THE ROLE OF AFFECTIVITY IN AN EXPANDED MODEL OF
PERSON-ENVIRONMENT FIT

by

Doruk Uysal Irak

A thesis submitted to
the Faculty of Graduate and Postdoctoral Affairs
in the partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

Doctor of Philosophy

in

Psychology

Carleton University
Ottawa, Canada

©2010 Doruk Uysal Irak

Library and Archives
Canada

Published Heritage
Branch

395 Wellington Street
Ottawa ON K1A 0N4
Canada

Bibliothèque et
Archives Canada

Direction du
Patrimoine de l'édition

395, rue Wellington
Ottawa ON K1A 0N4
Canada

Your file *Votre référence*
ISBN: 978-0-494-70552-0
Our file *Notre référence*
ISBN: 978-0-494-70552-0

NOTICE:

The author has granted a non-exclusive license allowing Library and Archives Canada to reproduce, publish, archive, preserve, conserve, communicate to the public by telecommunication or on the Internet, loan, distribute and sell theses worldwide, for commercial or non-commercial purposes, in microform, paper, electronic and/or any other formats.

The author retains copyright ownership and moral rights in this thesis. Neither the thesis nor substantial extracts from it may be printed or otherwise reproduced without the author's permission.

AVIS:

L'auteur a accordé une licence non exclusive permettant à la Bibliothèque et Archives Canada de reproduire, publier, archiver, sauvegarder, conserver, transmettre au public par télécommunication ou par l'Internet, prêter, distribuer et vendre des thèses partout dans le monde, à des fins commerciales ou autres, sur support microforme, papier, électronique et/ou autres formats.

L'auteur conserve la propriété du droit d'auteur et des droits moraux qui protège cette thèse. Ni la thèse ni des extraits substantiels de celle-ci ne doivent être imprimés ou autrement reproduits sans son autorisation.

In compliance with the Canadian Privacy Act some supporting forms may have been removed from this thesis.

While these forms may be included in the document page count, their removal does not represent any loss of content from the thesis.

Conformément à la loi canadienne sur la protection de la vie privée, quelques formulaires secondaires ont été enlevés de cette thèse.

Bien que ces formulaires aient inclus dans la pagination, il n'y aura aucun contenu manquant.

Canada

Abstract

The aim of the present study was to examine the various conceptualizations of person-environment fit including supplementary, complementary, needs-supplies, and demands-abilities perspectives, in order to clarify whether these were unique kinds of fit or whether they overlapped, given the lack of consistency among the operational definitions of person-environment fit. The person-environment fit perspectives were also examined at both the level of person-organization and person-job fit, which were then tested for their association with job satisfaction, life satisfaction, and perceived stress. Moreover, the role of affectivity in shaping individuals' judgments about fit with their environments was explored.

Findings from a sample of 383 working adults revealed that person-organization fit and person-job fit are two interrelated but different constructs that are each composed of four components, namely value and personality congruence, integrative congruence, general congruence, and ability congruence. These fit components are clearly differentiated from the traditional perspectives of supplementary, complementary, needs-supplies, and demands-abilities fit and should be considered in concert when investigating both organization and job fit. Moreover, although person-organization fit and person-job fit were both associated with increased job satisfaction, only person-organization fit was related to higher levels of life satisfaction whereas only person-job fit was related to lower levels of perceived stress. Finally, it was found that being higher in positive affectivity and lower in negative affectivity was strongly associated with reports of better person-organization and person-job fit and that person-organization fit and person-job fit partially mediated the effect of positive and negative affectivity on job satisfaction, life

satisfaction, and perceived stress. This research highlights the fact that when measuring person-environment fit, the multiple facets of fit and affectivity should be taken into consideration.

Acknowledgements

I would like to thank several people for their support and assistance. First, I would like to express my sincere gratitude to my supervisor, Dr. Janet Mantler, for her support and encouragement not only with respect to my dissertation but also all throughout my doctorate study at Carleton University. I also would like to thank to all of the members of my committee, Dr. Harjinder Gill, Dr. Lorraine Dyke, Dr. Bernadette Campbell, and Dr. Tzvetanka Dobрева- Martinova for their feedback, assistance, and valuable contributions.

I would also thank to my family and friends for all their support in completing my degree. I appreciate you valuable time and endless support that you have given to me.

I would like to thank my wonderful husband Metehan Irak for his unending support, encouragement, patience, and love. It won't be easy without your help. And finally I am grateful to two little guys who have kept me awake in last three years.

Table of Contents

Abstract.....	ii
Acknowledgements.....	iv
Table of Contents.....	v
List of Tables.....	viii
List of Figures.....	x
List of Appendices.....	xii
Introduction.....	1
Person-Environment Fit.....	4
A Brief History of Person-Environment Fit.....	4
Defining Person-Environment Fit.....	6
Levels of Person-Environment Fit.....	11
Measuring Person-Environment Fit.....	15
Person-Environment Fit and Individual Outcomes.....	17
Job Satisfaction.....	19
Life Satisfaction.....	22
Stress.....	24
The Role of Personality in Person-Environment Fit Perceptions.....	26
Dispositional Affect: Positive and Negative Affectivity.....	31
The Relation Between Affectivity and Person-Environment Fit.....	33
Job Features: Workplace Flexibility and Workload.....	37
Workplace Flexibility.....	37
Workload.....	39

Purpose of the Study.....	41
Method.....	43
Participants and Procedures.....	43
Measures.....	45
Results.....	53
Preliminary Analyses.....	53
Comparisons between the two Samples.....	57
Demographic Differences.....	58
Principal Components Analysis for the Person-Organization Fit Items.....	63
Principal Components Analysis for the Person-Job Fit Items.....	71
Influence of Affectivity on Person-Environment Fit.....	79
Influence of BIS and BAS on Person-Environment Fit.....	83
Differences between Person-Organization Fit and Person-Job Fit in Predicting Individual Outcomes.....	85
Influence of Positive and Negative Affectivity on Job Satisfaction, Life Satisfaction, and Perceived Stress.....	88
Person-Environment Fit (Organization & Job) as a Mediator between Affectivity and Individual Outcomes.....	89
Mediation Effects of Person-Organization Fit.....	89
Mediation Effects of Person-Job Fit.....	94
Influence of Workload on Individual Outcomes.....	100
Influence of Workplace Flexibility on Individual Outcomes.....	100
Moderation Effect of Workplace Flexibility.....	101

Model Testing.....	111
Overall Model of the Role of Person-Environment Fit	111
Model Estimation.....	111
Discussion.....	116
Components of Person-Environment Fit.....	116
Person-organization Fit versus Person-job fit.....	119
Influence of Affectivity on Person-organization Fit and Person-job Fit.....	120
Person-Environment Fit and Individual Outcomes.....	123
Workplace Flexibility and Workload.....	125
Implications of the Study.....	126
Limitations and Future Research.....	129
Conclusion.....	131
References.....	133
Appendices.....	155

List of Tables

Table	Description	Page
1	Correlations, Means, Standard Deviations and Reliabilities.....	56
2	Means, Standard Deviations, and Independent Samples t-tests by Sample.....	58
3	Means, Standard Deviations, and Independent Samples t-tests by Gender.....	60
4	Means, Standard Deviations, and Independent Samples t-tests by Employment Type.....	61
5	Means, Standard Deviations, and Independent Samples t-tests by Part-time and Full-time.....	63
6	Component Correlation Matrix.....	64
7	Factor Loadings of the 19 Person-Organization Fit Items on Four Components...	65
8	Factor Loadings of the 17 Person-Organization Fit Items on Three Components...	66
9	Factor Loadings for the PCA on the 17 Retained Person-Organization Fit Items with Forced Four Factors.....	70
10	Component Correlation Matrix of the Final Person-Organization Fit Scale.....	71
11	Factor Loadings of the 17 Person-Job Fit Items on Three Components.....	74
12	Factor Loadings for the PCA on the 17 Retained Person-Job Fit Items with Forced Four Factors.....	76
13	Component Correlation Matrix of the Final Person-Job Fit Scale	77
14	Correlations and Reliabilities of Subfactors of Person-Organization and Person- Job Fit Scales.....	78

15	Influence of Affectivity on Subfactors of Person-organization fit.....	82
16	Influence of Affectivity on Subfactors of Person-job fit	83
17	Multiple Regression Analyses for Variables Predicting Job Satisfaction.....	86
18	Multiple Regression Analyses for Variables Predicting Life Satisfaction.....	86
19	Multiple Regression Analyses for Variables Predicting Perceived Stress.....	86
20	Moderator Effects of Workplace Flexibility for the Association of Person- Organization Fit and Job Satisfaction where Positive Affectivity was controlled..	102
21	Moderator Effects of Workplace Flexibility for the Association of Person- Organization Fit and Job Satisfaction where Negative Affectivity was controlled	103
22	Moderator Effects of Workplace Flexibility for the Association of Person-Job Fit and Job Satisfaction where Positive Affectivity was controlled.....	106
23	Moderator Effects of Workplace Flexibility for the Association of Person-Job Fit and Job Satisfaction where Negative Affectivity was controlled.....	107
24	Moderator Effects of Workplace Flexibility for the Association of Person-Job Fit and Perceived Stress where Positive Affectivity was controlled.....	109
25	Direct Effects of Positive Affectivity, Negative Affectivity, Person-organization Fit and Person-job Fit.....	114

List of Figures

Figure	Description	Page
1	Proposed Model.....	42
2	Scree Plot for PCA on the 19 Person-Organization Fit Items.....	67
3	Scree Plot for PCA on the 17 Person-Job Fit Items.....	75
4	Mediation model of person-organization fit between positive affectivity and job satisfaction.....	90
5	Mediation model of person-organization fit between positive affectivity and life satisfaction.....	91
6	Mediation model of person-organization fit between positive affectivity and perceived stress.....	92
7	Mediation model of person-organization fit between negative affectivity and job satisfaction.....	93
8	Mediation model of person-organization fit between negative affectivity and life satisfaction.....	93
9	Mediation model of person-organization fit between negative affectivity and perceived stress.....	94
10	Mediation model of person-job fit between positive affectivity and job satisfaction.....	95
11	Mediation model of person-job fit between positive affectivity and life satisfaction.....	96
12	Mediation model of person-job fit between positive affectivity and perceived stress.....	97

13	Mediation model of person-job fit between negative affectivity and job satisfaction.....	98
14	Mediation model of person-job fit between negative affectivity and life satisfaction.....	98
15	Mediation model of person-job fit between negative affectivity and perceived stress.....	99
16	Moderation effect graphic of workplace flexibility for person-organization fit and job satisfaction.....	104
17	Moderation effect graphic of workplace flexibility for person-job fit and job satisfaction.....	108
18	Moderation effect graphic of workplace flexibility for person-job fit and perceived stress.....	110
19	Final SEM model (with unstandardized coefficients).....	115

List of Appendices

A	Recruitment E-mail Invitation for Snowball Sample.....	155
B	Recruitment E-mail Invitation for StudyResponse Project.....	156
C	Consent Information.....	159
D	Debriefing.....	161
E	Means, Standard Deviations, and Independent Samples t-tests by Demographics of Snowball and Study Response Groups.....	163
F	Chi-Square Tests by Demographics of Snowball and StudyResponse Groups.....	164
G	Questionnaire Items.....	165
H	Demographic Questions.....	172
I	Multiple Regression Analyses for Variables Predicting Job Satisfaction, Life Satisfaction, and Perceived Stress.....	174
J	Mediation Analyses of Person-Organization Fit.....	180
K	Mediation Analyses of Person-Job Fit.....	186

The Role of Affectivity in an Expanded Model of Person-Environment Fit

In Canada, the population of baby boomers who are approaching retirement eligibility has increased by 36% from 2001 to 2006, setting a new record (Statistics Canada, 2008). This approaching “retirement wave” will result in the departure of many talented and experienced employees from the workforce (McKenzie & Dryburgh, 2003). As baby boomers approach retirement eligibility, organizations are striving to find solutions to keep their experienced workforce as long as possible, under the expectation that employees will stay in their workplace longer when they are happy and motivated in that environment. Accordingly, there is evidence that factors such as workplace flexibility and lower workload have several positive impacts on employees’ perceptions about their workplaces as these factors are associated with high job satisfaction, family well-being, low turnover, and reduced stress (Campbell-Clark, 2001; Chou, Boldy, & Lee, 2002; Currivan, 1999; Hall & Parker, 1993; Marshall, & Barnett, 1994; Meyer, 1997).

Aside from organizational features such as flexibility and workload, another issue – the match between the person and his or her environment – is considered to be important for employee retention, commitment, job satisfaction, and well-being (Arthur, Bell, Villado & Doverspike, 2006; Cable & DeRue, 2002; Lauver & Kristof-Brown, 2001; Moos, 1987; Saks & Ashforth, 1997). It is believed that when employees achieve high levels of fit with their environment, they are happier and more productive at work (Muchinsky & Monahan, 1987; Pervin, 1968; Warr, 2007). Because of this, understanding the notion of person-work environment fit may help to predict and influence many individual and organizational outcomes.

The idea of person-environment fit has been studied for more than 100 years. Person-environment theory is based on the similarity between the characteristics of a

person and the work environment (Ostroff & Schulte, 2007). Although it is generally agreed that a congruence between a person and the environment leads to positive outcomes for both the individual and the organization, there is a great deal of confusion regarding the conceptualization of the construct, which makes its study rather problematic (see Kristof, 1996; Ostroff & Schulte, 2007). Some researchers have described the person-environment fit in terms of the similarity between various characteristics like values or goals of the person and his or her environment (e.g., Cable & Edwards, 2004; Chatman, 1991; O'Reilly, Chatman, & Caldwell, 1991), whereas others have explained the concept in terms of whether a person and the environment meet each other's needs or demands (e.g., Edwards, 1991; Muchinsky & Monahan, 1987). Despite some acknowledgement of these differences among the various conceptualizations of fit when research is introduced, these distinctions tend to be ignored when discussing the results of the studies, leading to potential misrepresentations in the research conclusions. Based on the lack of discrimination among the operational definitions of person-environment fit, the overall purpose of the present research is to examine various conceptualizations of person-environment fit in order to clarify the perspectives on the concept and explore how various forms of person-environment fit could influence individual outcomes such as job satisfaction, life satisfaction, and stress.

Person-environment fit studies tend to be generally grounded in the interactionist theory of behaviour, which considers the effects of personal characteristics in combination with situational factors (Muchinsky & Monahan, 1987). Researchers argue that the nature of the work environment is partly determined by the different personalities of the individuals who control those environments (Holland, 1976; Schneider, 1987). Moreover, it is believed that personality affects peoples' reactions to specific

environments as it shapes values and preferences (Judge & Cable, 1997). Despite the importance of personality in terms of its interaction with the work environment and its influence on organizational outcomes, there is lack of research on the role of personality in person-environment fit. Some research has explored how different personalities could be attracted to different occupations or organizational cultures (e.g., Burke & Deszca, 1982; Cable & Judge, 1994; Holland, 1985), and fit has been measured in terms of the similarity between personality and occupation or culture, but personality has not been studied directly in terms of its possible influence on peoples' perception of their person-work environment fit.

Exploring the relation between perceived person-work environment fit and personality will not only introduce new perspectives to the ways of assessing employee behaviours, it will also be useful for organizational practices such as selection or recruitment since the notion of fit is important for those practices (Cable & Yu, 2007; Lauver & Kristof-Brown, 2001; Saks & Ashforth, 1997). If personality has an impact on the fit perceptions of employees, the association between fit and individual outcomes, such as satisfaction or stress, will also need to be reassessed. Moreover, organizational practices and interventions will need to be revised considering the impact of personality in the workplace. Therefore, the second aim of the present study is to examine the role of personality in person-environment fit.

In sum, although person-environment fit has been studied for several years, there is still a great deal of confusion about the concept in the literature. The lack of integration of different fit perspectives and the lack of attention to the possible effects of personality has created a considerable deficiency in the person-environment fit literature which this study aims to fill. Additionally, the role of organizational features such as workplace

flexibility and workload, were included in this research in terms of the influence on individual outcomes such as job satisfaction, life satisfaction, and stress.

Person-environment fit

A brief history of person-environment fit

Initially, person-environment fit discussions were started by interactionists who believed that certain attitudes, cognitions, and behaviours are the outcomes of the interaction between the person and situational factors (Chatman, 1989; Muchinsky & Monahan, 1987; Ostroff & Schulte, 2007). The interactionist theory emphasized that neither personal characteristics nor situational factors alone could determine the responses or attitudes of individuals, but rather the interaction of these two was most important (Schneider, 1983; Terborg, 1981). According to this perspective, behaviour is a function of the person and the environment (Lewin, 1951), therefore the joint function should be considered rather than thinking exclusively about one or the other (Terborg, 1981). However, this perspective has been criticized because there is not enough explanation about how this interaction occurs (Ostroff & Schulte, 2007).

Person-environment fit studies were inspired largely by Murray's (1938) need-press model that was examined outside of the work environment. This theory highlighted the congruence between an individual's needs and the characteristics of the environment as the level of congruence would produce either need satisfaction or need frustration. Some of the early work in person-environment fit has also been influenced by vocational psychology. According to Holland's (1964) theory of careers, people should pursue occupations that they believe would be a match to their interests. High degree of fit between individual interests, attributes, and occupations has been related to career success and satisfaction (Holland, 1997).

Another theory that has had a high impact on fit studies is Schneider's (1987) attraction-selection-attrition (ASA) framework. Following Holland's theory, Schneider (1987) underlined that those with similar personalities were more likely to prefer to do similar things and behave in similar ways. This framework proposes that similar people are attracted to, selected by, and choose to remain in, settings where the goals are similar to their own. However, when people believe they do not fit with the environment, attrition will result, or in other words, they will leave (Schneider, 1987). This theory highlights the notion of selection, whereby the goals of an organization influence the selection of people into the organization based on their common attributes in the work environment. High fit between personal expectations and organizational life leads to high job satisfaction. Schneider (1987) stated that "environments are a function of persons behaving in them" (p.438). Therefore he has pointed out the importance of the interaction between a person and the environment. Both Holland's vocational theory and the attraction-selection-attrition framework emphasize the interaction between personal and environmental attributes in determining perceptions of fit in the workplace; however Holland's theory focuses more on careers or occupations whereas Schneider's work centres on the environment or organizational life.

A number of theories have focused solely on the congruence between an individual and the job itself such as the job characteristics theory (Hackman & Lawler, 1971; Hackman & Oldham, 1976, 1980) and the theory of work adjustment (Dawis & Lofquist, 1984). Some fit studies have used job characteristics theory when describing the congruence between a person and the environment. According to the job characteristics theory, core job characteristics such as autonomy or feedback are important as they have a positive impact on employee outcomes such as job satisfaction and motivation

(Oldham, 1996). On the other hand, according to the theory of work adjustment, work can be conceptualized in terms of the interaction between an employee and his or her work environment. In the work environment both individuals and the environment have some requirements from each other. For example, an employee is expected to have certain skills to perform the job tasks and the work environment is expected to provide preferable work conditions (Dawis & Lofquist, 1984). When the requirements are both met, then correspondence occurs. Both theories propose that fit between individual and environmental characteristics leads to successful work relations and positive outcomes like high work motivation, job satisfaction, and work effectiveness (Dawis & Lofquist, 1984; Hackman & Oldham, 1980).

In sum, person-environment fit studies have been influenced by various theories, all of which have highlighted the joint importance of personal and environmental factors on determining behavioural outcomes. Schneider's (1987) ASA framework in particular may have had the greatest impact on the fit studies; according to this theory people will be attracted to and remain in organizations sharing similar values, norms, or goals and allowing them to meet their needs and achieve their goals.

Defining person-environment fit

Over time, person-environment fit has come to be defined as the degree of match, correspondence, compatibility, or similarity between people and the environments in which they find themselves such as job, organization, group, or vocation (e.g., Kristof, 1996; Ostroff & Schulte, 2007; Pervin, 1968; Schneider, 1987; Warr, 2007). It has been described as the degree of congruence between personal and situational variables in producing significant selected outcomes such as job satisfaction (Muchinsky & Monahan, 1987). According to Kristof (1996), fit is "the compatibility between people and

organization [environment] that occurs when: a) at least one entity provides what the other needs, b) they share similar fundamental characteristics, or c) both” (p. 4-5). This compatibility should have positive outcomes for individuals such as higher satisfaction, less stress, higher performance, and lower turnover intentions (Ostroff & Schulte, 2007).

There are two basic perspectives about person-environment fit and a key distinction should be made between supplementary fit and complementary fit (Muchinsky & Monahan, 1987). According to the first perspective, *supplementary fit* (Kristof, 1996; Muchinsky & Monahan, 1987), people may believe they fit the environment because they share similar characteristics, values, norms, or interests with the others in the environment. This kind of fit has also been labelled value congruence (Cable & Edwards, 2004) as it underlines the similarity between individual and organizational values (Chatman, 1991; Kristof, 1996; O'Reilly, Chatman, & Caldwell, 1991). Theoretically, when there is a similarity between the values of individuals and the environment, they will be more likely to have higher job satisfaction and be less likely leave their job (Schneider, 1987) because their attitudes should be more positive (Cable & Edwards, 2004).

According to Social Identity Theory, people need to locate themselves within society and they use group membership to do this (Tajfel & Turner, 1986). Being a member of a social group shapes individual self-concept (Tajfel & Turner, 1986). Moreover, individuals identify their social group membership within their organization (Dutton, Dukerich, & Harquail, 1994). Similar attributes between organizational identity and individual self-concept creates organizational identification. Hence, when an individual defines himself or herself using the attributes of the organization, high organizational identification appears (Dutton, Dukerich, & Harquail, 1994), but if there is

no congruency between personal attributes and organizational attributes, cognitive conflict occurs and negative attitudes emerge (Cable & Edwards, 2004).

Conversely, the second perspective, *complementary fit*, focuses on improving the link between the person and his or her environment. According to this perspective, person-environment fit occurs when an individual adds something that was previously missing to his or her environment, which in turn provides effective results for that environment (Muchinsky & Monahan, 1987), such as high productivity. This kind of fit has been used in personnel selection where applicants are reviewed in terms of their specific abilities such that they are able to contribute uniquely to the functioning of a team or organization (Edwards, 1991; Muchinsky & Monahan, 1987).

Complementary fit may be further divided into two types: *needs-supplies fit* and *demands-abilities fit* (e.g., Cable & DeRue, 2002; Edwards, 1991; Edwards & Shipp, 2007; French, Caplan, & Harrison, 1982; Kristof, 1996; Ostroff & Schulte, 2007). People have different needs in the workplace including biological needs and psychological desires, motives, or goals (French, Rogers, & Cobb, 1974) and organizations are expected to meet individuals' needs or wishes in order to provide fit, hence there is a fit between individual needs and conditions supplied by the organization (Edwards & Shipp, 2007; French, Caplan, & Harrison, 1982; Kristof, 1996; Ostroff & Schulte, 2007). The notion of needs-supplies fit has been exemplified by the research on psychological need fulfillment (e.g., Cable & DeRue, 2002; Edwards, 1991; Saks & Ashforth, 1997). According to the need fulfillment theory, individual satisfaction increases with the supply provided by the environment. If there is less supply than one desires, then there will be dissatisfaction (Cable & Edwards, 2004).

By contrast, complementary fit may be a function of demands-abilities fit.

According to this view, each environment has some requirements from a person. For instance, organizational requirements could be the demands related to specific tasks or work roles (Edwards & Shipp, 2007); when individuals have the knowledge, skills, abilities (depending on the environment), and resources (e.g., time) to fulfill these demands, then there would be a match between demands and abilities (French, Caplan, & Harrison, 1982; Kristof, 1996).

Hence, although there is apparent agreement on the definition of “person-environment fit,” there remains confusion regarding the conceptualization of the construct (Kristof, 1996). According to Ostroff and Schulte (2007) these conceptualizations could be problematic if they are considered by the narrow perspective that supplementary fit only focuses on vocational fit because it studies the match between one’s interests, values and one’s job, whereas complementary fit focuses solely on personnel selection and hiring decisions (see Ostroff & Schulte, 2007) as it examines knowledge, skills, and abilities of an employee.

Further, the idea of complementary fit may be confusing as it typically is used to mean either needs-supply fit or demands-abilities fit (e.g., Cable & DeRue, 2002; Cable & Edwards, 2004; Edwards & Rothbard, 1999; Kristof, 1996; Piasentin, & Chapman, 2006; Sekiguchi, 2004): however, suggest that for the sake of clarity, complementary fit should not be conceptualized in this manner as needs-supplies and demands-abilities perspectives but rather should be examined separately. Indeed, they defined complementary fit as complementing organizational features with individual differences; therefore, according to this view, not only similarities but also differences from others in the environment are valuable in an organization and would be used to define high fit.

Hence, complementary fit could be a construct related to both needs-supplies and demands-abilities fit but more than simply an amalgamation of the 2 lower order constructs. They found, however, in their meta-analysis of person-organization fit including 46 studies, they found that only one study operationalized complementary fit appropriate to their definition (Piasentin & Chapman, 2006). Therefore, according to these researchers, complementary fit should be defined as a fourth perspective in person-environment fit in which “...an individual must perceive he or she is dissimilar to existing organizational characteristics on important criteria..., the individual must also perceive that this dissimilarity makes him or her unique in the organization...” (Piasentin & Chapman, 2007; p.342). In conclusion, conceptually “complementary fit” should be defined separate than needs-supplies fit and demands-abilities fit.

Cable and Edwards (2004) stated that because all perspectives are examining similar concepts, there is a need for integration of all these perspectives because the current lack of integration in terms of how researchers have defined “person-environment fit” makes it difficult to generalize the results. Moreover, the labels used for naming fit perspectives also add confusion in the literature as traditional labels are not clear and adequate enough in terms of how they describe fit. To address the confusion regarding the definition and scope of person-environment fit, the study aimed to investigate the overlap and uniqueness of the various conceptualizations of person-environment fit, including supplementary, complementary, needs-supplies, and demands-abilities. Because people can differentiate various kinds of person-environment fit perspectives one from another (Cable & DeRue, 2002) it is more important to examine all perspectives at the same time. Thus depending on the way researchers conceptualize person-environment fit, employees could have different person-environment fit perceptions. For example, when fit is defined

from a supplementary perspective, employees are asked about the congruence between their values and the values of the environment, resulting in a different level of congruence relative to when fit is defined from a needs-supplies perspective and employees are asked whether their needs are being met by their environment. Therefore, one of the research question was, are there significant differences between the four conceptualizations of person-environment fit or do they overlap to a great degree?

Hypothesis 1a: Person-organization fit would be composed of four different components- supplementary, complementary, needs-supplies, and demands-abilities fit- which would be significantly different from each other.

Hypothesis 1b: Person-job fit would be composed of four different components- supplementary, complementary, needs-supplies, and demands-abilities fit- which would be significantly different from each other.

Levels of person-environment fit

To further complicate the issue of person-environment fit, there may also be multiple levels at which there could be fit such as job, organization, vocation, or team (Kristof, 1996; Wheeler, Buckley, Halbesleben, Brouer, & Ferris, 2005). Person-organization fit is described as the compatibility between a person and the organization, where the person and the organization share similar characteristics or meet each other's needs (Kristof, 1996). Person-job fit is the match between the abilities and/or demands of a person and the demands and/or attributes of the job (Edwards, 1991). Person-vocation fit describes the congruence between a person and his or her occupation (Kristof, 1996). According to Holland (1966) different personality types require different environments, which is called a congruent person-environment interaction.

Most of the research in person-environment fit focuses either on the organization or job (e.g., Cable & Judge, 1996; Erdogan & Bauer, 2005; Lauver & Kristof-Brown, 2001) because of the belief about the influence of organization and job on work behaviours (e.g., Hoffman & Woehr, 2006; Kristof-Brown, 2000); however, there is insufficient research that includes both job and organization at the same time (Bretz, Rynes, & Gerhart, 1993; Cable & Judge, 1996; Lauver & Kristof-Brown, 2001). It is important to study both levels – person-organization fit and person-job fit - in one study in order to clarify the relationship between the levels of person-environment fit. Kristof-Brown (2000) and Saks and Ashforth (1997) both demonstrated that job and organization each has a unique effect on employee attitudes but are correlated with each other. Moreover, these levels have different antecedents and outcomes at the workplace (Cable & DeRue, 2002; Cable & Judge, 1996; Lauver & Kristof-Brown, 2001; Saks & Ashforth, 1997, 2002). Thus, an employee may perceive that he or she has good fit with a particular job but poor fit with the organization (Lauver & Kristof-Brown, 2001). Typically, researchers have examined the fit between a person and an organization from the supplementary perspective (e.g., Kristof, 1996) and the fit between a person and a job from the needs-supplies or demands-abilities perspectives (e.g., Edwards, 1991; Muchinsky & Monahan, 1987; Kristof, 1996). This dichotomous approach relates to an incomplete conceptualizations of fit, which this research aims to highlight.

Another important reason for examining different kinds of fit at both the job and organization level was to determine the role of each kind of fit on personal outcomes. There are many studies examining the association of person-environment fit on outcomes (e.g., Cable & DeRue, 2002; Edwards & Rothbard, 1999; Edwards & Shipp, 2007; O'Reilly, Chatman, & Caldwell, 1991); however, these studies have frequently preferred

to focus on only one kind of fit such as supplementary fit, needs-supplies fit, or demands abilities fit. In addition, these studies have investigated either person-organization or person-job fit and mostly they have found either each level of fit is related to different outcomes or significant differences between relationships.

High fit among individuals' needs and the supplies of a job are positively related to individuals' job satisfaction, career satisfaction, and occupational commitment (Cable & DeRue, 2002). A lack of value congruence results in cognitive dissonance and also dissatisfaction (O'Reilly, Chatman, & Caldwell, 1991) which shows person-organization fit should also be related to satisfaction. Edwards and Shipp (2007) focused on the importance of needs-supplies fit on work related attitudes and found that fit between needs and supplies results in high job satisfaction and commitment. While satisfaction and commitment are predictors of contextual performance (voluntary and positive job behaviours that are not often specified in job descriptions), needs-supplies fit would also related to high contextual performance (Edwards & Shipp, 2007). In a meta-analysis study, person-organization fit was found as it is related to organizational performance (Arthur, Bell, Villado, & Doverspike, 2006).

Moreover, person-environment fit is also related to stress (Edwards & Shipp, 2007). Stress can occur when personal needs are not being met by the environment, which also affects individual's mental and physical well-being (Edwards & Shipp, 2007). Fit between personal values and the values of an environment were also discussed in terms of their influence on stress and well-being (Edwards & Rothbard, 1999).

Person-organization fit is a better predictor of job satisfaction and commitment compared to person-job fit (Cable & Judge, 1996). According to Lauver and Kristof-Brown (2001), person-organization fit is a better predictor of intention to leave compared

to person-job fit, although there is not much difference between the two fit levels in terms of their influence on job satisfaction. However, other studies have showed that person-job fit has a strong association with job satisfaction, career satisfaction, and commitment (Cable & DeRue, 2002; Kristof-Brown, 2000; Saks & Ashforth, 1997), whereas person-organization fit has a strong association with organizational citizenship and retention (Cable & DeRue, 2002; Saks & Ashforth, 1997).

Although the recent findings regarding the differential impact of level of fit on personal outcomes are interesting, it is also possible that these results could be due to using different perspectives when examining person-organization and person-job fit. If a researcher uses the supplementary approach when examining person-organization fit and measures value or attribute congruence, it is more likely there will be high relation between person-organization fit and organizational outcomes such as organizational citizenship. Therefore, despite some initial, promising results regarding differential impacts of levels of fit, a more integrated approach is required to develop a conceptual framework about person-environment fit and the outcomes (Lauver & Kristof-Brown, 2001).

