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Abstract

Although numerous studies have examined the relationship between person-organisation fit (P-O fit) and organisational outcome variables, there is still little consensus and much confusion over a number of important issues regarding conceptualisation, operationalisation, and criteria used to measure P-O fit. Moreover, some inconsistent relationships have been found between P-O fit and outcome variables. This program of studies aimed to overcome limitations of previous P-O fit studies, to clarify the predictors of P-O fit, and to examine the relationships between P-O fit and important organisational outcome variables. The main objectives of the program were: (a) to investigate the role of goal congruence in the assessment of P-O fit, (b) to examine the role of organisational support and self-regulation (feedback seeking, proactive behaviour, emotional control, and social competence) in predicting P-O fit, (c) to assess the mediating role of P-O fit on the relationship between organisational support and self-regulation and the outcome variables of job satisfaction, organisational commitment, and job performance, (d) to test the mediating role of job satisfaction, organisational commitment, and job performance on the relationship between P-O fit and intention to quit, and (e) to investigate the development of P-O fit and the contribution of organisational support and self-regulation to the outcome variables after a period of 6 months. The data were collected from a large-scale electronic manufacturing company in Indonesia. This research has made several important contributions to the P-O fit literature that could improve understanding about P-O fit, and has implications for both the organisation as employer and the person as employee, in terms of improving the positive interaction between them and enhancing their productivity. This research program consisted of three studies. The first part of this
program of studies related to the development of a goal congruence measure, which has been accepted for publication. The second part of this program of studies comprises two papers, which have been submitted for publication, related to the association among all research variables cross-sectionally and longitudinally. An overview of the program of studies and literature review are presented in Chapter 1, whilst general discussion, empirical evidence, contribution to the P-O fit literature, practical implication, and methodological shortcomings and suggestions for future studies are synthesised in the last chapter of this thesis.
Chapter 1
Introduction

Research Overview

The relationship between people and their organisations has long been of interest to researchers and organisations as an important workplace variable. Numerous studies have examined the relationship between person-organisation fit (P-O fit) and work outcome variables and job performance. The results of previous P-O fit studies have shown how important it is to enhance the interaction between the individual and his or her organisation, as this in turn will lead to improvements in their performance and productivity, and increase their satisfaction and well-being. Despite the contributions of previous studies, there are a number of important issues associated with P-O fit, such as its definition and measurement, which remain to be resolved. These unresolved issues affect the usefulness and validity of previous research, compromise our understanding of the person and organisation interaction, and impede the development of interventions to improve P-O fit level.

The present program of studies aimed to overcome some of the limitations of previous P-O fit studies, to contribute to the list of predictors of P-O fit, and to examine the relationships between P-O fit and important outcome variables (i.e., job satisfaction, organisational commitment, job performance, and intention-to-quit), cross-sectionally and longitudinally. The program consisted of three studies. The first study (Study 1; reported in Chapter 2) examines the concept of goal congruence, which refers to the similarity between employee and organisational goals, and has not been studied previously. The previous P-O fit studies have focused on the congruence between the employee and management goals, subordinate and supervisor goals, manager and
organisation goals, goals among members in the same organisation, group and organisational goals, and goals between organisations.

Study 1 reports on the development and initial validation of a perceived goal congruence scale that can be used to measure perceptions of similarity fit. The results showed that (a) goal congruence measured a construct independent of the four existing P-O fit scales (value congruence, personality congruence, needs-supplies fit, and demands-abilities fit), (b) goal congruence could be represented as a component of a supplementary fit construct, and (c) goal congruence explained meaningful variability in all three work attitude variables (job satisfaction, organisational commitment, and intention to quit), over and above the variance accounted by the existing scales.

The second study (Study 2; reported in Chapter 3), examined organisational support and self-regulation (feedback seeking, proactive behaviour, emotion control, and social competence) as correlates of P-O fit, explored the mediating role of P-O fit in the relationship between organisational support and self-regulation and work attitudes (job satisfaction and organisational commitment) and work behaviour (job performance), and examined the mediating role of job satisfaction, organisational commitment, and job performance in the relationship between P-O fit and intention to quit. These cross-sectional results showed that (a) organisational support and one measure of self-regulation (i.e., proactive behaviour) were associated with P-O fit, P-O fit predicted job satisfaction, organisational commitment, and job performance, and these three work outcome variables predicted intention to quit, (b) P-O fit fully mediated the relationship between organisational support and organisational commitment and job performance, (c) P-O fit fully mediated the relationship between proactive behaviour and organisational commitment, (d) P-O fit partially mediated the
relationship between organisational support and job satisfaction, (e) P-O fit partially mediated the relationship between proactive behaviour and job satisfaction, and (f) organisational commitment fully mediated between P-O fit and intention to quit.

The third study (Study 3; reported in Chapter 4) assessed the longitudinal relationships among organisational support, self-regulation, P-O fit, job satisfaction, organisational commitment, job performance, and intention-to-quit. The results showed that, over time, after controlling for age and tenure (a) organisational support and proactive behaviour had a significant positive cross-lagged relationship with P-O fit, (b) P-O fit had a significant negative cross-lagged association with intention to quit, (c) organisational support had a significant positive direct association with organisational commitment and negative direct association with intention to quit, (d) proactive behaviour had a significant positive direct association with organisational commitment and negative direct association with intention to quit, (e) emotion control had a significant negative direct association with job performance, (f) P-O fit partially mediated the relationship between organisational support and organisational commitment and intention to quit, (g) P-O fit partially mediated the relationship between proactive behaviour and work outcome variables (organisational commitment and intention to quit), (h) P-O fit had a significant reciprocal relationship with organisational commitment, suggesting that P-O fit and organisational commitment reciprocally affects one another, (i) P-O fit did not mediate the relationship between emotion control and job performance, and (j) job satisfaction, organisational commitment, and job performance did not mediate the relationship between P-O fit and intention to quit. In summary here for the longitudinal analyses, P-O fit partially
mediated the relationship between organisational support and proactive behaviour with organisational commitment and intention to quit.

**Literature Review**

The relationship between the person and the organisational environment has long attracted the attention of researchers. The interactional psychology approach proposes that behaviour is a function of a multidirectional interaction between person characteristics and situation characteristics (Terborg, 1981). This is consistent with the principles of field theory (Lewin, 1951), that behaviour is a function of both the person and the environment, which is represented by the famous equation $B = f(P, E)$.

Interactions between people and their environment have become the main focus for many researchers and practitioners; notably that of the P-E fit area of applied psychology (Kristof-Brown & Guay, 2011).

In the organisational context, person-environment fit studies have distinguished between *person-vocation fit* (between individuals and their work environment/career choice), *person-job fit* (between individuals and their job or task characteristics), *person-organisation fit* (between individuals and the entire organisation), *person-group fit* (between individuals and their team or workgroup), and *person-supervisor fit* (between individuals and their supervisor). Of these studies, the person-organisation fit (P-O fit) is the most widely investigated area (Kristof, 1996).

**Person-organisation Fit**

P-O fit has long attracted the attention of researchers and organisations as an important workplace variable for entry level employees, primarily in recruitment and selection processes (e.g., Backhaus, 2003; Cable & Judge, 1997; Saks & Ashforth, 2002), as well as for existing employees, where work attitudes and work behaviours can
affect both employee and organisational performance (e.g., Goodman & Svyantek, 1999; Lauver & Kristof-Brown, 2001; Verquer, Beehr, & Wagner, 2003). However, there is still little consensus and much confusion over a number of important issues regarding conceptualisation, operationalisation, and criteria used to measure P-O fit, which reduces the validity of the study results, obstructs the comprehensive understanding about person and organisation interaction, and subsequently impedes the development of the intervention to improve P-O fit level.

**Definitions of P-O fit.** As can be seen in Table 1.1, the definition of P-O fit has been confused due to there being multiple conceptualisations and operationalisations. One key distinction in the P-O fit literature is between *supplementary fit* and *complementary fit*. Supplementary fit exists when the person and the organisation are similar or in congruence. Muchinsky and Monahan (1987), who coined the terms in the context of person-environment fit, stated that they chose supplementary label because the “individual supplements, embellishes or possesses characteristics which are similar to other individuals in the environment” (p. 269). They also noted that by complementary they meant that the characteristics of an individual served to “make whole”, or complement, the characteristics of an environment. The weakness or the need of the environment is offset by the strength of the individual, and vice versa. For example, an organisation needs employees with certain technical skill to perform efficiently and those employees need to earn money or have their needs met by the organisation.

In her integrative review, Kristof (1996) defined P-O fit as the compatibility between people and organisations that occurs when at least one entity provides what the other needs, or they share similar fundamental characteristics, or both. This definition
covers the multiple conceptualisations of P-O fit and focuses on the fit between a person and an organisation as a whole rather than with a specific group. Kristof proposed a model that consists of three types of fit. First, *supplementary fit* which exists when there is similarity between the characteristics of the person and the characteristics of the organisation. Second, *needs-supplies fit* which occurs when supplies from the organisation satisfy the needs of the individual. Third, *demands-abilities fit* which is achieved when the person has the abilities required to meet the demands of the organisation. Needs-supplies fit and demands-abilities fit expand the complementary fit definition proposed by Muchinsky and Monahan (1987). From these three types of fit, supplementary fit is the most common measure of P-O fit (Kristof, 1996).

Consistent with Kristof (1996), in their meta-analyses, Kristof-Brown, Zimmerman, and Johnson (2005) and Hoffman and Woehr (2006) operationalised complementary fit as demands-abilities fit and needs-supplies fit. Cable and DeRue (2002) also conceptualised fit based on the three types of fit by Kristof but supplementary fit was referred to as P-O fit.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author(s)</th>
<th>Supplementary fit</th>
<th>Complementary fit</th>
<th>Needs-supplies fit</th>
<th>Demands-abilities fit</th>
<th>General fit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Muchinsky and Monahan (1987)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kristof (1996)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kristof-Brown, Zimmerman, &amp; Johnson (2005)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hoffman and Woehr (2006)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cable &amp; DeRue (2002)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Piasentin &amp; Chapman (2007)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cable &amp; Judge (1996)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cable &amp; Judge (1997)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cooper-Thomas, Vianen, &amp; Anderson (2004)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adkins, Russell, &amp; Werbel (1994)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saks &amp; Ashforth (1997)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Piasentin and Chapman (2006) distinguished between complementary fit and other types of fit, and identified four P-O fit types, namely: (1) *supplementary fit*, which occurs when an individual possesses characteristics that are similar to the existing organisational characteristics; (2) *complementary fit*, when an individual fills a void or adds something that is missing in the organisation; (3) *needs-supplies fit*, when an individual’s needs are fulfilled by the organisation; and (4) *demand-abilities fit*, which occurs when an individual’s abilities meet the demands of the organisation. Piasentin and Chapman noted that complementary fit is frequently acknowledged as an important component of P-O fit, but most researchers seem to conceptualise complementary fit in terms of needs-supplies fit and demands-abilities fit, which are usually related to person-job fit (P-J fit) rather than to person-organisation fit (P-O fit).

In addition, some researchers measured a *general P-O fit* (e.g., Adkins, Russell, & Werbel, 1994; Saks & Ashforth, 1997), which refers to the individual’s global perception of fit between the person and the organisation, and is measured with a question such as “Overall, how well do you fit in with this organisation”, while other researchers focused only on one or two of the conceptualisations of P-O fit (e.g., Cable & Judge, 1996, 1997; Cooper-Thomas, Vianen, & Anderson, 2004).

Piasentin and Chapman (2007) examined subjective P-O fit using *perceived similarity fit* and *perceived complementary fit* as two distinct forms of P-O fit. Perceived similarity fit was defined as occurring when individuals perceived that their characteristics were similar to the organisational characteristics. Perceived complementary fit was defined as occurring when an individual possessed unique characteristics that were perceived to be different from other employees’ characteristics, yet were valuable to the organisation. It was found that both perceived similarity fit and
perceived complementary fit accounted for significant incremental variance in subjective P-O fit, and that both types together captured subjective P-O fit better than either type alone, with perceived complementary fit being a weaker predictor of subjective P-O fit than perceived similarity fit. It was also found that perceived complementary fit was important for predicting the subjective P-O fit only when perceived similarity fit was low.

Based on the findings above, the present program of studies utilised the conceptualisation of P-O fit from Kristof (1996), which covers the multiple conceptualisations of P-O fit (i.e., *supplementary fit, needs-supplies fit, and demands-abilities fit*). This conceptualisation has been used by most researchers in the P-O fit area and has been shown to have significant relationships with important work outcomes. Furthermore, it is important to explore all types of fit together, as different combinations of fit may have different implications for both the individuals and the organisation. Kristof (1996) proposed that multiple perspectives of fit should be examined in a single study to attain a more comprehensive picture. To date, only a few studies have tested all types of fit simultaneously. In support of this, Muchinsky and Monahan (1987) stated that both supplementary fit and complementary fit are significantly related to positive outcomes. Moreover, Schneider, Goldstein, and Smith (1995) stated that an organisation’s desire for supplementary fit would lead to excessive homogeneity over time, which in turn would produce negative consequences for organisational effectiveness, such as being unable to enact the changes required to adapt to a changing environment. Therefore, they proposed that both *homogeneity* (supplementary fit) and *heterogeneity* (needs-supplies fit and demands-abilities fit, in terms of complementary fit) are essential for the organisation.
Measuring P-O fit. There is also little consensus among researchers about how to measure P-O fit (see Table 1.2). P-O fit has been measured as perceived fit, subjective fit, and objective fit, although often these terms have been used inconsistently. Kristof (1996) distinguished two ways of measuring P-O fit: (a) direct measures to assess subjective or perceived fit and (b) indirect measures to assess actual or objective fit. Subjective or perceived fit was conceptualised as the person’s judgment that he or she fits well in an organisation. Actual or objective fit involved an explicit comparison between the individual and organisational characteristics, without judgments by the individual.

Verquer et al. (2003), in their meta-analysis of the relationship between P-O fit and work attitude, found three different ways to measure P-O fit, namely subjective P-O fit measures, perceived P-O fit measures, and objective P-O fit measures. Subjective P-O fit measures require individuals, in a straightforward manner, to indicate how well they think their own characteristics match those of their organisation. Perceived P-O fit measures require individuals to describe themselves and to rate their organisation on similar dimensions (i.e., the individual’s preferences and the individual’s perceptions of the organisation). The degree of fit is then calculated by assessing the discrepancy between these two descriptions. Objective P-O fit measures require individuals to describe their own characteristics, and subsequently ask others to describe the organisation on the same dimensions. In this case, the degree of fit is calculated by assessing the discrepancy between the individual’s and the others’ descriptions. These measuring distinctions were also used by Hoffman and Woehr (2006) in their meta-analysis of the relationship between P-O fit and behavioural outcomes.
## Table 1.2

### Different Measurement Operationalisations of P-O Fit

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Authors</th>
<th>Individuals describe how well they fit in with the organisation</th>
<th>Individuals describe themselves and the organisation separately</th>
<th>Individuals describe themselves and others describe the organisation</th>
<th>Others describe the individuals and the organisation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kristof (1996)</td>
<td>Direct measures of perceived / subjective fit</td>
<td>Perceived fit measures</td>
<td>Indirect measures of objective/actual</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verquer, Beehr, &amp; Wagner (2003)</td>
<td>Subjective fit measures</td>
<td>Perceived fit measures</td>
<td>Objective fit measures</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hoffman &amp; Woehr (2006)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Piasentin &amp; Chapman (2006)</td>
<td>Subjective/perceived fit</td>
<td></td>
<td>Objective/actual fit</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Piasentin &amp; Chapman (2007)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kristof-Brown, Zimmerman, &amp; Johnson (2005)</td>
<td>Perceived fit</td>
<td>Subjective fit</td>
<td>Objective fit</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Kristof-Brown and Jansen (2007) separated the way of measuring P-O fit into measures of subjective or perceived fit and objective fit. Subjective fit can be measured in two primary ways, namely, direct measures and indirect measures of perceived fit. Direct measures of perceived fit ask the person to report an overall assessment of the fit between themselves and their organisation. An example of a direct measure of perceived fit is the measure developed by Cable and DeRue (2002), which asks the individual to indicate the extent of their agreement to statements such as, “The things that I value in life are very similar to the things that my organisation values”. Indirect measures of perceived fit require the person to report his or her own characteristics, and subsequently (generally at a different point in time) to report the characteristics of his or her organisation. Indirect measures capture the person’s fit with their own perceived environment. Direct measures are the most widely used, and these measures have the strongest relationships with the outcome variables, especially attitude variables (Kristof-Brown & Jansen, 2007).

On the other hand, objective fit is the fit between the person and the organisation as it actually exists, rather than as it is perceived to exist by the person. The actual organisation characteristics can be measured objectively by examining organisational characteristics (e.g., pay system or structure) or by aggregated ratings of the organisation (e.g., managers’ aggregated view of organisational culture), whereas actual person characteristics can be measured using others’ views or ratings, such as by a recruiter or the person’s supervisor. The Organizational Culture Profile (OCP) developed by O’Reilly, Chatman, and Caldwell (1991) is an example of an objective fit measure. The objective fit of an individual is assessed by calculating the similarity between the supervisor ratings of the individual and the organisational culture, as
measured by the OCP completed by organisation managers. A measure of objective fit is used to avoid single source bias associated with subjective fit. However, prior studies have shown that objective fit measures typically have lower correlations with outcome variables than subjective fit measures (Kristof-Brown & Jansen, 2007).

Piasentin and Chapman (2006) assumed that subjective fit measures were designed to capture the individual’s perception of how well they fitted into their organisation. However, they did not distinguish between subjective fit and perceived fit as different measures of P-O fit. They pointed out that subjective fit was also called perceived fit, and objective fit was also called actual fit.

Kristof-Brown, Zimmerman, et al. (2005) indicated that because the cognitive processes underlying each measure of fit may differ, the following terms should be used: (a) perceived fit, when individuals make a direct assessment of the compatibility between themselves and the organisation; (b) subjective fit, when fit is assessed through the comparison of person variables and organisational variables as reported by the person; and (c) objective fit, when fit is calculated indirectly through the comparison of person and organisation variables as reported by other persons.

There has been a long-standing debate over whether objective fit is more or less important than subjective fit (Caplan, 1987). Cable and Judge (1997) argued that if individuals perceive that they fit into an organisation, then this will influence their work attitudes and behaviours accordingly. In addition, Kristof-Brown and Jansen (2007) noted that actual fit only has an effect on someone if that person perceives that the fit exists. It has also been argued that objective measures are not really objective at all since they use other people in the organisation, which represents another set of subjective views (Caplan, 1987). Moreover, Terborg (1981) also noted that different
people may perceive similar situations in different ways, and similar people may perceive different situations in the same way. This means that the psychological meaning of the situation for individuals is assumed to be an important factor in determining individuals’ behaviours.

In the context of interactional psychology, Endler and Magnusson (1976) summarised four key principles of the interactional model. The first basic principle is that an individual’s behaviour is determined by an ongoing feedback process between the person and the situation. The second proposition states that the individual plays an intentional and active role in creating the interaction by interpreting the situation and assigning meanings to it. The third principle, on the individual side and related to the second, emphasises the importance of cognitive factors, such as encoding strategies, self-regulation, and expectancies in determining the outcome of an interaction. The fourth principle emphasises the importance of the psychological environment (i.e., the meaning that it holds for an individual) in the $B = f(P, E)$ equation. Based on these key principles, interactional psychologists emphasise the perceived rather than the actual situation when predicting outcomes.

Because there is no clearly agreed-upon measure of fit, the present program of studies utilised perceived fit measures as proposed by Kristof-Brown, Zimmerman, et al. (2005), which are based on theoretical considerations of cognitive processes, related to interactional psychology principles, and have shown significant relationships with work outcome variables. In addition, Kristof (1996) proposed that when the aim of a P-O fit study is to predict work attitudes and work behaviours, researchers are advised to use perceived fit measures. Good fit is said to exist as long as it is perceived to exist, regardless of whether or not the person has similar characteristics to, or complements or
is complemented by, the organisation (Kristof, 1996). Moreover, Arthur, Bell, Villado, and Doverspike (2006), in their meta-analysis, found that perceived fit was a better predictor of work outcomes than the actual fit between the person and the organisation. Consistent with this finding, Verquer et al. (2003) found that fit estimated directly by the person was a consistently better predictor of work attitude outcomes (i.e., job satisfaction, organisational commitment, and intention to quit) than perceived fit (discrepancy between scores of the individual and the organisation described by the same person), and objective fit.

**Criteria to measure P-O fit.** Not only do P-O fit studies vary in their conceptualisation and operationalisation of P-O fit, but they also vary in the criteria to be used for P-O fit measurement. Prior studies used a combination of values, goals, and personality to measure P-O fit (e.g., Carless, 2005a; de Lara, 2008). Piasentin and Chapman (2006) noted that there is little understanding of the characteristics that are essential in assessing P-O fit. These authors suggested that future studies should focus on clearly measuring different characteristics of fit without confounding these characteristics in the same scale. In addition, Piasentin and Chapman found that most of P-O fit studies measured fit using multiple criteria in one instrument (e.g., “My values match those of current employees in the organisation” and “My personality matches with the personality of the organisation”), and even utilised items that contained multiple criteria (e.g., “To what degree do your values, goals, and personality match or fit with this organisation and the current employees in this organisation?”).

Similarly, Kristof-Brown and Jansen (2007) noted that many common measures of P-O fit assessed multiple criteria rather than a single criterion of congruence. Unclear criteria for congruence has forced meta-analysis studies to categorise congruence into
two separate types, referred to as *values congruence* and *others congruence* (see Hoffman & Woehr, 2006; Verquer et al., 2003). This differentiation demonstrates that the relative importance of different criteria of P-O fit remains unclear.

Bretz and Judge (1994) summarised the following four general perspectives of assessing P-O fit: (a) the degree to which an individual’s knowledge, skills and abilities (KSAs) matched the job requirements; (b) the degree of congruence between individual needs and organisational reinforcement systems and structures; (c) the match between an individual’s value orientation and the organisation’s culture and values; and (d) fit in terms of the individual’s personality and perceived organisational image.

Kristof (1996) found four common factors that have been used to specify P-O fit, namely values, personality, KSAs and goals. Those criteria have shown positive relationships with work attitudes and behaviours in numerous P-O fit studies. However, only a few studies have examined all criteria in a single study and none has examined the relative importance of each criterion on the P-O fit level.

**Values congruence.** Values are enduring beliefs and relatively stable individual characteristics that guide individual’s attitudes, judgments, and behaviours (Chatman, 1989; Meglino, Ravlin, & Adkins, 1989). Value congruence is defined as the similarity between the values of the individual and the cultural value system of the organisation (Chatman, 1989; Kristof, 1996; Westerman & Vanka, 2005). Value congruence has become widely accepted as the operationalisation of P-O fit, with most studies using this approach (see Hoffman & Woehr, 2006; Verquer et al., 2003). This is in line with the review by Piasentin and Chapman (2006), which concluded that value congruence was the most common source of fit. In addition, value congruence has been shown to
have a stronger relationship with work attitudes and work behaviours than other types of supplementary fit (Kristof-Brown & Jansen, 2007).

**Personality/characteristics congruence.** This criterion has been used by some researchers (e.g., Cable & DeRue, 2002; Chatman, 1989; O'Reilly et al., 1991; Westerman & Cyr, 2004). For example, Verquer et al. (2003) found that personality congruence was positively related to employee satisfaction and organisational commitment. However, there is an inconsistent relationship between personality congruence and work outcome variables. Antonioni and Park (2001) found that some, but not all, personality factor similarity was significantly related to work behaviours. For example, Kristof-Brown, Barrick, and Stevens (2005) found, in a study of person-group fit, that personality dissimilarity was associated with greater attraction to the team and subsequent higher performance. Other studies have found that personality congruence was not positively related to work attitudes (Westerman & Cyr, 2004), and to student satisfaction, but was positively related to student performance (Westerman & Vanka, 2005). Much remains to be done to investigate the relationship between personality congruence and work outcome variables in order to resolve these inconsistent results.

**Knowledge, skills, abilities (KSAs).** Generally, the basis of any personnel selection process is the assessment of individual KSAs. Individuals with the desired KSAs have a greater fit with their job and more positive work outcomes (Caldwell & O'Reilly, 1990). Kristof-Brown (2000) found that recruiters most often used KSAs to judge the level of applicants’ P-O fit. However, KSAs have a strong link with task-related performance, and as such, are more likely to be used by recruiters to judge the level of person-job (P-J) fit rather than P-O fit level. This is consistent with Cable and
Judge (1996), who used KSAs as a measure of P-J fit. Previous P-O fit studies have utilised KSAs as a measure of demands-abilities fit or complementary fit (e.g., Cable & DeRue, 2002; Piasentin & Chapman, 2007); however, it is important that fit studies do not confound P-O fit with P-J fit when using KSAs as the criterion for P-O fit measures.

**Goal congruence.** Goal congruence is one of the more important factors to consider when measuring P-O fit (Kristof, 1996). Schneider (1987) suggested that individuals and organisations are attracted to each other based on similar goals. Additionally, Nadler and Tushman (1992) proposed that an important aspect of fit between individuals and their organisations is the convergence of individual and organisational goals. However, only a few P-O fit studies have used goal congruence as the criterion for P-O fit measurement (e.g., Vancouver & Schmitt, 1991; Witt, 1998). These P-O fit studies examined the goal congruence of the supervisor-subordinate and member-constituent, but are limited because individuals were typically asked to rank the organisation’s goals rather than to report their own personal goals. Such congruence may reflect an agreement between the individual and others in the organisation on the organisational goals rather than reflect fit between one’s personal goals and organisational goals (Kristof-Brown & Jansen, 2007).

No P-O fit study to date has examined the congruence between the employee’s goals and the organisation’s goals. This is despite the updated attraction-selection-attrition (ASA) framework proposing that goal congruence is an important dimension of P-O fit, apart from personality, KSAs, and values (Schneider et al., 1995). According to the ASA framework, individuals will be attracted to organisations whose goals are congruent with their own goals, and employee will leave the organisation when there is little or no similarity between their goals and those of the organisation (Schneider et al.,
Moreover, Westerman and Cyr (2004) recommended that future research should investigate the influence of goal congruence on values, personality and work environment congruence in the prediction of employees’ work attitudes and work behaviours.

Based on the literature review above, the limitations of previous P-O fit studies, and the fact that there is no research which has focused on and examined perceived goal congruence between the individual’s goals and organisational goals, the program of studies included the development of a measure of perceived goal congruence to supplement the other types of congruence, so that a comprehensive assessment of supplementary fit, in terms of P-O fit, can be undertaken. This program of studies is the first that (a) examines the congruence between individual goals and organisational goals, (b) assesses P-O fit level using multiple criteria independently, and (c) examines the relative contribution of each criterion of congruence on the P-O fit level.

The meaning of “organisation” in P-O fit. There is also variability in measuring P-O fit in terms of the operational definition of organisation. Some P-O fit studies have focused on people as the representatives of the organisation (e.g., Carless, 2005b; de Lara, 2008; Judge & Cable, 1997), while other studies have operationalised organisation as an entity in general (e.g., Cooper-Thomas et al., 2004; Kim, Cable, & Kim, 2005; Siegall & McDonald, 2004). This perspective is consistent with Piasentin and Chapman (2006) review findings that some studies included items measuring fit between the individual and other employees in the organisation (e.g., “I think people who work at this organisation are similar to me”) as well as items measuring fit between individual characteristics and a combination of organisational characteristics and organisational members’ characteristics (e.g., “I feel my values match this
organisation and the current employees in this organisation”). Furthermore, some studies included items pertaining to co-workers as the organisation (e.g., “My personal values are different from those of my co-workers”; “My ability level is comparable to those of my co-workers”; Piasentin & Chapman, 2007), which could lead to different perceptions of fit (i.e., person-group fit). Thus, it is possible that different operationalisations of the organisation may influence the individual’s perception of fit.

Chatman (1989) noted that clarifying the conceptualisation of the organisation would help researchers build a more comprehensive framework of interactions within organisations. Therefore, the present program of studies focused only on the organisation in general. Participants were asked to rate their degree of fit with their perception of the entity of the organisation, in order to avoid the misleading influence of other types of fit (e.g., person-group fit or person-job fit).

The effects of P-O fit. P-O fit has been found to be related to both work attitudes (e.g., job satisfaction, organisational commitment, intention to quit) and work behaviours (e.g., motivation, work group cohesion, turnover, work-related stress, organisational citizenship behaviour, job performance, organisation choice, and career success) (Kristof, 1996). Regarding the effect of congruence between the person and the organisation, work attitudes is the most frequently studied outcomes (see Verquer et al., 2003). In a meta-analysis study on the relationship between P-O fit and work attitudes, P-O fit was found to have strong positive correlations with job satisfaction and organisational commitment and a moderate negative correlation with intention to quit (Kristof-Brown, Zimmerman et al., 2005).

