

Development of the Employee Rewards and
Recognition Preference Survey (ERRPS)

by Crystal L. Hunt

University of North Carolina at Pembroke

Running head: ERRPS



Development of the Employee Rewards and
Recognition Preference Survey (ERRPS)

Motivating employees has long been recognized as an important issue that companies face in modern industry. Herzberg, Mausner, & Snyderman (1959) state that motivating employees depends on characteristics of the work situation. Certain factors can contribute to an individual's satisfaction at work (e.g., recognition, responsibility, and achievement). Herzberg et al. (1959) called these intrinsic factors. Certain other factors can contribute to an individuals's dissatisfaction (e.g., pay, company policy, and job security). Herzberg et al. called these extrinsic factors.

Herzberg et al. (1959) noted that extrinsic factors cannot increase one's satisfaction, but can decrease satisfaction. Intrinsic factors, on the other hand, can increase satisfaction and thus increase motivation. Therefore, to motivate employees, organizations should concentrate more on intrinsic factors.

There are several other ways to motivate employees. This paper, however, will only concentrate on rewards and recognition. These two terms are often used interchangeably in the workplace and the literature. To address the potential ambiguity in the use of the two terms, Filipczak (1993) defines them.

According to Filipczak (1993), rewards imply contingencies. That is, an employee must perform a specific act to receive a reward. The act and the reward are specifically outlined in advance. For example, an employee must assemble 200 pieces in less than two hours to receive a \$50 cash bonus or an employee

must sell \$5000 worth of merchandise in one year to receive a paid vacation. Usually, rewards are given for acts that exceed basic requirements (Filipczak, 1993).

Rewards are also usually specified in terms of who can receive them. For example, a sales person may be eligible to receive a reward, but a line worker may not be or may be eligible to receive a different reward under different contingencies. The value of the reward is typically based on the significance of the material item received (Filipczak, 1993). It is usually of some substantial economic value (often a monetary bonus). Rewards do not include basic pay or benefits.

Recognition is also contingent like a reward, but it usually takes the form of an inexpensive token, usually not money. Therefore, due to the minimal economic value, its motivational influences stem from the intrinsic value associated with receiving it (Filipczak, 1993).

Recognition can be less clearly specified than rewards in several ways. First, the action to be recognized is often less clear in quantifiable terms, because elements to be recognized are difficult to measure (e.g., customer courtesy). Also, the act itself does not have to be extraordinary to receive recognition. It could even, and may often, include acts that are expected or required, such as perfect attendance or injury-free work.

Second, there is often a loose contingency between the action and receiving recognition (i.e., there is an intermittent schedule of reinforcement). Sometimes the recognition is given; sometimes it is not. On one hand, this can lead to confusion

concerning whether or not an employee will receive recognition for performing an action. But on the other hand, intermittent recognition may lead to persistence of the behavior (or behavior category) that occasions recognition (Bower & Hilgard, 1981).

Third, the forms of recognition given vary considerably. One time it may be verbal praise. Another time, it may be a plaque. Therefore, employees may not always know what form the token of recognition will take.

Fourth, the recognition can be given to an individual or a group. Exactly who will receive the recognition is rarely outlined in advance. This can also lead to confusion among employees when receiving recognition.

An example of the loose contingencies concerning recognition is as follows: a supervisor tells a subordinate to be polite to customers. When the employee complies, he/she unexpectedly receives verbal praise from the supervisor. This example shows the lack of structure concerning recognition in that the level of politeness was never specified, politeness is difficult to measure, the employee may not always receive verbal praise in particular, and receiving recognition may not occur every time. Because of this loose structure, the responsibility of giving recognition usually falls on individual managers or coworkers and depends on the organizational culture.

The need to receive both rewards and recognition would be considered an intrinsic factor, according to Herzberg et al. (1959), because these do not include basic salary and benefits. Therefore, this paper will refer to them both as R&R or use the

terms separately where appropriate, while recognizing that the two are not completely synonymous.

R&R is being used to increase productivity, increase morale, decrease turnover, and so on (Ulrich & Lake, 1990) in response to several factors. Costs rise as organizations are spending more money to pay for higher taxes and comply with regulations (Daft, 1992). Changes in technology are forcing companies to spend more money on upgrading their equipment and workforce.

Daft (1992) also points out that foreign competition is threatening American industry. For example, the Japanese have formed *keiretsus*, groups of companies that interlock to work with each other (Daft, 1992). This arrangement allows them to pool their resources. As a result, the Japanese can make products faster, better, and cheaper (Hale, 1989). American companies must respond to keep up with such competitors, or risk loss of business.

In order to keep profits up, many American companies are reducing costs by cutting their workforce. For example, between 1982 and 1986, the Dallas-based oil and gas producer Oryx cut 1500 of its 6000 employees (Henkoff, 1990). Also, many companies are letting employees make more of their own decisions, meaning that fewer managers are needed to do so, thus cutting the payroll (Miller, 1991). In the 1980s, one-third of middle managers were laid off in Fortune 500 companies (Miller, 1991). McCormick & Powell (1988) report that between 1977 and 1988, 2.8 million jobs were lost in Fortune 500 companies.

However, there can be severe consequences to cutting the workforce so drastically. Many remaining workers fear for

their jobs. This can result in less risk-taking and lower motivation (Day-Foley & Balok, 1991). Workforce cutbacks also reduce promotion opportunities (Rich & Florin-Thuma, 1990). This can lower morale and possibly cause employees to seek better job opportunities elsewhere. In summary, due to cutbacks, workers may feel insecure about their jobs.

In the face of declining workforces, potentially lowered motivation among remaining workers, and pressure to maintain profits, American companies need to keep the workforce producing at peak levels. After laying off so many employees, companies must now turn around and demonstrate that their employees are still a valuable asset, not just an expendable commodity. But employees are hesitant to remain loyal and work hard for a company that may lay them off at any time (Hennefrund, 1986).

In order to regain employees' loyalty and maintain motivation and willingness to be productive, companies are beginning to pay more attention to the effects of rewarding and recognizing employees. R&R has been found to increase morale and motivation (Garry, 1993; Meyer, 1988) and, therefore, lower absenteeism and turnover (Johnson, 1988). Martin (1986) points out that R&R programs can also increase productivity and loyalty. By doing so, R&R can literally pay for itself. Bunning (1989), for example, states that in 1985, the Union National Bank in Arkansas increased its productivity 50% by implementing an R&R program, although no actual figures are given.

Recognition can effectively increase productivity without spending the money for needed formal rewards. Fox (1994) notes that when Mary Kay Cosmetics implemented a recognition program,

their sales rose 16% annually, and profits rose 30% annually between 1986 to 1992. By affecting employees attitudes using R&R, absenteeism and turnover can decrease, resulting in higher productivity (Chruden & Sherman, 1984).

The popularity of R&R is increasing. A branch of Jostens, Inc. specializes in selling recognition products. According to their 1996 Fiscal Annual Report, Jostens sold \$695 million in recognition products (Jostens, 1996). Between 1979 and 1992, R&R programs in organizations more than doubled (Ettorre, 1992). In a Personnel Journal survey, nine out of 10 subscribers reported that they have an R&R program where they work (Magnus, 1986).

But implementing an R&R program must be carefully planned and implemented. There are many things to consider. For example, different employees have different expectancies. According to Vroom (1964), people work according to the perceived expectancy of a reward to follow. It is the perceived value of the outcome (the reward or recognition token) that determines how hard an employee will work to earn it (Filipczak, 1993; Vroom, 1964). This is why it should be clear to the employee that a certain amount of work will result in a reward. Filipczak (1993) also notes that a reward is necessary for increased work, because employees will not work harder for basic salary. It is the perceived value of something extra that leads to increased work.

In an Across the Board (1994) interview, Alfred Kohn, an author on rewards and behavior, notes that this perceived value may cause the employee to work for the reward itself and thus have little or no effect on intrinsic motivation. In fact, managers should be careful to note that when a reward is offered,

employees may do whatever it takes just to get the reward. They may become less interested in the work and more interested in just the reward. This may not necessarily lead to higher intrinsic motivation.

Employees also have different needs. According to Abraham Maslow (1943), there are five different levels of needs. The lowest level is physiological needs (e.g., hunger and thirst). The next level is safety needs (e.g., protection from threats). Belonging needs are next. They include affection and a sense of belonging. The fourth level of needs is esteem needs, which includes social esteem and self-esteem. It is social esteem that includes the need for recognition and appreciation from others. The highest level of needs is self-actualization, which is an individual's need to realize his/her full potential.

Meeting higher-level needs, such as receiving recognition, leads to self-fulfillment. But lower-level needs must be met first (Maslow, 1943). Money can satisfy lower-level needs by buying food and shelter. However, money cannot be used to satisfy higher level needs such as affection and self-esteem.

As mentioned previously, Herzberg et al. (1959) have a similar theory that states there are extrinsic and intrinsic needs. Achievement and receiving recognition would be considered intrinsic needs. Salary and working conditions would be considered extrinsic needs.

Herzberg et al. (1959) claim that meeting extrinsic needs will lead to dissatisfaction if not met but not necessarily to satisfaction if met. For example, an employee would likely be dissatisfied with low pay but not necessarily satisfied with

sufficient pay. It is the intrinsic needs that lead to increased motivation. For example, an employee would likely be more satisfied (motivated) if he/she were to receive recognition or enjoyed the work itself. Therefore, R&R presumably must satisfy intrinsic needs in order to be effective (Champagne & McAfee, 1989). However, a manager must be aware of just what his employees' intrinsic needs and preferences are so that he/she can give appropriate R&R tokens.

R&R tokens can take many forms, literally from a pat on the back to substantial financial rewards. Often, employees prefer noncash rewards (Braham, 1989; Jamieson & O'Mara, 1991; Puffer, 1990; Stoffman, 1987; Troy, 1993). According to Maslow's (1943) theory, this indicates that their lower level needs have already been met, since money is a medium of exchange to provide for survival needs. Employees whose lower-level needs have already been met will respond less to R&R geared toward these levels. These employees prefer R&R that meets higher-level needs, such as recognition.

Companies are taking this information on noncash R&R into account when developing R&R programs. A survey in 1993 revealed that 90% of Fortune 1000 companies use nonmonetary forms of R&R (Ledford, Lawler, & Mohrman, 1995). Not only does this meet higher level needs, but noncash R&R is often less expensive. As mentioned previously, the value of recognition is not in the monetary value but in the intrinsic value of the recognition itself (Filipczak, 1993).

Consequently, it is critical to the success of any R&R program to know what kinds of R&R each employee values, because

giving R&R that an employee does not value is unlikely to have the desired positive effect on performance. Kazemek (1990) illustrates this point with a real-life example where an employee quit, because the R&R he received was not valuable to him. His manager often gave him raises, but he told the manager that money meant little to him. He said the best reward he could receive would be to teach new employees. Eventually, he took another job with lower pay to do the job he wanted.

As shown in the above example from Kazemek (1990), sometimes managers may not realize what their employees prefer, or they may not be willing to take the time to learn. Managers often assume that their employees needs are the same as their own (Kovach, 1987). This is referred to as "self-reference". Kovach also states that managers often prefer money, because it is a quantifiable reward. The amount of money reflects how well they performed. Therefore, they assume that their employees want money, as well.

Kovach (1987), however, showed that non-managerial employees overall did not rank money as their most preferred reward, though managers did on surveys Kovach conducted in 1981 and 1986. Kovach cites a similar survey conducted in 1943 where employees also did not rank money as their most preferred reward. These similarities over such a long period of time give strong evidence supporting the preference for noncash rewards.

Meeting the individual needs of employees is not likely to be easy. Kovach's (1987) surveys revealed that people's values differ based on age, gender, income, job type, and organizational level, and may change as personal and professional

circumstances change. Thus, it would seem reasonable that each company should attempt to find out what R&R tokens its own employees value, because not all groups of employees or all companies are the same in terms of types of workers and culture (Puffer, 1990).

Puffer (1990) states that each employee and each organization has a different set of needs and preferences and therefore must satisfy those needs and preferences differently. For example, companies should probably offer different kinds of R&R to employee groups if they have more technical employees (Gomez-Mejia, Balkin, & Milkovich, 1990; Maccoby, 1987) or creative employees (Caudron, 1984).

According to Maccoby (1987), technical employees want to be respected for their skills. Gomez-Mejia, et al (1990) state that many technical employees are leaving their jobs, because they feel that they are unappreciated. These workers can receive traditional compensation anywhere. Things like recognition and flexibility are what make the difference. They also want the means to do their jobs more effectively.

Maccoby (1987) notes that because technical employees are usually more intelligent, they value rewards that stimulate them mentally. Therefore, it would be in a company's best interest to consider these findings when rewarding and recognizing technical employees. Good examples of effective R&R include educational benefits, budgetary discretion, and more freedom (Gomez-Mejia, et al, 1990).