Because the specific job and the workplace are highly connected to each other, it is unwise to ignore either one. Examining both at the same time makes it possible to explore the linkage between these two levels of fit (organization and job) and to clarify the differences between them in regard to antecedents and consequences. Therefore, one of the purpose of this present research was to examine levels of fit for person-organization and person-job and to explore each of the different perspectives (i.e., supplementary, complementary, needs-supplies, demands-abilities) within both of the

levels. By using different perspectives, the aim was to clarify their relative association with each other.

Measuring person-environment fit

In addition to different conceptualizations and levels in person-environment fit studies, how fit is measured is an important factor that should be considered. The means of measuring perceptions of person-environment fit have been debated by several researchers (e.g., Arthur, Bell, Villado, & Doverspike, 2006; Hoffman & Woehr, 2006; Kristof, 1996), and because there are various methods of measurement, it is important to clarify the differences before deciding on one for use in research.

In person-environment fit studies, there tends to be two main classifications of research methodologies -- direct measures and indirect measures (Kristof, 1996). Direct measures, also called direct perceived fit measures, explicitly ask people to describe their beliefs about the existence of fit between themselves and the environment (Arthur et al., 2006; Kristof, 1996). Direct measures can be further subdivided into subjective fit measures, in which individuals are only asked to answer questions about how well they fit with the target environment, and perceived fit measures, in which individuals are required to describe both themselves and their perceptions about environmental characteristics (Hoffman & Woehr, 2006; McCulloch & Turban, 2007) and fit is evaluated by assessing the congruence between one's description about the self and the environment. By contrast, indirect measures consist of comparisons of an individual and his or her environment as conducted by an independent rater (Kristof, 1996). In these measures, individuals are asked to describe themselves and then the characteristics of the environment are described by different sources in that environment and these two measures are compared (Arthur et al., 2006; Hoffman, & Woehr, 2006).

Direct measures, which directly question the perceived fit between the target individual and the environment, have presented the strongest relations with work attitudes and organizational outcomes (Arthur, et.al., 2006; Cable & Judge, 1996; Judge & Cable, 1997; Piasentin & Chapman, 2006; Verquer, Beehr, & Wagner, 2003). Although direct measures may be viewed as being more susceptible to measurement problems (e.g., common method variance) due to the lack of a universal definition (Piasentin & Chapman, 2006), this issue may be minimized by conceptualizing person-environment fit using various perspectives including supplementary, complementary, needs-supplies, and demands-abilities. When different conceptualizations are used in measuring person-environment fit, we would achieve broader information about employees' perceptions of fit with their work environments and also it helps to build integrity about person-environment fit.

There are some other criticisms that have been made against using direct measures of fit. According to Edwards (1991), direct measures prevent estimating individual effects of the constructs, the person, and the environment. Moreover, when other work-related outcomes are measured with direct measures, consistency bias may influence the results (Salancik & Pfeffer, 1977). For example one may think, "Yes I have a fit with my job so I am satisfied." However, Kristof (1996) stated that using direct measures could be beneficial because as long as individuals perceive good fit there will be good fit, regardless of actual congruence between the characteristics of a person and his or her environment.

In summary, although there are various ways of measuring person-environment fit, 'subjective direct fit measures' were used in the present research for two reasons. First, as it was mentioned these measures have demonstrated better relations between fit

and work attitudes, such as job satisfaction, life satisfaction, and stress. Second, personality characteristics have a role on fit perceptions as they influence personal judgements and cognitive processes (Holland, 1976; Judge & Larsen, 2001; Levin & Stokes, 1989; Schneider, 1987). Because employees' were asked about their perceptions about how they fit with their environments (organization and job), strong associations were expected between personality and fit perceptions. Therefore, I was interested in employees' personal judgements about person-work environment fit and subjective direct fit measures are a more suitable way to measure these judgements.

Person-environment fit and individual outcomes

Person-environment fit has been associated with several work-related outcomes such as job satisfaction (Arthur et al., 2006; Cable & DeRue, 2002; Cable & Edwards, 2004; Cable & Judge, 1996; Lauver & Kristof-Brown, 2001; Saks & Ashforth, 1997), career satisfaction (Cable & DeRue, 2002), organizational commitment (Arthur et al., 2006; Cable & DeRue, 2002; Cable & Judge, 1996; Meglino, Ravlin, & Adkins, 1989), turnover and turnover intentions (Arthur et al., 2006; Cable & DeRue, 2002; Lauver & Kristof-Brown, 2001; Saks & Ashforth, 1997), job performance (Arthur et al., 2006; Caldwell & O' Reilly, 1990), individual health, and adaptation (Moos, 1987). In general, person-environment fit is hypothesized to have direct association with positive outcomes when there is value congruence or when needs are met by the environment. According to Meir's (1989) study of congruence of vocational interests and occupational choices, in keeping with Holland's theory, when there is harmony between occupational choices and vocational interests, the satisfaction level of people increases. Therefore positive outcomes are expected when there is fit between people and their environment.

Although a great amount of research has been done regarding the consequences of person-environment fit at the workplace, and several arguments have been made about the differences between studies of fit in terms of how they define, conceptualize, and measure person-environment fit, there is no study that has included all perspectives at the same time. It would be expected that each of the different fit perspectives (supplementary, complementary, needs-supplies, and demands-abilities) would have unique effects on individual outcomes. Studies examining this kind of fit have frequently used either needs-supply or demands-abilities perspective of fit, but have not applied the supplementary/value congruence approach (e.g., Edwards, 1991; Lauver & Kristof-Brown, 2001; Sekiguchi, 2004). As a result, these studies have not questioned the relations between person-organization fit and job satisfaction nor have they examined person-job fit from the supplementary perspective of fit. Similarly, studies about person-organization fit have been focused more frequently on the supplementary approach of fit and have ignored the complementary side of fit or needs-supplies and demands-abilities perspectives. In their critical examination of the literature, Piasentin and Chapman (2006) found that only three studies out of 36 had used the demands-abilities approach in the study of person-organization fit. In other words, studies comparing different perspectives and their relations with personal outcomes are needed in order to broaden the conceptual knowledge about person-environment fit.

In the present study, three possible outcomes of person-environment fit, job satisfaction, life satisfaction, and stress were examined. Although many variables are influenced by person-work environment fit, these three outcomes in particular were expected to be relatively more important because of their relation to subjective well-being (Diener, Emmons, Larsen, & Griffin, 1985; Diener, Suh, Lucas, & Smith, 1999; Judge, &

Klinger, 2008; Larsen & Eid, 2008; Steel, Schmidt, & Shultz, 2008; Tetrick & LaRocco, 1987).

In recent years, subjective well-being has gained in importance in part as a reaction to studies on negative states of psychology (Diener, Suh, Lucas, & Smith, 1999) and also due to its strong influence on successful outcomes in life (see Lyubomirsky, King, & Diener, 2005). When people feel happy, they experience positive mood more often. This state encourages people to be more active, which in turn leads them to be successful in life (Lyubomirsky, King, & Diener, 2005). Life satisfaction is one of the components of subjective well-being, whereas job satisfaction and perceived stress are highly related to subjective well-being (Lent & Brown, 2008). Moreover, all three variables are highly related to each other wherein perceived high stress is related to low job satisfaction and lower well-being among employees (Jex & Thomas, 2003).

Job satisfaction

Not surprisingly, job satisfaction is the most widely studied topic in the history of industrial and organizational psychology (Judge & Church, 2000), likely due to its high association with job performance and critical job-related attitudes such as commitment and stress (e.g., Ostroff, 1992). Locke (1976) described job satisfaction as ‘a pleasurable or positive emotional state resulting from the appraisal of one’s job or job experiences’ (p. 1304). Lack of fit between an individual and the environment is associated with lower job satisfaction (Arthur et al., 2006; Cable & DeRue, 2002; Cable & Edwards, 2004; Cable & Judge, 1996; Lauver & Kristof-Brown, 2001; Saks & Ashforth, 1997). In their meta-analysis of person-organization fit, Arthur et al., (2006) found a large number of attitudinal outcome relations between satisfaction and fit. Need-supplies fit perceptions are important predictors of job-related outcomes like job satisfaction or career satisfaction

(Cable & DeRue, 2002). Moreover, perceptions of person-organization fit also predict employee job satisfaction (Cable & Judge, 1996).

Although job satisfaction has been studied frequently in person-environment fit studies, there is a lack of research comparing the association between job satisfaction and fit perceptions measured by different perspectives (supplementary versus complementary, needs-supplies, or demands-abilities). Indeed, these studies frequently conceptualize fit from the needs-supplies or demands-abilities perspectives without regard for the supplementary perspective. However, according to Locke's (1976) value-percept theory, job values are important in determining job satisfaction, which implies that not only needs or demands but also the congruence between personal values and the values of a job should be considered in satisfaction studies.

As a second problem, not many studies have examined job satisfaction as a consequence of person-organization fit (e.g., Silverthorne, 2004). Some researchers have argued that person-job fit should be more strongly related to job satisfaction than person-organization fit (Kristof, 1996). For example, Lauver and Kristof-Brown (2001) proposed that the relation between person-job fit and job satisfaction should be higher than the relation between person-organization fit and job satisfaction, because job satisfaction is an outcome of one's evaluations about the work or tasks. Moreover, person-organization fit is not highly related with daily job activities and therefore should expect less influence job satisfaction. Similarly, Cable and DeRue (2002) stated that person-organization fit is highly related to organizational-focused outcomes such as organizational citizenship behaviour and needs-supplies fit is more related to job satisfaction. However Schneider's (1987) attraction-selection-attrition framework highlights the importance of fit between personal expectations and organizational life for high job satisfaction. According to this

view, similar people are attracted to, selected by, and remain in settings where organizational goals are similar to their own. Individuals are attracted to organizations that are similar in personality and they are selected by such organizations for their common attributes in this environment. But, if the decision people made about their similarity to their environment is not correct and if they believe they do not fit with that environment, they leave. Thus, when there is high congruence between the personal expectations about the environment and the features of the environment, people will have higher job satisfaction.

It should be noted that both types of fit have a significant influence on job satisfaction (e.g., Lauver & Kristof-Brown, 2001; O'Reilly, Chatman, & Caldwell, 1991). However, person-job fit and person-organization fit have unique impacts on job satisfaction (Lauver & Kristof-Brown, 2001) and a non-significant correlation with each other (O'Reilly, Chatman, & Caldwell, 1991)). This is another controversial issue because other researchers have found a significant relation between person-organization fit and person-job fit (e.g., Kristof-Brown, 2000; Saks & Ashforth, 1997).

In the present research, job satisfaction was examined as a consequence of person-environment fit. Although job satisfaction is not a new variable of study for this research area, this study aimed to explore the differences between the associations of job satisfaction with different fit perspectives (supplementary, complementary, needs-supplies, and demands-abilities) and also the differences between two fit levels (person-organization and person-job fit).

Hypothesis 2a: Higher levels of person-organization fit and person-job fit would be associated with higher levels of job satisfaction.

Although I expected that both person-organization fit and person-job fit are important in predicting job satisfaction, as job satisfaction is mostly associated with the features of the job it was expected that the influence of person-job fit on job satisfaction would be higher compared to the influence of person-organization fit on job satisfaction. Thus this study provides novel information about the influence of person-environment fit on job satisfaction.

Hypothesis 2b: Person-job fit will have stronger association with job satisfaction relative to person-organization fit.

Life satisfaction

A feeling of satisfaction with one's life can be viewed as essential to subjective well-being since high life satisfaction has been associated with high self-esteem, optimism, and lower levels of depression (Compton, Smith, Cornish, & Qualls, 1996; Steger, Kashdan, Sullivan, & Lorentz, 2008). This component of subjective well-being (Andrews & Withey, 1976) has been defined as "a global assessment of a person's quality of life according to his chosen criteria" (Shin & Johnson, 1978, p. 478). For most people, work is an important part of life (Rain, Lane, & Steiner, 1991) and it is expected to play a critical role in the assessment of life quality. Holland's (1985) congruence theory has been tested by several researchers who have highlighted the significant relation between congruence and well-being measures (Lachterman & Meir, 2004). For example, when an employee's preferences have been met by the work environment, positive outcomes such as job, occupation, and work setting satisfaction are expected (Lachterman & Meir, 2004).

Further, if work has that much importance in people's lives, then a strong relation between job satisfaction and life satisfaction would be expected. Researchers have

focused on the relation between life satisfaction and job satisfaction (e.g., Chacko, 1983; Judge & Watanabe, 1993; Rain, Lane, & Steiner, 1991) and have found positive and reciprocal relations between job satisfaction and life satisfaction, although the cross-sectional effects of job satisfaction on life satisfaction may be stronger than the longitudinal effects (Judge & Watanabe, 1993). However, results from past research have been contradictory, in that some studies have found significant positive relations between the two variables (e.g., Judge & Watanabe, 1993; Rice, Near, & Hunt, 1980), whereas some did not find any relation between them (e.g., Ton & Hansen, 2001).

In sum, life satisfaction was examined in this study in order to explore the possible influence of person-work environment fit on employees' general satisfaction. It is known that people become happy when their needs, wants, and desires are satisfied by their environment (Shin & Johnson, 1978). Accordingly, perceptions of good fit between a person and his or her environment was expected to produce high life satisfaction. However, since person-environment fit has been mostly studied in the workplace, not many studies have mentioned the relationship of fit with variables other than job attitudes or organizational outcomes even though life satisfaction is an important measure of subjective well-being, and happiness introduces positive outcomes (Lachterman & Meir, 2004). In this study, high person-environment fit was expected to have positive influence on life satisfaction. Because each perspective has its own importance, significant differences between four fit perspectives (supplementary, complementary, needs-values, and demands-abilities) and their relations with life satisfaction were expected. Similarly, I expected differences between the influence of two levels (person-organization and person-job) of person-environment fit on employee's life satisfaction.

Hypothesis 3a: Higher levels of person-organization fit and person-job fit would be associated with greater life satisfaction.

Hypothesis 3b: Person-organization fit would have stronger association with life satisfaction relative to person-job fit.

Stress

Stress was also examined in this study as a consequence of person-environment fit. According to The New York Business Group on Health, employers in the United States spend around \$80 billion every year because of stress-related problems (Mann, 1996). In a recent study, one out of every four employees described themselves as more stressed today compared to two years ago, due to problems related to work, finances, or work/life balance (Employee Benefit News, 2008). Perceived stress is related to dissatisfaction, absenteeism, turnover, depression, and physical and mental illnesses (Brotheridge, & Grandey, 2002; Mann, 1996; Tetrick & LaRocco, 1987; Van-Harrison, 1978; Vente, Kamphuis, Emmelkamp, & Blonck, 2008)

The notion of stress has been shown important to the notion of person-environment fit (Caplan, 1987; Edwards, & Cooper, 1990; Osipow & Spokane, 1983). The theory of person-environment fit has an advantage over other approaches such as situational or response theories, which ignore either individual or situational variations (Edwards, 1996), because it involves the interaction between a person and the environment (see Edwards, 1996). It is believed that a complex interaction between person and environment results in stress (Beehr & Newman, 1978). So “any characteristics of the job environment which pose a threat” (p.1352) may be a reason for stress (Caplan, Cobb, French, Van Harrison, & Pinneau, 1980). According to the supplementary fit perspective, any mismatch between the environment and a person’s

values, desires, or goals can lead to stress (Van-Harrison, 1978). Social Identity Theory proposes that people need to locate themselves within society (Tajfel & Turner, 1986), and they identify themselves within their organization (Dutton, Dukerich, & Harquail, 1994). Thus when values, desires, or goals are not congruent among an individual and the organization, then organizational identification would be failed and cognitive conflict occurs and negative attitudes emerge (see Cable & Edwards, 2004) which could be associated with perceived stress.

Some researchers emphasize the perceptions of work roles which are related to person-environment fit could be a source of potential stress (Osipow, 1987). According to this perspective, there could be two types of stress in terms of person-environment fit theory. When an individual cannot meet the demands of the environment or when supplies cannot meet the needs of the individual, stress may arise (Caplan, Cobb, French, Van Harrison, & Pinneau, 1980; Van-Harrison, 1978). As McGrath (1976) said, “. . . there is a potential for stress when an environmental situation is perceived as presenting a demand which threatens to exceed the person's capabilities and resources for meeting it....” (p.1352). Therefore, it is important that an individual be able to meet the requirements of the job with their knowledge, skills, or abilities and at the same time that the environment be able to meet the requirements of an individual in order not to create stress.

In conclusion, while similarity between the person and the environment is beneficial for well-being, dissimilarity is associated to stress (French, Caplan, & Harrison, 1982). Good person-environment fit is important because it produces positive health outcomes which lead to high self-esteem and a sense of positive identity (Van-Harrison, 1978). In person-environment fit theory, stress can arise due to incongruence;

however, there is a lack of studies comparing different fit perspectives and stress relations in the same research. One aim of this study was to compare all approaches of fit (complementary, supplementary, needs-supplies and demands-abilities) with perceived stress of employees and also to investigate any possible differences between levels of fit (organization and job) and the stress relation.

In sum, this study aimed to study whether there are significant differences between the two levels of person-environment fit (person-organization and person-job) on individual outcomes such as job satisfaction, life satisfaction, and stress. Different levels of fit (organization and job) and various conceptualizations of fit were investigated in terms of their influence on these individual outcomes.

Hypothesis 4a: Higher levels of person-organization fit and person-job fit would be associated with lower levels of perceived stress.

Hypothesis 4b: Person-job fit would have stronger association with perceived stress relative to person-organization fit.

The role of personality in person-environment fit perceptions

Person-environment fit studies have been grounded in the interactionist theory of behaviour, which considers the effects of personality in combination with situational factors on important outcomes (Muchinsky & Monahan, 1987). Researchers argue that the nature of work environments are determined by the different personalities of the individuals who control those environments and personality plays a significant role on fit perceptions through its power to control and shape the environment (Holland, 1976; Schneider, 1987). In general, it is believed that personality could affect peoples' reactions to specific environments as it can shape values and preferences (Judge & Cable, 1997). Judge (2007) emphasized that in order to understand fit perceptions and to gain more

comprehensive knowledge we need more studies investigating the role of personality differences in person-environment fit.

Despite the importance of personality in terms of its interaction with the work environment and its influence on organizational outcomes, there is relatively little research regarding how different personalities could influence individuals' fit perceptions in the workplace. Of the research that does exist, most studies focus on either the relation between different personalities and how various traits are attracted to certain environments (Judge & Cable, 1997, O'Reilly, 1977) or other dimensions such as vocational interests on fit perceptions (Ehrhart & Makransky, 2007).

Holland (1977) has defined "fit" in terms of the congruence between personality and vocational environment. Hence, following Holland's theory, some studies (Burke, & Deszca, 1982; Cable & Judge, 1994; Kristof, 1996; Spokane, 1985) have focused on the congruence between individuals' personalities and their work environment. For example, Burke and Deszca (1982) found that employees with Type A personalities are more likely to prefer to work in organizations that show high performance standards, ambiguity, and spontaneity. Moreover, personality predicts individual preferences for specific organizational features such as pay systems or reward systems (Cable & Judge, 1994). Specifically, personality characteristics like materialism or self-efficacy are significant predictors of employees' preferences for organizations with specific pay systems like high pay level or individual-based payments, whereas locus of control is a significant predictor of employees' preferences for organizations offering flexible benefits

Perhaps the most common framework for examining the role of personality in person-environment fit has been the Five Factor Model (e.g., Ehrhart & Makransky, 2007; Hofstee, deRaad, & Goldberg, 1992; Judge & Cable, 1997; Lievens, Decaesteker,

Coetsier, & Geirnaert, 2001; Tokar & Swanson, 1995). Judge and Cable (1997) found that although people high in neuroticism prefer to work in innovative organizational cultures, people high in conscientiousness prefer to work in both innovative and outcome-oriented organizational cultures. Lievens, Decaestecker, Coetsier, & Geirnaert (2001) found that individuals who are high in conscientiousness are more likely to be attracted to large size organizations compared to individuals low in conscientiousness. In one study examining the impact of personality on job performance, researchers have shown that personality traits are related to performance when there is a match with the work environments (Barrick, Mitchell, & Stewart, 2003). For example, extraversion is related to performance when the workplace is competitive; whereas agreeableness is related to performance when cooperation is expected in the workplace (Barrick, Mitchell, & Stewart, 2003). Moreover, a poor fit between personality and the characteristics of the workplace could result in high turnover (Ryan & Kristof-Brown, 2003).

Especially if person-environment fit is measured using direct measures, when perceived fit is being investigated (Kristof, 1996), individual judgements about fit are generally the focus. Thus, actual personal characteristics and environmental characteristics could be ignored when only individual judgements are used. However personality and its association with person-work environment fit perceptions has rarely been examined apart from the few studies investigating the role of personality on fit perceptions using the Five Factor model of personality (extraversion, neuroticism, agreeableness, conscientiousness, openness to experience, e.g., Ehrhart & Makransky, 2007).

Ehrhart and Makransky (2007) hypothesized that the Five Factor model would predict one's perception about person-job fit. Person-job fit was measured by using job

characteristics such as complexity, structure, and leadership and respondents were asked if they experienced fit with several job characteristics. Only conscientiousness and emotional stability were found to have some relation to person-job fit, with higher conscientiousness related to jobs involving structure. Thus, people who are high on conscientiousness seem to value jobs that are structured and predictable (Ehrhart & Makransky, 2007). On the other hand, emotional stability and fit with leadership were found to be associated, demonstrating that individuals who are high in emotional stability may not prefer positions with power. Moreover they found that vocational interests are better predictors of person-job fit compared to the Big Five personality characteristics. Ehrhart and Makransky (2007) state that there is less support for the relationship between the Big Five factors and perceptions of fit and they argue that other personality dimensions might be equal or greater importance..

There are a couple of reasons that can account for why Ehrhart and Makransky (2007) did not find sufficient support for their hypothesis. First, they only used job characteristics for measuring perceptions of person-job fit. They did not use either the conceptualizations of needs-supplies fit or demands-abilities fit. Therefore, it can be concluded that the study had a very narrow perspective in examining the association between fit and personality. In order to explore this association more conceptually, person-organization fit should also be included in this association.

Second, they measured personality in terms of the Big Five Factors which are described as broad components of personality (Block, 1995; John, 1990). Broad factors of personality are composed of many variables which might create ambiguity (Block, 1995; John, 1990). For this reason, using specific subcomponents instead of broader factors is preferred for measuring traits because specific components are more informative

compared to broad ones (Saucier & Goldberg, 2003). Although there has been some association between the Big-5 personality factors, specifically conscientiousness and neuroticism, and some aspects of perceived person-environment fit, the lack of stronger associations between this personality framework and fit suggests that the Big-5 factor model may not be the right approach to use to explore the connection between personality and fit. The lack of association may be related to the broad scope of the five personality factors and the different psychological meanings that have been given to each factor by different researchers (Block, 1995; John, 1990). It is possible that using more specific personality characteristics would be more informative compared to using broader factors (Saucier & Goldberg, 2003). Hence, there is a need to look at additional traits in order to tease out the nuanced association of personality to person-environment fit.

Over the last two decades there has been an “affective revolution” in organizational psychology (Barsade, Brief, & Spataro, 2003) that has focused on the role of the dispositional aspect of affect. Affectivity has an influence on several attitudinal variables such as job satisfaction, organizational commitment, intention to quit, and burnout (Connolly & Viswesvaran, 2000; George, 1992; George & Jones, 1996). For example, people who are high in negative affectivity have a negativistic cognitive style and, as a result, these people are more likely focus on negative aspects of themselves and their environments (Watson, 2000), which leads, in turn, to more negative attitudes compared to people who are low in negative affectivity. Consistent with these results are research findings demonstrating that people who are high in positive affectivity are more positive toward their environments and this leads, in turn, to more positive outcomes in measures of attitudinal variables (Watson, Clark, & Carey, 1988). For example, people high in positive affectivity are more likely to enjoy their jobs (Watson & Slack, 1993).

Although several studies highlight the role of affectivity on employee behaviour, the dispositional aspect of affect has not been examined in the person-environment fit literature. In this study I aimed to examine the role of affectivity in shaping individual's judgements about fit with their environments, to explore the differences between fit perceptions of employees who are high or low in negative and positive affectivity.

Dispositional Affect: Positive and Negative Affectivity

Affect is a phenomenological state that is expressed in terms of emotions (Watson, 2000). There is a distinction between two types of affect: trait (dispositional) and state (situational) (George, 1992). State affect refers to the experience of emotions like happy or sad and concerns emotions one is feeling at any specific moment in time. By contrast, trait affect, also known as affectivity, is a stable personality dimension that refers to the experience of certain affective states over time and across situations (Watson, 2000). In the present study, the focus was only on the latter, trait affect (i.e., dispositional affect or affectivity).

Affective traits are described as “stable individual differences in the tendency to experience a corresponding mood state” (Watson, 2000, p. 15). People high in negative affectivity commonly experience negative mood states such as anxiety, depression, and guilt. These people also tend to focus on negative aspects of the environment and use negative cognitive styles, and, most of time they experience dissatisfaction and stress in their lives (Watson, 2000). Conversely, people who are high in positive affectivity are more likely to experience positive emotions, view themselves as active, and have a high sense of well-being (George, 1992; Watson, 2000). These people tend to focus on more positive aspects of the environment and they view themselves and the environment in more positive ways (Watson, 2000; Watson, Clark, & Carey, 1988).

Several studies have shown significant differences in employees' work attitudes in terms of positive and negative affectivity (e.g., Brief, Butcher, & Roberson, 1995; Brief, Burke, George, Robinson, & Webster, 1988; Chen & Spector, 1991; Connolly & Viswesvaran, 2000; Cropanzano, James, & Konovsky, 1993; Diener, & Lofquist, 1984; Staw, Bell, & Clausen, 1986; Watson, Pennebaker, & Folger, 1986). Brief, Burke, George, Robinson, and Webster (1988) reported that there is an association between negative affectivity and decreased job satisfaction, increased stress at work, and increased life stress. Iverson, Olekalns, and Erwin (1998) also found a significant positive association between affectivity and job satisfaction. In addition to lower job satisfaction, negative affectivity is also positively related to absenteeism and stress (Chen & Spector, 1991). In a study of subjective well-being, significant relations were found between negative affectivity and depression, and low life satisfaction; and positive affectivity and low depression and high life satisfaction (Benyamini, & Roziner, 2008). Thoresen, Kaplan, Barsky, Warren, and Chermont (2003) argued that affectivity has an impact on various psychological processes that can shape employee's evaluations about their workplace. For example, some studies have shown that negative affectivity and experiencing distress are related (Costa & McCrae, 1980; Tellegen, 1985; Watson & Clark, 1984) which may be explained by increased vulnerability to the stimuli as a result of negative affectivity (Larsen & Katelaar, 1991). Positive affectivity is also related to high job satisfaction, organizational commitment, and low turnover intentions (Cropanzano, James, & Konovsky, 1993). Overall, there is evidence indicating that individuals who are high in positive affectivity are more likely to have higher job satisfaction, greater life satisfaction, and lower stress, whereas individuals who are high

in negative affectivity are more likely have lower job satisfaction, lower life satisfaction, and higher stress.

Hypothesis 5a: People who were high on positive affectivity would report higher job satisfaction, higher life satisfaction, and lower perceived stress compared to people who were low on positive affectivity.

Hypothesis 5b: People who were low on negative affectivity would report higher job satisfaction, higher life satisfaction, and lower perceived stress compared to people who were low on negative affectivity.

The relation between affectivity and person-environment fit

Given the association between the affectivity and the work-related attitudes, it would be plausible that negative and positive affectivity should also be related to employees' person-environment fit perceptions. Although this association has not been examined before, there is theoretical justification for this association.

Studies have shown the association between personality and an individual's judgements and cognitive processes (Judge & Larsen, 2001; Levin & Stokes, 1989). Necowitz and Roznowski (1994) stated that people who are high in negative affectivity tend to report more dissatisfaction about their work environment compared to people who are low in negative affectivity. Thus, if asked to describe their activities at work, people who are high in negative affectivity will define their activities in more negative terms compared to people with low negative affectivity (Necowitz, & Roznomski, 1994). Because people who are high in negativity are more likely to focus on negative job experiences, whereas people who are high in positive affectivity tend to focus on positive job experiences (Judge & Larsen, 2001), the two groups should have different judgments about the same work environment. Watson and Clark (1984) stated that regardless of the

situation, people who are high in negative affectivity report distress or dissatisfaction more often than others. While people focus only on one set of attributes in their jobs, positive or negative, consistent with their affective experiences (Staw, 1984) their judgements of the same event will also be different depending on their positive and negative affectivity levels.

One of the approaches used to explain differences between individuals' responses to their environments is Gray's (1971, 1981, 1987) work. According to Gray, people have both a behavioural activation system (BAS) and behavioural inhibition system (BIS), which relate directly to negative or positive affectivity. This theory posits that two systems control individual's actions when there are stimuli indicative of rewards or punishment. Thus people who are high in positive affectivity have stronger sensitivity to stimuli indicative of rewards and people who are high in negative affectivity have stronger sensitivity to stimuli indicative of punishment. If it is the case that affectivity predisposes people to different levels of sensitivity to reward and punishment stimuli, then it could also be that affectivity could produce similar sensitivity to job contexts and strongly influence how individuals respond to the same work environment.

Another model arguing that affectivity has an impact on individual's responses to their environment was proposed by Weiss and Cropanzano (1996), in their Affective Events Theory (AET) in which they propose that affectivity predicts reactions at work, so not only cognitive processes but also affective processes have an influence on attitudes. In this model, it is argued that state affect mediates the impact of affective disposition on attitudes. Hence, through this channel, affective dispositions have an influence on employee's evaluations regarding their jobs. According to this theory, affect can be both antecedents and consequences at the workplace. Discrete events such as positive feedback

or success in a task can influence specific emotions and increase them. Thus, momentary positive emotions like joy or happiness will be seen. Hence, affective experiences lead to affective components of attitudes such as job satisfaction. Although this theory is used to explain the relation between affectivity and job attitudes like job satisfaction, it is an important approach as it highlights how the disposition aspect of affect can alter people's evaluations of their environments.

Judge and Larsen (2001) also propose a model which focuses on how affectivity influences individuals' responses and judgments. According to Stimulus-Organism-Response theory, any event in the environment has impact on a person, but depending on the characteristics of a person, emotional responses given to the same event will differ. This theory states that affectivity influences can be made by creating sensitivity between any event in the environment and an individual. This, in turn, could also act as a mediator, influencing the response of an individual. Judge and Larsen (2001) concluded that there could be individual differences in perceptions of specific work conditions, and that people react differently to the same stimulus depending on their personality.

These theories suggest that in specific situations people are more sensitive to their environment depending on their personality. Affectivity has an impact on emotions and these emotions shape individuals' responses to their environments. Therefore, people who are high in positive affectivity and negative affectivity would be expected to show sensitivity to different situations, to process, and to respond to these situations in different ways. Following these three theories, the characteristics of an organization or a job can be treated as a stimulus, which creates sensitivity in the environment and activates employees' affectivity. Thus, a stimulus in the environment would be perceived, processed, and evaluated in different ways by people who are high in negative affectivity

and positive affectivity. Hence, it was expected that positive and negative affectivity would play an important role in influencing reports of person-environment fit.

Hypothesis 6a: People who were high in positive affectivity would report better fit with their environment (organization-job) compared to people who were low in positive affectivity.

Hypothesis 6b: People who were low in negative affectivity would report better fit with their environment (organization-job) compared to people who were high in negative affectivity.

