Fairness in Pay and Technology: How Pay Dynamics Influence the Perception of Technology

Sachin Sharma[1], Matthew J. Aplin-Houtz[2], Johnna Murray[3], Sean Leahy[4], Mark Sanders[5], John Meriac[3]

[1]Independent Researcher
[2]Department of Psychology, Brooklyn College
[3]College of Business Administration, University of Missouri Saint Louis
[4]Quinlan School of Business, Loyola University
[5]College of Business Administration, Indiana University East

Author Note

Sachin Sharma https://orcid.org/0000-0002-3493-7817
Matthew J. Aplin-Houtz https://orcid.org/0000-0001-5793-9789
Johnna Murray https://orcid.org/0009-0003-5714-7628
Sean Leahy https://orcid.org/ 0000-0003-2308-3980
Mark Standers https://orcid.org/0000-0003-4607-0699
John Meriac https://orcid.org/0000-0002-6040-9890

We have no conflict of interest to disclose.

The data that support the findings of this study are available from the corresponding author upon reasonable request.

Correspondence concerning this article should be addressed to Matthew Aplin-Houtz. Email: orpheus262@hotmail.com

Fairness in Pay and Technology: How Pay Dynamics Influence the Perception of Technology

Abstract

This exploratory study examines the relationship between pay dynamics perceptions and workplace acceptance of new technology, with a particular focus on pay equity, satisfaction, and communication. We used a time-lag survey design with 396 full-time employees from a variety of US businesses, using Social Cognitive Theory as our theoretical framework. The impact of these pay-related attitudes on employees' acceptance and perceived utility of technology is evaluated in this study. Partial least squares structural equation modeling (PLS-SEM) results show that employees' opinions of communication and pay fairness have a big impact on how easy and beneficial they think new technologies are. In particular, the sense of technological utility is strengthened by clear pay communication, whereas the perception of ease of use is enhanced by views of fair pay. This study offers insights for firms looking to improve technology adoption through better pay practices and emphasizes the significance of taking socioeconomic variables into account within technology acceptance frameworks.

Keywords: Pay Communication, Technology Acceptance Model, Social Cognitive Theory

Introduction

As new technology, such as artificial intelligence, becomes increasingly accessible, businesses are compelled to undertake considerable business transformations to maintain a competitive edge. Their strategic goal is to close the skills and talent gap using technological advancements. Davis (2021) highlights that nearly 44% of companies are accelerating their digital transformation initiatives, with 30% focusing on enriching intuitive training programs for remote and hybrid employees to adapt to impending changes. Despite these proactive initiatives taken up by the organizations, employees frequently resist adopting new software or hardware, potentially resulting in substantial financial losses for businesses (Venkatesh & Davis, 1996; Zaker & Coloma, 2018). This resistance underscores the need to address barriers such as privacy concerns, visibility, and ease of use to facilitate technology adoption. Companies can overcome employee resistance by reflecting on work processes and identifying various barriers to technology adoption (Carroll & Conboy, 2020). Addressing these barriers is crucial for businesses to fully realize the benefits of technological advancements and maintain their competitive edge.

Understanding the antecedents and drivers of technological acceptance is critical, especially given the importance of behavioral components. User experience factors such as output quality and dependability are powerful predictors of technology acceptance (Mlekus et al., 2020), while performance expectancy, effort expectancy, social influence, and enjoyment expectancy significantly impact people's behavioral intentions (Momani, 2021). Perceived utility, simplicity of use, and social impact are important factors in individuals' adoption of technology (Ma et al., 2021). Additionally, self-efficacy, perceived safety, trust, anxiety, and legal requirements all play crucial roles in embracing technology (Seuwou et al., 2020). In recent

findings, Aplin-Houtz et al. (2023a) found that narcissism can positively influence how people view new technology, whereas psychopathy has the reverse effect. Similarly, Leahy et al. (2023) discovered that those with humanist and Kantian ethical perspectives are more likely to find new technology easy to use. These findings indicate that personal characteristics and ethical beliefs influence technology perceptions. Similarly, perceptions of pay dynamics, including fairness, transparency, and compensation satisfaction, play an important role in determining employee attitudes and behaviors inside firms (Aplin-Houtz et al., 2023b; March et al., 2023; Tenhiälä et al., 2024). Just as behavioral determinants influence technological acceptability, wage dynamics may influence employees' impressions of new technology. By investigating pay dynamics as an antecedent, we can acquire a more complete knowledge of how these perceptions influence the ultimate acceptability of technology in organizational contexts. This approach is consistent with the larger framework of behavioral antecedents, highlighting the role of fairness and transparency in promoting good attitudes and acceptance of new technology (Mahato & Kaur, 2023).

Trust is crucial for both accepting technology and perceiving fairness among employees. Pay equity, satisfaction, communication, and secrecy significantly shape employees' experiences and impact their views on fairness, organizational justice, and engagement. Research has established a connection between the sense of fair pay and organizational justice (Colquitt, 2001), and contentment with pay impacts job satisfaction and engagement (Aplin-Houtz et al., 2023b; March et al., 2023). Open and honest communication about salary promotes equity and confidence within companies (Kim & Leung, 2007), while keeping salary information confidential leads to speculation and a sense of unfairness (Aplin-Houtz et al., 2023b; Bamberger & Belogolovsky, 2010). The way a business manages pay and compensation reflects its values

and regard for its employees, significantly affecting morale and engagement (Greenberg, 1990). Understanding the intricacies of salary relations is vital for ensuring fairness and cultivating trust. The strategic importance of pay-related policies and practices in shaping organizational culture and attitudes toward new technologies is undeniable (Aplin-Houtz et al., 2023a; March et al., 2023). As organizations work to reduce resistance to technological advancements, understanding pay dynamics becomes crucial. This leads to our research question: *How do perceptions of pay dynamics influence the perception of potential new technology?*

To effectively situate our study within the broader academic discourse, it is important to understand the prior research that informs the need for this exploration. Previous studies have primarily focused on the technical aspects and user interface design as key factors influencing technology adoption (Johnson et al., 2016; Venkatesh & Davis, 1996). However, less attention has been given to how organizational pay dynamics, such as equity, satisfaction, and transparency, influence employees' attitudes toward new technology. This gap is significant because, while technological solutions and strategies for enhancing user experience are well-documented, the role of pay-related policies in shaping these attitudes remains underexplored. This oversight may hinder the comprehensive understanding needed to drive effective technology adoption strategies in the workplace.

Studying the relationship between pay dynamics and technology acceptance is beneficial for several reasons. First, it broadens the scope of technology acceptance research to include socio-economic factors, offering a more holistic view of the barriers and facilitators of technology use in organizations. Second, understanding this relationship can help managers and decision-makers design more effective adoption strategies that are sensitive to the nuances of organizational justice and employee compensation. Such strategies are crucial for boosting

employee morale and productivity, particularly in an era where remote and hybrid work arrangements are becoming more common. By exploring these dynamics, this study aims to fill a critical knowledge gap, providing insights that can lead to more informed, equitable, and effective technology implementation practices.

