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ABSTRACT

The purpose of this study was to seek further support for the realistic job information hypothesis and Wanous' (1980) matching model. Three theoretical models were proposed to describe the relationship between recruitment source, accuracy of information, applicant expectation, job satisfaction, organizational commitment, and turnover intention. The competing models were tested with structural equation path model analysis. The results of the structural equation path model analyses indicated there is an adequate fit between Model 3 and the actual data. Model 3 indicates that accuracy of information and applicant expectation contribute to the degree of match between the person and the job, which in turn has an indirect relationship with turnover intention. In addition, Model 3 shows that job satisfaction and organizational commitment act as mediators between the degree of match and turnover intention. Implications of the results were discussed.
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Introduction

An organization's first step in seeking qualified applicants for job openings is through recruitment. Organizations invest large amounts of money into recruitment programs to compete for the most qualified candidates from an applicant pool. Besides attracting qualified applicants, recruitment also determines the fit of the individual to the job of interest and to the organization. In prior studies, the evaluation of the role of fit depends on how one defines it. Fit is often defined as the match between an individual's knowledge, skills, and abilities (KSAs) and job requirements (Rynes & Gerhart, 1990). Recent studies have extended the discussion of fit of the individual to include the match between an individual's values, norms, and attitudes with the organizational climate, culture, and norms (Rynes & Gerhart, 1990).

It has been suggested that turnover may be due to the mismatch of the individual to the job (Wanous, 1992). The cost of turnover includes not only recruitment cost, but the cost for orientation and training (Wanous, 1992). Because turnover can be a great loss to the organization, it is essential to investigate all the avenues of fit of the individual with the job and the organization. One possible avenue to examine is the process of realistic job preview, a method of providing more accurate information to formal
recruiting sources. According to Wanous' (1980) matching model, which is based on the Minnesota Theory of Work Adjustment (TWA), the accuracy of information applicants receive may be linked to job satisfaction, job commitment, turnover intentions and behaviors (see Figure 1). The implication of examining the realistic job preview is to assist organizations to improve the fit of the individual to the job and to the organization. The outcome from improving the person-job fit may be employees with better job performance and deeper organizational commitment (Caldwell & O'Reilly, 1990).
Literature Review

Person-Job Fit

There has been a limited development of theories regarding the fit of individuals to different situations of jobs because often the characteristics of the person and the characteristics of the job are measured under different dimensions. Individual characteristics are usually measured using normative measures of personality while relatively broad classifications of jobs are used to measure job characteristics (Caldwell & O'Reilly, 1990). It is often difficult to generalize person-situation fit theories across jobs because many studies concentrate on the examination of person-situation fit in one or two jobs. An exception is Caldwell and O'Reilly's (1990) study on measuring person-job fit. Their study corrects for the limitation of jobs and the methodology for examining characteristics of the person and the job. Caldwell and O'Reilly used the profile-comparison process to measure the characteristics of the job and the person. In fact, the profile-comparison process used the statements generated by the characteristics of the job to rate individuals. The study consisted of seven investigations involving different levels and types of jobs. The results of Caldwell and O'Reilly's study illustrate that the fit of the individual to the job is related positively to job performance. Since this study involved different
levels and types of jobs, the results may be more generalizable to other situations.

Even though the person-situation fit theory may be more applicable in Caldwell and O'Reilly's study since the characteristics of the person and the job are measured with the same method, the results may be inflated by the use of the job statements to rate the individuals. Those who rated the individuals may be thinking more of the job situation than the characteristic of the individual. Caldwell and O'Reilly stated that the raters were told to think of the job and the person separately. However, it was not certain whether the raters did think of the job and the individuals as separate entities; therefore, the results of this study should be interpreted with caution.

The Concept of Met Expectation

In order to understand person-job fit theories, one must first understand the general principle that underlies the theories; namely met expectation. The concept of met expectation assumes that unmet expectations of new hires cause a variety of post entry adjustment problems (Wanous, 1992). There are a variety of studies on the theories and models that are based on the concept of met expectation; however, very few studies concentrate solely on the concept of met expectation (Wanous, Poland, Premack & Davis, 1992).
The meta-analysis of Wanous et al. (1992) is a systematic research review of the concept of met expectation. The studies included in the meta-analysis had to meet the criteria of Porter and Steer's definition of met expectation. According to Porter and Steer (1973), there are four aspects of the definition of met expectation. The first aspect is that unmet expectations are seen as leading to dissatisfaction of the individual which in turn leads to quitting an organization. The second aspect concerns the appropriate context for conducting research. Expectations held by job candidates before they enter an organization should be compared with their postentry expectations. The third aspect concerns the specific meaning of met expectations. A discrepancy in expectations is a discrepancy between one's initial expectations and one's subsequent beliefs after postentry into the organization. The fourth aspect concerns the meaning of expectations. Only those expectations for important aspects of the job or organization are included in the met expectation hypothesis (Wanous, 1992).

Published and unpublished studies on met expectation were used in order to create a complete meta-analysis on met expectations. Both corrected and uncorrected results were reported for each study. The meta-analysis was successful in finding relationships between met expectations and
organizational commitment, intent to remain, job performance, and job survival. The corrected mean correlations were found to be as follow: .34, .28, .12, and .17, respectively. The corrected between-studies variance was found to be nonsignificant. The meta-analysis is unsuccessful in explaining the effect of met expectation on job satisfaction. Even though the corrected mean correlation between met expectation and job satisfaction was found to be moderate, corrected $r = .36$, the corrected between studies variance was found to be significant. The researchers stated that the variability in the measurement of job satisfaction across studies may be the reason for the unexplained between-studies variance in the effect of met expectations on job satisfaction (Wanous et al, 1992). The researchers took extreme care in matching the studies with Porter and Steer's (1973) definition of met expectation. The studies were coded twice to match the definition and the coding was doubled-checked. Intercoder agreement was also examined, intercoder agreement exceeded 90% for all variables. The meta-analysis of Wanous et al. (1992) appears to be a thorough review of the studies on the concept of met expectation.

