

The Berg/Wiebe Resource Exchange Scale: A Reliability and Validity Study

Cooper Johnson

The University of Tennessee at Martin

Jamye Long

The University of Tennessee at Martin

The Berg/Wiebe Resource Exchange Scale was developed based on Resource Exchange Theory as presented by Foa and Foa (1974) and represents an attempt to measure the exchange of numerous resources at the workplace and the level of satisfaction with these exchanges (Berg & Wiebe, 1989; 1993). As such, the research contained in this paper focuses on the evaluation of the reliability and validity of the Berg/Wiebe Resource Exchange Scale. Results indicated the Berg/Wiebe Resource Exchange Scale is a reliable and valid instrument for measuring the exchange of resources in the workplace and the level of satisfaction with these exchanges.

Keywords: Resource Exchange Scale, Reliability, Validity, Social Exchange Theory

INTRODUCTION

Social Exchange Theory provides numerous theories concerning interpersonal exchanges and the affects these exchanges have on various types of relationships. Berg and Wiebe (1993) reported that researchers have assumed much of human behavior can be best understood through studying the resources and benefits people give to and receive from others. For example, Blau (1967), Homans (1961), Kelley and Thibaut (1978), and Thibaut and Kelley (1959), examined the exchange of resources from the perspective of interpersonal interactions. Additionally, Sabbaugh and Levy (2012) proposed that resource exchange is based on a range of behaviors identified through various facets. The collective work of these researchers provides valuable and useful information in the field of Social Exchange Theory.

Various theories of resource exchange evolved from Social Exchange Theory. Foa and Foa (1974; 2012) proposed a Resource Exchange Theory, which attempts to encompass the basic ideals of Social Exchange Theory, while at the same time allowing for the views of other disciplines. Resource theory presented by Foa and Foa (1974) examines the influence of resource type on exchange behavior. The Foas' Resource Exchange Theory has been applied in various situations; however, the majority of these focused on interpersonal interactions. While examining resource exchange in interpersonal relationships is important, the evaluation of resource exchange in other situations also holds significance. Of interest to business organizations is the assessment of which resources are exchanged, how these resources are exchanged, and the satisfaction of these exchanges in the workplace.

Berg and Wiebe (1993) stated that most people spend a large amount of time at work. The economic view of work and workplace exchanges reflects solely that workers exchange their services for money.

Berg and Wiebe believed that the work setting is one in which exchanges of many different types of resources occur. The exchanges should not be limited to those of services for money. Additionally, Berg and Wiebe (1989) utilized the Foa's (1974) Resource Exchange Theory and found that exchanges in the workplace include numerous aspects besides workers giving their time and effort in return for wages. Many exchanges involved resources such as information, status, and positive benefits unique to an employee's job. The results of Berg and Wiebe's (1989; 1993) studies provided evidence that the Foa's (1974) Resource Exchange Theory can be applied in examining exchanges taking place at workplaces.

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

Resource Exchange Theory has been applied in social areas involving friendship, family, intimates, marriage, and culture, as well as in the business areas of marketing and organizations. Through reviewing the application of the Resource Exchange Theory in these areas, a broader understanding of the theory can be obtained, thus better preparing one to realize the possibilities of further incorporation into other areas.

Family

Donnenwerth, Teichman, and Foa (1973) studied groups of delinquent and non-delinquent girls to test Resource Exchange Theory of the girls' perception of their own and their parents' behavior. The results of the study showed support for the theory. Rettig, Danes, and Bauer (1991) described how Resource Exchange Theory can be used to evaluate family life and its relationship to stress. Results found that Resource Exchange Theory can be used to evaluate the degree to which receiving resources satisfy personal needs and help in reducing stress levels.

Friendship

The work of Foa and Foa (1980) concluded that close friends are more likely to exchange particularistic resources than are casual friends. Additionally, Tornblom and Fredholm's (1984) study showed an increased degree of perceived friendship through exchanges of love and services than exchanges of other resources. Tornblom, Fredholm, and Jonsson (1987) found that new friendships had a greater chance of growing when similar particularistic resources were exchanged. Additional studies (Clark, 1982; Tornblom, Fredholm, & Jonsson, 1987) showed that friendships' existence can be attributed to the similarity and dissimilarity of resources exchanged.

Intimate Relationships

Foa and Foa's (1974) classification system was used by Berg and McQuinn (1986) to better understand the exchange of specific resources in intimate relationships. Cate (1981) applied Foa and Foa's (1974) Resource Exchange Theory to help couples improve their relationships. Hatfield, Utne, and Traupmann (1979) argued couples likely exchange resources from the six classes presented in Foa and Foa's Resource Exchange Theory. Close couples were more at liberty to exchange dissimilar resources than those in casual relationships according to additional research (Clark & Mills, 1979; Holmes, 1981; Walster, Walster, & Berscheid, 1978).

Marriage

Foa and Foa's (1974) Resource Exchange Theory was supported by the results of Rettig (1980), which studied predicting marriage evaluation (success or failure) for men and women. Additionally, Rettig and Bubolz (1983) found support for Foa and Foa's Resource Exchange Theory in predicting marriage satisfaction from the husband and wife. The studies of resource exchanges within marriages indicated the value of the Resource Exchange theory in this social environment.

Culture

Foa, Salcedo, Tornblom, Garner, Glaubman, and Teichman (1987) studied the interrelationships among interpersonal resources across five cultures. Their conclusions supported the idea that interrelationships of resources may be similar cross-culturally. Tornbolm, Johnson, and Foa (1985) found that different cultures establish varying preferences for rules of resource allocation with regards to resource class. Additionally, cross-cultural validity of Resource Exchange Theory was supported further by the work of Foa, Converse, Tornblom, and Foa (1993). Kraemer and Chen (2012) studied the affect resources exchanged across different cultures have based upon the impact of the variations in social relationships and orientations.