To address our research objectives in this exploratory study, we sampled full-time workers from a variety of industries in the United States (N = 396) using a time-lagged survey design. Drawing from the literature on technology acceptance and pay dynamics, we devised a theoretical model and formulated hypotheses through the theoretical lens of Social Cognitive Theory. We evaluated our hypotheses using partial least squares structural equation modeling (PLS-SEM). After obtaining our results, we discuss the findings, offer implications for management, suggest actionable changes, and outline avenues for future research.

Literature Review

Theoretical Framework

Social Cognitive Theory (SCT) explains human behavior through the interplay between psychological, behavioral, and environmental factors. People learn not only from direct experiences but also by observing others, a process known as observational learning or modeling (Bandura, 1989). This theory emphasizes attention, memory, and motivation in learning from the environment and social interactions (Schunk, 2012). Central to SCT is reciprocal determinism, which suggests that behavior, personal factors (like cognitive skills and attitudes), and the environment interact and influence each other (Bandura, 2001). This dynamic interplay makes individuals both products and producers of their environments. Bandura's agentic perspective views individuals as proactive agents of change, capable of self-regulation and self-reflection.

Self-efficacy, a key SCT component, refers to the belief in one's ability to plan and execute actions needed to handle future situations (Bandura, 1997). High self-efficacy enhances motivation, effort, perseverance, and resilience, leading individuals to take on challenging tasks and persist despite setbacks (Schunk & Usher, 2012). In the workplace, higher self-efficacy increases employees' willingness to adopt new technologies and procedures, while lower self-efficacy may cause hesitation due to fear of failure or perceived complexity.

SCT also includes outcome expectations, or beliefs about the consequences of an action. Combined with self-efficacy, these expectations shape decision-making and behavioral engagement. People pursue activities they believe will lead to positive outcomes and avoid those expected to result in negative consequences (Schunk & DiBenedetto, 2020). Employees' perceptions of the benefits and drawbacks of new technology significantly impact their adoption decisions. Positive expectations can encourage experimentation with new technologies, while negative expectations can lead to resistance.

SCT describes how media and symbolic communications influence behavior through direct and socially mediated channels. Direct paths involve informing and motivating individuals, while socially mediated paths connect them to social networks and community contexts for additional support (Bandura, 2001). Observational learning and modeling are crucial; employees are influenced by peers and leaders who demonstrate proficiency and confidence in using new technology. The organizational environment, including support structures, training programs, and a culture of innovation, shapes employee attitudes toward technology adoption. Addressing these factors provides insights into the barriers and enablers of workplace technology acceptance.

SCT has been widely applied in education, healthcare, and information science. In education, it informs strategies using modeling and self-regulation to enhance student learning and motivation. In healthcare, SCT has been used to develop interventions that boost self-efficacy and outcome expectations, promoting health behaviors and managing chronic conditions. In information science, SCT helps understand information-seeking behaviors and knowledge exchange among individuals and organizations (Middleton et al., 2019).

Technology Acceptance

The Technology Acceptance Model (TAM) is a key theory for understanding how and why people accept technology in their work and personal lives. TAM explains the factors influencing users' decisions to adopt new technology and predicts its adoption success (Davis, 1989). Decades of scholarly use highlight TAM's significance in understanding technology adoption (Svendsen et al., 2013). TAM has been applied across various industries, including healthcare (Beglaryan et al., 2017), entrepreneurship (Do et al., 2020), technology (Khan et al., 2014), retail (Gefen & Straub, 1997), and accounting (Jackson & Allen, 2023). It also applies to various demographics such as age (Chen & Chan, 2014), gender (Gefen & Straub, 1997), and race (Porter & Donthu, 2006). Despite expansions to the original model (Fathema et al., 2015; Venkatesh & Davis, 2000), TAM's core remains based on perceived usefulness (PU), perceived ease of use (PEOU), and external variables like self-efficacy, motivation, and autonomy (Davis, 1989).

PU explains how an individual determines the value of technology by assessing how much it enhances job performance and helps achieve goals. Critics argue that PU has limited importance compared to hedonic and motivational forces (Benbasat & Barki, 2007; Chuttur,

2009), but broad support shows PU significantly impacts technology acceptance (Aplin-Houtz et al., 2023a; Leahy et al., 2023; Svendsen et al., 2013).

PEOU describes the ease of using technology and its implementation in the environment (Davis, 1989). Poor user interfaces can cause multi-million-dollar projects to fail (Venkatesh & Davis, 1996). PEOU often includes internal and external control, intrinsic motivation, and emotional stress factors like anxiety (Venkatesh, 2000). Despite not always being directly tested, PEOU consistently explains significant validity and reliability without these antecedents (Fathema et al., 2015; Venkatesh, 2000; Venkatesh & Davis, 2000). Therefore, we will explore PEOU without direct effects from other variables, but consider indirect effects due to their likely impact on overall relationships.

Throughout TAM literature, scholars universally present that PEOU directly influences PU, leading to our hypothesis:

Hypothesis 1. *Higher levels of perceived ease of use (PEOU) will positively relate to higher levels of perceived usefulness (PU).*

The integration of SCT with TAM offers a framework for understanding technology acceptance, leveraging the principles of observational learning, self-efficacy, and the influence of behavior, cognitive and personal factors, and environmental influences. These elements directly relate to TAM's constructs of PEOU and PU, where self-efficacy plays a critical role in shaping individuals' perceptions towards technology's usability and utility (McFarland & Hamilton, 2006).

Research supports the integration of SCT and TAM, revealing that technology acceptance is not solely based on an individual's assessment of technology but is also significantly influenced by social environments, personal self-efficacy, and observational learning. For instance, studies have shown that environmental factors and individual characteristics shaped by these factors, such

as consumer innovativeness and security concerns, significantly impact consumer attitudes towards technology acceptance, including cloud computing services (Ratten, 2015). Furthermore, the integration of social capital theory, social exchange theory, and SCT with TAM has been applied to perceptions of technology, demonstrating how social trust, institutional trust, and social participation, alongside technological factors and system self-efficacy, influence usage intention (March et al., 2023; Tsai, 2014).

Pay Equity

Pay equity, which refers to the practice of ensuring that individuals receive equal compensation for work that is of comparable worth, plays a vital role in promoting a perception of justice and equality in the workplace (Zheng et al., 2014). Studies indicate that when employees regard their salary as fair in comparison to their colleagues, it positively impacts their overall job satisfaction and loyalty to the firm (Indranata et al., 2023). The concept of fairness has a crucial role in influencing the way employees perceive and behave, as suggested by SCT. This theory highlights the importance of observational learning and social reinforcement in the adoption of behaviors (Bandura, 1989). From the perspective of SCT, the way employees perceive pay equity is considered a crucial contextual component that has a direct impact on their attitudes and behaviors. Employees in surroundings viewed as equitable are more inclined to actively participate in and embrace organizational activities, viewing these programs as natural extensions of a nurturing workplace culture (Ijeoma, 2020). This is especially pertinent when using novel technologies in the workplace. When employees regard their compensation as fair, they are more inclined to see organizational changes and new tools, such as technology, as advantageous and backed by a management that prioritizes fairness and equality. This view can improve the perceived ease of use of the new technology, as employees feel more supported by

the organization and less anxious about using new systems (Zheng et al., 2014). Moreover, the perception of fair compensation may also enhance the perceived utility of novel technology. Employees may perceive the use of innovative tools as a chance for personal and professional development, expecting that the organization's fair approach will apply to all aspects of its operations, including technology progress (Kim & Shin, 2015). Based on the theoretical and empirical foundation, we can make the following hypotheses:

Hypothesis 2. *The perception of an environment of equitable pay will positively correlate with the potential PEOU of a new technology.*

Hypothesis 3. *The perception of an environment of equitable pay will positively correlate with the potential PU of a new technology.*

Pay Satisfaction

The assessment of satisfaction with one's pay is an essential element that impacts employee attitudes and actions in the workplace (Aplin-Houtz et al., 2023b; March et al., 2023). Pay satisfaction pertains to an employee's level of satisfaction with their overall compensation package, encompassing their salary, bonuses, and benefits (Heneman, 2000). The SCT proposes that this construct has a substantial impact on molding organizational behaviors through the processes of observational learning and self-efficacy (Bandura, 1989).

