

The incremental validity of perceived goal congruence: The assessment of person-organisation fit

Author

Supeli, Abas, Creed, Peter A

Published

2014

Journal Title

Journal of Career Assessment

DOI

<https://doi.org/10.1177/1069072713487849>

Copyright Statement

© 2013 SAGE Publications. This is the author-manuscript version of the paper. Reproduced in accordance with the copyright policy of the publisher. Please refer to the journal's website for access to the definitive, published version.

Downloaded from

<http://hdl.handle.net/10072/56800>

Griffith Research Online

<https://research-repository.griffith.edu.au>

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

Authors: Abas Supeli and Peter A. Creed

Affiliation: School of Applied Psychology and Griffith Health Institute

Contact: Professor Peter Creed
School of Applied Psychology
Griffith University
Gold Coast campus
Queensland 4222, Australia.
E-mail: p.creed@griffith.edu.au

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

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

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

Introduction

Person-organisation (P-O) fit has attracted the attention of researchers and organisations as an important workplace variable for entry level employees (primarily in recruitment and selection processes; e.g., Backhaus, 2003; Saks & Ashforth, 2002), as well as for existing employees, where work attitudes and behaviours can affect both employee and organisational performance (e.g., Lauver & Kristof-Brown, 2001; Verquer, Beehr, & Wagner, 2003). However, there is still little consensus and much confusion over a number of important issues regarding conceptualisation, operationalisation, and the criteria used to measure P-O fit. This reduces the validity of research studies, prevents a comprehensive understanding of the person/organisation interaction, and impedes the development of interventions to improve P-O fit levels. The current study contributes to a better understanding of P-O fit by (a) devising a scale to assess perceived goal congruence, and then (b) assessing the relative effects of all theorised types of P-O fit simultaneously using the one sample, which has not been done previously.

Defining P-O fit

The definition of P-O fit has been confused due to there being multiple conceptualisations and operationalisations. One key distinction in the P-O fit literature is between *supplementary fit* and *complementary fit* (Muchinsky & Monahan, 1987). Supplementary fit exists when the person and the organisation are similar or in congruence, whereas, complementary fit exists when the characteristics of an individual serve to “make whole”, or complement, the characteristics of an organisation. In her integrative review, Kristof (1996) defined P-O fit as the compatibility between people and the organisation that occurs when at least one entity provides what the other needs, or both entities share similar fundamental characteristics, or both. This definition covers the multiple conceptualisations of P-O fit and focuses on the fit between a person and the organisation as a whole, rather than

with a specific group or unit within an organisation. Kristof proposed a model that consists of three types of fit: (a) *supplementary fit*, when there is similarity between the characteristics of the person and the characteristics of the organisation, (b) *needs-supplies fit*, when the organisation satisfies the needs of the individual, and (c) *demands-abilities fit*, when the person has abilities required to meet the demands of the organisation. Needs-supplies fit and demands-abilities fit reflect the complementary fit definition proposed by Muchinsky and Monahan (1987). Of these three types of fit, supplementary fit is the most commonly measured (Kristof, 1996).

Consistent with Kristof (1996), Kristof-Brown, Zimmerman, and Johnson (2005) and Hoffman and Woehr (2006), in their meta-analyses, operationalised complementary fit as *needs-supplies* and *demands-abilities fit*. Cable and DeRue (2002) also conceptualised fit based on the three types of fit proposed by Kristof, but referred to supplementary fit as P-O fit. In addition, some researchers have measured a *general* P-O fit (e.g., Adkins, Russell, & Werbel, 1994; Saks & Ashforth, 1997), which refers to the individual's global perception of fit with the organisation. Several researchers have focused on one or two only of the above conceptualisations (e.g., Cable & Judge, 1997; Cooper-Thomas, Vianen, & Anderson, 2004), and others have proposed additional categories (e.g., Piasentin & Chapman, 2006).