Job satisfaction. Spector (1997) defined job satisfaction as the degree to which people felt satisfied about their job and different aspects of their job. Although job
satisfaction, compared to job performance, has previously attracted the most interest in organisational behaviour research, it is no longer considered to be the most important area of research (see Judge, Thoresen, Bono, & Patton, 2001). However, most P-O fit studies examined job satisfaction as the outcome variable and typically found significant positive relationships between them (see Verquer et al., 2003).

**Organisational commitment.** Allen and Meyer (1996) defined organisational commitment as, “a psychological link between the employee and his or her organisation that makes it less likely that the employee will voluntarily leave the organisation” (p. 252). They proposed a three component model of commitment, i.e., *affective commitment, continuance commitment, and normative commitment*. Affective commitment refers to employees’ emotional attachment to the organisation, identification with the organisation, and involvement in the organisation. Employees with strong affective commitment stay with the organisation because they want to do so. Continuance commitment refers to commitment based on the employee’s recognition of the costs associated with leaving the organisation. Employees with strong continuance commitment stay with the organisation because they avoid the consequences of leaving. Normative commitment refers to employees’ feelings of obligation to remain with the organisation. Employees with strong normative commitment stay with the organisation because they feel they ought to do so. Most P-O fit studies have predominantly utilised affective commitment as a single factor to measure organisational commitment (e.g., Ambrose, Arnaud, & Schminke, 2007; Piasentin & Chapman, 2007), and affective commitment has been shown to have the strongest relationship with a variety of organisation and work-related variables (Meyer, Stanley, Herscovitch, & Topolnytsky, 2002).
**Intention to quit.** With regard to ASA theory, intention to quit has been found to be related to low P-O fit (Schneider et al., 1995). In their meta-analysis, Harter, Schmidt, and Hayes (2002) found that satisfied employees felt productive, contributed to organisational goals, and generally had low turnover intentions. Turnover intention has been found to be the best predictor of actual employee turnover (Griffeth, Hom, & Gaertner, 2000; Hom & Kinicki, 2001), and has been strongly associated with organisational malfunctioning or ineffectiveness (Koys, 2001). However, because recent P-O fit studies have found inconsistent relationship between P-O fit and intention to quit (see Amos & Weathington, 2008; Vianen, Pater, & Dijk, 2007), further research is required to clarify the relationship between P-O fit and intention to quit.

Work behaviours, such as **job performance** and **contextual performance** or **organisational citizenship behaviour (OCB)**, also have been widely examined as outcome variables in the P-O fit literature, with mixed result (e.g., Arthur et al., 2006; Cable & DeRue, 2002; de Lara, 2008; Goodman & Svyantek, 1999), although Kristof (1996) in her review concluded that P-O fit explains significant variance in job performance and contextual performance (OCB).

**Job performance.** Motowidlo (2003) defined job performance as, “the total expected value to the organisation of the discrete behavioural episodes that an individual carries out over a standard period of time” (p. 39). Borman and Motowidlo (1997) referred to job performance as **task performance**, as opposed to contextual performance. These authors defined task performance as the effectiveness of an employee’s performance activities that contribute to the organisation’s technical core, either directly by implementing a part of its technological process or indirectly by providing needed materials or services. Recent P-O fit studies have found inconsistent
relationships between P-O fit and job performance (see Bright, 2007; Hoffman & Woehr, 2006). Therefore, future P-O fit studies are needed to clarify these relationships. However, these results may be explained, in part, by the relationship between P-O fit and job performance being partially mediated by work attitude (Arthur et al., 2006).

Based on the explanations above and in an attempt to overcome previous study limitations and to clarify the inconsistent relationships, the present program of studies examined the relationship between P-O fit (supplementary fit, need-supplies fit, and demands-abilities fit) as predictor variables and work attitudes (job satisfaction, organisational commitment, intention to quit) and work behaviours (job performance) as outcome variables.

**The developmental process of P-O fit.** Kristof-Brown and Jansen (2007) proposed that people experience changes in their values and priorities over time, just as organisational culture and values can shift with new leadership, structure or strategy. Hence, P-O fit may improve or worsen as either individuals or organisations change. These authors noted that “behaviour over time is a function of change in the person over time and change in the environment over time” (p. 144). They proposed two models of change, namely *spillover* and *spirals*. In the spillover model, one aspect of fit may influence another aspect. When individuals experience strong fit in one dimension, over time, they are likely to be motivated to modify other aspects of fit that are a poor fit or misfit, which can be positive or negative. For example, when individuals perceive strong fit with their workgroup, but their values differ from the values of the organisation, over time the individual is likely to reduce the difference by downplaying the important of value congruence, or modifying their perception of values congruence, or working to change the values of the organisation. In the spiral model, the relationship
between fit dimensions are *mutually reinforced* over time, where good fit gets better and poor fit gets worse.

Chatman (1989) recommended that researchers should assess P-O fit over time, because it is a dynamic process rather than an end result. Consistent with this, Ostroff and Rothausen (1997) found that the individual’s tenure moderated the level of P-O fit, indicating that those who stayed longer with the organisation had a better fit than those with a shorter tenure. This is in line with the proposition by Kristof (1996) regarding the *socialisation process*, whereby, as individuals obtain information about the organisation’s characteristics and the individual skills needed, they develop higher levels of P-O fit. In addition, Kristof-Brown, Zimmerman, et al. (2005) suggested that it was important for future research to explore how various types of fit influenced each other over time and how fit was influenced by family issues. Moreover, Piasentin and Chapman (2006) suggested that longitudinal research was important in order to understand the extent to which P-O fit may change for individuals over the course of their employment and to explore whether individual conceptualisations of fit were susceptible to change.

**Antecedent variables of P-O fit.** People as well as environments change over time. Changes in the work environment are frequently incorporated into research about P-O fit. An organisation may change its values, goals, and culture over time by implementing new strategies or technologies to keep up with market demands or as a result of economic conditions. At the micro level, organisations may change their structure with new management, supervisors, workgroups or team members (Kristof-Brown & Jansen, 2007). These changes can influence the level of P-O fit and require certain efforts from individuals within the organisation to maintain or improve their
performance. Therefore, in changing situations, particularly where P-O fit is worsening, it is important to know how the individual can maintain or improve their attitudes and behaviours, as these will subsequently influence productivity of both the individual and the organisation.

To date, little research has directly examined the predictors of P-O fit, which would be helpful when developing interventions to prevent poor fit or misfit. Many studies have shown that low levels of P-O fit lead to negative work attitudes and reduced work behaviours, but none has examined how to improve levels of P-O fit, so that organisations and individuals might intervene to maintain or improve fit, and subsequently, their required performance. Based on basic principles of interactional psychology and field theory regarding the multi-directional interaction between people and their organisation in dealing with changing situations, the present program of studies focused on the efforts of individuals and the support they receive from their environment. This program of studies considered self-regulation as the effort internal to the individual and perceived organisational support as the influence from the external environment. Self-regulation and perceived organisational support were examined as predictors of P-O fit, which was then assessed as a mediator between the antecedent and the outcome variables.

**Self-regulation.** Individual and environmental characteristics influence the individual’s behaviours. In particular, individual differences affect responses to P-O fit (Chatman, 1989). Much research has demonstrated individual variability in response to P-O fit. However, as little research has examined whether individual differences predict P-O fit, additional researches are needed (Kristof-Brown & Jansen, 2007).
A change in the environment may increase skills demands or require new skills and put more demands on employees to adapt and change in order to stay competitive (Kristof-Brown & Jansen, 2007). In dealing with a change in the environment, individual factors, namely cognitive, affective, motivational, and ability, are believed to be essential determinants of an individual’s behaviour, with the individual playing an intentional and active role in the interaction (Endler & Magnusson, 1976). Therefore, the present program of studies examined self-regulation as an antecedent that can influence the level of P-O fit and the outcome variables.

Self-regulation has become an important research topic in many psychology areas. The self-regulation perspective is currently well received in the industrial and organisational psychology literature, and self-regulation theory is a good fit with the emerging demands of modern organisations. Interventions based on self-regulation principles have also been developed and found to influence relevant organisational outcomes, such as increasing performance and reducing absenteeism (Vancouver & Day, 2005). In addition, self-regulation strategies have been found to be useful in an organisational setting when employees have to cope with change and to manage the commitment to organisational goals (Erez & Kanfer, 1983).

Several definitions of self-regulation exist, but there is little consensus regarding its boundaries (Vancouver, 2000). In his review, Wood (2005) noted that self-regulation included both internal and transactional processes. Transactional processes connected the internal self-regulatory processes to the context of human action, and provided a dynamic model for reciprocal analyses of person-environment fit. Karoly (1993) proposed a multi-element definition of self-regulation that referred to those processes (internal and/or transactional) that enabled individuals to guide their goal-directed
activities over time and across changing environments. Porath and Bateman (2006) extended this definition somewhat by defining it as, “processes that enable an individual to guide his or her goal-directed activities over time and across changing circumstances, including the modulation of thought, affect and behaviour” (p. 185). In their review, Vancouver and Day (2005) summarized that self-regulation refers to a set of processes that drive a dynamic and reciprocal interaction between the person, the environment, and behaviours.

Self-regulatory processes are initiated by certain events, such as when an individual has to deal with task challenges, when routine activity is inhibited, when an individual receives feedback on their performance progress, when external incentives are at risk (Karoly, 1993), when an individual perceives difficulty in achieving set goals, or when the individual perceives that they possess adequate ability to accomplish a goal (Kanfer & Ackerman, 1989). Wood (2005) noted that core components in all conceptions of self-regulation are goals and feedback. He proposed that research on these two constructs provides an important starting point for understanding the self-regulatory processes.

Vancouver and Day (2005) found that the most frequently used self-regulation constructs in industrial/organisational psychology were self-efficacy, goals, feedback, goal orientation, discrepancy, and goal commitment. They also proposed that the major theoretical self-regulation perspectives in industrial/organisational psychology were self-efficacy theory and control theory. According to self-efficacy theory, individuals with a strong belief in their capacity to perform (i.e., have high self-efficacy) will develop or accept, and commit to, difficult performance goals, and, as a result, will put more effort into attaining their goals. In dealing with difficult situations or with
obstacles, high self-efficacy individuals will persist or increase their effort and endurance to attain their goals. Consequently, they will perform well, which will subsequently lead to an increase in their self-efficacy and engagement in a positive spiral feedback loop. Therefore, individual with high self-regulation will make effort to adapt and commit to the demand from the job or organisation, which in turn will improve their skill, knowledge and abilities.

On the other hand, control theory, which takes its name from the primary function of the cybernetic negative feedback system, assumes that behaviour is driven by reducing perceived discrepancies between estimated or anticipated states and desired states (or goals). Control theory has generally been used to understand goal striving and revision processes. The central constructs of control theory are the goal-perception discrepancy (goal-performance discrepancy) and the use of feedback to create a continually changing perception about the state. The central process of control theory is discrepancy reduction. Based on the control theory, individuals with high self-regulation are more likely to make adjustments with the environment, which in turn will improve their congruence.

Porath and Bateman (2006) proposed four self-regulation strategies as mediators of the relationship between goal orientation and job performance, namely feedback seeking, proactive behaviour, emotional control, and social competence.

Feedback seeking. A critical variable that is often considered and measured in the self-regulation literature is feedback seeking (De Stobbeleir, Ashford, & Buyens, 2011; Wood, 2005). Feedback seeking involves the individual actively monitoring goal progress rather than simply waiting for the information from the environment (Vancouver & Day, 2005). Feedback seeking is an important aspect of an adaptive
process and stems from learning about the correctness and adequacy of behaviour for attaining desired end states or goals (Ashford, 1986). Kuhl (1985) proposed that feedback in self-regulatory processes was related to motivation. When the individual’s current intention is not sufficiently strong, self-regulatory processes are activated by selectively processing information that supports it, thus strengthening the motivational basis. Porath and Bateman (2006) noted that feedback seeking is an important self-regulation strategy for reducing discrepancies between the current state and the desired state, and it is likely to have an effect on performance by motivating and directing individuals toward effective performance strategies. Moreover, Crant (2000) noted that feedback was a valuable resource to individuals, which can help them generate and achieve their goals. Feedback seeking also has advantages for the organisation due to its potential to improve employee performance, which in turn will improve organisational performance (Ashford & Cummings, 1983). The goal of feedback seeking is to modify or improve the individuals’ behaviours in response to the acquired information related to their performance over time.

Ashford and Cumming (1983) proposed that individuals use one of two distinct strategies to obtain information from their environments: monitoring and inquiry strategy. Individuals may monitor the environment for information about their performance by observing how others respond to their behaviour. With the inquiry strategy, individuals make a direct request for feedback from the environment. Both feedback seeking strategies have different costs and benefits. The monitoring strategy has minimal cost in effort, but it has fewer benefits, because individuals may not get the desired information, must spend a longer time, and need more cognitive effort to interpret the situation or information. All of this may result in inaccurate information
because it is based on the individual’s own assumptions and understanding. The inquiry strategy has both greater costs and benefits. The individual obtains the desired information in a relatively shorter time than monitoring. However, this strategy has potential costs; for example, of risk of embarrassment that others will see it as a sign of weakness and uncertainty. De Stobbeleir et al. (2011) found that with the inquiry strategy, individuals seek feedback from multiple sources, such as supervisor, immediate co-workers, subordinates and extra-organisational sources, so that individuals may get more varied input. Ashford and Tsui (1991) found that individuals tend to seek more feedback from their supervisor than from other sources.

Proactive behaviour. There is little consensus on how to conceptualise and to measure proactive behaviour, although prior studies have emphasised active behaviour at work. Research on proactive behaviour places an emphasis on proactive personality, personal initiative, role of breadth self-efficacy, and taking charge. Proactive behaviour and initiative become even more critical determinants of organisational success because modern organisations increasingly rely on employees’ personal initiative to identify and solve problems (Crant, 2000).

Bateman and Crant (1993) defined proactive behaviour as behaviour that directly alters environments because it stems from people’s need to manipulate and control their environment. Proactive behaviour improves performance because proactive individuals will actively select a favourable environment and initiate and sustain their efforts to alter their environment. Crant (2000), specifically, defined proactive behaviour as taking initiative in improving current circumstances or creating new ones, which involves challenging the status quo rather than passively adapting to present conditions. Based on the definitions above, the goal of proactive behaviour is to change
or modify the environment in order to improve or achieve individual performance. This contrasts with feedback seeking where the goal is to modify individuals themselves.

Proactive behaviour is important for individual performance, especially in modern organisations, which are characterized by rapid change and reliance on individual initiatives. From the integrative model of antecedents and consequences of proactive behaviour proposed by Crant (2000), the outcomes for proactive behaviour at work are improved job performance, more career success, more positive job attitudes, higher personal control and increased role clarity. Proactive behaviour triggers higher job performance through its effects on selecting and changing the environment. In addition, proactive behaviour can itself stem from multiple goals, such as preventing a problem, fitting in with a particular organisation culture, or creating desirable impressions. Moreover, Crant noted that proactive behaviour is also associated with objective career success (i.e., salary increase and number of promotions) and subjective career success (i.e., career satisfaction). According to Sonnenstag (2003), proactive behaviour implies an active approach towards work, with aims of improving work methods and procedures and developing personal qualities for meeting future work demands. This means that by using this self-regulation strategy, individuals can actively deal with changes in the environment and changes in task-related demands, which will be helpful in managing P-O fit level.

*Emotional control.* Emotional control is an important factor in accomplishing the individual’s tasks. The role of emotional control is to facilitate individuals by keeping unrelated task concerns and emotions from diverting attention away from their tasks (Kanfer, Ackerman, & Heggestad, 1996) and by inhibiting emotional states that may decrease the efficiency of any action (Kuhl, 1985). Emotional control skills involve
the use of self-regulatory processes to prevent the emergence of negative emotional reactions during task engagement that may affect performance (Kanfer et al., 1996). These include the ability to regulate emotional communications and nonverbal displays that help individuals perform in teams (Riggio, 1986). Negative emotions are de-motivating and may reduce or divert attention resources away from on-task activities that affect learning processes and performance (Kanfer & Ackerman, 1989; Wood, Kakebeeke, Debowski, & Frese, 2000). Bell and Kozlowski (2008), for example, found that emotion control worked as an effective tool for decreasing state anxiety and sustaining individuals’ motivation and performance. In addition, it has been found that failures in emotion control led to excessive worry, upset, and evaluation apprehension during task engagement that diverted intentional resources away from task learning (Kanfer et al., 1996). Therefore, individual who has low emotional control is more likely to have difficulties to make adaptation to job demands and organisational requirements.

_Social competence._ In organisational contexts, individuals have to work with others as a member of a team or as a part of the organisation, even though they may have personal performance targets. Therefore, individuals need social competence to work together properly in order to achieve their performance targets. Social competence is defined as the ability to interact effectively with others (Baron & Markman, 2003). Social competence helps individuals complete their tasks in concert with others, which in turn may increase the organisation’s performance. Despite this, few researchers pay attention to social competence in the organisational context, with the main focus on social competence in education, child development, and clinical settings (see Riggio, 1986).
In organisational contexts, Porath and Bateman (2006) found that social competence helped individuals in three ways: (a) to develop work skills and to learn appropriate role behaviours; (b) to achieve better performance, which requires cooperation with others; and (c) to build friendship and support networks, which are instrumental in amplifying performance. Social competence has also been found to be a good predictor of financial success, high job performance, and effective decision making (Baron & Markman, 2003). This means that individuals with good social competence are more likely to have a good congruence with social and organisation.

The present program of studies examined the four self-regulation strategies proposed by Porath and Bateman (2006), which are feedback seeking, proactive behaviour, emotional control and social competence as predictors of P-O fit and the outcome variables. These self-regulation strategies involve the action to regulate individuals’ internal (feedback seeking and emotional control) and external (proactive behaviour and social competence) aspects in dealing with work-related problems and in maintaining their performance.

**Perceived organisational support.** With regard to changing situations within organisations, individuals have to deal with problems that occur at the individual, work-group, or organisation level. Support is one of the ways that helps individuals maintain their performance while dealing with work-related problems. Many studies have examined the beneficial effects of social support on health and wellbeing in general contexts (Stroebe, 2000).

In the organisational context, perceived organisational support is important as it increases employee’s obligation and affective commitment to the employer, increases involvement, and reduces intention to leave the organisation (Eisenberger, Cummings,
Armeli, & Lynch, 1997). Eisenberger, Huntington, Hutchison, and Sowa (1986) defined perceived organisational support as employee’s global beliefs concerning the extent to which the organization values their contributions and cares about their well-being (p.501). Organisational support has been found to have positive relationships with job performance, job satisfaction, affective organisational commitment and organisation citizenship behaviours, and negative relationships with turnover intention (Randall, Cropanzano, Bormann, & Birjulin, 1999). In a recent study, organisational support for employees and their families has also been found to have positive relationships with organisational commitment and negative relationships with intention to quit (Lee, Lee, & Lum, 2008).

In P-O fit studies, support at work has been found to facilitate and encourage individuals to communicate and collaborate with others in dealing with work-related difficulties and to make individuals feel valued at work, whilst perceived organisational support has been found to moderate the relationship between value congruence and job satisfaction and career satisfaction (Erdogan, Kraimer, & Liden, 2004). However, in a more recent study, perceived organisational support was found to improve levels of P-O fit (Janvier, Segers, & Henderickx, 2011). This is in line with the proposition by Eisenberger and his colleagues (1986) that organisational support influences employees’ interpretation of the organisation, suggesting that employees will incorporate organisational membership into their self-identity and expend greater effort to fulfil the organisation’s goals. Based on this proposition, it can be assumed that perceived organisational support would lead to a higher P-O fit. In addition, P-O fit has been found to partially mediate the relationship between organisational support and job satisfaction and organisational commitment (Janvier et al.) and between supervisor
support and organizational citizenship behaviour (Chen & Chiu, 2008). Therefore, the present study examined perceived organisational support as the antecedent of P-O fit and the outcome variables.

**Longitudinal studies of P-O fit.** The theory of P-O fit has existed for decades and in the last decade P-O fit has been established as an important predictor of work-related attitudes and behaviours. Despite the popularity and the advantage of using a longitudinal design, only a few P-O fit studies have done this. Most of the empirical P-O fit studies are based on cross-sectional designs (Verquer et al., 2003). This is consistent with the finding by Kristof-Brown and Jansen (2007) who indicated that almost all P-O fit studies were based on cross-sectional studies, which only allow researchers to explore fit at a certain point in time. Therefore, Kristof-Brown and Jansen encouraged researchers to examine the longitudinal effects.

P-O fit studies using longitudinal design started emerging in the early 1990’s (e.g., Chatman, 1991; O’Reilly et al., 1991). Their P-O fit studies were focused on value congruence in assessing P-O fit, using the Q-sort or template-matching approach, as an example of an objective P-O fit measure. However, Chatman (1991) assessed P-O fit at two points in time, while O’Reilly and his colleagues (1991) measured P-O fit only at Time 1 data collection. In these studies, work outcome variables were collected at Time 2 only. From their studies, the results showed that P-O fit predicted job satisfaction, organisational commitment, intention to quit, and actual turnover across time. Additionally, Chatman (1991) found that socialisation predicted P-O fit over time.

These longitudinal P-O fit studies were followed by other longitudinal P-O studies, which assessed P-O fit level at several points in time. For example, Cable and Judge (1996) studied the relationship between several types of fit (value congruence, P-
O fit, and P-J fit) and work-related outcome variables across three points in time from being job seekers until they accepted in the company. Cable and Judge measured P-O fit at Time 1 and Time 3, and work attitude variables only at Time 3 data collection. They found that across time P-O fit predicted job choice intention, organisational commitment, job satisfaction, turnover intentions, and willingness to recommend their organisation to others. At almost the same time, Saks and Ashforth (1997) studied the association between the predictors of P-O fit (i.e., self-esteem and job resources), P-O fit, and outcome variables at three points in time; that is, before graduating, after four months on the new job, and after 10 months on the job. Saks and Ashforth found that formal job information sources were positively related to P-O fit and P-O fit was negatively related to intention to quit and actual turnover.

A subsequent longitudinal P-O fit study, conducted by Cable and DeRue (2002), examined the association between different types of P-O fit (value fit, needs-supplies fit, and demands-abilities fit) and work-related outcome variables. These researchers collected P-O fit data, followed by collecting work-related outcome variable one year later. They found that value congruence, which they referred to as P-O fit, was related to organisation-focused outcome (e.g., organisational identification, citizenship behaviours, and turnover decision), whereas needs-supplies fit was related to job-focused outcomes (e.g., job satisfaction, career satisfaction, and occupational commitment) over time. However, demands-abilities fit did not predict commitment or job performance over time.

The following longitudinal P-O fit studies put emphasis on the predictor or antecedent variables of P-O fit over time. Using a three-wave longitudinal study, Cable and Parsons (2001) studied the association between socialisation tactics and fit (P-O fit
and value congruence. They found that some of socialisation tactics were positively related to P-O fit and changes in value congruence. However, some of socialisation tactics were negatively related to changes in value congruence, indicating a decrease in value congruence. Moreover, they found that respondent with low pre-entry value congruence and low P-O fit were more likely to leave the organisation. In addition, Cooper-Thomas et al. (2004) also found socialisation tactics predicts P-O fit, job satisfaction, and organisational commitment, and that actual and perceived P-O fit become more congruent over time. They also found that perceived P-O fit mediated the association between socialisation tactics and work-related outcome variables (i.e., job satisfaction and organisational commitment).

Another longitudinal study that examined predictor variables was conducted by Saks and Asforth (2002) using a two-wave data collection. They found that job search and career planning positively predicted pre-entry P-O fit but did not predict post-entry P-O fit. One interesting finding from their study was that pre-entry fit explained almost one-third of the variance in post-entry fit. This means that changes in pre-entry fit produce change in post-entry fit over time.

Nevertheless, none of the above studies measured the same variables at all points in time, which is considered a methodological shortcoming for longitudinal studies (de Lange, Taris, Kompier, Houtman, & Bongers, 2004). Consequently, these authors could not examine changes in variables and their associations over time. One recent longitudinal P-O fit study by Schmitt, Oswald, Friede, Imus, and Meritt (2008) followed the proposed methodology from de Lange and her colleagues (2004). Schmitt et al. used the same measure for all points in time, and examined the association between P-O fit and work attitude and behaviour outcomes across time in an academic setting. They
collected three waves of data and used autoregressive modelling and latent growth curve modelling to analyse the association among the variables and their changes, including the cross-lagged causal relationships. The results of their study showed that P-O fit predicted academic satisfaction, intention to quit, organisational citizenship behaviour, and absenteeism over time. They also found that change in academic fit and satisfaction was significantly related to change in intention to quit, but not related to change in absenteeism.

**Mediating and moderating role of P-O fit.** As interest in the interaction between person and organisation progressed, researchers of P-O fit have extended their designs to include more comprehensive methodologies. The mediating and moderating role of P-O fit has attracted the attention of fit researchers. The inconsistency of the relationships among research variables in P-O fit studies has encouraged researchers to assess the influence of P-O fit on the relationship between work variables.

**Mediating role of P-O fit.** Study of the moderating role of P-O fit has increased in the last ten years. Takeuchi, Takeuchi, and Toshima (2004), in their study with Japanese employees, found that P-O fit mediated the relationship between perception of human resources management (HRM) practices and organisational commitment. In a USA sample, Bright (2007) found that P-O fit mediated the relationship between public service motivation and job performance. In a Chinese sample, Chen and Chiu (2008) found that P-O fit mediated the relationship between supervisor support and organisational citizenship behaviours. Whilst, in a Dutch sample, Boon, Den Hartog, Boselie, and Paawe (2011) found that P-O fit partially mediated the relationship between HRM practices and organisational commitment and organisational citizenship behaviours. However, in the same study, Boon et al. found that P-O fit did not moderate
the effect of HRM practices on organisational commitment and OCB, indicating that the mediating role of P-O fit is more likely to occur and stronger than its moderating role.

**Moderating role of P-O fit.** The role of P-O fit as moderator has also appealed to P-O fit researchers. One study with a US sample by Shin & Holland (2004) found that P-O fit moderated the effect of personality on job performance. Using a Chinese sample, Chang, Chi, and Chuang (2010) found that P-O fit moderated the effect of perceived training investment on turnover intention. Kimura (2011), using Japanese respondents, found that P-O fit moderated the effect of structural empowerment on work engagement. However, Erdogan and Bauer (2005) found inconsistent results. In their US sample, P-O fit moderated the effect of proactive personality on career satisfaction and job satisfaction, but in their Eastern European group of respondents, P-O fit did not moderate the relationship between proactive personality and job satisfaction.

**The Present Program of Studies**

In order to overcome the limitation of the previous P-O fit studies, the present program of studies examined the association between values congruence, personality congruence, goal congruence, and KSAs in terms of perceived P-O fit (supplementary fit, needs-supplies fit, and demands-abilities fit), and work attitudes (job satisfaction, organisational commitment, and intention to quit) and work behaviour (task performance) as the outcome variables. Together, values congruence, personality congruence, and goal congruence, in terms of supplementary fit, were expected to be predictors of work outcome variables. Goal congruence was hypothesized to explain variance in the outcome variables over and above that explained by other types of congruence.
With regard to investigating how individuals manage P-O fit to improve work attitudes and work behaviour, this program of studies also examined the contribution of self-regulation (feedback seeking, proactive behaviour, emotion control, and social competence) and support from the organisation as antecedents to P-O fit and the work outcome variables. Self-regulation and organisational support were expected to influence the level of P-O fit and the outcome variables. However, because some inconsistent relationships among variables exist, this program of studies also examined the role of P-O fit as the mediator between the antecedent variables and outcome variables, and the mediating role of job satisfaction, organisational commitment, and job performance on the relationship between P-O fit and intention to quit, to determine the best fit of causal relationships among all variables (see Figure 1.1).

From the literature review, P-O fit studies need to examine the predictors of P-O fit, and assess the mediation role of P-O fit on the association between predictors and outcome variables across time. Even though longitudinal designs do not solve all of the weaknesses of cross-sectional designs, researchers can make stronger conclusions concerning possible causal relationship among variables when using this methodology (Taris & Kompier, 2003). Another advantage of the longitudinal design study is that it can be used to examine mediation effects in a more rigorous manner than do cross-sectional design. Cross-sectional studies provide biased and potentially misleading estimates of mediational processes (Cole & Maxwell, 2003).

