. How many employees in a typical organization, if they got a better deal from the organization than their similarly qualified co-workers did, would not feel guilty at all and would not try to increase their productivity on the job?

( ) LEVEL OF INPUTS ( ) RELATIVE LEVEL OF INPUTS TO OUTCOMES
( ) LEVEL OF OUTCOMES ( ) CERTAIN EQUITY RATIO ( ) NONE

( ) BENEVOLENT ( ) EQUITY SENSITIVE ( ) ENTITLED ( ) NONE

174. I admire people who are fair minded and only accept those rewards that they have worked for or rightfully deserve.

( ) LEVEL OF INPUTS ( ) RELATIVE LEVEL OF INPUTS TO OUTCOMES
( ) LEVEL OF OUTCOMES ( ) CERTAIN EQUITY RATIO ( ) NONE

( ) BENEVOLENT ( ) EQUITY SENSITIVE ( ) ENTITLED ( ) NONE

175. I perform my job satisfactorily and forget about helping others with their jobs.

( ) LEVEL OF INPUTS ( ) RELATIVE LEVEL OF INPUTS TO OUTCOMES
( ) LEVEL OF OUTCOMES ( ) CERTAIN EQUITY RATIO ( ) NONE

( ) BENEVOLENT ( ) EQUITY SENSITIVE ( ) ENTITLED ( ) NONE

176. How many employees in a typical organization shy away from accepting things that they have worked for or deserve because they do not like even the appearance of being indebted to others?

( ) LEVEL OF INPUTS ( ) RELATIVE LEVEL OF INPUTS TO OUTCOMES
( ) LEVEL OF OUTCOMES ( ) CERTAIN EQUITY RATIO ( ) NONE

( ) BENEVOLENT ( ) EQUITY SENSITIVE ( ) ENTITLED ( ) NONE
177. My services as an employee always go to the highest bidder in terms of pay and benefits.

( ) LEVEL OF INPUTS ( ) RELATIVE LEVEL OF INPUTS TO OUTCOMES
( ) LEVEL OF OUTCOMES ( ) CERTAIN EQUITY RATIO ( ) NONE

( ) BENEVOLENT ( ) EQUITY SENSITIVE ( ) ENTITLED ( ) NONE

178. How many employees in a typical organization, if they were paid a lower wage than similarly qualified co-workers who performed the same amount of work, would be most satisfied?

( ) LEVEL OF INPUTS ( ) RELATIVE LEVEL OF INPUTS TO OUTCOMES
( ) LEVEL OF OUTCOMES ( ) CERTAIN EQUITY RATIO ( ) NONE

( ) BENEVOLENT ( ) EQUITY SENSITIVE ( ) ENTITLED ( ) NONE

179. How many employees in a typical organization, if they were being paid less than similarly qualified co-workers for the same amount of work, would still be satisfied?

( ) LEVEL OF INPUTS ( ) RELATIVE LEVEL OF INPUTS TO OUTCOMES
( ) LEVEL OF OUTCOMES ( ) CERTAIN EQUITY RATIO ( ) NONE

( ) BENEVOLENT ( ) EQUITY SENSITIVE ( ) ENTITLED ( ) NONE

180. How many employees in a typical organization would agree that a good paycheck means more to them than doing a good job?

( ) LEVEL OF INPUTS ( ) RELATIVE LEVEL OF INPUTS TO OUTCOMES
( ) LEVEL OF OUTCOMES ( ) CERTAIN EQUITY RATIO ( ) NONE

( ) BENEVOLENT ( ) EQUITY SENSITIVE ( ) ENTITLED ( ) NONE

181. A job which requires me to busy during the day is better than a job which allows a lot of loafing.

( ) LEVEL OF INPUTS ( ) RELATIVE LEVEL OF INPUTS TO OUTCOMES
( ) LEVEL OF OUTCOMES ( ) CERTAIN EQUITY RATIO ( ) NONE

( ) BENEVOLENT ( ) EQUITY SENSITIVE ( ) ENTITLED ( ) NONE

182. Employees who are concerned about getting the most they can from an employer for the work they perform are not team players.

( ) LEVEL OF INPUTS ( ) RELATIVE LEVEL OF INPUTS TO OUTCOMES
( ) LEVEL OF OUTCOMES ( ) CERTAIN EQUITY RATIO ( ) NONE

( ) BENEVOLENT ( ) EQUITY SENSITIVE ( ) ENTITLED ( ) NONE
183. How many employees in a typical organization would be dissatisfied if they did not receive top dollar for the work they perform?

( ) LEVEL OF INPUTS ( ) RELATIVE LEVEL OF INPUTS TO OUTCOMES
( ) LEVEL OF OUTCOMES ( ) CERTAIN EQUITY RATIO ( ) NONE
( ) BENEVOLENT ( ) EQUITY SENSITIVE ( ) ENTITLED ( ) NONE

184. How many of your friends if they had to work real hard at a job full time would probably think about quitting?

( ) LEVEL OF INPUTS ( ) RELATIVE LEVEL OF INPUTS TO OUTCOMES
( ) LEVEL OF OUTCOMES ( ) CERTAIN EQUITY RATIO ( ) NONE
( ) BENEVOLENT ( ) EQUITY SENSITIVE ( ) ENTITLED ( ) NONE

185. How many employees in a typical organization take on extra work even though it's not required of them?

( ) LEVEL OF INPUTS ( ) RELATIVE LEVEL OF INPUTS TO OUTCOMES
( ) LEVEL OF OUTCOMES ( ) CERTAIN EQUITY RATIO ( ) NONE
( ) BENEVOLENT ( ) EQUITY SENSITIVE ( ) ENTITLED ( ) NONE

186. An ideal job for me is one with few duties and responsibilities.

( ) LEVEL OF INPUTS ( ) RELATIVE LEVEL OF INPUTS TO OUTCOMES
( ) LEVEL OF OUTCOMES ( ) CERTAIN EQUITY RATIO ( ) NONE
( ) BENEVOLENT ( ) EQUITY SENSITIVE ( ) ENTITLED ( ) NONE

187. If I were a manager, I would be reluctant to hire a person who is not overly interested in making top dollar for their work.

( ) LEVEL OF INPUTS ( ) RELATIVE LEVEL OF INPUTS TO OUTCOMES
( ) LEVEL OF OUTCOMES ( ) CERTAIN EQUITY RATIO ( ) NONE
( ) BENEVOLENT ( ) EQUITY SENSITIVE ( ) ENTITLED ( ) NONE

188. The most challenging tasks on the job usually turn out to be the most rewarding.

( ) LEVEL OF INPUTS ( ) RELATIVE LEVEL OF INPUTS TO OUTCOMES
( ) LEVEL OF OUTCOMES ( ) CERTAIN EQUITY RATIO ( ) NONE
( ) BENEVOLENT ( ) EQUITY SENSITIVE ( ) ENTITLED ( ) NONE
189. How many employees in a typical organization put in a full day of hard work on any given day?

( ) LEVEL OF INPUTS ( ) RELATIVE LEVEL OF INPUTS TO OUTCOMES
( ) LEVEL OF OUTCOMES ( ) CERTAIN EQUITY RATIO ( ) NONE

( ) BENEVOLENT ( ) EQUITY SENSITIVE ( ) ENTITLED ( ) NONE

190. Employees who feel uneasy when there is little work for them to do are the ones who will suffer burn out and will have to quit their jobs.

( ) LEVEL OF INPUTS ( ) RELATIVE LEVEL OF INPUTS TO OUTCOMES
( ) LEVEL OF OUTCOMES ( ) CERTAIN EQUITY RATIO ( ) NONE

( ) BENEVOLENT ( ) EQUITY SENSITIVE ( ) ENTITLED ( ) NONE

191. How many employees in a typical organization are very concerned about getting the most they can from their employer for the work they perform?

( ) LEVEL OF INPUTS ( ) RELATIVE LEVEL OF INPUTS TO OUTCOMES
( ) LEVEL OF OUTCOMES ( ) CERTAIN EQUITY RATIO ( ) NONE

( ) BENEVOLENT ( ) EQUITY SENSITIVE ( ) ENTITLED ( ) NONE

192. You are working significantly less than your co-worker, who is similar to you in both background and years of experience, but you receive significantly more rewards than does your co-worker. How satisfied would you be given this situation?

( ) LEVEL OF INPUTS ( ) RELATIVE LEVEL OF INPUTS TO OUTCOMES
( ) LEVEL OF OUTCOMES ( ) CERTAIN EQUITY RATIO ( ) NONE

( ) BENEVOLENT ( ) EQUITY SENSITIVE ( ) ENTITLED ( ) NONE

193. You and your co-worker, who is similar to you in both background and years of experience, are both working hard but you receive significantly more rewards than does your co-worker. How would you respond to this situation, in terms of productivity?

( ) LEVEL OF INPUTS ( ) RELATIVE LEVEL OF INPUTS TO OUTCOMES
( ) LEVEL OF OUTCOMES ( ) CERTAIN EQUITY RATIO ( ) NONE

( ) BENEVOLENT ( ) EQUITY SENSITIVE ( ) ENTITLED ( ) NONE
194. Employees who look out for themselves first and foremost are just a product of our society and should not be judged harshly.

( ) LEVEL OF INPUTS ( ) RELATIVE LEVEL OF INPUTS TO OUTCOMES
( ) LEVEL OF OUTCOMES ( ) CERTAIN EQUITY RATIO ( ) NONE
( ) BENEVOLENT ( ) EQUITY SENSITIVE ( ) ENTITLED ( ) NONE

195. I like to do as much as I can at work even if I don't get paid for it.

( ) LEVEL OF INPUTS ( ) RELATIVE LEVEL OF INPUTS TO OUTCOMES
( ) LEVEL OF OUTCOMES ( ) CERTAIN EQUITY RATIO ( ) NONE
( ) BENEVOLENT ( ) EQUITY SENSITIVE ( ) ENTITLED ( ) NONE

196. How many employees in a typical organization take unauthorized work breaks?

( ) LEVEL OF INPUTS ( ) RELATIVE LEVEL OF INPUTS TO OUTCOMES
( ) LEVEL OF OUTCOMES ( ) CERTAIN EQUITY RATIO ( ) NONE
( ) BENEVOLENT ( ) EQUITY SENSITIVE ( ) ENTITLED ( ) NONE

197. When I am rewarded well by an organization for the work I do, I am very happy regardless of whether or not I deserved it.

( ) LEVEL OF INPUTS ( ) RELATIVE LEVEL OF INPUTS TO OUTCOMES
( ) LEVEL OF OUTCOMES ( ) CERTAIN EQUITY RATIO ( ) NONE
( ) BENEVOLENT ( ) EQUITY SENSITIVE ( ) ENTITLED ( ) NONE

198. When you come right down to it, it is human nature to always do things at work with an eye to one's own advantage.

( ) LEVEL OF INPUTS ( ) RELATIVE LEVEL OF INPUTS TO OUTCOMES
( ) LEVEL OF OUTCOMES ( ) CERTAIN EQUITY RATIO ( ) NONE
( ) BENEVOLENT ( ) EQUITY SENSITIVE ( ) ENTITLED ( ) NONE

199. How many employees in a typical organization are most comfortable when what they get from their employer matches what they give to their employer?

( ) LEVEL OF INPUTS ( ) RELATIVE LEVEL OF INPUTS TO OUTCOMES
( ) LEVEL OF OUTCOMES ( ) CERTAIN EQUITY RATIO ( ) NONE
( ) BENEVOLENT ( ) EQUITY SENSITIVE ( ) ENTITLED ( ) NONE
200. How many employees in a typical organization prefer that the amount of work they perform matches the amount of money they are paid for it?

( ) LEVEL OF INPUTS ( ) RELATIVE LEVEL OF INPUTS TO OUTCOMES
( ) LEVEL OF OUTCOMES ( ) CERTAIN EQUITY RATIO ( ) NONE
( ) BENEVOLENT ( ) EQUITY SENSITIVE ( ) ENTITLED ( ) NONE

201. If I were a manager, I would probably severely discipline an employee who takes unauthorized work breaks.

( ) LEVEL OF INPUTS ( ) RELATIVE LEVEL OF INPUTS TO OUTCOMES
( ) LEVEL OF OUTCOMES ( ) CERTAIN EQUITY RATIO ( ) NONE
( ) BENEVOLENT ( ) EQUITY SENSITIVE ( ) ENTITLED ( ) NONE

202. At work, I feel uneasy when there is little for me to do.

( ) LEVEL OF INPUTS ( ) RELATIVE LEVEL OF INPUTS TO OUTCOMES
( ) LEVEL OF OUTCOMES ( ) CERTAIN EQUITY RATIO ( ) NONE
( ) BENEVOLENT ( ) EQUITY SENSITIVE ( ) ENTITLED ( ) NONE

203. How many of your friends live by the motto "a fair day's work (no more, no less) for a fair day's wage"?

( ) LEVEL OF INPUTS ( ) RELATIVE LEVEL OF INPUTS TO OUTCOMES
( ) LEVEL OF OUTCOMES ( ) CERTAIN EQUITY RATIO ( ) NONE
( ) BENEVOLENT ( ) EQUITY SENSITIVE ( ) ENTITLED ( ) NONE

204. I at times do less than my fair share at work so I feel I am not being taken advantage of.

( ) LEVEL OF INPUTS ( ) RELATIVE LEVEL OF INPUTS TO OUTCOMES
( ) LEVEL OF OUTCOMES ( ) CERTAIN EQUITY RATIO ( ) NONE
( ) BENEVOLENT ( ) EQUITY SENSITIVE ( ) ENTITLED ( ) NONE

205. How many of your friends only want those rewards that they worked for (no more, no less)?

( ) LEVEL OF INPUTS ( ) RELATIVE LEVEL OF INPUTS TO OUTCOMES
( ) LEVEL OF OUTCOMES ( ) CERTAIN EQUITY RATIO ( ) NONE
( ) BENEVOLENT ( ) EQUITY SENSITIVE ( ) ENTITLED ( ) NONE
206. How many of your friends would agree that doing a good job means more to them than receiving a good paycheck?

( ) LEVEL OF INPUTS ( ) RELATIVE LEVEL OF INPUTS TO OUTCOMES
( ) LEVEL OF OUTCOMES ( ) CERTAIN EQUITY RATIO ( ) NONE

( ) BENEVOLENT ( ) EQUITY SENSITIVE ( ) ENTITLED ( ) NONE

207. If I could get away with it, I would try to work a little slower than the boss expects.

( ) LEVEL OF INPUTS ( ) RELATIVE LEVEL OF INPUTS TO OUTCOMES
( ) LEVEL OF OUTCOMES ( ) CERTAIN EQUITY RATIO ( ) NONE

( ) BENEVOLENT ( ) EQUITY SENSITIVE ( ) ENTITLED ( ) NONE

208. How many employees in a typical organization are paid far less than they are actually worth?

( ) LEVEL OF INPUTS ( ) RELATIVE LEVEL OF INPUTS TO OUTCOMES
( ) LEVEL OF OUTCOMES ( ) CERTAIN EQUITY RATIO ( ) NONE

( ) BENEVOLENT ( ) EQUITY SENSITIVE ( ) ENTITLED ( ) NONE

209. How many of your friends, if they were being the same wage as similarly qualified co-workers for the same amount of work, would take unauthorized work breaks?

( ) LEVEL OF INPUTS ( ) RELATIVE LEVEL OF INPUTS TO OUTCOMES
( ) LEVEL OF OUTCOMES ( ) CERTAIN EQUITY RATIO ( ) NONE

( ) BENEVOLENT ( ) EQUITY SENSITIVE ( ) ENTITLED ( ) NONE

210. I would choose the job that pays the most regardless.

( ) LEVEL OF INPUTS ( ) RELATIVE LEVEL OF INPUTS TO OUTCOMES
( ) LEVEL OF OUTCOMES ( ) CERTAIN EQUITY RATIO ( ) NONE

( ) BENEVOLENT ( ) EQUITY SENSITIVE ( ) ENTITLED ( ) NONE

211. You and your co-worker, who is similar to you in both background and years of experience, are both loafing at work and both of you are given the same low level of rewards. How satisfied would you be given this situation?

( ) LEVEL OF INPUTS ( ) RELATIVE LEVEL OF INPUTS TO OUTCOMES
( ) LEVEL OF OUTCOMES ( ) CERTAIN EQUITY RATIO ( ) NONE

( ) BENEVOLENT ( ) EQUITY SENSITIVE ( ) ENTITLED ( ) NONE
212. I occasionally show up for work a little late.

( ) LEVEL OF INPUTS  ( ) RELATIVE LEVEL OF INPUTS TO OUTCOMES
( ) LEVEL OF OUTCOMES ( ) CERTAIN EQUITY RATIO ( ) NONE

( ) BENEVOLENT ( ) EQUITY SENSITIVE ( ) ENTITLED ( ) NONE

213. How many employees in a typical organization want more rewards than they work for or deserve?

( ) LEVEL OF INPUTS  ( ) RELATIVE LEVEL OF INPUTS TO OUTCOMES
( ) LEVEL OF OUTCOMES ( ) CERTAIN EQUITY RATIO ( ) NONE

( ) BENEVOLENT ( ) EQUITY SENSITIVE ( ) ENTITLED ( ) NONE

214. The best job I can have is one which permits me to do almost nothing during the work day.

( ) LEVEL OF INPUTS  ( ) RELATIVE LEVEL OF INPUTS TO OUTCOMES
( ) LEVEL OF OUTCOMES ( ) CERTAIN EQUITY RATIO ( ) NONE

( ) BENEVOLENT ( ) EQUITY SENSITIVE ( ) ENTITLED ( ) NONE

215. I at times do more than others at work so I know for sure that I have pulled my own weight.

( ) LEVEL OF INPUTS  ( ) RELATIVE LEVEL OF INPUTS TO OUTCOMES
( ) LEVEL OF OUTCOMES ( ) CERTAIN EQUITY RATIO ( ) NONE

( ) BENEVOLENT ( ) EQUITY SENSITIVE ( ) ENTITLED ( ) NONE

216. It is better to give than to receive.

( ) LEVEL OF INPUTS  ( ) RELATIVE LEVEL OF INPUTS TO OUTCOMES
( ) LEVEL OF OUTCOMES ( ) CERTAIN EQUITY RATIO ( ) NONE

( ) BENEVOLENT ( ) EQUITY SENSITIVE ( ) ENTITLED ( ) NONE

217. How many of your friends would feel like they are not doing enough at work even if they are paid less than similarly qualified co-workers?

( ) LEVEL OF INPUTS  ( ) RELATIVE LEVEL OF INPUTS TO OUTCOMES
( ) LEVEL OF OUTCOMES ( ) CERTAIN EQUITY RATIO ( ) NONE

( ) BENEVOLENT ( ) EQUITY SENSITIVE ( ) ENTITLED ( ) NONE
218. Only a fool worries about doing their best on a job, since it is important only that you do your job well enough not to get fired.

( ) LEVEL OF INPUTS ( ) RELATIVE LEVEL OF INPUTS TO OUTCOMES
( ) LEVEL OF OUTCOMES ( ) CERTAIN EQUITY RATIO ( ) NONE
( ) BENEVOLENT ( ) EQUITY SENSITIVE ( ) ENTITLED ( ) NONE

219. How many employees in a typical organization feel like they should do more work even though they already put in the same amount of work as others doing the same job?

( ) LEVEL OF INPUTS ( ) RELATIVE LEVEL OF INPUTS TO OUTCOMES
( ) LEVEL OF OUTCOMES ( ) CERTAIN EQUITY RATIO ( ) NONE
( ) BENEVOLENT ( ) EQUITY SENSITIVE ( ) ENTITLED ( ) NONE

220. You work significantly harder than your co-worker, who is similar to you in both background and years of experience, but you are both given the same level of rewards. How satisfied would you be given this situation?

( ) LEVEL OF INPUTS ( ) RELATIVE LEVEL OF INPUTS TO OUTCOMES
( ) LEVEL OF OUTCOMES ( ) CERTAIN EQUITY RATIO ( ) NONE
( ) BENEVOLENT ( ) EQUITY SENSITIVE ( ) ENTITLED ( ) NONE

221. Employees who are "takers" rather than "givers" are often problem employees.

( ) LEVEL OF INPUTS ( ) RELATIVE LEVEL OF INPUTS TO OUTCOMES
( ) LEVEL OF OUTCOMES ( ) CERTAIN EQUITY RATIO ( ) NONE
( ) BENEVOLENT ( ) EQUITY SENSITIVE ( ) ENTITLED ( ) NONE

222. How many of your friends would agree with this statement, "my first loyalty is to myself rather than to the organization for which I work"?

( ) LEVEL OF INPUTS ( ) RELATIVE LEVEL OF INPUTS TO OUTCOMES
( ) LEVEL OF OUTCOMES ( ) CERTAIN EQUITY RATIO ( ) NONE
( ) BENEVOLENT ( ) EQUITY SENSITIVE ( ) ENTITLED ( ) NONE

223. Employees should place an equal emphasis on helping themselves and helping other co-workers.

( ) LEVEL OF INPUTS ( ) RELATIVE LEVEL OF INPUTS TO OUTCOMES
( ) LEVEL OF OUTCOMES ( ) CERTAIN EQUITY RATIO ( ) NONE
( ) BENEVOLENT ( ) EQUITY SENSITIVE ( ) ENTITLED ( ) NONE
224. One of the most satisfying things at work is to help another co-worker without expecting anything in return.

( ) LEVEL OF INPUTS ( ) RELATIVE LEVEL OF INPUTS TO OUTCOMES
( ) LEVEL OF OUTCOMES ( ) CERTAIN EQUITY RATIO ( ) NONE

( ) BENEVOLENT ( ) EQUITY SENSITIVE ( ) ENTITLED ( ) NONE

225. People who are overly concerned about getting the most out of an employer for the work they perform are just greedy.

( ) LEVEL OF INPUTS ( ) RELATIVE LEVEL OF INPUTS TO OUTCOMES
( ) LEVEL OF OUTCOMES ( ) CERTAIN EQUITY RATIO ( ) NONE

( ) BENEVOLENT ( ) EQUITY SENSITIVE ( ) ENTITLED ( ) NONE

226. You and your co-worker, who is similar to you in both background and years of experience, are both working hard and both of you receive the same low level of rewards. How would you respond to this situation, in terms of productivity?

( ) LEVEL OF INPUTS ( ) RELATIVE LEVEL OF INPUTS TO OUTCOMES
( ) LEVEL OF OUTCOMES ( ) CERTAIN EQUITY RATIO ( ) NONE

( ) BENEVOLENT ( ) EQUITY SENSITIVE ( ) ENTITLED ( ) NONE

227. How many employees in a typical organization stay overtime to finish a job, even if they are not paid for it?

( ) LEVEL OF INPUTS ( ) RELATIVE LEVEL OF INPUTS TO OUTCOMES
( ) LEVEL OF OUTCOMES ( ) CERTAIN EQUITY RATIO ( ) NONE

( ) BENEVOLENT ( ) EQUITY SENSITIVE ( ) ENTITLED ( ) NONE

228. How many employees in a typical organization believe that if they are paid the same wage as similarly qualified co-workers, they should not have to work as hard as these co-workers?

( ) LEVEL OF INPUTS ( ) RELATIVE LEVEL OF INPUTS TO OUTCOMES
( ) LEVEL OF OUTCOMES ( ) CERTAIN EQUITY RATIO ( ) NONE

( ) BENEVOLENT ( ) EQUITY SENSITIVE ( ) ENTITLED ( ) NONE

229. I would take sick leave from work and get paid for it even though I was not really sick.

( ) LEVEL OF INPUTS ( ) RELATIVE LEVEL OF INPUTS TO OUTCOMES
( ) LEVEL OF OUTCOMES ( ) CERTAIN EQUITY RATIO ( ) NONE

( ) BENEVOLENT ( ) EQUITY SENSITIVE ( ) ENTITLED ( ) NONE
230. I prefer to do as little as possible at work while getting as much as I can from my employer.

( ) LEVEL OF INPUTS ( ) RELATIVE LEVEL OF INPUTS TO OUTCOMES
( ) LEVEL OF OUTCOMES ( ) CERTAIN EQUITY RATIO ( ) NONE

( ) BENEVOLENT ( ) EQUITY SENSITIVE ( ) ENTITLED ( ) NONE

231. How many of your friends, even if they believed they were being paid less than similarly qualified co-workers for the same amount of work, would still try very hard to do their best on the job?

( ) LEVEL OF INPUTS ( ) RELATIVE LEVEL OF INPUTS TO OUTCOMES
( ) LEVEL OF OUTCOMES ( ) CERTAIN EQUITY RATIO ( ) NONE

( ) BENEVOLENT ( ) EQUITY SENSITIVE ( ) ENTITLED ( ) NONE

232. How many employees in a typical organization believe that they should strive to get as much from the organization as they can while giving as little as possible in return?

( ) LEVEL OF INPUTS ( ) RELATIVE LEVEL OF INPUTS TO OUTCOMES
( ) LEVEL OF OUTCOMES ( ) CERTAIN EQUITY RATIO ( ) NONE

( ) BENEVOLENT ( ) EQUITY SENSITIVE ( ) ENTITLED ( ) NONE

233. When I am given a new assignment at work, the first thing I do is think "how will the organization compensate me for this."

( ) LEVEL OF INPUTS ( ) RELATIVE LEVEL OF INPUTS TO OUTCOMES
( ) LEVEL OF OUTCOMES ( ) CERTAIN EQUITY RATIO ( ) NONE

( ) BENEVOLENT ( ) EQUITY SENSITIVE ( ) ENTITLED ( ) NONE

234. Employees who say they are equally concerned about helping others and helping themselves are really lying.

( ) LEVEL OF INPUTS ( ) RELATIVE LEVEL OF INPUTS TO OUTCOMES
( ) LEVEL OF OUTCOMES ( ) CERTAIN EQUITY RATIO ( ) NONE

( ) BENEVOLENT ( ) EQUITY SENSITIVE ( ) ENTITLED ( ) NONE

235. I try to think of ways to do my job more efficiently and more effectively.

( ) LEVEL OF INPUTS ( ) RELATIVE LEVEL OF INPUTS TO OUTCOMES
( ) LEVEL OF OUTCOMES ( ) CERTAIN EQUITY RATIO ( ) NONE

( ) BENEVOLENT ( ) EQUITY SENSITIVE ( ) ENTITLED ( ) NONE
236. How many of your friends would agree that doing a good job at work and receiving a good paycheck are equally important?

( ) LEVEL OF INPUTS ( ) RELATIVE LEVEL OF INPUTS TO OUTCOMES
( ) LEVEL OF OUTCOMES ( ) CERTAIN EQUITY RATIO ( ) NONE

( ) BENEVOLENT ( ) EQUITY SENSITIVE ( ) ENTITLED ( ) NONE

237. How many employees in a typical organization believe that a job is something that is earned rather than given?

( ) LEVEL OF INPUTS ( ) RELATIVE LEVEL OF INPUTS TO OUTCOMES
( ) LEVEL OF OUTCOMES ( ) CERTAIN EQUITY RATIO ( ) NONE

( ) BENEVOLENT ( ) EQUITY SENSITIVE ( ) ENTITLED ( ) NONE

238. How many employees in a typical organization are satisfied only when they get a better deal from their employer than similarly qualified co-workers?

( ) LEVEL OF INPUTS ( ) RELATIVE LEVEL OF INPUTS TO OUTCOMES
( ) LEVEL OF OUTCOMES ( ) CERTAIN EQUITY RATIO ( ) NONE

( ) BENEVOLENT ( ) EQUITY SENSITIVE ( ) ENTITLED ( ) NONE

239. You and your co-worker, who is similar to you in both background and years of experience, are loafing at work but you are given significantly less rewards than your co-worker. How would you respond to this situation, in terms of productivity?