Studies examining the association between affectivity and employee attitudes have primarily focused on the direct influence between variables. Researchers propose that there is a relationship between affectivity and attitudes that can differentiate employee's responses to their environment (see Cropanzano, James, & Konovsky, 1993). However, according to Stimulus-Organism-Response theory, any stimulus in the environment can activate individuals' emotional response system and that this will change their response to the environment (Judge & Larsen, 2001). Hence, according to this theory, specific work conditions could influence affective responses in the workplace. Researchers have already found a significant influence of affectivity on the individual outcomes such as job satisfaction, life satisfaction, and stress (Brief, Burke, George, Robinson, & Webster., 1988; Iverson, Olekalns, & Erwin, 1998). However, indirect effects of other variables such as person-environment fit should also be considered. For example, person-environment fit may act as a stimulus to activate individuals' affective systems and result in different behaviours among employees. Thus, person-environment fit might help explain the association between affectivity and individual outcomes by mediating this relation. In summary, another aim of this study was to examine the

association between positive and negative affectivity and fit, as well, the role of perceptions about person-environment fit as a mediator in the relation between affectivity and individual outcomes, job satisfaction, life satisfaction and perceived stress. To date, there have been no published studies investigating the possibility that the perceptions about person-environment fit play a mediating role in the above mentioned relation.

Hypothesis 7: Person-environment fit would mediate the relation between affectivity and individual outcomes-job satisfaction, life satisfaction, and stress.

Job Features: Workplace flexibility and workload

Although a key driver of person-environment fit may be affectivity, it is also necessary to determine the role of organizational features that could have an effect on the relation between person-environment fit and individual outcomes. It has been consistently demonstrated that working in a flexible workplace and having an appropriate workload produce positive outcomes like job satisfaction, work satisfaction, organizational commitment, and reduced stress (Campbell-Clark, 2001; Chou, Boldy, & Lee, 2002; Currivan, 1999, 2000; Meyer, 1997). However, the role of organizational features on individual outcomes has been rarely examined in relation to person-environment fit perceptions. Despite their importance, workplace flexibility and workload have not been examined in relation to person-environment fit. For these reasons, this study was also aim to explore the effects of workplace flexibility and high workload on person-environment fit.

Workplace flexibility

Workplace flexibility has been defined as work schedule flexibility (Bailyn, 1997). Campbell-Clark (2001) named this kind of flexibility as temporal flexibility where employees have the ability to control when they work. Temporal flexibility has also been

labelled as alternative work schedules (Lu, Kao, Chang, Wu, & Cooper, 2008; Marshall & Barnett, 1994; Ronen, 1984). When employees have the ability to choose alternative time slots offered within a given period instead of being told when they will work, their job satisfaction, mental health, work-life balance, and family well-being is positively affected (Clark, 2001; Lu, Kao, Chang, Wu, & Cooper, 2008; MacEachen, Polzer, & Clark, 2008; Marshall, & Barnett, 1994).

More companies are recognizing the value of offering alternative work schedules to their employees as flexibility increases productivity (Ronen, 1984; Solomon, 1996). By offering flexible working hours, organizations give their employees a sense of autonomy (Ronen, 1984) while increasing employee perception of organizational support (Lu, Kao, Chang, Wu, & Cooper, 2008). In other words, when employees have greater control over their work schedule, they feel more supported by their organizations. Moreover, alternative work schedules are positively associated with job satisfaction and negatively associated with turnover intentions, burnout, and stress (Almer & Kaplan, 2002; Rothausen, 1994). When employees have control over their work schedules, work-life balance generally improves which, in turn, increases job satisfaction and decreases intention to quit. It has also been found that working under a flexible scheduling system has a negative association with emotional exhaustion and depersonalization (Almer & Kaplan, 2002).

Hypothesis 8a: People who had higher work flexibility would report higher job satisfaction compared to people with lower flexibility at work.

Hypothesis 8b: People who had higher work flexibility would report higher life satisfaction compared to people with lower flexibility at work.

Hypothesis 8c: People who had higher work flexibility would report lower stress compared to people with lower flexibility at work.

Although many studies have examined the effect of flexibility in the workplace, it has not been studied in terms of its role in person-environment fit perceptions. Because flexibility creates feelings of autonomy and employees feel they have support in the work environment, we would expect this organizational feature to also impact the association between fit and individual outcomes, job satisfaction, life satisfaction, and stress. According to this idea, employees may perceive that they have a good fit with their jobs, however when there is no flexibility in the work environment, employees' attitudes toward their jobs could be negatively affected by the absence of this organizational feature which also influences life satisfaction and may contribute to high stress.

Hence, flexibility could act as a moderator influencing person-environment fit and individual outcomes. According to this view, regardless of whether individuals perceive good fit or not, workers' experience of flexibility in their work environment, individual outcomes, job satisfaction, life satisfaction and stress would also be positively affected.

Hypothesis 9: Workplace flexibility would moderate the association between person-environment fit and individual outcomes-job satisfaction, life satisfaction, and stress, such that people with high flexibility person-environment fit would have higher association with job satisfaction, life satisfaction and perceived stress.

Workload

Like workplace flexibility, high workload is another important organizational feature which should be given greater consideration. High workload is usually referred to as a key job stressor (Spector, Dwyer, & Jex, 1988) that has important implications for employee health, quality of work, and well-being (French & Caplan, 1972; Kirmeyer &

Dougherty, 1988; Kossek & Ozeki, 1998). High workload occurs when an employee perceives there is too much to do in the time available (Kahn, Wolfe, Quinn, Snoek, & Rosenthal, 1964). High job demands create pressure on employees that has a negative effect on their well-being. Perceived workload is the strongest predictor of work exhaustion, after negative affectivity (Moore, 2000). Moreover, a positive association has been found between increased workload and anxiety, frustration, and negative health symptoms (Shirom, Nirel, & Vinokur, 2006). High workload is also highly related to work-to-family conflict and negative affect of employees (Ilies, Schwind, Wagner, Johnson, DeRue, & Ilgen, 2007) and it is negatively associated with job satisfaction (Pousette & Hanse, 2002; Spector, 1987).

Hypothesis 10a: People who reported higher workload would have lower job satisfaction, compared to people who reported lower workload.

Hypothesis 10b: People who reported higher workload would have lower life satisfaction, compared to people who reported lower workload.

Hypothesis 10c: People who reported higher workload would have higher stress compared to people who reported lower workload.

Although there are many studies examining the effects of workload, none of these has examined the role of workload on the relationship between fit perceptions and individual outcomes. Workload could also act like a moderator among person-environment fit and individual outcomes. Because high workload could influence people emotionally, as it causes exhaustion, congruence between individual characteristics and environmental characteristics will not be so important.

Hypothesis 11: Workload would moderate the association between person-environment fit and individual outcomes-job satisfaction, life satisfaction, and stress; such that people

with high workload person-environment fit would have higher association with job satisfaction, low satisfaction and perceived stress.

Purpose of the Study

In this study, I examined the role of negative and positive affectivity on perceptions of person environment fit at the workplace. It is believed that personality has an influence on how people perceive, explain, recognize, or focus on their environment and how they react to their environment. If personality shapes perceptions of person-environment fit, people with specific personalities would always perceive high fit with their environment, whereas others would always perceive low fit with their environment regardless of their actual fit. While examining person-environment fit, different conceptualizations of the notion of fit, including supplementary, complementary, needs-supplies, and demands-abilities perspectives were also studied. Thus, the aim was to compare different conceptualizations in order to clarify the definition problems of person-environment fit in the literature by exploring the differences between four different conceptualizations. In addition, I examined two types (person-organization and person-job fit) of person-environment fit and their association with individual outcomes: job satisfaction, life satisfaction and stress. Finally, I investigated the role of two organizational features, workload and workplace flexibility, and their influence on the association between person-environment fit and individual outcomes (job satisfaction, life satisfaction and stress). Thus, the model that was examined in this research is represented in Figure 1.

Figure 1. Proposed model.

Method

Participants and Procedure

Participants were people working either full time or part time in public and private companies who completed a 20-minute online survey about person-environment fit and individual outcomes related to work. Participants were recruited using two sources. The first method involved snowball sampling in which recruitment emails (see Appendix A) were sent out to personal contacts who were asked to complete the study and who were also asked to forward the survey invitation to any employed individuals they knew who may have been interested in participating in the survey. The second method involved recruiting participants through the Study Response Project, which is a web-based service hosted by the School of Information Studies at the University of Syracuse that facilitates survey data collection for academic researchers as part of its ongoing research into survey response rates. Study Response administrators sent out the recruitment email (Appendix B) to individuals who had volunteered to participate in web-based research and they administered payment to participants. Each participant had a Study Response code that they used to record their participation in the research. The recruitment email included a brief description of the study, contact information for the researchers, and a link to an online informed consent page. This service enables researchers to pay respondents while at the same time maintaining complete anonymity of the participants.

The survey was hosted by Survey Monkey and all data were sent to and stored on this server. To participate in the research, participants clicked on the link to the informed consent page (Appendix C), which outlined the study and their rights. If they agreed to be part of the research, they clicked on the “I agree” button indicating they were consenting or if they chose not to participate they clicked on the “quit” button. When the “I agree”

button had been clicked, the online survey page opened. Five hundred and four participants read the consent page, of which 6 declined to participate.

In the questionnaire, participants answered items about their judgements regarding person-work environment fit, their personality, life satisfaction, job satisfaction, perceived stress, workplace flexibility, workload, and general demographics in this order. The survey took approximately 20 minutes to complete. When participants clicked on the “submit” button they were automatically directed to a debriefing page (Appendix D), which included more information about the purpose of the research, some additional readings about person-environment fit, and contact information of the research team. For the Study Response participants, one week after the initial email was sent out, a second email was sent thanking those people who had already participated and reminding those who had not responded that there was still time to do so. No similar email was sent to the snowball sample because there was no pre-determined list of potential participants.

There were 383 responses to the survey of which 183 were from the snowball sample and 200 were from Study Response Project. The mean age of participants was 39 years (range: 16 to 71 years). Fifty-nine percent of the sample was female and 41% was male. Seventy-eight percent of participants had a permanent job, 13% were on contract or had temporary jobs, and 4% had casual employment. Eighty-two percent was working full-time and 13% was working part-time.

Participants from the two samples were similar in terms of type of work and working hours, but differed significantly in terms of age, gender, organizational and job tenure and employment type (see Appendix E, F). The participants from the snowball sample were younger, more likely to be female, and the participants from the Study Response were more likely to have permanent jobs. Also participants in the Study

Response group had higher job tenure and organizational tenure. Despite the differences between the samples, these demographic variables were not controlled in the subsequent analyses because they were not expected to have direct influence on the variables of interest. Therefore, both groups were entered in all analyses as one sample.

Measures

Person-environment fit

There are no available measures that incorporate all different perspectives (needs-supplies fit, demands-abilities fit, complementary fit, supplementary fit) and different levels of fit (person-organization, person-job) of person-environment fit. As a result, the scales used in the present study were adapted so as to assess each kind of fit -- each level of person-environment fit (person-organization and person-job) was assessed for supplementary, complementary, needs-supplies, and demands-abilities fit perspectives. Within each of these categories, fit was operationalized as direct subjective (perceived) fit as opposed to objective fit, such that respondents were asked about their overall assessment of the fit between themselves and their environments (Edwards, Cable, Williamson, Lambert, & Shipp, 2006).

Although there are no well-known scales that measure person-environment fit, the measures from Cable and Judge (1996) and Saks and Ashforth (1997) have been cited more frequently than others (e.g., Ehrhart, 2001; Hutcheson, 1999; Resick, Baltes, & Shantz., 2007), thus, these two scales were selected for use in this study as the items appeared to cover many aspects of the operational definitions of the concepts. However, additional items needed to be included in order to assess other aspects of the operational definitions. Ratings for all person-environment fit items were made on 5-point Likert-type scales ranging from 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree).

Person-organization fit. Perceived fit between oneself and one's organization was measured using four scales that addressed the different conceptualizations of fit including supplementary, complementary, needs-supplies, and demands-abilities. Supplementary person-organization fit was defined as the congruence between one's values and personality and the values and personality of the organization. It was measured with a five-item scale combining three items from Cable and Judge (1996; I feel my values match or fit this organization and the current employees in this organization; I think the values and personality of this organization reflect my own values and personality; My values match those of current employees in this organization) and two items from Saks and Ashforth (1997; The values of this organization are similar to my own values; I feel my personality matches the personality or image of this organization) (see Appendix G). The five-item scale had previously been used by Resick, Baltes, and Shantz (2007) and they reported an internal consistency of the five items as .94.

Complementary person-organization fit was defined in terms of individuals' perceptions about the differences that set them apart from other workers that serve to complement organizational characteristics. It was measured with the eight-item index from Piasentin and Chapman (2007; I feel that I am important to this company because I have such different skills and abilities than my co-workers; My co-workers rely on me because I have competencies that they do not have; When key decisions are made, my co-workers consult me because I have a different perspective than they do; I feel like I stand out in this organization; My knowledge, skills, and abilities offer something that other employees in this organization does not have; I feel that I am a unique piece of the puzzle that makes this organization work; Even though my personality differs from my co-workers, it seems to complement their personalities; People in my organization seem to

value that I am different from the ‘typical’ employee) (see Appendix F). The Cronbach’s alpha of the eight items was .79 in their research.

Needs-supplies person-organization fit was defined in terms of how employees perceive their organizations in terms of meeting personal needs and wishes. Needs-supplies fit was measured with a four-item scale adapted from Saks and Ashforth (1997; I feel that this organization enables me to do the kind of work I want to do; This organization measures up the kind of organization I was seeking; This organization is a good match for me; This organization fulfills my needs) (see Appendix G). This scale has been used by Resick, Baltez, and Shantz (2007) for measuring person-internship fit with a reported Cronbach’s alpha of .92.

Demand-abilities fit was defined as the perceptions of people in terms of whether they fulfill the organizational demands with their knowledge, skills, abilities, and resources. It was measured with a two-item scale adapted from Cable and Judge (1996; e.g., I think I possess the skills and abilities to succeed at this organization; I believe my skills and abilities match those required by this organization in general) (see Appendix G). The scale has been used by Hucheson (1999) and the internal consistency was .85.

In the present study the internal consistency for all person-organization fit scales was good. The Cronbach’s alpha for the overall person-organization fit scale was .89, and was .89 for Supplementary fit, .86 for Complementary fit, .93 for Needs-Supply fit, and .81 for Demands-Abilities fit.

Person-job fit. Similar to person-organization fit, for person-job fit supplementary fit was defined as the congruence between one’s values and personality and the values and personality of one’s job, complementary person-job fit was defined as individuals’ perceptions about their differences from others workers that serve to complement features

of their jobs, needs-supplies person-job fit was defined in terms of how employees perceive their jobs in terms of meeting personal needs and wishes, and demand-abilities fit was defined as the perceptions of people in terms of whether they fulfill the organizational demands with their knowledge, skills, abilities, and resources. Perceived person-job fit was measured with the same four scales that assessed the four different conceptualizations of fit for person-organization fit changing only the word “organization” to “job” for each item. See Appendix G for all items for person-job fit. One additional item from Cable and Judge (1996; My job performance is hurt by a lack of expertise on the job) was included in the demands-abilities fit scale. The item was used as a measure for person-job fit in the previous studies (Cable & Judge, 1996) but was not included in the person-organization fit scale as the item asks about individual performance that was directly related to job.

Five-point Likert type scales, ranging from 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree), were used for responses to the person-job fit scales. The internal consistency was good for all of the scales. The Cronbach’s alpha for the overall person-job fit scale was .89 and was .87 for Supplementary fit, .89 for Complementary fit, .94 for Needs-Supplies fit, and .73 for Demands-Abilities fit.

Positive and negative affectivity

Positive and negative affectivity were measured by using 20 items from the Positive Affect Negative Affect Schedule (PANAS; Watson, Clark, & Tellegen, 1988) (see Appendix G). The PANAS is a self report measure that reflects an individual’s disposition to respond negatively (e.g., afraid, angry) and positively (e.g., enthusiastic, active) across situations. Participants were asked to “indicate to what extent you generally feel this way, that is how you feel in general” (Watson, Clark, & Tellegen, 1988, p.1070).

Responses were made on five-point Likert type scales ranging from 1 (very slightly or not at all) to 5 (extremely). In the present study, Cronbach's alphas were .92 for positive affectivity and .89 for negative affectivity, indicating good internal consistency.

In addition to the PANAS, the sensitivity to rewards and punishment scale (BIS and BAS; Carver & White, 1994) was also used. The BIS/BAS scale is a 20-item self-report measure assessing one's dispositional behavioral inhibition system (BIS) and behavioral activation system (BAS) that are general motivation systems that are thought to cause behaviour and affect (Gray, 1981). BIS items (7 items) reflect anxiety in situations in which there is potential punishment and BAS items (13 items) reflect how people respond to reward situations. The BAS items are divided into three subscales (Drive, Reward Responsiveness, Fun Seeking) which includes pursuit of rewarding goals, seeking opportunities for reward, responsiveness to reward, and impulsivity (see Appendix G). Although the BIS/BAS scale is not a direct measure of positive and negative affectivity, researchers suggest that Gray's (1970,1987,1990) theories of BIS/BAS are linked to positive and negative affectivity (Thoresen, Kaplan, Barsky, Warren, & Chermont, 2003) and believe the BIS/BAS scale is a good measure of affect congruent traits (e.g., Leone, Perugini, Bagozzi, Pierro, & Mannetti, 2001; Suhr & Ysanadis, 2007). Negative affectivity has been found to be correlated with BIS, .42, $p < .001$, and positive affectivity has been found to be correlated with BAS (Bas Drive = .31, Reward = .28, Fun Seeking = .19, $p < .001$; Carver & White, 1994). Four-point Likert type scales ranging from 1 (strongly disagree) to 4 (strongly agree) were used as a response format. The Cronbach's alphas for the scales in the present study were .67 for BIS, .83 for BAS reward, .84 for BAS drive and .76 for BAS fun-seeking, consistent with

those reported by Carver and White (1994). The PANAS and the BIS/BAS were analyzed separately in order to examine the effects of different measures of affectivity on perceptions of person-environment fit.

Life satisfaction

Life satisfaction was assessed with the Satisfaction with Life Scale (Diener, Emmons, Larsen, & Griffin., 1985) (see Appendix G). This five-item scale aims to assess global life satisfaction (e.g., I am satisfied with my life) and has a reported .87 internal consistency, similar to the .88 alpha in the present study. Ratings were made on 5-point Likert-type scales ranging from 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree).

Job satisfaction

Job satisfaction was measured using the five-item version of Brayfield and Rothe's (1951) Overall Job Satisfaction Scale (see Appendix G), designed to assess how participants feel about their jobs. All items were measured by using 5-point Likert scales (1=strongly disagree, 5=strongly agree) and participants were asked the extent to which they agreed with the statements about their job (e.g., I am enthusiastic about my work). In past research, the reliability for this scale has ranged from .89 (Judge, Scott, & Ilies, 2006) to .95 (Judge & Ilies, 2004); in the present study the Cronbach's alpha was .85.

Perceived stress

The Perceived Stress Scale, developed by Cohen, Kamarck, and Mermelstein (1983), was used to measure stress (see Appendix G). The 14-item scale aimed to measure the degree to which respondents' perceived situations in the past month as being stressful. Using 5-point Likert scales (0=never, 1=almost never, 2=sometimes, 3=fairly often, 4=very often), respondents indicated the frequency of thoughts or feelings they

experienced in the past month (e.g., How often have you been upset because of something that happened unexpectedly? How often have you dealt successfully with irritating life hassles?). The Cronbach's alpha for this scale was .85, consistent with the .85 alpha reported by Cohen, Kamarch and Mermelstein (1983).

Workplace flexibility

Five items measuring temporal flexibility, developed by Clark (2001), were used to measure workplace flexibility (see Appendix G). The items consisted of questions regarding employees' perceived control over their working hours (e.g., I am free to work the hours that are best for my schedule). The response format was 5-point Likert scales (1=strongly disagree and 5= strongly agree). Clark (2001) reported the internal consistency of the five items as .84, consistent with the Cronbach's alpha of .82 in the present study.

A single item asking participants' attitudes toward workplace flexibility was also written for the present study in order to understand the importance of flexibility for participants (Do you think it is important to have flexible schedule at workplace?). The correlation between this item and the temporal flexibility scale was .18, $p < .01$.

Workload

Workload was measured by the Workload Scale developed by Quinn, Seashore, Kahn, Mangione, Campbell, Staines, and McCullough (1971) (see Appendix G). For each of the four items, participants were asked how often specific aspects appear in their job (e.g., How often does your job require you to work very fast?) in order to evaluate their subjective judgements about their workload. The Cronbach's alpha for this scale was .86 in the present study, similar to the internal consistency of the scale (.85) reported by

Quinn et al. (1971) Participants responded on five-point scales (1= rarely, 2= occasionally, 3= sometimes, 4= fairly often and 5= very often).

A single item asking about participants' attitudes toward their workload was also included (Do you think it is important having high or low workload at workplace?). The correlation between this item and the whole workload scale was .16, $p < .01$.

Demographics

Participants were asked to indicate their gender, age, organizational and job tenure, the type of industry they are working in, their type of employment (permanent, contract), their schedule (full-time, part-time) and the number of hours worked per week (see Appendix H).

Results

Preliminary Analyses

The data were checked for non-random missing data and for univariate and multivariate outliers in two separate phases because some respondents completed only the first and second scales. In order not to lose power for the factor analysis of the person-organization fit scale and the person-job fit scale, the first phase of the preliminary analyses involved checks for missing data and for univariate and multivariate outliers for the 420 participants who completed the Person-Organization Fit Scale and for the 387 participants who completed the Person-Job Fit Scale.

For the 19-item Person-Organization Fit Scale, three participants were excluded because they were missing eight or more items. Missing values were replaced by the mean of the variables for all other scale items for the 12 participants missing one item, four participants missing two items, and one participant missing three items from the scale. The normality of each variable was also assessed. Four cases with extremely low z scores were univariate outliers ($|z| \geq 3$) and seventeen other cases were identified through Mahalanobis distance as multivariate outliers with $p < .001$. After deleting the 24 outliers, there were 396 remaining cases in the Person-Organization Fit Scale.

For the 20-item Person-Job Fit Scale, two participants were excluded because they were missing 14 or more items. For the 13 participants missing one item and three participants missing two items from the scale, the missing values were also replaced by the mean of the variable for all other scale items for that respondent. Five cases with extremely low z scores were univariate outliers ($|z| \geq 3$) and 25 other cases were identified

through Mahalanobis distance as multivariate outliers with $p < .001$. There were 355 cases remaining for the Person-Job Fit Scale after deleting the 32 outliers.

The second phase of the checks for missing data and for univariate and multivariate outliers was conducted with the 383 participants who had completed all the scales in the survey. Because the numbers of completed scales were different for each of the scale, total numbers of responses for each of the scales were different. Four hundred and twenty participants completed person-organization fit scale, 387 participant completed person-job fit scale, however only 383 participants completed all of the scales in the survey. Because the outliers analysis were done separately in each phase, numbers of outliers excluded from the data were also different for each data set.

Sixteen participants were left in the sample even though they had more than 5% missing items; these items were coded as missing variables. Cases with fewer than 5% missing data from a scale were replaced by the mean of the variables for all other scale items for that respondent. The normality of each variable was also assessed. Thirteen cases with extremely low z scores were univariate outliers and six other cases were identified through Mahalanobis distance as multivariate outliers with $p < .001$. After deleting the 19 outliers, there were 364 remaining cases in the data set.

Because the outlier analyses were done separately for each of three response sets, the numbers of outliers excluded from the whole data set were less than the numbers of outliers excluded from the person-job fit scale response set. Therefore, after the missing data and outliers analyses, the total sample was reduced to 396 for person organization fit scale, 355 for person-job fit scale and 364 for the full survey.

Zero-order correlations, means, standard deviations, and reliabilities of the scales are presented in Table 1. The inter-item correlations followed the expected pattern. There was a very high correlation between person-organization fit and person-job fit, $r = .90$, consistent with past research on fit (e.g., Kristof-Brown, Zimmerman, & Johnson, 2005; O'Reilly, Chatman, & Caldwell, 1991). There was a significant correlation of person-organization fit with positive affectivity, $r = .52, p < .01$, and with negative affectivity, $r = -.36, p < .01$; similarly person-job fit was correlated with positive affectivity, $r = .51, p < .01$, and negative affectivity, $r = -.31, p < .01$. People who scored high in positive affectivity tended to report better fit with both their organization and their job, whereas people who scored high in negative affectivity tended to believe they had worse fit with their organization and their job. Consistent with past research, person-organization fit and person-job fit were highly correlated with job satisfaction and perceived stress. Also there was a significant association between person-environment fit (organization and job) and life satisfaction, workplace flexibility, and workload.

The primary scale used in this research to measure positive and negative affectivity was the PANAS. The BIS/BAS scale was used as an added check of the association between positive and negative affectivity and person-environment fit as there were high correlations between BIS and positive affectivity and the BAS subscales and negative affectivity.

Table 1

Correlations, Means, Standard Deviations and Reliabilities

	Person- organization fit	Person- job fit	Positive affectivity	Negative affectivity	BIS	BAS reward responsiveness	BAS drive	BAS fun seeking	Job satisfaction	Life satisfaction	Perceived stress	Workplace flexibility	Workload
Person- organization fit	(.89)												
Person-job fit	.90***	(.89)											
Positive affectivity	.52**	.51**	(.92)										
Negative affectivity	-.36**	-.31**	-.22**	(.90)									
BIS	-.12**	-.15**	-.22**	.32**	(.67)								
BAS reward responsiveness	.18**	.23**	.27**	-.12*	.08	(.83)							
BAS drive	.20**	.24**	.31**	-.12*	-.11**	.41**	(.84)						
BAS fun seeking	.10	.11*	.19**	-.03	-.06	.28**	.35**	(.76)					
Job satisfaction	.64**	.66**	.50**	-.37**	-.15**	.21**	.13*	.01	(.85)				
Life satisfaction	.40**	.40**	.44**	-.32**	-.13**	.12*	.21**	.16**	.42**	(.88)			
Perceived stress	-.28**	-.31**	-.31**	.53**	.45**	-.13*	-.14**	.00	-.38**	-.48**	(.85)		
Workplace flexibility	.16**	.13*	.09	-.01	-.01	.07	.03	.05	.25**	.12*	-.05	(.82)	
Workload	.11*	.11*	.24**	.06	-.06	.21**	.20**	.16**	-.00	.09	.07	-.06	(.86)
<i>M</i>	3.67	3.76	3.45	1.64	2.42	3.31	2.76	2.73	3.67	3.47	2.60	3.18	3.31
<i>(SD)</i>	(.56)	(.55)	(.80)	(.64)	(.40)	(.47)	(.60)	(.55)	(.80)	(.82)	(.51)	(.97)	(.90)
<i>N</i>	364	361	364	364	351	356	355	356	354	358	349	352	355

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

Note. Scale reliabilities are listed in the diagonal.

Comparisons between the two samples

Data were collected from two different samples (snowball sampling versus the Study Response project); therefore a series of t-tests was run to explore whether there were significant differences between the groups for person-organization fit, person-job fit, positive and negative affectivity, sensitivity to signals of punishment or reward, job satisfaction, life satisfaction, perceived stress, workplace flexibility, and workload. There were significant differences between the two groups for person-organization and person-job fit as well as negative affectivity, sensitivity to punishment and reward, and workplace flexibility; however, when the Bonferroni correction for multiple tests was used, there were significant differences between the two groups only for the BIS scale, the BAS drive subscale, and workplace flexibility (see Table 2 for means, standard deviations, and t-tests by sample).

Respondents in the snowball sample were significantly more sensitive to anxiety-provoking stimuli compared to respondents in the Study Response sample, whereas respondents in the Study Response group were more persistent in reaching their goals compared to the respondents in the snowball group. Participants in the snowball sample were more likely to report greater workplace flexibility scores, which could be due to differences between participants' country of employment. The people from the snowball sample were mostly working in organizations in Canada, whereas the people in the Study Response group were working in U.S.-based organizations. Thus, sample was controlled in subsequent analyses using BIS, BAS-drive, and flexibility.

Table 2

Means, Standard Deviations, and Independent Samples t-tests by Sample

Variable	Snowball	Study Response	<i>t</i>	Bonferroni Correction
	<i>M</i> (<i>SD</i>)	<i>M</i> (<i>SD</i>)		
Person-organization fit	3.60 (.55)	3.74 (.56)	-2.51*	-2.51
Person-job fit	3.69 (.56)	3.82 (.55)	-2.39*	-2.39
Positive affectivity	3.49 (.77)	3.41 (.83)	0.97	0.97
Negative affectivity	1.71 (.54)	1.57 (.72)	2.25*	2.25
BIS	2.48 (.37)	2.36 (.43)	2.79**	2.79 ¹
BAS reward responsiveness	3.37 (.44)	3.26 (.49)	2.45*	2.45
BAS drive	2.67 (.58)	2.84 (.60)	-2.70**	-2.70 ¹
BAS fun	2.72 (.54)	2.73 (.56)	-0.14	-0.14
Life satisfaction	3.54 (.75)	3.42 (.88)	1.39	1.39
Job satisfaction	3.72 (.77)	3.63 (.83)	1.10	1.10
Perceived stress	2.59 (.48)	2.60 (.54)	-0.23	-0.23
Workplace flexibility	3.45 (.92)	2.93 (.95)	5.10***	5.10 ¹
Workload	3.41 (.87)	3.22 (.92)	1.94	1.94

Snowball *n* = 175; Study Response *n* = 189.**p* < .05. ***p* < .01. ****p* < .001.¹Bonferroni *p* < .004.*Demographic Differences*

A series of independent sample *t*-tests was computed to check whether there were gender differences for any of the main variables (i.e., person-organization fit, person-job fit, positive affectivity, negative affectivity, BIS/BAS, job satisfaction, life satisfaction, perceived stress, workplace flexibility, workload). There were significant differences between males and females for BIS, and the reward subfactor of BAS scale (see Table 3 for means and standard deviations of the variables by gender), but after the Bonferroni correction was taken into account (because there were more than two *t*-tests), there was a

significant difference between males and females only for BAS reward responsiveness -- females tended to report more positive responses to the occurrence or anticipation of reward as compared to males which is consistent with Carver and White (1994).

Therefore, gender was controlled in subsequent analyses related to BIS/BAS scale.

A series of t-tests was computed to examine whether there were differences according to employment type [i.e., permanent, and other (contract/temporary, or casual)] for person-organization fit, person-job fit, positive affectivity, negative affectivity, sensitivity to signals of punishment or reward, job satisfaction, life satisfaction, stress, workplace flexibility, and workload (see Table 4 for means and standard deviations of the research variables by employment type). Because the number of permanent employees was considerably greater than other employees, the contract, temporary, and casual employees were analyzed as a single group. Although group sizes were not equal, Levene's test was not significant indicating that group variances were homogeneous. Significant group differences were found only for negative affectivity and workload; however, when the Bonferroni correction for multiple tests was used, no differences were found between scores of participants in terms of employment type; therefore, employment type was not used as a control variable in subsequent analyses.

