California State University, San Bernardino

CSUSB ScholarWorks

Theses Digitization Project

John M. Pfau Library

2009

Family-organization fit: An extension on person-organization fit

Rebekah Elaine Massmann

Follow this and additional works at: <https://scholarworks.lib.csusb.edu/etd-project>

Part of the [Industrial and Organizational Psychology Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Massmann, Rebekah Elaine, "Family-organization fit: An extension on person-organization fit" (2009).
Theses Digitization Project. 3549.

<https://scholarworks.lib.csusb.edu/etd-project/3549>

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by the John M. Pfau Library at CSUSB ScholarWorks. It has been accepted for inclusion in Theses Digitization Project by an authorized administrator of CSUSB ScholarWorks. For more information, please contact scholarworks@csusb.edu.

FAMILY-ORGANIZATION FIT:
AN EXTENSION ON PERSON-ORGANIZATION FIT

A Thesis
Presented to the
Faculty of
California State University,
San Bernardino

In Partial Fulfillment
of the Requirements for the Degree
Master of Science
in
Psychology:
Industrial/Organizational

by
Rebekah Elaine Massmann

September 2009

FAMILY-ORGANIZATION FIT:
AN EXTENSION ON PERSON-ORGANIZATION FIT

A Thesis
Presented to the
Faculty of
California State University,
San Bernardino

by
Rebekah Elaine Massmann

September 2009

Approved by:

Dr. Janelle Gilbert, Chair, Psychology

8/19/2009
Date

Dr. Janet Kottke

Dr. Kenneth Shultz

Copyright 2009 Rebekah Elaine Massmann

ABSTRACT

This study was designed to investigate how employees and/or their families "fit" or "match" with organizations. Family-Organization (F-O) fit was proposed as an extension on Person-Organization (P-O) fit, while also drawing from the work and family literature. A scale was created to measure F-O fit, and it consisted of complementary and supplementary items. Specifically, F-O fit was expected to be negatively related to work-family conflict (both family to work interference and work to family interference). F-O fit was also hypothesized to explain additional variance in stress, organizational commitment, job satisfaction, and turnover intentions after accounting for P-O fit. Finally, interaction effects among P-O and F-O fit were proposed.

Data was collected using a web-based survey format, and 159 participants with complete data were analyzed. Evidence was found to support F-O fit as a valid and reliable construct. The psychometric data indicated a normal distribution of F-O fit, with excellent internal reliability. Results showed that F-O fit was significantly negatively related to both directions of work-family conflict after controlling for gender, marital status, and number of dependents. Further, F-O fit was significantly

negatively related to stress and turnover intentions after controlling for gender, marital status, number of dependents, P-O fit, and Person-Job fit. No interaction effects were observed. Additional analyses suggest potential group differences in stress and WFC based on number of dependents (no dependents compared with one or more dependents).

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This thesis would not have been possible without the assistance of my professor, thesis committee chair, and employer, Dr. Gilbert. Thank you for seeing the big picture and for encouraging me to do my best. Thank you to the rest of my committee, Dr. Shultz and Dr. Kottke, for your feedback and support to make this a better project. A special thanks to Dr. Cramer for his help formalizing my research ideas into a successful proposal.

Thank you to my fellow classmates who assisted with scale development, who encouraged me along the way, and who provided invaluable feedback.

I am especially grateful for God's presence in my life, bringing me guidance, peace, and comfort through all the ups and downs of the last two years. Thank you to my parents, siblings, and friends who have supported me throughout my education. A special thank you goes out to the strong women in my family history who have pursued higher education and encouraged me to do the same.

Finally, thank you to my husband, Ben. I would not be here without your love, support, and willingness to move across the country. I love you.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ABSTRACT	iii
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS	v
LIST OF TABLES	viii
LIST OF FIGURES	ix
CHAPTER ONE: LITERATURE REVIEW	
Introduction	1
The Theoretical Lenses of "Fit"	3
Person-Environment Fit	8
Person-Organization Fit	10
Work and Family Background	19
Family-Organization Fit	41
Outcome Variables and Hypotheses	43
CHAPTER TWO: METHODS	
Participants	54
Apparatus	58
Materials	58
Procedure	66
CHAPTER THREE: RESULTS	69
Data Screening	70
Hypotheses Testing	78
Additional Analyses	101

CHAPTER FOUR: DISCUSSION	105
Limitations	113
Implications and Future Directions	115
APPENDIX A: FINAL SCALES	120
APPENDIX B: INFORMED CONSENT	133
APPENDIX C: SURVEY ORDERS.	135
APPENDIX D: DEBRIEFING STATEMENT	137
REFERENCES	139

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1.	Demographic Statistics—Categorical	55
Table 2.	Demographic Statistics—Continuous	56
Table 3.	Descriptive Statistics for Complete Cases Only	71
Table 4.	Correlation Matrix	76
Table 5.	Sequential Regression Coefficients and Test Statistics for Work to Family Interference	80
Table 6.	Sequential Regression Coefficients and Test Statistics for Family to Work Interference	83
Table 7.	Sequential Regression Coefficients and Test Statistics for Stress	86
Table 8.	Sequential Regression Coefficients and Test Statistics for Organizational Commitment	89
Table 9.	Sequential Regression Coefficients and Test Statistics for Job Satisfaction	93
Table 10.	Sequential Regression Coefficients and Test Statistics for Turnover Intentions	98
Table 11.	T-Tests for Number of Dependents	103

LIST OF FIGURES

Figure 1. Proposed interaction between family- organization and person-organization fit on organizational commitment	51
Figure 2. Proposed interaction between person- organization and family-organization fit on work-family conflict	53

CHAPTER ONE

LITERATURE REVIEW

Introduction

Person-organization (P-O) fit is, put quite simply, the fit between a person and his or her organization. A form of person-environment (P-E) fit, P-O fit has received a lot of attention in recent research literature (Kristof, 1996) and predicts organizational outcomes such as organizational commitment, job satisfaction, and turnover intentions (Cable & Judge, 1996). P-O fit has explained additional variance above and beyond that explained by person-job (P-J) fit on outcomes such as job satisfaction and organizational commitment (Scroggins, 2007) and job choice intentions (Gilbert & Rodgers, 2002). However, Kristof explains that research findings have been somewhat mixed, and she suggests further research on potential interactions between fit measured at different levels of analysis (e.g., P-O fit and P-J fit).