Kristof (1996) argued that these multiple perspectives of fit should be examined in a single study, as different combinations of fit might have different implications for the individual and the organisation. Further, Schneider, Goldstein, and Smith (1995) suggested that focusing primarily on supplementary fit might lead an organisation to become excessively homogeneous over time, which in turn could produce negative consequences for organisational effectiveness, such as being unable to enact the changes required to adapt to a changing environment. These authors argued that both *homogeneity* (supplementary fit) and *heterogeneity* (needs-supplies fit and demands-abilities fit, representing complementary fit)

should be assessed simultaneously. To date, few studies have tested multiple types of fit simultaneously, and no study has validated the best factor model of P-O fit.

Measuring P-O fit

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

Criteria to be used for P-O fit measurement

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

Prior studies utilised a combination of values, goals, and personality to measure P-O fit (e.g., de Lara, 2008; Judge & Cable, 1997). Some studies assessed P-O fit using multiple criteria in one instrument (e.g., "To what extent are the values of the organization similar to

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

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

Personality congruence has been used by some researchers in P-O fit studies (e.g., Westerman & Cyr, 2004), but these studies have found an inconsistent relationship between personality congruence and work outcome variables. In some studies, personality congruence was significantly related to work behaviour (e.g., Westerman & Vanka, 2005), but in others, no relationship was found (e.g., Westerman & Cyr, 2004). Much work remains to be done to test the relationship between personality congruence and work outcome variables in order to resolve these inconsistent results.

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

O fit studies have utilised KSAs as a measure of demands-abilities fit (e.g., Cable & DeRue, 2002).

Goal congruence has been identified as an important predictor in the organisational psychology literature. Nadler and Tushman (1992) defined congruence as, “the degree to which the needs, demands, goals, and structures of one component are consistent with the needs, demands, goals, and structures of another component. Congruence is therefore a measure of how well pairs of components fit together” (p. 51). Thus, an important aspect of fit between individuals and their organisations is the convergence of individual and organisational goals.

Most studies on goal congruence have focused on the congruence between the employee and management (e.g., Jauch, Osborn, & Terpening, 1980), subordinate and supervisor (e.g., Vancouver & Schmitt, 1991), manager and organisation (e.g., Bouillon, Ferrier, Stuebs, & West, 2006), among members in the same organisation (e.g., Kristof-Brown & Stevens, 2001), group and organisation (Chen, Lam, Naumann, & Schaubroeck, 2005), or between organisations (e.g., Scott & Gable, 1997). Few P-O fit studies have used goal congruence as the criterion for P-O fit measurement (e.g., Vancouver & Schmitt, 1991; Witt, 1998), and when they have, participants were typically asked to rank the organisation’s goals rather than to report their own personal goals. In such circumstances, congruence might reflect an agreement between the individual and others in the organisation on organisational goals, rather than reflect the fit between the individual’s own goals and the organisation’s goals (Kristof-Brown & Jansen, 2007). No P-O fit study has examined the congruence between the employee’s goals and the organisation’s goals. This is despite the updated attraction-selection-attrition (ASA) framework proposing that goal congruence is an important dimension of P-O fit, separate from personality, KSAs, and values (Schneider et al., 1995). According to the ASA framework, individuals will be attracted to organisations

that have goals congruent with their own goals, and employees will leave the organisation when there is little or no similarity between their goals and those of the organisation.

The meaning of “organisation” in P-O fit

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

The effects of P-O fit

Regarding the effects of congruence between the person and the organisation, work attitudes are the most frequently studied outcomes (e.g., Amos & Weathington, 2008; Piasentin & Chapman, 2007). For example, in a meta-analytic study on the relationship between P-O fit and work attitudes, P-O fit was found to have strong, positive correlations with job satisfaction and organisational commitment, and a moderate, negative correlation with intention to quit (Kristof-Brown et al., 2005).