Marketing

Brinberg and Wood (1983) used Foa and Foa's (1974) Resource Exchange Theory to describe marketing as an exchange process. Furthermore, Resource Exchange Theory could be helpful in describing the resources exchanged among consumers according to Brinberg and Castell (1982). Additionally, Brinberg and Ganesan (1993) found how Resource Exchange Theory could be applied in promoting products, services, or social issues. Finally, Miller (1980) studied how Resource Exchange Theory could be used as a model for charitable behavior.

Organizations

In Resource Exchange Theory, organizations are groups of individuals acting in their own self-interest (Kleyn, 1989). The interests of individuals and the interests of organizations may not be identical. According to March and Simon (1958) and Simon (1947), organizations are systems of stakeholders, who contribute necessary resources with the expectation of receiving valued outcomes. These stakeholders' contributions are the resources from which encouragement for participation are created. Kelyn (1989) used Resource Exchange Theory to determine the characteristics of legitimate organizations. Several authors (Huang & Knight, 2017; Levine & White, 1960; Thompson, 1967; Zhi, Ni, & Zeng, 2011) argue that resource exchange rests on the understanding that what an organization has to offer is socially wanted. If an organization is unable to exchange with others, it will not receive the resources it needs, thus failing to survive. Chernyak-Hai and Rabenu (2018) argue that traditional views of social exchange theory may not be relevant in the workplace. New approaches may be needed to explain exchange of resources.

PURPOSE OF THE STUDY

Berg and Wiebe's (1993) research attempted to apply Resource Exchange Theory to the work environment. To extend the range of situations in which Resource Exchange Theory has been applied, their work evaluated the types of work performed allowing opportunities to examine the effect of different work environments on resource exchange. Berg and Wiebe reported that most people spend a large amount of time at work. The traditional economic view of work and workplace exchanges reflects the predominate belief that workers exchange their services (time and labor) for money. Berg and Wiebe (1989; 1993) stated that the workplace is one in which many types of resources are exchanged. For example, a worker may gain status and praise for a job well done or others at the job site may provide him/her with knowledge or friendship. Furthermore, Berg and Wiebe (1989; 1993) believed that varying work situations and different categories of work could be expected to affect the types and amounts of resources workers likely receive. Different jobs altered the status they provided to workers. The organizational climate and the management techniques employed can make exchanges of resources probable. Finally, the individual characteristics of the workers themselves may affect their tendency to engage in exchanges and the value they place on resources.

Berg and Wiebe's research (1989; 1993) raises possibilities concerning the application of the Foa's (1974) Resource Exchange Theory to workplace exchanges. However, as promising as the results are, they must be taken with caution. Berg and Wiebe did not perform tests for reliability and validity of their

survey instrument the Berg/Wiebe Resource Exchange Scale. Reliability and validity are critical considerations in research, and they should be taken seriously in any research. The purpose of this research is to evaluate the instrument used by Berg and Wiebe (1989; 1993) in terms of its reliability and validity.

HYPOTHESES

***H1.** The Berg/Wiebe Resource Exchange Scale is a reliable instrument for measuring the exchange of resources in the workplace and the level of satisfaction with these exchanges.*

***H2.** The Berg/Wiebe Resource Exchange Scale is a valid instrument for measuring the exchange of resources in the workplace and the level of satisfaction with these exchanges.*

Berg and Wiebe (1989; 1993) failed to evaluate their scale in terms of reliability and validity. However, Berg and Wiebe do not stand alone concerning the issue of testing for reliability and validity. Research has shown reliability and validity should be major considerations (Drost, 2011; Kimberlin & Winterstein, 2008; Nardi 2018). Davis and Cosenza (1993) argued that if a measurement scale is not valid, then its measurements are of little or no use since the scale is not measuring what it was intended to be measuring. Beatty and Schneier (1981) pointed out that reliability is also an important issue as it measures the consistency or repeatability of a scale. The value of examining the reliability and validity of a measurement instrument is clear, and thus were major issues addressed through this study.

POPULATION

For this study, participants consisted of mostly line workers in a manufacturing facility. Employees of this particular facility were deemed appropriate for this study for the following reasons. First, such subjects provided a sample, which was relatively homogeneous with respect to work experience, age, and educational background. Second, these employees should have had a viable interest in the satisfaction of resources exchanged in the workplace and were more likely to offer a wide range of interactions in terms of exchange relationships. Additionally, these employees should have had greater insight for evaluating their satisfaction with exchange outcomes in the workplace, rather than say subjects (such as students) who were not currently employed in a business setting.

Kerlinger (1973) referred to the type of sample chosen for this study as a convenience sample. As reported by Scherer (1987) this type of sample does not use a random selection procedure but utilizes a selected group of individuals from the population under study who are accessible and available for participation. Although the sample was not randomly drawn, it was representative of the population of employees who are employed by various business entities.

Convenience sampling was appropriate for this study given it was exploratory in nature. According to Emory and Cooper (1991), exploration allows researchers to develop their concepts more clearly and to determine if additional research in the area is justified.

INSTRUMENTATION

Berg and Wiebe's Resource Exchange Scale

Berg and Wiebe's Resource Exchange Scale was developed based on studies addressing resources exchanged in the workplace. Brief questionnaires were distributed to workers inquiring about the resources given and received at the workplace. Open-ended questions were used to obtain responses from subjects concerning the resources given and received. Actual responses to the open-ended questions given by subjects in the Berg/Wiebe studies were used in the development of the final version of the Berg/Wiebe Resource Exchange Scale (see Appendix). Examples of receiving money, information, love,

status, services, and benefits unique to the job itself were selected for inclusion in the scale (Berg & Wiebe, 1989; 1993).