Major researchers in the field have supported the notion of "fit" being a valid construct at several levels of analysis (i.e., Kristof, 1996; Schneider, 1987). This project has endeavored to combine the fit literature with

the work and family literature to show that individuals' fit with their organizations does not just stem from personal, individual-level congruence. One proposal pursued by this project suggests that *family-organization* (F-O) fit is a related, yet discriminant extension of P-O fit, occurring when individuals' *families* and their organizations "fit." As research has shown that P-O fit is related to positive organizational outcomes, F-O fit is also expected to explain variance in these outcomes above and beyond P-O fit. Further, F-O fit is expected to be directly related to work-family conflict (WFC). Finally, drawing from Kristof's (1996) research propositions, F-O fit is expected to moderate the relationship between P-O fit and outcomes such as organizational commitment, job satisfaction, stress, and turnover.

This literature review will first showcase the theoretical bases of the fit construct and a more general form of fit (person-environment). Next, P-O fit will be explored in such detail as to lay conceptual groundwork for the proposed F-O fit. Relevant work and family literature (i.e., work and family policies, work and family fit) will be highlighted, which will lead into the need for and the

explanation of F-O fit as a construct. Finally, hypotheses regarding F-O fit will be proposed.

The Theoretical Lenses of "Fit"

The concept of fit emerged in the 1980s with Dawis and Lofquist's (1984) Theory of Work Adjustment (TWA) and Schneider's (1987) Attraction-Selection-Attrition (ASA) model. Both models provide the theoretical basis for further conceptualizations of fit.

In Dawis and Lofquist's (1984) TWA, individuals and their environments desire a natural state of "correspondence." Much like the physics concept of equal and opposite forces, the individual and the environment make demands upon each other and make "adjustments" to their characteristics to maintain the balanced state. For example, an employee may demand a positive work environment, a flexible schedule, and fair pay; the employer may demand a strong work ethic, on-time arrival, and sales quotas. Adjustments can be viewed as a kind of give-and-take bargaining situation, where the employee and the employer adjust their demands and supplies (what each provides the other party) to remain content with the situation (balanced).

Bretz and Judge (1994) explain that positive organizational outcomes occur when the correspondence is stable, and likewise, negative organizational outcomes occur when the correspondence is unstable. Continuing with the example, if the employer changed company policy to disallow flexible schedules and did not adjust its other offerings, that employee will likely become dissatisfied, disengaged, and he or she may even leave the organization. On a more positive note, "TWA and the related research suggest that individuals will seek out, find comfort, and flourish in environments that support their specific preferences" (Bretz & Judge, 1994, p. 33). TWA has in fact been studied extensively in the fit literature and clearly provides a starting point for understanding the importance of an individual's fit with his or her surrounding environment.

Schneider's (1987) ASA framework also provides theoretical groundwork for the fit literature, albeit with a more specific bent than TWA. ASA is based on the idea that organizations have "personalities" based on the people that comprise them. Schneider presents a counter argument to the traditional idea that organizations—their technology, structure, and external environment—mold

individuals' behavior. Drawing from interactional personality theory, vocational psychology, and industrial-organizational (I-O) psychology, Schneider proposes that "the attributes of people...are the fundamental determinants of organizational behavior" (p. 437).

The ASA model begins with the concept of attraction (Schneider, 1987). Sociologists and psychologists alike have discovered the tendency of individuals to prefer others like themselves. To take this concept one step further, Schneider builds on the consistent findings in vocational psychology that individuals prefer careers that match with their personalities and interests. Schneider continues by explaining that organizational theory has also shown the importance of people "matching" their work environments. These literatures lead Schneider to the conclusion that an individual who matches a particular organization in terms of "personality" will be attracted to that organization.

However, the ASA model goes beyond the concept of attraction or preferences. The model is a cyclical one centered around organizational goals (i.e., values, principles, behaviors), which began with the founder of the company (Schneider, 1987). Schneider draws the picture of

an organization that is founded with certain organizational goals to which its first employees are attracted. As time goes on, the employees in that organization adapt to constraints and challenges in order to survive, thereby forming new goals, to which new employees are attracted. Essentially, this process leads to individuals being attracted to a similar (or matching) work environment—one created by the other individuals who make it up (Schneider, 1987).

Adding to the natural similarity of these employees is another force—the second concept of ASA—selection (Schneider, 1987). Schneider argues that organizations, through their recruitment and selection processes, further restrict their employees' range of personalities (or attributes). For example, phenomena such as the "like me" interviewer bias can lead to the selection of sets of similar individuals. Schneider explains that individual differences within the organization are then displayed in terms of differing competencies, while their personality and value attributes remain similar.

The last force in ASA, completing the circle and maintaining the similarity in organizations, is attrition (Schneider, 1987). This concept, which Schneider draws from

the turnover literature, is simple—those who don't fit the organization tend to leave it. Schneider explains that some people will simply make initial decision errors. For example, some individuals may proceed through the selection process without getting a realistic organization preview, and they may become dissatisfied as they are introduced to the reality of the organization. Schneider also asserts that some people may eventually cease to fit with the organization as it changes and adapts. In this situation, an employee who has been with the company for years may not be able to adapt to new technology, new goals, or new leadership, because he or she prefers "the way things used to be," leading to potential dissatisfaction and/or turnover. In conclusion, ASA highlights the tendency for individuals to select environments that fit their needs, interests, personalities, and values. Additionally, this theory provides a basis for understanding both the positive outcomes of fit (e.g., job satisfaction, tenure) and the negative outcomes of fit (e.g., turnover or attrition).