According to Caudron (1994), creative employees take great pride in their work, and, therefore, should be rewarded and

recognized in a way that allows them to enhance their work. Caudron also points out that creative workers can be more insecure. So rewarding and recognizing them more often can reassure them that they are doing a good job. According to Maslow (1943), these employees have higher-level needs that they prefer to satisfy, because their lower-level needs have already been met. Examples of effective R&R tokens for creative employees are flexibility, less rigid structure in their work environment, and recognizing their creative efforts through frequent verbal praise (Caudron, 1994).

To meet the preferences of all of their employees, some companies have implemented flexible R&R programs. For example, the Linclay Corp. in St. Louis has a special way to reward employees for their tenth anniversary with the company (Halcrow, 1989). The company forms a committee that secretly finds out what the employee would want and spends up to \$2000 on what the committee feels is the perfect gift. This is reported to have been very successful.

At Appleton Papers in Ohio, each line manager has a reward budget. But each reward must be something personal and something that the employee would not normally buy (Caudron, 1993). At Bank of America, employees can choose items they prefer from a catalog (Rawlinson, 1988).

Many forms of R&R should be available from which to choose, because of the individual differences discussed earlier. Employees will work harder to receive a more valuable outcome for themselves (Filipczak, 1993; Vroom, 1964). Filipczak (1993) notes that it is important to offer R&R that employees perceive

as valuable. He also states that offering more forms of R&R increases the likelihood that each employee will find something of value for which to work when it is clear that he/she will receive some form of R&R.

Some forms of R&R are related to each other in content and would probably be valued about equally by an employee. For example, an employee who enjoys travel will probably also value a free plane ticket or a cruise, since the two are interrelated. To the organization, however, these two forms of R&R may differ greatly in price, availability, and so on.

One might surmise that, if R&R tokens are grouped (e.g., travel or merchandise), an employee would value all of the items in that group. If a manager needs to choose an R&R token, he/she can select items from a given valued category. This should increase the likelihood of picking a token that is of value to the employee, while maintaining a reasonable degree of flexibility for the organization.

From the organization's standpoint, price and availability are likely to be a factor. Therefore, choosing from among several tokens in a category would allow a manager to select items based on the organization's needs as well. An array of choices should allow selections that are more cost-effective.

Though many kinds of R&R tokens are mentioned in the literature, little exists about which R&R tokens can be grouped together into types or categories. Brooks (1994) proposes that there are four categories: money, travel, recognition, and merchandise but does not support those categories with data. Nolan (1991) notes that Dr. Gerald Graham separates R&R into two

categories: institutionalized (trips, certificates, etc.) and spontaneous (verbal praise). However, Nolan does not elaborate on this any further.

Because no data or bases for either Brook's (1994) or Nolan's (1991) findings above is reported, these categories may or may not be valid descriptions. Statistically confirmed categories could be established through an analysis of R&R preferences. Responses to individual R&R tokens could be analyzed using factor analysis to determine which tokens can be grouped into categories.

An organization-wide data base including employees' preferences as individuals and as a group could be very useful, because of the supporting justification in the previous paragraphs. Data could be collected on an employee's preferences and kept on file. If a manager or a coworker wishes to give an R&R token to an individual, he/she could simply look in that person's file to see what tokens the employee prefers. If R&R is given to a group, all of the data could be combined and analyzed for that given group.

Little also exists in the literature about how to systematically discover what employee's value. Kovach (1987) constructed a survey that listed a few (10 items), such as interesting work and job security. Employees ranked these items in terms of which were most important to them. This survey was administered in 1981 and 1986.

A survey such as Kovach's (1987) could be very useful in determining individual and group preferences. Some of the conclusions he reached are that employees under the age of 30

value good wages most, employees over the age of 50 value interesting work most, and employees making over \$25,000 annually (in 1986) value good wages less than all of the other income groups.

Kovach's (1987) information could be used to ensure that workers in certain categories (e.g., age, income, etc.) receive what they value. For example, an organization could give cash bonuses as the primary form of R&R to employees under 30. Also, since employees making higher salaries value good wages less, the organization could give them nonmonetary R&R.

Kovach (1987) surveyed 1000 industrial employees but only 100 supervisors. Dividing 100 supervisors into subgroups created a very small sample for some categories. Although, this sample was probably used for convenience, it would be interesting to see if a larger sample of supervisors would yield the same results.

Kovach (1987) used 10 very broad "job reward factors" in his study (e.g., good working conditions and job security). These factors are the same as the ones used in the 1946 survey. Kovach's (1987) study could be improved upon by using more specific examples of R&R tokens, such as verbal praise, jewelry, or a plaque.

These tokens could be grouped into categories through factor analysis (Hair, 1992). This would statistically examine each item in terms of how it relates to other items. Those items that are similar would be grouped into factors. These factors could then be correlated to employee characteristics, such as age and income to reach various conclusions (e.g., employees over 60 years old prefer the factor that relates to travel).

However, there is little guidance from the literature on the development of such a specific survey. The only source addressing the construction of an R&R survey merely states that the questions should be such that they allow for responses other than "just cash" (Filipczak, 1993). However, Filipczak does not address this topic any further in his article. Because there few guidelines on how to develop such a survey, it is assumed that those who have done so started from scratch with no examples from which to draw.

Research Plan

The purpose of this project was to develop a survey that would: 1) have high content validity, 2) statistically examine individual R&R tokens, 3) statistically identify R&R tokens into categories, 4) assess individual preferences, 5) assess group preferences, and 6) be generalizable across employee groupings and organizations.

The survey instrument listed individual examples of rewards and recognition tokens. The tokens were compiled from all of the examples of R&R found in a thorough search of the literature. Participants rated each example individually as if they were eligible to receive it and in terms of their needs and values.

Individual R&R tokens were statistically examined to assess their value. A factor analysis was conducted to group R&R tokens into categories. These categories were named according to the tokens within them and their values examined.

Method

Participants

Four-hundred fifty surveys were distributed. Two-hundred thirty six (52%) volunteer participants returned the survey (106 male and 130 female), most of whom were from North Carolina. Participants were drawn from a variety of sources, mostly students, friends, family, and coworkers. They all had previous job experience and ranged in age from 17-75 (mean, 37.3 years; standard deviation, 12.86 years). Educational level ranged from 11 to 22 years (mean, 15.15 years; standard deviation, 2.21 years). Income ranged from \$0 (unemployed) to \$85,000 (mean, \$26,098; standard deviation, \$14,283). Frequencies on job position and marital status are reported in Tables 1 and 2.

Materials

The Employee Rewards & Recognition Preference Survey (ERRPS) consisted of 100 R&R tokens (see Appendix A). The instrument used a Likert rating-scale from -3 to +3, with -3 indicating no perceived value, 0 indicating no preference, and +3 indicating high perceived value. The directions were carefully worded so that respondents answer each question individually, as opposed to comparing them to each other. The survey took 10-15 minutes to complete.

Procedure

Surveys were either mailed to participants or given on an individual or group basis. Data was collected over a two month period. In all cases, an informed consent form was given to the participants (see Appendix B). This form was collected separately to ensure confidentiality.

Biographical information was collected on age, job position, gender, income level, and marital status in a basic information form (see Appendix C). This form was attached to the survey so biographical information could be compared with the responses.

After all 236 surveys were collected and entered into a computer data file, basic statistics were computed on all 100 items. A factor analysis was conducted to identify the main factors represented in the 100 items and to see which items loaded on which factors. The biographical information was then correlated to the 100 items and then to each factor.

Results

General Plan of the Analysis

Because the analysis reported here involves a relatively large number of items and significance tests, some items will be incorrectly categorized as significant by chance. Therefore, a conservative significance level of $\alpha=.005$ was chosen. Furthermore, data referred to in this section is reported in tables accumulated at the end of the document.

Means and standard deviations were calculated for the ratings on each of the 100 items on the survey. For the sake of discussion, means with an absolute value above 1.000 and 2.000 were considered noteworthy. The means were correlated with participants' age, education level, and income. The means were then compared across gender.

A factor analysis was conducted to extract groups of R&R tokens. Factor scores were calculated for each of the factors by adding the ratings for items loading on a particular factor for each individual respondent and then dividing by the number of

items in that factor. Means and standard deviations were calculated for the factor scores. Factor scores were correlated with participants' age, education level, and income. The factor means were then compared to gender. Means were also calculated on job position and marital status for each factor. An ANOVA was conducted to determine differences among job position and marital status for each factor.

Descriptive Statistics for Survey Items

Means and standard deviations were calculated for ratings on each of the 100 items on the survey. Those are reported in Table 3. As can be seen, 32 items had means above 1.000. Only three items had means below -1.000. As can be seen, many more items were regarded positively than negatively.

Correlational Analyses for Survey Items

Correlations were calculated between ratings on each item and participants' age, educational level, and income. The correlations are reported in Table 4. At $\alpha=.005$, the critical value of r is equal to 0.183. At $\alpha=.001$, the critical value of r is equal to 0.217. Degrees of freedom was set at 235, because some participants left one item unanswered.

A total of 39 items had significant negative correlations with age. This means that as age increases, these items are preferred less. No items had a significant positive correlation with age.

Two items had significant negative correlations with educational level. One item had a significant positive correlation with educational level. Five items had significant negative correlations with income, while no items had a

significant positive correlation. This interestingly shows that no items are regarded more as income increases.

Multiple correlations with age, education, and income were considered. But due to the number of low correlations to begin with, this analysis was not done.

Categorical Analyses for Survey Items

A t-test was computed to test the significance between genders on each item. The results are reported in Table 5. Twelve differences were significant. Of these items, men had higher means on eight. Overall, men had means above 1.000 on 31 items, while women had means above 1.000 on 35 items. Men had two means below -1.000, while women had five means below -1.000, which shows that women disliked many more items than men.

Means were calculated for each of the 100 items for job position and marital status. The means are reported in Tables 6 and 7. As can be seen, several items in each table had means above an absolute value of 1.000. This reflects the high preferences of the 100 items in general, and also reveals differences in preference across job position and marital status.

Analysis of variance for job position and marital status for each of the 100 items was considered. However, it was decided that this information would be more useful in comparison to the factor scores.

Factor Analysis

Principle Components, Maximum Likelihood, and Iterated Principle Axis factor analyses were conducted using the 100 items on the survey. Each type of factor analysis was then rotated using six different methods. Items that did not load heavily

(above an absolute value of .50) on any one factor were discarded (Hair, 1992). Factors with eigenvalues less than 1.0 were discarded (Hair, 1992).

The factors extracted in each method were carefully compared to each other to determine which method yielded the most representative set of factors. The most interpretable method seemed to be the Principle Components method with an equamax rotation. This method yielded 16 factors which loaded on at least two tokens.

The factors were named on the basis of what the tokens comprising each factor appeared to have in common. The names and the items comprising them are listed in Appendix D. The factor loadings and eigenvalues are reported in Table 8 and Table 9, respectively. Means and standard deviations for factor scores are reported in Table 10. As can be seen, nine factors had means above 1.000. Note that the benefits factor had a mean of 2.468, remarkably larger than any other factor. Four factors had negative means (although not below -1.000), indicating a low overall preference for items in this factor. This would imply that these factors are generally not valued and should be considered carefully before being offered to make sure they would be valued.

Correlational Analyses for Factors

Participants' age, educational level, and income were correlated with factor scores for each factor. Correlations are reported in Table 11. At $\alpha=.005$, the critical value of r is equal to 0.183. At $\alpha=.001$, the critical value of r is equal to 0.217. Degrees of freedom was set at 235, because some

participants left one item unanswered.

Five factors had significant negative correlations with age, while only one factor had a significant positive correlation. Somewhat surprisingly, no factors had significant correlations with education or income. The lack of significant correlations for education and income reveal that these variables have little effect on R&R preferences

Multiple correlations with age, education, and income were considered. But due to the number of low correlations to begin with, this analysis was not done.

Categorical Comparisons for Factors

A t-test was computed to test the significance between genders on each factor. The results are reported in Table 12. Three factors had statistically significant differences. Of these factors, males had higher means on two. Overall, men had means above 1.000 on seven factors, while women had means above 1.000 on eight factors. Men had no means below -1.000, while women had one mean below -1.000. One would conclude that adventure would not be a good form of R&R to offer women.

Means were calculated for each of the factors for job position and marital status. The means are reported in Tables 13 and 14. As can be seen, several items in each table had means above an absolute value of 1.000. This seems to reflect the preferences of the factors in general, and also reveals differences in preference across job position and marital status.

An analysis of variance was conducted to determine significant differences for factor scores across job position.

The results are reported in Table 15. Although it would seem that there would be many significant differences, only one factor (adventure) significantly differed across job position. A Scheffe test revealed significant differences between military and clerical and military and professional job positions.