The Short-form Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire

A subtest of the 100-item Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire (MSQ), was developed as a 20-item, self-administering questionnaire (Weiss, Dawis, England, & Lofquist, 1967). Each item in the short-form represents one of the 20 scales in the long-form MSQ. Respondents were asked to choose one of five possible choices to express their level of job satisfaction (Bates, 1968). The short-form MSQ can be completed in approximately five minutes (Weirs, Dawis, Lofquist, & England, 1966) (see Appendix).

DATA COLLECTION

Participants were informed that the data collected was part of a research study seeking to examine the resources exchanged in the workplace and the satisfaction with these exchanges, as well as, satisfaction with their jobs. Questionnaires were completed by participants and returned within three days after initial receipt. Participants were asked to read the instructions and record their responses on the questionnaire forms.

Part I of the questionnaire contains questions concerning the exchange of resources and a measurement of satisfaction with the outcome of these exchanges as developed by Berg and Wiebe (1989; 1993). Part II contains a measurement of job satisfaction as measured by the Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire. The appendix contains a complete reproduction of the research instrument including the instructions for each section.

DATA ANALYSIS

Several analytical techniques were used to evaluate the reliability and validity of the Berg/Wiebe Resource Exchange Scale, which is designed to evaluate the exchange of resources at the workplace and the satisfaction with these exchanges. The resources that are measured by the Berg/Wiebe Resource Exchange Scale include: love, work, information, service, status, and money.

Correlation analysis was used to evaluate the reliability of the Berg/Wiebe Resource Exchange Scale. Initially, the exchange scores were combined with the satisfaction scores of the exchanges for evaluation. Correlation analysis was used to evaluate the relationship of the two questions, which were designed to measure particular exchanges and the satisfaction with these exchanges. Results from the correlation analysis are presented in Table 1.

TABLE 1
CORRELATION OF TWO MEASURES OF EXCHANGES AND SATISFACTION
LEVEL OF EXCHANGES FOR EACH RESOURCE

Number	Resources	Correlation Results
1.	Love/Work	.67*
2.	Love/Love	.61*
3.	Love/Information	.58*
4.	Service/Status	.80*
5.	Love/Money	.67*
6.	Information/Work	.27*
7.	Service/Information	.34*
8.	Information/Status	.78*
9.	Service/Work	.64*
10.	Information/Love	.58*
11.	Love/Status	.47*
12.	Service/Money	.69*
13.	Service/Love	.50*
14.	Information/Money	.73*
15.	Information/Information	.62*

* p < .05

The correlations yielded useful information. In addition to the combined scores, correlation analysis was conducted employing only the satisfaction with exchange scores to determine the degree of satisfaction with each exchange. Of interest in this analysis, was the relationship between the satisfaction scores of the two measures of each exchange being examined. Results from this correlation analysis are presented in Table 2.

TABLE 2
CORRELATION OF TWO MEASUREMENTS OF LEVEL OF
SATISFACTION FOR EACH RESOURCE

Number	Resources	Correlation results
1.	Love/Work	.65*
2.	Love/Love	.57*
3.	Love/Information	.63*
4.	Service/Status	.83*
5.	Love/Money	.66*
6.	Information/Work	.71*
7.	Service/Information	.61*
8.	Information/Status	.75*
9.	Service/Work	.66*
10.	Information/Love	.56*
11.	Love/Status	.80*
12.	Service/Money	.70*
13.	Service/Love	.50*
14.	Information/Money	.69*
15.	Information/Information	.65*

* p < .05

The results of the correlation analysis provided in Tables 1 and 2 suggest the correlation between the two measures of each type of exchange were more than adequate. The information appears to suggest that the two measures of exchange of each resource and the satisfaction with these exchanges are somewhat correlated. When one examines the results concerning the satisfaction scores, it becomes clear that the two measures of exchange appear to indeed be measuring the same concept with somewhat similar results.

Cronbach's Alpha was also calculated in evaluating the reliability and validity of the Berg/Wiebe Resource Exchange Scale. Coefficient Alpha was calculated for the satisfaction scale. The thirty questions, measuring the satisfaction with the exchange of particular resources, were divided into two halves consisting of fifteen questions each using a table of random numbers. Cronbach's Alpha for this procedure was .87. These results partially establish the reliability and validity of the Berg/Wiebe Resource Exchange Scale.

The Guttman split-half procedure for evaluating reliability and validity was also used. The Berg/Wiebe Resource Exchange Scale was divided into two equal halves. The results of the score on the first half were then correlated with the results of the second half. The resulting coefficient was used to evaluate the reliability of the scale. A table of random numbers was used to divide the Berg/Wiebe Resource Exchange Scale into two equal halves.

Results of the split-half procedure provides support for the reliability and validity of the Berg/Wiebe Resource Exchange Scale. The Cronbach's Alpha for the first half was .66 while the Cronbach's Alpha for the second half was .96. The correlation between the first and second half was .80 and the Guttman split-half reliability was .87. These results, along with those of the procedures employing correlation analysis and Cronbach's Alpha, further establish the reliability and validity of the Berg/Wiebe Resource Exchange Scale.

Further evaluation of the reliability and validity of the Berg/Wiebe Resource Exchange Scale involved the examination of a form of concurrent validity which is the degree to which the scores on a test are related to the scores on another, already established test, administered at the same time.

The Berg/Wiebe Resource Exchange Scale was administered along with the short-form Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire (validated instrument) to determine if the two instruments measure the same concept. Comparing results of the Berg/Wiebe Resource Exchange Scale with those of the MSQ allowed determination whether both instruments measured the same concept and were valid.

The overall score for the Berg/Wiebe Resource Exchange Scale was compared with an overall score for the Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire to evaluate the reliability and validity of the scale. Correlation analysis was used to evaluate the concurrent validity of the Berg/Wiebe Resource Exchange Scale. A comparison of the two instruments resulted in a correlation coefficient of .64.

