THE EFFECTS OF PSYCHOLOGICAL VARIABLES AND PERSONALITY FACTORS ON PERCEIVED INEQUITY AT WORK

Lanaya L. Ethington

Submitted to the faculty of the University Graduate School
in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the degree
Doctor of Philosophy
in the Counseling and Educational Psychology Department of the School of Education
Indiana University
May 2009

Accepted by the Graduate Faculty, Indiana University, in partial fulfillments of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy

Doctoral Committee

Rex Stockton, Ed.D.
Chancellor's Professor

Janet Near, Ph.D.
Professor

Jesse Steinfeldt, Ph.D.
Associate Professor

Michael Tracy, Ph.D.
Assistant Professor

May 7, 2009

Acknowledgements

The present study was made possible by the sharing of data provided by the Inter-University Consortium of Political and Social Research at the University of Michigan. Although I have not had direct contact with the agency or its employees, the spirit of sharing knowledge with the intent of advancing research has made this study possible. I am also grateful to the time and energy devoted to this project by the members of my dissertation committee: Dr. Janet Near, Dr. Jesse Steinfeldt, and Dr. Michael Tracy. I want to acknowledge the support provided by Dr. Rex Stockton, without whom I would not have been able to complete this study or my doctoral program. I would like to give special thanks to my loving husband Kevin Olszewski, who has been the most valuable source of encouragement and support during the last five years. I also want to acknowledge the influence of my parents, who always believed I could do this. Lastly, I would like to thank Kand McQueen, whose assistance and support at the eleventh hour was integral to the completion of this dissertation.

Lanaya L. Ethington

THE EFFECTS OF PSYCHOLOGICAL VARIABLES AND PERSONALITY FACTORS ON PERCEIVED INEQUITY AT WORK

Abstract

Perceived inequity at work has been demonstrated to have negative effects on organizational behavior; however, there is little research that examines how psychological variables are related to perceived inequity at work. This study examined specific psychological variables and personality factors that impact employees' perceived inequity at work in both direct and indirect relationships. This study utilized data that were collected for a previous study regarding mid-life attitudes and behaviors; thus, a secondary data analysis was conducted using variables of interest. Hierarchical multiple regression, analysis of variance, and independent t-tests were used to examine the data. Results indicated that inequity in the spousal/partner relationship, negative family-to-work conflict, internal locus of control, and Neuroticism were positively related to perceived inequity at work. External locus of control and Conscientiousness were negatively related to perceived inequity at work, and Conscientiousness was found to moderate the relationships of certain psychological variables in relation to perceived inequity at work. Differences across racial and ethnic groups in the experience of perceived inequity at work and family-to-work conflict were also found. The findings from this study may be used as a foundation for future research that examines psychological variables and personality factors as antecedents to perceived inequity at work. There are also implications for human resource management, such as selection, training, and organizational policy regarding work-family balance.

Rex Stockton, Ed.D.
Janet Near, Ph.D.
Jesse Steinfeldt, Ph.D.
Michael Tracy, Ph.D.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

List of Tables

CHAPTER I: RATIONALE AND LITERATURE REVIEW

Introduction

The purpose of this chapter is to provide an overview for the current study that examines how psychological variables and personality factors are related to perceived inequity at work. This discussion begins with the rationale regarding the contribution of this study to relevant academic fields, then follows with a review of relevant literature regarding the variables of interest. The gaps in the current knowledge base regarding these variables are discussed and then refined into research questions and testable hypotheses. Subsequent chapters will discuss the methodology used to examine the research questions, the results of the analyses, and the implications the findings from this study have for future research.

Rationale

Psychological theories have long been applied to the field of Human Resource Management (HRM) in order to examine what influences beliefs, behaviors, and attitudes in the workplace. Theories have been applied from various fields in psychology, including social, cognitive, personality, industrial/organizational, clinical, and counseling. There has historically been a significant overlap between the fields of HRM and psychology, as evidenced by the emergence of consulting psychologists. The majority of consulting psychologists graduate from programs that are accredited by the American Psychological Association (APA) in some form of applied psychology, such as clinical, community, counseling, school, education, and industrial/organizational psychology (Education and Training Committee, 2002). One study found that over 50% of consulting psychologists receive their degrees in the specialties of clinical and counseling psychology (Kurpius, Fuqua, Gibson, Kurpius, & Froehle, 1995). In addition, APA has published *Multicultural Guidelines on Education, Training, Research,*

Organizational Change, and Practice for Psychologists (APA, 2003). Thus, many consulting psychologists have a background in counseling psychology, and they are required to have adequate knowledge of how psychological theories are relevant to HRM practices in order to facilitate meaningful changes in organizations.

Some of the psychological concepts that have particular relevance to HRM include social identity (Tajfel, 1978), occupational identity (Christiansen, 1999), group membership (Turner, 1987), leadership (Pearce et al., 2002), groupthink (Janis, 1982), group polarization in decision-making (Smith & Bond, 1999), motivation (Locke & Latham, 2004; Landy & Becker, 1987), personality (Barrick & Mount, 1991), and the management of conflict (Tjosvold, 2008). Examining these constructs in the workplace enables scholars to better understand employees' behavior at work, attributions they make about situations in the workplace, and how they resolve conflicts that occur in the workplace, both with other employees and in response to cognitive dissonance. A concept that has foundations in social psychology but has been widely examined in the context of work is perceived inequity in relationships. Adams' (1963, 1965) conceptualization of equity theory involves the perceived fairness of inputs and outputs in social exchange relationships, particularly in the context of the workplace. The current study examined perceived inequity at work in relation to specific psychological variables and personality factors.

Conceptual Underpinnings for the Study

Perceived Inequity at Work

There has been an abundance of research about the impact that perceived inequity at work has on employees' attitudes, perceptions, and behaviors. Perceived inequity at work has been linked to a number of unfavorable outcomes for organizations, such as poor product quality (Cowherd & Levine, 1992), emotional exhaustion and health complaints (Taris, Kalimo, &

Schaufeli, 2002), absenteeism and turnover (Cropanzano & Greenberg, 1997; Geurts, Buunk, & Schaufeli, 1994), professional burnout (Dierendonk, Schaufeli, & Buunk, 1998), theft (Cropanzano & Greenberg, 1997), guilt (Brockner et al., 1986), and counterproductive work behaviors (Fox, Spector, & Miles, 2001). There are many studies that support the deleterious effects perceived inequity has on employees' attitudes, perceptions, and behaviors.

Psychological Variables

There has also been an abundance of research that examines how psychological variables and personality factors impact employees' attitudes, perceptions, and behaviors at work in direct, moderating, and mediating relationships. An important study by Staw, Bell, and Clausen (1986) examined attitudinal disposition in relation to job satisfaction, and their results showed that dispositional measures were a significant predictor of attitudes toward jobs over a time span of nearly fifty years. That is, people with a more positive affect showed higher levels of job satisfaction and people with a more negative affect demonstrated lower levels of job satisfaction. In a follow-up study, Steel and Rentsch (1997) also demonstrated that measures of job satisfaction were stable over the 10-year period of their study. Thus, whether employees have a greater degree of negative or positive affect may impact their level of job satisfaction.

Personality Factors

Personality factors have been widely studied in direct and moderating relationships to work attitudes and behaviors. In a landmark study by Barrick and Mount (1991), personality factors were studied in relation to job performance criteria. Their results indicated that some personality dimensions were valid predictors of job performance. Personality factors have also been found to predict counterproductive work behaviors and employee turnover (Salgado, 2002), forms of organizational citizenship behavior (Konovsky & Organ, 1996), and work-family

conflict (Wayne, Musisca, & Fleeson, 2004). Personality factors also moderate the effects of relationships, such as the relationship between family-to-work conflict and job performance (Witt & Carlson, 2006), and the relationship between distributive justice and counterproductive work behaviors (Flaherty & Moss, 2007).

There is a clear link in the HRM literature between employees' perceptions of inequity and consequences to the organization. Additionally, there is evidence that supports the impact of psychological variables and personality factors at work, and there is evidence that examines how employees' perceptions of inequity at work influences their subsequent cognitions and behaviors. What is missing is an examination of the relationships between psychological variables, personality factors, and perceived inequity at work. A better understanding of how psychological and personality factors contribute to the perceived inequity would better inform subsequent HRM practices. A purposeful examination of these relationships will allow interventions to be developed that address specific psychological variables or personality factors that impact perceived inequity at work.

Contribution to Counseling Psychology

The field of counseling psychology began to emerge as an identifiable profession in the years immediately following World War II. The Northwestern Conference, which took place in 1951, is considered the first major conference for the profession of counseling psychology. It was at this conference that leaders defined the roles of counseling psychologists, outlined standards for research and training, and delineated the content of core psychology courses (Gelso & Fretz, 2000). The Greyston Conference, the second major conference of the profession, took place in 1964 (Robinson, 1964). The conference served to reexamine the self-definition adopted at the Northwestern Conference, and it also resulted in specific recommendations and themes for

counseling psychologists to endorse. In an introduction to the conference, Thompson and Super (1964) discussed the specialty of counseling psychology as addressing educational and vocational development, providing an emphasis on assets for furthering individual development, maintaining a focus on the psychology of normal development, and examining the interactions between people and their environments. A fifth theme identified during this period was the emphasis on brief therapy as being suited for counseling psychology (Tyler, 1961).

The five themes that were identified during the 1960s helped to distinguish the field from other divisions of psychology, and these themes continue to define counseling psychology as it is currently conceptualized (Gelso & Fretz, 2000). It should be noted that the emphasis on educational and vocational development is considered by some to be the defining characteristic that separates counseling psychology from other applied psychological fields. In addition, scholars have identified three roles that are central to the field: the remedial, the preventative, and the developmental. The remedial role involves working with individuals or groups to address problems, and this may take the role of counseling or crisis interventions (Kagan et al., 1988). The preventative role enables counseling psychologists to use programming to forestall and circumvent difficulties that may arise in the future (Jordaan, Myers, Layton & Morgan, 1968). The developmental role allows counseling psychologists to focus on enhancing the skills and attitudes necessary to deal with everyday problems and maximize satisfaction (Gelso & Fretz, 2000).

As a field, counseling psychology encompasses many life domains and is relevant across many contexts. It has been claimed that counseling psychology is the most broadly applied specialty of the American Psychological Association (Ivey, 1979), and this is supported by the variety of fields in which counseling psychologists are employed. The breadth of training across

life domains that counseling psychologists experience is particularly useful when examining the world of work. This is evident by the large proportion of consulting psychologists that receive their training in clinical or counseling programs (Kurpius et al., 2002). The current study contributes to the knowledge bases of both counseling psychology and management by examining the intersection of multiple life domains: personality, work, relationships, and cultural identity.

From the perspective of counseling psychology, the current study has the potential to contribute to the three roles of remediation, prevention, and development. Having a better understanding of how personality factors and psychological variables relate to perceived inequity at work will allow human resource managers to provide remediation to difficulties experienced in the workplace, create policies that prevent perceived inequity at work, and to enhance employees' attitudes in order to maximize their effectiveness at work. The counseling psychology themes of vocation, normally functioning populations, and the interaction between people and their environments are also relevant to this study. The theme of vocational development is relevant as the focus of this study is the effect the variables of interest have on perceived inequity at work. Although vocational development is concerned mainly with the process by which individuals learn about how their skills, values, and interests match with specific occupational fields, it can also be applied to how employees' experiences in the world of work affects their overall development in a holistic manner. As the current study examined variables that affect multiple life domains, including the domain of work, it may be considered to have relevance to vocational development.

The counseling psychology themes of working with normal populations and examining the person-environment interaction are the most relevant to the current discussion. The sample

population in this study was drawn from noninstitutionalized individuals who were working either part-time or full-time. Although the sample may have included individuals who meet the diagnostic criteria for having a mental health disorder, the assumption is that the majority of individuals in the study were experiencing stressors that are considered typical across lifespan development. Another assumption is that the degree to which individuals were affected by these stressors, variations in personality factors, and scores reflecting the range of psychological variables are represented by the normal curve in this sample. This assumption will be discussed in greater detail and empirically tested as part of the analysis. The theme of examining the person-environment interaction is also well addressed in this study, as one of the purposes of the study is to examine how personality factors and psychological variables affect individuals' experience in the environment of the workplace. The relationship between people's experience of inequity across more than one environment will also be examined. The correlational analyses are appropriate under the assumption that the variables of interest are related and subsequently reflect a person-environment interaction. However, cause-effect relationships will not be examined in this study.

Purpose of the Study

This study served to increase the knowledge base with regard to psychological variables and personality factors that impact employees' perceived inequity at work. The potential consequences to organizations that may result from employees' perceived inequity at work are wide-ranging and well-researched. There are few studies, however, that examine potential antecedents that may affect employees' tendency to perceive inequity in the workplace. Thus, the purpose of the current study was to more thoroughly examine psychological and personality factors that contribute to individuals' perceptions of inequity at work. A secondary purpose was

to examine how psychological and personality factors moderate individuals' perceptions of inequity at work. A third purpose of the study was to examine differences between racial and ethnic groups in the variables of interest. Causation in the relationships were not examined because the data used were cross-sectional; however, regression analyses were used to examine how much variance was predicted in the relationships between variables. This may help direct future research that can examine these relationships in a causal manner.

It is also important to note that the indirect relationships that were examined in this study were moderating effects. Shadish and Sweeney (1991) describe moderators and mediators as third variables that help researchers understand the relationships between independent variables and dependent variables. Moderators may be categorical or continuous variables, cause statistical interactions, and affect the direction and/or strength of the relationship between IVs and DVs. Mediators are mechanisms through which the IV influences the DV; thus, the mediator exists only due to the relationship of the IV and DV (Shadish & Sweeney, 1991). The design of this study allowed only for the examination of moderating effects of variables; however, it is important to recognize that other mediators may exist between the IVs and DV, and this may have implications for the results of the analyses.

Assumptions and Design Controls

It is important to explicitly define assumptions related to the current study. One of the assumptions is that although the data were collected in 1995, the responses of the participants reflect trends that are relevant to employees in contemporary American society. Although the sociopolitical climate may be significantly different in 2009 than in 1995, the underlying psychological variables and personality factors are not considered distinctly different across the time periods. In order to conduct the analyses, the data needed to meet certain statistical

assumptions. The first is the assumption of normality, or the data being distributed on the normal curve. This was addressed in a number of ways, including the examination of the skewness and kurtosis values of the data.

In order to reduce the confounding effects that variables extraneous to this study may have on the variables of interest, a number of control variables were used in this analysis. When examining the psychological variables and personality factors, the potential co-varying effects of gender, age, marital status, children under 18, racial/ethnic group identification, level of education, socioeconomic status, and occupational industry were accounted for as controls. These variables have been empirically demonstrated to have a relationship with perceived inequity at work, family-to-work conflict, and locus of control. Controlling these variables reduced the amount of cofounding effects they have on the current study; however, it is also possible that other variables that have not been empirically supported in previous studies have direct and indirect relationships to the variables of interest. Other variables that may have potential confounding effects will be discussed in a later chapter.

Review of Relevant Literature

In order to structure a framework and formulate hypotheses for this study, management literature was reviewed that examined the effects of psychological and personality variables on work-related variables. Psychological, sociological, and vocational literature was also examined regarding variables that affect perceptions in social exchange relationships (both work and non-work), family-to-work conflict, and the moderating effects psychological variables and personality factors have across relationships. Psychological variables are considered to be those that reflect the modern study of psychology; that is, people's behavior and mental health processes and how they are affected by their physical state, mental state, and external

environment (Tavris & Wade, 1997). In contrast, personality variables are those that reflect intrinsic and pervasive patterns of perceiving, feeling, thinking, coping, and behaving (Millon & Davis, 1996). Thus, psychological variables are indicative of individuals' states, whereas personality variables are indicative of individuals' traits. Both psychological variables and personality dimensions may affect the perception of equity in relationships and will be examined in this study. The perceptions of inputs and outputs in both work and non-work relationships are central to this study, so equity theory will first be reviewed to help set the framework.

Equity Theory

Equity theory was preceded by a construct that emerged in sociology and social psychology known as *social exchange theory*. Emerson (1976) presents social exchange theory as a frame of reference within which many theories can speak to the transactions, rewards, and reactions that occur in social relationships. Social exchange theorists address, across a broad spectrum, how people feel about relationships depending on costs and rewards (Kelley & Thibaut, 1978), value (Homans, 1961), and comparison to other relationships (Thibaut & Kelley, 1959). In a general sense, the basic concepts of social exchange theory are reward, cost, outcome, and comparison level (Aronson, Wilson, & Akert, 1999). Although there are some components of social exchange theory that are the basis of equity theory, an important distinction is that social exchange theory does not address the perception of fairness in the relationship, or subsequent actions that social actors may take to address inequity in a relationship.

Equity theory was first postulated by Adams (1963, 1965) as a way to conceptualize the perceived fairness of an exchange between an employee and an employer. Adams (1963) suggests that equity and inequity are pervasive concerns in industry and government, and that there is an element of relative justice that underlies perceptions of these constructs. The

emphasis on the perception of inputs and outputs is central to Adams' theory; indeed, he says that inputs "are *as perceived by their contributor* and are not necessarily isomorphic with those of the other party to the exchange" (1963, p. 423, emphasis in original). Adams also emphasized the characteristics of recognition and relevance when discussing inputs and outputs. Recognition refers to whether an attribute is recognized by both a possessor and non-possessor as an input, or by both the recipient and giver as an outcome in an exchange. However, an attribute's potential of being an input to an exchange is dependent upon the possessor's perception of its relevance to the exchange. Similarly, if a recipient considers an attribute relevant to an exchange and it has some utility to him or her, it becomes an output (Adams, 1963). Thus, when examining inequity in relationships, it is essential to determine how the inputs and outputs are regarded by the contributors to the relationship and not rely on third-party observation. Other scholars have recognized the subjective nature of equity when considering who determines whether a relationship is inequitable. For example, Walster, Berscheid and Walster (1973) suggest that "equity is in the eye of the beholder…an individual's perception of how equitable a relationship is will depend on *his* [sic] assessment of the value and relevance of the various participants' inputs and outputs" (p. 152, emphasis in original).

Adams (1963) conceptualizes inputs to be factors such as education, intelligence, experience, seniority, age, sex, ethnic background, social status, and effort. In certain circumstances, other attributes of the individual or those associated with an individual may be relevant, such as personal appearance, attractiveness, health, possession of material goods, and even the characteristics of one's spouse. Adams (1963) also includes Homan's (1961) conceptualization of "investments" as components of what social actors perceive their contributions to a social exchange to be, and for which they expect a fair return.

Adams (1963) considered outputs in equity theory to include pay, rewards intrinsic to a job, seniority benefits, fringe benefits, job status, status symbols, and informally and formally sanctioned perquisites (such as a parking spot or corner office). He also makes explicit that although inputs and outputs are conceptually distinct, job inputs and outputs may be imperfectly correlated as people form expectations about what is "fair." Huseman, Hatfield, and Miles (1987) succinctly describe the four propositions that result from Adams' (1963, 1965) theory as follows:

1. Individuals evaluate their relationships with others by assessing the ratio of their outputs from and inputs to the relationship against the outcome/input ratio of a comparison other.
2. If the outcome/input ratios of the individual and comparison other are perceived to be unequal, then inequity exists.
3. The greater the inequity the individual perceives (in the form of either overreward or underreward), the more distress the individual feels.
4. The greater the distress an individual feels, the harder he or she will work to restore equity and, thus, reduce distress. Equity restoration techniques include altering or cognitively distorting inputs or outcomes, acting on or changing the comparison other, or terminating the relationship.

Equity theory utilizes components of Festinger's (1957) theory of cognitive dissonance, which posits that when people hold two cognitions that are inconsistent, they will experience a feeling of discomfort. They are then driven to reduce the feeling of discomfort by changing their behavior, justifying their behavior by changing their cognitions, or justifying their behavior by adding new cognitions (Aronson et al., 1999). Indeed, social actors may aggrandize others' relative outcomes or minimize their own to effectively convince themselves that inequitable

relationships are, in fact, equitable (Walster et al., 1973). Changing one's perceptions to reduce cognitive dissonance in response to inequity can have significant effects on an organization. Greenberg (1989) found that workers cognitively increased the perceived importance of their work environment as a contributor to their pay equity, effectively changing their cognitions to address perceived inequity. By reducing the cognitive dissonance experienced in the presence of perceived inequity, workers reportedly engaged in the same work behaviors but with different perceptions of their work environment.

Other concepts from social psychology are relevant when discussing equity theory. Based on social comparison theory (Festinger, 1954), it is suggested that people will compare their ratios of inputs and outputs to those of others perceived to be similar to them (Fadil, Williams, Limpaphayom, & Smatt, 2005). Indeed, literature suggests that although the major components of social comparison are inputs and outputs/outcomes, the choice of a "referent other," or the people to whom individuals compare themselves is an important theoretical factor (Goodman, 1974). Thus, how individuals perceive their own ratio of inputs and outputs, their perceptions of others' ratios of inputs and outputs, and against whom they make this comparison has implications for the perceived equity (or lack thereof) in a given situation.

Doyle (2003) suggests that in response to inequity, individuals will use the following means to resolve the inequity: changing one's own inputs/outcomes, changing others' inputs or outcomes, engaging in cognitive distortions, changing the referent other or group, or exiting the situation or relationship. Furnham (2005) distinguishes between these responses by categorizing *behavioral* and *psychological* reactions to inequity. Behavioral reactions include responses that include behavioral change, such as working less to alter the inputs, engaging in theft to decrease the outputs, sabotaging the work of others to change their inputs/outputs, or exiting the social

exchange relationship. Psychological reactions include changing thoughts or distorting reality (Walster et al., 1973) to restore psychological equity to the relationship. Thus, individuals' reactions to inequity may not always be easily observed if their responses are psychological rather than behavioral. Both psychological and behavioral responses to inequity will be discussed in the contexts of work and romantic relationships.

Research in the field of equity theory has evolved so that scholars differentiate between individuals' sensitivity to equity. After examining input/output ratios in relation to individuals' perceptions of equity, researchers have developed three categories of equity sensitivity that refute a universalistic view that all individuals prefer input/output ratios that are equal to the comparison other (King & Miles, 1994). *Benevolent* individuals prefer that their inputs exceed their outcomes; that is, their contentedness is derived from contributions they make to relationships (Huseman et al., 1985). *Equity sensitive* individuals prefer that outcomes equal inputs, and they may be considered to represent the more "traditional" model of equity theory. The third category includes *entitled* individuals, or those who prefer that outcomes exceed inputs (Huseman et al., 1985). It is important to recognize that there is evidence to support individual variation in the perception, preference, and response to inequity that has the potential to affect inferences that can be made with regard to inequity research.

Recently, scholars have examined the neural encoding of equity to further explain the relationship between psychological and neural underpinnings of equity. Preliminary results suggest that a sense of fairness is rooted in emotional processing; that is, emotional responses to perceived violations underlie individual variations in equity considerations and adherences to moral codes (Hsu, Anen, & Quartz, 2008). This is important to the current study because it supports the notion that dispositional variation affects perceptions of inequity. Thus, scholars

may examine personality dimensions, which predispose people to have certain emotional responses, in relation to perceived inequity with some evidence that this relationship is neurally based.

Equity and Equality

Although the constructs of equity and equality are conceptually related, they are distinct from one another. Resource allocation may be used to examine the differences between these two constructs. *Equity* is concerned with the perceived fairness of outputs in comparison to inputs in a social exchange relationship, and most individuals believe that, in a just distribution, resources will be allocated in proportion to their contributions (Deutsch, 1985). *Equality* refers to the belief that different members of a relationship have equal value as individuals (Kabanoff, 1991), and the equality mode of resource allocation refers to distributing resources to all contributing individuals (Sampson, 1980). Scholars have argued that differences in how equity and equality are valued by members of cultural groups will affect the extent to which Western research on equity theory is applicable across cultures (Fadil et al., 2005). This will be discussed in greater depth when examining cultural factors and their relation to perceived equity in relationships. It is important to recognize the conceptual difference between equity and equality, as they are related but not interchangeable constructs that can affect research that aims to measure effects of one or the other.

Work Inequity

In the field of organizational behavior, employees' reactions to inequity have been thoroughly examined, and the results indicate that there are organizational consequences to employees' perceptions of inequity. The consequences are well documented and occur across multiple domains, including pay, emotional investment, and organizational recognition.

Cowherd and Levine (1992) examined the outcome of pay equity on product quality in 102 business units in North America and Europe. Their results suggest that product quality may be decreased when there is a perceived pay discrepancy between upper-echelon and lower-level employees. Thus, when employees perceive inequity with regard to their inputs and outputs, they may respond by decreasing their input of effort into work, resulting in poorer product quality.

Perceptions of fairness are often evaluated in the context of remuneration that employees receive for their work (Siegel, Schraeder, & Morrison, 2008). That is, when employees perceive that they are being paid less than what they consider fair for their work inputs, they may take steps to address the inequity in ways that negatively impact the organization. One such consequence is theft, as it has been demonstrated that employees who perceive they are being underpaid will steal, and the amount of theft in which they engage is also related to the interpersonal treatment they receive (Cropanzano & Greenburg, 1997). That is, when employees are treated poorly *and* are underpaid, they may use theft as a way to even the score. It is also important to note that employees may also respond to inequity when they perceive they are being over-rewarded (Gilliland, 1993), so that they may reduce their effort into work, engage in more team-oriented behavior instead of achievement-oriented behavior (Harder, 1992), or cognitively reevaluate their status in the workplace.

Perceived inequity in the workplace may lead to decreased motivation, resulting in absenteeism and turnover (Croponzano & Greenburg, 1997; Geurts et al., 1994). This may be conceptualized as a way to terminate the relationship that is producing the cognitive dissonance, thereby reducing the dissonance. Finally, inequity has also been linked to professional burnout (Dierendonk, Schaufeli, & Buunk, 1998), as professionals who have a high emotional investment

in their work will be sensitive to rewards the organization provides in return. Rewards are not limited to pay, and inequity may be perceived as limited positive feedback or career advancement in relation to the emotional investment employees dedicate to their work.

Spousal/Partner Inequity

Adam's (1963, 1965) theory of inequity in social exchange was conceptualized through the lens of the employer-employee relationship, though he notes that the theoretical notions are relevant to any social situation where an exchange takes place, including the relationship between romantic partners (1965). Thus, in a partnership where one partner feels that the inputs are exceeding the outputs, the perception of inequity will occur. Research has examined the importance of equity to intimate relationships. For example, in relationships where one partner contributes more but receives less, the distress associated with the inequity is likely to strain the relationship, decrease satisfaction in the relationship, and decrease the commitment to the relationship (Sprecher, 2001). Research also suggests that women who feel under-benefited in a marriage are at greater risk for divorce (DeMaris, 2007). Perceived inequity in a marriage or partnership may lead to thus lead to members engaging in actions or cognitive re-evaluations to address the inequity.

Commitment has also been demonstrated to be positively correlated to relationship equity (Crawford, Feng, Fischer, & Diana, 2003), suggesting that the perceived input/output ratio in an intimate relationship is related to how committed partners are to the relationship. The availability of desirable relationship alternatives is also important to the research on equity in intimate relationships. That is, commitment to an intimate relationship results directly from feeling satisfied and rewarded in the relationship *and* perceiving that desirable relationship alternatives are not available. This may be similar to employees' commitment to an

organization, whereby their loyalty to an organization is related to their perceived equity *and* availability of job alternatives (Geurts, Schaufeli, & Rutte, 1999). In both contexts, the suggestion is that whether or not social actors have the possibility of leaving a relationship affects whether or not the relationship is perceived as equitable.