An analysis of variance was also conducted to determine significant differences for factor scores across marital status. The results are reported in Table 16. As can be seen, only one factor (sports) significantly differed across job position. However, for some reason, a Scheffe test did not reveal significant differences at the $\alpha < .005$ level. The results of the factor scores will be examined further in the discussion section.

Discussion

The purpose of this project was to statistically examine individual R&R tokens taken from the literature and group them according to how they related to each other. In addition, choices as a function of individual differences were examined. These groups could be used to predict individual and group preferences for R&R tokens.

A factor analysis on the 100 item survey grouped R&R tokens into 16 factors. The factors were named according to what the tokens within them had in common. The statistical information collected on the factors was then compared to the participants' biographical information to determine any relationships among these variables.

It should be noted that every item in the survey was rated highly in the respective article in which it was found. All items in the survey were effective, but may not necessarily be

effective in all cases, as is shown from the results of this project. Therefore, as pointed out previously by Puffer (1990), each company should choose its own form of R&R based on its unique circumstances and employees.

As can be seen in Table 3, the 33 items from the survey with means over 1.000 vary in content. This would support Maslow's (1943) findings that people have different needs. Interestingly, "ONLY money" rated lower than a cash bonus. A cash bonus does not exclude other forms of R&R. This would imply that although money is important, people value other tokens, as well, an implication that managers should be aware of so that they can make a variety of R&R tokens available to employees.

The means on the R&R tokens were correlated with participants' age, education level, and income. Thirty-nine items had significant negative correlations with age. No items had significant positive correlations with age. However, according to Kovach (1987), there is a positive correlation between age and the value of good wages. This is a notable discrepancy and should be researched further.

It is difficult to speculate what the lack of significant positive correlations with age on this survey imply. Perhaps as people grow older, their needs become more specific, or perhaps they simply value fewer forms of R&R. Perhaps it is a difference in generations or upbringing. I would suggest further research on this topic using a larger sample to find out more about what employees prefer as they grow older.

Two items had significant negative correlations with education. One was "day off with pay". Perhaps employees with

higher educational levels are more dedicated to being on the job. But this is only speculation. The other was "ONLY cash". I would conclude that employees with higher educational levels value noncash forms of R&R more than employees with lower educational levels. This does not imply that cash is not valued, just that other forms of R&R are valued, as well.

Five items had significant negative correlations with income, while no items had a significant positive correlation. As can be seen, these items are rather varied. With respect to "boss takes job for a day" and "watch or listen to TV at work", I suspect that job position is an extraneous variable in this correlation. Employees with higher income tend to have job positions which may not allow them to take advantage of these tokens.

I had suspected that more items on the survey (e.g. those relating to free merchandise, services, cash, etc.) would have a greater negative correlation with income. This was not the case. In fact, "ONLY money" had a nonsignificant correlation ($r = -.059$). A "cash bonus" also had a nonsignificant correlation ($r = .051$). These findings interestingly reveal that monetary R&R has no correlation with an employee's income level.

The lack of significant correlations for education and income reveal that these variables have little effect on R&R preferences. Further research should be conducted to explore these findings, confirm that age is the most significant biographical predictor of R&R preferences, and examine the interaction among more than one biographical category.

A t-test between genders and ratings on each item showed that 12 items were significantly different across gender. Of these 12 items, men had negative means while women had positive means (or vice versa) on six items: free tickets to a sporting event, balloons or flowers, hunting or fishing trip, hardware (tools, ladder, etc.), racecar or high speed driving school, and sporting goods. These items are important, because they not only show a difference across gender, but a difference in the opposite direction across gender. This outcome points toward a need to examine biographical categories as moderators.

The items that men had significantly higher means on related to adventure, sports, and tools. This was expected. The items that women had higher means on varied in content: "balloons or flowers", "boss takes your job for a day", "praise from immediate supervisor", and "job-related workshop". I suspected that "balloons or flowers" would be significantly different. However, the others were unexpected. They are all job-oriented. Perhaps job position among women is a confounded variable, meaning that women hold different job positions than men. Perhaps it would be more useful to test men and women in similar job positions.

It should be noted that some men and women had scores very different from these observations. Some women valued adventure very highly, and some men valued educational opportunities. These general observations should only serve as guidelines. I suggest that all tokens should be made available to both genders.

Factor analysis extracted 16 factors. Most factors were logical in terms of what the items within them had in common. However, the two items in the factor stock/membership seem to

have nothing in common in terms of content. But since these two items did group statistically, I chose to retain this factor. Item 17, "hardware (tools, ladder, etc.)", did not seem to fit in with the other two items in the adventure factor. Therefore, the name "adventure" should be used loosely.

The nine factor score means that were above 1.000 varied fairly widely. They were nonverbal recognition, entertainment, verbal recognition, responsibility, stress, travel, educational opportunities, benefits, and stock/membership. Benefits was the only factor to have a mean above 2.000. It was clearly larger than any other factor. This was unexpected. Based on this information, organizations should consider using R&R tokens relating to benefits more. No factors had means below -1.000.

Five factors had significant negative correlations with age. They were nonverbal recognition, sports, hobby, adventure, and stock/membership. Only one factor (educational opportunities) had a significant positive correlation with age. This would imply that as employees get older, they prefer R&R tokens relating to educational opportunities more. It would seem that younger employees would have less training and education, making these R&R tokens more valuable to them. Perhaps the job positions that employees hold as they get older require more education for advancement or that employees with more experience in general value further training and education.

It would also seem that as employees get older, R&R tokens in general seem to matter less. Benefits did not even have a significant correlation with age. It was suspected that younger

employees would not be as concerned with benefits as older employees. Surprisingly, this was not the case.

No factor had a significant correlation with education or income. Even educational level did not have a significant correlation with educational opportunities, although it was the closest to being significant than all of the other factors.

Of the three factors that significantly varied across gender, one factor (adventure) had a mean that varied in terms of direction (positive vs. negative). Men rated adventure positively, while women rated it negatively. This shows more of a distinct gender difference than the significant factors where men and women had means in the same direction.

It was expected that men preferred the sports and adventure factors significantly more than women. However, it was not expected that educational opportunities would be significant across gender, though a significant difference did occur. Perhaps women prefer educational opportunities more because of the types of jobs they hold or because education is needed more to enhance or advance in female gender-typical roles. I believe further research should be conducted on this.

The means on the factor scores for job position reveal that there are differences among these variables. The Scheffe test revealed that adventure is significantly different between military and clerical and military and professional job positions. More significant differences were expected. For example, it was suspected that retired employees would value travel significantly more and that clerical employees would value sports significantly less.

It is interesting that military was the only job position to have a positive mean (1.545) on adventure. Travel was rated highly, except by laborers. Household services was rated highly only by retired, self-employed, and other job positions. Gifts was rated highly only by retired participants.

These differences may be due to outside variables, such as time constraints for self-employed participants, physical constraints for retired participants, or an already existing exposure to adventure for military participants. This is a question for further research.

Nonverbal recognition, plants/fruit, and use of company equipment did not have means above an absolute value of 1.000 for any job position (i.e., not substantial in either direction). Entertainment, benefits, stock/membership, and educational opportunities were rated highly by all job positions. Verbal recognition was not rated highly by laborers, technicians, and military. I believe this finding in particular should be examined more closely using a larger sample, because verbal recognition is rated highly in the literature (Caudron, 1994).

The ANOVA for factor scores across marital status revealed significant difference for sports. The Scheffe test did not reveal significant differences at the $p < .005$ level, but did reveal a difference between single and both married and divorced participants at the $p < .05$ level. Upon visual examination, it was suspected that marital status would play a larger part in preference for R&R tokens relating to family gifts and opportunities. However, the factor analysis did not extract a factor related to family.

In general, the means across marital status are rather similar for entertainment, responsibility, stress, educational opportunities, benefits, and stock/membership. Differences among other categories are not easily explainable.

The results of this project support several findings in the literature, such as the preference for noncash rewards and recognition. This supports Braham (1989), Jamieson & O'Mara (1991), Puffer (1990), Stoffman (1987), and Troy, 1993). Also, difference in preferences among individuals (Maslow, 1943; Puffer, 1990) and groups (Caudron, 1994; Gomez-Mejia, et al, 1990; Maccoby, 1987) are supported.

The results of the analysis on the survey vary in places from what is in the literature. As mentioned previously, the literature sources from which the tokens in the survey were taken rated these tokens very highly. These were real examples used successfully in organizations. However, some of the tokens were not rated highly in this survey. This would lead me to believe that some R&R tokens are effective in some settings but not in others. This is a variable that should be explored further.

It is also apparent in the literature that there is a bias to report only positive findings. This may explain the positive regard for the R&R tokens mentioned in each article.

These results of this analysis also fill in some gaps in the literature. Although much is written about R&R preferences, there is no solid data to support the findings, so far as I could find. Kovach's (1987) survey is revealing in a broad sense, but it is not specific in terms of individual R&R tokens. This project provides specific statistical results upon which to

base some initial conclusions on R&R preferences.

Brooks (1994) states that there are four types of R&R tokens: money, travel, recognition, and merchandise. Brooks reported no data to justify these categories. However, the present data shows that there are more than four groups of R&R tokens. For example, recognition was divided into verbal and nonverbal. Other factors could be added, such as benefits, personal interests, stress reducing opportunities, and responsibility.

As mentioned previously, some of the items in the factors extracted by this analysis do not seem to relate to each other (e.g., stock and membership). Also, items that did seem to intuitively relate in content were not included in a factor (e.g., "all-expense paid trip" was not included in the travel factor).

It should be noted that the factors in this analysis were chosen on the basis of a factor analysis, not on the basis of what the items visibly have in common in terms of content. It would seem that there actually is a difference in preference for items that are similar in content. Further analysis should be conducted on factor groupings and why items that would seem to intuitively group together do not according to the data.

Although the results of this analysis provide informative data, it is based on a relatively small sample size (236 participants). This sample size may be sufficient to draw conclusions based on means. But because the ERRPS has 100 items, I would recommend a much larger sample size to ensure stability on the factor structure. Therefore, factor analysis results

should be interpreted with caution.

It should also be noted that the factors may have even turned out differently if more tokens relating to each other had been added to the survey. For example, if an item similar to one of the items that did not group had been added, another factor would have been created consisting of these two items. Therefore, the results of the factor analysis depend on the items in the survey. For this reason, perhaps it is better to group items by content or to readminister a more thorough survey using many more forms of similar tokens.

The results of the survey may have been slightly inaccurate because of the Likert rating-scale. This scale was chosen because it yielded quantifiable responses. The biggest problem was the tendency to mark zero, even when an item was of little or no value to the participant. It seems that employees would rather mark zero than a negative response, because they would rather receive something than nothing at all. Also, the labels on the scale (no value, no preference, and highly valued) may have been confusing.

Overall, the responses on the ERRPS were slightly skewed to the right. Thirty-six surveys were very skewed (a vast majority of ratings were from 0 to +3). Analyses were conducted with and without these 36 sets of responses. Because there were no major differences, all 236 cases were used.

Even though the results of this survey have some limitations, they could still be useful. Using the survey (or some modification of it) in specific settings could yield results that could increase employee motivation (Garry, 1993; Meyer,

1988) and, therefore, increase productivity (Chruden & Sherman, 1984; Martin, 1986) and lower absenteeism (Chruden & Sherman, 1984; Johnson, 1988). If an organization is unable to do this on an individual basis, the results on a group can possibly be used if a large sample size is used to attain generalizable findings.

It was originally intended to construct another survey based only on the factors extracted. There were 58 items that loaded on factors. Some of these items had negative ratings. Also, some of the remaining 42 items had high ratings and were regarded highly in the literature (i.e., actual cases). I conclude that these items should not be removed from the survey just because they do not group with other items. The ERRPS can be an effective way to measure R&R preferences with the original 100 items.

Overall, I feel that this project supports many findings and fills in some gaps in the literature. It provides data on R&R preferences, whereas findings in the literature do not include data-based justification. It provides a statistical basis for determining R&R preferences. For more generalizable results, however, this survey, or a similar version of it, needs to be administered to a larger sample. Although there are limitations to this survey, it could be useful in providing information to organizations on employee preferences.