Both TWA and ASA have provided the basis for ensuing theories of fit, many of which have centered around the workplace. Accordingly, both theories have also suggested relationships between fit and organizational outcome

variables (Bretz & Judge, 1994), furthering the theoretical ties.

Person-Environment Fit

The most general fit theory is P-E fit, which was developed as a psychological stress theory (Edwards & Rothbard, 1999). In general, the better the fit between a person and his or her environment, the lower the stress. The theory has seen further application in various workplace literatures: vocation/career choice (Carless, 2005), occupational stress (Voydanoff, 2005), and recruitment and selection (Carless, 2005). More recently, the theory's generality has facilitated its expansion to other realms, such as the family (e.g., Edwards & Rothbard, 1999; Kreiner, 2006).

According to Edwards and Rothbard (1999), "P-E fit theory predicts that a perceived match between the person and environment is beneficial to mental and physical well-being, whereas a perceived mismatch signifies stress, produces mental and physical strain (i.e., damage to well-being), and stimulates efforts to resolve P-E misfit" (p. 87). Accordingly, the criterion variables for the theory have expanded much beyond occupational stress. Other

criteria thought to be affected by fit range from general well being (Kreiner, 2006) to satisfaction (Carless, 2005) to conflict (Edwards & Rothbard, 1999; Kreiner, 2006).

Operationally, P-E fit leads to more specific fit analyses (Carless, 2005). In fact, P-E fit can be viewed at four levels of analysis—job, group, vocation, and organization (P-J, P-G, P-V, and P-O, respectively; Kristof, 1996). Kristof-Brown, Zimmerman, and Johnson (2005) present a comprehensive meta-analysis and review of the P-E fit literature, which shows more evidence of the multi-dimensional nature of fit. Kristof-Brown et al. show that while all forms of fit included in the meta-analysis (P-O, P-J, P-G, and person-supervisor) are significantly positively related, these constructs are still distinct, as evidenced by the differential outcomes predicted by different forms of fit and the relative strengths of fit-outcome relationships.

The nature of the P-O fit level of analysis lends itself to providing a basis for understanding F-O fit. For example, the organization has an additional “shareholder” or “customer” in considering the employee’s family’s values and needs. Thus, P-O fit is the starting point for the development of the F-O fit construct.

Person-Organization Fit

P-O fit can be described as the match or fit between a person and his or her organization. Theoretically, P-O fit has been conceptualized in different fashions by different authors. Kristof (1996) reviewed the P-O fit literature extensively to categorize and combine different authors' approaches, from their conceptual bases to their measurement strategies. She explains that key to understanding the P-O fit construct is the distinction between two research perspectives. The first perspective, complementary and supplementary fit, describes the relationship between a person and the organization in terms of their shared characteristics, which is analogous to the ASA framework of similarity (Kristof, 1996). Supplementary fit occurs when individuals share characteristics with their surrounding environment (in this case, the organization or the people in the organization). For example, if an employee of a non-profit organization (assumedly with the goal to help the community) has a personal goal to help others, supplementary fit exists. Complementary fit occurs when individuals provide a characteristic to the organization that "completes" a missing piece.

The second perspective, needs-supplies and demands-abilities fit, describes the person-organization relationship from a TWA perspective, where balance and stability are highlighted (Kristof, 1996). Needs-supplies fit refers to the organization supplying what the employee needs. For example, if an employee needs a telecommuting work option, and the employer provides such a benefit, needs-supplies fit exists. Demands-abilities fit refers to the employee more or less supplying what the organization needs—termed as the employees' abilities fitting with the organization's demands. For example, if the organization demands intense effort from an employee, and the employee has that ability, demands-abilities fit exists.

Most authors have approached fit from only one of these perspectives, with few exceptions for P-O fit (e.g., Bretz & Judge, 1994). Kristof (1996) argues that while both perspectives are useful, the best case scenario (i.e., the best total fit) and the best explanatory model would come from combining the two conceptual perspectives. Kristof therefore proposes a model of P-O fit considering all of the above, and describes P-O fit as "the compatibility between people and organizations that occurs when: (a) at least one entity provides what the other needs, or (b) they

share similar fundamental characteristics, or (c) both" (pp. 4-5). Fundamental characteristics can also be thought of as sharing the same "personality" (Cable & Judge, 1996, p. 294).

Essentially, the model (Kristof, 1996) incorporates supplementary fit as the fit between the person and the organization in terms of characteristics (i.e., culture/climate, values, goals, and norms). Complementary fit then incorporates demands-abilities and needs-supplies fit, drawing from its more general concept of "completion." To extend the non-profit organization example used earlier, complementary fit would occur if the employee has a need for intrinsic rewards, which the organization supplies via its mission and daily activities. In a more recent meta-analysis, Kristof-Brown et al. (2005) stipulate that P-O fit has rarely been operationalized at the complementary level; in fact, most research on P-O fit has focused on values-based measures, indicative of supplementary fit. In contrast, the majority of measures of P-J fit are operationalized at the complementary level (e.g., knowledge, skills, and abilities). Kristof-Brown et al. suggest that P-O fit researchers further explore the complementary conceptualization of P-O fit.

