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Abstract

Organisational fit is a construct that has captured the interest of both researchers and practitioners over decades. Often, recommendations are made that organisations seek to maximise person-organisation fit throughout processes such as personnel selection. However, the multitude of ways in which person-organisation fit has been conceptualised, operationalised and analysed in research settings impedes meaningful and robust application of the research in organisational settings. This thesis responds to calls for researchers to examine the construct definition and measurement of person-organisation fit as a critical enabler of theoretical progress. The research program is guided by two core questions: “what does organisational fit mean to organisational practitioners?” and “what does organisational fit mean in research?”. The program begins with a qualitative exploration of the way that organisational fit is understood and applied by organisational practitioners in selection settings. Turning to the application of the construct in empirical research, the dominant person-organisation fit instrument in the field is used as a case study to demonstrate that greater attention needs to be paid to underlying dimensionality in indirect assessments of fit. A confirmatory factor analysis of normative data is used to identify two factors that appear robust and have alignment with established models. Addressing the question of whether fit is fit, regardless of how it is measured, and using both values-based and personality-based measurement, relationships between indirect and direct operationalisations of person-organisation fit are examined using polynomial regression and response surface methodology. Finally, giving consideration to outcome variables that are likely to be of interest to organisations, relationships between indirect and direct operationalisations of person-organisation fit and outcome variables of job satisfaction, organisational commitment and work motivation are examined. Taken as a whole, this thesis makes the argument that different approaches to conceptualising and measuring person-organisation fit cannot be considered interchangeable in theory or
practice. Three key challenges that person-organisation fit scholars must respond to are laid out as an agenda for future research and theory development, and the practical implications of the findings are considered.
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Chapter One.

Introduction: The Imperative for Construct-Oriented Research on Person-Organisation Fit

Organisational fit “is one of the most widely used psychological constructs in industrial and work psychology” and yet it “remains questionably defined and often misunderstood” (Kristof-Brown & Billsberry, 2013, p. 1). The applied appeal of person-organisation fit is a consistent theme across decades of organisational research, from Caplan’s (1987, p. 248) argument “organizations and their members have a fundamental stake in how well characteristics of the person and the environment of the organization fit one another”; through Kristof’s (1996, p. 49) observation “achieving high levels of [person-organisation] fit through hiring and socialisation is often touted as the key to retaining a workforce with the flexibility and organizational commitment necessary to meet... competitive challenges”; to Morley’s (2007, p. 111) position that “achieving a high degree of [person-organisation] fit is viewed in many quarters as desirable in terms of positive work-related outcomes, especially in the context of a tight labor market and the war for talent”.

However, organisations looking to the research for guidance on how to realise the apparent benefits of person-organisation fit are presented with a multitude of ways in which person-organisation fit can be operationalised (Kristof-Brown & Jansen, 2007) and complexity in drawing conclusions beyond a general sense that “good fit leads to positive outcomes” (Oh, Guay, Kim, Harold, Lee, Heo & Shin, 2014, p. 99). Reflecting on organisational fit research, Harrison (2007, p. 389-390) concluded that “as an outsider... on fit theory and research, I get the sense that if fit doesn’t encompass the entirety of creation, it comes awfully close... Fit can’t be everything. If fit is everything, then it is

1 In this thesis, person-organisation fit, organisational fit and cultural fit are used synonymously
nothing – at least nothing with scientific utility. For fit to be meaningful, for fit to be a valuable and vibrant conception for understanding the organizational world, it needs to have recognizable borders and a coherent definition that distinguishes it from other conceptions.” In line with Harrison’s views, other scholars have described the construct of person-organisation fit as “elusive” (Billsberry, Ambronsini, Moss-Jones & Marsh, 2005; Judge & Ferris, 1992) and “problematic” (Morley, 2007). Kristof-Brown and Jansen (2007, p. 123-124) observed that “unlike other topics on person and organization interactions..., there appears to be no generally agreed way to define, measure or account for the impact of [person-organisation] fit”.

In a recent curation of the most exciting future directions for organisational fit research, Kristof-Brown and Billsberry (2013) sought to inspire researchers to focus on understanding the nature of the person-organisation fit itself: “rather than be perplexed and stymied by the lack of consensus on the construct definition of organizational fit, we suggest that this variety be embraced and explored by fit scholars” (p. 15). Their call echoes that made by Edwards (2008, p. 53) that researchers need to “confront the meaning of fit” in order to see conceptual progress in this field and Kristof-Brown and Guay’s (2011, p. 37) assertion that “one of the most critical and challenging questions is the question of what exactly fit is”.

This thesis responds to these calls with a research program that focuses on the nature of organisational fit in both theory and practice. Qualitative and quantitative methods are applied to explore two fundamental questions: “what does organisational fit mean to organisational practitioners?” and “what does organisational fit mean in the research?”. Central to this investigation is the relationship between the ways in which organisations may seek to measure organisational fit in order to make critical talent decisions, the way person-organisation fit has been operationalised in empirical research and the theoretical foundation that conceptually links organisational fit to consequences.
that are important for organisational success. While the themes discussed in this thesis are broadly applicable to person-organisation fit practice and research, particular attention is paid to the ability of the research to support sensible application of organisational fit constructs in personnel selection settings.

In this introductory chapter, groundwork for the research program is laid by first establishing the imperative for construct oriented research on person-organisation fit as integral to bridging the gap between science and practice in this field. Next, a review of way the construct of person-organisation fit has developed and been applied in organisational theory and research is presented. Finally, an overview of the research program is presented, positioning this research in the context of contemporary directions in organisational fit research.

*Bridging the Gap Between Science and Practice: The Importance of Definition, Measurement and Theory*

The motivation to undertake this research project came from the researcher’s experience as a psychologist and organisational behaviour specialist consulting to and working in organisations to apply robust research-based approaches to improve organisational practice, particularly in employee selection settings. In this work, the idea of ‘organisational fit’ repeatedly arose as something that managers felt they should care about and factor into decision making and about which the researcher wanted to provide quality, science-driven advice. Employing one of Ployhart’s (2014) recommendations for establishing the ‘real world’ relevance of research phenomena, a review of contemporary business publications such as the Wall Street Journal, Harvard Business Review and BusinessWeek can be used to highlight the prevalence of practitioner oriented discussion about organisational and cultural fit. Indicative titles include ‘Management Q&A: Assessing ‘Fit’ in Interviews’ (Wall Street Journal, Gutner, 2010); ‘Job Applicants’ Cultural Fit can

However, despite decades of interest in the topic, it is still difficult to draw clear conclusions from research about how organisational fit can support organisational decision making in high stakes settings such as personnel selection. Arthur, Bell, Doverspike and Villado (2006, p. 797) recommended that, in the absence of local validation data to support its use, “organizations should exercise caution when using P-O fit to make employment-related decisions (e.g., selection)”. Judge (2007, p. 439) observed that “in industrial-organizational psychology, we have selection researchers and fit researchers, but there seems to be very little integration of the two fields”. In their 2008 review of the personnel selection literature, Sackett and Lievens (p. 432) concluded that person-organisation fit “remains a topic for research rather than for operational use in selection”. Reviewing the state of selection literature in 2014, Ryan and Ployhart identified “how to select for company fit, values and culture” as an area that required more attention in research in order to meet practitioner demand for such instruments.

This thesis looks at one of the primary obstacles to the effective application of research to selection practices: the complexity of approaches to person-organisation fit definition, measurement and theory in the literature. A primary focus is the difference between the way that organisations may seek to assess person-organisation fit and the range of ways scholars have approached the construct in research. In this respect, this thesis has been approached with a deliberately scientist-practitioner mindset, aiming to apply research effort to questions that have business relevance and communicate the findings of the research in a manner that supports good practice (Anderson, Herriot & Hodgkinson, 2001; Arnold & Chambers, 2014; Ployhart, 2014; Rauschenberger & Mellon, 2014). As noted by Ployhart (2014, p. 259 – 260): “the science part of the [scientist-
practitioner] identity is what separates [scientist-practitioners] from general management consultants, managers informed by their own experiences, gurus, hucksters, and most anyone else who charges money for management advice”.

**Theoretical Foundations of the Person-Organisation Fit Construct**

Person-organisation fit is a subset of person-environment fit: “one of, if not the, dominant conceptual forces in the field [of psychology]” (Schneider, 2001, p. 142). While this domain of research has its roots in earlier work (e.g. Argyris, 1957; Lewin, 1935, 1951; Murray, 1938, 1951; Parsons, 1909; Tom, 1971), person-organisation fit primarily emerged as a construct of interest in organisational behaviour research in the late 1980s (Kristof-Brown & Jansen, 2007; Ostroff & Schulte, 2007). Two dominant theories developed during this period were Schneider’s Attraction-Selection-Attrition (ASA) theory and Chatman’s person-organisation fit theory. In this section, ASA theory and person-organisation fit theory are examined as the theoretical foundations of person-organisation fit research, exerting considerable influence over the way that the construct has been defined, measured and conceptually linked to organisational talent management practices.

**Schneider’s ASA Theory:** Schneider’s ASA theory has been termed the “theoretical cornerstone for research on the concept of person-organisation fit” (Kristof-Brown & Jansen, 2007) and has been influential in drawing a conceptual relationship between organisational talent management processes and organisational fit. ASA theory is based on the premise that similarity between employees in organisations is a key factor in individuals’ attraction to, selection by and retention in organisations (Schneider, 1987a, 1987b). ASA proposes that people are differentially attracted to organisational settings; that formal and informal selection practices restrict the range of people selected into organisations; and that people either voluntarily or involuntarily leave organisations when
they don’t fit well. ASA operates as a cycle so that over time, without intervention, organisations will become more homogenous in relation to personal attributes.

While the concept of fit is at the core of ASA theory, the original articulation of ASA framework was somewhat vague in relation to the way this construct was defined (Schneider, Goldstein & Smith, 1995). Schneider and colleagues (1995, p. 749) later clarified that “the attributes of interest are personality, attitudes and values”. Empirical tests of ASA propositions have used both personality (e.g. Bretz, Ash, Dreher, 1989; Schneider, Smith, Taylor & Fleenor, 1998) and values (e.g. Billsberry, 2007; De Cooman, De Gieter, Pepermans, Hermans, Du Bois, Caers, & Jegers, 2009) to operationalise fit.

While ASA theory has been a key force in organisational fit research, it is important to note that, to some extent, person-organisation fit research has progressed in a manner that runs counter to some of ASA’s key propositions and implications. ASA was developed as a theory to explain the nature of organisations, rather than the behaviour of individuals (Schneider et al., 1995), with a core argument that the “technology, structure, and larger environment of organizations are outcomes of, not causes of, people and their behaviour” (Schneider, 1987a, p. 440). A key implication of this theory is that organisations should guard against high levels of homogeneity, rather than actively seeking it out through recruitment and selection processes: “unless organizations consciously fight restriction in the range of the kinds of people they contain, when the environment changes they will (1) not be aware that it has changed and (2) probably not be capable of changing.” (Schneider, 1987a, p. 446). In contrast to ASA theory, much subsequent person-organisation fit research is focused on explaining individual behaviour (Ostroff & Schulte, 2007) looking at ways that organisations can maximise fit (e.g. Bowen, Ledford & Nathan, 1991).

Chatman’s Person-Organisation Fit Theory: Developed largely in parallel to ASA theory, Chatman’s (1989, p. 339) seminal work defined person-organisation fit as “the congruence between the norms and values of organizations and the values of person”. By
defining person-organisation fit in terms of values, Chatman provides a framework for understanding the antecedents and consequences of fit. Chatman’s model stipulated selection and socialisation as the key antecedents of person-organisation fit. When organisational values are stable, the fit of a particular individual will depend on first, the values that individual held when they were selected into the organisation and second, any changes to those values that have occurred through organisational socialisation processes. Chatman’s discussion of the consequences of fit are primarily focused on actions that could be taken to address lack of fit. In situations of low fit, Chatman proposes that there are three likely outcomes: a) the individual changes their values to align with the norms and values of the organisation; b) the organisation’s values change to align more closely with the individual or c) the individual leaves the organisation.

A key contribution of Chatman’s work was the introduction of the Organizational Culture Profile as a mechanism for measuring and comparing values in people and organizations (OCP; O’Reilly, Chatman & Caldwell, 1991). Kristof-Brown, Zimmerman and Johnson (2005, p. 285) noted that, in combination, Chatman’s person-organisation fit theory and the OCP led to “value congruence [becoming] widely accepted as the defining operationalization of [person-organisation] fit”. The OCP itself is an instrument designed to indirectly operationalise person-organisation fit, collecting information about personal values and organisational values separately. Later work has drawn on Chatman’s definition of person-organisation fit as value congruence to develop measures of perceived person-organisation fit, where individuals are asked to report directly on their experience of fit (e.g. Cable & DeRue, 2002).

For the purposes of the questions addressed in this thesis, the primary contributions of both ASA theory and Chatman’s person-organisation fit theory to the application to person-organisation fit in research have been: a) the identification of values, primarily, and personality, secondarily, as underlying attributes upon which fit can be
assessed; and b) the identification of the importance of organisational fit to organisational talent processes, such as selection.

Empirical Research and Methodological Debate

The introduction of the concept of person-organisation fit to the literature prompted a great deal of empirical research (Kristof-Brown & Jansen, 2007; Edwards, 2008). Studies examined how applicants’ perception of their fit with an organisation affects their attraction to that organisation and job choice decisions (e.g. Dineen, Ash and Noe, 2002; Cable & Judge, 1996; Chapman, Uggerslev, Carroll, Piasentin & Jones, 2005; Jones, Willness & Madey, 2014; Swider, Zimmerman & Barrick, 2015); how applicants form person-organisation fit perceptions (e.g. Cable & Judge, 1996; Cable & Yu, 2007; Saks & Ashforth, 1997; Saks & Ashforth, 2002); how recruiter judgement of fit impact selection decisions (e.g. Sekiguchi & Huber, 2011); the way that different types of socialisation tactics impact perceived and actual levels of person-organisation fit (Cable & Parsons, 2001; Cooper-Thomas, van Vianen and Anderson, 2004; Chatman, 1991); and how information about person-organisation fit can be used to facilitate effective transition in organisational change (e.g. Choi & Price, 2005; Ryan & Schmit, 1996).

A large body of empirical research examined the relationship between person-organisation fit and work outcomes such as job satisfaction, organisational commitment and, to a lesser extent, performance (e.g. Ambrose, Arnaud, & Schminke, 2008; Amos & Weathington, 2008; Andrews, Baker, & Hunt, 2010; Bretz & Judge, 1994; Cable & De Rue, 2002; Cable & Judge, 1996; Chatman, 1991; Christiansen, Villanova & Mikulay, 1997; Cooper-Thomas et al., 2004; Gregarus & Diefendorff, 2009; Gregory, Albritton & Osmonbekov, 2010; Hambleton, Kalliath & Taylor, 2000; Harris & Mossholder, 1996; Jansen & Kristof-Brown, 2005; Kalliath, Bluedorn & Strube, 1999; Lauver & Kristof-Brown, 2001; Lovelace & Rosen, 1996; O’Reilly et al., 1991; Piasentin & Chapman, 2007; Saks & Ashforth,
1997; Saks & Ashforth, 2002). This work has been synthesised in a number of meta-analytic reviews (Verquer, Beehr & Wagner, 2003; Hoffman & Woehr, 2006; Arthur et al., 2006; Kristof-Brown et al., 2005; Oh et al., 2014).

As the body of empirical research on person-organisation fit developed, Kristof identified the need to explain “the various issues involved in studying this complex construct” because the “level of ambiguity over what fit was and how to best assess it was overwhelming” (Kristof-Brown & Jansen, 2007, p. 124). In 1996, Kristof published an integrative review of the person-organisation fit literature that defined person-organisation fit as: “the compatibility between people and organisations that occurs when: (a) at least one entity provides what the other needs, or (b) they share similar fundamental characteristics, or (c) both.” Kristof’s broad definition included both supplementary fit, defined as similarity between person and environment characteristics, and complementary fit, “which occurs when a person’s characteristics “make whole” the environment or add to it what is missing” (Kristof, 1996, p. 3). While acknowledging the dominance of value congruence as the primary operationalisation of person-organisation fit in empirical research, Kristof noted that other research streams have conceptualised fit using personality (e.g. Schneider et al., 1998) or goal congruence (e.g. Kristof-Brown & Stevens, 2001; Vancouver & Schmitt, 1991; Vancouver, Millsap & Peters, 1994) as the underlying attribute upon which person-organisation fit is assessed.

Kristof’s comprehensive review also covered some key debates about appropriate ways to measure and analyse person-organisation fit. Kristof distinguished between direct measures of person-organisation fit, where individuals are asked to report on their perceived level of fit, and indirect measure of fit that collect information about the person and the organisation and use this data to calculate fit. Kristof also highlighted the debate

2 In the Kristof-Brown and Jansen (2007) publication, Kristof-Brown discusses the factors that led her to develop her 1996 integrative review.
about whether it was most appropriate to approach the calculation of fit with a profile similarity or polynomial regression approach. These ideas are explored in detail in the body of this thesis. Kristof (1996, p. 42) drew the conclusion that “as P-O fit becomes a more popular topic with both researchers and managers, increased attention must be paid to its multiple conceptualisations and measurement strategies”. The importance of attending to measurement has been reiterated in subsequent reviews by Kristof-Brown and Jansen (2007) and Kristof-Brown and Guay (2011).

*Person-Organisation Fit Measurement Nomenclature.* In addition to the actual complexity associated with the definition and application of the construct of person-organisation fit, an additional challenge in navigating this research is the inconsistent use of the nomenclature throughout the literature (Kristof-Brown & Guay, 2011). In this thesis, the terminology for differentiating between person-organisation fit measures follows Kristof-Brown and Guay (2011) and is described in Table 1. As outlined in the table, the term direct fit is used synonymously with the term perceived fit. The term indirect fit is used to reference measurement of fit that involves capturing data on personal characteristics and organisational characteristics separately. Indirect fit is further broken down into subjective fit and objective fit, depending on the source of personal and organisational data. While it should be noted that the labels ‘perceived fit’ and ‘subjective fit’ are not ideal because, arguably, all perceptions are subjective, the labels used in this thesis have the meaning outlined in Table 1 and are in accordance with precedents in the literature (Kristof-Brown & Guay, 2011).
Table 1: Types of Person-Organisation Fit Measures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Fit Measure</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Perceived fit</td>
<td>Direct assessments of person-organisation fit (e.g. by asking a target individual how well they feel they fit with the organisation)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subjective fit</td>
<td>Indirect measurement of person-organisation fit achieved by collecting measures of personal characteristics and organisational characteristics from the target individual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Objective fit</td>
<td>Indirect measurement of person-organisation fit achieved by collecting measures of personal characteristics and organisational characteristics from different sources (e.g. assessment of personal characteristic by the target individual and assessment of organisational characteristics by other employees in the same organisation)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Following Kristof-Brown and Guay (2011) where a theory or research study has used these categories but applied different labels, these terms have been relabelled to reflect the terminology applied in this thesis. A fourth category relevant to this thesis is recruiter judgements, used to refer to direct assessments of applicant fit made by the recruiter during a selection process.

Theoretical Progress: Contemporary Directions in Person-Organisation Fit Research

While future directions for the person-organisation fit research have been outlined many times, the research program presented in this thesis has been particularly influenced by the contemporary directions for person-organisation fit research laid out in Edwards (2008) critique of person-environment fit theory and Billsberry and Kristof-Brown’s (2013) recent volume on the future of organisational fit. In both cases, these eminent person-organisation fit researchers have highlighted the particular need to address the way that person-organisation fit is operationalised in organisational research in order to better understand how this construct can be meaningfully applied to organisational practice.
Edwards’ Critique of Person-Environment Fit Theory. Edwards’ (2008) review and critique of the extant person-environment fit theory, including person-organisation fit theory, described the field as being in a state of “theoretical stagnation”. Edwards (p. 169) argued that “many theories are stated in vague terms that obscure the meaning of P-E fit and its relationship with other constructs, and theories proposed in recent years are often less sophisticated than those developed decades earlier.” Edwards presented a series of recommendations for cultivating theoretical progress.

Of the recommendations made by Edwards, the ones most relevant to this thesis concern construct definition, measurement and analytical approach. In particular, Edwards argued that attention to the content of person and environment dimensions was integral to moving beyond general statements about fit and outcome relationships. He urged scholars to “confront the meaning of fit” by addressing the question of whether indirect and perceived fit operationalisations are distinct constructs (p. 219). Finally, Edwards reiterated his perspective that the use of statistical techniques, like polynomial regression, that enable the empirical test of theoretical propositions were important to ensure that theory could be critically evaluated. Each of these recommendations have informed the research program laid out in this thesis.

Kristof-Brown and Billsberry’s Call for Scholars to Embrace Multiple Conceptualisations of Fit. In 2013, Billsberry and Kristof-Brown (p. x) published a book on future directions for organisational fit research that contained “chapters from leaders in the field who have stepped back from their empirical work... and tried to reconceptualise our ways of thinking about fit”. The authors describe the development of this volume as a response to critical reviews of person-organisation fit research (e.g. Edwards, 2008; Harrison, 2007; Judge, 2007), seeking to respond to these critiques and invigorate new research directions for the field.
Several themes identified in the volume by Billsberry and Kristof-Brown (2013) are pursued through this thesis. First, across several chapters, there is an emphasis on understanding what people have in mind when they assess fit, recognising the value of qualitative methodologies in this exploratory work (e.g. Billsberry, Talbot & Ambrosini, 2013; van Vianen, Stoelhorst and De Goede, 2013). Second, it is argued that researchers need to recognise and engage with the differences between indirect and direct operationalisations of person-organisation fit, rather than viewing these as interchangeable constructs (Kristof-Brown & Billsberry, 2013; Yu, 2013). Finally, there is an emphasis on the role of motivation in explaining the relationship between fit and behaviour at work (Resick, Giberson, Dickson, Wynne & Bajdo, 2013).

Overview and Contributions of the Research Program

The research program reported in this thesis takes a detailed look at person-organisation fit construct definition, measurement and theory in both applied and research settings. The overarching objective of this thesis is to critically examine the research support for the use of person-organisation fit as a criterion for organisational decision making in situations such as personnel selection.

The research program begins, in Chapter Two, with a qualitative exploration of the way that organisational fit is understood and applied by organisational practitioners in selection settings. In this study, practitioners are asked about the way that they define, use and understand the construct of person-organisation fit in personnel selection and their responses are compared against the way that this construct is typically understood and measured in research settings. Chapter Two establishes that there is complexity in the way that practitioners define and apply the construct of person-organisation fit in organisational settings and that methods used to assess person-organisation fit in
organisations are not always the same as methods used to measure person-organisation fit in research.

Building on this theme, Chapter Three turns to the complexity that applies to the indirect measurement of person-organisation fit in empirical research and challenges the conclusions that have been drawn from holistic measures of indirect person-organisation fit. First, the case for focusing on content in person-organisation fit measurement is presented. Next, taking the OCP instrument as a case study, Chapter Three demonstrates that a holistic, ipsative and profile similarity approach to person-organisation fit measurement can lead to ambiguity in what is actually being measured by person-organisation fit instruments. Finally, a confirmatory factor analysis of data from a normative revision of the OCP is presented and used to identify two factors that could reasonably be used to examine indirect fit effects using more robust research methods.

Having addressed some of the key issues associated with the indirect measurement of person-organisation fit, Chapter Four expands its focus to include directly measured person-organisation fit and pursues the question ‘is fit fit, regardless of how it is measured?’ The analysis presented in this chapter explores the relationship between indirect and perceived operationalisations of person-organisation fit, using both values-based and personality-based operationalisations of indirect fit. Across all of the evidence, the strongest conclusion that can be drawn from Chapter Four is that indirectly measured person-organisation fit is not equivalent to the directly measured psychological experience of person-organisation fit.

If, as is argued in Chapter Four, different approaches to measuring person-organisation fit are not interchangeable, then it is important to understand the way in which different approaches to measuring fit relate to outcomes that matter to organisations. The focus of Chapter Five is the relationship between different operationalisations of person-organisation fit and organisationally relevant outcome
variables: job satisfaction, organisational commitment and work motivation. These variables, it is argued, are typically the kinds of outcomes that organisations are trying to influence when there are efforts to maximise person-organisation fit amongst employees. The analysis in Chapter Five demonstrates that direct perceptions of person-organisation fit, asking a target individual whether they experience a sense of fit with their organisation, exhibit strong relationships with these attitudinal measures. In contrast, there is very little evidence that indirectly measured person-organisation fit is related to these outcome measures.

Chapter Six, the concluding chapter, reflects on the conclusions that can be drawn from the research program as a whole and considers the implications of the findings for person-organisation fit theory and practice. Three key challenges that person-organisation fit scholars must respond to are laid out as an agenda for future research and theory development and the practical implications of the findings are considered. Taken as a whole, the research program highlights issues of construct definition, measurement and analysis that must be addressed for person-organisation fit to have continued relevance both as a field of organisational study and as a construct of interest in organisational practice.
Chapter Two.

What Does Organisational Fit Mean to Recruiters? A Qualitative Investigation into the Use of Person-Organisation Fit in Selection Processes.

As described in the introductory chapter, the conceptual link between person-organisation fit and selection has been articulated by scholars for decades (Bowen et al., 1991; Caplan, 1987; Chatman, 1989; Schneider, 1987a, 1987b), but there continue to be challenges with appropriately operationalising this construct in selection processes (e.g. Arthur et al, 2006; Ryan & Ployhart, 2014; Sackett & Lievens, 2008). At present, one of the limitations of organisational fit research is that very little is known about the use of organisational fit assessments in actual selection settings (Sackett & Lievens, 2008). The objectives of the qualitative investigation described in this chapter were twofold: first, to understand the extent to which the application of organisational fit in practice aligned with the treatment of the construct in organisational research; and second, to draw out recruiter insights into organisational fit to inform the design of scientist practitioner oriented research across the remainder of the research program.

Billsberry et al. (2013, p. 125) argues that some of the confusion associated with person-organisation fit construct definition and measurement stems from a lack of attention to the “initial exploratory work to understand what constitutes employees’ sense of fit”. While Billsberry et al. are focused on the employee experience, in the current study, the same reasoning is extended to organisational representatives who seek to apply and assess organisational fit in others in order to make personnel selection decisions. In this study, recruiters who are involved in making personnel selection decisions were interviewed about the way that they use organisational fit in their current selection practices. A qualitative design was employed to provide the opportunity for recruiters to
raise issues and describe experiences that may not have previously been a focus of research (Fletcher, 1994; Nowicki & Rosse, 2002). The advantages of applying qualitative techniques to organisational fit research have been highlighted a number of times (e.g. Kristof-Brown & Guay, 2011; Billsberry et al., 2013).

There were three key areas of interest in this study: a) how do recruiters define organisational fit?; b) what practices do recruiters use to assess organisational fit in selection processes?; and c) what do recruiters perceive to be the consequences of good or poor fit? Each of these topics has direct relevance to the use of organisational fit in selection. Practitioners who wish to use organisational fit in a selection process need to make decisions about how the term ‘organisational fit’ will be interpreted and how it will be assessed and they should have a clear rationale justifying the inclusion of organisational fit as a criterion, based on its capacity to predict subsequent workplace outcomes. In the following sections, the existing research on each topic is summarised and a rationale for the research questions is presented.

Recruiters’ Understanding of the Term ‘Organisational Fit’

As described in the introductory chapter, the most generally accepted scholarly definition of person-organisation fit is “the compatibility between people and organizations that occurs when: (a) at least one entity provides what the other needs, or (b) they share similar fundamental characteristics, or (c) both” (Kristof, 1996, pp. 4-5). Beyond this general definition, different researchers have more narrowly defined fit as compatibility between people and organisations on specific dimensions, such as values, goals, personality and abilities (Kristof, 1996). When it comes to the boundaries of the organisational fit construct, there is reasonable consensus amongst researchers that person-organisation fit is different to other fit constructs such as person-vocation fit,
person-group fit, and person-job fit (Kristof, 1996) and also different to a list of attributes that would be considered positive in all organisations (Bretz, Rynes, & Gerhart, 1993).

Contrasting the research literature’s treatment of organisational fit with recruiters’ perspectives, previous investigations have found mixed evidence about whether recruiters define organisational fit as the compatibility between individuals and organisations. Some research has found that recruiters appear to base their judgments about organisational fit on attributes that are relevant to organisational characteristics (Adkins, Russell, & Werbel, 1994; Rynes & Gerhart, 1990), while other research has concluded that recruiters’ person-organisation fit assessments are largely based on job-specific characteristics or generally positive characteristics rather than on organisation-specific attributes (Bretz et al., 1993; see also Rynes & Gerhart, 1990 for a discussion of the distinction between general employability and firm-specific employability). Similarly, some studies have provided evidence that recruiters do incorporate an assessment of applicant values into their person-organisation fit assessments (Cable & Judge, 1997; Kristof-Brown, 2000), while others have found that recruiters rarely mention values when they talk about judgements of organisational fit (Bretz et al., 1993). Taken as a whole, these studies suggest that there is some divergence between the way that recruiters and researchers approach the construct of organisational fit.

In the current study, recruiters were asked to describe their understanding of the term ‘organisational fit’. Responses were analysed to examine the extent to which recruiters’ definitions aligned with the commonly accepted research definition of organisational fit, as compatibility between people and organisations, and the extent to which recruiters’ definitions overlapped with other constructs. Distinctions that recruiters made between organisational fit and other concepts that were relevant to selection were also explored.

*Research question 2.1: How do recruiters describe organisational fit?*
The methods used by recruiters to assess organisational fit are particularly interesting because of the potential for a divergence between research and practice in the measurement of person-organisation fit. The nature of personnel selection precludes assessment in two of the four measurement categories that are of interest in this thesis. In particular, it is unlikely to be meaningful in a selection setting to directly assess perceived fit or to collect information about person and environment from the applicant (subjective indirect fit) because a) applicants may not have sufficient information about the organisation to make a reasonable assessment and b) such measures are likely to be highly susceptible to impression management in competitive selection processes. It seems more likely that recruiters will use objective assessments of fit (where person and environment information are collected from different sources) or direct judgements of fit made by the recruiter.

