2016

The Power of Perks: Equity Theory and Job Satisfaction in Silicon Valley

Kristi Sun
Scripps College

THE POWER OF PERKS:
EQUITY THEORY AND JOB SATISFACTION IN SILICON VALLEY

BY

KRISTI K. SUN

SUBMITTED TO SCRIPPS COLLEGE IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT
OF THE DEGREE OF BACHELOR OF ARTS

PROFESSOR WOOD
PROFESSOR LEMASTER

April 22nd, 2016

Abstract

Silicon Valley is known for its amazing workspace and perks. Due to Equity Theory and Two-factor Theory, employees should be content and stay longer. However, studies have found that there's a higher rate of job-hopping, which seems like a contradiction (Fallick et al, 2006). Participants were 135 engineers, ages 18 to 35 years old, who completed an online survey looking at job satisfaction, job expectations, perk usage, employee perception of perks, personal equity sensitivity, and comparison others. Recruitment was done through personal connections in the Bay Area and various social media sites that are targeted towards engineers. Results did not show that job satisfaction influenced job expectations while individual differences in equity didn't influence perk usage, perceptions of job expectations. In conclusion, this research adds to the dearth of literature about Silicon Valley, and, more broadly, explored a link between Equity Theory and Two-Factor Theory that had not been previously examined.

Search terms: Silicon Valley, Equity Theory, Job Satisfaction

Introduction

Today, Silicon Valley and its unbelievable workspace have officially permeated the cultural zeitgeist: in the past two years, there has been two movies about the life of Apple founder Steve Jobs. In the movie *The Internship* (2013), Google's massive Mountain View headquarters, the Googleplex, shares just as much screen time as Hollywood stars Owen Wilson and Vince Vaughn, while HBO has found success with its 2014 sitcom, *Silicon Valley*. Currently, there is an intense fascination about the workplace culture of the United States' hub of technological prowess.

Today, "Silicon Valley" is generally used as a metonym for the technology industry in the United States, just as "Wall Street" is used to refer to finance and "the Capitol," politics. To properly understand Silicon Valley, it is imperative to define the region and its history. Silicon Valley is a region and cultural mindset of the Bay Area in California and is delineated as the 1,854 square miles that make up San Francisco County, Santa Clara County, San Mateo County, and parts of Alameda County and Santa Cruz County (Silicon Valley Indicators, 2015). Although traditionally San Francisco is not considered part of Silicon Valley, the recent growth of technology giants that call it home, such as Pinterest, Airbnb, Uber, Dropbox, make it suitable for this study. In this study, the term "Silicon Valley" will be used interchangeably with tech culture in the Northern California area.

The prevalent myth that Silicon Valley experienced "instant industrialization," becoming a powerhouse for technology seemingly overnight is false: there has been a robust electronics industry in the area since the beginning of the radio, television, and military electronics industries (Kenney, 2000, p. 16). However, the Silicon Valley we know today originates from the various silicon chip manufacturers and producers, and where it also gets its name. In 1947,

William Shockley and his peers introduced the first transistor to the world and eventually won the Nobel Prize. Nine years later, he founded Shockley Semiconductor Laboratories in Palo Alto and recruited talented individuals to help him produce Fairchild semiconductors. Later, his employees all dispersed and created the staples that Silicon Valley originated from, such as Intel and Hewlett-Packard (Kenney, 2000).

Currently, the work hard, play hard mentality is highly prevalent and is openly encouraged by the companies themselves through the forms of various perks. This employee-first approach supposedly bodes well for the health of the company in accordance with Social Identity Theory and Equity Theory. Companies utilize these two theories to create company loyalty and retain top workers, mostly through perks and benefits. Since Silicon Valley is renowned for its amazing working conditions and other aspects that usually cause employees to score higher on the Job Satisfaction Survey (Spector, 1997). However, studies have found that there's a higher rate of job-hopping for college-educated men in Silicon Valley compared to other technology industries located in other parts of the United States (Fallick et al, 2006).

Thus, the question of interest would be even though it seems like Silicon Valley companies are doing everything correctly in regards to psychology theories, it remains unclear why they cannot retain their employees for as long as other non-Silicon Valley technology companies. Perhaps it is related to individuals' personal sense of equity sensitivity and if they are actually taking advantage of the perks that are offered and using them, or if there a sense of self-policing or a social norm that prohibits workers from using a certain perk. There might be a relationship between worker satisfaction and long-term job expectations, or it could be influenced by some other variable. Is there a relationship between equity sensitivity and perk

usage? All these questions and their psychological bases will be examined in the following pages.

To examine how companies are trying to appeal and retain their workers, it is important to start at the source. A quick browse through the websites of the tech companies casts them in thoughtful, magnanimous light. A review of three websites of well-known technology companies reveals certain perks and activities are common. For example, many emphasize their social activities, free food, and relaxed work environment. The primary concept is that they value each individual employee like family, and that their benefits and perks prove it. Palantir Technologies, a private data mining company located in Palo Alto, highlights its flexible work hours, free food, organized activities, and playful environment, urging their employees to choose their own adventure (Life at Palantir, 2015). It can't get any clearer when Google itself signs off with a modest, "Hey, we're family" on its benefits page (Benefits at Google, 2015). The use of the construct of family ties into Social Identity Theory, which has three components: social categorization, social identification, and social comparison (Tajfel & Turner, 1979). People naturally categorize themselves into groups, which then give us a sense of belonging and pride. In-groups could range from something as small as shared hobbies to something much more defining, like a shared ethnicity. This act of categorization is benign but leads to social identification, where people start identifying with an in-group more explicitly (Tajfel & Turner, 1979). The group norms that other members bring begin to be perceived as compatible with one's personal beliefs, and one begins to emulate them. Lastly, social comparison occurs, where one's own sense of self becomes closely intertwined with one's perceptions of personal identity and of group membership. One's sense of self-esteem increases or decreases based on how one's in-group is performing in society by comparing it to the out-group (Tajfel & Turner,

1979). Interestingly, the mere perception of two distinct groups, as in social categorization, is enough to elicit intergroup discrimination favoring the in-group. In other words, the mere awareness of the existence of an out-group is enough to aggravate the in-group to respond in a competitive or discriminatory fashion. (Billig & Tajfel, 1973). Out-groups, the groups we do not belong to, are discriminated against to increase feelings of superiority towards our own in-group. (Tajfel & Turner, 1979). By capitalizing on this sense of social identity, companies—and to a broader extent, all organizations—want to build a sense of community to increase in-group loyalty and retain valuable workers, and perhaps provoke intergroup competition.

Another theory relevant to the goals of this study is equity theory, which asserts that workers are motivated by a desire to be treated fairly, which is measured by the ratio of their inputs and outcomes (Adams, 1965). Workers possess certain inputs that they bring to the job, like skills, time, and effort. In return, they expect to receive certain outcomes from the job, such as a salary, benefits, and other forms of compensation. Workers are satisfied if they think their inputs are equal to their outcomes. The way this satisfaction is determined is by comparing themselves to "comparison others," like co-workers or peers. If workers draw the conclusion that conditions are inequitable, their motivation will change. Empirical evidence has been found in many studies including Greenberg, 1988; Greenberg & Ornstein, 1983; Valenzi and Andrews, 1971. It is important to note that this is not a measure of true equity, but what workers personally perceive to be equitable (Huseman, Hatfield, & Miles, 1987).

There are two types of perceived inequity: underpayment inequity and overpayment inequity. Underpayment inequity states that if the worker determines that their inputs are greater than their outcomes as compared to their comparison others, there will be four outcomes:

i. Increasing outcomes, like asking for a raise
ii. Decreasing inputs, like putting in less hours of work
iii. Changing the comparison other
iv. Leaving the situation, like switching companies.