References

- Across the Board (1994, January). ,Carrots, sticks, and self-deception. Across the Board, 31, 39-44.
- Bower, G. H. & Hilgard, E. R. (1981). Theories of learning (5th ed.). Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall.
- Braham, J. (1989, September 18). A rewarding place to work. Industry Week, 238, 15-19.
- Brooks, S. S. (1994, March). Noncash ways to compensate employees. HR Magazine, 39, 38-43.
- Bunning, R. L. (1989, January). Rewarding a job well done. Personnel Administrator, 34, 60-64.
- Caudron, S. (1993, August). Recognition can bolster quality efforts. Personnel Journal, 72, 48L.
- Caudron, S. (1994). Strategies for managing creative workers. Personnel Journal, 73, 103-106.
- Champagne, P. J. & McAfee, B. (1989). Motivating strategies for performance and productivity: A guide to human resource development. Westport, Connecticut: Greenwood Press.
- Chruden, H. J. & Sherman, A. W.. Jr. (1984). Managing human resources (7th ed.). Cincinnati, OH: South-Western.
- Daft, R. L. (1992). Organizational theory and design. St. Paul, Minnesota: West.
- Day-Foley, C. & Balok, R. (1991, September). When career panic strikes: Motivation calms the fears. Personnel, 68, 13.
- Ettorre, B. (1992, November). The winner is.... Management Review, 81, 16-20.
- Filipczak, B. (1993, August). Why no one likes your incentive program. Training, 30, 19-25.

Fox, B. (1994, January). Beating the competition. Chain Store Executive, 70, 64-66.

Garry, M. (1993, November). Bottoms-up brainstorm. Progressive Grocer, 72, 10.

Gomez-Mejia, L. R., Balkin, D. B., & Milkovich, G. T. (1990). Rethinking rewards for technical employees. Organizational Dynamics, 18, 62-76. ,

Hair, J. F. (1992). Multivariate data analysis (3rd ed.). New York: MacMillan.

Halcrow, A. (1989, February). Another decade, another dream. Personnel Journal, 68, 14.

Hale, R. L. (1989, January). Quality copiers, computers, and floor cleaning. Management Review, 78, 61-65.

Henkoff, R. (1990, April 9). Cost cutting: How to do it right. Fortune, 123, 40.

Hennefrund, W. (1986, July). What ever happened to loyalty? Association Management, 38, 82-85.

Herzberg, F., Mausner, B., & Snyderman, B. B. (1959). The motivation to work. New York: John Wiley & Sons.

Jamieson, D. & O'Mara, J. (1991). Managing workforce 2000: Gaining the diversity advantage. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Johnson, P. L. (1988, August 18). Cash, champagne spur success; Ohio agency keeps its employees through recognition, rewards. Travel Weekly, 47, 33-34.

Jostens (1996). Annual Report (On-line). Available: www.jostens.eworks.com/financial_info.html.

Kazemek, E. A. (1990, May). Appropriate rewards are key to motivation. Healthcare Financial Management, 44, 64.

Kovach, K. A. (1987, September-October). What motivates employees? Workers and supervisors give different answers. Business Horizons, 30, 58-65.

Ledford, G. E., Jr., Lawler, E. E., III, & Mohrman, Susan A. (1995, July-August). Reward innovations in *Fortune* 1000 companies. Compensation & Benefits Review, 27, 76-80.

Maccoby, M. (1987, January-February). Motivating technical people. Research-Technology Management, 30, 42-43.

Magnus, M. (1986, December). Surveying the diversity of rewards. Personnel Journal, 65, 69-74.

Martin, B. (1986, December). A case for rewarding recognition. Personnel Journal, 65, 66-68.

Maslow, A. H. (1943). A dynamic theory of human motivation. Psychological Review, 50, 370-396.

McCormick, J. & Powell, B. (1988, April 25). Management for the 1990s. Newsweek, 112, 47-48.

Meyer, J. (1988, September-October). Everyone's a winner. Management World, 17, 1.

Miller, C. (1991, August-September). Motivating middle managers. Reward & Recognition, 8-9.

Nolan, P. (1991, August-September). Selling recognition programs up, down, & all around. Reward & Recognition, 10-11.

Puffer, T. (1990, August). Eight ways to construct effective service reward systems. Reward & Recognition, 8-12.

Rawlinson, H. (1988, October). Renewed recognition at Bank of America. Personnel Journal, 67, 142-146.

Rich, J. R. & Florin-Thuma, B. C. (1990, November).
Rewarding employees in an environment of fewer promotions.
Pension World, 26, 16-17.

Stoffman, D. (1987, October).² The power of positive strokes.
Canadian Business, 60, 94-95.

Troy, K. L. (1993, March). To pay or not to pay? Across the Board, 72, 49.

Ulrich, D. & Lake, D. G. (1990). Organizational capability: Competing from the inside out. John Wiley & Sons.

Vroom, V. H. (1964). Work and motivation. New York: Wiley.

Appendix A

Imagine that, as part of a recognition program where you work, you are eligible to receive each of the items listed below. How would you value the following rewards? Do not compare one to another- assess each one **individually** and **regardless of size**. Please circle the appropriate response for every question:

	<u>No</u> <u>value</u>		<u>No</u> <u>preference</u>			<u>Highly</u> <u>valued</u>
1.	-3	-2	-1	0	+1	+2 +3
2.	-3	-2	-1	0	+1	+2 +3
3.	-3	-2	-1	0	+1	+2 +3
4.	-3	-2	-1	0	+1	+2 +3
5.	-3	-2	-1	0	+1	+2 +3
6.	-3	-2	-1	0	+1	+2 +3
7.	-3	-2	-1	0	+1	+2 +3
8.	-3	-2	-1	0	+1	+2 +3
9.	-3	-2	-1	0	+1	+2 +3
10.	-3	-2	-1	0	+1	+2 +3
11.	-3	-2	-1	0	+1	+2 +3
12.	-3	-2	-1	0	+1	+2 +3
13.	-3	-2	-1	0	+1	+2 +3
14.	-3	-2	-1	0	+1	+2 +3
15.	-3	-2	-1	0	+1	+2 +3
16.	-3	-2	-1	0	+1	+2 +3
17.	-3	-2	-1	0	+1	+2 +3
18.	-3	-2	-1	0	+1	+2 +3
19.	-3	-2	-1	0	+1	+2 +3
20.	-3	-2	-1	0	+1	+2 +3
21.	-3	-2	-1	0	+1	+2 +3
22.	-3	-2	-1	0	+1	+2 +3
23.	-3	-2	-1	0	+1	+2 +3
24.	-3	-2	-1	0	+1	+2 +3
25.	-3	-2	-1	0	+1	+2 +3
26.	-3	-2	-1	0	+1	+2 +3
27.	-3	-2	-1	0	+1	+2 +3
28.	-3	-2	-1	0	+1	+2 +3
29.	-3	-2	-1	0	+1	+2 +3
30.	-3	-2	-1	0	+1	+2 +3
31.	-3	-2	-1	0	+1	+2 +3
32.	-3	-2	-1	0	+1	+2 +3
33.	-3	-2	-1	0	+1	+2 +3
34.	-3	-2	-1	0	+1	+2 +3
35.	-3	-2	-1	0	+1	+2 +3
36.	-3	-2	-1	0	+1	+2 +3
37.	-3	-2	-1	0	+1	+2 +3
38.	-3	-2	-1	0	+1	+2 +3
39.	-3	-2	-1	0	+1	+2 +3
40.	-3	-2	-1	0	+1	+2 +3
41.	-3	-2	-1	0	+1	+2 +3
42.	-3	-2	-1	0	+1	+2 +3
43.	-3	-2	-1	0	+1	+2 +3
44.	-3	-2	-1	0	+1	+2 +3
45.	-3	-2	-1	0	+1	+2 +3
46.	-3	-2	-1	0	+1	+2 +3

	<u>No</u> <u>value</u>		<u>No</u> <u>preference</u>			<u>Highly</u> <u>valued</u>		
47.	Praise in front of peers at an awards dinner	-3	-2	-1	0	+1	+2	+3
48.	Free family photo session	-3	-2	-1	0	+1	+2	+3
49.	Plants	-3	-2	-1	0	+1	+2	+3
50.	Free housekeeping service	-3	-2	-1	0	+1	+2	+3
51.	Use of company photocopier and paper	-3	-2	-1	0	+1	+2	+3
52.	Dress casual at work	-3	-2	-1	0	+1	+2	+3
53.	Verbal praise from coworkers	-3	-2	-1	0	+1	+2	+3
54.	Free shopping spree	-3	-2	-1	0	+1	+2	+3
55.	Transfer to a different job	-3	-2	-1	0	+1	+2	+3
56.	Work at home during company hours	-3	-2	-1	0	+1	+2	+3
57.	Letter of appreciation presented at work	-3	-2	-1	0	+1	+2	+3
58.	Choose an item from a catalog	-3	-2	-1	0	+1	+2	+3
59.	Job-related workshop	-3	-2	-1	0	+1	+2	+3
60.	Sporting goods	-3	-2	-1	0	+1	+2	+3
61.	More authority	-3	-2	-1	0	+1	+2	+3
62.	Listen to YOUR radio or music at work	-3	-2	-1	0	+1	+2	+3
63.	Better job title	-3	-2	-1	0	+1	+2	+3
64.	Pizza or ice cream party at work	-3	-2	-1	0	+1	+2	+3
65.	Flexible work time	-3	-2	-1	0	+1	+2	+3
66.	Fruit	-3	-2	-1	0	+1	+2	+3
67.	Cash bonus	-3	-2	-1	0	+1	+2	+3
68.	Free weekend hotel stay	-3	-2	-1	0	+1	+2	+3
69.	All-expense paid trip	-3	-2	-1	0	+1	+2	+3
70.	Use of company car	-3	-2	-1	0	+1	+2	+3
71.	Gift certificate for merchandise	-3	-2	-1	0	+1	+2	+3
72.	Gift certificate to favorite restaurant	-3	-2	-1	0	+1	+2	+3
73.	Appliances	-3	-2	-1	0	+1	+2	+3
74.	Training or educational opportunities	-3	-2	-1	0	+1	+2	+3
75.	Better retirement package	-3	-2	-1	0	+1	+2	+3
76.	More sports programming on your TV	-3	-2	-1	0	+1	+2	+3
77.	Less stress at work	-3	-2	-1	0	+1	+2	+3
78.	Free car wash	-3	-2	-1	0	+1	+2	+3
79.	Lottery tickets (assume legal in your state)	-3	-2	-1	0	+1	+2	+3
80.	Free cruise	-3	-2	-1	0	+1	+2	+3
81.	Jewelry with company logo	-3	-2	-1	0	+1	+2	+3
82.	Use of company computer for personal use	-3	-2	-1	0	+1	+2	+3
83.	Learn new work skills	-3	-2	-1	0	+1	+2	+3
84.	Free movie rentals	-3	-2	-1	0	+1	+2	+3
85.	More paid vacation	-3	-2	-1	0	+1	+2	+3
86.	Promotion	-3	-2	-1	0	+1	+2	+3
87.	Plaque or trophy	-3	-2	-1	0	+1	+2	+3
88.	Free night on the town	-3	-2	-1	0	+1	+2	+3
89.	Company jacket or hat	-3	-2	-1	0	+1	+2	+3
90.	Items relating to a personal hobby	-3	-2	-1	0	+1	+2	+3
91.	More responsibility	-3	-2	-1	0	+1	+2	+3
92.	Stress reducing opportunities away from work	-3	-2	-1	0	+1	+2	+3
93.	Membership to professional organization	-3	-2	-1	0	+1	+2	+3
94.	Traditional gifts (crystal, clock, etc.)	-3	-2	-1	0	+1	+2	+3
95.	Box of chocolates	-3	-2	-1	0	+1	+2	+3
96.	Ticket for a free massage	-3	-2	-1	0	+1	+2	+3
97.	Different location for work area	-3	-2	-1	0	+1	+2	+3
98.	Company lapel pin	-3	-2	-1	0	+1	+2	+3
99.	Satellite dish at home	-3	-2	-1	0	+1	+2	+3
100.	ONLY money	-3	-2	-1	0	+1	+2	+3

Appendix B

INFORMED CONSENT FORM

Employee Rewards & Recognition Preference Survey (ERRPS)
Fall, 1996

I understand that the purpose of this survey is to investigate employee's preferences for rewards and recognition. I understand that I will be asked to answer several questions on what kinds of rewards and recognition I prefer. I understand that the survey will take approximately 10-15 minutes, and that the investigators believe that the study is of sufficient scientific merit to justify both their time and effort and that of myself and others.

I understand that Crystal Hunt is the principal investigator responsible for the overall design and conduct of this study under the guidance of Dr. Patrick Cabe. Crystal Hunt and Dr. Cabe agree to be available to discuss my experience in this study with me, and, at the completion of the entire study, to explain the outcomes and interpretation of the investigation. I understand, however, that it may be some time after my own participation before complete information about the entire study can be made available.

I understand that none of the questions asked in this survey is intended to be painful or to produce discomfort; that they produce no known physical or psychological harm; and that I should expect no pain, discomfort, or harm from the procedures to be used.

I understand that any personal information collected from or about me will be kept confidential and that only group, or anonymous individual, data will be used and reported.

I understand that I am free to refuse to participate in taking this survey and to refuse to answer any question at any time without prejudice to me. I understand that I am free to withdraw my consent and to withdraw from taking the survey at any time without prejudice to me.

