

- SAS Institute, Inc. (1985). *SAS User's Guide: Statistics*. Cary, NC: Author.
- Schmidt, F. L., Hunter, J. E., Outerbridge, A. N., & Goff, S. (1988). Joint relation of experience and ability with job performance: Test of three hypotheses. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 73, 46-57.
- Schneider, B. (1983). Interactional psychology and organizational behavior. In L. L. Cummings & B. M. Staw (Eds.), *Research in organizational behavior* (Vol. 5, pp. 1-31). Greenwich, CT: JAI Press.
- Schneider, B. (1987). The people make the place. *Personnel Psychology*, 40, 437-453.
- Schneider, B., Hanges, P. J., Goldstein, H. W., & Braverman, E. P. (1989). *Student evaluations of faculty effectiveness: Conceptualization and correlates*. Manuscript submitted for publication.
- Siegel, L., & Lane, I. M. (1987). *Personnel and organizational psychology* (2nd ed.). Homewood, IL: Irwin.
- Smith, P. C. (1976). Behaviors, results, and organizational effectiveness: The problems of criteria. In M. D. Dunnette (Ed.), *Handbook of industrial and organizational psychology* (pp. 745-775). Chicago: Rand McNally.
- Strube, M. J. (1988). Averaging correlation coefficients: Influence of heterogeneity and set size. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 73, 559-568.
- Terborg, J. R. (1981). Interactional psychology and research on human behavior in organizations. *Academy of Management Review*, 6, 569-576.
- Wernimont, P. F., & Campbell, J. P. (1968). Signs, samples, and criteria. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 52, 372-376.
- Wesman, A. G. (1952). *Reliability and confidence* (Test Service Bulletin No. 56). New York: Psychological Corporation.

Received August 14, 1989

Revision received June 14, 1990

Accepted June 15, 1990 ■

Correction to Greenberg

In the article "Employee Theft as a Reaction to Underpayment Inequity: The Hidden Cost of Pay Cuts," by Jerald Greenberg (*Journal of Applied Psychology*, 1990, Vol. 75, No. 5, pp. 561-568), through no fault of the author, the means and standard deviations in the first two rows of the During and After columns of Table 2 were transposed across rows. A corrected version of Table 2 is presented here.

Table 2
Data Summaries for Questionnaire Measures

		Response period					
		Before		During		After	
Measure/payment group	<i>n</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>
Pay basis ^a							
Inadequate explanation	30	40.70 _a	4.38	42.39 _a	3.40	43.74 _a	4.93
Adequate explanation	55	43.22 _a	5.58	76.10 _b	6.48	73.73 _b	5.70
Control	58	42.36 _a	6.49	40.72 _a	3.83	41.90 _a	4.46
Pay equity ^b							
Inadequate explanation	30	56.87 _a	5.54	40.20 _b	7.56	57.43 _a	6.70
Adequate explanation	55	61.22 _a	9.57	59.56 _a	9.52	56.03 _a	9.37
Control	58	61.29 _a	8.67	60.98 _a	9.18	58.02 _a	8.57

Note. Within each row and each column, means not sharing a common subscript are significantly different from each other beyond the .05 level on the basis of the Tukey honestly significant difference technique corrected for confounded comparisons with the Cicchetti (1972) approximation.

^a Mean scores for the pay basis measure could range from 20 to 100. Higher scores reflect greater degrees of familiarity with the basis for establishing pay. ^b Mean scores for the pay equity measure could range from 20 to 90. Higher scores reflect greater degrees of perceived payment equity.