Table 3

Means, Standard Deviations, and Independent Samples t-test by Gender

	Female	Male		
Variable	<i>M</i> (<i>SD</i>)	<i>M</i> (<i>SD</i>)	<i>t</i>	Bonferroni Correction
Person-organization fit	3.66 (.54)	3.71 (.60)	.91	.91
Person-job fit	3.74 (.54)	3.80 (.58)	1.04	1.04
Positive affectivity	3.48 (.78)	3.39 (.82)	-.96	-.96
Negative affectivity	1.61 (.57)	1.66 (.72)	.78	.78
BIS	2.45 (.42)	2.36 (.37)	-2.03*	-2.03
BAS reward responsiveness	3.38 (.48)	3.22 (.44)	-3.25***	-3.25 ¹
BAS drive	2.79 (.62)	2.70 (.57)	-1.37	-1.37
BAS fun seeking	2.70 (.54)	2.76 (.55)	1.05	1.05
Job satisfaction	3.69 (.78)	3.63 (.82)	-.66	-.66
Life satisfaction	3.45 (.78)	3.48 (.87)	.31	.31
Perceived stress	2.59 (.50)	2.61 (.53)	.38	.38
Workplace flexibility	3.16 (1.03)	3.20 (.87)	.41	.41
Workload	3.35 (.94)	3.25 (.86)	-1.05	-1.05

Female *n* = 204; Male *n* = 142.**p* < .05. ***p* < .01. ****p* < .001.¹Bonferroni *p* < .004.

Table 4

Means, Standard Deviations, and Independent Samples t-test by Employment Type

Employment type	Permanent <i>M</i> (<i>SD</i>)	Contract/Temporary/Casual <i>M</i> (<i>SD</i>)	<i>t</i>
Person-organization fit	3.70 (.57)	3.58 (.54)	1.52
Person-job fit	3.78 (.57)	3.70 (.50)	.98
Positive affectivity	3.43 (.80)	3.47 (.78)	-.32
Negative affectivity	1.59 (.63)	1.80 (.63)	-2.48*
BIS	2.40 (.41)	2.51 (.33)	-1.95
BAS reward responsiveness	3.29 (.47)	3.40 (.46)	-1.71
BAS drive	2.72 (.59)	2.88 (.63)	-1.94
BAS fun seeking	2.71 (.54)	2.74 (.57)	-.37
Job satisfaction	3.65 (.82)	3.73 (.72)	-.77
Life satisfaction	3.49 (.81)	3.38 (.85)	.92
Perceived stress	2.58 (.51)	2.67 (.53)	-1.29
Workplace flexibility	3.13 (.95)	3.37 (1.03)	-1.77
Workload	3.37* (.89)	3.03 (.96)	2.74**

Permanent $n = 288$; Other $n = 63$ * $p < .05$. ** $p < .01$.Bonferroni $p < .004$.

A final series of t-tests was computed to examine whether there were differences between full-time and part-time employees on person-organization fit, person-job fit, positive-negative affectivity, sensitivity to signals of punishment or reward, job satisfaction, life satisfaction, stress, workplace flexibility, and workload. Even when the Bonferroni correction for multiple tests was used, there remained a significant difference for workload between full-time and part-time employees, such that employees who

worked full-time reported a higher workload ($M = 3.38$, $SD = .89$) compared to part-time employees ($M = 2.91$, $SD = .92$), $t(350) = -3.35$, $p < .001$. There were no other differences between full-time and part-time employees on the study variables (see Table 5).

In sum, the preliminary analyses revealed a few between-groups differences that needed to be taken into account. Specifically, sample (snowball vs Study Response) and gender were controlled in analyses involving BIS/BAS, and sample (snowball vs Study Response) was controlled in analyses involving workplace flexibility. There were only 49 respondents who were working part-time. Because the number of part-time employees was very low, there was less confidence in the results of this comparison, therefore working part-time/full-time was not controlled in the subsequent analyses.

Table 5

Means, Standard Deviations, and Independent Samples t-tests by Part-time and Full-time

Variable	Part-time	Full-time	<i>t</i>
	<i>M</i> (<i>SD</i>)	<i>M</i> (<i>SD</i>)	
Person-organization fit	3.66 (.53)	3.67 (.57)	-.26
Person-job fit	3.71 (.54)	3.77 (.56)	-.73
Positive affectivity	3.46 (.85)	3.44 (.79)	.21
Negative affectivity	1.69 (.69)	1.61 (.62)	.75
BIS	2.46 (.39)	2.41 (.40)	.77
BAS reward responsiveness	3.35 (.41)	3.30 (.47)	.73
BAS drive	2.76 (.59)	2.75 (.59)	.08
BAS fun	2.69 (.45)	2.73 (.56)	-.53
Life satisfaction	3.35 (.89)	3.48 (.81)	-1.05
Job satisfaction	3.78 (.74)	3.65 (.81)	1.09
Perceived stress	2.54 (.51)	2.61 (.51)	-.77
Workplace flexibility	3.31 (1.01)	3.15 (.96)	1.05
Workload	2.91 (.92)	3.37 (.89)	-3.35***

Part time *n* = 49; Full time *n* = 302****p* < .001.*Principal Components Analysis for the Person-Organization Fit Items*

To test Hypothesis 1a, that person-organization fit would be composed of four components (supplementary, complementary, needs-supplies, demands-abilities), a principal components analysis (PCA) with varimax rotation was conducted. PCA is a method of simplifying a group of observed variables into a set of components most likely to form the constructs of interest (Tabachnick & Fidell, 2007), which was considered to be best for the present study given that the 19 items hypothesized to form the dimensions have not been included in a single questionnaire to date.

There were a large number of correlations (45%) greater than .30 between the 19 person-organization fit items, thus verifying there was enough association among the items to warrant using principal component analysis. Further, the Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin, a measure of sampling adequacy, had a value of .90, substantially higher than the .60 level that is considered as a good value for analysis (Tabachnick & Fidell, 2007). Although the components in a principal components analyses are assumed to be uncorrelated, the next step was to check the component correlation matrix (see Table 6), which showed that, with the exception of one correlation between components, the correlations did not exceed .32, therefore an orthogonal rotation was warranted (Tabachnick & Fidell, 2007).

Table 6

<i>Component Correlation Matrix</i>			
Component	1	2	3
2	.13		
3	.44	.21	
4	-.32	-.20	-.27

The PCA (varimax rotation; Eigenvalues ≥ 1) resulted in a solution with four components (see Table 7), explaining 68.5% of the total variance. In general, items with a loading of .32 are considered acceptable for retention on a component; however, according to Comrey and Lee (1992) loadings greater than .45 are considered as fair as they have 20% overlapping variance. Based on the more stringent .45 cutoff criterion, there were six items with loadings on two components. The items in the second component generally asked respondents about whether their difference from others in the organization made them important for their organization, whereas the items in the third

component asked about respondents' general beliefs regarding the fit with their organization. Although items 12 and 13 loaded on second factor, as expected, they had higher loadings on the third factor; thus, these items did not have face validity and they were removed from the *Person-Organization Fit Scale*.

Table 7

Factor Loadings of the 19 Person-Organization Fit Items on Four Components

Items	1	2	3	4
1 I feel my values "match" or fit this organization and the current employees in this organization.	.85	.07	.13	.17
2 I think the values and personality of this organization reflect my own values and personality.	.89	.11	.10	.04
3 The values of this organization are similar to my own values.	.88	.10	-.00	.09
4 My values match those of current employees in this organization.	.73	.16	-.03	.08
5 I feel my personality matches the "personality" or image of this organization.	.71	.14	.20	.16
6 I feel that I am important to this company because I have such different skills and abilities than my co-workers.	.10	.74	-.01	.13
7 My co-workers rely on me because I have competencies that they do not have.	.04	.74	-.08	.04
8 When key decisions are made, my co-workers consult me because I have a different perspective than they do.	.12	.69	.09	.09
9 I feel like I stand out in this organization.	.01	.75	.16	.05
10 My knowledge, skills, and abilities offer something that other employees in this organization do not have.	.02	.82	-.05	.12
11 I feel that I am a unique piece of the puzzle that makes this organization work.	.17	.71	.28	-.01
*12 Even though my personality differs from my co-workers, it seems to complement their personalities.	.09	.47	.50	.13
*13 People in my organization seem to value that I am different from the 'typical'.	-.03	.53	.59	-.04
14 I feel that this organization enables me to do the kind of work I want to do.	.53	.07	.60	.23
15 This organization measure up the kind of organization I was seeking.	.68	-.10	.54	.19
16 This organization is a good match for me.	.67	-.04	.54	.27
17 This organization fulfills my needs.	.62	-.03	.58	.16
18 I think I possess the skills and abilities to succeed at this organization.	.21	.17	.16	.86
19 I believe my skills and abilities match those required by this organization in general.	.28	.18	.08	.84

*these items were excluded from the final analysis.

After deleting items 12 and 13, a second PCA (varimax rotation; Eigenvalues ≥ 1) was conducted with the remaining 17 items to determine whether they would load on four components; however this PCA resulted in a solution with three components (see Table 8), explaining 66.3% of the total variance. Although four items (14, 15, 16, 17) were expected to form a single component assessing general feelings regarding the congruence between respondents and their organizations and their beliefs about general fit with their

organization, these items loaded on the first component, which asked about beliefs regarding the congruence between the values/personalities of the respondents and the organization's values and the personalities of others working in the same organization.

Table 8

Factor Loadings of the 17 Person-Organization Fit Items on Three Components

Items	1	2	3
1 I feel my values "match" or fit this organization and the current employees in this organization.	.85	.08	.12
2 I think the values and personality of this organization reflect my own values and personality.	.88	.12	-.01
3 The values of this organization are similar to my own values.	.84	.11	.01
4 My values match those of current employees in this organization.	.70	.16	-.01
5 I feel my personality matches the "personality" or image of this organization.	.73	.15	.16
6 I feel that I am important to this company because I have such different skills and abilities than my co-workers.	.08	.76	.11
7 My co-workers rely on me because I have competencies that they do not have.	-.00	.81	.00
8 When key decisions are made, my co-workers consult me because I have a different perspective than they do.	.13	.70	.10
9 I feel like I stand out in this organization.	.04	.76	.10
10 My knowledge, skills, and abilities offer something that other employees in this organization do not have.	-.01	.83	.09
11 I feel that I am a unique piece of the puzzle that makes this organization work.	.23	.72	.06
14 I feel that this organization enables me to do the kind of work I want to do.	.67	.10	.38
15 This organization measure up the kind of organization I was seeking.	.80	-.07	.31
16 This organization is a good match for me.	.78	-.01	.40
17 This organization fulfills my needs.	.75	.01	.31
18 I think I possess the skills and abilities to succeed at this organization.	.23	.18	.84
19 I believe my skills and abilities match those required by this organization in general.	.27	.19	.79

Based on the scree plot (see Figure 2), three components were clearly separated from the others, but a fourth component also appeared to be viable, indicating the possibility of a 4-component solution. Because of the uncertain results of the PCA using the criterion of eigenvalues greater than 1, a third PCA was conducted, also with varimax rotation, but this time forcing a four-component solution, which explained 72% of the total variance and on which all items had loadings of .61 or greater with no cross-loading. Based on these results, it was determined that the four-component solution was an

improvement on the three-component solution and therefore the four-component solution was retained (see Table 9).

Figure 2. Scree Plot for PCA on the 19 Person-Organization Fit Items

Past research has typically used different terms for perceptions of person-environment fit that have been overlapping or vague; therefore, the components in the present research were given slightly different names in order to describe and differentiate them more clearly. The first component comprised 6 items measuring *integrative congruence* (Cronbach's $\alpha = .87$). In this subscale, individuals indicated whether they perceive themselves as having different characteristics than their environment which enables them to complete something missing in the environment that also makes them important for the organization. A typical statement is "*I feel that I am important to this company, because I have such different skills and abilities than my co-workers.*"

The second component had 5 items (Cronbach's $\alpha = .90$) measuring *value and personality congruence*. Respondents indicated how much they think their values and personalities match with their organization by responding positively to statements such as: "*I feel my values "match" or fit this organization and the current employees in this organization*" and "*I feel my personality matches the "personality" or image of this organization.*"

The third component measured *general congruence* of an individual with his or her organization. Respondents indicated how much they agreed or disagreed with statements such as: "*I feel that this organization enables me to do the kind of work I want to do*" and "*This organization is a good match for me.*" This component comprised 4 items (Cronbach's $\alpha = .92$).

The fourth and final component comprised two items that measured *ability congruence* of the participants with their organizational demands (Cronbach's $\alpha = .81$). Respondents indicated how much their skills and abilities are congruent with their

organizational requirements by responding statements such as: “*I believe my skills and abilities match those required by this organization in general.*”

In sum, the internal reliability of the overall person-organization fit scale was good (Cronbach’s $\alpha = .90$). Moreover, it was expected that person-organization fit would consist of four components, and indeed, 17 items separated into four groups that have strong face validity. Only two items in the scale did not fit well with the other items and were excluded from the scale. The four components did not have complete overlap with past person-organization fit components and therefore were renamed in accordance to the current structure. The final correlations between components are in Table 10.

Table 9

Factor Loadings for the PCA on the 17 Retained Person-Organization Fit Items with Forced Four Factors

Component	Item	1	2	3	4
Integrative congruence	6 I feel that I am important to this company because I have such different skills and abilities than my co-workers.	.76	.04	.08	.13
	7 My co-workers rely on me because I have competencies that they do not have.	.80	.04	-.03	.03
	8 When key decisions are made, my co-workers consult me because I have a different perspective than they do.	.71	.06	.11	.07
	9 I feel like I stand out in this organization.	.77	.10	.03	.07
	10 My knowledge, skills, and abilities offer something that other employees in this organization do not have.	.80	.11	-.10	.15
	11 I feel that I am a unique piece of the puzzle that makes this organization work.	.73	.17	.23	.02
Value and Personality congruence	1 I feel my values "match" or fit this organization and the current employees in this organization.	.07	.79	.37	.17
	2 I think the values and personality of this organization reflect my own values and personality.	.10	.83	.35	.06
	3 The values of this organization are similar to my own values.	.09	.85	.26	.12
	4 My values match those of current employees in this organization.	.16	.71	.18	.09
	5 I feel my personality matches the "personality" or image of this organization.	.16	.58	.43	.17
General congruence	14 I feel that this organization enables me to do the kind of work I want to do.	.16	.29	.79	.16
	15 This organization measure up the kind of organization I was seeking.	-.02	.41	.80	.14
	16 This organization is a good match for me.	.05	.35	.83	.22
	17 This organization fulfills my needs.	.06	.31	.85	.10
Ability congruence	18 I think I possess the skills and abilities to succeed at this organization.	.18	.15	.23	.86
	19 I believe my skills and abilities match those required by this organization in general.	.17	.21	.19	.86
Percent of variance explained		21.4	21.1	19.5	9.9
Cumulative variance		21.4	42.5	62.1	72

Table 10

Component Correlation Matrix of the Final Person-Organization Fit Scale

Component	Integrative congruence	Value & personality congruence	General congruence
Value & personality congruence	.28		
General congruence	.15	.38	
Ability congruence	.29	.65	.42

Principal Components Analysis for the Person-Job Fit Items

To test Hypothesis 1b that person-job fit would be composed of four components, a principal components analysis (PCA) with varimax rotation was conducted. Based on the results from the person-organization fit items, items 12 and 13 for the person-job fit items were excluded from the analyses because these items were likely not very clear to the respondents. Forty-six percent of the correlations were greater than .30 and the Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin was .92, indicating that these data were acceptable for a PCA. The component correlation matrix indicated that with the exception of one correlation between components, the correlations did not exceed .32; therefore an orthogonal rotation was warranted (Tabachnick & Fidell, 2007).

The PCA (varimax rotation; Eigenvalues >1) for the remaining 18 person-job fit items resulted in a solution with four components, explaining 71.9% of the total variance. All items loaded on the expected components with loadings of .52 or greater. The reliability analyses indicated that one of the components had a low Cronbach's alpha of .53; but when one item ("My job performance is hurt by a lack of expertise on the job" the item that was developed in the present study for the Person-Job fit scale), was excluded from this component, the Cronbach's alpha increased to .72. Thus, this item was

excluded from subsequent analyses in order to improve the reliability of the scale and to ensure consistency between the person-organization fit scale and the person-job fit scale.

The PCA (varimax rotation; Eigenvalues >1) for the 17 person-job fit items resulted in a solution with three components, explaining 68.4 % of the total variance (see Table 11). Although four items (14, 15,16,17) were expected to form a single component about general feelings and beliefs regarding general fit between the respondents and their jobs, these items all loaded with the items on the first component, which asked about beliefs regarding the congruence between respondent's values-personalities and job values. Consequently, these two groups of items seem to assess different, but related, features of person-job fit. Moreover, based on the scree plot (see Figure 3), three components were clearly separated from the others, but also a fourth component also seemed viable.

Thus, a third PCA (varimax rotation; forced four factors) was conducted with the person-job fit items, which resulted in a four-component solution (see Table 12), explaining 74% of the total variance and with all items loading at .53 or greater with no cross-loading. The internal reliability of the overall scale was good (Cronbach's $\alpha = .91$).

Consistent with the treatment of the Person-Organization Fit Scale, the components for the Person-Job fit scale were renamed in order to make the distinction between different types of fit perceptions clear. The first component comprised 6 items measuring *integrative congruence* (Cronbach's $\alpha = .90$). In this subscale individuals indicated whether they perceived themselves as having different characteristics than their environment which enables them to do their job better or easier than other employees doing the same job. An example of integrative congruence is "My coworkers rely on me doing this job because I have competencies that they do not have."

The second component had 5 items (Cronbach's $\alpha = .88$) measuring *value and personality congruence*. Respondents indicated how much they think their values and personalities match their job by responding to statements such as "*I think the values and personality of my job reflect my own values and personality*" and "*The values of this job are similar to my own values.*"

The third component measured *general congruence* of respondents with their jobs. Respondents indicated how much they agreed or disagreed with statements such as "*This job is a good match for me*" and "*This job fulfills my needs.*" This component comprised 4 items (Cronbach's $\alpha = .94$).

The fourth and final component comprised 2 items that measured ability congruence of the participants with their jobs' demands (Cronbach's $\alpha = .72$). Respondents indicated how much their skills and abilities are congruent with their job requirements such as "*I believe my skills and abilities match those required by the job*".

Table 11

Factor Loadings of the 17 Person-Job Fit Items on Three Components

Items	1	2	3
1 I feel my values "match" or fit this job and the current employees doing the same job.	.74	.14	.01
2 I think the values and personality of my job reflect my own values and personality.	.80	.20	.10
3 The values of this job are similar to my own values.	.72	.14	-.23
4 My values match those of current employees doing the same job with me.	.82	.14	.06
5 I feel my personality matches the "personality" or image of this job.	.69	.25	.27
6 I feel that I am important to this job because I have such different skills and abilities than my co-workers doing the same job.	.14	.79	.19
7 My co-workers rely on me doing this job because I have competencies that they do not have.	.04	.85	.10
8 When key decisions are made, my co-workers consult me because I have a different perspective than they do.	.15	.80	.00
9 I feel like I stand out in this job.	.15	.77	.11
10 My knowledge, skills, and abilities offer something that other employees doing my job does not have.	.02	.85	.14
11 I feel that I am a unique piece of the puzzle that makes this job work.	.24	.77	.05
14 I feel that this job enables me to do the kind of work I want to do.	.80	.11	.30
15 This job measures up the kind of job I was seeking.	.81	.00	.30
16 This job is a good match for me.	.81	.07	.37
17 This job fulfills my needs.	.79	.06	.29
18 I believe my skills and abilities match those required by the job.	.37	.18	.76
20 I possess the skills and abilities to perform the job.	.16	.22	.77

Figure 3. Scree Plot for PCA on the 17 Person-Job Fit Items

Table 12

Factor Loadings for the PCA on the 17 Retained Person-Job Fit Items with Forced Four Components

Component	Item	1	2	3	4
Integrative congruence	6 I feel that I am important to this job because I have such different skills and abilities than my co-workers doing the same job.	.78	.07	.14	.22
	7 My co-workers rely on me doing this job because I have competencies that they do not have.	.85	.03	.03	.09
	8 When key decisions are made, my co-workers consult me because I have a different perspective than they do.	.80	.08	.13	-.00
	9 I feel like I stand out in this job.	.79	.21	.01	.03
	10 My knowledge, skills, and abilities offer something that other employees doing my job does not have.	.85	.02	.02	.14
	11 I feel that I am a unique piece of the puzzle that makes this job work.	.76	.11	.23	.08
Value and Personality congruence	1 I feel my values "match" or fit this job and the current employees doing the same job.	.09	.29	.77	.18
	2 I think the values and personality of my job reflect my own values and personality.	.18	.50	.63	.15
	3 My values match those of current employees doing the same job with me.	.09	.20	.83	-.03
	4 The values of this job are similar to my own values.	.12	.50	.67	.12
	5 I feel my personality matches the "personality" or image of this job.	.22	.45	.53	.32
	14 I feel that this job enables me to do the kind of work I want to do.	.14	.82	.31	.14
General congruence	15 This job measures up the kind of job I was seeking.	.05	.89	.25	.09
	16 This job is a good match for me.	.11	.88	.26	.17
	17 This job fulfills my needs.	.10	.84	.28	.11
Ability congruence	18 I believe my skills and abilities match those required by the job.	.17	.43	.11	.73
	20 I possess the skills and abilities to perform the job.	.18	.08	.16	.88
Percent of variance explained		24.2	23.7	16.7	9.6
Cumulative variance		24.2	47.9	64.6	74.2

Table 13

Component Correlation Matrix of the Final Person-Job Fit Scale

Component	Integrative congruence	Value & personality congruence	General congruence
Value & personality congruence	.24		
General congruence	.20	.52	
Ability congruence	.29	.29	.40

Zero-order correlations of variables and reliabilities of the scales are presented in Table 14 in which all four subfactors of person-organization fit and person job fit were also included. As expected, equivalent subfactors (value and personality congruence, integrative congruence, general congruence, and ability congruence) of person-organization fit and person-job fit were moderately correlated. Moreover, a high correlation was observed between general congruence subfactors of person-environment fit and job satisfaction (.71 for person-organization fit and .74 for person-job fit). Because the subfactors of general congruence include items asking about fit with the organization and with the job in more general terms, the correlations with job satisfaction were higher than the other subfactors of fit. Moreover, all correlations between subfactors of person-organization fit and person-job fit were significantly correlated with positive affectivity and negative affectivity.

Table 14

Correlations and Reliabilities of Subfactors of Person-Organization and Person-Job Fit Scales

	P-O V & P cong	P-O Int. cong	P-O Gen. cong	P-O Ab. cong	P-J V&P cong	P-J Int. cong	P-J Gen. cong	P-J Ab. con	P-O fit	P-J fit
P-O V&P cong	(.89)									
P-O Int. cong	.22***	(.86)								
P-O Gen. cong	.74**	.14**	(.94)							
P-O Ab. Cong	.42**	.29**	.50**	(.81)						
P-J V&P cong	.76**	.24**	.74**	.47**	(.87)					
P-J Int. cong	.20**	.88**	.17**	.31**	.25**	(.89)				
P-J Gen. cong	.68**	.16**	.87**	.45**	.71**	.18**	(.94)			
P-J Ab. Cong	.36**	.25**	.43**	.75**	.42**	.29**	.46**	(.73)		
P-O fit	.83**	.64**	.80**	.60**	.75**	.59**	.73**	.52**	(.89)	
P-J fit	.68**	.60**	.74**	.59**	.81**	.68**	.79**	.61**	.90***	(.89)
Positive affectivity	.40**	.32**	.45**	.36**	.39**	.35**	.42**	.33**	.52**	.51**
Negative affectivity	-.28**	-.19**	-.33**	-.30**	-.34**	-.14**	-.26**	-.20**	-.36**	-.31**
BIS	-.04	-.17**	-.03	-.12*	-.07	-.20**	-.05	.09	-.12**	-.15**
BAS	.09	.23**	.14**	.16**	.14**	.28**	.13*	.17**	.21**	.26**
Job satisfaction	.58**	.18**	.71**	.47**	.61**	.20**	.74**	.45**	.64**	.66**
Life satisfaction	.35**	.20**	.34**	.28**	.38**	.19**	.36**	.21**	.40**	.40**
Perceived stress	-.21**	-.12*	-.26**	-.33**	-.30**	-.15**	-.25**	-.26**	-.28**	-.31**
Workplace flexibility	.15**	.03	.18**	.15**	.12*	.01	.21**	.08	.16**	.13*
Workload	.02	.18**	.02	.13*	.01	.19**	-.02	.11*	.11*	.11*

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

V&P cong: Value and personality congruence; Int.cong: Integrative congruence; Gen. cong: General congruence; Ab. cong: Ability congruence

In sum, there were four clearly distinct components to person-environment fit, that although consistent with past research on supplementary, complementary, needs-supplies and demands-abilities fit, suggest that fit is related to value and personality congruence, ability congruence, integrative congruence, and overall congruence. Hence, by combining items that have measured various aspects of fit in isolation, in the present study it has been demonstrated that there are multiple facets of fit that can, and should, be assessed with a single scale. The factor analyses showed that both person-organization fit and person-job fit consisted of four separate components which expose perceptions about fit when evaluated together as a single score; hence, hypotheses 1a and 1b were supported.

Influence of Affectivity on Person-Environment Fit

In order to test the role of positive and negative affectivity on person-organization fit and person-job fit, a series of 2 x 2 factorial MANOVAs (positive affectivity: high/low X negative activity: high/low) were conducted. Because affectivity is a continuous variable, high and low groups were determined by using a median split. Positive affectivity scores higher and equal to 35 were coded as high positive affectivity, scores lower and equal to 34 were coded as low positive affectivity. Negative affectivity scores higher and equal to 15 were coded as high negative affectivity and scores lower and equal to 14 were coded as low negative affectivity. The first MANOVA used the overall person-organization fit and person-fit variables as outcomes; the second and third MANOVAs examined the role of affectivity on the subfactors for each of person-organization fit and person-job fit.

In support of our hypothesis, there were significant differences for person-environment fit perceptions based on level of positive affectivity, Wilks $\Lambda = .82$, $F(2,353) = 37.65$, $p < .001$, $\eta^2 = .176$. Follow-up univariate F tests showed that the main effect of positive affectivity was significant both for person-organization fit, $F(1) = 67.93$, $p < .001$, $\eta^2 = .161$, and for person-job fit, $F(1) = 72.43$, $p < .001$, $\eta^2 = .170$. Specifically, people who were high in positive affectivity reported significantly better person-organization fit ($M = 66.32$, $SD = 8.3$) relative to those who were low in positive affectivity ($M = 58.04$, $SD = 8.85$). Similarly, people who were high in positive affectivity reported better person-job fit ($M = 67.75$, $SD = 8.35$) compared to people low in positive affectivity ($M = 59.44$, $SD = 8.43$) providing supporting evidence for Hypothesis 5a.

There were also significant differences in person-environment fit perceptions for negative affectivity, Wilks $\Lambda = .86$, $F(2,353) = 29.12$, $p < .001$, $\eta^2 = .142$. According to follow-up univariate F tests, the main effect of negative affectivity was significant both for person-organization fit, $F(1) = 55.97$, $p < .001$, $\eta^2 = .137$, and for person-job fit, $F(1) = 32.31$, $p < .001$, $\eta^2 = .084$. Specifically, people low in negative affectivity reported better person-organization fit ($M = 66.38$, $SD = 8.1$) and better person-job fit ($M = 67.08$, $SD = 8.42$) relative to people high in negative affectivity ($M = 58.76$, $SD = 9.31$; $M = 60.88$, $SD = 9.21$, respectively) providing supporting evidence for Hypothesis 5b. In sum, as expected, more positive people tend to report better fit with their environment.

Because fit likely comprises four distinct components (value and personality congruence, integrative congruence, general congruence, and ability congruence) it was necessary to examine the effect of affectivity on each of these components for person-organization fit and for person-job fit. In the second 2 x 2 MANOVA (positive

affectivity: high/low X negative activity: high/low) on value and personality congruence, integrative congruence, general congruence, and ability congruence related to Person-Organization fit demonstrated a significant main effect for positive affectivity, Wilks $\Lambda = .82$, $F(4,354) = 19.61$, $p < .001$, $\eta^2 = .181$ and demonstrated a significant main effect for negative affectivity, Wilks $\Lambda = .86$, $F(4,354) = 13.96$, $p < .001$, $\eta^2 = .136$. According to follow-up univariate F tests, the main effect of positive affectivity was significant for value and personality congruence, $F(1) = 31.86$, $p < .001$, $\eta^2 = .082$, for integrative congruence, $F(1) = 15.24$, $p < .001$, $\eta^2 = .041$, for general congruence, $F(1) = 51.46$, $p < .001$, $\eta^2 = .126$, and for ability congruence, $F(1) = 39.42$, $p < .001$, $\eta^2 = .099$. Similarly, the main effect of negative affectivity was significant for value and personality congruence, $F(1) = 29.35$, $p < .001$, $\eta^2 = .076$, for integrative congruence, $F(1) = 20.04$, $p < .001$, $\eta^2 = .053$, for general congruence, $F(1) = 29.56$, $p < .001$, $\eta^2 = .076$, and for ability congruence, $F(1) = 20.01$, $p < .001$, $\eta^2 = .053$.

The third MANOVA (positive affectivity: high/low X negative activity: high/low) on value and personality congruence, integrative congruence, general congruence, and ability congruence related to Person-Job fit also demonstrated a significant main effect for level of positive affectivity, Wilks $\Lambda = .82$, $F(4,351) = 19.04$, $p < .001$, $\eta^2 = .178$ and demonstrated a significant main effect for negative affectivity, Wilks $\Lambda = .91$, $F(4,351) = 8.60$, $p < .001$, $\eta^2 = .089$. According to follow-up univariate F tests, the main effect of positive affectivity was significant for value and personality congruence, $F(1) = 32.37$, $p < .001$, $\eta^2 = .084$, for integrative congruence, $F(1) = 26.07$, $p < .001$, $\eta^2 = .069$, for general congruence, $F(1) = 47.48$, $p < .001$, $\eta^2 = .118$, and for ability congruence, $F(1) = 33.54$, $p < .001$, $\eta^2 = .087$. Moreover, the main effect of negative affectivity was significant for value and personality congruence, $F(1) = 26.74$, $p < .001$, $\eta^2 = .070$, for integrative

congruence, $F(1) = 10.94$, $p < .001$, $\eta^2 = .030$, for general congruence, $F(1) = 15.93$, $p < .001$, $\eta^2 = .043$, and for ability congruence, $F(1) = 6.20$, $p < .05$, $\eta^2 = .017$.

In conclusion high positive affectivity and low negative affectivity were related to reports of greater person-organization fit and person-job fit. Furthermore, high positive affectivity had a stronger association with integrative congruence in which people evaluate differences between their characteristics and characteristics of others in their environment. In addition, high positive affectivity had the weakest association with influence on ability congruence in which individuals indicated how much their skills and abilities are congruent with their organizational requirements or job requirements. Therefore, although affectivity does appear to be associated with how people perceive fit with their organization and job, affectivity may not be equally associated to the reports of fit at the level of the subfactors. As a result how a researcher conceptualizes person-environment fit may be critical especially when interpreting the results of the analyses. According to this, if person-environment fit perceptions are measured as a total score composed of four perspectives of fit, positive and negative affectivity would be more important on perceptions of fit than if person-environment fit perceptions are measured from one perspective, such as ability congruence. However, because affectivity is highly associated with fit perception, it should be included as a variable to take this into account.