Research also suggests that romantic partners may tolerate current perceived inequity in a relationship if there is "projected" equity in the future of the relationship (Ueleke, 1983). This suggests that partners may re-evaluate their perception of inequity in the relationship in order to reduce cognitive dissonance. Walster and colleagues (1973) suggest that in response to inequity, individuals may strive to obtain "actual equity" by changing their input to output ratio, or they may achieve "psychological equity" by changing what they consider to be equitable in a relationship. Thus, similar to how employees may cognitively re-evaluate the perceived inequity in a work relationship, partners may use the promise of future equity in their relationship to reframe and tolerate current inequity. Thus, reducing cognitive dissonance in a social exchange relationship may mean that the situation and/or behaviors remain the same, but the psychological equity experienced by the actors is restored.

Perceived inequity in any relationship has the potential to cause the social actors to change their behaviors, engage in cognitive re-evaluation, or "distort reality" (Walster et al., 1973) to restore equity to the relationship. It is possible that perceived inequity in one life domain may affect how equity is perceived in another life domain. It is also possible that how people respond to perceived inequity in one area of life may affect their response to perceived inequity in another area of life. It has been demonstrated that feelings, attitudes, and behaviors that emerge in the domain of family have a relationship with individuals' feelings, attitudes, and behaviors at work (Grzywacz & Bass, 2003; Googins, 1991). It is expected that the perception

of inequity the in spousal/partner relationship will be related to the perception of inequity at work. The "spillover" effects from the family to work domains of life have been well researched and are relevant to the current study.

Family-to-work Conflict

There has been considerable research conducted on the conflict between work and family, which usually results from conflicting role pressures so that participation in one role makes participation in the other more difficult (Greenhaus & Beutell, 1985). Many employees are members of a family with roles and responsibilities, and many family members must meet organizational demands and commitments in their daily lives. The scarcity of human resources, particularly time and energy (Marks, 1977), may result in employees/family members feeling their available resources are not enough to fulfill their commitments in both contexts. Addressing the integration of work and family demands has been identified as a critical challenge facing both workers and organizations (Kossek & Lambert, 2005).

The intersection of family and work roles has also been argued to be both negative (i.e., work-to-family conflict) and positive (i.e., work-to-family enrichment) (Bellavia & Frone, 2005). Additionally, this can occur in both directions – work-to-family and family-to-work (Frone, 2003). Work-to-family conflict (WFC) and family-to-work conflict (FWC) are distinct but related forms of interrole conflict (Netemeyer, Boles, & McMurrian, 1996; Greenhaus & Beutell, 1985). WFC occurs when the demands of, time devoted to, and strain created by the job interfere with performing family-related responsibilities, and FWC occurs when the demands of, time devoted to, and strain created by the family interfere with performing work-related responsibilities (Netemeyer et al., 1996). Research suggests that employees have the ability to differentiate between the source and direction of the interference, and the two types of

interference have distinct antecedents. For example, employees who experience stress at work are more likely to experience WFC (Mesmer-Magnus & Viswesvaran, 2005), and employees who experience stress at home are more likely to experience FWC (Byron, 2005). There is also research that suggests there may be cultural differences in the relationships between work and family conflict. A study by Aryee, Fields, and Luk (1999) found that the life satisfaction of Hong Kong employees was influenced primarily by work-family conflict, whereas the life satisfaction of American employees was influenced primarily by family-work conflict. Thus, examining cultural differences that may affect family-to-work conflict will contribute to the knowledge base on this construct.

It has been argued that the emphasis of research between the domains of work and family has focused on the influences that the workplace has on family, and less attention has been given to the effects that family life has on work (Crouter, 1984; Lambert, 1991). The emphasis on FWC conflict has increased in the management, psychology, and vocational literature in the past two decades, so that there is a significant knowledge base about the antecedents and effects of family-to-work conflict. The amount of WFC remains a significantly larger body of work; however, available literature on FWC is sufficient to discuss its characteristics and effects on employees. The negative effects at work that are related to family stressors have been conceptualized in the literature as family-to-work conflict (FWC), negative family-to-work spillover, and family interference with work (FIW). The current study will use FWC when discussing negative work effects that are related to family stressors, although the literature reviewed had some variation in defining the construct.

Family-to-work conflict has been demonstrated to have negative effects on job performance (Keene & Reynolds, 2005; Witt & Carlson, 2006), job satisfaction (Rogers & May

2003), organizational commitment (Netemeyer et al., 1996), turnover intent (Kelloway, Gottlieb, & Barham, 1999) and increased pressure at work (Grzywacz & Marks, 2000). Research supports the theory that employees' job performance and commitment to an organization may be negatively affected by family-related stress. Gender differences may moderate the negative effects that family stressors have on the workplace (Rogers & May, 1996; Crouter, 1984; Keene & Reynolds, 2005), as women are more likely to report that family demands negatively impact their job performance. Other factors may also moderate the relationship between FWC and effects on organizational functioning, such as perceived organizational support and the personality factor of Conscientiousness (Witt & Carlson, 2006).

FWC is present when the demands of attending to family stressors affect employees' workplace attitudes and behaviors, and the deleterious effects of FWC have been well documented. This study will attempt to add to the literature about the consequences of FWC by investigating its effect on perceived inequity at work. While a number of family and work variables have been examined to determine the relationship of family stressors on work variables, there is not a study in the available literature that examines the effect of FWC on perceived inequity at work. As the link between perceived inequity at work and unfavorable outcomes for organizations has been well established, a better understanding of what other factors contribute to perceived inequity at work, including FWC, will enhance the understanding of the construct.

Locus of Control

How people see themselves affects how they perceive many domains of their lives, including their jobs. Locus of control is a psychological construct that describes how people perceive the degree to which they have control over their lives. Individuals with an internal

locus of control believe that they are able to control or influence the events in their lives, and individuals with an external locus of control believe that the environment or fate controls events (Rotter, 1966). Locus of control has been examined with regard to individuals' behavior in organizations. Spector (1982) suggests that locus of control is related to motivation, effort, performance, satisfaction, perception of the job, compliance with authority, and supervisory style; furthermore, locus of control moderates between incentives and motivation, and satisfaction and turnover. Kidd and Utne (1978) suggest that causal attributions made about inequity influence people's responses to the inequity; thus, whether an internal or external attribution is made about an equitable situation will impact individuals' subsequent actions. Locus of control may also be considered a core self-evaluation (Judge, Locke, Durham, & Kluger, 1998), which may have a significant effect on perceived work characteristics. Judge et al. (1998) suggest that when individuals feel more in control, they see more variety, challenge, and intrinsic worth in their work.

Locus of control has also been studied in relation to perceptions of breaches of psychological contracts at work. Psychological contracts are conceptualized as people's perceptions and expectations about the obligations in the context of an employment exchange relationship (Rousseau, 1989), and psychological contracts are usually implicit. Perceived breach of the psychological contract occurs when employees experience the cognition that the organization has failed to meet one or more obligations of the contract (Morrison & Robinson, 1997). The results of a study by Raja, Johns, and Ntalianis (2004) indicated that individuals with high Neuroticism (low emotional stability), low Conscientiousness, and high external locus of control were the most likely to perceive breach of the psychological contract (Raja et al., 2004). This study is important in the current discussion because it makes an explicit connection between

personality factors, psychology factors (locus of control), and what individuals are likely to perceive.

Personality Factors

Personality is a broad concept, and scholars' definitions of psychology are influenced by the concepts they choose to measure, describe and understand human behavior. To provide multiple definitions of the construct and discuss which definitions are likely to be most accurate is beyond the scope of this study. However, it is important to note that personality psychology is concerned with the nature of human nature (Hogan, 2004). Some scholars suggests that there are two categories of personality definitions: one category of definitions is from the perspective of the observer and is concerned with how individuals are perceived by others, and the other category is from the perspective of the actor and is concerned with how people perceive themselves (Hogan 2004; MacKinnon, 1944). Winter (2005) also discusses the importance of context when examining personality, as one can "view personality as a series of embodied contexts – characteristics formed by environments and experience that, once developed, are then (more or less) resistant to further alteration or are altered only with more effort that it took to form them" (p. 574). Definitions of personality differ in what is considered focal to its conceptualization, and mechanisms explaining the traits may be difficult to isolate and measure (Saucier & Goldberg, 2002). The current discussion will provide a brief history of the study of personality, the conceptualization of the construct for this study, and a review of relevant studies with direct and moderating effects of personality on the variables of interest.

Personality Dimensions

There has been a significant amount of research dedicated to organizing the taxonomy of personality in a way that is comprehensive yet succinct. As early as the 1930s, a survey of the

literature at that time revealed almost 50 different definitions in use (Allport, 1937), and there was a call to analyze personality into distinguishable and separate factors (McDougall, 1932). The work of Cattell (1947) supported a complex taxonomy with primary and second-order factors of personality. The development of the five factor model by Tupes and Christal (1961) was corroborated and refined by subsequent studies, most notably by Norman (1963). His factor labels have been used in personality research for nearly fifty years, and only one factor label has been significantly refined. In the current study, personality variables examined will follow the five-factor model and utilize the following labels: Extraversion, Agreeableness, Conscientiousness (Norman, 1963), Neuroticism, and Openness to Experience (McCrae & Costa, 1985). These labels are commonly referred to as "The Big Five" in the literature. While there is general consensus among researchers with regard to the number of personality dimensions, variability remains in how they are defined and what characteristics effectively represent each dimension (Barrick & Mount, 1991).

The first dimension, Extraversion, may be considered the extent to which an individual is sociable, gregarious, assertive, talkative, active, and adventurous (Norman, 1963; McCrae & Costa, 1985; Barrick & Mount, 1991). The second dimension has been referred to as Emotional Stability, Stability, Emotionality, or Neuroticism. This dimension may represent the extent to which individuals are anxious, depressed, angry, embarrassed, worried, or insecure. Individuals who are more neurotic are characterized as nervous, tense, hypochondriacal, and impulsive, whereas individuals who are less neurotic are considered self-confident, calm, even-tempered, and composed (Norman, 1963; McCrae & Costa, 1985). The third dimension has been termed Agreeableness or Likability, and characteristics of this dimension reflect people who are courteous, flexible, trusting, good-natured, cooperative, forgiving, and tolerant (Norman, 1963;

Barrick & Mount 1991). The fourth dimension has most frequently been called Conscientiousness, and it may be conceptualized as the extent to which individuals are dependable, careful, thorough, responsible, organized, persevering, and planful (Norman, 1963). The last dimension has been the most difficult to identify and achieve consensus across researchers (Barrick & Mount, 1991). It has been interpreted as Intellect or Intelligence (Borgatta, 1964), Culture (Norman, 1963), and Openness to Experience (McCrae & Costa, 1985). This dimension includes characteristics of those who are imaginative, cultured, curious, original, broad-minded, and intelligent (Barrick & Mount, 1991). As is evident in this discussion, the five-factor model allows researchers to organize a vast amount of personality characteristics into a small but meaningful set of factors.

The five personality dimensions as defined here have been examined across a variety of contexts, including organizations and organizational behavior. In a landmark study by Barrick and Mount (1991), the Big Five personality factors were examined in relation to job performance. Their results suggested that Extraversion and Openness to Experience were valid predictors of specific criteria of job performance, whereas Conscientiousness was a valid predictor of all job performance criterion types across all occupational groups studied. Subsequent studies have also provided evidence that Conscientiousness has both direct and indirect effects on job performance, job satisfaction, and other work-related dimensions.

Some research suggests that conscientious individuals are better workers than less conscientious people because they are able to better control their work-related behaviors; thus, higher Conscientiousness is associated with a lack of deviant behavior and turnover in organizations (Salgado, 2002). Konovsky and Organ (1996) found that Conscientiousness predicted organizational citizenship behavior (OCB), a construct that examines employees'

contributions to work that are neither contractually rewarded nor practically enforceable by a supervisor. Zhao and Seibert (2006) found that entrepreneurs significantly differ from managers on four of the five personality dimensions, with Conscientiousness having the strongest relationship to entrepreneurial status. Conscientiousness has also be found to positively correlate to leadership (Judge, Bono, Ilies, & Gerhardt, 2002).

Neuroticism has also been found to have direct and indirect effects on employees and organization-related behavior. In a study of entrepreneurship, entrepreneurs scored significantly lower on the measure for Neuroticism than managers (Zhao & Siebert, 2006). In a study of leadership, Neuroticism was negatively correlated with leadership (Judge et al., 2002). Another conceptualization of Emotionality Stability/Neuroticism dimension is being representative of individuals' tendency to experience negative or positive affective states (Friede & Ryan, 2005). Judge and Bono (2001) argue that meta-analytic results suggest that negative affectivity is a measure of Neuroticism; therefore, it has been suggested that discussing findings with regard to negative affectivity is appropriate when examining Neuroticism (Friede & Ryan, 2005).

There has been limited research conducted that examines the relationship between personality factors and family-to-work conflict; however, preliminary studies have found direct and indirect relationships between these variables. Bruck and Allen (2003) found that individuals who were more conscientious reported experiencing less family interferences with work. They explain this finding by suggesting that the organizational skills associated with conscientious individuals may help them prevent the occurrence of family conflicts with work. Research in this area also supports a positive relationship between Neuroticism and family-to-work conflict (Bruck & Allen, 2003). Witt and Carlson (2006) found that negative affectivity was the strongest predictor of various types of work-family conflict in their study. In a study of

the Big Five in relationship to work-family conflict, employees who scored higher on a measure of neuroticism reported greater amounts of WFC and FWC, whereas employees who scored higher on a measure of Conscientiousness reported less WFC and FWC (Wayne et al., 2004).

Moderating Effects of Personality Factors

Personality factors have also been examined to understand moderating effects these factors have on relationships between other variables. Although personality factors have not been extensively studied in the context of work-to-family and family-to-work conflict, there are a few studies that have investigated how personality moderates the relationship between work-family conflict and work behaviors. Kinnunen, Vermulst, Gerris, and Mäkikangas (2003) found that emotional stability (low Neuroticism) moderated the relationship between work-family conflict and well-being at work. Specifically, fathers that were more emotionally stable were protected from the effects of WFC on job exhaustion. Fathers who were agreeable were protected from the negative effects of family-to-work conflict and marital satisfaction (Kinnunen et al., 2003). Although the results regarding Agreeableness are not relevant to the current study, it provides additional support for the moderating effects of personality factors on family-to-work conflict and its relation to other variables.

Conscientiousness has been found to attenuate the relationship between the work-family interface and behaviors at work. In a study of the effects of family-to-work conflict and family-to-work enrichment on job performance, researchers found that highly conscientious employees were more affected by FWC. The conclusion was that employees were already exerting significant levels of energy in both family and work roles, and would therefore accept a loss in job performance in order to conserve resources (Witt & Carlson, 2006). Although the direction of the moderating effect in their study is the opposite of what is expected in the current study, the

results provide support for the moderating effects of Conscientiousness between work-family conflict and organizational behavior variables. It is expected in the current study that Conscientiousness will attenuate the relationship between perceived inequity in the spousal/partner relationship and perceived inequity at work, because more conscientious individuals will be able to separate their work and family roles.

Cultural Factors

It is necessary to make a distinction between organizational culture and culture as a variable that affects how individuals and groups comprise an organization. In this discussion, *culture* is defined as "the embodiment of a worldview through learned and transmitted beliefs, values, and practices, including religious and spiritual traditions" (APA, 2003). The most current edition of the APA Ethics Code requires psychologists to "respect cultural, individual, and role differences, including those based on age, gender, gender identity, race, ethnicity, culture, national origin, religion, sexual orientation, disability, language, and socioeconomic status" (APA, 2002). Culture may be broadly conceptualized as a full range of human experience that affects how people interact with each other. This conceptualization of culture is distinct, but not altogether separate from, the concept of *organizational culture*. Denison's (1996) model of organizational culture distinguishes four business culture traits that may be measured and assessed in an organization: its mission, its involvement, its adaptability, and its consistency. Members of an organization contribute to and are affected by the organizational culture, but it is important to recognize that cultural influences from outside the organization may be brought in by members through their individual identities with particular cultural groups. The distinction made here between culture and organizational culture is not meant to be

simplistic; however, it is important to make explicit that culture, as it is defined above, is the focus of the current discussion.

Cultural Dimensions

Similar to the research on personality dimensions, scholars have tried to develop models that organize cultural dimensions into a succinct yet comprehensive set of factors. Much of the research on cultural dimensions has been conducted in the fields of business and management at the national level. One classic study is Hofstede's (1991) study of IBM employees in over 50 countries. The employees completed surveys regarding their values, and from the data Hofstede extracted four dimensions that manifest differently in national and organizational cultures: individualism vs. collectivism, power distance, uncertainty avoidance, and masculinity/femininity. The individualism-collectivism dimension refers to how people value social ties: in individualistic societies ties are loose and individuals look after themselves, whereas collectivistic societies promote the development of strong, cohesive groups. The power distance dimension reflects how less powerful members of organizations within a society expect and accept that power is not equally distributed. The uncertainty avoidance dimension reflects how members of a culture may feel threatened in response to uncertain or unknown situations. The last dimension, masculinity/femininity, refers to how gender roles in a society are defined: societies that are more masculine have distinct social gender roles, whereas greater femininity in a society reflects overlap in gender roles (Hofstede, 1991).

Other scholars have also examined cultural research to extract factors that represent cultural dimensions. Trompenaars and Hampden-Turner (1997) synthesized research on cultural differences in management that spanned 15 years, 30 companies, and 50 different countries. Their seven dimensions of culture fall under three general headings: relationships with other

people, the passage of time, and the relationship to the environment. Because much of the research has been conducted in the organizational context, there has also been a wealth of literature regarding differences along these dimensions with regard to work and work-related variables. Triandis (2002) examined cross-cultural differences that are reflected in individual and collectivist societies' motivation to work and inherent meaning of work. Although these scholars' research was conducted using employees' responses from various countries, it is important to recognize that within the United States, there are many cultural groups whose values may differ along these dimensions. Indeed, although these dimensions have been identified to distinguish between cultural groups, individuals within cultural groups have their own unique histories and identities, and this may reflect as significant within-group variation. Examining cultural differences is an important component of expanding the knowledge base of equity theory, but it is important to make explicit that culture is a complex construct that interacts with many other variables and may make interpretation and generalization difficult.

Cultural Differences and Perceived Inequity

Equity theory is based on the perception of inputs and outputs in social exchange relationships; however, it cannot be assumed that all individuals share the same norms of equity or what may be perceived as equitable relationships. What may be perceived as "fair" may vary across groups according to cultural dimensions. There has been some conceptual work in the management literature that addresses cultural factors which may affect the perception of inequity. Fadil and colleagues (2005) developed a conceptual "Culturally-Sensitive Equity Model" that recognizes differences between Western (individualist) and Eastern (collectivist) cultures when examining inputs, outcomes, the choice of the referent other, and the motivation to reduce inequity. Bolino and Turnley (2008) also suggest that the value orientation of culture is

an overarching framework under which individuals conceptualize inputs and outputs, select referent others, and perceive and react to inequity. Konopaske and Werner (2002) suggest that three factors may influence the perceived input and outcome expectations of expatriates: the personality characteristics of the expatriates, the length of assignment in a host country, and the degree of socioeconomic difference between the home and host country. There is a call to field for the increase in empirical research that would support the proposed models that have been conceptualized, and to investigate the hypothesized factors that affect the perception of inequity.

Differences in values across cultural groups may affect perceptions of inequity and responses to inequity, and there is research that supports this claim at the individual, group, and organizational levels. Differences were observed between cultural groups in their level of equity sensitivity when individuals responded to surveys in a study: American, Russian, and Indian respondents were more benevolence oriented, and British and French respondents were more entitlement oriented (Chhokar, Zhuplev, Fok, & Hartman, 2001). There is likely a complex interaction between cultural values and other factors in the perception and reaction to inequity. Indeed, Yamaguchi (2003) suggests that individual differences, cultural values, and dispositions affect employees' equity sensitivity. At the group level, there is also research that suggests cultural differences may influence allocation behavior. Allocation behavior is frequently examined in relation to equity and equality. In a study by Hui, Triandis, and Yee (1991), participants from a traditionally collectivistic society were more egalitarian in their resource allocation than were participants from a traditionally individualistic society. Thus, a cultural value influenced how resources were distributed, with equality being a greater influence for a collectivist group than equity.

Research has also been conducted on cultural differences with regard to inequity at the organizational level. Researchers observed differences between U.S. and Dutch firms when responding to interorganizational relationships (Scheer, Kumar, & Steenkamp, 2003). Dutch firms reacted negatively to both positive inequity (over-reward) and negative inequity (under-reward) in organizational relationships. When undercompensated, Dutch firms experienced hostility, and when overcompensated, they experienced guilt. The American firms only reacted negatively to negative inequity (under-reward) in the interorganizational relationship; the American firms experienced hostility in reaction to undercompensation, but did not have adverse reactions to overcompensation (Scheer et al., 2003). The researchers suggest their study demonstrates that equity theory may not be applied universally to interorganizational relationships, especially those that are cross-cultural.

When examined across cultures, differences have also been found in individuals' reactions to inequity in romantic relationships. Aumer-Ryan, Hatfield, and Frey (2007) examined the relationship between equity and relationship satisfaction in romantic partners from individualistic and collectivistic cultures. Their results suggest that relationship equity is important to partners in both cultures; however, partners from the individualistic culture valued equity more highly and reportedly experienced greater relationship satisfaction than partners from a more collectivistic culture. However, members of the collectivistic culture experienced the greatest satisfaction when they were overbenefitting from the relationship (Aumer-Ryan et al., 2007). Although the study was not structured to examine the sources of these differences, the authors conclude that cultural differences in the perception of equity and the response to inequity are reflected in their results.

Cultural differences in the perception of inequity across romantic and work relationships have thus been well documented, with a call to the fields of management and organizational psychology to increase the research that examines culture in relation to inequity. The current study will examine cultural differences as they manifest across racial and ethnic groups, because members of distinct racial groups in the United States may consider themselves to be members of different cultures. Research has also demonstrated that racial groups differ in their perception of inequity in starting salaries (Avery, 2003). In addition, the dataset includes a measure of respondents' ancestral origins and are indicative of ethnic origins. Respondents chose from countries and regions of the world that represented their ancestry, and this corresponds well to research to that has been conducted regarding cultural differences between groups of national origin. Thus, the current study will examine differences across racial and ethnic groups in the perception of inequity at work and in spousal/partner relationships.

Problem and Purposes Overview

After reviewing the relevant literature, gaps in the knowledge base of understanding how certain psychological variables and personality factors are related to perceived inequity at work were highlighted. The study of management has been considered interdisciplinary because of the variety of fields that are utilized to understand organizational behavior, including many psychological specialties. Indeed, there has been an abundance of research that examines how psychological factors and personality dimensions have direct, indirect, and moderating effects on work-related behaviors. There is also a well established link in the HRM literature between perceived inequity at work and unfavorable outcomes for organizations. Lastly, differences have been found between cultural groups in the experience of perceived inequity in social exchange relationships. However, there has been a lack of research that addresses how psychological

variables and personality factors have direct and indirect effects on perceived inequity at work, and whether there are cultural differences in these relationships.

To reiterate, the purpose of the current study is to more thoroughly examine psychological and personality factors that contribute to individuals' perceptions of inequity at work. A secondary purpose is to examine how psychological and personality factors moderate individuals' perceptions of inequity at work. Lastly, this study examines differences between racial and ethnic groups in their experiences of these variables. In order to address the gaps of the knowledge base that were highlighted during the review of the relevant literature, research questions were composed. Testable hypotheses were subsequently formulated in order to indicate how the research questions would be addressed in the current study. The following chapter will discuss the methodology used to examine the hypotheses.

Questions and Hypotheses

Research Questions

1. How does inequity in the spousal/partner relationship contribute to perceived inequity at work?
2. How does family-to-work conflict (FWC) contribute to perceived inequity at work?
3. How does locus of control relate to perceived inequity at work?
4. How do personality factors relate to perceived inequity at work?
5. Are there differences between racial groups in perceived inequity in relationships, and in the experience of family-to-work conflict (FWC)?

Hypotheses

Hypothesis 1a: Perceived inequity in the spousal/partner relationship is positively related to perceived inequity at work.

Hypothesis 1b: Conscientiousness moderates the degree to which perceived inequity in the spousal/partner relationship is related to perceived inequity at work.

Hypothesis 2a: Family-to-work conflict (FWC) is positively related to perceived inequity at work.

Hypothesis 2b: Conscientiousness moderates the degree to which family-to-work is related to perceived inequity at work.

Hypothesis 3a: There is a positive relationship between external locus of control and perceived inequity at work.

Hypothesis 3b: There is a negative relationship between internal locus of control and perceived inequity at work.

Hypothesis 4a: There is a positive relationship between Neuroticism and perceived inequity at work.

Hypothesis 4b: There is a negative relationship between Conscientiousness and perceived inequity at work.

Hypothesis 5a: There are differences between racial/ethnic groups in the perception of inequity at work.

Hypothesis 5b: There are differences between racial/ethnic groups in the perception of inequity in spousal/partner relationships.

Hypothesis 5c: There will be differences across racial groups in the experience of family to work conflict (FWC).

CHAPTER II: RESEARCH DESIGN AND METHODOLOGY

Introduction

The aim of the current study is to examine how psychological variables and personality factors relate to perceived inequity at work. The purpose of this chapter is to examine in greater detail the hypotheses that were formulated to address the research questions generated, and to also describe the appropriate methodology that was used to test these hypotheses. This is a secondary analysis of data that were collected as a larger study of issues of mid-life development. Although the data were collected in two phases, there was neither a consistent nor systematic time lag between the collection points that would facilitate causal analyses. Thus, correlational analyses were used to examine the relationships between the variables of interest. This chapter will provide descriptions of the dependent variable, independent variables, and control variables that were used in this study. Some of the variables were available as part of the existing dataset, and other variables were constructed using items from the survey that demonstrated statistical significance in representing underlying factors in the data.

Procedures

This study is an evaluation of a pre-existing study which examined patterns, predictors, and outcomes of mid-life development in areas of physical health, psychological well-being, and social responsibility. Respondents were asked to provide extensive information on their physical and mental health throughout their adult lives, and to assess the ways in which their lifestyles, including relationships and work-related demands, contributed to the conditions experienced. This study evaluated responses that relate to the experience of inequity at work, inequity in the spousal/partner relationship, family-to-work conflict, and other psychological and personality variables. Although some researchers have raised concerns about the accuracy and reliability of

data which is primarily self-reported, Adams' (1963, 1965) theory of inequity was strongly based on the individuals' perception of inequity. As "equity is in the eye of the beholder" (Kidd & Utne, 1978, p. 303), evaluation involves "*perceived* outcomes and inputs rather than 'objective' reality as conceived by a competent impartial observer" (Deutsch, 1985, p.12). In the current study, the self-report of feelings associated with inputs and outputs across relationships was desirable in order to measure the subjective experience of participants. This self-report was considered representative of participants' perception of equity and inequity in social exchange relationships.