There is very limited information available on recruiters’ use of objective assessments in actual selection settings. This is consistent with the paucity of research on the use of organisational fit in organisational settings in general (Sackett & Lievens, 2008). It is interesting to note that several commercial providers of personality questionnaires offer organisational fit reports (e.g. Saville Consulting offers online assessments that screen for culture fit). It is not clear the extent to which these reports encourage organisations to also undertake a systematic process of analysing the organisational environment or to compare these to generate an index of fit or perform some other kind of computation.

Research into recruiter judgements of the extent to which an applicant fits with the target organisation have typically focused on assessments made during the selection interview. In contrast to the literature on objective assessments of fit, there are a number of studies that look at the way recruiters form perceptions of fit in actual selection processes (e.g. Adkins et al., 1994; Bretz et al., 1993; Chen, Lee, & Yeh, 2008; Kristof-
Brown, 2000). In their review of this literature, Kristof-Brown, Reeves and Follmer (2013, p. 445) concluded that these studies highlight “glaring deficiencies in how these perceptions are formed”.

In particular, a troubling aspect of recruiter judgements of fit is the evidence that person-organisation fit assessments are made in an idiosyncratic or intuitive manner. Several authors have found evidence for idiosyncrasy in the way that recruiters make judgements of fit (Chen et al., 2008; Kristof-Brown, 2000). For example, Adkins et al. (1994) found that congruence between applicants’ self-reported work values and recruiters’ perceptions of the organisation’s values was unrelated to recruiter judgements of applicant person-organisation fit. Instead, congruence between applicants’ values and the values of the recruiter were related to both judgements of applicant person-organisation fit and judgements of the applicant’s general employability. Chuang and Sackett (2005) found that recruiters’ perceptions of how much emphasis they place on person-organisation fit in the selection process was only marginally related to an analysis of how much emphasis recruiters placed on person-organisation fit when the dimensions of fit were specified separately. Similarly, Judge and Ferris (1992) reported on the practice of recruiters using an intuitive approach, for example, “I know it when I see it” approach to assessing organisational fit.

Recruiter preferences for applying intuitive and subjective methods to the assessment of organisational fit is reflective of a broader issue in personnel selection. In discussing this issue, Highhouse (2008, p. 340) notes that “people trust that the complex characteristics of applicants can be best assessed by a sensitive, equally complex human being. This does not stand up to scientific scrutiny, and [industrial and organisational] psychologists need to begin focusing their efforts on understanding how to navigate these waters”. Finding out more about the practice of assessing organisational fit in a subjective
manner will be useful for studies that intend to investigate the implications of this practice and the processes that organisations can put in place to minimise it.

In sum, there are a number of areas where the research can be informed by data on recruiters’ current practices in this area. In the current study, recruiters were asked firstly if they assessed organisational fit in the selection process at all. If they did, recruiters were asked to describe the practices they use to assess organisational fit. Responses were analysed to examine the extent to which objective assessments or recruiter judgements of organisational fit were used, as well as exploring evidence that assessments of fit were made in a subjective and idiosyncratic manner.

Research question 2.2: Do recruiters assess organisational fit? If so, what methods are used to assess fit?

Recruiter Insight into Consequences of Organisational Fit

The final area investigated by the current study was what recruiters saw as the consequences of good or poor organisational fit. To date, most research examining the relationship between organisational fit and work relevant outcomes has focused on work attitudes, including job satisfaction, organisational commitment and intentions to turnover (Arthur et al., 2006; Kristof-Brown et al., 2005; Verquer et al., 2003). Researchers have highlighted the need to further investigate the relationship between organisational fit and job performance (Arthur et al., 2006) and to better articulate the conceptual relationships between organisational fit and work outcomes (Edwards, 2008; Chan, 2005). In addition, there have been calls for research on situations in which misfit might lead to positive organisational outcomes (e.g. Chan, 2005). While in the popular and the academic literature, there is a tendency to talk about the need to select for high levels of person-organisation fit (e.g. Anderson, Lievens, van Dam, & Ryan, 2004; Bowen et al., 1991; Wah, 1998), it has been argued that it not always be desirable for organisations to actively seek
high fit individuals (Schneider, 1987a). Researchers highlighting the risks of high fit tend to focus on the lack of creativity and innovation associated with a highly homogenous workforce (e.g. Chan, 2005).

The main contribution that practitioners can provide is observations of the consequences of fit in the real world. These insights, based on applied experiences, can be used to develop theory about the relationship between organisational fit and particular outcomes. In the current study, recruiters were asked to describe what they saw as the consequences associated with organisational fit. The analyses investigated the extent to which recruiters referred to outcomes that have already been identified in the literature, as well as the outcomes that are not commonly referenced. The analyses also examined whether recruiters articulated positive consequences associated with misfit.

Research question 2.3: What do recruiters report as the consequences of selecting on the basis of organisational fit?

Summary of Study

In summary, the current study collected data from recruiters on their perceptions of, and practices using, organisational fit. The study explored recruiters’ perspectives of the definition, assessment and consequences of organisational fit. Recruiters’ observations were examined for their consistency with current research treatments of the organisational fit construct.
Method

Participants

The sample for the current study comprised 17 recruiters from 12 organisations. At the request of the participants, one interview was conducted with two participants simultaneously. The interview data from these participants is treated as a single case so the analysis below is based on 16 interviews.

Of the 12 organisations, 10 were public sector agencies, one was a private sector firm and one was a recruiting consultancy (this participant offered their perspective as a consultant who assisted organisations in their recruitment processes). Organisations ranged in size from 18 to 22000 with a mean organisation size of 8451.

To recruit participants, the researcher initially contacted personal contacts in public sector organisations and then recruited further participants on the recommendations of these contacts. In addition, human resource (HR) representatives of a number of other private sector agencies were approached directly, but none of these agencies chose to participate in the study.

Participants in the current study held various job titles, including Human Resource (HR) Manager (n = 3), recruitment manager or officer (n = 6) and a range of other titles. The primary criterion for inclusion in the study was that the participant had involvement in making selection decisions in their organisation. For some participants, selection was the core part of their job. Other participants were line managers who participated in selection processes within their specific work area.

Procedure

One-on-one, semi-structured interviews were conducted with participants. Interviews were half an hour in duration and were tape-recorded and subsequently transcribed.
A semi-structured format was used to conduct the interviews. The primary interview questions are displayed in Table 2. These were asked of each participant and follow up questions were asked to further elaborate responses. As noted in Table 2, two of the questions were modified from Bretz et al. (1993).

Table 2: Interview Questions

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>What does the term <strong>organisational fit</strong> mean to you?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Assuming that an applicant has the right skills and attributes to perform a particular job, do you think it is <strong>important</strong> that they also fit with the organisation? Why/why not? Does this vary for different positions?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>What are the consequences if someone does not fit in the organisation?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Is organisational fit something you would typically look for in a selection process? If so, how would you <strong>assess</strong> an applicant’s organisational fit?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Generally speaking, if you were to consider whether or not an applicant will fit with your organisation, what would be the <strong>most important things</strong> you would look for? (Modified from Bretz, Rynes and Gerhart, 1993)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Why would these attributes be important for work in <strong>this organisation</strong>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Think of an applicant who might be very marketable in general for a particular position, but who would <strong>not fit</strong> your organisation. What kinds of characteristics would that applicant have? (Modified from Bretz, Rynes and Gerhart, 1993)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>Why would these characteristics be detrimental to work in <strong>this organisation</strong>?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Analysis**

Nvivo software was used to support management and organisation of the data using coding: “naming segments of data with a label that simultaneously categorizes, summarizes, and accounts for each piece of data” (Charmaz, 2006). Initial coding was used to identify themes and ideas emerging from the data. Interview transcripts were read and coded using categories that reflected the basic idea expressed by the interviewee. A focused coding process was used to refine codes in an iterative manner, through reflective review of text segments tagged with the same code and consideration of the overall set of codes. Throughout this process, and in an iterative manner, codes and the data were organised according to the three topics of interest in this study: definition of organisational...
fit; approaches to assessing organisational fit and perceived consequences of organisational fit. Thus, a hierarchical categorisation of the data was derived, with the three research questions representing the highest order of organisation and each question associated with themes and sub-categories. Counts were applied to each sub-category based on the number of times the sub-category was identified in the data. Following Bretz et al. (1993), references to a particular category were coded only once for each recruiter, even where a recruiter mentioned a category multiple times. Finally, to contextualise the data, text segments that were seen to most clearly express each idea were identified and presented alongside counts of the number of interview sources who made statements that were coded in the category.

Results

Tables 3, 4 and 5 summarise the findings for each category that was used in the analyses of recruiters’ definitions of organisational fit, methods used to assess organisational fit and perceived consequences of organisational fit respectively. Further detail on these categories is provided in the discussion of the analyses below.

Definition of Organisational Fit

The analysis of recruiters’ definitions of organisational fit focused on: first, the extent to which recruiters’ definitions aligned with the commonly accepted research definition of organisational fit, as “compatibility between people and organizations” (Kristof, 1996, p. 2); second, the extent to which recruiters’ definitions included constructs other than compatibility between people and organisations; and third, the distinctions that recruiters made between organisational fit and other concepts that were relevant to selection (Table 3).

Compatibility between people and organisations. To assess the extent to which recruiters defined fit as the compatibility between the organisation and the individual, interview segments were examined for instances where respondents referred to features
of both the organisation and the individual in their definition of fit. It was found that organisational fit was described in this way by all respondents at some point in the interviews (n = 16).

Interview segments that were coded in this category were then examined to identify further categories that could describe the recruiters’ definitions of organisational fit. These segments were organised according to the attributes upon which the individual and organisation were compatible: a) values, b) goals, and c) abilities. As shown in Table 3, it was found that almost all recruiters in the sample defined fit as the alignment between individual’s values and the organisational culture (n = 15), while a smaller proportion of the sample also defined fit in terms of the alignment between individual and organisational goals (n = 10) and as the ability to contribute to the organisation beyond the immediate job role (n = 2).

Constructs other than compatibility between people and organisations. The next aspect of recruiters’ definitions of fit that was examined was the extent to which recruiters defined fit in terms of concepts other than the generally accepted research definition of compatibility between the organisation and the individual. Interview segments were examined for instances where respondents used the term organisational fit to describe attributes of the individual without relating this individual attribute to attributes of the organisation.

It was found that just under half of the sample also used organisational fit to refer to a concept other than the compatibility between the individual and the organisation (n = 7). Interview segments coded in this category were then organised into further categorisations according to the construct that most accurately described the definition used by the recruiter: a) general positive attitude; b) person-job fit; and c) person-team fit. As shown in Table 3, it was found that some recruiters used the term organisational fit to describe general positive attributes without making reference to characteristics of the
organisation (n = 3); others did not make a clear distinction between person-organisation fit and person-job fit (defined as “the relationship between a person’s characteristics and those of the job or tasks that are performed at work”, (Kristof-Brown et al., 2005, p. 284; n = 2) or person-team fit (defined as “the interpersonal compatibility between individuals and their work groups”, Kristof-Brown et al., 2005, p. 286; n = 5).

**Distinctions between organisational fit and other constructs.** The final aspect of recruiters’ definitions of fit that was examined was the distinctions that recruiters made between organisational fit and other constructs. This aspect of the analysis focused on what recruiters saw as falling outside of the definition of organisational fit.

Interview segments where recruiters referred to a distinction between organisational fit and other constructs were organised into three categories: a) distinction between person-job fit and person-organisation fit; b) distinction between organisational fit and person-team fit; and c) distinction between pre-selection and post-selection organisational fit. As shown in Table 3, it was found that some recruiters made a distinction between person-organisation fit and technical skills; (n = 10) and some saw organisational fit as different to similarity with others in the organisation (n = 4). Finally, some recruiters made a distinction between good fit at selection and good fit once the individual was working as an employee in the organisation (n = 4).

It is interesting to note that these results suggest lack of agreement about whether person-organisation fit and person-job fit are different constructs. Technical skills, which some recruiters saw as different to organisational fit, are often associated with the requirements of particular jobs so this may indicate a distinction in recruiters’ minds between person-organisation and person-job fit. In contrast, other recruiters did not differentiate between person-organisation and person-job fit.

**Summary of findings.** These results show that while all recruiters in the sample used language to describe organisational fit that is consistent with the commonly accepted
definition as compatibility between individuals and organisations, there were multiple attributes upon which individuals and organisations could be compatible, including values, goals and abilities. Some recruiters did not make a clear distinction between organisational fit and the related constructs of general positive attitude, person-job fit and person-team fit, although others did differentiate between person-organisation and person-job fit. Finally, recruiters made a distinction between pre- and post-selection organisational fit.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme</th>
<th>Sub-category</th>
<th>Indicative quote</th>
<th>n</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
|       | Compatibility between people and organisations: Organisational fit definitions that made reference to features of both the organisation and the individual | • It means somebody who will be able to work within the organisation, whose work values and their conduct and their ethics will fit in with the organisation.  
• I suppose the culture that we have at the moment and someone who we see could walk in and within a reasonable period of time adapt to the way that we do things. | 15 |
|       | Values: Alignment between individual’s values and organisational culture | • Somebody might have ability but they don’t have organisational fit which is ‘do I believe in the directions of the organisation? Can I see how I can contribute? Do I have an interest in achieving outputs and getting on with the people I have to work with to get them? Unless you’ve got those attitudinal things as well. | 10 |
|       | Goals: Alignment between individual and organisational goals | • Good fit for me is ...someone who not just applies to the job but also has momentum or trajectory beyond that job within the opportunities we offer. | 2 |
|       | Abilities: Ability to contribute to the organisation beyond the immediate job role |                      |    |
| Overall |                      |                      | 16 |
Table 3: Recruiters’ Definitions of Organisational Fit (cont.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme</th>
<th>Sub-category</th>
<th>Indicative quote</th>
<th>n</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Constructs other than compatibility between people and organisations:</td>
<td>Use of the term organisational fit to describe attributes of individuals without relating the individual attribute to attributes of the organisation</td>
<td>• There’s an element that I think is critical and that is the energy and the passion for the job whatever it is and I think that often if you come across somebody with energy and passion you are going to get the commitment to developing the skill and learning because they want to, so to me the passion, the energy, the commitment.</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>General positive attitude: Descriptions of general positive attributes without making reference to characteristics of the organisation</td>
<td>• It’s about having a reasonable level of capacity to learn the technical skills or to already have the professional skills depending on the type of job involved plus an amalgam of other things which are essential to people being able to work effectively within our culture which is things like the ability to work within a team, a basic level of communication, capacity for judgment, commonsense.</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Person-job fit: Descriptions that reference characteristics of the job or the tasks that need to be performed</td>
<td>• We may look at … where there is a bit of a gap in the team and where they need to fill that gap.</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Person-team fit Descriptions that reference the team or work group</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Overall</td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theme</td>
<td>Sub-category</td>
<td>Indicative quote</td>
<td>n</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distinctions between organisational fit and other constructs:</td>
<td>Technical Skills: Distinction between technical skills and the attributes that were relevant to organisational fit</td>
<td>• Off the top of my head, the first time I heard it I thought, what we’re looking for here is something beyond just looking at somebody's qualifications, their registered capabilities or competencies, beyond the knowledge they have and perhaps some of the skills they have to how well they can apply them to a given environment.</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
|                                                                     | Similarity with others: Distinction between organisational fit and similarity with others in the organisation | • I think certainly there’s a proportion of challenge needs to be brought into any organisation but it can still be good fit if you’re defining organisational fit as being the ability just to disappear into the organisation and not cause ripples, no I don’t think that’s healthy at all, but I think a good fit to me is somebody that can effect change but actually works with the structure and the culture to get things going in the organisation.  
• So it is not about who will get on best with the team around them but who will work best with them or provide the most effective balance in a team, rather than being all the same, so organisational fit is not about fitting in with the team on a social level, we don’t want clones | 4  |
|                                                                     | Pre- and post-selection: Distinction between organisational fit at selection and organisational fit after a period in the organisation | • I suppose the culture that we have at the moment and someone who we see could walk in and within a reasonable period of time adapt to the way that we do things, still acknowledging and respecting the skills that they bring and valuing those skills, but being sure that we like to be comfortable or need to know that someone will be able to adapt to the way we do things and the style of the way we work. | 4  |
Assessing Organisational Fit

The second issue investigated was the methods recruiters used to assess organisational fit. The analysis looked at first, whether recruiters reported assessing organisational fit at all; second, the practices recruiters use to assess organisational fit; and third, the evidence that assessments of fit were made in a subjective manner (Table 4).

Use of organisational fit in selection. Interview transcripts were examined to identify the number of respondents who reported that organisational fit was something that was assessed in the selection process. Across the recruiters, most reported that organisational fit was factored into selection decisions in some way (n = 12). Two reported that organisational fit was not a great focus, while two others reported that it would be desirable to assess organisational fit but that it was difficult to do so in a way that would be acceptable to the organisation.

Methods of assessing organisational fit. Next, where recruiters did report that organisational fit was assessed in their organisation, the analysis examined whether objective assessments or recruiter judgments were used. Methods were coded as objective assessment code if a recruiter described a systematic process of collecting information from individual and organisation and comparing the two to reach conclusions about organisational fit. Methods were coded as recruiter judgement when a judgement about the applicant’s fit was made by a recruiter.

As shown in Table 4, it was found that no recruiters reported using an objective approach to assessing organisational fit. Two recruiters did report that they had used personality questionnaires to collect information about applicants in a systematic way, but they did not report undertaking a similar process to examine organisational attributes. Two other recruiters expressed an interest in using personality questionnaires to assess organisational fit but reported that they were not currently doing so.
In contrast, the assessments of organisational fit reported by this sample could all be coded as recruiter judgements, where the recruiter made a judgement about the degree to which the applicant fit with the organisation. Further examination of these responses showed that recruiters reported making recruiter judgements of fit based on information collected through the interview (n = 13); personality questionnaires (n = 2); work sample tests (n=4), referee reports (n = 3), resumes (n = 2) and general social interaction (n = 1).

**Subjectivity in recruiter judgements:** The final analysis on methods used to assess organisational fit looked at the evidence that recruiter judgements of fit were made in a subjective fashion. As shown in Table 4, it was found that some recruiters reported using an *intuitive approach* to reaching conclusions about organisational fit, often describing assessments as based on ‘gut feel’ (n = 7). Some recruiters noted that there was *idiosyncrasy* in judgements of fit based on subjective impressions specific to particular recruiters (n = 3).

**Summary of findings:** It was found that most recruiters do use organisational fit in making selection decisions and that, in this sample, organisational fit was assessed using recruiter judgements, rather than objective assessment methods. Further, there was strong evidence that recruiter judgements were made with a degree of subjectivity, with some recruiters describing the process of reaching conclusions about fit as intuitive and others noting that there was idiosyncrasy in the way that different recruiters assessed organisational fit.
Table 4: Methods Used to Assess Organisational Fit

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme</th>
<th>Sub-category</th>
<th>Indicative quote</th>
<th>n</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Methods of assessing organisational fit: References to the process used to collect information about the applicant’s organisational fit</td>
<td>Objective assessment: A systematic process of collecting information from individual and organisation and comparing the two to reach conclusions about organisational fit</td>
<td>• So what we’re looking at is how they interact in the interview and how they wrote their application, although we know that they may not have written it themselves, that’s probably the most obvious way that we look for fit. The content of their answers is probably less important as far as fit is concerned, and less judged, it’s either yeah we understand it or no, we don’t think you’re right with that.</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theme</td>
<td>Sub-category</td>
<td>Indicative quote</td>
<td>n</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Subjectivity in recruiter judgements: Evidence that recruiter judgements of fit were made in a subjective fashion | Intuitive approach: References to reaching conclusions about organisational fit in an intuitive manner | • A lot of it at the interview process is I suppose intuitive or just a gut feel from the panel, an impression that the panel would get and an assessment that they would make based on experience and knowing the staff that we have and the staff that work well ... Just to clarify when I said intuitive, we would be saying, we’re still looking for those core four or five skills and then the next question is, ‘are they going to fit?’ and that might be where it’s intuitive or a gut feel even though they might have those particular skills.  
• I think a lot of it is actually based on gut feeling and the feeling of the connection or lack thereof in an interview, talking to a person and seeing how they respond. | 7 |
| | Idiosyncrasy: Subjective impressions that are specific to particular recruiters | • So potentially you could have a particular candidate, if the panel of three just didn’t think that they were the right person, you could in theory have a different panel of three who might say yes we’d be happy to take them on, so it does, a lot of the selection process I suppose is quite subjective in that regard. | 3 |
Consequences of Organisational Fit

The final topic investigated by the current study was the consequences perceived to be associated with organisational fit. The analysis looked at: a) the extent to which recruiters referred to outcomes that have already been given consideration in the research literature: work attitudes, intentions to turnover and job performance; b) the outcomes that are not commonly referred to in the literature, and, c) whether recruiters saw that there were positive consequences associated with misfit (Table 5).

Traditional consequences: The outcomes that have typically been investigated in association with organisational fit are work attitudes, intentions to turnover and job performance. Interview segments were examined to identify the extent to which consequences of organisational fit identified by recruiters fell into each of these categories. As shown in Table 5, it was found that recruiters observed that poor fit was associated with poor work attitudes (n = 11); higher intentions to turnover (n = 3) and poor job performance (n = 7).

Other consequences: Interview segments were also examined to see if there were any consequences identified by recruiters that were not included in the categories of work attitudes, intentions to turnover or job performance. As shown in Table 5, it was found that recruiters emphasised the interpersonal consequences of organisational fit. That is, they described poor organisational fit as being associated with negative interactions between an employee and others in the workplace (n = 11). They also noted the negative impact that the presence of an individual who does not fit well can have on others’ experience of work (n = 4). For example, recruiters noted that the presence of a poorly fitting individual can be associated decreased morale and increased workload for the whole team.
Positive consequences of misfit: Finally, interview segments were examined to see if recruiters identified any positive consequences associated with misfit. As shown in Table 5, it was found that some recruiters observed that poor fit can be positive when it is associated with the *introduction of new ideas or change*.

Summary of findings: These findings show that recruiters perceived that poor fit was associated a range of negative consequences, including poor work attitudes, increased turnover and poor job performance. Recruiters also observed that poor fit was associated with dysfunctional relationships with others in the workplace and behaviour that negatively impacted on others’ experience of work. Finally, recruiters noted that at times poor organisational fit can have positive consequences when it is associated with the introduction of new ideas or change in the workplace.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme</th>
<th>Sub-category</th>
<th>Indicative quote</th>
<th>n</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Traditional consequences: References to an association between organisational fit and outcomes that have typically been associated with organisational fit (work attitudes, intentions to turnover and job performance) | Work attitudes: References to an association between organisational fit and job satisfaction or organisational commitment | • I’m thinking you would have people who basically the employee themselves could feel unhappy in their position because they would feel that their values were out of alignment with the organisation and the people they work with.  
• For the individual in the job, it can end up being a really disheartening thing, can end up leading to people really being confused and frustrated particularly, not really knowing how to go about doing their job. | 11 |
| | Turnover: References to an association between organisational fit and turnover | • We tend to not keep those people, I guess they come in and we spend all this time and money training them and then they’re not enjoying work, often it’s disruptive for the other team members, disruptive for the manager because they take more effort to manage and then they leave anyway so you kind of lose out all round. | 3 |
| | Job performance: References to an association between organisational fit and job performance | • I guess the main thing would be in terms of satisfaction with the work and that would probably lead to their performance so if they’re not satisfied and they’re not motivated or engaged that would lead to a reduction in their performance.  
• From experience there is usually a productivity loss that often comes from the actual resource that person themselves, usually because it’s accompanying something that’s upsetting them or people just find them difficult to deal with and therefore there’s a productivity loss there somewhere and the workflow can be very sporadic, the output can be very sporadic. | 7 |
Table 5: Perceived Consequences of Organisational Fit (cont.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme</th>
<th>Sub-category</th>
<th>Indicative quote</th>
<th>n</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
|       | Interactions with others: References to an association between organisational fit and interactions in the workplace | - They can become disruptive in terms of their interactions with others, this tends to put them at the end of the spectrum so they find it harder to become a part of the networks and collegiate support that operates in an organisation of this type.  
- There’s relationship breakdowns generally, their method of operating, they’ve not been that flexible or able to adjust so I guess their communication style might be inappropriate and ... so what they do is that they get the people they’re supposed to work with offside and then there’s resistance. | 11 |
|       | Impact on others’ experience of work: References to the impact than an employee with poor organisational fit has on others’ experience of work | - Poor morale in the work team. Obviously a lack of performance as well because when people are unhappy in the workplace their work obviously suffers so it has a massive impact ... at the end of the day you haven’t got somebody who is right for the job so it has a massive domino effect not just for the organisation but the people that are actually within that team as well and have to work with that person.  
- It’s also basically colleagues because they’re working hard and they see somebody who’s not, ... so it increases our workload dramatically ... it actually does increase the stress levels.  
- There’s a reputation impact upon the unit if somebody is not working the way that they should be working, when you get the rest of the organisation busting a gut. | 4  |
Table 5: Perceived Consequences of Organisational Fit (cont.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme</th>
<th>Sub-category</th>
<th>Indicative quote</th>
<th>n</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Positive consequences of misfit: References to an association between poor organisational fit and positive organisational outcomes</td>
<td>Introduction of new ideas or change</td>
<td>• <em>I think on certain occasions, by not taking a bit of a risk and taking on someone who might have a bit of a different skills mix but be able to bring some different qualities, we might be missing out on a good person because they don’t quite match what we’re looking for</em></td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Discussion

In this study, examination of recruiters’ perceptions, and use of, organisational fit in selection aimed to, first, assess the extent to which application of organisational fit in practice aligned with the treatment of the construct in organisational research; and second, to explore recruiter insights that can inform future research directions. Below, the key findings of the study are placed in the context of existing research, paying particular attention to the implications of these findings for person-organisation fit construct definition, measurement and theory.

Key Findings

Definition of Organisational Fit. The study found that recruiters use multiple conceptualisations of organisational fit and that they do not always distinguish between organisational fit and related constructs. While all recruiters described fit in terms that were consistent with the literature’s definition of compatibility between people and organisations (Kristof, 1996), a substantial proportion of the sample also described fit in terms that did not differentiate between ‘organisational fit’ and other constructs such as team fit, job fit and general positive attributes. Within a broad definition of fit as compatibility between individuals and organisations, the same recruiters used different dimensions to define fit including values, goals and abilities. Reflecting the research distinction between complementary and supplementary fit (Kristof, 1996), some recruiters saw organisational fit as different to similarity with others in the organisation, with one recruiter commenting that they were not after ‘clones’ and another commenting that they did not want people who would ‘disappear’ and ‘not cause ripples’. These results are generally consistent with past research that has found that some recruiters’ person-organisation fit assessments are based on factors that fall outside of the generally accepted research definition (Bretz et al., 1993; see also review by Kristof-Brown et al., 2013).
Methods for Assessing Organisational Fit. In this sample, most recruiters reported that organisational fit was a construct that factored into selection decisions in their organisations. However, in contrast to much of the research on this construct, all recruiters that did assess fit did so using recruiter judgments, rather than objective assessment techniques. Where systematic techniques were used for assessment of organisational fit, these were based on personality and there was no evidence that the information was explicitly and numerically compared with organisational attributes. Further, a large proportion of the sample reported that organisational fit assessments are made according to gut feel or intuition and that organisational fit assessments are made in a way that is idiosyncratic to particular recruiters. This finding is consistent with past research on recruiter judgements of organisational fit in selection processes (Kristof-Brown et al., 2013).

Consequences of organisational fit. In this sample, recruiters identified a range of consequences associated with good and poor fit. In line with existing research into the relationship between person-organisation fit and outcomes (Arthur et al., 2006; Kristof-Brown, et al., 2005; Verquer et al., 2003), recruiters identified relationships between person-organisation fit and work attitudes, turnover, and job performance. In addition, recruiters made a link between an individual’s poor organisational fit and outcomes for others who interact with the individual. Specifically, recruiters noted that when there is poor fit, this can have a detrimental effect on relationships between the individual and others in the work area and can have a negative impact on others’ experience of work. One interpretation of these findings is that poor fit has the most significant impact when it leads to the violation of social norms in a work area. Given organisational culture is manifested in workplace norms (Schein, 1996), this interpretation is consistent with the
emphasize on defining fit in terms of the congruence between individuals’ values and organisational culture.

Finally, several recruiters talked about the positive benefits of a lack of fit in terms of the capacity to challenge the status quo. Recruiters noted that the destabilisation accompanying the introduction of a ‘different’ individual in a work area could be both positive, because of the introduction of new ideas, and negative, because of the impact that destabilisation had on workplace relationships.

**Themes to be Progressed in Chapters Three, Four and Five**

The findings reported above paint a picture in which organisational fit is a concept that is seen to have practical relevance to organisations, but where there is a lack of clarity about the definition of the construct and where the use of intuitive and idiosyncratic judgements for assessing fit run counter to most recommendations for rigorous selection processes (Highhouse, 2008). These findings reiterate the need to produce rigorous research that can support recruiters in selection processes (Arthur et al., 2006). In particular, recruiters need more guidance about the situations in which it is appropriate to select applicants on the basis of organisational fit and on appropriate methods to assess organisational fit in selection processes.