The results obtained from correlation analysis, Cronbach's Alpha, and the Guttman split-half procedure provided encouraging results concerning the reliability and validity of the Berg/Wiebe Resource Exchange Scale. The results suggested that the scale can be used to evaluate the exchange of resources at the workplace as well as the level of satisfaction with these exchanges. The degree of correlation in this case appeared to be more than adequate.

SUMMARY

The primary purpose of this study was to evaluate the reliability and validity of the Berg/Wiebe Resource Exchange Scale (1989; 1993). The Berg/Wiebe Resource Exchange Scale, along with the Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire, were administered to employees of a manufacturing facility and had a response rate of 96%. Appropriate statistical procedures were used to evaluate the following two hypotheses:

***H1.** The Berg/Wiebe scale is a reliable instrument for measuring the exchange of resources in the workplace and the level of satisfaction with these exchanges.*

H2. *The Berg/Wiebe scale is a valid instrument for measuring the exchange of resources in the workplace and the level of satisfaction with these exchanges.*

The statistical analysis of hypotheses one and two showed that the Berg/Wiebe Resource Exchange Scale is a reliable and valid instrument for measuring the exchange of resources in the workplace and the level of satisfaction with these exchanges. Each statistical procedure employed in this study provided positive results concerning the reliability and validity of the Berg/Wiebe Resource Exchange Scale.

CONCLUSIONS

Based on the analysis of the data collected to test the two hypotheses, the following conclusions have been reached.

1. *The Berg/Wiebe Resource Exchange Scale is a reliable instrument for measuring the exchange of resources at the workplace and the level of satisfaction with these exchanges.*
2. *The Berg/Wiebe Resource Exchange Scale is a valid instrument for measuring the exchange of resources at the workplace and the level of satisfaction with these exchanges.*

Conclusions one and two are based on the results of several statistical procedures. Correlation analysis showed that all correlations of each group of two questions used to measure the exchange of resources are more than adequate. Each of these correlations were found to be significant at the .05 level of significance. These results held true when the likelihood of exchange scores was combined with the level of satisfaction scores for specific exchanges. Similar results were obtained when correlation analysis was performed using only the satisfaction scores.

Additional support for conclusions one and two were provided by the results of Cronbach's Alpha procedure of .87. Also, the Guttman split-half procedure provided a correlation between the first and second half of .80 and a split-half reliability of .87. Further support for the reliability and validity of the Berg/Wiebe Resource Exchange Scale was provided by correlating the overall satisfaction score from the scale with the overall score from the short-form MSQ resulting in a correlation of .64.

MANAGERIAL IMPLICATIONS

This research makes several contributions to the management literature. Many researchers have noted the need for more empirical studies of the reliability and validity of research instruments (Erdis & Median, 1989; Kassarjian, 1971; Peter, 1979). This study examines the reliability and validity of the instrument used to measure the exchange of resources in the workplace and the overall satisfaction with these exchanges. Thus, this study helps to provide a better understanding of the importance of the examination of the issues of reliability and validity of instruments in research.

In addition to the value this research provides to the body of literature available in the field, the study also serves as an educational tool that may be utilized by managers in most any industry. Managers should be able to use the results of the study to assist them in making improvements in many areas concerning the workplace. Areas that can benefit from the results of this study include behavior modification/motivation, goal setting, individual performance, job enrichment, job satisfaction, and leadership. It is possible that managers facing most any situation will be able to utilize the Berg/Wiebe Resource Exchange Scale to improve the workplace. In general, this should result in increased efficiency, effectiveness, and productivity. Using the results of this study, it is possible that managers will be able to develop innovative approaches to solving many of the problems they face in the workplace.

LIMITATIONS

The first limitation concerns the sample used in this study. The individuals for this study were not randomly selected for inclusion. All employees of a single manufacturing facility comprised the sample. Therefore, any inferences derived from the results of this study should be interpreted with caution.

Additionally, the sample included mostly individuals employed in the same type of work or job responsibility. The sample consisted of individuals who were generally in the same age categories and had similar levels of education. The homogeneous nature of this sample may not be representative of employees in general.

The second limitation of this study concerns the statistical procedures used to evaluate the reliability and validity of the Berg/Wiebe Resource Exchange Scale. The procedures employed to evaluate the reliability and validity of the scale were appropriate for this type of study and provided useful results. However, had it been possible to use additional statistical procedures, test-retest for example, the opportunity for greater evaluation of the reliability and validity of the scale would have been possible.

The third limitation involves the generalizability of the results of this study. As previously noted, the sample was limited to the employees of a single manufacturing facility. The individuals were mostly line workers, had the same level of education, and were for the most part in the same age category. This study did not test the Berg/Wiebe Resource Exchange Scale in different types of work settings. Also, the study did not involve individuals to a large extent that were in managerial positions, had high levels of education, or were either very young or old. Therefore, it is not certain that the Berg/Wiebe Resource Exchange Scale will yield similar results across different types of work settings. Additional research will show if the Berg/Wiebe Resource Exchange Scale can be used in other types of work settings.

FUTURE RESEARCH

While this study provides promising results, there are areas that need to be addressed in future research. First, additional research is needed to determine if the Berg/Wiebe Resource Exchange Scale can be used in other work settings to evaluate the exchange of resources and the level of satisfaction with these exchanges. Researchers should administer the scale in settings that include higher numbers of managers, varying levels of education, and various age groups. Also, the scale should be administered to samples other than manufacturing facilities to determine if the results of this study will be consistent over different types of work settings. Results of future studies will provide an indication of the generalizability of the results of this study and might identify areas for improvement in the scale as well as areas that need to be addressed by managers.