( ) LEVEL OF INPUTS ( ) RELATIVE LEVEL OF INPUTS TO OUTCOMES
( ) LEVEL OF OUTCOMES ( ) CERTAIN EQUITY RATIO ( ) NONE

( ) BENEVOLENT ( ) EQUITY SENSITIVE ( ) ENTITLED ( ) NONE

240. If I were a manager, I would definitely hire someone who is completely satisfied when they receive the same rewards as similarly qualified co-workers for the same amount of work.

( ) LEVEL OF INPUTS ( ) RELATIVE LEVEL OF INPUTS TO OUTCOMES
( ) LEVEL OF OUTCOMES ( ) CERTAIN EQUITY RATIO ( ) NONE

( ) BENEVOLENT ( ) EQUITY SENSITIVE ( ) ENTITLED ( ) NONE

241. If I were a manager, I would not hire applicants who are more concerned about what they can get from an employer than about what they can contribute to it.

( ) LEVEL OF INPUTS ( ) RELATIVE LEVEL OF INPUTS TO OUTCOMES
( ) LEVEL OF OUTCOMES ( ) CERTAIN EQUITY RATIO ( ) NONE

( ) BENEVOLENT ( ) EQUITY SENSITIVE ( ) ENTITLED ( ) NONE
242. When I have completed my tasks for the day at work I help other employees who have yet to complete their tasks.

( ) LEVEL OF INPUTS ( ) RELATIVE LEVEL OF INPUTS TO OUTCOMES
( ) LEVEL OF OUTCOMES ( ) CERTAIN EQUITY RATIO ( ) NONE

( ) BENEVOLENT ( ) EQUITY SENSITIVE ( ) ENTITLED ( ) NONE

243. How many employees in a typical organization would like to work for an organization that provides better pay and benefits to its employees than other organizations, although the work in this organization is much less interesting and challenging than the work in these other organizations?

( ) LEVEL OF INPUTS ( ) RELATIVE LEVEL OF INPUTS TO OUTCOMES
( ) LEVEL OF OUTCOMES ( ) CERTAIN EQUITY RATIO ( ) NONE

( ) BENEVOLENT ( ) EQUITY SENSITIVE ( ) ENTITLED ( ) NONE

244. Employees who are concerned about getting the best deal possible from an employer for the work they perform are just selfish.

( ) LEVEL OF INPUTS ( ) RELATIVE LEVEL OF INPUTS TO OUTCOMES
( ) LEVEL OF OUTCOMES ( ) CERTAIN EQUITY RATIO ( ) NONE

( ) BENEVOLENT ( ) EQUITY SENSITIVE ( ) ENTITLED ( ) NONE

245. If I were a manager, I would think twice before hiring someone who is willing to work hard even when they are paid less than other similarly qualified co-workers because that person does not know how to care of themselves and is probably not well-adjusted emotionally.

( ) LEVEL OF INPUTS ( ) RELATIVE LEVEL OF INPUTS TO OUTCOMES
( ) LEVEL OF OUTCOMES ( ) CERTAIN EQUITY RATIO ( ) NONE

( ) BENEVOLENT ( ) EQUITY SENSITIVE ( ) ENTITLED ( ) NONE

246. You work significantly harder than your co-worker, who is similar to you in both background and years of experience, but you are both given the same level of rewards. How would you respond to this situation, in terms of productivity?

( ) LEVEL OF INPUTS ( ) RELATIVE LEVEL OF INPUTS TO OUTCOMES
( ) LEVEL OF OUTCOMES ( ) CERTAIN EQUITY RATIO ( ) NONE

( ) BENEVOLENT ( ) EQUITY SENSITIVE ( ) ENTITLED ( ) NONE
247. How many of your friends would take sick leave from work and get paid for it even though they aren't really sick?

( ) LEVEL OF INPUTS ( ) RELATIVE LEVEL OF INPUTS TO OUTCOMES
( ) LEVEL OF OUTCOMES ( ) CERTAIN EQUITY RATIO ( ) NONE
( ) BENEVOLENT ( ) EQUITY SENSITIVE ( ) ENTITLED ( ) NONE

248. Employees who work hard and gain satisfaction from it are just idiots who play right into the manager's hands.

( ) LEVEL OF INPUTS ( ) RELATIVE LEVEL OF INPUTS TO OUTCOMES
( ) LEVEL OF OUTCOMES ( ) CERTAIN EQUITY RATIO ( ) NONE
( ) BENEVOLENT ( ) EQUITY SENSITIVE ( ) ENTITLED ( ) NONE

249. I feel obligated to do only what I am paid to do at work.

( ) LEVEL OF INPUTS ( ) RELATIVE LEVEL OF INPUTS TO OUTCOMES
( ) LEVEL OF OUTCOMES ( ) CERTAIN EQUITY RATIO ( ) NONE
( ) BENEVOLENT ( ) EQUITY SENSITIVE ( ) ENTITLED ( ) NONE

250. Employees who only want those rewards that they work for or deserve are just cheating themselves out of rewards they could have.

( ) LEVEL OF INPUTS ( ) RELATIVE LEVEL OF INPUTS TO OUTCOMES
( ) LEVEL OF OUTCOMES ( ) CERTAIN EQUITY RATIO ( ) NONE
( ) BENEVOLENT ( ) EQUITY SENSITIVE ( ) ENTITLED ( ) NONE

251. Having a job in America is a right and not a privilege.

( ) LEVEL OF INPUTS ( ) RELATIVE LEVEL OF INPUTS TO OUTCOMES
( ) LEVEL OF OUTCOMES ( ) CERTAIN EQUITY RATIO ( ) NONE
( ) BENEVOLENT ( ) EQUITY SENSITIVE ( ) ENTITLED ( ) NONE

252. How many employees in typical organization believe that there is nothing wrong with doing a poor job if one can get away with it?

( ) LEVEL OF INPUTS ( ) RELATIVE LEVEL OF INPUTS TO OUTCOMES
( ) LEVEL OF OUTCOMES ( ) CERTAIN EQUITY RATIO ( ) NONE
( ) BENEVOLENT ( ) EQUITY SENSITIVE ( ) ENTITLED ( ) NONE
253. How many employees in typical organization would like to work for an organization where it is expected that leisure time will be sacrificed if work pressures are great?

( ) LEVEL OF INPUTS ( ) RELATIVE LEVEL OF INPUTS TO OUTCOMES
( ) LEVEL OF OUTCOMES ( ) CERTAIN EQUITY RATIO ( ) NONE
( ) BENEVOLENT ( ) EQUITY SENSITIVE ( ) ENTITLED ( ) NONE

254. You and your co-worker, who is similar to you in both background and years of experience, are both loafing and both of you are given the same low level of rewards. How would respond to this situation, in terms of productivity?

( ) LEVEL OF INPUTS ( ) RELATIVE LEVEL OF INPUTS TO OUTCOMES
( ) LEVEL OF OUTCOMES ( ) CERTAIN EQUITY RATIO ( ) NONE
( ) BENEVOLENT ( ) EQUITY SENSITIVE ( ) ENTITLED ( ) NONE

255. How many employees in a typical organization believe that the right to work is something that is given freely and not earned?

( ) LEVEL OF INPUTS ( ) RELATIVE LEVEL OF INPUTS TO OUTCOMES
( ) LEVEL OF OUTCOMES ( ) CERTAIN EQUITY RATIO ( ) NONE
( ) BENEVOLENT ( ) EQUITY SENSITIVE ( ) ENTITLED ( ) NONE

256. How many employees in a typical organization, if similarly qualified co-workers got a better deal from the organization than they did, would not really be bothered by it and would continue to do their best on the job?

( ) LEVEL OF INPUTS ( ) RELATIVE LEVEL OF INPUTS TO OUTCOMES
( ) LEVEL OF OUTCOMES ( ) CERTAIN EQUITY RATIO ( ) NONE
( ) BENEVOLENT ( ) EQUITY SENSITIVE ( ) ENTITLED ( ) NONE

257. How many employees in a typical organization, even if they were being paid more than similarly qualified co-workers for the same amount of work, would feel very little motivation to do any more work?

( ) LEVEL OF INPUTS ( ) RELATIVE LEVEL OF INPUTS TO OUTCOMES
( ) LEVEL OF OUTCOMES ( ) CERTAIN EQUITY RATIO ( ) NONE
( ) BENEVOLENT ( ) EQUITY SENSITIVE ( ) ENTITLED ( ) NONE
258. You and your co-worker, who is similar to you in both background and years of experience, are both loafing but both of you are given the same high level of rewards. How satisfied would you be given this situation?

( ) LEVEL OF INPUTS ( ) RELATIVE LEVEL OF INPUTS TO OUTCOMES ( ) LEVEL OF OUTCOMES ( ) CERTAIN EQUITY RATIO ( ) NONE ( ) BENEOLENT ( ) EQUITY SENSITIVE ( ) ENTITLED ( ) NONE

259. How many of your friends believe that they are doing too much at work even though they may be paid more than similarly qualified co-workers?

( ) LEVEL OF INPUTS ( ) RELATIVE LEVEL OF INPUTS TO OUTCOMES ( ) LEVEL OF OUTCOMES ( ) CERTAIN EQUITY RATIO ( ) NONE ( ) BENEOLENT ( ) EQUITY SENSITIVE ( ) ENTITLED ( ) NONE

260. Employees who work hard even when they are paid less than similarly qualified co-workers make the best employees.

( ) LEVEL OF INPUTS ( ) RELATIVE LEVEL OF INPUTS TO OUTCOMES ( ) LEVEL OF OUTCOMES ( ) CERTAIN EQUITY RATIO ( ) NONE ( ) BENEOLENT ( ) EQUITY SENSITIVE ( ) ENTITLED ( ) NONE

261. If I were a manager, I definitely fire an employee if that employee thought that they should get paid the same as similarly qualified co-workers but have to work less.

( ) LEVEL OF INPUTS ( ) RELATIVE LEVEL OF INPUTS TO OUTCOMES ( ) LEVEL OF OUTCOMES ( ) CERTAIN EQUITY RATIO ( ) NONE ( ) BENEOLENT ( ) EQUITY SENSITIVE ( ) ENTITLED ( ) NONE

262. How many of your friends are most satisfied when the work they do outweighs what they are paid for it.

( ) LEVEL OF INPUTS ( ) RELATIVE LEVEL OF INPUTS TO OUTCOMES ( ) LEVEL OF OUTCOMES ( ) CERTAIN EQUITY RATIO ( ) NONE ( ) BENEOLENT ( ) EQUITY SENSITIVE ( ) ENTITLED ( ) NONE
263. How many of your friends, if they were being paid the same wage as similarly qualified co-workers for the same amount of work, would volunteer to stay overtime without being paid?

( ) LEVEL OF INPUTS ( ) RELATIVE LEVEL OF INPUTS TO OUTCOMES
( ) LEVEL OF OUTCOMES ( ) CERTAIN EQUITY RATIO ( ) NONE
( ) BENEVOLENT ( ) EQUITY SENSITIVE ( ) ENTITLED ( ) NONE

264. You and your co-worker, who is similar to you in both background and years of experience, are loafing but you are given significantly less rewards than your co-worker. How satisfied would you be given this situation?

( ) LEVEL OF INPUTS ( ) RELATIVE LEVEL OF INPUTS TO OUTCOMES
( ) LEVEL OF OUTCOMES ( ) CERTAIN EQUITY RATIO ( ) NONE
( ) BENEVOLENT ( ) EQUITY SENSITIVE ( ) ENTITLED ( ) NONE

265. All other things being equal, it is better to have a job with a lot of duties and responsibilities than one with few duties and responsibilities.

( ) LEVEL OF INPUTS ( ) RELATIVE LEVEL OF INPUTS TO OUTCOMES
( ) LEVEL OF OUTCOMES ( ) CERTAIN EQUITY RATIO ( ) NONE
( ) BENEVOLENT ( ) EQUITY SENSITIVE ( ) ENTITLED ( ) NONE

266. You are working significantly less than your co-worker, who is similar to you in both background and years of experience, but you receive the same level of rewards as your co-worker. How satisfied would you be given this situation?

( ) LEVEL OF INPUTS ( ) RELATIVE LEVEL OF INPUTS TO OUTCOMES
( ) LEVEL OF OUTCOMES ( ) CERTAIN EQUITY RATIO ( ) NONE
( ) BENEVOLENT ( ) EQUITY SENSITIVE ( ) ENTITLED ( ) NONE

267. As a rule, I am not all that concerned about the rewards an organization provides me for my work.

( ) LEVEL OF INPUTS ( ) RELATIVE LEVEL OF INPUTS TO OUTCOMES
( ) LEVEL OF OUTCOMES ( ) CERTAIN EQUITY RATIO ( ) NONE
( ) BENEVOLENT ( ) EQUITY SENSITIVE ( ) ENTITLED ( ) NONE
268. How many of your friends feel like they should always do more at work even though they may have already put in a fair day's work?

( ) LEVEL OF INPUTS ( ) RELATIVE LEVEL OF INPUTS TO OUTCOMES
( ) LEVEL OF OUTCOMES ( ) CERTAIN EQUITY RATIO ( ) NONE
( ) BENEVOLENT ( ) EQUITY SENSITIVE ( ) ENTITLED ( ) NONE

269. How many employees in a typical organization feel like they should always get something for nothing?

( ) LEVEL OF INPUTS ( ) RELATIVE LEVEL OF INPUTS TO OUTCOMES
( ) LEVEL OF OUTCOMES ( ) CERTAIN EQUITY RATIO ( ) NONE
( ) BENEVOLENT ( ) EQUITY SENSITIVE ( ) ENTITLED ( ) NONE

270. I would always choose the job which allows me to perform the most interesting work regardless.

( ) LEVEL OF INPUTS ( ) RELATIVE LEVEL OF INPUTS TO OUTCOMES
( ) LEVEL OF OUTCOMES ( ) CERTAIN EQUITY RATIO ( ) NONE
( ) BENEVOLENT ( ) EQUITY SENSITIVE ( ) ENTITLED ( ) NONE

271. I would not like to work for an organization where it is expected that my first commitment would be to the organization rather than to myself.

( ) LEVEL OF INPUTS ( ) RELATIVE LEVEL OF INPUTS TO OUTCOMES
( ) LEVEL OF OUTCOMES ( ) CERTAIN EQUITY RATIO ( ) NONE
( ) BENEVOLENT ( ) EQUITY SENSITIVE ( ) ENTITLED ( ) NONE

272. Employees who work hard even when they are paid less than similarly qualified co-workers send the wrong message to management (i.e., that management can treat their employees badly and suffer no negative consequences).

( ) LEVEL OF INPUTS ( ) RELATIVE LEVEL OF INPUTS TO OUTCOMES
( ) LEVEL OF OUTCOMES ( ) CERTAIN EQUITY RATIO ( ) NONE
( ) BENEVOLENT ( ) EQUITY SENSITIVE ( ) ENTITLED ( ) NONE

273. I am equally loyal to myself and my employer.

( ) LEVEL OF INPUTS ( ) RELATIVE LEVEL OF INPUTS TO OUTCOMES
( ) LEVEL OF OUTCOMES ( ) CERTAIN EQUITY RATIO ( ) NONE
( ) BENEVOLENT ( ) EQUITY SENSITIVE ( ) ENTITLED ( ) NONE
274. How many employees in a typical organization are only concerned about what the job pays them?

( ) LEVEL OF INPUTS  ( ) RELATIVE LEVEL OF INPUTS TO OUTCOMES
( ) LEVEL OF OUTCOMES ( ) CERTAIN EQUITY RATIO ( ) NONE
( ) BENEVOLENT ( ) EQUITY SENSITIVE ( ) ENTITLED ( ) NONE

275. How many of your friends believe that there is nothing as satisfying as doing the best job possible at work?

( ) LEVEL OF INPUTS  ( ) RELATIVE LEVEL OF INPUTS TO OUTCOMES
( ) LEVEL OF OUTCOMES ( ) CERTAIN EQUITY RATIO ( ) NONE
( ) BENEVOLENT ( ) EQUITY SENSITIVE ( ) ENTITLED ( ) NONE

276. Every employee in America is entitled to a fair day’s pay regardless of how well they perform.

( ) LEVEL OF INPUTS  ( ) RELATIVE LEVEL OF INPUTS TO OUTCOMES
( ) LEVEL OF OUTCOMES ( ) CERTAIN EQUITY RATIO ( ) NONE
( ) BENEVOLENT ( ) EQUITY SENSITIVE ( ) ENTITLED ( ) NONE

277. Employees who take unauthorized work breaks even when they are paid the same wage as similarly qualified co-workers (that is, they are treated fairly) should be severely disciplined.

( ) LEVEL OF INPUTS  ( ) RELATIVE LEVEL OF INPUTS TO OUTCOMES
( ) LEVEL OF OUTCOMES ( ) CERTAIN EQUITY RATIO ( ) NONE
( ) BENEVOLENT ( ) EQUITY SENSITIVE ( ) ENTITLED ( ) NONE

278. At work, my greatest concern is whether or not I am doing the best job I can.

( ) LEVEL OF INPUTS  ( ) RELATIVE LEVEL OF INPUTS TO OUTCOMES
( ) LEVEL OF OUTCOMES ( ) CERTAIN EQUITY RATIO ( ) NONE
( ) BENEVOLENT ( ) EQUITY SENSITIVE ( ) ENTITLED ( ) NONE

279. A job is something that is earned by one's hard work and dedication, not given.

( ) LEVEL OF INPUTS  ( ) RELATIVE LEVEL OF INPUTS TO OUTCOMES
( ) LEVEL OF OUTCOMES ( ) CERTAIN EQUITY RATIO ( ) NONE
( ) BENEVOLENT ( ) EQUITY SENSITIVE ( ) ENTITLED ( ) NONE
280. I can sympathize with employees who steal from their employers even when they are paid the same as other similarly qualified co-workers.

281. What an employer gives to me and what I give to an employer are equally important to me.

282. I am genuinely concerned about helping my employer become more successful.

283. People who state openly that they should be paid more and have to work less than similarly qualified co-workers are just saying what everyone else really believes but is afraid to say.

284. If I were a manager, I would be extremely suspicious of people who say that they are more concerned about helping the organization than helping themselves because we all know that everyone looks out for themselves first and others second.

285. I feel obligated to my employer to do more than I am paid to do at work.
286. Employees who take on extra-duties and responsibilities even though they are just paid the same wage as similarly qualified co-workers are a credit to themselves and to the organization.

( ) LEVEL OF INPUTS ( ) RELATIVE LEVEL OF INPUTS TO OUTCOMES
( ) LEVEL OF OUTCOMES ( ) CERTAIN EQUITY RATIO ( ) NONE
( ) BENEVOLENT ( ) EQUITY SENSITIVE ( ) ENTITLED ( ) NONE

287. My philosophy when it comes to both life and work is to get as much as you can today because tomorrow may never come.

( ) LEVEL OF INPUTS ( ) RELATIVE LEVEL OF INPUTS TO OUTCOMES
( ) LEVEL OF OUTCOMES ( ) CERTAIN EQUITY RATIO ( ) NONE
( ) BENEVOLENT ( ) EQUITY SENSITIVE ( ) ENTITLED ( ) NONE

288. You and your co-worker, who is similar to you in both background and years of experience, are both working hard but you receive significantly more rewards than does your co-worker. How satisfied would you be given this situation?

( ) LEVEL OF INPUTS ( ) RELATIVE LEVEL OF INPUTS TO OUTCOMES
( ) LEVEL OF OUTCOMES ( ) CERTAIN EQUITY RATIO ( ) NONE
( ) BENEVOLENT ( ) EQUITY SENSITIVE ( ) ENTITLED ( ) NONE

289. How many employees in a typical organization on any given day put in a full day of hard work?

( ) LEVEL OF INPUTS ( ) RELATIVE LEVEL OF INPUTS TO OUTCOMES
( ) LEVEL OF OUTCOMES ( ) CERTAIN EQUITY RATIO ( ) NONE
( ) BENEVOLENT ( ) EQUITY SENSITIVE ( ) ENTITLED ( ) NONE

290. How many employees in a typical organization are equally loyal to themselves and to their employers?

( ) LEVEL OF INPUTS ( ) RELATIVE LEVEL OF INPUTS TO OUTCOMES
( ) LEVEL OF OUTCOMES ( ) CERTAIN EQUITY RATIO ( ) NONE
( ) BENEVOLENT ( ) EQUITY SENSITIVE ( ) ENTITLED ( ) NONE

291. When it comes right down to it, most people are only concerned about themselves.

( ) LEVEL OF INPUTS ( ) RELATIVE LEVEL OF INPUTS TO OUTCOMES
( ) LEVEL OF OUTCOMES ( ) CERTAIN EQUITY RATIO ( ) NONE
( ) BENEVOLENT ( ) EQUITY SENSITIVE ( ) ENTITLED ( ) NONE
292. How many employees in a typical organization see a job as something that they are entitled to?

( ) LEVEL OF INPUTS ( ) RELATIVE LEVEL OF INPUTS TO OUTCOMES
( ) LEVEL OF OUTCOMES ( ) CERTAIN EQUITY RATIO ( ) NONE

( ) BENEVOLENT ( ) EQUITY SENSITIVE ( ) ENTITLED ( ) NONE

293. Employees who say that they are equally concerned about what they give to their employer and what they get from their employer are, in reality, more self-centered.

( ) LEVEL OF INPUTS ( ) RELATIVE LEVEL OF INPUTS TO OUTCOMES
( ) LEVEL OF OUTCOMES ( ) CERTAIN EQUITY RATIO ( ) NONE

( ) BENEVOLENT ( ) EQUITY SENSITIVE ( ) ENTITLED ( ) NONE

294. At work, my greatest concern is how my efforts will be rewarded by my employer.

( ) LEVEL OF INPUTS ( ) RELATIVE LEVEL OF INPUTS TO OUTCOMES
( ) LEVEL OF OUTCOMES ( ) CERTAIN EQUITY RATIO ( ) NONE

( ) BENEVOLENT ( ) EQUITY SENSITIVE ( ) ENTITLED ( ) NONE

295. My first commitment at work is to my organization and the second commitment is to myself.

( ) LEVEL OF INPUTS ( ) RELATIVE LEVEL OF INPUTS TO OUTCOMES
( ) LEVEL OF OUTCOMES ( ) CERTAIN EQUITY RATIO ( ) NONE

( ) BENEVOLENT ( ) EQUITY SENSITIVE ( ) ENTITLED ( ) NONE

*THANKS AGAIN FOR ALL YOUR HARD WORK! I REALLY DO APPRECIATE IT!*
APPENDIX N: CONTENT VALIDITY ASSESSMENT QUESTIONNAIRE FOR THE FOLLOW-UP CONTENT VALIDITY ASSESSMENT
CONTENT VALIDITY ASSESSMENT QUESTIONNAIRE: NEW EQUITY SENSITIVITY MEASURE

GENERAL INSTRUCTIONS: Please read the background section before completing the content validity assessment. It is extremely important that you thoroughly understand the equity sensitivity construct and its composition before beginning your content validity assessment. This content validity assessment is an integral part of my dissertation. As a content validity expert, you are playing a very important role in developing my new measure of equity sensitivity. Your efforts here will have a significant impact on determining the final content of my new and improved measure of equity sensitivity.

I very much appreciate all your effort and hard work in performing this assessment and I look forward to receiving the results of your content validity assessment in the near future. Good luck and God speed!

BACKGROUND:

Before you begin the content validity assessment, let me provide you with some background information on the equity sensitivity construct. The equity sensitivity construct, proposed by Huseman, Hatfield, and Miles (1987), relates directly to equity theory and suggests that individuals react in consistent but individually different ways to both perceived equity and inequity because they have different preferences for equity. Specifically, this construct proposes that there are three types of individuals: (a) Benevolents, who prefer that their outcome/input ratios be less than their comparison other's; (b) Equity Sensitives, who prefer that outcome/input ratios be equal to that of their comparison other's; and (c) Entitleds, who prefer that their outcome to input ratios be greater than their comparison other's.

The equity sensitivity construct, as originally formulated by Huseman et al. (1987), is also multidimensional. There are four general dimensions that comprise the equity sensitivity construct.

The FIRST DIMENSION is PREFERENCE FOR LEVEL OF INPUTS. For example, Benevolents prefer situations that allow them to give high levels of inputs. The SECOND DIMENSION is PREFERENCE FOR LEVEL OF OUTPUTS. For example, Entitleds prefer situations that allow them to receive high levels of outcomes. The THIRD DIMENSION is PREFERENCE FOR RELATIVE LEVEL OF INPUTS TO OUTCOMES. Here, Benevolents prefer their inputs to exceed their outcomes; Equity Sensitives prefer their inputs equal their outcomes; and Entitleds prefer that their outcomes exceed their inputs.
The FOURTH and final DIMENSION is the PREFERENCE FOR A CERTAIN EQUITY RATIO RELATIVE TO A COMPARISON OTHER. Here, Benevolents prefer that their outcome/input ratios be less than that of the comparison other's; Equity Sensitives prefer that their outcome/input ratios be equal to that of the comparison other's; and Entitleds prefer that their outcome/input ratios exceed that of the comparison other's.

NOTE: I have attached a copy of the Huseman et al. (1987) article if you would like additional information about the construct before conducting your content validity assessment.

CONTENT VALIDITY ASSESSMENT INSTRUCTIONS:

In this content validity assessment, you will be asked to make two judgments for each item. In the first judgment, you will be asked to determine the dimension of equity sensitivity that the item best represents. For example, if you decide that the item best represents the dimension of preference for level of inputs, then you will mark the option labeled "level of inputs". However, if you believe that the item does not represent one of the dimensions of equity sensitivity, you will mark the category labeled "NONE". In the second judgment, you will be asked to decide which type of individual (i.e., Benevolent, Equity Sensitive, or Entitled) the item best represents. For example, if you believe that the item best represents the Benevolent type of individual, then you will mark the option labeled "Benevolent." However, if you believe that the item does not represent one of the three types of individuals, then you will mark the category labeled "NONE". Please note that if the item was classified in the "NONE" category in the first judgment, the second judgment will not be necessary.

SAMPLE ITEM:

"I prefer those situations where my equity ratio is less than my comparison other's equity ratio."

SAMPLE CLASSIFICATIONS:

( ) LEVEL OF INPUTS ( ) RELATIVE LEVEL OF INPUTS TO OUTCOMES
( ) LEVEL OF OUTCOMES (X) CERTAIN EQUITY RATIO

(X) BENEVOLENT ( ) EQUITY SENSITIVE ( ) ENTITLED ( ) NONE

In the first judgment, the item was classified as best representing the dimension of preference for a certain equity ratio relative to a comparison other. In the second judgment, the item was classified as best representing the Benevolent type of individual.
296. How willing would you be to work alongside a co-worker who wants the amount of rewards he/she receives to match the amount of work he/she performs?

( ) LEVEL OF INPUTS ( ) RELATIVE LEVEL OF INPUTS TO OUTCOMES
( ) LEVEL OF OUTCOMES ( ) CERTAIN EQUITY RATIO ( ) NONE

( ) BENEVOLENT ( ) EQUITY SENSITIVE ( ) ENTITLED ( ) NONE

297. How many of your friends, if they worked the same amount as other similarly qualified co-workers, would expect to be paid the same amount (no more, no less) as these other similarly qualified co-workers?