The following three chapters respond to the need to support recruiters with an investigation of person-organisation fit construct definition, assessment and theory. Chapter Three tackles the question of what person-organisation fit instruments are assessing, taking the most commonly used research instrument for measuring organisational fit as a case study. In Chapters Four and Five, differences between methods of assessing person-organisation fit are explored, with a view to understanding the implications of these differences for organisational practice.
In addition, two particular recruiter insights are explored in further detail through the analyses presented in Chapters Four and Five. First, recruiters commented that they were looking for people who could ‘adapt’ to the culture or who had the potential to fit. The assessment based on personality presented in Chapter Four provides an opportunity to explore individual difference factors influencing perceptions of fit, responding to the idea that pre- and post-selection fit may be different and that an appropriate focus at selection may be the potential to fit rather than fit itself. Second, recruiters referenced concepts of “productivity”, “engagement” and “motivation” in describing the conceptual link between person-organisation fit and job performance. In Chapter Five, the examination of relationships between person-organisation fit operationalisations and work motivation is used as an opportunity to progress these ideas.

Other Implications for Research

Beyond the ideas progressed in the research program described in this thesis, this study also raised a number of interesting areas for future research. First, the insight that a target individual’s organisational fit affects others in the workplace who interact with that individual appears a promising area for future research. To date, outcome variables most commonly investigated in relation to person-organisation fit have been individual attitudes and, to a lesser extent, job performance. Investigations of the impact that organisational fit has on broader work relationships and morale would be consistent with movements within personnel selection to broaden the criterion domain beyond individual performance (Ryan & Ployhart, 2014).

Second, while researchers have long noted that misfit could have positive consequences (e.g., Schneider, 1987a; Chan, 2005), the benefits of poor fit has not been a strong focus of person-organisation fit research (Billsberry & Kristof-Brown, 2013). It would be useful for research to further investigate the potential value of misfit and, in particular,
to explore the particular balance of fit and misfit required to effect change in an organisation without meeting high levels of resistance from existing organisational members.

*Implications for Practice*

For recruiters, these results highlight the potential risks associated with the application of organisational fit in selection processes. It is clear that the term ‘organisational fit’ can mean different things to different people or even different things to the same person at different times. At times, organisational fit is used to refer to attributes of the individual that are unrelated to attributes of the organisation. Problems with the way that recruiters judge fit have been highlighted in a recent review of the literature (Kristof-Brown et al., 2013) and the issues with intuitive and subjective selection processes are well-documented (Highhouse, 2008).

*Limitations*

It is important to note that the current study was limited in a number of ways. As is common in qualitative studies, the sample included in the current study was small. It is not possible to ascertain whether the views reflected in this paper are indicative of the broader state of practice in Australia or internationally. The sample was also heavily weighted towards employees of public sector agencies and it is possible that different views would be found in employees of private companies. Finally, it could be argued that the questions used to guide the semi-structured interviews disproportionately emphasised the positive consequences of fit and the negative consequences of misfit. While the study’s design would have been strengthened by a greater balance in the initial interview prompts, it is notable that, despite this, some participants elaborated on the potential positive consequences of misfit.
Chapter Three.

What Are Organisational Fit Researchers Measuring? The Factor Structure of the Organisational Culture Profile

Chapter Two highlights variability and ambiguity in how practitioners define and assess the construct of organisational fit to make decisions in situations like personnel selection. Organisational representatives reported using multiple conceptualisations of person-organisation fit, some but not all of which were aligned with the way that the construct is typically defined in the literature. The primary method for assessing applicant fit was recruiter judgements, a method that was described as based on intuition and subject to idiosyncrasy depending on the particular recruiter making the judgment. While some representatives discussed use of personality instruments in fit assessments, none reported using a numerical method of computing fit from separate assessments of individual and organisational characteristics.

A core argument of this thesis is that, to ensure that the person-organisation fit literature is used appropriately to inform organisational practice, it is critical to attend to the way that the construct is defined and measured in empirical research. This is important for two reasons. First, if different approaches to measuring person-organisation fit yield different results or lead to different conclusions, then it is not reasonable to apply findings from one approach to measuring person-organisation fit in research to a different approach to measuring fit in practice. Second, accepted wisdom about the relationship between person-organisation fit and desirable work outcomes should be scrutinised with new data and different analytical techniques.

Making this concrete to the use of person-organisation fit in settings such as personnel selection, justifying the use of recruiter judgements of person-organisation fit as a criterion for personnel selection on the basis of empirical data linking person-organisation
fit to desirable workplace outcomes only makes sense if it can be reasonably argued that recruiter judgements measure the same construct as is measured in the empirical research. Appeals to researchers to develop instruments that can be used to assess person-organisation fit in selection processes, such as that by Ryan and Ployhart (2014), are only meaningful if there is clear evidence that indirectly assessed person-organisation fit is predictive of desirable workplace outcomes.

Over the next three chapters, this thesis explores some key aspects of organisational fit measurement and analysis that challenge both a) the notion that different approaches to measuring person-organisation fit are interchangeable and b) the conclusions about person-organisation fit that have often been drawn from empirical studies. Chapter Four addresses the question of whether fit is fit, regardless of whether it is measured directly or indirectly. Chapter Five looks at whether different approaches to measuring person-organisation fit lead to different conclusions about the relationship between person-organisation fit and work outcomes. Before the questions posed in Chapters Four and Five can be sensibly addressed, Chapter Three lays necessary groundwork with an exploration of some fundamental issues associated with the operationalisation of indirect person-organisation fit in research studies. In particular, Chapter Three explores the importance of paying attention to the content of indirect person-organisation fit instruments and the implications that different approaches to measuring indirect person-organisation fit have for researchers’ ability to draw meaningful conclusions from research data.

Chapter Three is structured into three sections. The first section explores the importance of focusing on instrument content, beginning with the drivers for theory development and unpacking methodological debates about analytical approach, ipsative vs normative data and commensurate dimensions. In parallel, the discussion in the first section gives consideration to the research philosophies that have historically led to a
minimal focus on content dimensions in indirect person-organisation fit measurement. The second section builds the argument by looking in detail at how, historically, empirical data has been used to draw conclusions about person-organisation fit effects without clarity about the substantive content of the instrument. This section takes the Organisational Culture Profile (OCP; O’Reilly et al, 1991) as a case study and presents a detailed examination of past literature examining the factor structure of this instrument. The analysis demonstrates that the research employing “the single most frequently used measure” of person-organisation fit (Verquer et al., 2003, pp. 475-476) is based on an instrument without a clear, theoretically driven and replicable factor structure. Finally, the third section takes empirical data from a normative revision of the OCP and examines a) the replicability of previously proposed factor structures for the OCP and b) the evidence for robust factors that can be linked back to theory and that are likely to have utility in the examination of indirect values-based person-organisation fit. As a whole, this chapter reinforces the importance of going beyond a holistic conceptualisation of indirect person-organisation fit and being clear about what an instrument is measuring in order to draw meaningful conclusions about the person-organisation fit construct.

Why Attend to Content in Person-Organisation Fit Measurement?

Holistic measurement of indirect person-organisation fit was central to Chatman’s seminal person-organisation fit theory and the basis for her subsequent development of the OCP as an instrument designed to measure indirect person-organisation fit (O’Reilly et al., 1991). In Chatman’s original model (1989, p. 342), person-organisation fit was conceptualised as a holistic construct that reflected “general congruence between the person and organization” and the purpose of the OCP was to support the determination of “overall fit of the person to the set of relevant situational attributes” (O’Reilly et al, 1991, p. 342).
However, there are a number of compelling reasons to attend to instrument content in person-organisation fit measurement.

**Content is Important for the Development of Theory.** First, lack of attention to the content dimensions of fit limits the development of clear and articulated theory about person-organisation fit effects. Edwards (2008, p. 220) criticised the treatment of person-organisation fit as a “general concept that subsumes the content dimensions specified by the frameworks” and argues that “P-E fit theories must move beyond general statements that disregard the content of the person and environment dimensions”. Similarly, Arthur et al (2006, p. 796) argue that “discussions of P-O fit as a predictor... need to occur within the context of the dimensions or constructs of fit, and future research needs to investigate the potential complexity of matching the dimensions of P-O fit to specified criterion measures or work outcomes to enhance the magnitude of prediction” (see also De Clercq, Fontaine & Anseel, 2008; Ostroff, Shin & Kinicki, 2005). In their discussion of theory in organisational sciences, Ferris, Hochwarter and Buckley (2012, p. 96) state that “theory represents a systematic explanatory statement about the relationships among a set of constructs, with accompanying logic and assumptions”. Without clarity about the meaning of the underlying dimensions of person-organisation fit, it is difficult to develop clear explanations about the relationship of this construct to other constructs in organisational behaviour.

Of note, a close read of Chatman (1989, p. 345) signals that her original intention was that the practical application of the construct of fit would go to a greater level of detail than simply a holistic notion of fit: “person-organization fit provides an initial index that can signal what specific values and norms we should investigate further. Specifically, we can begin to predict changes in both individual values and behaviour and in organizational values and norms”. In other words, the original conception of person-organisation fit recognised that meaningful application of this construct to organisational settings required
consideration of the content underlying the overarching concept of person-organisation fit. The core point here is that it is critical to understand what is being measured in order to meaningfully interpret results from an indirect person-organisation fit measure and to understand the extent to which these results can be generalised to organisational practice.

Commensurability of Factor Structure Can Help Understand Whether it is Reasonable to Consider Individual and Organisational Attributes as Equivalent. The second reason to pay attention to the content of person-organisation fit instruments is because the commensurability of factor structures can be informative about the comparability of individual and organisational measures. While some, like Schneider (2001, p. 146), argue that the “obsession [with commensurate measurement] is self-defeating”, advocates argue that commensurate measurement is critical for a meaningful comparison of person and environment characteristics (e.g. Cable & Edwards, 2004; Cable & Judge, 1997; Caplan, 1987; De Clercq et al., 2008; Edwards, 1994; O'Reilly et al., 1991). Harrison (2007) argues that commensurability between person and organisation measures is important for establishing clear boundaries between effects that can be considered ‘fit’ and effects that can more meaningfully be represented as an interaction between person and organisation variables.

However, as Kristof (1996) notes, exactly what constitutes commensurate measurement can be unclear because the same item, such as aggressiveness, will be interpreted differently when applied at individual and organisational levels. Here, examination of underlying dimensionality can be informative. When items cluster together differently for organisations and people, this may be an indication that the substantive interpretation of the items varies across people and organisations. Indeed, O'Reilly et al. (1991, p. 499) made this argument in their original paper presenting the OCP: “to be useful, the dimensions of individual preferences and organizational cultures should be comparable. Evidence of such comparability would indicate that the types of cultures
individuals indicate they want are generally equivalent to the cultures organizations offer, and lack of comparability would reduce the meaningfulness of person-organization fit”.

A Clear Factor Structure is Necessary for the Application of Robust Research Methods. The third and final reason to pay attention to content is because a clear factor structure is necessary for the application of robust research methods that enable meaningful conclusions about person-organisation fit. The two dominant approaches to analysing indirect person-organisation fit are the calculation of a profile similarity index, a single score that represents fit (Caldwell, Chatman & O’Reilly, 2007), and polynomial regression which seeks to articulate and understand the functional form of fit by exploring relationships between person, organisation and outcome variables (Edwards, 1993, 1994, 2007; Edwards & Parry, 1993).

Profile similarity indices generate a single score that represents overall person-organisation fit and are typically either a score based on summing differences between person and organisation profile elements or a score based on a correlation of person and organisation profiles (Edwards, 1993) and were particularly favoured by researchers in the 1990s following Chapman’s seminal paper (e.g. Cable & Judge, 1996, 1997; Cable & Parsons, 2001; Caldwell & O’Reilly, 1990; Chatman & Jehn, 1994; Judge & Cable, 1997; O’Reilly et al., 1991), although more recent examples of the application of this technique exist (e.g. Cennamo & Gardner, 2008; Leung & Chaturvedi, 2011; Tsai, Chen & Chen, 2012; van Vianen, De Pater & Van Dijk, 2007). Typically, profile similarity approaches to person-organisation fit do not make reference to the underlying factor structure of the instrument. Instead, the index is computed through a computation (either a difference score or a correlation) that is based on individual items in the instrument.

Edwards (1993, 1994) argues that polynomial regression techniques overcome the conceptual ambiguity inherent in the use of an overall fit index. Specifically, Edwards critiques profile similarity indices because they cannot differentiate between different
types of misfit (e.g. an individual who holds a value more strongly than they perceive the organisation to hold that value is treated the same as an individual who holds a value less strongly than they perceive the organisation to hold that value) and cannot identify the contribution of each element to the final score (Edwards, 1993). Polynomial regression techniques overcome this by allowing separate estimates of relationships between component measures as well as an assessment of the overall magnitude of the relationship (Edwards, 1994). Because polynomial regression approaches the analysis of the data at the dimension level, a clear understanding of the underlying dimensionality of the instrument is a prerequisite for the application of this technique.

*Caveat: Polynomial Regression Precludes Ipsative Measurement which May Limit the Psychological Fidelity of Measurement.* Before concluding this discussion about the benefits that a focus on content dimensions brings to person-organisation fit research, it should be noted that arguments about the robustness of polynomial regression research methods come with an important caveat. Polynomial regression approaches preclude the use of ipsative measurement methods, which may change the nature of the data collected from the instrument. Ipsative approaches to measurement use rank order or forced choice formats and are focused on the examination of relative preferences within an individual (Meglin & Ravlin, 1998). Of primary concern to researchers who advocate ipsative measurement is the strength of values relative to other values because ipsative scales “capture information about respondent’s values in choice situations that are impossible to assess using normative procedures” (Meglin & Ravlin, 1998, p. 362). By imposing constraints on possible responses, ipsative measurement is argued to protect against social desirability bias and force participants to make choices between different options (Cable & Judge, 1997; Judge & Cable, 1997). In this way, the ipsative measurement approach is seen to more closely reflect the cognitive organisation of values and the relationship between
values and perception and decision making than normative, likert-scales (Ravlin & Meglino, 1987).

Ipsative approaches can be contrasted with normative approaches that ask participants to rate each value independently and are focused on the absolute strength of the respondents’ views. The primary arguments for normative measurement and against ipsative measurement concern the approach used to calculate fit (Edwards, 2008; Kristof-Brown & Jansen, 2007). Ipsative data cannot be used in a range of statistical techniques, including polynomial regression, and impedes researchers’ ability to examine person-organisation fit at a dimension level. However, despite the statistical advantages of using normative over ipsative data, the tension between representing the psychological process by which values impact behaviour and collecting data that can be subject to robust analysis is not one that has been resolved with consensus in the literature (Kristof-Brown & Jansen, 2007).

What Happens When Content Is Not a Feature of Organisational Fit Research? The OCP as a Case Study

Despite the utility of attending to content dimensions, content has historically not been a focus in person-organisation fit literature. This is most clearly demonstrated through an examination of the factor structure, or lack thereof, of the dominant instrument for measuring indirect person-organisation fit, the OCP. The OCP was created by O’Reilly et al. (1991) using the Chatman (1989, p. 339) definition of person-organisation fit: “the congruence between the norms and values of organizations and the values of persons”. The OCP has been used extensively to study person-organisation fit in a number of key areas of organisational research, including applicant attraction (Cable & Judge, 1996; Dineen et al., 2002; Judge & Cable, 1997), personnel selection (Cable & Judge, 1997; Chatman, 1991), work attitudes (Cooper-Thomas et al., 2004; O’Reilly et al., 1991),
organisational socialisation (Cable & Parsons, 2001; Cooper-Thomas et al., 2004) and employee turnover (Cable & Parsons, 2001). In 2013, in a critique and discussion of the instrument’s measurement philosophy, Billsberry and colleagues (p. 128) stated that “the OCP has been, and continues to be, one of the most valuable tools we have for assessing [person-organisation] fit”. The purpose of this section is to demonstrate, on the basis of a literature review, that there is a lack of clarity about the underlying factor structure of the OCP. In doing so, this section highlights the fact that a large body of research has applied the OCP to draw conclusions about person-organisation fit, despite ambiguity associated with what is actually measured by this instrument. Below, the original development and factor analysis of the OCP is described, followed by the development of two subsequent iterations of this instrument. Lastly, an attempt to place the original OCP items in the framework of values theory is examined. Table 6 summarises the relationship between OCP items and the various factor structures identified in the research, where this information has been published.

**Development and Exploratory Factor Analysis of Ipsative 54-item OCP (O’Reilly et al., 1991):** O’Reilly et al. (1991) created the OCP as an instrument designed to measure personal and organisational values using an ipsative Q-sort methodology. To measure organisational values, participants were asked to sort 54 values into nine categories, from ‘most characteristic’ to ‘least characteristic’ of the organisation. To measure personal values, participants sorted the same 54 values into nine categories, from ‘most desirable’ to ‘least desirable’, in terms of how important it was to them that the characteristic was part of their employer organisation. Following the Q-sort methodology, constraints were imposed on the number of items allowed in each of the nine categories, such that fewer items were allowed at the extremes than in the central categories.

O’Reilly and colleagues’ original development of the OCP was based on an extensive review of organisational values and culture literature. A preliminary pool of 110
items was generated with a focus on items that could describe both people and organisations and were likely to show variability across different people and organisations. The items were reviewed by the authors, undergraduate students and faculty members to identify the final set of 54 items that were considered relevant to all types of organisations; likely to discriminate between organisations; readable; and non-redundant.

To investigate the factor structure of this instrument, O’Reilly et al. (1991) conducted an exploratory factor analysis (principal components analysis with varimax rotation) on personal values and organisational values data separately. They identified and named eight factors for the personal values data and seven factors for the organisational values data (items with factor loadings > .4 are displayed in Table 6). Of these, five factors were given the same names for both personal and organisational values data. However, only 16 of the 54 items in the instrument had a clean and strong (> .4) loading on the same factor for both personal and organisational values data and 15 of the items did not have a clean and strong factor loading on any factor in either solution. While O’Reilly et al. (1991, p. 504) concluded that “the results of the factor analyses suggest that the OCP can provide a reasonable mapping of organizational culture”, it is clear that the OCP factors identified by O’Reilly et al. did not include all the items, were not equivalent for individuals or organisations and were not conceptually linked to any theoretical models of either organisational values or personal values. Subsequently, Chatman and Jehn (1994) conducted an exploratory factor analysis of a separate data set of organisational values only. In this analysis, only 20 of the 54 items in the OCP loaded on the same organisational values factor as in O’Reilly et al. (1991).

**Confirmatory Factor Analysis of Ipsative 40-item OCP** (Cable & Judge, 1996, 1997): A second iteration of the OCP was developed by Cable and Judge (1996, 1997) with the goal of removing conceptual redundancy in the questionnaire and reducing completion time. The original set of 54 items was reviewed by 10 organisational researchers and 40 items
deemed truly unique were retained. The Cable and Judge (1996, 1997) version has been used in several subsequent research studies (e.g. (Cable & Parsons, 2001; Dineen et al., 2002). Judge and Cable (1997, p. 376) report confirmatory factor analysis model fit statistics to support the replication of O’Reilly et al.’s eight factor personal values structure and concluded that “these results suggest that the revised OCP does an adequate job of representing the dimensions of culture preferences found by Chatman (1991) and O’Reilly et al. (1991)”.

Item-level data was not published in the Cable and Judge (1996, 1997) studies; however, a review of the final instrument shows that 15 of the 40 items retained in Judge and Cable’s revision were not associated with a factor in O’Reilly et al.’s factor structure.

*Confirmatory Factor Analysis to Develop a 28 Item Normative* (Sarros, Gray, Densten & Cooper, 2005): In a third revision, Sarros et al. (2005) drew on the Cable and Judge (1996, 1997) version to develop a 28 item version of the OCP, shortened on the basis of a confirmatory factor analysis validation with a large sample of Australian executives. The most notable feature of the Sarros et al. revision is the move from the Q-sort methodology to a normative likert scale format.

Sarros et al. (2005)’s confirmatory factor analysis suggested that the factor structure of the revised instrument differed from O’Reilly et al.’s (1991) original factor structure. It is important to note that a limitation of Sarros et al’s approach was the attempt to replicate O’Reilly et al’s eight factor personal values structure with organisational values data. Sarros et al. (2005) used a confirmatory factor analysis to retain

---

3 Note: When Judge and Cable replicated the O’Reilly et al factor structure (based on personal values), they did CFA using oblique rotation (all elements in the ᵩ matrix were freed). Sample size was 519. Model fit indices were: GFI = .86, IFI = .74, TLI = .84, Critical N = 211.45. Average item loading was .59 and only 6/40 (15%) items failed to exhibit loadings greater than .40. All items loaded at least .30 on their hypothesized factor and all loadings were significant (p < .01). They concluded that “these results suggest that the revised OCP does an adequate job of representing the dimensions of culture preferences found by Chatman (1991) and O’Reilly et al. (1991)
28 items that fit in a different seven factor structure to that proposed by O’Reilly et al. (1991). Further analysis supported a higher order factor structure that grouped the seven factors into three second order factors. Items loading on each factor are displayed in Table 6. Thus, the Sarros et al. revision offers a factor structure based the use of a normative format on organisational values, but this structure is not a replication of past structures and has not, to the researcher’s knowledge, been replicated in subsequent studies.

Alignment of the Original 54 Items with the Schwartz Theory of Basic Human Values (Borg, Groenen, Jehn, Bilsky & Schwartz, 2011). Separate to the line of research that led to the Cable and Judge (1996, 1997) and Sarros et al. (2005) revisions is an examination of the OCP factor structure by mapping the items to factors present in Schwartz’s (1992) theory of basic human values. Researchers pursuing this goal argued that Schwartz’s theory could act as a “guiding framework for assessing [person-organisation] fit in future research” (De Clercq et al., 2008, p. 295). Schwartz’s theory proposes 10 basic values associated with four higher order values: conservatism, self-enhancement, self-transcendence and openness. The theory was developed with the goal of identifying a set of values that are universal across all societies. Schwartz’s theory has been highly influential and has been used in hundreds of studies (Schwartz et al., 2012). It is notable that alternative measures of person-organisation fit have been developed based on the Schwartz model (e.g. the Work Values Survey (Cable & Edwards, 2004; Edwards & Cable, 2009).

To place the OCP in the Schwartz (1992) model, De Clercq et al. (2008) had five experts analyse the extent to which OCP items could be mapped to the 10 value types proposed by Schwartz (1992). It was found that of the 54 items in O’Reilly et al.’s (1991) original instrument, 36 could be mapped to the ten-value typology with an acceptable level of rater agreement. Unfortunately, in their paper, De Clercq et al. do not provide detail about which items were mapped to the Schwartz factors. In a further investigation of the alignment between the OCP and the Schwartz (1992) model, Borg et al. (2011) used a
nonstandard multidimensional scaling method to show that a data set of personal values measured using the OCP could be structured using the four higher order factors in the Schwartz model. This confirmatory analysis was based on a mapping of 42 items of the 54 items to the four factor structure and is displayed in Table 6. Thus, while the Borg et al. (2011) model offers an opportunity to link OCP measurement to established values theory, the analysis mapping the items into this theory has been conducted on the basis of personal values only.

Summary. In summary, despite its dominance in organisational fit research, the OCP instrument developed on the basis of Chapman’s person-organisation fit theory has demonstrated a “relatively inconsistent factor structure” (Verquer et al., 2003, p. 481). Since O’Reilly et al.’s (1991) original study presenting the instrument, there has been no study, to the researcher’s knowledge, that has presented a detailed examination of the factor structure of individual and organisational values in the same data set. It appears that the popularity of profile similarity approaches to the analysis of this instrument, which typically are conducted independent of an instrument’s factor structure, have obscured the lack of clarity what it is that this instrument is actually measuring.

----

4 Vandenberghe (1999) report on a principal components analysis of ipsative OCP data but do not provide item level detail about the factor structure.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>O'Reilly et al. (1991) Organisational Values</th>
<th>Personal Values</th>
<th>Sarros et al. (2005) Organisational Values&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th>Organisational Values&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th>Borg et al. (2011) Personal Values</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Being achievement orientated</td>
<td>Outcome Orientation</td>
<td>Outcome Orientation</td>
<td>Competitiveness</td>
<td>Business</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emphasising quality</td>
<td>Not listed</td>
<td>Not listed</td>
<td>Competitiveness</td>
<td>Business</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Being distinctive and different from others</td>
<td>Not listed</td>
<td>Not listed</td>
<td>Competitiveness</td>
<td>Business</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Being competitive</td>
<td>Aggressiveness</td>
<td>Aggressiveness</td>
<td>Competitiveness</td>
<td>Business</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Being reflective</td>
<td>Not listed</td>
<td>Not listed</td>
<td>Social Responsibility</td>
<td>Environment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Having a good reputation</td>
<td>Not listed</td>
<td>Not listed</td>
<td>Social Responsibility</td>
<td>Environment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Being socially responsible</td>
<td>Aggressiveness</td>
<td>Aggressiveness</td>
<td>Social Responsibility</td>
<td>Environment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Having a clear guiding philosophy</td>
<td>Not listed</td>
<td>Not listed</td>
<td>Social Responsibility</td>
<td>Environment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Being team oriented</td>
<td>Team Orientation</td>
<td>Team Orientation</td>
<td>Supportiveness</td>
<td>People</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sharing information freely</td>
<td>Not listed</td>
<td>Supportiveness</td>
<td>Supportiveness</td>
<td>People</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Being people oriented</td>
<td>Team Orientation</td>
<td>Not listed</td>
<td>Supportiveness</td>
<td>People</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collaboration</td>
<td>Team Orientation</td>
<td>Team Orientation</td>
<td>Supportiveness</td>
<td>People</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Being innovative</td>
<td>Innovation</td>
<td>Innovation</td>
<td>Innovation</td>
<td>Business/People</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Being quick to take advantage of</td>
<td>Innovation</td>
<td>Aggressiveness</td>
<td>Innovation</td>
<td>Business/People</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>opportunities</td>
<td>Not listed</td>
<td>Not listed</td>
<td>Innovation</td>
<td>Business/People</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Risk taking</td>
<td>Innovation</td>
<td>Innovation</td>
<td>Innovation</td>
<td>Business/People</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taking individual responsibility</td>
<td>Not listed</td>
<td>Not listed</td>
<td>Innovation</td>
<td>Business/People</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fairness</td>
<td>Respect for People</td>
<td>Not listed</td>
<td>Emphasis on Rewards</td>
<td>People</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opportunities for professional growth</td>
<td>Not listed</td>
<td>Emphasis on Rewards</td>
<td>Emphasis on Rewards</td>
<td>People</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High pay for good performance</td>
<td>Not listed</td>
<td>Emphasis on Rewards</td>
<td>Emphasis on Rewards</td>
<td>People</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Praise for good performance</td>
<td>Not listed</td>
<td>Supportiveness</td>
<td>Emphasis on Rewards</td>
<td>People</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 6 OCP items mapped to factor structures proposed by O’Reilly et al. (1991), Sarros et al. (2005) and Borg et al. (2011) (cont).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>O'Reilly et al. (1991)</th>
<th>Sarros et al. (2005)</th>
<th>Borg et al. (2011)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Organisational Values</td>
<td>Personal Values</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Having high expectation for performance</td>
<td>Outcome Orientation</td>
<td>Outcome Orientation</td>
<td>Performance Orientation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enthusiasm for the job</td>
<td>Not listed</td>
<td>Not listed</td>
<td>Performance Orientation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Being results oriented</td>
<td>Outcome Orientation</td>
<td>Outcome Orientation</td>
<td>Performance Orientation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Being highly organized</td>
<td>Not listed</td>
<td>Innovation</td>
<td>Performance Orientation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stability</td>
<td>Stability</td>
<td>Innovation</td>
<td>Stability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Being calm</td>
<td>Not listed</td>
<td>Outcome Orientation</td>
<td>Stability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security of employment</td>
<td>Stability</td>
<td>Innovation</td>
<td>Stability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Having low conflict</td>
<td>Not listed</td>
<td>Decisiveness</td>
<td>Stability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Being rule oriented</td>
<td>Stability/Innovation</td>
<td>Innovation</td>
<td>Not included</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Being analytical</td>
<td>Attention to Detail</td>
<td>Attention to Detail</td>
<td>Not included</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paying attention to detail</td>
<td>Attention to Detail</td>
<td>Attention to Detail</td>
<td>Not included</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Being precise</td>
<td>Attention to Detail</td>
<td>Attention to Detail</td>
<td>Not included</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not being constrained by many rules</td>
<td>Stability</td>
<td>Not listed</td>
<td>Not included</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decisiveness</td>
<td>Not listed</td>
<td>Decisiveness</td>
<td>Not included</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Predictability</td>
<td>Stability</td>
<td>Decisiveness</td>
<td>Not included</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Being aggressive</td>
<td>Aggressiveness</td>
<td>Aggressiveness</td>
<td>Not included</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A willingness to experiment</td>
<td>Innovation</td>
<td>Innovation</td>
<td>Not included</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Being careful</td>
<td>Innovation</td>
<td>Innovation</td>
<td>Not included</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Action orientation</td>
<td>Outcome Orientation</td>
<td>Not listed</td>
<td>Not included</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 6 OCP items mapped to factor structures proposed by O’Reilly et al. (1991), Sarros et al. (2005) and Borg et al. (2011) (cont).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Organisational Values</td>
<td>Personal Values</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respect for the individual’s right</td>
<td>Respect for People</td>
<td>Not listed</td>
<td>Not included</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Not included</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Relations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tolerance</td>
<td>Respect for People</td>
<td>Not listed</td>
<td>Not included</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Not included</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Relations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Autonomy</td>
<td>Not listed</td>
<td>Team Orientation</td>
<td>Not included</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Not included</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Risks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Being supportive</td>
<td>Not listed</td>
<td>Supportiveness</td>
<td>Not included</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Not included</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Relations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working long hours</td>
<td>Not listed</td>
<td>Supportiveness</td>
<td>Not included</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Not included</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Results</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Being demanding</td>
<td>Not listed</td>
<td>Outcome Orientation</td>
<td>Not included</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Not included</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Results</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fitting in</td>
<td>Not listed</td>
<td>Emphasis on Rewards</td>
<td>Not included</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Not included</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Rules</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Informality</td>
<td>Not listed</td>
<td>Not listed</td>
<td>Not included</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Not included</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Confronting conflict directly</td>
<td>Not listed</td>
<td>Not listed</td>
<td>Not included</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Not included</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Results</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developing friends at work</td>
<td>Not listed</td>
<td>Not listed</td>
<td>Not included</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Not included</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Relations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adaptability</td>
<td>Not listed</td>
<td>Not listed</td>
<td>Not included</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Not included</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flexibility</td>
<td>Not listed</td>
<td>Not listed</td>
<td>Not included</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Not included</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emphasizing a single culture throughout the organization</td>
<td>Not listed</td>
<td>Not listed</td>
<td>Not included</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Being easy going</td>
<td>Not listed</td>
<td>Not listed</td>
<td>Not included</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Not included</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taking initiative</td>
<td>Not listed</td>
<td>Not listed</td>
<td>Not included</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Not included</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Results</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: * Sarros et al. (2005) lower order factor structure; † Sarros et al. (2005) higher order factor structure; ‡ Following Borg et al.’s (2011) recommendations, the language of results, relations, risks and rules is used for the four factors, rather than self-transcendence, self-enhancement, openness and conservatism respectively. ‘Not listed’ means that these items were not listed in O’Reilly et al.’s (1991) reporting of the factor solution, which was based on items loading greater than .40 on a single factor and with no significant cross-loadings; ‘Not measured’ means that items were not included in Sarros et al.’s (2005) reporting of the final factor solution. Sarros et al. (2005) state that their analysis was based on Cable and Judge’s (1996, 1997) reduced version of the OCP, however two items “collaboration” and “low conflict” appeared in Sarros et al.’s final solution but were not included by Cable and Judge (1996, 1997).
What Dimensions Should Be Attended to in Investigations of Indirect Values-Based Person-Organisation Fit?