Gilbert and Rodgers (2002), following Kristof's (1996) summary of how the literature has defined and measured P-O fit, defined P-O fit as the combination of values congruence, goal congruence, personality/climate congruence, and needs/supplies fit. Gilbert and Rodgers then created scales measuring each of these four variables and used structural equation modeling to show that they do in fact combine to form P-O fit, a latent construct.

Relationships with Outcome Variables

While Kristof (1996) suggests the construct and operationalization of P-O fit needs further definition (and in fact provides 18 propositions for future research), P-O fit is supported and accepted in the literature as a valid, reliable, and predictive concept. To summarize, P-O fit has been shown to predict job satisfaction (Bretz & Judge, 1994; Cable & Judge, 1996; Gilbert & Rodgers, 2002; Lovelace & Rosen, 1996; O'Reilly, Chatman & Caldwell, 1991; Scroggins, 2007), tenure (Bretz & Judge, 1994), job choice intentions (Cable & Judge, 1996; Gilbert & Rodgers, 2002), organizational commitment (Cable & Judge, 1996; O'Reilly, Chatman, & Caldwell, 1991; Scroggins, 2007), turnover intentions (Cable & Judge, 1996; Lovelace & Rosen, 1996; O'Reilly et al., 1991), willingness to recommend own

organization to other job-seekers (Cable & Judge, 1996), perceived stress (Lovelace & Rosen, 1996), and likelihood of staying with the organization (O'Reilly et al., 1991).

Of interest in the current study are the outcome variables of WFC, stress, organizational commitment, job satisfaction, and turnover intentions. The relationships between these variables and P-O and F-O fit will be explored. However, it is also important to explore the relationships among the types of fit (e.g., P-O, P-J, F-O).

Relationships with Other Forms of Fit

The nature of the relationships between different forms of fit is beginning to be researched. Kristof's (1996) review, for example, outlines how P-G fit may differ dramatically from P-O fit, given that "sub-organizational units such as groups may have different norms and values than the organization in which they are contained" (p. 8). Kristof iterates that the fit levels must be distinctly defined because of potential interactions between levels of fit, and she in fact encourages future researchers to evaluate potential mediating and moderating relationships. Janson and Kristof-Brown (2006) agree, "Broad consequences such as satisfaction, commitment, stress, adjustment and withdrawal are more realistically affected by the

compilation and interaction of fit assessments across multiple aspects of the environment" (p. 193).

Person-Job Fit. P-J fit can be defined as the "relationship between a person's abilities and the demands of a specific job or the desires of a person and the attributes of a specific job" (Janson & Kristof-Brown, 2006, p. 194). Though some similarities may exist between P-J and P-O fit, researchers should operationalize these constructs as unique, given the low correlation between the two (e.g., $r = .18$; Lauver & Kristof-Brown, 2001). Cable and Judge (1996) also report a moderate correlation ($r = .16-.35$) between P-O and P-J fit. Kristof (1996) iterates that "P-J fit should be judged relative to the tasks performed, not the organization in which the job exists" (p. 8). Lauver and Kristof-Brown further explain, "an employee can possess the skills to be competent in a job, yet not share the organization's values and vice versa" (p. 455).

Further, Cable and Judge (1996) report that P-J fit predicts different outcomes than P-O fit does, supporting this assumption of distinctness. Kristof-Brown et al.'s (2005) meta-analysis also showed that different types of fit are more strongly associated with different outcomes

(e.g., job satisfaction and P-J fit, organizational commitment and P-O fit). Further, Kristof-Brown et al. explain that "in studies that assessed multiple types of fit, most report a unique prediction attributable to each type of fit" (p. 316). Kristof-Brown et al. also found that the four types of fit were only moderately positively correlated. For example, they report the strongest relationship between P-J and P-O fit, with an average correlation of .58 and an estimated true score correlation of .72. The weakest relationship was between P-S and P-G fit, with an average correlation of .30 and an estimated true score correlation of .37. In summary, "these results underscore the uniqueness of each type of fit and the ability of individuals to discern among aspects of their work environment when assessing fit" (Kristof-Brown et al., 2005, p. 316).

Scroggins (2007) provides additional support for the necessity of considering the nature of the relationships and potential interactions between multiple levels of fit. In his study, P-O fit explained additional variance in job satisfaction and affective organizational commitment as part of a regression model already containing three types of P-J fit (demands-abilities, needs-supplies, and self-

concept/job). These results suggest measures of fit can have additive effects in explaining organizational outcomes. Interestingly, P-O fit did not predict more variance on turnover intentions, which Scroggins suggests is because some criteria may have more overlapping variance than others. In any case, Scroggins suggests that researchers emphasize, especially in practice, various forms of fit to achieve a more complete overall fit.

Gilbert and Rodgers (2002) showed that P-J fit did not directly predict job choice intentions; rather, it indirectly influenced job choice intentions via P-O fit. Using regression, Gilbert and Rodgers showed the importance of P-O fit to job choice intentions, as it predicted above and beyond P-J fit (in fact, P-J fit was not a significant predictor). Similarly, Lauver and Kristof-Brown (2001) showed that even across multiple job types, P-O fit was a stronger predictor of turnover intentions than P-J fit and that P-O and P-J fit contributed uniquely to job satisfaction and turnover intentions.

Other studies provide conceptual support for the idea of multi-faceted fit (e.g., Westerman & Cyr, 2004), and "as suggested by B. Schneider et al. (1995), fit may be a viable construct at many levels of analysis" (Kristof,

1996, p. 7). Based on these studies, multi-faceted or multi-dimensional approaches to fit are quite necessary and beneficial.