Table 15

Source	<i>df</i> ₁	<i>df</i> ₂	<i>F</i>	η	<i>p</i>
Positive affectivity	4	354	19.61	.18	.00
Negative affectivity	4	354	13.96	.14	.00
Pos affect X Neg affect	4	354	1.62	.02	.17

Table 16

<i>Influence of Affectivity on Subfactors of Person-job fit</i>					
Source	<i>df</i>	<i>df2</i>	<i>F</i>	<i>η</i>	<i>p</i>
Positive affectivity	4	351	19.04	.18	.00
Negative affectivity	4	351	8.60	.09	.00
Pos affect X Neg affect	4	351	1.10	.01	.36

Influence of BIS and BAS on Person-Environment Fit

Although BIS/BAS was not a direct measure of positive and negative affectivity, these variables were significantly correlated, consistent with past research in which people with high BIS scores also had high negative affectivity scores and people with high BAS scores had high positive affectivity scores (Carver & White, 1994). Thus, it was hypothesized that people with high BIS (those who feel more anxiety in situations with cues of impending punishment) would have lower perceptions of person-organization fit and person-job fit. By contrast, people with high BAS scores, who are more sensitive to cues of reward, would have higher perceptions of person-organization fit and person-job fit compared to those with low BAS scores. In order to examine this question, two 2X2 MANCOVAs were conducted. Because the preliminary analyses revealed significant differences in BIS/BAS scores between the two samples (Study Response group and snowball sample group) and between male and female participants, sample and gender were controlled as appropriate. In the first MANCOVA, the first independent variable was BIS (high and low), the second independent variable was BAS (high and low), and gender was included as a control variable. As BIS/BAS is a continuous variable, high and low groups were determined by using a median split. For

BIS, scores higher and equal to 18 were coded as high BIS, scores lower and equal to 17 were coded as low BIS. For BAS scores higher and equal to 39 were coded as high BAS and scores lower and equal to 38 were coded as low BAS.

Before the analysis, the assumptions of the MANCOVA were tested.

Homogeneity of covariance was tested using Box's M procedure. As Box M's was not significant (at $p < .05$) the assumption of homogeneity had not been violated. The homogeneity of the regression slopes for the covariate was also tested by examining the interactions between gender and BIS/BAS scores in SPSS Multivariate analysis by using Custom approach. The analysis showed that the interaction effects were not significant; therefore the assumption of homogeneity of regression slopes of covariate was not violated.

With the use of Wilks' criterion, the combined DVs (person-organization fit and person-job fit) were not significantly related to the covariate (gender). Taking gender into account, the combined DVs were significantly related to BIS, approximate Wilks' $\lambda^2 = .98$, $F(2,344) = 4.35$, $p < .01$, $\eta^2 = .03$ with power of .75, and significantly related to BAS, approximate Wilks' $\lambda^2 = .93$, $F(2,344) = 12.13$, $p < .001$, $\eta^2 = .07$ with power of .99. Univariate ANOVAs for BIS were significant for person-organization fit, $F(1) = 7.9$, $p < .01$, $\eta^2 = .02$, and person-job fit, $F(1) = 8.5$, $p < .01$, $\eta^2 = .02$, and for BAS were significant for person-organization fit, $F(1) = 13.9$, $p < .001$, $\eta^2 = .04$, and for person-job fit, $F(1) = 22.8$, $p < .001$, $\eta^2 = .06$. In sum, people with high BIS had lower person-organization fit ($M = 61.13$, $SD = 9.59$) and person-job fit ($M = 62.53$, $SD = 9.5$) compared to people with low BIS (person-organization fit, $M = 64.03$, $SD = 9.59$; person-job fit, $M = 65.76$, $SD = 9.24$) and people with high BAS had higher person-organization fit ($M = 64.33$, $SD = 9.4$) and higher person-job fit ($M = 66.19$, $SD = 9.4$) compared to

people with low BAS (person-organization fit, $M = 61.06$, $SD = 9.37$; person-job fit $M = 61.76$, $SD = 8.85$).

In the second MANCOVA, sample was included as the control variable. Before conducting the analysis the assumptions were tested and no violations were identified. With the use of Wilks' criterion, the combined DVs (person-organization fit and person-job fit) were not significantly related to the covariate (sample). After controlling for sample, the combined DVs were significantly related to BIS, approximate Wilks' $\lambda^2 = .98$, $F(2,344) = 3.29$, $p < .05$, $\eta^2 = .02$ with power of .62, and significantly related to BAS, approximate Wilks' $\lambda^2 = .94$, $F(2,344) = 11.56$, $p < .001$, $\eta^2 = .06$ with power of .99. Univariate ANOVAs for BIS were significant for person-organization fit, $F(1) = 5.8$, $p < .05$, $\eta^2 = .02$, and person-job fit, $F(1) = 6.5$, $p < .05$, $\eta^2 = .02$, and for BAS were significant for person-organization fit, $F(1) = 12.9$, $p < .001$, $\eta^2 = .04$, and for person-job fit, $F(1) = 21.6$, $p < .001$, $\eta^2 = .06$.

Differences between Person-Organization Fit and Person-Job Fit in Predicting Individual Outcomes

In order to examine the differences between person-organization fit and person-job fit in predicting individual outcomes, three linear regression analyses regressing each of job satisfaction, life satisfaction, and perceived stress on person-organization fit and person-job fit were conducted (see Tables 17, 18, 19). According to that there were significant differences between the two types of person-environment fit perceptions in terms of predicting individual outcomes. As expected, both person-organization fit ($B = .11$) and person-job fit ($B = .19$) were significantly related to job satisfaction, $R^2 = .45$, $F(2, 349) = 142.01$, $p < .001$. Interestingly, person-organization fit, but not person-job fit was significantly related to life satisfaction $R^2 = .17$, $F(2, 353) = 35.51$, $p < .001$, whereas

person-job fit, but not person-organization fit, was related to perceived stress, $R^2 = .10$, $F(2, 344) = 18.41$, $p < .001$. Thus, good fit with one's job is related to less personal stress, and by contrast, good fit with one's organization is related to greater life satisfaction. Fit with both the organization and job is important for job satisfaction; hence, Hypothesis 2a was supported.

Table 17

Multiple Regression Analyses for Variables Predicting Job Satisfaction

Variable	<i>B</i>	<i>SE B</i>	β	sr^2
Person-organization fit	.11	.04	.26**	.03
Person-job fit	.19	.04	.43***	.06

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

Table 18

Multiple Regression Analyses for Variables Predicting Life Satisfaction

Variable	<i>B</i>	<i>SE B</i>	β	sr^2
Person-organization fit	.11	.05	.25*	.02
Person-job fit	.08	.05	.17	.01

* $p < .05$.

Table 19

Multiple Regression Analyses for Variables Predicting Perceived Stress

Variable	<i>B</i>	<i>SE B</i>	β	sr^2
Person-organization fit	-.02	.09	-.02	.00
Person-job fit	-.22	.09	-.29*	.02

* $p < .05$.

The four components for each of person-organization fit and person-job fit were also examined with series of linear regressions for the three individual outcomes (see regression tables in Appendix I). According to these regression analyses, only general congruence and ability congruence of person-organization fit were significantly related to

job satisfaction, $R^2 = .54$, $F(4,349) = 101.94$, $p < .001$, (general congruence $B = .64$; ability congruence $B = .54$), and perceived stress, $R^2 = .12$, $F(4,344) = 12.12$, $p < .001$, (general congruence $B = -.31$; ability congruence $B = -1.42$), whereas general congruence ($B = .17$), value and personality congruence ($B = .19$) and integrative congruence ($B = .11$) were significantly related to life satisfaction $R^2 = .16$, $F(4,353) = 17.37$, $p < .001$.

Regression analyses showed that for person-job fit, value-personality congruence ($B = .18$), general congruence ($B = .64$), and ability congruence ($B = .37$) significantly predicted job satisfaction, $R^2 = .58$, $F(4,347) = 118.12$, $p < .001$. All dimensions of fit except ability congruence were significantly related to life satisfaction, $R^2 = .17$, $F(4,351) = 18.08$, $p < .001$ (value-personality congruence $B = .29$; general congruence $B = .19$, integrative congruence $B = .09$). For perceived stress, only value-personality congruence ($B = -.41$) and ability congruence ($B = -.80$) were significant, $R^2 = .11$, $F(4,342) = 10.93$, $p < .001$.

This analysis indicates that different groups of subfactors explain individual outcomes (job satisfaction, life satisfaction, and perceived stress) for person-organization fit and person-job fit supporting the hypothesis that the relation between person-organization fit and person-job fit with individual outcomes (job satisfaction, life satisfaction, and perceived stress) would be different. For example, general congruence and ability congruence of person-organization fit together explained 54% of the variance in job satisfaction; by contrast, value and personality congruence combined with general congruence and ability congruence in person-job fit to explain 58% of the variance in job satisfaction. In addition, both for person-organization fit and person-job fit, the same three subfactors (value-personality congruence, general congruence, integrative congruence) were significantly related to life satisfaction.

Influence of Positive and Negative Affectivity on Job Satisfaction, Life Satisfaction, and Perceived Stress

As already demonstrated, positive and negative affectivity had a strong associations with perceptions of person-environment fit. In order to determine whether affectivity has a significant effect on individual outcomes, a 2 x 2 factorial MANOVA (positive affectivity: high vs. low; negative affectivity: high vs. low) on job satisfaction, life satisfaction, and perceived stress was run.

Consistent with past research (Brief et. al. 1988; Iverson et al., 1998), there were significant differences between people with high versus low levels of positive affectivity, Wilks' $\Lambda = .79$, $F(3,339) = 29.6$, $p < .001$, $\eta^2 = .21$, and for those with high versus low negative affectivity, Wilks' $\Lambda = .78$, $F(3,339) = 31.48$, $p < .001$, $\eta^2 = .22$. Follow up univariate F tests revealed main effects of positive affectivity for job satisfaction, $F(1) = 64.28$, $p < .001$, $\eta^2 = .16$, life satisfaction, $F(1) = 40.85$, $p < .001$, $\eta^2 = .11$, and perceived stress, $F(1) = 23.10$, $p < .001$, $\eta^2 = .06$. Specifically, people who were high on positive affectivity reported higher job satisfaction ($M = 19.94$, $SD = 3.2$), higher life satisfaction ($M = 18.73$, $SD = 3.3$), and lower perceived stress ($M = 34.14$, $SD = 6.4$) compared to people who were low on positive affectivity (job satisfaction: $M = 16.48$, $SD = 3.98$; life satisfaction: $M = 15.74$, $SD = 4.3$; perceived stress: $M = 38.65$, $SD = 7.1$). Similarly, the follow-up univariate F tests revealed main effects of negative affectivity for job satisfaction, $F(1) = 27.10$, $p < .001$, $\eta^2 = .07$, life satisfaction, $F(1) = 21.59$, $p < .001$, $\eta^2 = .06$, and perceived stress, $F(1) = 82.07$, $p < .001$, $\eta^2 = .19$. People who were low on negative affectivity reported significantly higher job satisfaction ($M = 19.59$, $SD = 3.2$) and life satisfaction ($M = 18.51$, $SD = 3.5$) and lower perceived stress ($M = 32.91$, $SD = 6.1$) compared to people who were high on negative affectivity (job satisfaction: M

=16.99, $SD = 4.2$; life satisfaction: $M = 16.11$, $SD = 4.2$; perceived stress: $M = 39.69$, $SD = 6.4$). Thus people who reported generally feeling more positive (and less negative) were also most likely to be more satisfied with their jobs and their lives and less stressed compared to those who were less positive (and more negative) in their daily lives supporting Hypotheses 5a, and 5b.

Person-Environment Fit (Organization & Job) as a Mediator between Affectivity and Individual Outcomes

It was hypothesized that perceptions of person-environment fit (organization and job) would mediate the relation between affectivity (positive and negative) and individual outcomes (job satisfaction, life satisfaction, stress), such that affectivity would have a direct influence on perceptions of fit and that fit would drive the specific work-related attitudes and outcomes. Because there are two kinds of affectivity (positive and negative) and two kinds of person-environment fit (person-organization and person-job), in order to test the hypothesis that the effect of affectivity on outcomes is through a sense of person-environment fit, twelve mediation analyses were conducted using Baron and Kenny's (1986) causal steps approach followed by the Sobel Test.

Mediation Effects of Person-Organization Fit

The first set of mediation analyses investigated the role of person-*organization* fit as a mediator between positive and negative affectivity and the three individual outcomes (job satisfaction, life satisfaction, stress); the first three analyses included positive affectivity as the independent variable and the second three analyses included negative affectivity as the independent variable (see Appendix J for the full tables).

The first test of mediation explored whether person-organization fit (the full scale) mediated the association of positive affectivity and job satisfaction. In the first step, it was established that positive affectivity was related to job satisfaction by regressing job satisfaction (the dependent variable) on positive affectivity (the independent variable) yielding the unstandardized regression coefficient of $B = .25$. In the second step, the mediator variable (person-organization fit) was regressed on the independent variable (positive affectivity) to obtain the regression coefficient for Path a in Figure 4, which was .52. In the third step, the dependent variable (job satisfaction) was regressed simultaneously on both the mediator (person-organization fit) and the independent variable (positive affectivity). The relation between positive affectivity and job satisfaction was still significant but smaller than without the mediator. According to Baron and Kenny's (1986) causal steps approach, all conditions were met suggesting there was mediation, which was then tested using the Sobel test using Preacher's electronic calculator (<http://www.people.ku.edu/~preacher/sobel/sobel.htm>). According to the Sobel test the observed z score was 8.23, which was significant at $p = .00$, indicating significant mediation effect. Therefore, person-organization fit partially mediated the relation between positive affectivity and job satisfaction.

Figure 4. Mediation model of person-organization fit between positive affectivity and job satisfaction.
 *** $p < .001$.

The second test of mediation explored whether person-organization fit (the full scale) mediated the association of positive affectivity and life satisfaction. In the first step, it was established that positive affectivity was related to life satisfaction by regressing life satisfaction (dependent variable) on positive affectivity (independent variable). In the second step, person-organization fit was regressed on positive affectivity and in the third step life satisfaction was regressed on both person-organization fit and positive affectivity (see Figure 5). The relation between positive affectivity and life satisfaction remained significant but smaller than without the mediator. According to the Sobel test, the observed z score was 4.23 which was significant at $p < .001$, indicating a significant partial mediation effect of person-organization fit between positive affectivity and life satisfaction.

Figure 5. Mediation model of person-organization fit between positive affectivity and life satisfaction. *** $p < .001$.

The third test of mediation explored whether person-organization fit (the full scale) mediated the association of positive affectivity and perceived stress by regressing dependent variable (perceived stress) on independent variable (positive affectivity). Following this, person-organization fit was regressed on positive affectivity and then perceived stress was regressed simultaneously on both person-organization fit and positive affectivity, which resulted in a significantly weaker association between positive

affective and perceived stress. Based on the Sobel test, the observed z score was -2.92 which was significant at $p < .001$, indicating a significant mediation effect of person-organization fit between positive affectivity and perceived stress.

Figure 6. Mediation model of person-organization fit between positive affectivity and perceived stress. *** $p < .001$.

The fourth mediation analysis was a test of whether person-organization fit would mediate the relation between negative affectivity and job satisfaction. First, job satisfaction was regressed on negative affectivity. In the second step, person-organization fit was regressed on negative affectivity to obtain the regression coefficient for Path a in Figure 7. In the third step, job satisfaction was regressed simultaneously on both person-organization fit and negative affectivity. The relation between negative affectivity and job satisfaction remained significant (path c'), although it was significantly smaller.

According to the Sobel test, the observed z score was -12.49, which was significant at $p = .00$, indicating a significant mediation effect of person-organization fit between negative affectivity and job satisfaction.

Figure 7. Mediation model of person-organization fit between negative affectivity and job satisfaction.
 $***p < .001$.

In the fifth mediation analysis, it was expected that person-organization fit would mediate the relation between negative affectivity and life satisfaction. In the first step, life satisfaction was regressed on negative affectivity. In the second step, person-organization fit was regressed on negative affectivity, and in the third step, life satisfaction was regressed simultaneously on both person-organization fit and negative affectivity. The relation between negative affectivity and life satisfaction was still significant (path c') but significantly smaller than the value in the first step. Based on the Sobel test, the observed z score was -6.9, which was significant at $p=.00$ indicating significant mediation effect of person-organization fit between negative affectivity and life satisfaction.

Figure 8. Mediation model of person-organization fit between negative affectivity and life satisfaction.
 $***p < .001$.

In the final mediation analysis exploring person-*organization* fit, the independent variable was negative affectivity and the dependent variable was perceived stress. Person-organization fit was regressed on negative affectivity to obtain the regression coefficient for Path a in Figure 9. According to this step, the coefficient associated with the relation between person-organization fit and perceived stress (controlling for negative affectivity) was not significant. Therefore, no mediation effect of person-organization fit was found for the influence of negative affectivity on perceived stress.

Figure 9. Mediation model of person-organization fit between negative affectivity and perceived stress. *** $p < .001$.

In sum, person-organization fit partially mediated the relation between positive affectivity and job satisfaction, life satisfaction and perceived stress. There was also a partial mediation effect of person-organization fit between negative affectivity and job satisfaction and life satisfaction; however there was no mediation effect for the relation between negative affectivity and perceived stress.

Mediation Effects of Person-Job Fit

In the following six mediation analyses person-*job* fit was investigated as a mediator between positive and negative affectivity and the three outcomes (job satisfaction, life satisfaction, stress). In the first three analyses positive affectivity was

included as the independent variable and in the last three analyses negative affectivity was included as the independent variable. See Appendix K for the full regression tables.

It was hypothesized that person-job fit would mediate the relation between positive affectivity and job satisfaction. The first step indicated a significant association between positive affectivity and job satisfaction ($\beta = .50$). In the second step, the mediator variable (person-job fit) was regressed on the independent variable (positive affectivity) to obtain the regression coefficient for Path a in Figure 10. In the third step, the dependent variable (job satisfaction) was regressed simultaneously on both the mediator (person-job fit) and the independent variable (positive affectivity). The relation between positive affectivity and job satisfaction remained significant (path c'), but was significantly smaller than the value in the first step ($\beta = .23$), which shows significant partial mediation. According to the Sobel test, the observed z score was 8.30, which was significant at $p = .00$, indicating significant mediation effect of person-organization between positive affectivity and job satisfaction.

Figure 10. Mediation model of person-job fit between positive affectivity and job satisfaction.
*** $p < .001$.

It was expected that person-job fit would mediate the relation between positive affectivity and life satisfaction. As noted in the second mediation analysis, there was a

significant association of positive affectivity and life satisfaction ($\beta = .44$). In the second step, person-job fit was regressed on the positive affectivity, and in the third step, life satisfaction was regressed simultaneously on both person-job fit and positive affectivity (see Figure 11). The relation between positive affectivity and life satisfaction was still significant (path c') but was significantly smaller than the value in the first step ($\beta = .33$). According to the Sobel test, the observed z score was 4.62, which was significant at $p < .001$ indicating a significant mediation effect of person-job fit between positive affectivity and life satisfaction.

Figure 11. Mediation model of person-job fit between positive affectivity and life satisfaction.

*** $p < .001$.

It was established in the third mediation analysis that positive affectivity was related to perceived stress ($\beta = -.31$). In the second step, person-job fit was regressed on positive affectivity to obtain the regression coefficient for Path a in Figure 12. In the third step, perceived stress was regressed simultaneously on both person-job fit and positive affectivity. The relation between positive affectivity and perceived stress remained significant (path c') but was lower than the value in the first step ($\beta = -.21$) which shows partial mediation effect of person-job fit between positive affectivity and perceived stress. According to the Sobel test, the observed z score was -3.79, which was significant at

$p < .001$ indicating a significant mediation effect of person-job fit between positive affectivity and perceived stress.

Figure 12. Mediation model of person-job fit between positive affectivity and perceived stress.
 $***p < .001$.

In the next analysis it was hypothesized that person-job fit would mediate the relation between negative affectivity and job satisfaction. The first step was significant, as noted in mediation analysis 4 ($\beta = -.37$). In the second step, person-job fit was regressed on negative affectivity to obtain the regression coefficient for Path a in Figure 13. In the third step, job satisfaction was regressed simultaneously on both person-job fit and negative affectivity. The relation between negative affectivity and job satisfaction was still significant (path c') but reduced relative to the value in the first step ($\beta = -.17$). According to the Sobel test, the observed z score was 12.99, which was significant at $p = .00$ indicating a significant partial mediation effect of person-job fit between negative affectivity and job satisfaction.

Figure 13. Mediation model of person-job fit between negative affectivity and job satisfaction.

*** $p < .001$.

The first step in the test of eleventh mediation of the effect of negative affectivity and life satisfaction was significant as per the fifth mediation test. In the second step, person-job fit was regressed on negative affectivity to obtain the regression coefficient for Path a in Figure 14. In the third step, life satisfaction was regressed simultaneously on both person-job fit and negative affectivity. The relation between negative affectivity and life satisfaction was still significant (path c') but significantly smaller than the value in the first step showing partial mediation effect. According to the Sobel test, the observed z score was 6.99, which was significant at $p=.00$, indicating a significant partial mediation effect of person-job fit between negative affectivity and life satisfaction.

Figure 14. Mediation model of person-job fit between negative affectivity and life satisfaction.

*** $p < .001$.

For the final test of mediation, it was hypothesized that person-job fit would mediate the relation between negative affectivity and perceived stress. As per the sixth mediation test, negative affectivity was significantly associated with stress. In the second step, person-job fit was regressed on negative affectivity to obtain the regression coefficient for Path a in Figure 15. In the third step, perceived stress was regressed simultaneously on both person-job fit and negative affectivity. The relation between negative affectivity and perceived stress remained significant (path c') but was smaller relative to the value in the first step. Based on the subsequent Sobel test, the observed z score was 2.73, which was significant at $p < .01$, indicating a significant partial mediation effect of person-job fit between negative affectivity and perceived stress.

Figure 15. Mediation model of person-job fit between negative affectivity and perceived stress
 *** $p < .001$.

In sum, person-job fit partially mediated the relation between both positive affectivity and negative affectivity and job satisfaction, life satisfaction, and perceived stress. Thus, there was clear support for the expectation that person-environment fit would partially mediate the relation between affectivity and individual outcomes (job satisfaction, life satisfaction, perceived stress). The only exception was for the role of person-organization fit as a mediator of negative affectivity on perceived stress.

Influence of Workload on Individual Outcomes

It was hypothesized that individuals who reported high workload would also report high job satisfaction, life satisfaction; and low perceived stress. However, the correlations between workload and job satisfaction, life satisfaction, and perceived stress were not significant (see Table 1), therefore no further analyses regarding the role of workload on individual outcomes were conducted and hypotheses 10a, 10b, 10c and 11 were rejected.

Influence of Workplace Flexibility on Individual Outcomes

Working in a flexible workplace would be expected to have positive influence on employees and increase reports of job satisfaction, life satisfaction, and lower stress. To test this hypothesis, a MANCOVA (using the three outcome variables in a single model) was conducted. Because there were significant differences between the Study Response group and the snowball sample in terms of reported workplace flexibility, sample was included as a covariate. Prior to conducting the main analysis, the assumptions of the MANCOVA were tested; the Box M's was not significant ($p < .05$) indicating that the assumption of homogeneity had not been violated. The homogeneity of the regression slopes for the covariate was tested for interactions between type of sample and workplace flexibility in SPSS Multivariate analysis by using Custom approach, which indicated that the interaction effect was not significant and the assumption of homogeneity of regression slopes of covariate was not violated. Based on the Wilks' criterion, the combined DVs (job satisfaction, life satisfaction, perceived stress) were not significantly related to the covariate (sample).

The results of the MANCOVA were significant, approximate Wilks' $\lambda^2 = .97$, $F(3,342) = 3.16$, $p < .05$, $\eta^2 = .03$ with power of .73; however, the follow-up univariate

ANOVAs indicated that workplace flexibility had a significant main effect for job satisfaction, $F(1) = 7.1, p < .01, \eta^2 = .02$, and life satisfaction, $F(1) = 3.9, p < .05, \eta^2 = .01$, but not for perceived stress, $F(1) = .16, p = .69, \eta^2 = .00$. Thus, people who reported greater workplace flexibility at their organization were also more likely to report greater life satisfaction ($M = 17.73, SD = 3.86$) and greater job satisfaction ($M = 18.82, SD = 3.64$) compared to people who reported lower workplace flexibility (life satisfaction: $M = 16.76, SD = 4.25$; job satisfaction: $M = 17.63, SD = 4.25$), whereas greater workplace flexibility had no effect on levels of reported stress. Hence, Hypothesis 8a and 8b were accepted but 8c was rejected.

Moderation Effect of Workplace Flexibility

The potential effect of workplace flexibility as a moderator of the association between person-environment fit (person-organization fit and person-job fit) and individual outcomes (job satisfaction, life satisfaction, perceived stress) was tested using a series of hierarchical multiple regression analyses. Since positive and negative affectivity were highly related to job satisfaction, life satisfaction, and stress, affectivity was included as a control variable in the moderation analyses.

As a first step positive affectivity was examined as to whether it had the same effect across all levels of the other variables. The results showed that the interaction term was not significant indicating that positive affectivity was a covariate. In the moderation analysis positive affectivity was controlled and the moderating effect of workplace flexibility on the effect of person-organization fit (total score) on job satisfaction was examined. The second step yielded a significant positive relation between person-organization fit and job satisfaction and between workplace flexibility and job

satisfaction, explaining 23% of the variance in job satisfaction, $F(3,347) = 104.34, p < .001$. In the third step, the two-way interaction of person-organization fit by workplace flexibility was entered, which explained an additional 1.4% of the variance in job satisfaction, $F(4,346) = 82.65, p < .001$. The interaction term of person-organization fit and workplace flexibility was significant ($B = -.45, SE = .15, p < .01$) providing supporting evidence for Hypothesis 9 (see Table 20).

Table 20

Moderator Effects of Workplace Flexibility for the Association of Person-Organization Fit and Job Satisfaction where Positive Affectivity was controlled

Step and Variable	B	SE B	95 % CI	β	R^2 change
Step 1					
Positive Affectivity (z score)	2.01	.19	1.65-2.38	.50***	.25***
Step 2					
Positive Affectivity (z score)	.91	.18	.55-1.27	.23***	
Person-organization fit (z score)	1.99	.18	1.64-2.35	.50***	
Workplace flexibility (z score)	.59	.16	.28-.89	.15***	.23***
Step 3					
Positive Affectivity (z score)	.91	.18	.55-1.27	.23***	
Person-organization fit (z score)	1.99	.18	1.64-2.35	.50***	
Workplace flexibility (z score)	.59	.16	.28-.89	.15***	
Person-organization fit X workplace Flexibility	-.45	.15	-.74- -.17	-.12**	.01**

CI = confidence interval

** $p < .01$. *** $p < .001$.

Negative affectivity was also examined as a covariate in the moderation analysis of workplace flexibility of person-organization fit and job satisfaction and, because the interaction term of negative affectivity across all levels of the other variables was not significant, there was support for negative affectivity as a covariate. Person-organization fit and workplace flexibility were entered in the second step and explained 32% of the

variance in job satisfaction, $F(3,347) = 97.77, p < .001$. In the third step the two-way interaction was entered, explaining an additional 1% of the variance in job satisfaction, $F(4,346) = 76.14, p < .001$. The interaction term of person-organization fit and workplace flexibility was significant, $B = -.38, SE = .15, p < .01$, providing supporting evidence for Hypothesis 9 (see Table 21).

Table 21

Moderator Effects of Workplace Flexibility for the Association of Person-Organization Fit and Job Satisfaction where the Negative Affectivity was controlled

Step and Variable	B	SE B	95 % CI	β	R^2 change
Step 1					
Negative Affectivity (z score)	-1.49	.20	-1.89- -1.09	-.37***	.14***
Step 2					
Negative Affectivity (z score)	-.63	.17	-.97- -.29	-.16***	
Person-organization fit (z score)	2.22	.17	1.88-2.56	.56***	
Workplace flexibility (z score)	.65	.16	.33-.96	.16***	.32***
Step 3					
Negative Affectivity (z score)	-.57	.17	-.91--.23	-.14***	
Person-organization fit (z score)	2.24	.17	1.90-2.58	.56***	
Workplace flexibility (z score)	.63	.16	.32-.94	.16***	
Person-organization fit X workplace Flexibility	-.38	.15	-.68- -.09	-.10*	.01*

CI = confidence interval

* $p < .05$. *** $p < .001$.

In order to understand the direction of the interaction, a simple slopes analysis was done using an online calculator (<http://people.ku.edu/~preacher/interact/hlm2.htm>).

According to the slopes analysis (see Figure 16) perceived person-organization fit has a greater effect on employees' job satisfaction when they have lower workplace flexibility.

A post-hoc analysis was done in order to examine whether the simple slopes were different from zero, which indicated that all three simple slopes for high workplace

flexibility, average workplace flexibility, and low workplace flexibility differed significantly from zero ($p = .00$) indicating differences between all three levels of workplace flexibility.

Figure 16. Moderation effect graphic of workplace flexibility for person-organization fit and job satisfaction.

Note. X=person-organization fit, Y= job satisfaction

CVz1(1) = high workplace flexibility CVz1(2) = average workplace flexibility

CVz1(3) = low workplace flexibility

In the next set of moderation analyses, workplace flexibility was examined in the association between person-organization fit and life satisfaction, controlling for positive affectivity and negative affectivity. In the first analysis where positive affectivity was a covariate in the model, the conditional effect of person-organization fit on life satisfaction was significant, $B = .92, p < .001$; however, the conditional effect of workplace flexibility on life satisfaction and the moderation effect were not significant. In the second analysis, negative affectivity was controlled and again the conditional effect of person-organization

fit on life satisfaction was significant, $B = 1.22$, $p < .001$; however, the conditional effect of workplace flexibility on life satisfaction and the moderation effect were not significant, thus the hypothesis was rejected.

A set of moderation analyses examined workplace flexibility as a moderator between person-organization fit and perceived stress, controlling for positive affectivity and negative affectivity. Although there was a negative significant conditional effect of person-organization fit on perceived stress, $B = -1.13$, $p < .01$, the conditional effect of workplace flexibility on stress and the moderation effect were not significant when positive affectivity was a covariate in the model. In the moderation analysis where negative affectivity was a covariate in the model, the conditional effects of person-organization fit on perceived stress, workplace flexibility on perceived stress and the moderation effect were not significant.

Next, the moderation effect of workplace flexibility was examined in the association between person-*job* fit and individual outcomes where positive and negative affectivity were covariates in the model. The interaction terms were not significant where positive affectivity and negative affectivity were examined as covariates in the model between person-job fit and job satisfaction, life satisfaction, and perceived stress indicating that positive affectivity and negative affectivity were covariates.

In the moderation analysis in which positive affectivity was controlled and moderation effect of workplace flexibility between person-job fit and job satisfaction was examined, both conditional effects, $F(3,346) = 115.74$, $p < .001$, and the moderation effect, $F(4,345) = 93.57$, $p < .001$ were significant (see Table 22). The interaction between person-job fit and workplace flexibility explained an additional 1.9% of the

variance in job satisfaction scores over and above the 25% explained by the first order effects of person-job fit and workplace flexibility.