As noted above, after O’Reilly et al.’s original exploratory factor analyses, there have not been any published studies identified by the author that analyse both the personal and the organisational factor structure of the OCP in the same analysis. The goal of this final section of Chapter Three is to use original empirical data to identify whether robust factors can be identified from a normative application of OCP items that can be reasonably considered commensurate between people and organisations.

The Sarros et al. (2005) version of the instrument was chosen for this analysis because there is a precedent and a proposed factor structure based on the use of these items in a normative manner. Confirmatory factor analysis is progressed on the basis of Sarros et al.’s (2005) proposed factor structure for organisational values and on the basis of Borg et al.’s (2011) proposed mapping of these items into a personal values framework. The particular research questions are as follows:

Research question 3.1 Is the Sarros et al. (2005) factor structure replicable with organisational values data in a different sample?

Research question 3.2 Is the Sarros et al. (2005) factor structure replicable with personal values data?

Research question 3.3 Does the Schwartz (1992) higher order factor structure provide a better fit to the data than the Sarros et al. (2005) factor structure for personal values?

Research question 3.4 Does the Schwartz (1992) higher order factor structure provide a better fit to the data than the Sarros et al. (2005) factor structure for organisational values?
Beyond the questions about the replicability of the Sarros et al. (2005) and Schwartz (1992) factor structures, of primary interest in this analysis is whether it is possible to identify factors out of the OCP items, measured normatively, that appear robust (i.e. replicable across multiple studies), meaningful and commensurate across people and organisations. Factors that meet these criteria, it is argued, are those that can most reasonably be used to in research to assess indirect person-organisation fit effects.

*Research question 3.5 Are there factors within the OCP data that appear robust, meaningful and commensurate across people and organisations?*
Method

Participants

Participants in current employment were sought, drawing upon public sector agencies and working students. The 337 participants were from four Australian public sector agencies (n = 156), a pool of University Masters students (n = 17) and a pool of undergraduate psychology students (n = 164). Students were eligible to participate in the study if they were employed and they were asked to complete the questionnaire with reference to their principal place of work. Unfortunately, data required to compute a response rate was not captured at the time of data collection.

The sample was 72% female (public sector only was 70% female). Length of time in current role varied across the sample: Less than 1 year: 19%; 1 – 2 years: 20%; 2 – 5 years: 33%; more than 5 years: 28%. Limiting this to the public sector sample, these figures were: Less than 1 year: 10%; 1 – 2 years: 13%; 2 – 5 years: 31%; more than 5 years: 46%. Public sector participants were asked to describe their job level using standard public sector categories that correspond to administrative/operational, junior management, middle management and senior management: APS 1 – 4 or equivalent: 11%; APS 5 – 6 or equivalent: 51%; EL1 – 2 or equivalent: 36%; SES: 2%.

Students were asked to describe their job in the following categories: administrative/operational: 43%; professional: 15%; junior management: 16%; middle management: 9%; senior management: 3%; other: 14%. Those who selected ‘other’ were asked to specify the nature of their role and a review of responses suggests that most of these could be placed

---

5 Valid N listwise across Personal Values, Organisational Values and Subjective Person-Organisation Fit measures = 283.
6 Participants who only completed control variables were deleted from the sample. Undergraduate students who completed the study measures but reported they had no job ('student', 'no job', 'none' or 'n/a' in response to the question “How would you describe your job in your organisation?”, n = 12) were deleted from the sample. An additional undergraduate student response was deleted because the participant worked as a nanny and did not identify as working as part of an organisation.
in the ‘administrative/operational’ category. Students were also asked if they worked full time: Masters students: yes: 82%, no: 18%; undergraduate students: yes: 17%; no: 83%. Those who reported that they did not work full time were asked how many hours a week they worked on average: mean: 14 hours, median: 13 hours; range: 2 – 75 hours.

Procedure

Participants from public sector agencies were recruited through an invitation distributed by email by a representative of the organisation (typically an employee in a human resources role). The invitation contained information about the study and a link where participants could complete the questionnaire online. For a portion of the sample, the invitation to participate noted that “the first 100 participants will receive a movie ticket voucher”. For these participants, at the conclusion of the questionnaire, an option was provided where participants could enter contact details to receive the voucher.

Hard copy questionnaires were distributed to University Masters students by the researcher during a break between classes. Undergraduate psychology students were invited to complete the questionnaire online as part of the undergraduate psychology student participation program in which students participate in research in return for course credit.

Measures

Organisational Culture Profile: The Sarros et al. (2005) revision of the Organisational Culture Profile was used for this study. The 28 item instrument is structured against seven dimensions: competitiveness; social responsibility; supportiveness; innovation; emphasis on rewards; performance orientation; and stability.

To measure personal values, participants were asked the lead question “to what extent are you characterised by your preference for:” and asked to respond to each item using a five-point scale (‘not at all, minimally, moderately, considerably, very much’).
To measure organisational values, participants were asked the lead question “to what extent is your organisation characterised by:” and asked to respond to each item using a five-point scale (‘not at all, minimally, moderately, considerably, very much’). The order of the items was randomised in four blocks with one item from each value in each block.
Results

Confirmatory Factor Analysis of the Organisational Culture Profile

The dimensionality of the Revised OCP was examined using confirmatory factor analysis, conducted on the organisational values and the personal values data separately. Four confirmatory factor models were evaluated using AMOS v. 22 and a maximum likelihood minimisation function. First, following the recommendations of Kline (2005), a single factor model was examined (Figure 1 a). Kline (2005) argues that evaluation of more complex models may not be warranted if a single factor model shows a good fit to the data.

The second and third models tested addressed research questions 3.1 and 3.2, which relates to the replicability of the Sarros et al. (2005) factor structure. The second model tested was the seven-factor model specified by Sarros et al. (2005)(Figure 1 b). This model has seven latent factors, each with four indicators. The measurement model contains no double-loading indicators and all measurement error are presumed to be uncorrelated. The latent factors are permitted to be correlated. The model is overidentified with 329 df.

The third model tested was based on the three factor model identified by Sarros et al as a higher order solution (Figure 1 c). The model had three latent factors, with between 8 and 12 indicators each. Four indicators were allowed to load on two factors. All measurement error was presumed to be uncorrelated and the latent factors were permitted to be correlated. The model was overidentified with 343 df.
Figure 1: Model Diagrams
Figure 1 (cont.) Model Diagrams

- **d) Sarros et al. (2005) Three Factor**
  - Environment
  - People
  - Business
  - Stability
  - Being fair
  - Security of employment
  - Having low conflict
  - Being reflective
  - Having a good reputation
  - Being socially responsible
  - Having a clear guiding philosophy
  - Being team-oriented
  - Sharing information freely
  - Being people-oriented
  - Collaboration
  - Fairness
  - Opportunities for professional growth
  - High pay for good performance
  - Praise for good performance
  - Being innovative
  - Being quick to take advantage of opportunities
  - Risk taking
  - Taking individual responsibility
  - Having high expectations for performance
  - Enthusiasm for the job
  - Being results-oriented
  - Being highly organized
  - Being achievement-oriented
  - Emphasizing quality
  - Being distinctive and different from others
  - Being competitive

- **c) Borg et al. (2011) Four Factor**
  - Results
  - Risks
  - Relations
  - Rules
  - Being achievement-oriented
  - Emphasizing quality
  - Being competitive
  - Being results-oriented
  - Opportunities for professional growth
  - High pay for good performance
  - Having high expectations for performance
  - Being quick to take advantage of opportunities
  - Being innovative
  - Risk taking
  - Enthusiasm for the job
  - Being distinctive and different from others
  - Being socially responsible
  - Being team-oriented
  - Sharing information freely
  - Being people-oriented
  - Collaboration
  - Fairness
  - Praise for good performance
  - Having a clear guiding philosophy
  - Stability
  - Security of employment
The final model tested addressed research questions 3.3 and 3.4, which related to the model fit of the Schwartz (1992) higher order factor structure. The model examined was based on the mapping of the OCP values to the Schwarz model as shown in Borg et al. (2011; Figure 1d). This model had four latent factors, with between 3 and 8 indicators each. The measurement model contained no double-loading indicators and all measurement error was presumed to be uncorrelated. The latent factors were permitted to be correlated. The model was overidentified with 203 df.

Model fit was evaluated using the standardised root mean square residual (SRMR), root mean square error of approximation (RMSEA) and its 90% confidence interval (90% CI) and test of close fit (CFit), comparative fit index (CFI), and the Tucker-Lewis index (TLI). Guided by suggestions provided in Hu and Bentler (1999), acceptable fit was defined by the following criteria: RMSEA (≤ .06, 90% CI ≤ .06), SRMR (≤ .08), CFI (≥ .95) and TLI (≥ .95).

Together, this group of indices provide information about absolute fit, parsimony corrected fit and incremental fit.

**Data Screening**

Normality of the data was examined through absolute values of the skewness and kurtosis indices. Absolute values of the skew index ranged from -.86 to .39 for organisational values and from -.93 to .17 for personal values. Absolute values of the kurtosis index ranged from -.82 to .41 for organisational values and from -.58 to 1.79 for personal values. Kline (2005) notes that extreme skew would be indicated by absolute values of the skew index greater than 3.0, while absolute values of kurtosis greater than

---

Note: There appear to be a number of options for examining the Schwartz values structure. Vecchione, Casconi, and Barbaranelli (2009) examined a number of models in their examination of the factor structure of the Portrait Values Questionnaire (a questionnaire designed to measure personal values, based on the Schwartz model). Vecchione et al. tested a number of models, including a model with four oblique higher-order factors and a model based on two orthogonal dimensions. Borg et al. (2011) examined the structure of the original OCP using a nonstandard multidimensional scaling method.
10.0 should be considered problematic. Using these recommendations, there appears to be no substantial departure from univariate normality.

Also examined was Mardia’s normalised estimate of multivariate kurtosis. Byrne (2010) suggests that the critical ratio for this statistic should be examined with values greater than 5.00 indicative of multivariate nonnormality. Using this guide, the critical ratio of 31.65 for organisational values and 27.73 for personal values suggests that the assumption of multivariate normality is violated.

With nonnormal distributions, the maximum likelihood method of estimation is likely to return accurate parameter estimates but negatively biased standard errors. This means that true models are more likely to be rejected in actual fit tests than when the data has a normal distribution (Kline, 2005). Byrne (2010) reports that an asymptotic distribution method may be more appropriate for nonnormal samples but that this estimation method requires extremely large samples (1,000 – 5,000 cases) to provide realistic estimates. In smaller samples, it is possible to use the Santorra-Bentler robust approach to obtain more reliable test statistics; however, since this method is not available in the AMOS program, maximum likelihood estimation was used for the analysis.

Single Factor Model

As shown in Table 7, the single factor model was a poor fit to both the organisational values and the personal values data. For organisational values, SRMR = 0.064, RMSEA = 0.085 (90% CI: .080 - .091), CFI = 0.807, TLI = 0.792 and for personal values, SRMR = 0.079, RMSEA = 0.088 (90% CI: .082 - .093), CFI = 0.666, TLI = 0.639. The rejection of the single factor model suggests that investigation of more complex models is warranted (Kline, 2005).
Analyses of the Sarros et al. (2005) seven factor model for the organisational values and personal values data revealed that the covariance matrix was not positive definite and the solution was inadmissible in both cases\(^8\). Inadmissible solutions can result from a nonpositive definite input matrix or a nonpositive definite model matrix (Brown, 2006). Analysis of the same data with a differently specified models resulted in admissible solutions, which suggests that the input matrix was positive definite and that the issue in this analysis was a nonpositive definite model matrix. Brown (2006) lists a number of reasons for a nonpositive definite model matrix, including a misspecified model, a structurally or empirically under identified model, inappropriate starting values, a small sample size, use of an inappropriate estimation method and model complexity. Of these, it appears that a misspecified model is the most likely reason for the inadmissible solution in the current analysis. Brown (2006, p. 188) notes that model misspecification is the most common cause of nonpositive definite model matrices and states “improper solutions frequently occur when the specified model is very different from models that the data would support”. Given the evidence of a poorly specified model, the use of this model to guide respecification was not pursued.

\(^8\) Brown (2006) talks about out-of-range values being associated with inadmissible solutions. The parameter estimates for organisational values showed that four of the factor correlations were out-of-range (supportiveness with social responsibility, \(r = 1.006\); performance expectations with social responsibility, \(r = 1.003\); competitiveness with performance expectations, \(r = 1.080\); stability with social responsibility, \(r = 1.013\)). There were no negative factor variances or negative indicator variances. For personal values, two factor correlations were out-of-range (competitiveness with performance expectations, \(r = 1.199\); stability with social responsibility, \(r = 1.045\)). There were no negative factor variances or negative indicator variances.
Table 7: Model Fit Indices

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Chi-square</th>
<th>Df</th>
<th>Chi-square/df</th>
<th>p</th>
<th>SRMR</th>
<th>RMSEA</th>
<th>RMSEA 90% CI</th>
<th>CFI</th>
<th>TLI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Organisational Values</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single Factor</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>1131.25</td>
<td>350</td>
<td>3.232</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
<td>.064</td>
<td>.085</td>
<td>.080 - .091</td>
<td>.807</td>
<td>.792</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seven Factor (Sarros et al., 2005)</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>Inadmissible solution</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Three Factor (Sarros et al., 2005)</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>1034.04</td>
<td>343</td>
<td>3.015</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
<td>.063</td>
<td>.081</td>
<td>.075 - .087</td>
<td>.830</td>
<td>.812</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Four Factor (Borg et al., 2011)</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>664.24</td>
<td>203</td>
<td>3.272</td>
<td></td>
<td>.065</td>
<td>.086</td>
<td>.079 - .094</td>
<td>.844</td>
<td>.822</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Personal Values</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single Factor</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>1178.03</td>
<td>350</td>
<td>3.366</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
<td>.079</td>
<td>.088</td>
<td>.082 - .093</td>
<td>.666</td>
<td>.639</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seven Factor (Sarros et al., 2005)</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>Inadmissible solution</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Three Factor (Sarros et al., 2005)</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>1041.30</td>
<td>343</td>
<td>3.036</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
<td>.078</td>
<td>.081</td>
<td>.076 - .087</td>
<td>.718</td>
<td>.689</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Four Factor (Borg et al., 2011)</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>684.36</td>
<td>203</td>
<td>3.371</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
<td>.076</td>
<td>.088</td>
<td>0.081 - 0.095</td>
<td>.752</td>
<td>.717</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: SRMR: standardised root mean square residual; RMSEA = root mean square error of approximation; 90% CI: 90% confidence interval; CFI: comparative fit index; TLI: Tucker-Lewis index.
As shown in Table 7, the three factor model based on the higher order factor structure proposed by Sarros et al. (2005) returned a permissible solution but appeared to be a poor fit to the data for both organisational and personal values. For organisational values, SRMR = 0.063, RMSEA = 0.081 (90% CI: .075 - .087), CFI = 0.83, TLI = 0.812 and for personal values, SRMR = 0.078, RMSEA = 0.081 (90% CI: .076 - .087), CFI = 0.718, TLI = 0.689.

These findings support a negative response to research questions 3.1 and 3.2. The Sarros et al. (2005) factor structure was not replicated with organisational values data in a different sample to that used by Sarros et al. (2005). The Sarros et al. (2005) factor structure also was not replicated with the personal values data in this study’s sample.

**Borg et al. (2011) Four Factor Model**

The final model tested was that specified by Borg et al. (2011) based on a mapping of OCP items to the Schwartz (1992) model. Again, the analysis suggested that this model was a poor fit to the data for both organisational and personal values (Table 7). For organisational values, SRMR = 0.065, RMSEA = 0.086 (90% CI: .079 - .094), CFI = 0.844, TLI = 0.822 and for personal values, SRMR = 0.076, RMSEA = 0.088 (90% CI: 0.081 - 0.095), CFI = 0.752, TLI = 0.717.

In relation to research questions 3.3 and 3.4, these findings suggest that the Schwartz (1992) higher order factor structure does not provide a better fit to the data than the Sarros et al. (2005) factor structure for either personal values or organisational values.

**Model Respecification**

The above analysis demonstrated that none of the four models tested provided a good fit to the data for either organisational or personal values. Research question 3.5 asks whether there are factors within the OCP data that appear robust, meaningful and commensurate across people and organisations. To address this, model respecification
was pursued on the basis of the Borg et al. (2011) model. Model respecification is an exploratory application of confirmatory factor analysis techniques and falls within the framework of post-hoc analysis (Byrne, 2010). Guided by recommendations in Schumacker and Lomax (2004) and Kline (2005), Tables 8 and 9 document the model respecification steps and associated model fit statistics for the personal values and organisational values data.

First, unstandardised regression weights and associated critical ratios and probability values were examined for evidence that nonfixed parameters should be fixed in subsequent models. There was no substantive justification for fixing variances of the latent factors or error variables or the covariances of the latent factors so statistics relating to these parameters were not considered. All standardised regression weights were associated with significant (p<.001) critical ratios for both personal and organisational values.

Next, estimated factor correlations were examined for evidence of poor discriminant validity. As shown in Tables 8 and 9, with all 22 items, the correlation between relations and rules was greater than .9 for both personal and organisational values. On this basis, the relations and rules factors were combined. Model fit statistics for three-factor models that combine relations and rules are shown in Tables 8 and 9.

Model respecification continued with the examination of squared multiple correlations (SMCs) for each indicator. SMCs provide information about convergent validity and are an estimate of the percentage of the indicator’s variance that is explained by the predictor. The indicator with the lowest SMC was deleted from the model in an iterative fashion. For each iteration, the estimated factor correlations were also examined and factors were combined when the correlation was greater than .9. For personal values, the correlation between the results and risks factors was greater than .9 at step 8. For
organisational values, the correlation between results and risks factors was greater than .9 at step 4.
### Table 8: Model Respecification – Personal Values

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Step</th>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Chi-square</th>
<th>Df</th>
<th>Chi-square/df</th>
<th>p</th>
<th>SRMR &lt;.08</th>
<th>RMSEA &lt;.06</th>
<th>RMSEA 90% CI</th>
<th>CFI &gt;.95</th>
<th>TLI &gt;.95</th>
<th>Action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>684.36</td>
<td>203</td>
<td>3.371</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
<td>.0758</td>
<td>.088</td>
<td>.081 - .095</td>
<td>.752</td>
<td>.717</td>
<td>Combine Relations-Rules</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>689.135</td>
<td>206</td>
<td>3.345</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
<td>.0761</td>
<td>.087</td>
<td>.08 - .095</td>
<td>.751</td>
<td>.72</td>
<td>Delete ‘Sharing information freely’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>637.409</td>
<td>186</td>
<td>3.427</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
<td>.0755</td>
<td>.089</td>
<td>.081 - .097</td>
<td>.758</td>
<td>.727</td>
<td>Delete ‘Stability’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>59.66</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>3.537</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
<td>.0764</td>
<td>.091</td>
<td>.083 - .099</td>
<td>.763</td>
<td>.73</td>
<td>Delete ‘Security of employment’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Delete ‘Being distinctive and different from others’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>507.349</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>3.405</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
<td>.073</td>
<td>.089</td>
<td>.08 - .097</td>
<td>.785</td>
<td>.754</td>
<td>Delete ‘High pay for good performance’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>441.925</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>3.348</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
<td>.0721</td>
<td>.087</td>
<td>.079 - .097</td>
<td>.803</td>
<td>.771</td>
<td>Delete ‘Risk taking’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>354.787</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>3.059</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
<td>.0683</td>
<td>.082</td>
<td>.072 - .092</td>
<td>.834</td>
<td>.806</td>
<td>Delete ‘Having a clear guiding philosophy’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>324.617</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>3.214</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
<td>.0693</td>
<td>.085</td>
<td>.075 - .095</td>
<td>.837</td>
<td>.806</td>
<td>Delete ‘Enthusiasm for the job’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>341.328</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>3.314</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
<td>.0716</td>
<td>.087</td>
<td>.077 - .097</td>
<td>.826</td>
<td>.798</td>
<td>Delete ‘Being competitive’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>297.539</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>3.343</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
<td>.0663</td>
<td>.087</td>
<td>.077 - .098</td>
<td>.838</td>
<td>.808</td>
<td>Delete ‘Being socially responsible’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>191.576</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>2.993</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
<td>.0607</td>
<td>.081</td>
<td>.068 - .094</td>
<td>.881</td>
<td>.855</td>
<td>Delete ‘Being quick to take advantage of opportunities’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>16.079</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>3.02</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
<td>.0614</td>
<td>.081</td>
<td>.067 - .096</td>
<td>.891</td>
<td>.865</td>
<td>Delete ‘Being innovative’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>95.356</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>2.218</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
<td>.0528</td>
<td>.063</td>
<td>.046 - .08</td>
<td>.939</td>
<td>.922</td>
<td>Delete ‘Fairness’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>76.466</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>2.249</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
<td>.0535</td>
<td>.064</td>
<td>.045 - .083</td>
<td>.946</td>
<td>.928</td>
<td>Delete ‘Praise for good performance’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>63.757</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>2.452</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
<td>.0537</td>
<td>.069</td>
<td>.048 - .09</td>
<td>.947</td>
<td>.926</td>
<td>Delete ‘Emphasising quality’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
<td>.0574</td>
<td>.081</td>
<td>.057 - .105</td>
<td>.94</td>
<td>.912</td>
<td>Delete ‘Being competitive’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>38.915</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>2.993</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
<td>.0505</td>
<td>.081</td>
<td>.052 - .11</td>
<td>.953</td>
<td>.924</td>
<td>Delete ‘Being innovative’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9.345</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1.168</td>
<td>.314</td>
<td>.0304</td>
<td>.023</td>
<td>.0 - .073</td>
<td>.997</td>
<td>.994</td>
<td>Personal Values Solution (Figure 2a)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Column headers: **Step** - the step number in the respecification process. **Items** - the number of items in the analysis. **Chi-square** - the chi-square value. **Df** - degrees of freedom. **Chi-square/df** - the chi-square divided by the degrees of freedom. **p** - the significance level. **SRMR <.08** - the standardized root mean square residual less than .08. **RMSEA <.06** - the root mean square error of approximation less than .06. **RMSEA 90% CI** - the 90% confidence interval for the RMSEA. **CFI >.95** - the comparative fit index greater than .95. **TLI >.95** - the Tucker-Lewis index greater than .95. **Action** - the action taken based on the analysis results. **Correlation** - the correlation coefficient. **Lowest SMC** - the lowest standardized mean correlation.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Step</th>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Chi-square</th>
<th>Df</th>
<th>Chi-square/df</th>
<th>p</th>
<th>SRMR &lt;.08</th>
<th>RMSEA &lt;.06</th>
<th>RMSEA 90% CI</th>
<th>CFI &gt;.95</th>
<th>TLI &gt;.95</th>
<th>Action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>664.236</td>
<td>203</td>
<td>3.272</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
<td>.0653</td>
<td>.086</td>
<td>.079 - .094</td>
<td>.844</td>
<td>.822</td>
<td>Combine Relations-Rules</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>671.041</td>
<td>206</td>
<td>3.257</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
<td>.0651</td>
<td>.086</td>
<td>.079 - .093</td>
<td>.843</td>
<td>.824</td>
<td>Delete 'Security of employment'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>614.373</td>
<td>186</td>
<td>3.303</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
<td>.064</td>
<td>.087</td>
<td>.079 - .094</td>
<td>.851</td>
<td>.832</td>
<td>Delete 'Risk taking'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>527.263</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>3.157</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
<td>.0604</td>
<td>.084</td>
<td>.076 - .092</td>
<td>.870</td>
<td>.852</td>
<td>Delete 'Results-Risks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>547.878</td>
<td>169</td>
<td>3.242</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
<td>.0597</td>
<td>.086</td>
<td>.078 - .094</td>
<td>.863</td>
<td>.846</td>
<td>Delete 'High pay for good performance'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>499.328</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>3.307</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
<td>.0596</td>
<td>.087</td>
<td>.078 - .095</td>
<td>.870</td>
<td>.853</td>
<td>Delete 'Being competitive'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>437.337</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>3.264</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
<td>.0581</td>
<td>.086</td>
<td>.077 - .095</td>
<td>.882</td>
<td>.865</td>
<td>Delete 'Being socially responsible'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Delete 'Being distinctive and different from others'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>394.509</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>3.343</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
<td>.0587</td>
<td>.088</td>
<td>.078 - .097</td>
<td>.887</td>
<td>.869</td>
<td>Lowest SMC .360</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>376.318</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>3.654</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
<td>.0615</td>
<td>.093</td>
<td>.083 - .103</td>
<td>.882</td>
<td>.863</td>
<td>Delete 'Sharing information freely'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>32.392</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
<td>.0582</td>
<td>.092</td>
<td>.081 - .103</td>
<td>.893</td>
<td>.873</td>
<td>Lowest SMC .380</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>278.028</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>3.658</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
<td>.0581</td>
<td>.093</td>
<td>.082 - .105</td>
<td>.899</td>
<td>.879</td>
<td>Delete 'Having a clear guiding philosophy'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>264.014</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>4.125</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
<td>.0604</td>
<td>.101</td>
<td>.089 - .114</td>
<td>.893</td>
<td>.870</td>
<td>Lowest SMC .428</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>242.911</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>4.583</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
<td>.061</td>
<td>.108</td>
<td>.095 - .122</td>
<td>.890</td>
<td>.863</td>
<td>Delete 'Being quick to take advantage of opportunities'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>182.705</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>4.249</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
<td>.0638</td>
<td>.103</td>
<td>.088 - .119</td>
<td>.909</td>
<td>.883</td>
<td>Lowest SMC .404</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>15.454</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>4.425</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
<td>.0674</td>
<td>.106</td>
<td>.089 - .123</td>
<td>.915</td>
<td>.888</td>
<td>Lowest SMC .413</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>76.489</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>2.942</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
<td>.0524</td>
<td>.080</td>
<td>.059 - .101</td>
<td>.957</td>
<td>.941</td>
<td>Delete 'Emphasising quality'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>43.371</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>2.283</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
<td>.0381</td>
<td>.065</td>
<td>.039 - .09</td>
<td>.976</td>
<td>.965</td>
<td>Organisational Values Solution (Figure 2b)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>16.073</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2.009</td>
<td>.041</td>
<td>.0276</td>
<td>.057</td>
<td>.011 - .098</td>
<td>.988</td>
<td>.978</td>
<td>Replicate the Personal Values Solution (Figure 2a)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Step 19 produced a two-factor, six item model with acceptable fit statistics for personal values (Figure 2a). For organisational values, a two-factor, eight item model with acceptable fit statistics was identified at step 17 (Figure 2b). Comparison of the two models showed that both models included a factor with items: ‘being achievement oriented’, ‘being results oriented’ and ‘having high expectations for performance’. As these items all originated from the ‘Results’ factor in the Borg et al. (2011) model, this factor is called ‘Results’ in the final solution. The second factor for both models contained items originating from the ‘Relations’ factor in the Borg et al. (2011) model and included ‘being team oriented’, ‘being people oriented’ and ‘collaboration’. For organisational values, items ‘fairness’ and ‘praise for good performance’ also loaded on the ‘relations’ factor.

Table 9 also shows fit statistics for the two factor, six item personal values solution (Figure 2a) tested on organisational values. As shown, this model had acceptable fit statistics. It is interesting to note that the final items in the ‘relations’ factor all load on ‘people’ in the Sarros et al. (2005) three factor model and the final items in the ‘results’ factor all load on ‘business’ in the Sarros et al. (2005) three factor model. This suggests that these groupings of items may be the most robust and replicable factors in both the Borg et al. (2011) and Sarros et al. (2005) models. In subsequent analysis, the six-item, two-factor personal values solution is used as the final model for both personal values and organisational values.