Empirical research suggests a direct correlation between pay satisfaction and perceptions of pay equity. When employees are satisfied with their pay, they are more likely to view the pay structure as fair and just (Abdin et al., 2020). This relationship can be comprehended by applying the SCT) as employees who are satisfied with their earnings are inclined to perceive their work environment as supportive and equitable. This further strengthens their favorable perceptions through ongoing experiences of satisfaction and reinforcement (Ijeoma, 2020). Furthermore, the

way people perceive fair compensation acts as a mediator between their contentment with their income and their willingness to embrace workplace innovations.

The notion of fair compensation among employees can have a substantial impact on their level of engagement with new tools and processes. More precisely, a work environment that ensures fair compensation increases the probability that employees would view new technologies as beneficial and user-friendly. This is because they perceive the organization's efforts, such as implementing technology, as fair and supportive of their performance (Kim & Shin, 2015). Mediation is crucial for comprehending the influence of pay-related attitudes on technology engagement and acceptability. Considering these factors, we propose:

Hypothesis 4. *The perception of satisfaction with one's pay will positively and directly relate to perceptions of Pay equity.*

Hypothesis 5. *The perception of an environment of equitable pay will mediate the positive relationship between perceptions of Pay satisfaction and the PEOU for a technology.*

Hypothesis 6. *The perception of an environment of equitable pay will mediate the positive relationship between perceptions of Pay satisfaction and the PU of technology.*

Pay Communication

Effective communication on pay inside a company is a vital component that impacts how employees perceive the justness and impartiality of their remuneration. The practice of having transparent compensation systems not only builds trust but also promotes a sense of fairness among employees (Welbourne & Cable, 1995). SCT posits that the environmental context, particularly communication practices, has a significant impact on shaping individual behaviors and perceptions. This influence occurs through mechanisms such as observational learning and

reciprocal determinism (Bandura, 1989). Studies have demonstrated that when firms establish and maintain transparent lines of communication regarding salary, employees are more inclined to perceive their compensation as just and unbiased (Bernerth et al., 2007; Day, 2012). The reason for this is because straightforward communication diminishes ambiguities and misunderstandings regarding compensation, resulting in a greater feeling of fairness in pay (Bernerth et al., 2007). The heightened sense of equity enhances the creation of a nurturing work environment, which is crucial for effectively executing organizational transformations, such as the integration of novel technology.

Employees in workplaces that have transparent communication regarding compensation not only tend to consider their pay as fair, but also have a greater inclination to perceive new technology as user-friendly and beneficial. The reason for this is that employees have confidence in the organization's tools, believing that they are designed to enhance their productivity rather than compromise their working circumstances (Kim & Shin, 2015). With this comprehension, we propose the following hypotheses:

> **Hypothesis 7.** *In environments where there are higher perceptions of communication about pay, people will also have higher perceptions of pay equity*
>
> **Hypothesis 8.** *The perception of an environment of equitable pay will mediate the positive relationship between higher perceptions of commutation about pay and the potential PEOU for a technology.*
>
> **Hypothesis 9.** *The perception of an environment of equitable pay will mediate the positive relationship between higher perceptions of commutation about pay and the potential PU of a technology.*

Pay Secrecy Policies

Pay secrecy refers to the restriction placed on employees on the quantity of information they ca Pay secrecy refers to limitations placed on employees about the disclosure of their coworkers' salary details. Pay secrecy, despite being common, frequently leads to unfavorable views regarding the fairness of pay, which in turn erodes trust and obstructs individual career progress (Day, 2012). The absence of transparency may deter employees from embracing new technology as a result of reduced trust and perceived lack of support from the firm (Greenberg & Cropanzano, 1993).

According to Kim and Shin (2015), individuals view these technologies as instruments that can increase their sense of control and improve their skills, making them easier to use and more valuable. In contrast, in settings where salary information is kept confidential, the lack of trust and perceived injustice may result in employees resisting or becoming disengaged with new systems and tools. This is because they may regard these changes as adding to the already existing lack of transparency and unfairness within the business. Therefore, we propose the following hypotheses:

Hypothesis 10. *In environments where there are higher perceptions of Pay secrecy policies there will be lower perceptions of Pay equity.*

Hypothesis 11. *The perception of an environment of equitable pay will mediate the relationship between the positive perceptions of an environment where pay secrecy policies and the potential PEOU for a technology.*

Hypothesis 12. *The perception of an environment of equitable pay will mediate the relationship between the positive perceptions of an environment where pay secrecy policies and the potential PU of a technology.*

(Insert Figure 1. about her).

Method

Participants and Procedures

We gathered data from volunteers who participated through the Qualtrics Panel, all of whom were over the age of 18, employed in the United States, and possessed at least one year of work experience. The decision to employ Qualtrics as our data collection tool was strategic, aiming to leverage the platform's known advantages in ensuring consistency in sample composition, the integrity of respondents, and the quality and structure of the data, as well as in achieving reliable results (Smith et al., 2016). Data collection took place through two separate surveys administered from October 24 to November 24, 2021, with a week's interval between them. Additional variables unrelated to this specific study were also gathered. On average, completing both surveys took participants 54.08 minutes, divided into 22.57 minutes for the first and 31.65 minutes for the second survey.

The study's participant pool consisted of 396 adults employed in the U.S., ranging in age from 30 to 87 years (mean age = 59.01 years, SD = 10.722), with diverse educational backgrounds and work experience spanning 5 to 70 years (mean = 35.60 years, SD = 11.12). The sample, however, lacked diversity in racial and ethnic backgrounds, with a predominant 91.162% identifying as white/Caucasian. Please see Table 1 for details.

(insert Table 1 about here)

Variables

Data Screening

In this study, we incorporated several key variables from the Technology Acceptance Model (TAM; Davis, 1989) to assess participants' perceptions towards a general new technology. Specifically, we measured PU and PEUO with 6 items each on a 7-point Likert-type scale.

Furthermore, we explored participants' perceptions of pay communication, satisfaction, equity, and pay secrecy policies within their current roles, utilizing Day's (2012) questionnaires. These were assessed using 4, 4, 11, and 10 items, respectively, on a 5-point Likert-type scale, each consolidated into single variables for analysis.