The Present Study

In order to overcome the limitation of previous P-O fit studies, the current study utilised perceived P-O fit self-report measures to examine all types of fit simultaneously, and assessed the organisation as an institution in general. The study had three aims. As there was no existing measure that could assess the fit between an employee’s goals and the

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

Method

Participants

Participants were 895 employees from a large-scale electronic manufacturing company in Indonesia. Approximately 1000 questionnaires were distributed via section heads and departmental supervisors. Nine hundred and ten employees returned the survey, representing a response rate of 91%, although only 895 returned usable questionnaires. There were 790 men (88.3%) and 105 women, whose average age was 33 years ($SD = 8.6$). The majority was married (66.4%). Two hundred and thirteen (23.8%) held a bachelor or graduate-level degree, 185 (20.7%) had post-high school qualifications (primarily technical

college qualifications), 449 (50.2%) were high school graduates, and 48 (5.4%) had completed junior high school. The majority (509; 58.0%) were machine operators, 244 (27.8%) were supervisors, and 124 (14.1%) were middle or top level managers (18, or 2%, did not answer this question). The average tenure with the company was 10.8 years ($SD = 7.4$; range < 1 year to 36 years), the average total work experience was 11.5 years ($SD = 7.8$; range < 1 year to 36 years), and the average hours worked per week was 42.7 ($SD = 6.0$; range 8 to > 50).

Procedure

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

Measures

The survey contained the four existing P-O fit scales (values congruence, personality congruence, needs-supplies fit, and demands-abilities fit), eight experimental items for the new goal congruence P-O fit scale, three work attitude scales (organisational commitment, job satisfaction, intention to quit), and questions asking for information on gender, age, education, tenure with company in years, work experience in years, and average hours worked per week. All measures were translated into the Indonesian language using the standard translation and back-translation methodology (Brislin, 1970). The items were translated from English to Indonesian by the first author, whose first language is Indonesian,

and back-translated into English by four independent translators, who were proficient in both English and Indonesian languages. The researchers then compared the back-translated versions with the original English version, and where discrepancies were identified, changes were made to the Indonesian version. Respondents were asked to indicate their level of agreement with the items on a 6-point Likert scale, where 1 = *strongly disagree* and 6 = *strongly agree*. Scores were summed to provide a total, with higher scores reflecting a higher level of a construct.

Supplementary P-O fit.

Values congruence was measured using the 3-item scale developed by Cable and DeRue (2002). These authors reported an internal reliability of .91 in a single-firm sample and .92 in a multiple-firm sample (.90 in this study). A sample item was, “The things that I value in life are very similar to the things that my organisation values”. The scale has been used in a range of studies (e.g., Erdogan & Bauer, 2005; Kim et al., 2005), where construct validity has been demonstrated by assessing the relationship with other constructs.

Personality congruence was measured using the 3-item scale developed by Judge and Cable (1997). We modified items to focus on personality congruence between the individual and the organisation, rather than between multiple constructs (i.e., values, goals, personality) and multiple entities (i.e., other employees, the organisation). For example, the item, “To what degree do your values, goals, and personality ‘match’ or fit this organization and the current employees in this organization?”, was modified to, “My personality matches this organisation’s personality”. Judge and Cable reported an internal reliability of .80. After confirmatory factor analysis, we deleted one item, which was negatively worded and had a very low factor loading. The internal reliability of the 2-item scale was .84. The original scale has been modified for use in a number of P-O fit studies and has been shown to have good

construct validity when tested against other variables (e.g., Carless, 2005a; Cooper-Thomas, Vianen, & Anderson, 2004).

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

Complementary P-O fit.

Needs-supplies fit was measured using the 3-item scale developed by Cable and DeRue (2002). In order that respondents focused on organisational fit, the word “job” in this

measure was changed to “organisation”. Cable and DeRue reported an internal reliability of .89 in a single-firm sample and .93 in a multiple-firm sample (.88 in this study). A sample item was, “There is a good fit between what my organisation offers me and what I am looking for in an organisation”. Validity has been supported by assessing the relationship with other constructs (Kennedy & Huff, 2005).

Demands-abilities fit was measured using the 3-item scale developed by Cable and DeRue (2002). These authors reported an internal reliability of .89 in a single-firm sample and .84 in a multiple-firm sample (.90 in this study). The word “job” in this measure was changed to “organisation”, in order to bring it into line with the objectives of this study. A sample item was, “There is a good match between the demands of this organisation and my personal skills”. This scale has been used in other P-O studies (e.g., Erdogan & Bauer, 2005; Greguras & Diefendorff, 2009), where construct validity was demonstrated by assessing the relationship with other variables.