From the meta-analysis of Wanous et al. (1992), met expectation seems to relate to organizational commitment, intent to remain, job performance, and job survival.
Examining the concept of met expectation leads to the understanding of why the fit of an individual with the job and the organization affects organizational outcomes, such as job performance. For Industrial/Organizational psychologists, it is extremely important to understand the underlying concepts of an individual's fit with the job and the organization. However, more importantly for the organization is how to obtain this fit. Research on recruitment has found that realistic job previews may enhance the fit of the individual with the job and organization.

Realistic Job Previews

During realistic job previews (RJPs), the applicants are given information concerning the job and the organization. It is assumed with the realistic job information hypothesis that realistic job previews give applicants a more realistic expectation of the job and of the organization (Kirnan, Farley, & Geisinger, 1989). Since the applicants are given a more realistic expectation, they can judge if they will fit into the job and the organization.

Vandenberg and Scarpello's (1990) study examined the processes underlying realistic job previews within the context of Wanous' (1980) Matching model. The Matching Model consists of extensions from the Minnesota Theory of
Work Adjustment (TWA) which is based on the concept of met
expectation. The TWA states that a match between the
individual's preferences for job rewards and perceptions of
available job rewards results in job satisfaction and
subsequent employment stability. The first extension of the
Matching Model is that job satisfaction is influenced not
only by the need-reward match outcome, but also by comparing
the present job with jobs in other organizations. The
second extension covers organizational commitment. It
states that organizational commitment is inversely related
to turnover intentions and behaviors, and related to job
satisfaction. The third extension concerns realistic job
previews. It states that realistic job previews enhance the
need-reward match process by improving the accuracy of
information applicants receive about the job (Vandenberg &
Scarpello, 1990). The results of Vandenberg and Scarpello's
(1990) study indicates that all the relationships in the
Matching Model are significant except the relationship
between job satisfaction and turnover intentions.
Nevertheless, the researchers stated that the relationship
between job satisfaction and turnover intentions may be
indirectly related.

By finding significant relationships in the Matching
Model, Vandenberg and Scarpello also validated the
importance of realistic job previews for the degree of match
between the applicant and the job. The accuracy of information is the first component in the Matching Model; hence, if the first component changes, the rest of the components may also change. The RJP may be a way to enhance the accuracy of information relating to the job and therefore, may also affect the other components in the matching model. According to Wanous (1989), Premack and Wanous' (1985) meta-analysis of 21 experiments has found that RJP's lower initial expectations and increase job survival rates. From Vandenberg and Scarpello's (1990) study and research on RJP's, realistic job previews may be used as a process to enhance the fit of the individual to the job and the organization.

**Recruiting Source**

Many studies on recruiting sources have found informal recruiting sources, especially employee referrals, to produce superior hires in job performance and job survival compared with formal recruiting sources (Kirnan et al. 1989). A possible hypothesis to explain the dominant findings is again the realistic job information hypothesis. Current employees are familiar with the job and the organization; therefore, employee referrals are assumed to have more realistic job information than other applicants (Kirnan et al, 1989). The study by Kirnan et al. (1989) supports the superiority of the informal recruiting sources
over formal sources. Even though Kirnan et al. examined the prescreening hypotheses in relation to the superior hires from the informal recruiting sources, the results of their study may also support the realistic information hypothesis. Applicants who are referred by current employees are more likely to have accurate information regarding the job than applicants of other sources and, hence, have more realistic expectation of the job. As a result, applicants from employee referrals are more likely to have higher levels of performance, commitment, intent to remain, and job survival.

From the above studies, it appears that the accuracy of information regarding the job and the organization affects the expectations of new hires and hence, may directly influence the organizational outcomes such as job satisfaction. Employee referrals may produce more superior new hires because the information given to the applicants from current employees are more accurate. In order to test the realistic job information hypothesis, the accuracy of information on the job and on the organization between recruits of different recruiting sources must be examined. The accuracy of information on the job and on the organization may also be used to measure the fit of the individual to the job and the organization. From the person-job fit measures, job performance, organizational
commitment, and possibly turnover intentions may be predicted.
Hypotheses

The purpose of the present study is to find additional support for the realistic job information hypothesis and the Matching Model. Results from the previous studies on the realistic information hypothesis and on Wanous' (1980) Matching Model have led to the following competing models. In Model 1, organizational commitment, job satisfaction, and turnover intention are viewed as outcomes of the degree of match between the person and the job. It is hypothesized that job satisfaction has a direct effect on organizational commitment. Consistency of information and applicant expectations for the job and for the organization will be used as measures of the degree of match. Recruitment source is hypothesized to directly influence consistency of information, applicant expectation, and the degree of match between the person and the job (See Figure 2). Differences between Model 2 and Model 1 are the relationships between the organizational outcome variables and the degree of match between the person and the job. Turnover intention is viewed as the outcome of organizational commitment which in turn is a outcome of job satisfaction. It is hypothesized that job satisfaction will be influenced directly by the degree of match between the person and the job (See Figure 3). Model 3 deviates from Model 1 and Model 2 by viewing turnover intention as the outcome of job satisfaction and
organizational commitment. The degree of match between the person and the job is hypothesized to predict job satisfaction and organizational commitment. It is also predicted that job satisfaction will have a direct effect on organizational commitment in Model 3 (See Figure 4).
Method

Subjects

Subjects for this study were students from psychology and management classes at California State University, San Bernardino. Surveys were given to students who indicated that they met the established criteria: 1) the student must currently be working and 2) have worked for his/her current employer for less than 3 years. 208 surveys were passed out to students and 127 were returned. Out of the 127 surveys returned, 12 of the surveys were completed by students who have worked for their employer for over three years and 2 of the surveys had missing pages; these surveys were discarded. From the 113 usable surveys, the ethnic composition of the subjects was: 58.4% Anglo, 17.7% Latin-American, 8% African-American, 5.3% Asian-American, 4.4% Native-American, and 6.2% labeled themselves other. The subjects who returned the surveys were comprised of 65% women and 35% men. Mean age of the subjects was 22.7 years old.

From Cohen (1992), it was predicted that at least 91 subjects were needed for the analysis of the path models to detect a medium effect size for power of .80 at an alpha of .05. According to Tabachnick and Fidell (1989), power may be unacceptably low if there is less than 100 cases in a study for correlational analysis. As suggested by Cohen (1992), a medium effect size which was expected in this
study, is an effect that is likely to be visible to the naked eye of a careful observer. A medium effect size was expected because superior hires have been observed in majority of studies on informal recruiting sources (Kirnan et al., 1989). Likewise, Gannon (1971) and Decker and Cornelius (1979) have found significant differences between different types of recruiting sources.