Family-Organization Fit. Exploring the family as a part of the fit literature is a logical next step in research analysis. Kristof-Brown et al. (2005) call for future research to further integrate how the family plays into understanding the fit construct. Kristof's (1996) definition provided earlier provides a good synopsis of an P-O fit—the two entities of person and organization must either be the supply for the other's demands/needs, share fundamental characteristics, or both. Despite the P-O fit literature focusing on supplementary fit, both supplementary and complementary F-O fit are critical. Thus, this definition is a good place to start when thinking about the proposed F-O fit construct, because the word "entities" need not just refer to the person and the organization. In accordance with Kristof's P-O fit model, job seekers might also evaluate fit with an organization based on their families' values and/or needs matching up with the organizations' values and/or supplies.

Work and Family Background

Much of the theoretical groundwork for F-O fit comes from the work and family literature. The merging of this literature with the P-O fit literature will allow for more in-depth understanding of important relationships as well as synergy and knowledge transfer between two fields, ultimately benefiting the employee. Relevant portions of the WFC, work-family policies (WFP), and work-family fit literatures are summarized.

Work-Family Conflict

WFC research has recently become very popular in psychology, business, and related fields, as evidenced by the over 5,000 articles found when searching PsychInfo, PsychArticles, Academic Search Premier, and Business Source Premier databases for "work family conflict." Individuals are facing increasing competing demands from family and from work, and most individuals experience stress related to WFC (Carlson, Kacmar, & Williams, 2000). In fact, the House Subcommittee on Workforce Protections of the Committee on Education and the Workforce held a special hearing in June 2007 entitled "Balancing work and family: What policies best support American families?" which

illustrates the gravity of the work and family situation in America.

The theoretical basis of WFC stems from role dynamics theory. Kahn, Wolfe, Quinn, Snoek, and Rosenthal (1964) define a role as being made up of role expectations which are "sent" by the members of that group. For example, a person's familial role is likely determined by expectations of family members, at least in part. Kahn et al. continue by explaining that role pressures are then put upon the person to conform to the expectations of his or her role. Thus, objective role conflict is defined as "simultaneous occurrence of two (or more) sets of pressures such that compliance with one would make more difficult compliance with the other" (Kahn et al., 1964, p. 19).

More specifically, inter-role conflict occurs when "role pressures associated with membership in one organization are in conflict with pressures stemming from membership in other groups" (Kahn et al., 1964, p. 20). Greenhaus and Beutell (1985) describe this type of conflict as when participation in one role (i.e., work) interferes with participation in another competing role (i.e., caregiver). In other words, when sets of pressures from an employee's work role are incompatible with sets of

pressures from an employee's home role, conflict-WFC- occurs.

Greenhaus and Beutell (1985) reviewed the WFC literature and defined WFC as "a form of interrole conflict in which the role pressures from the work and family domains are mutually incompatible in some respect" (p.77). This definition highlights how WFC is particularly relevant to the fit construct, as fit has been conceptualized in terms of compatibility and balance. Greenhaus and Beutell's definition and review laid the groundwork for much of the modern WFC research (Ford, Heinen, & Langkamer, 2007).

In fact, as originally suggested by Greenhaus and Beutell (1985), WFC can be further partitioned into three types-time-, strain-, and behavior-based WFC. Time-based WFC is "when time devoted to one role makes it difficult to participate in another role," strain-based WFC is when "strain experienced in one role intrudes into and interferes with participation in another role," and behavior-based WFC is "when specific behaviors required in one role are incompatible with behavioral expectation in another role" (Carlson et al., 2000, p. 250). Essentially, according to Greenhaus and Beutell's model, time pressure, strain, and behavior requirements from one role will affect

participation in the other role. The more pressure, the more interrole conflict.

More recently, the literature has begun to consider WFC in terms of its *direction* as two "related but distinct forms of interrole conflict"—work interference with family and family interference with work (Kossek & Ozeki, 1998, p. 140). Traditional WFC literature has predominately focused on the work to family interference direction (Allen, Herst, Bruck, & Sutton, 2000; Carlson et al., 2000; Ford et al., 2007). In other words, rather than just considering how someone's work may be affecting his or her family life, researchers are beginning to also study how someone's family may be affecting him or her at work.

Kossek and Ozeki's (1998) review called for further measurement and construct development of WFC, and the literature has begun to develop and validate models and measures to answer this call. Kossek and Ozeki suggested concentrating on developing both family-to-work measures and work-to-family measures (direction) that also incorporate differences in the activities or attitudes of WFC (type or nature). Allen et al. (2000) agree that ambiguity exists in the nature of and measurement of the WFC construct, and the authors suggest inconsistent results

in the WFC literature may be a result of poor measurement. As such, it is critical that WFC be examined in light of its direction and type/nature, and that models be developed, validated, and evaluated for fit and parsimony.

Indeed, several newer studies have measured family to work interference and work to family interference (e.g., Luk & Shaffer, 2005; Smith & Gardner, 2007). Brough, O'Driscoll, and Kalliath (2005) showed that family-to-work interference predicted family satisfaction, and work-to-family interference predicted job satisfaction. Markedly, Ford et al.'s (2007) meta-analysis measured work-to-family conflict and family-to-work conflict precisely by leaving out studies that used bidirectional (global) measures of WFC. As 178 studies were included in their meta-analysis, clearly the literature has supported the further development of WFC measures by specifically measuring WFC direction.

Despite its proliferation in current research, WFC has not been extensively researched in the fit literature (see the work-family fit section for exceptions). Perhaps the fit research has focused so much on the individual that an outcome relating to one's family is not necessarily intuitive. However, this project proposes that WFC is in

fact related to fit, perhaps in both a direct and indirect manner. Looking back to Kristof's (1996) model at complementary fit, it is conceivable that the time demanded by the organization is not a fit with the employee because of family responsibilities. If one continues to work for that organization, this particular lack of fit could predict time-based WFC. From a different angle, the schedule required of an employee may not fit with the needs of his or her family, which could also predict time-based WFC.