Overpayment inequity, which states that if the worker feels that their outcomes are greater than their inputs as compared to their comparison others, manifests in four different results:

i. Increasing inputs, such as working extra hours to feel like they have earned the extra outcomes
ii. Decreasing outcomes, such as asking for a cut in pay; this is the least likely scenario
iii. Changing the comparison other to someone in a higher position
iv. Distorting the situation through rationalization, like telling themselves that they deserve this increased outcome because of their higher work quality

However, equity theory sometimes has difficulty predicting behaviors, especially when people act non-rationally. For instance, Valenzi and Andrews' (1971) study found that, contrary to inequity theory predictions and to previous inequity theory experiments, there were no significant work performance differences among the three groups, overpay, underpay, and control. However, 3 out of 11 underpay workers quit, and during the debriefing process, many others reported wanting to quit as well. The limitations of the study also acknowledged that underpay workers may also feel that decreasing their work performance had an element of revenge that was personally distasteful to them and would have caused admonishment. Ultimately, the researchers concluded that "self-esteem" was an important variable, and suggested that future research on wage inequity should focus more on variables, e.g., turnover, satisfaction, and recruitment rather than solely on work performance.

The idea of "self-esteem" was extended into a more developed perspective of Equity Theory—the Equity Sensitivity Construct (Huseman, Hatfield, & Miles, 1987). This perspective

states that there are individual differences that influence different preferences for outcome/input ratios, and is influenced by how sensitive the individual is to equity in the first place. (Huseman, Hatfield, & Miles, 1987). Equity Sensitives are workers who are rational about equity: they feel unhappy when they feel underbenefited and guilty when they feel overbenefited. They are the only group that feels both distress and guilt. There have not been any recent studies on this theory in Industrial-Organizational psychology examining technology work culture, revealing a gap in the literature.

On the two opposing ends of the spectrum are the Benevolents and the Entitleds. Benevolents are more altruistic and feel fairly fine with staying in a situation of underpayment inequity. Their contentment comes from perceptions that their outcome to input ratios are smaller than the comparison other's. The conceptual origins of Benevolents can be traced back to Alfred Adler's (1935, as cited in Huseman, Hatfield, & Miles, 1987) "socially useful, ideal" type that gives without expecting much in return. This orientation may come from a few sources, such as altruism or a personal and cultural philosophy of social responsibility. The latter was the reasoning Weick et al. (1976) posited in their study of work differences between Dutch and American students. Altruism could also be tied to employees' long-term relationship with their company and wanting to help fulfill employer needs (Huseman, Hatfield, & Miles, 1987). As King, Miles, and Day (1993, as cited in Sauley & Bedeian, 2000) found, Benevolents are better at tolerating, not preferring, under-reward while Entitleds are more focused on the outcomes as compared to their personal input contribution. In Alderian psychology, Entitleds are known as the exploitative "getting type" who tends to feel that others are indebted to them and they deserve everything that they get (Alder, 1935). Entitleds, as the name suggests, are more intolerant of under-reward, more tolerant of over reward than are either Equity Sensitives or

Benevolents. In other words, Entitleds are workers who are determined to make high outcomes, even if they have not contributed the equivalent amount of inputs to their job.

It is also important to note that compensation don't have to be monetary—a nominal title is sufficient to elicit feelings of overpayment and increase one's standing in an "organizational status hierarchy" (Greenberg, 1988, Greenberg & Ornstein, 1983). Greenberg (1988) hypothesized that offices were status symbols that reflected the status of the worker within it. For instance, a coveted corner office with windows is more desirable and correlated with higher-status employees. Greenberg and colleagues reassigned employees to offices of either higher, equal, or lower status as compared to their personal position in their company. The results found that employees in the higher status condition were more productive than the control group while workers relocated to offices of lower status were less productive than the control group. The results show that money is not the only motivating factor for equity theory; the prestige of the status symbol was enough compensation. This finding follows Foa and Foa's Resource Exchange Theory (1974, as cited in Greenberg & Ornstein, 1983), which states that one type of outcomes can be substituted for another in social exchange settings; here, one outcome—the perks of a great work space—compensated for another—money.

Nonetheless, there is a limitation to overrewarding employees in the hopes that they will work harder—the employees have to feel that their increased outcome was earned. If not, their performance will not improve over the long-term. Greenberg and Ornstein (1983) ran a study involving undergraduate students doing a proofreading job and rewarding some with the title of "senior proofreader." They found that workers who received an earned title and additional responsibilities felt equitably paid, while those performing an increased amount of work without a title felt underpaid. In another condition, participants were given an unearned title, which

caused their performance to improved immediately, but then drop again later. This difference was attributed to the subjects feeling suspicious towards the experimenter for giving them this unearned title, and their self-reported liking of the experimenter dropped over time. Thus, the participants believed that the experimenter gave them the title in order to deceive them into doing more work, which made them dislike the experimenter.

One way companies use equity theory to their benefit is adding perks to increase their perception of outcomes. In other words, by making the employees feel valued, companies might trigger a sense of overpayment inequity. With perks, there is no changing the comparison other or decreasing outcomes, so the only two remaining scenarios are increasing inputs, such as working extra hours to feel like they have earned the extra outcomes, and distorting the situation through rationalization by believing that they deserve this increased outcome because of their higher work quality. To understand how this works, a definition for perk is necessary. A perk, short for perquisite, is a privilege, gain, or profit that accompanies a worker's regular salary (Perquisite Definition at Merriam-Webster, 2015). In a general survey conducted by Ceridian Employer Services, out of 129 companies, 65% believed perks were important for attracting and retaining employees (Meece, 1999). Some of the most popular perks included a casual dress code, flexible hours, personal development training, entertainment and product discounts, and free food and drinks. Perks exist because they supplement employees' salaries and influence them to work more (Kuntze & Matulich, 2010). This study will specifically be focusing on perks that have "productive consumption" attributes. Coined by Rosen (2000), the use of these perks has a direct effect on productivity, either positively or negatively. Therefore, the type of perks not studied here will be perks that have no direct influence on day-to-day productivity,

such as dental or health insurance. To categorize these perks, Marino (2008) identified four different types:

1. "Personal business machines," like company-provided computers, laptops, and cell phones
2. Workplace amenities, such as a pleasing work environment with good location views
3. Personal services, such as a concierge, company gym, or masseuses
4. Transportation services, such as cars, company planes, or shuttles

Within the literature, there has been some controversy regarding the efficacy and use of these perks. Some researchers (Jensen & Meckling, 1976; Yermack, 2006) worry about the possibility of abuse or excessive consumption, especially among the upper-level executives. For instance, CEOs and the like typically have access to better perks to match their higher status, such as private jets and country club dues. Besides potentially wasting company funds and enabling unethical conduct, excessive perk use may dampen morale if lower-level employees notice. However, a larger group of researchers view these perks as legitimate incentives to increase productivity (Kuntze & Matulich, 2010; Oyer, 2004; Rajan & Wulf, 2006; Rosen, 2000). According to Oyer (2004), it is in the best interest of the company to provide goods that benefit the workers' well-being. Through the subcontracting of meals, entertainment options at the workplace, and errand services to a third party, the company frees up employees' time to complete the high-level work that they are being paid for. Essentially, by providing all of life's necessities free of charge, the company eliminates reasons for employees to leave and exacts more work time out of them. In other terms: "Paternalistic interest by firms in their workers' welfare can arise solely on considerations of self-interest, without any altruism whatsoever" (Rosen, 2000).

Furthermore, there is a dearth of literature on how employees themselves feel about using said perks. Even though many generous perks are offered, do employees actually take advantage of all of them? Perhaps there is a sense of self-policing that comes along with the spacious open-floor plans of a typical Silicon Valley office. For instance, even if the individual has the ability to take a two-hour long lunch breaks, would avoid it due to the fear of judgment from coworkers. Thus, the feeling that one might not be able to accept certain benefits might extend to larger things, such as maternity leave or vacation days. In September 2015, Yahoo CEO Marissa Mayer made headlines when she announced that she was expecting twins and would only take a two-week long maternity leave (Rodriguez, 2015, September 1). This announcement came a few months after Netflix announced an unheard-of 52 weeks off parental leave policy for both new mothers and fathers (Lang, 2015, August 7). However, that comes with its own set of pressures—at this fast paced company with a reputation of firing workers who aren't excelling, new parents will be extremely reluctant to take all the time off, or may lessen the quality of parental leave by fretfully working from home.