**Measures**

*Type of Recruitment Source*  
Information on the type of recruitment source was obtained with the Information Sheet. The subjects were asked "How did you hear about your position?", and they were told to respond to the question by checking one of the given responses (See Appendix B). Each type of recruitment source was placed into a continuum with 9 anchored scores. The scores were based on the formality of the recruitment process from the organization's point of view. "1" representing the least formal type of recruitment source and "9" representing the most formal type of recruitment source. Recruitment sources were scored as the following in the continuum: 1 = Relative/Friend, 2 = Current employee, 3 = Self-initiated Application, 4 = Job-Line, 5 = Radio/TV Station, 6 = Newspaper, 7 = Professional Journal, 8 = School/College Placement Bureaus, and 9 = Public/Private Employment Agency. Formal recruiting sources in the past studies included public and private employment
agencies; trade unions, school or college placement bureaus; and advertisements through radio, television, newspaper, and professional journals. Informal recruiting sources included employee referrals, referrals by friends or relatives, and self-initiated applications such as walk-ins or write-ins (Kirnan et al., 1989).

Accuracy Accuracy of information regarding the job and the organization was operationalized through the Consistency of Information Questionnaire. The first three items in the Consistency of Information Questionnaire were created by Vandenberg and Scarpello (1990). The other seventeen items were developed by the researcher. The consistency items were evaluated as one combined scale. Reliability and validity coefficients were not provided by Vandenberg and Scarpello (1990) for the first three items. The reliability of the consistency scale was examined after data collection because it was not feasible to obtain a sample for the pilot-test.

Subjects were asked to reflect whether the information on the job and on the organization provided by the company during the application process was consistent with what they believe before initiating his/her application for the job (See Appendix C). The items were anchored with a 5-point scale (1 = much more negative; 5 = much more positive). The items were later recoded such that a 1 and a 5 equal 1 (
very inconsistent), a 2 and a 4 equal 2 (somewhat inconsistent), and a 3 remained the same (consistent). A total score for the scale was created by adding item scores. The higher the score, the more consistent the information is perceived. The degree of consistency between the information provided by the company and what the subjects believed represented the degree of accuracy of the information regarding the job and the organization.

**Expectation** This construct was operationalized with the Realism Questionnaire. The items in the Realism Questionnaire are identical to the items in the Consistency of Information Questionnaire. The only difference between the two scales is the instructions. In the Realism Questionnaire, subjects were asked to reflect whether his/her expectations for the job and for the organization, during the application process, were consistent with the reality of the job (See Appendix D). The scoring process of the realism items was identical to the scoring process of the consistency items. The reliability of the realism scale was also evaluated after data collection.

**Job Satisfaction** This construct was operationalized with Gregson's (1990) modified version of the Job Descriptive Index (JDI) of Smith, Kendall, and Hulin (1969). The Job Descriptive Index originally consisted of 72 items, used a yes/no format, and was designed to measure the five
dimensions of pay, promotions, coworkers, supervision, and work. Likert-type format of the original JDI has been examined and compared with the yes/no format by Johnson, Smith, and Tucker (1987). Internal consistency coefficients were found for both formats. Overall, an average coefficients of .84 has been found for the yes/no format and .87 for the Likert-type format. Multitrait-Multimethod matrix has suggested convergent and discriminant validity of the JDI scales using either format. The average convergent validity coefficient was found to .66 (Johnson et al., 1987). Gregson (1990) reduced the 72 items into 30 items and converted the yes/no format into a 5-point Likert scale. Gregson (1990) found that the 30 items loaded into the five dimensions identically like the way they did for Smith et al. (1969). The Likert scale format scored from 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree). Items which were negatively worded were reverse scored and responses were summed to create an overall score. The higher the score, the greater the job satisfaction (See Appendix F).

Organizational Commitment This construct was measured with the Organizational Commitment Questionnaire (OCQ) (Mowday, Steers, & Porter, 1979). Mowday et al. (1979) found coefficient alpha for the OCQ to be consistently high, ranging from .82 to .91. Test-retest reliability was found to be comparable to other attitude measures, with $r = .72$. 
over a 2-month period and $r = .62$ over a 3-month period for retail management trainees. The OCQ was also correlated with the Sources of Organizational Attachment Questionnaire to examine evidence of convergent validity. The Sources of Organizational Attachment Questionnaire measures the perceived influence of various aspects of the job, work environment, and organization. The convergent validities found across six diverse samples ranged from .63 to .74. Responses in the OCQ will be anchored with a 7-point scale: 1) strongly disagree; 2) moderately disagree; 3) slightly disagree; 4) neither disagree nor agree; 5) slightly agree; 6) moderately agree; and 7) strongly agree (See Appendix E). Items which are negatively phrased will be reversed scored. Responses will be summed to create an overall score. The higher the score, the greater the commitment.

Turnover Intentions. Turnover intentions was measured in lieu of turnover behaviors. As noted by Wanous (1980), when differences in turnover behaviors do not exist between those who receive accurate and inaccurate job information, turnover intentions may distinguish between the two groups (Vandenberg & Scarpello, 1990). A modified version of the intentions to quit item (TOI2) and the original intentions to quit item (TOI1) created by Vandenberg & Scarpello (1990) were used to measure turnover intentions separately. The two intentions to quit items have be added to the end of the
modified JDI. The two items were examined for any significant differences. Because turnover intentions may be influenced by job opportunities from other organizations, the modified intentions to quit item was used to measure turnover intentions if job opportunities were offered to the subjects. The response format of both items were modified to create a continuum from 0% to 100%, with finite points anchored at 10 percent increments (See Appendix F). The validity of the original intentions to quit item "is supported by Vandenberg and McCullin's (1989) longitudinal study in which this measure was predictive of job search ($r = .37$) and turnover behaviors ($r = .31$)..." (Vandenberg & Scarpello, 1990, p. 62).