Table 22

Moderator Effects of Workplace Flexibility for the Association of Person-Job Fit and Job Satisfaction where Positive Affectivity was controlled

Step and Variable	<i>B</i>	<i>SE B</i>	95 % <i>CI</i>	β	<i>R</i> ² <i>change</i>
Step 1					
Positive Affectivity (z score)	2.01	.19	1.65-2.38	.50***	.25***
Step 2					
Positive Affectivity (z score)	.85	.18	.50-1.2	.21***	
Person-job (z score)	2.14	.17	1.80-2.49	.54***	
Workplace flexibility (z score)	.65	.15	.35-.95	.16***	.25***
Step 3					
Positive Affectivity (z score)	.85	.18	.50-1.19	.21***	
Person-job (z score)	2.14	.17	1.80-2.49	.54***	
Workplace flexibility (z score)	.65	.15	.35-.95	.16***	
Person-job fit X workplace Flexibility	-.55	.15	-.84--.26	-.14***	.02***

Outcome: Job satisfaction

CI = confidence interval

****p* < .001.

In the next analysis negative affectivity was controlled and the moderation effect of workplace flexibility between person-job fit and job satisfaction was examined. Both conditional effects, $F(3,346) = 113.09$, $p < .001$, and moderation effect, $F(4,345) = 89.49$, $p < .001$, were significant (see Table 23). The interaction between person-job fit and workplace flexibility explained an additional 1.4% of the variance in job satisfaction scores over and above the 36% explained by the first order effects of person-job fit and workplace flexibility alone where negative affectivity was a covariate in the model

Table 23

Moderator Effects of Workplace Flexibility for the Association of Person-Job Fit and Job Satisfaction where Negative Affectivity was controlled

Step and Variable	<i>B</i>	<i>SE B</i>	95 % <i>CI</i>	β	<i>R</i> ² change
Step 1					
Negative Affectivity (z score)	-1.49	.20	-1.89- -1.09	-.37***	.14***
Step 2					
Negative Affectivity (z score)	-.71	.16	-1.03- -.39	-.18***	
Person-job fit (z score)	2.32	.16	2.00-2.64	.58***	
Workplace flexibility (z score)	.70	.15	.39-1.00	.18***	.36***
Step 3					
Negative Affectivity (z score)	-.63	.16	-.95--.31	-.16***	
Person-job fit (z score)	2.36	.16	2.04-2.68	.59***	
Workplace flexibility (z score)	.69	.15	-.39-.99	.17***	
Person-job fit X workplace Flexibility	-.47	.15	-.77- -.18	-.12**	.01**

Outcome: Job satisfaction

CI = confidence interval

p* < .01. *p* < .001.

Slopes analysis (see Figure 17) showed that perceptions of person-job fit would have greater effect on job satisfaction for employees who have lower workplace flexibility. The post-hoc analysis also demonstrated that all three simple slopes -- for high workplace flexibility, average workplace flexibility and low workplace flexibility -- differed significantly from zero ($p = .00$).

Figure 17. Moderation effect graphic of workplace flexibility for person-job fit and job satisfaction.

Note. X=person-job fit, Y= job satisfaction.

CVz1(1) = high workplace flexibility CVz1(2) = average workplace flexibility CVz1(3) = low workplace flexibility

In the next moderation analyses, workplace flexibility was examined in the association between person-job fit and life satisfaction controlling for positive affectivity and negative affectivity. In the first analysis positive affectivity was controlled and a significant conditional effect of person-job fit on life satisfaction was found, $B = .92, p < .001$; however, the conditional effect of workplace flexibility on life satisfaction and the moderation effect were not significant. In the second analysis negative affectivity was controlled. Similarly, a significant conditional effect of person-job fit on life satisfaction was found, $B = 1.25, p < .001$; but the conditional effect of workplace flexibility on life satisfaction and the moderation effect were not significant.

In the final moderation analyses positive affectivity and negative affectivity were controlled and the moderation effect of workplace flexibility between person-job fit and perceived stress were examined. In the analysis controlling for positive affectivity only the effect of person-job fit, $F(3,342) = 16.74, p < .001$, and the moderation effect, F

(4,341) = 13.83, $p < .001$, were significant, but the effect of workplace flexibility was not significant (see Table 24). The interaction between person-job fit and workplace flexibility explained an additional 1.2% of the variance in perceived stress scores over and above the 3.1% explained by the first order effects of person-job fit and workplace flexibility alone where positive affectivity was a covariate in the model.

Slopes analysis (see Figure 18) showed that perceptions of person-job fit would have a greater effect on perceived stress for employees who have greater flexibility at work. A post-hoc analysis showed that all three simple slopes -- for high workplace flexibility, average workplace flexibility, and low workplace flexibility -- differed significantly from zero ($p = .00$).

Table 24

Moderator Effects of Workplace Flexibility for the Association of Person-Job Fit and Perceived Stress where Positive Affectivity was controlled

Step and Variable	<i>B</i>	<i>SE B</i>	95 % <i>CI</i>	β	<i>R</i> ² change
Step 1					
Positive Affectivity (z score)	-2.23	.37	-2.95- -1.51	-.31**	.10***
Step 2					
Positive Affectivity (z score)	-1.46	.42	-2.28- -.64	-.20***	
Person-job fit (z score)	-1.48	.42	-2.31- -.67	-.21***	
Workplace flexibility (z score)	-.04	.36	-.75- .67	-.01	.03**
Step 3					
Positive Affectivity (z score)	-1.46	.42	-2.28- -.64	-.20***	
Person-job fit (z score)	-1.49	.42	-2.31- -.67	-.21***	
Workplace flexibility (z score)	-.04	.36	-.75- .67	-.01	
Person-job fit X workplace Flexibility	.75	.35	.06-1.44	.11*	.01*

Outcome: Perceived stress

CI = confidence interval

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

Figure 18. Moderation effect graphic of workplace flexibility for person-job fit and perceived stress.

Note. X=person-job fit, Y= perceived stress.

CVz1(1) = high workplace flexibility CVz1(2) = average workplace flexibility CVz1(3) = low workplace flexibility

When negative affectivity was controlled in the moderation analysis of workplace flexibility between person-job fit and perceived stress only the effect of person-job fit on perceived stress was significant, $B = -1.07$, $p < .01$. The moderation effect was not significant.

In conclusion, workplace flexibility moderated the relation between person-organization fit and job satisfaction, between person-job fit and job satisfaction, and between person-job fit and perceived stress after controlling for affectivity. Thus, flexibility in the workplace is an important variable that can affect the direction and strength of the relations between person-environment fit and some, but not all, individual

outcomes. Hence, although perceptions about person-environment fit have a strong influence on individual outcomes such as job satisfaction, life satisfaction, and stress, working in a flexible environment would change the strength of those relations.

Model Testing

Overall Model of the Role of Person-Environment Fit

The final analysis involved testing an overall model that incorporated the role of both kinds of person-environment fit on all three individual outcomes (see model in Figure 1). It was hypothesized that positive affectivity and negative affectivity would directly predict person-organization fit and person-job fit and that person-organization fit and person-job fit would serve as intervening variables between positive and negative affectivity and individual outcomes -- job satisfaction, life satisfaction, and perceived stress. In addition, workplace flexibility was expected to directly predict person-organization fit and person-job fit and workload was expected to directly predict person-job fit.

Model Estimation

According to the model fit statistics, Satorra-Bentler χ^2 (21, $N = 345$) = 735.67, $p < .001$, $GFI = .72$, $RMSEA = .32$, $CFI = .45$, $NFI = .45$, $TLI = .06$, the hypothesized model was not a good fit for the data. The relations between workload and person-job fit, perceived stress and person-organization fit, perceived stress and workload, and workload and job satisfaction were not significant. Hence, contrary to our expectations, workload did not predict most of the variables as was hypothesized. Further, the model statistics

indicated that direct effects of positive affectivity and negative affectivity on individual outcomes might be needed in order to improve the model fit.

Because of the poor fit of the hypothesized model, post-hoc model modifications were performed in an attempt to develop a better fitting model. The modifications were done on the basis of the modification indices and expected change statistics which pointed to evidence for misspecified error covariances in our model (Byrne, 2001, see also Jöreskog, 1993). These are systematic measurement errors due to characteristics of respondents or items that have an effect on inferences of SEM (Jöreskog, 1993). Byrne (2001) specified that these correlated errors could be an indicator of overlap in item content, such as asking the same question even though worded differently. On the basis of the model modification indices, two residual covariances (person-organization fit and person-job fit) were estimated, covariance between positive affectivity and negative affectivity was included, direct influences were estimated from positive affectivity to job satisfaction, life satisfaction and workload and from negative affectivity to job satisfaction, life satisfaction, and perceived stress, and a direct influence of life satisfaction on perceived stress was estimated. The hypothesized direct links from workload to perceived stress and from workload to person-job fit were deleted. The revised model was a good fit to the data, Satorra-Bentler χ^2 (13, $N = 345$) = 26.98, $p < .01$, $GFI = .98$, $RMSEA = .056$, $CFI = .99$, $NFI = .98$, $TLI = .97$.

Based on the revised model, better person-organization fit and better person-job fit were predicted by higher positive affectivity and by lower negative affectivity. Greater life satisfaction was predicted by better person-organization fit, higher levels of positive affectivity, and lower levels of negative affectivity. Greater job satisfaction was predicted

by better person-job fit, higher levels of positive affectivity, lower levels of negative affectivity, greater workplace flexibility, and lower workload. Higher perceived stress was predicted by better person-organization fit, fewer person-job fit, higher levels of negative affectivity, and lower levels of life satisfaction.

Contrary to expectations, the relation between person-organization fit and perceived stress was positive. Although the correlation between the two variables was -.28, the unstandardized regression weight between person-organization fit and perceived stress was .18 in the model. As the previous analysis did not give significant results between person-organization fit and perceived stress, we might interpret this unexpected result with the other relations in the model. This result might highlight the significant relation between person-job fit and perceived stress. Maybe high fit with the organization could lead to high stress which should be something to avoid in some circumstances.

Once all of the associations among variables have been taken into account, it is clear that positive and negative affectivity have high impact on both fit perceptions. Therefore, being positive or being negative in general is important in predicting both perceptions of fit and also job satisfaction, life satisfaction and perceived stress. An interesting finding was the difference between two fit types. According to that, person-job fit was a significant predictor of job satisfaction but not person-organization fit which shows the relative importance of person-job fit in predicting job satisfaction compared to person-organization fit which is also consistent with Cable and DeRue (2002), Kristof-Brown (2000), and Saks and Ashforth (1997). Moreover, contrary to expectations, workload was not a significant predictor of fit perceptions whereas workplace flexibility was important in predicting perceptions of person-organization fit and person-job fit.

However, workplace flexibility was not a significant predictor of life satisfaction and perceived stress.

Table 25

Direct Effects of Positive Affectivity, Negative Affectivity, Person-organization Fit, and Person-job Fit

	Person- organization fit	Person-job fit	Job satisfaction	Life satisfaction	Perceived stress
Positive affectivity	.53***	.52***	.11***	.15***	
Negative affectivity	-.42***	-.34***	-.10***	-.14***	.47***
Person-organization fit			.04	.07***	.18*
Person-job fit			.21***		-.20**

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

Figure 19. Final SEM model (with unstandardized coefficients).

Discussion

Overall, the present study revealed that person-organization fit and person-job fit are two interrelated but different constructs that are each composed of four components, namely value and personality congruence, integrative congruence, general congruence, and ability congruence. As such, this research highlights the fact that when measuring person-environment fit, the multiple facets of fit need to be taken into consideration. Moreover, it has established that affectivity and perceived workplace flexibility must be taken into account when examining the effect of person-environment fit on typically important workplace outcomes such as stress and satisfaction.

Components of Person-environment Fit

Past research has typically divided person-environment fit into either supplementary fit or complementary fit, and further subdivided complementary fit into needs-supplies fit and demands-abilities fit. In general, studies of person-organization fit have used the supplementary fit perspective (Kristof, 1996) and defined person-organization fit in terms of value congruence, goal congruence, or personality congruence alone (e.g., Cable & Edwards, 2004; Chatman, 1991; O'Reilly, Chatman, & Caldwell, 1991; Kristof, 1996), although there are some studies (e.g., Hutcheson, 1999; Kennedy & Huff, 2005; Lyons, Brenner, & Fassinger, 2005; Mosley, 2002; Saks & Ashforth, 2002; Scheu & Ryan, 2001; Sekiguchi, 2004; Shantz, 2003) that have used the complementary fit perspective when examining person-organization fit. In contrast to the person-organization fit studies that mostly used the supplementary fit perspective, person-job fit research tends to use the paradigm of needs-supplies fit and demands-abilities fit and ignore the supplementary fit perspective (e.g., Edwards, 1991; Lauver & Kristof-Brown,

2001; Sekiguchi, 2004). The present research revealed that the concept of person-environment fit is a combination of all four fit perspectives all of which should be considered together when investigating both organization and job fit in the workplace. Therefore all four perspectives are unique but overall measure is also important when evaluating employees' fit perceptions about their environment.

Another key issue in the exploration of person-environment fit has been confusion regarding the conceptualization of complementary fit (Piasentin & Chapman, 2006). Muchinsky and Monahan (1987) state "by complementary we mean the characteristics of an individual serve to 'make whole' or complement the characteristics of an environment" (p.271). Although researchers typically investigate complementary fit using measures of either needs-supplies and/or demands-abilities perspectives (e.g., Cable & DeRue, 2002; Cable & Edwards, 2004), Piasentin and Chapman (2006) underlined that there is a conceptual overlap between the needs-supplies and demands-abilities fit constructs and argued that complementary fit should be considered as a form of fit distinct from needs-supplies and demands-abilities fit. Thus, Piasentin and Chapman (2007) suggested that not only similarities with the environment but also differences from others in the environment are valuable in an organization and should be used to define good fit.

Because no research, to date, has tested the four fit perspectives at the same time, a key purpose of the present study was to clearly define and assess each perspective to determine whether there is conceptual overlap or whether all four perspectives contribute to a greater whole and, indeed, it was found that the four perspectives need to be considered separately and together when measuring person-organization fit and person-

job fit. It was also readily apparent that the traditional names for the four perspectives were less than satisfactory. Indeed, there has been considerable inconsistency regarding the naming of components of person-environment fit and even studies that use the same labels, such as complementary fit, supplementary fit, needs/supplies fit, demands-abilities fit, define those perspectives in different ways. As Cable and Edwards (2004) underlined, the lack of integration in terms of how researchers have defined “person-environment fit” makes it difficult to generalize the results, creating difficulties in comparing research results. The factor analyses in the present research provided evidence that person-environment fit (both person-organization fit and person-job fit) were composed of four distinct subfactors, but these factors did not map exactly onto the four traditional labels. Therefore, the factors were renamed as 1) value and personality congruence, which looks at the consistency of values and personality; 2) integrative congruence, which looks at the difference between an employee and the environment; 3) general congruence, which looks for more general aspects of the fit with the environment; and 4) ability congruence, which looks for the existence of some ability features needed for the environment that the environment would not have otherwise. These new labels more accurately reflect what the items measure, provide more information about the features of the components, help to eliminate the overlap and conflict between the four concepts, and provide simpler terminology that clearly differentiates the four perspectives such that each component is labelled in terms of how it defines or explains fit, thus providing the opportunity for better operational definitions of these concepts.

Person-organization Fit versus Person-job Fit

The present study also found that person-organization fit was distinct from person-job fit, although both kinds of fit were composed of the same four components. Indeed, the two scales contained the same items with only the word “job” substituted with the word “organization,” so that one scale concentrated on issues related to the respondent’s organization and the other concentrated on issues related to the respondent’s job. As expected, there was a strong correlation between the person-organization fit scale and the person-job fit scale (with slightly weaker correlations among the subscales), which could suggest that they were measuring the same thing; however, similar to other studies (e.g., Kristof-Brown, 2000; Saks, & Ashforth, 1997) person-organization fit and person-job fit had different patterns of associations with employee outcomes. Both person-organization fit and person-job fit were significantly related to job satisfaction, but only person-organization fit was related to life satisfaction and only person-job fit was related to perceived stress. Accordingly, people’s perception of how well they fit with their organization likely plays a role in their general outlook and, as such, is related to greater life satisfaction. By contrast, when people have better fit with their specific job, it likely affects their day-to-day experiences and, as a result, is more closely related to levels of perceived stress. These results are consistent with Cable and DeRue (2002) who found that people can, and do, differentiate various kinds of person-environment fit perspectives.

The pattern found here with person-organization fit and person-job fit is reminiscent of the patterns of correlations for procedural justice and distributive justice, which are typically correlated at about .70, but clearly assess different aspects of

organizational justice. Folger (1987) suggested that when two variables have such a strong association, it is likely that perceptions of one can influence the perceptions of the other. In consequence, when there are strong perceptions of person-organization fit, it would be expected that there would also be strong perceptions of person-job fit and that these perceptions would change in the same direction if there were changes either to the job or the organization. In sum, although person-organization fit and person-job are distinct constructs, and people can consistently differentiate the two types of fit (Cable & DeRue, 2002), they are highly related and in order to explore the differences and overlaps between two types of fit, they should be examined together.

Influence of Affectivity on Person-Organization Fit and Person-Job Fit

Person-environment fit has been examined in several studies in terms of its impact on many outcomes (e.g., Arthur et al., 2006; Cable & DeRue, 2002; Cable & Edwards, 2004; Cable & Judge, 1996; Hoffman & Woehr, 2006; Kristof-Brown, Zimmerman, & Johnson, 2005; Lauver & Kristof-Brown, 2001; Saks & Ashforth, 1997); however, far fewer studies have examined the antecedents of fit perceptions. Those studies have typically examined specific recruitment practices or job search strategies as antecedents of fit (e.g., Cable & Judge, 1994; 1996; 1997; Judge & Bretz, 1992; Kristof, 1996; Rynes & Gerhart, 1990). For example, people who are high in self-awareness might be more aware of their values and goals and be able to find an organization or job with better fit relative to those lower in self-awareness (Kristof, 1996). As a second example, individual and organizational socialization practices can also increase person-environment fit (Chatman, 1991; Morrison, 1993). However, such research has been fairly narrowly focused and in order to have a clearer understanding of how fit perceptions develop,

expanded research, particularly assessing the influence of personality traits (Judge, 2007), is needed. Indeed, traits such as conscientiousness, neuroticism, and emotional stability have been found to be associated with fit perceptions. (Ehrhart & Makrasnky, 2007; Hofstee, deRaad, & Goldberg, 1992; Judge & Cable, 1997; Lievens, Decaesteker, Coetsier & Geirnaert, 2001; Tokar & Swanson, 1995); however these studies have concentrated on the relation between Big Five traits and employees' preferences for working in specific work environments. It appears that the role of personality in the development of a sense of person-environment fit and the interplay of personality and fit on outcomes such as commitment and satisfaction is still in the infancy stages of research (Greguras & Diefendorff, 2009). Consequently, one of the main purposes of this study was to examine the role of negative affectivity and positive affectivity on perceptions of person-environment fit.

The dispositional role of affect has attracted the attention of researchers because of the potential it has to influence an individual's attitudes about his or her environment (e.g., Cropanzano, James, & Konovsky, 1993; George, 1991; 1992; Thoresen, Kaplan, Barsky, Warren, & Chermont, 2003). People with greater positive affectivity tend to have consistently more positive reports of work-related attitudes, even in the same objective conditions, compared to people with lower levels of positive affectivity (e.g., Cropanzano, James & Konovsky, 1993; George, 1989; George, 1991; Thoresen, Kaplan, Barsky, Warren & Chermont, 2003). Consistent with Watson, Clark, and Carey, (1988), Watson and Slack, (1993), and Watson (2000), the results of the present research showed that being high in positive affectivity was strongly associated with being more positive about one's environment, such that people higher in positive affectivity had better person-

organization and person-job fit perceptions compared to people who were lower in positive affectivity, and similarly, people lower in negative affectivity had significantly more positive reports of fit with their jobs and organizations relative to people higher in negative affectivity. This relation is particularly important given that research typically assesses subjective fit, in which only the responses of individuals are collected. Because their perception of fit is partly determined by personal characteristics such as positive and negative affectivity, these characteristics need to be taken into account before assessing the direct impact of perceived fit on organizational and personal outcomes.

It should also be noted, however, that the role of affectivity may change depending on how one conceptualizes person-environment fit. The results of the present study indicate that affectivity had a greater influence on the perceptions of person-environment fit when it incorporated all four components; negative and positive affectivity had less impact on each single component. Hence, future research should examine why the role of affectivity changes depending on the specificity of person-environment fit measures. As Judge (2007) stated, in order to discover more about the forces that alter fit at work, more studies about the influence of personality are still needed.

Positive and negative affectivity tend to also influence self-reports of life satisfaction, job satisfaction, and perceived stress (e.g., Benyamini, & Roziner, 2008; Chen & Spector, 1991; Costa & McCrae, 1980; Cropanzano, James, & Konovsky, 1993; Necowitz, & Roznomski, 1994; Tellegen, 1985; Watson & Clark, 1984). The present study found, however, that person-environment fit partially mediates the relation between positive affectivity and negative affectivity and these outcomes suggesting that it is clear

that person-environment fit is an important variable in understanding peoples' reactions to work over and above their level of affectivity. It should be noted, though, that fit did not mediate the effect of negative affectivity on perceived stress, suggesting that people who are typically higher in negative affectivity are likely to report greater levels of stress regardless of their work situation. In sum, although positive affectivity and negative affectivity were important variables in predicting job satisfaction, life satisfaction, and perceived stress, perception of fit was also an important construct which had an impact on those individual outcomes.

Person-Environment Fit and Individual Outcomes

The relative influence of person-environment fit on individual outcomes, particularly job satisfaction (e.g., Arthur et al., 2006; Cable & DeRue, 2002; Cable & Judge, 1996; Edwards & Shipp, 2007; Kristof-Brown, 2000; Saks & Ashforth, 1997) has been the subject of considerable research. Similar to past research, a strong relation was found between fit (both organization and job) and job satisfaction in the present study. Moreover, consistent with Lauver and Kristof-Brown (2001) there was very little difference between the two kinds of fit in terms of their influence on job satisfaction. Hence, both person-job fit and person-organization fit are important influences on employees' overall sense of job satisfaction – people appear to be quite aware that job satisfaction requires both feeling that there is congruence with both the job and the employing organization. However, when all other variables were considered in the model, person-job fit was the one which predicts job satisfaction.

Interestingly, in the present research there was a positive association of person-organization fit with life satisfaction, but no significant relation between the person-job fit and life satisfaction. However, when these relations were investigated in terms of the four components of fit, the results were slightly different. For both levels of fit (organization and job) value and personality congruence, integrative congruence, and general congruence were associated with life satisfaction but ability congruence was not, which suggests that congruence of one's abilities with the organization is less important for feelings of general life satisfaction. Ability congruence is about people's evaluations of their abilities relative to the abilities required by their environment, whereas the other components of fit assess general perceptions about how they match with their environments, perceptions of the match of values or characteristics, or how they fill the place in their job. Hence, those three components should be considered more important when assessing the influence of fit on life satisfaction.

Another interesting finding was the relation between perceived fit and perceived stress, in which perceived stress was related to person-job fit but not to person-organization fit. Edwards and Shipp (2007) also found that supplies-values and demands-abilities components of person-environment misfit is related to stress, and, as Pervin (1968) states, when there is an agreement between one's personality characteristics and his or her environment, lower stress is expected.

Although past research on person-environment fit has typically studied the effect of fit on stress from the supplies-values perspective, in which supplies are related to job characteristics (Caplan, Cobb, French, Harrison, & Pinneau, 1980; Edwards, 1996; French, Caplan, & Harrison, 1982; Shaw & Gupta, 2004), the present results were

consistent as perceptions about one's job were more important in determining perceived stress compared to perceptions about one's organization. Further, when this relation was examined in terms of four components, two subfactors -- general congruence and ability congruence -- were the key drivers of perceived stress, consistent with past research in which supplies-values fit and demands-abilities fit were most strongly related to health and well-being outcomes including stress (Cummings & Cooper, 1979; Edwards, 1992; Shaw & Gupta, 2004).

In sum, this study revealed that when person-organization fit and person-job fit are considered as a total score, the fit perceptions were significantly different in terms of their relation with job satisfaction, life satisfaction, and perceived stress and this was a consistent finding with the literature. This study, however, provides more information about the influence of person-organization fit and person-job fit on job satisfaction, life satisfaction and perceived stress by examining four components individually, which revealed that particular aspects of fit may have greater influence over different outcomes.

Workplace Flexibility and Workload

The role of organizational features has rarely been examined in studies of person-environment fit. In the present study two important variables -- flexible workplace and workload -- were investigated in terms of their influence on relations between the person-environment fit and job satisfaction, life satisfaction, and stress. It was thought that having the ability to control when one works and having a personally appropriate workload would alter the effect of perceptions of fit on job satisfaction, life satisfaction, and stress, but the results did not support the expected influence of workload on these

outcomes. Given that it has been strongly established that high work demands result in negative reactions such as low job satisfaction and high stress (Pousette & Hanse, 2002; Spector, 1987; Spector, Dwyer, & Jex, 1988), this unexpected result could be due to how workload was measured. In the present research Quinn et al.'s (1971) scale, consisting of 4 items asking frequency of specific behaviors related to their jobs, was used. This scale may not have been precise enough to get at people's perceptions of their workload. It is likely that items that directly ask people if they believe there is too much to do in the time available at the workplace would better assess the construct of work load.

The study results did, however, provide support for the importance of the role of workplace flexibility as flexibility was significantly related to job satisfaction and life satisfaction, although not to perceived stress. Workplace flexibility also affected the direction and strength of the relations between person-environment fit and individual outcomes, even after controlling for positive and negative affectivity. According to that, when workplace flexibility is low, person-environment fit (both organization and job) has greater effect on employees' job satisfaction and when workplace flexibility is high perceptions of person-job fit also have a greater effect on perceived stress of employees. Since there were few studies about flexibility at workplace the results challenge new research questions in the area.

Implications of the Study

The current study contributes to the literature in several ways. Although person-environment fit has been studied from different perspectives, to date there has been little research examining the four different perspectives in one study. This study provides a

broader view of person-environment fit by using four perspectives together and defines person-environment fit as personality and value congruence, integrative congruence, general congruence and ability congruence. By examining fit perceptions from four different perspectives instead of only one or two, the concept of fit would be defined and measured more accurately and completely.

Moreover, with this study the four perspectives were used for different types of fit, both for person-organization fit and person-job fit. Despite the arguments about using a single perspective in fit studies (Piasentin & Chapman, 2006), previous studies often examined person-organization fit from a supplementary perspective and person-job fit from a complementary perspective (e.g., Cable & Edwards, 2004; Greguras & Diefendorff, 2009). The present research demonstrates that all four perspectives are important to include in order to exposing the subtle associations of different aspects of fit on individual attitudes and behaviours. Moreover, the results highlighted the difference between the concepts of 'job' and 'organization' in terms of their relative importance in a person's mind. While experiencing high fit with the organization, high life satisfaction would also be expected fit with the job is more likely associated to job satisfaction and perceived stress. According to Tyler (2000), identification with the environment is important as it is related to personal evaluations about the organizational practices. Therefore high congruence among individual values, thoughts, beliefs and organizational characteristics would promote social identification which would be important for high life satisfaction.

In addition, although it is well established that affectivity is an important variable to include in research as it alters numerous outcomes, no study to date has directly studied

the influence of positive and negative affectivity on perceptions of organization and/or job fit. Thus, the results of the present study, which indicate that being more positive or more negative alters perceptions of fit, has exposed the importance of affectivity on fit perceptions. This study provides new information regarding the relation between affectivity and person-environment fit and also supports the existing knowledge about the relations between affectivity and individual responses.

Moreover, with this study two organizational features, workload and workplace flexibility were investigated. As there are few studies about those constructs, this study proposed new research questions about workplace flexibility-the influence of where employees have the ability to control when they work- and also workload- employees' subjective judgments about how often specific aspects appear in their job- on employee related variables.

Finally, from an applied perspective, the study underlines the importance of fit perceptions in terms of their association to some of the individual and organizational features. Since organizations seek to attract and to keep the best possible employees, it is important to clarify the difference between two levels of fit perceptions. For example, given the results of the study, practitioners should consider the consequence of both types of fit, job and organization. According to this, for high job satisfaction, person-job fit is relatively more important than person-organization fit while perceptions of high organization fit is more important in life satisfaction. Thus employers should always consider the differences between two fit types. If an employee experiences low person-job fit, offering another job opportunity in the same organization would be a good option; or if an employee perceives low person-organization fit, possible reasons of low fit should

be investigated by using four perspectives. Moreover new intervention programs could be developed in order to increase personal fit perceptions about the organization. In addition, while workplace flexibility was found as an effective organizational feature, flexible hours at workplace could be promoted in organizations.

Limitations and Future Research

Although the present research has made some important contributions to the study of person-environment fit, it does, of course, have some limitations that need to be taken into consideration. First, the two scales, person-organization fit scale and person-job fit scale, were used for the first time. Because there was no validated person-environment fit scale that assessed all the hypothesized components of fit, the present scales were established by gathering and rearranging items used in a number of previous fit studies. As a result, the number of items for each of the four components was different, which may be a particular problem for the ability congruence component which has only two items and so might have lower reliability and validity relative to the other components. In addition, the high correlation between the two fit scales was subject to discussion. Although the interrelation between person-organization fit and person-job fit is accepted in the literature, the scales were new and therefore more research is needed to clarify whether the high correlation is due to overlap of the concepts or whether it is due to the similarity of items. Future studies may want to compare the scales using a wider nomological net or add new items to the scales to determine whether these items would differentiate the constructs in a positive manner.

The second limitation relates to the two participant groups in the study.

Participants were recruited using either snowball sampling or using a web based service called the Study Response Project. Because there were two different groups, possible difference between two samples was investigated, and differences were found with regard to BIS, BAS drive, and workplace flexibility. As a consequence, sample was included as a control variable for key analyses involving BIS, BAS drive, and flexibility, and therefore should not have had much of an effect on the results. The between-samples differences, however, particularly for workplace flexibility could highlight some potential cultural differences, especially related to the differences between participants' country of employment (U.S. versus Canada). People from the snowball sample were mostly working in organizations in Canada, whereas the people in the Study Response group were working in U.S.-based organizations. It was one possibility that national policies could alter flexibility at workplace, therefore, future research may want to consider differences between the cultural differences in terms of organizational features like workplace flexibility.

The third limitation was the length of the survey. Because there were 10 scales in the survey, and considerable overlap in the measures of person-organization and person-job fit, some respondents might have been bored and did not complete all of the survey. The lack of response was a particular issue for the number of completed scales for the person-environment fit scales relative to the rest of the survey. Indeed, 428 people completed the person-organization fit scale, 387 people completed the person-job fit scale, and only 383 participants completed all of the scales in the survey. It is possible that respondents felt the overlap between the organization and job fit scales was too great

and because they could not see the value in responding to similar items, submitted the survey without completing it. It is possible that a change in the order of the scales would improve the response rate without having a negative effect on the responses to the individual scales.

Finally measures used in this study were all self report items that could be generated a potential problem of common method variance. However, common method variance is not expected to be a problem for several reasons. First researchers argued that using self reports for many private events such as job satisfaction is acceptable (e.g., Chan, 2009). Most of the variables measured are job attitudes which are generally assessed by self-report measures. Also in this study 'perceptions of fit' was the main question of interest and employees are best suited to report their observations of fit with their environments. Thus, only subjective measures are included in this research rather than objective measures of person-environment fit. In conclusion, common method variance should not be considered as a major problem in this study as the research did not focus simply predictor-outcome relationships but also examined differences between different levels and types of fit.

Conclusion

In summary, integrating and expanding upon the person-environment fit literature the current study aimed to deal with the confusion regarding the conceptualization of the person-environment fit construct. According to the results, person-environment fit is likely to be composed of four basic components which are related but distinct constructs and that new labels are required to clarify the content and relation of these components. Additionally with this study a different approach to the fit literature is emphasized by

focusing not only the consequences of fit but also the antecedents were investigated in this research. High fit is believed to have influence on outcomes that are related to an employee's organizational life cycle. While recent studies of fit have often focused on the outcomes of person-environment fit, we also need to know what affects perceptions of fit. Consequently this study revealed the importance of affectivity to fit perceptions and showed that new studies are needed in this area in order to investigate the role of personality.