To enhance the robustness of our analysis and mitigate potential confounding factors, we followed Bernerth and Aguinis's (2016) recommendation to include control variables. These comprised Brayfield and Rothe's (1951) job satisfaction measure and Chen et al.'s (2001) general self-efficacy measure, both assessed on a 5-point Likert-type scale and unified as single variables. In research on organizational behavior and technological acceptability, job satisfaction is an important determinant. A person's self-efficacy and outcome expectations, which in turn influence how they react to new technology, can be influenced by their level of job satisfaction (Bandura, 1989). Furthermore, understanding behavioral adjustments in organizational settings, especially with new technology, requires a solid grasp of general self-efficacy (GSE). GSE is a strong predictor of technology acceptance within the context of SCT because it influences motivation, action choices, and expected outcomes (Bandura, 2001). Additionally, we considered age, gender, and organizational tenure as control variables, acknowledging their significance in motivation and performance research as highlighted by Bernerth and Aguinis (2016).

Missing Data. Data were collected from 396 participants across two phases. The first phase gathered demographic information (age, gender, race, organizational tenure, education level) and assessed general self-efficacy, perceptions of pay communication and equity, and pay secrecy policies. Minimal missing data were observed: only one instance (0.3%) for age, pay communication, and the pay equity scale. No missing cases were reported for gender, race, education, organizational tenure, or general self-efficacy.

The second phase, which did not reassess demographics, focused on key dependent variables—perceived ease of use and perceived usefulness—and the control variable of job satisfaction. We encountered 146 missing responses (36.9%) for these items, all linked to the same participants, with job satisfaction missing in 147 instances. Little's MCAR (X^2 (234) = 265.808, p =0.075) indicated the missing data were random. We used the Expectation Maximization (EM) method to impute the missing data for 147 cases.

. Analysis and Results

Measurement Model Analysis

To investigate the conceptual model, we used Partial Least Squares Structural Equation Modeling (PLS-SEM) with SmartPLS 4.0 (Ringle et al., 2015) to examine the relationships between the constructs and their corresponding indicators. Even though PLS is similar to traditional covariance-based Structural Equation Modeling (e.g. AMOS) in that both techniques model the structural relations in a set of constructs, the research team believes that PLS-SEM is the most appropriate analytical tool for a number of reasons. Since the model utilizes the influence of antecedent variables on specific outcomes, the prerequisite for employing PLS-SEM has been satisfied, as the environment requires predictive-causal analysis (Chin et al., 2003). Moreover, PLS-SEM requires fewer statistical requirements and data constraints than covariance-based SEM.

Analysis of Measurement Model

As part of the measurement model analysis, the elimination of study items with modest factor loadings (0.6: Gefen et al., 2000) was assessed. Two items were below 0.6, requiring elimination. The minimum values of 0.7 for composite reliability (CR: Wasko & Faraj, 2005) and 0.6 for Cronbach's alpha scores for inclusion of the measures in the analysis were used to

evaluate the constructs' reliability. Each factor met these criteria. Since the average variance extracted (AVE) was greater than 0.5 for all variables, it was determined that the convergent validity was satisfactory.

The discriminant validity with the Fornell-Larcker criterion was used to determine whether the square root of AVE for each testable construct was more critical than the inter-construct correlation with the other constructs. Moreover, the Heterotrait-to-monotrait correlation ratio confirmed the discriminant validity of the study (Henseler et al., 2015). Since all values in question were less than the 0.90 threshold, it was determined that discriminant validity had been established (see Table 3 for more details).

(Insert Table 3 about here)

Structural Model

The significance of paths and R^2 were used to evaluate the relationships using the structural model hypothesized in the research framework. The quality of model fit was determined by the intensity of each structural path as defined by the R^2 value for the dependent variable, with R^2 expected to be at least 0.10 (Falk & Miller, 1992). R^2 values of independent variables were higher than 0.1. Thus, the ability to predict has been established (see Table 2). In addition, the model's fit was evaluated using the standard root mean square residual (SRMR); the SRMR for the model was 0.073. Since this value was below the required threshold of 0.1, it was determined that the model fit was adequate (Hair et al., 2010).

Direct Effects

In analyzing the relationships within our model, we evaluated all paths to ascertain the significance of each connection. This thorough examination of our hypotheses highlighted a mix of significant and nonsignificant relationships. Specifically, the first two hypotheses

demonstrated significance (H1: PEOU → Perceived PU: β = 0.624, t = 13.121, p = 0.000; H2: Pay Equity (PayEq) → PEOU: β = 0.117, t = 2.506, p = 0.012). However, the third hypothesis did not garner support (H3: Pay Equity (PayEq) → PU: β = 0.067, t = 1.821, p = 0.069).

The hypothesis concerning Pay Satisfaction (PaySat) influencing Pay Equity (PayEq) (H4) found strong support with a significant positive effect (β = 0.513, t = 12.177, p = 0.000), as did the pathway from Pay Communication (PayCom) to Pay Equity (PayEq) (H7: β = 0.203, t = 3.672, p = 0.000). Additionally, the path involving Pay Secrecy Policies (PaySP) affecting Pay Equity (PayEq) (P10) was statistically significant (β = 0.110, t = 2.417, p = 0.016).

Our mediation analysis delved into the intricate interrelationships within our proposed model, particularly focusing on how pay-related factors influence perceptions related to technology acceptance. This analysis underscored the nuanced role of pay equity as a mediator in the dynamics between pay satisfaction, pay communication, pay secrecy policies, and the perceptions of technology's ease of use and usefulness.

Significant mediation was observed in the pathway where pay satisfaction influenced PEOU through pay equity (β = 0.060, p = 0.012), suggesting that individuals' satisfaction with their pay can enhance their perception of technology's ease of use, mediated by their perceptions of pay equity. A similar, though marginally significant, mediation effect was noted when examining pay satisfaction's impact on PU through pay equity (β = 0.034, p = 0.070), indicating that the fairness of pay might also subtly influence how useful technology is perceived to be.

Moreover, the pathway from pay satisfaction through pay equity to PEOU and then to PU demonstrated significant mediation (β = 0.037, p = 0.011), further reinforcing the interconnectedness of these variables and suggesting that perceptions of pay equity play a crucial role in shaping technology acceptance.

Our findings also revealed a borderline significant mediation effect in the relationship between pay communication and PEOU through pay equity ($\beta = 0.024$, $p = 0.052$), hinting at the potential influence of effective pay communication on technology perceptions, again mediated by pay equity. However, the mediation effect of pay communication on PU through pay equity was not significant ($\beta = 0.014$, $p = 0.125$), suggesting that other factors might play a more dominant role in determining technology's perceived usefulness.

There was no significant relationship for Hypotheses 10, 11, and 12 which explored the relationship between pay secrecy policies on perceived ease of use and perceived usefulness of technology. These outcomes indicate that the direct impact of pay secrecy policies on technology acceptance may be less pronounced or mediated through other mechanisms not captured in our current model.