Procedure

Surveys were passed out to students in psychology and management classes. The researcher explained the nature of the study to the students and told the students that their participation was voluntary. Subjects in the psychology classes were offered extra credit for participating in the study by their instructors. Each subject was assigned a subject number for the purpose of data collection. Data were then collected from the surveys and evaluated. Completed surveys from subjects who did not meet the established criteria were discarded.
Analyses

Data were screened prior to analysis for outliers, missing data, and abnormal distributions. Descriptive statistics and reliability coefficients were obtained for the scales. Differences between the original intentions to quit item and the modified intentions to quit item were examined with a paired t-test. Univariate correlations were computed and assessed for the scales, recruitment source, and the turnover intention questions. The proposed models were then tested with structural equation path model analysis using the EQS software program developed by Bentler and Wu (1993).
Results

Descriptive Statistics

Distributions of scores from all scales adequately approximated normal. However, the distribution of recruitment sources was skewed in the positive direction with 78.7% of the recruitment sources scored as 3 or less on the recruitment source continuum. Actual frequencies of the recruitment sources are reported in Table 1. Because of its abnormality, the distribution of the recruitment sources was transformed into a more normal distribution by reducing the continuum from 9 anchors into 4. Recruitment sources which were graded as 5 or above on the recruitment source continuum were now graded as 4 in the revised continuum. It appears reasonable to combine recruitment sources which were graded as 5 or above as 4 in the revised continuum because all recruitment sources with a 5 or above have been described as formal recruitment sources in past studies. Thus, a "4" in the revised continuum represents the most formal end of the continuum.

Means, standard deviations, and reliability coefficients for scales used to measure accuracy of information, expectations, organizational commitment, and job satisfaction are reported in Table 2. Scale reliabilities for accuracy of information, expectation, and job satisfaction were acceptable (ranging from .75 to .94).
However, reliability of job satisfaction, which was measured with the modified Job Descriptive Index (JDI), was found to be lower than previously found reliabilities for the modified JDI; internal reliability was found to be .87 in Smith and Tucker's (1987) study. The reliability coefficient of organizational commitment, which was measured with the Organizational Commitment Questionnaire (OCQ; Mowday et al., 1979), was found to be much lower ($r = .65$) than previously measured reliabilities of the OCQ. The reliability of the OCQ was found to range from .82 to .91 in Mowday et al.'s (1979) study. Riggs and Knight (1994) found the reliability of the OCQ to be .87.

A bivariate correlation matrix was developed with SPSS Correlation. Listwise correlations ($N = 107$) of recruitment source, the original intentions to quit item, the modified intentions to quit item, and the scale scores are presented in Table 3. As the correlation matrix indicates, there is no significant relationship between recruitment source and any of the other variables. To investigate whether the relationships between recruitment source and the other variables would improve, recruitment source was dichotomized into informal and formal groups, as past research has done. The informal group consisted of referrals from relative/friend, current employee, and self-initiated process. The formal group was composed of referrals from
job-line, radio/TV, newspaper, professional journal, school/college placement, and public/private agencies. The two groups were dummy-coded as "1" and "2", respectively, in order to produce a correlation matrix between the dichotomized recruitment sources and the other variables. The dichotomization of the recruitment sources also did not lead to any significant relationships with the other variables. For this reason, recruitment source was not used in the structural equation path model analyses.

The original intentions to quit item was used in the structural equation path model analyses in lieu of the modified intentions to quit item because validity for the original intentions to quit item has already been established by Vandenberg and Scarpello (1990). In addition, the original intentions to quit item had higher correlation coefficients with other variables than the modified intentions to quit item. Differences between the two intentions to quit items were examined with SPSS Paired t-test. Results of the paired t-test between the original intentions to quit item and the modified intentions to quit item indicated that there is a significant difference between the two items ($t = -5.86, df = 112, p < .001$). It appears that when opportunity to leave an organization is provided, it influences the response to the original intentions to quit item. Validity of the modified
intentions to quit item needs to be examined in the future before it is used to operationalize intentions to quit.

The correlation between accuracy of information and expectation ($r = .67, p < .01$) appeared to justify the use of the Consistency of Information Questionnaire and the Realism Questionnaire to measure the degree of match between the person and the job in the theoretical models. As expected, job satisfaction correlated with accuracy of information, expectation, and organizational commitment in the positive direction. However, the correlation coefficients between job satisfaction and accuracy of information ($r = .06$) and between job satisfaction and expectation ($r = .17$) were found to be nonsignificant. The correlation between job satisfaction and organizational commitment was found to be significant ($r = .30, p < .01$), but lower than expected. The relationship between job satisfaction and organizational commitment in the theoretical models was supported by the bivariate correlation between these two variables. It was found that organizational commitment correlated with accuracy of information ($r = -.21, p < .05$) and expectation ($r = -.19$, nonsignificant) in the negative direction. The negative direction of the relationships between organizational commitment and accuracy of information and between organizational commitment and expectation were unexpected.
As predicted, turnover intention (TOII) was negatively related to organizational commitment \((r = -0.39, p < 0.01)\).

To the contrary, turnover intention (TOII) was found to be correlated in the positive direction with job satisfaction \((r = 0.20, p < 0.05)\), expectation \((r = 0.19, p < 0.05)\) and accuracy of information \((r = 0.18, \text{nonsignificant})\).

**Structural Equation Analyses**

Scale total scores created from SPSS Compute were entered into an EQS file. The scale total scores were used directly to build the structural equation path models by using EQS/Windows Build EQS. The standardized path coefficients and error coefficients for Model 1 are shown in Figure 5. Chi-square, the Bentler-Bonett normed fit index (NFI), the Bentler-Bonett non-normed fit index (NNFI), and the Comparative Fit index (CFI) were computed to assess the goodness of fit of the model to the actual data (Bentler 1993). The obtained chi-square \((df = 4, N=107)\) of 27.27 was statistically significant \((p < 0.001)\). According to Bentler (1993), a statistically significant chi-square test indicates a poor fit. Goodness-of-fit indices \((\text{NFI} = 0.77, \text{NNFI} = 0.46, \text{CFI} = 0.79)\) also indicate that Model 1 does not fit the actual data well (Bentler, 1993).