The Berg/Wiebe Resource Exchange Scale could be used in conjunction with other pre-established measures to make improvements in areas of concern to managers. As discussed earlier, the Berg/Wiebe Resource Exchange Scale provides information that can be useful to managers. This information could be used to make improvements in areas such as behavior modification/motivation, goal setting, individual performance, job enrichment, job satisfaction, and leadership. The advances and improvements that can be made in the area of management appears to be unlimited if the information obtained from the Berg/Wiebe Resource Exchange Scale is appropriately combined with other measures.

REFERENCES

- Bates, G. L. (1968). *The relationship of personality and work adjustment of vocational rehabilitants: A test of Holland's Theory* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). University of Oklahoma, Oklahoma.
- Berg, J. H., & McQuinn, R. D. (1986). Attraction and exchange in continuing and non-continuing dating relationships. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 50(5), 942-952.
- Berg, J. H., & Wiebe, F. A. (1989). Increased resources exchanged in quality circles: An application of resources theory. *Advances in Industrial Organization Psychology*, 85-92.
- Berg, J. H., & Wiebe, F. A. (1993). Resource exchange in the workplace: Exchange of economic and interpersonal resources. In *Resource Theory – Explorations and Applications* (pp. 97-122). Retrieved from https://catalog.library.vanderbilt.edu/discovery/search?query=any,contains,%22Resource%20exchange%20in%20the%20workplace:%20%20Exchange%20of%20economic%20and%20interpersonal%20resources%22&tab=Everything&search_scope=MyInst_and_CI&vid=01VAN_INST:vanui&offset=0&pcAvailability=true
- Blau, P. (1964). *Exchange and Power in Social Life*. New York: Wiley.
- Brinberg, D., & Castell, P. (1982). A resource exchange theory approach to interpersonal interactions: A test of Foa's theory. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 43(2), 260-269.
- Brinberg, D., & Ganesan, S. (1993). An application of Foa's resource exchange theory to product positioning. In U. G. Foa, J. Converse Jr., K. Tornblom, & E. B. Foa's *Resource Theory: Explorations and applications*. San Diego: Academic Press, Inc.
- Brinberg, D., & Wood, R. (1983). A resource exchange theory analysis of consumer behavior. *Journal of Consumer Research*, 10, 330-338.
- Cate, R. M. (1981). An interpersonal resource exchange program for couples. *Social Casework: The Journal of Contemporary Social Work*, 210-217.
- Chernyak-Hai, L., & Rabenu, E. (2018). The new era workplace relationships: Is social exchange theory still relevant? *Industrial and Organizational Psychology*, 11(3), 456-481. Retrieved from <https://www.cambridge.org/core/journals/industrial-and-organizational-psychology/article/new-era-workplace-relationships-is-social-exchange-theory-still-relevant/F4E7EA06887C7CD12A3BF6F038D88CE6>
- Clark, M. S. (1982). Reactions to aid in communal and exchange relationships. In J. Fisher, A. Nadler, and B. De Paulo (eds.), *New Directions in Research on Helping*. New York: Academic Press.
- Clark, M. S., & Mills, J. (1979). Interpersonal attraction in exchange and communal relationships. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 37, 12-24.
- Davis, D., & Cosenza, R. M. (1993). Foundations of measurement. In *Business Research for Decision Making* (3rd ed.). Belmont: Wadsworth.
- Donnenwerth, G. V., Teichman, M., & Foa, U. G. (1973). Cognitive differentiation of self and parents in delinquent and non-delinquent girls. *British Journal of Social Clinical Psychology*, 12, 144-152.
- Drost, E.A. (2011). Validity and reliability in social science research. *Education Research and Perspectives*, 38(1).
- Emory, C. W., & Cooper, D. R. (1991). *Business Research Methods* (4th ed.). Boston: Richard D. Irwin, Inc.
- Foa, E. B., & Foa, U. G. (1980). Resource theory: Interpersonal behavior as exchange. In Gergen, K. J., Greenberg, M. S., & Willis, R. H. *Social Exchange: Advances in Theory and Research*. New York: Plenum Press.
- Foa, E. B., & Foa, U. G. (2012). Resource theory of social exchange. In *Handbook of social resource theory* (pp. 15-32). Retrieved from https://link.springer.com/chapter/10.1007/978-1-4614-4175-5_2
- Foa, U., Converse, J., Tornblom, K., & Foa, E. (1993). *Resource theory: Explorations and applications*. San Diego: Academic Press, Inc.
- Foa, U. G., & Foa, E. B. (1974). *Societal structures of the mind*. Springfield, Illinois: Thomas.