Among the control variables, only a select few showed statistical significance in our model. Notably, the effect of Age on Perceived Ease of Use (PEOU) and Perceived Usefulness (PU) were both significant (Age → PEOU: $\beta = -0.281$, $t = 6.810$, $p = 0.000$; Age → PU: $\beta = -0.145$, $t = 3.600$, $p = 0.000$). The relationship between General Self-Efficacy (GSE) and PEOU was also significant (GSE → PEOU: $\beta = 0.335$, $t = 6.794$, $p = 0.000$), as well as the influence of Job Tenure on PU (Job Tenure → PU: $\beta = 0.198$, $t = 4.902$, $p = 0.000$). However, the majority of the control variables, including the effects of Gender and Job Satisfaction on both PEOU and PU, did not achieve statistical significance, indicating a more nuanced influence on the model.

In terms of total effects, our analysis confirmed strong direct relationships between perceived ease of use and perceived usefulness ($\beta = 0.624$, $p < 0.001$), highlighting the fundamental importance of these perceptions in technology acceptance. The significant total effects of pay equity on both PEOU and PU ($\beta = 0.117$, $p = 0.012$ and $\beta = 0.140$, $p = 0.003$,

respectively) further emphasize the central role of pay equity perceptions in shaping technology acceptance.

For comprehensive details on the paths evaluated within our model, including those with and without specified hypotheses (consult Table 3).

(Insert Table 3 about here)

Discussion

This study explored the relationship between pay dynamics and technology adoption, focusing on established frameworks such as the TAM, SCT, and current theories related to pay equity and satisfaction. The findings unveiled both corroborated and refuted assumptions. Our results offer a diverse perspective on the impact of pay-related factors on technology acceptance.

The results of our study strongly confirm Hypothesis 1, which states that the perception of how easy it is to use a technology (PEOU) is a significant predictor of how helpful it is seen to be (PU). This finding aligns with the fundamental concepts of the TAM, which posits that ease of use enhances the perceived value of technology (Davis, 1989). Furthermore, Hypothesis 2 was confirmed, suggesting that perceptions of equitable compensation have an impact on the PEOU. The impact of pay equity on technology acceptance is not extensively studied in the TAM literature. However, it is supported by SCT, which suggests that fair workplaces promote engagement with new technologies (Bandura, 1989). Recent research has started to investigate organizational justice as a factor that affects technology acceptance. It is suggested that the perception of fairness inside the business might have a substantial impact on how employees adopt and use technology (Zheng et al., 2014). Based on the strong positive outcome for Hypothesis 7, pay communication can help to increase the perception for pay equity.

The study found strong evidence of mediation in Hypotheses 5 and 6, indicating that pay satisfaction has an impact on PEOU through perceptions of pay equity. This supports previous research suggesting that pay satisfaction can increase engagement with new technologies when fairness perceptions are considered (Abdin et al., 2020). The findings emphasize the significance of fairness in organizational procedures, in line with theories of organizational justice that propose that perceptions of fairness can stimulate positive attitudes toward workplace modifications (Greenberg, 1990; Colquitt, 2001).

Hypothesis 8 was moderately supported. The outcome of Hypothesis 8 suggests that perceptions of equitable pay can mediate between pay communication and PEOU. When viewing these results through the lens of SCT, this borderline result may be due to other factors in the workplace environment contributing to perceptions of pay equity and PEOU.

Unsubstantiated Hypotheses and Theoretical Implications

Hypothesis 3, which proposed a direct correlation between pay equity and perceived usefulness, did not receive any evidence to support it. This indicates that although pay equity has an impact on the PEOU, it does not immediately improve evaluations of its utility. This discovery may indicate a sophisticated comprehension of how employees assess the worth of technology, which could be influenced by additional elements such as personal innovativeness or special job requirements that are not solely captured by pay-related considerations alone (Venkatesh & Davis, 2000; Venkatesh et al., 2016).

Furthermore, the lack of substantial mediation in Hypothesis 9, which examines the impact of pay communication on PU through pay equality, indicates that although communication improves perceptions of justice, it may not be enough to strengthen beliefs about the effectiveness of technology. This suggests that fairness perceptions may become

disconnected from functional evaluations of technology, emphasizing the intricate nature of the elements that impact technology acceptability (Bernerth et al., 2007).

The absence of significance for Hypotheses 10, 11 and 12 may be due to several factors not included in this study. Bamberger and Belogolovsky (2010), examined pay secrecy and individual tolerance for pay inequity. Other factors contributing to a lack of significance for these hypotheses may be the technology used and the specific policies for pay secrecy. Additional research may incorporate these factors.

Limitations and Future Research

The primary limitation of our study is the demographic skewness toward older, predominantly white individuals, with 61.869% of participants aged 56 to 70 years. This restricts the generalizability of our findings, limiting their relevance to younger and more racially diverse populations. Future research should include a broader demographic profile to enhance the external validity of the findings.

Additionally, the exploratory nature of our study prevented us from investigating causal relationships or underlying reasons behind the observed dynamics between pay secrecy and perceptions of workplace ostracism among older workers. Future research should conduct in-depth qualitative studies to unpack these complex dynamics and understand how older workers perceive and are impacted by workplace dynamics and technology acceptance.

Our study's focus on general technology rather than specific applications limits the precision of our claims about technology acceptance behaviors across different types of technologies. Future research should test specific technologies to determine if the findings hold true in varied contexts, especially for technologies that do not provide immediate feedback or appear directly useful (e.g., communication platforms, gaming, and social media technologies).

Managerial Implications

The findings from this study provide actionable strategies for managers aiming to enhance technology utilization within their organizations. Confirming Hypothesis 2, our research underscores the importance of equitable pay in fostering a positive perception of new technologies' ease of use. Managers should prioritize fair compensation strategies to boost employee engagement with new technologies. By ensuring that pay equity is transparently communicated and consistently applied, managers can build trust and a sense of fairness, which are critical for encouraging the adoption of new systems (Bandura, 1989). Regular pay audits can be initiated to ensure equity and address any discrepancies, reinforcing the organization's commitment to fairness.

Given the strong evidence supporting Hypotheses 5 and 6, it is evident that managers should also consider how pay satisfaction could influence employees' interactions with technology. Creating a culture where employees feel valued and fairly compensated can indirectly enhance their interactions with new technological tools. Implementing comprehensive support and training programs that focus on the operational aspects of new technologies and align them with the organization’s reward systems can ensure employees see a clear connection between their use of technology and their personal benefit (Abdin et al., 2020).

However, the lack of support for Hypothesis 3 suggests that while pay equity improves how easily technology can be used, it doesn’t necessarily enhance perceptions of its usefulness. Managers should be aware that other factors such as personal innovativeness or specific job demands may influence perceptions of technology's utility (Venkatesh & Davis, 2000). To address this, managers could tailor communication about new technologies to highlight not only their ease of use but also how they directly benefit the user’s specific job functions. Customized

training sessions that address specific job roles and the utility of the technology in those roles could help bridge this gap.

Despite the lack of substantial mediation in Hypothesis 9, the role of effective communication about pay remains critical. Managers should ensure that communications around compensation are clear, consistent, and transparent, helping to sustain a culture of fairness (Bernerth et al., 2007). Workshops and Q&A sessions about compensation policies and how they are aligned with organizational goals could help in demystifying pay structures, which in turn could foster a more accepting attitude towards technological changes.