Work attitude variables.

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

Job satisfaction was measured using the 3-item scale from the Michigan Organizational Assessment Questionnaire, which was developed by Cammann, Fichman, Jenkin Jr., and Klesh (1983). These authors reported an internal reliability of .77 (.71 in this study). We modified one item to minimise bias associated with assessing satisfaction with the organisation rather than satisfaction with the job. The item, “In general, I like working here”, was modified to, “In general, I like doing my job”. This scale has been used in a range of work-related and P-O fit studies, and has established construct validity (e.g., Saks & Ashforth, 2002; Wheeler, Gallagher, Brouer, & Sablinski, 2007).

Intention to quit was measured using the 3-item scale from the Michigan Organizational Assessment Questionnaire, which was developed by Cammann et al. (1983). These authors reported an internal reliability of .83 (.87 in this study). A sample item was, “I often think about quitting this job”. This scale has been found to have negative relationships with goal congruence (Vancouver, Millsap, & Peter, 1994; Vancouver & Schmitt, 1991) and organisational commitment (Bishop, Scott, & Burroughs, 2000).

Results

Random Split of Original Sample

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

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

First, we used Sample A to conduct a series of exploratory factor analyses (principal axis factor analysis with direct oblimin rotation) on the eight goal congruence items. The first

analysis indicated two factors that accounted for 64.77% of the variance. The first factor (47.71%) consisted of the six positively worded items, whereas the second factor (17.06%) contained the two negatively worded items. As the negatively worded items were likely to reflect a response bias to negative wording (known as context-dependent item sets; Haladyna, 1992), we deleted these two items and ran a second analysis. This second analysis (KMO = .89; Bartlett's test $\chi^2[15] = 3020.80, p < .001$) identified a single factor, which accounted for 66.33% of the variance, and contained factor loadings that ranged from .68 to .83. We labelled these six items the Perceived Goal Congruence Scale; see Table 1 for items. The internal reliability for the six items was .88.

Insert Table 1 about here

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

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

The CFA consisted of four latent variables, each with three observed (item) indicators, except for personality congruence, which contained two observed indicators. All latent variables were allowed to covary. The fit statistics for this model were satisfactory, indicating

that each existing P-O fit scale was adequately represented by its respective indicators, and that each scale was factorially independent of the other scales, $\chi^2(37) = 68.64, p < .001, \chi^2/df = 1.85, GFI = .97, CFI = .99, RMSEA = .04$. All factor scores were significant at $p < .001$.

Testing Relationship between Goal Congruence and Existing P-O Fit Scales (Sample B)

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

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

Using the full sample ($N = 895$), we conducted hierarchical regression analyses to test if goal congruence explained variance over and above the variance accounted for by the other four fit scales, using the three work attitude variables of organisational commitment, job satisfaction, and intention to quit as outcome variables. In these analyses, we included the four existing fit scales (values congruence, personality congruence, needs-supplies fit, and demands-abilities fit) at Step 1, and included goal congruence at Step 2. See Table 2 for summary data for these variables, and Table 3 for the results of the hierarchical regression analyses.

Insert Tables 2 and 3 about here

Organisation Commitment

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

Job Satisfaction

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

accounted for unique variance ($\beta = .28, p < .001; sr^2 = 4.0\%$), and goal congruence, needs-supplies fit, and demands-abilities fit each accounted for $> 1\%$ of variance.

Intention to Quit

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

Discussion

This study makes a unique contribution to current P-O fit knowledge. It is the first study to examine the congruence between individual goals and the goals of the organisation, to assess levels of P-O fit using multiple criteria simultaneously, to test the structural independence of all fit measures, and to examine the relative contribution of each criterion of P-O fit in explaining the work attitudes variables of organisational commitment, job satisfaction, and intention to quit.