Based on the explanations above, this program of studies also assessed P-O fit over time to investigate the developmental progress of the research variables, to address the inconsistent contribution of P-O fit on the work outcome variables, and to assess the mediating role of P-O fit on the relationship between predictor variables and the
outcome variables after a period of six months. Therefore, the aims of the present program of studies were: (1) to get a clear and comprehensive picture of the relationship between P-O fit and the outcome variables, (1a) to examine the contribution of goal congruence to the relationship between other types of congruence in supplementary fit and the outcome variables, (1b) to examine the relative contribution of each type of supplementary fit on the outcome variables, (1c) to assess the relative contribution of each type of fit on the outcome variables, (1d) to investigate the best factor model of the relationships among research variables, (2) to get a comprehensive understanding about the relationships among the predictor variables, P-O fit, and the outcome variables, (2a) to examine the relationship between of self-regulation and P-O fit and the outcome variables, (2b) to examine the relationship between organisational support and P-O fit and the outcome variables (2c) to investigate the contribution of P-O fit to the outcome variables, (2d) to inspect the role of P-O fit on the relationship between the predictor variables and work outcome variables, and (3) to investigate the development of P-O fit and other study variables and their relationships after a period of six months.
Figure 1.1. General hypothesized model. The positive and negative signs represent the direction of the relationships.
The first aim was investigated in Study 1 (reported in Chapter 2), the second aim was tested in Study 2 (reported in Chapter 3), and the third aim was assessed in Study 3 (reported in Chapter 4). In order to organise all reports of the studies in this thesis, the order number of tables and figures has been modified according to the related chapter. Additional information, tables and figures, have been included in an appendix at the end of the related chapter to provide more detail on the study. In addition, a confirmation of acceptance or confirmation of submission of the paper has been included in an appendix at the end of the associated chapter. Moreover, to avoid any overlap, references for these studies have been integrated into the reference section at the end of this thesis.

The data reported in this program of studies was based on data collected at two points in time from a large-scale electronic manufacturing company in Indonesia, which employed about 1000 permanent employees and more than 1300 temporary employees (who were not included in this research program). This company was established in 1975 and had produced varieties of electronic goods, i.e., audio, video, home appliance, and mobile phone. The products have been sold and exported to more than 30 countries around the world. Agreement to conduct the study was obtained from company’s management and ethical approval was granted by Griffith University Human Research Ethics Committee (see Appendix A and Appendix B at the end of this thesis).

All measures for this research program were translated into Indonesian language using the standard translation and back-translation methodology (Brislin, 1970). Information sheet and original measures (English version), can be seen in Appendix C and Bahasa Indonesia version can be seen in Appendix D, whilst information sheet in Bahasa Indonesia version for second data collection can be seen in Appendix E, at the end of this thesis.
Chapter 2

The Incremental Validity of Perceived Goal Congruence: The Assessment of Person-Organisational Fit

Overview

This chapter reports the research carried out in Study 1, which tested the first aim of the research program, which was to gain a comprehensive picture of the relationships between the P-O fit dimensions (values congruence, personality congruence, goal congruence, needs-supplies fit, and demands-abilities fit) and the outcome variables (job satisfaction, organisational commitment, and intention to quit).

This chapter focuses on measurement development, to generate a Perceived Goal Congruence scale as the additional measure of similarity P-O fit. This scale was devised to measure perceived goal congruence between the individual’s goal and the organisational goals, which have not been included in previous P-O fit studies. Such a scale was crucial to the research program to allow goal congruence to be tested against other aspects of congruence. The development of the Perceived Goal Congruence scale included clarifying the goal congruence construct, item generation, expert review, pilot testing, data collection, and exploratory and confirmatory factor analyses. Validating the scale involved testing the correlates with other work-related variables in the goal congruence nomological net. This study also tested different factor models and investigated the best fit factor model of the relationship among the research variables.

This study was presented as a conference paper at the 9th Industrial and Organisational Psychology Conference in Brisbane, 23-26 June 2011, and a similar version of this chapter has subsequently been accepted for publication in the Journal of Career Assessment (see Appendix F at the end of this chapter).
Abstract

Person-organisation (P-O) fit has attracted much attention as an important workplace and career variable, but there is little consensus regarding conceptualisation, operationalisation, and the criteria used to measure it. Values congruence, personality congruence, knowledge-skills-abilities, and goal congruence are recognized as separate aspects of P-O fit, and have been identified as predictors of work attitudes and behaviours. The present study reports on the development and initial validation of a perceived goal congruence scale that can be used to measure perceptions of similarity between employee and organisational goals, which has not been studied previously. Initial items were administered to 895 employees of a manufacturing company in Indonesia. Exploratory factor analyses identified a single factor, which was confirmed on a holdout sample using confirmatory factor analysis. Construct validity was demonstrated by testing correlations between the new scale and attitudinal variables of job satisfaction, intention to quit, and organisational commitment. Structural validity was demonstrated by showing that perceived goal congruence was independent from, and explained additional variance over and above, the other measures of fit.

Keywords: P-O fit; values congruence; personality congruence; goal congruence; needs-supplies fit; demands-abilities fit; organisational commitment; job satisfaction; intention to quit
Introduction

Person-organisation (P-O) fit has attracted the attention of researchers and organisations as an important workplace and career variable. Perceptions of fit affect career choice (Cable & Judge, 1996), career planning, job-seeking behaviours (Saks & Ashforth, 2002), retention in the recruitment and selection process (Avery, 2003), satisfaction, commitment, involvement, attitudes, and performance on the job (Cable & DeRue, 2002), career success, and turnover intentions (Ballout, 2007). The importance of P-O fit in the career development process is also implied or explicitly stated in career development theories (cf. Dawis & Lofquist, 1984; Holland, 1985). However, there is still little consensus and much confusion over a number of important issues regarding conceptualisation, operationalisation, and the criteria used to measure P-O fit. This reduces the validity of research studies, prevents a comprehensive understanding of the person/organisation interaction, and impedes the development of interventions to improve P-O fit levels. The current study contributes to a better understanding of P-O fit by (a) devising a scale to assess perceived goal congruence, and then (b) assessing the relative effects of all theorised types of P-O fit simultaneously using the one sample, which has not been done previously.

Defining P-O fit

The definition of P-O fit has been confused due to there being multiple conceptualisations and operationalisations. One key distinction in the P-O fit literature is between supplementary fit and complementary fit (Muchinsky & Monahan, 1987). Supplementary fit exists when the person and the organisation are similar or in congruence, whereas, complementary fit exists when the characteristics of an individual serve to “make whole”, or complement, the characteristics of an organisation. In her
integrative review, Kristof (1996) defined P-O fit as the compatibility between people and the organisation that occurs when at least one entity provides what the other needs, or both entities share similar fundamental characteristics, or both. This definition covers the multiple conceptualisations of P-O fit and focuses on the fit between a person and the organisation as a whole, rather than with a specific group or unit within an organisation. Kristof proposed a model that consists of three types of fit: (a) supplementary fit, when there is similarity between the characteristics of the person and the characteristics of the organisation, (b) needs-supplies fit, when the organisation satisfies the needs of the individual, and (c) demands-abilities fit, when the person has abilities required to meet the demands of the organisation. Needs-supplies fit and demands-abilities fit reflect the complementary fit definition proposed by Muchinsky and Monahan (1987). Of these three types of fit, supplementary fit is the most commonly measured (Kristof, 1996).

Consistent with Kristof (1996), Kristof-Brown, Zimmerman, and Johnson (2005) and Hoffman and Woehr (2006), in their meta-analyses, operationalised complementary fit as needs-supplies and demands-abilities fit. Cable and DeRue (2002) also conceptualised fit based on the three types of fit proposed by Kristof, but referred to supplementary fit as P-O fit. In addition, some researchers have measured a general P-O fit (e.g., Adkins, Russell, & Werbel, 1994; Saks & Ashforth, 1997), which refers to the individual’s global perception of fit with the organisation. Several researchers have focused on one or two only of the above conceptualisations (e.g., Cable & Judge, 1997; Cooper-Thomas, Vianen, & Anderson, 2004), and others have proposed additional categories (e.g., Piasentin & Chapman, 2006).
Kristof (1996) argued that these multiple perspectives of fit should be examined in a single study, as different combinations of fit might have different implications for the individual and the organisation. Further, Schneider, Goldstein, and Smith (1995) suggested that focusing primarily on supplementary fit might lead an organisation to become excessively homogeneous over time, which in turn could produce negative consequences for organisational effectiveness, such as being unable to enact the changes required to adapt to a changing environment. These authors argued that both homogeneity (supplementary fit) and heterogeneity (needs-supplies fit and demands-abilities fit, representing complementary fit) should be assessed simultaneously. To date, few studies have tested multiple types of fit simultaneously, and no study has validated the best factor model of P-O fit.

**Measuring P-O fit**

There is also little consensus among researchers about how to measure P-O fit. P-O fit has been assessed as perceived fit, subjective fit, and objective fit, although these terms are often used inconsistently (Kristof-Brown et al., 2005; Verquer, Beehr, & Wagner, 2003). It has been shown that perceived fit is a better predictor of work outcomes than the actual fit between the person and the organisation (Arthur, Bell, Villado, & Doverspike, 2006), and that perceived fit is a strong predictor of work attitudes and behaviours (Cable & Judge, 1997). Kristof-Brown and Jansen (2007) noted that actual fit only has an effect on someone if the person perceives the fit to exist. This is consistent with Kristof’s (1996) perspective that when the aim of a P-O fit study is to predict work attitudes and behaviours, researchers are advised to use perceived fit measures. Good fit is said to exist as long as it is perceived to exist, regardless of
whether or not the person has similar characteristics to, complements, or is complemented by, the organisation.

Criteria to be used for P-O fit measurement

Previous studies also vary in the criteria used for P-O fit measurement. Kristof (1996) found four common factors were used to specify P-O fit, namely values, personality, KSAs, and goals. Individually, these criteria show positive relationships with work attitudes and behaviours across numerous P-O fit studies. However, few P-O fit studies have examined multiple criteria in a single study, and none has examined the relative importance of the criteria in the assessment of P-O fit.

Prior studies utilised a combination of values, goals, and personality to measure P-O fit (e.g., de Lara, 2008; Judge & Cable, 1997). Some studies assessed P-O fit using multiple criteria in one instrument (e.g., “To what extent are the values of the organization similar to your own values?”, and “To what extent does your personality match the personality or image of the organization?”; Saks & Ashforth, 1997), and others have utilised items that contained multiple criteria (e.g., “To what degree do your values, goals and personality match or fit with this organization and the current employees in this organization?”; Judge & Cable, 1997). In addition, unclear criteria for congruence have forced meta-analytic studies to categorise congruence into two separate types, referred to as values congruence and others congruence (Hoffman & Woehr, 2006; Verquer et al., 2003). This differentiation demonstrates that the relative importance of different criteria of P-O fit remains unclear.

Values congruence is widely accepted as the main operationalisation for P-O fit and to account for the most variance in outcome variables, with the majority of studies using this approach (Hoffman & Woehr, 2006; Verquer et al., 2003). Values congruence
has been shown to have stronger relationships with work attitudes and behaviours than other types of supplementary fit (Kristof-Brown & Jansen, 2007).

*Personality congruence* has been used by some researchers in P-O fit studies (e.g., Westerman & Cyr, 2004), but these studies have found inconsistent relationships between personality congruence and work outcome variables. In some studies, personality congruence was significantly related to work behaviour (e.g., Westerman & Vanka, 2005), but in others, no relationship was found (e.g., Westerman & Cyr, 2004). Ryan and Kristof-Brown (2003) argue the need to assess this type of congruence, although the effect of personality congruence is yet to be resolved.

*Knowledge, skills, and abilities (KSAs)* form the basis of most personnel selection processes when assessing individual characteristics. Individuals with the desired KSAs have a greater fit with their job and have more positive work outcomes (Caldwell & O'Reilly, 1990). However, KSAs have a strong link with task-related performance, and as such, are more likely to be used by recruiters to judge the level of person-job fit rather than P-O fit. Prior P-O fit studies have utilised KSAs as a measure of demands-abilities fit (e.g., Cable & DeRue, 2002).

*Goal congruence* has been identified as an important predictor in the organisational psychology literature. Nadler and Tushman (1992) defined congruence as, “the degree to which the needs, demands, goals, and structures of one component are consistent with the needs, demands, goals, and structures of another component. Congruence is therefore a measure of how well pairs of components fit together” (p. 51). Thus, an important aspect of fit between individuals and their organisations is the convergence of individual and organisational goals.
Most studies on goal congruence have focused on the congruence between the employee and management (e.g., Jauch, Osborn, & Terpening, 1980), subordinate and supervisor (e.g., Vancouver & Schmitt, 1991), manager and organisation (e.g., Bouillon, Ferrier, Stuebs, & West, 2006), among members in the same organisation (e.g., Kristof-Brown & Stevens, 2001), group and organisation (Chen, Lam, Naumann, & Schaubroeck, 2005), or between organisations (e.g., Scott & Gable, 1997). Few P-O fit studies have used goal congruence as the criterion for P-O fit measurement (e.g., Vancouver & Schmitt, 1991; Witt, 1998), and when they have, participants were typically asked to rank the organisation’s goals rather than to report their own personal goals. In such circumstances, congruence might reflect an agreement between the individual and others in the organisation on organisational goals, rather than reflect the fit between the individual’s own goals and the organisation’s goals (Kristof-Brown & Jansen, 2007). No P-O fit study has examined the congruence between the employee’s goals and the organisation’s goals. This is despite the updated attraction-selection-attrition (ASA) framework proposing that goal congruence is an important dimension of P-O fit, separate from personality, KSAs, and values (Schneider et al., 1995). According to the ASA framework, individuals will be attracted to organisations that have goals congruent with their own goals, and employees will leave the organisation when there is little or no similarity between their goals and those of the organisation.

The meaning of “organisation” in P-O fit

There is variability also in measuring P-O fit because of the operational definition of organisation. Some P-O fit studies have focused on people as the representatives of the organisation (e.g., Carless, 2005b), while others have operationalised the organisation as an entity in general (e.g., Kim, Cable, & Kim, 2005).
In addition, some studies included items measuring fit between the individual and a combination of the organisation and other employees (e.g., “I feel my values match this organisation and the current employees in this organisation”; Judge & Cable, 1997), and some studies included items pertaining to co-workers as the organisation (e.g., “My personal values are different from those of my co-workers”; “My ability level is comparable to those of my co-workers”; Piasentin & Chapman, 2007), which could lead to different perceptions of fit (i.e., person-group fit).

**The effects of P-O fit**

Regarding the effects of congruence between the person and the organisation, work attitudes are the most frequently studied outcomes. For example, in a meta-analytic study on the relationship between P-O fit and work attitudes, P-O fit was found to have strong, positive correlations with job satisfaction and organisational commitment, and a moderate, negative correlation with intention to quit (Kristof-Brown et al., 2005). P-O fit is also positively related to work and task performance (Cable & DeRue, 2002), and positively associated with organizational citizenship behaviours (Chen et al., 2005). Schneider (2001) considered P-O fit “to be one of, if not the, dominant conceptual forces in the field” of applied psychology, while Kristof-Brown et al. (2005) considered perceptions of fit to be involved in most career-related decisions.

In sum, P-O fit promotes satisfaction, commitment, and performance, and reduces the intention to quit, which in turn affects an individual’s career development and progress.

**The Present Study**

In order to overcome the limitation of previous P-O fit studies, the current study utilised perceived P-O fit self-report measures to examine all types of fit simultaneously, and assessed the organisation as an institution in general. The study had
three aims. As there was no existing measure that could assess the fit between an employee’s goals and the organisation’s goals, the first aim was to develop a brief measure that could assess this construct. Second, as no study has tested the structural independence of all fit measures (i.e., values congruence, personality congruence, needs-supplies fit, demands-abilities fit, and goal congruence), we administered the newly developed perceived goal congruence scale with the other existing fit measures and tested their relationship with one another. Finally, as it was important to assess the relative contribution of different perspectives of fit when explaining workplace variables, the study tested the association between the five types of P-O fit and the work attitudes of job satisfaction, organisational commitment, and intention to quit. Based on theory and previous empirical studies, we expected (a) that the existing P-O fit scales (values congruence, personality congruence, needs-supplies fit, and demands-abilities fit) and the newly developed goal congruence scale would reflect five independent constructs. We expected (b) that perceived goal congruence would, along with values congruence and personality congruence, reflect a general measure of supplementary fit. We also expected, (c) that goal congruence would account for additional variance in our outcome variables (job satisfaction, organisational commitment, and intention to quit), over and above the variance accounted for by the four existing P-O fit scales.

**Method**

**Participants**

Participants were 895 employees from a large-scale electronic manufacturing company in Indonesia. Approximately 1000 questionnaires were distributed via section heads and departmental supervisors. Nine hundred and ten employees returned the survey, representing a response rate of 91%, although only 895 returned usable
questionnaires. There were 790 men (88.3%) and 105 women, whose average age was 33 years ($SD = 8.6$). The majority was married (66.4%). Two hundred and thirteen (23.8%) held a bachelor or graduate-level degree, 185 (20.7%) had post-high school qualifications (primarily technical college qualifications), 449 (50.2%) were high school graduates, and 48 (5.4%) had completed junior high school. The majority (509; 58.0%) were machine operators, 244 (27.8%) were supervisors, and 124 (14.1%) were middle or top level managers (18, or 2%, did not answer this question). The average tenure with the company was 10.8 years ($SD = 7.4$; range < 1 year to 36 years), the average total work experience was 11.5 years ($SD = 7.8$; range < 1 year to 36 years), and the average hours worked per week was 42.7 ($SD = 6.0$; range 8 to > 50).

**Procedure**

Ethical approval was granted by the authors’ university ethics committee. Permission and agreement to carry out the study was obtained from management of the participating company. All permanent employees were invited to complete an anonymous questionnaire and return it to the first researcher in a sealed envelope to ensure responses remained anonymous and confidential. A cover letter was attached to each questionnaire to inform the purpose of the study, to explain that no individual report would be provided to the organisation, and to assure that participation was voluntary and would not affect their employment in any way. The data reported in this study form one part of a larger research project examining person-organisational fit.

**Measures**

The survey contained the four existing P-O fit scales (values congruence, personality congruence, needs-supplies fit, and demands-abilities fit), eight experimental items for the new goal congruence P-O fit scale, three work attitude scales
(organisational commitment, job satisfaction, intention to quit), and questions asking for information on gender, age, education, tenure with company in years, work experience in years, and average hours worked per week. All measures were translated into the Indonesian language using the standard translation and back-translation methodology (Brislin, 1970). The items were translated from English to Indonesian by the first author, whose first language is Indonesian, and back-translated into English by four independent translators, who were proficient in both English and Indonesian languages. The researchers then compared the back-translated versions with the original English version, and where discrepancies were identified, changes were made to the Indonesian version. Respondents were asked to indicate their level of agreement with the items on a 6-point Likert scale, where 1 = strongly disagree and 6 = strongly agree. Scores were summed to provide a total, with higher scores reflecting a higher level of a construct.

**Supplementary P-O fit.**

*Values congruence* was measured using the 3-item scale developed by Cable and DeRue (2002). A sample item was, “The things that I value in life are very similar to the things that my organisation values”. These authors reported an internal reliability of .91 (.90 in this study), and supported validity by showing that values congruence differed from other forms of fit and was positively associated with organisational identification and citizenship behaviours. The scale has been widely used (e.g., Erdogan & Bauer, 2005; Kim et al., 2005).

*Personality congruence* was measured using the 3-item scale devised by Judge and Cable (1997). We made minor changes to the items so that they reflected congruence between personality of the individual and personality of the organisation. For example, the item, “To what degree do your values, goals, and personality ‘match’
or fit this organization and the current employees in this organization?”, was modified to, “My personality matches or fits this organisation’s personality”. Judge and Cable reported an internal reliability of .80, and provided support for validity by showing that personality congruence was separate from objective fit and positively associated with organisational attractiveness. After confirmatory factor analysis, we deleted one item, which was negatively worded and had a very low factor loading. The internal reliability of the 2-item scale was .84 (Pearson’s correlation = .71). The original scale has been modified for use in a number of P-O fit studies and has been shown to have good construct validity when tested against other variables (e.g., Cooper-Thomas et al., 2004).

Goal congruence was measured using the Perceived Goal Congruence Scale, which was developed for this study. The scale was based on the theoretical conception of supplementary fit proposed by Muchinsky and Monahan (1987), in which the focus is on individuals perceiving that they have similar, values, tastes, and goals to the organisation. For goal congruence, we focused on the individual’s perceptions that their personal and work goals matched the goals of their organisation, and items were devised to reflect this fit. Scale development consisted of two stages: (a) an initial stage, which involved item generation, expert review, and refinement of items; and (b) a second stage, which included data collection and statistical analyses to derive the scale. In the initial stage, the first researcher conducted interviews with five employed adults, with the intention of validating the two domains of goal congruence. The data from these interviews confirmed content related to personal and work-related goals. Both authors then generated 15 initial items that would represent the construct. These 15 items were reviewed by four academic staff with expertise in psychometrics and/or
organisational psychology. As a result of this review, some items were deleted and/or revised, and a final list of eight items was identified (can be seen in Table 2.4 in Appendix G). These eight items were piloted with a small number of employed adults to assess language level and readability. In the second stage, we conducted exploratory and confirmatory factor analyses to identify the most suitable items to retain in the final measure. As the Perceived Goal Congruence Scale will be used with other P-O fit scales, we aimed to devise a brief measure containing from 6-8 items. To further assess validity, we tested if the Perceived Goal Congruence Scale explained incremental variance in several work attitudes variables over and above that explained by the existing P-O fit scales.

Complementary P-O fit.

Needs-supplies fit was measured using the 3-item scale developed by Cable and DeRue (2002). In order that respondents focused on organisational fit, the word “job” in this measure was changed to “organisation”. A sample item was, “There is a good fit between what my organisation offers me and what I am looking for in an organisation”. Cable and DeRue reported an internal reliability of .89 (.88 in this study), and showed the scale was separate from other forms of fit and positively correlated with job satisfaction and organisational commitment.

Demands-abilities fit was measured using the 3-item scale developed by Cable and DeRue (2002). We changed the word “job” in the measure to “organisation”, in order to bring it into line with the objectives of this study. A sample item was, “There is a good match between the demands of this organisation and my personal skills”. Cable and DeRue reported an internal reliability of .89 (.90 in this study), and demonstrated validity by showing the scale was positively associated with organisational
identification and support, and job satisfaction. The scale has been used in other P-O studies (e.g., Erdogan & Bauer, 2005).

**Work attitude variables.**

*Organisational commitment* was measured using the Organizational Commitment Scale develop by Allen and Meyer (1990), which assesses *normative, affective,* and *continuance* commitment. We utilised affective commitment, which has been the focus of previous P-O fit studies (e.g., Ambrose, Arnaud, & Schminke, 2007), has been shown to have the strongest relationship with organisational and work-related variables (Meyer, Stanley, Herscovitch, & Topolnytsky, 2002), and been found to be a valid indicator of organisational commitment (e.g., Maurer & Lippstreu, 2008). We used the four highest loading items from the original 8-item scale, based on a factor analysis by Allen and Meyer. A sample item was, “I don’t feel like ‘part of the family’ in this organisation”. The internal reliability for the eight items was .82 (.69 for the 4 items in this study). Allen and Meyer showed that affective commitment was separate from normative and continuance commitment, and positively related to perceived job challenge, role clarity, and peer cohesion, in support of validity.

*Job satisfaction* was measured using the 3-item scale from the Michigan Organizational Assessment Questionnaire, devised by Cammann, Fichman, Jenkins Jr., and Klesh (1983). We modified one item to minimise bias associated with assessing satisfaction with the organisation rather than satisfaction with the job. The item, “In general, I like working here”, was modified to, “In general, I like doing my job”. Internal reliability for the scale has been reported as .93 (.71 in this study), with validity supported by showing it to be positively associated with organisational commitment and negatively associated with turnover intentions (Saks & Ashforth, 2002).
Intention to quit was measured using the 3-item scale from the Michigan Organizational Assessment Questionnaire (Cammann et al., 1983). A sample item was, “I often think about quitting this job”. Cammann et al. reported an internal reliability of .83 (.87 in this study). This scale has been widely used, and, in support of validity, has been found to have negative relationships with organisational commitment (Bishop, Scott, & Burroughs, 2000).

Results

Random Split of Original Sample

The full sample of 895 participants was split randomly into two groups of 450 (Sample A) and a hold-out sample of 445 (Sample B). Chi-square and independent sample t-tests found no differences between the two groups on any of the demographic variables of age, \( t(893) = -.24, p = .81 \), gender, \( \chi^2(1) = .002, p = .97 \), education level, \( \chi^2(5) = 2.40, p = .79 \), and job level, \( \chi^2(5) = 8.32, p = .14 \), indicating no bias on these variables in the samples based on the random split.

Exploratory Factor Analysis of the Goal Congruence Scale (Sample A)

First, we used Sample A to conduct a series of exploratory factor analyses (principal axis factor analysis with direct oblimin rotation) on the eight goal congruence items. The first analysis indicated two factors that accounted for 64.77% of the variance. The first factor (47.71%) consisted of the six positively worded items, whereas the second factor (17.06%) contained the two negatively worded items. As the negatively worded items were likely to reflect a response bias to negative wording (known as context-dependent item sets; Haladyna, 1992), we deleted these two items and ran a second analysis. This second analysis (KMO = .89; Bartlett’s test \( \chi^2[15] = 3020.80, p < .001 \)) identified a single factor, which accounted for 66.33% of the variance, and
contained factor loadings that ranged from .68 to .83. We labelled these six items the Perceived Goal Congruence Scale; see Table 2.1 for items. The internal reliability for the six items was .88.

**Testing Structural Validity of Existing P-O Fit Scales (Sample B)**

Second, we used Sample B to conduct a confirmatory factor analysis (AMOS: maximum likelihood estimation) on the four existing P-O fit scales of values congruence, personality congruence, needs-supplies fit, and demands-abilities fit. For fit indices, Hair, Black, Babin, and Anderson (2010) suggested that, in addition to the $\chi^2$ statistic and the $\chi^2/df$ ratio, one absolute fit index and one incremental fit index should be used to test the goodness of fit of a model. Along with $\chi^2$ and $\chi^2/df$, we report the Goodness-of-Fit Index (GFI) and the Root Mean Square Error of Approximation (RMSEA) as absolute fit indexes, and the Comparative Fit Index (CFI) as the incremental fit index. With a sample size > 250, and the number of observed variables > 12, a significant $\chi^2$ value, $\chi^2/df$ values between 1 and 3, GFI values > .90, CFI values > .92, and RMSEA values < .07, indicate a good model fit to the data (Hair et al., 2010).

The CFA consisted of four latent variables, each with three observed (item) indicators, except for personality congruence, which contained two observed indicators. All latent variables were allowed to covary. The fit statistics for this model were satisfactory, indicating that each existing P-O fit scale was adequately represented by its respective indicators, and that each scale was factorially independent of the other scales, $\chi^2(37) = 68.64, p < .001, \chi^2/df = 1.85, GFI = .97, CFI = .99, RMSEA = .04$. All factor loadings were significant at $p < .001$. 
Table 2.1

*Exploratory Factor Analysis; Sample A, N = 450*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Loadings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>My personal goals match the goals of this organisation</td>
<td>.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Achieving this organisation’s goals also means attaining my personal goals</td>
<td>.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My personal goals are consistent with the goals of this organisation</td>
<td>.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The goals of this organisation are similar to my work-related goals</td>
<td>.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My personal goals are compatible with this organisation’s goals</td>
<td>.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This organisation’s goals give me the opportunity to achieve my personal goals</td>
<td>.68</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Testing Relationship between Goal Congruence and Existing P-O Fit Scales

(Sample B)

Third, we used confirmatory factor analyses and Sample B to assess the relationship between the new Perceived Goal Congruence Scale and the four existing P-O fit scales (values congruence, personality congruence, needs-supplies fit, demands-abilities fit). We assessed two models. The first was a 5-factor model where the five fit scales were each represented by a latent variable and their respective fit items. This model assessed if the Perceived Goal Congruence Scale items could be represented as an independent factor separate from the existing P-O fit scales. The second model, a 3-factor model, contained one second-order factor (similarity fit), which was represented by three latent variables (values congruence, personality congruence, and goal congruence), a second latent variable, which was represented by the three needs-supplies fit items, and a third latent variable, which was represented by the three demands-abilities items. This model assessed if the Perceived Goal Congruence Scale items could be represented as a component of a supplementary fit construct (containing values congruence, personality congruence, and goal congruence items), separate from the needs-supplies fit construct and demands-abilities fit construct. Both models produced satisfactory fit statistics, suggesting, first, that the Perceived Goal Congruence Scale measures a construct independent of the four existing P-O fit scales, \(\chi^2(107) = 222.44, p < .001, \chi^2/df = 2.08, \text{GFI} = .95, \text{CFI} = .98, \text{RMSEA} = .05\), and, second, that the Perceived Goal Congruence Scale sits with values congruence and personality congruence as one component of a supplementary fit construct, separate from needs-supplies fit and demands-abilities fit, \(\chi^2(111) = 243.51, p < .001, \chi^2/df = 2.19, \text{GFI} = .96\)
.94, CFI = .98, RMSEA = .05. Additional results for all models are presented in Table 2.5 in Appendix H at the end of this chapter.