( ) LEVEL OF INPUTS ( ) RELATIVE LEVEL OF INPUTS TO OUTCOMES
( ) LEVEL OF OUTCOMES ( ) CERTAIN EQUITY RATIO ( ) NONE

( ) BENEVOLENT ( ) EQUITY SENSITIVE ( ) ENTITLED ( ) NONE

298. Low wages and poor benefits are the primary reasons why most employees are dissatisfied.

( ) LEVEL OF INPUTS ( ) RELATIVE LEVEL OF INPUTS TO OUTCOMES
( ) LEVEL OF OUTCOMES ( ) CERTAIN EQUITY RATIO ( ) NONE

( ) BENEVOLENT ( ) EQUITY SENSITIVE ( ) ENTITLED ( ) NONE

299. How many of your friends once they have completed their tasks for the day, would rather do nothing than help other people with their tasks?

( ) LEVEL OF INPUTS ( ) RELATIVE LEVEL OF INPUTS TO OUTCOMES
( ) LEVEL OF OUTCOMES ( ) CERTAIN EQUITY RATIO ( ) NONE

( ) BENEVOLENT ( ) EQUITY SENSITIVE ( ) ENTITLED ( ) NONE

300. If I had to work hard all day at my job, I would probably quit.

( ) LEVEL OF INPUTS ( ) RELATIVE LEVEL OF INPUTS TO OUTCOMES
( ) LEVEL OF OUTCOMES ( ) CERTAIN EQUITY RATIO ( ) NONE

( ) BENEVOLENT ( ) EQUITY SENSITIVE ( ) ENTITLED ( ) NONE
301. If I received low wages and poor benefits from my employer, I would not be seriously bothered by it.

( ) LEVEL OF INPUTS ( ) RELATIVE LEVEL OF INPUTS TO OUTCOMES
( ) LEVEL OF OUTCOMES ( ) CERTAIN EQUITY RATIO ( ) NONE
( ) BENEVOLENT ( ) EQUITY SENSITIVE ( ) ENTITLED ( ) NONE

302. I like to do my best at work.

( ) LEVEL OF INPUTS ( ) RELATIVE LEVEL OF INPUTS TO OUTCOMES
( ) LEVEL OF OUTCOMES ( ) CERTAIN EQUITY RATIO ( ) NONE
( ) BENEVOLENT ( ) EQUITY SENSITIVE ( ) ENTITLED ( ) NONE

303. How many of your friends believe that one should not be overly concerned about receiving the highest wages and best benefits one can from an employer?

( ) LEVEL OF INPUTS ( ) RELATIVE LEVEL OF INPUTS TO OUTCOMES
( ) LEVEL OF OUTCOMES ( ) CERTAIN EQUITY RATIO ( ) NONE
( ) BENEVOLENT ( ) EQUITY SENSITIVE ( ) ENTITLED ( ) NONE

304. I could be satisfied with a job that provided me with less than top dollar for my work.

( ) LEVEL OF INPUTS ( ) RELATIVE LEVEL OF INPUTS TO OUTCOMES
( ) LEVEL OF OUTCOMES ( ) CERTAIN EQUITY RATIO ( ) NONE
( ) BENEVOLENT ( ) EQUITY SENSITIVE ( ) ENTITLED ( ) NONE

305. I am always looking to maximize what I get from my employer.

( ) LEVEL OF INPUTS ( ) RELATIVE LEVEL OF INPUTS TO OUTCOMES
( ) LEVEL OF OUTCOMES ( ) CERTAIN EQUITY RATIO ( ) NONE
( ) BENEVOLENT ( ) EQUITY SENSITIVE ( ) ENTITLED ( ) NONE

306. How many of your friends if they had to work hard all day at their jobs would be very unhappy?

( ) LEVEL OF INPUTS ( ) RELATIVE LEVEL OF INPUTS TO OUTCOMES
( ) LEVEL OF OUTCOMES ( ) CERTAIN EQUITY RATIO ( ) NONE
( ) BENEVOLENT ( ) EQUITY SENSITIVE ( ) ENTITLED ( ) NONE
How willing would you be, if you were an employer, to promote an employee who only wants the same deal (no better, no worse) that other similarly qualified co-workers are receiving from you?

( ) LEVEL OF INPUTS ( ) RELATIVE LEVEL OF INPUTS TO OUTCOMES
( ) LEVEL OF OUTCOMES ( ) CERTAIN EQUITY RATIO ( ) NONE

( ) BENEVOLENT ( ) EQUITY SENSITIVE ( ) ENTITLED ( ) NONE

If I was receiving top dollar for my work, I would feel a little guilty.

( ) LEVEL OF INPUTS ( ) RELATIVE LEVEL OF INPUTS TO OUTCOMES
( ) LEVEL OF OUTCOMES ( ) CERTAIN EQUITY RATIO ( ) NONE

( ) BENEVOLENT ( ) EQUITY SENSITIVE ( ) ENTITLED ( ) NONE

How willing would you be to work alongside a co-worker who wants to take it easy on the job?

( ) LEVEL OF INPUTS ( ) RELATIVE LEVEL OF INPUTS TO OUTCOMES
( ) LEVEL OF OUTCOMES ( ) CERTAIN EQUITY RATIO ( ) NONE

( ) BENEVOLENT ( ) EQUITY SENSITIVE ( ) ENTITLED ( ) NONE

How many of your friends, if they worked less than other similarly qualified co-workers, would expect to be paid less than these other similarly qualified co-workers?

( ) LEVEL OF INPUTS ( ) RELATIVE LEVEL OF INPUTS TO OUTCOMES
( ) LEVEL OF OUTCOMES ( ) CERTAIN EQUITY RATIO ( ) NONE

( ) BENEVOLENT ( ) EQUITY SENSITIVE ( ) ENTITLED ( ) NONE

If I was paid less than top dollar for my work, I would probably reduce my productivity.

( ) LEVEL OF INPUTS ( ) RELATIVE LEVEL OF INPUTS TO OUTCOMES
( ) LEVEL OF OUTCOMES ( ) CERTAIN EQUITY RATIO ( ) NONE

( ) BENEVOLENT ( ) EQUITY SENSITIVE ( ) ENTITLED ( ) NONE

An organization that provides me with less than top dollar to its employees is an organization for which I could not work.

( ) LEVEL OF INPUTS ( ) RELATIVE LEVEL OF INPUTS TO OUTCOMES
( ) LEVEL OF OUTCOMES ( ) CERTAIN EQUITY RATIO ( ) NONE

( ) BENEVOLENT ( ) EQUITY SENSITIVE ( ) ENTITLED ( ) NONE
313. How many of your friends believe that you must be concerned about taking care of yourself first and that means getting as much as you can from your employer for the work you do?

( ) LEVEL OF INPUTS ( ) RELATIVE LEVEL OF INPUTS TO OUTCOMES
( ) LEVEL OF OUTCOMES ( ) CERTAIN EQUITY RATIO ( ) NONE

( ) BENEVOLENT ( ) EQUITY SENSITIVE ( ) ENTITLED ( ) NONE

314. How many employees in a typical organization, if given a choice between two jobs, would always choose the job which requires them to do the least amount of work, everything else being equal?

( ) LEVEL OF INPUTS ( ) RELATIVE LEVEL OF INPUTS TO OUTCOMES
( ) LEVEL OF OUTCOMES ( ) CERTAIN EQUITY RATIO ( ) NONE

( ) BENEVOLENT ( ) EQUITY SENSITIVE ( ) ENTITLED ( ) NONE

315. How many of your friends, even in the face of low wages and poor benefits, could still be satisfied at work under certain conditions?

( ) LEVEL OF INPUTS ( ) RELATIVE LEVEL OF INPUTS TO OUTCOMES
( ) LEVEL OF OUTCOMES ( ) CERTAIN EQUITY RATIO ( ) NONE

( ) BENEVOLENT ( ) EQUITY SENSITIVE ( ) ENTITLED ( ) NONE

316. How many employees in a typical organization, if they received low wages and benefits from their employer, would be extremely dissatisfied with their jobs?

( ) LEVEL OF INPUTS ( ) RELATIVE LEVEL OF INPUTS TO OUTCOMES
( ) LEVEL OF OUTCOMES ( ) CERTAIN EQUITY RATIO ( ) NONE

( ) BENEVOLENT ( ) EQUITY SENSITIVE ( ) ENTITLED ( ) NONE

317. High wages and good benefits are the primary reason why I work.

( ) LEVEL OF INPUTS ( ) RELATIVE LEVEL OF INPUTS TO OUTCOMES
( ) LEVEL OF OUTCOMES ( ) CERTAIN EQUITY RATIO ( ) NONE

( ) BENEVOLENT ( ) EQUITY SENSITIVE ( ) ENTITLED ( ) NONE
318. One should not be overly concerned about receiving the highest wages and best benefits one can from an employer.

( ) LEVEL OF INPUTS ( ) RELATIVE LEVEL OF INPUTS TO OUTCOMES
( ) LEVEL OF OUTCOMES ( ) CERTAIN EQUITY RATIO ( ) NONE

( ) BENEVOLENT ( ) EQUITY SENSITIVE ( ) ENTITLED ( ) NONE

319. How many of your friends believe that it's better to have a job where you work hard than one where you loaf all day?

( ) LEVEL OF INPUTS ( ) RELATIVE LEVEL OF INPUTS TO OUTCOMES
( ) LEVEL OF OUTCOMES ( ) CERTAIN EQUITY RATIO ( ) NONE

( ) BENEVOLENT ( ) EQUITY SENSITIVE ( ) ENTITLED ( ) NONE

320. How many employees in a typical organization could be satisfied with a job that provided them with less than top dollar for their work?

( ) LEVEL OF INPUTS ( ) RELATIVE LEVEL OF INPUTS TO OUTCOMES
( ) LEVEL OF OUTCOMES ( ) CERTAIN EQUITY RATIO ( ) NONE

( ) BENEVOLENT ( ) EQUITY SENSITIVE ( ) ENTITLED ( ) NONE

321. The only things that are important to me at work are the wages and benefits the employer provides me for my services.

( ) LEVEL OF INPUTS ( ) RELATIVE LEVEL OF INPUTS TO OUTCOMES
( ) LEVEL OF OUTCOMES ( ) CERTAIN EQUITY RATIO ( ) NONE

( ) BENEVOLENT ( ) EQUITY SENSITIVE ( ) ENTITLED ( ) NONE

322. How many of your friends if they had little or nothing to do at work would be completely satisfied?

( ) LEVEL OF INPUTS ( ) RELATIVE LEVEL OF INPUTS TO OUTCOMES
( ) LEVEL OF OUTCOMES ( ) CERTAIN EQUITY RATIO ( ) NONE

( ) BENEVOLENT ( ) EQUITY SENSITIVE ( ) ENTITLED ( ) NONE

323. It is extremely important for me to get the best deal possible, in terms of pay and benefits, from my employer.

( ) LEVEL OF INPUTS ( ) RELATIVE LEVEL OF INPUTS TO OUTCOMES
( ) LEVEL OF OUTCOMES ( ) CERTAIN EQUITY RATIO ( ) NONE

( ) BENEVOLENT ( ) EQUITY SENSITIVE ( ) ENTITLED ( ) NONE
324. How many of your friends try to do as little as possible at work?

( ) LEVEL OF INPUTS ( ) RELATIVE LEVEL OF INPUTS TO OUTCOMES
( ) LEVEL OF OUTCOMES ( ) CERTAIN EQUITY RATIO ( ) NONE

( ) BENEVOLENT ( ) EQUITY SENSITIVE ( ) ENTITLED ( ) NONE

325. How willing would you be, if you were an employer, to hire an applicant who believes that if he/she is paid the same wage as other similarly qualified co-workers, then he/she should work harder than these other co-workers?

( ) LEVEL OF INPUTS ( ) RELATIVE LEVEL OF INPUTS TO OUTCOMES
( ) LEVEL OF OUTCOMES ( ) CERTAIN EQUITY RATIO ( ) NONE

( ) BENEVOLENT ( ) EQUITY SENSITIVE ( ) ENTITLED ( ) NONE

326. How willing would you be, if you were an employer, to hire an applicant who even if he/she received low wages and benefits from you, could still be satisfied with his/her job?

( ) LEVEL OF INPUTS ( ) RELATIVE LEVEL OF INPUTS TO OUTCOMES
( ) LEVEL OF OUTCOMES ( ) CERTAIN EQUITY RATIO ( ) NONE

( ) BENEVOLENT ( ) EQUITY SENSITIVE ( ) ENTITLED ( ) NONE

327. How many employees in a typical organization believe that the best day at work is one where there is little work for them to do?

( ) LEVEL OF INPUTS ( ) RELATIVE LEVEL OF INPUTS TO OUTCOMES
( ) LEVEL OF OUTCOMES ( ) CERTAIN EQUITY RATIO ( ) NONE

( ) BENEVOLENT ( ) EQUITY SENSITIVE ( ) ENTITLED ( ) NONE

328. How many of your friends if they were paid a high wage by their employer would still take it easy on their jobs?

( ) LEVEL OF INPUTS ( ) RELATIVE LEVEL OF INPUTS TO OUTCOMES
( ) LEVEL OF OUTCOMES ( ) CERTAIN EQUITY RATIO ( ) NONE

( ) BENEVOLENT ( ) EQUITY SENSITIVE ( ) ENTITLED ( ) NONE

329. How many employees in a typical organization are constantly striving to get better pay and benefits from their employer?

( ) LEVEL OF INPUTS ( ) RELATIVE LEVEL OF INPUTS TO OUTCOMES
( ) LEVEL OF OUTCOMES ( ) CERTAIN EQUITY RATIO ( ) NONE

( ) BENEVOLENT ( ) EQUITY SENSITIVE ( ) ENTITLED ( ) NONE
330. How willing would you be to work alongside a co-worker who is a giver rather than a taker?

( ) LEVEL OF INPUTS ( ) RELATIVE LEVEL OF INPUTS TO OUTCOMES
( ) LEVEL OF OUTCOMES ( ) CERTAIN EQUITY RATIO ( ) NONE

( ) BENEVOLENT ( ) EQUITY SENSITIVE ( ) ENTITLED ( ) NONE

331. How many employees in a typical organization do more than they are paid to do at work?

( ) LEVEL OF INPUTS ( ) RELATIVE LEVEL OF INPUTS TO OUTCOMES
( ) LEVEL OF OUTCOMES ( ) CERTAIN EQUITY RATIO ( ) NONE

( ) BENEVOLENT ( ) EQUITY SENSITIVE ( ) ENTITLED ( ) NONE

332. How many of your friends, if they don't get the best deal possible, in terms of pay and benefits, from an employer, would not really be bothered by it?

( ) LEVEL OF INPUTS ( ) RELATIVE LEVEL OF INPUTS TO OUTCOMES
( ) LEVEL OF OUTCOMES ( ) CERTAIN EQUITY RATIO ( ) NONE

( ) BENEVOLENT ( ) EQUITY SENSITIVE ( ) ENTITLED ( ) NONE

333. How many employees in a typical organization enjoy doing as little as possible at work?

( ) LEVEL OF INPUTS ( ) RELATIVE LEVEL OF INPUTS TO OUTCOMES
( ) LEVEL OF OUTCOMES ( ) CERTAIN EQUITY RATIO ( ) NONE

( ) BENEVOLENT ( ) EQUITY SENSITIVE ( ) ENTITLED ( ) NONE

334. How willing would you be, if you were an employer, to promote an employee who is equally concerned about what he/she can give to the you and you and what he/she can get from you?

( ) LEVEL OF INPUTS ( ) RELATIVE LEVEL OF INPUTS TO OUTCOMES
( ) LEVEL OF OUTCOMES ( ) CERTAIN EQUITY RATIO ( ) NONE

( ) BENEVOLENT ( ) EQUITY SENSITIVE ( ) ENTITLED ( ) NONE

335. How many employees in a typical organization would take it easy on the job if they could get away with it?

( ) LEVEL OF INPUTS ( ) RELATIVE LEVEL OF INPUTS TO OUTCOMES
( ) LEVEL OF OUTCOMES ( ) CERTAIN EQUITY RATIO ( ) NONE

( ) BENEVOLENT ( ) EQUITY SENSITIVE ( ) ENTITLED ( ) NONE
336. How many employees in a typical organization, if they were not getting as much pay and benefits as they believed they could from their employer, would be dissatisfied?

(  ) LEVEL OF INPUTS (  ) RELATIVE LEVEL OF INPUTS TO OUTCOMES
(  ) LEVEL OF OUTCOMES (  ) CERTAIN EQUITY RATIO (  ) NONE
(  ) BENEVOLENT (  ) EQUITY SENSITIVE (  ) ENTITLED (  ) NONE

337. How willing would you be, if you were an employer, to promote an employee who is satisfied only when he/she receives a higher wage than other similarly qualified co-workers for the same amount of work?

(  ) LEVEL OF INPUTS (  ) RELATIVE LEVEL OF INPUTS TO OUTCOMES
(  ) LEVEL OF OUTCOMES (  ) CERTAIN EQUITY RATIO (  ) NONE
(  ) BENEVOLENT (  ) EQUITY SENSITIVE (  ) ENTITLED (  ) NONE

338. How willing would you be, if you were an employer, to promote an employee whose primary concern is getting the best deal possible, in terms of pay and benefits, from you?

(  ) LEVEL OF INPUTS (  ) RELATIVE LEVEL OF INPUTS TO OUTCOMES
(  ) LEVEL OF OUTCOMES (  ) CERTAIN EQUITY RATIO (  ) NONE
(  ) BENEVOLENT (  ) EQUITY SENSITIVE (  ) ENTITLED (  ) NONE

339. How many employees in a typical organization are most satisfied when the work they perform is greater than the amount they are paid for it?

(  ) LEVEL OF INPUTS (  ) RELATIVE LEVEL OF INPUTS TO OUTCOMES
(  ) LEVEL OF OUTCOMES (  ) CERTAIN EQUITY RATIO (  ) NONE
(  ) BENEVOLENT (  ) EQUITY SENSITIVE (  ) ENTITLED (  ) NONE

340. How willing would you be, if you were an employer, to hire an applicant who looks for ways to avoid work?

(  ) LEVEL OF INPUTS (  ) RELATIVE LEVEL OF INPUTS TO OUTCOMES
(  ) LEVEL OF OUTCOMES (  ) CERTAIN EQUITY RATIO (  ) NONE
(  ) BENEVOLENT (  ) EQUITY SENSITIVE (  ) ENTITLED (  ) NONE
341. How willing would you be to work alongside a co-worker who if he/she were paid the same wage as other similarly qualified co-workers for the same amount of work, would feel "guilty" and would increase his/her productivity?

( ) LEVEL OF INPUTS ( ) RELATIVE LEVEL OF INPUTS TO OUTCOMES ( ) LEVEL OF OUTCOMES ( ) CERTAIN EQUITY RATIO ( ) NONE

( ) BENEVOLENT ( ) EQUITY SENSITIVE ( ) ENTITLED ( ) NONE

342. How many employees in a typical organization, if they worked the same amount as other similarly qualified co-workers, would expect to be paid a lower amount than these other similarly qualified co-workers?

( ) LEVEL OF INPUTS ( ) RELATIVE LEVEL OF INPUTS TO OUTCOMES ( ) LEVEL OF OUTCOMES ( ) CERTAIN EQUITY RATIO ( ) NONE

( ) BENEVOLENT ( ) EQUITY SENSITIVE ( ) ENTITLED ( ) NONE

343. How willing would you be to work alongside a co-worker who is only interested in getting as much as he/she can from his/her employer, in terms of pay and benefits?

( ) LEVEL OF INPUTS ( ) RELATIVE LEVEL OF INPUTS TO OUTCOMES ( ) LEVEL OF OUTCOMES ( ) CERTAIN EQUITY RATIO ( ) NONE

( ) BENEVOLENT ( ) EQUITY SENSITIVE ( ) ENTITLED ( ) NONE

344. How willing would you be, if you were an employer, to promote an employee who is more concerned about how he/she will help you rather than how you will help him/her?

( ) LEVEL OF INPUTS ( ) RELATIVE LEVEL OF INPUTS TO OUTCOMES ( ) LEVEL OF OUTCOMES ( ) CERTAIN EQUITY RATIO ( ) NONE

( ) BENEVOLENT ( ) EQUITY SENSITIVE ( ) ENTITLED ( ) NONE

345. How many of your friends, if similarly qualified co-workers worked less and received lower wages than them, would be satisfied with how their employer treated them?

( ) LEVEL OF INPUTS ( ) RELATIVE LEVEL OF INPUTS TO OUTCOMES ( ) LEVEL OF OUTCOMES ( ) CERTAIN EQUITY RATIO ( ) NONE

( ) BENEVOLENT ( ) EQUITY SENSITIVE ( ) ENTITLED ( ) NONE
346. How willing would you be, if you were an employer, to promote an employee who even if he/she is being paid less than other similarly qualified co-workers for the same amount of work, would still be satisfied and productive?

( ) LEVEL OF INPUTS ( ) RELATIVE LEVEL OF INPUTS TO OUTCOMES
( ) LEVEL OF OUTCOMES ( ) CERTAIN EQUITY RATIO ( ) NONE
( ) BENEVOLENT ( ) EQUITY SENSITIVE ( ) ENTITLED ( ) NONE

347. The amount of pay and benefits an employer provides me is not that important to me.

( ) LEVEL OF INPUTS ( ) RELATIVE LEVEL OF INPUTS TO OUTCOMES
( ) LEVEL OF OUTCOMES ( ) CERTAIN EQUITY RATIO ( ) NONE
( ) BENEVOLENT ( ) EQUITY SENSITIVE ( ) ENTITLED ( ) NONE

348. Even if I received low wages and benefits from my employer, I could still be satisfied with my job.

( ) LEVEL OF INPUTS ( ) RELATIVE LEVEL OF INPUTS TO OUTCOMES
( ) LEVEL OF OUTCOMES ( ) CERTAIN EQUITY RATIO ( ) NONE
( ) BENEVOLENT ( ) EQUITY SENSITIVE ( ) ENTITLED ( ) NONE

349. How many of your friends believe that if they are paid less than other similarly qualified co-workers they should work less than these co-workers, and that if they are paid more than other similarly qualified co-workers, they should work more than these co-workers?

( ) LEVEL OF INPUTS ( ) RELATIVE LEVEL OF INPUTS TO OUTCOMES
( ) LEVEL OF OUTCOMES ( ) CERTAIN EQUITY RATIO ( ) NONE
( ) BENEVOLENT ( ) EQUITY SENSITIVE ( ) ENTITLED ( ) NONE

350. How many of your friends are concerned about getting the most they can from their employers, in terms of pay, benefits, and the like?

( ) LEVEL OF INPUTS ( ) RELATIVE LEVEL OF INPUTS TO OUTCOMES
( ) LEVEL OF OUTCOMES ( ) CERTAIN EQUITY RATIO ( ) NONE
( ) BENEVOLENT ( ) EQUITY SENSITIVE ( ) ENTITLED ( ) NONE
351. How many of your friends would like jobs where they have to stay busy all day?

( ) LEVEL OF INPUTS  ( ) RELATIVE LEVEL OF INPUTS TO OUTCOMES
( ) LEVEL OF OUTCOMES ( ) CERTAIN EQUITY RATIO ( ) NONE

( ) BENEVOLENT ( ) EQUITY SENSITIVE ( ) ENTITLED ( ) NONE

352. How many of your friends, if they worked the same amount as other similarly qualified co-workers, would expect to be paid more than these similarly qualified co-workers?

( ) LEVEL OF INPUTS  ( ) RELATIVE LEVEL OF INPUTS TO OUTCOMES
( ) LEVEL OF OUTCOMES ( ) CERTAIN EQUITY RATIO ( ) NONE

( ) BENEVOLENT ( ) EQUITY SENSITIVE ( ) ENTITLED ( ) NONE

353. How many of your friends believe that high wages and good benefits are the most important reasons for working?

( ) LEVEL OF INPUTS  ( ) RELATIVE LEVEL OF INPUTS TO OUTCOMES
( ) LEVEL OF OUTCOMES ( ) CERTAIN EQUITY RATIO ( ) NONE

( ) BENEVOLENT ( ) EQUITY SENSITIVE ( ) ENTITLED ( ) NONE

354. How many employees in a typical organization, even if their employer did not reward them well in terms of pay and benefits, could still be satisfied with their jobs?

( ) LEVEL OF INPUTS  ( ) RELATIVE LEVEL OF INPUTS TO OUTCOMES
( ) LEVEL OF OUTCOMES ( ) CERTAIN EQUITY RATIO ( ) NONE

( ) BENEVOLENT ( ) EQUITY SENSITIVE ( ) ENTITLED ( ) NONE

355. How many of your friends, if they were paid the same wage as other similarly qualified co-workers, would work as hard but not harder than these similarly qualified co-workers?

( ) LEVEL OF INPUTS  ( ) RELATIVE LEVEL OF INPUTS TO OUTCOMES
( ) LEVEL OF OUTCOMES ( ) CERTAIN EQUITY RATIO ( ) NONE

( ) BENEVOLENT ( ) EQUITY SENSITIVE ( ) ENTITLED ( ) NONE

356. How many of your friends when at their jobs look for ways to get out of work?

( ) LEVEL OF INPUTS  ( ) RELATIVE LEVEL OF INPUTS TO OUTCOMES
( ) LEVEL OF OUTCOMES ( ) CERTAIN EQUITY RATIO ( ) NONE

( ) BENEVOLENT ( ) EQUITY SENSITIVE ( ) ENTITLED ( ) NONE
357. How willing would you be, if you were an employer, to promote an employee who wants the amount of pay he/she receives to be greater than the amount of work he/she performs?

( ) LEVEL OF INPUTS ( ) RELATIVE LEVEL OF INPUTS TO OUTCOMES
( ) LEVEL OF OUTCOMES ( ) CERTAIN EQUITY RATIO ( ) NONE
( ) BENEVOLENT ( ) EQUITY SENSITIVE ( ) ENTITLED ( ) NONE

358. How willing would you be, if you were an employer, to hire an applicant who believes that they should be paid more than other similarly qualified co-workers but have to work less than these co-workers?

( ) LEVEL OF INPUTS ( ) RELATIVE LEVEL OF INPUTS TO OUTCOMES
( ) LEVEL OF OUTCOMES ( ) CERTAIN EQUITY RATIO ( ) NONE
( ) BENEVOLENT ( ) EQUITY SENSITIVE ( ) ENTITLED ( ) NONE

359. How many employees in a typical organization once they have completed their tasks for the day would rather help other people with their tasks than do nothing?

( ) LEVEL OF INPUTS ( ) RELATIVE LEVEL OF INPUTS TO OUTCOMES
( ) LEVEL OF OUTCOMES ( ) CERTAIN EQUITY RATIO ( ) NONE
( ) BENEVOLENT ( ) EQUITY SENSITIVE ( ) ENTITLED ( ) NONE

360. I will not settle for anything less than top dollar for my work.

( ) LEVEL OF INPUTS ( ) RELATIVE LEVEL OF INPUTS TO OUTCOMES
( ) LEVEL OF OUTCOMES ( ) CERTAIN EQUITY RATIO ( ) NONE
( ) BENEVOLENT ( ) EQUITY SENSITIVE ( ) ENTITLED ( ) NONE

361. How willing would you be, if you were an employer, to hire an applicant who believes that if he/she is paid the same wage as other similarly qualified co-workers, he/she should work the same amount (no more, no less) as these similarly qualified co-workers?

( ) LEVEL OF INPUTS ( ) RELATIVE LEVEL OF INPUTS TO OUTCOMES
( ) LEVEL OF OUTCOMES ( ) CERTAIN EQUITY RATIO ( ) NONE
( ) BENEVOLENT ( ) EQUITY SENSITIVE ( ) ENTITLED ( ) NONE
362. If given a choice between two jobs, I would always choose the job which requires me to do the least amount or work, everything else being equal.