I understand that my consent to participate in this survey does not waive any of my legal rights.

Having read and comprehended the above statement, I hereby agree to take this survey as a volunteer in the scientific investigation described in the foregoing statement.

Participant's name (please print)

Participant's signature

Date

Appendix C

BASIC INFORMATION FORM

Age: _____

Years of Education: _____

Income (estimated): \$ _____

Job Position:

- a. Clerical
- b. Professional
- c. Laborer
- d. Managerial
- e. Other

Sex: a. Male
 b. Female

Marital Status:

- a. Married
- b. Single
- c. Divorced
- d. Separated
- e. Engaged

Appendix D

Nonverbal Recognition

47. Praise in front of peers at an awards dinner
46. Photo in company newsletter
35. Photo in local newspaper
27. Photo on bulletin board at work
39. Parking space with your name for all to see
44. Ribbons or "gold stars" for all to see

Sports

1. Free tickets to a sporting event
11. Items relating to a sports team or figure
76. More sports programming on your TV
60. Sporting goods

Gifts

81. Jewelry with company logo
98. Company lapel pin
89. Company jacket or hat
43. Token gift (coffee mug, key chain, etc.)
23. Pen set

Household

42. Free household repairs
15. Free lawn care
50. Free housekeeping service

Entertainment

68. Free weekend hotel stay
72. Gift certificate to favorite restaurant

Verbal Recognition

14. Praise from the president of the company
33. Praise from immediate supervisor
53. Verbal praise from coworkers
45. A simple "pat on the back"

Hobby

34. Magazine subscription
90. Items relating to a personal hobby

Plants/Fruit

49. Plants
66. Fruit

Appendix D

Adventure

- 8. Adventure- sky diving, bungee jumping
- 37. Racecar or high speed driving school
- 17. Hardware (tools, ladder, etc.)

Responsibility

- 61. More authority
- 86. Promotion
- 91. More responsibility

Stress

- 77. Less stress at work
- 92. Stress reducing opportunities away from work
- 40. Better working conditions

Use of Company Equipment

- 6. Use of company tools or equipment
- 51. Use of company photocopier and paper

Travel

- 5. Travel opportunities
- 31. Sightseeing trip

Educational Opportunities

- 74. Training or educational opportunities
- 59. Job-related workshop
- 83. Learn new work skills

Benefits

- 21. Better benefits
- 75. Better retirement package

Stock/Membership

- 19. Stock in company
- 22. Paid membership (gym, club, NRA, etc.)

Table 1

Frequencies of Job Position

Job Position	Frequency	Percentage
Clerical	39	16%
Professional	79	33%
Laborer	18	8%
Manager	31	13%
Technician	4	13%
Sales	12	2%
Retired	4	5%
Military	11	2%
Self-employed	7	5%
Other	31	3%

Table 2

Frequencies of Marital Status

Marital Status	Frequency	Percentage
Married	116	49%
Single	76	32%
Divorced	21	9%
Separated	16	7%
Engaged	7	3%

Table 3

Means and Standard Deviations for Ratings on R&R Tokens

Item	Mean	SD
1	-0.220	2.138
2	1.097 #	1.729
3	1.885 #	1.361
4	0.175	2.028
5	1.742 #	1.610
6	0.346	1.909
7	-0.443	1.754
8	-1.191 #	2.133
9	0.333	1.797
10	1.263 #	1.458
11	-0.869	1.901
12	0.051	1.828
13	-0.962	2.018
14	1.284 #	1.721
15	0.220	2.162
16	0.750	2.034
17	-0.145	1.949
18	2.470 ##	1.004
19	1.979 #	1.548
20	0.487	1.816
21	2.424 ##	1.014
22	1.242 #	1.897
23	-0.521	1.674
24	1.987 #	1.120
25	0.953	1.720
26	-0.369	1.756
27	-0.958	1.757
28	0.114	1.796
29	0.470	1.806
30	0.428	1.808
31	0.763	1.839
32	0.970	1.605
33	1.212 #	1.554

absolute value > 1.000.

absolute value > 2.000.

(table continues)

Table 3

Means and Standard Deviations for Ratings on R&R Tokens

Item	Mean	SD
34	-0.128	1.763
35	-0.424	1.840
36	0.526	1.874
37	-0.640	2.271
38	1.305 #	1.684
39	-0.644	1.877
40	1.869 #	1.316
41	-0.678	1.870
42	0.928	1.939
43	-0.445	1.777
44	-1.017 #	1.698
45	0.835	1.836
46	-0.483	1.871
47	0.136	1.933
48	0.038	1.971
49	0.026	1.874
50	0.872	2.110
51	0.356	1.758
52	1.008 #	1.590
53	0.860	1.585
54	1.742 #	1.698
55	0.532	1.911
56	1.025 #	1.937
57	0.555	1.777
58	0.551	1.787
59	0.924	1.664
60	-0.335	2.043
61	0.872	1.842
62	0.638	2.022
63	0.590	1.964
64	-0.009	1.881
65	1.736 #	1.579
66	-0.047	1.839

absolute value > 1.000.

absolute value > 2.000.

(table continues)

Table 3

Means and Standard Deviations for Ratings on R&R Tokens

Item	Mean	SD
67	2.593 ##	0.961
68	1.852 #	1.535
69	2.339 ##	1.345
70	1.462 #	1.887
71	1.665 #	1.406
72	1.686 #	1.418
73	0.796	1.824
74	2.081 ##	1.216
75	2.489 ##	0.980
76	-1.004 #	1.990
77	1.830 #	1.382
78	0.542	1.839
79	0.689	1.970
80	1.962 #	1.661
81	-0.814	1.856
82	0.470	1.907
83	1.779 #	1.334
84	0.483	1.876
85	2.212 ##	1.284
86	2.196 ##	1.164
87	-0.272	1.907
88	0.653	2.115
89	-0.643	1.833
90	0.661	1.869
91	0.653	1.890
92	1.555 #	1.459
93	0.538	1.809
94	-0.004	1.800
95	-0.719	1.818
96	0.464	2.163
97	0.328	1.780
98	-0.898	1.657
99	0.609	2.221
100	2.004 ##	1.460

absolute value > 1.000.

absolute value > 2.000.

Table 4

Correlations Between Age, Education, and Income and Ratings on R&R
Tokens

Item	Age	Education	Income
1	-0.249**	0.070	0.022
2	0.038	0.073	0.030
3	0.007	0.105	-0.017
4	-0.335**	0.086	-0.041
5	-0.195*	0.133	-0.029
6	-0.061	-0.007	0.090
7	-0.191*	0.023	0.106
8	-0.553**	0.007	-0.240**
9	-0.121	-0.019	0.003
10	-0.143	0.024	-0.080
11	-0.260**	-0.031	0.045
12	-0.112	0.050	-0.100
13	-0.211*	-0.059	0.010
14	0.085	-0.016	0.090
15	0.010	0.068	-0.068
16	-0.264**	-0.070	-0.217**
17	-0.129	-0.051	0.001
18	-0.126	-0.236**	-0.124
19	-0.003	0.028	0.062
20	-0.139	-0.040	-0.042
21	0.002	-0.022	-0.068
22	-0.333**	0.165	-0.134
23	-0.020	-0.019	0.015
24	-0.014	-0.095	-0.056
25	-0.224**	0.009	-0.050
26	-0.254**	-0.078	-0.094
27	-0.144	0.018	0.064
28	-0.043	0.057	0.058
29	-0.225**	0.074	-0.063
30	-0.157	0.036	-0.006
31	0.004	0.077	0.019
32	-0.263**	-0.030	-0.212*
33	-0.000	-0.040	0.016

* $\alpha < .005$.** $\alpha < .001$.

(table continues)

Table 4

Correlations Between Age, Education, and Income and Ratings on R&R
Tokens

Item	Age	Education	Income
34	-0.242**	0.202*	-0.113
35	-0.133	0.176	0.041
36	-0.502**	0.005	-0.166
37	-0.332**	-0.033	-0.107
38	-0.221**	-0.018	-0.092
39	-0.237**	0.013	0.004
40	-0.017	0.002	0.029
41	-0.370**	-0.006	-0.186*
42	-0.044	-0.036	-0.100
43	-0.174	-0.040	-0.011
44	-0.182	-0.013	-0.047
45	0.059	0.016	-0.030
46	-0.103	0.057	0.118
47	-0.175	0.049	0.050
48	-0.206*	0.058	-0.063
49	-0.125	0.112	-0.109
50	-0.083	0.069	-0.097
51	0.002	-0.016	-0.008
52	-0.160	-0.156	-0.181
53	-0.037	-0.021	-0.042
54	-0.151	-0.019	-0.129
55	-0.134	-0.060	-0.111
56	-0.189*	-0.025	-0.077
57	-0.072	-0.060	-0.013
58	-0.191*	0.033	-0.128
59	0.158	-0.067	0.005
60	-0.341**	0.019	-0.061
61	-0.226**	0.106	-0.072
62	-0.230**	-0.157	-0.158
63	-0.209*	-0.086	-0.071
64	-0.181	-0.055	-0.152
65	-0.227**	0.021	-0.073
66	-0.086	-0.106	-0.102

* $\alpha < .005$.** $\alpha < .001$.

(table continues)

Table 4

Correlations Between Age, Education, and Income and Ratings on R&R
Tokens

Item	Age	Education	Income
67	0.003	-0.101	0.051
68	-0.149	0.000	-0.120
69	-0.078	-0.012	-0.111
70	-0.123	0.020	-0.015
71	-0.075	-0.102	-0.053
72	-0.121	0.026	-0.055
73	-0.065	-0.015	-0.080
74	0.166	-0.162	0.084
75	0.088	-0.096	0.042
76	-0.202*	0.009	-0.008
77	-0.181	0.068	-0.092
78	-0.147	0.054	-0.068
79	-0.166	-0.038	-0.061
80	-0.188*	0.072	-0.073
81	-0.130	0.066	0.067
82	-0.186*	0.044	0.020
83	0.159	-0.146	-0.015
84	-0.317**	0.130	-0.136
85	-0.083	0.004	-0.037
86	-0.074	-0.072	0.030
87	-0.257**	0.024	-0.021
88	-0.306**	0.112	-0.107
89	-0.093	-0.028	0.095
90	-0.245**	-0.006	-0.050
91	-0.066	0.023	0.076
92	-0.277**	0.054	-0.119
93	-0.160	0.172	-0.072
94	-0.164	-0.035	-0.083
95	-0.304**	0.017	-0.158
96	-0.369**	0.072	-0.218**
97	-0.076	0.012	-0.014
98	-0.184*	0.043	0.062
99	-0.341**	-0.043	-0.042
100	-0.142	-0.206*	-0.059

* $\alpha < .005$.** $\alpha < .001$.

Table 5

t-test (two-tailed) Between Genders on Ratings of R&R Tokens

Item	Mean (Male)	Mean (Female)	p
1	0.236	-0.592	0.003 *
2	0.830	1.315 #	0.033
3	1.774 #	1.977 #	0.259
4	0.505	-0.093	0.023
5	1.679 #	1.792 #	0.589
6	0.733	0.031	0.004 *
7	-0.314	-0.546	0.313
8	-0.610	-1.662 #	0.000 **
9	0.152	0.481	0.167
10	1.132 #	1.369 #	0.215 ⁷
11	-0.538	-1.138 #	0.016
12	-0.962	0.844	0.000 **
13	0.358	-1.454 #	0.000 **
14	1.028 #	1.492 #	0.041
15	0.085	0.331	0.380
16	0.292	1.123 #	0.002 *
17	0.434	-0.620	0.000 **
18	2.396 ##	2.531 ##	0.314
19	1.811 #	2.115 ##	0.139
20	0.142	0.769	0.008
21	2.462 ##	2.392 ##	0.588
22	1.094 #	1.362 #	0.279
23	-0.528	-0.515	0.953
24	1.792 #	2.146 ##	0.018
25	1.104 #	0.829	0.225
26	-0.434	-0.315	0.607
27	-0.934	-0.977	0.853
28	0.085	0.138	0.820
29	0.689	0.292	0.093
30	0.368	0.477	0.647
31	0.698	0.815	0.627
32	0.962	0.977	0.945
33	0.896	1.469 #	0.005 *

* $p < .005$. ** $p < .001$.

absolute value > 1.000. ## absolute value > 2.000.