Ultimately, what is the basic theory of employee retention, and why are companies so focused on worker retention in Silicon Valley? In Occupational Health psychology, located at the crossroads between Health Psychology and Industrial-Organizational Psychology, there is the two-factor theory, also known as Herzberg's Motivation-Hygiene Theory. Based in Maslow's Theory of Motivation, the two-factor theory states that there are two separate, independent factors that cause job satisfaction and job dissatisfaction (Herzberg, Mausner, Snyderman, 1959). Employees are not satisfied with just the fulfillment of basic physiological and safety needs at work, such as a salary or nice working conditions. Instead, they want their higher-level needs, such as achievement, credit, responsibility, and advancement, to be fulfilled

as well. By interviewing 203 Pittsburgh engineers and accountants, empirical evidence was found for this theory (Herzberg, 1964). Beyond drawing from Maslow's theory, Herzberg also suggested that there was a two-factor model of motivation: the presence of one set of job characteristics (motivators) leads to worker satisfaction at work, while the absence of another different set of job characteristics (hygiene) leads to dissatisfaction at work. Motivators are more intrinsic, such as rewarding work, recognition, responsibilities, a sense of importance and belonging to the organization. Hygiene factors are more extrinsic, and involve high workplace status, perks, and insurance (Hackman & Oldham, 1976). Thus, satisfaction and dissatisfaction are not inversely related on a spectrum, with one increases while the other decreases, but are independent agents. There are four types of combinations (Herzberg, 1964):

1. High Hygiene and High Motivation: The ideal situation where employees have their needs taken care of and are highly motivated.
2. High Hygiene and Low Motivation: Employees have their needs taken care of but aren't highly motivated. The job is viewed as merely a source of income.
3. Low Hygiene and High Motivation: Employees are motivated by the work but have many complaints about the working conditions.
4. Low Hygiene and Low Motivation: The worst situation where employees are not motivated and have many complaints about the working conditions.

To keep workers satisfied and ultimately retain them, companies must be aware of both factors. While Silicon Valley is definitely high on hygiene factors and motivated, skilled workers, it is surprising that they cannot retain their workers.

As Fallick et al (2006) found, there is evidence that, compared to other metropolitan areas with large IT clusters, Silicon Valley has a higher rate of "employer-to-employer mobility." Furthermore, this effect does not hold true for other industries in California, which suggests there is something special about the interaction between features of the technology

industry and features of a specific geographic location. In regards to the high technology side, Dockel, Basson, and Coetzee (2006) postulated that the difficulty in worker retention is caused by a revolutionary shift in how we view work. In the past, the world of work was based in a worker-intensive, industrial society with high organizational loyalty. Nowadays, the modern workforce is increasingly highly educated and less concerned with loyalty to a specific organization. Furthermore, the markets that technology industries specialize are unpredictable and grow at an extremely fast pace. Their employees prefer a large degree of independence and are largely responsible for the organization's intellectual capital (Murphy, 2000 as cited by Dockel, Basson, and Coetzee, 2006). There is also an ideological clash between the employee and the company that influences worker retention: while high technology employees want to develop projects that enrich their careers, assets and future earning power, the organization generally wants their current knowledge used to create profitable products. The employee is loyal not to individual companies, but to a distinct high technology culture and mindset (Von Glinow & Mohrman, 1990). Furthermore, there is no stigma against leaving a successful company to launch a startup, and, even if it fails, ample jobs are available at other companies (Lesser, 2000). Another defining characteristic of Silicon Valley is rapid turnover—workers shift swiftly from company to company (Lesser, 2000). This movement is important because of the diffusion of knowledge know-how (Lesser, 2000). The current demand for engineers is greater than the supply, so talented candidates are aggressively recruited by other companies (Storey, 1992). With all these characteristics, it is unsurprising that employers struggle to retain their valuable employees.

Ultimately, this study aims to bring together Equity Theory, individual differences in equity sensitivity, and two-factor theory to examine an unorthodox workspace with

magnanimous perks and benefits. While employee perks have been examined in Economics and Industrial-Organizational Psychology literature, not much has been written about Silicon Valley's workplace precisely. These perks are offered because there is a relatively small pool of talented engineers that these companies are trying to entice, and there are studies offering empirical evidence on how Silicon Valley is a very special area (Lesser, 2000; Fallick et al 2006). This dearth of research is noteworthy because of the unprecedented atmosphere that this unorthodox work environment offers, and how these high technology workers feel about their workspace, so this study aims to cover that gap. Hopefully the results of this proposed study could be applicable to other high technology industries around the nation and world.

Brief overview of the study:

Data will be collected through an online survey on SurveyMonkey.com. Participants will be engineers who have spent at least one summer working in the Silicon Valley technology industry. Since this entire study will all be conducted online, the link can be easily spread through various other resources. Participants will be recruited through social media, specifically Facebook, and through personal connections.

The first portion of the survey will give a perk list where participants will indicate the ones that they have used recently and its frequency of usage. This list will be 20 items long and will be later coded into the four separate categories of perks: personal business machines, workplace amenities, personal services, and transportation services. Participants will be also asked about their perceptions of perks and how long they saw themselves staying at the company in 1 year, 2 years, and 5 years increments. They will also experience be a modified Job Satisfaction Survey, an established Likert scale that is a popular measurement for job satisfaction. Another portion of the survey will include an established scale that measures

personal equity sensitivity that will be taken from Sauley and Bedeian's (2000) study. Participants will also be asked about their comparison others. Finally, the survey concludes with demographic questions, which will be asked at the end as not to influence results, include age range, gender, ethnicity, education, and size of their company. I will also ask if they are entry level, middle management, or upper management in order to get a sense of their title. Compensation will be a chance to enter a raffle for one of seven $50 Amazon gift card, funded by Scripps Associated Students, the Hearst Thesis Fund, and the Motley Coffeehouse.

The current hypotheses are as follows:

Hypothesis I: Based on the Two-Factor Theory, if employees are satisfied at their job, they should want to stay longer as compared to employees who are not satisfied.

Hypothesis II: Based on Two-Factor Theory (Herzberg, 1964), employees who were more satisfied in their jobs should use more perks. Thus, employees who used many perks should also have high job satisfaction. However, this should also be tempered by their personal equity sensitivity; Entitleds who used more perks should be more satisfied and Benevolents who used less perks should be more satisfied.

Hypothesis III: An individual's Personal Equity Sensitivity should influence how they use their compensation (Huseman, Hatfield, & Miles, 1987). Employees with higher equity sensitivity should use fewer perks when they perceived themselves to be overcompensated. Employees with lower equity sensitivity should use fewer perks when they perceived themselves to be overcompensated.

Hypothesis IV: There is a persistent and significant compensation gap across most industries (Corbett & Hill, 2012). However, women may not recognize or feel that they are underbenefiting relative to men if they are using other women as their comparison others.

Women who compare themselves to other women may not feel an inequity, but if women are comparing themselves to men or everyone, they may become aware of this inequity.

Hypothesis V: The lower the job satisfaction, the less productive and loyal they will be to the company (Hackman & Oldham, 1976). By tying together Equity Theory and two-factor theory, this study predicts that Benevolents will be more likely to see themselves staying at the company regardless of how satisfied they feel, while Entitleds will be less likely to see themselves staying at the company if they are not satisfied.