Lastly, the integration of socio-economic and psychological aspects into TAM suggests that broader organizational dynamics affect technology adoption decisions. Managers should consider these broader dynamics when planning the rollout of new technologies. This involves not only looking at the technological aspects but also considering how these technologies fit into the larger work culture and how they are perceived in terms of fairness and personal benefit (Venkatesh et al., 2016).

References

Abdin, F., Ismail, A., Muhamad, N., & Nor, A. (2020). EFFECT OF PERCEIVED FAIRNESS IN PAY SYSTEM ON WORK-RELATED ATTITUDE. *International Journal of Management Studies*. https://doi.org/10.32890/IJMS.27.2.2020.7792.

Aplin-Houtz, M. J., Leahy, S., Willey, S., Lane, E. K., Sharma, S., & Meriac, J. (2023a). Tales from the dark side of technology acceptance: The Dark Triad and the Technology Acceptance Model. *Employee Responsibilities and Rights Journal*, 1-33.

Aplin-Houtz, M. J., Sanders, M., & Lane, E. K. (2023b). A policy of potential problems: The buffering effects of the perceptions of pay secrecy and cynicism on workplace ostracism. *Employee Responsibilities and Rights Journal*, *35*(4), 493–518. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10672-022-09425-2.

Bamberger, P., & Belogolovsky, E. (2010). The impact of pay secrecy on individual task performance. *Personnel Psychology*, *63*(4), 965-996.

Bandura, A. (1989). Regulation of cognitive processes through perceived self-efficacy. *Developmental psychology*, *25*(5), 729.

Bandura, A. (1997). *Self-efficacy: The exercise of control.* New York: Freeman.

Bandura, A. (2001). Social Cognitive Theory of Mass Communication. *Media Psychology*, 3, 265 - 299. https://doi.org/10.1207/S1532785XMEP0303_03.

Beglaryan, M., Petrosyan, V., & Bunker, E. (2017). Development of a tripolar model of technology acceptance: Hospital-based physicians' perspective on EHR. International Journal of Medical Informatics, 102, 50-61.

Benbasat, I., & Barki, H. (2007). Quo vadis TAM? *Journal of the Association for Information Systems*, *8*(4), 7. https://doi.org/10.17705/1jais.00126

Bernerth, J. B., & Aguinis, H. (2016). A critical review and best- practice recommendations for control variable usage. Personnel Psychology, 69(1), 229-283. https://doi.org/10.1111/peps.12103

Bernerth, J. B., Armenakis, A. A., Feild, H. S., Giles, W. F., & Jack Walker, H. (2007). Is personality associated with perceptions of LMX? An empirical study. *Leadership & Organization Development Journal*, 28(7), 613-631.

Brayfield, A. H., & Rothe, H. F. (1951). An index of job satisfaction. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *35*(5), 307–311. https://doi.org/10.1037/h0055617

Carroll, N., & Conboy, K. (2020). Normalising the "new normal": Changing tech-driven work practices under pandemic time pressure. *International Journal of Information Management*, *55*, 102186.

Chen, G., Gully, S. M., & Eden, D. (2001). Validation of a new general self-efficacy scale. *Organizational research methods*, *4*(1), 62-83.

Chen, K., & Chan, A. H. (2014). Gerontechnology acceptance by elderly Hong Kong Chinese: a senior technology acceptance model (STAM). Ergonomics, 57(5), 635-652.

Chin, W. W., Marcolin, B. L., & Newsted, P. R. (2003). A partial least squares latent variable modeling approach for measuring interaction effects: Results from a Monte Carlo simulation study and an electronic-mail emotion/adoption study. Information systems research, 14(2), 189-217.

Chuttur, M. (2009). Overview of the technology acceptance model: Origins, developments, and future direction. *Sprouts: Working Papers on Information Systems*, *9*(37).

Colquitt, J. A. (2001). On the dimensionality of organizational justice: A construct validation of a measure. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 86*(3), 386–400. https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.86.3.386

Davis, D. (1989). Perceived usefulness, perceived ease of use, and user acceptance of information technology. *MIS Quarterly*, 13, 319–339.

Davis, Z. (2021, September 29). The 2021 State of IT. Spiceworks Ziff Davis. Retrieved December 10, 2021, from https://swzd.com/resources/state-of-it-2021/

Day, N. E. (2012). Pay equity mediates the relationships among attitudes and communication about pay level determination and pay secrecy. *Journal of Leadership & Organizational Studies*, 19(4), 462-476. https://psycnet.apa.org/doi/10.1177/1548051812455240

Do, B., Dadvari, A., & Moslehpour, M. (2020). Exploring the mediation effect of social media acceptance on the relationship between entrepreneurial personality and entrepreneurial intention. Management Science Letters, 10(16), 3801-3810.

Falk, R. F., & Miller, N. B. (1992). A primer for soft modeling. University of Akron Press.

Fathema, N., Shannon, D., & Ross, M. (2015). Expanding the technology acceptance model (TAM) to examine faculty use of learning management systems (LMSs) in higher education institutions. *Journal of Online Learning & Teaching, 11*(2), 210-232.

Gefen, D., & Straub, D. W. (1997). Gender differences in the perception and use of e-mail: An extension to the technology acceptance model. MIS Quarterly, 389-400.

Gefen, D., Straub, D., & Boudreau. M. (2000). Structural Equation Modeling and Regression: Guidelines for Research Practice. *Communications of the Association for Information Systems* 4(7). https://doi.org/10.17705/1CAIS.00407

Greenberg, J. (1990). Organizational justice: Yesterday, today, and tomorrow. *Journal of management*, *16*(2), 399-432.

Greenberg, J., & Cropanzano, R. (1993). The social side of fairness: Interpersonal and informational classes of organizational justice. *Justice in the Workplace: Approaching Fairness in Human Resource Management; Cropanzano, R., Ed*.

Hair, J., Black, W., Babin, B., & Anderson, R. (2010). Multivariate Data Analysis, 7th ed., Prentice-Hall, Upper Saddle River, NJ.

Heneman, R. L. (2000). The changing nature of pay systems and the need for new midrange theories of pay. *Human Resource Management Review*, *10*(3), 245-247.

Henseler, J., Ringle, C. M., & Sarstedt, M. (2015). A new criterion for assessing discriminant validity in variance-based structural equation modeling. Journal of the academy of marketing science, 43, 115-135.

Ijeoma, C. (2020). Employee Participation in Decision Making and its impact on Organizational Performance: Evidence from Government Owned Enterprises, Port Harcourt, Nigeria. *ERN: Personnel Policies (Topic)*. https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.3667548.

Indranata, M., Safaria, S., Perbanas, A., Januar, M., & Indranata, B. (2023). The Effect of Compensation and Empowerment on Employee Loyalty Mediated by Job Satisfaction (Case Study at PT Permodalan Nasional Madani Regional Surabaya 1). *Formosa Journal of Sustainable Research*. https://doi.org/10.55927/fjsr.v2i8.5358.

Jackson, D., & Allen, C. (2023). Enablers, barriers and strategies for adopting technology in accounting. *International Journal of Accounting Information Systems*. 52,100666.