( ) LEVEL OF INPUTS ( ) RELATIVE LEVEL OF INPUTS TO OUTCOMES
( ) LEVEL OF OUTCOMES ( ) CERTAIN EQUITY RATIO ( ) NONE

( ) BENEVOLENT ( ) EQUITY SENSITIVE ( ) ENTITLED ( ) NONE

363. When my employer rewards me well in terms of pay and benefits, I am satisfied.

( ) LEVEL OF INPUTS ( ) RELATIVE LEVEL OF INPUTS TO OUTCOMES
( ) LEVEL OF OUTCOMES ( ) CERTAIN EQUITY RATIO ( ) NONE

( ) BENEVOLENT ( ) EQUITY SENSITIVE ( ) ENTITLED ( ) NONE

364. How willing would you be to work alongside a co-worker who if he/she were paid the same wage as other similarly qualified co-workers for the same amount of work, would be dissatisfied and would reduce his/her productivity?

( ) LEVEL OF INPUTS ( ) RELATIVE LEVEL OF INPUTS TO OUTCOMES
( ) LEVEL OF OUTCOMES ( ) CERTAIN EQUITY RATIO ( ) NONE

( ) BENEVOLENT ( ) EQUITY SENSITIVE ( ) ENTITLED ( ) NONE

365. How many employees in a typical organization, if the amount of wages they received matched the amount of work they performed, would feel "guilty" and would increase his/her productivity?

( ) LEVEL OF INPUTS ( ) RELATIVE LEVEL OF INPUTS TO OUTCOMES
( ) LEVEL OF OUTCOMES ( ) CERTAIN EQUITY RATIO ( ) NONE

( ) BENEVOLENT ( ) EQUITY SENSITIVE ( ) ENTITLED ( ) NONE

366. How many of your friends believe that it is extremely important for them to get the best deal possible, in terms of pay and benefits, from their employer?

( ) LEVEL OF INPUTS ( ) RELATIVE LEVEL OF INPUTS TO OUTCOMES
( ) LEVEL OF OUTCOMES ( ) CERTAIN EQUITY RATIO ( ) NONE

( ) BENEVOLENT ( ) EQUITY SENSITIVE ( ) ENTITLED ( ) NONE
367. How many of your friends are only satisfied when the rewards they receive from their employer are greater than the amount of work they perform?

( ) LEVEL OF INPUTS ( ) RELATIVE LEVEL OF INPUTS TO OUTCOMES
( ) LEVEL OF OUTCOMES ( ) CERTAIN EQUITY RATIO ( ) NONE
( ) BENEVOLENT ( ) EQUITY SENSITIVE ( ) ENTITLED ( ) NONE

368. How many of your friends believe that they should be paid as much or more than other similarly qualified co-workers but have to work less than these other co-workers?

( ) LEVEL OF INPUTS ( ) RELATIVE LEVEL OF INPUTS TO OUTCOMES
( ) LEVEL OF OUTCOMES ( ) CERTAIN EQUITY RATIO ( ) NONE
( ) BENEVOLENT ( ) EQUITY SENSITIVE ( ) ENTITLED ( ) NONE

369. How many employees in a typical organization believe that it's not enough to get a good deal, in terms of pay and benefits, from their employers rather they must get the best deal?

( ) LEVEL OF INPUTS ( ) RELATIVE LEVEL OF INPUTS TO OUTCOMES
( ) LEVEL OF OUTCOMES ( ) CERTAIN EQUITY RATIO ( ) NONE
( ) BENEVOLENT ( ) EQUITY SENSITIVE ( ) ENTITLED ( ) NONE

370. How many of your friends could be satisfied with a job that requires a lot of hard work but the pay and benefits are not so great?

( ) LEVEL OF INPUTS ( ) RELATIVE LEVEL OF INPUTS TO OUTCOMES
( ) LEVEL OF OUTCOMES ( ) CERTAIN EQUITY RATIO ( ) NONE
( ) BENEVOLENT ( ) EQUITY SENSITIVE ( ) ENTITLED ( ) NONE

371. How willing would you be, if you were an employer, to hire an applicant who feels obligated to do more than he/she is paid to do at work?

( ) LEVEL OF INPUTS ( ) RELATIVE LEVEL OF INPUTS TO OUTCOMES
( ) LEVEL OF OUTCOMES ( ) CERTAIN EQUITY RATIO ( ) NONE
( ) BENEVOLENT ( ) EQUITY SENSITIVE ( ) ENTITLED ( ) NONE
372. How willing would you be to work alongside a co-worker who if he/she were paid the same wage as other similarly qualified co-workers for the same amount of work, would be completely satisfied?

( ) LEVEL OF INPUTS  ( ) RELATIVE LEVEL OF INPUTS TO OUTCOMES  
( ) LEVEL OF OUTCOMES  ( ) CERTAIN EQUITY RATIO  ( ) NONE

( ) BENEVOLENT  ( ) EQUITY SENSITIVE  ( ) ENTITLED  ( ) NONE

373. How many of your friends enjoy working hard at their jobs?

( ) LEVEL OF INPUTS  ( ) RELATIVE LEVEL OF INPUTS TO OUTCOMES  
( ) LEVEL OF OUTCOMES  ( ) CERTAIN EQUITY RATIO  ( ) NONE

( ) BENEVOLENT  ( ) EQUITY SENSITIVE  ( ) ENTITLED  ( ) NONE

374. How many of your friends, if similarly qualified co-workers were paid the same wage as them for the same amount of work, would be satisfied and would neither increase nor decrease their productivity?

( ) LEVEL OF INPUTS  ( ) RELATIVE LEVEL OF INPUTS TO OUTCOMES  
( ) LEVEL OF OUTCOMES  ( ) CERTAIN EQUITY RATIO  ( ) NONE

( ) BENEVOLENT  ( ) EQUITY SENSITIVE  ( ) ENTITLED  ( ) NONE

375. How many of your friends, if the amount of wages they received matched the amount of work they performed, would be dissatisfied and would lower their productivity?

( ) LEVEL OF INPUTS  ( ) RELATIVE LEVEL OF INPUTS TO OUTCOMES  
( ) LEVEL OF OUTCOMES  ( ) CERTAIN EQUITY RATIO  ( ) NONE

( ) BENEVOLENT  ( ) EQUITY SENSITIVE  ( ) ENTITLED  ( ) NONE

376. People today are too concerned about getting the best pay and benefit packages they can from their employers.

( ) LEVEL OF INPUTS  ( ) RELATIVE LEVEL OF INPUTS TO OUTCOMES  
( ) LEVEL OF OUTCOMES  ( ) CERTAIN EQUITY RATIO  ( ) NONE

( ) BENEVOLENT  ( ) EQUITY SENSITIVE  ( ) ENTITLED  ( ) NONE

377. When I am at my job, I think of ways to get out of work.

( ) LEVEL OF INPUTS  ( ) RELATIVE LEVEL OF INPUTS TO OUTCOMES  
( ) LEVEL OF OUTCOMES  ( ) CERTAIN EQUITY RATIO  ( ) NONE

( ) BENEVOLENT  ( ) EQUITY SENSITIVE  ( ) ENTITLED  ( ) NONE
378. How willing would you be, if you were an employer, to promote an employee who could be satisfied with a job that provides his/her with less less than top dollar for his/her work?

( ) LEVEL OF INPUTS  ( ) RELATIVE LEVEL OF INPUTS TO OUTCOMES
( ) LEVEL OF OUTCOMES  ( ) CERTAIN EQUITY RATIO  ( ) NONE
( ) BENEVOLENT  ( ) EQUITY SENSITIVE  ( ) ENTITLED  ( ) NONE

379. It drives me crazy when I have nothing to do at work.

( ) LEVEL OF INPUTS  ( ) RELATIVE LEVEL OF INPUTS TO OUTCOMES
( ) LEVEL OF OUTCOMES  ( ) CERTAIN EQUITY RATIO  ( ) NONE
( ) BENEVOLENT  ( ) EQUITY SENSITIVE  ( ) ENTITLED  ( ) NONE

380. How many of your friends like to do their best at work?

( ) LEVEL OF INPUTS  ( ) RELATIVE LEVEL OF INPUTS TO OUTCOMES
( ) LEVEL OF OUTCOMES  ( ) CERTAIN EQUITY RATIO  ( ) NONE
( ) BENEVOLENT  ( ) EQUITY SENSITIVE  ( ) ENTITLED  ( ) NONE

381. Satisfaction for me comes from knowing that I am getting as much as I can from my employer, in terms of pay and benefits.

( ) LEVEL OF INPUTS  ( ) RELATIVE LEVEL OF INPUTS TO OUTCOMES
( ) LEVEL OF OUTCOMES  ( ) CERTAIN EQUITY RATIO  ( ) NONE
( ) BENEVOLENT  ( ) EQUITY SENSITIVE  ( ) ENTITLED  ( ) NONE

382. How many employees in a typical organization believe that the best job for them is one that has many duties and responsibilities?

( ) LEVEL OF INPUTS  ( ) RELATIVE LEVEL OF INPUTS TO OUTCOMES
( ) LEVEL OF OUTCOMES  ( ) CERTAIN EQUITY RATIO  ( ) NONE
( ) BENEVOLENT  ( ) EQUITY SENSITIVE  ( ) ENTITLED  ( ) NONE

383. How willing would you be, if you were an employer, to hire an applicant who is concerned about putting in a full day of hard work?

( ) LEVEL OF INPUTS  ( ) RELATIVE LEVEL OF INPUTS TO OUTCOMES
( ) LEVEL OF OUTCOMES  ( ) CERTAIN EQUITY RATIO  ( ) NONE
( ) BENEVOLENT  ( ) EQUITY SENSITIVE  ( ) ENTITLED  ( ) NONE
384. How many employees in a typical organization, even if they received low wages and benefits from their employer, would still try to do their best at their jobs?

( ) LEVEL OF INPUTS  ( ) RELATIVE LEVEL OF INPUTS TO OUTCOMES  
( ) LEVEL OF OUTCOMES ( ) CERTAIN EQUITY RATIO ( ) NONE

( ) BENEVOLENT ( ) EQUITY SENSITIVE ( ) ENTITLED ( ) NONE

385. I am extremely concerned about getting the most I can from my employer, in terms of pay, benefits, and the like.

( ) LEVEL OF INPUTS  ( ) RELATIVE LEVEL OF INPUTS TO OUTCOMES  
( ) LEVEL OF OUTCOMES ( ) CERTAIN EQUITY RATIO ( ) NONE

( ) BENEVOLENT ( ) EQUITY SENSITIVE ( ) ENTITLED ( ) NONE

386. How willing would you be, if you were an employer, to hire an applicant who believes that it is equally good to give and to receive?

( ) LEVEL OF INPUTS  ( ) RELATIVE LEVEL OF INPUTS TO OUTCOMES  
( ) LEVEL OF OUTCOMES ( ) CERTAIN EQUITY RATIO ( ) NONE

( ) BENEVOLENT ( ) EQUITY SENSITIVE ( ) ENTITLED ( ) NONE

387. How willing would you be, if you were an employer, to hire an applicant who believes that he/she should always get something for nothing at work?

( ) LEVEL OF INPUTS  ( ) RELATIVE LEVEL OF INPUTS TO OUTCOMES  
( ) LEVEL OF OUTCOMES ( ) CERTAIN EQUITY RATIO ( ) NONE

( ) BENEVOLENT ( ) EQUITY SENSITIVE ( ) ENTITLED ( ) NONE

388. How many of your friends, if they worked less than similarly qualified co-workers, would expect to be paid as much as or more than these similarly qualified co-workers?

( ) LEVEL OF INPUTS  ( ) RELATIVE LEVEL OF INPUTS TO OUTCOMES  
( ) LEVEL OF OUTCOMES ( ) CERTAIN EQUITY RATIO ( ) NONE

( ) BENEVOLENT ( ) EQUITY SENSITIVE ( ) ENTITLED ( ) NONE
389. How many of your friends, if they were paid more than similarly qualified co-workers for the same amount of work, would not feel "guilty" and would not increase their productivity?

( ) LEVEL OF INPUTS  ( ) RELATIVE LEVEL OF INPUTS TO OUTCOMES
( ) LEVEL OF OUTCOMES  ( ) CERTAIN EQUITY RATIO  ( ) NONE

( ) BENEVOLENT  ( ) EQUITY SENSITIVE  ( ) ENTITLED  ( ) NONE

390. How many of your friends will not settle for anything less than top dollar for their work?

( ) LEVEL OF INPUTS  ( ) RELATIVE LEVEL OF INPUTS TO OUTCOMES
( ) LEVEL OF OUTCOMES  ( ) CERTAIN EQUITY RATIO  ( ) NONE

( ) BENEVOLENT  ( ) EQUITY SENSITIVE  ( ) ENTITLED  ( ) NONE

391. How many of your friends believe that a big paycheck and a good benefits package is enough to make them completely satisfied at work?

( ) LEVEL OF INPUTS  ( ) RELATIVE LEVEL OF INPUTS TO OUTCOMES
( ) LEVEL OF OUTCOMES  ( ) CERTAIN EQUITY RATIO  ( ) NONE

( ) BENEVOLENT  ( ) EQUITY SENSITIVE  ( ) ENTITLED  ( ) NONE

392. How many of your friends, even if they received low wages and benefits from their employers, could still be satisfied with their jobs?

( ) LEVEL OF INPUTS  ( ) RELATIVE LEVEL OF INPUTS TO OUTCOMES
( ) LEVEL OF OUTCOMES  ( ) CERTAIN EQUITY RATIO  ( ) NONE

( ) BENEVOLENT  ( ) EQUITY SENSITIVE  ( ) ENTITLED  ( ) NONE

393. How many employees in a typical organization believe that people today are too concerned about getting the best pay and benefit packages they can from their employers?

( ) LEVEL OF INPUTS  ( ) RELATIVE LEVEL OF INPUTS TO OUTCOMES
( ) LEVEL OF OUTCOMES  ( ) CERTAIN EQUITY RATIO  ( ) NONE

( ) BENEVOLENT  ( ) EQUITY SENSITIVE  ( ) ENTITLED  ( ) NONE

394. How many of your friends actively seek extra work at their jobs?

( ) LEVEL OF INPUTS  ( ) RELATIVE LEVEL OF INPUTS TO OUTCOMES
( ) LEVEL OF OUTCOMES  ( ) CERTAIN EQUITY RATIO  ( ) NONE

( ) BENEVOLENT  ( ) EQUITY SENSITIVE  ( ) ENTITLED  ( ) NONE
395. How many of your friends, if they believed that they were getting a good deal, in terms of pay and benefits, but not the best deal from their employers, would be dissatisfied?

( ) LEVEL OF INPUTS ( ) RELATIVE LEVEL OF INPUTS TO OUTCOMES
( ) LEVEL OF OUTCOMES ( ) CERTAIN EQUITY RATIO ( ) NONE
( ) BENEVOLENT ( ) EQUITY SENSITIVE ( ) ENTITLED ( ) NONE

396. How many employees in a typical organization believe that the amount of pay and benefits an employer provides them is really not that important?

( ) LEVEL OF INPUTS ( ) RELATIVE LEVEL OF INPUTS TO OUTCOMES
( ) LEVEL OF OUTCOMES ( ) CERTAIN EQUITY RATIO ( ) NONE
( ) BENEVOLENT ( ) EQUITY SENSITIVE ( ) ENTITLED ( ) NONE

397. How willing would you be to work alongside a co-worker who is not concerned with getting the most he/she can, in terms of pay and benefits, from his/her employer?

( ) LEVEL OF INPUTS ( ) RELATIVE LEVEL OF INPUTS TO OUTCOMES
( ) LEVEL OF OUTCOMES ( ) CERTAIN EQUITY RATIO ( ) NONE
( ) BENEVOLENT ( ) EQUITY SENSITIVE ( ) ENTITLED ( ) NONE

398. How many employees in a typical organization would always feel compelled to do their best at work regardless of the wage they are paid by their employer?

( ) LEVEL OF INPUTS ( ) RELATIVE LEVEL OF INPUTS TO OUTCOMES
( ) LEVEL OF OUTCOMES ( ) CERTAIN EQUITY RATIO ( ) NONE
( ) BENEVOLENT ( ) EQUITY SENSITIVE ( ) ENTITLED ( ) NONE

399. I would always choose the job that provides me the greatest pay and benefits regardless.

( ) LEVEL OF INPUTS ( ) RELATIVE LEVEL OF INPUTS TO OUTCOMES
( ) LEVEL OF OUTCOMES ( ) CERTAIN EQUITY RATIO ( ) NONE
( ) BENEVOLENT ( ) EQUITY SENSITIVE ( ) ENTITLED ( ) NONE

400. I am driven to get as much as I can, in terms of pay and benefits, at work.

( ) LEVEL OF INPUTS ( ) RELATIVE LEVEL OF INPUTS TO OUTCOMES
( ) LEVEL OF OUTCOMES ( ) CERTAIN EQUITY RATIO ( ) NONE
( ) BENEVOLENT ( ) EQUITY SENSITIVE ( ) ENTITLED ( ) NONE
401. There is more to work than just the amount of pay and benefits you receive from your employer.

( ) LEVEL OF INPUTS ( ) RELATIVE LEVEL OF INPUTS TO OUTCOMES
( ) LEVEL OF OUTCOMES ( ) CERTAIN EQUITY RATIO ( ) NONE

( ) BENEVOLENT ( ) EQUITY SENSITIVE ( ) ENTITLED ( ) NONE

402. How many of your friends, when making a choice between jobs, would always choose the job which provides them the greatest pay and benefits regardless?

( ) LEVEL OF INPUTS ( ) RELATIVE LEVEL OF INPUTS TO OUTCOMES
( ) LEVEL OF OUTCOMES ( ) CERTAIN EQUITY RATIO ( ) NONE

( ) BENEVOLENT ( ) EQUITY SENSITIVE ( ) ENTITLED ( ) NONE

403. How willing would you be to work alongside a co-worker who believes that it is better to receive than to give?

( ) LEVEL OF INPUTS ( ) RELATIVE LEVEL OF INPUTS TO OUTCOMES
( ) LEVEL OF OUTCOMES ( ) CERTAIN EQUITY RATIO ( ) NONE

( ) BENEVOLENT ( ) EQUITY SENSITIVE ( ) ENTITLED ( ) NONE

404. How many employees in a typical organization, if they received low wages and poor benefits from their employer, would not be seriously bothered by it?

( ) LEVEL OF INPUTS ( ) RELATIVE LEVEL OF INPUTS TO OUTCOMES
( ) LEVEL OF OUTCOMES ( ) CERTAIN EQUITY RATIO ( ) NONE

( ) BENEVOLENT ( ) EQUITY SENSITIVE ( ) ENTITLED ( ) NONE

405. If my employer did not reward me well in terms of pay and benefits, I would be dissatisfied with my job.

( ) LEVEL OF INPUTS ( ) RELATIVE LEVEL OF INPUTS TO OUTCOMES
( ) LEVEL OF OUTCOMES ( ) CERTAIN EQUITY RATIO ( ) NONE

( ) BENEVOLENT ( ) EQUITY SENSITIVE ( ) ENTITLED ( ) NONE

406. How willing would you be, if you were an employer, to hire an applicant who if he/she did not receive top wages and benefits from his/her employer would be dissatisfied?

( ) LEVEL OF INPUTS ( ) RELATIVE LEVEL OF INPUTS TO OUTCOMES
( ) LEVEL OF OUTCOMES ( ) CERTAIN EQUITY RATIO ( ) NONE

( ) BENEVOLENT ( ) EQUITY SENSITIVE ( ) ENTITLED ( ) NONE
407. How willing would you be, if you were an employer, to promote an employee who takes on extra duties and responsibilities?

( ) LEVEL OF INPUTS ( ) RELATIVE LEVEL OF INPUTS TO OUTCOMES
( ) LEVEL OF OUTCOMES ( ) CERTAIN EQUITY RATIO ( ) NONE
( ) BENEVOLENT ( ) EQUITY SENSITIVE ( ) ENTITLED ( ) NONE

408. If I were given low wages and poor benefits by my employer, I would reduce my productivity at work.

( ) LEVEL OF INPUTS ( ) RELATIVE LEVEL OF INPUTS TO OUTCOMES
( ) LEVEL OF OUTCOMES ( ) CERTAIN EQUITY RATIO ( ) NONE
( ) BENEVOLENT ( ) EQUITY SENSITIVE ( ) ENTITLED ( ) NONE

409. How many of your friends, if similarly qualified co-workers worked harder and were paid a higher wage than them, would feel like they were being treated fairly by their employer and would be satisfied?

( ) LEVEL OF INPUTS ( ) RELATIVE LEVEL OF INPUTS TO OUTCOMES
( ) LEVEL OF OUTCOMES ( ) CERTAIN EQUITY RATIO ( ) NONE
( ) BENEVOLENT ( ) EQUITY SENSITIVE ( ) ENTITLED ( ) NONE

410. My services as an employee don't necessarily go to the employer who provides the best pay and benefits.

( ) LEVEL OF INPUTS ( ) RELATIVE LEVEL OF INPUTS TO OUTCOMES
( ) LEVEL OF OUTCOMES ( ) CERTAIN EQUITY RATIO ( ) NONE
( ) BENEVOLENT ( ) EQUITY SENSITIVE ( ) ENTITLED ( ) NONE

411. A big paycheck and a good benefits package is enough to make me completely satisfied at work.

( ) LEVEL OF INPUTS ( ) RELATIVE LEVEL OF INPUTS TO OUTCOMES
( ) LEVEL OF OUTCOMES ( ) CERTAIN EQUITY RATIO ( ) NONE
( ) BENEVOLENT ( ) EQUITY SENSITIVE ( ) ENTITLED ( ) NONE

412. How many employees in a typical organization are really not concerned at all with doing their best on the job?

( ) LEVEL OF INPUTS ( ) RELATIVE LEVEL OF INPUTS TO OUTCOMES
( ) LEVEL OF OUTCOMES ( ) CERTAIN EQUITY RATIO ( ) NONE
( ) BENEVOLENT ( ) EQUITY SENSITIVE ( ) ENTITLED ( ) NONE
413. For me, it's not enough to get a good deal, in terms of pay and benefits, from my employer; I must get the best deal.

( ) LEVEL OF INPUTS ( ) RELATIVE LEVEL OF INPUTS TO OUTCOMES
( ) LEVEL OF OUTCOMES ( ) CERTAIN EQUITY RATIO ( ) NONE
( ) BENEVOLENT ( ) EQUITY SENSITIVE ( ) ENTITLED ( ) NONE

414. How many employees in a typical organization, even if they were paid a low wage by their employer, would still work hard?

( ) LEVEL OF INPUTS ( ) RELATIVE LEVEL OF INPUTS TO OUTCOMES
( ) LEVEL OF OUTCOMES ( ) CERTAIN EQUITY RATIO ( ) NONE
( ) BENEVOLENT ( ) EQUITY SENSITIVE ( ) ENTITLED ( ) NONE

415. How willing would you be to work alongside a co-worker who strives to do his/her best on the job?

( ) LEVEL OF INPUTS ( ) RELATIVE LEVEL OF INPUTS TO OUTCOMES
( ) LEVEL OF OUTCOMES ( ) CERTAIN EQUITY RATIO ( ) NONE
( ) BENEVOLENT ( ) EQUITY SENSITIVE ( ) ENTITLED ( ) NONE

416. How many of your friends believe that there is more to life at work than just receiving a big paycheck?

( ) LEVEL OF INPUTS ( ) RELATIVE LEVEL OF INPUTS TO OUTCOMES
( ) LEVEL OF OUTCOMES ( ) CERTAIN EQUITY RATIO ( ) NONE
( ) BENEVOLENT ( ) EQUITY SENSITIVE ( ) ENTITLED ( ) NONE

417. Even in the face of low wages and poor benefits, I could still be satisfied at work under certain conditions.

( ) LEVEL OF INPUTS ( ) RELATIVE LEVEL OF INPUTS TO OUTCOMES
( ) LEVEL OF OUTCOMES ( ) CERTAIN EQUITY RATIO ( ) NONE
( ) BENEVOLENT ( ) EQUITY SENSITIVE ( ) ENTITLED ( ) NONE

418. How many employees in a typical organization are not all that concerned about getting the best deal possible, in terms of pay and benefits, from their employer for the work they perform?

( ) LEVEL OF INPUTS ( ) RELATIVE LEVEL OF INPUTS TO OUTCOMES
( ) LEVEL OF OUTCOMES ( ) CERTAIN EQUITY RATIO ( ) NONE
( ) BENEVOLENT ( ) EQUITY SENSITIVE ( ) ENTITLED ( ) NONE
419. How many employees in a typical organization, if they worked the same amount as other similarly qualified co-workers, would expect to be paid the same amount (no more, no less) as these other similarly qualified co-workers?

( ) LEVEL OF INPUTS ( ) RELATIVE LEVEL OF INPUTS TO OUTCOMES
( ) LEVEL OF OUTCOMES ( ) CERTAIN EQUITY RATIO ( ) NONE
( ) BENEVOLENT ( ) EQUITY SENSITIVE ( ) ENTITLED ( ) NONE

420. How many of your friends, if similarly qualified co-workers received the same deal, in terms of pay and benefits, from the employer as did they, would still be satisfied with the deal they received?

( ) LEVEL OF INPUTS ( ) RELATIVE LEVEL OF INPUTS TO OUTCOMES
( ) LEVEL OF OUTCOMES ( ) CERTAIN EQUITY RATIO ( ) NONE
( ) BENEVOLENT ( ) EQUITY SENSITIVE ( ) ENTITLED ( ) NONE

421. How many of your friends, if they were paid the same wage as similarly qualified co-workers but produced less work, would feel no motivation to increase their productivity?

( ) LEVEL OF INPUTS ( ) RELATIVE LEVEL OF INPUTS TO OUTCOMES
( ) LEVEL OF OUTCOMES ( ) CERTAIN EQUITY RATIO ( ) NONE
( ) BENEVOLENT ( ) EQUITY SENSITIVE ( ) ENTITLED ( ) NONE

422. How many of your friends believe that too much emphasis today is placed on getting as much as you can, in terms of pay and benefits, from your employer?

( ) LEVEL OF INPUTS ( ) RELATIVE LEVEL OF INPUTS TO OUTCOMES
( ) LEVEL OF OUTCOMES ( ) CERTAIN EQUITY RATIO ( ) NONE
( ) BENEVOLENT ( ) EQUITY SENSITIVE ( ) ENTITLED ( ) NONE

423. How many of your friends are not really that concerned about getting the best pay and benefits from their employer?

( ) LEVEL OF INPUTS ( ) RELATIVE LEVEL OF INPUTS TO OUTCOMES
( ) LEVEL OF OUTCOMES ( ) CERTAIN EQUITY RATIO ( ) NONE
( ) BENEVOLENT ( ) EQUITY SENSITIVE ( ) ENTITLED ( ) NONE
424. How many of your friends, if they were paid the same wage as similarly qualified co-workers for the same amount of work, would think about quitting their jobs?