Method

Participants

The participants for this study were men and women working or who have worked at technology companies in Silicon Valley. Data was collected from 135 participants, 63 men, 30 women, 1 non-binary, and 41 individuals that didn't respond.[1] Those 41 participants were not included in analyses about gender. The age range was 18 to 35 years old ($M = 23$, $SD = 3.25$). This age range was selected because it encompasses the group known as Millennials, who share a similar cultural background of growing up at the same time. Multiple races and ethnicities were represented, but they were inherently limited by the races and ethnicities represented at the companies. Out of the 97 participants that responded to the ethnicity question, 2 were African-American/Black, 59 were Asian/Asian-American/Pacific Islander, 8 were Hispanic/Latino/Mexican-American, 1 was Native American, and 38 were White. Current statistics indicate that the tech industry is predominately young White males (Diemer, 2015; Diversity, 2015); therefore, this study hypothesized that participants will predominantly fit this

[1] While all individuals could participate in this study, only data from participants who identified as men and women were used for analyses. However, future research should focus on individuals who do not identify as a binary gender.

description. In order to reduce confounding variables, this study limited its investigation to only engineers. They were defined by the Standard Industrial Classification (SIC) code 35: Industrial and Commercial Machinery and Computer Equipment (Fallick et al, 2006).

Materials

Demographics. Demographics, which were asked at the end of the survey as not to influence results, involved a more in-depth look at the participants' backgrounds. Participants were asked for their age, gender, race/ethnicity, and educational background. Out of the 100 participants that answered what the highest level of education they've received, 2 said high school, 42 said in the process of obtaining a Bachelor's degree, 36 said a Bachelor's degree, 7 were in the process of obtaining a Master's degree, 11 had a Master's Degree, and 2 had a Ph.D. Participants were also asked how long they've worked at their current company, with 93 responses ranging from a summer internship (3 months) to 9 years; however, most respondents responded with under a year. 100 participants also responded to what level they considered the job they've been currently rating it this survey, and 49 were current/past interns, 23 were entry level, 24 were experienced (non-manager) level, 4 were middle management, and none considered themselves upper management. Lastly, participants were asked about the size of their company. 100 participants responded to this question, and nine said 1-20 employees, six said 20-50 employees, six said 50-100 employees, ten said 100-500 employees, five said 500-1000 employees, 15 said 1000-2000 employees, six said 2000-5000 employees, and 43 said 5000+ employees. Thus, while there was an even distribution of half of the participants among the smaller to medium sized companies, the other half of the participants were in a large company.

Perk usage. Perk usage was a list of 20 perks that are commonly found in a Silicon Valley company (see Appendix A). These perks fell into the four categories proposed by Marino (2008): personal business machines, workplace amenities, personal services, and transportation services. Examples of certain perks were free meals, family leave, shuttle services, and flexible work hours. Participants were prompted with, "To what extent do you use each of the following perks?" then were provided with a 6-point Likert scale: *never, almost never, occasionally, almost always, always, not offered at my company*.

Job Satisfaction. Job satisfaction was measured with the Job Satisfaction Survey (JSS; Spector, 1985, as cited in Spector, 1997) (see Appendix B). This scale is an extremely popular one within the field of job satisfaction research. Over a thousand studies have cited it, and various other studies have shown to be reliable and valid (Fields, 2002; Spector, 1988; Van Saane et al, 2003). This scale measures nine facets of job satisfaction with each facet asking four questions, making the survey 36 items long. The nine facets are pay, promotion, supervision, fringe benefits, contingent rewards, operating conditions, coworkers, nature of work, and communication. One sample question asks, "I am not satisfied with the benefits I receive." The JSS yields 10 scores, with each of the nine subscales having its own score, and the tenth score a sum. The total score can range from 36 to 216. The more specific ranges are 36 to 108 for dissatisfaction, 108 to 144 for ambivalent, and between 144 to 216 for satisfaction. The questions are formatted as 6-point Likert scales, with choices being *disagree very much, disagree moderately, disagree slightly, agree slightly, agree moderately,* and *agree very much*.

This survey used a modified version of the JSS, shortened to from, 36 to 20 items. Two questions from each of the nine facets were chosen, except for the "fringe benefits" category—all four questions were included in this category as it was most relevant to perks. This

modification was allowed, as stated in the original study to make the length of the survey more manageable (Spector, 1985, as cited in Spector, 1997).

Job Expectations. This set of questions concerned long-term career goals. Participants were asked: "I can see myself working here in 1 year," "I can see myself working here in 2 years." and "I can see myself working here in 5 years." These three items were formatted as 6-point Likert scales: *disagree very much, disagree moderately, disagree slightly, agree slightly, agree moderately,* and *agree very much*.

Employee Perceptions of Compensation. This section was measured by three Likert scale type questions. The Likert type items were: "I feel that I am being compensated more than my job merits," "I believe that my compensation is fair," and "Perks are part of my overall compensation." Participants chose a response from 5 responses: *strongly disagree, disagree, neither agree nor disagree (neutral), agree,* and *strongly agree*. A composite score was created from the first two questions as an average based on two dimensions. Participants were also asked "Why?" after each Likert scale item. Their responses will be analyzed to see if there are any common themes.

Personal Equity Sensitivity. The Equity Preferences Questionnaire (EPQ, Sauley & Bedeian, 2000) was used in this study (see Appendix C). In order to measure equity sensitivity, two different scales had been developed in the past. Huseman, Hatfield, and Miles (1987) were the first to develop a scale called the Equity Sensitivity Index, while Sauley and Bedeian (2000) developed the Equity Preferences Questionnaire (EPQ). Multiple studies have measured the validity and reliability of both scales and agree that they produce comparable results (Jeon, 2012, Wheeler, 2007). This study used the EPQ because the format was more compatible with the means of online data collection. Developed by Sauley and Bedeian (2000), the EPQ was a list of

16 items that investigate an individual's sense of equity theory. A sample question was, "Employees who are more concerned about what they can get from their employer rather than what they can give to their employer are the wise ones." The questions were rated on 5-point Likert scales with the responses *strongly disagree, disagree, neither agree nor disagree (neutral), agree,* and *strongly agree*. Scores ranged from 16 to 80. Entitleds fell in the range between 16 to 37 points, Equity Sensitives fell in the range between 35 to 58 points, and Benevolents fell in the range between 59 to 80 points.

Comparison Others. This section was measured with one item. The question began with, "When I think about how I'm doing in my job, I compare myself to__." Participants chose the answer that they most identified with among *men, women,* and *men and women*.

Procedure

This study was conducted completely online. Participants clicked on a SurveyMonkey link, where they were presented with the informed consent form for the study and notified that this project was reviewed and approved by the Scripps IRB prior to launch. Participants were only be able to continue after checking a box that indicated their consent and understanding.

The second and third pages of the survey was the perk list and the employee perceptions of perks. The fourth page assessed participants' long-term job expectations. The fifth page measured the participant's job satisfaction; the sixth asked about the participant's comparison others. It was important to collect the perk list and the employee perceptions of perks data before their personal equity sensitivity to reduce self-report biases and contamination effects, specifically regarding social desirability bias and inability to accurately reflect on and predict behavior. The seventh page asked about the participant's equity sensitivity and the eight page

asked about demographics. The last page provided compensation information, thanked the participants for their participation, and debriefed them on the purpose of the study.

Ethics

This study did not involve using deception or working with a protected population. It was below the level of minimal risk because it only involved taking a survey online, an activity that almost everyone has experienced before, especially among this population that had plenty of experience with computers. Questions did not ask for the participants' name or information on any sensitive or triggering subjects. The only questions asked were about the participant's work life and perceptions of equity. Participants were not be personally identified in any of the written study materials. The researcher never met the participants in person nor know who the participants are. The only places names were collected was in the compensation survey, which was given as a separate SurveyMonkey link at the end of data collection. That survey was separate from the participants' responses on the data collection. Data were stored on a password protected SurveyMonkey account and on a password protected Z drive.

Before the study, participants were informed beforehand that participation is completely voluntary, they could choose to not respond to any questions they do not wish to answer, and they could stop taking the survey at any time. Participants indicated their informed consent before beginning and could ask questions about the informed consent or the study prior to agreeing to participate by emailing the researcher. Participants who did not wish to continue with the research after reading the informed consent could exit the survey and were assured that no negative consequences would occur as a result of their decision not to participate.