**Testing the Contribution of Goal Congruence over Existing P-O Fit Scales (Full Sample)**

Using the full sample (N = 895), we conducted hierarchical regression analyses to test if goal congruence explained variance over and above the variance accounted for by the other four fit scales, using the three work attitude variables of organisational commitment, job satisfaction, and intention to quit as outcome variables. In these analyses, we included the four existing fit scales (values congruence, personality congruence, needs-supplies fit, and demands-abilities fit) at Step 1, and included goal congruence at Step 2. See Table 2.2 for summary data for these variables, and Table 2.3 for the results of the hierarchical regression analyses.

**Organisation Commitment.** At Step 1, the four original fit measures explained 23.8% of the variance in organisation commitment, $F(4, 890) = 69.50, p < .001$, with all four scales contributing unique variance, although only needs-supplies fit explained > 1% of the variance. When goal congruence was added at Step 2, an additional 6.7% of the variance was accounted for, $F_{C3}(1, 889) = 85.13, p < .001$. At this Step, goal congruence accounted for unique variance ($\beta = .36, p < .001; sr^2 = 6.66\%$), and goal congruence and needs-supplies fit each accounted for > 1% of the variance.
Table 2.2

Summary Data and Correlations among Variables; N = 895

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Values congruence</td>
<td>12.46</td>
<td>3.12</td>
<td>.71</td>
<td>.54</td>
<td>.28</td>
<td>.59</td>
<td>.39</td>
<td>.34</td>
<td>-.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Personality congruence</td>
<td>7.94</td>
<td>2.16</td>
<td>.53</td>
<td>.34</td>
<td>.60</td>
<td>.39</td>
<td>.40</td>
<td>-.36</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Needs-supplies fit</td>
<td>11.71</td>
<td>3.05</td>
<td>.37</td>
<td>.58</td>
<td>.44</td>
<td>.52</td>
<td>-.49</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Demands-abilities fit</td>
<td>14.16</td>
<td>2.40</td>
<td>.35</td>
<td>.27</td>
<td>.45</td>
<td>-.30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Goal congruence</td>
<td>26.14</td>
<td>4.99</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Organisational commitment</td>
<td>18.32</td>
<td>3.27</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Job satisfaction</td>
<td>13.61</td>
<td>2.43</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Intention to quit</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>3.38</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note:* All correlations significant at $p < .001$. 
Table 2.3

Summary Data for Hierarchical Regression Analyses Predicting Organisational Commitment, Job Satisfaction, and Intention to Quit; N = 895.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Organisational Commitment</th>
<th></th>
<th>Job Satisfaction</th>
<th></th>
<th>Intention to Quit</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>SE(B)</td>
<td>β</td>
<td>sr²(%)</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>SE(B)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Values congruence</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.13**</td>
<td>.74</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personality congruence</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.12**</td>
<td>.62</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Needs-supplies fit</td>
<td>.29</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.27***</td>
<td>4.45</td>
<td>.29</td>
<td>.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demands-abilities fit</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.10**</td>
<td>.85</td>
<td>.29</td>
<td>.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Values congruence</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personality congruence</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Needs-supplies fit</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.16***</td>
<td>1.51</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td>.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demands-abilities fit</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.07*</td>
<td>.37</td>
<td>.26</td>
<td>.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goal congruence</td>
<td>.24</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.36***</td>
<td>6.66</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.02</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: For organisational commitment, $R^2$ at Step 1 = .24 ($R^2_{Adj} = .24$), $R^2$ at Step 2 = .31 ($R^2_{Adj} = .30$); for job satisfaction, $R^2$ at Step 1 = .36 ($R^2_{Adj} = .36$), $R^2$ at Step 2 = .40 ($R^2_{Adj} = .39$); for intention to quit, $R^2$ at Step 1 = .27 ($R^2_{Adj} = .27$), $R^2$ at Step 2 = .30 ($R^2_{Adj} = .30$).

*p < .05, **p < .01, ***p < .001.
**Job Satisfaction.** The four original fit measures explained 35.8% of the variance in job satisfaction, $F(4, 890) = 123.86$, $p < .001$, with personality congruence, needs-supplies fit, and demands-abilities fit each contributing unique variance, and needs-supplies fit and demands-abilities fit each accounting for > 1%. When goal congruence was added at Step 2, an additional 4.0% of the variance was accounted for, $F_{Ch}(1, 889) = 59.20$, $p < .001$. At this Step, goal congruence accounted for unique variance ($\beta = .28$, $p < .001; \eta^2 = 4.0\%$), and goal congruence, needs-supplies fit, and demands-abilities fit each accounted for > 1% of variance.

**Intention to Quit.** The four original fit measures explained 26.8% of the variance in intention to quit, $F(4, 890) = 81.49$, $p < .001$, with personality congruence, needs-supplies fit, and demands-abilities fit each contributing unique variance, and needs-supplies fit and demands-abilities fit each explaining > 1%. When goal congruence was added at Step 2, an additional 3.4% of the variance in intention to quit was accounted for, $F_{Ch}(1, 889) = 43.02$, $p < .001$. At this Step, goal congruence accounted for unique variance ($\beta = -.26$, $p < .001; \eta^2 = 3.4\%$), as did values congruence, needs-supplies fit, and demands-abilities fit, with goal congruence and needs-supplies fit explaining > 1%.

**Discussion**

This study makes a unique contribution to current P-O fit knowledge. It is the first study to examine the congruence between individual goals and the goals of the organisation, to assess levels of P-O fit using multiple criteria simultaneously, to test the structural independence of all fit measures, and to examine the relative contribution of each criterion of P-O fit in explaining the work attitudes variables of organisational commitment, job satisfaction, and intention to quit.
The first objective of this study was to address a void in the literature by developing a brief, valid, and reliable scale to measure goal congruence. In devising the Perceived Goal Congruence Scale, we employed standard scale development technology, which included reference to the literature, reference to the target group (via interviews), reference to scale development experts (academics), pilot testing the derived items with the target population, and item and factor analyses based on a large sample. Content validity was addressed in the item development phase, and construct validity was demonstrated by showing discriminant validity with other P-O fit scales and finding the expected relationship with all three work attitudes variables. The Perceived Goal Congruence Scale can be considered to have sound internal reliability, to assess a separate construct to other fit measures, and to have demonstrated sound, initial validity.

The Perceived Goal Congruence Scale was validated in relation to existing scales of P-O fit, and in relation to three widely assessed work attitudes of organisational commitment, job satisfaction, and intention to quit. The results demonstrated that goal congruence explained meaningful variability in all three work attitude variables, over and above the variance accounted by the existing scales. When predicting organisational commitment and job satisfaction, goal congruence reduced the effects of values and personality congruence, suggesting that goal congruence might be a more important construct to assess fit than values and personality congruence, particularly in relation to these two attitudes. When predicting intention to quit, goal congruence reduced the effect of personality congruence, reinforcing the usefulness of goal congruence and suggesting that different outcome variables might be associated with different combinations of fit.
These results are inconsistent with previous P-O fit studies, which have shown that values congruence has the strongest relationship with work attitudes (see Verqueer et al., 2003). The majority of these studies utilised the Organizational Culture Profile (O’Reilly, Chatman, & Caldwell, 1991) to assess values congruence using the Q-sort methodology and profile similarity index. However, this technique has been criticised as values are framed as a need rather than as fit (Edwards, 1993; Kristof-Brown & Jansen, 2007), and because it attempts to assess objective P-O fit, where individuals describe their own values and others describe the organisation’s values, rather than assessing the individual’s perceived fit (Westerman & Vanka, 2005). Our study utilised perceived values congruence in order to be consistent with other widely used measures of fit. From this perspective, our results suggest that goal congruence might be a more important similarity fit variable. Our results are consistent with, and lend support to, the revised attraction-selection-attrition (ASA) framework, which proposes that goal congruence is an important dimension of P-O fit, additional to personality, KSAs, and values (Schneider et al., 1995), and should be considered an important dimension associated with career development.

Further, our results confirm suggestions that the construct of P-O fit is broader than the domains currently being assessed by the existing fit scales of values congruence, personality congruence, needs-supplies fit, and demands-abilities fit (see Kristof, 1996). The results also support suggestions that assessing goal congruence as part of an assessment of P-O fit will provide a more complete measure of fit (Cooper-Thomas et al., 2004; Westerman & Cyr, 2004). The scale will be useful to researchers who wish to account fully for the fit variable in their studies, and will be useful to
practitioners who wish to assess more comprehensively the connection between employees and their organisation.

Both of the fit models we tested produced satisfactory statistics. The 5-factor model suggested that values congruence, personality congruence, goal congruence, needs-supplies fit, and demands-abilities fit should be considered as independent factors reflecting P-O fit. These results demonstrated that all five fit measures are potentially important variables and should be taken into consideration when examining P-O fit. The 3-factor model was consistent with the multiple conceptualisations perspective of P-O fit identified by Kristof (1996), who suggested that fit comprises similarity fit, needs-supplies fit, and demands-abilities fit (with values, personality, and goal congruence reflecting similarity fit).

The results of our study suggest further that there might be redundancy in the current measures of P-O fit, despite these being widely assessed in the literature (see Kristof-Brown et al., 2005). Values congruence and personality congruence were bivariately associated with each outcome variable, but this association disappeared when the relationships were tested in the regression analyses. Our results suggest that values congruence and personality congruence may be redundant, although additional studies with different samples and more diverse outcome variables are required before these components should be dropped.

Conclusions

The strength of our study was that it measured and assessed all five fit criteria simultaneously. Assessing the effects of all types of fit in one study provides a more comprehensive picture of its influence. We also used a large sample, with a very high participation rate, and containing a range of job levels and job types, thereby enhancing
the generalisability of the findings. However, the study is not without limitations. First, the results were based on self-report survey data. We were not able to collect data from a second source, and, ideally, future studies that assess goal congruence and its relationship to the other P-O fit variables and work attitudes should attempt to do this. Second, it is important to note that all data were collected from one organization in a single industry, and were collected in Indonesia. Further studies need to be conducted in different organisations, industries, and cultural settings. Third, our sample contained a disproportionate number of men, and future research needs to assess if our results remain stable across both genders. Finally, our personality congruence scale was reduced from three to two items, and future studies should endeavour to assess a broader construct of personality fit. Despite these caveats, having a goal congruency measure of P-O fit augments the measures of perceived P-O fit currently available in the organisational literature, and the results of our study suggest that for researchers and practitioners to assess perceived P-O fit comprehensively, goal congruency needs to be considered.
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Appendix G

Piloted Measure of Perceived Goal Congruence Scale

Table 2.4

_Eight Items Piloted Measure of Perceived Goal Congruence_

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. The goals of this organisation are similar to my work-related goals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Achieving this organisation’s goals also means attaining my personal goals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. My personal goals match the goals of this organisation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Achieving my personal goals conflicts with achieving this organisation’s goals (R)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. My personal goals are consistent with the goals of this organisation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. This organisation’s goals give me the opportunity to achieve my personal goals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. The goals of this organisation push me to change my personal goals (R)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. My personal goals are compatible with this organisation’s goals</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* Item 4 and item 7 were reversed items
**Appendix H**

Factor Models Analyses

Table 2.5

*Fit Indices for Alternate Models of P-O Fit; N = 445*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Models</th>
<th>$\chi^2$</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>$\chi^2$/df</th>
<th>GFI</th>
<th>CFI</th>
<th>RMSEA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1-factor</td>
<td>236.70***</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>2.42</td>
<td>.94</td>
<td>.98</td>
<td>.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-factor</td>
<td>243.51***</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>2.19</td>
<td>.94</td>
<td>.98</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-factor</td>
<td>243.51***</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>2.19</td>
<td>.94</td>
<td>.98</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-factor</td>
<td>222.44***</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>2.08</td>
<td>.95</td>
<td>.98</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*** = $p < .001$

*Note.* The first model was a 1-factor model where one latent variable was represented by all 18 individual items. This model assessed if all items could be represented as P-O fit. The second model was a 2-factor model where one latent variable was represented by the 12 supplementary fit items (values congruence, personality congruence, and goal congruence) and a second latent variable was represented by the six complementary fit items (needs-supplies and demands-abilities). This model assessed if similarity fit and complementary fit could be represented as two separate factor of P-O fit. The third model was a 3-factor model. It contained one second-order factor (similarity fit), which was represented by three latent variables (values congruence, personality congruence, and goal congruence), a second latent variable, which was represented by the three needs-supplies fit items, and a third latent variable, which was represented by the three demands-abilities items. This model assessed if the Perceived Goal Congruence Scale items could be represented as a component of the supplementary fit construct (containing values congruence, personality congruence, and goal congruence items), separate from the needs-supplies fit construct and
demands-abilities fit construct. The last model was a 5-factor model where the five fit scales were each represented by a latent variable and their respective items. This model assessed if the Perceived Goal Congruence Scale items could be represented as an independent factor separate from the existing P-O fit scales. All models produced satisfactory fit statistics, suggesting: (a) from the 1-factor model, that the Perceived Goal Congruence scale, together with the other fit variables, measured P-O fit, (b) from the 2-factor model, that similarity fit (values congruence, personality congruence, and goal congruence) measured a construct independent of the complementary fit construct, (c) from the 3-factor model, that the Perceived Goal Congruence Scale sits with values congruence and personality congruence as one component of a supplementary fit construct, separate from needs-supplies fit and demands-abilities fit, and (d) from the 5-factor model, that the Perceived Goal Congruence Scale measured a construct independent of the four existing P-O fit scales. Only the 5-factor model achieved this without incorporating correlated error terms. The 2-factor model was consistent with the supplementary and complementary model of fit proposed by Muchinsky and Monahan (1987). The 3-factor model and the 2-factor model have similar fit statistics; supporting the literature that 3-factor model by Kristof (1996) was expanded from the 2-factor model by Muchinsky and Monahan (1987). The 1-factor and 2-factor models represent additional analyses that were not included in the paper accepted by the Journal of Career Assessment.
Chapter 3

P-O Fit as a Mediator between Organisational Support and Self-regulation and Work Outcomes

Overview

The second aim of this research program (i.e., to gain a comprehensive understanding of the relationship among the predictor variables, P-O fit, and the outcome variables) is addressed in this chapter (i.e., Study 2). In Study 2, self-regulation and perceived organisational support were examined as predictors of P-O fit, and predictors of the outcome variables. This study considered self-regulation as the effort internal to the individual and perceived organisational support as the influence from the external environment that could influence how individuals deal with the environmental and P-O fit changes. This study was the first to examine the relationship between self-regulation and P-O fit.

This Study 2 assessed the relationship between the predictor variables (organisational support and self-regulation) and the work outcome variables (job satisfaction, organisational commitment, intention to quit, and job performance), cross-sectionally, and tested the mediation role of P-O fit on this relationship. The study also examined the mediation role of job satisfaction, organisational commitment, and job performance on the relationship between P-O fit and intention to quit.

This study has been accepted for review by the Journal of Personnel Psychology (see Appendix I at the end of this chapter) and will be presented as a conference paper at the 13th European Congress of Psychology in Stockholm, Sweden, 9-12 July 2013 (see Appendix J at the end of this chapter).
Abstract

This study assessed self-regulation and organisational support as the predictor variables to influence the level of P-O fit and explored the mediating role of P-O fit in the relationship between organisational support and self-regulation and work attitudes (job satisfaction and organisational commitment) and work behaviour (job performance). In addition, this study examined the role of job satisfaction, organisational commitment, and job performance in predicting intention to quit. We surveyed 881 employees (88% male; mean age 33 years) from a large-scale, electronic manufacturing company in Indonesia. Our result indicated that organisational support and one measure of self-regulation (i.e., proactive behaviour) predicted P-O fit, P-O fit predicted job satisfaction, organisational commitment, and job performance, and these three variables predicted intention to quit. P-O fit fully mediated the relationship between organisational support and organisational commitment and job performance, and fully mediated between proactive behaviour and organisational commitment, and partially mediated between organisational support and job satisfaction, and partially mediated between proactive behaviour and job satisfaction. Organisational commitment fully mediated between P-O fit and intention to quit.

Keywords: organisational support, self-regulation, P-O fit, job satisfaction, organisational commitment, job performance, intention to quit, Indonesia
Introduction

Previous research has contributed to our understanding of the relationship between person-organisation fit (P-O fit) and work attitudes (e.g., job satisfaction) and work behaviours (e.g., job performance; for reviews see Hoffman & Woehr, 2006; Verquer, Beehr, & Wagner, 2003). However, despite this research, inconsistent relationships have been identified between P-O fit and these outcome variables, and little research has tested whether P-O fit carries the influence of other important variables to work attitudes and behaviours. We utilised a comprehensive assessment of P-O fit (Supeli & Creed, in press), and tested if P-O fit mediated the relationship between person- (operationalized as self-regulation) and contextual-based variables (organisational support) and work attitude (job satisfaction, organisational commitment, intention to quit) and behaviour (job performance).

Person-Organisation Fit

Research into P-O fit has been hampered due to their being multiple conceptualisations and operationalizations of the construct. P-O fit is the compatibility between the individual and the organization that occurs when one party provides what the other needs (i.e., complementary fit), when both parties share similar basic characteristics (supplementary fit), or when both conditions apply (Kristof, 1996). Kristof (1996) proposed three types of fit: supplementary, needs-supplies (organisation meets needs of employee), and demands-abilities fit (employee meets demands of organization). The latter two reflect complementary fit. Recent meta-analyses adopted these definitions (Hoffman & Woehr, 2006; Kristof-Brown, Zimmerman, & Johnson, 2005), although other researchers have assessed a general fit (Saks & Ashforth, 1997), one aspect only of the construct (Cooper-Thomas, Vianen, & Anderson, 2004), or added...
additional domains (Piasentin & Chapman, 2007). Supplementary fit is the most commonly measured, although Kristof (1996) recommended that the full construct be assessed, as different aspects will have different implications for the two parties. To date, few studies have tested multiple types of fit simultaneously.

Additionally, there is little consensus about how P-O fit should be assessed. It has been measured as both perceived and objective fit (Kristof-Brown et al., 2005), with perceived fit being the more strongly correlated with work outcomes (Arthur, Bell, Villado, & Doverspike, 2006). Four types of perceived fit are assessed: values, personality, KSA, and goals (Kristof, 1996), each of which individually shows associations with work outcome variables (Kristof-Brown et al., 2005). Typically, however, studies assess a single type, an incomplete cluster of types (de Lara, 2008) or assess a general construct (Saks & Ashforth, 1997), rather than include all types together. Meta-analyses have dealt with these vagaries by categorising fit as either values or other-fit (Hoffman & Woehr, 2006; Verquer et al., 2003).

Values-fit is the most widely assessed form of supplementary fit (Hoffman & Woehr, 2006). It has a stronger relationship with work attitudes and behaviours than other supplementary types (Kristof-Brown & Jansen, 2007). Personality-fit is used by some researchers, but the relationships here with work outcomes are inconsistent (Westerman & Cyr, 2004; Westerman & Vanka, 2005). KSA-fit has a strong link with performance, reflected in its use in selection processes, and some studies have used it as a measure of demands-abilities fit (Cable & DeRue, 2002). Last, goal-congruence has been used to assess fit between employees and management (Jauch, Osborn, & Terpening, 1980), subordinate and supervisor (Vancouver & Schmitt, 1991), and manager and organization (Bouillon, Ferrier, Stuebs, & West, 2006), but when used,
participants are typically asked to rank the organization’s goals rather than indicate their fit with them (Kristof-Brown & Jansen, 2007). Few studies to date have tested the fit between employee and organizational goals.

Last, there is variability in how the organization is defined, with studies representing it as the employees (Carless, 2005b), the co-workers (Piasentin & Chapman, 2007), as an entity in general (Kim, Cable, & Kim, 2005), and as a combination of employees and entity (Judge & Cable, 1997), all of which can lead to different perceptions of fit. Supeli and Creed (in press) recently developed and validated a scale to assess employee-organisation goal-fit and showed that five types of fit (values, personality, needs-supplies, demands-abilities, and goal) can be represented as a second-order construct. We use this measure to operationalize and assess P-O fit, test the correlates with work attitudes and behaviours, and test two important antecedents of P-O fit: organisational support and individual self-regulation.

Organisational Support

Support represents resources for the individual drawn from the external environment. At work, people deal with problems at the individual, group, and organisation level, and support helps them maintain their levels of well-being and performance (Stroebe, 2000). Support is important as it increases employee’s obligation, affective commitment, and involvement, and reduces intention to leave (Eisenberger, Cummings, Armeli, & Lynch, 1997). It also has positive associations with job performance and citizenship behaviours (Randall, Cropanzano, Bormann, & Birjulin, 1999). Support facilitates and encourages individuals at work to engage with others to deal with problems, makes them feel more valued (Erdogan, Kraimer, & Liden, 2004), and improves P-O fit levels (Janvier, Segers, & Henderickx, 2011).
Relevant to our study, P-O fit partially mediates the relationship between support at work and job satisfaction and organisational commitment (Janvier et al., 2011).

**Self-regulation**

Self-regulation is an adaption-focused, individual resource that is well placed to assist employees manage the demands of modern organisations. Improving self-regulation has positive outcomes for performance and absenteeism (Vancouver & Day, 2005), and helps employees cope with change and manage organisational commitment (Erez & Kanfer, 1983). Self-regulation includes internal self-regulatory processes, external action processes, and processes that allow for dynamic analyses of P-O fit (Wood, 2005). Porath and Bateman (2006) defined self-regulation as those “processes that enable an individual to guide his or her goal-directed activities over time and across changing circumstances, including the modulation of thought, affect and behaviour” (p. 185). These processes are initiated by both internal and external events, such as when an employee has to deal with task challenges or feedback on their performance (Karoly, 1993). We considered self-regulation as a correlate of P-O fit, as it allows employees to respond to change and manage their work lives.

Porath and Bateman (2006) proposed four self-regulatory strategies as important correlates of job attitudes and performance: *feedback seeking, proactive behaviour, emotional control, and social competence*. We assessed these four strategies as antecedents to P-O fit, and as they have been assessed to be associated with job attitudes and performance, also assessed the capacity of P-O fit to mediate between them and our outcome variables.

Feedback seeking informs about the correctness and adequacy of behaviour for attaining desired goals, and affects performance by motivating and directing individuals
toward effective performance strategies. Employees monitor their environment for information about their performance and use inquiry to elicit direct feedback on how they are doing (Porath & Bateman, 2003). Proactive behaviour is reflected in personal initiative, broad self-efficacy, and taking charge, rather than in passively adapting to existing conditions; it allows workers to select and modify environments to achieve better individual performance (Crant, 2000). Emotional control is the ability to regulate emotional communications and nonverbal displays. It facilitates goal achievement by keeping unrelated task concerns and emotions from diverting attention away from immediate responsibilities, and by inhibiting emotional states that may decrease efficiency (Kuhl, 1985). Most research has focused on negative emotional reactions, which can be de-motivating, distracting, and affect learning and performance (Bell & Kozlowski, 2008). Finally, social competence is the ability to interact and work effectively with others (Baron & Markman, 2003). It helps individuals develop work skills, learn role behaviours, achieve better performance, and build friendships and support networks (Porath & Bateman, 2006). To the best of our knowledge, our study is the first to examine the relationship between self-regulation and P-O fit.

Outcomes of P-O Fit

Work attitudes are the most frequently studied outcomes of P-O fit, although it is also related to a range of work behaviours (Kristof-Brown & Jansen, 2007). We assessed the association between P-O fit and three work attitudes (job satisfaction, organisational commitment, and intention to quit) and one measure of job performance. Job satisfaction is the degree to which people feel satisfied with their job (Bowling & Hammond, 2008), while organisational commitment is the “psychological link between the employee and his or her organisation” (Allen & Meyer, 1996; p. 252). Three
domains of commitment (affective, continuance, and normative) have been proposed, although affective commitment has the strongest association with work-related variables (Meyer, Stanley, Herscovitch, & Topolnytsky, 2002). Intentions are the most immediate antecedents to actual behaviour (Ajzen & Fishbein, 1980), and intention to quit one’s organisation reflects an important determinant of such behaviour. P-O fit is positively associated with job satisfaction and organisational commitment, and negatively associated with intention to quit (Kristof-Brown et al., 2005), although as the association with intention to quit is inconsistent, further research is required to clarify this relationship (Vianen, Pater, & Dijk, 2007).

Job performance is the sum of the employee’s effective activities that contribute to the organisation’s core business: these can be direct (e.g., by undertaking a task) or indirect (e.g., providing a service; Borman & Motowidlo, 1997). Job performance is examined widely as an outcome variable in the P-O fit literature, although the results of these studies have been with mixed (Arthur et al., 2006; Hoffman & Woehr, 2006). Kristof (1996) concluded that P-O fit explains significant variance in job performance, but the association is weak. Given these inconsistencies, additional studies are required to clarify these relationships.

The present study

In recent studies, P-O fit has mediated between individual adaptability characteristics and work attitudes such as intention to quit (Wang, Zhan, McCune, & Truxillo, 2011), and mediated between motivation and job performance (Bright, 2007). In addition, P-O fit has mediated between environment characteristics and work attitudes (Janvier et al., 2011) and job performance (Chi & Pan, 2012). However, no study has tested how P-O fit might mediate between self-regulatory resources and work
attitudes or job performance. We tested these relationships and included a measure of environmental resources to assess their relative importance. Additionally, P-O fit is associated with intention to quit, and this relationship mediated by job satisfaction and organisational commitment (Westerman & Cyr, 2004). Job performance is also related to intention to quit (Zimmerman & Darnold, 2009), but no study has tested performance as a mediator between P-O fit and intention to quit. We tested both attitudes and performance as mediators between P-O fit and intention to quit, as no study has assessed work attitudes and job performance together in this context. In summary, we tested organisational support and self-regulation as predictors of work attitudes (job satisfaction, organisational commitment, intention to quit) and job performance, tested P-O fit as a mediator between organisational support and self-regulation and the organisational outcome variables, and tested job satisfaction, organisational commitment, and job performance as mediators between P-O fit and intention to quit. Hypothesised model of this study is presented in Figure 3.1.

Method

Participants

Participants were 881 employees from a large-scale, electronic manufacturing company in Indonesia. Approximately 1000 surveys were distributed via section heads and supervisors: 910 returned a survey (response rate = 91%), although only 881 were usable. There were 776 men (88.1%) and 105 women, whose mean age was 33 years (SD = 8.6). Two hundred and twelve (24.1%) had a university degree, 183 (20.8%) had post-high school qualifications (mainly technical college), 439 (49.8%) were senior high school graduates, 40 (4.5%) had completed junior high school, and seven (0.8%) had completed elementary school. The majority (499; 56.6%) were operators and
Figure 3.1. Hypothesized model. P-O fit mediates the relationship between organisational support and self-regulation and job satisfaction, organisational commitment, and job performance; and job satisfaction, organisational commitment, and job performance mediate the relationship between P-O fit and intention to quit.
clerical workers, 242 (27.5%) were supervisors, and 124 (14.1%) were middle or top
level managers (16, or 1.8%, did not answer this question). Average tenure was 10.8
years ($SD = 7.4$; range < 1 to 36 years), average total work experience was 11.5 years
($SD = 7.8$; range < 1 to 36 years), and average hours worked per week was 42.9 ($SD =
7.4$; range 8 to > 50 hours).

**Measures**

All measures were translated into the Indonesian language using the standard
translation and back-translation methodology (Brislin, 1970). Unless indicated
otherwise, all items were answered on a 6-point Likert-like scale with end-points of 1 = *strongly disagree* and 6 = *strongly disagree*. Score were summed to provide a total, with
higher scores reflecting a higher level of a construct.

**P-O fit.** We assessed values congruence, personality congruence, goal
congruence, needs-supplies fit, and demands-abilities fit. For some items, we made
minor changes so that they referred to the organisation rather than the job. Three 3-item
scales by Cable and DeRue (2002) were used to assess *values congruence* (“The things
that I value in life are very similar to the things that my organisation values”), *needs-
supplies fit* (“There is a good fit between what my organisation offers me and what I am
looking for in an organisation”), and *demands-abilities fit* (“There is a good match
between the demands of this organisation and my personal skills”). The authors reported
alphas of .91, .89, and .89, respectively, and showed that the three scales correlated with
other organisational constructs (i.e., organisational identification, citizenship
behaviours), in the expected directions. *Personality congruence* was measured using a
3-item scale devised by Judge and Cable (1997; “My personality matches this
organisation’s personality”). Judge and Cable reported an alpha of .80, and supported
validity by testing associations with organisational attractiveness. Finally, goal congruence was measured using three items devised by Supeli and Creed (in press; “My personal goals match the goals of this organisation”). These authors reported an alpha of .88 for six items, and supported validity by showing goal congruence was positively associated with job satisfaction and negatively associated with intention to quit. Supeli and Creed showed that these five fit constructs could be represented by a second-order factor. After our confirmatory factor analysis, we deleted one personality item that had a low factor loading. Alpha for the 14 items was .91.