Supplementary analysis also examined the impact of pursuing model respecification on the basis of the Sarros et al. (2005) three factor model. The same decision rules described for the respecification of the Borg et al model were applied. This analysis with the personal values data converged on the same two-factor, six-item model identified for the Borg et al. model. Analysis with the organisational values data led to a single factor solution.
Figure 2: Final Solutions

b) **Personal Values Solution**

- **Relations**
  - E9: Being team oriented
  - E11: Being people oriented
  - E12: Collaboration

- **Results**
  - E1: Being achievement oriented
  - E22: Being results oriented
  - E21: Having high expectations for performance


a) **Organisational Values Solution**

- **Relations**
  - E9: Being team oriented
  - E11: Being people oriented
  - E12: Collaboration
  - E17: Fairness
  - E20: Praise for good performance

- **Results**
  - E1: Being achievement oriented
  - E22: Being results oriented
  - E21: Having high expectations for performance
Results Summary

In summary, there was no support for research questions 3.1 and 3.2, concerned with cross-validating the Sarros et al. (2005) factor structure or 3.3 or 3.4, concerned with cross validating the Borg et al., (2011) factor structure. None of four models tested provided a good fit for the data for either organisational or personal values. In response to research question 3.5, model respecification identified a two-factor, six-item model that had acceptable fit statistics for both personal and organisational values.
Discussion

The overall objective of Chapter Three was to establish the importance of attending to the content of instruments that operationalise indirect person-organisation fit, as a necessary prerequisite for drawing conclusions from data using those instruments. In this Chapter, the case for attending to content was made and the OCP was examined as a case study of a person-organisation fit instrument that has been widely used in empirical research but that does not have a clearly replicable, theoretically driven factor structure that is commensurate across the person and organisation levels of analysis.

Replicability of Past Factor Structures

The final section of Chapter Three presented a confirmatory factor analysis of original data using a normative revision of the OCP (Sarros et al., 2005). The confirmatory factor analysis showed that none of three substantive models tested provided a good fit for the data for either organisational or personal values. There are a number of ways to interpret this finding. First, the lack of replication could highlight fuzziness in original construct definition. As outlined earlier in this chapter, the Sarros et al. (2005) model is an adaptation of the original factor structure proposed by O’Reilly et al. (1991). While O’Reilly et al. (1991) referenced past culture and values literature in their development of the OCP instrument, the factor model associated with their instrument was derived from exploratory analysis and was not linked to any theoretical models about of personal values or organisational culture dimensions. Second, the lack of replication could stem from the alignment of the instrument to the substantive model. One of the models tested in the analysis, the Borg et al. (2011) model, was grounded in Schwartz’s Theory of Basic Human Values: a framework with a substantial empirical support (Schwartz et al., 2012). However, while the items were mapped into the framework, the instrument used in this study was
Finally, it is possible that approaches to measurement contributed to this finding. For example, it is interesting to consider the extent to which the lead question may influence the replicability of these results. In the current study, respondents were asked to consider the extent to which they were “characterised by [their] preference for” each value and the extent to which their organisation was “characterised by” each value. In comparison, Sarros et al. (2005, p. 164) led with the question “to what extent is your organization recognized for its...”. The original O'Reilly et al. (1991, p. 494) instrument asked participants to sort values on the basis of “their personal preference for each value in their ideal organization” to assess personal values and on the basis of “the extent to which items were characteristic of the organization” to assess organisational values. The nuances associated with different ways of seeking information about personal and organisational characteristics is worthy of further consideration (see Cable & Edwards, 2009, for research that contrasts different lead questions using a different type of values instrument). Overall, these findings reinforce the importance of testing the replicability of factor structures over multiple studies (McKinley, 2010).

Identification of Robust Factors and Review of Alignment with Other Culture and Values Frameworks

The second focus of the analysis was whether there were robust factors with replicability to past research and commensurability between people and organisations. Model respecification was pursued on the basis of the Borg et al. (2011) model because this model had the strongest theoretical grounding. In essence, this process represented an exploratory application of confirmatory factor analysis (Schreiber, Stage, King, Nora &
Barlow, 2006). Numerous items were eliminated before a well-fitting model was identified. Of the 28 items in Sarros et al.’s (2005) instrument, 6 were retained in the final model that demonstrated commensurability across both personal and organisational values. The final model retained a Relations factor, reflecting team orientation, people orientation and collaboration; and a Results factor, reflecting achievement orientation, results orientation and having high expectations for performance.

While the final model as a whole is narrower than both the Sarros et al. (2005) and Borg et al. (2011) models, there is conceptual alignment between the Relations and Results dimensions dimensions in the Sarros et al. (2005), Borg et al. (2011) and O’Reilly et al. (1991) models. Specifically, the items in the Relations factor are largely aligned with Sarros et al.’s (2005) People dimension, O’Reilly et al.’s (1991) Team Orientation dimension and Borg et al.’s (2011) Relations dimension. The items in the Results factor are aligned with Sarros et al.’s (2005) Business dimension, O’Reilly et al.’s (1991) Outcome Orientation dimension and Borg et al.’s (2011) Results dimension.

In addition, a review of other frameworks commonly applied to polynomial person-organisation fit research shows that the Relations factor has conceptual overlap with the Humanity/Human Relations/Concern for People dimensions applied by Abbott, White and Charles (2005), Finegan (2000), Kalliath et al., (1999a), Kalliath, Bluedorn and Gillespie (1999b), Meyer, Hecht, Gill and Toplonytsky (2010), Newton and Mazur (2015), Ostroff et al. (2005) and van Vianen (2000). The Results factor has conceptual overlap with the Rational Goal dimension applied by Meyer et al. (2010), Newton and Mazur (2015) and Kalliath et al. (1999b). Applying the same Competing Values Framework as Meyer et al.

\footnote{With one exception, the three items mapped to the Relations factor are aligned to the team orientation dimension in O’Reilly et al.’s (1991) organisational and personal values structures – see Table 6 for further detail.}
(2010), Newton and Mazur (2015) and Kalliath et al. (1999b), Ostroff et al.’s (2005) Internal Process factor appears most aligned with the Results factor identified in the current model.

On the basis of the replicability of these specific factors with other models proposed for the OCP and the alignment of the factors with other culture and values frameworks, it seems reasonable to use these factors in further investigations of indirect person-organisation fit. In the next two chapters, these factors are used to support polynomial regression investigations into the relationships between operationalisations of person-organisation fit and between person-organisation fit operationalisation, work attitudes and work motivation. The analyses in the next two chapters represent an opportunity to apply a content focused approach to the interpretation of data from OCP items, moving beyond a general statement about person-organisation fit to a consideration of instrument content.

Limitations

It is important to note limitations of the analysis presented in this chapter. First, while the analysis was focused on a revision of the OCP, rather than the original instrument and as such it was only based on 28 of the original 54 items. Second, the sample upon which the data was based included students as well as employees, although it is noted that a condition for participation in the study was that the student sample needed to be employed. Responses were screened to remove employment situations where person-organisation fit was unlikely to be a meaningful construct (e.g. nanny position). Public sector proportion of the sample came from just four agencies, all located within the Australian public sector. This is likely to have contributed to some restriction in the range of organisational values reported in this sample. Finally, because of the significant respecification undertaken in the exploratory component of the analysis, it is important to
be cautious about placing too much weight on the final model (Schreiber et al., 2006). It is noteworthy that there are only three items per factor in the final model. Marsh, Hau, Balla and Grayson (1998) make an argument that, as a rule, researchers should seek to have more indicators per factor for robust models. Despite these limitations, the study makes a contribution to the literature by focusing attention on the importance of attending to underlying content dimensions in research on person-organisation fit. Future research could build on this contribution with examination of the replicability of the factor structure identified in this study with a more diverse sample.
Chapter Four: Do Different Approaches to Measuring Organisational Fit Measure the Same Thing? Relationships between Person-Organisation Fit Operationalisations

At the core of Edwards’ (2008, p. 219) assertion that researchers need to “confront the meaning of fit” was the need to address the difference between indirect and perceived operationalisations of person-environment fit. Edwards (2008, p. 219) argued that “[person-environment] fit theories are essentially silent as to whether [person-environment] fit is linguistic shorthand for the person and environment considered jointly or refers to a construct that exists separately from the person and environment”. Similarly, Kristof-Brown and Billsberry (2013) identified indirect calculated forms of fit and the perceived psychological experience of fit as the two primary paradigms in the research and highlighted the value of considering these conceptualisations as distinct, rather than interchangeable operationalisations of the same construct.

In this chapter, the second of three chapters focusing on the meaning of person-organisation fit in research, this thesis examines empirically the relationship between indirect and perceived operationalisations. Drawing on the Relations and Results factors identified in Chapter Three and responding to a) the dominance of values-based operationalisations in research and b) suggestions that personality instruments have potential for supporting person-organisation fit assessments in practice (Chapter Two; Ryan & Ployhart, 2014), this study examines these relationships using both values-congruence and personality/organisational values operationalisations of indirect fit.

Potential differences between indirect and perceived fit have been discussed for some time (e.g. Kristof, 1996), but empirical research examining the relationship between these operationalisations is lacking (Hoffman & Woehr, 2006), particularly empirical investigations employing polynomial regression techniques (Edwards, Cable, Williamson,
Lambert and Shipp, 2006). This chapter contributes to this research with the application of factors drawn from the field’s most widely used instrument, the OCP, to the examination of this fundamental question about person-organisation fit operationalisation. In addition, the inclusion of an analysis based on personality provides the opportunity to consider the potential value of personality measures in person-organisation fit assessment. Finally, this study provides the opportunity to conceptualise the personality trait of adaptability as an individual difference variable that may influence the development of perceived fit, independent of other personal or environmental attributes.

Operationalisations of Person-Organisation Fit in Organisational Settings

Before turning to the detail of the analyses, it is useful to draw a connection between the investigation into recruiter practices in Chapter Two and the focus of the current and subsequent chapters. The investigation into recruiter practices in Chapter Two found that, first, the recruiters interviewed did not use systematic objective methods to assess person-organisation fit in a manner that aligned with typical approaches to objective operationalisation of person-organisation fit in the research. Second, to the extent that structured methods were used, these approaches were based on personality instruments rather than an assessment of, and comparison between, individual and organisational values, the assessment format upon which much empirical person-organisation fit research is based (Kristof, 1996).

There are two potential ways in which the examination of relationships between indirect and perceived person-organisation fit operationalisations can support decisions about the use of organisational fit measures in personnel selection. First, given the well-documented problems associated with selection methods that rely on intuition or ‘gut feel’ (e.g. Highhouse, 2008), it seems reasonable to expect that organisations may benefit from
employing more structured methods of assessing organisational fit in selection settings. If it can be demonstrated that structured indirect methods of assessing person-organisation fit are predictive of later performance outcomes, then these methods represent an opportunity to respond to Ryan and Ployhart’s (2014) call for methods that assess organisational fit. Second, to the extent that indirect methods do not exhibit the expected relationships with the psychological experience of person-organisation fit, this suggests that pursuing indirect methods of person-organisation fit assessment may not yield the value to organisations that would be expected if these constructs were strongly related.

Below, the theoretical logic connecting indirect and direct operationalisations of person-organisation fit is explored and the way that the current study builds on and extends previous empirical examinations of this topic is presented.

**Indirect and Perceived Person-Organisation Fit as Distinct Constructs**

Historically, discussions of the relationship between indirect and direct operationalisations of person-organisation fit have assumed that these different operationalisations measure the same underlying construct and that differences between operationalisations are based on the accuracy of individuals’ assessments of themselves and the environment. For example, Judge and Cable (1997, p. 368) state that “although both [objective and perceived fit] are meant to assess the same basic construct (“true” person-organization fit), there are many motivational and cognitive biases that may divorce fit perceptions from an objective assessment of fit”. Kristof-Brown et al. (2005, p. 291) suggests that “when an individual has a high degree of contact with reality (i.e. assesses the environment accurately) and an accurate self-assessment, these three types of fit [objective, subjective and perceived] should have similar relationships.”
In contrast, the argument proposed more recently by Kristof-Brown and Billsberry (2013) and Billsberry et al. (2013) is that indirect and perceived person-organisation fit operationalisations are best conceptualised as representing different constructs. Billsberry et al. (2013, p. 125) suggests that the conceptual confusion associated with person-organisation fit construct definition is “because we have conducted fit research without first establishing what the psychological construct of fit actually is. We have built methodologies and techniques to explore interactions. We have sampled elements of fit and explored those. And we have taken overall fit perceptions and looked at their antecedents and consequences. But we have done all of this without first understanding what constitutes people’s sense of fit or misfit. Until we do that, we shall never know what fit is and what it is not.”

The difference between indirect and perceived operationalisations of person-organisation fit has been addressed empirically using profile similarity approaches (e.g. Leung & Chaturvedi, 2011; Judge & Cable, 1997); however, one of the challenges in interpreting these studies is that it is not possible to separate independent effects of person and organisation variables from the joint effects of these variables (Kalliath et al., 1999). As discussed in Chapter Three, the polynomial regression approach championed by Edwards (1993, 1994, 2007) enables a detailed examination of the functional form of the person-organisation relationship with the outcome variable but does require that person and organisation data are collected on normative rather than ipsative scales.

Polynomial regression studies investigating the relationship between indirect fit and perceived fit are limited. When Kristof-Brown and Billsberry (2013, p. 5) noted that “most evidence... suggests that there are only low to moderate correlations between these more calculated forms of fit and an individual’s experience of perceived fit”, the only citation to support this statement was a 2006 study by Edwards and colleagues. In Edwards
et al.’s study, business school students were asked to think of a job for which they had recently interviewed and rate eight job dimensions: pay, span of control, travel, vacation time, autonomy, closeness of supervision, prestige and variety. Students provided assessments of their perceived and desired amounts of each job dimension, as well as an assessment of their perceived fit to the organisation on each job dimension. Edwards et al (2006, p. 817) concluded “overall, our results indicate that these relationships deviate markedly from the conceptual logic that links the ... approaches” and “the results of this study raise fundamental questions about the subjective meaning of [person-environment] fit”.

In the only other polynomial regression study located by the researcher that directly assessed the relationship between different operationalisations of person-organisation fit, van Vuuren, Veldkamp, de Jong and Seydel (2007) measured individual and organisational values and direct perceptions of person-organisation fit in a sample of hospital and chemical plant employees. Using polynomial regression, van Vuuren et al., found no evidence for an indirect subjective operationalisation of person-organisation fit and overall perceived person-organisation fit. In contrast to Edwards et al., (2006), van Vuuren et al.’s (2007, p. 1744) interpretation of their results was that they reflected a flaw in the measurement approach rather than in the lack of relatedness of the constructs themselves: “we propose that the high means and low standard deviations in the assessment of individual values lead to the comparison of a measure (i.e. organisational values) with a constant variable (i.e. individual values) which in turn impedes possible main and interaction effects of the variable.... We suggest that the operationalization of individual values is the main cause for the lack of effects... we propose that this has to do with an underestimated disadvantage of normative measures that frustrates congruence research by ignoring the nature of values as preference opposed to other options”
The analysis presented in this chapter extends Edwards et al. (2006) and van Vuuren et al. (2007) with a polynomial regression examination of the relationship between indirect subjective person-organisation fit and perceived person-organisation fit using the OCP Relations and Results factors identified in Chapter Three. For greater specificity about this particular operationalisation of subjective person-organisation fit, and in accordance with previous treatment in the literature (e.g. Edwards & Cable, 2009), the label subjective value congruence is used to describe this analysis. An attempt was made to operationalise indirect objective person-organisation fit but the limited variance in the objective measure of organisational values precluded meaningful analysis of this data. This is of interest in its own right and is revisited in the discussion.

**Hypothesis 4.1:** Subjective value congruence for the Results factor will be positively related to perceived person-organisation fit.

**Hypothesis 4.2:** Subjective value congruence for the Relations factor will be positively related to perceived person-organisation fit.

In addition to the replication and extension of the Edwards et al. (2006) and van Vuuren et al. (2007) studies through a value congruence operationalisation of indirect person-organisation fit, the inclusion of a measure of personality in this study provides an opportunity to respond to some of the themes in the interpretations of the data made in these two studies. First, responding to van Vuuren et al.’s concerns that the data reflect a problem with the measurement of individual values, personality offers the opportunity to consider an alternative measure of individual attributes in the operationalisation of person-organisation fit. Second, responding to Edwards et al.’s interpretation that the findings challenge the longstanding assumption that psychological experience of organisational fit
stems from a cognitive calculation of or comparison between individual and organisational characteristics, personality traits are examined as individual difference antecedents of perceived fit. This avenue of investigation aligns with a growing body of research focused on understanding the factors that influence perceived fit (Kristof-Brown & Billsberry, 2013; Yu, 2009).

In the next section, the rationale for the analysis based on personality and the difference between value congruence and personality-based operationalisations of person-organisation fit are discussed in detail.

*Personality as an Alternate Way to Assess Indirect Fit or as a Predictor of Perceived Fit*

While values-based person-organisation fit has been the predominant indirect person-organisation fit conceptualisation since Chatman’s seminal work in the early 1990s, a separate stream of research has considered personality as an individual difference characteristic that could provide useful information about person-organisation fit (Ryan & Kristof-Brown, 2003; Kristof-Brown & Jansen, 2007). Conceptually, researchers have differentiated between values and personality as related but distinct constructs. Judge and Cable (1997, p.359) argue that the work values should be a function of individuals’ personality traits, describing personality traits as “individuals’ stable, even innate mental structures which provide general direction for their choices and behaviour” and values as “subjective judgements [that are] less static than personality”. Similarly, Ryan and Kristof-Brown (2003, p. 265) argue that personality is more stable, innate and observable than values, with values reflecting “what a person wants to achieve” and personality reflecting “how a person prefers to act or strive to achieve their goals”.

While Ryan and Kristof-Brown (2003) argued that personality-based person-organisation fit represented a fruitful area for further research, this area of person-
organisation fit has received far less attention than values-based conceptualisations of person-organisation fit. In this study, two areas raised by Ryan and Kristof-Brown (2003) are progressed through the application of polynomial regression to an examination of the relationship between personality traits, organisational values and perceived person-organisation fit. First, personality is conceptualised as an element of indirect person-organisation fit, reflecting the ‘person’ side of the equation. Second, the possibility that some individual difference variables may influence person-organisation fit is explored by examining the linear relationships between personality traits and perceptions of person-organisation fit.

**Personality as an Element of Indirect Fit.** There are two key ways in which personality has been operationalised as an element of person-organisation fit in past research. First, researchers have examined personality based fit by looking at congruence between the target individual’s personality traits and the personality traits of other employees in the organisation (e.g. Day & Bedeian, 1995; Westerman & Cyr, 2004; Schneider et al., 1998; Tom, 1971). Advocates of this approach generally emphasise the importance of operationalising person-organisation fit using commensurate dimensions (Ryan & Kristof-Brown, 2003).

Second, studies have operationalised fit as an indirect interaction between person and organisation. For example, Anderson, Spataro and Flynn (2008) examined differences in the relationship between personality traits and peer-ratings of influence at work in firms with different organisational cultures. Many studies that have applied this approach have employed experimental methodologies, in which research participants read organisational descriptions that manipulate various organisational attributes and then the influence of personality traits on outcome measures in these different organisations is considered (e.g.
In the current study, the conceptualisation of personality-based person-organisation fit as an interaction is extended with the application of a polynomial regression approach to examine the relationship between personality, organisational values and perceived person-organisation fit. This technique has the advantages of being able to detect both interactive and curvilinear effects in the examination of the functional form of the relationship between personality traits, organisational values and perceived person-organisation fit. While the approach presented in this chapter largely follows the recommendations laid out by Edwards and Cable (2009) for assessing values-congruence effects using polynomial regression, it is important to note that the concept of congruence is less meaningful in this context because individual and organisational attributes are not commensurate. For this reason, the term ‘congruence-like’ is used to reference the anticipated relationship between personality traits and organisational values in relation to perceived fit. Of interest in particular is whether there is evidence of curvilinear and interactive effects that suggest that there is a joint effect of person and organisation attributes on perceived fit.

Given the lack of commensurability between individual and organisational attributes in this analysis, it is important to be mindful of one of Harrison’s (2007, p. 390) central criticisms of fit research: that if fit is defined as any interactive effect between person and environment attributes relative to an outcome variable, “then fit would come close to spanning most of the known universe of organizational research”. The different views on this issue are addressed by Kristof-Brown and Guay (2011) who distinguish between exact correspondence, where fit only exists with exact correspondence between
commensurate person and environment characteristics and general compatibility, where fit is operationalised on conceptually relevant but not commensurate dimensions.

The conceptual relevance of the two Relations and Results factors identified in Chapter Three and the seven primary scales of the personality instrument applied in this study, the Hogan Personality Inventory, can be derived through an examination of the scale descriptors (Hogan & Hogan, 1992). The Relations factor, concerning the extent to which the organisation is team and people oriented and values collaboration, appears most relevant to the Sociability and Interpersonal Sensitivity scales. The Sociability scale relates to levels of extraversion, gregariousness and the need for social interaction. It appears reasonable that individuals who score highly on this scale will feel a greater sense of fit in organisations that are more team oriented and collaborative, while individuals who have lower scores on this scale will feel a greater sense of fit in organisations that are less team oriented and collaborative. A similar argument applies for Interpersonal Sensitivity, relating to levels of tact, perceptiveness and ability to maintain relationships.

The Results factor, concerning the extent to which the organisation is achievement and results oriented and carries high expectations for performance, appears most relevant to the Ambition, Prudence and Learning Orientation scales. The Ambition scale relates to levels of initiative, competitiveness and desire for leadership roles. The Prudence scale relates to levels of self-discipline, responsibility and conscientiousness. The Learning Orientation scale relates to levels of achievement orientation and desire to be up-to-date on business and technical matters.

**Hypothesis 4.3:** Congruence-like effects will be observed for the analysis of Sociability and perceptions of organisational Relations values on perceived person-organisation fit, such that higher levels of fit are reported when the individual and
organisation are both high or both low on these scales and lower levels of fit are reported with discrepancy from a match relative to the original scales.

Hypothesis 4.4: Congruence-like effects will be observed for the analysis of Interpersonal Sensitivity and perceptions of organisational Relations values on perceived person-organisation fit.

Hypothesis 4.5: Congruence-like effects will be observed for the analysis of Ambition and perceptions of organisational Results values on perceived person-organisation fit.

Hypothesis 4.6: Congruence-like effects will be observed for the analysis of Prudence and perceptions of organisational Results values on perceived person-organisation fit.

Hypothesis 4.7: Congruence-like effects will be observed for the analysis of Learning Approach and perceptions of organisational Results values on perceived person-organisation fit.

Individual Difference Predictor of Perceived Fit. The application of polynomial regression to the examination of the relationships between personality traits, organisational values and perceived person-organisation fit has the additional advantage of enabling the examination of personality traits as individual difference predictors of perceived fit. Several scholars have suggested that there may be individual differences that influence person-organisation fit. Chatman (1989) proposed that the individual difference value of openness to influence may moderate the consequence of low person-organisation fit, such that individuals with high openness to influence are likely to change their values in line with the organisation while individuals with low openness to influence are likely to leave the organisation. Piasentin and Chapman (2006) suggest that, of the big five
personality variables, openness to experience is the most likely to influence how individuals perceive fit, with individuals high in this trait more likely to perceive fit with the organisation. Finally, Ryan and Kristof-Brown (2003) highlighted the relationship between adaptability and person-organisation fit as an interesting area for future research. Ryan and Kristof-Brown argued that individuals high in adaptability may be more likely to adapt to the organisational environment, regardless of their initial level of fit.

In the Hogan Personality Inventory model, there are two scales that have conceptual overlap with the individual difference variables proposed by Chatman (1989), Piasentin and Chapman (2006) and Ryan and Kristof-Brown (2003). These are: Adjustment, relating to confidence, self-esteem and composure under pressure; and Inquisitive, relating to imagination, curiosity and creative potential. Arguably, individuals with higher levels of Adjustment will be likely to experience positive emotion, interpreted as a sense of fit, across a wider range of situations than individuals with low Adjustment. If so, this would be manifested as a positive correlation between Adjustment and person-organisation fit. Similarly, it could be argued that individuals with higher levels of Inquisitiveness would be more flexible in identifying situations in which they experience fit than those with lower levels of imagination and curiosity.

**Hypothesis 4.8:** Individuals higher on Adjustment will report higher levels of perceived person-organisation fit.

**Hypothesis 4.9:** Individuals higher on Inquisitive will report higher levels of perceived person-organisation fit.
Method:

Participants and Procedure

The analyses in Chapter Four drew on the same data set used in Chapter Three. However, only participants from three of the public sector agencies completed the Hogan Personality Inventory. Thus, the analysis drawing on the Hogan Personality Inventory is based on a subset (n = 72) of the full sample, equating to approximately a quarter of the overall sample.

Measures

Organisational Culture Profile: Personal values and organisational values measures are described in Chapter Three.

Perceived Person-Organisation Fit: The perceived person-organisation fit scale used two items adapted from Higgins and Judge (2004) “I am a good match or fit with my organisation and its current employees” and “My values reflect the values of my organisation”. A third item “I fit in well with other people in this organisation” was drafted for this study. Participants were asked to rate their agreement with the statements of a five-point scale (strongly disagree, disagree, neutral, agree, strongly agree). The scale exhibited good reliability, Cronbach’s α = .82.

Personality: Personality was measured using the Hogan Personality Inventory. This measure is one of the most popular of the major personality inventories designed for application in organisations and is supported by a large body of criterion-related validity studies (Salgado, Moscoso & Alonso, 2013). The Hogan Personality Inventory is comprised of 206 true-false items with seven primary scales: Adjustment, relating to confidence, self-esteem and composure under pressure; Ambition, relating to initiative, competitiveness and desire for leadership roles; Sociability, relating to levels of extraversion, gregariousness and the need for social interaction; Interpersonal Sensitivity, relating to tact,
perceptiveness and ability to maintain relationships; Prudence, relating to self-discipline, responsibility and conscientiousness; Inquisitive, relating to imagination, curiosity and creative potential; and Learning Approach, relating to levels of achievement orientation and desire to be up-to-date on business and technical matters.

Polynomial Regression Analysis

As noted by Kristof-Brown and Guay (2011) and consistent with precedents established by prior studies (e.g. Kalliath et al., 1999; Finegan, 2000; Cable & Edwards, 2004), the appropriate polynomial regression equation to test person-environment fit congruence relationships is the squared difference model:

\[ Z = b_0 + b_1P + b_2O + b_3P^2 + b_4PO + b_5O^2 + e \]

where \( Z \) refers to the outcome variable of interest (e.g. perceived person-organisation fit); \( P \) refers to a personal value; and \( O \) refers to the corresponding organisational value. The squared difference model enables examination of a relationship where a match between personal and organisational values leads to the most positive outcomes, with more negative outcomes associated with misfit in either direction. A depiction of the idealised value congruence relationship is presented in Figure 3 and explained in detail following a description of the analytical procedure.

For each analysis, the personal value (\( P \)) and the organisational value (\( O \)) terms were entered in Step One and higher order terms (\( P^2 \), \( PO \) and \( O^2 \)) were entered in Step Two. To reduce multicollinearity effects and aid interpretation of the results, \( P \) and \( O \) variables were scale centered by subtracting the midpoint of the scale prior to the computation of higher order terms\(^{10} \). Step Two was only undertaken where Step One was

\[ \text{Note: Finegan (2000, p. 157) uses mean-centering while Edwards and Cable (2009, p. 660), Jansen and Kristof-Brown (2005, p. 98) and Ostroff (2005) center by subtracting the mid-point of the scale. Mean centering is associated with more favourable multicollinearity statistics.} \]
associated with a significant $R^2$ value ($p < .05$). Coefficients for Step Two were only interpreted if this step was associated with a significant ($p < .05$) increase in $R^2$ above the variance explained by the variables entered in Step One. Where the increment in $R^2$ associated with Step Two was significant, a third step examined whether any further higher order terms were significant by entering $PO^2$, $P^2O$, $P^3$ and $O^{11}$.

Where it is established that there is evidence to support quadratic effects (i.e. $R^2_\Delta$ for Step Two is significant, $p < .05$) and it is possible to rule out cubic effects (i.e. $R^2_\Delta$ for Step Three is not significant, $p \geq .05$), response surface methodology was used to examine evidence for congruence effects. Following Edwards and Cable (2009), three features of the response surface were examined for evidence of value congruence$^{12}$.

First, the response surface was examined for evidence for downward curvature along the incongruence line ($O = -P$). Satisfaction of this condition would mean that participants reported lower levels of perceived person-organisation fit with increasing discrepancy between personal and organisational values. This condition was examined by testing whether the linear combination of regression coefficients $b_3 - b_4 + b_5$ differed significantly from 0 ($p < .05$). The condition was satisfied if there was evidence that the linear combination of coefficients did differ significantly from 0 and was negative.

Second, the response surface was examined for evidence that the ridge of the surface ran along the congruence line ($O = P$). Satisfaction of this condition would mean that highest levels of perceived person-organisation fit were reported when personal and organisational values were the same, at all levels of personal and organisational values.

(tolerance/VIF) but scale centering is easier to interpret when examining response surfaces for congruence effects because the $P$ and $O$ variables are on the same scale.

This follows the advice of Edwards (1994, p. 73) who argues that “it is possible to obtain coefficient estimates that are significant, in the appropriate direction, and satisfy relevant constraints, but fail to depict higher order curvatures in the underlying surface.”

$^{12}$Tests of all three conditions were conducted using SPSS syntax supplied in the public domain by Jeff Edwards http://public.kenan-flagler.unc.edu/faculty/edwardsj/SPSSResponseSurfaceAnalysis.htm
Following Edwards and Cable (2009), this condition was examined by using 10,000 bootstrap samples and constructing bias-corrected confidence intervals for the slope and intercept of the first principal axis. The condition was satisfied when the 95% confidence interval for intercept (p10) of the first principal axis included 0 and when the 95% confidence interval for slope (p11) of the first principal axis included 1.