In regards to anonymity, participants were not personally identifiable in the data. All responses were anonymous. The only places names and addresses were collected was in another survey for compensation purposes. This compensation survey was presented as a separate link after data collection to record the participants who wanted the chance to be compensated by entering the lottery.

Finally, the benefits outweighed the risks. The risks were extremely low while the benefits—potential compensation and a chance to think critically about their workplace—were high. In fact, the benefits could extend beyond the individual participant and add to the current literature on Silicon Valley. The results of this study could help Silicon Valley employees become aware of their compensation and perceptions of fairness, and perhaps put any gender/group differences in perspective. Ultimately, this study follows all the ethical guidelines necessary to pass IRB inspection and could be rewarding for participants.

Results

Data Preparation and Transformation.

Reliability analyses were conducted for the developed scales, perk usage list and long-term Job Expectations. Composite scores were created for the perk usage construct to determine how many perks each individual participant used. Another composite score was created for the perception of perks. Lastly, a composite score was created for long-term job expectations to see the average amount of years participants saw themselves staying at their current job.

Relationship Between Equity Sensitivity and Perk Use.

An individual's Personal Equity Sensitivity influence how they view and utilized their non-financial compensation (Huseman, Hatfield, & Miles, 1987). Thus, if an individual was

considered a Benevolent, they would likely use fewer perks compared to an individual who is less sensitive. In order to demonstrate whether the individual's Personal Equity Sensitivity influences perk usage, there had to be a relationship between participants' equity sensitivity and how many perks they used. However, since there were no Entitled participants, data was only used for Equity Sensitives ($M = 50.50$, $SD = 17.73$, $n = 30$) and Benevolents ($M = 54.93$, $SD = 13.15$, $n = 58$). This analysis was executed with a between-groups one-way ANOVA, $F(1, 86) = 1.76$, $p = .188$, and there was no significant difference between an individual's equity sensitivity and the extent they used the given perks.

Effects of Job Satisfaction

Relationship Between Job Satisfaction and Long-Term Job Expectations.

If employees are satisfied at their job, they should want to stay longer as compared to employees who are not satisfied, based on the Two-Factor Theory (Herzberg, 1964). Initially, a between-groups one-way Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) was proposed to be run, but since only one participant was considered dissatisfied this 3 group based approach was not feasible. Instead, an independent t-test was run on the remaining two groups, ambivalent ($M = 2.89$, $SD = 1.36$, $n = 35$) and satisfied ($M = 4.20$, $SD = 4.20$, $n = 53$). Levene's Test was found to be non-significant, $F(1, 86) = 1.05$, $p = .309$. However, there was a slight negative skew towards higher job satisfaction among the participants. Thus, there was a simple correlation: as satisfaction goes up, so does long-term job expectations.

Job Satisfaction and Perk Usage.

Based on Two-Factor Theory (Herzberg, 1964), employees who were more satisfied in their jobs should use more perks. Thus, employees who used many perks should also have high

job satisfaction. However, this should also be tempered by their personal equity sensitivity; Entitleds who used more perks should be more satisfied and Benevolents who used less perks should be more satisfied. Since there was only one participant that was considered dissatisfied, an independent samples t-test was run with ambivalent ($M = 48.52$, $SD = 16.84$, $n = 33$) and satisfied ($M = 55.71$, $SD = 11.91$, $n = 49$) participants and a significant effect of perk score was found between Perk Usage and Job Satisfaction for different levels of personal equity sensitivity, $F(2, 82) = 3.98$, $p = .022$ in the predicted direction.

However, once an ANOVA was run to test the interaction, the satisfaction effect goes away with p = .055. To understand this loss of significance better, a chi-square test was run with the job satisfaction categories and the equity sensitivity categories, $\chi^2(1, N=86) = 15.9$, $p < .001$. There were slightly more ambivalent, Equity Sensitive individuals and more satisfied, Benevolent individuals (see Figure 1).

	Equity Sensitive	*Benevolent*	***Total***
Ambivalent	20	14	34
Satisfied	9	43	52
Total	29	57	86

Figure 1. Number of Individuals in Each Job Satisfaction Category and Equity Sensitivity Category.

Job Satisfaction, Personal Equity Sensitivity, and Long-Term Job Expectations.

The original hypothesis was that Benevolents would be more likely to stay at the company even if they were less satisfied in their jobs, while Entitleds would be less likely to stay at the company if they were less satisfied in their jobs. A One-way Analysis of Covariance

(ANCOVA) was conducted to determine if there was a statistically significant difference between participants' Personal Equity Sensitivity on long-term job expectations controlling for their job satisfaction. However, since there were no Entitled participants, data was only used for Equity Sensitives ($M = 3.73, SD = .231, n = 29$) and Benevolents ($M = 3.74, SD = .157, n = 57$). The ANCOVA found that while the Job Satisfaction Survey does predict satisfaction, $F(1, 83) = 31.69, p < .001$, the hypothesis was not supported, $F(1, 83) = .00, p = .99$. There was no statistically significant interaction between job satisfaction, personal equity sensitivity, and long-term job expectations.

Effects of Equity Sensitivity

Equity Sensitivity and Perception of Perks.

Employees with higher equity sensitivity were hypothesized to use fewer perks when they perceive themselves to be overcompensated, while employees with lower equity sensitivity should use fewer perks when they perceived themselves to be overcompensated. A between-groups one-way ANOVA was run to determine if there was an interaction between participants' equity sensitivity and their perception of perks. Since there were no Entitled participants, the analysis was run with Equity Sensitive ($M = 3.20, SD = .54, n = 33$) and Benevolent ($M = 3.30, SD = .67, n = 61$) participants. There was no significant difference, $F(1, 92) = .617, p = .434$, between the way Equity Sensitives and Benevolents perceived perks.

Written Responses on the Employee Perceptions of Compensation.

In the section on Employee Perceptions of Compensation, participants were asked to rate the degree to which they agreed with three statement on a five-point Likert scale from *strongly*

disagree, disagree, neither agree or disagree, agree, and *strongly agree*. After each statement, they were asked, "Why?" and provided with a blank textbox to share their thoughts. Responses had a variety of interesting themes and thoughts regarding equity.

"I feel that I am being compensated more than my job merits. Why?" and "I believe that my compensation is fair. Why?"

Because a composite score was created from the first two questions as an average based on two dimensions, it is reasonable to analyze the responses to the two open-ended "Why?" questions together because of overlapping themes.

In this section, participants discussed their feelings on why they agreed or disagreed that they were being overcompensated (their output) in comparison to the amount of work they do (their input). The participants that disagreed with the statement stated that their job was very stressful and they had to put in a lot of time, effort, and education to obtain their positions, compensation included. They also cited the "tech bubble," and how the current market placed a high value on their skills and thus the given compensation was warranted in order for the company to remain competitive in hiring. Participants also mentioned the high cost of living in Silicon Valley, showing how the term "compensation" in this item was viewed as including monetary compensation. Participants also observed that their compensation is equal to the same position at other similar technology companies. Lastly, they appealed to simple economics, stating that because the supply of highly-skilled engineers is low, their skills are in high demand and can be compensated as such.

On the other hand, the participants that agreed with the statement were more likely to be present and past interns and new graduates that viewed their time at a Silicon Valley tech company as overcompensating them for their lower skills. One participant wrote,

> During my internship, I felt that $40 per hour and numerous perks were far more than the benefits gained by the company/society from my project. However, I understand that this is unique to an internship experience as tech employers are trying to have interns convert to full-time and thus make the internship a pleasant experience.

Unlike participants who disagreed with this statement and who compared their situation with other similar tech positions, these "agree" participants were more likely to use jobs from non-tech industries as their comparison other. Participants discussed how they felt that there are other industries that benefited society more directly, worked harder, and were more deserving of this high level of compensation, but those occupations don't receive it. Certain professions mentioned were "teachers" and "coal miners."

Perceptions of Equity Differences Between Genders.