Organisational support. This was measured using four items from the Survey of Perceived Organizational Support Scale developed by Eisenberger, Huntington, Hutchison, and Sowa (1986). Two negative and two positively worded items were selected based on high factor loadings in the factor analysis reported by the authors (e.g., “This organisation really cares about my well-being”). Short forms of this scale have been used in other fit studies (e.g., Dawley, Houghton, & Bucklew, 2010), where alphas were reported at > .80 and the scale correlated in the expected directions with turnover intention. Alpha in our study = .83.

Self-regulation. We used four scales recommended by Porath and Bateman (2006): feedback seeking and emotional control (strategies to regulate internal aspects of the individual) and proactive behaviour and social competence (for regulating aspects external to the individual).

Feedback seeking was measured using the four highest loading items from the Feedback Seeking Scale (Callister, Kramer, & Turban, 1999; “I ask my supervisor if I am meeting all my job requirements”). A short form of this scale has been used in recent work-related studies (e.g., De Stobbeleir, Ashford, & Buyen, 2011), where sound
reliability was reported and construct validity was demonstrated by factor analysis and testing the correlates with creative performance. Alpha in our study = .70.

*Proactive behaviour* was measured using the five highest loading items from the Proactive Personality Scale (Bateman & Crant, 1993; “Where ever I have been, I have been a powerful force for constructive change”). The authors reported an alpha of .89 for the full scale, and tested validity using factor analysis. A short form has been used in other fit studies (e.g., Erdogan & Bauer, 2005). Alpha in our study = .69.

*Emotion control* was measured using five items from the Emotional Control Scale, which was adapted by Porath and Bateman (2006) from a scale developed by Kuhl (1985; “I can manage my mood so that my work flows easily”). Porath and Bateman reported an alpha of .80, and demonstrated validity by assessing the relationship with other study variables. Alpha in our study = .88.

*Social competence* was measured using the 5-item social adaptability factor of the Social Competence Scale (Baron & Markman, 2003; “I can talk to anybody about almost anything”). Porath and Bateman reported an alpha of .85. Alpha in our study = .88.

*Job satisfaction.* This was assessed using the 3-item scale from the Michigan Organizational Assessment Questionnaire (see Bowling & Hammond, 2008). We modified one item to minimise bias associated with assessing satisfaction with the organisation rather than satisfaction with the job. Sample item = “In general, I like doing my job”. Internal reliability for the scale has been reported as .84 (.71 in this study), with validity supported by showing it to be related to workplace variables in the expected directions.
**Organisational commitment.** This was measured using the four highest loading items from the affective commitment domain of the Organizational Commitment Scale (Allen & Meyer, 1990). Affective commitment has been shown to have the strongest relationship with work-related variables and to be a valid indicator of organisational commitment (Maurer & Lippstreu, 2008). Sample item = “I don’t feel like ‘part of the family’ in this organisation”. Alpha for the full scale was .82; for the four items it was .69.

**Job performance.** This was measured using the four highest loading items from the Task Performance Scale developed by Goodman and Svyantek (1999). A sample item was “I demonstrate expertise in all my job-related tasks”. These authors reported an alpha of .93. Short forms of this scale have been used successfully in other work-related studies, where construct validity has been demonstrated by assessing the relationship with work engagement (Gorgievski, Bakker, & Schaufeli, 2010). Alpha for the four items was .84.

**Intention to quit.** We used the 3-item scale from the Michigan Organizational Assessment Questionnaire (Cammann et al., 1983). Sample item = “I often think about quitting this job”. Cammann et al. (1983) reported an internal reliability of .83 (.87 in this study). This scale has been widely used, and in support of validity, has been found to have negative relationships with organisational commitment (Bishop, Scott, & Burroughs, 2000).

**Procedure**

We obtained ethical approval and received agreement from the participating company to undertake the study. All permanent employees were invited to complete an anonymous survey and return it to the first researcher in a sealed envelope. No
individual incentives were offered, but we did provide a report to the company summarising the aggregated results. The data reported in this study form one part of a larger research project examining person-organisational fit (see Supeli & Creed, in press). Data analysis involved (a) testing a measurement model containing all latent variables, (b) testing the structural model, and (c) testing for mediation using the bias-corrected bootstrap method (Shrout & Bolger, 2002). This procedure involves testing two structural models: one that tests direct effects only, and one that tests both direct and indirect effects together. Mediation is established when the predictor is associated with the outcome, the mediator is associated with the predictor and the outcome, and the association between the predictor and the outcome is reduced to zero (full mediation) or reduced significantly (partial mediation) when the mediator is included (Baron & Kenny, 1986). We used 1000 replacement samples to estimate the standard errors and 95% bias-corrected confidence intervals (CIs). Mediation occurs when the 95% CIs do not include zero.

Results

All analyses were conducted using maximum likelihood estimation in AMOS 19. For fit statistics, we report: chi-square ($\chi^2$), normed chi-square ($\chi^2/df$), Goodness-of-Fit Index (GFI), Comparative Fit Index (CFI), and Root Mean Square Error of Approximation (RMSEA), with the following cut-off values based on a large sample and observed variables > 30: $\chi^2$ with significant $p$-value, $\chi^2/df$ between 1 and 3, CFI > .90, GFI > .90, and RMSEA < .07 (Hair, Black, Babin, & Anderson, 2010). See Table 3.1 for summary data for all variables.
Table 3.1

Mean, Standard Deviation, Range, and Mid-point for all Variables (N = 881)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Range</th>
<th>Mid-point</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Feedback seeking</td>
<td>16.60</td>
<td>3.26</td>
<td>4-24</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proactive behaviour</td>
<td>23.10</td>
<td>3.25</td>
<td>5-30</td>
<td>17.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotional control</td>
<td>23.74</td>
<td>3.04</td>
<td>10-30</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social competence</td>
<td>22.27</td>
<td>3.64</td>
<td>10-30</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-O fit</td>
<td>59.54</td>
<td>10.23</td>
<td>23-84</td>
<td>53.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organisational</td>
<td>18.34</td>
<td>3.26</td>
<td>4-24</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>commitment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job satisfaction</td>
<td>13.61</td>
<td>2.44</td>
<td>3-18</td>
<td>10.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job performance</td>
<td>18.91</td>
<td>2.49</td>
<td>8-24</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intention to quit</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>3.38</td>
<td>3-18</td>
<td>10.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Measurement Model

Individual items were used to represent all latent variables, except for P-O fit, where the items were allocated to three parcels using an item-to-construct balance approach (i.e., assigning highest and lowest loading items across parcels; Little, Cunningham, Shahar, & Widaman, 2002). The measurement model was based on the variables reported in Figure 3.1 with the exception that self-regulation was represented by four latent variables. The ten latent variables were self-regulation (feedback seeking, proactive behaviour, emotional control, and social competence), organisational support, P-O fit, job satisfaction, organisational commitment, job performance, and intention to quit. All latent variables were allowed to freely covary. The fit statistics for this model were good, $\chi^2(686) = 1771.08, p < .001, \chi^2/df = 2.58$, GFI = .91, CFI = .94, RMSEA = .04, and all correlations were consistent with the bivariate correlations (see Table 3.2).
Table 3.2

Correlations among all Study Variables (N = 881)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Feedback seeking</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>.24***</td>
<td>.28***</td>
<td>.18***</td>
<td>.20***</td>
<td>.16***</td>
<td>.22***</td>
<td>-.08*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Proactive behaviour</td>
<td>.26***</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>.37***</td>
<td>-.00</td>
<td>.19***</td>
<td>.15***</td>
<td>.40***</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Emotional control</td>
<td>.21***</td>
<td>.61***</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>.26***</td>
<td>.33***</td>
<td>.29***</td>
<td>.35***</td>
<td>.49***</td>
<td>-.24***</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Social competence</td>
<td>.29***</td>
<td>.52***</td>
<td>.65***</td>
<td>.20***</td>
<td>.32***</td>
<td>.21***</td>
<td>.27***</td>
<td>.41***</td>
<td>-.19***</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Organisational support</td>
<td>.22***</td>
<td>.16***</td>
<td>.37***</td>
<td>.31***</td>
<td>.62***</td>
<td>.54***</td>
<td>.51***</td>
<td>.11**</td>
<td>-.55***</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. P-O fit</td>
<td>.20***</td>
<td>.20***</td>
<td>.36***</td>
<td>.38***</td>
<td>.75***</td>
<td>.52***</td>
<td>.57***</td>
<td>.35***</td>
<td>-.50***</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Organisational commitment</td>
<td>.11*</td>
<td>.31***</td>
<td>.35***</td>
<td>.31***</td>
<td>.70***</td>
<td>.63***</td>
<td>.54***</td>
<td>.24***</td>
<td>-.53***</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Job satisfaction</td>
<td>.17***</td>
<td>.38***</td>
<td>.43***</td>
<td>.34***</td>
<td>.67***</td>
<td>.63***</td>
<td>.63***</td>
<td>.33***</td>
<td>-.59***</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Job performance</td>
<td>.21***</td>
<td>.61***</td>
<td>.56***</td>
<td>.49***</td>
<td>.19***</td>
<td>.38***</td>
<td>.38***</td>
<td>.40***</td>
<td>-.18***</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Intention to quit</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>-.12**</td>
<td>-.26***</td>
<td>-.19***</td>
<td>-.61***</td>
<td>-.50***</td>
<td>-.50***</td>
<td>-.68***</td>
<td>-.19***</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. Zero order correlations reported above diagonal; latent variables correlations reported below diagonal.

* p < .05, ** p < .01, *** p < .001.
Structural Model

To analyse the structural model, the respecification approach by Kline (2011) was followed. This approach utilises model trimming and model building, and is appropriate when based on a priori hypotheses that are theoretically driven. Model trimming involves the removal of non-significant pathways; model building involves the post hoc addition of statistically-driven significant pathways that are plausible and consistent with theory. The first test of the hypothesized model produced a less than satisfactory fit, $\chi^2(710) = 2398.27$, $p < .001$, $\chi^2/df = 3.38$, GFI = .87, CFI = .90, RMSEA = .05. Three pathways were not significant and were deleted: feedback seeking to P-O fit, emotional control to P-O fit, and social competence to P-O fit. The modification indices identified that one additional pathway (from proactive behaviour to job performance) should be added. As proactive behaviour has been found previously to be associated with job performance (Crant, 2000), this pathway was added. These respecifications were progressively tested, resulting in a final model (see Figure 3.2) that generated a good fit, $\chi^2(704) = 1789.73$, $p < .001$, $\chi^2/df = 2.54$, GFI = .91, CFI = .94, RMSEA = .04. In this model, organisational support and proactive behaviour accounted for 60.5% of the variance in P-O fit, P-O fit accounted for 31.0% of job satisfaction and 31.4% of organisational commitment, P-O fit and proactive behaviour accounted for 49.0% of job performance, and job satisfaction, organisational commitment, and job performance accounted for 49.0% in intention to quit.

Mediation

Nine potential mediation paths were tested: P-O fit mediating between support and job satisfaction, organisational commitment, and job satisfaction; P-O fit mediating
between proactive behaviour and the same variables; and job satisfaction, organisational commitment, and job performance mediating between P-O fit and intention to quit.

**P-O fit as mediator.** When testing the direct effects, organisational support and proactive behaviour were both associated with job satisfaction ($\beta = .63$ and $.27, p < .001$, respectively), organisational commitment ($\beta = .69$ and $.19, p < .001$), and job performance ($\beta = .13$ and $.67, p < .001$), which met the first criterion of mediation. When the direct and indirect paths were tested together, organisational support ($\beta = .72, p < .001$) and proactive behaviour ($\beta = .21, p < .001$) predicted P-O fit, and P-O fit predicted job satisfaction ($\beta = 1.30, p < .001$), organisational commitment ($\beta = .76, p < .001$), and job performance ($\beta = .23, p < .001$), confirming that the predictors were associated with the mediator and the mediator was associated with the outcome variables, meeting the second criterion of mediation. All the result in more detail can be seen in Table 3.3 in Appendix K at the end of this chapter.

When the indirect paths were assessed, the CIs for all indirect association between organisational support and proactive behaviour and the outcome variables did not contain zero, confirming the third criterion for mediation. The association between organisational support and organisational commitment and job performance, and the association between proactive behaviour and organisational commitment, were no longer significant after the mediator was included, indicating full mediation by P-O fit. The association between organisational support and job satisfaction, and between proactive behaviour and job satisfaction were still significant after the mediator was included, indicating partial mediation by P-O fit. For the association between proactive behaviour and job performance, there was no change to the association when the mediator was included, indicating no mediation effect.
Figure 3.2. Final structural model, with standardised regression weights reported. P-O fit fully mediated the relationship between organisational support and organisational commitment and job performance, and between proactive behaviour and organisational commitment, and partially mediated the relationship between organisational support and job satisfaction, and between proactive behaviour and job satisfaction. Organisational commitment fully mediated the association between P-O fit and intention to quit.
Job satisfaction, organisational commitment, and job performance as mediators. Using the same procedures, we tested job satisfaction, organisational commitment, and job performance as mediators between P-O fit and intention to quit. The direct path from P-O fit to intention to quit was significant ($\beta = -.12, p < .01$). P-O fit predicted job satisfaction ($\beta = .94, p < .001$), organisational commitment ($\beta = 1.04, p < .001$), and job performance ($\beta = .18, p < .001$), and job satisfaction and organisational commitment predicted intention to quit ($\beta = -.63$ and $- .68, p < .001$, respectively), but there was no association between job performance and intention to quit ($\beta = .07, p = .08$).

When we examined the paths with the mediators included and checked the CIs, organisational commitment fully mediated between P-O fit and intention to quit, but there were no effects for job satisfaction or job performance. All results for this mediation are presented in Appendix L (Table 3.4) at the end of this chapter.

Discussion

We (a) tested the hypothesized relationships reported in Figure 3.1, (b) tested P-O fit as a mediator between organisational support and self-regulation and work attitudes (job satisfaction, organisational commitment, intention to quit) and job performance, and (c) tested job satisfaction, organisational commitment, and job performance as mediators between P-O fit and intention to quit.

Consistent with previous research (Janvier et al., 2011), we found organisational support to be positively associated with P-O fit, suggesting that perceptions of the organisation as supportive is associated with a better connection to the organisation. Of the four self-regulatory domains examined (feedback seeking, emotion control, social competence, and proactive behaviour) only proactive behaviour was associated with P-O fit levels, suggesting here that being more proactive in the relationship with one’s
organisation is also associated with a better fit. Organisational support and proactive behaviour in concert accounted for more than half of the variance in P-O fit, suggesting that both external supports and internal resources play a part when fitting in to one’s work setting, which is consistent with interactional principles (Terborg, 1981). While our study was cross-sectional, the results suggest that P-O fit might be improved when the organisation implements strategies that, on the one hand, provide and demonstrate support for the individual, and, on the other, allow for the expression of individual proactivity on the job.

There were direct relationships between P-O fit and job satisfaction, organisational commitment, job performance, and intention to quit, which is in line with previous studies that have demonstrated that P-O fit predicts work attitudes (Verquer et al., 2003) and job performance (Hoffman & Woehr, 2006). In terms of mediation, P-O fit fully mediated the relationship between organisational support and organisational commitment, and partially mediated the relationship between organisational support and job satisfaction. These results are also in line with previous studies (Janvier et al., 2011), and suggest that both organisational support and P-O fit are important factors in promoting organisational commitment and job satisfaction. In addition, P-O fit fully mediated the relationship between organisational support and job performance. This is an important finding. The present study has contributed to the P-O fit literature by demonstrating that the previously understood association between organisational support and job performance (e.g., Randall et al., 1999) disappears when P-O fit is taken into consideration. This finding suggests that organisational support is important as it improves P-O fit, which in turn facilitates improved job performance. This has practical implications as it suggests that organisations could focus their support strategies on
improving P-O fit, rather than assuming they will have a direct effect on their employees’ job performance.

P-O fit also fully mediated the relationship between proactive behaviour and organisational commitment. This finding contributes to both the self-regulation and P-O fit literatures, as this was the first test of these associations. These results clarify the integrative model developed by Crant (2000), which proposed that proactive behaviour improves organisational commitment, but suggests also that the relationship disappears when P-O fit is included. A practical implication of this finding is that organisations, when fostering independent and autonomous behaviours, should make the connection with P-O fit for employees, rather than assuming that such strategies will have a direct effect on commitment. There was a partial mediation effect for P-O fit on the relationship between proactive behaviour and job satisfaction, which contributes to the self-regulation and fit literatures. The assumption here is that proactive individuals work to improve their fit, and that as a consequence of better fit, they also are more satisfied with their job. Consistent with this, Li et al. (2010) found that proactive employees tended to create a more conducive situation for themselves, which led them to feel more personally successful at work. Our finding might explain the finding of Erdogan and Bauer (2005), who failed to demonstrate that P-O fit moderated between proactive behaviour and job satisfaction.

Contrary to our expectations, P-O fit did not mediate between proactive behaviour and job performance, despite there being a strong, direct association between proactive behaviour and job performance. This finding is consistent with Crant’s (2000) integrative model, which suggests that one of the outcomes of proactive behaviour at work is improved job performance. This finding also suggests that proactive behaviour
has a stronger association with job performance than does P-O fit. Thus, while proactive employees might work on their fit with the organisation, which in turn increases their satisfaction and commitment, this might not lead to increased performance. In our study, P-O fit had a weak relationship with job performance, which might reflect the low levels of autonomy that production workers have in the company tested (i.e., no matter what level of fit, job performance needs to be maintained); however, being proactive seemed to bring performance benefits. From this, organisations should enhance proactivity as this has a strong direct effect on performance.

P-O fit was negatively associated with intention to quit, but this relationship was fully mediated by organisational commitment; that is, reduced levels of fit were associated with less commitment, which in turn, was associated with a stronger intention to quit. These results are consistent with previous fit studies (Arthur et al., 2006; Janvier et al., 2011). Additionally, job performance and job satisfaction had direct associations with intention to quit, but neither variable mediated the relationship between P-O fit and intention to quit. This suggests that to reduce employees’ intention to quit, job satisfaction and perceptions of performance should be dealt with directly, rather than through P-O fit. Finally, consistent with other research (e.g., Zimmerman & Darnold, 2009), job performance was only weakly associated with intention to quit, suggesting that job satisfaction and commitment are more important to wanting to leave an organisation than one’s perceived productivity. It is possible that this finding reflects local cultural factors, where the average company tenure of respondents was more than ten years. Employees in this study, in contrast to workers in Western countries, might have a strong social contract with their employer and do not expect to leave the organisation, reflecting more of a “job-for-life”.
Contrary to expectations, there were no pathways from feedback seeking, emotional control, and social competence to P-O fit. There are several possible explanations for this. First, from the descriptive statistics, most respondents used the monitoring feedback seeking strategy, rather than the inquiry strategy, perhaps indicating that the employees may not be getting timely or appropriate information, or the information may be inaccurate. Reliance on monitoring is consistent with collectivist cultural values that reinforce modesty, avoiding shame, and censure asking directly about oneself (Hofstede, 1984). Thus, feedback may not be related to P-O fit and the other variables, as it is not sought in the same way as in other countries. Second, cultural values might also explain the null effect for emotional control. In the Indonesian culture, people are not encouraged to express their feeling freely, especially in work and formal situations. Indonesians, for example, would not be expected to state their disagreement or offer their opinion assertively. Third, all employees worked in an electronic manufacturing company, which has standard operation procedures that have to be followed by all employees. These procedures also regulate many of the individual relationships at work, for example, who can talk with whom, and when. Most participants were machine operators, and could not interact while they were working, in part to avoid distraction and to minimise accidents. Thus, social competence at work might not make a significant contribution to improving the P-O fit level in this study.

Concluding Remarks

As with all studies, our results need to be considered in the light of their limitations. First, cultural factors affect the way people behave and respond, and can be expected to have influenced the results of our study. While the study does provide valuable insight into the relationships among the variables in a collectivist culture, it
does limit the generalisation of results to other contexts. Second, the study was cross-sectional, and while a plausible directional model was proposed, correlational data cannot tease out causal associations (i.e., there is the possibility of reversed or bidirectional pathways). Some researchers have suggested that P-O fit comes before proactive behaviour (Kim, Cable, & Kim, 2005), whereas we argued that this personality-based variable was a distal antecedent to attitudes and performance. Third, all measures were based on self-report, which might have been affected by perceptual frame and/or other biases, such as the need to present one’s behaviour and emotion in a more positive light, and might have contributed to inflated associations amongst our variables, although the use of latent variable analysis does reduce some concerns about biased path estimates.

Despite these limitations, our expanded model had much to recommend it. First, it has filled several voids identified in previous fit studies. Second, it demonstrated a good fit with the data that were collected, and thus, there can be some confidence in the results. Third, the sample was relatively large and representative of employees from operators to management. Fourth, a meaningful amount of variance was explained in P-O fit (61%), job satisfaction and organisational commitment (both 31%), and job performance and intention to quit (both 49%). Finally, the study contributed to a better understanding of the relationship that fit has with internal resources and contextual supports, on the one hand, and work attitudes and performance, on the other.
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**Appendix K**

P-O Fit Mediation Analysis

Table 3.3

*Paths Estimates of P-O fit as Mediator, including Standard Errors, and 95% CI; N=881*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model Paths</th>
<th>Estimate&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th>β&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th>SE&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th>95% CI Lower</th>
<th>95% CI Upper</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Model 1: Direct effect model</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct effect</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organisational support → job satisfaction ***</td>
<td>.49</td>
<td>.63</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.41</td>
<td>.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organisational support → org. commitment ***</td>
<td>.72</td>
<td>.69</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.60</td>
<td>.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organisational support → job performance ***</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proactive behaviour → job satisfaction ***</td>
<td>.57</td>
<td>.27</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.33</td>
<td>.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proactive behaviour → org. commitment ***</td>
<td>.54</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.26</td>
<td>.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proactive behaviour → job performance ***</td>
<td>1.17</td>
<td>.67</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.79</td>
<td>1.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Model 2: Indirect effect model</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct effect</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organisational support → P-O fit ***</td>
<td>3.15</td>
<td>.72</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>2.81</td>
<td>3.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-O fit → job satisfaction ***</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td>1.30</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organisational support → job satisfaction *</td>
<td>-.23</td>
<td>-.30</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>-.59</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organisational support → P-O fit ***</td>
<td>3.09</td>
<td>.70</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>2.72</td>
<td>3.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-O fit → org. commitment ***</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>.76</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organisational support → org. commitment **</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organisational support → P-O fit ***</td>
<td>3.11</td>
<td>.71</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>2.75</td>
<td>3.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-O fit → job performance ***</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organisational support → job performance **</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>-.14</td>
<td>.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proactive behaviour → P-O fit ***</td>
<td>2.47</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>1.63</td>
<td>3.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-O fit → job satisfaction ***</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>.88</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proactive behaviour → job satisfaction *</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proactive behaviour → P-O fit ***</td>
<td>2.80</td>
<td>.24</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>1.88</td>
<td>4.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-O fit → organisational commitment ***</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td>.98</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proactive behaviour → org. commitment **</td>
<td>-.15</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>-.48</td>
<td>.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proactive behaviour → P-O fit ***</td>
<td>2.65</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>1.75</td>
<td>4.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-O fit → job performance ***</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proactive behaviour → job performance ***</td>
<td>1.08</td>
<td>.62</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.71</td>
<td>1.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Indirect effect via P-O fit</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organisational support → job satisfaction **</td>
<td>.72</td>
<td>.93</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>.47</td>
<td>1.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organisational support → org. commitment **</td>
<td>.55</td>
<td>.53</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.32</td>
<td>.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organisational support → job performance **</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proactive behaviour → job satisfaction **</td>
<td>.38</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.24</td>
<td>.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proactive behaviour → org. commitment **</td>
<td>.65</td>
<td>.24</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.40</td>
<td>1.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proactive behaviour → job performance **</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. β = standardised estimates; SE = standardised standard error; CI = unstandardized confidence interval.

<sup>a</sup> Maximum likelihood estimates.  
<sup>b</sup> 1000 Bootstrapped samples.

* p < .05. ** p < .01. *** p < .001
Appendix L

Work Outcome Variables Mediation Analysis

Table 3.4

Paths Estimates of Job Satisfaction, Organisational Commitment, and Job Performance as Simple Mediators, including Standard Errors, and 95% Confidence Intervals; N=881

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model Paths</th>
<th>Estimate&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th>β</th>
<th>SE&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th>95% CI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Lower</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Model 1: Direct effect model</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct effect</td>
<td>P-O fit → intention to quit**</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>-.12</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Model 2: Indirect effect model</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct effect</td>
<td>P-O fit → job satisfaction ***</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>.94</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Job satisfaction → intention to quit ***</td>
<td>-1.15</td>
<td>-.63</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P-O fit → intention to quit ***</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>-.15</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P-O fit → organisational commitment ***</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td>1.04</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Org.commitment → intention to quit ***</td>
<td>-1.00</td>
<td>-.68</td>
<td>.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P-O fit → intention to quit ns</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P-O fit → job performance ***</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Job performance → intention to quit ns</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P-O fit → intention to quit ***</td>
<td>-.15</td>
<td>-.51</td>
<td>.04</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Indirect effect via moderators**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Estimate&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th>β</th>
<th>SE&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th>95% CI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Lower</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P-O fit → job satisfaction → intention to quit **</td>
<td>-.18</td>
<td>-.58</td>
<td>.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P-O fit → org. commitment → intention to quit **</td>
<td>-.22</td>
<td>-.69</td>
<td>.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P-O fit → job performance → intention to quit ns</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. β = standardised estimates; SE = standardized standard error; CI = unstandardized confidence interval.

<sup>a</sup> Maximum likelihood estimates. <sup>b</sup> 1000 Bootstrapped samples.

** p < .01. *** p < .001. ns = non-significant
Chapter 4

The Longitudinal Relationship between Organisational Support, Self-regulation, and Work Outcome Variables: The Mediating Role of Person-Organisation Fit

Overview

This chapter reports Study 3, which assessed the longitudinal relationships among the predictor variables (organisational support and self-regulation), P-O fit, and the work outcome variables (job satisfaction, organisational commitment, intention to quit, and job performance), to test whether changes in the predictor variables were associated with changes in P-O fit and the work outcome variables across time, and to assess the various causal models (e.g., cross-lagged, reverse-causation, reciprocal) of the relationships between the predictor variables, P-O fit, and outcome variables across time.

Most of the empirical P-O fit studies have been based on cross-sectional designs. In addition, where longitudinal designs have been used, they have not always used the same measures at all waves of data collection. Despite the advantages of using longitudinal design and utilising the same measures at all points in time, only a few P-O studies have done this. Study 3 represents one of the few to use this type of longitudinal design utilising the same measures at both points in time. This allows for testing of the different possible causal associations among the research variables; that is, normal, reversed, or reciprocal relationships. In addition, the variables of age and tenure were included as control variables. This study was important to gain a comprehensive picture about the relationship among research variables across time.

This study has been accepted for review by the European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology (see Appendix M at the end of this chapter).
Abstract

We surveyed 680 employees from a large-scale, electronic manufacturing company in Indonesia (87% men; average age = 33 years) at two points in time approximately six months apart. We tested (a) whether changes in organisational support and self-regulation resulted in changes in P-O fit levels, (b) whether changes in P-O fit levels resulted in changes in job satisfaction, organisational commitment, job performance, and intention to quit, (c) whether changes in P-O fit mediated between changes in the antecedent variables and changes in outcome variables, and (d) whether changes in job satisfaction, organisational commitment, and job performance mediated between changes in P-O fit and changes in intention to quit. We found that changes in organisational support and self-regulation (proactive behaviour) over time were associated with changes in organisational commitment and intention to quit over time, and that change in P-O fit was a partial mediator in these relationships.