( ) LEVEL OF INPUTS ( ) RELATIVE LEVEL OF INPUTS TO OUTCOMES
( ) LEVEL OF OUTCOMES ( ) CERTAIN EQUITY RATIO ( ) NONE

( ) BENEVOLENT ( ) EQUITY SENSITIVE ( ) ENTITLED ( ) NONE

425. I worry about doing the best job I can at work.

( ) LEVEL OF INPUTS ( ) RELATIVE LEVEL OF INPUTS TO OUTCOMES
( ) LEVEL OF OUTCOMES ( ) CERTAIN EQUITY RATIO ( ) NONE

( ) BENEVOLENT ( ) EQUITY SENSITIVE ( ) ENTITLED ( ) NONE

426. How many employees in a typical organization if they had little or no work to do would be dissatisfied?

( ) LEVEL OF INPUTS ( ) RELATIVE LEVEL OF INPUTS TO OUTCOMES
( ) LEVEL OF OUTCOMES ( ) CERTAIN EQUITY RATIO ( ) NONE

( ) BENEVOLENT ( ) EQUITY SENSITIVE ( ) ENTITLED ( ) NONE

427. How many of your friends believe that the best job is one that requires a lot of hard work?

( ) LEVEL OF INPUTS ( ) RELATIVE LEVEL OF INPUTS TO OUTCOMES
( ) LEVEL OF OUTCOMES ( ) CERTAIN EQUITY RATIO ( ) NONE

( ) BENEVOLENT ( ) EQUITY SENSITIVE ( ) ENTITLED ( ) NONE

428. Even if I received low wages and benefits from my employer, I would still try to do my best at my job.

( ) LEVEL OF INPUTS ( ) RELATIVE LEVEL OF INPUTS TO OUTCOMES
( ) LEVEL OF OUTCOMES ( ) CERTAIN EQUITY RATIO ( ) NONE

( ) BENEVOLENT ( ) EQUITY SENSITIVE ( ) ENTITLED ( ) NONE

429. How many of your friends, if they were receiving top dollar for their work, would feel a little guilty?

( ) LEVEL OF INPUTS ( ) RELATIVE LEVEL OF INPUTS TO OUTCOMES
( ) LEVEL OF OUTCOMES ( ) CERTAIN EQUITY RATIO ( ) NONE

( ) BENEVOLENT ( ) EQUITY SENSITIVE ( ) ENTITLED ( ) NONE
430. How many of your friends would agree that satisfaction for them comes from knowing that they are getting as much as they can from their employers, in terms of pay and benefits?

( ) LEVEL OF INPUTS ( ) RELATIVE LEVEL OF INPUTS TO OUTCOMES
( ) LEVEL OF OUTCOMES ( ) CERTAIN EQUITY RATIO ( ) NONE
( ) BENEVOLENT ( ) EQUITY SENSITIVE ( ) ENTITLED ( ) NONE

431. How many employees in a typical organization, if they believed that their employer was not paying them top dollar for their work, would seriously think about quitting?

( ) LEVEL OF INPUTS ( ) RELATIVE LEVEL OF INPUTS TO OUTCOMES
( ) LEVEL OF OUTCOMES ( ) CERTAIN EQUITY RATIO ( ) NONE
( ) BENEVOLENT ( ) EQUITY SENSITIVE ( ) ENTITLED ( ) NONE

432. My first thought when I am considering taking a position with an employer is how well the employer will pay me for my services.

( ) LEVEL OF INPUTS ( ) RELATIVE LEVEL OF INPUTS TO OUTCOMES
( ) LEVEL OF OUTCOMES ( ) CERTAIN EQUITY RATIO ( ) NONE
( ) BENEVOLENT ( ) EQUITY SENSITIVE ( ) ENTITLED ( ) NONE

433. How many of your friends, if they were paid a low wage by their employer, would still do their best at their jobs?

( ) LEVEL OF INPUTS ( ) RELATIVE LEVEL OF INPUTS TO OUTCOMES
( ) LEVEL OF OUTCOMES ( ) CERTAIN EQUITY RATIO ( ) NONE
( ) BENEVOLENT ( ) EQUITY SENSITIVE ( ) ENTITLED ( ) NONE

434. I am most satisfied at work when I have to do as little as possible.

( ) LEVEL OF INPUTS ( ) RELATIVE LEVEL OF INPUTS TO OUTCOMES
( ) LEVEL OF OUTCOMES ( ) CERTAIN EQUITY RATIO ( ) NONE
( ) BENEVOLENT ( ) EQUITY SENSITIVE ( ) ENTITLED ( ) NONE

435. If I was not getting as much pay and benefits as I believed I could from my employer, I would be dissatisfied.

( ) LEVEL OF INPUTS ( ) RELATIVE LEVEL OF INPUTS TO OUTCOMES
( ) LEVEL OF OUTCOMES ( ) CERTAIN EQUITY RATIO ( ) NONE
( ) BENEVOLENT ( ) EQUITY SENSITIVE ( ) ENTITLED ( ) NONE
436. How many employees in a typical organization believe that the best job is one that requires you to do as little work as possible?

( ) LEVEL OF INPUTS ( ) RELATIVE LEVEL OF INPUTS TO OUTCOMES
( ) LEVEL OF OUTCOMES ( ) CERTAIN EQUITY RATIO ( ) NONE

( ) BENEVOLENT ( ) EQUITY SENSITIVE ( ) ENTITLED ( ) NONE

437. The only job for me is one that provides me with top dollar for my work.

( ) LEVEL OF INPUTS ( ) RELATIVE LEVEL OF INPUTS TO OUTCOMES
( ) LEVEL OF OUTCOMES ( ) CERTAIN EQUITY RATIO ( ) NONE

( ) BENEVOLENT ( ) EQUITY SENSITIVE ( ) ENTITLED ( ) NONE

438. How many of your friends believe that the only things that are important at work are the wages and benefits the employer provides them for their services?

( ) LEVEL OF INPUTS ( ) RELATIVE LEVEL OF INPUTS TO OUTCOMES
( ) LEVEL OF OUTCOMES ( ) CERTAIN EQUITY RATIO ( ) NONE

( ) BENEVOLENT ( ) EQUITY SENSITIVE ( ) ENTITLED ( ) NONE

439. How many of your friends, if they could get away with it, would take it easy on their jobs?

( ) LEVEL OF INPUTS ( ) RELATIVE LEVEL OF INPUTS TO OUTCOMES
( ) LEVEL OF OUTCOMES ( ) CERTAIN EQUITY RATIO ( ) NONE

( ) BENEVOLENT ( ) EQUITY SENSITIVE ( ) ENTITLED ( ) NONE

440. I am constantly striving to get better pay and benefits from my employer.

( ) LEVEL OF INPUTS ( ) RELATIVE LEVEL OF INPUTS TO OUTCOMES
( ) LEVEL OF OUTCOMES ( ) CERTAIN EQUITY RATIO ( ) NONE

( ) BENEVOLENT ( ) EQUITY SENSITIVE ( ) ENTITLED ( ) NONE
APPENDIX O: DIRECTIONS FOR THE INITIAL PILOT STUDY
DIRECTIONS

1. The purpose of this research project is to develop a new questionnaire concerning how people approach life at work. This new questionnaire will measure a person’s beliefs, attitudes, and perceptions concerning life at work.

2. As part of this research project, you are asked to complete two questionnaires (the LSU Life at Work Survey and the BIDR questionnaire) and a demographic form.

3. Please be open and honest in responding to the questionnaires and the demographic form. It is important to this research project that you provide unbiased information. Your responses to the questionnaires and the demographic form are made anonymously and will be kept in strict confidentiality. As such, you are provided with an identification number. Please don't place your name or student id number on any of your answer sheets.

4. Please complete the LSU Life at Work Survey first, the BIDR questionnaire second, and the demographic form last.

   Special Instructions for the LSU Life at Work Survey: Please start with item #65 (on the questionnaire and on the scantron) and then complete the ENTIRE survey (all 270 items).

5. Three scantrons are provided for you to record your responses to the two questionnaires. Two scantrons are required for the LSU Life at Work Survey because this questionnaire has 270 items whereas a scantron only has 240 items. Therefore, your response to item #241 of the LSU Life at Work Survey should be placed in the #1 item of the second scantron. Likewise, your response to item #270 of the LSU Life at Work Survey should be placed in the #30 item of the second scantron. The BIDR questionnaire with its 40 items should be placed on the third scantron.

6. Thank you for your participation in this research project. I really appreciate all your help!
APPENDIX P: PREFATORY INSTRUCTIONS FOR THE LSU LIFE AT WORK SURVEY
LSU LIFE AT WORK SURVEY

Dear Survey Participant:

This inventory was developed by a doctoral student in I/O psychology at Louisiana State University in order to explore people's beliefs about, opinions concerning, and reactions to life at work. This is not a test. The only right answers to the questions are your honest and thoughtful replies. The information obtained will be used to better understand how people approach life at work.

PROTECTION OF PRIVACY

Public Law 93-579, entitled the Privacy Act of 1974, requires that all individuals be informed of the purposes and uses to be made of the information which is solicited. The following is furnished to explain why the information is requested and the general uses to which that information may be put.

PURPOSE: The purpose of the inventory is to better understand how people approach life at work.

USES: The survey data will be used for research and analysis purposes only. Individual responses are strictly confidential.

I would like to assure you that your answers to this inventory will be completely confidential. No one other than myself will see your individual answers. If the inventory is to be helpful in advancing our understanding of how people approach life at work, it is important that you provide honest and candid answers, and that you "tell it like it is."

Please place your answers on the Scantron provided. Do not answer on the Inventory or place any marks on the Inventory.

When you are finished, please check your Scantron to see that you have answered all the questions. Your cooperation is sincerely appreciated.

Sincerely,

Kerry S. Sauley
Doctoral Candidate
Department of Psychology
APPENDIX Q: LSU LIFE AT WORK SURVEY FOR PILOT STUDY ONE
For each of the following questions, please give the percentage (%) which you think is the best answer.

1. How many employees in a typical organization always strive to do their best at a job regardless?
   - 0-20%  (a)
   - 21-40% (b)
   - 41-60% (c)
   - 61-80% (d)
   - 81-100% (e)

2. How many employees in a typical organization are equally concerned about themselves and the organization for which they work?
   - 0-20%  (a)
   - 21-40% (b)
   - 41-60% (c)
   - 61-80% (d)
   - 81-100% (e)

3. How many employees in a typical organization believe that if they are paid the same wage as similarly qualified co-workers, they should work harder than these co-workers?
   - 0-20%  (a)
   - 21-40% (b)
   - 41-60% (c)
   - 61-80% (d)
   - 81-100% (e)

4. How many employees in a typical organization are really not concerned at all with doing their best on the job?
   - 0-20%  (a)
   - 21-40% (b)
   - 41-60% (c)
   - 61-80% (d)
   - 81-100% (e)

5. How many employees in a typical organization take on extra work for their jobs even though it is not required of them?
   - 0-20%  (a)
   - 21-40% (b)
   - 41-60% (c)
   - 61-80% (d)
   - 81-100% (e)

6. How many employees in a typical organization do less than they are paid to do?
   - 0-20%  (a)
   - 21-40% (b)
   - 41-60% (c)
   - 61-80% (d)
   - 81-100% (e)

7. How many employees in a typical organization are satisfied only when they get a better deal from the organization than similarly qualified co-workers?
   - 0-20%  (a)
   - 21-40% (b)
   - 41-60% (c)
   - 61-80% (d)
   - 81-100% (e)

8. How many employees in a typical organization are equally concerned about what they get from the organization and what they give to the organization?
   - 0-20%  (a)
   - 21-40% (b)
   - 41-60% (c)
   - 61-80% (d)
   - 81-100% (e)

9. How many employees in a typical organization are most satisfied when the amount of work they perform is greater than the amount they are paid for it?
   - 0-20%  (a)
   - 21-40% (b)
   - 41-60% (c)
   - 61-80% (d)
   - 81-100% (e)
*** Please do not mark on the inventory. Place your answers on Scantron and check to see that you have answered all the questions.***

10. How many employees in a typical organization, even if they received low wages and benefits from their employer, would still try to do their best at their jobs?

- 0-20%  
- 21-40%  
- 41-60%  
- 61-80%  
- 81-100%  
(a) (b) (c) (d) (e)

11. How many employees in a typical organization, if they were being paid a lower wage than similarly qualified co-workers who performed the same amount of work, would be most satisfied?

- 0-20%  
- 21-40%  
- 41-60%  
- 61-80%  
- 81-100%  
(a) (b) (c) (d) (e)

12. How many employees in a typical organization, if similarly qualified co-workers got a better deal from the organization than they did, would not really be bothered by it and would continue to do their best on the job?

- 0-20%  
- 21-40%  
- 41-60%  
- 61-80%  
- 81-100%  
(a) (b) (c) (d) (e)

13. How many employees in a typical organization, if they were paid the same amount as similarly qualified co-workers for the same amount of work, would feel guilty and increase the amount of work they performed?

- 0-20%  
- 21-40%  
- 41-60%  
- 61-80%  
- 81-100%  
(a) (b) (c) (d) (e)

14. How many employees in a typical organization believe that they should strive to get as much from the organization as they can while giving as little as possible in return?

- 0-20%  
- 21-40%  
- 41-60%  
- 61-80%  
- 81-100%  
(a) (b) (c) (d) (e)

15. How many employees in a typical organization, if they were paid a higher wage than similarly qualified co-workers for the same amount of work, would be most satisfied?

- 0-20%  
- 21-40%  
- 41-60%  
- 61-80%  
- 81-100%  
(a) (b) (c) (d) (e)

16. How many employees in a typical organization believe that the best job for them is one that has many duties and responsibilities?

- 0-20%  
- 21-40%  
- 41-60%  
- 61-80%  
- 81-100%  
(a) (b) (c) (d) (e)

17. How many employees in a typical organization believe that if they are paid the same wage as similarly qualified co-workers, they should not have to work as hard as these co-workers?

- 0-20%  
- 21-40%  
- 41-60%  
- 61-80%  
- 81-100%  
(a) (b) (c) (d) (e)

18. How many employees in a typical organization, if they were being paid less than similarly qualified co-workers for the same amount of work, would still be satisfied?

- 0-20%  
- 21-40%  
- 41-60%  
- 61-80%  
- 81-100%  
(a) (b) (c) (d) (e)
19. How many employees in a typical organization believe that the amount of pay and benefits an employer provides them is really not that important?

0-20% 21-40% 41-60% 61-80% 81-100%
(a) (b) (c) (d) (e)

20. How many employees in a typical organization, if they worked the same amount as other similarly qualified co-workers, would expect to be paid the same amount (no more, no less) as these other similarly qualified co-workers?

0-20% 21-40% 41-60% 61-80% 81-100%
(a) (b) (c) (d) (e)

21. How many employees in a typical organization, if they were being paid less than similarly qualified co-workers for the same amount of work, would still keep up their productivity?

0-20% 21-40% 41-60% 61-80% 81-100%
(a) (b) (c) (d) (e)

22. How many employees in a typical organization prefer that the amount of work they perform matches the amount they are paid for it?

0-20% 21-40% 41-60% 61-80% 81-100%
(a) (b) (c) (d) (e)

23. How many employees in a typical organization believe that they should be paid the same amount (no more, no less) as similarly qualified co-workers for the same amount of work?

0-20% 21-40% 41-60% 61-80% 81-100%
(a) (b) (c) (d) (e)

24. How many employees in a typical organization believe that it’s not enough to get a good deal, in terms of pay and benefits, from the employer rather they must get the best deal?

0-20% 21-40% 41-60% 61-80% 81-100%
(a) (b) (c) (d) (e)

25. How many employees in a typical organization, even if they were being paid more than similarly qualified co-workers for the same amount of work, would feel very little motivation to do any more work?

0-20% 21-40% 41-60% 61-80% 81-100%
(a) (b) (c) (d) (e)

26. How many employees in a typical organization are constantly striving to get better pay and benefits from their employer?

0-20% 21-40% 41-60% 61-80% 81-100%
(a) (b) (c) (d) (e)

27. How many employees in a typical organization, if they were not getting as much pay and benefits as they believed they could from their employer, would be dissatisfied?

0-20% 21-40% 41-60% 61-80% 81-100%
(a) (b) (c) (d) (e)
28. How many employees in a typical organization would take it easy on the job if they could get away with it?

0-20%——21-40%——41-60%——61-80%——81-100%
(a) (b) (c) (d) (e)

29. How many employees in a typical organization, if they believed that their employer was not paying them top dollar for their work, would seriously think about quitting?

0-20%——21-40%——41-60%——61-80%——81-100%
(a) (b) (c) (d) (e)

30. How many employees in a typical organization want more rewards than they work for or deserve?

0-20%——21-40%——41-60%——61-80%——81-100%
(a) (b) (c) (d) (e)

31. How many employees in a typical organization believe that the best job is one that requires you to do as little work as possible?

0-20%——21-40%——41-60%——61-80%——81-100%
(a) (b) (c) (d) (e)

32. How many employees in a typical organization, even if they were paid a fair wage relative to similarly qualified co-workers, would try to get out of work?

0-20%——21-40%——41-60%——61-80%——81-100%
(a) (b) (c) (d) (e)

33. How many employees in a typical organization, if they got a better deal from the organization than their similarly qualified co-workers did, would not feel guilty and would not try to increase their productivity on the job?

0-20%——21-40%——41-60%——61-80%——81-100%
(a) (b) (c) (d) (e)

34. How many employees in a typical organization arrive a little late for work on any given day?

0-20%——21-40%——41-60%——61-80%——81-100%
(a) (b) (c) (d) (e)

35. How many employees in a typical organization, if they were being paid the same wage as similarly qualified co-workers for the same amount of work, would still take unauthorized work breaks?

0-20%——21-40%——41-60%——61-80%——81-100%
(a) (b) (c) (d) (e)

36. How many employees in a typical organization, even if their employer did not reward them well, in terms of pay and benefits, could still be satisfied with their jobs?

0-20%——21-40%——41-60%——61-80%——81-100%
(a) (b) (c) (d) (e)
37. How many employees in a typical organization feel like they should do more work even though they have already put in the same amount of work as others doing the same job?

0-20% — 21-40% — 41-60% — 61-80% — 81-100%  
(a) (b) (c) (d) (e)

38. How many employees in a typical organization, if they worked the same amount as other similarly qualified co-workers, would expect to be paid a lower amount than these other similarly qualified co-workers?

0-20% — 21-40% — 41-60% — 61-80% — 81-100%  
(a) (b) (c) (d) (e)

39. How many employees in a typical organization could be considered loafers?

0-20% — 21-40% — 41-60% — 61-80% — 81-100%  
(a) (b) (c) (d) (e)

40. How many employees in a typical organization shy away from accepting those things that they have worked for or deserve because they do not like even the appearance of being indebted to others?

0-20% — 21-40% — 41-60% — 61-80% — 81-100%  
(a) (b) (c) (d) (e)

41. How many employees in a typical organization, if they were paid the same wage as similarly qualified co-workers for the same amount of work, would be completely satisfied?

0-20% — 21-40% — 41-60% — 61-80% — 81-100%  
(a) (b) (c) (d) (e)

42. How many employees in a typical organization are only concerned about what the job pays them?

0-20% — 21-40% — 41-60% — 61-80% — 81-100%  
(a) (b) (c) (d) (e)

43. How many employees in a typical organization, if they received low wages and poor benefits from their employer, would not be seriously bothered by it?

0-20% — 21-40% — 41-60% — 61-80% — 81-100%  
(a) (b) (c) (d) (e)

44. How many employees in a typical organization are most comfortable when what they get from their employer matches what they give to their employer?

0-20% — 21-40% — 41-60% — 61-80% — 81-100%  
(a) (b) (c) (d) (e)

45. How many employees in a typical organization, if they were paid the same wage as similarly qualified co-workers for the same amount of work, would feel satisfied and would continue to do as much work as they have in the past?

0-20% — 21-40% — 41-60% — 61-80% — 81-100%  
(a) (b) (c) (d) (e)
*** Please do not mark on the inventory. Place your answers on Scantron and check to see that you have answered all the questions.***

46. How many employees in a typical organization believe that an employee should try to stay busy all day rather than try to find ways to get out of doing work?

0-20% (a) 21-40% (b) 41-60% (c) 61-80% (d) 81-100% (e)

47. How many employees in a typical organization would always feel compelled to do their best at work regardless of the wage they are paid by their employer?

0-20% (a) 21-40% (b) 41-60% (c) 61-80% (d) 81-100% (e)

48. How many employees in a typical organization believe that if they are paid the same wage as similarly qualified co-workers, they should work only as much as these co-workers do?

0-20% (a) 21-40% (b) 41-60% (c) 61-80% (d) 81-100% (e)

49. How many employees in a typical organization, if they were paid the same wage as similarly qualified co-workers for the same amount of work, would still take paid sick leave even though they were not sick?

0-20% (a) 21-40% (b) 41-60% (c) 61-80% (d) 81-100% (e)

50. How many employees in a typical organization if they had little or no work to do would be dissatisfied?

0-20% (a) 21-40% (b) 41-60% (c) 61-80% (d) 81-100% (e)

51. How many employees in a typical organization do more than they are paid to do at work?

0-20% (a) 21-40% (b) 41-60% (c) 61-80% (d) 81-100% (e)

52. How many employees in a typical organization put in a fair day's work (no more, no less) for a fair day's wage?

0-20% (a) 21-40% (b) 41-60% (c) 61-80% (d) 81-100% (e)

53. How many employees in a typical organization would choose the job which pays the most?

0-20% (a) 21-40% (b) 41-60% (c) 61-80% (d) 81-100% (e)

54. How many employees in a typical organization on any given day put in a full day of hard work?

0-20% (a) 21-40% (b) 41-60% (c) 61-80% (d) 81-100% (e)

55. How many employees in a typical organization believe it's better to give than to receive?

0-20% (a) 21-40% (b) 41-60% (c) 61-80% (d) 81-100% (e)
56. How many employees in a typical organization believe that the best day at work is one where there is little work for them to do?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percentage Range</th>
<th>(a)</th>
<th>(b)</th>
<th>(c)</th>
<th>(d)</th>
<th>(e)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0-20%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21-40%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41-60%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61-80%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81-100%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

57. How many employees in a typical organization prefer that the amount of work they perform always exceeds the wages they are paid for it?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percentage Range</th>
<th>(a)</th>
<th>(b)</th>
<th>(c)</th>
<th>(d)</th>
<th>(e)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0-20%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21-40%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41-60%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61-80%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81-100%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

58. How many employees in a typical organization believe that they should be paid more than similarly qualified co-workers but have to work less?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percentage Range</th>
<th>(a)</th>
<th>(b)</th>
<th>(c)</th>
<th>(d)</th>
<th>(e)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0-20%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21-40%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41-60%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61-80%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81-100%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

59. How many employees in a typical organization feel like they should always get something for nothing?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percentage Range</th>
<th>(a)</th>
<th>(b)</th>
<th>(c)</th>
<th>(d)</th>
<th>(e)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0-20%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21-40%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41-60%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61-80%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81-100%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

60. How many employees in a typical organization enjoy doing as little as possible at work?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percentage Range</th>
<th>(a)</th>
<th>(b)</th>
<th>(c)</th>
<th>(d)</th>
<th>(e)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0-20%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21-40%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41-60%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61-80%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81-100%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

61. How many employees in a typical organization put in a full day of hard work, on a given day?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percentage Range</th>
<th>(a)</th>
<th>(b)</th>
<th>(c)</th>
<th>(d)</th>
<th>(e)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0-20%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21-40%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41-60%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61-80%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81-100%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

62. How many employees in a typical organization live by the motto "a fair day's work (no more, no less) for a fair day's wage"?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percentage Range</th>
<th>(a)</th>
<th>(b)</th>
<th>(c)</th>
<th>(d)</th>
<th>(e)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0-20%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21-40%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41-60%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61-80%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81-100%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

63. How many employees in a typical organization believe that it's equally good to give and to receive?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percentage Range</th>
<th>(a)</th>
<th>(b)</th>
<th>(c)</th>
<th>(d)</th>
<th>(e)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0-20%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21-40%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41-60%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61-80%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81-100%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

64. How many employees in a typical organization are "takers" rather than "givers"?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percentage Range</th>
<th>(a)</th>
<th>(b)</th>
<th>(c)</th>
<th>(d)</th>
<th>(e)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0-20%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21-40%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41-60%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61-80%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81-100%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
For each of the following questions, please indicate how much you agree or disagree with each statement.

65. I am extremely concerned about getting the most I can from my employer, in terms of pay, benefits, and the like.

   | Strongly Agree | Neither | Strongly Disagree |
   | (a) | (b) | (c) | (d) | (e) |

66. When it comes to work, I worry more about what I can get than what I can give.

   | Strongly Agree | Neither | Strongly Disagree |
   | (a) | (b) | (c) | (d) | (e) |

67. If I were offered what I considered to be a "fair deal" by my employer for the work I performed, I would still try to negotiate with my employer to get a better deal.

   | Strongly Agree | Neither | Strongly Disagree |
   | (a) | (b) | (c) | (d) | (e) |

68. There is more to work than just the amount of pay and benefits you receive from your employer.

   | Strongly Agree | Neither | Strongly Disagree |
   | (a) | (b) | (c) | (d) | (e) |

69. I, at times, do more than my fair share at work so I know for sure that I have pulled my own weight.

   | Strongly Agree | Neither | Strongly Disagree |
   | (a) | (b) | (c) | (d) | (e) |

70. When I am looking for a job, the most important consideration is what an employer can provide me in terms of benefits, pay, and the like.

   | Strongly Agree | Neither | Strongly Disagree |
   | (a) | (b) | (c) | (d) | (e) |

71. If I had to work hard all day at my job, I would probably quit.

<p>| Strongly Agree | Neither | Strongly Disagree |
| (a) | (b) | (c) | (d) | (e) |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Rating Options</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>72. When I have completed my tasks for the day, I help out other employees who have yet to complete their tasks.</td>
<td>Strongly Disagree – Disagree – Neither – Agree – Strongly Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73. People who do not like to do their best at a job are probably unhappy.</td>
<td>Strongly Disagree – Disagree – Neither – Agree – Strongly Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>74. At work, I feel uneasy when there is little work for me to do.</td>
<td>Strongly Disagree – Disagree – Neither – Agree – Strongly Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75. My first thought when I am considering taking a position with an employer is how well the employer will pay me for my services.</td>
<td>Strongly Disagree – Disagree – Neither – Agree – Strongly Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76. I am driven to get as much as I can, in terms of pay and benefits, at work.</td>
<td>Strongly Disagree – Disagree – Neither – Agree – Strongly Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>77. I worry about doing the best job I can at work.</td>
<td>Strongly Disagree – Disagree – Neither – Agree – Strongly Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78. If people were more interested in what they could do for their employers and less interested in what their employers could do for them, this country would be a better and more productive place.</td>
<td>Strongly Disagree – Disagree – Neither – Agree – Strongly Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79. If I received low wages and poor benefits from my employer, I would not be seriously bothered by it.</td>
<td>Strongly Disagree – Disagree – Neither – Agree – Strongly Agree</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
80. If I were a manager, I would probably hire applicants who are more concerned about what they can get from their employer than what they can give to their employer.

- Strongly Disagree
- Disagree
- Neither
- Agree
- Strongly Agree

(a) (b) (c) (d) (e)

81. If I were a manager, I would definitely hire someone who is completely satisfied when they receive the same rewards as similarly qualified co-workers for the same amount of work.

- Strongly Disagree
- Disagree
- Neither
- Agree
- Strongly Agree

(a) (b) (c) (d) (e)

82. I feel obligated to my employer to do more than I am paid to do at work.

- Strongly Disagree
- Disagree
- Neither
- Agree
- Strongly Agree

(a) (b) (c) (d) (e)

83. The amount of pay and benefits an employer provides me is not that important to me.

- Strongly Disagree
- Disagree
- Neither
- Agree
- Strongly Agree

(a) (b) (c) (d) (e)

84. The only job for me is one that provides me with top dollar for my work.

- Strongly Disagree
- Disagree
- Neither
- Agree
- Strongly Agree

(a) (b) (c) (d) (e)

85. When I take a job I am more concerned about how I will benefit the organization rather than how the organization will benefit me.

- Strongly Disagree
- Disagree
- Neither
- Agree
- Strongly Agree

(a) (b) (c) (d) (e)

86. When it comes to work, I am equally concerned about what I can give to my employer and what I can get from my employer.