The Source of Data and Method of Collection

Data were collected for the National Survey of Midlife Development in the United States (MIDUS) by the John D. and Catherine T. MacArthur Foundation Research Network on Successful Midlife Development in 1995. The data are available through the Inter-university Consortium for Political and Social Research (ICPSR), housed at the University of Michigan. Data were collected via telephone interviews and a mail-back questionnaire, and respondents were a nationally representative general population sample of noninstitutionalized persons aged 25-74 who had telephones. People who were contacted were informed that the study was being carried out through the Harvard Medical School and was designed to study health and well-being during the middle years of life. The sample was obtained through random digit dialing, and respondents first participated in a telephone interview lasting approximately 40 minutes. Respondents to the telephone survey were then asked to complete two self-administered mail-back questionnaires.

There are three parts to the MIDUS dataset: the main respondent sample (RDD), data for siblings of respondents in the RDD, and data for twins of respondents in the RDD. The number

of participants in the complete MIDUS dataset is 7,108. The sample to be used in the analyses for this study will be based on the main RDD dataset, as response rates and psychometrics for constructed scales are available for this subset. The overall response rate for the main RDD for both the telephone and mail-back questionnaires was 60.8%, and the number of respondents in this group is 3,487. The sample used in this study included all part-time and full-time employed respondents aged 25-65.

Participants who completed both the telephone and mail-back questionnaires may have had up to a four-week period in between their responses; therefore, it was necessary to go through the data and select cases where the participants indicated they were working either full-time or part-time at both stages of data collection. Participants whose work situation changed between collection points (i.e., they indicated they were employed during the telephone interview but checked "looking for work/unemployed" on the questionnaire) were excluded from the dataset. Although there was some lag time between the two collection periods, there was neither a systematic nor consistent time difference between respondents' answers. Therefore, the data are considered cross-sectional and not longitudinal, which will affect the analyses appropriate to review the data. After reviewing the data to ensure consistency across participants' answers, the number of participants for in the current study was 1,734 (male = 881, female = 853).

Study Variables

Dependent Variable

Perceived Inequity at Work. This variable was not part of the original MIDUS dataset; rather, it was constructed using items from the dataset that have empirical and statistical support to capture perceived inequity at work. The "Work" section of the self-administered

questionnaire (SAQ) of the MIDUS asked respondents to indicate the extent to which they felt certain characteristics or situations were true of their jobs, how they felt about their jobs, and how they felt about their relationships with coworkers and supervisors. There were 25 items in this section, and it was hypothesized that the variable of interest in this study, perceived inequity at work, would emerge as a factor using a confirmatory factor analysis. Factor analysis is commonly used in the development of questionnaires to ensure that underlying traits are captured by the questions in the survey (Field, 2005).

When examining this set of questions in the SAQ, it was determined that the questions about relationships with coworkers and supervisors were not relevant to the current study. This group of questions assessed how often co-workers and supervisors assisted or interacted with participants, not about how the participants viewed these others' perceptions of themselves as employees. The remaining 20 questions asked participants to measure how often they endorsed characteristics or experiences as being true of their experience at work. Based on the face validity of the 20 questions, it was hypothesized that four factors would emerge from this analysis. It was hypothesized that the items measuring perceived inputs and outputs would constitute a factor of perceived inequity at work. It was also hypothesized that items measuring equal opportunities would constitute a factor of perceived inequality. The third hypothesized factor of autonomy at work was based on items that measured the extent to which employees dictated activities during their workday. Lastly, it was hypothesized that items measuring how many demands were made on employees' time would emerge as a factor of time constraints at work.

The confirmatory factor analysis (CFA) was conducted using SPSS, and the initial communality estimates were determined using principal components analysis (PCA). Some

statisticians have challenged the use of PCA in a factor analysis; however, this method has been demonstrated to yield similar results to other forms of extraction methods (Schoenmann, 1990; Field, 2005). The correlation matrix did not reveal any problems in the data with multicollinearity, which exists when two or more predictors in a model are strongly correlated with each other. As suggested by Field (2005), strong multicollinearity exists when variables have correlations that are above .80 or .90. The variables in the correlation matrix did not have correlations that were above .60, so this condition was met. It was hypothesized that four factors would emerge from the data and this number was used to pre-determine the factor structure of the analysis. The four factor solution was found to explain 55.9% of the variance in the items. The solution was also checked for unidimensionality (one underlying dimension related to all the items in the survey) by examining the eigenvalues. The first factor was *not* three times or more the value of the second factors; thus, it was concluded that there were multiple underlying dimensions in the data (G. Delandshere, personal communication, March 20, 2007).

The five items that comprised the factor of perceived inequity at work included "How often do you learn new things at work," "How often does your work demand a high level of skill of expertise," "How often does your job provide you with a variety of things that interest you," "When I think about the work I do on my job, I feel a good deal of pride," and "I feel that others respect the work I do on my job." Adams (1963, 1965) conceptualized level of education as an input, and this is confirmed in the analysis by the inclusion of an item that reflects skill or expertise that is likely obtained through specialized training or advanced education. The items reflecting how often employees learn new things at work or have a variety of things that interest them may be conceptualized as intrinsic inputs (i.e., how much employees value being able to continually learn from their jobs and maintain a level of interest in their work). The item that

reflects having pride in one's job may be reflective of brand equity, or an association that an organization conveys a sense of respect to its members (Cardy, Miller, & Ellis, 2007). Employees may also have an organizational-level identity where they consider their organizations a part of themselves (Ashforth & Mael, 1989; Thatcher & Zhu, 2006). Thus, an outcome of pride and respect may also indicate ties to the organization. The item that reflects perception of others' respect may be considered an outcome of status or prestige that is valued by referent others. The five items were then reverse coded so that high scores reflect higher levels of perceived inequity at work. Cronbach's α for the constructed variable in this sample is .75.

Independent Variables

Perceived Inequity in the Spousal/Partner Relationship. This variable was not part of the original MIDUS dataset; rather, it was constructed using items that were empirically and statistically supported to capture perceived inequity in the spousal/partner relationship. In the self-administered questionnaire (SAQ), there were questions in the section called "Marriage or Close Relationship" that measured how much respondents felt their partners cared about them, how much they criticized them, and the division of labor in the relationship with regard to chores. There were 19 items in this section, and it was hypothesized that perceived inequity in the spousal/partner relationship would emerge as a factor using a confirmatory factor analysis.

Based on the face validity of the 19 questions, it was hypothesized that three factors would emerge from this analysis. It was hypothesized that items relating to the division of labor in the household and how fair respondents felt the division was would load on a factor that represented perceived inequity in the spousal/partner relationship. The confirmatory factor analysis (CFA) was conducted using SPSS, and the initial communality estimates were

determined using principal components analysis (PCA). The correlation matrix did not reveal any concerns with multicollinearity, as none of the items had an *r* that was above .70.

It was hypothesized that three factors would emerge from the data and this number was used to pre-determine the factor structure of the analysis. The three factor solution was found to explain 61.91 % of the variance in the items. The solution was also checked for unidimensionality (one underlying dimension related to all the items in the survey) by examining the eigenvalues. The first factor was more than three times the value of the second factor; therefore, it is possible that there is one underlying dimension across the data and the factors that emerged through the analysis do not represent distinct dimensions in the spousal/partner relationship. The implications of this on the results of the study will be discussed in a later chapter.

The three factors that emerged through the analysis represented perceived support from the spouse/partner, perceived strain and inequity from the spouse/partner, and perceived equity for the spouse/partner. Although three factors were hypothesized in this analysis, the loadings of the items on each factor were somewhat unexpected. The items that measured respondents' perception of equity in relation to both themselves and to their partners were expected to load on the same factor; however, this was not the result. Two items that measured perceived inequity to the spouse or partner loaded on a separate factor and were: "Overall, do you do more of the chores, does your spouse or partner do more of them, or do you split them equally?" and "How fair do you think this arrangement of household chores is to your spouse/partner?"

The item that represented perceived inequity from the perspective of the respondent loaded on the same factor with items that measured strain from the spouse/partner. The seven items that loaded on this factor were: "How often does your spouse or partner make too many

demands on you," "How often does he or she argue with you," "How often does he or she make you feel tense," "How often does he or she criticize you," "How often does he or she let you down when you are counting on him or her," "How often does he or she get on your nerves," and "How fair to you think this arrangement of household chores is to you?" This variable was constructed as the mean of these seven items, and items were recoded so that high scores represented higher strain and perceived inequity in the spousal/partner relationship. Cronbach's α for this variable is .86. It should be noted that the statistical analysis used to support the construct of inequity in the spousal/partner relationship was not as robust as hypothesized, and implications for this will be discussed in the limitations section.

Family-to-Work Conflict (FWC). Although this variable does not exist in the MIDUS dataset, the scales reference document in the MIDUS literature instructs that Negative Family to Work Spillover may be constructed by calculating the sum of the reverse-coded items in each scale. Negative Family to Work Spillover has been used in numerous studies (Grzywacz & Marks, 2000; Grzywacz et al., 2002) and conceptually represents family-to-work conflict (FWC). In the current study, FWC was constructed by first reverse-coding items in the dataset so that higher scores represented greater family-to-work conflict. The mean was then calculated, so that FWC was represented by the mean of four items that measured the degree to which the demands of the family interfered with workplace attitudes and behaviors. The four items in the MIDUS dataset that measure family-to-work conflict are: "Responsibilities at home reduce the effort you can devote to your job," "Personal or family worries and problems distract you when you are at work," "Activities and chores at home prevent you from getting the amount of sleep you need to do your job well," and "Stress at home makes you irritable at work." Cronbach's α

that has been reported for constructing the Negative Work to Family Spillover variable in the MIDUS dataset is .81. Cronbach's α for this study was .73.

To examine *Locus of Control*, the Personal Mastery and Personal Constraints variables were examined in the MIDUS dataset. In the dataset, the Personal Mastery variable was constructed as the mean of four items that measured an internal locus of control ("Whether or not I am able to get what I want is in my own hands," "What happens to me in the future mostly depends on me," "I can do just about anything I really set my mind to," "When I really want to do something, I usually find a way to succeed at it"). The Personal Constraints variable was constructed as the mean of eight items that measured an external locus of control ("Other people determine most of what I can and cannot do," There is little I can do to change the important things in my life," "I often feel helpless in dealing with the problems of life," "What happens in my life is beyond my control," "There are many things that interfere with what I want to do," "I have little control over the things that happen to me," "There is really no way I can solve the problems I have," and "I sometimes feel I am being pushed around in my life."). For both variables, items were recoded so that high scores reflect higher standing in each dimension Cronbach's α as reported for the Personal Mastery variable in the dataset was .70; Cronbach's α as reported for the Personal Constraints variable in the dataset was .86. In this sample, Cronbach's α for Personal Mastery was .68, and Cronbach's α for Personal Constraints was .83.

Personality Traits. Respondents were asked to indicate the degree to which each of 30 self-descriptive adjectives described themselves. The personality variables were constructed by calculating the mean across each set of items, and items were recoded so that high scores reflect higher standings in each dimension. Neuroticism was measured as the degree to which respondents reported they were moody, worrying, nervous, or calm. Cronbach's α for

Neuroticism in the dataset was .74, and Cronbach's α for the current sample was .74. Extraversion was measured as the degree to which respondents reported they were outgoing, friendly, lively, active, and talkative. Cronbach's α for Extraversion in the dataset was .78, and Cronbach's α for the current sample was .78. Openness to Experience was measured as the degree to which respondents reported they were creative, imaginative, intelligent, curious, broad-minded, sophisticated, and adventurous. Cronbach's α for Opennness to Experience in the dataset was .77, and Cronbach's α for the current sample was .77. Conscientiousness was measured as the degree to which respondents reported they were organized, responsible, hardworking, and careless. Cronbach's α for Conscientiousness in the dataset was .58, and Cronbach's α for the current sample was .69. Agreeableness was measured as the degree to which respondents reported they were helpful, warm, outgoing, caring, softhearted, and sympathetic. Cronbach's α for Agreeableness in the current study was .80, and Cronbach's α for the current sample was 80.

Racial/Ethnic Identification. Respondents were asked to indicate of which racial group they consider themselves to be a member, and they were asked to select only one response from the available categories. Although it has been argued that race is a socially constructed variable, the decision to use race as it was defined in the dataset was out of necessity. There was a need to examine this variable but it is also important to acknowledge that commonly used methods of collecting data using forced-choice categories may underscore the variations in racial and ethnic identities. In the MIDUS dataset, respondents chose from the following categories and were coded as follows: White = 1, Black and/or African American = 2, Native American or Aleutian Islander/Eskimo = 3, Asian or Pacific Islander = 4, Other = 5, or Multiracial = 6.

The use of predetermined racial categories to examine differences between racial/ethnic groups has been criticized by scholars. The criticism is that this may limit within-group variation or not fully capture individuals' ethnic origins. This study attempted to address this flaw by including a variable that captures ethnic origin. In the demographics section of the MIDUS self-administered questionnaire (SAQ), respondents were asked to indicate the countries from which their ancestors originated and therefore represented their main ethnic origins. There were over 65 countries and regions on list, and a new variable was created for the current study to address respondents' reports of their ethnic origins. There were eight categories created for this variable to represent ethnic identity as it relates to respondents' ancestry: Europe = 1; Native American = 2; Latin/South America = 3; Asia = 4; Africa = 5; Middle East =6; North America (non-Spanish speaking) = 7; Don't Know = 8. Differences between respondents' answers for both their racial and ethnic identities will be examined using these two variables.

Control Variables

Control variables have been identified that may be potential determinants of the perception of inequity at work and may co-vary with the psychological and personality variables in this study. Indeed, perceived inequity at work or in romantic relationships may be due to actual inequity or discrimination that exists. Controlling variables in this analysis will facilitate the examination of the variables of interest while minimizing confounding effects from the controls. To control for these variables in the hierarchical regression analysis, the control variables were entered first in order to observe how the variables of interest accounted for additional variance in the hypothesized relationships. Previous outcomes on the effects of personality traits on job performance have held across industries and level of education (Barrick & Mount, 1991); therefore, personality factors were not entered as controls in any of the

analyses. However, when examining the psychological variables and the personality variables in relation to perceived inequity at work, the potential co-varying effects of gender, age, marital status, racial/ethnic group, level of education, socioeconomic status, and occupational industry were used as controls.

Gender. Societal expectations that shape the traits of men and women may systematically differ in ways that confound how those traits affect perceptions of inequity at work or inequity in the spousal/partner relationship. It is also possible that actual discrimination that may exist in the workplace on the basis of employees' gender will affect the examination of perceived inequity. Gender differences have also been found in FWC and WFC (Roxburgh, 1999; Duxbury & Higgins, 1991; MacEwen & Barling, 1994), which also supports this variable being controlled in the current study. Gender differences have also been reported when examining job satisfaction and life satisfaction in relation to work-family conflict (Kossek & Ozeki, 1998). In the MIDUS dataset, gender was coded as male = 1 and female = 2.

Age. Age is a variable that may have a confounding relationship to perceived inequity because many of the inputs and outputs in Adams' (1963, 1965) conceptualization increase with employees' age and tenure within an organization: status, seniority, job status, and experience. It is also possible that an employee whose age may be considered a deficit (and therefore, not a relevant input or output) would affect perceptions of inequity. Differences between generational cohorts have been found in relation to work-family demands and perceived inequality (Carr, 2002). Thus, controlling for age in this analysis will help eliminate confounding effects this variable has in relation to equity in social exchange relationships. In the MIDUS dataset, respondents' age was computed by subtracting their date of birth from the telephone interview date. The age of respondents in this study range from 25-65. Although the effects of age were

controlled for in the study, it is important to note the range of respondents is representative of the American workforce. Respondents in this range were of post-baccalaureate and pre-retirement age, which is representative of the majority of workers in the United States (United States Bureau of Labor Statistics, 2009).

Marital Status/Living with Partner. Whether or not respondents were married or partnered could affect the variables of interest in the study. Marital status has been found to affect relationships between work, family, and mental health, and has been controlled in previous studies (Grzywacz & Bass, 2003). For example, marital satisfaction has been examined as a predictor of family-to-work conflict and has been controlled for in many studies (Dilworth, 2004; Byron, 2005; Witt & Carlson, 2006). In the MIDUS dataset, marital status is represented by the following: married = 1, separated = 2, divorced = 3, widowed = 4, never married = 5. Because marital status is a categorical variable with more than two categories, this variable was dummy coded and entered into separate blocks in the hierarchical regression analysis, as suggested by Field (2005). Sole use of marital status would not capture partnerships that may exist between individuals who are not married (i.e., cohabitating or same-sex relationships). Thus, an additional variable was used to control the effects that partnerships may have on the variables of interest. This variable is Married or Living With Partner, and it is represented in the dataset as 1 = Yes or 2 = No.

Children under 18. The number of children that employees have has been found to affect their role conflicts between life and work (Holahan & Gilbert, 1979). The number of children has been used as a predictor variable when examining family-to-work conflict (Dilworth, 2004), and being a parent to a child under 6 has been used as a control variable when examining work-to-family and family-to-work conflict (Grzywacz & Bass, 2003). In addition, being a parent has

been found to moderate the relationship between work and psychological distress (Barnett, 1994). Thus, controlling for the effects of having children under 18 in a household was necessary to reduce confounding effects this variable had on the variables of interest. In the MIDUS dataset, this variable is Any Children Under 18, and it coded as Yes = 1, No = 0. It was beyond the scope of this study to examine differences in the number and ages of children and effects they may have on the variables of interest. Rather, it was deemed sufficient to control for the effects that being a parent may have on the relationships examined in this study.

Race. For some of the analyses, race is included in a control variable because of the potential confounding effects it may have on the variables of interest. Actual discrimination that employees experience due to their racial and/or ethnic identity will confound the examination of perceived inequity at work. Race is also examined as a variable of interest to examine hypothesized differences across racial groups; it is the differences that may exist across groups that require this variable be controlled for when examining the proposed relationships regarding perceived inequity at work. For example, the racial background of respondents was found to significantly predict negative spillover from family to work (Dilworth, 2004). In the MIDUS dataset, respondents chose from the following categories and were coded as follows: White = 1, Black and/or African American = 2, Native American or Aleutian Islander/Eskimo = 3, Asian or Pacific Islander = 4, Other = 5, or Multiracial = 6. As a control variable in the regression analysis, the categories of race needed to be dummy coded before their entry into the analysis. As suggested by Field (2005), the dummy coded variables for race were entered into a separate block in the analysis from other variables that were dummy coded.

Level of education. Employees' level of education may co-vary with perceived inequity at work for many reasons, one of which is that Adams (1963, 1965) identifies this factor as a

potential input in social exchanges. Individuals' level of education may also determine their status within an organization; for example, management positions may require that employees have a certain degree, such as a bachelor's or master's degree. Level of education may also be related to other variables, such as socioeconomic status and race (U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics, 2009). Thus, controlling for this variable was necessary in the analysis. In the MIDUS dataset, this variable is represented as: no school/some grade school = 1, eighth grade/junior high school = 2, some high school = 3, GED = 4, graduated from high school = 5, 1 to 2 years of college (no degree) = 6, 3 years of college (no degree) = 7, graduate of 2 year college, vocational school, or associate's degree = 8, bachelor's degree = 9, some graduate school = 10, master's degree = 11, professional degree = 12. As a control variable in the regression analysis, the categories of education were dummy coded before their entry into the analysis. As suggested by Field (2005), the dummy coded variables for education were entered into a separate block in the analysis from other variables that were dummy coded.

Socio-economic status. Socio-economic status (SES) is another variable that may co-vary with the variables of interest and with other control variables in this study. SES has been demonstrated to have a relationship with race (Kessler & Neighbors, 1986), level of education (Ostrove & Adler, 1998), and status within an organization (Adler & Coriell, 1997). Individuals who come from low-SES groups may not have the same educational and occupational opportunities available to them as individuals from middle- and upper-SES groups. This may affect the occupational fields into which they enter as employees, the positions they hold within organizations, and their tenure with an organization. In the MIDUS dataset, this variable is measured as the total household income of the respondents and their spouses/partners. The range of the variables is from $0 to $300,000 and above. It should be noted that incomes of $300,000

and above are represented by one variable (300000 in the dataset). This may help prevent the effects of outliers in the analyses.

Occupational industry. It was necessary to control for occupational industry because of the complex interaction this variable may have with the variables of interest. It is possible that in some occupational fields, there may be variations in how much perceived inequity at work affects employees. It is also possible that family-to-work conflict (FWC) may vary across occupational fields due to characteristics associated with certain occupations, such as hours spent at work, the shifts that employees work, and safety concerns related to particular jobs. Occupational industry is represented in the MIDUS dataset by a three digit code that is based on the first three digits from the Dictionary of Occupational Titles (DOT) (National Academy of Sciences, 1981). The DOT takes into account characteristics of particular jobs, including the level of complexity at which the worker functions, training and aptitudes needed to perform the job, temperamental attributes, activities requiring business with other people, physical demands of the job, and environmental conditions under which the work is performed (England & Kilbourne, 1988). In this analysis, occupational industry was considered a categorical variable that needed to be dummy coded for the multiple regression analysis. Thus, the first number of the three digit code in the analysis was used to categorize into the following nine categories: 0/1 = professional, technical, and managerial occupations, 2 = clerical and sales occupations, 3 = service occupations, 4 = agricultural, fishery, forestry, and related occupations, 5 = processing occupations, 6 = machine trades occupations, 7 = benchwork occupations, 8 = structural work occupations, and 9 = miscellaneous occupations. As suggested by Field (2005), the dummy coded variables for occupational industry were entered into the analysis in a separate block from other variables that were dummy coded.

Hypotheses and Analyses

The data in this sample are considered cross sectional; therefore, statistical analyses were used examine differences between the variables at a single point in time. Thus, the appropriate analyses were correlational research procedures because none of the variables were systematically manipulated to examine cause-effect relationships. Licht (1995) proposes that multiple regression and correlational analysis (MRC) can be used for two types of studies: "those that attempt to *predict* events or behavior for practical decision-making purposes in applied settings and…those that attempt to *understand* or *explain* the nature of a phenomenon for purposes of testing or developing theories" (p. 21, italics in original). The use of multiple regression and correlational analyses in this study was to predict characteristics of the hypothesized relationships for practical decision-making purposes in human resource management. The intention was not to examine predictors in a causal relationship; rather, the intention was to examine how much variance of the relationships could be predicted using statistical analyses.

As suggested by Field (2005), the appropriate analysis to examine how much variance is predicted in a relationship between two more variables is multiple regression. By using simple and multiple linear regression analyses, one can examine how much of the variance in the dependent variable is accounted for by a singular independent variable or a combination of independent variables. In addition, the use of hierarchical regression analyses allows researchers to control for effects of variables that have been empirically shown to have a relationship with the proposed variables of interest, and also to examine the moderating effects of independent variables. To examine the hypotheses regarding differences between groups on their scores of variables of interest, independent t-tests and analysis of variance (ANOVA) were used.

Before conducting the analyses, the data were checked to determine whether they met the necessary assumptions for regression analysis. Data need to display multivariate normality, linearity, homoscedasticity, and independence (Field, 2005). Descriptive statistics and histograms were used to check the assumption of normality, and results showed that the dependent variables and most of the independent variables were normally distributed and within the accepted ranges of skewness and kurtosis (± 1). Pearson's correlation matrix was used to test for linear relationships between the variables, and the data met this assumption (see Table 1). Scatterplots between the predicted and observed residuals were used to check for the assumption of homoscedasticity, and the DV and IVs met this assumption. In addition, the residuals were normally distributed. Lastly, all of the data were collected from independent respondents, so the observations and errors for the data were independent of each other. Thus, the assumptions necessary for regression analyses were met and the results of the analyses are considered meaningful and interpretable.

It is also important to note that as recommended by Aiken and West (1991), the predictor variables were centered before their entry into the analyses. Centering the variables was completed by subtracting each variable's mean from each case's value on that variable. This is particularly important when examining interaction effects, because if variables are not centered their product may by highly correlated with the original independent variable (Aiken & West, 1991).

Research Question 1: How does inequity in the spousal/partner relationship contribute to perceived inequity at work?

Hypothesis 1a: Perceived inequity in the spousal/partner relationship is positively related to perceived inequity at work.

Hypothesis 1b: Conscientiousness moderates the degree to which perceived inequity in the spousal/partner relationship is related to perceived inequity at work.

Hypotheses 1a and 1b were addressed through the use of a hierarchical multiple regression analysis. The first block of variables entered into the analysis contained the identified control variables that were continuous or dichotomous: gender, age, household income, married or living with someone, and any children under 18. The second block included the dummy coded variables for marital status categories, the third block included the dummy coded variables for education level categories, the fourth block included the dummy coded variables for racial categories, and the fifth block included the dummy coded variables for occupational industry categories. At this point in the model, R^2 reflected the variance in perceived inequity at work that was predicted by the control variables. In the sixth block, perceived inequity in the spousal/partner relationship was entered. The difference between R^2 in the fifth and sixth blocks allowed for the examination of how much variance in perceived inequity at work was accounted for by the perceived inequity in the spousal/partner relationship. In the seventh and final block, the interaction variable (conscientiousness X spousal/partner relationship) was entered. The difference between R^2 in the sixth and seventh blocks allowed for the determination of how much variance was accounted for by the moderating effect of conscientiousness on the relationship between perceived inequity at work and perceived inequity in the spousal/partner relationship.

Research Question 2: How does family-to-work conflict (FWC) contribute to perceived inequity at work?

Hypothesis 2a: Family-to-work conflict (FWC) is positively related to perceived inequity at work.

Hypothesis 2b: Conscientiousness moderates the degree to which family-to-work is related to perceived inequity at work.

Hypotheses 2a and 2b were addressed through the use of a hierarchical multiple regression analysis. As described for Question 1, the first five blocks of variables were entered into the analysis. At this point in the model, R^2 reflected the variance in perceived inequity at work that was predicted by the control variables. In the sixth block, family-to-work conflict (FWC) was entered. The difference between R^2 in the fifth and sixth blocks allowed for the examination of how much variance in perceived inequity at work was accounted for by the family-to-work conflict. In the seventh and final block, the interaction variable (Conscientiousness X FWC) was entered. The difference between R^2 in the sixth and seventh blocks allowed for the determination of how much variance was accounted for by the moderating effect of Conscientiousness on the relationship between perceived inequity at work and family-to-work conflict.

Research Question 3: How does locus of control relate to perceived inequity at work?

Hypothesis 3a: There is a positive relationship between external locus of control and perceived inequity at work.

Hypothesis 3b: There is a negative relationship between internal locus of control and perceived inequity at work.

Hypotheses 3a and 3b were addressed through the use of a hierarchical regression analysis. As described for Questions 1 and 2, the first five blocks of variables were entered into the analysis so that the model reflected the variance in perceived inequity at work that was

predicted by the control variables. In the sixth block, Personal Constraints (external locos of control) and Personal Mastery (internal locus of control) were entered. The difference between R^2 in the fifth and sixth blocks allowed for the examination of how much variance in perceived inequity at work was accounted for by the addition of Personal Constraints and Personal Mastery into the model. The standardized coefficients of these variables allowed for the examination of the variance explained in the model that was unique to each variable.

Research Question 4: How do personality factors relate to perceived inequity at work?