(table continues)

Table 5

t-test (two-tailed) Between Genders on Ratings of R&R Tokens

Item	Mean (Male)	Mean (Female)	p
34	-0.123	-0.133	0.965
35	-0.396	-0.446	0.834
36	0.663	0.415	0.314
37	0.453	-1.531 #	0.000 **
38	1.425 #	1.208 #	0.321
39	-0.566	-0.708	0.567
40	1.858 #	1.877 #	0.915
41	-0.462	-0.854	0.110
42	0.934	0.923	0.966
43	-0.594	-0.323	0.241
44	-1.198 #	-0.869	0.134
45	0.811	0.854	0.860
46	-0.481	-0.485	0.989
47	0.085	0.177	0.715
48	0.000	0.069	0.790
49	-0.321	0.310	0.010
50	0.509	1.171 #	0.017
51	0.340	0.369	0.897
52	1.019 #	1.000 #	0.928
53	0.915	0.815	0.630
54	1.472 #	1.962 #	0.028
55	0.557	0.512	0.857
56	0.877	1.146 #	0.287
57	0.311	0.754	0.055
58	0.472	0.615	0.539
59	0.481	1.285 #	0.000 **
60	0.245	-0.808	0.000 **
61	1.105 #	0.685	0.078
62	0.829	0.485	0.192
63	0.410	0.736	0.204
64	-0.075	0.047	0.621
65	1.557 #	1.884 #	0.113
66	-0.283	0.146	0.075

* $p < .005$. ** $p < .001$.

absolute value > 1.000. ## absolute value > 2.000.

(table continues)

Table 5

t-test (two-tailed) Between Genders on Ratings of R&R Tokens

Item	Mean (Male)	Mean (Female)	p
67	2.632 ##	2.562 ##	0.556
68	1.925 #	1.792 #	0.504
69	2.500 ##	2.208 ##	0.088
70	1.613 #	1.338 #	0.260
71	1.434 #	1.854 #	0.023
72	1.547 #	1.800 #	0.171
73	0.660	0.907	0.295
74	1.858 #	2.262 ##	0.012
75	2.443 ##	2.527 ##	0.516
76	-0.509	-1.408 #	0.001 **
77	1.717 #	1.922 #	0.258
78	0.368	0.685	0.184
79	0.571	0.785	0.407
80	2.075 ##	1.869 #	0.334
81	-0.811	-0.815	0.987
82	0.538	0.415	0.624
83	1.676 #	1.862 #	0.291
84	0.566	0.415	0.541
85	2.264 ##	2.169 ##	0.574
86	2.208 ##	2.186 ##	0.887
87	-0.495	-0.092	0.106
88	0.849	0.492	0.191
89	-0.472	-0.783	0.196
90	0.906	0.462	0.068
91	0.830	0.508	0.190
92	1.604 #	1.515 #	0.641
93	0.528	0.546	0.939
94	-0.264	0.208	0.044
95	-0.953	-0.527	0.072
96	0.453	0.473	0.944
97	0.152	0.469	0.174
98	-1.028 #	-0.792	0.275
99	0.915	0.357	0.054
100	2.113 ##	1.915 #	0.287

* $p < .005$. ** $p < .001$.# absolute value > 1.000 .## absolute value > 2.000 .

Table 6

Means for Job Positions for Ratings on R&R Tokens

Item Number	Clerical	Professional	Laborer	Manager	Technician
1	-0.436 #	-0.481 #	1.111 #	-0.161 #	-0.500 ##
2	1.308 ##	1.152 #	1.056 #	1.226 #	-2.000 ##
3	2.000 ##	1.835 #	1.889 #	2.097 ##	1.000 #
4	-0.921 #	0.141 #	0.444 #	0.677 #	0.500 #
5	1.667 #	1.557 #	1.111 #	1.774 #	2.500 ##
6	-0.564 #	0.359 #	0.222 #	0.871 #	0.250 #
7	-0.769 #	-0.481 #	-0.722 #	0.000 #	1.750 #
8	-1.821 #	-1.684 #	-0.118 #	-1.000 #	-1.500 #
9	0.590 #	0.372 #	0.471 #	-0.032 #	-1.000 #
10	1.410 #	0.924 #	1.611 #	0.871 #	2.000 ##
11	-1.103 #	-0.962 #	0.222 #	-0.839 #	-2.250 ##
12	0.923 #	0.013 #	-0.500 #	-0.323 #	-0.250 #
13	-1.718 #	-1.228 #	0.111 #	-0.677 #	-0.750 #
14	1.590 #	1.215 #	0.444 #	1.710 #	0.500 #
15	0.205 #	0.253 #	-0.222 #	-0.065 #	-1.000 #
16	0.718 #	0.392 #	1.389 #	0.484 #	-0.250 #
17	-1.263 #	-0.468 #	1.000 #	0.032 #	0.500 #
18	2.359 ##	2.291 ##	2.722 ##	2.452 ##	2.750 ##
19	1.718 #	1.949 #	2.333 ##	2.419 ##	1.250 #
20	0.821 #	0.354 #	1.056 #	0.387 #	-0.250 #
21	2.308 ##	2.278 ##	2.611 ##	2.484 ##	2.750 ##
22	1.077 #	1.089 #	1.389 #	1.194 #	1.000 #
23	-0.487 #	0.633 #	-0.278 #	-0.774 #	-1.000 #
24	2.282 ##	1.835 #	1.722 #	2.032 ##	2.750 ##
25	1.282 #	0.608 #	1.056 #	0.800 #	1.750 #

absolute value > 1.000 ## absolute value > 2.000 ### absolute value > 3.000

(table continues)

Table 6

Means for Job Positions for Ratings on R&R Tokens

Item Number	Clerical	Professional	Laborer	Manager	Technician
26	-0.538	-0.544	-0.944	-0.194	0.000
27	-1.231 #	-0.937	-1.444 #	-1.000 #	-2.250 ##
28	0.103	-0.127	0.444	0.355	0.500
29	0.026	0.127	0.778	0.548	0.250
30	0.462	0.165	0.222	0.226	1.000 #
31	1.128	0.456	0.333	1.032 #	0.250
32	1.179	0.641	1.056 #	0.452	1.250 #
33	1.641 #	1.253 #	0.444	1.194 #	0.750
34	0.000	-0.143	-0.389	-0.581	-0.750
35	-0.590	-0.316	-0.833	-1.161 #	-1.750 #
36	0.385	0.114	0.944	0.097	2.500 ##
37	-1.744 #	-0.975	0.611	-1.323 #	0.750
38	1.410 #	0.734	1.556 #	1.161 #	2.250 ##
39	-0.923	-0.810	-0.278	-0.677	-0.250
40	2.077 ##	1.646 #	2.500 ##	2.000 ##	2.250 ##
41	-0.615	-1.304 #	0.500	-0.645	-0.500
42	1.103 #	0.544	1.556 #	0.677	0.000
43	-0.436 #	-0.747	-0.556	-0.548	-0.250
44	-1.000 #	-1.203 #	-1.167 #	-0.871	-1.750 #
45	-0.795	0.886	1.000 #	0.452	1.000 #
46	-0.795	-0.342	-0.556	-0.774	-1.750 #
47	-0.154	0.253	-0.278	-0.194	2.000 ##
48	-0.179	-0.241	-0.278	0.000	-1.000 #
49	0.205	-0.192	0.444	-0.226	-0.250
50	1.179 #	0.615	1.111 #	0.581	-0.250

absolute value > 1.000 ## absolute value > 2.000 ### absolute value > 3.000

(table continues)

Table 6

Means for Job Positions for Ratings on R&R Tokens

Item Number	Clerical	Professional	Laborer	Manager	Technician
51	-0.179	0.582	0.944	0.290	1.000
52	1.000	0.823	1.444	0.935	-0.250
53	-0.744	0.861	0.611	0.806	-0.250
54	1.769	1.646	1.611	1.355	1.250
55	0.816	0.013	0.444	0.677	1.000
56	1.051	0.835	1.111	1.194	1.250
57	0.769	0.443	0.000	0.323	0.250
58	0.538	0.456	0.833	0.226	1.500
59	1.333	0.975	0.111	1.387	1.000
60	-0.667	-0.722	0.889	-0.355	-0.500
61	0.590	0.603	1.111	0.935	0.750
62	0.795	-0.205	1.667	0.548	2.500
63	1.026	0.051	0.722	0.667	-0.750
64	0.308	-0.367	0.722	-0.700	0.750
65	1.974	1.392	1.882	2.097	2.000
66	0.359	-0.304	0.500	-0.065	-0.750
67	2.821	2.506	2.833	2.419	3.000
68	2.026	1.481	2.278	1.774	3.000
69	2.513	2.152	2.667	1.968	2.500
70	1.077	1.430	0.833	1.419	1.250
71	2.077	1.544	1.228	1.226	3.000
72	1.846	1.468	1.722	1.645	3.000
73	0.872	0.595	0.944	0.533	1.000
74	2.256	2.063	1.778	2.452	3.000
75	2.590	2.346	2.556	2.742	3.000

absolute value > 1.000 ## absolute value > 2.000 ### absolute value > 3.000

(table continues)

Table 6

Means for Job Positions for Ratings on R&R Tokens

Item Number	Clerical	Professional	Laborer	Manager	Technician
76	-1.077 #	-1.253 #	-0.333 #	-0.806 #	-2.250 ##
77	2.051 ##	1.468 #	2.444 ##	1.806 #	1.250 #
78	0.692 #	0.278 #	0.778 #	0.129 #	0.000 #
79	1.026 #	0.192 #	1.444 #	0.710 #	0.250 #
80	2.154 ##	1.722 #	2.000 ##	1.774 #	1.500 #
81	-0.692 #	-0.911 #	-0.722 #	-0.903 #	-1.000 #
82	0.154 #	0.620 #	0.000 #	0.677 #	-0.500 #
83	2.128 ##	1.608 #	1.833 #	1.871 #	1.750 #
84	0.410 #	0.203 #	1.111 #	-0.032 #	0.250 #
85	2.308 ##	2.025 ##	2.667 ##	2.097 ##	2.500 ##
86	2.553 ##	1.873 #	1.889 #	2.452 ##	1.750 #
87	-0.282 #	-0.449 #	-0.500 #	-0.419 #	-1.250 #
88	0.564 #	0.354 #	0.778 #	0.194 #	1.250 #
89	-0.921 #	-0.684 #	-0.778 #	-0.903 #	0.250 #
90	0.231 #	0.544 #	0.722 #	0.484 #	1.750 #
91	0.667 #	0.329 #	0.056 #	0.968 #	0.000 #
92	1.359 #	1.342 #	1.944 #	1.387 #	1.500 #
93	0.179 #	0.316 #	0.722 #	0.839 #	-0.750 #
94	0.000 #	-0.127 #	-0.444 #	-0.097 #	-0.500 #
95	-0.395 #	-1.101 #	-0.167 #	-0.806 #	-1.250 #
96	0.513 #	-0.115 #	1.444 #	-0.290 #	0.500 #
97	0.590 #	0.190 #	0.389 #	0.600 #	-1.250 #
98	-0.923 #	-1.089 #	-0.889 #	-0.484 #	-1.250 #
99	0.795 #	0.241 #	1.167 #	-0.100 #	0.750 #
100	2.026 ##	1.873 #	2.667 ##	1.548 #	3.000 ###

absolute value > 1.000 ## absolute value > 2.000 ### absolute value > 3.000

(table continues)

Table 6

Means for Job Positions for Ratings on R&R Tokens

Item Number	Sales	Retired	Military	Self-employed	Other
1	-0.083	-1.000	0.000	-1.000	0.065
2	0.333	1.500	0.364	1.714	1.355
3	1.500	2.750	2.182	1.857	1.710
4	-0.333	0.250	1.182	-0.286	0.839
5	2.250	2.000	2.364	2.143	2.000
6	-0.083	0.000	1.091	1.286	0.767
7	-0.417	-2.250	-0.364	-0.667	-0.258
8	-0.917	-1.500	2.000	-2.714	-0.742
9	0.250	-1.750	-0.091	0.429	0.806
10	1.750	0.750	1.000	2.286	1.774
11	-0.417	-1.750	-0.636	-1.143	-0.903
12	0.750	-0.500	-0.909	-0.286	0.000
13	-0.917	-1.250	0.091	-1.000	-0.613
14	1.417	1.250	0.545	1.000	1.516
15	0.500	1.250	-0.091	0.714	0.613
16	2.083	2.000	1.727	-0.143	0.903
17	-0.417	1.000	0.727	0.714	0.581
18	2.833	2.500	2.636	2.857	2.613
19	2.083	2.500	1.545	2.286	1.806
20	1.000	-1.250	0.909	-0.143	0.290
21	2.417	2.750	2.545	2.429	2.645
22	1.750	1.500	1.455	0.571	1.677
23	-0.250	0.500	-0.455	-0.429	-0.387
24	2.250	1.750	1.273	2.286	2.129
25	0.833	0.500	2.000	0.571	1.226

absolute value > 1.000 ## absolute value > 2.000 ### absolute value > 3.000

(table continues)