Results of Model 2 from the structural equation path analysis are presented in Figure 6. The chi-square value \((df = 5, N = 107)\) obtained was 23.44 \((p < 0.001)\). The chi-
square value was also found to be statistically significant. The goodness-of-fit indices were found to be .80 for the NFI, .66 for the NNFI, and .83 for the CFI. Caution must be used to interpret the results of the structural equation path model analysis for Model 2 because an out of range causal path coefficient and error variance were detected. The causal path coefficient between the degree of match and expectation in Model 2 was found to be 1.00 with an error variance of .00. The output of the structural equation path analysis indicated that the causal path coefficient and error variance were constrained at a lower bound, 1.00 and .00. If estimates were not constrained automatically by the EQS program, the causal path coefficient would be over 1.00 and the error variance would be negative. According to Bentler (1993), test results may not be appropriate when out of range estimates are found.

The out of range estimates of Model 2 may be caused by various reasons "including inappropriateness or misspecification of the model, theoretical and/or empirical underidentification of the parameters, population parameters close to the boundary of admissible values,..., and small sample size" (Bentler & Jamshidian, 1994, p. 80). According to Bentler and Jamshidian (1994), improper estimates may be prevented by ensuring that covariance matrices being estimated are Gramian, that is, covariance matrixes must be
composed of real numbers, non-negative definite. However, in general, the Gramian matrix constraint changes estimates only by a small amount. Therefore, the interpretations of the models would be approximately the same with or without the Gramian constraint. Because situations in which an inappropriate solution becomes appropriate and unconstrained has not been encountered in any of the literature and the fact that removal of improper solutions with the Gramian covariance matrix constraints does not eliminate the underlying causes of improper solutions (Bentler & Jamshidian, 1994), the solution of Model 2 was not reanalyzed with the Gramian matrix constraint. Using the Gramian matrix constraint would not have increased the clarity of interpretations for Model 2. It is possible that the improper estimates found in Model 2 were created by the small sample size of the study (N=107) and/or inappropriateness of the model.

The results of the structural equation analysis for Model 3 is shown in Figure 7. The resulting chi-square value (df = 3, N=107) of 1.52 for the third model was nonsignificant (p = .677). The nonsignificance of the chi-square test indicates that Model 3 fits the actual data. The goodness-of-fit indices (NFI = .99, NNFI = 1.0, CFI = 1.0) also indicate that there is a good fit between Model 3 and the actual data.
Discussion

Adequacy of the Results to Support the Realistic Information Hypothesis and the Matching Model

The fit of Model 3 to the actual data is important to validating the realistic information hypothesis and Wanous' (1980) Matching Model. The results of the structural equation path model analysis of Model 3 supports the realistic job information hypothesis when organizational commitment is the mediator. However, Model 3 does not support the realistic job information hypothesis when job satisfaction is the mediator. The realistic job information hypothesis states that, "individuals who are provided with realistic information regarding a job (both positive and negative) are more likely to survive on the job because their expectations are likely to be met" (Kirnan et al., 1989, p. 295). The realistic information hypothesis assumes that there is an inverse relationship between accuracy of information and turnover intention. The causal paths of Model 3 indicate that the degree of match, which is operationalized through accuracy of information and applicant expectation, has an indirect and inverse relationship with turnover intention when organizational commitment is the mediator. However, when job satisfaction is the mediator, Model 3 does not support the negative relationship between accuracy of information and turnover
intention as predicted by the realistic information hypothesis.

The results of the structural equation path model analysis of Model 3 also provided partial support for Wanous' (1980) Matching Model. According to the Matching Model, accuracy of information contributes to the degree of match which, in turn, is positively related to job satisfaction and organizational commitment. It is predicted in the Matching Model that job satisfaction and organizational commitment will have a inverse relationship with turnover intention (Vandenberg & Scarpello, 1990). The results of the structural equation path model analysis of Model 3 validated the assumption that accuracy of information contributes to the degree of match. The correlation coefficient between accuracy of information and the degree of match was found to be .74. As predicted in the Matching Model, the relationship between the degree of match and job satisfaction was in the positive direction. However, the correlation coefficient between job satisfaction and turnover intention was found to be in the positive direction also, which contradicts one of the assumptions of the Matching Model.

The unpredicted positive relationship between job satisfaction and turnover intention in Model 3 may be explained by the existence of other mediators. An example
is that job search may be a mediator between job satisfaction and turnover intention as proposed by Vandenberg and Scarpello (1990). It is possible that employees may be dissatisfied with their current job, but have no intentions of leaving the organization because there may be better jobs internally in which the employees can pursue. It is proposed that turnover intention will have an inverse relationship with job satisfaction when there are no desirable jobs internally and the employees are dissatisfied with both the current job and the organization (Vandenberg & Scarpello, 1990).

Another possible explanation for the positive relationship between job satisfaction and turnover intention is that the relationship found in this study may be sample specific. Most of the other studies regarding job satisfaction have focused on subjects who were working on a full time basis. The subjects in this study were all students who most likely worked part time only. Most students do not consider their part time job a career. The purpose of the part time job is to get the students through college so they may find a career-oriented job. Because of the perception that the part time job is merely a stepping stone to a better job in the future, the students will leave the organization even if they are satisfied with their jobs. Thus, the relationship between job satisfaction and turnover
intention will be in the positive direction. Future research on job satisfaction and turnover intention should examine other possible mediators and utilize different samples to determine if the positive relationship found in this study is specific to students.

Because of the abnormal relationship found between job satisfaction and turnover intention, the researcher also examined the relationships between the subscales of the Modified Job Descriptive Index and turnover intention. The items in the Modified Job Descriptive Index were broken down into the five subscales indicated by Gregson (1990). These subscales were work, pay, promotions, supervision, and co-workers. Supervision was found to correlate significantly with turnover intention item 1 in the positive direction ($r = .31, p = .001$). Work was also found to correlate significantly with turnover intention item 1. However, the relationship between work and turnover intention was in the negative direction ($r = -.27, p = .005$), as predicted by the Matching Model. The other job satisfaction subscales did not correlate significantly with turnover intention item 1. Future studies should examine the subscales within the Modified Job Descriptive Index to investigate if the subscales should be used in lieu of the combined scale in job satisfaction and turnover intention studies.
The results of the structural equation path model analysis of Model 3 indicates that the relationship between the degree of match and organizational commitment is in the negative direction. The negative relationship between these two variables contradicts one of the assumptions of the Matching Model. The Matching Model predicted that their relationship would be in the positive direction. However, the inverse relationship between organizational commitment and turnover intention and the positive relationship between job satisfaction and organizational commitment, as predicted in the Matching Model, are confirmed with the results of the structural equation path model analysis.