Hypothesis 4a: There is a positive relationship between Neuroticism and perceived inequity at work.

Hypothesis 4b: There is a negative relationship between Conscientiousness and perceived inequity at work.

Hypotheses 4a and 4b were addressed through the use of a hierarchical regression analysis. As described for Questions 1, 2, and 3, the first five blocks of variables were entered into the analysis so that the model reflected the variance in perceived inequity at work that was predicted by the control variables. In the sixth block, Neuroticism and Conscientiousness were entered. The difference between R^2 in the fifth and sixth blocks allowed for the examination of how much variance in perceived inequity at work was accounted for by the addition of Neuroticism and Conscientiousness into the model. The standardized coefficients of these variables allowed for the examination of the variance explained in the model that was unique to each variable.

Research Question 5: Are there differences between racial/ethnic groups in perceived inequity in relationships?

Hypothesis 5a: There are differences between racial/ethnic groups in the perception of inequity at work.

Hypothesis 5a was addressed using four separate analyses. The first analysis used a one-way univariate analysis of variance (ANOVA) to examine the differences between racial groups in their scores on the measure of perceived inequity at work. For this analysis, the research sample was divided according to respondents' self-report of their race by the available categories. A second analysis was conducted using race as a dichotomous factor, where the groups were differentiated as White and non-White. This replicates previous studies that utilized dichotomous groups (White/non-White or Black/non-Black) to examine differences between racial groups using the MIDUS dataset (Grzywacz & Bass, 2003; Grzywacz et al., 2002). An independent samples t-test was the appropriate analysis to examine the differences between the means of the two groups in their scores on the variables of interest. The third analysis used a one-way univariate analysis of variance (ANOVA) to examine the differences between ethnic groups in their scores on the measure of perceived inequity at work. For this analysis, the research sample was divided according to the categories that represented respondents' regions of ethnic identity. A fourth analysis was conducted using ethnicity as a dichotomous factor, where the groups were differentiated as of European ancestry and of non-European ancestry. This replicates studies that have utilized the MIDUS dataset to look at differences between dichotomous racial groups (Grzywacz & Bass, 2003; Grzywacz et al., 2002), but used ancestral origins of Europe and non-Europe as the grouping variable.

Hypothesis 5b: There are differences between racial/ethnic groups in the perception of inequity in spousal/partner relationships.

Hypothesis 5b was addressed using four separate analyses. The first analysis used a one-way univariate analysis of variance (ANOVA) to examine the differences between racial groups in their scores on the measure of perceived inequity in the spousal/partner relationship. For this analysis, the research sample was divided according to respondents' self-report of their race by the available categories. A second analysis was conducted using race as a dichotomous factor, where the groups were differentiated as White and non-White. This replicates previous studies that utilized dichotomous groups (White/non-White or Black/non-Black) to examine differences between racial groups using the MIDUS dataset (Grzywacz & Bass, 2003; Grzywacz et al., 2002). An independent samples t-test was the appropriate analysis to examine the differences between the means of the two groups in their scores on the variables of interest. The third analysis used a one-way univariate analysis of variance (ANOVA) to examine the differences between ethnic groups in their scores on the measure of perceived inequity in the spousal/partner relatinoship. For this analysis, the research sample was divided according to the categories that represented respondents' regions of ethnic identity. A fourth analysis was conducted using ethnicity as a dichotomous factor, where the groups were differentiated as of European ancestry and of non-European ancestry. This replicates studies that have utilized the MIDUS dataset to look at differences between dichotomous racial groups (Grzywacz & Bass, 2003; Grzywacz et al., 2002), but used ancestral origins of Europe and non-Europe as the grouping variable.

Hypothesis 5c: There will be differences across racial/ethnic groups in the experience of FWC.

Hypothesis 5c was addressed using four separate analyses. The first analysis used a one-way univariate analysis of variance (ANOVA) to examine the differences between racial groups in their scores on the measure of FWC. For this analysis, the research sample was divided

according to respondents' self-report of their race by the available categories. A second analysis was conducted using race as a dichotomous factor, where the groups were differentiated as White and non-White. This replicates previous studies that utilized dichotomous groups (White/non-White or Black/non-Black) to examine differences between racial groups using the MIDUS dataset (Grzywacz & Bass, 2003; Grzywacz et al., 2002). An independent samples t-test was the appropriate analysis to examine the differences between the means of the two groups in their scores on the variables of interest. The third analysis used a one-way univariate analysis of variance (ANOVA) to examine the differences between ethnic groups in their scores on the measure of FWC. For this analysis, the research sample was divided according to the categories that represented respondents' regions of ethnic identity. A fourth analysis was conducted using ethnicity as a dichotomous factor, where the groups were differentiated as of European ancestry and of non-European ancestry. This replicates studies that have utilized the MIDUS dataset to look at differences between dichotomous racial groups (Grzywacz & Bass, 2003; Grzywacz et al., 2002), but used ancestral origins of Europe and non-Europe as the grouping variable.

CHAPTER III: RESULTS

Introduction

The purpose of this chapter is to report the results of the analyses described in the previous chapter. In this study, confirmatory factor analysis was used to validate the construction of the dependent variable and one of the independent variables. Hierarchical multiple regression was used to examine direct and moderating effects that variables of interest had on perceived inequity at work. One-way univariate analyses of variance (ANOVA) and independent t-tests were used to examine differences between racial and ethnic groups on their experience of perceived inequity at work, perceived inequity in spousal/partner relationships, and family-to-work conflict.

The results of the data analyses for the current study are presented in three parts. First, results of the confirmatory factor analyses used to construct the variables representing perceived inequity at work and perceived inequity in the spousal/partner relationship are discussed. Second, descriptive analyses of each of the main variables in the study are described: perceived inequity at work, perceived inequity in the spousal/partner relationship, family-to-work conflict, locus of control, Conscientiousness, and Neuroticism. Descriptive statistics of the control variables are also discussed. Finally, results of the analyses for the specific research questions and hypotheses are presented.

Confirmatory Factor Analysis

It was necessary to construct the variables capturing perceived inequity at work and perceived inequity in the spousal/partner relationship as they were not part of the original MIDUS dataset. Using items from the dataset that captured inputs and outputs in social exchange relationships, factors were hypothesized to represent multiple underlying dimensions

in the data that represented the variables of interest. As described in the previous chapter, the confirmatory factor analyses (CFA) for both constructed variables were conducted using SPSS, and the initial communality estimates were determined using principal components analysis (PCA). Neither of the correlation matrices revealed problems with multicollinearity as none of the variables were correlated above .70.

For the items relating to respondents' perceptions at work, it was hypothesized that four factors would emerge from the data and this number was used to pre-determine the factor structure of the analysis. The four factor solution was found to explain 55.9% of the variance in the items. The solution was also checked for unidimensionality (one underlying dimension related to all the items in the survey) by examining the eigenvalues. The first factor was *not* three times or more the value of the second factors; thus, it was concluded that there were multiple underlying dimensions in the data (G. Delandshere, personal communication, March 20, 2007). There were five items that loaded on the factor hypothesized to represent perceived inequity at work, and this is represented in Table 2. It should be noted that one of the items, "How often does your job provide you with a variety of things that interest you," loaded on two different factors. The decision to include this item in the construction of the variable was that interest in work has been empirically supported as an input (as the decision to specialize) when examining perceived inequity at work (Koeske & Krowinski, 2004)

For the items relating to respondents' perceptions of inequity in the spousal/partner relationship, it was hypothesized that three factors would emerge from the data and this number was used to pre-determine the factor structure of the analysis. The three factor solution was found to explain 61.91 % of the variance in the items. There were seven items that loaded on the factor hypothesized to represent perceived inequity in the spousal/partner relationship, and this is

represented in Table 3. The solution was also checked for unidimensionality (one underlying dimension related to all the items in the survey) by examining the eigenvalues. The first factor was more than three times the value of the second factor; therefore, it is possible that there is one underlying dimension across the data and the factors that emerged through the analysis do not represent distinct dimensions in the spousal/partner relationship. It should also be noted that the items relating to perceived fairness of the division of household labor with regard to the spouse/partner loaded on a different item than the perceived fairness of the division of household labor from the perspective of the respondent. Implications for the items that loaded on the factors will be discussed in the next chapter.

Descriptive Statistics

Sample from the MIDUS Dataset

The sample in this study included all part-time and full-time employees from the main MIDUS response dataset. The total number of respondents in this sample was 1,734, with 881 males and 853 females. The ages of respondents ranged from 24-65, with the mean response age of 42.65. Although the shape of the distribution was somewhat kurtotic (-.967), the distribution followed the normal curve and was within the accepted limits of skewness and kurtosis (± 1; see Table 4). The 1990 census indicated that the percentage of males and females who were in the workforce in the United States was 53% and 47%, respectively (United States Census Bureau, 2009). The percentage of males in this study is 50.8% and the percentage of females is 49.2 % (see Table 5).

Dependent Variable

Perceived Inequity at Work. Perceived inequity at work is a measure of employees' perceived fairness of their inputs and outputs in the social exchange relationship at work. This

variable is continuous with a range of 1.00 to 4.00, and it was constructed so that high scores were representative of greater perceived inequity at work. The mean score on this variable was 1.81 with a standard deviation of .667. It is important to note that this variable met the assumptions of normality. The skewness and kurtosis values were within accepted limits, and the distribution was representative of the normal curve (see Table 6).

Independent Variables

Perceived Inequity in the Spousal/Partner Relationship. Perceived inequity in the spousal/partner relationship is a measure of respondents' perceived fairness of their inputs and outputs in the romantic social exchange relationship. This variable is continuous with a range of 1.00 to 5.00, and it was constructed so that high scores are representative of greater perceived inequity in the spousal/partner relationship. The mean score on this variable was 2.18 with a standard deviation of .605. It is important to note that this variable met the assumptions of normality. The skewness and kurtosis values were within accepted limits, and the distribution was representative of the normal curve (see Table 6).

Family-to-Work Conflict. Family-to-work conflict is a measure of how the effects of individuals' home life "spills" over to have negative effects on their work experience. This variable is continuous with a range of 1.00 to 5.00, and it was constructed to that high scores are representative of greater family-to-work conflict. The mean score on this variable was 2.09 with a standard deviation of .632. It is important to note that this variable met the assumptions of normality. The skewness and kurtosis values were within accepted limits, and the distribution was representative of the normal curve (see Table 6).

External Locus of Control. External locus of control is a measure of the degree to which respondents feel that their lives are controlled by external forces. In the MIDUS dataset, it is

represented by the Personal Constraints variable, which is a continuous variable with a range of 1.00 to 6.75. High scores are representative of greater perceived external constraints and therefore a higher external locus of control. The mean score on this variable was 2.59 with a standard deviation of 1.169. It is important to note that this variable met the assumptions of normality. The skewness and kurtosis values were within accepted limits, and the distribution was representative of the normal curve (see Table 6).

Internal Locus of Control. Internal locus of control is a measure of the degree to which respondents feel that they have inherent control over their lives. In the MIDUS dataset, it is represented by the Personal Mastery variable, which is a continuous variable with a range of 1.00 to 7.00. High scores are representative of greater personal mastery, which is indicative of internal locus of control. The mean score for this variable was 5.89 with a standard deviation of .973. It is important to note that this variable violated the assumptions of normality, as the skewness value was -1.279 and the kurtosis value was 2.059 (see Table 6). This indicates that the data are negatively skewed and do not represent a normal distribution. Implications for this violation will be discussed in the limitations section.

Neuroticism. Neuroticism is a measure of one of the Big Five personality dimensions. It represents respondents' self-report of how anxious, worried, embarrassed, and insecure they perceive themselves to be. This variable is continuous with a range of 1.00 to 4.00, and high scores reflect higher levels of neuroticism. The mean score on this variable was 2.24 with a standard deviation of .662. It is important to note that this variable met the assumptions of normality. The skewness and kurtosis values were within accepted limits, and the distribution was representative of the normal curve (see Table 6).

Conscientiousness. Conscientiousness is a measure of another Big Five personality dimension. It represents respondents' self-report of how hard-working, responsible, and intentional they perceive themselves to be. This variable is continuous with a range of 1.00 to 4.00, and high scores reflect higher levels of conscientiousness. The mean score on this variable was 3.43 with a standard deviation of .443. It is important to note that this variable met the assumptions of normality. The skewness and kurtosis values were within accepted limits, and the distribution was representative of the normal curve (see Table 6).

Racial/Ethnic Identification. Respondents were asked to indicate of which racial group they considered themselves to be a member, and they were asked to select only one response from the available categories. In this study, 86.3% of respondents identified as White, 7.2% identified as Black, 0.7% identified as Native American/Aleutian/Eskimo, 1.2% identified as Asian or Pacific Islander, 3.6% identified as Other, 0.7% of respondents identified as Multiracial, and 2.0% of respondents did not identify their racial group (see Table 7). Respondents were also asked to identify which geographic region was representative of their ancestry, and categories that were representative of world regions were created as a measure of Ethnicity. In this study, 54.8% of respondents indicated they had European ancestry, 5.9% indicated Native American ancestry, 3.1% indicated they had Latin/South American ancestry, 1.0% percent identified Asian ancestry, 3.8% identified African ancestry, 0.7% identified Middle East ancestry, 1.4% identified non-Hispanic North American ancestry, and 28.3% of respondents did not know their ancestry. An additional 1.0% of respondents chose not to answer the question (see Table 8).

Control Variables

Table 4 provides descriptive statistics of the continuous control variables in this study, age and household income. The age range of the respondents was 24-65, with a mean age of

42.65. Frequency tables reflect the number and percentages of respondents for the dichotomous control variables of gender (see Table 5), married or living with someone (see Table 9), and children under 18 (see Table 10). There were 881 males and 853 females in this sample. Sixty-two percent of respondents indicated they were married, and 68% indicated they were either married or living with someone. Fifty four percent of respondents did not have any children, and 46% indicated they had one or more children under the age of 18. Frequency tables also reflect the number and percentages of respondents for the categorical variables of marital status (see Table 11), race (see Table 7), level of education (see Table 12), and occupational industry (see Table 13). Readers are referred to the aforementioned tables for information regarding the number of respondents and corresponding percentages related to specifics of their marital status, level of education, and occupational industry.

Hypotheses and Analyses

Research Question 1: How does inequity in the spousal/partner relationship contribute to perceived inequity at work?

Hypothesis 1a: Perceived inequity in the spousal/partner relationship is positively related to perceived inequity at work.

Hypothesis 1b: Conscientiousness moderates the degree to which perceived inequity in the spousal/partner relationship is related to perceived inequity at work.

Hypotheses 1a and 1b were addressed through the use of hierarchical multiple regression. The first five blocks of the model were used to enter the control variables. The use of five blocks was necessary due to the number of categorical control variables that were dummy coded for use in the analysis. After the control variables were entered, the value of R^2 was .139, meaning that

13.9 % of the variance in the dependent variable was accounted for by the identified controls of age, gender, race, SES, marital status/partnered, occupational industry, level of education, and children under 18. The sixth block of the model added the independent variable of interest, perceived inequity in the spousal/partner relationship. The difference between R^2 in the fifth and sixth blocks was .023, which is significant at the $p < .001$ level. Thus, an additional 2.3% of the variance in perceived inequity at work was accounted for by respondents' experience of perceived inequity in the spousal/partner relationship. The standardized beta weight was positive ($\beta = .158$), indicating that the relationship between perceived inequity at work and perceived inequity in the spousal partner relationship is positive. Thus, Hypothesis 1a was supported by this analysis.

At this point in the analysis, the model explained approximately 16% of the variance in perceived inequity at work. When adjusted for sample size and number of predictors, the percent of variance explained dropped slightly to 14%. Perceived inequity in the spousal/partner relationship (b = .172, $p < .001$) was a significant predictor in this model. Specifically, for every additional point scored on the scale of perceived inequity in the spousal/partner relationship, perceived inequity at work is expected to increase by .16 points, holding all other variables constant. The 95% confidence interval for the regression coefficient was .110 □ .235.

The seventh block of the model added the interaction term of perceived inequity in the spousal/partner relationship X Conscientiousness. The difference between R^2 in the sixth and seventh blocks was .000, which is not significant ($p = .982$). The standardized beta for the interaction variable was also not significant ($\beta = .000$). Adding the interaction term to the model did not significantly explain any additional variance in perceived inequity at work. Thus, Hypothesis 1b is not supported. The final model explained 16% of the variance in perceived

inequity at work. When adjusted for sample size and number of predictors, the percent of variance explained dropped to 14%. Table 14 provides the unstandardized coefficients, the standard error of the coefficients, and the standardized betas for the variables in the model.

Research Question 2: How does family-to-work conflict (FWC) contribute to perceived inequity at work?

Hypothesis 2a: Family-to-work conflict (FWC) is positively related to perceived inequity at work.

Hypothesis 2b: Conscientiousness moderates the degree to which family-to-work is related to perceived inequity at work.

Hypotheses 2a and 2b were addressed through the use of hierarchical multiple regression. The first five blocks of the model were used to enter the control variables. The use of five blocks was necessary due to the number of categorical control variables that were dummy coded for use in the analysis. After the control variables were entered, the value of R^2 was .158, meaning that 15.8 % of the variance in the dependent variable was accounted for by the identified controls of age, gender, race, SES, marital status/partnered, occupational industry, level of education, and children under 18. The sixth block of the model added the independent variable of interest, family-to-work conflict (FWC). The difference between R^2 in the fifth and sixth blocks was .026, which is significant at the $p < .001$ level. Thus, an additional 2.6% of the variance in perceived inequity at work was accounted for by respondents' experience of family-to-work conflict. The standardized beta weight was positive ($\beta = .178$), indicating that the relationship between family-to-work conflict and perceived inequity at work is positive. Thus, Hypothesis 2a was supported by this analysis.

At this point in the analysis, the model explained approximately 16% of the variance in perceived inequity at work. When adjusted for sample size and number of predictors, the percent of variance explained dropped slightly to 14%. Family-to-work conflict (b = .170, $p < .001$) was a significant predictor in this model. Specifically, for every additional point scored on the scale of family-to-work conflict, perceived inequity at work is expected to increase by .18 points, holding all other variables constant. The 95% confidence interval for the regression coefficient was .127 □ .229.

The seventh block of the model added the interaction term of FWC X Conscientiousness. The difference between R^2 in the sixth and seventh blocks was .000, which is not significant (p = .350). The standardized beta for the interaction variable was also not significant (β = .022, p = .350). Adding the interaction term to the model did not significantly explain any additional variance in perceived inequity at work. Thus, Hypothesis 2b is not supported. The final model explained 16% of the variance in perceived inequity at work. When adjusted for sample size and number of predictors, the percent of variance explained dropped to 14%. Table 15 provides the unstandardized coefficients, the standard error of the coefficients, and the standardized beta for the variables in the model.

Research Question 3: How does locus of control relate to perceived inequity at work?

Hypothesis 3a: There is a positive relationship between external locus of control and perceived inequity at work.

Hypothesis 3b: There is a negative relationship between internal locus of control and perceived inequity at work.

Hypotheses 3a and 3b were addressed through the use of hierarchical multiple regression. The first five blocks of the model were used to enter the control variables. The use of five blocks

was necessary due to the number of categorical control variables that were dummy coded for use in the analysis. After the control variables were entered, the value of R^2 was .134, meaning that 13.4 % of the variance in the dependent variable was accounted for by the identified controls of age, gender, race, SES, marital status/partnered, occupational industry, level of education, and children under 18. The sixth block of the model added the independent variables of interest, external locus of control and internal locus of control. The difference between R^2 in the fifth and sixth blocks was. 096, which is significant at the $p < .001$ level. Thus, an additional 9.6% of the variance in perceived inequity at work was accounted for by respondents' external locus of control and internal locus of control. The standardized beta weight for external locus of control was positive, indicating that the relationship between perceived inequity at work and external locus of control is positive. The standardized beta weight for internal locus of control is negative, indicating that the relationship between perceived inequity at work and internal locus of control is negative. Thus, Hypothesis 3a and Hypothesis 3b were supported by this analysis.

The final model explained approximately 23% of the variance in perceived inequity at work. When adjusted for sample size and number of predictors, the percent of variance explained dropped slightly to 21%. Both external locus of control (b = .140, $p < .001$) and internal locus of control (b = -. 089, $p < .001$) were significant predictors in the final model. Specifically, for every additional point scored on the scale of external locus of control, perceived inequity at work is expected to increase by .24 points, holding all other variables constant. The 95% confidence interval for the regression coefficient was .111 - .168. Furthermore, every additional point scored on the scale of internal locus of control resulted in an expected decrease of .13 points in perceived inequity at work (holding all other variables constant). The 95% confidence interval for the regression coefficient was -.123 - -.055. Examination of the

standardized coefficients indicates that external locus of control uniquely explained more of the variance in the outcome (β = .244) than internal locus of control (β = -.129). Table 16 provides the unstandardized coefficients, the standard error of the coefficients, and the standardized beta for the variables in the model.

Research Question 4: How do personality factors relate to perceived inequity at work?

Hypothesis 4a: There is a positive relationship between Neuroticism and perceived inequity at work.

Hypothesis 4b: There is a negative relationship between Conscientiousness and perceived inequity at work.

Hypotheses 4a and 4b were addressed through the use of hierarchical multiple regression. The first five blocks of the model were used to enter the control variables. The use of five blocks was necessary due to the number of categorical control variables that were dummy coded for use in the analysis. After the control variables were entered, the value of R^2 was .115, meaning that 11.5 % of the variance in the dependent variable was accounted for by the identified controls of age, gender, race, SES, marital status/partnered, occupational industry, level of education, and children under 18. The sixth block of the model added the independent variables of interest, Neuroticism and Conscientiousness. The difference between R^2 in the fifth and sixth blocks was .061, which is significant at the $p < .001$ level. Thus, an additional 6.1% of the variance in perceived inequity at work was accounted for by respondents' self-reported characteristics of Neuroticism and Conscientiousness. The standardized beta weight for Neuroticism was positive, indicating that the relationship between perceived inequity at work and Neuroticism is positive. The standardized beta weight for Conscientiousness was negative, indicating that the relationship

between perceived inequity at work and Conscientiousness is negative. Thus, Hypothesis 4a and Hypothesis 4b were supported by this analysis.

The final model explained approximately 20% of the variance in perceived inequity at work. When adjusted for sample size and number of predictors, the percent of variance explained dropped slightly to 18%. Both Neuroticism (b = .205, $p < .001$) and Conscientiousness (b = -. 183, $p < .001$) were significant predictors in the final model. Specifically, for every additional point scored on the scale of Neuroticism, perceived inequity at work is expected to increase by .20 points, holding all other variables constant. The 95% confidence interval for the regression coefficient was .157 - .253. Furthermore, every additional point scored on the scale of Conscientiousness resulted in an expected decrease of .12 points in perceived inequity at work (holding all other variables constant). The 95% confidence interval for the regression coefficient was -.183 - .036. Examination of the standardized coefficients indicates that Neuroticism uniquely explained more of the variance in the outcome (β = .203) than Conscientiousness (β = -.123). Table 17 provides the unstandardized coefficients, the standard error of the coefficients, and the standardized beta for the variables in the model.

Research Question 5: Are there differences between racial/ethnic groups in perceived inequity in relationships, and in the experience of family-to-work conflict (FWC)?

Hypothesis 5a: There are differences between racial/ethnic groups in the perception of inequity at work.

Hypothesis 5a was examined through four analyses: A one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) using the categories available to respondents, an independent samples t-test using White and non-White as the two groups, an ANOVA using the ancestral origins of respondents, and an independent samples t-test that used ancestral origins that were Europe an or non-

European as the grouping variable. The results of the one-way ANOVA using racial categories available to respondents indicated that there was not a statistically significant difference between the groups in their experience of perceived inequity at work ($F(5, 1615) = .853$ $p = .512$; see Table 18). The results of the independent t-test using White and non-White as the groups of racial identification indicated that there were no significant differences between the two group means in their experience of perceived inequity at work ($t = -1.819$, df = 1619, $p = .069$, two-tailed; see Table 19).

The results of the one-way ANOVA using ancestral origins of respondents indicated that there was not a statistically significant difference between the groups in their experience of perceived inequity at work ($F(7,1625) = 1.372$, $p = .213$; see Table 20). The results of the independent t-test using European and non-European ancestral origins as the grouping variable indicated that there were significant differences between the two group means in their experience of perceived inequity at work ($t = -2.564$, df = 1631, $p = .01$, two tailed; see Table 21). Thus, Hypothesis 5a was partially supported.

Hypothesis 5b: There are differences between racial/ethnic groups in the perception of inequity in spousal/partner relationships.

Hypothesis 5b was examined through four analyses: A one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) using the categories available to respondents, an independent samples t-test using White and non-White as the two groups, an ANOVA using the ancestral origins of respondents, and an independent samples t-test that used ancestral origins that were European or non-European as the grouping variable. The results of the one-way ANOVA using racial categories available to respondents indicated that there was not a statistically significant difference between the groups in their experience of perceived inequity in the spousal/partner relationship ($F(5,$

1163) = 1.598, p = .158; see Table 22). The results of the independent t-test using White and non-White as the groups of racial identification indicated that there were no significant differences between the two group means in their experience of perceived inequity in the spousal/partner relationship (t = -.465, df = 1168, p = .642, two-tailed; see Table 23).

The results of the one-way ANOVA using ancestral origins of respondents indicated that there was not a statistically significant difference between the groups in their experience of perceived inequity in the spousal/partner relationship (F(7,1162) = .497, p = .837; see Table 24). The results of the independent t-test using European and non-European ancestral origins as the grouping variable indicated that there were no significant differences between the two group means in their experience of perceived inequity in the spousal/partner relationship (t = -1.236, df = 159, p = .218, two-tailed; see Table 25). Thus, Hypothesis 5b was not supported.

Hypothesis 5c: There will be differences across racial/ethnic groups in the experience of family-to-work conflict (FWC).

Hypothesis 5c was examined through four analyses: A one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) using the categories available to respondents, an independent samples t-test using White and non-White as the two groups, an ANOVA using the ancestral origins of respondents, and an independent samples t-test that used ancestral origins that were European or non-European as the grouping variable. The results of the one-way ANOVA using racial categories available to respondents indicated that there was a statistically significant difference between the groups in their experience of FWC (F(5,1595) = 2.812, p < .05; see Table 26). The results of the independent t-test using White and non-White as the groups of racial identification indicated that there were significant differences between the two group means in their experience of FWC (t = 2.322, df = 255, p < .05, two-tailed; see Table 27).

The results of the one-way ANOVA using ancestral origins of respondents indicated that there was a statistically significant difference between the groups in their experience of FWC ($F(7,1605) = 2.468$, $p < .05$; see Table 28). The results of the independent t-test using European and non-European ancestral origins as the grouping variable indicated that there were significant differences between the two group means in their experience of FWC ($t = 2.859$, df = 1611, $p < .01$, two tailed; see Table 29). Thus, Hypothesis 5c was supported.

CHAPTER IV: DISCUSSION, RECOMMENDATIONS, AND LIMITATIONS

Introduction

The purpose of this chapter is to discuss the findings of the study and to explore the implications they have on the fields of counseling psychology and human resource management. Suggestions for how to use the results of this study to shape future research are made, and implications for the development of organizational policies are also discussed. Lastly, limitations of the study will be examined that may affect the generalizability and interpretations of the results.