Strain-based WFC is a natural progression from role strain theory. For example, an employee's work-related strains (either physical or mental) may adversely affect family responsibilities or the capacity to handle family strains or stressors. Again, if the employee remains at the organization, this lack of fit (or overload, if you will) would likely predict strain-based work to family interference. The reverse could also occur, where the family strains are such that good fit with the organization would be a function of a *lack of* work strain, perhaps predicting strain-based family to work interference. Finally, strain-based WFC conceptually could occur from

both complementary misfit (e.g., stress as a function of pay) or supplementary misfit (e.g., ethics practices).

Accordingly, behavior-based WFC could also stem from both complementary and supplementary misfit. For example, if an employee has a child with a disability, this employee may need to be "on-call" so to speak at all times. If an organization is such that dealing with personal issues at work is not acceptable (a behavior), good complementary fit will not occur, as the needs of the employee are not being met. An alternative, and albeit a little facetious, example would be an employee for a law firm specializing in divorce, when his or her family has religious objections to divorce. The behaviors required at work would not be a good supplementary fit (religion, values, etc.).

Work-Family Policies

WFP are typically expected to lead to positive organizational outcomes, such as increased organizational commitment (Muse, Harris, Giles, & Feild, 2008). These expectations come from social exchange theory, which iterates that valued resources from both parties are exchanged in a reciprocal manner (Blau, 1964). This theory can be applied to the employer-employee relationship, where supplies or rewards are provided by one party, thereby

"obligating" the other party to reciprocate. Blau asserts that social exchange (versus economic exchange) is unique in that the type of return—or even a return occurring—is not guaranteed. Further "only social exchange tends to engender feelings of personal obligation, gratitude, and trust" (Blau, 1964, p. 94). Essentially family-friendly policies or benefits are considered the valued resources provided by the organization, while positive organizational attitudes and behaviors are considered the valued resources provided by the employee.

The WFP literature has recently been expanding, as more policies are invented (e.g., child development seminars) and as "work-life balance" has become a hot topic in the business world. Kossek and Ozeki (1998) describe how much of the role conflict-based research (WFC literature) has not addressed the effects of organizational policies; conversely, the WFP literature has not typically studied WFC, using instead demographic characteristics as apparent indicators of WFC. The WFP literature has also tended to address the family to work direction of conflict, assuming that policies will mitigate the family's assumed negative influences on the organization. The WFC literature typically has addressed the work to family direction of

conflict, assuming that a person's work will automatically encroach on his or her family life. Kossek and Ozeki call for future research to build a bridge between these two concepts, asserting that this link is critical to understanding how to implement family policies in ways that actually improve job or life/family satisfaction and reduce WFC. Since Kossek and Ozeki's meta-analysis, several authors have attempted to answer this call and bridge the WFP and WFC literatures.

Kossek and Ozeki (1999) began to bridge this gap by using meta-analysis to look at the relationships between WFC, WFP, and performance outcomes. The authors found that WFC does relate to organizational outcomes (e.g., turnover intentions, organizational commitment), and that despite some mixed results, WFP do appear to affect WFC. Importantly, Kossek and Ozeki recommend that when implementing WFP, "it is important to be sure they are well thought out and *fit* [italics added] with the needs of both employees and the organization" (p. 25).

Batt and Valcour (2003) examined WFP, HR incentives, and work design measures and their effects on work-to-family conflict, employee control over work time, and turnover intentions. The scope of their study focused on

how dual-earner couples' work demands interfere with home life and how both formal and informal WFP might mitigate those effects. The authors used multiple regression to look at the variance explained by the WFP block, the HR incentives block, and the work design block. Adding WFP to a model already containing individual difference characteristics (which explained 21.4 percent of the variance in WFC) significantly improved prediction and explained an additional 1.2 percent of the variance in WFC.

Interestingly, in Batt and Valcour's (2003) study, one common example of formal WFP, flexible scheduling options, was found to be unrelated to WFC but negatively related to turnover intentions. Supervisor support (an informal WFP) was found to be negatively associated with both WFC and turnover intentions, while dependent care programs were unrelated to any of the outcomes. Concluding, the authors argue that "work-family policies are a necessary but insufficient strategy to help employees effectively manage work and family demands" and that a system of HR practices will be most effective (Batt & Valcour, 2003, p. 190). The current project expands on that suggestion to argue that WFP are in fact part of the needs-supplies, complementary form of F-O fit.

Simply providing family-friendly benefits has seen mixed results (Kossek & Ozeki, 1998). For example, Brough et al. (2005) were expecting use of family-friendly resources to be negatively related to family-to-work interference. Instead, policy use predicted more family-to-work interference, suggesting that other underlying processes are occurring. These and other mixed results have researchers looking more closely at the WFP-Outcome relationships. As mentioned in Batt and Valcour's (2003) study, some researchers have found that supervisor (and organization) support is critical to the usability and effectiveness of WFP (e.g., Smith & Gardner, 2007).

This paper proposes that WFP are in fact part of F-O fit, at the complementary fit level—a relationship that could help explain inconsistent results in the literature. For example, if an employee's family needs on-site childcare, and the organization does not provide this benefit, complementary F-O fit will be low. If an employee needs flex-time, and the organization offers and supports this work choice, complementary F-O fit will be high. Only after considering how WFP fit with what the employee's family needs, will WFC be reduced, and in turn, outcomes such as job satisfaction increased.

Allen (2001) acknowledges supervisor support as important, but she proposes the idea of family-supportive organizations or benefits (e.g., flextime, on-site day care). Family-friendly benefits are "designed to alleviate the difficulty inherent in coordinating and managing multiple life roles," but support from the organization (especially from direct supervisors) and ability to use these policies are critical to the usefulness of these programs (Allen, 2001, p. 415).