Table 6

Means for Job Positions for Ratings on R&R Tokens

Item Number	Sales	Retired	Military	Self-employed	Other
26	0.083	-0.250	0.091	-0.286	0.032
27	-0.167	-1.250	-1.000	-0.143	-0.613
28	0.250	1.250	-0.364	1.000	0.032
29	0.583	1.750	0.636	1.429	1.194
30	0.750	1.500	0.091	1.429	0.935
31	0.167	1.500	1.273	1.143	1.000
32	1.333	1.000	1.818	1.286	1.452
33	1.083	0.500	-0.091	1.286	1.677
34	-0.083	-0.500	0.364	0.571	0.129
35	0.417	0.500	-1.000	1.286	0.032
36	1.417	0.000	1.909	1.000	0.828
37	-1.000	1.750	1.909	1.143	-0.097
38	1.500	2.250	2.727	2.143	1.613
39	-0.500	0.250	-0.909	0.143	-0.355
40	1.500	2.500	2.364	1.857	1.516
41	0.250	-2.000	-0.455	-0.571	-0.194
42	0.583	1.500	0.636	1.714	1.677
43	0.500	-1.750	0.091	0.000	-0.032
44	-0.250	-1.750	-0.636	-0.429	-1.000
45	1.083	1.500	1.000	0.857	0.774
46	-0.083	-0.750	-0.818	0.714	-0.226
47	0.333	0.750	0.000	0.714	0.290
48	0.917	0.500	0.364	0.714	0.710
49	0.250	0.500	0.000	0.286	0.194
50	0.583	1.250	0.818	1.714	1.323

absolute value > 1.000 ## absolute value > 2.000 ### absolute value > 3.000

(table continues)

Table 6

Means for Job Positions for Ratings on R&R Tokens

Item Number	Sales	Retired	Military	Self-employed	Other
51	0.000	0.500	0.000	0.286	0.355
52	0.500	0.500	1.455	1.000	1.581
53	0.583	1.500	1.000	1.286	1.226
54	2.083	1.750	2.455	2.857	1.839
55	1.667	-0.500	2.000	0.857	0.452
56	1.000	1.750	2.273	1.143	0.677
57	0.917	1.250	0.455	0.286	1.032
58	0.583	0.250	0.909	1.714	0.484
59	0.750	1.750	0.273	0.857	0.484
60	-0.083	-0.750	0.545	-0.429	0.065
61	0.833	2.500	1.818	1.571	1.032
62	1.000	-0.250	2.364	1.429	1.000
63	1.500	0.000	1.273	0.429	0.935
64	0.333	0.250	0.000	1.000	0.258
65	2.083	1.000	2.182	1.571	1.677
66	0.000	0.000	0.091	-0.286	-0.129
67	2.750	2.500	2.909	2.857	2.290
68	2.000	2.500	2.455	2.143	1.839
69	2.333	3.000	2.909	2.714	2.387
70	1.583	2.500	2.364	2.714	1.677
71	1.833	1.750	2.000	1.714	1.742
72	1.833	2.250	1.909	1.857	1.645
73	0.667	1.250	1.364	1.429	1.000
74	1.917	2.250	1.727	1.571	1.871
75	2.000	2.250	2.182	2.714	2.645

absolute value > 1.000 ## absolute value > 2.000 ### absolute value > 3.000

(table continues)

Table 6

Means for Job Positions for Ratings on R&R Tokens

Item Number	Sales	Retired	Military	Self-employed	Other
76	-0.750	-1.250	-0.545	-1.286	-0.871
77	2.000	1.500	2.455	1.714	2.000
78	0.750	0.500	1.182	0.714	1.032
79	0.917	-1.000	1.455	0.857	0.935
80	2.083	2.500	2.636	2.286	2.129
81	-0.833	-1.500	-0.455	-0.857	-0.677
82	0.500	-0.250	1.182	0.143	0.581
83	2.000	1.750	1.909	1.429	1.600
84	0.667	0.250	1.455	0.571	1.065
85	2.417	3.000	2.545	2.429	2.032
86	2.333	2.500	2.727	1.714	2.387
87	1.000	-0.250	0.091	-0.286	-0.032
88	1.667	1.000	2.091	0.714	0.871
89	-0.917	-1.250	-0.273	0.143	-0.097
90	0.833	0.000	1.727	1.143	1.032
91	1.000	2.500	1.545	1.143	0.774
92	1.833	1.750	2.545	1.571	1.806
93	1.167	1.250	1.091	0.000	0.903
94	0.500	0.000	0.273	0.429	0.323
95	-0.250	-1.250	-0.909	-0.571	-0.387
96	0.833	0.250	2.091	-0.286	1.516
97	0.417	0.500	1.000	0.000	0.032
98	-0.417	-1.750	-0.727	-1.000	-0.871
99	1.083	-1.000	2.182	-0.571	1.129
100	2.167	1.000	2.636	2.571	1.968

absolute value > 1.000 ## absolute value > 2.000 ### absolute value > 3.000

Table 7

Means for Marital Status for Ratings on R&R Tokens

Item Number	Married	Single	Divorced	Separated	Engaged
1	-0.440 #	0.342	-1.143 #	-0.250 #	0.143 ##
2	1.207 #	0.763	1.286 #	1.000 #	2.571 ##
3	1.922 #	1.662 #	2.333 ##	1.937 #	2.143 ##
4	0.103 #	0.227 #	0.100 #	-0.062 #	1.571 #
5	1.586 #	2.039 ##	1.286 #	1.625 #	2.714 ##
6	0.243 #	0.200 #	0.762 #	0.750 #	1.429 #
7	-0.452 #	-0.289 #	-0.667 #	-1.125 #	0.286 #
8	-1.552 #	-0.720 #	-1.762 #	-0.438 #	-0.286 #
9	0.259 #	0.573 #	-0.100 #	-0.062 #	1.143 #
10	1.293 #	1.237 #	0.810 #	1.437 #	2.000 ##
11	-1.164 #	-0.329 #	-1.714 #	-1.000 #	1.000 #
12	0.086 #	0.118 #	-0.667 #	0.000 #	1.000 #
13	-1.017 #	-0.882 #	-1.238 #	-0.375 #	-1.429 #
14	1.345 #	1.276 #	1.286 #	1.000 #	1.000 #
15	0.345 #	0.000 #	0.143 #	-0.062 #	1.429 #
16	0.690 #	1.066 #	-0.381 #	0.687 #	1.857 #
17	-0.113 #	-0.303 #	-0.238 #	-0.063 #	1.143 #
18	2.293 ##	2.671 ##	2.429 ##	2.625 ##	3.000 ###
19	2.052 ##	1.855 #	1.667 #	2.375 ##	2.143 ##
20	0.293 ##	0.921 #	-0.048 #	0.563 #	0.429 #
21	2.405 ##	2.395 ##	2.381 ##	2.625 ##	2.714 ##
22	0.983 #	1.566 #	1.238 #	1.500 #	1.429 #
23	-0.491 #	-0.579 #	-0.905 #	-0.063 #	-0.286 #
24	1.879 #	2.197 ##	1.905 #	1.750 #	2.286 ##
25	0.643 #	1.395 #	0.667 #	1.000 #	2.000 ##

absolute value > 1.000 ## absolute value > 2.000 ### absolute value > 3.000
 (table continues)

Table 7

Means for Marital Status for Ratings on R&R Tokens

Item Number	Married	Single	Divorced	Separated	Engaged
26	-0.440	-0.184	-0.857	-0.687	1.000 #
27	-1.069 #	-0.776	-1.476 #	-0.687	-0.143
28	0.078	0.105	-0.143	0.375	1.000 #
29	0.388	0.789	-0.714	0.625	1.571 #
30	0.310	0.829	-0.619	0.437	1.143 #
31	0.767	0.842	0.619	0.312	1.286 #
32	0.670	1.434 #	0.571	1.062 #	1.857 #
33	1.164 #	1.289 #	1.048 #	1.250 #	1.571 #
34	-0.430	0.197	-0.333	0.687	0.000
35	-0.569	-0.224	-0.714	0.438	0.714
36	0.217	1.053 #	-0.714	1.250 #	2.000 ##
37	-1.026 #	-0.250 #	-1.048 #	0.688 #	-0.286 #
38	1.164 #	1.461 #	1.143 #	1.750 #	1.429 #
39	-0.897	-0.250 #	-1.476 #	-0.188 #	0.714 #
40	1.802 #	2.066 ##	1.667 #	1.687 #	1.857 #
41	-1.112 #	0.026 #	-1.667 #	-0.063 #	0.429 #
42	0.983	0.763	0.714	1.062 #	2.143 ##
43	-0.578	-0.039	-1.190 #	-0.437	-0.429
44	-1.172 #	-0.671	-1.524 #	-0.937	-0.857
45	1.060	0.750	0.667	0.188	0.000
46	-0.440	-0.329	-1.524 #	-0.500	0.286
47	0.017	0.553	-0.857	0.062	0.714
48	-0.069	0.250	-0.714	0.375	1.000 #
49	0.060	0.092	-0.300	0.000	-0.286
50	0.965	0.934	0.238	0.625	1.143 #

absolute value > 1.000 ## absolute value > 2.000 ### absolute value > 3.000

(table continues)

Table 7

Means for Marital Status for Ratings on R&R Tokens

Item Number	Married	Single	Divorced	Separated	Engaged
51	0.3622	0.158	0.524	0.562	1.429
52	0.776	1.184	1.095	1.188	2.286
53	0.724	1.039	0.667	0.750	2.000
54	1.586	1.947	1.524	2.000	2.143
55	0.226	0.763	0.667	1.187	1.143
56	1.087	0.842	0.619	1.750	1.714
57	0.466	0.829	-0.286	0.500	1.714
58	0.466	0.829	0.143	0.500	1.143
59	1.190	0.539	0.762	1.000	1.000
60	-0.543	0.145	-1.476	-0.062	0.714
61	0.652	1.079	0.381	1.563	2.143
62	0.374	0.776	0.810	0.875	2.429
63	0.377	0.987	-0.048	0.750	1.286
64	-0.165	0.263	-0.333	-0.188	1.000
65	1.478	1.908	2.048	2.063	2.429
66	-0.060	0.105	-0.714	0.062	0.286
67	2.569	2.592	2.714	2.438	3.000
68	1.655	2.000	2.095	1.938	2.571
69	2.121	2.618	2.381	2.375	2.714
70	1.267	1.789	0.810	1.750	2.429
71	1.500	1.895	1.810	1.313	2.286
72	1.543	1.895	1.762	1.437	2.143
73	0.730	0.816	0.381	1.312	1.714
74	2.181	1.842	2.238	2.188	2.286
75	2.586	2.413	2.048	2.625	2.714

absolute value > 1.000 ## absolute value > 2.000 ### absolute value > 3.000

(table continues)

Table 7

Means for Marital Status for Ratings on R&R Tokens

Item Number	Married	Single	Divorced	Separated	Engaged
76	-1.267 #	-0.461 ##	-1.714 #	-0.875 ##	-0.714 ##
77	1.621 #	2.066 ##	1.667 #	2.313 ##	2.167 ##
78	0.190	0.921	0.810	0.937	0.571
79	0.313	1.079 #	0.571	1.375 #	1.429 #
80	1.569 #	2.316 ##	2.143 ##	2.500 ##	2.857 ##
81	-0.845	-0.671	-1.238 #	2.250 ##	-0.857
82	0.000	1.053 #	0.048	-0.067	1.857 #
83	1.791 #	1.632 #	1.714 #	1.000 #	2.429 ##
84	0.121	0.921	0.667	-0.687	0.571
85	2.069 ##	2.211 ##	2.714 ##	0.875	3.000 ###
86	2.078 ##	2.316 ##	2.143 ##	0.812	2.857 ##
87	-0.457	0.132	-1.095 #	2.000 ##	0.429
88	0.155	1.408 #	-0.095	0.562	2.143 ##
89	-0.690	-0.533	-1.048 #	-0.063	0.286
90	0.440	1.158 #	-0.190	-0.375	1.000 #
91	0.500	0.697	0.905	0.812	1.571 #
92	1.336 #	1.803 #	1.381 #	2.000 ##	2.000 ##
93	0.284	0.816	0.762	0.562	1.000 #
94	-0.129	0.237	-0.381	-0.063	0.714
95	-0.784	-0.613	-1.143 #	-0.375	-0.286
96	0.130	0.789	0.476	0.812	1.571 #
97	0.302	0.227	0.238	0.750	1.143 #
98	-0.879	-0.842	-1.476 #	-0.500	-1.000 #
99	0.322	1.105 #	-0.524	1.000 #	2.429 ##
100	1.716 #	2.316 ##	2.095 ##	2.063 ##	3.000 ###

absolute value > 1.000 ## absolute value > 2.000 ### absolute value > 3.000

Table 8

Factor Names and Loadings

Item Number	Nonverbal Recognition	Sports	Gifts	Household
47	0.708			
46	0.629			
35	0.625			
27	0.530			
39	0.525			
44	0.510			
1		0.787		
11		0.736		
76		0.705		
60		0.672		
81			0.711	
98			0.652	
89			0.652	
43			0.526	
23			0.514	
42				0.655
15				0.553
50				0.547