Summary of the Study

Perceived inequity at work has been demonstrated to have negative effects on organizational behavior; however, there is little research that examines how psychological variables and personality factors are related to perceived inequity at work. This study examined specific psychological variables and personality factors that impact employees' perceived inequity at work in both direct and indirect relationships. This study utilized data that were collected for a previous study regarding mid-life attitudes and behaviors; thus, a secondary data analysis was conducted using variables of interest. Hierarchical multiple regression, analysis of variance, and independent t-tests were used to examine the data. This study examined the relationship between perceived inequity in the spousal/partner relationship and perceived inequity at work, and also the moderating effect of conscientiousness on this relationship. This study also examined the relationship between family-to-work conflict and perceived inequity at work, and also the moderating effect of conscientiousness on this relationship. The relationship between internal and external locus of control on perceived inequity at work was examined, as well as the relationship between Conscientiousness and Neuroticism and perceived inequity at

work. Lastly, differences between racial and ethnic groups were examined in their perception of perceived inequity at work, perceived inequity in the spousal/partner relationship, and family-to-work conflict.

Findings and Discussion

It is important to make explicit that as hierarchical regression analyses were used for this study, the relationships between the variables are correlational in nature and therefore causation cannot be implied. Using multiple regression analyses, it was possible to determine the amount of variance in the dependent variable that was accounted for by the independent and control variables. This type of analysis allowes for the creation of an equation that could be used to predict the amount of perceived inequity at work based on respondents' scores on the independent variables. However, this model does not allow for the inference of causation or to determine which variables are antecedents. The conclusions drawn from the findings may be explained by theorized directions of the relationships; however, it is recommended that research conducted as a follow-up to this study use experimental designs that would allow for the examination of causal effects.

The first research question addressed in this study examined the relationship between perceived inequity in the spousal/partner relationship and perceived inequity at work. Results of the analysis indicated that perceived inequity in the spousal/partner relationship is positively related to perceived inequity at work. Thus, an increase in the amount of reported inequity in the spousal/partner relationship will be correlated to an increase in the amount of perceived inequity at work. In the regression equation, this means that when holding all other variables constant, an increase in perceived inequity in the spousal/partner relationship will predict an increase in the experience of perceived inequity at work. Conscientiousness was examined as a moderator

between the effects of perceived inequity in the spousal/partner relationship and perceived inequity at work. Results indicated that Conscientiousness did not significantly attenuate the relationship between the variable, as was expected.

Although the results of the study are correlational in nature, the results from the first research question suggest that perceived inequity in the spousal/partner relationship affects perceived inequity at work. It has been demonstrated that feelings, attitudes, and behaviors that emerge in the domain of family have a relationship with individuals' feelings, attitudes, and behaviors at work (Grzywacz & Bass, 2003; Googins, 1991). Results from this study support the notion that the individuals' perception of inequity may cross life domains as there is a positive relationship between perceived inequity in the spousal/partner relationship and perceived inequity at work.

Previous research has indicated that personality factors can moderate the relationship between variables, including the relationship between home- and work-related variables (Kinnunen et al., 2003; Witt & Carlson, 2006). Conscientiousness has been identified as a personality factor that can moderate between home- and work-related variables, and it was hypothesized that Conscientiousness would moderate the relationship between perceived inequity in the spousal/partner relationship and perceived inequity at work. The moderating effects of Conscientiousness were not supported by the analyses in this study. It is possible that other personality factors that were not examined in this study have moderating effects between these variables. For example, other studies have examined the moderating effects of Neuroticism and Agreeableness between home- and work-related variables (Kinnunen et al., 2003). It is also possible that Conscientiousness does indeed moderate the relationship between perceived inequity in the spousal/partner relationship and perceived inequity at work, but

limitations in the measurement of the dependent and independent variables may have affected the analyses in this study.

The second research question in this study examined the relationship between family-to-work conflict (FWC) and perceived inequity at work. Results of the analysis indicated that family-to-work conflict is positively related to perceived inequity at work. Thus, an increase in the amount of reported family-to-work conflict is correlated to an increase in the amount of perceived inequity at work. In the regression equation, this means than when holding all other variables constant, an increase in the amount of reported family-to-work conflict will predict an increase in the experience of perceived inequity at work. Conscientiousness was examined as a moderator between the effects of FWC and perceived inequity at work. Results indicated that Conscientiousness did not moderate the relationship between the variables, as was expected.

The results from the second research question suggest that family-to-work conflict is associated with increased perceived inequity at work. Although the analyses used in this study are correlational in nature, family-to-work conflict is a directional variable because it measures the negative effects at work that individuals attribute to their roles in the family. FWC occurs when the demands of, time devoted to, and strain created by the family interfere with performing work-related responsibilities (Netemeyer et al., 1996). Research suggests that employees have the ability to differentiate between the source and direction of the interference, and the two types of interference have distinct antecedents (Mesmer-Magnus & Viswesvaran, 2005; Byron, 2005). The results from this study may be explained by the conceptualization that an increase in the demands of the family role are expected to affect employees' perceived inequity at work. Although employees may be aware that strain from their family responsibilities have an effect on their work-related responsibilities, there is not evidence from this study to suggest that they have

an awareness of how it impacts their perceived inequity at work. However, it may be conceptualized that an increase in family-to-work conflict may be experienced as unfair, especially as employees try to maintain a balance in their home and work lives. This experience of unfairness may then carry over to work roles, resulting in an increase of perceived inequity at work. Although it was hypothesized that Conscientiousness would moderate the relationship between FWC and perceived inequity at work, the results of this study did not support that hypothesis. This may imply that Conscientiousness is not the appropriate moderator between the variables, or limitations in the measurement of the dependent variable affected the analyses. This will be discussed further in the limitations section.

The third research question examined the relationship between locus of control and perceived inequity at work. The findings from this study support the powerful effects that locus on control may have on individuals and their worldview. Results of the analysis indicated that there is a positive relationship between an external locus of control and perceived inequity at work, and there is a negative relationship between an internal locus of control and perceived inequity at work. This finding suggests that the experience of perceived inequity at work can be expected to increase as individuals' use of an external locus of control increases. Individuals' experience of perceived inequity at work can be expected to decrease as individuals' use of an internal locus of control increases. It is also important to note that in the analysis, external locus of control uniquely contributed to the explained variance almost twice as much as internal locus of control. Thus, it may be interpreted that having an external locus of control has a greater effect on individuals' perception of inequity than having an internal locus of control. This may be expected because individuals who have an external locus of control may develop feelings of

learned helplessness over time because of their belief that powerful others or fate controls their lives.

Kidd and Utne (1978) suggest that causal attributions made about inequity influence people's responses to the inequity; thus, whether an internal or external attribution is made about an equitable situation will impact individuals' subsequent actions. Having an internal locus of control suggests that individuals feel they have control or agency over events in their lives (Friede & Ryan, 2005); thus, they may be more likely to have a behavioral response to inequity which involves changing their inputs and outputs, changing the inputs and outputs of others, or exiting the situation or relationship. Having an external locus of control may result in individuals feeling that they have little to no control over events in their lives; thus, they may believe that are incapable of behavioral change or that whatever changes they do make may not have any meaningful effects on their lives. Based on this conceptualization of the relationship between attribution and perceived inequity, it may be expected that individuals with an external locus of control are more likely to engage in psychological reactions to perceived inequity. This may be in the form of "distorting reality" or cognitively re-evaluating the situation so that the inequity is no longer perceived, or it is seen as tolerable.

The fourth research question examined the relationship between personality factors and perceived inequity at work. Results of analysis indicated that there is a positive relationship between Neuroticism and perceived inequity at work, and there is a negative relationship between Conscientiousness and perceived inequity at work. This finding indicates that individuals who self-report as high on the personality dimension of Neuroticism are likely to report an increased level of perceived inequity at work. This also indicates that individuals who self-report as high on the personality dimension of Conscientiousness are likely to experience a

decreased level of perceived inequity at work. These findings supported the hypothesized direction of the relationship between these personality factors and perceived inequity at work.

Individuals who score high on a scale of Neuroticism may be expected to be nervous, tense, hypochondriacal, and impulsive (Norman, 1963; McCrae & Costa, 1985). In this study, Neuroticism was represented as respondents' endorsement of being moody, worrying, nervous, or calm (reverse-coded in the construct). These characteristics may also be interpreted as being representative of having a negative self-concept or tendency toward negative affectivity. Judge and Bono (2001) argue that meta-analytic results suggest that negative affectivity is a measure of Neuroticism; therefore, it has been suggested that discussing findings with regard to negative affectivity is appropriate when examining Neuroticism (Friede & Ryan, 2005). Particularly relevant to this study is the suggestion that individuals with a high level of negative affectivity are more likely to interpret environment stimuli negatively (Fogarty et al., 1999). Thus, individuals who are Neurotic are more likely to interpret environmental stimuli in social exchange relationships as unfair and inequitable. Therefore, in the workplace, employees who are highly Neurotic (and therefore less emotionally stable) may be seen as more likely to perceive inequity at work than individuals who are less Neurotic (and therefore more emotionally stable). In the management literature, Neuroticism has been found to have a positive relationship with factors that impede organizational behavior, such as family-to-work conflict (Bruck & Allen, 2003), and a negative relationship with desired organizational behaviors, such as leadership (Judge et al., 2002).

It is important to note that in the analysis, Neuroticism uniquely contributed to the explained variance almost twice as much as Conscientiousness. Thus, it may be interpreted that being neurotic (or less emotionally stable) has a greater effect on individuals' perception of

inequity at work than being conscientious. The difference in magnitude of the relationship between the personality factors and perceived inequity at work was not hypothesized or expected. However, this finding may be explained by research that suggests Neuroticism is related to individuals' subjective well-being. Individuals who are high in Neuroticism have been found to be prone to negatively appraise their environment (Watson & Hubbard, 1996), to be predisposed to experiencing negative life events (Magnus, Diener, Fujita, & Pavot, 1993), and to use ineffective coping strategies when responding to problems and stress (Watson & Hubbard, 1996). Thus, previous research has demonstrated that the personality dimension of Neuroticism has significant relationships (both correlational and predictive) with negative life events and outcomes. This study confirmed the powerful effects that Neuroticism has on perceived inequity at work and may have implications for the selection of employees.

This study also demonstrated that Conscientiousness has a negative relationship to perceived inequity at work. Conscientiousness has been conceptualized as the extent to which individuals are dependable, careful, thorough, responsible, organized, persevering, and planful (Norman, 1963). In this study, Conscientiousness was measured as respondents' endorsement of the characteristics organized, responsible, hardworking, and careless (reverse-coded in the analysis) (MIDUS, 1995). In the HRM literature, Conscientiousness has been positively related to successful managers (Furnham, 2008), career success (Stewart & Barrick, 2004), and performance at the individual and group level (Neuman & Wright, 1999). Conscientiousness has also been demonstrated to be negatively related to family-to-work conflict (Wayne et al., 2004), counterproductive work behaviors (Salgado, 2002), and absenteeism (Judge, Mattocchio, & Thorensen, 1997).

The fifth research question examined the differences between racial and ethnic groups in their experience of perceived inequity at work, perceived inequity in the spousal/partner relationship, and family-to-work conflict. Results indicated that there were no significant differences between racial groups in their experience of perceived inequity at work. When examining ancestral origins dichotomously (European vs. non-European ancestry), differences between groups in their experience of perceived inequity at work were indicated. There were no differences found between the racial or ethnic groups in the experience of perceived inequity in the spousal/partner relationship. Lastly, significant differences were found between racial and ethnic groups in their reported experience of family-to-work conflict.

The results relating to differences between racial and ethnic groups in their experience of perceived inequity at work and perceived inequity in the spousal/partner relationship were not as significant as hypothesized. However, the results are not interpreted to mean that there are not differences between the groups; rather, they indicate design and methodological difficulties when examining the variables of interest. The census data from 1990 indicated that 80.3% of the population identified as White, 12.1% indentified as Black, 0.8% identified as Native American, 2.9% identified as Asian/Pacific Islander, and 3.9% identified as Other. The sample used in the current study was representative of the reported racial groups of Americans in the 1990s, as 86.3% of the respondents self-identified as White, 7.2% identified as Black, 0.8% identified as Native American, 1.2% identified as Asian/Pacific Islander, 3.6% identified as Other, and 0.8% identified as Multiracial. Although the percentage of African Americans in the study sample was 5% less than what would be expected when compared to their representation in the American population in 1990, the percentages of respondents were largely representative of the United States workforce. However, this has methodological implications when comparing means

between groups, because there was a significant difference in size between the largest group (White, *N* = 1467) and the smallest groups (Native American, *N* = 13; Multiracial, *N* = 13).

Due to these differences in size between the racial groups in the MIDUS dataset, other studies that have utilized this data have examined differences between dichotomous groups (White/non-White or Black/non-Black) (Grzywacz & Bass, 2003; Grzywacz et al., 2002). Using the dichotomous groupings race did not yield differences when examining perceived inequity at work or perceived inequity in the spousal/partner relationship. This may indicate that there are not significant differences between the groups, or it may reflect the methodological limitations in the measurement of the dependent and independent variable, which will be discussed in a later section. When examining differences between racial groups in the experience of family-to-work conflict, there were significant differences in both the ANOVA and t-test analyses. This may be due to the measurement of FWC being more robust than the measurement of perceived inequity at work or perceived inequity in the spousal/partner relationship, or it may indicate that members of racial groups have varying experiences of family-to-work conflict.

There were not data available regarding the ancestral origins of the American population in 1990, so there was not a meaningful source against which to compare the representativeness of the ancestral origins of the MIDUS sample. However, utilizing the same process of previous researchers, the dichotomous grouping of European/non-European ancestral origins was also used to examine differences between ethnic groups. Although there were more participants who identified with a diversity of ancestral regions, there was still a significant difference in size between the largest group (Europe, *N* = 950) and the smallest group (Middle East, *N* = 12). A significant difference was found between ethnic groups in the experience of perceived inequity at work when using the dichotomous grouping of Europe/non-Europe. Therefore, it may be

concluded that ancestral origin has some effect on the extent to which individuals perceive inequity at work. Whether or not individuals identify with an ethnic group that is European or non-European in origin may also represent cultural differences that exist between those two backgrounds.

When examining differences between ethnic groups in the experience of family-to-work conflict, significant differences were found in both the ANOVA and t-test analyses. Again, this may be due to the measurement of FWC being more robust than the measurement of perceived inequity at work or perceived inequity in the spousal/partner relationship, or it may indicate that members of ethnic groups have do indeed have varying experiences of FWC. Thus, the results of the current study provide support that differences do exist between racial and ethnic groups in their experience of FWC, and some support that differences exist between ethnic groups in the experience of perceived inequity at work. Ways to more intentionally examine differences between ethnic and racial groups on these variables of interest will be discussed in the recommendations section, as meaningful interpretations may not be drawn from the current results.

Implications

Implications for Counseling Psychology

The results of this study have a variety of implications for counseling psychologists. Because counseling psychology is a broadly applied field (Ivey, 1979), there are a number of applications across the many contexts in which counseling psychologists are employed. The implications discussed here will relate to the three roles of remediation, prevention, and development, with particular attention to the themes of vocation, normally functioning populations, and the person-environment interaction.

A typical remedial role for a counseling psychologist is that of a therapist. Counseling psychologists work in a variety of treatment settings, such as community health centers, hospitals, VA agencies, university counseling centers, and in private practice. Although the roles of counseling psychologists overlap with clinical psychologists (Fitzgerald & Osipow, 1986), the traditional role of counseling psychologists is to work with normally functioning populations (Gelso & Fretz, 2000). This is relevant to the current discussion because it is assumed that populations with a normal degree of insight will be able engage in counseling and make meaningful changes to their lives. This study provides evidence that perceived inequity has the potential to affect multiple life domains, and when clients discuss inequity in one area of their lives, therapists are advised to assess for client perceptions of inequity in other areas. This study also provides support for addressing clients' locus of control and personality characteristics that may facilitate a perception of inequity in social exchange relationships. Specific characteristics of neuroticism that may be relevant are anxiety and insecurity (McCrae & Costa, 1985). Helping facilitate a sense of agency and empowerment within clients may also increase their experience of having an internal locus of control, which may also decrease their perception of inequity in social exchange relationships. Although counselors may use their remediation role to process and address difficulties related to actual inequity in relationships, including racism and discrimination, it is important they acknowledge how clients' perceptions and personality characteristics may affect their experiences.

Another remedial role for counseling psychologists is in the position of consultant. There are generally considered to be four stages in the process of organizational consultation: entry, diagnosis, implementation, and disengagement (Dougherty, 2005). *Entry* refers to both the physical and psychological introduction of the consultant into the organization. *Diagnosis* refers

to the consultant's assessment of dysfunction within an organization. During this phase, the consultant also conceptualizes interventions that will promote and facilitate change. *Implementation* refers to the process of introducing the strategies developed during the diagnosis phase. The *disengagement* phase refers to the consultant's exit from the system. If perceived inequity within a system is identified as a source of dysfunction, proposed strategies to improve functioning will include addressing the perceived inequity. Thus, in the role of consultant, counseling psychologists may also utilize a preventative approach by implementing ways to decrease actual or perceived inequity at work. This may include increasing communication skills between managers and subordinates, which may be a training opportunity for organizations.

A developmental application of the results of this study is relevant to counseling psychologists' focus on enhancing people's skills and attitudes necessary to deal with everyday problems and maximize satisfaction (Gelso & Fretz, 2000). This is important in the realm of vocational psychology, which has long been considered one of the defining characteristics of counseling psychology (Fitzgerald & Osipow, 1986). There are a number of theories of vocational development, including John Holland's (1959) person-environment typology and Super's (1990) life-span theory of vocational development. Both of these theories exemplify the person-environment focus of counseling psychology by examining the fit between people's personalities and their career environment (Holland, 1959) and addressing how individuals' career preferences change with time and experience (Super, 1990). The results of this study have implications for the person-environment fit in the context of work, because Neuroticism, external locus of control, and family-to-work conflict have a positive relationship with perceived inequity at work, and Conscientiousness and internal locus of control have a negative relationship with perceived inequity at work. Thus, individuals who have a high degree of Neuroticism and a low

degree of Conscientiousness may do poorly in a work environment with ambiguous roles or poor communication structures, because they may make comparisons with referent others which results in perceived inequity. Individuals who have a high degree of family demands may also not fit in a work environment that does not value family-friendly policies or have scheduling flexibility, because this is likely to contribute to perceived inequity at work. Thus, when addressing vocational concerns, counseling psychologists are advised to consider how the variables of interest in this study may affect individuals' fit with certain careers.

Implications for Human Resource Management Practices

Selection

Previous research has demonstrated a negative relationship between perceived inequity at work and job satisfaction (Abraham, 1999), and research also demonstrates a positive relationship between job satisfaction and job performance (Shore & Martin, 1989). Thus, it is possible that perceived inequity at work has the potential to affect job satisfaction and job performance. The current study suggests a significant relationship between the personality dimensions of Conscientiousness and Neuroticism and perceived inequity at work. If managers know that employees that are high in Neuroticism and low in Conscientiousness are more likely to perceive inequity at work and possibly react to the inequity in ways that have a negative impact on the organization, it is likely that selecting personnel who are low in Neuroticism and high in Conscientiousness would be beneficial for the organization.

The use of personality measures in the selection process has been both empirically supported and publicly debated. The use of personality measures in the selection process has been useful in predicting how, why, and when individuals behave in certain ways in and out of the workplace (Furnham, 2005). Arnold and colleagues (2005) conclude that the literature

"suggests that when used appropriately, personality measures can add significant incremental validity in a selection process over and above cognitive ability testing" (pp. 186-187). However, the use of personality assessment in the selection process has also been contested. Soroka v. Dayton Hudson Corporation in 1991 is a legal case involving the use of personality measures for selection. Individuals had applied to a Target store as security guards and were administered select items from the MMPI as part of the job application process. Those not selected later sued the corporation for violation of privacy, as some of the items facially related to sexual orientation and religion (APA, n.d.). Although the case was settled out of court, it brought the use of personality measures in the selection process to national attention.

Organizations that use personality measures in selection must justify that the information gained through the assessments is necessary and relevant to employees' job performance. It must be demonstrated that the items used are valid measures and maintain employees' rights with regard to privacy and confidentiality. Although it may be desirable to have employees who are less likely to perceive inequity in the workplace, it is doubtful that organizations could make a sound argument that this is both relevant and necessary as part of the selection process. In addition, the link between personality dimensions and perceived inequity at work is preliminary and would need to be supported by further research.

Training

The results of this study may have implications for training at multiple levels within an organization. Adams' (1963, 1965) theory emphasized the perception of fairness by social actors as integral to equity theory, and this has been reinforced by other scholars in the years following his initial discussion of inequity (Walster et al., 1973; Donnerstein & Hatfield, 1982). Thus, individuals' assessment regarding their inputs and outputs in comparison to their perceptions of

others' inputs and outputs is a subjective process. From a management perspective, it is important to address organizational policies and practices that may be potential sources of perceived inequity by employees. Kenton (1989) suggests that communication from managers is essential when discussing issues such as overtime or pay cuts. Additionally, supervisors may be trained to provide their subordinates with accurate information, with particular emphasis on understanding the receivers' needs and satisfaction of those needs (Kenton, 1989).

It has been demonstrated in this study that an internal locus of control is negatively related to perceived inequity at work, and an external locus control is positively related to perceived inequity at work. Another implication that follows from this study and builds on the recommendations by Kenton (1989) is to provide employees with training related to skills that may empower them in the workplace. This may look like providing training around conflict resolution, negotiation, and procedures for filing a grievance. This may help facilitate a sense of agency, or internal locus of control, in response to work situations. Employees may be more likely to use organizational means to address their perceptions of inequity in a way that does not involve negative outcomes for the organization, rather than engaging in counterproductive work behaviors. If employees have the belief that there are options available to them to address potential causes of inequity in the workplace, they may be less likely to perceive inequity.

Organizational Policy.

The results of this study indicate a positive relationship between family-to-work conflict (FWC) and perceived inequity at work; thus, a decrease in FWC would likely be related to a decrease in perceived inequity at work. Thus, organizational policy designed to help decrease FWC would theoretically result in a decrease in perceived inequity at work, and a subsequent decrease in negative outcomes for the organization. A longitudinal study or use of analyses to

determine causality between FWC and perceived inequity at work would help support the need to implement organizational policy to address conflict between work and family roles with the specific intention of decreasing perceived inequity at work. The reality is that many organizations have already developed policy initiatives that emphasize a work-family balance in response to research. One of the primary means of facilitating this balance falls under the realm of schedule flexibility available to employees (Kingston, 1990), such as flextime, job sharing, part-time work, family leave, dependent-care time, and telecommuting (Valcour and Hunter, 2005). Other family-friendly policies may involve increasing rewards (such as offering dependent medical insurance), reducing costs (such as offering stress management programs), and reducing demands (such as offering on-site daycare to reduce commuting demands) (Poelmans, Stepanova, & Masuda, 2008). It has been argued that organizations cannot afford to ignore the interconnectedness between work and family (Dorio, Bryant, & Allen, 2008), and many of the family friendly policies enacted by organizations seek to facilitate the relationship between the two life roles. The results of this study provide further support that decreasing the conflict between family and work life may have beneficial outcomes for organizations.

Limitations

It is important to recognize limitations of the current study that may affect the interpretation and generalizability of the results. The discussion of the limitations has been broken down into three sections: limitations related to the use of a pre-existing dataset, limitations with regard to other potential confounding variables, and limitations related to the operationalization of constructs.

Use of a Pre-Existing Dataset

This study is an examination of a sample from a pre-existing dataset. Data were collected for the National Survey of Midlife Development in the United States (MIDUS) by the John D. and Catherine T. MacArthur Foundation Research Network on Successful Midlife Development in 1995. The original study included a randomized sample of noninstitutionalized persons aged 25-74 who had telephones. Some of the variables of interest in this study were part of the original data collection, such as internal locus of control, external locus of control, Conscientiousness, Neuroticism, and family-to-work conflict. It should also be recognized that the items measuring internal locus of control were labeled as "Personal Mastery" and the items measuring external locus of control were "Personal Constraints." Although it may be argued that the differences between the names of the variables in the dataset and the constructs that they purport to measure is a lexical matter, it remains that differences in the operationalization of constructs has the potential to affect the generalizability of the results.

Another limitation of the study related to the use of a pre-existing dataset is that some of the variables of interest were constructed from items in the telephone survey and/or self-administered questionnaire (SAQ). The dependent variable, perceived inequity at work, and an independent variable, perceived inequity in the spousal/partner relationship, were both constructed using items from the survey. The items were empirically demonstrated to be related to the theoretical constructs of perceived inequity at work and perceived inequity in the spousal/partner relationship, and a confirmatory factor analysis was used to demonstrate that these items hung together as a factor which captured those constructs. However, it may be argued that these variables of interest could have been more effectively captured by items that were purposefully designed to measure the variables. Instruments that have been specifically constructed to capture perceived inequity at work and perceived inequity in the spousal/partner

relationship will be discussed in the recommendations section as a way to improve the measurement of these constructs in future research.

Another limitation is the time period of the original data collection in 1995. Although one of the assumptions of the study was that the findings would be relevant to the contemporary workforce, it is also possible that differences in the social and political climate may affect the generalizability of the findings. For example, the state of the American economy was significantly more sound in 1995 (when the data were collected) than in 2009 (when the current study was conducted). The instability of the American economy in 2009 may have significant effects on people's mental and physical health, and this may be reflected in some of the psychological variables and personality factors that are currently being examined. Although steps were taken in this analysis to control for the effects of variables that have been found to co-vary with perceived inequity at work and other variables of interest, the possibility remains that the differences in the American economy between 1995 and 2009 may affect the generalizability of the findings from this study.

Lastly, because this study is a secondary data analysis, the variables of interest were not manipulated in an experimental research design. In an optimal research design, participants would have been administered surveys with a sufficient amount of time lag in order to make causal interpretations on the basis of the analysis. A longitudinal design would have allowed for the examination of the effects of psychological variables and personality factors on perceived inequity at work over time. Because the data are considered cross-sectional, the appropriate analyses were correlational in nature, which allowed for the determination of relationships among variables but did not allow causal inferences to be made.

Potential Confounding Variables

Though every effort was made to control for potential confounding effects from variables that have been demonstrated to have a relationship with perceived inequity at work, it is possible that other variables not measured in this study could have an impact on the results. For example, regulatory focus theory suggests that when individuals have a promotion versus prevention focus, their perception of fairness with regard to resource allocation is affected (Cropanzano, Paddock, Rupp, Bagger, & Baldwin, 2008). Other scholars have suggested the examination of other psychological variables in direct and indirect relationships to perceived inequity at work, such as self-esteem and self-efficacy (Abraham, 1999), work ethic (Greenberg, 1978), and national culture as a moderator of what justice means and the degree of justice expected (Steiner, 2001). Lastly, there are other variables that may have a relationship with some of the behavioral reactions that are related to perceived inequity at work. For example, turnover within an organization may be related to a multitude of life factors for employees and may not represent a consequence of perceived inequity. Cole and Bruch (2006) suggest that a strong organizational identity and organizational commitment affect turnover intentions, and this relationship may obfuscate the relationship between perceived inequity and behavioral responses. Thus, it is possible that in the current study, there were variables that had a confounding effect on the analyses but were not controlled or accounted for in the analyses.