- Foa, U. G., Salcedo, L. N., Tornblom, K. Y., Garner, M., Glaubman, H., & Teichman, M. (1987). Interrelation of social resources: Evidence of pancultural invariance. *Journal of Cross-cultural Psychology*, 18(2), 221-233.
- Griesinger, D. W. (1990). The human side of economic organization. *Academy of Management Review*, 15(3), 478-499.
- Hatfield, E., Utne, M. K., & Traupmann, J. (1979). Equity theory and intimate relationships. In Burgess, L. & Huston, T. (Eds.) *Social Exchange in Developing Relationships*. New York: Academic Press.
- Holmes, J. G. (1981). The exchange process in close relationships: Microbehavior and macromotive. In Lerner, M. J. & Lerner, S. C. (Eds.) *The Justice motive in social behavior: Adapting to times of scarcity and change*. New York: Plenum Press.
- Homans, C. G. (1961). *Social behavior: Its elementary forms*. New York: Harcourt, Brace, & World.
- Huang, L., & Knight, A.P. (2017). Resources and relationships in entrepreneurship: An exchange theory of the development and effects of the entrepreneur-investor relationship. *Academy of Management Review*, 42(1), 80. Retrieved from <http://ezproxy.utm.edu/login?url=https://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=edb&AN=120436475&site=eds-live>
- Kassarjian, H. (1971). Personality and consumer behaviour: A review. *Journal of Marketing Research*, 8, 409-18.
- Kelley, H., & Tibaut, J. (1978). *Interpersonal relations: A theory of interdependence*. New York: Wiley.
- Kerlinger, F. N. (1973). *Foundations of Behavior Research* (2nd ed.). New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston, Inc.
- Kimberlin, C. L., & Winterstein, A.G. (2008). Validity and reliability of measurement instruments used in research. *American Journal of Health-system Pharmacy*, 65(23), 2276-2284. Retrieved from <https://doi.org/10.2146/aghp070364>
- Kleyn, J. E. (1989). *What are the Characteristics of Legitimate Organizations? An Examination of Factors Associated with the External Ratings of Four Year Colleges and Universities*. University of Washington.
- Kraemer, J., & Chen, C.C. (2012). Cultural differences in resource exchange at the workplace: A Sino-US comparison. In *Handbook of social resource theory* (pp. 283-300). Retrieved from https://link.springer.com/chapter/10.1007/978-1-4614-4175-5_18
- Levine, S., & White, P. E. (1960). Exchange as a conceptual framework for the study of interorganizational relations. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 5, 583-601.
- March, J. G., & Simon, H. A. (1958). *Organizations*. New York: Wiley.
- Miller, G. L. (1980). *Donor behavior as resource exchange: An examination of the structure and desirability of resources* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation).
- Nardi, P. M. (2018). *Doing survey research: A guide to quantitative research*. New York: Routledge.
- Peter, J. P. (1979). Reliability: A review of psychometric basics and recent marketing practices. *Journal of Marketing Research*, 16, 6-17.
- Rettig, K. D. (1980). *Interpersonal resource exchanges as predictors of quality of marriage and family life* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). Michigan State University: Michigan.
- Rettig, K. D., & Bubolz, M. M. (1983). Interpersonal resource exchanges as indicators of quality of marriage. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 497-509.
- Rettig, K. D., Danes, S. M., & Bauer, J. W. (1991). Family life quality: Theory and assessment in economically stressed farm families. *Social Indicators Research*, 24, 269-299.
- Sabbagh, C., & Levy, S. (2012). Toward an expansion of resource exchange theory: A facet approach. In *Handbook of social resource theory* (pp. 67-80). Retrieved from https://link.springer.com/chapter/10.1007/978-1-4614-4175-5_4
- Scherer, R. F. (1987). *A Social Learning Explanation for the Development of Entrepreneurial Characteristics and Career Selection* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). The University of Mississippi, Mississippi.
- Schoell, W. F., & Guiltinan, J. P. (1992). *Marketing: Contemporary Concepts and Practices* (5th ed.). Boston: Allyn and Bacon.

- Simon, H. A. (1947). *Administration Behavior*. New York: Free Press.
- Thibaut, J. W., & Kelly, H. H. (1959). *The Social Psychology of Groups*. New York: Wiley.
- Thompson, J. D. (1967). *Organizations in Action*. New York: McGraw Hill.
- Tornblom, K., Jonsson, D., & Foa, U. (1985). Nationality, resource class, and preferences among three allocation rules: Sweden vs. USA. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, 9, 51-77.
- Tornblom, K. Y., & Fredholm, E. M. (1984). Attribution of friendship: The influence of the nature and comparability of resources given and received. *Social Psychology Quarterly*, 47, 50-61.
- Tornblom, K. Y., Fredholm, E. M., & Jonsson, D. R. (1987). New and Old Friendships: Attributed Effects of Type and Similarity of Transacted Resources. *Human Relations*, 40, 337-359.
- Tornblom, K., Jonsson, D., & Foa, U. (1985). Nationality, resource class, and preferences among three allocation rules: Sweden vs. USA. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, 9, 51-77.
- Walster, E., Walster, G. W., & Berscheid, E. (1978). *Equity Theory and Research*. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.
- Weiss, D. J., Davis, R. V., England, F. W., & Lofquist, L. H. (1967). *Manual for the Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire*. Industrial Relations Center, University of Minnesota.
- Weiss, D. J., Davis, R. V., Lofquist, L. H., & England, G. W. (1966). Instrumentation for the theory of work adjustment. In *Industrial Relations Center Bulletin*, 44; *Minnesota Studies in Vocational Rehabilitation*, 21. University of Minnesota: Minneapolis, MN., 85.
- Zhi, Y., Ni, D.B., & Zeng, Y. (2011). Entrepreneurs' social relation networks, resource exchange and firm economic performance. *Journal of Industrial Engineering and Engineering Management*, 1. Retrieved from http://en.cnki.com.cn/Article_en/CJFDTOTAL-GLGU201101027.htm

APPENDIX

Motivation Questionnaire

Instructions: Please read each of the following situations, then answer the two questions that follow the situations by marking the appropriate response.