(table continues)

Table 8

Factor Names and Loadings

Item Number	Entertainment	Verbal Recognition	Hobby	Plants/ Fruit
68	0.637			
72	0.589			
33		0.763		
14		0.741		
53		0.570		
45		0.541		
34			0.710	
90			0.545	
49				0.684
66				0.633

(table continues)

Table 8

Factor Names and Loadings

Item Number	Adventure	Responsibility	Stress	Use of Co. Equipment
37	0.712			
8	0.674			
17	0.551			
91		0.778		
61		0.642		
86		0.573		
77			0.818	
92			0.712	
40			0.575	
6				0.777
51				0.732

(table continues)

Table 8

Factor Names and Loadings

Item Number	Travel	Educational Opportunities	Benefits	Stock/ Membership
5	0.773			
31	0.502			
74		0.756		
59		0.688		
83		0.665		
75			0.755	
21			0.695	
19				0.780
22				0.507

Table 9

Eigenvalues

Factor Name	Eigenvalue
Nonverbal Recognition	3.749
Sports	3.695
Gifts	3.686
Household	3.551
Entertainment	3.361
Verbal Recognition	3.327
Hobby	3.319
Plants/Fruit	3.209
Adventure	3.193
Responsibility	3.173
Stress	3.124
Use of Co. Equipment	3.100
Travel	3.037
Educ. Opportunities	2.870
Stock/Membership	2.700
Benefits	2.507

Table 10

Means and Standard Deviations for Ratings on Factors

Factor	Mean	SD
Nonverbal Recognition	1.048 #	1.300
Sports	-0.607	1.730
Gifts	-0.669	1.431
Household	0.667	1.780
Entertainment	1.769 #	1.362
Verbal Recognition	1.048 #	1.300
Hobby	0.269	1.568
Plants/Fruit	-0.011	1.684
Adventure	-0.657	1.646
Responsibility	1.255 #	1.290
Stress	1.755 #	1.118
Use of Co. Equipment	0.353	1.618
Travel	1.252 #	1.455
Educ. Opportunities	1.590 #	1.109
Stock/Membership	1.610 #	1.409
Benefits	2.468 ##	0.813

absolute value > 1.000.

absolute value > 2.000.

Table 11

Correlations Between Age, Education, and Income and Ratings on Factors

Factor	Age	Education	Income
Nonverbal Recognition	-0.194 *	0.075	0.052
Sports	-0.304 **	0.034	-0.017
Gifts	-0.159	0.013	0.055
Household	-0.020	0.039	-0.079
Entertainment	-0.139	0.008	-0.104
Verbal Recognition	0.049	-0.011	0.035
Hobby	-0.290 **	0.120	-0.087
Plants/Fruit	-0.085	0.005	-0.097
Adventure	-0.438 **	-0.027	-0.153
Responsibility	-0.176	0.060	0.012
Stress	-0.158	0.044	-0.066
Use of Co. Equipment	-0.016	-0.034	0.047
Travel	-0.112	0.115	-0.010
Educ. Opportunities	0.198 *	-0.141	0.042
Stock/Membership	-0.211 *	0.131	-0.048
Benefits	0.078	-0.077	-0.005

* $\alpha < .005$.** $\alpha < .001$.

Table 12

t-test (two-tailed) Between Gender and Ratings on Factors

Factor	Mean (Male)	Mean (Female)	p
Nonverbal Recognition	-0.582	-0.551	0.873
Sports	-0.142	-0.987	0.000 **
Gifts	-0.687	-0.654	0.862
Household	0.509	0.769	0.219
Entertainment	1.736 #	1.796 #	0.732
Verbal Recognition	0.913	1.158 #	0.149
Hobby	0.392	0.168	0.276
Plants/Fruit	-0.302	0.229	0.016
Adventure	0.089	-1.264 #	0.000 **
Responsibility	1.390 #	1.145 #	0.146
Stress	1.726 #	1.778 #	0.728
Use of Co. Equipment	0.538	0.202	0.105
Travel	1.189 #	1.304 #	0.544
Educ. Opportunities	1.327 #	1.803 #	0.001 **
Stock/Membership	1.453 #	1.738 #	0.123
Benefits	2.453 ##	2.481 ##	0.792

* $p < .005$. ** $p < .001$.

absolute value > 1.000. ## absolute value > 2.000.

Table 13

Means for Job Positions for Ratings on Factors

Factor Name	Clerical	Professional	Laborer	Manager
Nonverbal Recognition	-0.782	-0.559	-0.759	-0.780
Sports	-0.821	-0.854	0.472	-0.540
Gifts	-0.721	-0.813	-0.644	-0.723
Household	0.829	0.449	0.815	0.398
Entertainment	1.936	1.475	2.000	1.710
Verbal Recognition	1.192	1.054	0.625	1.040
Hobby	0.115	0.208	0.167	-0.048
Plants/Fruit	0.282	-0.250	0.472	-0.145
Adventure	-1.588	-1.042	0.490	-0.763
Responsibility	1.333	0.944	1.019	1.452
Stress	1.829	1.485	2.296	1.731
Use of Co. Equipment	-0.372	0.474	0.583	0.581
Travel	1.397	1.006	0.722	1.403
Educ. Opportunities	1.906	1.549	1.241	1.903
Stock/Membership	1.397	1.519	1.861	1.806
Benefits	2.449	2.346	2.583	2.613

absolute value > 1.000 ## absolute value > 2.000 ### absolute value > 3.000

(table continues)

Table 13

Means for Job Positions for Ratings on Factors

Factor	Technician	Sales	Retired	Military
Nonverbal Recognition	-0.958	-0.042	-0.375	-0.727
Sports	-1.375 #	-0.333	-1.187 #	-0.159
Gifts	-0.650	-0.383	-1.150 #	-0.364
Household	-0.417	0.556	1.333 #	0.455
Entertainment	3.000 ###	1.917 #	2.375 ##	2.182 ##
Verbal Recognition	0.500	1.042 #	1.187 #	0.614 #
Hobby	0.500	0.375	-0.250	1.045 #
Plants/Fruit	-0.500	0.125	0.250	0.045
Adventure	-0.083	-0.778	0.417	1.545 #
Responsibility	0.833	1.389 #	2.500 ##	2.030 ##
Stress	1.667 #	1.778 #	1.917 #	2.455 ##
Use of Co. Equipment	0.625	-0.042	0.250	0.545
Travel	1.375 #	1.208 #	1.750 #	1.818 #
Educ. Opportunities	1.917 #	1.556 #	1.917 #	1.303 #
Stock/Membership	1.125 #	1.917 #	2.000 ##	1.500 #
Benefits	2.875 ##	2.208 ##	2.500 ##	2.364 ##

absolute value > 1.000 ## absolute value > 2.000 ### absolute value > 3.000

(table continues)

Table 13

Means for Job Positions for Ratings on Factors

Factor Name	Self-employed	Other
Nonverbal Recognition	0.381	-0.312
Sports	-0.964	-0.411
Gifts	-0.429	-0.413
Household	1.381 #	1.204 #
Entertainment	2.000 ##	1.742 #
Verbal Recognition	1.107 #	1.298 #
Hobby	0.857	0.581
Plants/Fruit	0.000	0.032
Adventure	-0.286	-0.086
Responsibility	1.476 #	1.398 #
Stress	1.714 #	1.800 #
Use of Co. Equipment	0.786	0.567
Travel	1.643 #	1.500 #
Educ. Opportunities	1.286 #	1.278 #
Stock/Membership	1.429 #	1.742 #
Benefits	2.571 ##	2.645 ##

absolute value > 1.000 ## absolute value > 2.000 ### absolute value > 3.000

Table 14

Means for Marital Status for Ratings on Factors

Factor Name	Married	Single	Divorced	Separated
Nonverbal Recognition	-0.688	-0.283	-1.262	-0.448
Sports	-0.853	-0.076	-1.512	-0.547
Gifts	-0.697	-0.547	-1.171	-0.475
Household	0.751	0.566	0.365	0.542
Entertainment	1.599	1.947	1.929	1.687
Verbal Recognition	1.073	1.089	0.917	0.797
Hobby	0.009	0.678	-0.262	0.781
Plants/Fruit	0.000	0.099	-0.525	0.031
Adventure	-0.887	-0.436	-1.016	0.063
Responsibility	1.105	1.364	1.143	1.542
Stress	1.586	1.978	1.571	2.000
Use of Co. Equipment	0.304	0.180	0.643	0.656
Travel	1.177	1.441	0.952	0.969
Educ. Opportunities	1.713	1.338	1.571	1.792
Stock/Membership	1.517	1.711	1.452	1.937
Benefits	2.496	2.440	2.214	2.625

absolute value > 1.000 ## absolute value > 2.000 ### absolute value > 3.000

(table continues)

Table 14

Means for Marital Status for Ratings on Factors

Factor Name	Engaged
Nonverbal Recognition	0.238
Sports	0.286
Gifts	-0.457
Household	1.571 #
Entertainment	2.357 ##
Verbal Recognition	1.143 #
Hobby	0.500
Plants/Fruit	0.000
Adventure	0.190
Responsibility	2.190 ##
Stress	2.167 ##
Use of Co. Equipment	1.429 #
Travel	2.000 ##
Educ. Opportunities	1.905 #
Stock/Membership	1.786 #
Benefits	2.714 ##

absolute value > 1.000 ## absolute value > 2.000 ### absolute value > 3.000

Table 15

ANOVA for Job Position for ratings on Factors

Factor	df	MS	F-ratio	p
Nonverbal Recognition	9	1.837	0.859	0.563
ERROR	226	2.139		
Sports	9	4.068	1.378	0.199
ERROR	226	2.951		
Gifts	9	0.800	0.381	0.943
ERROR	225	2.089		
Household	9	3.002	0.946	0.486
ERROR	225	3.175		
Entertainment	9	2.118	1.149	0.329
ERROR	226	1.843		
Verbal Recognition	9	1.040	0.606	0.792
ERROR	226	1.717		
Hobby	9	2.001	0.808	0.609
ERROR	224	2.476		
Plants/Fruit	9	1.568	0.543	0.842
ERROR	225	2.887		
Adventure	9	15.322	6.960	0.000 **
ERROR	224	2.201		

* $p < .005$.** $p < .001$.

(table continues)

Table 15

ANOVA for Job Position for ratings on Factors

Factor	df	MS	F-ratio	p
Responsibility	9	2.742	1.691	0.092
ERROR	224	1.621		
Stress	9	1.872	1.528	0.139
ERROR	225	1.226		
Use of Co. Equipment	9	3.277	1.264	0.258
ERROR	224	2.592		
Travel	9	2.103	0.993	0.447
ERROR	226	2.119		
Educ. Opportunities	9	1.624	1.337	0.219
ERROR	225	1.215		
Stock/Membership	9	0.925	0.456	0.902
ERROR	226	2.028		
Benefits	9	0.523	0.785	0.630
ERROR	225	0.666		

* $p < .005$.** $p < .001$.

Table 16

ANOVA for Marital Status for ratings on Factors

Factor	df	MS	F-ratio	p
Nonverbal Recognition	4	5.686	2.753	0.029
ERROR	231	2.066		
Sports	4	12.834	4.545	0.001 **
ERROR	231	2.824		
Gifts	4	1.982	1.628	0.462
ERROR	230	1.218		
Household	4	2.369	0.745	0.563
ERROR	230	3.182		
Entertainment	4	2.207	1.194	0.314
ERROR	231	1.848		
Verbal Recognition	4	0.409	0.239	0.916
ERROR	231	1.713		
Hobby	4	7.725	3.266	0.013
ERROR	229	2.365		
Plants/Fruit	4	1.560	0.546	0.702
ERROR	230	2.859		
Adventure	4	6.443	2.438	0.048
ERROR	229	2.643		

* $p < .005$.** $p < .001$.

(table continues)

Table 16

ANOVA for Marital Status for ratings on Factors

Factor	df	MS	F-ratio	p
Responsibility	4	2.791	1.697	0.152
ERROR	229	1.645		
Stress	4	2.443	1.986	0.097
ERROR	230	1.230		
Use of Co. Equipment	4	3.463	1.330	0.260
ERROR	229	2.604		
Travel	4	2.613	1.239	0.295
ERROR	231	2.110		
Educ. Opportunities	4	1.982	1.628	0.168
ERROR	230	1.218		
Stock/Membership	4	1.055	0.527	0.716
ERROR	231	2.002		
Benefits	4	0.580	0.876	0.479
ERROR	230	0.662		

* $p < .005$.** $p < .001$.