- Strongly Disagree
- Disagree
- Neither
- Agree
- Strongly Agree

(a) (b) (c) (d) (e)
87. Employees who are more concerned about what they can get from their employer rather than what they can contribute to their employer are the wise ones.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Neither</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(a)</td>
<td>(b)</td>
<td>(c)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

88. I prefer work situations where I know the work I am contributing is worth more than what my employer is paying me for it.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Neither</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(a)</td>
<td>(b)</td>
<td>(c)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

89. I am constantly striving to get better pay and benefits from my employer.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Neither</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(a)</td>
<td>(b)</td>
<td>(c)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

90. If I were a manager, I would definitely hire someone who is concerned about a "fair day's work for a fair day's wage".

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Neither</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(a)</td>
<td>(b)</td>
<td>(c)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

91. A job which requires me to be busy during the day is better than a job which allows a lot of loafing.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Neither</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(a)</td>
<td>(b)</td>
<td>(c)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

92. It is really satisfying to me when I can get something for nothing at work.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Neither</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(a)</td>
<td>(b)</td>
<td>(c)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

93. When my employer rewards me well in terms of pay and benefits, I am satisfied.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Neither</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(a)</td>
<td>(b)</td>
<td>(c)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

94. Employees who work hard even when they are paid less than similarly qualified coworkers make the best employees.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Neither</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(a)</td>
<td>(b)</td>
<td>(c)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
95. It is extremely important for me to get the best deal possible, in terms of pay and benefits, from my employer.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Neither Agree Nor</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(a)</td>
<td>(b)</td>
<td>(c)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(d)</td>
<td>(e)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

96. Even if I received low wages and benefits from my employer, I could still be satisfied with my job.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Neither Agree Nor</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(a)</td>
<td>(b)</td>
<td>(c)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(d)</td>
<td>(e)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

97. High wages and good benefits are the primary reason why I work.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Neither Agree Nor</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(a)</td>
<td>(b)</td>
<td>(c)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(d)</td>
<td>(e)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

98. When it comes to my employer, I am equally concerned about what I can give to my employer and what I can get from my employer.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Neither Agree Nor</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(a)</td>
<td>(b)</td>
<td>(c)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(d)</td>
<td>(e)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

99. For me, it’s not enough to get a good deal, in terms of pay and benefits, from my employer; I must get the best deal.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Neither Agree Nor</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(a)</td>
<td>(b)</td>
<td>(c)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(d)</td>
<td>(e)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

100. I prefer to do as little as possible at work while getting as much as I can from my employer.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Neither Agree Nor</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(a)</td>
<td>(b)</td>
<td>(c)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(d)</td>
<td>(e)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

101. Employees who are equally concerned about themselves and the organization make the best employees.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Neither Agree Nor</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(a)</td>
<td>(b)</td>
<td>(c)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(d)</td>
<td>(e)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
102. If I believed I was not getting as much pay and benefits as I could from my employer, I would be dissatisfied.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Neither</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(a)</td>
<td>(b)</td>
<td>(c)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(d)</td>
<td></td>
<td>(e)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

103. Employees who take on extra-duties and responsibilities even though they are just paid the same wage as similarly qualified co-workers are a credit to themselves and to their employer.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Neither</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(a)</td>
<td>(b)</td>
<td>(c)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(d)</td>
<td></td>
<td>(e)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

104. It drives me crazy when I have nothing to do at work.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Neither</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(a)</td>
<td>(b)</td>
<td>(c)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(d)</td>
<td></td>
<td>(e)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

105. I try to think of ways to do my job more effectively and efficiently.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Neither</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(a)</td>
<td>(b)</td>
<td>(c)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(d)</td>
<td></td>
<td>(e)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

106. It is the smart employee who get as much they can from an employer while giving as little as possible in return.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Neither</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(a)</td>
<td>(b)</td>
<td>(c)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(d)</td>
<td></td>
<td>(e)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

107. A big paycheck and a good benefits package is enough to make me completely satisfied at work.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Neither</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(a)</td>
<td>(b)</td>
<td>(c)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(d)</td>
<td></td>
<td>(e)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

108. Employees who believe that it's equally good to give and to receive are the most well-adjusted employees.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Neither</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(a)</td>
<td>(b)</td>
<td>(c)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(d)</td>
<td></td>
<td>(e)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
109. All other things being equal, it is better to have a job with a lot of duties and responsibilities than one with few duties and responsibilities.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neither</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(a)</td>
<td>(b)</td>
<td>(c)</td>
<td>(d)</td>
<td>(e)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

110. I am always looking to maximize what I get from my employer.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neither</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(a)</td>
<td>(b)</td>
<td>(c)</td>
<td>(d)</td>
<td>(e)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

111. My dream is to get ahead in life without having to try too hard to do it.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neither</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(a)</td>
<td>(b)</td>
<td>(c)</td>
<td>(d)</td>
<td>(e)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

112. I have a responsibility to my employer to do the best job I can.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neither</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(a)</td>
<td>(b)</td>
<td>(c)</td>
<td>(d)</td>
<td>(e)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

113. If I were given low wages and poor benefits by my employer, I would reduce my productivity at work.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neither</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(a)</td>
<td>(b)</td>
<td>(c)</td>
<td>(d)</td>
<td>(e)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

114. I admire people who are fair minded and accept only those rewards that they have worked for or rightfully deserve.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neither</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(a)</td>
<td>(b)</td>
<td>(c)</td>
<td>(d)</td>
<td>(e)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

115. Only fools worry about doing their best at their jobs.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neither</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(a)</td>
<td>(b)</td>
<td>(c)</td>
<td>(d)</td>
<td>(e)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

116. Employees who are not overly concerned about getting the best deal from their employers for the work they perform are the ones that turn out to be good employees.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neither</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(a)</td>
<td>(b)</td>
<td>(c)</td>
<td>(d)</td>
<td>(e)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Please do not mark on the inventory. Place your answers on Scantron and check to see that you have answered all the questions.**

117. **Even in the face of low wages and poor benefits, I could still be satisfied at work under certain conditions.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neither</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(a)</td>
<td>(b)</td>
<td>(c)</td>
<td>(d)</td>
<td>(e)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

118. **What an employer gives to me and what I give to an employer are equally important to me.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neither</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(a)</td>
<td>(b)</td>
<td>(c)</td>
<td>(d)</td>
<td>(e)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

119. **Satisfaction for me comes from knowing that I am getting as much as I can from my employer, in terms of pay and benefits.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neither</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(a)</td>
<td>(b)</td>
<td>(c)</td>
<td>(d)</td>
<td>(e)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

120. **If my employer did not reward me well in terms of pay and benefits, I would be dissatisfied with my job.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neither</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(a)</td>
<td>(b)</td>
<td>(c)</td>
<td>(d)</td>
<td>(e)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

121. **I believe if I do a good job, I should be rewarded well, but if I do a poor job, I should be rewarded poorly.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neither</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(a)</td>
<td>(b)</td>
<td>(c)</td>
<td>(d)</td>
<td>(e)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

122. **I am most satisfied at work when I have to do as little as possible.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neither</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(a)</td>
<td>(b)</td>
<td>(c)</td>
<td>(d)</td>
<td>(e)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

123. **As a rule, I am not at all concerned about the rewards an employer provides me for my work.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neither</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(a)</td>
<td>(b)</td>
<td>(c)</td>
<td>(d)</td>
<td>(e)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
124. At work, my greatest concern is whether or not I am doing the best job I can.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Neither Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(a)</td>
<td>(b)</td>
<td>(c)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

125. I would become very dissatisfied with my job if I had little or no work to do.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Neither Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(a)</td>
<td>(b)</td>
<td>(c)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

126. An employer that provides me with less than top dollar to its employees is an employer for which I could not work.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Neither Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(a)</td>
<td>(b)</td>
<td>(c)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

127. I usually show up for work a little early, to get things ready.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Neither Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(a)</td>
<td>(b)</td>
<td>(c)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

128. Even if I received low wages and benefits from my employer, I would still try to do my best at my job.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Neither Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(a)</td>
<td>(b)</td>
<td>(c)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

129. When I am at my job, I think of ways to get out of work.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Neither Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(a)</td>
<td>(b)</td>
<td>(c)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

130. It is equally good to give and to receive.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Neither Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(a)</td>
<td>(b)</td>
<td>(c)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

131. My services as an employee don't necessarily go to the employer who provides the best pay and benefits.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Neither Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(a)</td>
<td>(b)</td>
<td>(c)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
132. If I could get away with it, I would take it easy on the job.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Neither Agree Nor</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(a)</td>
<td>(b)</td>
<td>(c)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

133. I would choose the job which pays the most regardless.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Neither Agree Nor</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(a)</td>
<td>(b)</td>
<td>(c)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

134. I would always choose the job that provides me the greatest pay and benefits regardless.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Neither Agree Nor</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(a)</td>
<td>(b)</td>
<td>(c)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

135. I always try to do things the easy way at work.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Neither Agree Nor</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(a)</td>
<td>(b)</td>
<td>(c)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

136. An ideal job for me is one with few duties and responsibilities.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Neither Agree Nor</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(a)</td>
<td>(b)</td>
<td>(c)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

137. I am genuinely concerned about helping my employer become more successful.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Neither Agree Nor</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(a)</td>
<td>(b)</td>
<td>(c)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

138. The best job I can have is one which permits me to do almost nothing during the work day.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Neither Agree Nor</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(a)</td>
<td>(b)</td>
<td>(c)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

139. I occasionally show up for work a little late.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Neither Agree Nor</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(a)</td>
<td>(b)</td>
<td>(c)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Please do not mark on the inventory. Place your answers on Scantron and check to see that you have answered all the questions.**

140. If I could get away with it, I would try to work just a little slower than the boss expects.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree Not</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(a)</td>
<td>(b)</td>
<td>(c)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

141. It is better to give than to receive.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree Not</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(a)</td>
<td>(b)</td>
<td>(c)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

142. I am most satisfied when the rewards I receive from my employer match the amount of the work I perform.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree Not</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(a)</td>
<td>(b)</td>
<td>(c)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

143. I like to do my best at work.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree Not</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(a)</td>
<td>(b)</td>
<td>(c)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For each of the following questions, please indicate how you would respond, in terms of productivity, to the situation described in the question.

144. You and your co-worker, who is similar to you in both background and years of experience, are both loafing at work but you are given significantly less rewards than your co-worker. How would you respond to this situation, in terms of productivity?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Decrease productivity</th>
<th>Decrease productivity</th>
<th>No change in productivity</th>
<th>Increase productivity</th>
<th>Increase productivity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(a)</td>
<td>(b)</td>
<td>(c)</td>
<td>(d)</td>
<td>(e)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

145. You work significantly harder than your co-worker, who is similar to you in both background and years of experience, but both you are given the same level of rewards. How would you respond to this situation, in terms of productivity?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Decrease productivity</th>
<th>Decrease productivity</th>
<th>No change in productivity</th>
<th>Increase productivity</th>
<th>Increase productivity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(a)</td>
<td>(b)</td>
<td>(c)</td>
<td>(d)</td>
<td>(e)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
146. You and your co-worker, who is similar to you in both background and years of experience, are both working hard and both of you are given the same high level of rewards. How would you respond to this situation, in terms of productivity?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Decrease productivity</th>
<th>Decrease productivity</th>
<th>No change in productivity</th>
<th>Increase productivity</th>
<th>Increase productivity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Extent</td>
<td>a)</td>
<td>b)</td>
<td>c)</td>
<td>d)</td>
<td>e)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extent</td>
<td>great extent</td>
<td>extent</td>
<td>extent</td>
<td>great extent</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

147. You and your co-worker, who is similar to you in both background and years of experience, are working equally hard but you are given significantly less rewards than your co-worker. How would you respond to this situation, in terms of productivity?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Decrease productivity</th>
<th>Decrease productivity</th>
<th>Increase productivity</th>
<th>Increase productivity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Extent</td>
<td>a)</td>
<td>(b)</td>
<td>c)</td>
<td>(d)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extent</td>
<td>to a very extent</td>
<td>to some extent</td>
<td>to some extent</td>
<td>to a very great extent</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

148. You and your co-worker, who is similar to you in both background and years of experience, are both loafing at work but both of you are given the same low level of rewards. How would you respond to this situation, in terms of productivity?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Decrease productivity</th>
<th>Decrease productivity</th>
<th>No change in productivity</th>
<th>Increase productivity</th>
<th>Increase productivity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Extent</td>
<td>a)</td>
<td>(b)</td>
<td>(c)</td>
<td>(d)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extent</td>
<td>to a very extent</td>
<td>to some extent</td>
<td>to some extent</td>
<td>to a very great extent</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

149. You and your co-worker, who is similar to you in both background and years of experience, are both loafing at work but both of you are given the same high level of rewards. How would you respond to this situation, in terms of productivity?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Decrease productivity</th>
<th>Decrease productivity</th>
<th>No change in productivity</th>
<th>Increase productivity</th>
<th>Increase productivity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Extent</td>
<td>a)</td>
<td>(b)</td>
<td>(c)</td>
<td>(d)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extent</td>
<td>to a very extent</td>
<td>to some extent</td>
<td>to some extent</td>
<td>to a very great extent</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

150. You and your co-worker, who is similar to you in both work background and experience, are both loafing at work but you receive significantly more rewards than does your co-worker. How would you respond to this situation, in terms of productivity?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Decrease productivity</th>
<th>Decrease productivity</th>
<th>No change in productivity</th>
<th>Increase productivity</th>
<th>Increase productivity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Extent</td>
<td>a)</td>
<td>b)</td>
<td>c)</td>
<td>(d)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extent</td>
<td>to a very extent</td>
<td>to some extent</td>
<td>to some extent</td>
<td>to a very great extent</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

151. You and your co-worker, who is similar to you in both background and years of experience, are both working hard and both of you receive the same level of rewards. How would you respond to this situation, in terms of productivity?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Decrease productivity</th>
<th>Decrease productivity</th>
<th>No change in productivity</th>
<th>Increase productivity</th>
<th>Increase productivity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Extent</td>
<td>a)</td>
<td>(b)</td>
<td>(c)</td>
<td>(d)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extent</td>
<td>to a very extent</td>
<td>to some extent</td>
<td>to some extent</td>
<td>to a very great extent</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
152. You are working significantly less than your co-worker, who is similar to you in both background and years of experience, but you receive the same level of rewards as your co-worker. How would you respond to this situation, in terms of productivity?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Decrease productivity</th>
<th>Decrease productivity</th>
<th>No change in productivity</th>
<th>Increase productivity</th>
<th>Increase productivity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>to a very great extent</td>
<td>to some extent</td>
<td>to some extent</td>
<td>to a very great extent</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(a) (b) (c) (d) (e)

153. You work significantly harder than your co-worker, who is similar to you in both background and years of experience, but you receive significantly less rewards than your co-worker. How would you respond to this situation, in terms of productivity?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Decrease productivity</th>
<th>Decrease productivity</th>
<th>No change in productivity</th>
<th>Increase productivity</th>
<th>Increase productivity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>to a very great extent</td>
<td>to some extent</td>
<td>to some extent</td>
<td>to a very great extent</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(a) (b) (c) (d) (e)

154. You and your co-worker, who is similar to you in both background and years of experience, are loafing at work but you are given significantly less rewards than your co-worker. How would you respond to this situation, in terms of productivity?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Decrease productivity</th>
<th>Decrease productivity</th>
<th>No change in productivity</th>
<th>Increase productivity</th>
<th>Increase productivity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>to a very great extent</td>
<td>to some extent</td>
<td>to some extent</td>
<td>to a very great extent</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(a) (b) (c) (d) (e)

155. You are working significantly less than your co-worker, who is similar to you in both background and years of experience, and you receive significantly less rewards than your co-worker. How would you respond to this situation, in terms of productivity?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Decrease productivity</th>
<th>Decrease productivity</th>
<th>No change in productivity</th>
<th>Increase productivity</th>
<th>Increase productivity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>to a very great extent</td>
<td>to some extent</td>
<td>to some extent</td>
<td>to a very great extent</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(a) (b) (c) (d) (e)

156. You are working significantly less than your co-worker, who is similar to you in both background and years of experience, but you receive significantly more rewards than does your co-worker. How would you respond to this situation, in terms of productivity?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Decrease productivity</th>
<th>Decrease productivity</th>
<th>No change in productivity</th>
<th>Increase productivity</th>
<th>Increase productivity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>to a very great extent</td>
<td>to some extent</td>
<td>to some extent</td>
<td>to a very great extent</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(a) (b) (c) (d) (e)
For each of the following questions, please indicate how you would respond, in terms of satisfaction, to the situation described in the question.

157. You are working significantly less than your co-worker, who is similar to you in both background and years of experience, but you receive significantly more rewards than does your co-worker. How satisfied would you be given this situation?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Very Dissatisfied</th>
<th>Dissatisfied</th>
<th>Neither satisfied</th>
<th>Satisfied</th>
<th>Very Satisfied</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(a)</td>
<td>(b)</td>
<td>(c)</td>
<td>(d)</td>
<td>(e)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

158. You and your co-worker, who is similar to you in both background and years of experience, are both losing at work and both of you are given the same high level of rewards. How satisfied would you be given this situation?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Very Dissatisfied</th>
<th>Dissatisfied</th>
<th>Neither satisfied</th>
<th>Satisfied</th>
<th>Very Satisfied</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(a)</td>
<td>(b)</td>
<td>(c)</td>
<td>(d)</td>
<td>(e)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

159. You and your co-worker, who is similar to you in both background and years of experience, are working equally hard but you are given significantly less rewards than your co-worker. How satisfied would you be given this situation?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Very Dissatisfied</th>
<th>Dissatisfied</th>
<th>Neither satisfied</th>
<th>Satisfied</th>
<th>Very Satisfied</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(a)</td>
<td>(b)</td>
<td>(c)</td>
<td>(d)</td>
<td>(e)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

160. You work significantly harder than your co-worker, who is similar to you in both background and years of experience, but both of you are given significantly less rewards than your co-worker. How satisfied would you be given this situation?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Very Dissatisfied</th>
<th>Dissatisfied</th>
<th>Neither satisfied</th>
<th>Satisfied</th>
<th>Very Satisfied</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(a)</td>
<td>(b)</td>
<td>(c)</td>
<td>(d)</td>
<td>(e)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

161. You work significantly harder than your co-worker, who is similar to you in both background and years of experience and both of you are given the same level of rewards. How satisfied would you be given this situation?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Very Dissatisfied</th>
<th>Dissatisfied</th>
<th>Neither satisfied</th>
<th>Satisfied</th>
<th>Very Satisfied</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(a)</td>
<td>(b)</td>
<td>(c)</td>
<td>(d)</td>
<td>(e)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

162. You are working significantly less than your co-worker, who is similar to you in both background and years of experience, and you receive significantly less rewards than your co-worker. How satisfied would you be given this situation?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Very Dissatisfied</th>
<th>Dissatisfied</th>
<th>Neither satisfied</th>
<th>Satisfied</th>
<th>Very Satisfied</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(a)</td>
<td>(b)</td>
<td>(c)</td>
<td>(d)</td>
<td>(e)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
163. You and your co-worker, who is similar to you in both background and years of experience, are both working equally hard and both of you are given the same high level of rewards. How satisfied would you be given this situation?

Very Dissatisfied——Satisfied——Neither satisfied nor satisfied——Satisfied——Very satisfied
(a) (b) (c) (d) (e)

164. You and your co-worker, who is similar to you in both background and years of experience, are both loafing at work and both of you are given the same low level of rewards. How satisfied would you be given this situation?

Very Dissatisfied——Satisfied——Neither satisfied nor satisfied——Satisfied——Very satisfied
(a) (b) (c) (d) (e)

165. You and your co-worker, who is similar to you in both background and years of experience, are both working hard but you receive significantly more rewards than does your co-worker. How satisfied would you be given this situation?

Very Dissatisfied——Satisfied——Neither satisfied nor satisfied——Satisfied——Very satisfied
(a) (b) (c) (d) (e)

166. You and your co-worker, who is similar to you in both background and years of experience, are both working and both of you receive the same low level of rewards. How satisfied would you be given this situation?

Very Dissatisfied——Satisfied——Neither satisfied nor satisfied——Satisfied——Very satisfied
(a) (b) (c) (d) (e)

167. You and your co-worker, who is similar to you in both work background and experience, are both loafing but you receive significantly more rewards than does your co-worker. How satisfied would you be given this situation?

Very Dissatisfied——Satisfied——Neither satisfied nor satisfied——Satisfied——Very satisfied
(a) (b) (c) (d) (e)

168. You are working significantly less than your co-worker, who is similar to you in both background and years of experience, but you receive the same level of rewards as your co-worker. How satisfied would you be given this situation?

Very Dissatisfied——Satisfied——Neither satisfied nor satisfied——Satisfied——Very satisfied
(a) (b) (c) (d) (e)
169. You and your co-worker, who is similar to you in both background and years of experience, are both working hard but you receive significantly more rewards than does your co-worker. How satisfied would you be given this situation?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Very Dissatisfied</th>
<th>Dissatisfied</th>
<th>Neither satisfied nor satisfied</th>
<th>Satisfied</th>
<th>Very Satisfied</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(a)</td>
<td>(b)</td>
<td>(c)</td>
<td>(d)</td>
<td>(e)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For each of the following questions check the one answer which best reflects your own opinion.

170. How many of your friends would agree that satisfaction for them comes from knowing that they are getting as much as they can from their employers, in terms of pay and benefits?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>None</th>
<th>Very few</th>
<th>Few</th>
<th>Some</th>
<th>Many</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(a)</td>
<td>(b)</td>
<td>(c)</td>
<td>(d)</td>
<td>(e)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

171. How many of your friends believe that a big paycheck and a good benefits package is enough to make them completely satisfied at work?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>None</th>
<th>Very few</th>
<th>Few</th>
<th>Some</th>
<th>Many</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(a)</td>
<td>(b)</td>
<td>(c)</td>
<td>(d)</td>
<td>(e)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

172. How many of your friends, if similarly qualified co-workers worked harder and were paid a higher wage than them, would feel like they were being treated fairly by their employer and would be satisfied?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>None</th>
<th>Very few</th>
<th>Few</th>
<th>Some</th>
<th>Many</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(a)</td>
<td>(b)</td>
<td>(c)</td>
<td>(d)</td>
<td>(e)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

173. How many of your friends believe that high wages and good benefits are the most important reasons for working?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>None</th>
<th>Very few</th>
<th>Few</th>
<th>Some</th>
<th>Many</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(a)</td>
<td>(b)</td>
<td>(c)</td>
<td>(d)</td>
<td>(e)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

174. How many of your friends believe that there is more to life at work than just receiving a big paycheck?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>None</th>
<th>Very few</th>
<th>Few</th>
<th>Some</th>
<th>Many</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(a)</td>
<td>(b)</td>
<td>(c)</td>
<td>(d)</td>
<td>(e)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

175. How many of your friends, if they don't get the best deal possible, in terms of pay and benefits, from their employers, would not really be bothered by it?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>None</th>
<th>Very few</th>
<th>Few</th>
<th>Some</th>
<th>Many</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(a)</td>
<td>(b)</td>
<td>(c)</td>
<td>(d)</td>
<td>(e)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

176. How many of your friends, if they were paid more than similarly qualified co-workers for the same amount of work, would not feel guilty and would not increase their productivity?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>None</th>
<th>Very few</th>
<th>Few</th>
<th>Some</th>
<th>Many</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(a)</td>
<td>(b)</td>
<td>(c)</td>
<td>(d)</td>
<td>(e)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
177. How many of your friends, if they were paid the same wage as other similarly qualified co-workers, would work as hard but not harder than these similarly qualified co-workers?

None — Very few — Few — Some — Many
(a) (b) (c) (d) (e)

178. How many of your friends, if they were paid the same wage as similarly qualified co-workers for the same amount of work, would volunteer for extra work?

None — Very few — Few — Some — Many
(a) (b) (c) (d) (e)

179. How many of your friends, when making a choice between jobs, would always choose the job which provides them the greatest pay and benefits regardless?

None — Very few — Few — Some — Many
(a) (b) (c) (d) (e)

180. How many of your friends would probably keep on working even if they did not need the money?

None — Very few — Few — Some — Many
(a) (b) (c) (d) (e)

181. How many of your friends enjoy working hard at their jobs?

None — Very few — Few — Some — Many
(a) (b) (c) (d) (e)

182. How many of your friends are concerned about getting the most they can from their employers, in terms of pay, benefits, and the like?

None — Very few — Few — Some — Many
(a) (b) (c) (d) (e)

183. How many of your friends when at their jobs look for ways to get out of work?

None — Very few — Few — Some — Many
(a) (b) (c) (d) (e)

184. How many of your friends believe that if a person is given a choice between jobs which pay the same money, the person should choose the one which requires less work?

None — Very few — Few — Some — Many
(a) (b) (c) (d) (e)

185. How many of your friends would like jobs where they have to stay busy all day?

None — Very few — Few — Some — Many
(a) (b) (c) (d) (e)

186. How many of your friends believe it's equally good to give and to receive?

None — Very few — Few — Some — Many
(a) (b) (c) (d) (e)
187. How many of your friends, if they worked less than other similarly qualified co-workers, would expect to be paid less than these other similarly qualified co-workers?

None — Very few — Few — Some — Many
(a) (b) (c) (d) (e)

188. How many employees in a typical organization, if the amount of wages they received matched the amount of work they performed, would feel guilty and would increase their productivity?

None — Very few — Few — Some — Many
(a) (b) (c) (d) (e)

189. How many of your friends, if similarly qualified co-workers were paid the same wage as them for the same amount of work, would be satisfied and would neither increase nor decrease their productivity?

None — Very few — Few — Some — Many
(a) (b) (c) (d) (e)

190. How many of your friends believe that the best job is one that requires a lot of hard work?

None — Very few — Few — Some — Many
(a) (b) (c) (d) (e)

191. How many of your friends, if similarly qualified co-workers received the same deal, in terms of pay and benefits, from the employer as did they, would still be satisfied with the deal they received?

None — Very few — Few — Some — Many
(a) (b) (c) (d) (e)

192. How many of your friends believe that they should be paid as much or more than other similarly qualified co-workers but have to work less than these other co-workers?

None — Very few — Few — Some — Many
(a) (b) (c) (d) (e)

193. How many of your friends, even if they worked less than similarly qualified co-workers, would expect to be paid as much as or more than these similarly qualified co-workers?

None — Very few — Few — Some — Many
(a) (b) (c) (d) (e)

194. How many of your friends feel like they should always get something for nothing at work?

None — Very few — Few — Some — Many
(a) (b) (c) (d) (e)

195. How many of your friends, if they were being paid the same wage as similarly qualified co-workers for the same amount of work, would take unauthorized work breaks?

None — Very few — Few — Some — Many
(a) (b) (c) (d) (e)
How many of your friends would agree that doing a good job means more to them than receiving a good paycheck?

None  Very few  Few  Some  Many
(a)    (b)    (c)    (d)    (e)

How many of your friends are equally concerned about what they can get from their employer and what they can give to their employer?

None  Very few  Few  Some  Many
(a)    (b)    (c)    (d)    (e)

How many of your friends are not really that concerned about getting the best pay and benefits from their employer?

None  Very few  Few  Some  Many
(a)    (b)    (c)    (d)    (e)

How many of your friends try to do as little as possible at work?

None  Very few  Few  Some  Many
(a)    (b)    (c)    (d)    (e)

How many of your friends live by the motto "a fair day's work (no more, no less) for a fair day's wage"?

None  Very few  Few  Some  Many
(a)    (b)    (c)    (d)    (e)

How many of your friends only want those rewards (no more, or less) that they worked for?

None  Very few  Few  Some  Many
(a)    (b)    (c)    (d)    (e)

How many of your friends try hard to do well at work?