1. In all aspects of the workplace have you given loyalty and devotion to the company when the company has given you good working conditions?
Almost Always Frequently Occasionally Seldom Never
A B C D E
2. How satisfied are you with the situation described above?
Very Dissatisfied Dissatisfied Neutral Satisfied Very Satisfied
A B C D E
3. In all aspects of the workplace have you given loyalty and devotion to the company when the company has given you an opportunity to work with friendly people?
Almost Always Frequently Occasionally Seldom Never
A B C D E
4. How satisfied are you with the situation described above?
Very Dissatisfied Dissatisfied Neutral Satisfied Very Satisfied
A B C D E
5. In all aspects of the workplace have you given loyalty and devotion to the company when the company has told you more about what is going on?
Almost Always Frequently Occasionally Seldom Never
A B C D E
6. How satisfied are you with the situation described above?
Very Dissatisfied Dissatisfied Neutral Satisfied Very Satisfied
A B C D E
7. In all aspects of the workplace have you given a good day's work when the company has given you an opportunity to be part of something worthwhile?
Almost Always Frequently Occasionally Seldom Never
A B C D E
8. How satisfied are you with the situation described above?
Very Dissatisfied Dissatisfied Neutral Satisfied Very Satisfied
A B C D E
9. In all aspects of the workplace have you given loyalty and devotion to the company when the company has given you more pay and benefits?
Almost Always Frequently Occasionally Seldom Never
A B C D E
10. How satisfied are you with the situation described above?
Very Dissatisfied Dissatisfied Neutral Satisfied Very Satisfied
A B C D E
11. In all aspects of the workplace have you given solutions to problems that the company faces when the company has given you good working conditions?
Almost Always Frequently Occasionally Seldom Never
A B C D E
12. How satisfied are you with the situation described above?
Very Dissatisfied Dissatisfied Neutral Satisfied Very Satisfied
A B C D E

13. In all aspects of the workplace have you given a good day's work when the company has told you more about what is going on?
 Almost Always Frequently Occasionally Seldom Never
 A B C D E
14. How satisfied are you with the situation described above?
 Very Dissatisfied Dissatisfied Neutral Satisfied Very Satisfied
 A B C D E
15. In all aspects of the workplace have you given solutions to problems that the company faces when the company has given you an opportunity for independence and responsibility?
 Almost Always Frequently Occasionally Seldom Never
 A B C D E
16. How satisfied are you with the situation described above?
 Very Dissatisfied Dissatisfied Neutral Satisfied Very Satisfied
 A B C D E
17. In all aspects of the workplace have you given loyalty and devotion to the company when the company has given you job and financial security?
 Almost Always Frequently Occasionally Seldom Never
 A B C D E
18. How satisfied are you with the situation described above?
 Very Dissatisfied Dissatisfied Neutral Satisfied Very Satisfied
 A B C D E
19. In all aspects of the workplace have you given a good day's work when the company has given you good working conditions?
 Almost Always Frequently Occasionally Seldom Never
 A B C D E
20. How satisfied are you with the situation described above?
 Very Dissatisfied Dissatisfied Neutral Satisfied Very Satisfied
 A B C D E
21. In all aspects of the workplace have you given solutions to problems that the company faces when the company has given you an opportunity to work with friendly people?
 Almost Always Frequently Occasionally Seldom Never
 A B C D E
22. How satisfied are you with the situation described above?
 Very Dissatisfied Dissatisfied Neutral Satisfied Very Satisfied
 A B C D E
23. In all aspects of the workplace have you given solutions to problems that the company faces when the company has given you an opportunity to be part of something worthwhile?
 Almost Always Frequently Occasionally Seldom Never
 A B C D E
24. How satisfied are you with the situation described above?
 Very Dissatisfied Dissatisfied Neutral Satisfied Very Satisfied
 A B C D E
25. In all aspects of the workplace have you given a good day's work when the company has given you job training and experience?
 Almost Always Frequently Occasionally Seldom Never
 A B C D E

26. How satisfied are you with the situation described above?
 Very Dissatisfied Dissatisfied Neutral Satisfied Very Satisfied
 A B C D E
27. In all aspects of the workplace have you given loyalty and devotion to the company when the company has given you an opportunity for independence and responsibility?
 Almost Always Frequently Occasionally Seldom Never
 A B C D E
28. How satisfied are you with the situation described above?
 Very Dissatisfied Dissatisfied Neutral Satisfied Very Satisfied
 A B C D E
29. In all aspects of the workplace have you given a good day's work when the company has given you job and financial security?
 Almost Always Frequently Occasionally Seldom Never
 A B C D E
30. How satisfied are you with the situation described above?
 Very Dissatisfied Dissatisfied Neutral Satisfied Very Satisfied
 A B C D E
31. In all aspects of the workplace have you given loyalty and devotion to the company when the company has given you recognition for a job well done?
 Almost Always Frequently Occasionally Seldom Never
 A B C D E
32. How satisfied are you with the situation described above?
 Very Dissatisfied Dissatisfied Neutral Satisfied Very Satisfied
 A B C D E
33. In all aspects of the workplace have you given a good day's work when the company has given you an opportunity to work with friendly people?
 Almost Always Frequently Occasionally Seldom Never
 A B C D E
34. How satisfied are you with the situation described above?
 Very Dissatisfied Dissatisfied Neutral Satisfied Very Satisfied
 A B C D E
35. In all aspects of the workplace have you given solutions to problems that the company faces when the company has given you recognition for a job well done?
 Almost Always Frequently Occasionally Seldom Never
 A B C D E
36. How satisfied are you with the situation described above?
 Very Dissatisfied Dissatisfied Neutral Satisfied Very Satisfied
 A B C D E
37. In all aspects of the workplace have you given solutions to problems that the company faces when the company has given you job and financial security?
 Almost Always Frequently Occasionally Seldom Never
 A B C D E
38. How satisfied are you with the situation described above?
 Very Dissatisfied Dissatisfied Neutral Satisfied Very Satisfied
 A B C D E

39. In all aspects of the workplace have you given a good day's work when the company has given you an opportunity to be part of something worthwhile?

Almost Always Frequently Occasionally Seldom Never
A B C D E

40. How satisfied are you with the situation described above?

Very Dissatisfied Dissatisfied Neutral Satisfied Very Satisfied
A B C D E

41. In all aspects of the workplace have you given loyalty and devotion to the company when the company has given you an opportunity to be part of something worthwhile?