The unexpected negative relationship between the degree of match and organizational commitment may also be sample specific. Most of the studies regarding organizational commitment have focused on non-student subjects. Due to the fact that students do not perceive their part time job as a career, it is not likely that the students will be committed to the organization that they are working for. Therefore, even if there is a high degree of match between the student and the job, it is not likely that the degree of match will lead to high organizational commitment. The low Cronbach's alpha found for the Organizational Commitment Questionnaire in this study may also be specific to students and/or part-time workers. It is possible that the Organizational
Commitment Questionnaire is better suited to measure organizational commitment of non-student subjects.

Differentiation Among Recruiting Sources

It was unexpected that recruiting source would have nonsignificant relationships with all of the variables in the proposed models. A possible explanation for this unexpected result may be that it is inappropriate to differentiate recruiting sources based on an informal to formal continuum. In fact, it may not be appropriate to differentiate recruiting sources based only on the concept of formality. Past research on recruiting sources have revealed that differentiation among recruiting sources, based only on the concept of formality, has led to complex results. Internal differences among recruiting sources grouped into the same category of formality have been found (Decker & Cornelius, 1979; Gannon, 1971). Even though professional journal/convention advertisement, college placement office, and newspaper have all been grouped into the category of formal recruiting sources, employees recruited through professional journal/convention advertisement were found to be superior in performance than employees recruited through college placement offices and newspaper in Breaugh's (1981) study. In terms of turnover rates, school placement, which is usually placed in the formal recruiting source category (Kirnan et al., 1989), was
found to be superior to hiring agency, newspaper advertising, and hiring agencies in Gannon's (1971) study. Researchers in the area of recruitment should consider using other aspects of recruiting source to differentiate among recruiting sources such as the kind of information obtained by the applicants. By examining recruiting source in greater detail, we may be able to better understanding what makes one recruiting source better than another. Future research on recruiting source should consider other methods of differentiating between different recruiting sources in lieu of using the concept of formality.

Another possible explanation for the nonsignificant relationships between recruitment source and the other variables is that there may be differential effects of recruiting sources on organizational outcomes for different ethnic groups. Caldwell and Spivey (1983) found that informal recruiting sources were a better source of longer tenure employees for whites while formal recruiting sources were associated with longer tenure for blacks. Differential effects of recruiting sources for different ethnic groups may have led to the nonsignificant relationships found in this study. However, before a conclusion can be made on the differential effects of recruiting sources on organizational outcomes for different ethnic groups, more research is needed in this area. Future research on recruiting sources
should also consider examining differential effects for
different genders. Gender differences were examined in this
study for all of the variables with independent t-tests;
however, no differences were detected for the male and
female subjects in any of the variables.

Implications

The results of the structural equation path model
analysis of Model 1 have shown that the degree of match
between the person and the job does not directly influence
turnover intention. The fit of Model 3 to actual data
indicates that attitudinal variables such as job
satisfaction and organizational commitment mediate between
the degree of match and turnover intention. Thus, changing
the degree of match between a person and the job will not
directly influence turnover intention. Attitudinal
variables must be considered to fully understand turnover
intention.

Caution should be taken regarding the generalizability
of the results because of its specific sample. The results
of this study may be better suited for students and/or part-
time workers. Further research is necessary to determine
whether the abnormalities found in the results of this study
are specific to the subjects in this study and whether the
results are generalizable to other samples. Future research
should also expand the causal relationships examined in this
study by exploring other attitudinal variables that may act as mediators between the degree of match and turnover intention.

The results of this study have provided a better understanding of the causal links between accuracy of information and turnover intention. Organizations which are attempting to improve organizational outcomes should keep the relationships found in this study in mind when implementing programs for change. To effectively understand the reasons for the turnover of employees, an organization must measure attitudinal variables such as job satisfaction and organizational commitment in addition to measuring turnover intention. Attempts to change turnover rates without considering attitudinal variables which influences turnover intention may be futile.
Appendix A

Informed Consent

The study in which you are about to participate is being conducted for two reasons. The first is to discover whether the amount of information one has on the job and on the organization will effect one's expectations for the job and for the organization. The second is to investigate the relationship between applicant expectations and organizational outcomes. The information from this study may lead to the design of better recruitment processes.

This study is conducted by Angel Yu, under the supervision of Dr. Matt Riggs, Ph. D., Professor of Psychology at California State University of San Bernardino (CSUSB). The surveys are to be answered anonymously. You will be assigned a subject number for the purpose of data collection and analysis. All data will be reported in group form only and your confidentiality will be maintained. If you do decide to participate, your involvement should not take more than 20 minutes of your time.

Your participation in this research is totally voluntary and you are free to withdraw at any time during the study without penalty. If you have any questions or comments regarding the study, please contact Dr. Riggs, Ph.D. in the Psychology Department. His office telephone number is (909)880-5590.

Please read the following statement and sign below, if you agree to participate in the study.

I confirm that I have read and understand the above information concerning the study and agree that my participation is absolutely voluntary.

Signature ___________________________ Date ____________

* Please detach this sheet from the surveys and return this sheet and the surveys to Peer Advising, TO-21 or TO-22, as soon as possible. Deadline is May 15, 1995.
Debriefing Statement

There are no right or wrong answers to the surveys which you have participated in. Individuals will respond differently depending on the amount of information they have on the job and on the organization. Responses to the surveys will also depend on individual characteristics.

The study is being conducted for two reasons. The first is to discover whether the amount of information one has on the job and on the organization will effect one's expectations for the job and for the organization. The second is to investigate the relationship between applicant expectations and organizational outcomes.

If you have any questions or concerns as a result of your participation, please contact Dr. Riggs, Ph.D. at (909) 880-5590. You may also receive the results of the study, if you are interested, by contacting Dr. Riggs. It is estimated that the results will be available Winter of 1995. Please do not reveal the nature of this study to other potential subjects because it may affect the results of the study.