Eaton (2003) also found that "perceived usability of flexible work-family policies" is more important than simply having formal or informal policies in place (p. 163). Muse et al. (2008) accordingly found that benefit use and perceived value of said benefits were indirectly related to positive organizational behaviors through affective organizational commitment. Allen (2001) proposes the measure of family-supportive organizational perceptions (FSOP), a more comprehensive concept encompassing perceptions of the entire organizational environment. Allen found that supervisor support, benefit availability, and control variables significantly predicted the work-related outcomes of WFC, organizational commitment, job satisfaction, and turnover intentions. However, measuring

FSOP explained significantly more variance in these outcomes when adding it to the previous model. Further, "recent research has demonstrated that informal aspects of the work environment explain a greater share of the variance associated with employee outcomes, such as work-family conflict, than do formal benefits and policies" (Lapierre & Allen, 2006, p. 178). These authors have shown that tangible, concrete benefit availability may not be capturing the full variance of relevant outcomes.

Allen (2001) has attempted to capture perceptions of an organization's environment—an idea not far removed from the fit literature, but one that has yet to be integrated. Allen suggests further research address the psychological reasons why family-supportive benefits and organizations in fact predict these positive organizational outcomes (e.g., less turnover, more job satisfaction). A conceptual link can be drawn from Allen's (2001) more value-based proposed model to the concept of supplementary F-O fit.

Work-Family Fit

Kanter (1977) in a review of work and family interactions proposed the idea that families may differ in their interactions with the workplace and encouraged future researchers to address these differences. Thus, even

researchers not focused on the fit construct recognize the potential of individual differences as antecedents and predictors of WFC. Kossek and Ozeki (1998) in fact called for more research on how individual differences and family differences may affect attitudes towards and use of WFP. Additionally, Orthner and Pittman (1986) showed that in the U.S. Air Force, perceived organizational support indirectly affects job commitment through family support. Essentially, the organization has more "customers" than just the individual employee.

A small body of literature now exists examining the concept of work-family fit, a first attempt at integrating the fit and work-family literatures. Again, much of the WFC and WFP literature has shown mixed results in the strength of predicted relationships. While Kossek and Ozeki (1998) report that the nature of the sample and method of WFC measurement explain some of the inconsistencies, this project asserts that fit could provide greater explanation and deeper understanding of these complex relationships.

The work-family fit articles reviewed here will provide some guidance to this project in terms of their findings and future research suggestions. They will also provide guidance in terms of their theoretical weaknesses

or gaps. This project proposes that the F-O fit construct fills some of these gaps and in fact replaces work-family fit as a more viable and parsimonious construct.

Barnett, Gareis, and Brennan (1999) explored a complementary form of work-family fit and developed and validated a scale of this fit. Barnett et al. address a very specific form of work-family fit, scheduling fit, for dual career couples. Thus, their 9-item scale was intended to assess how well scheduling requirements from the job "fit" with the family's needs. This study shows that family differences and needs are an important piece of the work and family relationship. Barnett et al. also contribute to the literature by exploring fit as a mediator. In fact, the work hours-burnout relationship was mediated by schedule fit. The authors specify, "even among respondents who have voluntarily reduced their work hours, the better the perceived fit of one's own and one's partner's work schedules, the lower one's feelings of burnout on the job" (Barnett et al., 1999, p. 314).

Edwards and Rothbard (1999) approached the work-family fit concept by addressing the missing component of cognitive appraisal in the work and family literature. Essentially, the authors assert that most of the literature

has assumed that individual demographic differences (e.g., gender, marital status) moderate relationships between work and family. Edwards and Rothbard argue that the cognitive appraisal process in P-E fit theory applies to the work and family relationship as well. Using polynomial regression techniques, Edwards and Rothbard explored supplies-values fit along autonomy, relationships, security, and segmentation (preference to keep work and family separate) dimensions. Fit was found to influence well-being in all cases, with a general relationship of increasing well-being as supplies increased towards values (relationships differed as supplies surpassed values). Edwards and Rothbard encourage future researchers to further explore these complex relationships.

Kreiner (2006) also approached the work and family interface from the P-E fit perspective. Kreiner was primarily interested in individuals' preferences for segmentation or integration of work and family. Kreiner defines segmentation as "the degree to which aspects of each domain...are kept separate from one another—cognitively, physically or behaviorally" and states that integration "represents the merging and blending of various aspects of work and home" (p. 485). Supplies-preferences fit in terms

of segmentation was found to predict work-home conflict, after controlling for demographic variables and work design variables. Additionally, the better the fit between supplies and preferences, the lower the conflict and stress, and the higher job satisfaction.

Rothbard, Phillips, and Dumas (2005) also examined segmentation and integration, and they explain that some WFP tend to be more integrating (e.g., telecommuting), while others tend to be more segmenting (e.g., flexible scheduling). Rothbard et al. explain that the effectiveness of these policies may depend on individual preferences for segmentation or integration of work and family, and they draw from P-O fit theory by stating that "organizational policies can reflect differing values [italics added] regarding segmentation and integration that may be *incongruent* [italics added] with the desires of the individuals" (p. 244). In essence, Rothbard et al. are defining segmentation preference as a value that may or may not fit with the organization's values.

The concepts of segmentation and integration are part of boundary theory, which is part of the work and family literature addressing the relationship between home and work (Rothbard et al., 2005). Much of the small amount of

literature on work-family fit, as evidenced by Kreiner (2006), Edwards and Rothbard (1999), and Rothbard et al. (2005), has addressed segmentation preferences. Work and family researchers are clearly interested in individual differences, and this criterion has become a popular one. However, this one value preference does not define the entire construct of work-family fit, just as congruence on ethics doesn't solely define P-O fit. If further research is to occur, some more general measure of family-related fit should be developed. Essentially, searching for the value preferences underlying every organizational policy or job characteristic may not be the most efficient way to include this phenomenon in the theory. The current proposal asserts that WFP preferences are actually part of complementary F-O fit, in that families' needs or preferences will fit (or not) with those policies provided by the organization.