Keywords: P-O fit; organisational support; self-regulation; work attitudes, work behaviours
Introduction

Due to the limitations of cross-sectional designs in determining causal relationships, there has been an increase in popularity of longitudinal studies in applied psychology as these allow researchers to assess whether relationships change or remain stable across time (Zapf, Dorman, & Frese, 1996), and assess the strength and direction of the relationship among variables of interest (i.e., whether the relationships are standard causal, reversed, or reciprocal; de Lange et al., 2004). Specifically in relation to P-O fit studies, Kristof-Brown and Jansen (2007) recommended that researchers assess P-O fit over time as neither person nor organisational variables are stable: work environments change when new policies, structures, or technologies are implemented, and individuals experience changes in interests, values, aspirations, and priorities as they learn and develop. We examined P-O fit over time by (a) testing whether changes in important antecedents to P-O fit (organisational support and self-regulation) resulted in changes in P-O fit levels; (b) testing whether changes in P-O fit levels resulted in changes in work outcome variables (job satisfaction, organisational commitment, job performance, and intention to quit); (c) testing whether changes in P-O fit mediated between changes in the antecedent variables and changes in outcome variables; and (d) testing whether changes in job satisfaction, organisational commitment, and job performance mediated between changes in P-O fit and changes in intention to quit. See Figure 4.1.
Figure 4.1. Hypothesized model. Organisational support and self-regulation predict P-O fit; P-O fit predicts job satisfaction, organisational commitment, job performance, and intention to quit; and job satisfaction, organisational commitment, and job performance predict intention to quit. P-O fit mediates between organisational support, self-regulation, and job satisfaction, organisational commitment, and job performance; and job satisfaction, organisational commitment, and job performance mediate between P-O fit and intention to quit.
P-O Fit

P-O fit is the compatibility between the individual and the organization that occurs when both parties share similar basic characteristics (supplementary fit), when one party provides what the other needs (complementary fit: comprising needs/supplies fit where the organisation meets the needs of the employee, and demands-abilities fit where the employee meets the demands of the organization), or when both conditions apply (Kristof, 1996). Supplementary fit is the construct most commonly assessed in P-O fit studies, using single measures or combinations of values-congruence, personality-congruence, knowledge-skills-ability-congruence, or goals-congruence (Kristof-Brown, Zimmerman, & Johnson, 2005). P-O fit is associated with important workplace attitudes and behaviours. Kristof-Brown et al. (2005) found moderate correlations (corrected for measurement error) between P-O fit and job satisfaction (.44), organisational commitment (.51), and intention to quit (-.35), and smaller correlations with task (.13) and contextual performance (.27). However, while P-O fit is an important correlate of workplace outcomes (Hoffman & Woehr, 2006; Kristof-Brown et al., 2005; Verquer, Beehr, & Wagner, 2003), almost all studies examining the construct have been cross-sectional in nature (Kristof-Brown & Jansen, 2007).

When P-O fit has been assessed longitudinally as a precursor to work attitudes and behaviours, improvements in P-O fit over time were associated with improvements in job satisfaction and organisational commitment and reductions in intention to quit and actual turnover (Cable & Judge, 1996; Chatman, 1991; O’Reilly, Chatman, & Caldwell, 1991; Saks & Ashforth, 1997). Improvements in P-O fit (measured as values congruence) also predicted improvements in organisational identification and citizenship behaviours and declines in turnover intention, and (when measured as needs-
supplies fit) was related to improvements in job satisfaction, career satisfaction, and occupational commitment, although P-O fit (as demands-abilities fit) did not predict improvements in job performance (Cable & DeRue, 2002). Recently, Schmitt, Oswald, Friede, Imus, and Meritt (2008) showed that increases in P-O fit predicted improvements in academic satisfaction, organisational citizenship behaviours, and intention to quit, and were also associated with reductions in absenteeism.

When the antecedents to P-O fit have been assessed longitudinally, improvements in P-O fit were associated with organisational socialisation (Cable & Parsons, 2001; Chatman, 1991) and formal job information sources (Cable & DeRue, 2002), although some socialisation tactics were associated with poorer levels of P-O fit and with employees leaving the organisation (Cable & Parsons, 2001). Job search and career planning has predicted pre-entry perceptions of P-O fit, although not post-entry levels, and pre-entry levels of P-O fit were strong predictors of post-entry levels (Saks & Ashforth, 2002). Salient to our study, P-O fit also has been found to mediate between organisational socialisation and work attitudes (job satisfaction and organisational commitment; Cooper-Thomas, Vianen, & Anderson, 2004), and P-O fit has been shown to be mediated by job satisfaction when intention to quit was examined as the workplace outcome (Schmitt et al., 2008).

Kristof-Brown and Jansen (2007) noted that “behaviour over time is a function of change in the person over time and change in the environment over time” (p. 144). In organisational settings, changes in the work environment place demands on employees and employees need to adapt and changes in order to stay competitive, and the reverse is true, organisation must adapt to the changing mores, expectations, and aspirations of their employees as well as adapt to changes in their business environment. Thus, in
keeping with the basic principles of interactional psychology regarding the multi-directional interaction between people and their organisation in dealing with changing situations (Terborg, 1981), we focused on the personal resources of individuals and the support they receive from their environment. We assessed two potential antecedents to P-O fit, one environmental (organisational support) and one person-based (self-regulation), and assessed both work attitudes (job satisfaction, organisational commitment, and intention to quit) and work behaviours (job performance) as outcomes of P-O fit.

**Organisational Support**

Support from others is an important environmental resource that assists individuals to maintain their performance while dealing with work-related problems. Support comes from work (e.g., supervisor and colleagues) and non-work domains (e.g., family, friends; Elfering, Semmer, Schade, Grund, & Boos, 2002). In the work domain, perceived organisational support is considered important as the employee’s obligation, commitment, and involvement can be increased, and their intention to leave the organisation reduced (Eisenberger, Cummings, Armeli, & Lynch, 1997; Lee, Lee, & Lum, 2008), although some studies have found negative results for work-based support, suggesting that some types of support imply incompetence and/or lack of confidence (Deelstra, Peeters, Schaufeli, Stroebe, Zijlstra, & van Doornen, 2003). In P-O fit studies, support at work has been found to facilitate and encourage individuals to communicate and collaborate with others in dealing with work-related difficulties and to make individuals feel valued at work (Erdoğan, Kraimer, & Liden, 2004). Thus, we expected organisational support to be positively related to P-O fit, work attitudes, and work behaviours.
**Self-regulation**

Self-regulation enables individuals to guide their goal-directed activities over time and across changing environments (Karoly, 1993), and is comprised of both internal and transactional processes, which constitute dynamic mechanisms for managing internal and contextual responses to changes in the environment (Wood, 2005). Self-regulatory processes are initiated when individuals have to deal with task challenges, when routine responses are no longer functional, when challenging feedback is received on performance, when external incentives are at risk, or when goal achievement is thwarted (Karoly, 1993). Self-regulation is an important research topic in the organisational psychology literature. Interventions based on self-regulation principles have been found to influence relevant organisational outcomes, such as increasing performance and reducing absenteeism (Vancouver & Day, 2005), and are useful when employees have to cope with change and to manage the commitment to organisational goals (Erez & Kanfer, 1983).

Porath and Bateman (2006) proposed four self-regulation strategies as mediators between goal orientation/achievement and job performance. These strategies, *feedback seeking, proactive behaviour, emotional control,* and *social competence*, are seen as effective as they have the capacity to reduce discrepancies between current and desired states and affect performance by motivating and directing individuals toward more successful performance strategies. Feedback seeking involves actively monitoring goal progress (rather than simply waiting for the information from the environment), which informs individuals about the correctness and adequacy of behaviour for attaining desired goal states (Vancouver & Day, 2005). Proactive behaviour reflects individual initiative and the capacity to identify and solve problems. The aim of proactive
behaviour is to modify the environment in order to improve individual performance, and can be triggered by the need to prevent a problem, fit in with a particular organisation culture, or create a desirable impression (Crant, 2000). Emotional control allows individuals to keep unrelated task concerns and emotions from diverting attention away from their responsibilities and inhibits emotional states that might decrease the efficiency of any action (Kanfer, Ackerman, & Heggestad, 1996). Negative emotions especially are demotivating and affect learning processes and performance (Wood, Kakebeeke, Debowski, & Frese, 2000). Finally, social competence reflects the ability to interact effectively with others. This helps the individual complete tasks in concert with others, which in turn increases the organisation’s performance (Baron & Markman, 2003). Social competence also assists individuals to develop work skills, to learn appropriate role behaviours, and to build friendship and support networks, which are instrumental in building and managing performance (Porath & Bateman, 2006). We expected these self-regulatory strategies to be positively related to P-O fit, work attitudes, and work behaviours.

**Outcome Variables**

Work attitudes and work behaviours are the most frequently studied outcome variables in P-O fit studies (Kristof-Brown & Jansen, 2007). We assessed four variables as outcomes of organisational support, self-regulation, and P-O fit: job satisfaction, organisational commitment, job performance, and intention to quit. Job satisfaction reflects the degree of satisfaction people feel about certain aspects of their job or their whole job (Bowling & Hammond, 2008). Organisational commitment is the affective connection people feel towards their organisation (Meyer, Stanley, Herscovitch, & Topolnytsky, 2002). Job performance is the sum of the employee’s direct and/or
indirect contribution to the achievements of the organisation (Borman & Motowidlo, 1997). Finally, intention to quit represents one of the most important proximal antecedents to actually leaving an organisation (Harter, Schmidt, & Hayes, 2002). P-O fit has been shown to be related to all outcome variables, although the relationship with attitudes is stronger than the relationship with job performance (Kristof, 1996).

**Current Study**

The current study extends previous research by testing a comprehensive model of antecedents and outcomes to P-O fit across two time points. Testing such a model allows for a clearer picture of the effects of changes in antecedent variables on changes in P-O fit, and changes in P-O fit on changes in organisational outcome variables of work attitudes and behaviours. We also test if changes in P-O fit mediate between changes in antecedent variables and changes in outcome variables, which has not been previously examined. In the first step, we assessed the across-time, causal relationships between antecedent variables, P-O fit, and work attitudes and performance. We expected organisational support and self-regulation to be related positively to P-O fit over time, and P-O fit to be related positively to job satisfaction, organisational commitment, and job performance, and related negatively to intention to quit over time.

In the second step, we assessed the role of P-O fit as mediator on the cross-lagged relationships between organisational support and self-regulation and the work outcome variables. The role of P-O fit as a mediator has been tested using cross-sectional data (Boon, Den Hartog, Boselie, & Paawe, 2011; Bright, 2007), but not longitudinally. We expected that increases in organisational support and self-regulation over time would be associated with an increase in P-O fit, which in turn would be associated with increases in job satisfaction, organisation commitment, and job performance, and reductions in
intentions to quit. In a third step, we also assess the role of job satisfaction, organisational commitment, and job performance as mediators in the cross-lagged, causal associations between P-O fit and intention to quit. In previous cross-sectional P-O fit studies, job satisfaction and organisational commitment mediated the association between fit and intention to quit (Cooper-Thomas & Poutasi, 2011; Liu, Liu, & Hu, 2010).

Method

Participants

Participants at T1 were 881 employees from a large-scale, electronic manufacturing company in Indonesia (approximately 1000 surveys were distributed via section heads and supervisors, 910 surveys were returned, 29 responses were not usable, response rate = 91%). At T2, 680 employees responded to a second survey approximately six months after the first one. These respondents consisted of 594 men (87.4%) and 86 women (12.6%), whose average age was 33 years (SD = 8.5) at T1. At T1, 179 respondents (26.3%) held a bachelor or graduate-level degree, 143 (21.1%) had post-high school qualifications (primarily technical college qualifications), 329 (48.4%) were senior high school graduates, 22 (3.2%) had completed junior high school, and seven (1.0%) had completed elementary school. The majority (384, 55.5%) were operators or clerical workers, 194 (28.5%) were supervisors, and 100 (14.7%) were middle or top level managers (2 respondents did not answer this question). The average tenure with the company was 10.7 years (SD = 7.5; range < 1 to 36 years), the average total work experience was 11.6 years (SD = 8.0; range < 1 year to 40 years), and the average hours worked per week were 42.7 (SD = 7.0; range < 40 to > 50 hours).

Measures
Measures were the same at T1 and T2, with responses indicated on a 6-point scale with endpoints of 1 (strongly disagree) and 6 (strongly disagree). All items were translated into the Indonesian language using the standard translation and back-translation methodology recommended by Brislin (1970).

**P-O fit (values congruence, personality congruence, goal congruence, needs-supply fit, and demands-ability fit).** Three 3-item scales (Cable & DeRue, 2002) were used to assess values congruence (“The things that I value in life are very similar to the things that my organisation values”), needs-supplies fit (“There is a good fit between what my organisation offers me and what I am looking for in an organisation”), and demands-abilities fit (“There is a good match between the demands of this organisation and my personal skills”). The authors reported alphas > .80, and showed that the scales correlated with other organisational constructs (i.e., organisational identification, citizenship behaviours) in the expected directions. A 3-item scale (Judge & Cable, 1997) assessed personality congruence (“My personality matches this organisation’s personality”). The authors reported an alpha of .80, and supported validity by testing associations with organisational attractiveness. Last, goal congruence was measured using three items devised by Supeli and Creed (in press; “My personal goals match the goals of this organisation”). These authors reported an alpha of .88 for six items, and supported validity by showing goal congruence was positively associated with job satisfaction and negatively associated with intention to quit. Supeli and Creed showed that these five fit constructs could be represented by a second-order factor. After our confirmatory factor analysis, we deleted one personality item that had a low factor loading (< .10) and low correlations with the other two personality congruence items (r
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= .18 and \( r = .13 \), suggesting that it was not assessing the same construct as the other two items. Removing this item reduced error in this measure.

**Organisational support.** We used four items from the Survey of Perceived Organizational Support Scale (Eisenberger, Huntington, Hutchison, & Sowa, 1986). Two negative and two positively worded items were selected based on high factor loadings in the analysis reported by the authors (e.g., “This organisation really cares about my well-being”). Short forms of this scale have been used in other fit studies (e.g., Dawley, Houghton, & Bucklew, 2010), where alphas were reported at > .80 and the scale correlated in the expected direction with other organisational variables (e.g., turnover intention).

**Self-regulation.** Four scales recommended by Porath and Bateman (2006) were used to measure feedback seeking, emotional control (strategies to regulate internal aspects of the individual), proactive behaviour, and social competence (for regulating aspects external to the individual). *Feedback seeking:* the four highest loading items from the Feedback Seeking Scale (Callister, Kramer, & Turban, 1999; “I ask my supervisor if I am meeting all my job requirements”). A short form of this scale has been used in recent work-related studies (e.g., De Stobbeleir, Ashford, & Buyens, 2011), where sound reliability was reported and construct validity was demonstrated by factor analysis and testing the correlates with creative performance. *Proactive behaviour:* the five highest loading items from the Proactive Personality Scale (Bateman & Crant, 1993; “Where ever I have been, I have been a powerful force for constructive change”). The authors reported an alpha of .89 for the full scale, and tested validity using factor analysis. A short form has been used in other fit studies (e.g., Erdogan & Bauer, 2005). *Emotion control:* five items from the Emotional Control Scale, which was
adapted by Porath and Bateman (2006) from a scale developed by Kuhl (1985; “I can manage my mood so that my work flows easily”). Porath and Bateman reported an alpha of .80, and demonstrated validity by assessing the relationship with other study variables. **Social competence**: the 5-item social adaptability factor of the Social Competence Scale (Baron & Markman, 2003; “I can talk to anybody about almost anything”). Porath and Bateman reported an alpha of .85.

**Job satisfaction.** This was assessed using the 3-item scale from the Michigan Organizational Assessment Questionnaire (see Bowling & Hammond, 2008). We modified one item to minimise bias associated with assessing satisfaction with the organisation rather than satisfaction with the job. Sample item = “In general, I like doing my job”. Internal reliability for the scale has been reported as .84, with validity supported by showing it to be related to work place variables in the expected directions.

**Organisational commitment.** This was measured using the four highest loading items from the affective commitment domain of the Organizational Commitment Scale (Allen & Meyer, 1996). Affective commitment has been shown to have the strongest relationship with work-related variables and to be a reliable (alpha > .80) and valid indicator of organisational commitment (Maurer & Lippstreu, 2008). Sample item = “I don’t feel like ‘part of the family’ in this organisation”.

**Intention to quit.** We used the 3-item scale from the Michigan Organizational Assessment Questionnaire (Cammann, Fichman, Jenkin Jr., & Klesh, 1983). Sample item = “I often think about quitting this job”. Cammann et al. (1983) reported an internal reliability of .83. This scale has been widely used, and in support of validity, has been found to have negative relationships with organisational commitment (Bishop, Scott, & Burroughs, 2000).
Job performance. This was measured using the four highest loading items from the Task Performance Scale developed by Goodman and Svyantek (1999). A sample item was “I demonstrate expertise in all my job-related tasks”. These authors reported an alpha of .93. Short forms of this scale have been used successfully in other work-related studies, where construct validity has been demonstrated by assessing the relationship with work engagement (Gorgievski, Bakker, & Schaufeli, 2010).

Procedure

We obtained ethical approval and received agreement from the participating company to undertake the study. All permanent employees were invited to complete an anonymous survey and return it to the first researcher in a sealed envelope. We used a code to match the T1 and T2 surveys. No individual incentives were offered, but we did provide a report to the company summarising the aggregated results. The six month time lag was considered sufficient to allow for changes to take place within the person and the organisation. The company conducts performance appraisal reviews for all employees every six months, and these were expected to facilitate individual and organisational changes. The data reported in this study form one part of a larger research project examining organisational fit (see Supeli & Creed, in press; Supeli & Creed, submitted).

Results

First, we assessed a longitudinal measurement model. To do this, all latent variables for T1 and T2 were simultaneously included in the confirmatory factor analysis, and every latent variable was allowed to correlate with every other latent variable at T1 and T2, as recommended by Cole and Maxwell (2003). Second, we tested
four cross-lagged associations between our predictor (organisational support, self-regulation, and P-O fit) and outcome variables (job satisfaction, organisational commitment, job performance, and intention to quit) from T1 to T2, as recommended by de Lange and her colleagues (2004). The four models were (a) baseline model (the stability model; M0), which included auto-regressive pathways from T1 to T2 with no cross-lagged associations (this model tests the associations between the same variables at T1 and T2; i.e., do the variables change over time?); (b) normal causation model (the causality model; M1), which added cross-lagged paths to the baseline model from T1 predictors to T2 outcome variables (this model tests the associations between the antecedents at T1 and outcome variables at T2; i.e., are changes in the antecedent variables associated with changes in the outcome variables?); (c) reversed causation model (the reversed model; M2), which added cross-lagged paths to the baseline model from T1 outcome variables to T2 predictors (this model tests the associations between the outcome variables at T1 and the antecedent variables at T2; i.e., are changes in the outcome variables associated with changes in the outcome variables?); and (d) reciprocal causation model (the reciprocal model; M3), which added cross-lagged paths to the baseline model from T1 predictors to T2 outcome variables and T1 outcome variables to T2 predictor variables (this model assesses whether there are reciprocal relationships; e.g., P-O fit at T1 is associated with intention to quit at T2; intention to quit at T1 is associated with P-O fit at T2). We used the chi-square difference test to assess differences among the competing nested models. When a difference was not found using the chi-square difference test, we accepted the most parsimonious model (i.e., with the smallest AIC value; Kline, 2011). As it is assumed in longitudinal panel
models that measurement error covaries across time, we allowed error terms for the same item to correlate over time (Little, Preacher, Selig, & Card, 2007).

Third, we tested (a) if P-O fit mediated between organisational support and self-regulation and the outcome variables (job satisfaction, organisational commitment, job performance, and intention to quit), and (b) if job satisfaction, organisational commitment, and job performance mediated between P-O fit and intention to quit. To test the mediation, we followed the recommendations for two-wave designs. To do this, we (a) tested the association between the predictors at T1 and the outcome variables at T2 (without the mediators) in order to assess if there were cross-time associations between the predictor and outcome variables. Then (b), we tested the cross-lagged relationships between the predictors at T1 and the mediator at T2, to determine if changes in the predictors were associated with changes in the mediator. Finally (c), we tested the cross-lagged relationships between the mediator at T1 and the outcomes variables at T2, to assess if changes in the mediator were associated with changes in the outcome variables. Partial mediation can be said to occur when all pathways in a hypothesised mediation relationship are confirmed (Cole & Maxwell, 2003; Taris & Kompier, 2006).

All analyses were conducted using maximum likelihood estimation in AMOS 19. For fit statistics, we report: chi-square ($\chi^2$), normed chi-square ($\chi^2/df$), Goodness-of-Fit Index (GFI), Comparative Fit Index (CFI), and Root Mean Square Error of Approximation (RMSEA). The following cut-off values are recommended for a large sample and observed variables > 30: $\chi^2$ with significant $p$-value, $\chi^2/df$ between 1 and 3, CFI > .90, GFI > .90, and RMSEA < .07. For a large sample where the number of observed variables is < 30, the cut-offs should be adjusted to CFI > .92, GFI > .95 (Hair,
Summary data, internal reliability coefficients, bivariate correlations, and correlations among latent variables at T1 and T2 are reported in Table 4.1.

**Measurement Model**

The measurement model reflected Figure 4.1, except that self-regulation was represented by four latent variables. The model consisted of 10 x T1 and 10 x T2 variables, all of which were represented by individual items, except for P-O fit where the items were allocated to three parcels using an item-to-construct balance approach (i.e., assigning highest and lowest loading items across parcels; Little, Cunningham, Shahar, & Widaman, 2002). The variables were organisational support, self-regulation (feedback seeking, proactive behaviour, emotional control, and social competence), P-O fit, job satisfaction, organisational commitment, job performance, and intention to quit. The fit statistics for this model were good, demonstrating that all factors were independent of one another and the model well fitted the data, $\chi^2(2851) = 5615.73, p < .001, \chi^2/df = 1.97, CFI = .92, RMSEA = .038, AIC = 6393.75$. The correlations among all latent variables were significant and consistent with the zero-order bivariate correlations (see Table 4.1).
Table 4.1

Summary Data, Internal Reliability (Cronbach’s Alpha), and Bivariate Correlations among Variables (N = 680)

| Variables                      | M     | SD    | α    | 1     | 2     | 3     | 4     | 5     | 6     | 7     | 8     | 9     | 10    | 11    | 12    | 13    | 14    | 15    | 16    | 17    | 18    | 19    | 20    |
|--------------------------------|-------|-------|------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|
| 1. Organisational support T1  | 16.68 | 3.68  | .84  | .19   | .01   | .26   | .20   | .63   | .54   | .53   | .13   | -.57  | .60   | .10   | -.08  | .18   | .13   | .49   | .43   | .39   | .06   | -.45  |
| 2. Feedback seeking T1        | 16.56 | 3.32  | .73  | .18   | -.23  | .25   | .28   | .23   | .13   | .18   | .24   | -.09  | .08   | .47   | .18   | .13   | .21   | .18   | .14   | .19   | .18   | -.14  |
| 3. Proactive behaviour T1     | 23.08 | 3.28  | .69  | .18   | .25   | .39   | .36   | .22   | .16   | .18   | .37   | -.03  | .02   | .23   | .57   | .25   | .28   | .18   | .16   | .12   | .33   | -.04  |
| 4. Emotional control T1       | 23.78 | 3.00  | .89  | .33   | .19   | .60   | .51   | .34   | .28   | .37   | .47   | -.25  | .16   | .23   | .27   | .60   | .38   | .27   | .26   | .31   | .40   | -.22  |
| 5. Social competence T1       | 22.24 | 3.64  | .81  | .29   | .27   | .51   | .61   | .31   | .21   | .25   | .40   | -.20  | .15   | .25   | .26   | .37   | .63   | .26   | .18   | .19   | .33   | -.12  |
| 6. P-O fit T1                 | 59.75 | 9.96  | .91  | .74   | .20   | .37   | .36   | .35   | .54   | .59   | .38   | -.51  | .48   | .18   | .15   | .28   | .24   | .68   | .44   | .46   | .28   | -.45  |
| 7. Org. commitment T1         | 18.49 | 3.17  | .68  | .79   | .09   | .40   | .38   | .32   | .73   | .54   | .26   | -.52  | .40   | .13   | .14   | .27   | .18   | .46   | .61   | .39   | .19   | -.41  |
| 8. Job satisfaction T1        | 13.62 | 2.42  | .70  | .67   | .15   | .41   | .43   | .31   | .64   | .83   | .37   | -.60  | .33   | .16   | .13   | .28   | .21   | .44   | .43   | .59   | .29   | -.46  |
| 9. Job performance T1         | 18.98 | 2.49  | .86  | .18   | .20   | .57   | .52   | .46   | .40   | .34   | .43   | -.18  | .13   | .28   | .34   | .40   | .37   | .31   | .27   | .34   | .63   | -.21  |
| 10. Intention to quit T1      | 7.47  | 3.30  | .87  | .62   | -.03  | .16   | -.26  | -.20  | -.49  | -.64  | -.68  | -.17  | -.38  | -.07  | -.00  | -.23  | -.13  | -.41  | -.41  | -.42  | -.15  | .64   |
| 11. Organisational support T2 | 16.61 | 3.53  | .86  | .63   | .01   | .09   | .12   | .15   | .43   | .47   | .32   | .08   | -.32  | .11   | .03   | .23   | .21   | .62   | .54   | .46   | .17   | -.52  |
| 12. Feedback seeking T2       | 16.52 | 3.18  | .73  | .10   | .59   | .27   | .20   | .26   | .17   | .11   | .15   | .23   | .01   | .05   | .36   | .28   | .34   | .22   | .17   | .17   | .30   | -.12  |
| 13. Proactive behaviour T2    | 22.97 | 3.19  | .72  | .07   | .15   | .62   | .45   | .40   | .26   | .31   | .34   | .49   | -.13  | .08   | .38   | .40   | .41   | .21   | .14   | .22   | .47   | -.05  |
| 14. Emotional control T2      | 23.55 | 3.11  | .91  | .21   | .09   | .42   | .64   | .43   | .29   | .34   | .35   | .43   | -.23  | .18   | .23   | .64   | .55   | .36   | .31   | .36   | .52   | -.28  |
| 15. Social competence T2      | 22.01 | 3.63  | .84  | .20   | .19   | .42   | .44   | .75   | .28   | .27   | .26   | .42   | -.13  | .20   | .37   | .63   | .63   | .33   | .23   | .25   | .49   | -.14  |
| 16. P-O fit T2                | 60.00 | 10.28 | .93  | .57   | .15   | .33   | .28   | .28   | .71   | .60   | .49   | .33   | -.39  | .55   | .18   | .39   | .37   | .38   | .56   | .60   | .40   | -.57  |
| 17. Org. commitment T2        | 18.20 | 3.13  | .71  | .61   | .13   | .35   | .34   | .26   | .58   | .76   | .62   | .33   | -.47  | .60   | .17   | .37   | .38   | .34   | .70   | .51   | .29   | -.59  |
| 18. Job satisfaction T2       | 13.50 | 2.17  | .69  | .52   | .18   | .33   | .37   | .23   | .52   | .64   | .80   | .42   | -.50  | .47   | .13   | .41   | .42   | .30   | .68   | .82   | .41   | -.57  |
| 19. Job performance T2        | 18.66 | 2.69  | .90  | .08   | .16   | .46   | .44   | .36   | .30   | .24   | .32   | .69   | -.14  | .11   | .25   | .66   | .56   | .55   | .43   | .37   | .45   | -.24  |
| 20. Intention to quit T2      | 7.54  | 3.20  | .89  | -.49  | -.10  | -.18  | -.23  | -.12  | -.43  | -.49  | -.52  | -.21  | .66   | -.48  | -.08  | -.21  | -.27  | -.16  | -.56  | -.69  | -.73  | -.24  |

Note. Correlations > .08 significant at p < .05, > .11 significant at p < .01, and > .13 significant at p < .001.

Zero order correlations reported above the diagonal and correlations among the latent variables reported below the diagonal.
Cross-lagged model

The bivariate relationships between most demographic and outcome variables were trivial to small and these variables were not included in the model (Zapf et al., 1996). The correlations for age ranged between .04 and -.33, and for tenure between .06 and -.34. As these two variables might have influenced the results, they were included as controls.

The fit statistics for the baseline, stability model (M0: T1 to T2 auto-regressive pathways only) were $\chi^2(3117) = 6192.15, p < .001, \chi^2/df = 1.99, \text{CFI} = .92, \text{RMSEA} = .038, \text{AIC} = 6764.15$. The causality model (M1: cross-lagged paths from T1 predictors to T2 outcome variables), $\chi^2(3108) = 6111.93, p < .001, \chi^2/df = 1.98, \text{CFI} = .92, \text{RMSEA} = .038, \text{AIC} = 6750.59$, was significantly different from the stability model ($\Delta\chi^2 = 31.56, \Delta df = 9, p < .001$), as were the reversed model (M2: cross-lagged paths from T1 outcome variables to T2 predictors), $\chi^2(3108) = 6096.54, p < .001, \chi^2/df = 1.97, \text{CFI} = .92, \text{RMSEA} = .038, \text{AIC} = 6754.64; \Delta\chi^2 = 27.51, \Delta df = 9, p < .01$), and the reciprocal model (M3: cross-lagged paths from T1 predictors to T2 outcome variables and T1 outcome variables to T2 predictor variables), $\chi^2(3099) = 6043.50, p < .001, \chi^2/df = 1.98, \text{CFI} = .92, \text{RMSEA} = .038, \text{AIC} = 6754.80; \Delta\chi^2 = 45.35, \Delta df = 18, p < .001$).

The reciprocal model was significantly different from the reversed model, $\Delta\chi^2 = 17.84, \Delta df = 9, p < .05$, but was not a better fit than the causality model, $\Delta\chi^2 = 13.79, \Delta df = 9, p > .05$), indicating that the causality model was the best fitting model. Supporting this, the causality model also had the smallest AIC value. In this final model (see Figure 4.2), after controlling for age and tenure, organisational support and proactive behaviour at T1 predicted P-O fit at T2 ($\beta = .13, p < .01$ and $\beta = .08, p < .05$, respectively), and P-O fit at T1 predicted intention to quit at T2 ($\beta = -.12, p < .001$). All cross-lagged
relationships analyses can be seen in Appendix N (Table 4.2) and Appendix O (Table 4.3) at the end of this chapter.