Third, the response surface was examined for evidence that the surface was flat along the congruence line (O = P). Satisfaction of this condition would mean that when personal and organisational values are equal, levels of perceived person-organisation fit are the same, regardless of whether personal and organisational values are low or high in absolute terms. This condition was examined by testing whether the linear combination of regression coefficients $b_1 + b_2$ and $b_3 + b_4 + b_5$ differed significantly from 0 ($p < .05$)\(^\text{13}\). The condition was satisfied if there was evidence that, as a set, the linear combinations of regression coefficients did not differ significantly from 0.

\(^{13}\) Using SPSS syntax supplied in the public domain by Jeff Edwards [http://public.kenan-flagler.unc.edu/faculty/edwardsj/SPSSResponseSurfaceAnalysis.htm](http://public.kenan-flagler.unc.edu/faculty/edwardsj/SPSSResponseSurfaceAnalysis.htm)
Figure 3: Example Response Surface depicting Value Congruence
The example response surface depicted in Figure 3 demonstrates each of the three conditions for value congruence. First, consider values of $Z$ along the incongruence line ($O = -P$) shown on the base of the graph in red. Values of $Z$ are lowest at the far left ($O = 2, P = -2, Z = 1$) and the far right ($O = -2, P = 2, Z = 1$) of this line. Values of $Z$ are highest in the centre ($O = 0, P = 0, Z = 5$) of this line. In other words, perceived person-organisation fit ($Z$) is highest when personal and organisational values are equal and lower with increasing discrepancy between personal and organisational values. Second, consider the direction of the ridge of the response surface. The ridge, where values of $F$ are at their highest, runs along the congruence line ($O = P$) shown on the base of the graph in blue. This means that value congruence (where $O = P$) is associated with the highest levels of perceived person-organisation fit. Finally, consider the values of $Z$ along the congruence line ($O = P$) shown at the base of the graph in blue. Values of $Z$ are equal to 5 all the way along this line, regardless of whether $P$ and $O$ are both low ($P = -2, O = -2, Z = 5$) or both high ($P = 2, O = 2, Z = 5$).

It is also worth noting a fourth feature of the example response surface depicting value congruence. The response surface shown is symmetrical. Discrepancy between personal and organisational values has the same effect on perceived person-organisation fit regardless of whether personal values are higher than organisational values or whether organisational values are higher than personal values. The green triangle on the base of the graph depicts the area of the graph where personal values exceed organisational values. If the response surface was asymmetrical and values of $Z$ were lower in the green triangle ($O < P$) than in the grey triangle ($O > P$), this would mean that value incongruence where personal values exceed organisational values had a more detrimental impact on perceived person-organisation fit than value incongruence where organisational values
exceed personal values (see Edwards & Shipp, 2007, for a discussion of the different functional forms that can relate person-environment fit to outcomes).

**Computation of Factor Scores:** The primary analysis was conducted using the Relations and Rules factors identified in Chapter Three. Factor scores were created as the average of the three items loading on each factor.

**Computation of Organisational Values to Assess Objective Value Congruence:** In this analysis, examination of subjective value congruence was based on the individual’s perception of organisational values (i.e. their rating on the same questionnaire they used to report personal values). An attempt was also made to examine objective value congruence, where the assessment of the organisation was made by individuals other than the target employee. Following Ostroff et al. (2005), an aggregate score for organisational values was computed by first removing the focal individual and then computing the average rating across the remaining participants from the focal individual’s organisation. However, examination of the aggregate ratings showed that there was insufficient variance in this variable to enable meaningful analysis of an objective operationalisation of person-organisation fit. Consequently, no analysis of the basis of an objective value congruence operationalisation was undertaken.

**Polynomial Regression Analysis for Personality and Organisational Values:** Following the same approach described above, regression equations were estimated using the squared difference model where P was a personality variable and O was an organisational value factor. The dependent variable, Z, was perceived person-organisation fit in all cases.

**Scaling of Personality Variables:** In this analysis, personality variables represent the person side of the person-organisation fit operationalisation. Unlike the analyses presented above, personality variables are not commensurate measures and data were not
collected on the same scale as the organisational variables. To place the personality variables on the same scale as organisational variables, raw scores for each of the seven primary scales of the Hogan Personality Inventory were first centered by subtracting the midpoint of the scale and then converted to a -2 to 2 scale through a linear transformation (i.e. division by the maximum possible score and multiplication by 2).

Removal of Invalid Personality Cases: Following advice in the Hogan Personality Inventory Manual (1992), three cases with raw scores on the Validity scale less than 10 were removed before progressing the analysis relating to personality and organisational values. Cases with Validity scores less than 10 are likely to represent participants who completed the questionnaire in such a careless manner that their results are not meaningful.

Results

Table 10 presents means, standard deviations and bivariate correlations for personal values, organisational values, personality scales and perceived person-organisation fit. For all analyses presented below, preliminary analyses were conducted to ensure no violation of the assumptions of normality, linearity, multicollinearity and homoscedasticity. In some cases, outliers were detected on the basis of Mahalanobis distance and Cook’s distance, however removal of these cases had no impact on the conclusions so these outliers were retained in the final analysis.

Organisational values data were collected on a five-point scale. Scale centering by subtracting the scale mid-point results in a lowest possible score of -2 and a highest possible score of 2.
Table 10: Descriptive Statistics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</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>
<th>11</th>
<th>12</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Personal Values</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Relations</td>
<td>3.94</td>
<td>.67</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Results</td>
<td>4.07</td>
<td>.63</td>
<td>.37**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organisational Values</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Relations</td>
<td>3.68</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td>.19**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Results</td>
<td>4.04</td>
<td>.77</td>
<td>.28**</td>
<td>.21**</td>
<td>.54**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hogan Personality Scales</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Adjustment</td>
<td>23.35</td>
<td>6.83</td>
<td>.26*</td>
<td>.24</td>
<td>.36**</td>
<td>.35**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Ambition</td>
<td>20.77</td>
<td>6.07</td>
<td>.36**</td>
<td>.24</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.52**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Sociability</td>
<td>12.58</td>
<td>5.24</td>
<td>.31*</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>.25*</td>
<td>.60**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Interpersonal Sensitivity</td>
<td>18.06</td>
<td>2.93</td>
<td>.54**</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>.36**</td>
<td>.40**</td>
<td>.46**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Prudence</td>
<td>19.12</td>
<td>4.24</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>.26*</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td>.27*</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>-.34**</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Inquisitive</td>
<td>13.42</td>
<td>5.08</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>-.00</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>.24*</td>
<td>.42**</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td>-.11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Learning Approach</td>
<td>9.36</td>
<td>3.66</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>.31*</td>
<td>.26*</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.42**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Perceived Person-Organisation Fit</td>
<td>3.79</td>
<td>.73</td>
<td>.36**</td>
<td>.24**</td>
<td>.54**</td>
<td>.37**</td>
<td>.51**</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.25*</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Personal values, organisational values and perceived person-organisation fit rated on a 1 – 5 scale. Scales for Hogan Personality variables are: Adjustment: 0 – 37; Ambition 0 – 29; Sociability 0 – 24; Interpersonal Sensitivity 0 – 22; Prudence 0 – 31; Inquisitive 0 – 25; Learning Approach 0 – 14.
* p < .05, ** p < .01
Relationship Between Subjective Value Congruence and Perceived Person-Organisation Fit

Table 11 displays the results of the polynomial regression analyses for subjective value congruence with perceived person-organisation fit as the dependent variable. For both the Relations and the Results factors, the regression of the linear personal value (P) and perceived organisational value (O) terms on perceived person-organisation fit in Step One was associated with a significant $R^2$ ($R^2 \geq .16, p < .05$). With the significance of $R^2$ associated with Step One established, the quadratic terms were entered in Step Two.

Hypothesis 4.1 predicts a positive relationship between subjective value congruence and perceived person-organisation fit for the Results factor and hypothesis 4.2 predicts a positive relationship between subjective value congruence and perceived person-organisation fit for the Relations factor. However, as shown in Table 11, the inclusion of quadratic terms ($P^2$, $PO$ and $O^2$) in Step Two did not explain significantly more variance than the inclusion of the linear terms alone for either the Relations or the Results factor ($R^2_{\Delta} \leq .02, p > .05$). This indicates that there is no support for curvilinear effects in the relationship between P, O and perceived person-organisation fit, a necessary precondition for establishing value congruence. Hypotheses 4.1 and 4.2 are not supported.

Further examination of the standardised regression coefficients in Step One of both equations shows that both personal values ($\beta \geq .17, p < .01$) and organisational values ($\beta \geq .34, p < .01$) are associated with higher levels of perceived person-organisation fit. In other words, participants are more likely to report high levels of perceived person-organisation fit when they report that the organisation is characterised by high Relations or Results values and when they report that their personal Relations or Results values are high, but there is no evidence that the congruence between self-reported personal and organisational values is related to perceptions of person-organisation fit.
Table 11: Polynomial Regression of Personal and Organisational Values on Perceived Person-Organisation fit

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Step 1</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Step 2</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>$R^2$</td>
<td></td>
<td>P</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relations</td>
<td>0.26**</td>
<td>0.49**</td>
<td>0.36**</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Results</td>
<td>0.17**</td>
<td>0.34**</td>
<td>0.16**</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* p < .05, ** p < .01 Variables presented are standardised regression coefficients (betas). Note: Person and organisational values were scale centered.

Relationship Between Organisational Values and Personality in Predicting Perceived Person-Organisation Fit

Hypotheses 4.3 – 4.7 posit congruence-like effects in the relationship between organisational values and personality traits on perceived person-organisation fit, such that higher levels of fit are reported when the individual and organisation are both high or both low on these scales and lower levels of fit are reported with discrepancy from a match relative to the original scales. Tables 12 and 13 display the results of the polynomial regression analyses examining the relationship between personality dimensions and self-reported organisational values on perceived person-organisation fit for the Relations factor and the Results factor. Analyses of all possible combinations of personality scales and organisational values are displayed, but only the combinations that were specified a priori are interpreted here. Tests that relate to the hypotheses are displayed in bold text.

For the tests of all hypotheses 4.3 – 4.7, the entry of linear terms in Step One was associated with a significant $R^2$, p < .05. The inclusion of quadratic terms in Step Two did not explain significantly more variance than the inclusion of linear terms for the tests of hypotheses 4.4 – 4.7 (across all tests $R^2_\Delta < .09$, p > .05). Thus, an indirect subjective operationalisation of person-organisation fit based on personality and organisational values was unrelated to the perceived experience of person-organisation fit for all combinations.
relating to the Results factor and for the combination of Interpersonal Sensitivity and Relations.

Table 12: Polynomial Regression of Personality Variables and Organisational Relations Value on Perceived Person-Organisation Fit (Subjective Organisational Value)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>variables</th>
<th>Step 1</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>R²</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>P²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjustment</td>
<td>0.35**</td>
<td>0.44**</td>
<td>0.43**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ambition</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>0.56**</td>
<td>0.34**</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
<td>0.41*</td>
<td>0.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sociability</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.57**</td>
<td>0.32**</td>
<td>-0.09</td>
<td>0.67**</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interpersonal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sensitivity</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>0.54**</td>
<td>0.35**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prudence</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.56**</td>
<td>0.32**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inquisitive</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.57**</td>
<td>0.32**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning Approach</td>
<td>-0.03</td>
<td>0.56**</td>
<td>0.32**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.08</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* p < .05, ** p < .01 Variables presented are standardised regression coefficients (betas). Note: Personality variables and organisational values were scale centered. Note: Step Three for Sociability is significant R²Δ = .089, F(4,56) = 2.72, p < .05. Note: All combinations displayed for completeness, tests in bold relate to hypotheses. Note: n = 72.

Table 13: Polynomial Regression of Personality Variables and Organisational Results Value on Perceived Person-Organisation Fit (Subjective Organisational Value)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>variables</th>
<th>Step 1</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>R²</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>P²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjustment</td>
<td>0.39**</td>
<td>0.35**</td>
<td>0.37**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ambition</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>0.48**</td>
<td>0.26**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sociability</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.49**</td>
<td>0.24**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interpersonal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sensitivity</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>0.45**</td>
<td>0.26**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prudence</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.48**</td>
<td>0.24**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inquisitive</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.49**</td>
<td>0.24**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning Approach</td>
<td>-0.07</td>
<td>0.49**</td>
<td>0.24**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.04</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* p < .05, ** p < .01 Variables presented are standardised regression coefficients (betas). Note: Personality variables and organisational values were scale centered. Note: All combinations displayed for completeness, tests in bold relate to hypotheses. Note: n = 72.

The inclusion of quadratic terms in Step Two was associated with a significant increase in the explanation of variance for the test involving Sociability and organisational Relations values (Hypothesis 4.3). A third step, not displayed in the table, demonstrated that there was evidence of cubic effects for Sociability and Relations (R²Δ = 0.089, F(4,56) = 2.72, p < .05). Edwards (1994, p. 73) argues that it is necessary to test for higher order terms because “it is possible to obtain coefficient estimates that are significant, in the
appropriate direction, and satisfy relevant constraints, but fail to depict higher order
curvatures in the underlying surface.” Edwards (1994, p. 73) offers no further guidance
about how to proceed in situations where the cubic term is significant other than to note
that “in any case, analyses will be illuminated considerably by comparing three-dimensional
plots of raw data to the surface estimated by the model of interest”. Edwards’ current
publicly available advice is that significant effects for cubic terms rarely survive cross-
validation and that post-hoc interpretations of cubic effects are rarely warranted. Given
this advice, a cautious interpretation of the results against hypothesis 4.3 was made with
reference to the quadratic equation estimated in Step Two.

Figure 4 displays the response surfaces for a subjective operationalisation of
person-organisation fit using personality variables of Sociability and self-reported
organisational Relations values. Table 14 displays the results of the three tests of features

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcome</th>
<th>Condition 1</th>
<th>Condition 2</th>
<th>Condition 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sociability</td>
<td>10.68**</td>
<td>p10: .70 – 3.11</td>
<td>p11: -.17 – 1.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* p < .05, ** p < .01.

Condition 1: Table entry is the F statistic associated with a test that $b_3 - b_4 + b_5 = 0$. Condition is satisfied if $b_3 - b_4 + b_5 < 0$, p < .05. Entries are bolded when the condition is satisfied.

Condition 2: Table entry displays 95% bias corrected confidence intervals associated with
the intercept (p10) and slope (p11) of the primary axis. Condition is satisfied when the confidence
interval for p10 includes 0 and the confidence interval for p11 includes 1. Entries are bolded when
the condition is satisfied.

Condition 3: Table entry is the F statistic associated with a test that $b_1 + b_2 = 0$ and $b_3 + b_4 +
b_5 = 0$. Condition is satisfied when the F statistic is not significant, p ≥ .05. Entries are bolded when
the condition is satisfied.

Note: I note that the advice in Edwards’ publicly available powerpoint (found here:
public.kenan-flagler.unc.edu/faculty/edwardsj/diff.berlin.prs.ppt) is “The higher-order terms to be
included in the equation depend entirely on one’s hypotheses regarding the joint relationships of X
and Y with Z. In most cases, I have found that the three quadratic terms (i.e., $X^2$, $XY$, and $Y^2$) are
sufficient to capture most theoretically meaningful effects. In exploratory analyses, I have found
significant effects for cubic and quartic terms, but these rarely survive cross-validation and are often
symptoms of a few outliers or influential cases in the data.”
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As shown in Table 14, condition 1 was satisfied, $F = 10.68$, $p < .01$. This indicates that there was evidence of downward curvature along the incongruence line $O = -P$ such that perceived person-organisation fit tended to be higher when the personality and organisational values were at similar points along their relative scales (e.g. both high or both low) and lower when personality and organisational values were at different points along their relative scales (e.g. personality high and organisational values low). Condition 2 was not satisfied, indicating that the ridge of the response surface deviated significantly from the congruence line $O = P$. Condition 3 was not satisfied, reflecting an upwards slope along the congruence line $O - P$. These findings can be interpreted as partial support for Hypothesis 4.3.

Hypotheses 4.8 and 4.9 predicted positive linear relationships between personality scales of Adjustment and Inquisitive and perceived person-organisation fit. Examination of the regression coefficients for these variables in Tables 12 and 13 shows that this
hypothesis is supported for Adjustment (hypothesis 4.8) but not Inquisitive (hypothesis 4.9).

Self-reported Relations and Results organisational values also had positive linear relationships with perceived person-organisation fit. It is important to note that the same data set has been used to test hypotheses 4.1 and 4.2. The finding in both sets of analyses that self-reports of organisational values are positively and linearly related to perceived person-organisation fit represents a single result present in the same data set rather than a replication of this relationship across multiple studies.

Discussion

The purpose of the analysis presented in Chapter Four was to examine the relationship between indirect (subjective) and perceived operationalisations of person-organisation fit. This analysis was approached in two ways. First, reflecting the most common approach to operationalising fit in the research, indirect person-organisation fit was measured using a value congruence approach, applying the Results and Relations factors identified in Chapter Three. Second, reflecting the approach seen to hold the most potential as a structured indirect mechanism for assessing person-organisation fit, indirect person-organisation fit was operationalised via an examination of the relationship between personality traits and organisational values. The findings from these two approaches to the analysis are described below.

Indirect Person-Organisation Fit as Value Congruence

In the first set of analyses, there was no support for a value congruence relationship based on either the Relations or the Results factors. These findings replicate and extend two prior studies, Edwards et al., (2006) and van Vuuren et al. (2007). Across
the different measures for individual and organisational attributes and perceived fit
employed in Edwards et al. (2006), van Vuuren et al. (2007) and the current study, there is
little evidence that a match between person and organisation attributes was associated
with the highest levels of perceptions of organisational fit.

There are two possible interpretations of these findings. Following Edwards et al.’s
(2006), one interpretation is that these findings support the conclusion that different
operationalisations of fit reflect different constructs. Edwards et al. (2006, p. 822)
concluded that “our findings showed that the approaches are not interchangeable, and
treating them as such will hinder the accumulation of knowledge in P-E fit research”. In
other words, Edwards’ argument is that the lack of congruence effects in a polynomial
regression investigation of the data reflects a substantive difference between indirect and
direct person-environment fit constructs.

In contrast, van Vuuren et al. (2007) argued that the lack of quadratic effect
observed in their analysis reflected problems associated with the normative measurement
of personal values. As discussed in Chapter Three, some scholars argue that normative
approaches to the measurement of values do not adequately capture the psychological
mechanism by which values influence behaviour (e.g. Meglino & Ravlin, 1998). Unless
forced to choose between values, it is argued that most individuals will see most values as
desirable. The information of most interest to these scholars is the relativities between
values in situations where individuals are forced to choose one value over another. In
support of this argument, van Vuuren et al (2007) presented a comparison of the means
and standard deviation ranges for organisational and personal values in eight published
studies, including their own, that showed that personal values were general associated
with higher means and lower standard deviations than organisational values. In the
analyses presented in this chapter, this same pattern of higher means and lower standard
deviations for personal values relative to organisational values is observed, although the differences are small.

It is not possible, from the analysis presented in this chapter, to fully address the question of whether the lack of results reflects a true differentiation between indirect value congruence and perceptions of person-organisation fit or whether these effects are there but that the cognitive factors underlying the measurement scale obscure the true effect. Nevertheless, it can be concluded on the basis of this data that there is not clear support for the interchangeability of indirect and directly measured person-organisation fit constructs. These findings stand in contrast to investigations of the same research question using profile similarity approaches and highlight the importance of attending to methodology and analysis in order to critically challenge conclusions from past research (see a similar argument in Kalliath et al., 1999).

**Indirect Person-Organisation Fit as a Function of Personality and Organisational Values**

The second set of analyses also provided minimal support for a strong relationship between indirect and perceived operationalisations of person-organisation fit, applying a personality-based approach to the measurement of indirect person-organisation fit. Of the five hypotheses predicting congruence-like effects between personality scales and organisational values, only the hypothesis conceptually relating Sociability and Relations had partial support.

The application of personality to the indirect measurement of person-organisation fit was investigated as an opportunity to examine a different method of measuring the person side of the person-organisation fit equation, responding to particularly to van Vuuren et al.’s (2007) arguments about the normative measurement of values. It also provided an opportunity to more closely link the measurement of indirect person-
organisation fit with instruments currently used in organisations, further to the qualitative investigation in Chapter Two. However, these results provide limited support for a link between a personality based operationalisation of indirect person-organisation fit and directly measured perceptions of person-organisation fit.

An additional opportunity offered by the inclusion of a personality measure in this study was the ability to examine individual difference factors that may influence perceptions of person-organisation fit. As predicted, the personality scale of Adjustment was found to have a positive linear relationship with perceptions of person-organisation fit. Individuals who are high on Adjustment are described by Hogan as confident, resilient, and optimistic. Contrary to expectations, there was no relationship between individuals’ scores on the Inquisitive scale and their perceptions of person-organisation fit. These findings lend some support to predictions made by multiple researchers that there may be individual difference factors that influence individuals’ propensity to fit in organisations, regardless of the organisation (Chatman, 1989; Piasentin & Chapman, 2006; Ryan & Kristof-Brown, 2003).

**Theoretical Significance of Main Effects**

Beyond the main effect of the Adjustment personality variable, considered above, it is notable that main effects were observed for both personal and organisational Results and Relations values in predicting perceptions of person-organisation fit. The finding in the current study that the overall variance explained by linear terms is greater than the variance explained by non-linear terms is consistent with a meta-analysis of polynomial regression findings across 30 person-environment fit studies (Yang, Levine, Smith, Ipsas & Rossi, 2008). Kalliath et al. (1999, p. 1194), upon finding the same effect, offer an explanation for these effects based on the extent to which they reflect a reduction in
uncertainty which is more comfortable for individuals than ambiguity: “a strongly held and emphasized value, whether perceived in others...or in oneself, reveals less ambiguity, hence less uncertainty, concerning values and behavior than perceptions of moderately or weakly held values. Much of organization theory ...is based on the premise that individuals and organizations dislike uncertainty and will attempt to reduce it.”

**Limitations**

Several limitations of the analyses presented in this chapter should be noted. First, the use of the Results and Relations factors identified in Chapter Three in this analysis is both a strength and a limitation. While the identification of these factors make it possible to apply a polynomial regression approach to the analysis of OCP items, it must be noted that these factors do not represent the full range of values identified in values and culture frameworks (e.g. Meyer et al. (2010); Schwartz et al., 2012).

Second, restrictions in range in the component measures may have limited the opportunity to identify fit effects. Examination of the personal values, organisational values and perceived person-organisation fit means in Table 10 demonstrates that variable means were clustered in the upper ranges of the 1 to 5 scale, from 3.68 to 4.07. It is likely that there was an effect of self-selection in the sampling process, such that individuals with stronger preferences and perceptions were more likely to volunteer to participate in the study. It is also possible that there was a restriction in the variance because a large portion of the sample was drawn from the public sector. It should be noted that an attempt was made to operationalise objective person-organisation fit by computing an aggregate measure of organisational values from other employees in the same organisation as the target individual. However, aggregation demonstrated that there was very little variance in the aggregate organisational values variables, essentially creating a constant variable
unsuitable for meaningful analysis of objective person-organisation fit effects. While the variance of the subjective organisational values measures was greater, allowing meaningful analysis, it is still likely that the variance was limited due to the public sector weighting of the sample.

Third, analyses involving the personality variables should be interpreted with caution as the sample used for these analyses was small. With the sample of 72, power to detect a medium effect ($f^2 = .15$) at $p = .05$ in multiple regression with 5 predictors was approximately .68. Edwards (1993) notes that a limitation of the polynomial regression technique is that with the inclusion of multiple elements in the regression equation, residual degrees of freedom are decreased and larger samples are required to detect effects.

Finally, the self-report, cross-sectional nature of the data raises considerations of common method variance (CMV). Spector (2006) discusses CMV as an inflation in correlations attributable to method rather than the relationship between the underlying constructs of interest and notes that CMV concerns are most commonly raised in situations with self-report, cross-sectional data. Biasing factors such as social desirability, negative affectivity and acquiescence may influence the way in which individuals respond to items in general, regardless of the substantive content of the items. In this study, two attempts to introduce a multi-method source of data were made: first, as documented above, the attempt to calculate an aggregate organisational values variable that would have offered a non-self-report data point for organisational values; second, as noted in the Appendix 2, an attempt to collect matched employee supervisor data that could have offered a supervisor perspective on each of the primary variables assessed in this study. While these attempts
were ultimately unsuccessful, they offer a direction for future study for researchers who are able to successfully capture this data\textsuperscript{16}.

Summary

In summary, the analysis presented in Chapter Four has been valuable in establishing that there is not strong support for a relationship between indirect subjective person-organisation fit operationalisations and perceived person-organisation fit. This applies whether indirect person-organisation fit is operationalised as value congruence or as a congruence-like relationship between personality and organisational variables. In Chapter Five, this analysis is extended with an investigation of the relationship between fit operationalisations and work outcomes.

\textsuperscript{16} Note that I tried to collect matched employee-supervisor data but that the final sample size was too small to allow meaningful analysis. Unsuccessful attempts at data collection are documented in Appendix 2.
Chapter Five: Why Should Organisations Care About Fit? Relationships Between Person-Organisation Fit Operationalisations and Work Attitudes and Motivation

The analyses presented in Chapter Four provide empirical support to arguments that indirect and perceived fit need to be conceptualised as distinct constructs (e.g. Edwards et al., 2006; Kristof-Brown & Billsberry, 2013; Yu, 2009). However, in isolation, they offer little guidance to practitioners seeking to apply organisational fit research to improve personnel selection processes. That indirectly measured person and organisation characteristics match or that an individual feels a sense of fit with the organisation is of little practical relevance. It is only when there are clear empirically supported and theoretically sound relationships between a person-organisation fit operationalisation as a predictor and work outcomes as criteria that it makes sense for organisations to attend to person-organisation fit in selection (Chan, 2005).

In this chapter, the third and final chapter presenting empirical data to examine the meaning of person-organisation fit in research, the focus of the analysis moves from an examination of how person-organisation fit operationalisations relate to each other, to how these operationalisations relate to organisationally meaningful outcomes. Specifically, the purpose of this chapter is to investigate the relationships between person-organisation fit operationalisations (subjective and perceived) and outcomes of job satisfaction, organisational commitment and work motivation. It is noted that this chapter only focuses on a value congruence operationalisation of indirect person-organisation fit because there were insufficient data to examine the research questions using a personality based operationalisation of indirect person-organisation fit.

This chapter makes three particular contributions to the body of research investigating relationships between person-organisation fit and outcomes. First, the two
values factors derived from the OCP in Chapter Three are used to apply a polynomial regression approach to the analysis of the relationship between value congruence and attitudinal outcomes. Second, by presenting different operationalisations (subjective and perceived) in a single study, this analysis prompts consideration of the theoretical implications of differences between these different operationalisations. Finally, while examination of the relationship between motivation and person-organisation fit is a burgeoning body of research (e.g. Yu, 2013; Resick et al., 2013), to the researcher’s knowledge the analyses presented in this chapter represent the first application of polynomial regression to examine the relationship between value congruence and extrinsic and intrinsic motivation.

*Construct Definition in Theoretical Explanations of Person-Organisation Fit/Outcome Relationships*

Like the previous chapter, the research focus of this chapter responds directly to the issues that Edwards (2008) raised when he asserted that researchers need to “confront the meaning of fit”. In particular, Edwards (2008, p. 220) argued that understanding more about the relationship between person and environment characteristics and the psychological experience of fit was critical for future development in fit theory:

“introducing subjective P–E fit judgments into theories of P–E fit requires us to elaborate our theories to explain the psychological processes that map the perceived person and environment onto judgments of P–E fit and identify factors beyond the perceived person and environment that influence these judgments....Incorporating subjective P–E fit judgments in theories of P–E fit is crucial to our understanding of the meaning of P–E fit as a psychological phenomenon and the mechanisms by which it relates to other constructs.”
In the domains of both personnel selection and person-organisation fit, researchers have highlighted the importance of theory for informing useful application of person-organisation fit constructs. Empirical research has been criticised for its overemphasis on examining bivariate predictor-criterion relationships without attending to the conceptual mechanisms that explain how these variables are related (Chan, 2005; Edwards, 2008; Edwards & Cable, 2009). This becomes problematic when empirical evidence suggests that something that has often been conceptualised as a single construct, person-organisation fit, actually represents different constructs. If indirect person-organisation fit and the psychological experience of person-organisation fit are distinct constructs, then how do organisations determine which, if any, measures of fit are suitable for application in organisational talent decisions? Below, the discussion turns to the theoretical explanations and empirical evidence that link different operationalisations of person-organisation fit and work outcomes.

**Relationships Between Value Congruence, Perceived Fit and Work Attitudes**

In this chapter, the work attitudes of interest are job satisfaction and organisational commitment. Judge and Kaymmeyer-Mueller (2012, p. 343) define job satisfaction as “an evaluative state that expresses contentment with, and positive feelings about, one’s job” and organizational commitment as “an individual’s psychological bond with the organization, as represented by an affective attachment to the organization, a feeling of loyalty toward it, and an intention to remain as part of it”. While researchers have criticised the heavy emphasis in the organisational fit literature on work attitudes over measures of job performance, the main criterion of interest in selection settings (e.g. Arthur et al., 2006), it should be noted that there is a reasonable body of work demonstrating a positive relationship between work attitudes and job performance (see
review by Judge & Kammeyer-Mueller, 2012). In addition, for this study, because the research represents an application of a new factor structure based on the OCP, it is useful to examine the extent to which the data replicates past research in order to position the data associated with a relatively new construct to be directly measured as a criterion in organisational fit research, work motivation.