Johnson, A. M., Jacovina, M. E., Russell, D. G., & Soto, C. M. (2016). Challenges and solutions when using technologies in the classroom. In *Adaptive educational technologies for literacy instruction* (pp. 13-30). Routledge.

Khan, M., Iahad, N. A., & Mikson, S. (2014). Exploring the influence of big five personality traits towards computer-based learning (CBL) adoption. Journal of Information Systems Research and Innovation, 8, 1-8.

Kim, K. J., & Shin, D. H. (2015). An acceptance model for smart watches: Implications for the adoption of future wearable technology. *Internet Research*, *25*(4), 527-541.

Kim, T.-Y., & Leung, K. (2007). Forming and reacting to overall fairness: A cross-cultural comparison. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, *104*(1), 83–95. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.obhdp.2007.01.004

Leahy, S., Aplin-Houtz, M. J., Willey, S., Lane, E. K., Sharma, S., & Meriac, J. (2023). The Light Side of Technology Acceptance: The Direct Effects of the Light Triad on the Technology Acceptance Model 1. *Journal of Managerial Issues*, *35*(3), 300-330.

Ma, Q., Chan, A., & Teh, P. (2021). Insights into Older Adults' Technology Acceptance through Meta-Analysis. *International Journal of Human–Computer Interaction*, 37, 1049 - 1062. https://doi.org/10.1080/10447318.2020.1865005.

Mahato, S., & Kaur, J. (2023). The impact of compensation and reward system on the performance of employees. *Shanlax International Journal of Management*, *10*(4), 10-16.

March, K. G., Aplin-Houtz, M. J., Lawrence, U. E., Lane, E. N., & Meriac, J. (2023). Mutual Benefits: Delving into Leader-Member Exchange (LMX) and Pay Dynamics with Social Exchange Theory. *Employee Responsibilities and Rights Journal*, 1-25.

McFarland, D., & Hamilton, D. (2006). Adding contextual specificity to the technology acceptance model. *Comput. Hum. Behav.*, 22, 427-447. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chb.2004.09.009.

Middleton, L., Hall, H., & Raeside, R. (2019). Applications and applicability of Social Cognitive Theory in information science research. *Journal of Librarianship and Information Science*, *51*(4), 927-937.

Mlekus, L., Bentler, D., Paruzel, A., Kato-Beiderwieden, A., & Maier, G. (2020). How to raise technology acceptance: user experience characteristics as technology-inherent determinants. *Gruppe. Interaktion. Organisation. Zeitschrift für Angewandte Organisationspsychologie (GIO)*, 51, 273 - 283. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11612-020-00529-7.

Momani, A. (2021). A Modified Technology Acceptance Theory to Assess Social Commerce Technology Adoption. *Inf. Resour. Manag. J.*, 34, 43-62. https://doi.org/10.4018/IRMJ.2021040103.

Porter, C. E., & Donthu, N. (2006). Using the technology acceptance model to explain how attitudes determine Internet usage: The role of perceived access barriers and demographics. *Journal of Business Research*, *59*(9), 999–1007. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusres.2006.06.003

Ratten, V. (2015). International Consumer Attitudes Toward Cloud Computing: A Social Cognitive Theory and Technology Acceptance Model Perspective. *Thunderbird International Business Review*, 57, 217-228. https://doi.org/10.1002/TIE.21692.

Ringle, C., Da Silva, D., & Bido, D. (2015). Structural equation modeling with the SmartPLS. Bido, D., da Silva, D., & Ringle, C.(2014). Structural Equation Modeling with the Smartpls. *Brazilian Journal of Marketing*, 13(2).

Schunk, D. H. (2012). Social cognitive theory. In K. R. Harris, S. Graham, T. Urdan, C. B. McCormick, G. M. Sinatra, & J. Sweller (Eds.), *APA educational psychology handbook*,

Vol. 1. Theories, constructs, and critical issues (pp. 101–123). American Psychological Association. https://doi.org/10.1037/13273-005

Schunk, D. H., & DiBenedetto, M. K. (2020). Motivation and social cognitive theory. *Contemporary educational psychology*, *60*, 101832.

Schunk, D. H., & Usher, E. L. (2012). Social cognitive theory and motivation. *The Oxford handbook of human motivation*, *2*, 11-26.

Seuwou, P., Chrysoulas, C., Banissi, E., & Ubakanma, G. (2020). Measuring Consumer Behavioural Intention to Accept Technology: Towards Autonomous Vehicles Technology Acceptance Model (AVTAM). , 507-516. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-45688-7_51.

Smith, S. M., Roster, C. A., Golden, L. L., & Albaum, G. S. (2016). A multi-group analysis of online survey respondent data quality: Comparing a regular USA consumer panel to MTurk samples. Journal of Business Research, 69(8), 3139-3148.

Svendsen, G. B., Johnsen, J. A. K., Almås-Sørensen, L., & Vittersø, J. (2013). Personality and technology acceptance: the influence of personality factors on the core constructs of the Technology Acceptance Model. Behaviour & Information Technology, 32(4), 323-334.

Tenhiälä, A., Chung, D. J., & Park, T.-Y. (2024). Procedural Pay Transparency, Motivational Climate, and Employee Outcomes. Compensation & Benefits Review, 56(2), 83-102. https://doi.org/10.1177/08863687231216135

Tsai, C. (2014). Integrating Social Capital Theory, Social Cognitive Theory, and the Technology Acceptance Model to Explore a Behavioral Model of Telehealth Systems. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health*, 11, 4905 - 4925. https://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph110504905.

Venkatesh, V. (2000). Determinants of perceived ease of use: Integrating control, intrinsic motivation, and emotion into the technology acceptance model. Information systems research, 11(4), 342-365.

Venkatesh, V., & Davis, F. D. (1996). A model of the antecedents of perceived ease of use: Development and test. Decision Sciences, 27(3), 451-481.

Venkatesh, V., & Davis, F. D. (2000). A theoretical extension of the technology acceptance model: Four longitudinal field studies. Management Science, 46(2), 186-204.

Venkatesh, V., Thong, J. Y., & Xu, X. (2016). Unified theory of acceptance and use of technology: A synthesis and the road ahead. Journal of the association for Information Systems, 17(5), 328-376.

Wasko, M. M., & Faraj, S. (2005). Why should I share? Examining social capital and knowledge contribution in electronic networks of practice. MIS quarterly, 35-57. https://doi.org/10.2307/25148667

Welbourne, T. M., & Cable, D. M. (1995). Group incentives and pay satisfaction: Understanding the relationship through an identity theory perspective. *Human Relations*, *48*(6), 711-726.

Zaker, R., & Coloma, E. (2018). Virtual reality-integrated workflow in BIM-enabled projects collaboration and design review: a case study. *Visualization in Engineering*, *6*, 1-15.