The first objective of this study was to address a void in the literature by developing a brief, valid, and reliable scale to measure goal congruence. In devising the Perceived Goal Congruence Scale, we employed standard scale development technology, which included reference to the literature, reference to the target group (via interviews), reference to scale development experts (academics), pilot testing the derived items with the target population, and item and factor analyses based on a large sample. Content validity was addressed in the item development phase, and construct validity was demonstrated by showing discriminant

validity with other P-O fit scales and finding the expected relationship with all three work attitudes variables. The Perceived Goal Congruence Scale can be considered to have sound internal reliability, to assess a separate construct to other fit measures, and to have demonstrated sound, initial validity.

The Perceived Goal Congruence Scale was validated in relation to existing scales of P-O fit, and in relation to three widely assessed work attitudes of organisational commitment, job satisfaction, and intention to quit. The results demonstrated that goal congruence explained meaningful variability in all three work attitude variables, over and above the variance accounted by the existing scales. When predicting organisational commitment and job satisfaction, goal congruence reduced the effects of values and personality congruence, suggesting that goal congruence might be a more important construct to assess fit than values and personality congruence, particularly in relation to these two attitudes. When predicting intention to quit, goal congruence reduced the effect of personality congruence, reinforcing the usefulness of goal congruence and suggesting that different outcome variables might be associated with different combinations of fit.

These results are inconsistent with previous P-O fit studies, which have shown that values congruence has the strongest relationship with work attitudes (see Verqueer et al., 2003). The majority of these studies utilised the Organizational Culture Profile (O'Reilly, Chatman, & Caldwell, 1991) to assess values congruence using the Q-sort methodology and profile similarity index. However, this technique has been criticised as values are framed as a need rather than as fit (Edwards, 1993; Kristof-Brown & Jansen, 2007), and because it attempts to assess *objective* P-O fit, where individuals describe their own values and others describe the organisation's values, rather than assessing the individual's perceived fit (Westerman & Vanka, 2005). Our study utilised perceived values congruence in order to be consistent with other widely used measures of fit. From this perspective, our results suggest

that goal congruence might be a more important similarity fit variable. Our results are consistent with, and lend support to, the revised attraction-selection-attrition (ASA) framework, which proposes that goal congruence is an important dimension of P-O fit, additional to personality, KSAs, and values (Schneider et al., 1995), and should be considered an important dimension associated with employee career development and progress.

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

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

The results of our study suggest further that there might be redundancy in the current measures of P-O fit, despite these being widely assessed in the literature (see Kristof-Brown et al., 2005). Values congruence and personality congruence were bivariately associated with each outcome variable, but this association disappeared when the relationships were tested in

the regression analyses. Our results suggest that values congruence and personality congruence may be redundant, although additional studies with different samples and more diverse outcome variables are required before these components should be dropped.

Conclusions

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

References

- Adkins, C. L., Russell, C. J., & Werbel, J. D. (1994). Judgments of fit in the selection process: The role of work value congruence. *Personnel Psychology*, 47, 605-623. doi:10.1111/j.1744-6570.1994.tb01740.x
- Allen, N. J., & Meyer, J. P. (1990). The measurement and antecedents of affective, continuance and normative commitment to the organization. *Journal of Occupational Psychology*, 63, 1-18. doi: 10.1111/j.2044-8325.1990.tb00506.x
- Ambrose, M. L., Arnaud, A., & Schminke, M. (2007). Individual moral development and ethical climate: The influence of person-organization fit on job attitudes. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 77, 323-333. doi:10.1007/s10551-007-9352-1
- Amos, E. A., & Weathington, B. L. (2008). An analysis of the relation between employee-organization value congruence and employee attitudes. *The Journal of Psychology*, 142, 615-631. doi:10.3200/JRLP.142.6.615-632
- Arthur, W., Jr., Bell, S. T., 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, 786-801. doi:10.1016/S0021-9010(06)61893-1
- Backhaus, K. (2003). Importance of person-organization fit to job seekers. *Career Development International*, 8, 21-26. doi:10.1108/13620430310459487
- Bishop, J. W., Scott, K. D., & Burroughs, S. M. (2000). Support, commitment, and employee outcomes in a team environment. *Journal of Management*, 26, 1113-1132. doi:10.1016/S0149-2063(00)00083-0
- Bouillon, M. L., Ferrier, G. D., Stuebs, J. M. T., & West, T. D. (2006). The economic benefit of goal congruence and implications for management control systems. *Journal of Accounting and Public Policy*, 25, 265-298. doi:10.1016/j.jaccpubpol.2006.03.003