Almost Always Frequently Occasionally Seldom Never
A B C D E

42. How satisfied are you with the situation described above?

Very Dissatisfied Dissatisfied Neutral Satisfied Very Satisfied
A B C D E

43. In all aspects of the workplace have you given solutions to problems that the company faces when the company has given you job training and experience?

Almost Always Frequently Occasionally Seldom Never
A B C D E

44. How satisfied are you with the situation described above?

Very Dissatisfied Dissatisfied Neutral Satisfied Very Satisfied
A B C D E

45. In all aspects of the workplace have you given solutions to problems that the company faces when the company has told you more about what is going on?

Almost Always Frequently Occasionally Seldom Never
A B C D E

46. How satisfied are you with the situation described above?

Very Dissatisfied Dissatisfied Neutral Satisfied Very Satisfied
A B C D E

47. In all aspects of the workplace have you given loyalty and devotion to the company when the company has given you job training and experience?

Almost Always Frequently Occasionally Seldom Never
A B C D E

48. How satisfied are you with the situation described above?

Very Dissatisfied Dissatisfied Neutral Satisfied Very Satisfied
A B C D E

49. In all aspects of the workplace have you given a good day's work when the company has given you recognition for a job well done?

Almost Always Frequently Occasionally Seldom Never
A B C D E

50. How satisfied are you with the situation described above?

Very Dissatisfied Dissatisfied Neutral Satisfied Very Satisfied
A B C D E

51. In all aspects of the workplace have you given solutions to problems that the company faces when the company has given you more pay and benefits?

Almost Always Frequently Occasionally Seldom Never
A B C D E

52. How satisfied are you with the situation described above?
 Very Dissatisfied Dissatisfied Neutral Satisfied Very Satisfied
 A B C D E
53. In all aspects of the workplace have you given a good day's work when the company has given you more pay and benefits?
 Almost Always Frequently Occasionally Seldom Never
 A B C D E
54. How satisfied are you with the situation described above?
 Very Dissatisfied Dissatisfied Neutral Satisfied Very Satisfied
 A B C D E
55. In all aspects of the workplace have you given a good day's work when the company has given you opportunity to do the kind of job you like?
 Almost Always Frequently Occasionally Seldom Never
 A B C D E
56. How satisfied are you with the situation described above?
 Very Dissatisfied Dissatisfied Neutral Satisfied Very Satisfied
 A B C D E
57. In all aspects of the workplace have you given loyalty and devotion to the company when the company has given you the opportunity to do the kind of job that you like?
 Almost Always Frequently Occasionally Seldom Never
 A B C D E
58. How satisfied are you with the situation described above?
 Very Dissatisfied Dissatisfied Neutral Satisfied Very Satisfied
 A B C D E
59. In all aspects of the workplace have you given solutions to problems that the company faces when the company has given you the opportunity to do the kind of job that you like?
 Almost Always Frequently Occasionally Seldom Never
 A B C D E
60. How satisfied are you with the situation described above?
 Very Dissatisfied Dissatisfied Neutral Satisfied Very Satisfied
 A B C D E

Satisfaction Questionnaire

The purpose of this questionnaire is to give you a chance to tell how you feel about your present job, what things you are satisfied with and what things you are not satisfied with.

On the basis of your answers we hope to get a better understanding of the things individuals like and dislike about their jobs.

On the following pages you will find statements about your present job.

- ★ Read each statement carefully.
- ★ Decide how satisfied you feel about the aspect of your job described by the statement.

Keeping the statement in mind:

- if you feel that your job gives you more than you expected, check the box under "VS" (Very Satisfied);
- if you feel that your job gives you what you expected, check the box under "S" (Satisfied);
- if you cannot make up your mind whether or not the job gives you what you expected, check the box under "N" (Neither Satisfied nor Dissatisfied);

- if you feel that your job gives you less than you expected, check the box under "DS" (Dissatisfied);
- if you feel that your job gives you much less than you expected, check the box under "VDS" (Very Dissatisfied).

- ★ Remember: Keep the statement in mind when deciding how satisfied you feel about that aspect of your job.
- ★ Do this for all statements. Please answer every item.
- ★ Be frank and honest. Give a true picture of your feelings about your present job.

Ask yourself: How satisfied am I with this aspect of my job?

- VS** = I am very satisfied with this aspect of my job.
- S** = I am satisfied with this aspect of my job.
- N** = I can't decide whether I am satisfied or not with this aspect of my job.
- DS** = I am dissatisfied with this aspect of my job.
- VDS** = I am very dissatisfied with this aspect of my job.

ON MY PRESENT JOB, THIS IS HOW I FEEL ABOUT:

	VDS	DS	N	S	VS
1. Being able to keep busy all the time.	—	—	—	—	—
2. The chance to work alone on the job.	—	—	—	—	—
3. The chance to do different things from time to time.	—	—	—	—	—
4. The chance to be "somebody" in the community.	—	—	—	—	—
5. The way my boss handles his employees.	—	—	—	—	—
6. The competence of my supervisor in making decisions.	—	—	—	—	—
7. Being able to do things that don't go against my conscience.	—	—	—	—	—
8. The way my job provides for steady employment.	—	—	—	—	—
9. The chance to do things for people.	—	—	—	—	—
10. The chance to tell people what to do.	—	—	—	—	—
11. The chance to do something that makes use of my abilities.	—	—	—	—	—
12. The way company policies are put into practice.	—	—	—	—	—
13. My pay and the amount of work I do.	—	—	—	—	—
14. The chances for advancement on this job.	—	—	—	—	—
15. The freedom to use my own judgment.	—	—	—	—	—
16. The chance to try my own methods of doing the job.	—	—	—	—	—
17. The working conditions.	—	—	—	—	—
18. The way my co-workers get along with each other.	—	—	—	—	—
19. The praise I get for doing a good job.	—	—	—	—	—
20. The feeling of accomplishment I get from the job.	—	—	—	—	—