Figure 4.2. Final model. Organisational support and proactive behaviour at T1 predict P-O fit at T2; P-O fit at T1 predicts intention to quit at T2; * $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$, *** $p < .001$.

Mediation models

Two mediation effects were assessed: (a) P-O fit mediating the cross-lagged relationship between organisational support and self-regulation and the outcome variables, and (b) job satisfaction, organisational commitment, and job performance mediating the cross-lagged relationship between P-O fit and intention to quit. As in the previous models, we controlled for age and tenure.
**P-O fit as mediator.** The first step was to assess the direct effect of the T1 predictor variables (organisational support, feedback seeking, proactive behaviour, emotional control, and social competence) on the T2 outcome variables (job satisfaction, organisational commitment, job performance, and intention to quit), without including the P-O fit variable as mediator variable. The fit statistic for this direct effect model showed a good fit, $\chi^2(2661) = 5208.57, p < .001, \chi^2/df = 1.96, CFI = .92, RMSEA = .038, AIC = 5738.57$. Three predictor variables met the first criteria for mediation: T1 organisational support had a direct effect on T2 organisational commitment and T2 intention to quit ($\beta = .18, p < .01$ and $\beta = -.17, p < .001$, respectively); T1 proactive behaviour had a direct effect on T2 organisational commitment and T2 intention to quit ($\beta = .10, p < .05$ and $\beta = -.07, p < .05$, respectively); and T1 emotional control had a direct effect on T2 job performance ($\beta = .14, p < .001$). The final direct effect model is presented in Figure 4.3 (Appendix P at the end of this chapter).

The second step was to test if the T1 predictors (organisational support, feedback seeking, proactive behaviour, emotional control, and social competence) predicted T2 mediator (P-O fit). We tested four models in this analysis (stability, causality, reversed, and reciprocal), finding that the causality model (T1 organisational support, feedback seeking, proactive behaviour, emotional control, and social support predicting T2 P-O fit), had the best fit to the data, $\chi^2(1301) = 2619.80, p < .001, \chi^2/df = 2.01, CFI = .94, RMSEA = .039, AIC = 2987.80$, and was significantly different from the stability model, $\Delta\chi^2 = 11.55, \Delta df = 5, p < .05$. In this model (see Figure 4.4 in Appendix Q), T1 organisational support and T1 proactive behaviour predicted T2 P-O fit ($\beta = .12, p < .01$ and $\beta = .11, p < .05$, respectively). From this analysis, emotional
control no longer met the criteria for mediation. The results for these analyses are presented in Table 4.4 and Table 4.5 in Appendix R and Appendix S, respectively, at the end of this chapter.

The third step was to test if T1 mediator (P-O fit) predicted the T2 outcome variables (job satisfaction, organisational commitment, job performance, and intention to quit). Again, we tested four models (stability, causality, reversed, and reciprocal). On this occasion, the reciprocal model produced the best fit, $\chi^2(538) = 1348.56, p < .001$, $\chi^2/df = 2.51$, CFI = .95, RMSEA = .047, AIC = 1604.86, and was significantly different from the stability model ($\Delta \chi^2 = 34.54, \Delta df = 8, p < .001$), the causality model ($\Delta \chi^2 = 11.56, \Delta df = 4, p < .05$), and the reversed model ($\Delta \chi^2 = 20.70, \Delta df = 4, p < .001$). In this model (see Figure 4.5 in Appendix T at the end of this chapter), T1 P-O fit predicted T2 organisational commitment and T2 intention to quit ($\beta = .11, p < .05$ and $\beta = -.15, p < .001$, respectively) and T1 organisational commitment predicted T2 P-O fit ($\beta = .20, p < .01$). From these analyses, it can be concluded that P-O fit partially mediated the effect of organisational support and proactive behaviour on organisational commitment and intention to quit across time; that is, changes in organisational support and proactive behaviour from T1 to T2, were associated with changes in P-O fit from T1 to T2, which in turn were associated with changes in organisational commitment and intention to quit from T1 to T2.

**Job satisfaction, organisational commitment, and job performance as mediators.** For job satisfaction, organisational commitment, and job performance as across-time mediators between P-O fit and intention to quit, there was a direct effect of T1 P-O fit (as predictor) on T2 intention to quit (as outcome; $\beta = -.16, p < .001$), when assessed without the mediators, and controlling for age and tenure, $\chi^2(64) = 271.86, p <$
When T1 P-O fit was assessed as a predictor of T2 job satisfaction, T2 organisational commitment, and T2 job performance, the reversed model produced the best fit, $\chi^2(369) = 952.77, p < .001, \chi^2/df = 2.59, CFI = .96, \text{RMSEA} = .048, \text{AIC} = 1144.77$ (see Table 4.6 in Appendix V), and was significantly different from the baseline, stability model, $\Delta \chi^2 = 14.18, \Delta df = 3, p < .01$ (see Table 4.7 in Appendix W). In this model, (see Figure 4.7 in Appendix X), T1 organisation commitment (as mediator) predicted T2 P-O fit (as predictor; $\beta = .26, p < .01$). This result indicated that there was no cross-lagged association between the predictor (P-O fit) and the outcome variables (job satisfaction, organisational commitment, and job performance), demonstrating that no mediation effect existed.

**Discussion**

We tested (a) whether changes in the two antecedents to P-O fit produced changes in P-O fit, (b) whether changes in P-O fit produced changes in work attitudes and performance, (c) whether changes in P-O fit mediated between changes in the antecedents and outcome variables, and (d) whether changes in job satisfaction, organisational commitment, and job performance mediated the changes in P-O fit and intention to quit relationship. Our study was the first to examine the mediating role of P-O fit using longitudinal data with the same measure at both points in time; thus, we expected that the result would give a more comprehensive picture of P-O fit, how it changes, and its associations with other variables across time.

First, from the cross-lagged analyses, all T1 variables had moderate to strong correlations with their T2 counterparts, with correlations ranging from .47 to .68 (see...
Table 4.1). These results indicate considerable stability for all variables across the two
time points, with, in all cases, the best predictor at T2 for any variable being the same
variable at T1 (e.g., just under half of the variance in P-O fit at T2 was accounted for by
P-O fit at T1). The correlations also indicate fluctuations in the variables across time,
which mean that other extraneous variables are related to changes in levels over time.

Second, the cross-lagged analyses showed that, after controlling for age and
tenure, changes in organisational support from T1 to T2 were associated with changes
in P-O fit across the two time points. These results add support to earlier cross-sectional
studies, which showed that organisational support predicted P-O fit (Gutierrez, Candela,
& Carver, 2012; Janvier, Segers, & Henderickx, 2011), and suggest that organisations
that invest resources to support their staff will produce perceptions of better fit between
the self and the organisations from their staff. Of the self-regulatory strategies, only
proactive behaviour had a significant cross-lagged relationship with P-O fit, indicating
that changes in proactive behaviour were associated with changes in P-O fit over time.
This result is in line with previous P-O fit studies (Erdogan & Bauer, 2005; Kammeyer-
Mueller & Wanberg, 2003), and adds support to the proposition by Vianen and Pater
(2012) that proactive behaviours may relate to better P-O fit due to the individual’s
potential to change their environment, their perception of the environment, themselves,
or all three. This finding has practical implications for organisations and individuals,
suggesting that organisations should foster and direct proactive behaviour in their
employees and, where possible, employees should exercise their initiative, as these are
likely to improve employee congruency with the organisation, to the benefit of both
parties.
None of the other self-regulatory strategies had significant cross-lagged associations with P-O fit, suggesting that change over time in P-O fit is more influenced by other variables than feedback seeking, emotional control, and social competence. Feedback seeking has been shown recently to produce mixed effects (see Vianen & Pater, 2012), and the negative effects of feedback seeking, such as raising anxiety and lowering confidence, might need to be teased out from the positive effects. Some studies have found that emotional intelligence, which is an overlapping construct with emotional control (i.e., the ability to manage and regulate emotions), is unrelated to P-O fit (Bates, 2009), and managing emotions might be more important for other aspects of work life, such as relationships with others and task accomplishment, rather than perceptions of organisational congruence. Finally, social competence might be more salient for person-group fit rather than P-O fit, as social competence reflects the ability to collaborate and work effectively with others, and might be more influential at this rather than the organisational level (Baron & Markman, 2003).

Third, the cross-lagged analyses showed that P-O fit had a significant cross-lagged association with intention to quit, again after controlling for age and tenure; that is, changes in perceptions of P-O fit over time were associated with changes in wanting to leave the organisation. This result is consistent with what has been found previously in the P-O fit literature (see Verquer et al., 2003), and consistent with the attraction-selection-attrition cycle (Schneider, Goldstein, & Smith, 1995), which predicts that individuals act to leave organisations they do not fit. There were no cross-lagged associations between P-O fit and job satisfaction, organisational commitment, and job performance. Thus, while cross-sectional studies have found same-time associations between P-O fit and these outcome variables (Hoffman & Woehr, 2006; Kristof-Brown
et al., 2005), changes in P-O fit across time were not associated with across-time changes in them. This is an important finding as much of the literature assumes that improving P-O fit will lead to improved work attitudes (e.g., job satisfaction) and job performance (e.g., Hoffman & Woehr, 2006). Our results suggest that, while P-O fit is associated with work attitudes and behaviour, improvements in P-O fit beyond a certain level do not lead to additional improvements in all attitudes and behaviours.

Fourth, regarding the mediation analyses, changes in P-O fit across time carried some of the effect of changes in organisational support and proactive behaviour to changes in organisational commitment and intention to quit. That is, changes in organisational support and proactive behaviour led to changes in P-O fit, which in turn led to changes in organisational commitment and intention to quit. Meta-analytic studies have shown that organisational support to be related to organisation commitment and desire to remain with the organisation (Riggle, Edmondson, & Hansen, 2009; Rhoades & Eisenberger, 2002). Our results highlight the role of P-O fit in these relationships. Organisations that enhance support for their employees can be rewarded by increased commitment to their organisation and desire to stay. Such support strategies are likely to operate by improving perceptions of fit with the organisation. Along the same lines, previous cross-sectional studies have found associations between proactive behaviour and organisational commitment (Rank, Carsten, Unger, & Spector, 2007) and intention to quit (Saks, Gruman, & Cooper-Thomas, 2011). Organisations that foster employee autonomy will not only benefit from increased levels of fit, but this will flow onto greater levels of commitment and reduced intentions to leave.

We found no mediation effect for job satisfaction, organisational commitment, and job performance on the relationship between P-O fit and intention to quit. Several
previous cross-sectional studies have identified a role for work attitudes and behaviour as mediators between fit and intention to quit (Cooper-Thomas & Poutasi, 2011; Liu et al., 2010; Schmitt et al., 2008), and while this finding appears to be well accepted and consistent with theory (Kristof, 1996), it cannot be assumed to occur over time and/or in all circumstances, with our study showing a much stronger effect for a direct cross-lagged relationship between P-O fit and intention to quit.

Finally, our study shed light on the direction of the causal relationship among the variables investigated. When all variables were included in the model and age and tenure were controlled, organisational support and proactive behaviour were confirmed as antecedents to P-O fit, P-O fit was confirmed as an antecedent to intention to quit, and the significant mediational relationships were as expected (i.e., organisational support and proactive behaviour were antecedents to P-O fit, and P-O fit was antecedent to organisational commitment and intention to quit).

Conclusions

Our study benefitted from having access to a large and representative sample of employees from different levels of the organisational structure, and used recommended strategies to assess mediation over time. However, all employees were from a single company and from one country. Our measures were based on self-report data, and data were collected at two time points only, when three waves would have been more desirable to assess the mediation hypotheses (Cole & Maxwell, 2003; Taris & Kompier, 2006). Notwithstanding these limitations, organisational support and proactive behaviour emerged as important factors associated with organisational commitment and intention to quit across time, and P-O fit was confirmed as an important mediator in these relationships. Future studies can build on this research by testing the salient
relationships in different situations using more data collection points. One important issue yet to be resolved is that different aspects of organisational fit can have different relationships with the antecedent and outcome variables, and teasing out how these operate over time will allow organisations to fine tune their policies, induction strategies, and training activities.
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Cross-lagged Relationships Analyses

Table 4.2

Cross-lagged Relationships Analyses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model description</th>
<th>$\chi^2$</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>$\chi^2$/df</th>
<th>CFI</th>
<th>RMSEA</th>
<th>AIC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Measurement model</td>
<td>5615.73</td>
<td>2851</td>
<td>1.97</td>
<td>.92</td>
<td>.038</td>
<td>6393.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M0 (Stability model)</td>
<td>6192.15</td>
<td>3117</td>
<td>1.99</td>
<td>.92</td>
<td>.038</td>
<td>6764.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M1 (Causality model)</td>
<td>6111.93</td>
<td>3108</td>
<td>1.98</td>
<td>.92</td>
<td>.038</td>
<td>6750.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M2 (Reversed model)</td>
<td>6096.54</td>
<td>3108</td>
<td>1.97</td>
<td>.92</td>
<td>.038</td>
<td>6754.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M3 (Reciprocal model)</td>
<td>6043.50</td>
<td>3099</td>
<td>1.98</td>
<td>.92</td>
<td>.038</td>
<td>6754.80</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. * $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$, *** $p < .001$. 
Appendix O
Comparisons of Cross-lagged Model Analyses

Table 4.3
Comparative Model of Cross-lagged Relationship Analyses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model comparisons</th>
<th>$\Delta \chi^2$</th>
<th>$\Delta df$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Stability vs. Causality</td>
<td>31.56 ***</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stability vs. Reversed</td>
<td>27.51 **</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stability vs. Reciprocal</td>
<td>45.35 ***</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Causality vs. Reciprocal</td>
<td>13.79</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reversed vs. Reciprocal</td>
<td>17.84 *</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. * $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$, *** $p < .001$.

Causality model, reversed model, and reciprocal model are better fit than stability model; Causality model is better fit than reciprocal and reserved model.
Appendix P

Final Direct Effect Model without Mediator

![Diagram of the final direct effect model without mediator.](image)

**Figure 4.3.** Final direct effect model with P-O fit as mediator; *p < .05, **p < .01, and ***p < .001.
Appendix Q

First Model of P-O Fit Mediation Analyses

Figure 4.4. The first set of mediation analyses with P-O fit as mediator; * p < .05, ** p < .01, and *** p < .001.

Appendix R
Table 4.4

*The First Mediation Analyses with P-O Fit as the Mediator*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model description</th>
<th>$\chi^2$</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>$\chi^2$/df</th>
<th>CFI</th>
<th>RMSEA</th>
<th>AIC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>First step:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct effect</td>
<td>5208.57</td>
<td>2661</td>
<td>1.96</td>
<td>.92</td>
<td>.038</td>
<td>5738.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Second step:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M3-0 (Stability model)</td>
<td>2631.35</td>
<td>1306</td>
<td>2.02</td>
<td>.94</td>
<td>.039</td>
<td>2989.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M3-1 (Causality model)</td>
<td>2619.80</td>
<td>1301</td>
<td>2.01</td>
<td>.94</td>
<td>.039</td>
<td>2987.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M3-2 (Reversed model)</td>
<td>2627.24</td>
<td>1301</td>
<td>2.02</td>
<td>.94</td>
<td>.039</td>
<td>2995.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M3-3 (Reciprocal model)</td>
<td>2615.31</td>
<td>1296</td>
<td>2.02</td>
<td>.94</td>
<td>.039</td>
<td>2993.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Third step:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M4-0 (Stability model)</td>
<td>1383.40</td>
<td>546</td>
<td>2.53</td>
<td>.95</td>
<td>.048</td>
<td>1623.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M4-1 (Causality model)</td>
<td>1360.42</td>
<td>542</td>
<td>2.51</td>
<td>.95</td>
<td>.048</td>
<td>1608.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M4-2 (Reversed model)</td>
<td>1369.56</td>
<td>542</td>
<td>2.53</td>
<td>.95</td>
<td>.047</td>
<td>1617.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M4-3 (Reciprocal model)</td>
<td>1348.86</td>
<td>538</td>
<td>2.51</td>
<td>.95</td>
<td>.047</td>
<td>1604.86</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Appendix S*
Comparisons of P-O fit Mediation Model Analyses

Table 4.5

*Comparative Model for P-O Fit as Mediator*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model comparisons</th>
<th>Predictor variables and mediator</th>
<th>Mediator and outcome variables</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$\Delta \chi^2$</td>
<td>$\Delta df$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stability vs. Causality</td>
<td>11.55*</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stability vs. Reversed</td>
<td>4.11</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stability vs. Reciprocal</td>
<td>16.04</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Causality vs. Reciprocal</td>
<td>4.49</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reversed vs. Reciprocal</td>
<td>11.93*</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. * $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$, *** $p < .001$.*

Appendix T

Second Model of P-O Fit Mediation Analyses
Note: The findings confirmed the reciprocal cross-lagged relationships between organisational commitment and P-O fit across time. Kristof-Brown et al. (2005) found that organisational commitment had the strongest association with P-O fit. In addition, organisational commitment theory by Allen and Meyer (1996) proposed that affective commitment is associated with employees’ emotional attachment to the organisation, identification with the organisation, and involvement in the organisation. With an increase in affective commitment, employees will have a higher emotional attachment to the organisation and a stronger association with the organisation identification, which in turn will increase their P-O fit level. In addition, with the reciprocal cross-lagged relationship across time, organisational commitment can operate as an antecedent variable and also as an outcome variable of P-O fit.

Appendix U

Direct Effect Model P-O Fit and Intention to Quit
Figure 4.6. Direct effect P-O fit on intention to quit without mediators; * $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$, and *** $p < .001$.

Appendix V

Work Outcomes Mediation Model Analyses
Table 4.6

The second mediation analyses with job satisfaction, organisational commitment, and job performance as mediators

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model description</th>
<th>$\chi^2$</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>$\chi^2$/df</th>
<th>CFI</th>
<th>RMSEA</th>
<th>AIC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>First step:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct effect</td>
<td>271.86</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>4.25</td>
<td>.98</td>
<td>.069</td>
<td>353.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second step:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M3-0 (Stability model)</td>
<td>966.95</td>
<td>372</td>
<td>2.60</td>
<td>.96</td>
<td>.049</td>
<td>1152.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M3-1 (Causality model)</td>
<td>962.18</td>
<td>369</td>
<td>2.61</td>
<td>.96</td>
<td>.049</td>
<td>1154.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M3-2 (Reversed model)</td>
<td>952.77</td>
<td>369</td>
<td>2.59</td>
<td>.96</td>
<td>.048</td>
<td>1144.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M3-3 (Reciprocal model)</td>
<td>949.99</td>
<td>366</td>
<td>2.60</td>
<td>.96</td>
<td>.048</td>
<td>1147.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Third step:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M4-0 (Stability model)</td>
<td>933.10</td>
<td>374</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>.95</td>
<td>.047</td>
<td>1115.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M4-1 (Causality model)</td>
<td>919.68</td>
<td>371</td>
<td>2.48</td>
<td>.95</td>
<td>.047</td>
<td>1107.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M4-2 (Reversed model)</td>
<td>932.92</td>
<td>371</td>
<td>2.52</td>
<td>.95</td>
<td>.047</td>
<td>1120.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M4-3 (Reciprocal model)</td>
<td>918.11</td>
<td>368</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>.95</td>
<td>.047</td>
<td>1112.11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Appendix W

Comparisons of Work Outcomes Mediation Model Analyses
Table 4.7

Comparative model for job satisfaction, organisational commitment, and job performance as mediators

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model comparisons</th>
<th>Predictor variables and mediator $\Delta \chi^2$</th>
<th>$\Delta df$</th>
<th>Mediator and outcome variables $\Delta \chi^2$</th>
<th>$\Delta df$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Stability vs. Causality</td>
<td>4.77</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>13.42 **</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stability vs. Reversed</td>
<td>14.18 **</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stability vs. Reciprocal</td>
<td>16.96 ***</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>14.99 *</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Causality vs. Reciprocal</td>
<td>12.19 **</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.57</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reversed vs. Reciprocal</td>
<td>2.78</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>14.81 **</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. * $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$, *** $p < .001$.

Appendix X

First Model of Work Outcome Mediation
Figure 4.7. The first set of mediation analyses with job satisfaction, organisational commitment, and job performance as mediators; * $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$, and *** $p < .001$.

Note: This result showed that there was no cross-lagged association between the predictor (P-O fit) and the outcome variables (job satisfaction, organisational commitment, and job performance), demonstrating that the work outcome variables did not mediate between P-O fit and intention to quit. This result also supported the reciprocal association between organisational commitment and P-O fit.
Chapter 5

General Discussion and Conclusion

The aims of this thesis were to overcome limitations of previous P-O fit studies in term of the assessment of P-O fit, to add clarify regarding the predictors of P-O fit, and to examine the relationships among predictor variables, P-O fit and outcome variables both cross-sectionally and longitudinally. The inconsistency in the previous P-O fit studies in conceptualisation, operationalisation, measurement of P-O fit, and the meaning of organisation, has been the stimulus for this research program to (a) assess perceived P-O fit (i.e., employee make a direct assessment of the compatibility between themselves and the organisation) as proposed by Kristof (1996); that is, that good fit is said to exist as long as it is perceived to exist, regardless of whether or not the person has similar characteristics to, complements, or is complemented by the organisation, (b) to assess organisation as an entity in general, in order to avoid the misleading influence of other type of fit (e.g., person-group fit or person-job fit), and (c) to include the variable goal congruence (i.e., the similarity between employee’s goals and the organisation’s goal), which typically has not been included by previous researchers of P-O fit, even though this variable has been proposed as an important dimension of P-O fit (Schneider, Goldstein, & Smith, 1995; Westerman & Cyr, 2004).

In order to address a void in the P-O fit literature, Study 1 (reported in Chapter 2) developed the Perceived Goal Congruence scale. This measure was devised to assess one of the dimensions of similarity fit (goal congruence), along with values congruence and personality congruence. This study also assessed the effect of all types of fit simultaneously as recommended by Kristof (1996). The results showed that goal
congruence was an independent measure of P-O fit, and that it explained additional variance over and about the other measures of fit.

These results were somewhat inconsistent with previous P-O fit studies, which have shown that values congruence has the strongest relationship with work attitudes (see Verquer, Beehr, & Wagner, 2003). In Study 1, need-supplies, goal congruence, and demands-abilities fit had the highest correlations with the outcome measures. A possible explanation for these results is that values and personality, the other fit dimensions, are less objective and observable than the three stronger correlates. Employees have access to their organisation’s goals through its vision and mission statements and statements about strategic directions, but they cannot easily assess or identify the organisation’s values or personality. In addition, it has been found that there is an inconsistent relationship between personality congruence and work outcome variables (Westerman & Cyr, 2004), the terms of personality and values have sometimes been used interchangeably, values have been shown to have a strong positive relationship with personality, and the role of personality in P-O fit assessment is less understood (for detailed discussion see Ryan & Kristof-Brown, 2003), indicating why personality congruence inadequately explains variance in P-O fit and has a weak correlation with work outcome variables. Values congruence, as an overlapping construct with personality congruence, suffers from the same limitations.

In term of how to measure P-O fit, four competing models (1-factor, 2-factor, 3-factor, and 5-factor model) were tested in Chapter 2. The results showed that all models produced satisfactory fit statistics, indicating that to assess P-O fit, all fit variables can be used (a) simultaneously as the total of P-O fit, (b) as two factors of supplementary (values congruence, personality congruence, and goal congruence) and complementary
(needs-supplies fit and demands-abilities fit) as proposed by Muchinsky and Monahan (1987), (c) as three factors (similarity fit, needs-supplies fit, and demands-abilities fit) as identified by Kristof (1996), or (d) as five independent variables where each variable can potentially make an individual contribution to the variance of P-O fit, as shown in Chapter 2, depending on the needs of the researcher.

As few P-O fit studies have assessed predictors of P-O fit and explored its role as mediator, Study 2 (reported in Chapter 3) contributed to the literature by (a) assessing two sources of predictor variables of P-O fit: one internal to the individual (self-regulation, i.e., feedback seeking, proactive behaviour, emotional control, and social competence) and one external to the employee (i.e., organisational support), and (b) assessing the role of P-O fit as mediator on the relationship between predictors and outcome variables.

The results showed that proactive behaviour and organisational support were associated with levels of P-O fit, indicating that both external supports and internal effort play a role in improving employee congruency with the organisation and enhancing their commitment, job satisfaction, and job performance, which in turn can improve their intention to stay. This is consistent with the interactional psychology approach, which emphasizes a continuous and multidirectional interaction between person characteristics and situation characteristics (Terborg, 1981). In addition, P-O fit had a direct association with all outcome variables, supporting previous P-O fit studies (Hoffman & Woehr, 2006; Verquer et al., 2003).

The mediation role of P-O fit in cross-sectional design was also assessed in Study 2. The results here showed that P-O fit fully mediated the relationship between organisational support (as antecedent variable) and organisational commitment and job
performance (as work-outcome variables), suggesting that organisational support will improve P-O fit, which in turn will improve organisation commitment and job performance. In addition, P-O fit also fully mediated the relationship between proactive behaviour (as antecedent variable) and organisational commitment, suggesting that proactive behaviour can improve P-O fit, which in turn can lead to more organisational commitment. Proactive behaviour had a stronger direct relationship with job performance than P-O fit, suggesting that proactive behaviour might be more important in improving job performance than P-O fit. Moreover, P-O fit also partially mediated the relationship between organisational support and proactive behaviour (as predictor variables) and job satisfaction (as outcome variable), suggesting that organisational support and proactive behaviour were associated with P-O fit, which in turn can improve job satisfaction. As the association between organisational support and proactive behaviour and job satisfaction did not totally disappear when P-O fit was taken into consideration, indicating that organisational support, proactive behaviour, and P-O fit were all associated with job satisfaction.

In terms of the mediating role of the work-related variables (organisational commitment, job satisfaction, and job performance) on the relationship between P-O fit and intention to quit, it was found that organisational commitment fully mediated the relationship between P-O fit and intention to quit, suggesting that lower P-O fit was related to a lower organisational commitment, which in turn, was associated with a higher intention to quit. The association between P-O fit and intention to quit disappeared when organisational commitment was taken into consideration. This suggests that in order to reduce employees’ levels of intention to quit, improvement in P-O fit and organisational commitment should be considered.
In order to assess the relationship between the predictor variables, P-O fit, and the outcome variables, to clarify the direction of the associations, and to explore the changes in the research variables over two time points, a longitudinal design was used in Study 3 (reported in Chapter 4). In this study, there were moderate correlations between two of the demographic variables (i.e., age and tenure) and the research variables; thus, they were included as control variables, as suggested by Zapf, Dormann, and Frese (1996).

From the cross-lagged model, it was found that changes in organisational support and proactive behaviour were associated with changes in P-O fit across time, and changes in P-O fit were associated with changes in intention to quit over time, supporting the result from Study 2 and previous cross-sectional studies (e.g., Erdogan & Bauer, 2005; Janvier, Segers, & Henderickx, 2011). This suggests that, after controlling for age and tenure, increasing support from the organisation and effort from employee will be associated with increases in P-O fit over time and, as a consequence, increases in P-O fit will reduce employees’ intention to quit across time.

Regarding the mediation analyses, P-O fit partially mediated the relationship between organisational support and proactive behaviour (antecedent variables) and organisational commitment and intention to quit (work-outcome variables), suggesting that increases in organisational support and proactive behaviour led to increases in P-O fit, which in turn led to increases in organisational commitment and decreases in intention to quit over time. With the finding of the reciprocal relationship between P-O fit and organisational commitment over time, it can be concluded that organisational support and proactive behaviour are important considerations when organisation are
seeking to improve P-O fit and organisational commitment, which in turn will increase P-O fit, organisational commitment, and intention to stay over time.

**Contributions to Fit Literature**

The research program reported in this thesis has made several important contributions to the fit literature. A summary of the contributions, which has been taken from the three studies described above, is reported below:

1) It was shown that perceived goal congruence explained additional variance over and above other measures of fit. Therefore, future studies need to consider perceived goal congruence in assessing perceived P-O fit.

2) All five measures of fit (value congruence, personality congruence, goal congruence, needs-supplies fit, and demands-abilities fit) are potentially important variables and should be taken into consideration when assessing P-O fit.

3) The five measures of fit can be used as one dimension (i.e., as a total P-O fit measure), as two factors (supplementary fit and complementary fit), as three factors (similarity fit, needs-supplies fit, and demands abilities fit), or as five factors (each measure representing individual variables of P-O fit).

4) This was the first test of the mediating role of P-O fit on the relationship between self-regulation and the outcome variables. The findings confirmed previous fit studies that P-O fit mediates the relationship between antecedent variables and outcome variables. The mediating role of P-O fit is more consistent in fit studies than the role of moderating role of P-O fit. However, comparative studies are required to explore the role of P-O fit.