- Brislin, R. W. (1970). Back-translation for cross-cultural research. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology, 1*, 185-216. doi:10.1177/135910457000100301
- Cable, D. M., & DeRue, D. S. (2002). The convergent and discriminant validity of subjective fit perceptions. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 87*, 875-884. doi:10.1037/0021-9010.87.5.875
- Cable, D. M., & Judge, T. A. (1997). Interviewers' perceptions of person-organization fit and organizational selection decisions. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 82*, 546-561. doi:10.1037/0021-9010.82.4.546
- Caldwell, D. F., & O'Reilly, C. A. (1990). Measuring person-job fit with a profile-comparison process. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 75*, 648-657. doi:10.1037//0021-9010.75.6.648
- Cammann, C., Fichman, M., Jenkins Jr., G. D., & Klesh, J. R. (1983). Assessing the attitudes and perceptions of organizational members. In S. E. Seashore, E. E. Lawler III, P. H. Mirvis, & C. Cammann (Eds.), *Assessing organizational change: A guide to methods, measures, and practices* (pp. 71-138). New York, NY: Wiley-Interscience.
- Carless, S. A. (2005a). The influence of fit perceptions, equal opportunity policies, and social support network on pre-entry police officer career commitment and intentions to remain. *Journal of Criminal Justice, 33*, 341-352. doi:10.1016/j.jcrimjus.2005.04.004
- Carless, S. A. (2005b). Person-job fit versus person-organization fit as predictors of organizational attraction and job acceptance intentions: A longitudinal study. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology, 78*, 411. doi:10.1348/096317905X25995
- Chen, X.-P., Lam, S. S. K., Naumann, S. E., & Schaubroeck, J. (2005). Group citizenship behaviour: Conceptualization and preliminary tests of its antecedents and consequences. *Management and Organization Review, 1*, 273-300. doi:10.1111/j.1740-8784.2005.00012.x

- Cooper-Thomas, H. D., Vianen, A. v., & Anderson, N. (2004). Changes in person-organization fit: The impact of socialization tactics on perceived and actual P-O fit. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology, 13*, 52-78.
doi:10.1080/13594320344000246
- de Lara, P. Z.-M. (2008). Should faith and hope be included in the employees' agenda? *Journal of Managerial Psychology, 23*, 73. doi:10.1108/02683940810849675
- Edwards, J. R. (1993). Problems with the use of profile similarity indices in the study of congruence in organizational research. *Personnel Psychology, 46*, 641-665.
doi:10.1111/j.1744-6570.1993.tb00889.x
- Erdogan, B., & Bauer, T. N. (2005). Enhancing career benefits of employee proactive personality: The role of fit with job and organizations. *Personnel Psychology, 58*, 859-891. doi:10.1111/j.1744-6570.2005.00772.x
- Greguras, G. J., & Diefendorff, J. M. (2009). Different fits satisfy different needs: Linking person-environment fit to employee commitment and performance using self-determination theory. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 94*, 465-477.
doi:10.1037/a0014068
- Hair, J. F., Black, W. C., Babin, B. J., & Anderson, R. E. (2010). *Multivariate data analysis: A global perspective* (7th ed.). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson Education.
- Haladyna, T. M. (1992). Context-dependent item sets. *Educational Measurement: Issues and Practice, 11*, 21-25. doi:10.1111/j.1745-3992.1992.tb00223.x
- 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. doi:10.1016/j.jvb.2005.08.003