**Distinctions between Person-Organisation Fit Operationalisations in Theory:**

Researchers seeking to explain the relationship between person-organisation fit and work attitudes have drawn on a range of theories and paradigms, including the similarity-attraction paradigm (Arthur et al., 2006; Kristof-Brown & Guay, 2011); need fulfilment (Arthur et al., 2006; Gregarus & Diefendorff, 2009; Kristof-Brown & Guay, 2011); self-perception theory, cognitive dissonance theory and affective-consistency perspective (Leung & Chaturvedi, 2011; Kristof-Brown et al., 2005; Yu, 2009); hedonistic mechanisms (Yu, 2009) and explanatory mechanisms of improved communication, increased trust and increased attraction (Edwards & Cable, 2009).

Two challenges in navigating this literature are, first, the limited integration of conceptual explanations for person-organisation fit and outcome relationships. Edwards and Cable (2009, p.654) observe that “reasons given for value congruence effects are scattered throughout the literature and have not been assembled, distilled, and integrated into a coherent theoretical model”. Second, scholars are generally not clear about the way that differences between operationalisations of person-organisation fit are addressed in theory (Edwards, 2008).

As evidence of the second point, the relationship between person-organisation fit operationalisations and work attitudes is not explicitly addressed by the foundational person-organisation fit theories presented in the introduction to this thesis, ASA theory and Chatman’s person-organisation fit theory. In both theories, it is argued that individuals will
be prompted to leave the organisation in situations of misfit; Chatman’s theory poses this as one of three likely possibilities, with the other possibilities being that the individual’s values will change or that the organisation’s values will change. ASA theory also proposes that fit will have positive relationships with work attitudes, contrasting this with the potential negative effects for the organisation of having too many employees with high fit (Schneider, 1987a). In both theories, the psychological experience of fit seems integral to the explanations posited. There appears to be an implicit assumption that individuals’ experience and are motivated to seek fit. A distinction is not made between what is psychologically experienced by the individual and the separate assessments of person and organisation attributes.

The possibility that indirect and perceived fit operationalisations assess distinct constructs was raised in by Kristof (1996) in her integrative review of the literature as an empirical question requiring further research. Kristof (1996, p. 34) proposed that “perceived fit should have more of an impact on individual attitudinal outcomes; whereas, actual fit should be more influential on process and performance outcomes”. Kristof also raised as a possibility that psychological experience of fit may not be necessary for indirect fit to impact outcomes: “actual fit between people and organisations may result in improved process outcomes, such as communication, group functioning, or work coordination, even if the perception of fit does not exist.”

Kristof’s (1996) distinction foreshadows her later argument that indirect fit and perceived fit should be treated as different domains (Kristof-Brown & Billsberry, 2013). Kristof-Brown and Billsberry argue that conceptualising indirect and perceived fit differently inspires investigation into how organisational fit perceptions form and influence attitudes and behaviour. The line of research pursued by Yu (2009; 2013; 2014) is a good example of emerging research that incorporates differences between indirect and
perceived fit operationalisations into theoretical explanations of the relationships between these constructs and between these constructs and outcomes. Yu (2009, p. 1211) argues that “most empirical research treats any noncorrespondence between objective and subjective person and environment as error or methodological nuisance. Unfortunately, this stance ignores a vast amount of research suggesting that subjective perceptions of both the environment and the self can be distorted by factors such as the social context, cognitive reconstructions, decision-making biases and affective experience”.

Distinctions between Person-Organisation Fit Operationalisations in Empirical Work: The relationship between different operationalisations of person-organisation fit and work attitudes has been studied extensively (e.g. Oh et al., 2014; Verquer et al., 2003) but differences between these operationalisations has received less attention. Meta-analytic studies investigating the relationships between person-organisation fit and work attitudes have found strong positive relationships between perceived person-organisation fit operationalisations and work attitudes (Verquer et al., 2003; Kristof-Brown et al., 2005; Oh et al., 2014).

Empirical evidence for the relationship between indirect operationalisations of person-organisation fit and work attitudes is less clear. Both Verquer et al (2003) and Kristof-Brown et al. (2005) examined measurement strategy as a moderator of the relationship between fit and attitudes in meta-analytic investigations and found that indirectly measured fit exhibited positive though less pronounced relationships with outcomes. However, because polynomial regression studies do not yield a statistic that can be included in a meta-analysis, Verquer et al. (2003) and Kristof-Brown et al.’s (2005) investigations were based only on profile similarity approaches to assessing fit. Kalliath et al. (1999) demonstrated, using normatively measured values, that a profile similarity approach to the computation of indirect person-organisation fit data could yield a positive
correlation between overall fit and outcomes that is present because of independent effects of person or organisation characteristics.

Studies investigating the relationship between person-organisation fit and work attitudes using polynomial regression provide limited support for the proposition that these outcomes are more positive when person and organisation attributes match and less positive when there is discrepancy between person and organisation attributes (e.g. Kalliath et al. 1999; see also reviews by Kristof-Brown & Billsberry, 2013; Kristof-Brown & Guay, 2011; Kristof-Brown & Jansen, 2007). In particular, in many cases, results provide evidence of independent and additive effects of person and organisation characteristics rather than an interactive relationship (e.g. Abbott et al., 2005; Choi & Price, 2005; Finegan, 2000; Kalliath et al., 1999; Newton & Mazur, 2015). Most often, organisational characteristics are found to be the dominant independent predictors such that outcomes are more positive when the organisation is measured more positively regardless of the measure of individual characteristics (e.g. Abbott et al., 2005; Finegan, 2000; Newton & Mazur, 2015 – this effect is also referenced in Kristof-Brown & Guay, 2011 and Yang et al., 2008). It is of note that none of the empirical polynomial regression studies examining relationships between person-organisation fit and work attitudes identified by the researcher addressed different operationalisations of person-organisation fit in the same study.

In the analyses presented in this chapter, this research gap is addressed with the investigation of the relationship between indirect (subjective) and perceived person-organisation fit and work attitudes in a single study. As noted in Chapter Three, one of the advantages of a polynomial regression approach to investigating person-organisation fit is that it enables examination of different effects for different dimensions of person-organisation fit. In this study, the relationship between person-organisation fit based on
Relations, emphasising team and people orientation and collaboration; and Results, emphasising achievement and results orientations and high expectations for performance.

**Hypothesis 5.1:** Perceived person-organisation fit will be positively related to a) job satisfaction; and b) organisational commitment.

**Hypothesis 5.2:** A subjective value congruence effect on job satisfaction will be present for: a) the Results factor; and b) the Relations factor such that participants will be more satisfied when individual and self-reported organisational values are the same and job satisfaction will be reduced with increasing discrepancy between individual and self-reported organisational values.

**Hypothesis 5.3:** A subjective value congruence effect on organisational commitment will be present for: a) the Results factor; and b) the Relations factor such that participants will be more committed when individual and self-reported organisational values are the same and organisational commitment will be reduced with increasing discrepancy between individual and self-reported organisational values.

*Relationships Between Value Congruence, Perceived Person-Organisation Fit and Work Motivation*

The relationship between person-organisation fit and motivational mechanisms is an emerging area of research (e.g. Gregarus & Diefendorff, 2009; Resick et al., 2013; Tett, Simonet, Walser & Brown, 2013). This chapter follows Judge and Kaymmeyer-Mueller (2012, p. 347) in viewing job attitudes separately from motivational constructs: “motivational energies are likely to be influenced by, and to influence, attitudes, but the actual energy to achieve ends and one’s attitudes toward the sources and objects of these energies are distinct constructs” and draws on Locke and Latham’s (2004, p. 388) definition
of motivation as “internal factors that impel action and external factors that can act as inducements to action”.

The measure of motivation used in the analyses presented in this chapter is derived from Ryan and Deci’s (2000) Self-Determination Theory (SDT; see also Deci & Ryan, 2000; Deci & Ryan, 2008a; Deci & Ryan, 2008b; Deci & Ryan, 2009). SDT expands the notion that motivation can be described according to internal and external factors with a continuum of motivational types that run from intrinsic motivation, “doing an activity for its inherent satisfaction”, to external regulation, what is traditionally conceptualised as extrinsic motivation “behaviours are performed to satisfy an external demand or reward contingency” (Ryan & Deci, 2000, p. 72; Gagne & Deci, 2005). Inside this continuum, SDT differentiates between three other motivational types (introjected, identified and integrated regulation) that represent increasing levels of internalisation. As motivation becomes more internalised, the energy to act is less subject to the presence of an external contingency (i.e. from working only when the boss is watching to working even when the boss is not watching).

Self-determination theory provides a useful framework for studying the relationship between person-organisation fit and motivation because the extent to which an employee’s work motivation is internalised is often at the core of the reason that organisations are seeking individuals who fit. In Chapter Two, recruiters’ references to “productivity”, “motivation” and “engagement” when describing the consequences of organisational fit at work are consistent with Bowen et al.’s (1991) advocacy of hiring for person-organisation fit because it results in “self-motivated” employees.

There are two ways to conceptually link the internalisation of motivation and person-organisation fit defined as value congruence. First, the concepts are linked through the definition of values themselves. Schwartz and Bardi (2001, p. 269) define values as
“desirable, transsituational goals, varying in importance, that serve as guiding principles in people’s lives” and further argue that “the basic social function of values is to motivate and control the behaviour of group members... values serve as internalised guides for individuals; they relieve the group of the necessity for constant social control”. To the extent that the individual perceives that their personal values match the organisation’s values, then it follows that the individual would experience their activity at work as internally motivated. Second, the principles of need fulfilment have been applied to explanations of both constructs. Need fulfilment is central to SDT, which proposes that satisfaction of the three basic psychological needs, the need for autonomy, the need for relatedness and the need for competence, is critical for the experience of internalised motivation (Deci & Ryan, 2008; Deci & Ryan, 2009; Gagne & Deci, 2005). Similarly, need fulfilment is a central paradigm that underpins many of the conceptual arguments that link person-organisation fit to outcomes (Kristof-Brown & Guay, 2011).

Empirical research directly addressing relationships between person-organisation fit and explicitly measured intrinsic and extrinsic work motivation are limited to perceived fit operationalisations. Rubino, Lukstye, Perry and Volpone (2009) found that poor perceived person-profession fit was associated lower levels of intrinsic motivation, associated in turn with self-reports of inefficiency on the job. Astakhova and Porter (2015) conceptualise perceptions of person-organisation fit as a moderator of the relationship between work passion and job performance. Astakhova and Porter differentiate between harmonious work passion, driven by intrinsic motivation, and obsessive work passion, driven by extrinsic motivation. They find that the relationship between harmonious work passion and performance is positive for individuals with higher levels of perceived person-organisation fit, while relationships between harmonious work passion and performance for individuals with low person-organisation fit and relationships between obsessive work
passion and performance for individuals with high or low person-organisation fit are not significantly different from zero. Finally Gregarus and Diefendorff (2009), while not measuring motivation directly, demonstrated that perceived person-organisation fit was positively related to the satisfaction of needs for autonomy, relatedness and competence. As noted above, these three needs are central to SDT’s propositions. Gregarus and Diefendorff noted that a limitation of their study was that they did not include an explicit measure of intrinsic motivation in their model. They suggest that “models that do not include intrinsic motivation may be omitting an important intervening factor” (p. 475).

In the analyses presented in this chapter, the examination of the relationship between person-organisation fit and motivation is extended with a comparison of the differences between different operationalisations of person-organisation fit in their relationship with work motivation.

**Hypothesis 5.4:** A subjective value congruence effect on identified regulation will be present for: a) the Results factor; and b) the Relations factor such that participants will report higher levels of identified regulation when individual and self-reported organisational values are the same and levels of identified regulation will be reduced with increasing discrepancy between individual and self-reported organisational values.

**Hypothesis 5.5:** A subjective value congruence effect on integrated regulation will be present for: a) the Results factor; and b) the Relations factor such that participants will report higher levels of integrated regulation when individual and self-reported organisational values are the same and levels of integrated regulation will be reduced with increasing discrepancy between individual and self-reported organisational values.

**Hypothesis 5.6:** A subjective value congruence effect on intrinsic motivation will be present for: a) the Results factor; and b) the Relations factor such that participants will report higher levels of intrinsic motivation when individual and self-reported organisational
values are the same and levels of intrinsic motivation will be reduced with increasing discrepancy between individual and self-reported organisational values.

Hypothesis 5.7: Perceived person-organisation fit will be positively related to a) identified regulation; b) integrated regulation and c) intrinsic motivation.
Method

Participants and Procedure

The analyses in Chapter Five were based on the same data set used in Chapters 3 and 4. A total of 217 participants completed the measures used in the Chapter Five analyses.\(^{17}\)

Measures

Organisational Culture Profile: Personal values and organisational values measures are described in Chapter Three.

Perceived Person-Organisation Fit: As described in Chapter Four.

Organisational Commitment: Organisational commitment was measured using an eight-item scale developed by Schyns and Van Veldhoven (2010). Example items are “I really feel very closely involved with this organisation” and “It would take very little negative change to make me leave” (reverse scored). Participants rated their level of agreement with each statement on a five-point scale (strongly disagree, disagree, neutral, agree, strongly agree). The scale exhibited good reliability, Cronbach’s α = .80.

Job Satisfaction: Job satisfaction was measured using the Michigan Organizational Assessment Questionnaire Job Satisfaction Subscale was used for this study (Cammann, Fichman, Jenkins, & Klesh, 1983). The items were “All in all, I am satisfied with my job,” “In general, I don’t like my job (reverse scored), “In general, I like working here”. Participants rated their level of agreement with each statement on a five-point scale (strongly disagree, strongly agree = .217;
disagree, neutral, agree, strongly agree). The scale exhibited good reliability, Cronbach’s α = .86.

_Work Motivation:_ The Work Extrinsic and Intrinsic Motivation Scale (Tremblay, Blanchard, Taylor, Pelletier, & Villeneuve, 2009) was used to measure work motivation. This scale contains 18 items in total with three items each measuring: _intrinsic motivation_, e.g. “Because I derive much pleasure from learning new things”, Cronbach’s α = .89; _integrated regulation_, e.g. “Because it has become a fundamental part of who I am”, Cronbach’s α = .80; _identified regulation_, e.g. “Because this is the type of work I chose to do to attain a certain lifestyle”, Cronbach’s α = .74, _introjected regulation_, “Because I want to succeed at this job, if not I would be very ashamed of myself”, Cronbach’s α = .80, _external regulation_, “For the income it provides me”, Cronbach’s α = .59 and _amotivation_, e.g. “I ask myself this question, I don’t seem to be able to manage the important tasks related to this work”, Cronbach’s α = .81. Participants are asked “To what extent do each of following items correspond to the reasons why you are presently involved in your work?” and asked to rate each item on a five-point scale ranging from ‘does not correspond at all’ to ‘corresponds exactly’.

_Polynomial Regression Analysis_

Following the same approach presented in Chapter Four, regression equations were estimated using the squared difference model. Equations were estimated for each factor (Rules and Relations) and each outcome variable (organisational commitment, job satisfaction, motivation type) using a subjective operationalisations of value congruence.
**Results**

Table 15 presents means, standard deviations and bivariate correlations for perceived person-organisation fit, personal values, organisational values, work attitudes and work motivation scales.

**Table 15: Descriptive statistics**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</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>
<th>11</th>
<th>12</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Perceived Person-Organisation Fit</td>
<td>3.79</td>
<td>.73</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal Values</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Relations</td>
<td>3.94</td>
<td>.67</td>
<td>.36**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Results</td>
<td>4.07</td>
<td>.63</td>
<td>.24**</td>
<td>.37**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organisational Values</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Relations</td>
<td>3.68</td>
<td>.8</td>
<td>.54**</td>
<td>.19**</td>
<td>.16**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Results</td>
<td>4.04</td>
<td>.77</td>
<td>.37**</td>
<td>.28**</td>
<td>.21**</td>
<td>.54**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work Attitudes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Job satisfaction</td>
<td>3.73</td>
<td>.85</td>
<td>.71**</td>
<td>.26**</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.43**</td>
<td>.29**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Organisational Commitment</td>
<td>3.24</td>
<td>.65</td>
<td>.66**</td>
<td>.25**</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.41**</td>
<td>.22**</td>
<td>.67**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work Motivation Scales</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Amotivation</td>
<td>1.79</td>
<td>.89</td>
<td>-.14*</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>-.15*</td>
<td>-.20**</td>
<td>-.16*</td>
<td>-.23**</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. External regulation</td>
<td>3.61</td>
<td>.79</td>
<td>.18**</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>.25**</td>
<td>.18**</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Introjected regulation</td>
<td>2.52</td>
<td>1.05</td>
<td>.21**</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.23**</td>
<td>.36**</td>
<td>.39**</td>
<td>.16*</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Identified regulation</td>
<td>2.68</td>
<td>1.02</td>
<td>.28**</td>
<td>.16*</td>
<td>.19**</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.38**</td>
<td>.44**</td>
<td>.28**</td>
<td>.14*</td>
<td>.68**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Integrated regulation</td>
<td>2.63</td>
<td>1.07</td>
<td>.35**</td>
<td>.19**</td>
<td>.14*</td>
<td>.15**</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.41**</td>
<td>.53**</td>
<td>.29**</td>
<td>.1</td>
<td>.66**</td>
<td>.73**</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Intrinsic motivation</td>
<td>3.07</td>
<td>1.14</td>
<td>.36**</td>
<td>.28**</td>
<td>.24**</td>
<td>.16*</td>
<td>.15*</td>
<td>.49**</td>
<td>.46**</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>.64**</td>
<td>.71**</td>
<td>.64**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* p < .05, ** p < .01
For all analyses presented below, preliminary analyses were conducted to ensure no violation of the assumptions of normality, linearity, multicollinearity and homoscedasticity. In some cases, outliers were detected on the basis of Mahalabon's distance, however removal of these cases had no impact on the conclusions so these outliers were retained in the final analysis.

Relationship Between Different Person-Organisation Fit Operationalisations and Job Satisfaction and Organisational Commitment

Relationship Between Perceived Person-Organisation Fit and Job Satisfaction and Organisational Commitment. In support of hypotheses 5.1a) and 5.1b), there were significant and positive correlations between perceived person-organisation fit and job satisfaction: .71, p. < .001; and between perceived person-organisation fit and organisational commitment: .66, p. < .001 (Table 15).

Relationship Between Subjective Value Congruence and Job Satisfaction and Organisational Commitment. Tables 16 and 17 display the results of the polynomial regression analyses for both Relations and Rules values with job satisfaction and organisational commitment as dependent variables. In all cases, the regression of the linear personal value (P) and perceived organisational value (O) terms on the dependent variable in Step One was associated with a significant $R^2$ ($R^2 \geq .05$, p < .01). With the significance of $R^2$ associated with Step One established, the quadratic terms were entered in Step Two.

Hypothesis 5.2 predicted a subjective value congruence effect on job satisfaction for a) the Results factor and b) the Relations factor. Hypothesis 5.3 predicted a subjective
value congruence effect on organisational commitment for a) the Results factor and b) the Relations factor. However, as shown in Tables 16 and 17, the inclusion of quadratic terms (P^2, PO and O^2) in Step Two did not explain significantly more variance than the inclusion of the linear terms alone in any of the relevant equations (R^2 Δ ≤ .03, p > .05). This indicates that there is no support for curvilinear effects in the relationship between P, O and the dependent variable for either values factor, a necessary pre-condition for establishing value congruence. Thus, Hypotheses 5.2a), 5.2b), 5.3a) and 5.3b) are not supported.

**Table 16: Polynomial Regression of Personal and Organisational Values on Job Satisfaction**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Step 1</th>
<th>Step 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relations</td>
<td>0.17**</td>
<td>0.39**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Results</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.28**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* p < .05, ** p < .01 Variables presented are standardised regression coefficients (betas). Note: Person and organisational values were scale centered.

**Table 17: Polynomial Regression of Personal and Organisational Values on Organisational Commitment**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Step 1</th>
<th>Step 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relations</td>
<td>0.18**</td>
<td>0.38**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Results</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>0.20**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* p < .05, ** p < .01 Variables presented are standardised regression coefficients (betas). Note: Person and organisational values were scale centered.

Closer examination of the pattern of standardised regression coefficients indicates that for the Relations factor, both personal values (β ≥ 0.17, p < .01) and organisational values (β ≥ 0.38, p < .01) are significantly related to the dependent variable. For the Results factor, organisational values are significant related to the dependent variable (β ≥ 0.20, p < .01), but personal values are not significantly related to the dependent variable (β ≤ 0.04, p > .05). In other words, participants are more likely to report high levels of job satisfaction and organisational commitment when they report that the organisation is
characterised by high Relations or Results values and when they report that their personal
Relations values are high, but there is no evidence that the congruence between self-
reported personal and organisational values is related to job satisfaction or organisational
commitment.

**Relationship Between Perceived Person-Organisation Fit, Subjective Value Congruence and
Work Motivation**

Table 18 displays the results of the polynomial regression analyses examining the
relationship between subjective value congruence for the Relations and Results factors and
the six types of work motivation. Hypotheses 5.4, 5.5 and 5.6 predicted that there would
be a subjective value congruence effect on identified, integrated and intrinsic motivation
respectively. As shown in Table 18, the regression of the linear personal value (P) and the
organisational value (O) on the outcome variable in Step One was not associated with a
significant $R^2, p > .05$, for the test of Results value congruence on Integrated Regulation
(Hypothesis 5.5a). Without evidence for a significant relationship between the linear terms
and the outcome variables, it is not appropriate to progress the analysis to the examination
of quadratic relationships (Edwards, 1994) and these results can be interpreted as a lack of
support for hypothesis 5.5a).
### Table 18: Polynomial Regression of Personal and Organisational Values on Motivation Types

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Motivation type</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Step 1</th>
<th>Step 2</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>P</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>R²</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>P²</td>
<td>PO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amotivation</td>
<td>Relations</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>-.20**</td>
<td>.04*</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amotivation</td>
<td>Results</td>
<td>-.12</td>
<td>-.13</td>
<td>.04*</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>External Regulation</td>
<td>Relations</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.25**</td>
<td>.07**</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>External Regulation</td>
<td>Results</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>.20**</td>
<td>.04*</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Introjected Regulation</td>
<td>Relations</td>
<td></td>
<td>.01</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Introjected Regulation</td>
<td>Results</td>
<td></td>
<td>.02</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identified Regulation</td>
<td>Relations</td>
<td>.14*</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.03*</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identified Regulation</td>
<td>Results</td>
<td>.19**</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.04*</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integrated Regulation</td>
<td>Relations</td>
<td>.17*</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.05**</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integrated Regulation</td>
<td>Results</td>
<td></td>
<td>.02</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intrinsic motivation</td>
<td>Relations</td>
<td>.26**</td>
<td>.1</td>
<td>.09**</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intrinsic motivation</td>
<td>Results</td>
<td>.21**</td>
<td>.1</td>
<td>.06**</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* p < .05, ** p < .01 Variables presented are standardised regression coefficients (betas). Note: Person and organisational values were scale centered.

For the four remaining hypotheses tests, specifically identified regulation and intrinsic motivation for Results (hypotheses 5.4a and 5.6a) and identified regulation, integrated regulation and intrinsic motivation for Relations (hypotheses 5.4b, 5.5b and 5.6b), the entry of linear terms in Step One was associated with a significant $R^2$, $p < .05$, but the inclusion of quadratic terms in Step Two did not explain significantly more variance than the inclusion of linear terms alone for this analysis. This indicates that there is no support for curvilinear effects in the relationship between P, O and job satisfaction, a necessary pre-condition for establishing value congruence. These results can be interpreted as a lack of support for hypotheses 5.4a), 5.4b), 5.5b), 5.6a) and 5.6b).

Further examination of the standardised regression coefficients for Step One shows that both personal values appear to have positive and independent relationships with intrinsic motivation (Relations $\beta = .26, p < .01$; Results: $\beta = 0.21, p < .01$), integrated motivation (Relations: $\beta = 0.17, p < .05$) and identified regulation (Relations $\beta = .14, p < .05$);
Results: $\beta = 0.19$, $p < .01)$. Overall, these results suggest that an individual’s personal perception of their values are positively related to internalised forms of motivation, but the congruence between self-reported personal values and organisational values is not related to levels of motivation.

Hypothesis 5.7 predicted that perceived person-organisation fit would be positively related to identified regulation, integrated regulation and intrinsic motivation. Table 19 displays bivariate correlations between the six motivation types and perceived person-organisation fit. In support of hypothesis 5.7, significant positive correlations are observed between perceived person-organisation fit and integrated regulation, identified regulation and intrinsic motivation.

Table 19: Correlations between Perceived Person-Organisation Fit and Motivation Types

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Perceived Person-O rganisation Fit</th>
<th>Amotivation</th>
<th>External Regulation</th>
<th>Introjected Regulation</th>
<th>Integrated Regulation</th>
<th>Identified Regulation</th>
<th>Intrinsic Motivation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-.14*</td>
<td>.18**</td>
<td>.21**</td>
<td>.28**</td>
<td>.35**</td>
<td>.36**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$
Discussion

In this chapter, the argument was made that as a criterion variable in situations such as personnel selection, person-organisation fit will only be of use to organisations if it can be demonstrated that there are relationships between person-organisation fit and outcome variables that can be linked to the achievement of business outcomes. The objective of the analyses presented in this chapter was to examine the relationship between indirect and perceived operationalisations of person-organisation fit and two sets of outcome variables: work attitudes and work motivation. The results show that different conclusions can be reached from the assessment of an indirect subjective value congruence operationalisation of person-organisation fit and from the direct measurement of perceived person-organisation fit. These findings are discussed in more detail below.

Indirect Person-Organisation Fit and Work Outcomes

It was found that there was no support for an indirect subjective value congruence relationship between person and organisational values and any of the outcome variables tested, including job satisfaction, organisational commitment and internalised work motivation types. That is, there was no evidence that holding high, low or moderate personal values combined with equivalently high, low or moderate organisational values added any predictive power over the consideration of an individual’s absolute value of personal values or absolute perception of organisational values. This lack of strong support for a relationship between indirectly operationalised person-organisation fit and work attitudes is consistent with other polynomial regression investigations (e.g. Kallith et al., 1999; Choi & Price, 2005; Abbott et al., 2005; Finegan, 2000; Newton & Mazur, 2015) and stands in contrast to the conclusions of most profile similarity investigations of indirect person-organisation fit (Verquer et al, 2003; Kristof-Brown et al., 2005; Oh et al., 2014).
The absence of indirect person-organisation fit effects in this study runs counter to the predictions of person-organisation fit theories (e.g. Chatman, 1989; Schneider, 1987a; Kristof-Brown & Guay, 2011), as well as to the arguments made in this chapter about the relationship between subjective value congruence and internalised motivation. It was expected that where self-reported individuals’ values matched perceived organisational values, more positive work attitudes and higher levels of internalised motivation would be reported. These findings reinforce the need to ensure that person-organisation fit theory adequately differentiates between indirect and direct operationalisations of person-organisation fit and accommodates the lack of fit effects from a growing body of polynomial regression research.

Perceived Person-Organisation Fit and Work Outcomes

In contrast to the findings for indirect subjective value congruence and consistent with past research, directly measured perceived person-organisation fit exhibited strong positive relationships with job satisfaction, organisational commitment and internalised work motivation. A particular strength of the analysis presented in this chapter was the examination of both indirect and direct person-organisation fit effects in a single study.

Limitations

The limitations of the data outlined in Chapter Four apply to the analyses in Chapter Five. In particular, it is important to note that the analysis is based on only two values factors and does not represent the full range of potential values that could be assessed. There may be restriction in range of the sample, which has a large proportion of public sector employees, and reliance on a single method of data collection at a single point in time raises the possibility of common method variance. Additionally, it is important to note that the motivation scale used in this study has been subject to critique by scholars in the presentation of a revised work motivation scale (Gagne et al., 2015). Finally, while the
hypotheses in this study position person-organisation fit as an independent variable and work outcomes as dependent variables, it is important to note that the data are cross-sectional and therefore do not support inferences of causality. This is of less relevance to the finding that there were no subjective values congruence relationships with any of the outcome variables tested but is relevant to the interpretation of the finding that perceived person-organisation fit had positive relationships with the outcomes investigated in this study. A direction for future research into this relationship is the issue of causality: are employees more motivated because they feel that they fit the culture or does the perception of a sense of fit with the organisation evolve as employees experience motivation in the workplace?
Chapter Six.

Where To from Here? Supporting Good Organisational Practice with Methodologically Sound Organisational Science.

The driving force behind this thesis has been the need to address the construct definition of person-organisation fit (Edwards, 2008; Kristof-Brown & Billsberry, 2013) as a critical element in promoting theoretical progress in the field and supporting better business outcomes. The thesis began by recognising that the idea of person-organisation fit has captured the interest of both researchers and practitioners over decades and that there is a prevailing wisdom that ‘fit is a good thing’ that organisations should seek to maximise in employees (e.g. Oh et al., 2014). At the same time, despite the decades of attention, adequately defining and measuring the construct of person-organisation fit has remained a core challenge for this domain of literature (Edwards, 2008; Kristof-Brown & Billsberry, 2013; Kristof-Brown & Guay, 2011).

On this basis, this thesis set out to respond to two key questions about the nature of person-organisation fit in theory and practice: “what does organisational fit mean to organisational practitioners?” and “what does organisational fit mean in research?”. The effort to answer these questions has raised and responded to other queries about the connections between and within practitioner and researcher definitions of person-organisation fit. Are practitioners and researchers talking about the same thing when they talk about fit? Are the accepted methods for measuring fit measuring the same thing that practitioners talk about and are empirical operationalisations of fit measuring the same thing that academics talk about in organisational theory? Are methods for measuring organisational fit interchangeable and, if they are not, what does this mean for theory that talks about person-organisation fit as a singular construct? And what does this all mean for
organisations who look to the organisational behaviour literature to support them in their mission to manage human resources in a way that results in effective, high performing and financially viable businesses?