There is a persistent and significant compensation gap across most industries. However, women may not recognize or feel that they are under-benefitted relative to men if they are using other women as their comparison others. Women who compare themselves to other women may not feel an inequity, but if women are comparing themselves to men or everyone, they may become aware of this inequity. Female participants' perception of Comparison Others and their response to the perception of perks composite were used to run an independent samples t-test instead of an ANOVA because only one female participant chose women as her comparison other. The rest of the female participants responded that they compared themselves to men (M = 3.80, SD = 1.10, n = 5) and men and women (M = 3.39, SD = .89, n = 23). No significant difference was found between women who used men as their comparison other and women who used men and women as their comparison other and how they viewed their perks, $F(1, 26) = .02$, $p = .885$.

Gender Differences

Although no additional hypotheses were initially predicted beyond comparison others and gender, several exploratory analyses were run.

Equity Sensitivity.

A chi-square test was run between men ($n = 63$) and women ($n = 29$) and their equity sensitivity. No significant difference was found between gender and equity sensitivity, $\chi^2(1, N = 92) = .08, p = .780$. This means that there was a somewhat equal distribution between men and women in the two equity sensitive categories; there were not more female Benevolents or male Equity Sensitives, for instance.

Specific Perks.

Certain perks offered on the perk usage list were considered more stereotypically gendered, such as how family leave might be more important for women and video games might be more important to men. A chi-square test was performed between men ($n = 63$) and women ($n = 30$) and how often they used family leave, with no significant difference found, $\chi^2(5, N = 93) = 3.52, p = .621$. Another chi-square test was performed between men ($n = 63$) and women ($n = 30$) and how often they used electronic entertainment systems (video games), with no significant difference found, $\chi^2(5, N = 93) = 10.36, p = .06$, although this analysis approached significance in the predicted direction.

Discussion

Overall, this project examined an important component of work compensation, satisfaction with perks, in an environment saturated with them. Employees as a group rated

overall satisfied with their jobs and compensation, perks included. Few differences were seen among subgroups of employees. Even though it wasn't reflected in the actual numbers with statistical significance, the written portions of the survey revealed that there was a variation in how participants perceived equity. While the original hypotheses were not supported, this study did learn about how there seems like there were fewer gender differences than expected and how perks might not be that powerful after all.

The study did face a few challenges. In the sample, no employee identified as an Entitled participant, limiting the ability to test certain hypotheses. Thus, all the tests run were with Equity Sensitive participants and Benevolent participants. The same thing happened with the hypotheses regarding job satisfaction, as there was only one dissatisfied employee, and the analyses were run with Ambivalent and Satisfied employees. The "middle ground" of Equity Sensitive individuals and Ambivalent individuals were not discussed in the original hypotheses, thus making it difficult to declare that the hypotheses null. While this lack of a certain type of participant is frustrating, it is still a noteworthy point. This skew towards satisfaction and high equity sensitivity does not seem representative of the working population as a whole. Perhaps Silicon Valley engineers are more satisfied in their jobs and highly Benevolent, or perhaps only engineers who liked their job wanted to take this survey to discuss their perks. Perhaps the personality of the Benevolent type made it more likely for them to click on and take the time to take an anonymous online survey with no guaranteed compensation (Adler, 1935)

There was no significant difference between an individual's equity sensitivity and the extent they used the perks listed. An alternative explanation may be that perhaps perks have been normalized in the Silicon Valley work culture that even those with higher equity sensitivity view it as part of their overall compensation. There was a simple correlation between job satisfaction

and long-term job expectations: if employees were satisfied at their job, they could see themselves staying there longer (Spector, 1985).

The analyses was between job satisfaction and perk usage were noteworthy. While the first analysis found a significant effect of perk score between Perk Usage and Job Satisfaction for different levels of personal equity sensitivity, further analysis suggested that the effect of satisfaction goes away. Although there was no statistical significance, the distribution of individuals suggest that there the individuals who were ambivalent were also more likely to be Equity Sensitive and that the individuals who were satisfied were also more likely to be Benevolent. Thus, this was not about an individual's satisfaction or equity sensitivity, but about a third latent variable, perhaps like a personality trait. This is a logical hypotheses because the concept of Equity Sensitivity is based on the way Alderian psychology views the different manifestations of altruism, with Benevolents being the "socially useful, ideal" type that gives without expecting much in return and the Entitleds being the exploitative "getting type" who are more focused on the outcomes as compared to their personal input (Alder, 1935). Furthermore, because these were modified versions of the original scale, it might be harder to eliminate self-report biases.

A surprising and interesting result of this study was the relationship between gender differences and comparison others. It was fascinating that out of the 29 participants who reported that they were female and responded to the comparison others question, only one chose "women" as her comparison other. Five female participants responded that they compared themselves to men and 23 female participants responded that they compared themselves to men and women. It is possible that the five women who chose the male option did so because they work in a setting where there aren't enough women in their workplace to make the comparison.

They might very well be the only woman on their team. A more in-depth analysis revealed that three out of the five women were interns or past interns. This is important because perhaps as interns, they were the only women on their team of college-aged men. No gender differences in equity sensitivity were found, which was surprising because with the socialization of women, it becomes expected that there would be more female Benevolents than male Benevolents. Perhaps the majority of women chose the more egalitarian "everyone" option because perhaps female engineers are aware of what it means now to be a woman in engineering. In the past few years, there has been a rising movement of women fighting back against the "brogrammer" culture (Friedman, 2014). From the publication of the COO of Facebook Sheryl Sandberg's book *Lean In: Women, Work, and the Will to Lead* (2013) detailing how to be an assertive woman in the workforce to the "#ILookLikeanEngineer" campaign, women have been raising awareness to redefine the narrow perception of what engineers look like and how only men can be successful in these spaces. Perhaps that is why there was no reported difference in specific perks that could be perceived as more gendered, like family leave and video games. Women are trying to fit this more egalitarian side, while men, who are now exposed to more male models of taking paternity leave like Mark Zuckerberg, CEO of Facebook, did for the birth of his first daughter.

There were a few limitations to this study, mostly involving power and the number of participants. Although 202 participants started the survey, only 135 participants had usable data. This attrition rate may have been caused by the length of the survey—many participants stopped after filling out the first item, the perk usage list. Participants were allowed to skip any question they liked after giving informed consent. Thus, out of the 135 participants, not all participants filled out every item completely, causing the number of participants to vary among the analyses. Furthermore, many more men than women participated in the survey, which made finding

significance on the gender differences difficult because of the lack of power. Furthermore, the demographics of the participants did not fully reflect the current makeup of Silicon Valley. Out of the 97 participants that reported their ethnicity, 39% were white and 60% were Asian/Asian-American/Pacific Islander. The large Asian contingent is not unusual to see in Silicon Valley because the area does have a high Asian population, but the expected largest contingent would have been white. Furthermore, out of 100 participants who reported their highest level of education received, 42% were in the process of obtaining a Bachelor's degree and 36% had obtained their Bachelor's degree; furthermore, 49% said that they had been drawing from their past internship experience while conducting this survey. Thus, the demographics show that most participants were a few years younger than the average full-time Silicon Valley engineer, most likely due to recruiting through the researcher's personal connections. Since this survey was limited to Millennials, the average age of the participant was 23 years old. Most likely, participants are probably still working at their first job and haven't had time to job-hop yet or figure out their long-term career goals.

Another limitation of this survey involved using modified versions of established scales in order to make it more convenient for the online survey format. For instance, the original Equity Preferences Questionnaire, along with the 16 Likert items, had short vignettes that participants were supposed to respond to. The original 36-item Job Satisfaction Survey was shortened to 20 items make the length of the survey more manageable. Perhaps if all items were included, there would be a clearer picture of individuals' scores; however, the attrition rate most likely would have increased as well due to length.