- Jauch, L. R., Osborn, R. N., & Terpening, W. D. (1980). Goal congruence and employee orientations: The substitution effect. *Academy of Management Journal*, 23, 544.
doi:10.2307/255518
- Judge, T. A., & Cable, D. M. (1997). Applicant personality, organizational culture, and organization attraction. *Personnel Psychology*, 50, 359-394. doi:10.1111/j.1744-6570.1997.tb00912.x
- Kim, T.-Y., Cable, D. M., & Kim, S.-P. (2005). Socialization tactics, employee proactivity, and person-organization fit. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 90, 232-241.
doi:10.1037/0021-9010.90.2.232
- Kline, R. B. (2011). *Principles and practice of structural equation modeling* (3rd ed.). New York, NY: The Guilford Press.
- Kristof-Brown, A. L., & Jansen, K. J. (2007). Issues of person-organization fit. In C. Ostroff & T. A. Judge (Eds.), *Perspectives on organizational fit* (pp. 123-153). New York, NY: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Kristof-Brown, A. L., & Stevens, C. K. (2001). Goal congruence in project teams: Does the fit between members' personal mastery and performance goals matters? *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 86, 1083-1095. doi:10.1037//0021-9010.86.6.1083
- 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.
doi:10.1111/j.1744-6570.2005.00672.x
- Kristof, A. L. (1996). Person-organization fit: An integrative review of its conceptualizations, measurement, and implications. *Personnel Psychology*, 49, 1-49. doi:10.1111/j.1744-6570.1996.tb01790.x

- Lauver, K. J., & Kristof-Brown, A. L. (2001). Distinguishing between employees' perceptions of person-job and person-organization fit. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 59, 454-470. doi:10.1006/jvbe.2001.1807
- Maurer, T. J., & Lippstreu, M. (2008). Who will be committed to an organization that provides support for employee development? *Journal of Management Development*, 27, 328-347. doi:10.1108/02621710810858632
- Meyer, J. P., Stanley, D. J., Herscovitch, L., & Topolnytsky, L. (2002). Affective, continuance, and normative commitment to the organization: A meta-analysis of antecedents, correlates, and consequences. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 61, 20-52. doi:10.1006/jvbe.2001.1842
- 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. doi:10.1016/0001-8791(87)90043-1
- Nadler, D. A., & Tushman, M. L. (1992). Designing organizations that have good fit: A framework for understanding new architectures. In D. A. Nadler, M. S. Gerstein, & R. B. Shaw (Eds.), *Organizational architecture: Designs for changing organizations*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- 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, 487-516. doi: 10.2307/256404
- 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. doi:10.1016/j.jvb.2006.05.001

- 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. doi:10.1348/096317906X115453
- Ryan, A. M., & Kristof-Brown, A. (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*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- 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. doi:10.1111/j.1744-6570.1997.tb00913.x
- Saks, A. M., & Ashforth, B. E. (2002). Is job search related to employment quality? It all depends on the fit. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 87, 646-654. doi:10.1037/0021-9010.87.4.646
- Schneider, B., Goldstein, H. W., & Smith, D. B. (1995). The ASA framework: An update. *Personnel Psychology*, 48, 747-773. doi:10.1111/j.1744-6570.1995.tb01780.x
- Scott, J. E., & Gable, G. (1997). *Goal congruence, trust, and organizational culture: Strengthening knowledge links*. Paper presented at the Proceedings of the 18th International Conference on Information Systems. Retrieved from <http://portal.acm.org/citation.cfm?id=353109>
- Terborg, J. R., Richardson, P., & Pritchard, R. D. (1980). Person-situation effects in the prediction of performance: An investigation of ability, self-esteem, and reward contingencies. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 65, 574-583. doi:10.1037/0021-9010.65.5.574