Cognitive complexity is another factor that may moderate the relationship between variables and perceived inequity at work. Cognitive complexity refers to the amount and diversity of information, concepts, and methods that people use in their lives (Brousseau, 1988). The greater the complexity, the inputs and outputs to which individuals respond will be more varied (de Janasz & Behson, 2007). Cognitive complexity may be considered context specific (Little, 1972); however, individuals who are cognitively complex in interpersonal domains are

theorized to have advanced social perception skills, such as identifying others' states and inferring their dispositions (Burleson, 1994). Thus, cognitively complex individuals are able to use their "system of personal constructs to construe how a situation appears within the construct system of another" (Hale & Delia, 1976, p. 198). Cognitive complexity has been examined in relation to work-family conflict (de Janasz & Behson, 2007), and it is suggested that individuals with low cognitive complexity likely perceive an "either/or" proposition in response to the collision of work and family domains, whereas individuals with high cognitive complexity are more likely to brainstorm and come up with alternatives to satisfy demands in both domains. Cognitive complexity has been found to moderate the relationship between family-to-work conflict and work-related variables (de Janasz & Behson, 2007), whereby a higher level of cognitive complexity diminishes negative relationships between WFC and job satisfaction, and also between FWC and organizational commitment. It is possible that cognitive complexity had an impact on individuals' perceived inequity at work, because low complexity is more likely to be associated with lower social perception skills. Thus, individuals' perceptions of others' inputs and outputs may be affected by their degree of cognitive complexity, and this may affect their subsequent reactions to address the inequity. There was not a way to measure cognitive complexity in the current study, but it is important to recognize this as a potential confounding factor.

Differences in Operationalization

Scholars recognize the importance of being explicit when discussing the operationalization of terms in their research. When examining a theoretically broad construct, such as personality, variations in operationalization may result in differences as to how the construct is measured and represented in the research. Traits have been empirically studied as

characteristics of personality (McCrae & Costa, 1985), disposition (Staw et al., 1986), affect (Judge & Bono, 2001), and core self-evaluations (Judge, Erez, & Bono, 1998). In this study, personality was measured by respondents' self-report of how much they endorsed certain traits that were representative of the Big Five personality dimensions. It is important to recognize that although the Big Five are commonly used in research to examine personality, other traits have been operationalized as measuring personality in both the management and psychology literature. Indeed, Friede and Ryan (2005) consider locus of control to be a core self-evaluation that is reflective of personality.

Recommendations

The results of this study indicate that there are significant relationships between certain psychological variables and perceived inequity at work, and between personality factors and perceived inequity at work. Due to the use of a pre-existing dataset and design limitations, causal relationships were not able to be examined in this analysis. There were also methodological limitations in the measurement of perceived inequity at work and in the measurement of perceived inequity in the spousal/partner relationship. This may have affected the results of the direct relationships between the variables, and also the interaction variable that examined moderating effects of Conscientiousness. In addition, unequal cell sizes in the ANOVA that examined cultural differences between groups impacted the results, interpretation, and generalizability of the analyses.

Recommendations for future research begin with using an experimental design that allows researchers to make directional inferences about the relationships between the variables. A longitudinal research design would allow researchers to collect data over time and to measure differences in the relationships between the variables of interest that occur over time. As an

example, researchers could collect a measure of perceived inequity at work, perceived inequity in the spousal/partner relationship, and family-to-work conflict at Time 1. The same measures could be collected at various time intervals, such as Time 2 three months later, and Time 3 three months after Time 2. Thus, researchers would be able to examine whether an increase in perceived inequity in the spousal/partner relationship is followed by an increase in perceived inequity at work, or whether an increase in family-to-work conflict is followed by an increase in perceived inequity at work. This is similar to a design used by Kelloway and colleagues (1999) to examine the direction of work and family conflict.

Causality between the variables of interest may also be examined by using more complex statistical analyses. After conducting studies to help determine the directionality of the relationship between the variables examined in this study and perceived inequity at work, structural equation modeling (SEM) may be used to test the causal, moderating, and mediating relationships between the variables. The relationships between the variables may then be entered into a model, which can also be evaluated using SEM. When examining models, SEM "evaluates the adequacy of each measured variable as a measure of the construct, identifies instances in which items overlap constructs or load more highly on a construct other than the one presumed, and helps to identify new clusters of variables not stipulated in the original model" (Floyd & Wasner, 1994, p. 57). In order use utilize SEM, the theory underlying the relationships must be sound and empirically supported; thus, future research on the directionality of the relationship between the variables of interest and perceived inequity at work is necessary before constructing a model of relationships between multiple variables.

Another recommendation for future research is to increase the robustness of measuring the variables of interest. Although equity theory has been widely used in the management

literature, a major criticism is that people do not universally respond to inequity in the same way (Mowday, 1991). This has been discussed by scholars as individuals' differences in addressing inequity with behavioral or psychological reactions (Walster et al., 1973; Furnham, 2005). To address this deficiency, Huseman and colleagues (1987) developed the concept of equity sensitivity which purports to measure individual differences in sensitivity to equity. These scholars developed the Equity Sensitivity Instrument (ESI) (Huseman et al., 1987) to measure differences in Benevolents (individuals who over-reward in social exchange relationships), Equity Sensitives (individuals who ascribe to "traditional" norms of equity), and Entitleds (individuals who under-reward in social exchange relationships). The ESI has been used to measure differences in outcome pay between the three types (Miles et al., 1994), managerial ratings (Hartman, Villere, & Fok, 1995), and moderating effects between psychological contract breach and employees' attitudes and behaviors (Kickul & Lester, 2001). Another measurement of equity sensitivity has been developed by Sauley & Bedeian (2000) called the Equity Preference Questionnaire (EPQ), which has been used to examine relationships between personality traits and equity sensitivity (Shore & Strauss, 2008). Although researchers are still conducting studies with regard to the psychometric properties of the ESI and the ESQ (Shore & Strauss, 2008; Foote & Harmon, 2006), it remains that these measures of equity sensitivity provide more information about individuals' perception of inequity in social exchange relationships and differences in their preferences for equity in relationships.

There are also measures that have been constructed to measure perceived equity and inequity in spousal/partner, family, and social exchange relationships. The Hatfield and colleagues (1978) Global Measure of Equity asks: "Consider what you put into your relationship with your partner, compared to what you get out of it…and what your partner puts in compared

to what he/she gets out of it. How does your relationship "stack up"?" The response to this item is a Likert scale ranging from 1 ("I am getting a much better deal than my partner") to 7 ("My partner is getting a much better deal"). To supplement this item in research about inequity and emotions in close relationships, Sprecher (1986) developed an item that is suggested to yield more variation in respondents' answers due to nuances in the wording of the item and availability of responses. These two items have been used by researchers to quantify equity in close relationships (Canary & Stafford, 1993), including parent-adolescent relationships (Vogl-Bauer, Kalbfleisch, & Beatty, 1999). Another measure being developed is the Perceived Social Inequity Scale – Women's Form (PSIS-W) to measure how women perceive social inequity in comparison with men across a variety of domains (Corning, 2000). Although scholars are still in the process of examining the psychometrics associated with these measures, using constructed items or measures of perceived inequity in close relationships has the potential to enhance the analyses, the interpretation of the results, and the generalizability to other populations.

A final recommendation with regard to future research is to improve the purposeful examination of issues related to culture, race, and ethnicity. Research has documented differences between cultures with regard to perceived inequity at work (Fadil et al., 2005; Bolino & Turnley, 2008), perceived inequity in the spousal/partner relationship (Aumer-Ryan et al., 2007), equity sensitivity (Chhokar et al., 2001), and family-to-work conflict (Aryee et al., 1999). Although the sample in the current study was representative of the American population in 1995 (U.S. Census, 2009), there was, as a result, a limited number of respondents from minority groups. Subsequent research will be improved upon by the purposeful inclusion of minority group members to meaningfully examine differences between groups. Although the use of dichotomous groupings (White/non-White; Europe/non-Europe) has been used with the MIDUS

dataset to examine differences between racial groups, current researchers have the knowledge and empirical support to move beyond simplistic examinations of racial and ethnic differences.

Summary

The results of this study supported direct relationships between psychological variables and personality factors on perceived inequity at work. Future researchers are advised to use the recommendations made to improve upon subsequent studies in order to increase the generalizability of the results. This includes using more robust measures of the constructs represented by the variables, using a design and/or statistical analyses that would allow for causal inferences, and to examine the moderating effects of other personality dimensions that may attenuate relationships between home- and work-related variables. It is also highly recommended that future researches include members of racial and ethnic minority groups in studies so that meaningful interpretations may be made about differences (or lack thereof) that may exist between groups.

References

Abraham, R. (1999). The relationship between differential inequity, job satisfaction, intention to turnover, and self-esteem. *The Journal of Psychology, 133*, 205-215.

Adams, J. S. (1963). Toward an understanding of inequity. *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 67*, 422-436.

Adams, J. S. (1965). Inequity in social exchange. In L. Berkowitz (Ed.), *Advances in experimental social psychology* (Vol. 2, pp. 267-299). New York: Academic Press.

Adler, N. E., & Coriell, M. (1997). Socioeconomic status and women's health. In S. J. Gallant, G. Puryear Keita, & R. Royak-Schaler (Eds.), *Health care for women: Psychological, social, and behavioral influences* (pp. 11-23). Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.

Aiken, L. S., & West, S. G. (1991). *Multiple regression: Testing and interpreting interactions*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Allport, G. W. (1937). *Personality: A psychological interpretation*. New York: Holt.

American Psychological Association. (n.d.). Soroka v. Dayton Hudson Corp., dba Target Stores. Retrieved March 15, 2009, from http://www.apa.org/psyclaw/soroka.html

American Psychological Association. (2002). Ethical principles of psychologists and codes of conduct. *American Psychologist, 57*, 1060-1073.

American Psychological Association. (2003). Guidelines on multicultural education, training, research, practice, and organizational change for psychologists. *American Psychologist, 58*(5), 377-402.

Arnold, J., Silvester, J., Patterson, F., Robertson, I., Cooper, C., & Burnes, B. (2005). *Work psychology: Understanding human behaviour in the workplace*. Harlow, UK: Prentice Hall.

Aronson, E., Wilson, T. D., & Akert, R. M. (1999). *Social Psychology* (3rd ed.). New York: Longman.

Aryee, S., Fields, D., & Luk, V. (1999). A cross-cultural test of a model of the work-family interface. *Journal of Management, 25*, 491-511.

Ashforth, B. E., & Mael, F. (1989). Social identity theory and the organization. *Academy of Management Review, 14*, 20-39.

Aumer-Ryan, K., Hatfield, E., & Frey, R. (2007). Examining equity theory across cultures. *Interpersona, 1*, 61-75.

Avery, D. R. (2003). Racial differences in perceptions of starting salaries: How failing to discriminate can perpetuate discrimination. *Journal of Business and Psychology, 17*, 439-450.

Barnett, R. C. (1994). Home-to-work spillover revisited: A study of full-time employed women in dual-earner couples. *Journal of Marriage and the Family, 56*, 647-656.

Barrick, M. R., & Mount, M. K. (1991). The big five personality dimensions and job performance: A meta-analysis. *Personnel Psychology, 44*, 1-26.

Bellavia, G., & Frone, M. R. (2005). Work-family conflict. In J. Barling, E. K. Kelloway, & M. R. Frone (Eds.), *Handbook of Work Stress*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Bolino, M. C., & Turnley, W. H. (2008). Old faces, new places: equity theory in cross-cultural contexts. *Journal of Organizational Behavior, 29*, 29-50.

Borgatta, E.F. (1964). The structure of personality characteristics. *Behavoiral Science, 9*, 8-17.

Brim, O. G., Baltes, P. B., Bumpass, L. L., Cleary, P. D., Featherman, D. L., Hazzard, W. R., Kessler, R. C., Lachman, M. E., Markus, H. R., Marmot, M. G., Rossi, A. S., Ryff, C. D., Shweder, R. A. (2007). NATIONAL SURVEY OF MIDLIFE DEVELOPMENT IN THE UNITED STATES (MIDUS), 1995-1996 [Computer file]. ICPSR02760-v4. Ann Arbor, MI: DataStat, Inc./Boston, MA: Harvard Medical School, Dept. of Health Care Policy [producers]. Ann Arbor, MI: Inter-university Consortium for Political and Social Research [distributor], 2007-04-16. oi:10.3886/ICPSR02760

Brockner, J., Greenberg, J., Brockner, A., Bortz, J., Davy, J., & Carter, C. (1986). Layoffs, equity theory, and work performance: Further evidence of the impact of survivor guilt. *Academy of Management Journal, 29*, 373-384.

Brousseau, K. R. (1988). *Cognitive motives*. Santa Monica, CA: Decision Dynamics Corporation.

Bruck, C. S., & Allen, T. D. (2003). The relationship between big five personality traits, negative affectivity, type A behavior, and work-family conflict. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 63*, 457-472.

Burleson, B. R. (1994). Friendship and similarities in social-cognitive and communication abilities: Social skill bases of interpersonal attraction in childhood. *Personal Relationships, 1*, 371-389.

Byron, K. (2005). A meta-analytic review of work-family conflict and its antecedents. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 67*, 169-198.

Canary, D. J. & Stafford, L. (1993). Preservation of relational characteristics: Maintenance strategies, equity, and locus of control. In P.J. Kalbfleisch (Ed.), *Interpersonal*

communication: Evolving interpersonal relationships (pp. 237-259). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Cardy, R. L., Miller, J. S., & Ellis, A. D. (2007). Employee equity: Toward a person-based approach to HRM. *Human Resource Management Review, 17*, 140-151.

Carr, D. (2002). The psychological consequences of work-family trade-offs for three cohorts of men and women. *Social Psychology Quarterly, 65*, 103-124.

Cattell, R. B. (1947). Confirmation and clarification of primary personality factors. *Psychometrika, 12*, 197-220.

Chhokar, J. S., Zhuplev, A., Fok, L. Y., & Hartman, S. J. (2001). The impact of culture on equity sensitivity perceptions and organizational citizenship behavior: A five-country study. *International Journal of Value-Based Management, 14*, 79-98.

Christiansen, C. H. (1999). Defining lives: Occupation as identity: An essay on competence, coherence, and the creation of meaning. *The American Journal of Occupational Therapy, 53*, 547-558.

Cole, M. S., & Bruch, H. (2006). Organizational identity strength, identification, and commitment and their relationships to turnover intention: Does organizational hierarchy matter? *Journal of Organizational Behavior, 27*, 585-605.

Corning, A. F. (2000). Assessing perceived social inequity: A relative deprivation framework. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 78*, 463-477.

Cowherd, D. M., & Levine, D. I. (1992). Product quality and pay equity between lower-level employees and top management: An investigation of distributive

Crawford, D. W., Feng, D., Fischer, J. L., & Diana, L. K. (2003). The influence of love, equity, and alternatives on commitment in romantic relationships. *Family and Consumer Sciences Research Journal, 31*, 253-271.

Cropanzano, R., & Greenberg, J. (1997). Progress in organizational justice: Tunneling through the maze. In C. L. Cooper & L. T. Robertson (Eds.), *International review of industrial and organizational psychology* (Vol. 12, pp. 317 – 372). Chichester, England: Wiley.

Cropanzano, R., Paddock, L., Rupp, D. E., Bagger, J., & Baldwin, A. (2008). How regulatory focus impacts the process-by-outcome interaction for perceived fairness and emotions. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes, 105*, 36-51.

Crouter, A. C. (1984). Spillover from family to work: The neglected side of the work-family interface. *Human Relations, 37*, 425-442.

de Janasz, S. C., & Behson, S. J. (2007). Cognitive capacity for processing work-family conflict: An initial examination. *Career Development International, 12*, 397-411.

DeMaris, A. (2007). The role of relationship inequity in marital disruption. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships, 24*, 177-195.

Denison, D. R. (1996). What is the difference between organizational culture and organizational climate? A native's point of view on a decade of paradigm wars. *Academy of Management Review, 21*, 619-654.

Deutsch, M. (1985). *Distributive justice: A social-psychological perspective*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.

Dilworth, D. E. L. (2004). Predictors of negative spillover from family to work. *Journal of Family Issues, 25*, 241-261.

Dierendonck, D., Schaufeli, W. B., & Buunk. B. P. (1998). The evaluation of an individual burnout intervention program: The role of inequity and social support. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 83*, 392-407.

Donnerstein, E., & Hatfield, E. (1982). Aggression and inequity. In J. Greenberg and R. L. Cohen (Eds.), *Equity and justice in social behavior* (pp. 309-336). New York: Academic Press.

Dorio, J. M., Bryant, R. H. & Allen, T. D. (2008). Work-related outcomes of the work-family interface: why organizations should care. In K. Korabik, D. S. Lero, & D. L. Whitehead (Eds.), *Handbook of work-family integration: Research, theory, and best practices* (pp. 157-176). New York: Academic Press.

Dougherty, A. M. (2005). *Psychological consultation and collaboration in school and community settings*. (4th ed.). Belmont, CA: Brooks/Cole

Doyle, C. E. (2003). *Work and organizational psychology*. Hove, New York: Psychology Press.

Duxbury, L. E., & Higgins, C. A. (1991). Gender differences in work-family conflict. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 76*, 60-74.

Education and Training Committee, Society of Consulting Psychology, American Psychological Association. (2002). Principles for education and training at the doctoral and post-doctoral level in consulting psychology/organizational psychology. *Consulting Psychology Journal, 54*, 213-222.

England, P. & Kilbourne, B. (1988). OCCUPATIONAL MEASURES FROM THE DICTIONARY OF OCCUPATIONAL TITLES FOR 1980 CENSUS DETAILED OCCUPATIONS [Computer file]. Richardson, TX: Paula England and Barbara

Kilbourne [producers], 1988. Ann Arbor, MI: Inter-university Consortium for Political and Social Research [distributor], 1988. doi:10.3886/ICPSR08942

Emerson, R. M. (1976). Social exchange theory. *Annual Review of Sociology, 2,* 255-362.

Fadil, P.A., Williams, R. J., Limpaphayom, W., & Smatt, C. (2005). Equity or equality? A conceptual examination of the influence of individualism/collectivism on the cross-cultural application of equity theory. *Cross Cultural Management, 12,* 17-35.

Festinger, L., (1954). A theory of social comparison processes. *Human Relations, 7,* 117-140.

Festinger, L. (1957). *A theory of cognitive dissonance*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.

Field, A. (2005). *Discovering statistics using SPSS*. Thousand Oaks CA: Sage Publications.

Fitzgerald, L. F., & Osipow, S. H. (1986). An occupational analysis of counseling psychology: How special is the specialty? *American Psychologist, 41,* 535-544.

Flaherty, S., & Moss, S. A. (2007). The impact of personality and team context on the relationship between workplace injustice and counterproductive work behavior. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 37,* 2549-2575.

Floyd, F. J., & Wasner, G. H. (1994). Social exchange, equity, and commitment: Structural equation modeling of dating relationships. *Journal of Family Psychology, 8,* 55-73.

Fogarty, G. J., Machin, M. A., Albion, M. J., Sutherland, L. F., Lalor, G. I., & Revitt, S. (1999). Predicting occupational strain and job satisfaction: The role of stress, coping, personality, and affectivity variables. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 54,* 429-452.

Foote, D. A., & Harmon, S. (2006). Measuring equity sensitivity. *Journal of Managerial Psychology, 21,* 90-108.

Fox, S., Spector, P. E., & Miles, D. (2001). Counterproductive work behavior (CWB) in response to job stressors and organizational justice: Some mediator and moderator tests for autonomy and emotions. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 59,* 291-309.

Friede, A., & Ryan, A. (2005). The importance of the individual: How self-evaluations influence the work-family interface. In E. E. Kossek & S. J. Lambert (Eds)., *Work and Life integration: Organizational, cultural, and individual perspectives* (pp. 193-209). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Frone, M. R. (2003). Work-family balance. In J. C. Quick & L. E Tetrick (Eds.), *Handbook of occupational health psychology* (pp. 143-162). Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.

Furnham, A. (2005). *The psychology of behavior at work.* New York: Taylor & Francis, Inc.

Furnham, A. (2008). *Personality and intelligence at work.* New Work: Routledge.

Gelso, C. G., & Fretz, B. (2000). *Counseling psychology: An introduction to the field*. Fort Worth, TX: Harcourt College Publishers.

Geurts, S. A., Buunk, B. P., & Schaufeli, W. B. (1994). Health complaints, social comparisons and absenteeism. *Work & Stress, 8,* 220-234.

Geurts, S. A., Schaufeli, W. B., & Rutte, C. G. (1999). Absenteeism, turnover intention, and inequity in the employment relationship. *Work & Stress, 13,* 253-267.

Gilliland, S. W. (1993). The perceived fairness of selection systems: An organizational justice perspective. *Academy of Management Review, 18,* 694-734.

Goodman, P. (1974). An examination of referents used in the evaluation of pay. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes, 12,* 170-195.

Googins, B. K. (1991). *Work/family conflicts: Private lives-public responses*. New York: Auburn House.

Greenberg, J. (1978). Equity, equality, and the protestant ethic: Allocating rewards following fair and unfair competition. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology,14*, 217-226.

Greenberg, J. (1989). Cognitive reevaluation of outcomes in response to underpayment inequity. *Academy of Management Journal, 32*, 174-184.

Greenhaus, J., & Beutell, N. (1985). Sources of conflict between work and family roles. *Academy of Management Review, 10*, 76-88.

Grzywacz, J. G., & Bass, B. L. (2003). Work, family, and mental health: Testing different models of work-family fit. *Journal of Marriage and Family, 65*, 248-262.

Grzywacz, J. G., & Marks, N. F. (2000). Reconceptualizing the work-family interface: An ecological perspective on the correlates of positive and negative spillover between work and family. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology, 5*, 111-126.

Grzywacz, J. G., Almeida, D. M., & McDonald, D. A. (2002). Work-family spillover and daily reports of work and family stress in the adult labor force. *Family Relations, 51*, 28-36.

Hale, C. L., & Delia, J. G. (1976). Cognitive complexity and social perspective taking. *Communication Monographs, 43*, 195-203.

Harder, J. W. (1992). Play for pay: effects of inequity in a pay-for-performance context. *Administrative Science Quarterly, 37*, 321-335.

Hartman, S. J., Villere, M. F., & Fok, L. Y. (1995). An investigation of the Huseman et al. proposals for three equity types. *International Journal of Management, 12*, 137-148.

Hatfield, E., Utne, M. K., & Traupmann, J. (1978). Equity theory and intimate relationships. In Burgess, R. L., & Huston, T. L. (Eds.), *Social exchange in developing relationships* (pp. 99-133). New York: Academic Press.

Hofstede, G. (1991). *Cultures and Organizations: Software of the Mind.* London: McGraw-Hill International.

Hogan, R. (2004). Personality psychology for organizational researchers. In B. Schneider & D. B. Smith (Eds), *Personality and organizations* (pp. 3-23). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Holahan, C. K., & Gilbert, L. A. (1979). Conflict between major life roles: Women and men in dual career couples. *Human Relations, 326*, 451–467.

Holland, J. L. (1959). A theory of vocational choice. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 6*, 35-45.

Homans, G. C. (1961). *Social behavior: Its elementary forms*. New York: Harcourt, Brace, & World.

Hsu, M., Anen, C., & Quartz, S. R. (2008). The right and the good: Distributive justice and neural encoding of equity and efficiency. *Science, 320*, 1092-1095.

Hui, C. H., Triandis, H. C., & Yee, C. (1991). Cultural differences in reward allocation: is collectivism the explanation? *British Journal of Social Psychology, 30*, 145-157.

Huseman, R. C., Hatfield, J. D., & Miles, E. M. (1985). Test for individual perceptions of job equity: Some preliminary findings. *Perceptual and Motor Skills, 61*, 1055-1064.

Huseman, R. C., Hatfield, J. D., & Miles, E. M. (1987). A new perspective on equity theory: The equity sensitivity construct. *Academy of Management Review, 12*, 222-234.

Ivey, A. E. (1979). Counseling psychology – the most broadly based applied psychology specialty. *The Counseling Psychologist, 8*, 3-6.

Janis, I. L. (1982). *Groupthink* (2nd ed.). Boston, MA: Houghton Mifflin.

Jordaan, J. E., Myers, R. A., Layton, W. C., & Morgan, H. H. (1968). *The counseling psychologist*. Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.

Judge, T. A., & Bono, J. E. (2001). A rose by any other name: Are self-esteem, generalized self-efficacy, neuroticism, and locus of control indicators of a common construct? In B. W. Roberts & R. Hogan (Eds.), *Personality psychology in the workplace* (pp. 93-120). Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.

Judge, T. A., Bono, J. E., Ilies, R., & Gerhardt, M. W. (2002). Personality and leadership: A qualitative and quantitative review. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 87*, 765-780.

Judge, T. A., Erez, A., & Bono, J. E. (1998). The power of being positive: The relation between positive self-concept and job performance. *Human Performance, 11*, 167-187.

Judge, T. A., Locke, E. A., Durham, C. C., & Kluger, A. N. (1998). Dispositional effects on job and life satisfaction: The role of core evaluations. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 83*, 17-34.

Judge, T., Mottocchio, J., & Thorensen, C. (1997). Five-factor model of personality and employee absence. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 82*, 745-755.

Kabanoff, B. (1991). Equity, equality, power, and conflict. *Academy of Management Review, 16*, 416-441.

Kagan, N., Armsworth, M. W., Altmaier, E. M., Dowd, E. T., Hansen, J. C., Mills, D. E., Schlossberg, N., Sprinthall, N. A., Tanney, M. F., & Vasquez, M. J. T. (1988).

Professional practice of counseling psychology in various settings. *The Counseling Psychologist, 16,* 347-365.

Keene, J. R., & Reynolds, J. R. (2005). The job costs of family demands: Gender differences in negative family-to-work spillover. *Journal of Family Issues, 26,* 275-299.

Kelley, H. H. & Thibaut, J. (1978). *Interpersonal relations: A theory of interdependence.* New York: Wiley.

Kelloway, E. K., Gottlieb, B. H., & Barham, L. (1999). The source, nature, and direction of work and family conflict: A longitudinal investigation. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology, 4,* 337-346.

Kenton, S. B. (1989). The role of communication in managing perceived inequity. *Management Communication Quarterly, 2,* 536-543.

Kessler, R. C., & Neighbors, H. W. (1986). A new perspective on the relationship among race, social class, and psychological distress. *Journal of Health Social Behavior, 27,* 107-15.

Kickul, J., & Lester, S. W. (2001). Broken promises: Equity sensitivity as a moderator between psychological contract breach and employee attitudes and behavior. *Journal of Business and Psychology, 16,* 191-217.

Kidd, R. F., & Utne, M. K. (1978). Reactions to inequity: A prospective on the role of human attributions. *Law and Human Behavior, 2,* 301-312.

King, W. C., Jr., & Miles, E. M. (1994). The measurement of equity sensitivity. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology, 67,* 133-142.

Kingston, P. W. (1990). Illusions and ignorance about the family-responsive workplace. *Journal of Family Issues, 11,* 438-454.