None  Very few  Few  Some  Many
(a)    (b)    (c)    (d)    (e)

How many of your friends believe it's better to give than to receive?

None  Very few  Few  Some  Many
(a)    (b)    (c)    (d)    (e)

How many of your friends, once they have completed their tasks for the day, would rather do nothing than help other co-workers with their tasks?

None  Very few  Few  Some  Many
(a)    (b)    (c)    (d)    (e)

How many of your friends, if they worked the same amount as other similarly qualified co-workers, would expect to be paid more than these similarly qualified co-workers?

None  Very few  Few  Some  Many
(a)    (b)    (c)    (d)    (e)
Please do not mark on the inventory. Place your answers on Scantron and check to see that you have answered all the questions.

206. How many of your friends, if they were paid the same wage as similarly qualified coworkers but produced less work, would feel no motivation to produce more work in the future?

None—Very few—Few—Some—Many

(a) (b) (c) (d) (e)

207. How many of your friends, if they were paid the same wage as similarly qualified coworkers for the same amount of work, would be completely satisfied?

None—Very few—Few—Some—Many

(a) (b) (c) (d) (e)

208. How many of your friends believe that you must be concerned about taking care of yourself first and that means getting as much as you can from your employer for the work you do?

None—Very few—Few—Some—Many

(a) (b) (c) (d) (e)

209. How many of your friends actively seek extra work at their jobs?

None—Very few—Few—Some—Many

(a) (b) (c) (d) (e)

210. How many of your friends try to do less work than they are paid to do?

None—Very few—Few—Some—Many

(a) (b) (c) (d) (e)

211. How many of your friends believe it's equally important to watch out for your own good and to help others?

None—Very few—Few—Some—Many

(a) (b) (c) (d) (e)

212. How many of your friends are satisfied only when the rewards they receive from their employer are greater than the amount of work they perform?

None—Very few—Few—Some—Many

(a) (b) (c) (d) (e)

213. How many of your friends feel most comfortable when the amount of work they perform matches the wages they are paid for it?

None—Very few—Few—Some—Many

(a) (b) (c) (d) (e)

214. How many of your friends if they had little or nothing to do at work would be completely satisfied?

None—Very few—Few—Some—Many

(a) (b) (c) (d) (e)

215. How many of your friends, if their co-workers got a better deal from the employer than they did, would still be satisfied and would continue to produce as much as they have in the past?

None—Very few—Few—Some—Many

(a) (b) (c) (d) (e)
216. How many of your friends believe that it's better to have a job where you work hard than one where you loaf all day?

None — Very few — Few — Some — Many
(a) (b) (c) (d) (e)

217. How many of your friends believe that they are doing too much at work even though they may be paid more than similarly qualified co-workers?

None — Very few — Few — Some — Many
(a) (b) (c) (d) (e)

218. How many of your friends believe that if they are paid less than other similarly qualified co-workers they should work less than these co-workers and that if they are paid more than other similarly qualified co-workers, they should work more than these co-workers?

None — Very few — Few — Some — Many
(a) (b) (c) (d) (e)

219. How many of your friends like to do their best at work?

None — Very few — Few — Some — Many
(a) (b) (c) (d) (e)

220. How many of your friends, if they were offered what they considered to be a "fair deal" by their employer for the work they performed, would still try to negotiate with their employer to get a better deal?

None — Very few — Few — Some — Many
(a) (b) (c) (d) (e)

221. How many of your friends, even if they received low wages and benefits from their employers, could still be satisfied with their jobs?

None — Very few — Few — Some — Many
(a) (b) (c) (d) (e)

222. How many of your friends would agree that doing a good job at work and receiving a good paycheck are equally important?

None — Very few — Few — Some — Many
(a) (b) (c) (d) (e)

223. How many of your friends try to do more than they are paid to do at work?

None — Very few — Few — Some — Many
(a) (b) (c) (d) (e)

224. How many of your friends, if they were being paid the same wage as similarly qualified co-workers for the same amount of work, would take on extra duties and responsibilities?

None — Very few — Few — Some — Many
(a) (b) (c) (d) (e)
223. How many of your friends are the type of people who won't work hard unless they are forced to do so?

None——Very few——Few——Some——Many
(a) (b) (c) (d) (e)

226. How many of your friends believe that the only things that are important at work are the wages and benefits the employer provides them for their services?

None——Very few——Few——Some——Many
(a) (b) (c) (d) (e)

227. How many of your friends, if they were being paid the same wages as similarly qualified co-workers for the same amount of work, would volunteer to stay overtime without being paid?

None——Very few——Few——Some——Many
(a) (b) (c) (d) (e)

228. How many of your friends do you consider to be "givers" rather than "takers"?

None——Very few——Few——Some——Many
(a) (b) (c) (d) (e)

229. How many of your friends want more rewards for their work than they deserve?

None——Very few——Few——Some——Many
(a) (b) (c) (d) (e)

230. How many of your friends are concerned about doing the most work they can for their employer?

None——Very few——Few——Some——Many
(a) (b) (c) (d) (e)

231. How many of your friends are most satisfied when the amount of work they do outweighs the amount they are paid for it by their employers?

None——Very few——Few——Some——Many
(a) (b) (c) (d) (e)

232. How many of your friends, if they could get away with it, would take it easy on their jobs?

None——Very few——Few——Some——Many
(a) (b) (c) (d) (e)

233. How many of your friends would be satisfied with a job that requires a lot of hard work but the pay and benefits are not so great?

None——Very few——Few——Some——Many
(a) (b) (c) (d) (e)

234. How many of your friends would feel like they are not doing enough at work even if they are paid less than similarly qualified co-workers?

None——Very few——Few——Some——Many
(a) (b) (c) (d) (e)

235. How many of your friends would loaf on the job if given the opportunity?

None——Very few——Few——Some——Many
(a) (b) (c) (d) (e)
236. How many of your friends, if the amount of wages they received matched the amount of work they performed, would be dissatisfied and would lower their productivity?

None — Very few — Few — Some — Many
(a) (b) (c) (d) (e)

237. How many of your friends, if they had to work real hard at a job full time, would think about quitting?

None — Very few — Few — Some — Many
(a) (b) (c) (d) (e)

238. How many of your friends, if they were paid a high wage by their employer, would still take it easy on their jobs?

None — Very few — Few — Some — Many
(a) (b) (c) (d) (e)

239. How many of your friends, if they were paid the same wage as similarly qualified co-workers for the same amount of work, would think about quitting their jobs?

None — Very few — Few — Some — Many
(a) (b) (c) (d) (e)

240. How many of your friends believe that it is extremely important for them to get the best deal possible, in terms of pay and benefits, from their employer?

None — Very few — Few — Some — Many
(a) (b) (c) (d) (e)

241. How many of your friends, if they were being paid less than similarly qualified co-workers for the same amount of work, would still try very hard to do their best on the job?

None — Very few — Few — Some — Many
(a) (b) (c) (d) (e)

For each of the following questions, please indicate how willing or unwilling you would be to carry out the act described in the question.

242. How willing would you be, if you were an employer, to hire an applicant who feels obligated to do more than he/she is paid to do at work?

Very unwilling — Unwilling — Neither willing nor unwilling — Willing — Very willing
(a) (b) (c) (d) (e)

243. How willing would you be, if you were an employer, to promote an employee who takes on extra duties and responsibilities?

Very unwilling — Unwilling — Neither willing nor unwilling — Willing — Very willing
(a) (b) (c) (d) (e)
244. How willing would you be to work alongside a co-worker who believes that it is better to receive than to give?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Very unwilling</th>
<th>Unwilling</th>
<th>Neither willing</th>
<th>Willing</th>
<th>Very willing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(a)</td>
<td>(b)</td>
<td>(c)</td>
<td>(d)</td>
<td>(e)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

243. How willing would you be, if you were an employer, to promote an employee who is equally concerned about what he/she can give to you and what he/she can get from you?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Very unwilling</th>
<th>Unwilling</th>
<th>Neither willing</th>
<th>Willing</th>
<th>Very willing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(a)</td>
<td>(b)</td>
<td>(c)</td>
<td>(d)</td>
<td>(e)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

246. How willing would you be, if you were an employer, to promote an employee who prefers to do as little work as possible?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Very unwilling</th>
<th>Unwilling</th>
<th>Neither willing</th>
<th>Willing</th>
<th>Very willing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(a)</td>
<td>(b)</td>
<td>(c)</td>
<td>(d)</td>
<td>(e)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

247. How willing would you be, if you were an employer, to promote an employee who only wants the same deal (no better, no worse) that other similarly qualified co-workers are receiving from you?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Very unwilling</th>
<th>Unwilling</th>
<th>Neither willing</th>
<th>Willing</th>
<th>Very willing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(a)</td>
<td>(b)</td>
<td>(c)</td>
<td>(d)</td>
<td>(e)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

248. How willing would you be, if you were an employer, to hire an applicant who believes that it is equally good to give and to receive?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Very unwilling</th>
<th>Unwilling</th>
<th>Neither willing</th>
<th>Willing</th>
<th>Very willing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(a)</td>
<td>(b)</td>
<td>(c)</td>
<td>(d)</td>
<td>(e)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

249. How willing would you be, if you were an employer, to hire an applicant who if he/she did not receive top wages and benefits from his/her employer would be dissatisfied?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Very unwilling</th>
<th>Unwilling</th>
<th>Neither willing</th>
<th>Willing</th>
<th>Very willing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(a)</td>
<td>(b)</td>
<td>(c)</td>
<td>(d)</td>
<td>(e)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

250. How willing would you be to work alongside a co-worker who, if he/she were paid the same wage as other similarly qualified co-workers for the same amount of work, would feel guilty and would increase his/her productivity?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Very unwilling</th>
<th>Unwilling</th>
<th>Neither willing</th>
<th>Willing</th>
<th>Very willing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(a)</td>
<td>(b)</td>
<td>(c)</td>
<td>(d)</td>
<td>(e)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
251. How willing would you be, if you were an employer, to hire an applicant who believes that they should be paid more than other similarly qualified co-workers but have to work less than these co-workers?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Very willing</th>
<th>Neither willing</th>
<th>Very unwilling</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(a)</td>
<td>(b)</td>
<td>(c)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(d)</td>
<td>(e)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

252. How willing would you be, if you were an employer, to promote an employee who wants the amount of pay he/she receives to be greater than the amount of work he/she performs?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Very willing</th>
<th>Neither willing</th>
<th>Very unwilling</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(a)</td>
<td>(b)</td>
<td>(c)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(d)</td>
<td>(e)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

253. How willing would you be to work alongside a co-worker who if he/she were paid the same wage as other similarly qualified co-workers for the same amount of work, would be completely satisfied?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Very willing</th>
<th>Neither willing</th>
<th>Very unwilling</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(a)</td>
<td>(b)</td>
<td>(c)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(d)</td>
<td>(e)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

254. How willing would you be, if you were an employer, to hire an applicant who believes that if he/she is paid the same wage as other similarly qualified co-workers, he/she should work the same amount (no more, no less) as these similarly qualified co-workers?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Very willing</th>
<th>Neither willing</th>
<th>Very unwilling</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(a)</td>
<td>(b)</td>
<td>(c)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(d)</td>
<td>(e)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

255. How willing would you be to work alongside a co-worker who is not concerned with getting the most he/she can, in terms of pay and benefits, from his/her employer?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Very willing</th>
<th>Neither willing</th>
<th>Very unwilling</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(a)</td>
<td>(b)</td>
<td>(c)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(d)</td>
<td>(e)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

256. How willing would you be to work alongside a co-worker who if he/she were paid the same wage as other similarly qualified co-workers for the same amount of work, would be dissatisfied and would reduce his/her productivity?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Very willing</th>
<th>Neither willing</th>
<th>Very unwilling</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(a)</td>
<td>(b)</td>
<td>(c)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(d)</td>
<td>(e)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
257. How willing would you be, if you were an employer, to promote an employee who even if he/she is being paid less than other similarly qualified co-workers for the same amount of work, would still be satisfied and productive?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Very willing</th>
<th>Neither willing</th>
<th>Unwilling</th>
<th>Very unwilling</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(a)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(c)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(d)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

258. How willing would you be to work alongside a co-worker who is only interested in getting as much as he/she can from his/her employer, in terms of pay and benefits?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Very willing</th>
<th>Neither willing</th>
<th>Unwilling</th>
<th>Very unwilling</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(a)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(c)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(d)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

259. How willing would you be, if you were an employer, to promote an employee who is satisfied only when he/she receives a higher wage than other similarly qualified co-workers for the same amount of work?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Very willing</th>
<th>Neither willing</th>
<th>Unwilling</th>
<th>Very unwilling</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(a)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(c)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(d)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

260. How willing would you be, if you were an employer, to hire an applicant who believes that if he/she is paid the same wage as other similarly qualified co-workers, then he/she should work harder than these other co-workers?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Very willing</th>
<th>Neither willing</th>
<th>Unwilling</th>
<th>Very unwilling</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(a)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(c)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(d)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

261. How willing would you be, if you were an employer, to hire an applicant who is concerned about putting in a full day of hard work?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Very willing</th>
<th>Neither willing</th>
<th>Unwilling</th>
<th>Very unwilling</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(a)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(c)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(d)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

262. How willing would you be, if you were an employer, to hire an applicant who believes that he/she should always get something for nothing at work?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Very willing</th>
<th>Neither willing</th>
<th>Unwilling</th>
<th>Very unwilling</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(a)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(c)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(d)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
263. How willing would you be, if you were an employer, to hire an applicant who looks for ways to avoid work?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Very willing</th>
<th>Neither willing</th>
<th>Very unwilling</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(b)</td>
<td>(c)</td>
<td>(d)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

264. How willing would you be, if you were an employer, to hire an applicant who if he/she received low wages and poor benefits from his/her employer, would not be seriously bothered by it?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Very willing</th>
<th>Neither willing</th>
<th>Very unwilling</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(b)</td>
<td>(c)</td>
<td>(d)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

265. How willing would you be, if you were an employer, to promote an employee who is more concerned about what he/she can give to you rather than what he/she can gain from you?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Very willing</th>
<th>Neither willing</th>
<th>Very unwilling</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(b)</td>
<td>(c)</td>
<td>(d)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

266. How willing would you be, if you were an employer, to promote an employee whose primary concern at work is getting as much as he/she can from you, in terms of pay and benefits?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Very willing</th>
<th>Neither willing</th>
<th>Very unwilling</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(b)</td>
<td>(c)</td>
<td>(d)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

267. How willing would you be to work alongside a co-worker who always strives to do his/her best at a job?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Very willing</th>
<th>Neither willing</th>
<th>Very unwilling</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(b)</td>
<td>(c)</td>
<td>(d)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

268. How willing would you be to work alongside a co-worker who believes that it is equally good to give and to receive?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Very willing</th>
<th>Neither willing</th>
<th>Very unwilling</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(b)</td>
<td>(c)</td>
<td>(d)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

269. How willing would you be, if you were an employer, to promote an employee who if he/she had to work hard all day, would think about quitting his/her job?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Very willing</th>
<th>Neither willing</th>
<th>Very unwilling</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(b)</td>
<td>(c)</td>
<td>(d)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
*** Please do not mark on the inventory. Place your answers on Scantron and check to see that you have answered all the questions.***

270. How willing would you be, if you were an employer, to promote an employee who even if he/she received low wages from you, could still be satisfied with his/her job?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Very willing</th>
<th>Neither willing</th>
<th>Very unwilling</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Unwilling</td>
<td>not</td>
<td>unwilling</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(a) (b) (c) (d) (e)

271. How willing would you be to work alongside a co-worker who is concerned about doing more than they are paid to do at work?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Very willing</th>
<th>Neither willing</th>
<th>Very unwilling</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Unwilling</td>
<td>not</td>
<td>unwilling</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(a) (b) (c) (d) (e)
APPENDIX R: DEMOGRAPHIC FORM
DEMOGRAPHIC FORM

ID# __________________________

1. How old were you on your last birthday? ______

2. Gender _____ M _____ F

3. Race (check one) _____ White
   _____ Black
   _____ Hispanic
   _____ Asian or Pacific Islander
   _____ American Indian or Alaskan Native

4. Educational level 13 14 15 16 Degree Received_____
                        17 18 19 20

5. Major __________________________

6. What is your present marital status?
   _____ Married
   _____ Widowed
   _____ Divorced
   _____ Separated
   _____ Never been married

7. Have you ever held a full-time job? Yes____ No____

8. If yes, how long have you held a full-time job? _______years

9. I am currently employed approximately _____ hours per week.

10. The title of my position is ________________________________.
APPENDIX S: LSU LIFE AT WORK SURVEY FOR PILOT STUDY TWO
For each of the following questions check the one answer which best reflects your own opinion.

1. How many of your friends live by the motto "a fair day's work (no more, no less) for a fair day's wage?"
   - None
   - Very few
   - Few
   - Some
   - Many

2. How many of your friends feel most comfortable when the amount of work they perform matches the wages they are paid for it?
   - None
   - Very few
   - Few
   - Some
   - Many

3. How many of your friends try to do less work than they are paid to do?
   - None
   - Very few
   - Few
   - Some
   - Many

4. How many of your friends, if they had to work real hard at a job full time, would think about quitting?
   - None
   - Very few
   - Few
   - Some
   - Many

5. How many of your friends, if they were being paid the same wage as similarly qualified co-workers for the same amount of work, would take unauthorized work breaks?
   - None
   - Very few
   - Few
   - Some
   - Many

6. How many of your friends feel like they should always get something for nothing at work?
   - None
   - Very few
   - Few
   - Some
   - Many

7. How many of your friends believe that high wages and good benefits are the most important reasons for working?
   - None
   - Very few
   - Few
   - Some
   - Many

8. How many of your friends believe that if a person is given a choice between jobs which pay the same money, the person should choose the one which requires less work?
   - None
   - Very few
   - Few
   - Some
   - Many

9. How many of your friends if they had little or nothing to do at work would be completely satisfied?
   - None
   - Very few
   - Few
   - Some
   - Many

10. How many of your friends are satisfied only when the rewards they receive from their employer are greater than the amount of work they perform?
    - None
    - Very few
    - Few
    - Some
    - Many
11. How many of your friends like to do their best at work?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>None</th>
<th>Very few</th>
<th>Few</th>
<th>Some</th>
<th>Many</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(a)</td>
<td>(b)</td>
<td>(c)</td>
<td>(d)</td>
<td>(e)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

12. How many of your friends believe that a big paycheck and a good benefits package is enough to make them completely satisfied at work?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>None</th>
<th>Very few</th>
<th>Few</th>
<th>Some</th>
<th>Many</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(a)</td>
<td>(b)</td>
<td>(c)</td>
<td>(d)</td>
<td>(e)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

13. How many of your friends believe it's equally important to watch out for your own good and to help others?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>None</th>
<th>Very few</th>
<th>Few</th>
<th>Some</th>
<th>Many</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(a)</td>
<td>(b)</td>
<td>(c)</td>
<td>(d)</td>
<td>(e)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

14. How many of your friends believe that it is extremely important for them to get the best deal possible, in terms of pay and benefits, from their employer?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>None</th>
<th>Very few</th>
<th>Few</th>
<th>Some</th>
<th>Many</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(a)</td>
<td>(b)</td>
<td>(c)</td>
<td>(d)</td>
<td>(e)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

15. How many of your friends would lose on the job if given the opportunity?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>None</th>
<th>Very few</th>
<th>Few</th>
<th>Some</th>
<th>Many</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(a)</td>
<td>(b)</td>
<td>(c)</td>
<td>(d)</td>
<td>(e)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

16. How many of your friends, if they were offered what they considered to be a "fair deal" by their employer for the work they performed, would still try to negotiate with their employer to get a better deal?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>None</th>
<th>Very few</th>
<th>Few</th>
<th>Some</th>
<th>Many</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(a)</td>
<td>(b)</td>
<td>(c)</td>
<td>(d)</td>
<td>(e)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

17. How many of your friends are concerned about getting the most they can from their employers, in terms of pay, benefits, and the like?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>None</th>
<th>Very few</th>
<th>Few</th>
<th>Some</th>
<th>Many</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(a)</td>
<td>(b)</td>
<td>(c)</td>
<td>(d)</td>
<td>(e)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

18. How many of your friends, if they could get away with it, would take it easy on their jobs?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>None</th>
<th>Very few</th>
<th>Few</th>
<th>Some</th>
<th>Many</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(a)</td>
<td>(b)</td>
<td>(c)</td>
<td>(d)</td>
<td>(e)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

19. How many of your friends are the type of people who won't work hard unless they are forced to do so?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>None</th>
<th>Very few</th>
<th>Few</th>
<th>Some</th>
<th>Many</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(a)</td>
<td>(b)</td>
<td>(c)</td>
<td>(d)</td>
<td>(e)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

20. How many of your friends are equally concerned about what they can get from their employer and what they can give to their employer?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>None</th>
<th>Very few</th>
<th>Few</th>
<th>Some</th>
<th>Many</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(a)</td>
<td>(b)</td>
<td>(c)</td>
<td>(d)</td>
<td>(e)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
21. How many of your friends believe that you must be concerned about taking care of yourself first and that means getting as much as you can from your employer for the work you do?

None — Very few — Few — Some — Many
(a) (b) (c) (d) (e)

22. How many of your friends try to do as little as possible at work?

None — Very few — Few — Some — Many
(a) (b) (c) (d) (e)

23. How many of your friends believe that the only things that are important at work are the wages and benefits the employer provides them for their services?

None — Very few — Few — Some — Many
(a) (b) (c) (d) (e)

24. How many of your friends would agree that satisfaction for them comes from knowing that they are getting as much as they can from their employers, in terms of pay and benefits?

None — Very few — Few — Some — Many
(a) (b) (c) (d) (e)

25. How many of your friends would agree that doing a good job at work and receiving a good paycheck are equally important?

None — Very few — Few — Some — Many
(a) (b) (c) (d) (e)

26. How many of your friends, if they were paid the same wage as similarly qualified coworkers for the same amount of work, would be completely satisfied?

None — Very few — Few — Some — Many
(a) (b) (c) (d) (e)

27. How many of your friends are most satisfied when the amount of work they do outweighs the amount they are paid for it by their employers?

None — Very few — Few — Some — Many
(a) (b) (c) (d) (e)

28. How many of your friends believe it's equally good to give and to receive?

None — Very few — Few — Some — Many
(a) (b) (c) (d) (e)

29. How many of your friends, if they were paid a high wage by their employer, would still take it easy on their jobs?

None — Very few — Few — Some — Many
(a) (b) (c) (d) (e)

30. How many of your friends, when making a choice between jobs, would always choose the job which provides them the greatest pay and benefits regardless?

None — Very few — Few — Some — Many
(a) (b) (c) (d) (e)
31. How many of your friends like to do their best at work?

None — Very few — Few — Some — Many
(a) (b) (c) (d) (e)

32. How many of your friends want more rewards for their work than they deserve?

None — Very few — Few — Some — Many
(a) (b) (c) (d) (e)

33. How many of your friends, if they worked less than other similarly qualified co-workers, would expect to be paid less than these other similarly qualified co-workers?

None — Very few — Few — Some — Many
(a) (b) (c) (d) (e)

34. How many of your friends when at their jobs look for ways to get out of work?

None — Very few — Few — Some — Many
(a) (b) (c) (d) (e)

35. How many of your friends, if they were paid the same wage as similarly qualified co-workers but produced less work, would feel no motivation to produce more work in the future?

None — Very few — Few — Some — Many
(a) (b) (c) (d) (e)

36. How many of your friends believe that if they are paid less than other similarly qualified co-workers they should work less than these co-workers and that if they are paid more than other similarly qualified co-workers, they should work more than these co-workers?

None — Very few — Few — Some — Many
(a) (b) (c) (d) (e)

For each of the following questions, please indicate how much you agree or disagree with each statement.

37. Even if I received low wages and benefits from my employer, I would still try to do my best at my job.

Strongly Disagree — Disagree — Neither — Agree — Strongly Agree
(a) (b) (c) (d) (e)

38. An ideal job for me is one with few duties and responsibilities.

Strongly Disagree — Disagree — Neither — Agree — Strongly Agree
(a) (b) (c) (d) (e)

39. The best job I can have is one which permits me to do almost nothing during the work day.

Strongly Disagree — Disagree — Neither — Agree — Strongly Agree
(a) (b) (c) (d) (e)
40. My dream is to get ahead in life without having to try too hard to do it.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Neither Agree Nor Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(a)</td>
<td>(b)</td>
<td>(c)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

41. If I could get away with it, I would take it easy on the job.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Neither Agree Nor Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(a)</td>
<td>(b)</td>
<td>(c)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

42. It is better to give than to receive.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Neither Agree Nor Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(a)</td>
<td>(b)</td>
<td>(c)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

43. Employees who are more concerned about what they can get from their employer rather than what they can contribute to their employer are the wise ones.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Neither Agree Nor Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(a)</td>
<td>(b)</td>
<td>(c)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

44. A job which requires me to be busy during the day is better than a job which allows a lot of loafing.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Neither Agree Nor Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(a)</td>
<td>(b)</td>
<td>(c)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

45. I like to do my best at work.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Neither Agree Nor Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(a)</td>
<td>(b)</td>
<td>(c)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

46. If I could get away with it, I would try to work just a little slower than the boss expects.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Neither Agree Nor Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(a)</td>
<td>(b)</td>
<td>(c)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

47. If I had to work hard all day at my job, I would probably quit.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Neither Agree Nor Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(a)</td>
<td>(b)</td>
<td>(c)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
48. I would become very dissatisfied with my job if I had little or no work to do.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neither Agree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(a)</td>
<td>(b)</td>
<td>(c)</td>
<td>(d)</td>
<td>(e)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

49. All other things being equal, it is better to have a job with a lot of duties and responsibilities than one with few duties and responsibilities.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neither Agree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(a)</td>
<td>(b)</td>
<td>(c)</td>
<td>(d)</td>
<td>(e)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

50. It is really satisfying to me when I can get something for nothing at work.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neither Agree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(a)</td>
<td>(b)</td>
<td>(c)</td>
<td>(d)</td>
<td>(e)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

51. At work, my greatest concern is whether or not I am doing the best job I can.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neither Agree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(a)</td>
<td>(b)</td>
<td>(c)</td>
<td>(d)</td>
<td>(e)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

52. Even in the face of low wages and poor benefits, I could still be satisfied at work under certain conditions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neither Agree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(a)</td>
<td>(b)</td>
<td>(c)</td>
<td>(d)</td>
<td>(e)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

53. It is the smart employee who get as much they can from an employer while giving as little as possible in return.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neither Agree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(a)</td>
<td>(b)</td>
<td>(c)</td>
<td>(d)</td>
<td>(e)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

54. When I have completed my tasks for the day, I help out other employees who have yet to complete their tasks.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neither Agree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(a)</td>
<td>(b)</td>
<td>(c)</td>
<td>(d)</td>
<td>(e)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

55. I worry about doing the best job I can at work.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neither Agree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(a)</td>
<td>(b)</td>
<td>(c)</td>
<td>(d)</td>
<td>(e)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
56. I prefer to do as little as possible at work while getting as much as I can from my employer.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Neither Agree Nor</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(a)</td>
<td>(b)</td>
<td>(c)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

57. At work, I feel uneasy when there is little work for me to do.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Neither Agree Nor</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(a)</td>
<td>(b)</td>
<td>(c)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

58. I am most satisfied at work when I have to do as little as possible.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Neither Agree Nor</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(a)</td>
<td>(b)</td>
<td>(c)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

59. If I were given low wages and poor benefits by my employer, I would reduce my productivity at work.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Neither Agree Nor</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(a)</td>
<td>(b)</td>
<td>(c)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

60. I always try to do things the easy way at work.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Neither Agree Nor</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(a)</td>
<td>(b)</td>
<td>(c)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

61. I feel obligated to my employer to do more than I am paid to do at work.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Neither Agree Nor</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(a)</td>
<td>(b)</td>
<td>(c)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

62. When I am at my job, I think of ways to get out of work.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Neither Agree Nor</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(a)</td>
<td>(b)</td>
<td>(c)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

63. It drives me crazy when I have nothing to do at work.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Neither Agree Nor</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(a)</td>
<td>(b)</td>
<td>(c)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
For each of the following questions, please indicate how you would respond, in terms of satisfaction, to the situation described in the question.