- Van Vuuren, M., de Jong, M. D. T. , & Seydel, E. R. (2007). Direct and indirect effects of supervisor communication on organizational commitment. *Corporate Communications: An International Journal*, 12, 116-128. doi:10.1108/13563280710744801
- Vancouver, J. B., Millsap, R. E., & Peter, P. A. (1994). Multilevel analysis of organizational goal congruence. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 79, 666-679. doi:10.1037/0021-9010.79.5.666
- Vancouver, J. B., & Schmitt, N. W. (1991). An exploratory examination of person-organization fit: Organizational goal congruence. *Personnel Psychology*, 44, 333-352. doi:10.1111/j.1744-6570.1991.tb00962.x
- 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. doi:10.1016/S0001-8791(02)00036-2
- Westerman, J. W., & Cyr, L. A. (2004). An integrative analysis of person-organization fit theories. *International Journal of Selection and Assessment*, 12, 252-261. doi:10.1111/j.0965-075X.2004.279_1.x
- Westerman, J. W., & Vanka, S. (2005). A cross-cultural empirical analysis of person-organization fit measures as predictors of student performance in business education: Comparing students in the United States and India. *Academy of Management Learning & Education*, 4, 409-420. doi:10.5465/AMLE.2005.19086783
- Wheeler, A. R., Gallagher, V. C., Brouer, R. L., & Sablinski, C. J. (2007). When person-organization (mis)fit and (dis)satisfaction lead to turnover. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 22, 203-219. doi:10.1108/02683940710726447
- Witt, L. A. (1998). Enhancing organizational goal congruence: A solution to organizational politics. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 83, 666-674. doi:10.1037/0021-9010.83.4.666

Table 1

Exploratory Factor Analysis; Sample A, N = 450

Items	Loadings
My personal goals match the goals of this organisation	.83
Achieving this organisation's goals also means attaining my personal goals	.78
My personal goals are consistent with the goals of this organisation	.83
The goals of this organisation are similar to my work-related goals	.70
My personal goals are compatible with this organisation's goals	.82
This organisation's goals give me the opportunity to achieve my personal goals	.68

Table 2

Summary Data and Correlations among Variables; N = 895

Variables	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
1. Values congruence	12.46	3.12	.71	.54	.28	.59	.39	.34	-.31
2. Personality congruence	7.94	2.16		.53	.34	.60	.39	.40	-.36
3. Needs-supplies fit	11.71	3.05			.37	.58	.44	.52	-.49
4. Demands-abilities fit	14.16	2.40				.35	.27	.45	-.30
5. Goal congruence	26.14	4.99					.52	.51	-.46
6. Organisational commitment	18.32	3.27						.54	-.53
7. Job satisfaction	13.61	2.43							-.60
8. Intention to quit	7.62	3.38							-

Note: All correlations significant at $p < .001$.

Table 3

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

Variable	Organisational Commitment				Job Satisfaction				Intention to Quit			
	<i>B</i>	<i>SE(B)</i>	β	$sr^2(\%)$	<i>B</i>	<i>SE(B)</i>	β	$sr^2(\%)$	<i>B</i>	<i>SE(B)</i>	β	$sr^2(\%)$
Step 1												
Values congruence	.13	.05	.13**	.74	-.02	.03	-.03	.03	.04	.05	.03	.05
Personality congruence	.18	.07	.12**	.62	.14	.05	.12**	.69	-.20	.07	-.13**	.72
Needs-supplies fit	.29	.04	.27***	4.45	.29	.03	.37***	8.41	-.44	.04	-.40***	10.05
Demands-abilities fit	.14	.04	.10**	.85	.29	.03	.29***	6.71	-.17	.04	-.12***	1.23
Step 2												
Values congruence	.05	.04	.05	.10	-.07	.03	-.09	.35	.10	.05	.09*	.36
Personality congruence	.04	.07	.02	.03	.06	.05	.05	.11	-.09	.07	-.06	.15
Needs-supplies fit	.18	.04	.16***	1.51	.23	.03	.29***	4.67	-.36	.04	-.33***	6.10
Demands-abilities fit	.09	.04	.07*	.37	.26	.03	.26***	5.48	-.14	.04	-.10**	.79
Goal congruence	.24	.03	.36***	6.66	.14	.02	.28***	4.00	-.17	.03	-.26***	3.39

Note: For organisational commitment, R^2 at Step 1 = .24 (R^2_{Adj} = .24), R^2 at Step 2 = .31 (R^2_{Adj} = .30); for job satisfaction, R^2 at Step 1 = .36 (R^2_{Adj} = .36), R^2 at Step 2 = .40 (R^2_{Adj} = .39); for intention to quit, R^2 at Step 1 = .27 (R^2_{Adj} = .27), R^2 at Step 2 = .30 (R^2_{Adj} = .30). * p < .05, ** p < .01, *** p < .001.