Future research would look into older age groups and different factors of job retention. While statistical significance was not found in these analyses, it is possible that the participants'

age and relatively young careers influenced some responses. As the researcher's most successful recruitment came from personal, similarly-aged personal connections, it is unsurprising that the demographics were this way, and how this sampling could be another limitation. It would be interesting to conduct longitudinal studies following individuals throughout the course of their careers in Silicon Valley and seeing how one's equity sensitivity and satisfaction may change. Furthermore, it is possible that perks are no longer as important as they used to be, and it might be beneficial to look more into other factors. Moreover, at the current time of writing, Silicon Valley may be undergoing a shift in how engineers are choosing to leave or stay at their jobs. As a recent analysis in the *Wall Street Journal* has found, Silicon Valley is facing somewhat of a downturn, with startups failing and venture funding slowing down. Even older, more established companies aren't unaffected—LinkedIn has seen its stock shares drop dramatically by 56% this year (Feintzeig, 2016, March 17). Engineers may be choosing larger, more stable companies over smaller, flashier start-ups that could fail, and excessive perks may be a sign that a company isn't prioritizing wisely. It would also be interesting to see if other industries beyond the high technology industry can replicate Silicon Valley's business model to the same success.

Although the original hypotheses were unsupported, the data did still raise some interesting questions regarding whether or not perk usage or job satisfaction can really predict the future movements of workers. Ultimately, this is an extremely timely topic that is still developing, and may take some interesting and unexpected developments in the near future.

References

Adams, J. S. (1965). Inequity in social exchange. *Advances in Experimental Social Psychology*, *2*, 267-299.

Adler, A. (1935) The fundamental views of individual psychology. *International Journal of Individual Psychology*, *1*(1), 5-8.

Benefits at Google. (2015). Retrieved October 13, 2015. Retrieved from https://www.google.com/about/careers/lifeatgoogle/benefits/

Billig, M. and Tajfel, H. (1973), Social categorization and similarity in intergroup behaviour. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, 3, 27–52. doi: 10.1002/ejsp.2420030103

Corbett, C., & Hill, C. (2012). Graduating to a pay gap: the earnings of women and men one year after college graduation. *American Association of University Women,* 1-37.

Diemer, A.E. (2015). Implicit barriers to the tech industry's boys' club (undergraduate thesis). Retrieved from Scholarship at Claremont.

Diversity. (2015). Retrieved December 9, 2015, from https://www.google.com/diversity/

Dockel, A., Basson, J. S., & Coetzee, M. (2006). The effect of retention factors on organisational commitment: an investigation of high technology employees. *SA Journal of Human Resource Management*, *4*(2), 20-28.

Fallick, B., Fleischman C., & Rebitzer, J. (2006). Job-hopping in Silicon Valley: some evidence concerning the microfoundations of a high-technology cluster. *The Review of Economics and Statistics*, *88*(3), 472-481. doi:10.1162/rest.88.3.472

Fields, D. L. (2002). *Taking the measure of work: A guide to validated scales for organizational research and diagnosis*. Sage.

Feintzeig, R. (2016, March 17). Tech Workers Get Choosy About Changing Jobs. Retrieved April 11, 2016, from http://www.wsj.com/articles/tech-workers-get-choosy-about-changing-jobs-1458086282

Friedman, A. (2014). Etsy's Trying to Fix Tech's Women Problem. Why Aren't You? Retrieved April 17, 2016, from https://medium.com/matter/this-is-the-last-thing-youll-ever-need-to-read-about-sexism-in-tech-56b9a3a77af0#.fu787mxmg

Foa, U. G., & Foa, E. B. (1974). *Societal structures of the mind*. Springfield, Illinois. Charles C Thomas.

Greenberg, J., & Ornstein, S. (1983). High status job title compensation for underpayment: A test of equity theory. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 68*(2), 285-297. doi:10.1037/0021-9010.68.2.285

Greenberg, J. (1988). Equity and workplace status: A field experiment. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *73*(4), 606-613. doi:10.1037/0021-9010.73.4.606

Hackman, J., Oldham, G.R. (1976). Motivation through the design of work: test of a theory. *Organizational Behavior and Human Performance 16*(2). 250–279. doi:10.1016/0030-5073(76)90016-7

Herzberg, F. (1964). The motivation-hygiene concept and problems of manpower. *Personnel Administrator, 27*, 3-7.

Herzberg, F., Mausner, B., Snyderman, B. (1959). *The Motivation to Work* New York: John Wiley.

Huseman, R. C., Hatfield, J. D., & Miles, E. W. (1987). A new perspective on equity theory: The equity sensitivity construct. *Academy of Management Review*, *12*(2), 222-234. doi:10.5465/AMR.1987.4307799

Jensen, M., & Meckling, W. (1976). Theory of the firm: Managerial behavior, agency costs and ownership structure. *Journal of Financial Economics, 3*(4), 305-360. doi.org/10.1016/0304-405X(76)90026-X

Jeon, G. (2012). Equity sensitivity versus equity preference: validating a new viewpoint on equity sensitivity (Masters thesis). Retrieved from Illinois Digital Environment for Access to Learning and Scholarship.

Kenney, M. (2000). How Silicon Valley came to be. *Understanding Silicon Valley: The Anatomy of an Entrepreneurial Region*. (pp. 15-47). Stanford, California: Stanford University Press.

Kuntze, R., & Matulich, E. (2010). Google: Searching for Value. *Journal of Case Research in Business and Economics*, *2*, 1-10.

Lang, M. (2015, August 7). The problem with Netflix's unlimited parental leave policy. Retrieved October 21, 2015, from http://www.sfchronicle.com/business/article/The-problem-with-Netflix-s-unlimited-parental-6432157.php

Lesser, E. (2000). Chapter 8: Social Capital and Capital Gains in Silicon Valley. In *Knowledge and Social Capital: Foundations and Applications* (pp. 179-184). Boston, Massachusetts: Routledge.

Life at Palantir. (2015). Retrieved October 13, 2015. Retrieved from https://www.palantir.com/life-at-palantir/

Marino, A. M. & Zábojník, J. (2008). Work-related perks, agency problems, and

optimal incentive contracts. *The RAND Journal of Economics, 39*(2), 565-585. doi:10.1111/j.0741-6261.2008.00028.x

Meece, M. (1999, December 11). The lure of free food in the conference room. Retrieved from http://www.nytimes.com

Murphy, C. (2000). The survey says: Lots of IT jobs, not enough workers. *Information Week*, 782, 152.

Oyer, P. (2004). Salary or benefits?. *UCSC Economics Department Seminars*. UC Santa Cruz: Department of Economics, UCSC. Retrieved from http://escholarship.org/uc/item/8xs3k3j8

Rajan, R, & Wulf, J. (2006). Are perks purely managerial excess? *Journal of Financial Economics, 79*(1), 1-33. doi.org/10.1016/j.jfineco.2005.01.003

Rodriguez, S. (2015, September 1). Yahoo CEO Marissa Mayer's Pregnancy Sparks Debate Over Maternity Leave: Is Two Weeks Really Enough? Retrieved October 19, 2015, from http://www.ibtimes.com/yahoo-ceo-marissa-mayers-pregnancy-sparks-debate-over-maternity-leave-two-weeks-2077529

Rosen, S. (2000). Does the composition of pay matter? *Employee Benefits and Labor Markets in Canada and the United States*. (pp. 13-30). Chicago, Illinois: Upjohn Institute Press

Sandberg, S. (2013). *Lean In: Women, Work, and the Will to Lead*. Knopf.

Sauley, K. S., & Bedeian, A. G. (2000). Equity sensitivity: construction of a measure and examination of its psychometric properties. *Journal of Management*, *26*(5), 885-910.

Silicon Valley Indicators. (2015). Snapshot of the Region: Silicon Valley Institute for Regional Studies. Retrieved from http://siliconvalleyindicators.org

Spector, P. E. (1997). *Job Satisfaction: Application, Assessment, Cause, and Consequences*. Thousand Oaks, Calif: SAGE Publications, Inc.

Spector, P. E. (1988). Development of the work locus of control scale. *Journal of Occupational Psychology*, *61*(4), 335-340.

Stangor, C. (2015). *Research methods for the behavioral sciences* (5th ed). Belmont, CA: Wadsworth, Inc.

Storey, J. (1992). *Developments in the management of human resources*. Oxford: Blackwell.