References

- Almer, E.D., & Kaplan, S.E. (2002). The effects of flexible work arrangements on stressors, burnout, and behavioral job outcomes in public accounting. *Behavioral Research in Accounting*, 14, 1-34.
- Andrew, F. M., & Withey, F. B. (1976). *Social indicators of well-being in America: The development and measurement of perceptual indicators*. New York: Plenum.
- Arthur, Jr. W., Bell, S., Villado, A.J., & Doverspike, D. (2006). The use of person-organization fit in employment decision making: An assessment of its criterion-related validity. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 91(4), 786-801.
- Ashford, S.J., Lee, C. L., & Bobko, P. (1989). Content, causes, and consequences of job insecurity: A theory-based measure and substantive test. *Academy of Management Journal*, 32, 803- 829.
- Bailyn, L. (1997). The impact of corporate culture on work-family integration. In S. Parasuraman & J.H. Greenhaus (Eds.), *Integration work and family: Challenges and choices for a changing world* (pp. 209-219). Westport, CT: Quorum Books.
- Barrick, M. R., Mitchell, T. R., & Stewart, G. L. (2003). Situational and motivational influences on trait-behavior relationships. In Barrick MR, Ryan AM (Eds.), *Personality and work: Reconsidering the role of personality in organizations* (pp. 60–82). San Francisco : Jossey-Bass.
- Barsade, S.G., Brief, A. P., & Spataro, S.E. (2003). The affective revolution in organizational behavior: The emergence of a paradigm. In J. Greenberg (Ed.), *Organizational behavior: The state of science* (2nd ed., pp.3-51). Hillsdale,NJ: Erlbaum.
- Beehr, T.A., & Newman, J. E. (1978). Job stress, employee health, and organizational

- effectiveness: A facet analysis, model, and literature review. *Personnel Psychology*, 31, 665-699.
- Benyamini, R., & Roziner, I. (2008). The predictive validity of optimism and affectivity in a longitudinal study of older adults. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 44(4), 853-864.
- Block, J. (1995). A contrarian view of the five factor approach to personality description. *Psychological Bulletin*, 117(2), 187-215.
- Brayfield, A. H., & Rothe, H.F. (1951). An index of job satisfaction. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 35, 307- 311.
- Bretz, R.D., & Judge, T.A. (1994). Person-organization fit and the theory of work adjustment: Implications for satisfaction, tenure, and career success. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 44, 32-54.
- Bretz, R. D., Rynes, S. L., & Gerhart, B. (1993). Recruiter perceptions of applicant fit: Implications for individual career preparation and job search behavior. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 43, 310-327.
- Brief, A. P., Burke, M. J., George, J.M., Robinson, B. S., & Webster, J. (1988). Should negative affectivity remain an unmeasured variable in the study of job stress? *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 73, 193-198.
- Brief, A.P., Butcher, A. N., & Roberson, L. (1995). Cookies, disposition, and job attitudes: The effects of positive mood-inducing events and negative affectivity on job satisfaction in a field experiment. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 62(1), 55-62.
- Brotheridge, C.M., & Grandey, A.A. (2002). Emotional labor and burnout: Comparing two perspectives of “People work”. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 60, 17-39.

- Burke, R.J., & Deszca, E. (1982). Preferred organizational climates of Type A individuals. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 21, 50-59.
- Byrne, B. M. (2001). *Structural equation modeling with AMOS, Basic concepts, applications, and programming*. Hillsdale, New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Cable, D.M., & DeRue, D. S. (2002). The convergent and discriminant validity of subjective fit perceptions. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 87(5), 875-884.
- Cable, D.M., & Edwards, J.R. (2004). Complementary and supplementary fit: A theoretical and empirical integration. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 89(5), 822-834.
- Cable, D.M., & Judge, T.A. (1994). Pay preferences and job search decisions: A person organization fit perspective. *Personnel Psychology*, 47, 317- 348.
- Cable, D. M., & Judge, T. A. (1996). Person-organization fit, job-choice decisions, and organizational entry. *Organizational Decisions and Human Decision Processes*, 67(3), 294-311.
- Cable, D. M., & Judge, T. A. (1997). Interviewers' perception of person-organization fit and organizational selection decisions. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 82, 546-561.
- Cable, D.M., & Yu, K.Y.T. (2007). How selection and recruitment practices develop the beliefs used to assess fit. In C. Ostroff & T.A. Judge (Eds.), *Perspectives on organizational fit* (pp.155-182). New York:Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Caldwell, D. F., & O'Reilly, C. A., (1990). Measuring person-job fit with a profile comparison process. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 75, 648-657.
- Campbell-Clark, S. (2001).Work cultures and work/family balance. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 58, 348-365.

- Caplan, R.D. (1987). Person-environment fit theory and organizations: Commensurate dimensions, time perspectives and mechanisms. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 31, 248-267.
- Caplan, R.D., Cobb, S., French, J.R.P. Jr., Van Harrison, R., & Pinneau, S.R. Jr., (1980). *Job demands and worker health: Main effects and occupational differences*. Ann Arbor, MI: Institute for Social Research.
- Carver, C.S., & White, T.L. (1994). Behavioral inhibition, behavioral activation, and affective responses to impending reward and punishment: The BIS/BAS scales. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 67, 319-333.
- Chatman, C. A. (1989). Improving interactional organizational research: A model of person-organization fit. *Academy of Management Review*, 14(3), 333-349.
- Chatman, C.A. (1991). Matching people and organizations: Selection and socialization in public accounting firms. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 36, 459-484.
- Chacko, T. I. (1983). Job and life satisfactions: A casual analysis of their relationships. *Academy of Management Journal*, 26 (1), 163-169.
- Chen, P. Y., & Spector, P. E. (1991). Negative affectivity as the underlying cause of correlations between stressors and strains. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 76(3), 398-407.
- Chou, S., Boldy, D.P., & Lee, A.H., (2002). Staff satisfaction and its components in residential aged care. *International Journal for Quality in Health Care*, 14(3), 207- 217.
- Clark, S.C. (2001). Work cultures and work/family balance. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 58, 348- 365.
- Cohen, S., Kamarck, T., & Mermelstein, R. (1983). A global measure of perceived stress.

Journal of Health and Social Behavior, 24(4), 385-396.

Compton, W. C., Smith, M. L., Cornish, K. A., & Qualls, D. L. (1996). Factor structure of mental health measures. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 71, 406-413.

Comrey, A. L., & Lee, H. B. (1992). *A first course in factor analysis* (2nd ed.). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Connolly, J.J., & Viswesvaran, C. (2000). The role of affectivity in job satisfaction: a meta-analysis. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 29, 265- 281.

Costa, P.T., & McCrae, R.R. (1980). Influence of extraversion and neuroticism on subjective well-being: Happy and unhappy people. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 38(4), 668-678.

Cropanzano, R., James, K., & Konovsky, M.A. (1993). Dispositional affectivity as a predictor of work attitudes and job performance. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 14(6), 595-606.

Cummings, T.G., & Cooper, C. L. (1979). A cybernetic framework for studying occupational stress. *Human Relations*, 32, 395-418.

Curry, D.B. (1999). The causal order of job satisfaction and organizational commitment in models of employee turnover. *Human Resources Management Review*, 9(4), 495-524.

Curry, D.B. (2000). The causal order of job satisfaction and organizational commitment in models of employee turnover. *Human Resources Management Review*, 9(4), 495-524.

Dawis, R.V., & Lofquist, L.H. (1984). *A psychological theory of work adjustment*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

- Diener, E., Emmons, R.A., Larsen, R. J., & Griffin, S. (1985). *Journal of Personality Assessment*, 49(1), 71-75.
- Diener, E., Suh, E. M., Lucas, E. R., & Smith, H. L. (1999). Subjective well-being: Three decades of progress. *Psychological Bulletin*, 125(2), 276-302.
- Dutton, J.E., Dukerich, J.M., & Harquail, C.V. (1994). Organizational images and member identification. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 39, 239-263.
- Edwards, J. E., Cable, D.M., Williamson, I. O., Lambert, L.S., Shipp, A.J. (2006). The phenomenology of fit: Linking the person and environment to the subjective experience of person-environment fit. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 91, 802-827.
- Edwards, J. R. (1991). Person-job fit: A conceptual integration, literature review and methodological critique. *International review of industrial/organizational psychology*, (Vol. 6, pp.283-357). London: Wiley.
- Edwards, J. R. (1992). A cybernetic theory of stress, coping, and well-being in organizations. *Academy of Management Review*, 17, 234-274.
- Edwards, J. R. (1996). An examination of competing versions of the person-environment fit approach to stress. *Academy of Management Journal*, 39(2), 292-339.
- Edwards, J. R., & Cooper, C.C. (1990). The person-environment fit approach to stress: Recurring problems and some suggested solutions. *Journal of Organizational Behaviour*, 11, 293-307.
- Edwards, J. R., & Rothbard, N. P. (1999). Work and family stress and well-being: An examination of person-environment fit in the work and family domains. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 77(2), 85-129.
- Edwards, J. R., & Shipp, A.J. (2007). The relationship between person-environment fit

and outcomes: An integrative theoretical framework. In C.Ostroff & T.A. Judge (Eds.), *Perspectives on organizational fit* (pp.209-258). New York: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates

Ehrhart, K.H. (2001) The role of job characteristic beliefs and personality in understanding person-job fit. Ph.D. dissertation, University of Maryland College Park, United States – Maryland. Retrieved November 26, 2008, from Dissertations & Theses: Full Text database. (Publication No. AAT 3024919).

Ehrhart, K.H., & Makransky, G. (2007). Testing vocational interests and personality as predictors of person-vocation and person-job fit. *Journal of Career Assessment*, 15(2), 206-226.

Employment Business News. (2008, October, 22). Retrieved November 26, 2008
<http://ebn.benefitnews.com/asset/article/723062/while-some-workers-make-better-health.html?pg=>

Erdogan, B., & Brauer, T. N. (2005). Enhancing career benefits of employee proactive personality: The role of fit with jobs and organizations. *Personnel Psychology*, 58, 859-891.

French, J. R. P.& Caplan, R. D. (1972). Organizational stress and individual strain. In A. J. Marrow (Ed.), *The failure of success* (pp.30-66). New York : AMA Committee.

French, J.P.R., Caplan, R. D., & Harrison, R.V. (1982). *The mechanisms of job stress and strain*. New York: Wiley.

French.J. P. R., Rogers, W., & Cobb, S. (1974). Adjustment as person-environment fit. In G.Coelho, D. Hamburg, & J. Adams (Eds.), *Coping and adaptation* (pp.316-333). New York: Basic Books.

Folger, R. (1987). Distributive and procedural justice in the workplace. *Social Justice*

Research, 1, 143-159.

George, J.M. (1989). Mood and absence. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 74*, 317-324.

George, J.M. (1991). State or trait: Effects of positive mood on prosocial behaviors at work. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 76*, 299-307.

George, J.M. (1992). The role of personality in organizational life: Issues and evidence. *Journal of Management, 18*(2), 185-213.

George, J.M., & Jones, G. R. (1996). The experience of work and turnover intentions: Interactive effects of value attainment, job satisfaction, and positive mood. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 81*(3), 318-325.

Gray, J.A. (1970). The psychophysiological basis of introversion-extroversion. *Behavioral Research and Therapy, 8*, 249-266.

Gray, J.A. (1971). *The psychology of fear and stress*. London: Weidenfeld & Nicolson.

Gray, J.A. (1981). A critique of Eysenck's theory of personality. In H.J. Eysenck (Ed.), *A model for personality* (pp.246-276). New York: Springer.

Gray, J.A. (1987). Perspectives on anxiety and impulsivity: A commentary. *Journal of Research in Personality, 21*, 493-509.

Gray, J. A. (1990). Brain systems that mediate both emotion and cognition. *Cognition and emotion, 4*, 269-288.

Greguras, G. J., & Diefendorff, J. M. (2009). Different fit satisfy different needs: Linking person-environment fit to employee commitment and performance using self-determination theory. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 94*, 465-477.

Hackman, J.R., & Lawler, E.E. (1971). Employee reactions to job characteristics. *Journal of Applied Psychology Monograph, 55*, 259-286.

Hackman, J.R., & Oldham, G.R. (1976). Motivation through the design of work: Test of a

- theory. *Organizational Behavior and Human Performance*, 16, 250-279.
- Hackman, J.R., & Oldham, G.R. (1980). *Work redesign*. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.
- Hall, D.T., & Parker, V.A. (1993). The role of workplace flexibility in managing diversity. *Organizational Dynamics*, 22(1), 4-18.
- Hoffman, B. J., & Woehr, D. J. (2006). A quantitative review of the relationship between person organization fit and behavioral outcomes. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 68, 389-399.
- Hofstee, D.K.B., de Raad, B., & Goldberg, L.R. (1992). Integration of the big five and circumplex approaches to trait structure. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 63(1), 146-163.
- Holland, J.L. (1964). *Explorations of a theory of vocational choice*. Moravia, NY: Chronicle Guidance Professional Services.
- Holland, J. L. (1966). A psychological classification scheme for vocations and major fields. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, 13, 278-288.
- Holland, J.L. (1976). Vocational preferences. In M.D. Dunnette (Ed.), *Handbook of industrial and organizational psychology* (pp.521-570). Chicago: Rand McNally.
- Holland, J.L. (1977). *The vocational preference inventory*. Palo Alto, CA: Consulting Psychologists Press.
- Holland, J.L. (1985). *Making vocational choices*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Hutcheson, J.M. (1999) An examination of three levels of person-environment fit. Ph.D. dissertation, University of Houston, United States -- Texas. Retrieved November 26, 2008, from Dissertations & Theses: Full Text database. (Publication No. AAT 9934188).
- Ilies, R., Schwind, K.M., Wagner, D. T., Johnson, M.D., DeRue, D.S., & Ilgen, D.R.

- (2007). When can employees have a family life? The effects of daily workload and affect on work-family conflict and social behaviours at home. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 92(5), 1368-1379.
- Iverson, R. D., Olekalns, M., & Erwin, P. J. (1998). Affectivity, organizational stressors, and absenteeism: A causal model of burnout and its consequences. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 52(1), 1-23.
- Jex, S. M., & Thomas, J. L. (2003). Relations between stressors and group perceptions: main and mediating effect. *Work and Stress*, 17, 158-169.
- John, O. P. (1990). The 'big five' factor taxonomy: Dimensions of personality in the natural language and in questionnaires. In L. Pervin (Ed.), *Handbook of personality: Theory and research* (pp.66-100). New York: Guilford Press.
- Jöreskog, K. G. (1993). Testing structural equation models. In K. A. Bollen, & J. S. Long (Eds.), *Testing structural equation models* (pp.294-316). Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Judge (2007). The future of person-organization fit research: Comments, observations, and a few suggestions. In C. Ostroff & T. A. Judge (Eds.), *Perspectives on organizational fit* (pp.417-446). New York: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Judge, T. A., & Bretz, R. D., Jr. (1992). Effects of work values on job choice decisions. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 77, 261-271.
- Judge, T. A., & Cable, D. M. (1997). Applicant personality, organizational culture, and organization attraction. *Personnel Psychology*, 50, 359-394.
- Judge, T. A., & Church, A. H. (2000). Job satisfaction: research and practice. In C. L. Cooper, & E. A. Locke (Eds.), *Industrial and organizational psychology: Linking theory with practice* (pp.166-198). Malden, MA: Blackwell Business.

- Judge, T.A., & Ilies, R. (2004). Affect and job satisfaction: A study of their relationship at work and at home. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 89, 661-673.
- Judge, T. A., & Klinger, R. (2008). Job satisfaction: Subjective well-being at work. In M. Eid & R.J. Larsen (Eds.), *The science of subjective well-being* (pp.393-413).New York: The Guilford Press.
- Judge, T. A., Larsen, R. J. (2001). Dispositional affect and job satisfaction: A review and theoretical extension. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 86(1), 67-98.
- Judge, T. A., & Scott, B.A., & Ilies, R. (2006). Hostility, job attitudes, and workplace deviance: A test of a multilevel model. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 91(1), 126-138.
- Judge, T. A., & Watanabe, S. (1993). Another look at the job satisfaction-life satisfaction relationship. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 78, 939-948.
- Kahn, R.L., Wolfe, D.M., Quinn, R.P., Snoek, J.D., & Rosenthal, R.A. (1964). *Organizational stress: Studies in role conflict and ambiguity*. New York: Wiley.
- Kennedy, M., & Huff, J. (2005). *An empirical investigation of subjective person-environment fit perceptions*. Paper presented at the 20th Annual Meeting of the Society for Industrial and Organizational Psychology, Los Angeles, California.
- Kirmeyer, S.L., & Dougherty, T. W. (1988). Workload, tension, and coping: Moderating effects of supervisor support. *Personnel Psychology*, 41, 125-139.
- Kossek, E., & Ozeki, C. (1998). Work-family conflict, policies, and the job-life satisfaction relationship: A review and directions for organizational behavior-human resources research. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 83, 139-149.
- Kristof, A.L. (1996). Person-organization fit: An integrative review of its

conceptualizations, measurement, and implications. *Personnel Psychology*, 49, 1-49.

Kristof-Brown, A.L. (2000). Perceived applicant fit: Distinguishing between recruiters' perceptions of person-job and person-organization fit. *Personnel Psychology*, 53, 643-671.

Kristof-Brown, A. L., Zimmerman, R. D., & Johnson, E. C. (2005). Consequences of individuals' fit at work: A meta-analysis of person-job, person-organization, person-group, and person-supervisor fit. *Personnel Psychology*, 58, 281- 342.

Lachterman, B., & Meir, E.I. (2004). The impact of work setting congruence on well-being. *Journal of Career Assessment*, 12(2), 150-168.

Larsen, R. J., & Eid, M. (2008). Ed Diener and the science of subjective well-being. In M. Eid & R.J. Larsen (Eds.), *The science of subjective well-being* (pp.1-13).New York: The Guilford Press.

Larsen, R.J., & Katelaar, T. (1991). Personality and susceptibility to positive and negative emotional states. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 61(1), 132-140.

Lauver, K.J., & Kristof-Brown, A. (2001). Distinguishing between employees' perceptions of person-job and person-organization fit. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 59, 454-470.

Lent, R. W., & Brown, S. D. (2008). Social cognitive career theory and subjective well-being in the context of work. *Journal of Career Assessment*, 16 (1), 6-21.

Leone, L., Perugini, M., Bagozzi, R, Pierro, A., & Mannetti, L. (2001). Construct validity and generalizability of the Carver-White behavioural inhibition system/behavioural activation system scales. *European Journal of Personality*, 15, 373- 390.

- Levin, I., & Stokes, J.P. (1989). Dispositional approach to job satisfaction: Role of negative affectivity. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 74, 752-758.
- Lewin, K.A. (1951). *Field theory in social science: Selected theoretical papers*. New York: Harper.
- Lievens, F., Decaesteker, C., Coetsier, P., & Geirnaert, J. (2001). Organizational attractiveness for prospective applicants: A person-organization fit perspective. *Applied Psychology: An International Review*, 50(1), 30-51.
- Locke, E. A., (1976). The nature and causes of job satisfaction. In M.D. Dunnette (Ed.), *Handbook of industrial and organizational psychology* (pp.1297-1349). Chicago: Rand McNally.
- Lu, L., Kao, S., Chang, T., Wu, H., & Cooper, C. (2008). Work/family demands, work flexibility, work/family conflict, and their consequences at work: A national probability sample in Taiwan. *International Journal of Stress Management*, 15, 1-21.
- Lyons, H. Z., Brenner, B. R., & Fassinger, R. E. (2005). A multicultural test of the theory of work adjustment: investigating the role of heterosexism and fit perceptions in the job satisfaction of lesbians, gay and bisexual employees. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, 52, 537-548.
- Lyubomirsky, S., King, L., & Diener, E. (2005). The benefits of frequent positive affect: Does happiness lead to success? *Psychological Bulletin*, 131, 803-855.
- MacEachen, E., Polzer, J., & Clark, J. (2008). You are free to set your own hours: Governing worker productivity and health through flexibility and resilience. *Social Science and Medicine*, 66 (5), 1019-1033.
- McKenzie, A., & Dryburgh, H. (2003). The retirement wave. *Perspectives on Labor and*

Income, 4 (2), 5-11.

Mann, S.E. (1996). Employee stress an important cost in mergers. *Business Insurance*, 30(48), 24

Marshall, N.L., & Barnett, R.C. (1994). Family-friendly workplaces, work-family interface, and worker health. In G.P. Keita, & J.L. Hurrell, Jr. (Eds.), *Job Stress in a Changing Workforce* (pp. 253-264). Washington, DC: APA Books.

McCulloch, M.C., & Turban, D. B. (2007). Using person-organization fit to select employees for high-turnover jobs. *International Journal of Selection and Assessment*, 15(1), 63-71.

McGrath, J. E. (1976). Stress and behavior in organizations. In M. Dunnette (Ed.), *Handbook of industrial and organizational psychology*. Chicago: Rand McNally.

Meglino, B.M., Ravlin, E. C., & Adkins, C.L. (1989). A work values approach to corporate culture: A field test of the value congruence process and its relationship to individual outcomes. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 74, 424- 432.

Meir, E. I. (1989). Integrative elaboration of the congruence theory. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 35, 219-230.

Meyer, J.A. (1997). Examining workplace flexibility across work and family domains (Doctoral Dissertation, University of Tulsa, 1997). Dissertation Abstracts International Section B: The Sciences and Engineering, 57(8-B), 5375.

Moore, J. E. (2000). Why is this happening? A casual attribution approach to work exhaustion consequences. *Academy of Management Review*, 25, 335-349.

Moos, R.H. (1987). Person-environment congruence in work, school, and health care settings. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 31, 231-247.

Morrison, E. W. (1993). Longitudinal study of the effects of information seeking on

- newcomer socialization. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 78, 173-183.
- Mosley, D. C. (2002). The influence of person-job fit, person-organization fit, and self-efficacy on work attitudes, job performance, and turnover. Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, Mississippi State University.
- Muchinsky, P.M., & Monahan, C.J. (1987). What is person-environment congruence? Supplementary versus complementary models of fit. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 31, 268-277.
- Murray, H.A. (1938). *Explorations in personality*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Necowitz, L.B., & Roznowski, M. (1994). Negative affectivity and job satisfaction: Cognitive processes underlying the relationship and effects on employee behaviors. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 45(3), 270-294.
- O'Reilly, C.A. (1977). Personality-job fit: Implications for individual attitudes and performance. *Organizational Behavior and Human Performance*, 18, 36-46.
- O'Reilly, C.A., Chatman, J., & Caldwell, D.F. (1991). People and organizational culture: A profile comparison approach to assessing person-organization fit. *Academy of Management Journal*, 34(3), 487-516.
- Oldham, G.R. (1996) Job design. *International Review of Industrial and Organizational Psychology*, 11, 33-60.
- Osipow, S. H. (1987). Applying person-environment theory to vocational behavior. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 31, 333-336.
- Osipow, S. H., & Spokane, A. R. (1983). *Manual for measuring occupational stress, strain, and coping*. Columbus, OH: Marathon Consulting and Press.
- Ostroff, C. (1992). The relationship between satisfaction, attitudes, and performance: An organizational level analysis. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 77(6), 963-974.

- Ostroff, C., & Schulte, M. (2007). Multiple perspectives of fit in organizations across levels of analysis. In C. Ostroff & T.A. Judge (Eds.), *Perspectives on organizational fit* (pp.3-69). New York:Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Pousette, A., & Hanse, J.J. (2002). Job characteristics as predictors of ill-health and sickness absenteeism in different occupational types—a multigroup structural equation modeling approach. *Work and Stress, 16*, 229-250.
- Pervin,L.A. (1968). Performance and satisfaction as a function of individual-environment fit. *Psychological Bulletin, 69*, 56-68.
- Piasentin, K.A., & Chapman, D. S. (2006). Subjective person-organization fit: Bridging the gap between conceptualization and measurement. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 69*, 202-221.
- Piasentin, K.A., & Chapman, D.S. (2007). Perceived similarity and complementarity as predictors of subjective person-organization fit. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology, 80*, 341-354.
- Pousette, A., & Hanse, J. J. (2002). Job characteristics as predictors of ill-health and sickness absenteeism in different occupational types: A multigroup structural equation modeling approach. *Work & Stress, 16*, 229-250
- Quinn, R.P., Seashore, S., Kahn, R., Mangione, T., Campbell, D., Staines, G., McCullough, M. (1971). Survey of working conditions: Final report in univariate and bivariate tables (Document No:2916-0001). Washington, D.C., US. Government Printing Office.
- McCullough, M. (1971). Survey of working conditions: Final report in univariate and bivariate tables (Document No:2916-0001). Washington, D.C., US. Government Printing Office.

- Rain, J. S., Lane, I. M., Steiner, D. D. (1991). A current look at the job satisfaction/life satisfaction relationship: Review and future considerations. *Human Relations*, 44(3), 287-307.
- Resick, C. J., Baltes, B. B., & Shantz, C.W.(2007). Person-organization fit and work related attitudes and decisions: Examining interactive effects with job fit and conscientiousness. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 92 (5), 1446-1455.
- Rice, R. W., Near, J. P., & Hunt, R. G. (1980). The job satisfaction/life satisfaction relationship: A review of empirical research. *Basic and Applied Social Psychology*, 1(1), 37-64
- Rothausen, T.J. (1994). Job satisfaction and the parent worker: The role of flexibility and rewards. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 44, 317-336.
- Ronen, S. (1984). *Alternative work schedules: Selecting, implementing, and evaluating*. Homewood, IL: Dow-Jones-Irwin
- Ryan, A. M., & Kristof-Brown, A. L. (2003). Focusing on personality in person-organization fit research: Unaddressed issues. In M. R. Barrick & A. M. Ryan (Eds.), *Personality and work: Reconsidering the role of personality in organizations* (pp. 262-288). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Rynes, S. L., & Gerhart, B. (1990). Interviewer assessments of applicant “fit”: An explanatory investigation. *Personnel Psychology*, 43, 13-35.
- Saks, A. M., & Ashforth, B.E. (1997). A longitudinal investigation of the relationships between job information sources, applicant perceptions of fit, and work outcomes. *Personnel Psychology*, 50, 395-426.
- Saks, A. M., & Ashforth, B.E. (2002).Is job search related to employment quality? It all depends on to fit. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 87, 646-654.

- Salancik, G. R., & Pfeffer, J. (1977). An examination of need-satisfaction models of job attitudes. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 22, 427-456.
- Saucier, G., & Goldberg, L.R. (2003). The structure of personality attributes. In M.R. Barrick, & A.M. Ryan (Eds.), *Personality and work* (pp.1-29). SanFrancisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Scheu, C. R., & Ryan, A. M. (2001). *Achieving recruiting goals: Applying what we know about person-organization fit across a range of organizational image*. Paper presented at the 16th Annual Meeting of the Society for Industrial and Organizational Psychology, San Diego, California.
- Schneider, B. (1983). Interactional psychology and organizational behaviour, *Research in Organizational Behavior*, 5, 1-31.
- Schneider, B. (1987). The people make the place. *Personnel Psychology*, 40, 437-453.
- Sekiguchi, T. (2004). Person-organization fit and person-job fit in employee selection: A review of the literature. *Osaka Keidai Ronshu*, 54(6), 179-196.
- Shantz, C. A. (2003). Person-organization fit: Individual differences, socialization, and outcomes. Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, Wayne State University.
- Shaw, J.D., & Gupta, N. (2004). Job complexity, performance, and well-being: When does supplies-values fit matter? *Personnel Psychology*, 57, 847-879.
- Shin, D. C., & Johnson, D. M. (1978). Avowed happiness as an overall assessment of the quality of the life. *Social Indicators Research*, 5, 475-492.
- Shirom, A., Nirel, N., & Vinokur, A. D. (2006). Overload, autonomy, and burnout as predictors of physicians quality of care. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, 11(4), 328-342.
- Silverthorne, C. (2004). The impact of organizational culture and person-organizational

- fit on organizational commitment and job satisfaction in Taiwan. *The Leadership and Organization Development Journal*, 25(7), 592-599.
- Solomon, C.M. (1996). Flexibility comes out of flux. *Personnel Journal*, 75, 34-43.
- Spector, P. E. (1987). Interactive effects of perceived control and job stressors on affective reactions and health outcomes for clerical workers. *Work and Stress*, 1, 155-162.
- Spector, P.E., Dwyer, D.J., & Jex, S.M. (1988). Relation of job stressors to affective, health, and performance outcomes: A comparison of multiple data sources. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 73(1), 11-19.
- Spokane, A.R. (1985). A review of research on person-environment congruence in Holland's theory of careers (Monograph). *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 26, 306-343.
- Statistics Canada (2007, July 17). Retrieved October 22, 2008, from <http://www12.statcan.ca/census-recensement/2006/rt-td/as-eng.cf>
- Staw, B.M. (1984). Organizational behavior: A review and reformulation of the field's outcome variables. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 35, 627-666.
- Staw, B.M., Bell, N.E., & Clausen, J.A. (1986). The dispositional approach to job attitudes. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 31(1), 56-77.
- Steel, P., Schmidt, J., & Shultz, J. (2008). Refining the relationship between personality and subjective well-being. *Psychological Bulletin*, 134(1), 138-161.
- Steger, M. F., Kashdan, T. B., Sullivan, B. A., & Lorentz, D. (2008). Understanding the search for meaning in life: Personality, cognitive style, and the dynamic between seeking and experiencing meaning. *Journal of Personality*, 76(2), 199-228.
- Tabachnick, B. G., & Fidell, L. S. (2007). *Using multivariate statistics* (5th ed.). Boston:

Pearson Education.

- Tajfel, H., & Turner, J.C. (1986). The social identity theory of intergroup behavior. In S. Worchel & W. G. Austin (Eds.), *Psychology of intergroup relations* (2nd ed.). Chicago, IL: Nelson Hall.
- Tellegen, A. (1985). Structures of mood and personality and their relevance to assessing anxiety with an emphasis on self-report. In A.H. Tuma & J.D. Maser (Eds.), *Anxiety and the anxiety disorder* (pp.681-706). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Terborg, J.R. (1981). Interactional psychology and research on human behavior in organizations. *Academy of Management Review*, 6, 569-576.
- Tetrick, L. E., & LaRocco, J. M. (1987). Understanding prediction, and control as moderators of the relationship between perceived stress, satisfaction, and psychological well-being. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 72(4), 538-543.
- Thoresen, C.J., Kaplan, S.E., Barsky, A.P., Warren.C.R., & Chermont, K., (2003). The affective underpinnings of job perceptions and attitudes: A met-analytic review and integration. *Psychological Bulletin*, 129(6), 914-945.
- Tokar, D.M., & Swanson, J.L. (1995). Evaluation of the correspondence between Holland's vocational personality typology and the Five-factor model of personality. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 46, 89-108.
- Ton, M. N., & Hansen, J. C. (2001). Using a person-environment fit framework to predict satisfaction and motivation in work and marital roles. *Journal of Career Assessment*, 9(4), 315-331.
- Tyler, T. R. (2000). Social justice. *International Journal of Psychology*, 35, 117-125.
- Van-Harrison, R. (1978). Person-environment fit and job stress, In C. Cooper & R.Panyé (Eds.), *Stress at work*. New York: John Wiley.