64. You and your co-worker, who is similar to you in both work background and experience, are both loafing but you receive significantly more rewards than does your co-worker. How satisfied would you be given this situation?

Very Dis- Satisfied----Satisfied----Fied nor----Satisfied----Satisfied
(d) (b) (c) (d) (e)

65. You and your co-worker, who is similar to you in both background and years of experience, are working equally hard but you are given significantly less rewards than your co-worker. How satisfied would you be given this situation?

Very Dis- Satisfied----Satisfied----Fied nor----Satisfied----Satisfied
(d) (b) (c) (d) (e)

66. You are working significantly less than your co-worker, who is similar to you in both background and years of experience, but you receive the same level of rewards as your co-worker. How satisfied would you be given this situation?

Very Dis- Satisfied----Satisfied----Fied nor----Satisfied----Satisfied
(d) (b) (c) (d) (e)

67. You and your co-worker, who is similar to you in both background and years of experience, are both loafing at work and both of you are given the same high level of rewards. How satisfied would you be given this situation?

Very Dis- Satisfied----Satisfied----Fied nor----Satisfied----Satisfied
(d) (b) (c) (d) (e)

68. You are working significantly less than your co-worker, who is similar to you in both background and years of experience, but you receive significantly more rewards than does your co-worker. How satisfied would you be given this situation?

Very Dis- Satisfied----Satisfied----Fied nor----Satisfied----Satisfied
(d) (b) (c) (d) (e)

For each of the following questions, please indicate how you would respond, in terms of productivity, to the situation described in the question.

69. You and your co-worker, who is similar to you in both background and years of experience, are both loafing at work but both of you are given the same high level of rewards. How would you respond to this situation, in terms of productivity?

Decrease productivity Decrease productivity No change in productivity Increase productivity to a very great extent---to some extent---to a very great extent---to a very great extent
(a) (b) (c) (d) (e)
70. You and your co-worker, who is similar to you in both background and years of experience, are working equally hard but you are given significantly less rewards than your co-worker. How would you respond to this situation, in terms of productivity?

Decrease productivity to a very great extent
Decrease productivity to some extent
No change in productivity
Increase productivity to some extent
Increase productivity to a very great extent
(a) (b) (c) (d) (e)

71. You and your co-worker, who is similar to you in both background and years of experience, are loafing at work but you are given significantly less rewards than your co-worker. How would you respond to this situation, in terms of productivity?

Decrease productivity to a very great extent
Decrease productivity to some extent
No change in productivity
Increase productivity to some extent
Increase productivity to a very great extent
(a) (b) (c) (d) (e)

For each of the following questions, please give the percentage (%) which you think is the best answer.

72. How many employees in a typical organization would take it easy on the job if they could get away with it?

0-20% 21-40% 41-60% 61-80% 81-100%
(a) (b) (c) (d) (e)

73. How many employees in a typical organization, if the amount of wages they received matched the amount of work they performed, would feel guilty and would increase their productivity?

0-20% 21-40% 41-60% 61-80% 81-100%
(a) (b) (c) (d) (e)

74. How many employees in a typical organization want more rewards than they work for or deserve?

0-20% 21-40% 41-60% 61-80% 81-100%
(a) (b) (c) (d) (e)

75. How many employees in a typical organization prefer that the amount of work they perform matches the amount they are paid for it?

0-20% 21-40% 41-60% 61-80% 81-100%
(a) (b) (c) (d) (e)

76. How many employees in a typical organization enjoy doing as little as possible at work?

0-20% 21-40% 41-60% 61-80% 81-100%
(a) (b) (c) (d) (e)

77. How many employees in a typical organization believe that if they are paid the same wage as similarly qualified co-workers, they should work harder than these co-workers?

0-20% 21-40% 41-60% 61-80% 81-100%
(a) (b) (c) (d) (e)
78. How many employees in a typical organization, if they were being paid less than similarly qualified co-workers for the same amount of work, would still keep up their productivity?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>0-20%</th>
<th>21-40%</th>
<th>41-60%</th>
<th>61-80%</th>
<th>81-100%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>d</td>
<td>e</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

79. How many employees in a typical organization, if they worked the same amount as other similarly qualified co-workers, would expect to be paid a lower amount than these other similarly qualified co-workers?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>0-20%</th>
<th>21-40%</th>
<th>41-60%</th>
<th>61-80%</th>
<th>81-100%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>(c)</td>
<td>d</td>
<td>e</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

80. How many employees in a typical organization feel like they should do more work even though they have already put in the same amount of work as others doing the same job?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>0-20%</th>
<th>21-40%</th>
<th>41-60%</th>
<th>61-80%</th>
<th>81-100%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>d</td>
<td>e</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

81. How many employees in a typical organization believe that it's equally good to give and to receive?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>0-20%</th>
<th>21-40%</th>
<th>41-60%</th>
<th>61-80%</th>
<th>81-100%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>d</td>
<td>e</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

82. How many employees in a typical organization, if they were being paid less than similarly qualified co-workers for the same amount of work, would still be satisfied?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>0-20%</th>
<th>21-40%</th>
<th>41-60%</th>
<th>61-80%</th>
<th>81-100%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>d</td>
<td>e</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

83. How many employees in a typical organization put in a fair day's work (no more, no less) for a fair day's wage?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>0-20%</th>
<th>21-40%</th>
<th>41-60%</th>
<th>61-80%</th>
<th>81-100%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>d</td>
<td>e</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

84. How many employees in a typical organization believe that the amount of pay and benefits an employer provides them is really not that important?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>0-20%</th>
<th>21-40%</th>
<th>41-60%</th>
<th>61-80%</th>
<th>81-100%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>d</td>
<td>e</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

85. How many employees in a typical organization live by the motto "a fair day's work (no more, no less) for a fair day's wage"?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>0-20%</th>
<th>21-40%</th>
<th>41-60%</th>
<th>61-80%</th>
<th>81-100%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>d</td>
<td>e</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

86. How many employees in a typical organization put in a full day of hard work, on a given day?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>0-20%</th>
<th>21-40%</th>
<th>41-60%</th>
<th>61-80%</th>
<th>81-100%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>d</td>
<td>e</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
87. How many employees in a typical organization, if they were being paid the same wage as similarly qualified co-workers for the same amount of work, would still take unauthorized work breaks?

0 - 20% — 21 - 40% — 41 - 60% — 61 - 80% — 81 - 100%
(a) (b) (c) (d) (e)

88. How many employees in a typical organization are most satisfied when the amount of work they perform is greater than the amount they are paid for it?

0 - 20% — 21 - 40% — 41 - 60% — 61 - 80% — 81 - 100%
(a) (b) (c) (d) (e)

89. How many employees in a typical organization, even if they received low wages and benefits from their employer, would still try to do their best at their jobs?

0 - 20% — 21 - 40% — 41 - 60% — 61 - 80% — 81 - 100%
(a) (b) (c) (d) (e)

90. How many employees in a typical organization believe that the best day at work is one where there is little work for them to do?

0 - 20% — 21 - 40% — 41 - 60% — 61 - 80% — 81 - 100%
(a) (b) (c) (d) (e)

91. How many employees in a typical organization on any given day put in a full day of hard work?

0 - 20% — 21 - 40% — 41 - 60% — 61 - 80% — 81 - 100%
(a) (b) (c) (d) (e)

92. How many employees in a typical organization prefer that the amount of work they perform always exceeds the wages they are paid for it?

0 - 20% — 21 - 40% — 41 - 60% — 61 - 80% — 81 - 100%
(a) (b) (c) (d) (e)

93. How many employees in a typical organization, if they worked the same amount as other similarly qualified co-workers, would expect to be paid the same amount (no more, no less) as these other similarly qualified co-workers?

0 - 20% — 21 - 40% — 41 - 60% — 61 - 80% — 81 - 100%
(a) (b) (c) (d) (e)

94. How many employees in a typical organization are most comfortable when what they get from their employer matches what they give to their employer?

0 - 20% — 21 - 40% — 41 - 60% — 61 - 80% — 81 - 100%
(a) (b) (c) (d) (e)

95. How many employees in a typical organization shy away from accepting those things that they have worked for or deserve because they do not like even the appearance of being indebted to others?

0 - 20% — 21 - 40% — 41 - 60% — 61 - 80% — 81 - 100%
(a) (b) (c) (d) (e)
96. How many employees in a typical organization, if similarly qualified co-workers got a better deal from the organization than they did, would not really be bothered by it and would continue to do their best on the job?

0-20% —— 21-40% —— 41-60% —— 61-80% —— 81-100%
(a) (b) (c) (d) (e)

97. How many employees in a typical organization believe that they should be paid the same amount (no more, no less) as similarly qualified co-workers for the same amount of work?

0-20% —— 21-40% —— 41-60% —— 61-80% —— 81-100%
(a) (b) (c) (d) (e)

98. How many employees in a typical organization, if they received low wages and poor benefits from their employer, would not be seriously bothered by it?

0-20% —— 21-40% —— 41-60% —— 61-80% —— 81-100%
(a) (b) (c) (d) (e)

99. How many employees in a typical organization, if they were paid the same wage as similarly qualified co-workers for the same amount of work, would be completely satisfied?

0-20% —— 21-40% —— 41-60% —— 61-80% —— 81-100%
(a) (b) (c) (d) (e)

100. How many employees in a typical organization feel like they should always get something for nothing?

0-20% —— 21-40% —— 41-60% —— 61-80% —— 81-100%
(a) (b) (c) (d) (e)

101. How many employees in a typical organization take on extra work for their jobs even though it is not required of them?

0-20% —— 21-40% —— 41-60% —— 61-80% —— 81-100%
(a) (b) (c) (d) (e)

102. How many employees in a typical organization, even if they were paid a fair wage relative to similarly qualified co-workers, would try to get out of work?

0-20% —— 21-40% —— 41-60% —— 61-80% —— 81-100%
(a) (b) (c) (d) (e)

103. How many employees in a typical organization, if they were paid the same amount as similarly qualified co-workers for the same amount of work, would feel guilty and increase the amount of work they performed?

0-20% —— 21-40% —— 41-60% —— 61-80% —— 81-100%
(a) (b) (c) (d) (e)

104. How many employees in a typical organization are "takers" rather than "givers"?

0-20% —— 21-40% —— 41-60% —— 61-80% —— 81-100%
(a) (b) (c) (d) (e)
105. How many employees in a typical organization are only concerned about what the job pays them?

0-20% — 21-40% — 41-60% — 61-80% — 81-100%
(a) (b) (c) (d) (e)

106. How many employees in a typical organization believe that the best job is one that requires you to do as little work as possible?

0-20% — 21-40% — 41-60% — 61-80% — 81-100%
(a) (b) (c) (d) (e)

107. How many employees in a typical organization, if they were being paid a lower wage than similarly qualified co-workers who performed the same amount of work, would be most satisfied?

0-20% — 21-40% — 41-60% — 61-80% — 81-100%
(a) (b) (c) (d) (e)

108. How many employees in a typical organization, if they believed that their employer was not paying them top dollar for their work, would seriously think about quitting?

0-20% — 21-40% — 41-60% — 61-80% — 81-100%
(a) (b) (c) (d) (e)

109. How many employees in a typical organization, if they were paid the same wage as similarly qualified co-workers for the same amount of work, would feel satisfied and would continue to do as much work as they have in the past?

0-20% — 21-40% — 41-60% — 61-80% — 81-100%
(a) (b) (c) (d) (e)

110. How many employees in a typical organization believe that an employee should try to stay busy all day rather than try to find ways to get out of doing work?

0-20% — 21-40% — 41-60% — 61-80% — 81-100%
(a) (b) (c) (d) (e)

111. How many employees in a typical organization believe that they should strive to get as much from the organization as they can while giving as little as possible in return?

0-20% — 21-40% — 41-60% — 61-80% — 81-100%
(a) (b) (c) (d) (e)

For each of the following questions, please indicate how willing or unwilling you would be to carry out the act described in the question.

112. How willing would you be, if you were an employer, to hire an applicant who believes that they should be paid more than other similarly qualified co-workers but have to work less than these co-workers?

Very unwilling — Unwilling — Neither willing nor unwilling — Willing — Very willing
(a) (b) (c) (d) (e)
### 113. How willing would you be, if you were an employer, to hire an applicant who looks for ways to avoid work?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Very unwilling</th>
<th>Unwilling</th>
<th>Neither willing</th>
<th>nor</th>
<th>Willing</th>
<th>Very willing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(a)</td>
<td>(b)</td>
<td>(c)</td>
<td>(d)</td>
<td>(e)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 114. How willing would you be, if you were an employer, to hire an applicant who believes that he/she should always get something for nothing at work?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Very unwilling</th>
<th>Unwilling</th>
<th>Neither willing</th>
<th>nor</th>
<th>Willing</th>
<th>Very willing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(a)</td>
<td>(b)</td>
<td>(c)</td>
<td>(d)</td>
<td>(e)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX T: FINAL LSU LIFE AT WORK SURVEY
For each of the following questions, please give the percentage (%) which you think is the best answer.

1. How many employees in a typical organization, if the amount of wages they received matched the amount of work they performed, would feel guilty and would increase their productivity?

0-20% — 21-40% — 41-60% — 61-80% — 81-100%
(a) (b) (c) (d) (e)

2. How many employees in a typical organization are most comfortable when what they get from their employer matches what they give to their employer?

0-20% — 21-40% — 41-60% — 61-80% — 81-100%
(a) (b) (c) (d) (e)

3. How many employees in a typical organization, if they were paid the same amount as similarly qualified co-workers for the same amount of work, would feel guilty and increase the amount of work they performed?

0-20% — 21-40% — 41-60% — 61-80% — 81-100%
(a) (b) (c) (d) (e)

4. How many employees in a typical organization believe that if they are paid the same wage as similarly qualified co-workers, they should work harder than these co-workers?

0-20% — 21-40% — 41-60% — 61-80% — 81-100%
(a) (b) (c) (d) (e)

5. How many employees in a typical organization prefer that the amount of work they perform always exceeds the wages they are paid for it?

0-20% — 21-40% — 41-60% — 61-80% — 81-100%
(a) (b) (c) (d) (e)

6. How many employees in a typical organization, even if they were paid a fair wage relative to similarly qualified co-workers, would try to get out of work?

0-20% — 21-40% — 41-60% — 61-80% — 81-100%
(a) (b) (c) (d) (e)

7. How many employees in a typical organization believe that the amount of pay and benefits an employer provides them is really not that important?

0-20% — 21-40% — 41-60% — 61-80% — 81-100%
(a) (b) (c) (d) (e)

8. How many employees in a typical organization, if they were being paid a lower wage than similarly qualified co-workers who performed the same amount of work, would be most satisfied?

0-20% — 21-40% — 41-60% — 61-80% — 81-100%
(a) (b) (c) (d) (e)
9. How many employees in a typical organization, if they were being paid less than similarly qualified co-workers for the same amount of work, would still be satisfied?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>0-20%</th>
<th>21-40%</th>
<th>41-60%</th>
<th>61-80%</th>
<th>81-100%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tally</td>
<td>(a)</td>
<td>(b)</td>
<td>(c)</td>
<td>(d)</td>
<td>(e)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

10. How many employees in a typical organization, if they were paid the same wage as similarly qualified co-workers for the same amount of work, would be completely satisfied?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>0-20%</th>
<th>21-40%</th>
<th>41-60%</th>
<th>61-80%</th>
<th>81-100%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tally</td>
<td>(a)</td>
<td>(b)</td>
<td>(c)</td>
<td>(d)</td>
<td>(e)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

11. How many employees in a typical organization feel like they should do more work even though they have already put in the same amount of work as others doing the same job?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>0-20%</th>
<th>21-40%</th>
<th>41-60%</th>
<th>61-80%</th>
<th>81-100%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tally</td>
<td>(a)</td>
<td>(b)</td>
<td>(c)</td>
<td>(d)</td>
<td>(e)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

12. How many employees in a typical organization, if they were paid the same wage as similarly qualified co-workers for the same amount of work, would feel satisfied and would continue to do as much work as they have in the past?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>0-20%</th>
<th>21-40%</th>
<th>41-60%</th>
<th>61-80%</th>
<th>81-100%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tally</td>
<td>(a)</td>
<td>(b)</td>
<td>(c)</td>
<td>(d)</td>
<td>(e)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

13. How many employees in a typical organization put in a fair day’s work (no more, no less) for a fair day’s wage?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>0-20%</th>
<th>21-40%</th>
<th>41-60%</th>
<th>61-80%</th>
<th>81-100%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tally</td>
<td>(a)</td>
<td>(b)</td>
<td>(c)</td>
<td>(d)</td>
<td>(e)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

14. How many employees in a typical organization, if they were being paid the same wage as similarly qualified co-workers for the same amount of work, would still take unauthorized work breaks?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>0-20%</th>
<th>21-40%</th>
<th>41-60%</th>
<th>61-80%</th>
<th>81-100%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tally</td>
<td>(a)</td>
<td>(b)</td>
<td>(c)</td>
<td>(d)</td>
<td>(e)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

15. How many employees in a typical organization prefer that the amount of work they perform matches the amount they are paid for it?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>0-20%</th>
<th>21-40%</th>
<th>41-60%</th>
<th>61-80%</th>
<th>81-100%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tally</td>
<td>(a)</td>
<td>(b)</td>
<td>(c)</td>
<td>(d)</td>
<td>(e)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

16. How many employees in a typical organization, if they worked the same amount as other similarly qualified co-workers, would expect to be paid a lower amount than these other similarly qualified co-workers?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>0-20%</th>
<th>21-40%</th>
<th>41-60%</th>
<th>61-80%</th>
<th>81-100%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tally</td>
<td>(a)</td>
<td>(b)</td>
<td>(c)</td>
<td>(d)</td>
<td>(e)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

17. How many employees in a typical organization live by the motto “a fair day’s work (no more, no less) for a fair day’s wage”?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>0-20%</th>
<th>21-40%</th>
<th>41-60%</th>
<th>61-80%</th>
<th>81-100%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tally</td>
<td>(a)</td>
<td>(b)</td>
<td>(c)</td>
<td>(d)</td>
<td>(e)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
18. How many employees in a typical organization believe that an employee should try to stay busy all day rather than try to find ways to get out of doing work?

0-20% — 21-40% — 41-60% — 61-80% — 81-100%
(a) (b) (c) (d) (e)

19. How many employees in a typical organization, if similarly qualified co-workers get a better deal from the organization than they did, would not really be bothered by it and would continue to do their best on the job?

0-20% — 21-40% — 41-60% — 61-80% — 81-100%
(a) (b) (c) (d) (e)

20. How many employees in a typical organization believe that they should be paid the same amount (no more, no less) as similarly qualified co-workers for the same amount of work?

0-20% — 21-40% — 41-60% — 61-80% — 81-100%
(a) (b) (c) (d) (e)

21. How many employees in a typical organization are most satisfied when the amount of work they perform is greater than the amount they are paid for it?

0-20% — 21-40% — 41-60% — 61-80% — 81-100%
(a) (b) (c) (d) (e)

22. How many employees in a typical organization are only concerned about what the job pays them?

0-20% — 21-40% — 41-60% — 61-80% — 81-100%
(a) (b) (c) (d) (e)

23. How many employees in a typical organization put in a full day of hard work, on a given day?

0-20% — 21-40% — 41-60% — 61-80% — 81-100%
(a) (b) (c) (d) (e)

24. How many employees in a typical organization are "takers" rather than "givers"?

0-20% — 21-40% — 41-60% — 61-80% — 81-100%
(a) (b) (c) (d) (e)

25. How many employees in a typical organization believe that the best day at work is one where there is little work for them to do?

0-20% — 21-40% — 41-60% — 61-80% — 81-100%
(a) (b) (c) (d) (e)

26. How many employees in a typical organization take on extra work for their jobs even though it is not required of them?

0-20% — 21-40% — 41-60% — 61-80% — 81-100%
(a) (b) (c) (d) (e)

27. How many employees in a typical organization feel like they should always get something for nothing?

0-20% — 21-40% — 41-60% — 61-80% — 81-100%
(a) (b) (c) (d) (e)
28. How many employees in a typical organization, if they received low wages and poor benefits from their employer, would not be seriously bothered by it?

0-20% (a) 21-40% (b) 41-60% (c) 61-80% (d) 81-100% (e)

29. How many employees in a typical organization on any given day put in a full day of hard work?

0-20% (a) 21-40% (b) 41-60% (c) 61-80% (d) 81-100% (e)

30. How many employees in a typical organization shy away from accepting those things that they have worked for or deserve because they do not like even the appearance of being indebted to others?

0-20% (a) 21-40% (b) 41-60% (c) 61-80% (d) 81-100% (e)

31. How many employees in a typical organization, if they worked the same amount as other similarly qualified co-workers, would expect to be paid the same amount (no more, no less) as these other similarly qualified co-workers?

0-20% (a) 21-40% (b) 41-60% (c) 61-80% (d) 81-100% (e)

For each of the following questions check the one answer which best reflects your own opinion.

32. How many of your friends, if they could get away with it, would take it easy on their jobs?

None (a) Very few (b) Few (c) Some (d) Many (e)

33. How many of your friends believe it's equally good to give and to receive?

None (a) Very few (b) Few (c) Some (d) Many (e)

34. How many of your friends are concerned about getting the most they can from their employers, in terms of pay, benefits, and the like?

None (a) Very few (b) Few (c) Some (d) Many (e)

35. How many of your friends when at their jobs look for ways to get out of work?

None (a) Very few (b) Few (c) Some (d) Many (e)

36. How many of your friends believe that if they are paid less than other similarly qualified co-workers they should work less than these co-workers and that if they are paid more than other similarly qualified co-workers, they should work more than these co-workers?

None (a) Very few (b) Few (c) Some (d) Many (e)
37. How many of your friends, if they were paid the same wage as similarly qualified co-workers but produced less work, would feel no motivation to produce more work in the future?

None (a) Very few (b) Few (c) Some (d) Many (e)

38. How many of your friends believe that you must be concerned about taking care of yourself first and that means getting as much as you can from your employer for the work you do?

None (a) Very few (b) Few (c) Some (d) Many (e)

39. How many of your friends try to do less work than they are paid to do?

None (a) Very few (b) Few (c) Some (d) Many (e)

40. How many of your friends are satisfied only when the rewards they receive from their employer are greater than the amount of work they perform?

None (a) Very few (b) Few (c) Some (d) Many (e)

41. How many of your friends want more rewards for their work than they deserve?

None (a) Very few (b) Few (c) Some (d) Many (e)

42. How many of your friends, if they were offered what they considered to be a "fair deal" by their employer for the work they performed, would still try to negotiate with their employer to get a better deal?

None (a) Very few (b) Few (c) Some (d) Many (e)

43. How many of your friends believe it's equally important to watch out for your own good and to help others?

None (a) Very few (b) Few (c) Some (d) Many (e)

44. How many of your friends, if they were paid the same wage as similarly qualified co-workers for the same amount of work, would be completely satisfied?

None (a) Very few (b) Few (c) Some (d) Many (e)

45. How many of your friends are equally concerned about what they can get from their employer and what they can give to their employer?

None (a) Very few (b) Few (c) Some (d) Many (e)

46. How many of your friends believe that the only things that are important at work are the wages and benefits the employer provides them for their services?

None (a) Very few (b) Few (c) Some (d) Many (e)
47. How willing would you be, if you were an employer, to hire an applicant who looks for ways to avoid work?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Very unwilling</th>
<th>Unwilling</th>
<th>Neither</th>
<th>Slightly willing</th>
<th>Very willing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(a)</td>
<td>(b)</td>
<td>(c)</td>
<td>(d)</td>
<td>(e)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

48. How willing would you be, if you were an employer, to hire an applicant who believes that they should be paid more than other similarly qualified co-workers but have to work less than these co-workers?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Very unwilling</th>
<th>Unwilling</th>
<th>Neither</th>
<th>Slightly willing</th>
<th>Very willing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(a)</td>
<td>(b)</td>
<td>(c)</td>
<td>(d)</td>
<td>(e)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For each of the following questions, please indicate how much you agree or disagree with each statement.

49. When I have completed my tasks for the day, I help out other employees who have yet to complete their tasks.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neither</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(a)</td>
<td>(b)</td>
<td>(c)</td>
<td>(d)</td>
<td>(e)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

50. A job which requires me to be busy during the day is better than a job which allows a lot of loafing.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neither</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(a)</td>
<td>(b)</td>
<td>(c)</td>
<td>(d)</td>
<td>(e)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

51. It is the smart employee who get as much they can from an employer while giving as little as possible in return.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neither</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(a)</td>
<td>(b)</td>
<td>(c)</td>
<td>(d)</td>
<td>(e)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

52. I am most satisfied at work when I have to do as little as possible.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neither</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(a)</td>
<td>(b)</td>
<td>(c)</td>
<td>(d)</td>
<td>(e)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

53. When I am at my job, I think of ways to get out of work.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neither</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(a)</td>
<td>(b)</td>
<td>(c)</td>
<td>(d)</td>
<td>(e)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
54. If I had to work hard all day at my job, I would probably quit.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Neuter</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(a)</td>
<td>(b)</td>
<td>(c)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(d)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(e)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

55. At work, my greatest concern is whether or not I am doing the best job I can.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Neuter</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(a)</td>
<td>(b)</td>
<td>(c)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(d)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(e)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

56. Even if I received low wages and benefits from my employer, I would still try to do my best at my job.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Neuter</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(a)</td>
<td>(b)</td>
<td>(c)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(d)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(e)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

57. All other things being equal, it is better to have a job with a lot of duties and responsibilities than one with few duties and responsibilities.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Neuter</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(a)</td>
<td>(b)</td>
<td>(c)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(d)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(e)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

58. I prefer to do as little as possible at work while getting as much as I can from my employer.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Neuter</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(a)</td>
<td>(b)</td>
<td>(c)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(d)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(e)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

59. It is really satisfying to me when I can get something for nothing at work.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Neuter</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(a)</td>
<td>(b)</td>
<td>(c)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(d)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(e)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

60. Employees who are more concerned about what they can get from their employer rather than what they can contribute to their employer are the wise ones.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Neuter</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(a)</td>
<td>(b)</td>
<td>(c)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(d)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(e)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

61. At work, I feel uneasy when there is little work for me to do.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Neuter</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(a)</td>
<td>(b)</td>
<td>(c)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(d)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(e)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX U: INSTRUCTIONS FOR SECOND HALF OF MEASURE VALIDATION STUDY
INSTRUCTIONS

In this part of the research project, you will be asked to respond to a series of work situations. Specifically, you will be asked to read a scenario describing a situation at work and then answer four questions concerning your reactions to that situation. I would like to assure you that your answers will be completely confidential. No one other than myself will see your individual answers. It is important that you provide honest and candid answers, and you "tell it like it is" in order to advance our understanding of people at work.

There are some special instructions for this part of the project. First, please complete the scenarios in the order they are presented. Second, once you have finished reading a scenario you are to respond to the four questions following that scenario. Please do not skip over the questions and begin reading the next scenario. Finally, please do not refer back to the previous scenario or your answers to that scenario when reading the later scenario or making your responses to the later scenario. So, please do not skip back and forth among the scenarios or your responses to them.
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