Tajfel, H., & Turner, J. C. (1979). An integrative theory of intergroup conflict. *The Social*

Psychology of Intergroup Relations, *33*(47), 74.

Perquisite Definition at Merriam-Webster. (2015). Retrieved September 30, 2015, from http://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/perquisite

Valenzi, E. R., & Andrews, I. R. (1971). Effect of hourly overpay and underpay inequity when tested with a new induction procedure. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *55*(1), 22-27. http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/h0030634

Van Saane, N., Sluiter, J. K., Verbeek, J. H. A. M., & Frings-Dresen, M. H. W. (2003). Reliability and validity of instruments measuring job satisfaction—a systematic review. *Occupational Medicine*, *53*(3), 191-200.

Von Glinow, M. A., & Mohrman, S. A. (1990). Attachment and withdrawal patterns of high technology workers. *The Journal of High Technology Management Research*, *1*(2), 149-165.

Weick, K.E., Bougon, M.G., & Maruyama, G. (1976). The equity context. *Organizational Behavior and Human Performance*, 15, 32-65.

Wheeler, K. (2007). Empirical comparison of equity preference questionnaire and equity sensitivity instrument in relation to work outcome preferences. *Psychological Reports, 100*(3), 955-962.

Yermack, David. (2006). Flights of fancy: Corporate jets, CEO perquisites, and inferior shareholder returns. *Journal of Financial Economics* (80)1. 211-242. doi.org/10.1016/j.jfineco.2005.05.002

Appendix A
PERK USAGE LIST

2. To what extent do you use each of the following perks?

	Never	Almost never	Occasionally	Almost always	Always	Not offered at my company
Company-provided computers	○	○	○	○	○	○
Company-provided phone or phone plan	○	○	○	○	○	○
Pleasing work environment	○	○	○	○	○	○
Flexible work hours	○	○	○	○	○	○
Coworkers as a social support system	○	○	○	○	○	○
Company parties	○	○	○	○	○	○
Company gym/exercise classes	○	○	○	○	○	○
Company-provided meals	○	○	○	○	○	○
Company-provided alcohol	○	○	○	○	○	○
Company-provided snacks and non-alcoholic beverages	○	○	○	○	○	○

	Never	Almost never	Occasionally	Almost always	Always	Not available at my company
Pet-friendly environment	○	○	○	○	○	○
Company swag/free gear	○	○	○	○	○	○
On-site laundry services	○	○	○	○	○	○
Electronic entertainment systems (video games)	○	○	○	○	○	○
On-site recreational activities	○	○	○	○	○	○
Massages	○	○	○	○	○	○
Unlimited vacation days	○	○	○	○	○	○
Company concierge services	○	○	○	○	○	○
Workshops/classes	○	○	○	○	○	○
Family leave	○	○	○	○	○	○

Appendix B

Job Satisfaction Survey (JSS; Spector, 1985, as cited in Spector, 1997)

	JOB SATISFACTION SURVEY Paul E. Spector Department of Psychology University of South Florida 	
	PLEASE CIRCLE THE ONE NUMBER FOR EACH QUESTION THAT COMES CLOSEST TO REFLECTING YOUR OPINION ABOUT IT.	Disagree Very Much 1 · Disagree Moderately 2 · Disagree Slightly 3 · Agree Slightly 4 · Agree Moderately 5 · Agree Very Much 6
1	I feel I am being paid a fair amount for the work I do.	1 2 3 4 5 6
2	There is really too little chance for promotion on my job.	1 2 3 4 5 6
3	My supervisor is quite competent in doing his/her job.	1 2 3 4 5 6
4	I am not satisfied with the benefits I receive.	1 2 3 4 5 6
5	When I do a good job, I receive the recognition for it that I should receive.	1 2 3 4 5 6
6	Many of our rules and procedures make doing a good job difficult.	1 2 3 4 5 6
7	I like the people I work with.	1 2 3 4 5 6
8	I sometimes feel my job is meaningless.	1 2 3 4 5 6
9	Communications seem good within this organization.	1 2 3 4 5 6
10	Raises are too few and far between.	1 2 3 4 5 6
11	Those who do well on the job stand a fair chance of being promoted.	1 2 3 4 5 6
12	My supervisor is unfair to me.	1 2 3 4 5 6
13	The benefits we receive are as good as most other organizations offer.	1 2 3 4 5 6
14	I do not feel that the work I do is appreciated.	1 2 3 4 5 6
15	My efforts to do a good job are seldom blocked by red tape.	1 2 3 4 5 6
16	I find I have to work harder at my job because of the incompetence of people I work with.	1 2 3 4 5 6
17	I like doing the things I do at work.	1 2 3 4 5 6
18	The goals of this organization are not clear to me.	1 2 3 4 5 6

	PLEASE CIRCLE THE ONE NUMBER FOR EACH QUESTION THAT COMES CLOSEST TO REFLECTING YOUR OPINION ABOUT IT.	Disagree Very Much	Disagree Moderately	Disagree Slightly	Agree Slightly	Agree Moderately	Agree Very Much
19	I feel unappreciated by the organization when I think about what they pay me.	1	2	3	4	5	6
20	People get ahead as fast here as they do in other places.	1	2	3	4	5	6
21	My supervisor shows too little interest in the feelings of subordinates.	1	2	3	4	5	6
22	The benefit package we have is equitable.	1	2	3	4	5	6
23	There are few rewards for those who work here.	1	2	3	4	5	6
24	I have too much to do at work.	1	2	3	4	5	6
25	I enjoy my coworkers.	1	2	3	4	5	6
26	I often feel that I do not know what is going on with the organization.	1	2	3	4	5	6
27	I feel a sense of pride in doing my job.	1	2	3	4	5	6
28	I feel satisfied with my chances for salary increases.	1	2	3	4	5	6
29	There are benefits we do not have which we should have.	1	2	3	4	5	6
30	I like my supervisor.	1	2	3	4	5	6
31	I have too much paperwork.	1	2	3	4	5	6
32	I don't feel my efforts are rewarded the way they should be.	1	2	3	4	5	6
33	I am satisfied with my chances for promotion.	1	2	3	4	5	6
34	There is too much bickering and fighting at work.	1	2	3	4	5	6
35	My job is enjoyable.	1	2	3	4	5	6
36	Work assignments are not fully explained.	1	2	3	4	5	6

Appendix C

Equity Sensitivity Questionnaire (EPQ, Sauley & Bedeian, 2000)

Below is a series of statements concerning men and women and their relationships in contemporary society. Please indicate the degree to which you agree or disagree with each statement using the following scale: 1 = *strongly disagree*; 2 = disagree; 3 = *neither agree nor disagree (neutral)*; 4 = agree; 5 = strongly agree.

Item[a]	
1.	I prefer to do as little as possible at work while getting as much as I can from my employer.[b]
2.	I am most satisfied at work when I have to do as little as possible.[b]
3.	When I am at my job, I think of ways to get out of work.[b]
4.	If I could get away with it, I would try to work just a little bit slower than the boss expects.[b]
5.	It is really satisfying to me when I can get something for nothing at work.[b]
6.	It is the smart employee who gets as much as he/she can while giving as little as possible in return.[b]
7.	Employees who are more concerned about what they can get from their employer rather than what they can give to their employer are the wise ones.[b]
8.	When I have completed my task for the day, I help out other employees who have yet to complete their tasks.
9.	Even if I received low wages and poor benefits from my employer, I would still try to do my best at my job.
10.	If I had to work hard all day at my job, I would probably quit.[b]
11.	I feel obligated to do more than I am paid to do at work.
12.	At work, my greatest concern is whether or not I am doing the best job I can.
13.	A job which requires me to be busy during the day is better than a job which allows me a lot of loafing.
14.	At work, I feel uneasy when there is little work for me to do.
15.	I would become very dissatisfied with my job if I had little or no work to do.
16.	All other things being equal, it is better to have a job with a lot of duties and responsibilities than one with few duties and responsibilities.

Coefficient