The focus in this thesis on construct definition and instrumentation as a critical enabler of theoretical progress is consistent with the arguments made by Edwards (2008) in relation to person-environment fit and by McKinley (2010) and Ferris et al. (2012) in relation to organisational sciences more generally. In particular, these scholars make the argument that research that seeks to incrementally test, challenge and consolidate existing theory is as important for theoretical progress as the development of new theory. The emphasis throughout the thesis on the capacity of the research to support good organisational practices, particularly in the domain of personnel selection, also reflects scientist-practitioner role of organisational research. As Rauschenberger and Mellon (2014, p. 297) note: “much of I/O’s perceived value lies in our ability to present complex information in terms that resonate with our business customers”.

The goal of this final chapter is to draw together the primary insights from across the research program to consider how they contribute to person-organisation fit theory, lay out an agenda for future research and identify the implications for organisational practice. Taking a bird’s eye view, the strongest conclusion of this thesis is that there appear to be multiple ways to conceptualise person-organisation fit and that these conceptualisations are not the same as each other. In the discussion that follows, three critical challenges for person-organisation fit scholars to take up in future research are identified. The primary practical implications of the findings are also considered. To support the reader, a summary of findings against the research questions and hypotheses is presented at Appendix 1.
How Should Indirect Person-Organisation Fit be Treated in Theory?

The first challenge posed to person-organisation fit theory by this thesis is the need to be explicit about the differences between indirect and direct conceptualisations of fit and, where indirect person-organisation fit effects are predicted, to ground these in the content dimensions on which fit is assessed. In Chapter Three, the case was made for attending to the content of person-organisation fit instruments and the risks of treating indirect person-organisation fit as a single, holistic construct were highlighted. Chapter Four demonstrated the ways in which indirect person-organisation fit can be operationalised using both values and personality as the basis of measurement content. Finally, in Chapters Four and Five, the data support the argument that the indirect and direct measures of person-organisation fit used in these analyses cannot be used interchangeably.

These empirical findings are aligned with, and add weight to, contemporary arguments about the direction that the person-organisation fit field must take in order to establish the continued relevance of this field of study (Edwards, 2008; Billsberry & Kristof-Brown, 2013). In particular, these scholars, interested in the future of person-organisation fit research, have laid out the case for a conceptual separation between indirect and direct conceptualisations of person-organisation fit and between content dimensions of fit. Addressing this raises two interesting questions for future research and theory development.

First, to what extent is the psychological experience of fit required for the propositions and conceptual logic of the theory to hold? To date, person-organisation fit theory has typically held an implicit assumption that person-organisation fit is psychologically experienced. For example, that individuals experience, and seek to
maximise, fit is the basis for the attraction and attrition effects in Schneider’s ASA theory (Schneider, 1987a).

However, it may be possible to reformulate or mature theory such that core propositions are independent of an assumed psychological experience of fit. For example, Edwards and Cable (2009, p. 656) posit, as a potential pathway by which value congruence influences job satisfaction and organisational identification, that “value congruence should promote communication because having shared standards about what is important establishes a common frame for describing, classifying and interpreting events”. In this explanation, the logic that flows from individual and organisational characteristics to outcomes does not require a sense of fit to be psychologically experienced. In a similar vein, Tett’s Trait Activation Theory (TAT; Tett & Burnett, 2003; Tett & Guterman, 2000; Tett et al., 2013) is a good example of an emerging theory where the interplay of person and organisational characteristics is integral to the theory’s propositions but where the psychological experience of fitting in is not required for the conceptual logic to apply. The focus of TAT is on the way in which personality traits are expressed in situations with different work demands. While this is not explicitly a person-organisation fit theory, there have been recent efforts to position this theory within the person-workplace fit literature (Tett et al., 2013).

Second, if the joint effects of person and organisation can be separated from psychologically experienced fit, how can theories about indirect person-organisation fit effects be conceptually integrated to have continued relevance? In his recommendations for cultivating theoretical progress in the field of person-environment fit, Edwards (2008) argued that if person-environment fit is defined as a relationship between person and environment variables, then it should be translated into a description about the joint relationship between person and environment, rather than addressed as a separate
construct. Edwards (2008, p. 221) also makes the argument that “without content, the meaning and implications of P-E fit will remain elusive, and P-E fit theories are unlikely to yield predictions that go beyond simplistic generalizations”. Chapter Three of this thesis presented an argument, on the basis of a literature review and a confirmatory factor analysis of original data, that the emphasis on indirect person-organisation fit as a holistic construct has obscured the ambiguity about the underlying content on which the fit is assessed.

The scholars who follow Edwards’ (2008) recommendations will end up with a series of propositions about the functional form of person and organisation relationships with specific outcomes on specific content dimensions. As an example, Edwards and Cable (2009) in seeking to develop a theoretical model about the way in which value congruence might influence outcomes propose four explanations on the basis of trust, communication, interpersonal attraction and predictability. The challenge for future researchers who pursue indirect person-organisation fit as an area of study will be to either conceptually integrate these propositions under the banner of person-organisation fit, if indeed it is meaningful to do so, or make a clear argument for why it is no longer reasonable to talk about indirect person-organisation fit effects in an integrated way.

Are Perceptions of Person-Organisation Fit Always About People and Organisations?

A second fundamental challenge to the person-organisation fit literature posed by this thesis is whether person-organisation fit as interpreted by practitioners and employees is indeed about people and organisations, considered jointly. While the ‘elusiveness’ of the construct has been the focus of much of the criticism of person-organisation fit research (Edwards, 2008; Harrison, 2007; Morley, 2007), the general notion of person-organisation fit is interactionist. Chatman (1989) restricted the definition to congruence...
between individual and organisational values, Harrison (2007) argued for a specific, exact correspondence interpretation of fit, and Kristof-Brown (1996) proposed a broad and inclusive definition that defined fit in terms of compatibility and allowed fit to be defined in supplementary or complementary terms, based on a range of attributes.

In contrast to the varying interactionist research definitions of person-organisation fit, the qualitative investigation of recruiter practices presented in Chapter Two highlighted that, in some cases, recruiter definitions appeared to be more about hiring a universally positive candidate than about hiring an individual who has attributes that will be a particularly good fit in that organisation, as opposed to in any other organisation. There were also reports of recruiter judgements of organisational fit being made in a manner that was idiosyncratic to the particular recruiter making the assessment rather than relating to features of the applicant and organisational environment. In Chapter Four, the polynomial regression results provided little support for the proposition that the extent to which employees’ perceptions of person-organisation fit are based on joint effects of perceptions of people and organisation. In this study, it appears that, primarily, perceptions of the organisation or perceptions of the person drive perceived person-organisation fit, rather than joint consideration of person and organisation.

These findings suggest a number of areas that would benefit from further research. First, there is likely to be continued merit in research agendas that seek to qualitatively investigate person-organisation fit as it is experienced in organisational settings (Billsberry et al., 2013). This research will help the field understand whether first, the phenomenon that is referred to as organisational fit by practitioners is adequately captured and reflected in the literature; second, whether the relevance and meaning of the person-organisation fit concept in lay terms has changed with the macro changes in the labour market since the origin of the term “person-organisation fit“ in academic literature in the late 1980s (Ostroff
and third, whether there is a risk that the fuzzy and difficult-to-define construct of organisational fit may be used to justify workplace decisions that may otherwise be deemed discriminatory.

An example of research conducted in this vein is Jansen and Shipp (2012, 2013). In a qualitative investigation, Jansen and Shipp (2013) identified four prototypical fit themes which reflected different ways in which people make sense of their fit experiences. The identification of these themes (transactional, instrumental, affiliative and custodial) from qualitative data support a conclusion that individuals seek and experience fit in different ways, resulting in different kinds of behaviours and different organisational outcomes. In another example, Billsberry et al. (2013) present a discussion of the exploratory methods that researchers can apply to better understand the way that fit and misfit is perceived and experienced by individuals. Ongoing research in this arena will support a clearer articulation of the boundaries of person-organisation fit, as this term is applied in organisational settings.

A second promising area for future research is the extent to which individual differences are a driver of person-organisation fit perceptions. In Chapter Four, it was found that individuals who were higher on the personality dimension of adjustment were more likely to report that they were a good fit with their organisation. Further exploration of this finding in future research could examine patterns of fit perceptions over individuals’ careers. Is it the case that as people move between organisations over the course of a career, some individuals are more predisposed to establishing a good sense of fit than others? This might be expected in, for example, individuals who are skilled reading social cues and adjusting their behaviour in line with established practice. With this in mind, it is interesting to reflect on commentary made by recruiters in Chapter Two’s qualitative study that an individual who fit was one who “could walk in and within a reasonable period of
time adapt to the way that we do things” and “works within the structure and the culture to get things going in the organisation”.

Finally, as noted in the discussion sections of each Chapter, the data utilised in this thesis was subject to particular limitations. Values frameworks (e.g. Schwartz, 1992; Borg et al., 2011) and culture frameworks (e.g. Quinn, 1988) typically reference dimensions beyond the Results and Relations dimensions used in this thesis. Further investigation of the relationship between indirect and direct measures of fit with other values dimensions and with different approaches to the measurement of values would provide increased opportunities to test the arguments presented in this thesis.

*If Perceived Fit is Conceptualised as an Attitude, Separate to Objective Person and Organisation Features, What Value Does It Provide to Business Beyond Other Attitudes?*

A third critical challenge for researchers to consider is whether organisations should attend to fit perceptions at all. In their introduction to their volume on contemporary organisational fit research, Billsberry and Kristof-Brown (2013, p. xx - xxi) reflected on their perspectives on future directions for the field. They describe how Jon Billsberry “views perceived fit as the “real fit” and argues that we should focus exclusively on fit as a psychological construct in people’s heads in a similar manner to the way we think about job satisfaction, stress, or motivation. Such an approach would, once and for all, end our definitional and conceptual issues and allow us to develop a research agenda with the prospect of helping people make the most out of their organisational lives”.

In this thesis, the empirical data presented in Chapter Four showed that subjective person-organisation fit operationalised as value congruence or as a relationship between personality and organisational values was not strongly related to perceptions of fit. The analysis presented in Chapter Five demonstrated that perceptions of organisational fit, but
not subjectively measured organisational fit, was positively related to job satisfaction, organisational commitment and internalised forms of work motivation.

Given the emphasis on perceived fit in the contemporary research agenda, combined with the evidence presented in this thesis and elsewhere (e.g. Edwards et al., 2006; van Vuuren et al., 2007) that suggests that perceptions of fit are difficult to predict from separately measured people and organisational attributes, the business case for attending to person-organisation fit as a criterion for decision making must be considered. While Billsberry supports a research agenda that helps people “make the most out of their organisational lives”, the interests of organisational decision makers consuming organisational behaviour research are typically more commercial, focusing on organisational productivity and performance (Schmitt, 2014). For perceived fit to be a useful construct to support organisational practices, it is important to demonstrate, both theoretically and empirically, how the application of this construct contributes to the achievement of business outcomes.

One way to address this challenge is to conduct research that looks at the extent to which perceived person-organisation fit predicts outcomes beyond and in addition to other work attitudes. For example, to what extent does perceived person-organisation fit explain variance in work performance, over and above the effects of other work attitudes? Is person-organisation fit more useful than other work attitudes in predicting particular types of work outcomes? In the qualitative investigation in Chapter Two, some recruiters highlighted the consequences of poor fit for team morale, reputation or productivity. Future research could examine predictive relationships between perceptions of person-organisation fit and outcomes beyond individual attitudes or performance.

A second way to address this challenge may be to reconsider the role that perceived person-organisation fit as a concept has to play in psychological theory and
organisational practice. On the one hand, it is possible to take a personnel selection-centric perspective of person-organisation fit in which person-organisation fit is seen as a potential predictor in selection decision making (e.g. Ryan & Ployhart, 2014). With this perspective, the bivariate relationship between person-organisation fit and organisationally relevant outcomes is of prime importance, evaluated in the same way as other personnel selection predictors (e.g. Schmidt & Hunter, 1998). Person-organisation fit is conceptualised as a generally stable construct that can be measured at a point in time.

On the other hand, the ongoing utility of the perceived person-organisation fit construct may not be in its ability as a static construct that can be measured and used to predict other things, but in its ability to explain employee perception and behaviour. In the same introduction referenced above, Billsberry and Kristof-Brown (2013, p. xxi) note that for Kristof “much of the interesting work to be done on fit has to do with the motivations behind people’s striving for fit. The process of seeking fit, finding it, losing it, and then moving on to seek it again provides the backdrop against which we can understand most of the transitions people make in their work lives”. Jansen and Kristof-Brown (2006, p. 206) reflect on the same opportunity to reconsider the emphasis of person-organisation (and person-environment) fit research: “as the research on... fit accumulates, it becomes apparent that increasing our understanding of single dimensions of fit, in the isolation of time and context, is no longer sufficient. Instead an integrative approach that explains the process of fit assessment... is needed”. Thus, the explanatory potential of perceived person-organisation fit is a fruitful area for further research.

Even within this area of research however, it is important that researchers ensure that attitudinal constructs are treated with appropriate parsimony and coherence and perceived person-organisation fit is not merely a repackaging of other constructs, such as job satisfaction (see McKinley, 2010, for a discussion on the need for parsimony in the
development of organisational theory). To the extent that researchers consider business to be their primary audience, it is important that the logic that follows from organisational attention to perceived person-organisation and improved business outcomes is clearly articulated.

**Practical Implications: How Can Person-Organisation Fit Research Support Better Organisational Practice?**

There are three primary ways in which the findings of this thesis are meaningful to organisational practice. First, this thesis contributes data that respond to the central question implied by Ryan and Ployhart’s (2014) recommendation that research focus on ways to assess organisational or cultural fit in selection must be addressed: is it appropriate to assess organisational fit in selection at all? The findings presented in this thesis largely do not support the application of either recruiter judgements, which may be intuitive and idiosyncratic, or indirect measurement, which appear unlikely to meaningfully predict future perceptions of fit or work outcomes. As others have noted (e.g. Yu, 2009) and as discussed in the section above, it is likely that person-organisation fit has more utility in considerations of other organisational processes, such as socialisation, applicant attraction or culture change, than as a predictive criterion in decision processes such as personnel selection.

Second, the arguments and data presented in this thesis emphasise the importance of quality communication between organisational behaviour scientists and practitioners. The field of person-organisation fit has significant methodological complexity that must be navigated by researchers in order to communicate effectively to practitioners. For example, while meta-analyses suggest that indirect person-organisation fit has positive relationships with work attitudes (e.g. Verquer et al. 2003), a polynomial regression
approach to the same data suggest that these findings are more likely to represent linear effect of organisations than joint effects of people and organisations. Arguments about whether it is preferable to measure values ipsatively or normatively rely on a level of statistical knowledge that needs to be appropriately translated when communicating to a practitioner audience. Thus, in addition to continuing to debate and seek resolution of these issues in the research community, the complexity of these issues highlights the need for clear communication to business to ensure that results are not used inappropriately.

Finally, building on the discussion of individual difference predictors of person-organisation fit perceptions above, organisations who wish to optimise perceptions of person-organisation fit in their workforce may benefit from attending to particular individual difference variables. In Chapter Four, it was found that the personality scale of Adjustment had positive linear relationships with perceived person-organisation fit. In line with the arguments noted above, the use of this result to justify the inclusion of an Adjustment scale in a selection process would need to go beyond the findings of this thesis to demonstrate a link between person-organisation fit perception and job performance outcomes. However, as an avenue for further investigation with likely practical implications in the future, the relationship between individual difference variables and perceptions of person-organisation fit holds merit.

Conclusion

In the preface to their volume on the future of organisational fit research, Billsberry and Kristof-Brown (2013, p. x) note that “some recent critical reviews have seemed to question the continued viability of research on organizational fit”. Billsberry and Kristof-
Brown (2013), together with the scholars that authored chapters in their book, present a compelling case that there is still much value in continuing to study the construct of fit and that, in particular, an increased focus on the psychological experience of fit represents “fertile ground for new organizational fit research” (Kristof-Brown & Billsberry, 2013, p. 5).

In this thesis, organisational fit research has been viewed through the lens of a scientist-practitioner seeking to support robust organisational talent processes. The core conclusions of the research program reflect and extend Billsberry and Kristof-Brown’s conclusions. In particular, the empirical findings, by and large, emphasise problems and challenges with the application of person-organisation fit research in organisations rather than outlining solutions. However, the results also highlight the ongoing relevance of the organisational fit construct to organisational decision makers such as recruiters. Given the business interest in this construct, combined with the risks associated with its inappropriate application in settings like personnel selection, it is imperative that organisational fit researchers continue to respond to these questions with methodologically sound and practically relevant research.


Schwartz, S.H., Cieciuch, J., Vecchione, M., Davidov, E., Fischer, R., Beierlein, C., Ramos, A., Verkasalo, M., Lönnqvist, J.-E.,Demirutku, K., Dirilen-Gumus, O., & Konty, M.


Appendices

Appendix 1: Research Questions and Hypotheses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Chapter Two</th>
<th>Research Question and Hypotheses</th>
<th>Conclusion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Research question 2.1: How do recruiters describe organisational fit?</td>
<td>Qualitative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Research question 2.2: Do recruiters assess organisational fit? If so, what methods are used to assess fit?</td>
<td>Qualitative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Research question 2.3: What do recruiters report as the consequences of selecting on the basis of organisational fit?</td>
<td>Qualitative</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Chapter Three | Research question 3.1 Is the Sarros et al. (2005) factor structure replicable with organisational values data in a different sample? | No            |
|               | Research question 3.2 Is the Sarros et al. (2005) factor structure replicable with personal values data? | No            |
|               | Research question 3.3 Does the Schwartz (1992) higher order factor structure provide a better fit to the data than the Sarros et al. (2005) factor structure for personal values? | No            |
|               | Research question 3.4 Does the Schwartz (1992) higher order factor structure provide a better fit to the data than the Sarros et al. (2005) factor structure for organisational values? | No            |
|               | Research question 3.5 Are there factors within the OCP data that appear robust, meaningful and commensurate across people and organisations? | Results and Relations factors identified |

<p>| Chapter Four | Hypothesis 4.1: Subjective value congruence for the Results factor will be positively related to perceived person-organisation fit. | Not supported |
|              | Hypothesis 4.2: Subjective value congruence for the Relations factor will be positively related to perceived person-organisation fit. | Not supported |
|              | Hypothesis 4.3: Congruence-like effects will be observed for the analysis of Sociability and perceptions of organisational Relations values on perceived person-organisation fit. | Partially supported |
|              | Hypothesis 4.4: Congruence-like effects will be observed for the analysis of Interpersonal Sensitivity and perceptions of organisational Relations values on perceived person-organisation fit. | Not supported |
|              | Hypothesis 4.5: Congruence-like effects will be observed for the analysis of Ambition and perceptions of organisational Results values on perceived person-organisation fit. | Not supported |
|              | Hypothesis 4.6: Congruence-like effects will be observed for the analysis of Prudence and perceptions of organisational Results values on perceived person-organisation fit. | Not supported |
|              | Hypothesis 4.7: Congruence-like effects will be observed for the analysis of Learning Approach and perceptions of organisational Results values on perceived person-organisation fit. | Not supported |
|              | Hypothesis 4.8: Individuals higher on Adjustment will report higher levels of perceived person-organisation fit. | Supported |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Research Questions and Hypotheses</th>
<th>Conclusion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hypothesis 4.9: Individuals higher on Inquisitive will report higher levels of perceived person-organisation fit.</td>
<td>Not supported</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Chapter Five**

| Hypothesis 5.1: Perceived person-organisation fit will be positively related to a) job satisfaction; and b) organisational commitment. | Supported              |
| Hypothesis 5.2: A subjective value congruence effect on job satisfaction will be present for: a) the Results factor; and b) the Relations factor | Not supported          |
| Hypothesis 5.3: A subjective value congruence effect on organisational commitment will be present for: a) the Results factor; and b) the Relations factor | Not supported          |
| Hypothesis 5.4: A subjective value congruence effect on identified regulation will be present for: a) the Results factor; and b) the Relations factor | Not supported          |
| Hypothesis 5.5: A subjective value congruence effect on integrated regulation will be present for: a) the Results factor; and b) the Relations factor. | Not supported          |
| Hypothesis 5.6: A subjective value congruence effect on intrinsic motivation will be present for: a) the Results factor; and b) the Relations factor. | Not supported          |
| Hypothesis 5.7: Perceived person-organisation fit will be positively related to a) identified regulation; b) integrated regulation and c) intrinsic motivation. | Supported              |
Appendix 2: Phd Timeline and Data Collection Activity

A timeline of the activities conducted for this Phd is documented below. Of note, the Phd was completed on a part-time basis throughout and was subject to a number of periods of intermission for maternity leave and administrative coordination of a transfer between universities. In addition to the data analysed and reported upon in the body of this thesis, significant effort went towards data collection attempts that proved unfruitful. These are documented below.

Summary of Phd Activity Jan 2007 – Feb 2013

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Activity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jan 2007 – Jan 2008</td>
<td>Development of research proposal and study design</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jan-Mar 2008</td>
<td>Submission and approval of Ethics Application</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apr-Aug 2008</td>
<td>SJT Study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Initial attempt at data collection including:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Liaison with Department of Defence representatives to obtain approval to collect data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Conduct of Focus Group with Defence employees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Distribution of a questionnaire to Organisational Psychology Masters students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Distribution of questionnaire to Expert Judges</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Main data collection through Defence Graduate Assessment Centres.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Data collection was unsuccessful due to low levels of participation by graduate candidates.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>In most cases, candidates cited mental exhaustion at the end of the day as a reason for not participating.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sep 2008</td>
<td>Qualitative Study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Revision of study design.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Submission and approval of Ethics Amendment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jan 2009</td>
<td>Participation in one week ACSRPI Program ‘Qualitative Research Techniques’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jan 2009 – Sep 2009</td>
<td>Analysis and write up of qualitative study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 2009</td>
<td>Conference presentation on qualitative study at the 8th Industrial and Organisational Psychology Conference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sep 2009 – Aug 2010</td>
<td>Quantitative Study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Revision of study design and development of study measures.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aug-Sep 2010</td>
<td>Submission and approval of ethics amendment</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Other Attempts at Data Collection

The original design of this research included the collection of data that matched employees’ self-reported person-organisation fit and supervisors’ ratings of job performance. Two attempts at collecting such data were made through this PhD project as described below. In both cases, the data collected through these attempts was insufficient to warrant statistical analysis.

Situational Judgement Test Study. From April to August 2008, an attempt was made to conduct a study with applicants to the Department of Defence’s Graduate Development Program. The goals of this study were first, to develop a situational judgement test (SJT) that measured applicants’ likely behaviour in various workplace situations and second, to compare applicants’ personal values with their responses to the SJT. A series of meetings were held with Department of Defence representatives to obtain approval to collect the data. To develop the SJT, a focus group was conducted with current Defence graduates and an initial set of situations for the test was prepared. The
questionnaire was then distributed to Organisational Psychology Masters students to generate a set of possible responses to each situation. Finally, expert judges (consultants experienced in personnel selection) coded each response to generate a scoring key.

The main phase of data collection was intended to occur through Defence Graduate Assessment Centres that were held in locations throughout Australia. Defence representatives took the questionnaire to each Assessment Centre and invited applicants to complete the questionnaire at the conclusion of the assessment activities. Data collection was unsuccessful due to low levels of participation by graduate candidates. In most cases, candidates cited mental exhaustion at the end of the day as a reason for not participating. A planned extension to the study to collect longitudinal data on supervisory ratings of job performance was not attempted.

Due to the organisation-specific nature of the SJT questionnaire and the annual timeframes for graduate assessment activities, it was not practical to refine and repeat the study following the unsuccessful data collection attempt.
Log of data collection activities for the SJT study

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Activity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>January 2008</td>
<td>Submission of Ethics Application</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February 2008</td>
<td>Ethics Committee identify issues for further clarification</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 2008</td>
<td>Submission of responses to Ethics Committee questions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 2008</td>
<td>Ethics Approval</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 2008</td>
<td>Meeting with Department of Defence representatives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 2008</td>
<td>Conduct of a Focus Group with Defence representatives. Information from this focus group was used to develop a draft SJT. An additional focus group was planned but it was not possible to organise participants for this session. As an alternative, I asked Defence representatives to review the draft SJT.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 2008</td>
<td>Travel to Melbourne to distribute the questionnaire to Masters students for the development of the scoring key. I attended the end of a class and asked students to complete my questionnaire. I had approximately 10 participants.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 2008</td>
<td>Submission of Ethics Amendment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 2008</td>
<td>Completion of questionnaire by Expert Judges for the development of the scoring key</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June/July 2008</td>
<td>Defence representatives distribute SJT at Assessment Centres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August 2008</td>
<td>Only 11 completed questionnaires are received In most cases, candidates cited mental exhaustion at the end of the day as a reason for not participating.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Supervisor evaluations of employee behaviour. It was my original intent to collect matched data from employees and supervisors. Employees were invited to complete the questionnaire online and also provide their name, their supervisor’s name and their supervisor’s email address. This information was used to send the supervisor an email, inviting them to complete a questionnaire about the employee.

There were two reasons why this attempt at data collection was unsuccessful. First, there was opportunity for attrition at two stages of the process which resulted in very low participation rates. Second, technical problems were experienced with the online survey set up so that, even where supervisors did complete the questionnaire, it was not possible to match this data to employee responses. A log of data collection activities is presented in below. When it became clear that obtaining matched supervisor data was not feasible, amendments were made to the employee questionnaire to enable meaningful analysis of data from the employee questionnaire in the absence of matched supervisor data.

Log of Activities for Quantitative Data Collection

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Activity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>September 2009 – August 2010</td>
<td>Development of revised research proposal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August 2010</td>
<td>Take a Phd week of days banked over EOFY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Development of study measures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Submission of ethics application</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Contact with Hogan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Initial request to IT about creating electronic survey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September 2010</td>
<td>Submission of Research Program Application to Hogan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Contact the ATO about the study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>First teleconference with ATO about the study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Building electronic survey – locked the survey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Follow up with IT about the use of codes in the survey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October 2010</td>
<td>Finalisation of agreement with Hogan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Follow up with IT about the development of the Monash side of the survey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Development of a response to ATO Corporate Research Council concerns (5000 words)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November 2010</td>
<td>Approach DAFF about the study – they say they will get back to me</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Activity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December 2010</td>
<td>Call from the ATO to say that they are still progressing the study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January 2011</td>
<td>Initial contact with DIAC about the study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reminder email to DAFF about the study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February 2011</td>
<td>ATO have a meeting with business leaders about the study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Formal permission letter from DIAC approved by Ethics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reminder email to DAFF about the study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Request changes to the survey with Monash IT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 2011</td>
<td>Distribution of the survey to 300 staff at DIAC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reminder emails sent to 300 staff plus distribution to an additional 300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Identified that Monash’s licence with survey monkey had lapsed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>which means that participants are not directed to the Hogan website –</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>contacted Monash IT to correct this – takes approximately 1 week to</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>resolve</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Only 18 employee responses and 8 supervisor responses received (response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>rate ~ 3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Contact with Hoyts Cinemas about movie ticket vouchers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Submission of funding request for movie ticket vouchers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 2011</td>
<td>Review of ATO submission to APSC about the study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Initial contact with DHS about the study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Meeting with DHS about the study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 2011</td>
<td>Meeting with DIAC representatives about the study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Contact with ATO about revisions to the study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ATO plan a roll out of the study for October. Get back to the ATO about</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>a number of questions they have.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April – June 2011</td>
<td>Set up of survey with Monash IT to allow for movie ticket vouchers –</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>involves 30 exchanges with IT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 2011</td>
<td>Distribution of survey to 400 staff at DIAC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Received 5 employee responses and 1 supervisor response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Teleconference with ATO about the study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July 2011</td>
<td>Teleconference with DIAC representatives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Distribution of survey to 230 employees in People Strategy and Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Division. Support from Branch Heads.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Completion of survey by 12 employees and 9 supervisors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reminder email to DAFF about the study – they get back to me to decline</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>to participate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Submit change request to Monash IT for changes to DHS survey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Identify that usernames and passwords are not displaying – contact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Monash IT urgently</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Initial contact made with the Department of Finance about the study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Follow up with Finance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Initial contact made with Infrastructure about the study – no response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Permission letter received from DHS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ethics approval for DHS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Activity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| August 2011| Called DIAC representatives  
Additional promotion of the survey to DIAC sample  
Email contact with ATO about the study  
Monash IT tell me that my contact is moving on and that I have a new contact for my survey. I try to contact the new contact and receive an out-of-office message. Contact Monash IT to try to sort out arrangements for my survey  
Make changes to survey requested by DHS  
Survey distributed to DHS employees  
Meeting with Finance about the study  
Initial contact made with GPET, MDBA, NBA, DMO about the study  
Emails sent to UC Masters Conveners about the study (5 in total) with follow up phone calls – 1 response  
Emails sent to Monash Masters Conveners (6 in total) – no response |
| September 2011 | Agreement to conduct face-to-face data collection with UC students. Permission letter received (12/09). Data collected 17/9  
Follow up calls and messages to MDBA (7 attempts in total) – no response  
Follow up calls and messages to GPET (7 attempts in total) – GPET declined to participate  
Follow up calls and meeting with NBA. Meeting with CEO and Director of HR. Permission letter received 21/9.  
Email contact with the ATO  
Email contact with Finance  
Email contact with DHS. IT issues with the display of user names and passwords  
Study adapted for UPSPP – study made live on UPSPP site 15/09/11 |
| October 2011 | Decision made with ATO to stop efforts to collect data – see email 24/10/11  
DMO decline to participate in the study  
Follow up with Finance by phone and email. Permission letter received 25/10  
Email contact with NBA – modification of study to exclude Hogan  
Study distributed to 560 DHS staff (12/10) |
| November 2011 | Study distributed to Finance employees. IT problem to sort out.  
Study distributed to NBA employees (11/11). Reminder email to NBA employees (28/11)  
Meeting with Defence representatives about the study (from initial contact with DMO in August) – decision not to proceed based on timeframes/maternity leave. |
| December 2011 | Data collection finalised – begin data analysis |