Kinnunen, U., Vermulst, A., Gerris, J., & Mäkikangas, A. (2003). Work-family conflict and its relations to well-being: the role of personality as a moderating factor. *Personality and Individual Differences, 35,* 1669-1683.

Koeske, G. F., & Krowinski, W. J. (2004). Gender-based salary inequity in social work: Mediators of gender's effect on salary. *Social Work, 49,* 309-317.

Konopaske, R., Werner, S. (2002). Equity in non-North American contexts: Adapting equity theory to the new global business environment. *Human Resource Management Review, 12,* 405-418.

Konovsky, M. A., & Organ, D. W. (1996). Dispositional and contextual determinants of organizational citizenship behavior. *Journal of Organizational Behavior, 17,* 253-266.

Kossek, E. E., & Lambert, S. J. (2005). "Work-family scholarship:" Voice and context. In E. E. Kossek & S. J. Lambert (Eds.), *Work and life integration: organizational, cultural, and individual perspectives* (pp.3-17). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.

Kossek, E. E., & Ozeki, C. (1988). Work-family conflict, policies and the job-life satisfaction relationship: A review and directions for the organizational behavior-human resource research. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 31,* 56-77.

Kurpius, S. E. R., Fuqua, D. R., Gibson, G., Kurpius, D. J., Froehle, T. C. (1995). An occupational analysis of consulting psychology: Results of a national survey. *Consulting Psychology Journal: Practice and Research, 47*(2), 75-88.

Lambert, S. (1991). Processes linking work and family: A critical review and research agenda. *Human Relations, 43,* 239-257.

Landy, F. S., & Becker, W. S. (1987). Motivation theory reconsidered. *Research in Organizational Behavior, 9,* 1-38.

Licht, M. H. (1995). Multiple regression and correlation. In L. G. Grimm & P. R. Yarnold (Eds.), *Reading and understanding multivariate statistics* (pp. 19-64). Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.

Little, B. R. (1972). Psychologist man as scientist, humanist, and specialist. *Journal of Experimental Research in Personality, 6,* 95-118.

Lobel, S. A. (1991). Allocation of investment in work and family roles: Alternative theories and implications for research. *Academy of Management Review,16,* 507-521.

Locke, E. A., & Latham, G. P. (2004). What should we do about motivation theory? Six recommendations for the twenty-first century. *Academy of Management Review, 29,* 388-403.

MacEwen, K. E., & Barling, J. (1994). Daily consequences of work interference with family and family interference with work. *Work & Stress, 8,* 244-254.

MacKinnon, D. W. (1944). The structure of personality. In J. McV. Hunt (Ed.), *Personality the behavior disorders* (Vol I., pp. 4-43). New York: Ronald.

Magnus, K., Diener, E., Fujita, F., & Pavot, W. (1993). Extraversion and neuroticism as predictors of objective life events: A longitudinal analysis. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 65,* 1046-1053.

Marks, S. R. (1977). Multiple roles and role strain: Some notes on human energy, time, and commitment. *American Sociological Review, 42,* 921-936.

McCrae, R. R., & Costa, P. T., Jr. (1985). Updating Norman's "adequate taxonomy": Intelligence and personality dimensions in natural language and in questionnaires. *Journal of Personality & Social Psychology, 49,* 710-721.

McDougall, W. (1932). Of the words character and personality. *Character Personality, 1,* 3-16.

Mesmer-Magnus, J. R., & Viswesvaran, C. (2005). Convergence between measures of work-to-family and family-to-work conflict: A meta-analytic examination. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 67*, 215-232.

Miles, E. W., Hatfield, J. D., Huseman, R. C. (1994) Equity sensitivity and outcome importance. *Journal of Organizational Behavior, 15*, 585-596.

Millon, T., & Davis, R. D. (1996). *Disorders of personality: DSM-IV and beyond*. New York: John Wiley & Sons.

Morrison, E. W., & Robinson, S. L. (1997). When employees feel betrayed: A model of how psychological contract violation develops. *Academy of Management Review, 22*, 226-256.

Mowday, R. T. (1991). Equity theory predictions of behavior in organizations. In R. M. Steers & L.W. Porter (Eds.), *Motivation and work behavior* (pp. 111-131) (5th ed.). New York: McGraw-Hill.

National Academy of Sciences, Committee on Occupational Classification and Analysis. (1981). DICTIONARY OF OCCUPATIONAL TITLES (DOT): PART I - CURRENT POPULATION SURVEY, APRIL 1971, AUGMENTED WITH DOT CHARACTERISTICS, AND PART II - FOURTH EDITION DICTIONARY OF DOT SCORES FOR 1970 CENSUS CATEGORIES [Computer file]. Washington, DC: U.S. Dept. of Commerce, Bureau of the Census [producer], 1970. Ann Arbor, MI: Inter-university Consortium for Political and Social Research [distributor].

Netemeyer, R. G., Boles, J. S., & McMurrian, R. (1996). Development and validation of work-family conflict and family-work conflict scales. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 81*, 400-410.

Neuman,G. A., & Wright, J. (1999). Team effectiveness: Beyond skills and cognitive ability. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 84*, 376-389.

Norman, W. T. (1963). Toward an adequate taxonomy of personality attributes: Replicated actors structure in peer nomination personality ratings. *Journal of Abnormal & Social Psychology, 66*, 574-583.

Ostrove, J. M., & Adler, N. E. (1998) The relationship of socio-economic status, labor force participation, and health among men and women. *Journal of Health Psychology, 3*, 451-463.

Pearce, C. L., Sims, H. P., Cox, J. F., Ball, G., Schnell, E., Smith, K. A., & Trevino, L. (2002). Transactors, transformers and beyond: A multi-method development of a theoretical typology of leadership. *Journal of Management Development, 22*, 273-307.

Poelmans, S., Stepanova, O., & Masuda, A. (2008). Positive spillover between personal and professional life: Definitions, antecedents, consequences, and strategies. In K. Korabik, D. S. Lero, and D. L. Whitehead (Eds.), *Handbook of work-family integration: Research, theory, and best practices* (pp. 141-156). New York: Academic Press.

Raja, U., Johns, G., & Ntalianis, F. (2004). The impact of personality on psychological contracts. *Academy of Management Journal, 47*, 350-367.

Robinson, F. P. (1964). Counseling psychology since the Northwestern conference. In A. S. Thompson & D. E. Super (Eds.), *The professional preparation of counseling psychologists: Report of the 1964 Greyston Conference*. (pp.35-42). New York: Columbia University, Teacher's College.

Rogers, S. J., & May, D. C. (2003). Spillover between marital quality and job satisfaction: long-term patterns and gender differences. *Journal of Marriage and Family, 65*, 482-495.

Rotter, J. B. (1966). Generalized expectancies for internal versus external control of reinforcement. *Psychological Monographs, 80* (1, Whole no. 609).

Rousseau, D. M. (1989). Psychological and implied contracts in organizations. *Employee Responsibilities and Rights Journal, 2*, 121-139.

Roxburgh, S. (1999). Exploring the work and family relationship: Gender differences in the influence of parenthood and social support on job satisfaction. *Journal of Family Issues, 20*, 771-788.

Salgado, J. F. (2002). The big five personality dimensions and counterproductive behaviors. *International Journal of Selection and Assessment, 10*, 117-125.

Sampson, E. E. (1980). Justice and social character. In G. Mikula (Ed.), *Justice and social interaction*. Bern: Hans Huber.

Saucier, G., & Goldberg, L. R. (2002). Assessing the big five: Applications of 10 psychometric criteria to the development of marker scales. In B. de Raad & M. Perugini (Eds.), *Big five assessment* (pp. 30-54). Ashland, OH: Hogrefe & Huber Publishers.

Sauley K. S., & Bedeian, A. G. (2000). Equity sensitivity: construction of a measure and examination of its psychometric properties. *Journal of Management, 26*, 885-910.

Scheer, L. K., Kumar, N., & Steenkamp, J. E. M. (2003). Reactions to perceived inequity in U.S. and Dutch interorganizational relationships. *Academy of Management Journal*, 46, 303-316.

Schoenmann, P. H. (1990). Facts, fictions, and common-sense about factors and components. *Multivariate Behavioral Research, 25*, 47-51.

Shadish, W. R., Jr., & Sweeney, R. B. (1991). Mediators and moderators in meta-analysis: There's a reason we don't let Dodo birds tell us which psychotherapies should have prizes. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 59*, 883-893.

Shore, L. M., & Martin, H. J. (1989). Job satisfaction and organizational commitment in relation to work performance and turnover intentions. *Human Relations, 42*, 625-638.

Shore, T. H., & Strauss, J. (2008). Measurement of equity sensitivity: A comparison of the equity sensitivity instrument and equity preference questionnaire. *Psychological Reports, 102*, 64-78.

Siegel, P. H., Schraeder, M., & Morrison, R. (2008). A taxonomy of equity factors. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 38*, 61-75.

Smith, P. B., & Bond, M. H. (1999). *Social psychology across cultures*. Needham Heights, MA: Allyn & Bacon.

Spector, P. (1982). Behavior in organizations as a function of employees' locus of control. *Psychological Bulletin, 91*, 482-497.

Sprecher, S. (1986). The relationship between inequity and emotions in close relationships. *Social Psychology Quarterly, 49*, 309-321.

Sprecher, S. (2001). Equity and social exchange in dating couples: associations with satisfaction, commitment, and stability. *Journal of Marriage and Family, 63*, 599-613.

Staw, B. M., Bell, N. E., & Clausen, J. A. (1986). The dispositional approach to job attitudes: A lifetime longitudinal test. *Administrative Science Quarterly, 31*, 56-77.

Steel, R. P., & Rentsch, J. R. (1997). The dispositional model of job attitudes revisited: Findings of a 10-year study. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 82*, 873-879.

Steiner, D. D. (2001). Cultural influences on perceptions of distributive and procedural justice. In S. Gilliland, D. Steiner, & D. Skarlicki (Eds.), *Theoretical and cultural perspectives on organizational justice* (pp. 111-138). Greenwich, CT: Information Age.

Stewart, G. L., & Barrick, M. R. (2004). Four lessons learned from the person-situation debate: A review and research agenda. In B. Schneider & D. B. Smith (Eds.), *Personality and organizations*. (pp. 61-85). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates Publishers.

Super, D. E. (1990). A life-span, life-space approach to career development. In D. Brown, L. Brooks, & Associates (Eds.), *Career choice and development* (2nd ed.). San Francisco: Josey-Bass.

Tajfel, H. (1978). Social categorization, social identity, and social comparison. In H. Tajfel (Ed.), *Differentiation between social groups* (pp.61-76). London: Academic Press.

Taris, T. W., Kalimo, R., & Schaufeli, W. B. (2002). Inequity at work: its measurement and association with worker health. *Work and Stress, 16*, 287-301.

Tavris, C., & Wade, C. (1997). *Psychology in perspective*. (2nd ed.). New York: Longman.

Thatcher, S. M. B., & Zhu, X. (2006). Changing identities in a changing workplace: Identification, identity enactment, self-verification, and telecommuting. *Academy of Management Review, 31*, 1076-1088.

Thibaut, J., & Kelley, H. H. (1959). *The social psychology of groups*. New York: Wiley.

Thompson, A. S., & Super, D. E. (Eds). (1964). *The professional preparation of counseling psychologists: Report of the 1964 Greyston Conference*. New York: Columbia University, Teacher's College.

Tjosvold, D. (2008). The conflict-positive organization: it depends on us. *Journal of Organizational Behavior, 29*, 19-28.

Triandis, H. C. (2002). Motivation to work in cross-cultural perspective. In J. M. Brett & F. Drasgow (Eds.), *The Psychology of Work: Theoretically Based Empirical Research* (pp. 101-118). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates Publishers

Trompenaars, F., & Hampden-Turner, C. (1997). *Riding the waves of culture* (2nd ed.). London: Nicholas Brealey Publishing.

Tupes, E. C., & Christal, R. E. (1961). Recurrent personality factors based on trait ratings. *United States Air Force Aeronautical Systems Division Technical Report* (No. 61-97).

Turner, J. C. (1987). *Rediscovering the social group: A self-categorization theory*. New York: Basil Blackwell, Inc.

Tyler, L. E. (1961). *The work of the counselor* (2nd ed). New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, Inc.

Ueleke, W. (1983). Inequity resolving behavior as a response to inequity in a hypothetical marital relationship. *Psychology: A Journal of Human Behavior, 20*, 4-8.

United States Census Bureau. (2009). We asked…you told us: Work experience in 1989. Retrieved January 23, 2009 from: http://www.census.gov/apsd/cqc/cqc23.pdf.

United States Bureau of Labor Statistics. (2009). Labor force statistics from the current population survey. Retrieved January 20, 2009 from: http://www.bls.gov/cps/tables.htm#charemp.

Valcour, P. M., & Hunter, L. W. (2005). Technology, organizations, and work-life integration. In E. E. Kossek and S. J. Lambert (Eds.), *Work and life integration: Organizational, cultural, and individual perspectives* (pp. 61-84). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum Associates.

Vogl-Bauer, S., Kalbfleisch, P. J., & Beatty, M. J. (1999). Perceived equity, satisfaction, and relational maintenance strategies in parent-adolescent dyads. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence 28*, 27-49.

Walster, E., Berschedi, E., & Walster, G.W. (1973). New directions in equity research. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *25*, 151-176.

Watson, D., & Hubbard, B. (1996). Adaptational style and dispositional structure: Coping in the context of the five-factor model. *Journal of Personality, 64*, 737-774.

Wayne, J. H., Musisca, N., & Fleeson, W. (2004). Considering the role of personality in the work-family experience: Relationships of the big five to work-family conflict and facilitation. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 64*, 108-130.

Winter, D. G. (2005). Things I've learned about personality from studying political leaders at a distance. *Journal of Personality, 73*, 557-584.

Witt, L. A., & Carlson, D. S. (2006). The work-family interface and job performance: Moderating effects of conscientiousness and perceived organizational support. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology, 11*, 343-357.

Yamaguchi, I. (2003). The relationships among individual differences, needs and equity sensitivity. *Journal of Managerial Psychology, 18*, 324-344.

Zhao, H., & Siebert, S. E. (2006). The Big Five personality dimensions and entrepreneurial status: A meta-analytic review. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 91*, 259-271.

Table 1

Pearson Correlation Matrix among Dependent and Independent Variables

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
1. Perceived Inequity at Work	-						
2. Perceived Inequity in S/P Relationship	.173**	-					
3. Family-to-Work Conflict	.171**	.378**	-				
4. External Locus of Control	.334**	.263**	.279**	-			
5. Internal Locus of Control	-.232**	-.141**	-.156**	-.426**	-		
6. Neuroticism	.264**	.238**	.329**	.416**	-.238**	-	
7. Conscientiousness	-.184**	-.120**	-.201**	-.289**	.233**	-.187**	-

*$p < .05$, **$p < .01$, ***$p < .001$

Table 2

*Factor Loadings and Communalities Based on a Principal Components Analysis with Varimax Rotation for 20 Items from the "Work" Section of the MIDUS Self Administered Questionnaire (SAQ) (*N = *1582)*

Rotated Component Matrix[a]					
	Component				Communalities
	1	2	3	4	
Work intensively	-.066	.585	.250	.126	.425
Learn new things at work	.228	.242	.487	-.084	.355
Work demands high skill	.225	.424	.564	-.083	.555
Initiate things at work	.587	.357	.279	-.026	.551
Have choice how to work	.768	.155	.151	-.139	.656
Have choice what to do at work	.816	.096	.075	-.079	.687
Make decisions at work	.806	.051	.163	-.192	.715
Plan work environment	.719	.169	.114	-.186	.570
Work interests you	.485	.081	.490	-.285	.563
Work demands hard to combine	.171	.674	.144	.041	.506
Too many demands at job	.074	.799	.004	.083	.651
Control time for tasks at job	.615	-.235	.180	-.024	.466
Time to get job tasks done	.120	-.717	.168	.110	.575
Lots of interruption at job	.154	.623	-.018	.048	.415
Feel cheated about job chances	-.153	.155	-.092	.739	.602
Feel pride for my job	.173	-.051	.770	-.223	.674
Others respect my job	.152	-.139	.734	-.230	.634
Others have more rewarding job	-.139	-.040	-.204	.729	.594
Have as good job opp as others	.104	.022	.346	-.501	.383
Others have better job than I do	-.122	.068	-.080	.808	.679

a. Rotation converged in 6 iterations

Table 3

*Factor Loadings and Communalities Based on a Principal Components Analysis with Varimax Rotation for 19 items from the "Family" Section of the MIDUS Self Administered Questionnaire (SAQ) (*N = *1154)*

Rotated Component Matrix[a]				
	Component			Communalities
	1	2	3	
S/P cares about you	.682	.313	-.041	.565
S/P understands you	.640	.495	-.042	.657
S/P appreciates you	.630	.508	-.070	.660
S/P can be relied on	.724	.328	-.095	.641
S/P open to talk	.714	.375	-.051	.653
S/P can relax with	.660	.378	-.020	.580
S/P makes many demands	.164	.714	.-044	.538
S/P makes you feel tense	.295	.766	-.036	.675
S/P argues with you	.143	.773	.208	.661
S/P criticizes you	.243	.765	.173	.674
S/P lets you down	.355	.628	-.164	.548
S/P gets on your nerves	.289	.731	-.065	.622
Who does more HH chores	-.175	-.214	.827	.760
How fair is HH chores to you	.313	.447	-.180	.331
How fair is HH chores to S/P	.106	.185	.698	.533
Make decision w/ S/P as a team	.762	.294	.009	.667
Talk w/ S/P make things better	.771	.286	-.003	.676
Talk w/ S/P before making plans	.807	.066	.019	.655
Ask S/P for advice before decision	.814	.058	.031	.667

a. Rotation converged in 6 iterations

Table 4

Descriptive Statistics for Continuous Control Variables of Age and Household Income

Variable	N	Min.	Max.	Mean	Std. Dev.	Skewness	Kurtosis
Age	1734	24	65	42.56	10.36	.141	-.967
Household Income	1734	0	300,000	57,204	44,704	2.347	7.491

Table 5

Frequency Table of Gender of Respondents

Gender of Respondent				
	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Male	881	50.8	50.8	50.8
Female	853	49.2	49.2	100.00
Total	1734	100.0	100.0	

Table 6

Descriptive Statistics for Dependent Variable and Independent Variables

Variable	N	Min.	Max.	Mean	Std. Dev.	Skewness	Kurtosis
Perceived Inequity at Work	1650	1	4	1.81	.667	.322	-.432
Perceived Inequity in S/P Rel.	1183	1	4	2.18	.605	.476	.018
Family-to-Work Conflict	1630	1	5	2.09	.632	.369	.711
Internal Locus of Control	1723	1	6.75	2.59	1.169	.740	.020
External Locus of Control	1723	1	7	5.89	.973	-1.279	2.059
Neuroticism	1729	1	4	2.24	.662	.233	-.380
Conscientiousness	1729	1	4	3.43	.443	-.829	.807

Table 7

Frequency Table of Respondents' Race

		Race			
		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
	White	1467	84.6	86.3	86.3
	Black/African American	123	7.1	7.2	93.6
	Native American/ Aleutian Islander/Eskimo	13	.7	.8	94.3
	Asian or Pacific Islander	21	1.2	1.2	95.6
	Other	62	3.6	3.6	99.2
	Multiracial	13	.7	.8	100.0
	Total	1699	98.0	100.0	
Missing	System	35	2.0		
Total		1734	100		

Table 8

Frequency Table of Respondents' Region of Ancestry/Ethnicity

		Ethnicity			
		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
	Europe	950	54.8	55.3	55.3
	Native American	103	5.9	6.0	61.3
	Latin/South America	54	3.1	3.1	64.5
	Asia	17	1.0	1.0	65.5
	Africa	66	3.8	3.8	69.3
	Middle East	12	.7	.7	70.0
	North America/Non-Hispanic	24	1.4	1.5	71.5
	Other/Don't Know	490	28.3	28.5	100.0
	Total	1717	99.0	100.0	
Missing	System	17	1.0		
Total		1734	100		

Table 9

Frequency Table of Respondents Married or Living with Someone

Married or Living with Someone				
	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Yes	1181	68.1	68.1	68.1
No	553	31.9	31.9	100.00
Total	1734	100.0	100.0	

Table 10

Frequency Table of Respondents with Children Under 18

Any Children Under 18				
	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
No	945	54.5	54.5	54.5
Yes	789	45.5	45.5	100.00
Total	1734	100.0	100.0	

Table 11

Frequency Table of Respondents' Marital Status

Marital Status				
	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Married	1083	62.5	62.5	62.5
Separated	60	3.5	3.5	65.9
Divorced	306	17.6	17.6	83.6
Widowed	48	2.8	2.8	86.3
Never Married	237	13.7	13.7	100.00
Total	1734	100.0	100.0	

Table 12

Frequency Table of Respondents' Level of Education

Level of Education				
	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
No School/Some Grade School	5	.3	.3	.3
8th Grade/ Junior High School	15	.9	.9	1.2
Some High School	82	4.7	4.7	5.9
GED	25	1.4	1.4	7.3
Graduated from High School	468	27.0	27.0	34.3
1-2 Years of College, No Degree	332	19.1	19.1	53.5
3+ Years of College, No Degree	92	5.3	5.3	58.8
Graduate of 2 Yr. College, Vocational School, or Associate's	134	7.7	7.7	66.5
Graduate of 4 Yr. College or Bachelor's	340	19.6	19.6	86.1
Some Graduate School	49	2.8	2.8	88.9
Master's Degree	140	8.1	8.1	97.0
PhD, EdD, MD, DDS, LLB, LLD, JD or other Professional Degree	52	3.0	3.0	100.0
Total	1734	100.0	100.0	

Table 13

Frequency Table of Respondents' Occupational Categories

Occupational Categories					
		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
	Professional, Technical, Managerial	212	12.2	12.5	12.5
	Clerical and Sales	62	3.6	3.6	16.1
	Service Occupations	158	9.1	9.3	25.4
	Agricultural, Fishery, Forestry, and Related Occupations	143	8.2	8.4	33.8
	Processing Occupations	98	5.7	5.8	39.6
	Machines Trades Occupations	151	8.7	8.9	48.4
	Benchwork Occupations	233	13.4	13.7	62.1
	Structural Work Occupations	535	30.9	31.5	93.6
	Misc. Occupations	109	6.3	6.4	100.0
	Total	1701	98.1	100.0	
Missing	System	33	1.9		
Total		1734	100.0		

Table 14
Coefficients from the Hierarchical Regression Analysis Predicting Perceived Inequity at Work from Perceived Inequity in the Spousal/Partner Relationship

		b	SE b	β
Block 1				
	Constant	2.176	.167	
	M1 Age	-.005	.002	-.076*
	Gender	.041	.038	.031
	Married or Living with someone	-.060	.112	-.016
	Children Under 18	.084	.041	.064
	Income	-3.477E-6	.000	-.253***
Block 2				
	Constant	2.219	.185	
	M1 Age	-.006	.002	-.091**
	Gender	.039	.038	.030
	Married or Living with someone	-.046	.141	-.012
	Children Under 18	.066	.043	.051
	Income	-3.470E-6	.000	-.252***
	Marital Status	-.146	.102	-.046
Block 3				
	Constant	2.273	.189	
	M1 Age	-.007	.002	-.113***
	Gender	.031	.038	.024
	Married or Living with someone	.015	.142	.004
	Children Under 18	.052	.042	.040
	Income	-2.767E-6	.000	-.201***
	Marital Status	-.154	.102	-.048
	Education	-.370	.118	-.096**
Block 4				
	Constant	2.260	.189	
	M1 Age	-.007	.002	-.106**
	Gender	.037	.038	.028
	Married or Living with someone	.002	.142	.000
	Children Under 18	.062	.042	.048
	Income	-2.751E-6	.000	-.200***
	Marital Status	-.148	.102	-.046
	Education	-.400	.119	-.103***
	Race	-.109	.220	-.014
Block 5				

	Constant	2.130	.202	
	M1 Age	-.007	.002	-.103**
	Gender	.036	.042	.027
	Married or Living with someone	-.002	.142	.000
	Children Under 18	.069	.043	.053
	Income	-2.701E-6	.000	-.196***
	Marital Status	-.158	.101	-.050
	Education	-.348	.123	-.090**
	Race	-.107	.221	-.014
	Occupation	.060	.083	.042
Block 6				
	Constant	1.836	.207	
	M1 Age	-.007	.002	-.107***
	Gender	.006	.042	.005
	Married or Living with someone	-.007	.140	-.002
	Children Under 18	.029	.043	.023
	Income	-2.688E-6	.000	-.195***
	Marital Status	-.147	.100	-.046
	Education	-.350	.122	-.091**
	Race	-.146	.218	-.019
	Occupation	.055	.082	.038
	Perceived Inequity in S/P rel.	.172	.032	.158***
Block 7				
	Constant	1.805	.205	
	M1 Age	-.006	.002	-.100**
	Gender	.035	.042	.027
	Married or Living with someone	-.014	.139	-.004
	Children Under 18	.031	.042	.024
	Income	-2.592E-6	.000	-.188***
	Marital Status	-.151	.099	-.048
	Education	-.373	.121	-.097**
	Race	-.095	.216	-.012
	Occupation	.076	.082	.053
	Perceived Inequity in S/P rel.	.458	.070	.420***
	Inequity in S/P X Conscientiousness	-.002	.073	.000

Note: R^2 = . 09 for Block 1; Δ R^2 = .003 for Block 2; Δ R^2 = .024*** for Block 3; Δ R^2 = .010* for Block 4; Δ R^2 = .013* for Block 5; Δ R^2 = .023*** for Block 6; Δ R^2 = .000 for Block 7; *p < .05, **p < .01, ***p < .001

Table 15
Coefficients from the Hierarchical Regression Analysis Predicting Perceived Inequity at Work from Family-to-Work Conflict

		b	SE b	β
Block 1				
	Constant	2.282	.108	
	M1 Age	-.008	.002	-.118***
	Gender	.016	.033	.012
	Married or Living with someone	.003	.038	.002
	Children Under 18	.046	.035	.035
	Income	-3.540E-6	.000	-.237***
Block 2				
	Constant	2.151	.127	
	M1 Age	-.007	.002	-.107***
	Gender	.024	.033	.018
	Married or Living with someone	.103	.076	.072
	Children Under 18	.047	.038	.036
	Income	-3.578E-6	.000	-.240***
	Marital Status	-.062	.082	-.032
Block 3				
	Constant	1.758	.464	
	M1 Age	-.008	.002	-.127***
	Gender	.020	.033	.015
	Married or Living with someone	.151	.076	.106*
	Children Under 18	.030	.038	.023
	Income	-2.792E-6	.000	-.187***
	Marital Status	-.059	.082	-.030
	Education	-.024	.455	-.006
Block 4				
	Constant	1.733	.467	
	M1 Age	-.008	.002	-.124***
	Gender	.023	.033	.018
	Married or Living with someone	.150	.076	.105*
	Children Under 18	.033	.038	.025
	Income	-2.767E-6	.000	-.186***
	Marital Status	-.057	.082	-.029
	Education	-.031	.457	-.008
	Race	-.005	.176	.000