Thank you very much for your participation.
Appendix B

Information Sheet

Please respond to the following questions:

A. What type of organization do you work for?

___ Finance/Banking   ___ Utilities   ___ Retail   ___ Transportation
___ Manufacturer    ___ Education    ___ Government   ___ Services
___ Non-Profit     ___ Entertainment   ___ Other __________________________

B. What type of work do you do?

___ Clerical   ___ Managerial  ___ Sales   ___ Production
___ Maintenance    ___ Customer Service  ___ Other __________________________

C. What is the title of your Position? __________________________

D. How long have you worked for your organization?

Years ______  Months ______

E. What is your age? ______

F. What is your gender? ___ Male  ___ Female

G. What is your ethnicity?

___ African-American  ___ Latino    ___ Anglo
___ Asian-American    ___ Native-American
___ Other ________________

H. How did you hear about your position?

___ Radio/TV Station  ___ Newspaper  ___ Professional Journal
___ Current Employee   ___ Relative/Friend  ___ Job-Line
___ School/College ___ Public/Private   ___ Self-initiated Applications
___ Placement Bureaus   ___ Employment Agency  (Write-ins or Walk-ins)
___ Other ________________
Appendix C

Consistency of Information Questionnaire

Instructions

Refer to the time period marked A in the above time line to respond to the items in this survey. Please think back to what you knew about your current job before you applied for the job. Then think about the information you obtained from the organization concerning your current job during the application process (before you actually took the job). Was the information provided by your company during the application process consistent with what you believed before initiating your application for the job? Respond to each item by checking one of the five alternatives.

**Key:** 1 = Much more negative; 2 = More negative; 3 = Consistent; 4 = More positive; 5 = Much more positive.

<p>| | | | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1. Job responsibilities and demands *</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2. Career progress and opportunities *</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3. Type of work you would perform in your position *</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4. Type of environment you would be working in</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5. Accessibility of supervisors</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Adapted from Vandenberg & Scarpello (1990)
**Key:** 1 = Much more negative; 2 = More negative; 3 = Consistent; 4 = More positive; 5 = Much more positive.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Factor Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Flexibility of your schedule</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Salary range and pay raise</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Relationships with supervisors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Supervisors' acceptance of your ideas and opinion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Benefits relating to the job</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Feedback from supervisors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Relationships with co-workers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>The tasks your unit (group, department, division) perform</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Relationships between departments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>The goals and objectives of your unit (group, division, department)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Company rules and procedures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Organization's acceptance of new ideas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>The atmosphere at work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Organization goals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Organization's emphasis on personal growth</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Realism Questionnaire

Instructions

Refer to the time period marked B in the above time line to respond to the items in this survey. Please think back to the time you applied for your current job and think about the expectations that you had for the job and for the organization at that time. Now that you have worked in your job and in the organization, do you think that the expectations you had during the application process (before you actually took the job) were consistent with the reality of the job and the organization? Respond to each item by checking one of the five alternatives.

Key: 1 = Much more negative; 2 = More negative; 3 = Consistent; 4 = More positive; 5 = Much more positive.

1 2 3 4 5 1. Job responsibilities and demands * 
1 2 3 4 5 2. Career progress and opportunities * 
1 2 3 4 5 3. Type of work you would perform in your position * 
1 2 3 4 5 4. Type of environment you would be working in 
1 2 3 4 5 5. Accessibility of supervisors

* Adapted from Vandenberg & Scarpello (1990)
**Key:** 1 = Much more negative; 2 = More negative; 3 = Consistent; 4 = More positive; 5 = Much more positive.

<p>| | | | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6. Flexibility of your schedule</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7. Salary range and pay raise</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8. Relationships with supervisors</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9. Supervisors' acceptance of your ideas and opinion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10. Benefits relating to the job</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>11. Feedback from supervisors</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>12. Relationships with co-workers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>13. The tasks your unit (group, department, division) perform</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>14. Relationships between departments</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>15. The goals and objectives of your unit (group, division, department)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>16. Company rules and procedures</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>17. Organization's acceptance of new ideas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>18. The atmosphere at work</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>19. Organization goals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>20. Organization's emphasis on personal growth</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix E

Organizational Commitment Questionnaire *

Instructions
Listed below are a series of statements that represent possible feelings that individuals might have about the company or organization for which they work. With respect to your own feelings about the particular organization for which you are now working, please indicate the degree of your agreement or disagreement with each statement by checking one of the seven alternatives below each statement.

1. I am willing to put in a great deal of effort beyond that normally expected in order to help this organization be successful.

   (1) strongly disagree           (5) slightly agree
   (2) moderately disagree        (6) moderately agree
   (3) slightly disagree           (7) strongly agree
   (4) neither disagree nor agree

2. I talk up this organization to my friends as a great organization to work for.

   (1) strongly disagree           (5) slightly agree
   (2) moderately disagree         (6) moderately agree
   (3) slightly disagree            (7) strongly agree
   (4) neither disagree nor agree

3. I feel very little loyalty to this organization.

   (1) strongly disagree           (5) slightly agree
   (2) moderately disagree         (6) moderately agree
   (3) slightly disagree            (7) strongly agree
   (4) neither disagree nor agree

4. I would accept almost any type of job assignment in order to keep working for this organization.

   (1) strongly disagree           (5) slightly agree
   (2) moderately disagree         (6) moderately agree
   (3) slightly disagree            (7) strongly agree
   (4) neither disagree nor agree

* Adapted from Mowday, Steers, & Porter (1979)
5. I find that my values and the organization's values are very similar.

(1) strongly disagree   (5) slightly agree
(2) moderately disagree (6) moderately agree
(3) slightly disagree   (7) strongly agree
(4) neither disagree nor agree

6. I am proud to tell others that I am part of this organization.

(1) strongly disagree   (5) slightly agree
(2) moderately disagree (6) moderately agree
(3) slightly disagree   (7) strongly agree
(4) neither disagree nor agree

7. I could just as well be working for a different organization as long as the type of work was similar.

(1) strongly disagree   (5) slightly agree
(2) moderately disagree (6) moderately agree
(3) slightly disagree   (7) strongly agree
(4) neither disagree nor agree

8. This organization really inspires the very best in me in the way of job performance.

(1) strongly disagree   (5) slightly agree
(2) moderately disagree (6) moderately agree
(3) slightly disagree   (7) strongly agree
(4) neither disagree nor agree

9. It would take very little change in my present circumstances to cause me to leave the organization.

(1) strongly disagree   (5) slightly agree
(2) moderately disagree (6) moderately agree
(3) slightly disagree   (7) strongly agree
(4) neither disagree nor agree

10. I am extremely glad that I chose this organization to work for over others I was considering at the time I joined.

(1) strongly disagree   (4) neither disagree nor agree   (7) strongly agree
(2) moderately disagree (5) slightly agree
(3) slightly disagree   (6) moderately agree
11. There's not too much to be gained by sticking with this organization indefinitely.