- Vente, W., Kamphuis, J. H., Emmelkamp, P.M.G., & Blonk, R.W.B. (2008). Individual and group cognitive-behavioral treatment for work-related stress complaints and sickness absence: A randomized controlled trial. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology, 13*(3), 214-231.
- Verquer, M. L., Beehr, T. A., Wagner, S. H. (2003). A meta-analysis of relations between person-organization fit and work attitudes. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 63*, 473-489.
- Warr, P.B. (2007). *Work, happiness, and unhappiness*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Watson, D. (2000). *Mood and temperament*. New York: The Guilford Press.
- Watson, D., & Clark, L.A. (1984). Negative affectivity: The disposition to experience aversive emotional states. *Psychological Bulletin, 96*, 465-490.
- Watson, D., & Clark, L.A. (1992). On traits and temperament: General and specific factors of emotional experience and their relation to the five-factor model. *Journal of Personality, 60*, 441-476.
- Watson, D., Clark, L.A., & Carey, G. (1988). Positive and negative affectivity and their relation to anxiety and depressive disorders. *Journal of Abnormal Psychology, 97*, 346-353.
- Watson, D., Clark, L.A., McIntyre, C.W., & Hamaker, S. (1992). Affect, personality and social activity. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 63*, 1011-1025.
- Watson, D., Clark, L.A., & Tellegen, A. (1988). Development and validation of brief measures of positive and negative affect: The Panas scales. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 54*(6), 1063-1070.
- Watson, D., Pennebaker, J.W., & Folger, R. (1987). Beyond negative affectivity:

- Measuring stress and satisfaction in the workplace. *Journal of Organizational Behavior Management*, 8(2), 141-157.
- Watson, D., & Slack, A.K. (1993). General factors of affective temperament and their relation to job satisfaction over time. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 54, 181-202.
- Watson, D. & Walker, L. M. (1996). The long-term stability and predictive validity of trait measures of affect. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 70(3), 567-577.
- Weiss, H.M., & Cropanzano, R. (1996). Affective events theory: A theoretical discussion of the structure, causes, and consequences of affective experience at work. In B.M.Staw & L.L. Cummings (Eds.), *Research in organizational behavior: An annual series of analytical essays and critical reviews*, Vol.18. (pp. 1-74). US: Elsevier Science.
- Wheeler, J.W., Buckley, M. R., Halbesleben, J. R., Brouer, R.L., & Ferris, G.R. (2005). The elusive criterion of fit revisited: Toward an integrative theory of multidimensional fit. In J. Martocchio (Ed.), *Research in personnel and human resource management* (pp.265-304). Greenwich: JAI Press.

Appendix A

Recruitment E-Mail Invitation for Snowball Sample

Hi,

I am a PhD student in the Department of Psychology at Carleton University and I am conducting a study about whether people feel they have a good or bad fit with the companies for which they work. This study will also ask a few questions about stress at work, how satisfied you are with your job, and about how you generally feel about yourself. This survey is completely anonymous and confidential. The study was approved by the Ethics Committee for Psychology research in Carleton University.

If you would like to complete the survey, which takes about 15 – 20 minutes, please click this link:

https://www.surveymonkey.com/s.aspx?sm=aW7ZEGLEH7gsNWBk_2fTDa1w_3d_3d

(You may also copy and paste this link into your internet browser). To complete this survey, you need to be working, either at a full or part-time job.

If you know of other people who would be interested in completing this survey, would you please forward this email to them? I would like about 500 people to take the survey, so it would be helpful if you could send this to as many of your contacts as possible.

Thank you for your help and your time! If you have any questions about this research, please contact me or my research supervisor.

Doruk Uysal Irak
Dr. J. Mantler
Carleton University
Department of Psychology
1125 Colonel By Drive,
Ottawa, ON, K1S 5B6
(613- 520-2600, ext.1034)

Appendix B

Recruitment E-Mail Invitation for StudyResponse Project

Participant [ID]: New Direct Payment Survey Invitation

Dear StudyResponse Project Participant:

We are requesting your assistance with a study conducted by researchers at Carleton University on person-environment fit. You must be at least 18 years of age to participate and you must be employed either full or part-time. The study will take you approximately 20 minutes but there are no time limits. If you choose not to respond within the first week, we will send you a reminder in one week. Note that instructions on how to discontinue your participation in StudyResponse and stop receiving emails from us appear at the end of this message.

The study is anonymous, so please do not enter any identifying information into the research instrument except your Study Response ID, which is [ID]. The researcher has pledged to keep your data confidential and only to report aggregated results in any published scientific study.

In appreciation of your choice to participated in this study we will give you a \$5.00 gift certificate to Amazon.com. The researchers have provided StudyResponse with the funding for this payment. Note that your StudyResponse ID number is [ID] (also shown in the subject line of this message) and that you must enter that number into the survey to be eligible for the \$5.00 gift certificate. StudyResponse will start issuing the certificates approximately a week after the researcher receives the completed survey.

Follow this link to participate:

https://www.surveymonkey.com/s.aspx?sm=56fxJCUfHEHIU4bkf0VrSQ_3d_3d

Appendix B (cont.)

Participation in this study is voluntary and you may withdraw from participation at any time. You must submit your answers in order to receive the \$5 electronic gift card. If you have any questions you may contact the researchers at:

Doruk Uysal Irak, MA, PhD Candidate

Janet Mantler, PhD, Associate Professor

Carleton University

Department of Psychology

1125 Colonel By Drive,

Ottawa, ON, K1S 5B6

(613- 520-2600, ext.1034)

duirak@connect.carleton.ca

We very much appreciate your participation in the StudyResponse project and your willingness to consider completing this study.

You received this email because you signed up as a research participant for the StudyResponse project, which is based at Syracuse University's School of Information Studies, in Syracuse NY, USA. You also provided a confirmation of that signup in a subsequent step. The StudyResponse project has received institutional review board approval (07-199), affirming our commitment to ethical treatment of research participants. Although StudyResponse is not a commercial service and does not send unsolicited email, the project complies with the obligations of the 2003 CAN-SPAM act. In accordance with the act, you have the following options for ceasing participation in the StudyResponse project:

1. You may simply reply to this email with the word UNSUBSCRIBE in the subject.
2. You may use our self service account management interface at:

<http://studyresponse.syr.edu/studyresponse/update.htm>

Appendix B (cont.)

3. You may contact a staff member of the StudyResponse project using the contact information provided below.

* Conditions apply. In case of any clarifications, please feel free to contact us at SRhelp@syr.edu

For further information about the StudyResponse project, you may contact a member of the StudyResponse staff:

StudyResponse Project; Director: Jeffrey Stanton; Hinds Hall, Syracuse University, Syracuse, NY 13244-4100, 315-443-7267, SRhelp@syr.edu

Appendix C

Consent Information

The research:

This survey will ask you a variety of questions pertaining to how you feel about your job and the company for which you work. There are also some questions about how you see yourself, how you feel about life, your recent stress level, how you feel about your work schedule and workload, and general demographic questions (e.g., age, gender). It should take about 15-20 minutes to complete the questionnaire.

Anonymity/confidentiality:

The data collected in the study are strictly confidential. Please do not put any identifying markers on your completed questionnaire – this ensures that there is no way to identify you. All of the information you provide will be kept in strict confidence. Your survey responses will be submitted to a third-party server that strips all potential identifiers before we see the responses. **Please note that you can withdraw and your data can be deleted any time before completion of the survey. However once the survey was submitted your identity is stripped from the questionnaire which makes it impossible to withdrawn after submission.**

Your rights:

You are under no obligation to complete this survey. Completion of this survey implies consent. If there are questions that you do not wish to answer, please skip them. Your data will be stored at Carleton University for a minimum of 5 years and will be made available to Carleton University Research Ethics Committee if required for their review process.

The results:

A report of this study will be made available on the website www.carleton.ca/~jmantler/reports by the end of November 2009. Results from this study may also be used in conference presentations, academic publications, and press releases.

The researchers

The principal researcher is Doruk Uysal Irak (613- 520-2600, ext.1034; email: duirak@connect.carleton.ca), a PhD student in Psychology at Carleton University, in Ottawa. Her supervisor is Dr. J. Mantler (613-520-2600, ext. 4173). Feel free to contact either researcher if you have any questions about the survey.

For more information:

Appendix C (cont.)

This study has been approved by the Carleton University Ethics Committee for Psychological Research. Should you have any concerns about your ethical treatment in this study, please contact Dr. Avi Parush, Chair, the Carleton University Ethics Committee for Psychological Research at 613-520-2600 ext. 6026 or Dr. A. Forth, Associate Chair, Department of Psychology, at 613-520-2600 ext. 1267.

Although we do not anticipate that any of the questions we ask should cause you pain or anxiety, if you feel the need to talk to someone about an issue that emerged while you were completing this questionnaire, you can contact your family physician for a referral to counselling services. Alternatively, you may call the Crisis Line in your area; the phone number for the Crisis Line should be in the Yellow Pages of your local phone book.

Appendix D Debriefing

Thank you for your time and effort in participating in this study.

This research is about a concept called person-environment fit. We asked you questions about how well you feel you fit with your job and with your company. We were looking to find out how much your general approach to life (more positive or more negative) and how much your workload and work schedule affect how you feel about how well you fit with your job.

When we understand the factors influencing our beliefs about how we fit with our work environment, we will have greater knowledge about career preferences and work-related needs. Based on research like this, some organizations could create new jobs that would be more satisfying to employees, who would in turn be more engaged in their jobs and work life. Thus, the results from this study could have important implications for organizational practices (such as the development and implementation of interventions related to training, selection and recruiting) and for the development of human resource policies.

If you would like to know more about finding a job that is a good fit with you are, you may want to check out websites like <http://www.careerkey.org/index.asp>

It is important to have as many people as possible answer this questionnaire so that we can find out if the idea of person-environment fit is the same for people with a variety of jobs and very different work schedules. This study is for my PhD in Organizational Psychology and the findings of this research will be made available to you in a report posted on www.carleton.ca/~jmantler/reports by November 2009. Please check back to read more about this study.

Although the questions we asked were not intended to cause any stress, if you feel the need to talk to someone about an issue that emerged while you were completing this questionnaire, you can contact your family physician for a referral to counselling services. You could also call your local Crisis Centre; the number is listed in the Yellow Pages of your local phone book.

If you have any questions about this research, you may contact Doruk Uysal Irak (613-520-2600, ext.1034; email: duirak@connect.carleton.ca) or Dr. Janet Mantler at the Department of Psychology, Carleton University, at 613-520-2600, ext. 4173.

Should you have any concerns about your ethical treatment in this study, please contact Dr. Avi Parush, Chair, Carleton University Ethics Committee for Psychological Research at 613-520-2600 ext. 6026 or Dr. Adelle Forth, Associate Chair, Department of Psychology, at 613-520-2600 ext. 1267.

Appendix D (cont.)

Thank you again for participating in this study. I look forward to sharing the results with you very soon.

If you know of anyone else who might be interested in filling out this questionnaire, please feel free to send them the link to this study:

https://www.surveymonkey.com/s.aspx?sm=aW7ZEGLEH7gsNWBk_2fTDa1w_3d_3d

Appendix E

Means, Standard Deviations, and Independent Samples t-tests by Demographics of Snowball and Study Response Groups

Variable	Snowball	Study Response	<i>t</i>	Bonferroni
	<i>M</i> (<i>SD</i>)	<i>M</i> (<i>SD</i>)		
Age	35 (9.0)	43 (11.7)	-6.64***	6.42 ¹ ***
Organizational Tenure	5.8 (6.1)	8.7 (7.9)	-3.56***	3.56***
Job Tenure	3.2 (4.1)	6.3 (6.4)	-5.28***	5.28***
Working Hours	37.5 (28.4)	36.9 (10.2)	0.33	0.33

Snowball *N* = 165; Study Response *N* = 186

*** *p* < .001.

¹Bonferroni *p* < .00025

Appendix F

Chi-Square Tests by Demographics of Snowball and Study Response Groups

Variable	χ^2	df	p
Gender	14.8526	1	0.001
Employment type (permanent/temporary)	13.31	2	0.001
Type of job (part-time/full-time)	4.03	2	0.134

Snowball $N = 165$; Study Response $N = 186$

Appendix G

Questionnaire Items

Person-Organization Fit

Response options:

- ☐ Strongly disagree
- ☐ Disagree
- ☐ Neutral
- ☐ Agree
- ☐ Strongly agree

Supplementary fit

1. I feel my values “match” or fit this organization and the current employees in this organization.
2. I think the values and personality of this organization reflect my own values and personality.
3. The values of this organization are similar to my own values.
4. My values match those of current employees in this organization.
5. I feel my personality matches the “personality” or image of this organization.

Complementary fit

6. I feel that I am important to this company because I have such different skills and abilities than my co-workers.
7. My co-workers rely on me because I have competencies that they do not have.
8. When key decisions are made, my co-workers consult me because I have a different perspective than they do.
9. I feel like I stand out in this organization.
10. My knowledge, skills, and abilities offer something that other employees in this organization do not have.
11. I feel that I am a unique piece of the puzzle that makes this organization work.
12. Even though my personality differs from my co-workers, it seems to complement their personalities.
13. People in my organization seem to value that I am different from the ‘typical’

Needs-supplies fit

14. I feel that this organization enables me to do the kind of work I want to do.
15. This organization measure up the kind of organization I was seeking.
16. This organization is a good match for me.
17. This organization fulfills my needs.

Demands-abilities fit

18. I think I possess the skills and abilities to succeed at this organization.
19. I believe my skills and abilities match those required by this organization in general.

Appendix G (cont.)

Person-Job Fit

Response options:

- ☐ Strongly disagree
- ☐ Disagree
- ☐ Neutral
- ☐ Agree
- ☐ Strongly agree

Supplementary fit

1. I feel my values match or fit this job and the current employees doing the same job
2. I think the values and personality of my job reflect my own values and personality
3. My values match those of current employees doing the same job with me
4. The values of this job are similar to my own values
5. I feel my personality matches the personality or image of this job.

Complementary fit

6. I feel that I am important to this job because I have such different skills and abilities than my co-workers doing the same job.
7. My co-workers rely on me on doing this job because I have competencies that they do not have.
8. When key decisions are made , my co-workers consult me because I have a different perspective than they do.
9. I feel like I stand out in this job.
10. My knowledge, skills, and abilities offer something that other employees doing my job does not have.
11. I feel that I am a unique piece of the puzzle that makes this job work.
12. Even though my personality differs from my co-workers doing same job, it seems to complement their personalities.
13. People doing my job seem to value that I am different from the 'typical' employee

Needs-supplies fit

14. I feel that this job enables me to do the kind of work I want to do
15. This job measures up the kind of job I was seeking
16. This job is a good match for me
17. This job fulfills my needs

Demands-abilities fit

18. I believe my skills and abilities match those required by the job
19. My job performance is hurt by a lack of expertise on the job.
20. I possess the skills and abilities to perform the job.

Appendix G (cont.)

Positive and Negative Affectivity

Response options:

- ☐ very slightly/not at all
- ☐ a little
- ☐ moderately
- ☐ quite a bit
- ☐ extremely

This scale consists of a number of words that describe different feelings and emotions. Read each item and then mark the appropriate answer in the space next to that word. Indicate to what extent you feel in general. Use the following scale to record your answers.

1. interested (positive affectivity)
2. distressed (negative affectivity)
3. excited (positive affectivity)
4. upset (negative affectivity)
5. strong (positive affectivity)
6. guilty (negative affectivity)
7. scared (negative affectivity)
8. hostile (negative affectivity)
9. enthusiastic (positive affectivity)
10. proud (positive affectivity)
11. irritable (negative affectivity)
12. alert (negative affectivity)
13. ashamed (negative affectivity)
14. inspired (positive affectivity)
15. nervous (negative affectivity)
16. determined (positive affectivity)
17. attentive (positive affectivity)
18. jittery (positive affectivity)
19. active (positive affectivity)
20. afraid (negative affectivity)

Appendix G (cont.)

Sensitivity to Reward and Punishment

Response options:

- ☐ Strongly disagree
- ☐ Disagree
- ☐ Agree
- ☐ Strongly agree

1. If I think something unpleasant is going to happen I usually get pretty "worked up."
2. I worry about making mistakes.
3. Criticism or scolding hurts me quite a bit.
4. I feel pretty worried or upset when I think or know somebody is angry at me.
5. Even if something bad is about to happen to me, I rarely experience fear or nervousness.
6. I feel worried when I think I have done poorly at something.
7. I have very few fears compared to my friends.
8. When I get something I want, I feel excited and energized.
9. When I'm doing well at something, I love to keep at it.
10. When good things happen to me, it affects me strongly.
11. It would excite me to win a contest.
12. When I see an opportunity for something I like, I get excited right away.
13. When I want something, I usually go all-out to get it.
14. I go out of my way to get things I want.
15. If I see a chance to get something I want, I move on it right away.
16. When I go after something I use a "no holds barred" approach.
17. I will often do things for no other reason than that they might be fun.
18. I crave excitement and new sensations.
19. I'm always willing to try something new if I think it will be fun.
20. I often act on the spur of the moment.

Appendix G (cont.)

Life Satisfaction Scale

Response options:

- ☐ Strongly disagree
- ☐ Disagree
- ☐ Neutral
- ☐ Agree
- ☐ Strongly agree

1. In most ways my life is close to ideal.
2. The conditions of my life are excellent.
3. I am satisfied with my life.
4. So far I have gotten the important things I want in life.
5. If I could live my life over, I would change almost nothing.

Overall Job Satisfaction Scale

Response options:

- ☐ Strongly disagree
- ☐ Disagree
- ☐ Neutral
- ☐ Agree
- ☐ Strongly agree

1. I am enthusiastic about my work
2. I feel fairly satisfied with my present job
3. Each minute at work seems like it never ends
4. I am finding real enjoyment in my work
5. I consider my job rather unpleasant

Perceived Stress

Response options:

- ☐ Never
- ☐ Almost never
- ☐ Sometimes
- ☐ Fairly often
- ☐ Very often

Appendix G (cont.)

1. In the last month, how often have you been upset because of something that happened unexpectedly?
2. In the last month, how often have you felt that you were unable to control the important things in your life?
3. In the last month, how often have you felt nervous and “stressed”?
4. In the last month, how often have you dealt successfully with irritating life hassles?
5. In the last month, how often have you felt that you were effectively coping with important changes that were occurring in your life?
6. In the last month, how often have you felt confident about your ability to handle your personal problems?
7. In the last month, how often have you felt that things were going your way?
8. In the last month, how often have you found that you could not cope with all the things that you had to do?
9. In the last month, how often have you been able to control irritations in your life?
10. In the last month, how often have you felt that you were on top of things?
11. In the last month, how often have you been angered because of things that happened that were outside of your control?
12. In the last month, how often have you found yourself thinking about things that you have accomplished?
13. In the last month, how often have you been able to control the way you spend your time?
14. In the last month, how often have you felt difficulties were piling up so high that you could not overcome them?

Workplace Flexibility

Response options:

- ☐ Strongly disagree
- ☐ Disagree
- ☐ Neutral
- ☐ Agree
- ☐ Strongly agree

1. I am able to arrive and depart from work when I want.
2. I am free to work the hours that are best for my schedule.
3. There is no flexibility in my schedule. (reverse coded)
4. It is O.K. with my employer if I work at home.
5. I would easily take a day off or work if I wanted to

Appendix G (cont.)

Written Question

Do you think it is important to have flexible schedule at workplace?

Workload

Response options:

- ☐ Rarely
- ☐ Occasionally
- ☐ Sometimes
- ☐ Fairly often
- ☐ Very often

1. How often does your job require you to work very fast?
2. How often does your job require you to work very hard?
3. How often does your job leave you with little time to get things done?
4. How often is there a great deal to be done?

Written Question

Is it important to have high or low workload at workplace?

Appendix H

Demographic Questions

1. Age
____years
2. Gender
____Male
____Female
3. What is your highest level of education?
____Elementary school
____Some high school
____High school
____Some community college
____Community college (Diploma)
____Some university
____University degree
____Masters Degree
____Doctoral Degree
4. Which of the following job categories best describes your current job:
____ Administration
____ Advertising, marketing, or PR
____ Construction and property management
____ Counseling, social, and guidance services
____ Education, teaching and lecturing
____ Engineering
____ Finance and management consultancy
____ Health care
____ Hospitality, restaurant worker

Appendix H (cont.)

___ Human resources and employment

___ IT, information services

___ Law enforcement and public protection

___ Legal services

___ Logistics and transportation

___ Manufacturing and processing

___ Performing arts and publishing

___ Sales and retail

___ Scientific services

___ Other -- Please Specify _____

5. How many years have you been employed by this organization (including all positions that you may have held while working for this company)?

_____ years

6. How long have you been working in your current job/position?

_____ years

7. How would you best describe your employment?

___ Permanent

___ Contract / Temporary

___ Casual

___ Other

8. Do you work

___ Part time

___ Full time

9. Approximately how many hours a week do you work?

___ Regular hours _____ Overtime hours

Appendix I

Multiple Regression Analyses for Variables Predicting Job Satisfaction

Variable-four subfactors of Person-organization fit	<i>B</i>	<i>SE B</i>	β	<i>R</i> ²
Value and personality congruence	.08	.06	.08	
Integrative congruence	.02	.04	.02	
General congruence	.64	.06	.57***	
Ability congruence	.54	.13	.18***	.54
*** <i>p</i> < .001.				

Appendix I (cont.)

Multiple Regression Analyses for Variables Predicting Life Satisfaction

Variable-four subfactors	<i>B</i>	<i>SE B</i>	β	<i>R</i> ²
of Person-organization fit				
Value and personality congruence	.19	.08	.18*	
Integrative congruence	.11	.05	.12*	
General congruence	.17	.09	.15*	
Ability congruence	.33	.18	.11	.16

* $p < .05$.

Appendix I (cont.)

Multiple Regression Analyses for Variables Predicting Perceived Stress

Variable- four subfactors of Person-organization fit	<i>B</i>	<i>SE B</i>	β	<i>R</i> ²
Value and personality congruence	.04	.15	.02	
Integrative congruence	-.04	.09	-.03	
General congruence	-.31	.16	-.15*	
Ability congruence	-1.42	.32	-.26***	.12
* <i>p</i> < .05, *** <i>p</i> < .001.				

Appendix I (cont.)

Multiple Regression Analyses for Variables Predicting Job Satisfaction

Variable-four subfactors of Person-job fit	<i>B</i>	<i>SE B</i>	β	<i>R</i> ²
Value and Personality congruence	.18	.06	.15**	
Integrative congruence	.02	.03	.02	
General congruence	.64	.06	.58***	
Ability congruence	.37	.12	.12**	.58
** <i>p</i> < .01. *** <i>p</i> < .001.				

Appendix I (cont.)

Multiple Regression Analyses for Variables Predicting Life Satisfaction

Variable-four subfactors	<i>B</i>	<i>SE B</i>	β	<i>R</i> ²
of Person-organization fit				
Value and personality congruence	.29	.09	.23***	
Integrative congruence	.09	.05	.10*	
General congruence	.19	.08	.17*	
Ability congruence	.01	.18	.00	.17

* $p < .05$. *** $p < .001$.

Appendix I (cont.)

Multiple Regression Analyses for Variables Predicting Perceived Stress

Variable-four subfactors of Person-job fit	<i>B</i>	<i>SE B</i>	β	<i>R</i> ²
Value and Personality congruence	-.41	.16	-.19*	
Integrative congruence	-.08	.09	-.05	
General congruence	-.09	.15	-.05	
Ability congruence	-.80	.32	-.15*	.11

* $p < .05$.

Appendix J

Testing Mediator Effects of Person-Organization Fit between Positive Affectivity and Job Satisfaction

Testing steps in mediation model	<i>B</i>	<i>SE B</i>	95% <i>CI</i>	β
Testing step 1				
Outcome: Job satisfaction	.25	.02	.205- .296	.50***
Predictor: Positive affectivity				
Testing step 2				
Outcome: Person-organization fit	.62	.05	.514- .724	.52***
Predictor: Positive affectivity				
Testing step 3				
Outcome: Job satisfaction				
Mediator: Person-organization fit	.22	.02	.180- .256	.52***
Predictor: Positive affectivity	.12	.02	.070- .161	.23***

Note. *CI* = confidence interval

*** $p < .001$.

Appendix J (cont.)

Testing Mediator Effects of Person-Organization Fit between Positive Affectivity and Life Satisfaction

Testing steps in mediation model	<i>B</i>	<i>SE B</i>	95% <i>CI</i>	β
Testing step 1				
Outcome: Life satisfaction				
Predictor: Positive affectivity	.23	.02	.178- .273	.44***
Testing step 2				
Outcome: Person-organization fit				
Predictor: Positive affectivity	.62	.05	.514-.724	.52***
Testing step 3				
Outcome: Life satisfaction				
Mediator: Person-organization fit	.09	.02	.053-.145	.23***
Predictor: Positive affectivity	.16	.03	.110-.219	.32***

Note. *CI* = confidence interval

*** $p < .001$.

Appendix J (cont.)

Testing Mediator Effects of Person-Organization Fit between Positive Affectivity and Perceived Stress

Testing steps in mediation model	<i>B</i>	<i>SE B</i>	95% <i>CI</i>	β
Testing step 1				
Outcome: Perceived stress				
Predictor: Positive affectivity	-.28	.05	-.365- -.186	-.31***
Testing step 2				
Outcome: Person-organization fit				
Predictor: Positive affectivity	.62	.05	.514-.724	.52***
Testing step 3				
Outcome: Perceived stress				
Mediator: Person-organization fit	-.12	.04	-.206- -.033	-.16**
Predictor: Positive affectivity	-.20	.05	-.305- -.097	-.23***

Note. *CI* = confidence interval

****p* < .001. ***p* < .01.

Appendix J (cont.)

Testing Mediator Effects of Person-Organization Fit between Negative Affectivity and Job Satisfaction

Testing steps in mediation model	<i>B</i>	<i>SE B</i>	95% CI	β
Testing step 1				
Outcome: Job satisfaction				
Predictor: Negative affectivity	-.23	.03	-.296- -.172	-.37***
Testing step 2				
Outcome: Person-organization fit				
Predictor: Negative affectivity	-.54	.07	-.683-- -.396	-.36***
Testing step 3				
Outcome: Job satisfaction				
Mediator: Person-organization fit	.25	.02	.209- .280	.58***
Predictor: Negative affectivity	-.09	.03	-.149- -.040	-.15***

Note. *CI* = confidence interval

****p* < .001.

Appendix J (cont.)

Testing Mediator Effects of Person-Organization Fit between Negative Affectivity and Life Satisfaction

Testing steps in mediation model	<i>B</i>	<i>SE B</i>	95% <i>CI</i>	β
Testing step 1				
Outcome: Life satisfaction				
Predictor: Negative affectivity	-.21	.03	-.268- -.142	-.32***
Testing step 2				
Outcome: Person-organization fit				
Predictor: Negative affectivity	-.54	.07	-.683--.396	-.36***
Testing step 3				
Outcome: Life satisfaction				
Mediator: Person-organization fit	.14	.02	.096-.182	.33***
Predictor: Negative affectivity	-.13	.03	-.195--.067	-.21***

Note. *CI*= confidence interval

*** $p < .001$.

Appendix J (cont.)

Testing Mediator Effects of Person-Organization Fit between Negative Affectivity and Perceived Stress

Testing steps in mediation model	B	SE B	95% CI	β
Testing step 1				
Outcome: Perceived stress				
Predictor: Negative affectivity	.59	.05	.489-.690	.53***
Testing step 2				
Outcome: Person-organization fit				
Predictor: Negative affectivity	-.54	.07	-.683--.396	-.36***
Testing step 3				
Outcome: Perceived stress				
Mediator: Person-organization fit	-.07	.04	-.138-.006	-.09
Predictor: Negative affectivity	.55	.06	.442-.660	.49***

Note. CI= confidence interval

*** $p < .001$.

Appendix K

Testing Mediator Effects of Person-Job Fit between Positive Affectivity and Job Satisfaction

Testing steps in mediation model	<i>B</i>	<i>SE B</i>	95% <i>CI</i>	β
Testing step 1				
Outcome: Job satisfaction				
Predictor: Positive affectivity	.25	.02	.205- .296	.50***
Testing step 2				
Outcome: Person-job fit				
Predictor: Positive affectivity	.60	.05	.495- .704	.51***
Testing step 3				
Outcome: Job satisfaction				
Mediator: Person-job fit	.23	.02	.196- .272	.55***
Predictor: Positive affectivity	.11	.02	.069- .158	.23***

Note. *CI* = confidence interval

*** $p < .001$.

Appendix K (cont.)

Testing Mediator Effects of Person-Job Fit between Positive Affectivity and Life Satisfaction

Testing steps in mediation model	<i>B</i>	<i>SE B</i>	95% <i>CI</i>	β
Testing step 1				
Outcome: Life satisfaction				
Predictor: Positive affectivity	.23	.02	.178-.273	.44***
Testing step 2				
Outcome: Person-job fit				
Predictor: Positive affectivity	.60	.05	.495-.704	.51***
Testing step 3				
Outcome: Life satisfaction				
Mediator: Person-job fit	.10	.02	.052-.145	.23***
Predictor: Positive affectivity	.17	.03	.114-.223	.33***

Note. *CI* = confidence interval

****p* < .001.

Appendix K (cont.)

Testing Mediator Effects of Person-Job Fit between Positive Affectivity and Perceived Stress

Testing steps in mediation model	<i>B</i>	<i>SE B</i>	95% <i>CI</i>	β
Testing step 1				
Outcome: Perceived stress				
Predictor: Positive affectivity	-.28	.05	-.365- -.186	-.31***
Testing step 2				
Outcome: Person-job fit				
Predictor: Positive affectivity	.60	.05	.495-.704	.51***
Testing step 3				
Outcome: Perceived stress				
Mediator: Person-job fit	-.16	.04	-.244- -.069	-.21***
Predictor: Positive affectivity	-.18	.05	-.287- -.080	-.21***

Note. *CI* = confidence interval

*** $p \leq .001$.

Appendix K (cont.)

Testing Mediator Effects of Person-Job Fit between Negative Affectivity and Job Satisfaction

Testing steps in mediation model	<i>B</i>	<i>SE B</i>	95% <i>CI</i>	β
Testing step 1				
Outcome: Job satisfaction				
Predictor: Negative affectivity	-.23	.03	-.296- -.172	-.37***
Testing step 2				
Outcome: Person-job fit				
Predictor: Negative affectivity	-.46	.07	-.600- -.312	-.31***
Testing step 3				
Outcome: Job satisfaction				
Mediator: Person-job fit	.26	.02	.224-.294	.61***
Predictor: Negative affectivity	-.11	.03	-.159- -.056	-.17***

Note. *CI* = confidence interval

*** $p < .001$.

Appendix K (cont.)

Testing Mediator Effects of Person-Job Fit between Negative Affectivity and Life Satisfaction

Testing steps in mediation model	<i>B</i>	<i>SE B</i>	95% <i>CI</i>	β
Testing step 1				
Outcome: Life satisfaction				
Predictor: Negative affectivity	-.21	.03	-.268- -.142	-.32***
Testing step 2				
Outcome: Person-job fit				
Predictor: Negative affectivity	-.46	.07	-.600- -.312	-.31***
Testing step 3				
Outcome: Life satisfaction				
Mediator: Person-job fit	.14	.02	.099-.196	.33***
Predictor: Negative affectivity	-.14	.03	-.202- -.076	-.22***

Note. *CI* = confidence interval

*** $p < .001$.

Appendix K (cont.)

Testing Mediator Effects of Person-Job Fit between Negative Affectivity and Perceived Stress

Testing steps in mediation model	<i>B</i>	<i>SE B</i>	95% <i>CI</i>	β
Testing step 1				
Outcome: Perceived stress				
Predictor: Negative affectivity	.59	.05	.489-.690	.53***
Testing step 2				
Outcome: Person-job fit				
Predictor: Negative affectivity	-.46	.07	-.600- -.312	-.31***
Testing step 3				
Outcome: Perceived stress				
Mediator: Person-job fit	-.12	.04	-.187- -.043	-.15**
Predictor: Negative affectivity	.53	.05	.425-.636	.47***

Note. *CI* = confidence interval

** $p < .01$. *** $p < .001$.