Block 5				
	Constant	1.615	.468	
	M1 Age	-.007	.002	-.113***
	Gender	.035	.035	.026
	Married or Living with someone	.150	.076	.105*
	Children Under 18	.035	.038	.027
	Income	-2.777E-6	.000	-.186***
	Marital Status	-.058	.081	-.030
	Education	-.031	.454	-.008
	Race	.021	.175	.003
	Occupation	.059	.069	.041
Block 6				
	Constant	1.173	.466	
	M1 Age	-.005	.002	-.085**
	Gender	.017	.035	.013
	Married or Living with someone	.146	.075	.102
	Children Under 18	-.002	.038	-.001
	Income	-2.786E-6	.000	-.187***
	Marital Status	-.037	.080	-.019
	Education	-.042	.448	-.011
	Race	.038	.173	.005
	Occupation	.069	.068	.049
	Family-to-work conflict	.178	.026	.170***
Block 7				
	Constant	1.081	.463	
	M1 Age	-.005	.002	-.084**
	Gender	.040	.035	.030
	Married or living with someone	.136	.074	.095*
	Children Under 18	-.003	.038	-.002
	Income	-2.652E-6	.000	-.178***
	Marital Status	-.039	.080	-.020
	Education	.040	.445	.010
	Race	.065	.172	.009
	Occupation	.076	.068	.054
	Family-to-work conflict	.422	.057	.402***
	FWC X Conscientiousness	-.051	.054	.022

Note: R^2 = . 08 for Block 1; Δ R^2 = .003 for Block 2; Δ R^2 = .028*** for Block 3; Δ R^2 = .001 for Block 4; Δ R^2 = .017*** for Block 5; Δ R^2 = .026*** for Block 6; Δ R^2 = .001 for Block 7; *p < .05, **p < .01, ***p < .001

Table 16
Coefficients from the Hierarchical Regression Analysis Predicting Perceived Inequity at Work from Internal Locus of Control and External Locus of Control

		b	SE b	β
Block 1				
	Constant	2.297	.108	
	M1 Age	-.008	.002	-.118***
	Gender	.012	.033	.009
	Married or Living with someone	.004	.038	.003
	Children Under 18	.043	.035	.032
	Income	-3.611E-6	.000	-.241***
Block 2				
	Constant	2.152	.127	
	M1 Age	-.007	.002	-.105***
	Gender	.022	.033	.016
	Married or Living with someone	.108	.076	.075
	Children Under 18	.048	.038	.036
	Income	-3.649E-6	.000	-.244***
	Marital Status	-.053	.082	-.027
Block 3				
	Constant	1.753	.464	
	M1 Age	-.008	.002	-.125***
	Gender	.015	.033	.012
	Married or Living with someone	.155	.076	.108*
	Children Under 18	.029	.038	.022
	Income	-2.864E-6	.000	-.191***
	Marital Status	-.049	.081	-.025
	Education	-.016	.455	-.004
Block 4				
	Constant	1.734	.467	
	M1 Age	-.008	.002	-.122***
	Gender	.018	.033	.014
	Married or Living with someone	.154	.076	.107*
	Children Under 18	.032	.038	.024
	Income	-2.842E-6	.000	-.190***
	Marital Status	-.047	.081	-.024

	Education	-.026	.458	-.007
	Race	-.009	.176	-.001
Block 5				
	Constant	1.601	.469	
	M1 Age	-.007	.002	-.111***
	Gender	.027	.035	.020
	Married or Living with someone	.157	.075	.109*
	Children Under 18	.034	.038	.025
	Income	-2.842E-6	.000	-.190***
	Marital Status	-.050	.081	-.025
	Education	-.022	.455	-.006
	Race	.019	.176	.003
	Occupation	.070	.068	.049
Block 6				
	Constant	1.790	.468	
	M1 Age	-.009	.002	-.144***
	Gender	-.008	.033	-.006
	Married or Living with someone	.120	.071	.083
	Children Under 18	-.012	.036	-.009
	Income	-2.575E-6	.000	-.172***
	Marital Status	-.054	.076	-.028
	Education	.153	.430	.039
	Race	-.024	.166	-.003
	Occupation	.070	.064	.049
	External locus of control	.140	.015	.244***
	Internal locus of control	-.089	.017	-.129***

Note: R^2 = . 08 for Block 1; ΔR^2 = .004 for Block 2; ΔR^2 = .028*** for Block 3; ΔR^2 = .001 for Block 4; ΔR^2 = .016*** for Block 5; ΔR^2 = .096*** for Block 6; *p < .05, **p < .01, ***p < .001

Table 16
Coefficients from the Hierarchical Regression Analysis Predicting Perceived Inequity at Work From Neuroticism and Conscientiousness

		b	SE b	β
Block 1				
	Constant	2.291	.108	
	M1 Age	-.008	.002	-.119***
	Gender	.015	.033	.011
	Married or Living with someone	.004	.038	.003
	Children Under 18	.048	.035	.036
	Income	-3.559E-6	.000	-.238***
Block 2				
	Constant	2.150	.127	
	M1 Age	-.007	.002	-.107***
	Gender	.023	.033	.018
	Married or Living with someone	.106	.076	.074
	Children Under 18	.052	.038	.039
	Income	-3.598E-6	.000	-.240***
	Marital Status	-.056	.082	-.029
Block 3				
	Constant	1.751	.464	
	M1 Age	-.008	.002	-.125***
	Gender	.018	.033	.014
	Married or Living with someone	.153	.076	.106*
	Children Under 18	.035	.038	.026
	Income	-2.814E-6	.000	-.188***
	Marital Status	-.050	.081	-.026
	Education	-.033	.455	-.008
Block 4				
	Constant	1.731	.467	
	M1 Age	-.008	.002	-.122***
	Gender	.021	.033	.016
	Married or Living with someone	.152	.076	.106*
	Children Under 18	.038	.038	.028
	Income	-2.790E-6	.000	-.186***
	Marital Status	-.049	.082	-.025
	Education	-.042	.458	-.011
	Race	-.010	.176	-.001
Block 5				

	Constant	1.604	.469	
	M1 Age	-.007	.002	-.111***
	Gender	.030	.035	.023
	Married or Living with someone	.154	.075	.107*
	Children Under 18	.039	.038	.029
	Income	-2.791E-6	.000	-.186***
	Marital Status	-.052	.081	-.027
	Education	-.040	.455	-.010
	Race	.018	.176	.002
	Occupation	.066	.068	.047
Block 6				
	Constant	1.418	.468	
	M1 Age	-.005	.002	-.075**
	Gender	.014	.035	.011
	Married or Living with someone	.138	.073	.096
	Children Under 18	.025	.036	.019
	Income	-2.711E-6	.000	-.181***
	Marital Status	-.066	.078	-.034
	Education	.233	.440	.060
	Race	.074	.170	.010
	Occupation	.076	.066	.053
	Neuroticism	.205	.024	.203***
	Conscientiousness	-.183	.036	-.123***

Note: R^2 = . 08 for Block 1; Δ R^2 = .004 for Block 2; Δ R^2 = .028*** for Block 3; Δ R^2 = .001 for Block 4; Δ R^2 = .016*** for Block 5; Δ R^2 = .096*** for Block 6; *p < .05, **p < .01, ***p < .001

Table 17
ANOVA for Differences Between Racial Groups on Perceived Inequity at Work

	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F
Between Groups	1.898	5	.380	.853
Within Groups	718.959	1615	.445	
Total	720.857	1620		

Table 18
Independent T-Test of Perceived Inequity at Work by Racial Group

	Perceived Inequity at Work				
Group	*M*	*SD*	*t*	*df*	*p*
White (*N* = 1407)	1.80	.661	-1.819	1619	.069
Non-White (*N* = 214)	1.89	.703			

*$p < .05$, **$p < .01$, ***$p < .001$

Table 20
ANOVA for Differences Between Ethnic Groups on Perceived Inequity at Work

	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F
Between Groups	4.265	7	.609	1.372
Within Groups	721.643	1624	.444	
Total	725.908	1632		

*$p < .05$

Table 21
Independent T-Test of Perceived Inequity at Work by Ethnic Group

	Perceived Inequity at Work				
Group	*M*	*SD*	*t*	*df*	*p*
European (*N* = 916)	1.77	.665	-2.564	1631	.010**
Non-European (*N* = 717)	1.86	.667			

*$p < .05$, **$p < .01$, ***$p < .001$

Table 22
ANOVA for Differences Between Racial Groups on Perceived Inequity in Spousal/Partner Relationship

	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F
Between Groups	2.900	5	.580	.1.598
Within Groups	422.247	1163	.363	
Total	425.147	1168		

Table 23
Independent T-Test of Perceived Inequity in Spousal/Partner Relationship by Racial Group

	Perceived Inequity at Work				
Group	*M*	*SD*	*t*	*df*	*p*
White (*N* = 1035)	2.17	.591	-1.236	1619	.165
Non-White (*N* = 134)	12.25	.687			

Table 24
ANOVA for Differences Between Ethnic Groups on Perceived Inequity in the Spousal/Partner Relationship

	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F
Between Groups	1.283	7	.183	.497
Within Groups	428.585	1162	.369	
Total	429.867	1169		

Table 25
Independent T-Test of Perceived Inequity in the Spousal/Partner Relationship by Ethnic Group

	Perceived Inequity at Work				
Group	*M*	*SD*	*t*	*df*	*p*
European (*N* = 670)	2.17	.584	-.465	1168	.642
Non-European (*N* = 500)	2.19	.634			

Table 26
ANOVA for Differences Between Racial Groups on Family-to-Work Conflict

	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F
Between Groups	5.527	5	1.114	2.812*
Within Groups	632.112	1595	.396	
Total	637.684	1600		

*$p < .05$

Table 27
Independent T-Test of Family-to-Work Conflict by Racial Group

	Perceived Inequity at Work				
Group	*M*	*SD*	*t*	*df*	*p*
White (*N* = 1389)	2.11	.609	2.322	255	.021*
Non-White (*N* = 212)	1.99	.749			

*$p < .05$, **$p < .01$, ***$p < .001$

Table 28
ANOVA for Differences Between Ethnic Groups on Family-to-Work Conflict

	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F
Between Groups	6.6861	7	.980	2.468*
Within Groups	637.518	1605	.397	
Total	644.379	1612		

*$p < .05$

Table 29
Independent T-Test of Family-to-Work Conflict by Ethnic Group

	Perceived Inequity at Work				
Group	*M*	*SD*	*t*	*df*	*p*
European (*N* = 905)	2.14	.612	2.869	1611	.004**
Non-European (*N* = 708)	2.04	.653			

*$p < .05$, **$p < .01$, ***$p < .001$

LANAYA L. ETHINGTON, M.A.

706 24th St. Unit 1
Ames, IA 50010
H: (248) 767-6300
W: (515) 294-0163
lanaya@iastate.edu

EDUCATION:

Indiana University – Bloomington, IN **August 2004 - Present**
Ph.D., Counseling Psychology (anticipated May 2009)
Minor: Business/Organizational Management

Dublin City University – Dublin, Ireland **October 2001 – November 2002**
M.A., Intercultural Studies

University of Michigan – Ann Arbor, MI **September 1997 – April 2001**
B.A., Spanish and Psychology

CLINICAL EXPERIENCE:

IOWA STATE UNIVERSITY STUDENT COUNSELING SERVICE – AMES, IA
Predoctoral Intern **August 2008 – July 2009**
Training Supervisors: Ron Jackson, Ph.D., and Jon Brandon, Ph.D.

- Provided individual counseling for clients with a wide range of clinical issues, including sexual assault, mood disorders, anxiety disorders, personality disorders, adjustment disorders, eating disorders, and career concerns
- Co-facilitated four process groups: two interpersonal process groups, one trauma group, and one eating disorders group
- Conducted comprehensive individual and couples' screenings, including full DSM-IV diagnoses and recommendations for treatment
- Provided crisis counseling to walk-ins, carried an after-hours crisis phone intermittently during the year, and consulted with faculty, staff, and parents
- Received specialized training in the areas of administration at a college counseling center and eating disorders
- Provided supervision to two doctoral practicum students, participated in a supervision of supervision seminar, and received individual supervision from licensed psychologists
- Completed eating disorder and substance abuse assessments, which included diagnostic protocols, interpretations of standardized assessments, and recommendations for further treatment
- Conducted outreach with international students, athletes, and student groups around a variety of topics including adjustment, eating disorders, and career concerns

BLOOMINGTON HOSPITAL – BLOOMINGTON, IN
Advanced Practicum Counselor **May 2007 – September 2007**
Training Supervisors: Julie Chapin, Ph.D., H.S.P.P., and Donna Bard, Psy.D.

- Conducted comprehensive biopsychosocial reports for patients within 72 hours of their admission to the hospital

- Provided individual counseling services for patients with a wide range of clinical issues, including mood disorders, anxiety disorders, personality disorders, substance abuse, and sexual assault
- Facilitated a weekly psychotherapy group with patients on the Stress Care unit
- Held treatment team meetings with doctors, nurses, and patients to determine appropriate interventions and follow-up treatment upon discharge from the hospital
- Collaborated with patients' family members to assess functioning, gather additional information about previous and current psychological treatment, and complete biopsychosocial reports if patients were unable to provide information
- Consulted with other agencies regarding patients' treatment after discharge, including community mental health centers, substance abuse treatment programs, domestic violence shelters, and university counseling centers
- Participated in weekly individual supervision, as well as daily rounds with doctors and nurses

COUNSELING & PSYCHOLOGICAL SERVICES – INDIANA UNIVERSITY, BLOOMINGTON

Advanced Practicum Counselor **August 2006 – May 2007**

Training Supervisor: Andrew J. Shea, Ph.D., H.S.P.P

- Provided individual counseling services for undergraduate, graduate, and returning students with a wide range of clinical issues including mood disorders, anxiety disorders, personality disorders, adjustment disorders, eating disorders, substance abuse, sexual assault and academic/career concerns
- Conducted comprehensive intake sessions, including administration and interpretation of the OQ®-45.2 and full DSM-IV diagnoses
- Referred clients for psychiatric consultation and/or group counseling as needed
- Consulted with other agencies regarding client transfer of care when necessary
- Collaborated with group leaders as a process observer for an undergraduate interpersonal therapy group
- Participated in weekly individual and group supervision, as well as weekly clinical team meetings

CENTER FOR HUMAN GROWTH – INDIANA UNIVERSITY, BLOOMINGTON

Advanced Practicum Counselor **August 2005 – August 2006**

Training Supervisors: Thomas Sexton, Ph.D., A.B.P.P, and Kimberly Wagner, Ph.D.

- Provided individual and couples counseling services for both university students and the surrounding community population in a department training clinic
- Clients presented with a wide range of clinical issues including anxiety and mood distress, phase of life and identity development issues, relationship and marital problems, bereavement, and academic/career concerns
- Conducted comprehensive individual and couples' intake interviews, including administration and interpretation of the OQ®45-2
- Maintained weekly crisis and walk-in hours
- Consulted with university counseling center and other community agencies regarding client transfer of care when necessary, including outside referrals for psychiatric consultation
- Participated in campus outreach activities, including national screening days, and

community outreach programs to raise awareness of mental health issues
- Participated in weekly individual and group supervision, as well as weekly staff meetings

COUNSELING & PSYCHOLOGICAL SERVICES – INDIANA UNIVERSITY-PURDUE UNIVERSITY AT INDIANAPOLIS
Doctoral Practicum Counselor **January 2005 – August 2005**
Training Supervisors: Julia Lash, Ph.D., H.S.P.P, and John Sharp, Ed.D., H.S.P.P

- Provided individual counseling services for undergraduate, graduate, and returning students with a wide range of clinical issues, such as mood disorders, eating disorders, identity disorders, substance abuse, personality disorders, sexual assault, anxiety disorders, ADHD, developmental disorders, and academic/career concerns
- Conducted comprehensive individual and couples' intake sessions, including full DSM-IV diagnoses and administration and interpretation of the BDI, the BAI, and AUDIT when necessary
- Created goal-oriented treatment plans for clients seen more than three sessions
- Made referrals for psychiatric care as needed, and collaborated with on-staff psychiatrist to determine appropriate care
- Participated in campus outreach activities, including national screening days
- Consulted with other community agencies regarding client transfer of care when necessary
- Participated in weekly individual and group supervision, and made formal case presentations during staff meetings at least twice per semester

LARUE D. CARTER MEMORIAL HOSPITAL – INDIANAPOLIS, IN
Master's Level Group Practicum **January 2005 – April 2005**
Training Supervisor: Amy Oxley, L.M.H.C.

- Co-facilitated a psychoeducational group to prepare patients for reintegration into society upon discharge from the facility
- Collaborated with supervisor, nurses, and other interns to determine patients' level of functioning and appropriateness for the group

TEACHING EXPERIENCE:

DEPARTMENT OF COUNSELING AND EDUCATIONAL PSYCHOLOGY – INDIANA UNIVERSITY, BLOOMINGTON
Associate Instructor **August 2006 – May 2007, August 2007 – December 2007**
Supervisor: Jack Cummings, Ph.D.

- Taught three sections per academic year of G203: Communication in the Classroom
  - An undergraduate course primarily for education majors covering interpersonal communication skills, group dynamics, and multicultural issues
- Developed course syllabus, lectures, and teaching materials
- Utilized campus resources, such as the GLB Speaker's Bureau and Information and Technology Services to enhance the course
- Evaluated student performance through a midterm examination, essays and other written assignments, and a final group project and presentation

Teaching Assistant **January 2006 – May 2006**

Supervisor: Paul Toth, Ph.D.

- Assisted an adjunct professor with G532: Introduction to Group Counseling
  - A master's level course for counseling students covering theoretical approaches to group counseling and including an experiential component
- Led weekly small group exercises, and co-facilitated experiential component of the course
- Taught a complete class session on multicultural issues in group counseling

RESEARCH EXPERIENCE:

CENTER FOR ADOLESCENT AND FAMILY STUDIES – INDIANA UNIVERSITY, BLOOMINGTON

Research Assistant **January 2008 – August 2008**

Supervisor and Principal Investigator: Jeffrey A. Anderson, Ph.D.

- Assisted the principal investigator with an external evaluation of a federally funded mental health integration initiative at Indianapolis Public Schools
- Conducted interviews with IPS principals, program care coordinators, school psychologists, parents, and social workers
- Mined archival data to construct themes appropriate to the analysis
- Synthesized data from interviews, archives, and Department of Education statistics to prepare school-specific reports with a summary of progress and recommendations, as well as an overall annual report integrating information from all twelve schools with the program

DEPARTMENT OF COUNSELING AND EDUCATIONAL PSYCHOLOGY – INDIANA UNIVERSITY, BLOOMINGTON

Research Assistant **August 2005 – August 2007**

Supervisor: Charles R. Ridley, Ph.D.

- Collaborate in writing, preparing, and revising manuscripts for publication
  - Topics include positive psychology, cultural confrontation, and multicultural consultation
- Serve as the contact person for multi-authored documents when collaborating with faculty from other universities
- Prepare paperwork to be reviewed by the university's Institutional Review Board
- Design and disseminate a survey to examine how consultants incorporate cultural data into their practice

CENTER FOR ADOLESCENT AND FAMILY STUDIES – INDIANA UNIVERSITY, BLOOMINGTON

Research Team Member **August 2004 – August 2005**

Supervisor: Thomas L. Sexton, Ph.D., A.B.P.P.

- Collaborated with a Functional Family Therapy (FFT) site in Miami, FL, to obtain cultural data regarding clients in their system
- Helped create a database that included cells for desired cultural data, which was used to help modify the information collected at FFT sites
- Assisted in preparing the data for analysis of the effectiveness of FFT versus other

treatment programs (overall), and the effectiveness of FFT versus other treatment programs by ethnicity group

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN PSYCHOLOGY DEPARTMENT – ANN ARBOR, MI
Research Assistant **January 2000 – July 2001**
Supervisor: David G. Winter, Ph.D.

- Learned scoring procedure to measure motive imagery in documents and determine motive profiles
- Utilized time-series analysis to analyze motive imagery and its relation to escalation events during the Gulf War
- Used time-series analysis to analyze motive imagery in a measure of national mood and in the presidential speeches during the 2000 election
  - The relationship between the two motive profiles was examined in relation to the Gallop poll, the Dow Jones daily average, and the NASDAQ

PROFESSIONAL ACTIVITIES:

MIDWEST CROSSROADS-ALLIANCE FOR GRADUATE EDUCATION AND THE PROFESSORIATE (AGEP) – INDIANA UNIVERSITY, BLOOMINGTON
Emissary for Graduate Student Diversity **May 2007 – May 2008**
Program Director: Yolanda Treviño, Assistant Dean of Graduate Studies

- Member of the inaugural class of emissaries for graduate student diversity
- Participate in programs designed to recruit students from minority and underrepresented groups into graduate programs at Indiana University
- Make weekly contributions to the AGEP graduate emissary blog
- Correspond with prospective minority graduate students and answer questions about funding at Indiana University, life in Bloomington, and applying to graduate school

DEPARTMENT OF COUNSELING AND EDUCATIONAL PSYCHOLOGY – INDIANA UNIVERSITY, BLOOMINGTON
Doctoral Student Representative **September 2006 – September 2007**
Training Directors: Charles R. Ridley, Ph.D., and Rex Stockton, Ph.D.

- Elected by peers as doctoral student representative to the faculty of the counseling psychology program
- Primary duties included attendance and participation in monthly faculty meetings, providing a voice of the student body as a whole, and communicating to all doctoral students important and relevant items from the faculty meetings

DEPARTMENT OF COUNSELING AND EDUCATIONAL PSYCHOLOGY – INDIANA UNIVERSITY, BLOOMINGTON
Policy Committee Member **May 2006 – January 2007**
Chair: Charles R. Ridley, Ph.D.

- Primary member in the development and completion of the first and current working document of the counseling psychology program's policy statement
- Assisted in the development and revision of the document, including preamble, program values, operational guidelines, and accountability sections

OTHER WORK EXPERIENCE:

THE UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN PHYSICS DEPARTMENT
Financial Clerk III **June 2003 – June 2004**
Supervisor: Krista Farmer

- Reconciled 114 department accounts each month and made reports to the department chair, the business manager, and faculty members on the accounts
- Processed allocations of funding to accounts each fiscal year, and made projections of funding based on endowments
- Used People Soft on a daily basis to access grant information and to complete requisitions, purchase orders, and non-purchase order vouchers
- Utilized University software to run and create queries to manage accounts, such as payroll information, graduate student assistantships, and appointments on multiple accounts
- Reviewed and completed travel expense reports
- Assisted co-workers with reconciling accounts, creating an office-level work plan, and reviewing grant proposals

THE UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN OFFICE OF NEW STUDENT PROGRAMS
Information and Referral Assistant **March 2000 – September 2001**
Supervisor: Sarah Flynn

- Assisted in the scheduling of 6,000 incoming students for transfer, summer, and fall orientations
- Participated as a speaker in student panels during summer orientation sessions
- Verified and updated information in the New Student Handbook
- Collaborated with other departments at the University to improve orientation programming
- Compiled feedback regarding Parent Orientation for the Director of the program
- Provided customer service to students and parents and answered questions about the University

VOLUNTEER EXPERIENCE:

DOMESTIC VIOLENCE PROJECT/SAFE HOUSE – ANN ARBOR, MI
Crisis Line/Sexual Assault Response Team Volunteer **January 2003 – August 2004**

- Provided support to survivors of domestic violence on the crisis line
  - Volunteered on a weekly four-hour crisis line shift and a bimonthly overnight shift
- Served on the pilot Sexual Assault Response Team in Washtenaw County
  - Served on-call one day per week for a fifteen-hour shift
  - Provided advocacy to survivors of sexual assault in the hospital
  - Made referrals to legal services, if desired

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN HEALTH SYSTEM – ANN ARBOR, MI
Surgery Family Waiting Room Volunteer **April 2000 – December 2000**

- Volunteered on a weekly basis for a four-hour shift in the surgery waiting room
- Provided updates to families regarding patients' completion of surgery and transfer time to their rooms
- Directed doctors, interpreters, and phone calls to the appropriate families

AWARDS AND HONORS:

Chancellor's Fellowship Recipient – Indiana University	August 2004 – May 2008
Degree with First Class Honours – Dublin City University	November 2002
Completion of Degree with Highest Distinction, High Honors in Spanish, and Honors in Spanish – University of Michigan	April 2001
Tanner Award for Excellence in Undergraduate Research – University of Michigan	April 2001
Phi Beta Kappa – University of Michigan	April 2000

PROFESSIONAL AFFILIATIONS:

American Psychological Association (APA) – Graduate Student Affiliate	2007 - present
Division 17, Society of Counseling Psychology – Graduate Student Affiliate	2007 - present

PUBLICATIONS:

Ridley, C.R., & Ethington, L.L. (in press). Cross-cultural consultation. In C.S. Clauss-Ehlers (Ed.), *Encyclopedia of Cross-Cultural School Psychology (ECCSP)* (pp. XX-XX). New York: Springer.

Ridley, C.R., Ethington, L.L., & Heppner, P.P (2007). Cultural confrontation: A skill of advanced cultural empathy. In P. Pederson, W.J. Lonner, J.G. Draguns, & J.E. Trimble (Eds.), *Counseling Across Cultures* (6th ed, pp. 377-393). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Mollen, D., Ethington, L.L., & Ridley, C.R. (2006). Positive psychology: Considerations and implications for counseling psychology. *The Counseling Psychologist, 34*(2), 304-312.

PRESENTATIONS:

Ethington, L.L. (2007, August). Multicultural Consultation: Themes and Issues. In C. Ridley (Chair), *Emerging issues in organizational consultation.* Symposium conducted at the 115th annual conference of the American Psychological Association, San Francisco, CA.

Ethington, L.L., & Ridley, C.R. (2006, April). Cultural confrontation: A skill of advanced cultural empathy. Paper presented at the 19th Annual American Psychological Association Division 17 Great Lakes Regional Conference, West Lafayette, IN.

Barfield, J., Datchi-Phillips, C., Ethington, L.L., Kwon, S. & Parab, R. (2005, April). The challenges of real-world social justice research. Symposium conducted at the 18th Annual American Psychological Association Division 17 Great Lakes Regional Conference, Bloomington, IN.

Ethington, L.L. (2001, June). Election 2000: A time-series analysis of motive profiles and other variables in the U.S. presidential campaign. Paper presented the 24th annual scientific meeting of the International Society of Political Psychology in Cuernavaca, Mexico.

Ethington, L.L. (2000, July). Motive imagery and conflict escalation: A time-series study of the Gulf conflict and the Gulf war. Paper presented at the 23rd annual scientific meeting of the International Society of Political Psychology in Seattle, WA.

PROFESSIONAL REFERENCES:

Jon Brandon, Ph.D.
Training Director
Student Counseling Service
Iowa State University
2223 Student Services Building
Ames, IA 50011-2223
Phone: (515) 294-0166
Fax: (515) 294-5205
jbrandon@iastate.edu

Ron Jackson, Ph.D.
Senior Staff Psychologist
Student Counseling Service
Iowa State University
2223 Student Services Building
Ames, IA 50011-2223
Phone: (515) 294-0157
Fax: (515) 294-5205
doctorj@iastate.edu

Rex Stockton, Ed.D.
Director of Training
Counseling Psychology
Indiana University
201 N. Rose Ave
W.W. Wright Education Building
Bloomington, IN 47405
Phone: (812) 856-8344
Fax: (812) 856-8333
stocktor@indiana.edu