5) Organisational support and proactive behaviour were shown to be antecedents to P-O fit, P-O fit was confirmed as an antecedent to intention to quit, and the significant
mediational relationships were as expected (i.e., organisational support and proactive behaviour were antecedents to P-O fit, and P-O fit was antecedent to organisational commitment and intention to quit).

6) The association between organisational support and job performance disappears when P-O fit is taken into consideration, but P-O fit did not mediate between proactive behaviour and job performance, despite there being a strong, direct association between proactive behaviour and job performance. These findings suggested that P-O fit has a stronger association with job performance than organisational support; however, proactive behaviour has a stronger association with job performance than does P-O fit.

7) Proactive behaviour is an important variable to consider when attempting to improve P-O fit. P-O fit fully mediated the relationship between proactive behaviour and organisational commitment. P-O fit partially mediated the relationship between proactive behaviour and job satisfaction. Proactive individuals strive to improve their fit, and that as a consequence of better fit, they also are more committed to their organisation and more satisfied with their job.

8) Study 3 was the first to examine the mediating role of P-O fit using longitudinal data with the same measure at both points in time; meaning that the results give a more comprehensive picture of P-O fit, how it changes, and its associations with other variables across time. With this longitudinal design, the results suggested that improvements in P-O fit beyond a certain level do not lead to additional changes in all attitudes and behaviours.

9) The role of work variables as mediators on the relationship between P-O fit and intention to quit cannot be assumed to occur over time and/or in all circumstances,
with the results showing a much stronger effect for a direct cross-lagged relationship between P-O fit and intention to quit.

10) There is a reciprocal cross-lagged relationship between organisational commitment and P-O fit across time. This finding contributes to the fit literature by giving a clear direction on the association between organisational commitment and P-O fit across time: organisational commitment operates as an antecedent variable and as an outcome variable in its relationship with P-O fit over time.

**Practical Implications**

There are several practical implications for organisations and employees resulting from three studies in this research program:

1) P-O fit can be expected to be improved if the organisation implements strategies that provide and demonstrate support for the individual and allow for the expression of individual proactivity on the job.

2) Both organisational support and P-O fit are important factors in promoting organisational commitment and job satisfaction. Organisations could focus their support strategies on improving P-O fit, rather than assuming they will have a direct effect on their employees’ job performance.

3) P-O fit also fully mediated the relationship between proactive behaviour and organisational commitment. Organisations, when fostering independent and autonomous behaviours, should make the connection with P-O fit for employees, rather than assuming that such strategies will have a direct effect on commitment.

4) Proactive behaviour has a stronger association with job performance than does P-O fit. Being proactive seemed to bring performance benefits. From this, organisations should enhance proactivity as this has a strong direct effect on performance.
5) Organisational support (external) and proactive behaviour (internal) play important roles in improving P-O fit and workplace outcome variables. Efforts from both sides are needed in order to improve productivity. Organisations should enhance the support they give and promote and direct proactive behaviour in their employees, and, where possible, employees should practise their initiative, as this is likely to improve their congruency with the organisation, to the benefit of both parties.

6) The association between organisational support and proactive behaviour and job satisfaction did not totally disappear when P-O fit was taken into consideration. Employees’ job satisfaction can be improved by organisations through developing support, and improved by employees via exercising their initiative.

7) Job performance and job satisfaction had direct associations with intention to quit, but neither variable mediated the relationship between P-O fit and intention to quit over time. In the long term, to reduce intention to quit, organisations should also focus on improving P-O fit over time.

8) Organisations should enhance and invest resources to support their employees in order to produce better fit perception from employees and to increase commitment to their organisation and desire to stay.

9) Organisations should foster employee autonomy which will not only benefit in increased levels of fit, but this will flow onto greater levels of commitment and reduced intentions to leave.

**Limitations and Suggestions for Future Studies**

Based on the three studies in this research program, some limitations and suggestions for future studies are outlined, as follows:
1) The studies were based on self-report survey data and did not use data from second sources. Despite it being difficult, future studies should attempt validate current results using these secondary data sources, as this, for example, reduces common method bias.

2) In order to validate the current results and increase generalizability of the findings, future studies should test the variables of interest in several organisations, types of industries, and cultural settings.

3) There might be redundancy in the current measures of P-O fit, despite being widely assessed in the literature (see Kristof-Brown, Zimmerman, & Johnson, 2005). Future studies need to explore the contribution of values congruence and personality congruence in term of perceived P-O fit.

4) P-O fit had a weak relationship with job performance. Previous studies have found inconsistent results for this relationship; thus, future studies should continue to explore this relationship.

5) Cultural factors may have influenced the results of the current studies. Studies with other cultural background participants are needed to get a more comprehensive picture of P-O fit and its relationship to antecedent and outcome variables.

6) From the descriptive statistics, most respondents used the monitoring feedback seeking strategy, rather than the inquiry strategy, which possibly reflected cultural values within the sample. Future studies should discriminate between these two types of strategies and test for differential relationships.

7) Of the four self-regulation domains examined, only proactive behaviour was associated with P-O fit and the outcome variables, both cross-sectionally and longitudinally. Future studies might explore the role of each factor in different
settings. In addition, future studies should consider other aspects of self-regulation as predictor variables.

8) In order to assess P-O fit more fully as a mediator, future studies should collect data at least at three points in time (de Lange et al., 2004).

Conclusion

P-O fit has long been an important theme in the field of applied psychology. The progress of P-O fit research as a part of general person-environment fit has contributed much to the literature. P-O fit research has developed from simple studies (e.g., with only two variables) to a complex studies (i.e., with more than three variables), from testing direct relationships to testing mediation and moderation, and from using cross-sectional designs to using longitudinal designs. Despite this, there remains considerable scope for additional studies before a complete, comprehensive framework and understanding about person and organisation interaction is attained.

This research program has attempted to fill a void not addressed by previous P-O fit studies: to clarify the and assess the different aspects of fit, to explore more variables related to P-O fit, especially antecedent variables, to test mediation, and to incorporate a longitudinal design into the research to make a contribution to the fit literature. The studies in this thesis have strengths and limitations. However, the results and the findings of the studies contribute to the fit literature, provide practical implications for organisations and employees, and offer suggestions for future studies. The results of the studies have the potential to contribute to improving employees’ productivity and well-being at work, which in turn should increase productivity of organisations.
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To allow us to match up your two surveys, we are asking that you put the initial of your mother’s first name and the last two digits of your year of birth on both surveys (these will be destroyed after we match up your surveys).

Griffith University conducts research in accordance with the National Statement on Ethical Conduct in Human Research. If you have any concern over the manner in which this research (GU Ref No: PSY/89/09/HREC) is conducted, please do not hesitate to contact Griffith University Research Ethics Committee at the following address:

Manager, Research Ethics
Office for Research, Bray Centre, Nathan Campus
Griffith University
Phone: (07) 3735 5585
e-mail: research-ethics@griffith.edu.au

Thank you for your time and co-operation with this important research.

Chief Investigator,
Prof. Peter Creed
School of Psychology
Griffith University
Australia

Research Investigator,
Assoc. Prof. Alfred Lizzio
School of Psychology
Griffith University
Australia

Student Investigator,
Abas Supeli
School of Psychology
Griffith University
Australia
**Appendix C (Cont’d.)**

### DEMOGRAPHIC INFORMATION

1. **Are you:**
   - [ ] Male
   - [ ] Female

2. **Age:** _____ years

3. **What is your highest level of education completed?**
   - [ ] Year 10
   - [ ] TAFE or other college (including apprenticeship) AFTER Year 10
   - [ ] Year 11
   - [ ] TAFE or other college (including apprenticeship) AFTER Year 11
   - [ ] Year 12
   - [ ] TAFE or other college (including apprenticeship) AFTER Year 12
   - [ ] University

4. **Are you married or in a similar long-term relationship?**
   - [ ] Yes
   - [ ] No

5. **What is your current job title?** ______________________________

6. **How many people do you supervise?** _____ person(s)

7. **How many hours do you regularly work in a week in your current job?** _____ hours

8. **How long have you been working in your current job?** _____ year(s)

9. **How long have you been working in your current organisation?** _____ year(s)

10. **How long have you been working in total?** _____ year(s)

11. **What general area do you work in?**
    - [ ] Business Development
    - [ ] Finance & Accounting
    - [ ] Human Resources
    - [ ] Legal
    - [ ] Information System
    - [ ] Sales & Marketing
These next questions are intended to match up your first and second survey only. This keeps your responses remain anonymous.

14. What is the initial of your mother’s maiden name? ____________________

15. What are the last 2 digits of your year of birth? __ __ __ __
When you answer these questions, think about your current job and organisation.

There are no right or wrong answers. We are interested in your opinion. Please click on the answer that best reflects what applies to you.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>These questions ask about <strong>your personal values</strong> and your organisation’s values</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Somewhat Disagree</th>
<th>Somewhat Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A1. The things that I value in life are very similar to the things that my organisation values</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A2. My personal values match my organisation’s values and culture</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A3. My organisation’s values and culture provide a good fit with the things that I value in life</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>These questions ask about <strong>your personality</strong> and your organisation’s “personality”</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Somewhat Disagree</th>
<th>Somewhat Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B1. My personality matches this organisation’s “personality”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B2. My personality prevents me from “fitting in” with this organisation (R)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B3. The “personality” of this organisation reflects my own personality</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>These questions ask about <strong>your working needs</strong></th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Somewhat Disagree</th>
<th>Somewhat Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>C1. There is a good fit between what my organisation offers me and what I am looking for in an organisation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C2. The attributes that I look for in an organisation are fulfilled very well by this organisation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C3. This organisation gives me just about everything that I want from an organisation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>These questions ask about <strong>your personal characteristics</strong> and your organisation’s demands</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Somewhat Disagree</th>
<th>Somewhat Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>D1. There is a good match between the demands of this organisation and my personal skills</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D2. My abilities and skills are a good fit with the requirements of this organisation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D3. My personal abilities and education provide a good match with the demands of this organisation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
These questions ask about **your personal goal** and **your organisation's goal**.

<p>| | | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>E1. The goals of this organisation are similar to my work-related goals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E2. Achieving this organisation’s goals also means attaining my personal goals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E3. My personal goals match the goals of this organisation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E4. My personal goals are consistent with the goals of this organisation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E5. This organisation’s goals give me the opportunity to achieve my personal goals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E6. My personal goals are compatible with this organisation’s goals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These questions ask about **how well you get on** in your organisation. Please click on the answer that best reflects what applies to you.

<p>| | | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>F1. I don’t feel like “part of the family” in this organisation (R)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F2. It is likely that I will actively look for a new job within the next 12 months</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F3. All in all, I am satisfied with my job</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F4. I do not feel “emotionally attached” to this organisation (R)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F5. I often think about quitting this job</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F6. In general, I don’t like my job (R)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F7. This organisation has a great deal of personal meaning for me</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F8. I will probably look for a new job within the next 12 months</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F9. In general, I like doing my job</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F10. I do not feel a strong sense of belonging to this organisation (R)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>These questions are about <strong>you and your job</strong></td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Somewhat Disagree</td>
<td>Somewhat Agree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G1. I demonstrate expertise in all my job-related tasks</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G2. I fulfill all of the requirements of my current job</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G3. I am competent in all areas of my current job (e.g., I handle tasks properly)</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G4. Overall, I perform well in my job (e.g., by carrying out tasks as expected)</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>These questions ask about <strong>how you monitor your work performance</strong></th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Somewhat Disagree</th>
<th>Somewhat Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>H1. I ask my supervisor if I am meeting all my job requirements</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H2. I ask my workmates if I am doing a good job</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H3. From their reactions, I can tell how well I am getting along with members of my work group.</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H4. From watching my supervisor, I can tell how well I am performing my job</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>These questions ask about <strong>how you express yourself at work</strong></th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Somewhat Disagree</th>
<th>Somewhat Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I1. Nothing is more exciting than seeing my ideas turn into reality</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I2. Wherever I have been, I have been a powerful force for constructive change</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I3. No matter what the odds, if I believe in something I will make it happen</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I4. I always look for better ways to do things</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I5. If I believe in an idea, no obstacle will prevent me from making it happen</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>These questions ask about <strong>your mood at work</strong></th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Somewhat Disagree</th>
<th>Somewhat Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>J1. I can change my mood so that it fits better with what I have to do</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J2. I can manage my moods so that my work flows easily</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J3. I can put myself in the mood that I need, in order to keep my work on track</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J4. I can do something to get rid of unpleasant moods that block me from progressing towards a goal</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J5. I can put myself into a happy mood to help me make progress towards my goals.</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
These questions ask about **your social life at work**. Please click on the answer that best reflects what applies to you.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Somewhat Disagree</th>
<th>Somewhat Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>K1. I can easily adjust to being in just about any social situation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K2. I am comfortable with all types of people – young or old, people from the same or different background as my self</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K3. I can talk to anybody about almost anything</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K4. People tell me that I am sensitive and understanding</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K5. I have no problems introducing myself to strangers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These questions ask about **the support that you get while you work**. Please click on the answer that best reflects what applies to you.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>How much support do you get from your organisation?</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Somewhat Disagree</th>
<th>Somewhat Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>L1. This organisation really cares about my well-being</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L2. This organisation is willing to extend itself in order to help me perform my job to the best of my ability</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L3. Even if I did the best job possible, this organisation would fail to notice</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L4. This organisation would ignore any complaint from me</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note:** Value congruence was measured using item A1 to A3; personality congruence was measured using item B1 to B3; goal congruence was measured using item E1 to E6; needs-supplies fit was measured using item C1 to C3; demands-abilities fit was measured using item D1 to D3; job satisfaction was measured using item F3, F6(R), and F9; organisational commitment was measured using item F1(R), F4(R), F7, and F10(R); intention to quit was measured using item F2, F5, and F8; job performance was measured using item G1 to G4; feedback seeking was measured using item H1 to H4; proactive behaviour was measured using item I1 to I5; emotional control was measured using item J1 to J5; social competence was measured using item K1 to K5; and organisational support was measured using item L1 to L4
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Informasi Umum:

1. Apakah jenis kelamin Anda?:
   - Pria
   - Wanita

2. Berapakah usia Anda?: _____ tahun

3. Apakah tingkat pendidikan terakhir yang Anda selesaikan?
   - SLTP atau sederajat
   - SLTA atau sederajat
   - D1 atau D2
   - D3 atau D4
   - Sarjana (S1)
   - Master (S2)
   - Doktor (S3)

4. Apakah status pernikahan Anda saat ini?
   - Lajang
   - Menikah
   - Bercerai
   - Janda / Duda

5. Apakah nama JABATAN Anda saat ini? ________________________________

6. Berapa orang jumlah bawahan langsung Anda: _____ orang

7. Berapa jam biasanya Anda bekerja dalam seminggu? ___________ jam

8. Berapakah total waktu Anda bekerja pada JABATAN Anda saat ini? _____ tahun

9. Berapakah total waktu Anda bekerja di PERUSAHAAN ini? _____ tahun

10. Berapakah total waktu Anda bekerja secara KESELURUHAN? _____ tahun

11. Di bidang atau bagian apakah Anda bekerja?
    - Business Development
    - Finance & Accounting
    - Human Resources
    - Legal
    - Information System
    - Sales & Marketing
- Customer Relation (misal: Customer Service, Technician)
- Manufacturing & Logistic (misal: Produksi, PPIC, R&D, QA, Pembelian, Gudang)
- Selain di atas

Pertanyaan berikut ini hanya untuk kepentingan pencocokan kesamaan responden antara survey pertama dan survey kedua. Hal ini akan tetap membuat jatidiri Anda tidak dapat diidentifikasi (anonym).

14. Apakah singkatan nama ibu kandung Anda? ___ ___ ___ ___ ___
   (Misal: Nurkhasanah Dimyati ditulis N_D)

15. Apakah 2 (DUA) angka terakhir tahun kelahiran Anda? ___ ___
   Misalnya tahun 1969 ditulis: 6_9

Tanggal pengisian (tgl – bulan – tahun): ___ - ___ - _______
**Appendix D (Cont’d.)**

Ketika mengisi angket survey ini, pusatkan perhatian Anda pada **pekerjaan** dan **perusahaan** tempat Anda bekerja **SAAT INI**.

Pilihlah jawaban yang **paling menggambarkan kondisi dan pendapat anda** dengan memberi **tanda contreng (✓)** pada pilihan jawaban yang tersedia.

**TIDAK ADA JAWABAN YANG BENAR ATAU SALAH**, Jawaban Anda merupakan kontribusi yang sangat berharga bagi penelitian ini.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pernyataan berikut ini berkaitan dengan nilai pribadi Anda dan perusahaan</th>
<th>Sangat Tidak Setuju</th>
<th>Tidak Setuju</th>
<th>Agak Tidak Setuju</th>
<th>Agak Setuju</th>
<th>Setuju</th>
<th>Sangat Setuju</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A1. Hal-hal yang menjadi nilai dalam hidup saya sangat mirip dengan apa yang menjadi nilai dalam perusahaan ini</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A2. Nilai-nilai hidup pribadi saya sesuai dengan nilai dan budaya perusahaan ini</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A3. Nilai dan budaya perusahaan ini sangat cocok dengan hal-hal yang menjadi nilai dalam hidup saya</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pernyataan berikut ini berkaitan dengan kepribadian Anda dan perusahaan</th>
<th>Sangat Tidak Setuju</th>
<th>Tidak Setuju</th>
<th>Agak Tidak Setuju</th>
<th>Agak Setuju</th>
<th>Setuju</th>
<th>Sangat Setuju</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B1. Kepribadian saya cocok dengan “kepribadian” perusahaan ini</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B2. Kepribadian saya menghambat saya untuk bisa “masuk” ke dalam perusahaan ini (R)</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B3. “Kepribadian” perusahaan ini mencerminkan kepribadian saya</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pernyataan berikut ini berkaitan dengan pemenuhan kebutuhan pekerjaan Anda.</th>
<th>Sangat Tidak Setuju</th>
<th>Tidak Setuju</th>
<th>Agak Tidak Setuju</th>
<th>Agak Setuju</th>
<th>Setuju</th>
<th>Sangat Setuju</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>C1. Apa yang ditawarkan perusahaan ini sangat sesuai dengan apa yang saya cari dari sebuah perusahaan.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C2. Hal-hal yang saya cari dari sebuah perusahaan sebagai tempat bekerja dapat dipenuhi perusahaan ini dengan baik</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C3. Perusahaan ini memberikan hampir semua hal yang saya inginkan dari sebuah perusahaan</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pernyataan berikut ini berkaitan dengan pribadi Anda dan kebutuhan perusahaan.</th>
<th>Sangat Tidak Setuju</th>
<th>Tidak Setuju</th>
<th>Agak Tidak Setuju</th>
<th>Agak Setuju</th>
<th>Setuju</th>
<th>Sangat Setuju</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>D1. Apa yang dituntut perusahaan ini sangat cocok dengan keahlian yang saya miliki</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D2. Keahlian dan kemampuan yang saya miliki sangat sesuai dengan persyaratan dari perusahaan ini</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Pernyataan berikut ini berkaitan dengan **tujuan pribadi Anda** dan **tujuan perusahaan**.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Pernyataan</th>
<th>Sangat Tidak Setuju</th>
<th>Tidak Setuju</th>
<th>Agak Tidak Setuju</th>
<th>Agak Setuju</th>
<th>Setuju</th>
<th>Sangat Setuju</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>E1</td>
<td>Tujuan (goal) perusahaan ini sama dengan tujuan pekerjaan saya</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E2</td>
<td>Pencapaian tujuan (goal) perusahaan ini berarti juga pencapaian tujuan pribadi saya</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E3</td>
<td>Tujuan hidup pribadi saya cocok dengan tujuan perusahaan ini.</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E4</td>
<td>Tujuan hidup pribadi saya sejalan dengan tujuan (goal) dari perusahaan ini</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E5</td>
<td>Tujuan (goal) dari perusahaan ini memberikan kesempatan kepada saya untuk mencapai tujuan hidup pribadi saya</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E6</td>
<td>Tujuan hidup pribadi saya selaras dengan tujuan perusahaan ini</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Pernyataan berikut ini berkaitan dengan **kondisi pekerjaan dan perusahaan**. Silakan pilih jawaban yang paling sesuai dengan pendapat Anda.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Pernyataan</th>
<th>Sangat Tidak Setuju</th>
<th>Tidak Setuju</th>
<th>Agak Tidak Setuju</th>
<th>Agak Setuju</th>
<th>Setuju</th>
<th>Sangat Setuju</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>F1</td>
<td>Saya tidak merasa sebagai “bagian keluarga” dari perusahaan ini</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F2</td>
<td>Kemungkinan besar, saya akan aktif mencari pekerjaan baru dalam waktu 12 bulan ke depan</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F3</td>
<td>Dalam semua hal, saya puas dengan pekerjaan saya saat ini</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F4</td>
<td>Saya tidak merasa punya “ikatan emosional” dengan perusahaan ini</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F5</td>
<td>Saya sering berpikir untuk keluar dari pekerjaan saya saat ini</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F6</td>
<td>Secara umum, saya tidak suka dengan pekerjaan saya saat ini</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F7</td>
<td>Perusahaan ini memiliki nilai yang sangat berarti buat saya secara pribadi</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F8</td>
<td>Saya mungkin akan mencari pekerjaan baru dalam waktu 12 bulan ke depan</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F9</td>
<td>Secara umum, saya suka melakukan pekerjaan saya saat ini</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F10</td>
<td>Saya tidak merasakan adanya “rasa memiliki” yang kuat terhadap perusahaan ini</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pernyataan berikut ini berkaitan dengan Anda dan pekerjaan Anda saat ini</td>
<td>Sangat Setuju</td>
<td>Tidak setuju</td>
<td>Agak Tidak Setuju</td>
<td>Agak Setuju</td>
<td>Setuju</td>
<td>Sangat Setuju</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G1. Saya mampu menunjukkan bahwa saya ahli dalam menjalankan semua tugas pekerjaan saya</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G2. Saya dapat memenuhi semua persyaratan dari pekerjaan saya saat ini.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G3. Saya kompeten mengerjakan semua area di pekerjaan saya saat ini dengan baik</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G4. Saya berprestasi dalam keseluruhan pekerjaan saya, dengan mengerjakan semua tugas sesuai yang diharapkan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pernyataan berikut berkaitan tentang bagaimana Anda memonitor pekerjaan Anda</th>
<th>Sangat Setuju</th>
<th>Tidak setuju</th>
<th>Agak Tidak Setuju</th>
<th>Agak Setuju</th>
<th>Setuju</th>
<th>Sangat Setuju</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>H1. Saya suka bertanya pada atasan langsung saya apakah saya memenuhi semua tuntutan pekerjaan saya</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H2. Saya suka bertanya pada rekan kerja saya apakah saya bekerja dengan baik</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H3. Dari reaksi mereka, saya dapat menyimpulkan seberapa baik saya bekerja bersama rekan-rekan dalam tim kerja saya.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H4. Dengan mengamati sikap atasan langsung, saya dapat mengatakan seberapa baik saya berprestasi pada pekerjaan saya</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pernyataan berikut ini berkaitan dengan bagaimana Anda menampilkan diri Anda ketika bekerja</th>
<th>Sangat Setuju</th>
<th>Tidak setuju</th>
<th>Agak Tidak Setuju</th>
<th>Agak Setuju</th>
<th>Setuju</th>
<th>Sangat Setuju</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I1. Tidak ada yang lebih menarik daripada melihat ide-ide saya menjadi kenyataan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I2. Dimanapun saya berada, saya seorang yang penuh semangat untuk melakukan perubahan yang membangun</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I3. Walaupun kelihatannya aneh, jika saya percaya akan sesuatu hal, saya akan membuatnya menjadi kenyataan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I4. Saya selalu mencari cara-cara yang lebih baik untuk mengerjakan sesuatu</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I5. Jika saya yakin akan suatu ide, tidak ada yang bisa menghalangi saya untuk membuatnya menjadi kenyataan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pernyataan berikut ini berkaitan dengan perasaan anda ketika bekerja</th>
<th>Sangat Setuju</th>
<th>Tidak setuju</th>
<th>Agak Tidak Setuju</th>
<th>Agak Setuju</th>
<th>Setuju</th>
<th>Sangat Setuju</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>J1. Saya mampu mengubah suasana hati (mood) saya sehingga lebih sesuai dengan apa yang harus saya kerjakan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J2. Saya mampu mengelola suasana hati saya agar pekerjaan saya selesai dengan lebih mudah</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J3. Saya mampu mengatur suasana hati saya sesuai tuntutan pekerjaan, agar tetap dapat bekerja pada jalurnya</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J4. Saya mampu melakukan sesuatu untuk menghilangkan perasaan tidak menyenangkan yang menghambat saya untuk mencapai sasaran.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J5. Saya mampu membuat suasana hati saya menjadi gembira untuk membantu saya mencapai target kerja saya</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Pernyataan berikut ini berkaitan dengan kehidupan sosial Anda dalam lingkungan pekerjaan:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pernyataan</th>
<th>Sangat Setuju</th>
<th>Tidak Setuju</th>
<th>Agak Setuju</th>
<th>Agak Tidak Setuju</th>
<th>Tidak</th>
<th>Sangat Tidak Setuju</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>K1. Saya dapat dengan mudah beradaptasi pada setiap situasi sosial</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K2. Saya merasa nyaman berhubungan dengan berbagai tipe orang - muda atau tua, dari latar belakang yang sama atau berbeda dengan saya.</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K3. Saya dapat berbicara tentang apa saja dengan semua orang</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K4. Orang-orang mengatakan bahwa saya seorang yang peka dan pengertian</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K5. Saya tidak mengalami kesulitan untuk memperkenalkan diri pada orang yang belum dikenal</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Pertanyaan berikut ini berkaitan dengan dukungan (support) yang anda dapatkan ketika Anda bekerja:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pertanyaan</th>
<th>Sangat Setuju</th>
<th>Tidak Setuju</th>
<th>Agak Setuju</th>
<th>Agak Tidak Setuju</th>
<th>Tidak</th>
<th>Sangat Tidak Setuju</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>L1. Perusahaan ini memerhatikan kesejahteraan hidup saya</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L2. Perusahaan ini membantu saya untuk berprestasi sesuai dengan kemampuan saya secara optimal</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L3. Walaupun saya sudah bekerja semaksimal mungkin, perusahaan ini tidak akan memberikan perhatian</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L4. Perusahaan ini tidak memerhatikan keluhan-keluhan saya</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix E

Information Sheet for Second Data Collection (Bahasa Indonesia Version)

LEMBAR INFORMASI
UNTUK PROYEK PENELITIAN:
PROMOTING SELF-REGULATION IN BUSINESS SETTINGS
(Pemberdayaan "Pengelolaan-Diri" dalam lingkungan kerja)
(GU Ref No: PSY/89/09/HREC)


Seperti yang telah diinformasikan pada survey pertama, partisipasi pada proyek penelitian ini bersifat sukarela, dan jawaban Anda akan dijamin dan dijaga kerahasiaannya karena Anda tidak diharuskan menuliskan detil identitas secara jelas (anonym). Selain itu, tidak ada resiko apapun yang akan muncul akibat Anda berpartisipasi pada proyek penelitian ini karena perusahaan tempat Anda bekerja tidak akan mendapatkan laporan hasil secara individual dan informasi tentang siapa saja yang ikut berpartisipasi. Untuk itu, harap diisi seluruhnya sesuai dengan kondisi yang Anda rasakan saat ini.

Sekarang, Anda diharapkan untuk berpartisipasi kembali untuk survey yang ke dua. Isi survey ke dua ini sama dengan survey yang pertama. Pengisian survey ini hanya akan memakan waktu sekitar 15 menit.

Untuk memungkinkan peneliti mengukur dan membandingkan perkembangan selama 6 bulan, Anda diminta untuk menuliskan singkat nama ibu kandung Anda dan 2 (dua) angka tahun kelahiran Anda pada survey yang ke dua ini sama persis dengan apa yang Anda tuliskan pada survey pertama, dengan tujuan hanya untuk kepentingan tersebut di atas. Anda tidak perlu khawatir karena informasi ini tidak dapat mengidentifikasi jati diri Anda dan data survey ini akan dihancurkan setelah kami melakukan perbandingan.

Semua penelitian pada Griffith University mengacu pada the National Statement on Ethical Conduct in Human Research (peraturan nasional Australia tentang kode etik untuk penelitian pada manusia). Jika Anda mengalami masalah kode etik pada saat pelaksanaan penelitian ini, silakan menghubungi Griffith University Research Ethics Committee dengan menyebutkan GU Ref No: PSY/89/09/HREC di alamat sbb:

Manager, Research Ethics
Office for Research, Bray Centre, Nathan Campus
Griffith University
Phone: (+61) (07) 3735 5585
e-mail: research-ethics@griffith.edu.au

Terima kasih atas waktu dan partisipasi Anda pada penelitian ini.
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