(1) strongly disagree  (5) slightly agree
(2) moderately disagree  (6) moderately agree
(3) slightly disagree  (7) strongly agree
(4) neither disagree nor agree

12. Often, I find it difficult to agree with this organization's policies on important matters relating to its employees.

(1) strongly disagree  (5) slightly agree
(2) moderately disagree  (6) moderately agree
(3) slightly disagree  (7) strongly agree
(4) neither disagree nor agree

13. I really care about the fate of this organization.

(1) strongly disagree  (5) slightly agree
(2) moderately disagree  (6) moderately agree
(3) slightly disagree  (7) strongly agree
(4) neither disagree nor agree

14. For me this is the best of all possible organizations for which to work.

(1) strongly disagree  (5) slightly agree
(2) moderately disagree  (6) moderately agree
(3) slightly disagree  (7) strongly agree
(4) neither disagree nor agree

15. Deciding to work for this organization was a definite mistake on my part.

(1) strongly disagree  (5) slightly agree
(2) moderately disagree  (6) moderately agree
(3) slightly disagree  (7) strongly agree
(4) neither disagree nor agree
Appendix F

Job Descriptive Index (modified) *

Instructions

Please respond to each statement with one of the five alternatives.

Key: 1 = Strongly Disagree; 2 = Disagree; 3 = Neither disagree nor agree; 4 = Agree; 5 = Strongly agree

<p>| | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>SA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1. My work is satisfying.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2. My work is boring.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3. My work is good.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4. My work is tiresome.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5. My work is challenging.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6. My work gives me a sense of accomplishment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7. My income is adequate for normal expenses.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8. I am underpaid.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9. My pay is bad.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10. My pay is less than I deserve.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>11. I am highly paid.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>12. My income is barely enough to live on.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>13. There are good opportunities for advancement at my firm.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>14. Opportunities are some what limited at my firm.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>15. Promotions are based on ability at my firm.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Adapted from Gregson (1990). Original JDI's copyright is held by Bowling Green State University; 1975, 1985. Reproduced by permission.
**Key:** 1 = Strongly Disagree; 2 = Disagree; 3 = Neither disagree nor agree; 4 = Agree; 5 = Strongly agree

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SD</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>SA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

16. My job is a dead-end job.

17. There is a good chance for promotion at my firm.

18. My firm has an unfair promotion policy.

19. My supervisors are hard to please.

20. My supervisors are impolite.

21. My supervisors are tactful.

22. My supervisors are quick-tempered.

23. My supervisors are annoying.

24. My supervisors are stubborn.

25. My co-workers are boring.

26. My co-workers are slow.

27. My co-workers are stupid.

28. My co-workers are intelligent.

29. It is easy to make enemies of my co-workers.

30. My co-workers are lazy.

### Turnover Intentions

1. Please estimate the probability of leaving your current organization for another organization in the next 6 months by making a mark on the following scale.*

![Probability Scale](image)

* Adapted from Vandenberg & Scarpello (1990)
2. If you are given an opportunity to leave your current organization, what is the probability that you would actually leave? Please estimate that probability by making a mark on the following scale.
Table 1  
Frequencies of Recruitment Sources

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Recruitment Source</th>
<th>Value in Continuum</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Relative/Friend</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>44.2</td>
<td>44.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current Employee</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>13.3</td>
<td>57.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-initiated</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>21.2</td>
<td>78.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job-Line</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>81.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Radio/TV</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.9</td>
<td>82.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newspaper</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>91.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Journal</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>92.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School/College Placement</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public/Private Employment Agencies</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scale</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>Cronbach's alpha</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accuracy of Information</td>
<td>65.76</td>
<td>9.71</td>
<td>.88</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expectation</td>
<td>66.96</td>
<td>14.08</td>
<td>.94</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Satisfaction</td>
<td>89.63</td>
<td>12.85</td>
<td>.75</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational Commitment</td>
<td>62.98</td>
<td>12.19</td>
<td>.65</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 3  
**Listwise Correlations**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Recruitment Source</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Accuracy of Information</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Expectation</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>.67**</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Job Satisfaction</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Organizational Commitment</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>-.21*</td>
<td>-.19</td>
<td>.30**</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. TOI1</td>
<td>-.11</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>.19*</td>
<td>.20*</td>
<td>-.39**</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. TOI2</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>.19*</td>
<td>-.30**</td>
<td>.75**</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* "*" is printed if $p < .05$. "**" is printed if $p < .01$. 
Figure 1. Wanous' (1980) matching model. The matching model depicts the relationships between accuracy of job information, person-job fit, and organizational outcomes.
Figure 2. Causal paths, variables, and error terms which represent the proposed theoretical Model 1. E = Error term.
Figure 3. Causal paths, variables, and error terms which represent the proposed theoretical Model 2. E = Error term.
Figure 4. Causal paths, variables, and error terms which represent the proposed theoretical Model 3. E = Error term.
Chi-Square ($df = 4$) = 27.27 ($p < .001$)

Bentler-Bonett NFI = .77

Bentler-Bonett NNFI = .46

Comparative Fit Index = .79

Figure 5. Resulting path coefficients and error terms from the structural equation path analysis of Model 1. NFI = normed fit index; NNFI = non-normed fit index.
Chi-Square ($df = 5) = 23.44 (p < .001)$

Bentler-Bonett NFI = .80

Bentler-Bonett NNFI = .66

Comparative Fit Index = .83

Figure 6. Resulting path coefficients and error terms from the structural equation path analysis of Model 2. NFI = normed fit index; NNFI = non-normed fit index.
Chi-Square ($df = 3$) = 1.52 ($p = .677$)

Bentler-Bonett NFI = .99

Bentler-Bonett NNFI = 1.0

Comparative Fit Index = 1.0

Figure 7. Resulting path coefficients and error terms from the structural equation path analysis of Model 3. NFI = normed fit index; NNFI = non-normed fit index.
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