Zheng, S., Wang, Z., & Song, S. (2014). Pay Satisfaction of Employees: A Case Study of a State-Owned Science Institute in China. *Social Indicators Research*, 119, 1219-1231. https://doi.org/10.1007/S11205-013-0554-X

Appendix: A

Table 1 Descriptive Statistics of the Sample

Age	*n*	%
30-35	14	3.534
36-40	16	4.040
41-45	31	7.828
46-50	22	5.556
51-55	34	8.871
56-60	71	17.929
61-65	81	20.455
66-70	93	23.485
71-75	23	5.808
76-80	9	2.273
81	2	0.505

Education	*n*	%
High School	27	6.818
Vocational Training	9	2.273
Some College	43	10.859
Associates Degree	37	9.343
Bachelor's Degree	169	42.677
Master's Degree	82	20.707
Doctorate Degree	27	6.818
Other	2	0.505

Race	*n*	%
Asian	18	4.545
Black or African American	5	1.263
Hispanic/Latino	2	0.505
White or Caucasian	361	91.162
Multiracial or other	6	1.515
Prefer not to answer	4	1.010

Industry with SIC code		*n*	%
Agriculture, Forestry and Fishing	*01-09*	5	1.263
Mining	*10-14*	4	1.010
Construction	*15-17*	18	4.545
Manufacturing	*20-39*	55	13.889
Transportation and Public Utilities	*40-49*	72	18.182
Wholesale Trade	*50-51*	15	3.788
Retail Trade	*53-59*	41	10.354
Finance, Insurance, Real Estate	*60-67*	37	9.343
Services	*70-89*	100	25.253
Public Administration	*91-99*	49	12.374

Table 2 Fornell-Larcker criterion and Heterotrait–monotrait ratio of correlations

Heterotrait-Monotrait Ratio

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
1. Perceived Usefulness								
2. Perceived Ease of Use	0.653							
3. Pay Equity	0.229	0.244						
4. Pay Satisfaction	0.090	0.151	0.612					
5. Pay Communication	0.348	0.208	0.453	0.424				
6. Pay Secret Policies	0.193	0.123	0.129	0.061	0.188			
7. General Self Efficacy	0.171	0.399	0.197	0.280	0.137	0.049		
8. Job Satisfaction	0.211	0.298	0.385	0.604	0.366	0.059	0.492	

Fornell-Larker Criterion

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
1. Perceived Usefulness	0.949							
2. Perceived Ease of Use	0.639	0.932						
3. Pay Equity	0.220	0.238	0.779					
4. Pay Satisfaction	0.088	0.148	0.603	0.984				
5. Pay Communication	0.333	0.200	0.426	0.407	0.908			
6. Pay Secret Policies	0.189	0.140	0.176	0.082	0.138	0.786		
7. General Self Efficacy	0.170	0.387	0.174	0.265	0.121	-0.030	0.792	
8. Job Satisfaction	0.205	0.289	0.374	0.583	0.345	-0.003	0.462	0.905

Table 3 Path Analysis Results

Direct Effects	β	SD	T	P	Bias	2.50%	97.50%
H1: PEOU→PU	**0.624**	**0.048**	**13.121**	**0.000**	**0.000**	**0.528**	**0.712**
H2: PayEq →PEOU	**0.117**	**0.047**	**2.506**	**0.012**	**-0.002**	**0.024**	**0.209**
H3: PayEq→ PU	0.067	0.037	1.821	0.069	0.000	-0.004	0.140
H4: PaySat → PayEq	**0.513**	**0.042**	**12.177**	**0.000**	**0.001**	**0.418**	**0.586**
H7: PayCom→ PayEq	**0.203**	**0.055**	**3.672**	**0.000**	**0.000**	**0.085**	**0.302**
P10: PaySP →PayEq	**0.110**	**0.044**	**2.417**	**0.016**	**0.003**	**-0.009**	**0.179**
Controls							
Age →PEOU	**-0.281**	**0.041**	**6.810**	**0.000**	**0.001**	**-0.364**	**-0.200**
Age →PU	**-0.145**	**0.040**	**3.600**	**0.000**	**0.000**	**-0.226**	**-0.066**
Gender→PEOU	-0.161	0.092	1.726	0.084	-0.002	-0.337	0.025
Gender→PU	0.074	0.076	0.961	0.337	0.001	-0.074	0.225
GSE→ PEOU	**0.335**	**0.049**	**6.794**	**0.000**	**0.005**	**0.228**	**0.419**
GSE→PU	**-0.111**	**0.050**	**2.234**	**0.026**	**0.001**	**-0.214**	**-0.015**
Job Satisfaction → PEOU	0.102	0.061	1.717	0.086	-0.002	-0.013	0.229
Job Satisfaction → PU	0.038	0.055	0.682	0.495	0.001	-0.070	0.143
Job Tenure →PEOU	0.027	0.045	0.605	0.545	0.000	-0.061	0.114
Job Tenure → PU	**0.198**	**0.040**	**4.902**	**0.000**	**0.001**	**0.118**	**0.277**
Special Indirect Effects							
H5: PaySat-> PayEq -> PEOU	**0.060**	**0.024**	**2.515**	**0.012**	**-0.001**	**0.014**	**0.108**
H6: PaySat → PayEQ →PU	0.034	0.019	1.810	0.070	0.000	-0.002	0.073
PaySat →PayEq→ PEOU→ PU	**0.037**	**0.015**	**2.531**	**0.011**	**-0.001**	**0.009**	**0.068**
H8: PayCom → PayEq → PEOU	0.024	0.012	1.946	0.052	0.000	0.005	0.053
H9: PayCom→ PayEq → PU	0.014	0.009	1.535	0.125	0.000	0.000	0.036
PayCom→ PayEq→ PEOU → PU	0.015	0.008	1.951	0.051	0.000	0.003	0.033
H11: PaySP→ PayEq → PEOU	0.013	0.008	1.594	0.111	0.000	0.001	0.033
H12: PaySP→ PayEq→ PU	0.007	0.005	1.318	0.188	0.000	0.000	0.021
PaySP→ PayEq→ PEOU → PU	0.008	0.005	1.588	0.112	0.000	0.001	0.020
Total Effects							
PEOU→ PU	**0.624**	**0.048**	**13.121**	**0.000**	**0.000**	**0.528**	**0.712**
PayEq→ PEOU	**0.117**	**0.047**	**2.506**	**0.012**	**-0.002**	**0.024**	**0.209**
PayEq→PU	**0.140**	**0.048**	**2.959**	**0.003**	**-0.001**	**0.049**	**0.235**
PaySat → PayEq	**0.513**	**0.042**	**12.177**	**0.000**	**0.001**	**0.418**	**0.586**
PaySat→PEOU	**0.060**	**0.024**	**2.515**	**0.012**	**-0.001**	**0.014**	**0.108**
PaySat→PU	**0.071**	**0.024**	**2.968**	**0.003**	**-0.001**	**0.027**	**0.123**
PayCom→ PayEq	**0.203**	**0.055**	**3.672**	**0.000**	**0.000**	**0.085**	**0.302**
PayCom → PEOU	0.024	0.012	1.946	0.052	0.000	0.005	0.053
PayCom→ PU	**0.029**	**0.013**	**2.145**	**0.032**	**0.000**	**0.008**	**0.061**
PaySP-> PayEq	**0.110**	**0.044**	**2.417**	**0.016**	**0.003**	**-0.009**	**0.179**
PaySP → PEOU	0.013	0.008	1.594	0.111	0.000	0.001	0.033
PaySP→ PU	0.016	0.009	1.714	0.087	0.001	0.002	0.036

Figure 1. Conceptual Model.