An important strength of Rothbard et al.'s (2005) study is a practical one, as they showed that implementing WFP without considering the needs of the employees may in fact result in negative outcomes. For example, Rothbard et al.'s study showed that those preferring segmentation actually had lower job satisfaction and organizational

commitment when they had access to on-site childcare (an integrating WFP). This relationship still existed even when flex-time (considered a segmenting WFP) was offered as well. Only when flex-time was offered alone did segmentation preference and outcome variables have a positive relationship. The importance of this article to the current project is that individual (or family) preferences matter to effectiveness of WFP through a fit mechanism.

Other researchers have addressed work-family fit from a more holistic perspective, albeit with a very specific sample of military families. Military families could exhibit very different patterns of work and family issues, given unique situations like overseas deployment, moving around frequently, and base housing conditions. Pittman (1994) set out to address the mixed findings in the work hours-marital quality relationship by drawing on the work-family fit perspective. Pittman's measure of work-family fit appears to address both complementary (e.g., "family needs and concerns") and supplementary (e.g., "military good child-rearing milieu") types of fit, although the author did not label the items as such. However, the measure is very specifically written for the U.S. Army

sample. Pittman found that work hours indirectly affect marital quality through work-family fit, as hypothesized. As work-family fit increased, marital tension decreased. This relationship shows that fit can potentially explain apparent inconsistent findings in the work and family literature.

Pittman, Kerpelman, and McFadyen (2004) also studied a U.S. Army sample in the context of deployment situations (highly stressful). Pittman et al. specifically outlined demands-capacities and needs-rewards types of work-family fit in their measure, lending credence to the different conceptualizations of fit. Work-family fit was found to be an outcome in the sense of an adaptive support mechanism for military families during times of deployment. This research adds to the literature by showing how work-family fit should also be explored as a criterion along with the more popular antecedent, mediator, or moderator studies.

Teng (1999) reviewed multiple roles, job demands, and spillover-crossover research trends to show the need for a fit model in the work and family literature. As shown, mixed results in much of the work and family literature are indicative of a missing piece. Teng asserts that in the other models, "theoretically optimal results require

unrealistic conditions." Therefore, fit could be the missing piece, which would both greatly inform further research while having great implications for practice by providing better guidance to organizations on effectively selecting WFP.

Additionally, Teng (1999) significantly contributed to the work-family fit literature by validating a 31-item scale measure of work-family fit. Based upon other work-family fit models, Teng's work assessed demands-abilities/expectations and rewards-needs work-family fit. The present study is strengthened by the reliability ($\alpha = .91$) and validity of Teng's measure, as work-family fit was in fact positively related to job satisfaction, work productivity, and family functioning. In fact, work-family fit significantly predicted job satisfaction, work productivity, and family functioning after accounting for demographic variables, social desirability, structural job and family demands, family to work spillover, work to family spillover, and crossover from spouse's work. Additionally, confirmatory factor analysis exhibited that the measure showed good fit as a 2-factor model, as hypothesized. Fit between the family and the organization gains more strength as a construct through Teng's research.

However, Teng's scale only addresses complementary fit, which is inconsistent with what the fit literature recommends (see Kristof, 1996).

Voydanoff (2005), in a comprehensive literature review of the work-family fit research states, "measurement of work-family fit and balance is quite undeveloped" (p. 834). Voydanoff attempts to better define work-family fit as a theory, drawing upon other proposed theoretical models (e.g., Teng, 1999). According to Voydanoff, work-family fit is "a form of interrole congruence in which the resources associated with one role are sufficient to meet the demands of another role such that participation in the second role can be effective" (p. 825). Interestingly, this definition incorporates demands-resources fit from both work to family and family to work. Voydanoff further explains that these two types of fit make up a global assessment of work-family balance. Voydanoff suggests development of a fit scale to follow her proposed model. The consideration of demands and resources is important to further work-family fit development. However, if the model is truly based on P-E fit theory, goals and values congruence, or supplementary fit, should also be considered in a work-family fit scale.

While the work-family fit construct is still new and being developed, its commonalities revolve around the balances between demands-abilities and needs-supplies. Much of the work-family fit literature overlaps with the WFP literature in this sense. In both, congruence on values (i.e., supplementary fit) has been neglected, despite its proliferation in the P-O fit literature. This project asserts that, as P-O fit may be best understood by considering both complementary and supplementary fit (Kristof, 1996), and as P-O fit literature has been dominated by supplementary fit research, work-family fit has missed a critical piece of the puzzle by disregarding supplementary fit. When an employee is evaluating how his or her family fits with an organization, he or she is not simply looking at what that organization can provide to the family—the underlying characteristics of the organization will be evaluated for fit as well.

Family-Organization Fit

Considering this literature review, individuals are not just choosing organizations based on their own values and needs—they have to consider spouses or partners, children, step-children, parents, and sometimes even

extended family members. Further, Janson and Kristof-Brown (2006), who proposed a model of P-E fit incorporating a nested view of P-V, P-J, P-O, P-G, and person-supervisor (P-S) or person-person (P-P) fit, recommend extending the research to fit beyond the person level. They provide potential examples, such as job-vocation fit or group-organization fit. Thus, F-O fit is a reasonable answer to this call for further multi-level research.

The WFP and work-family fit literature do not fully encompass supplementary fit and its importance to families. Conversely, one facet not previously addressed in the individually based P-O fit literature is the family and its values and needs. To integrate these bodies of literature, F-O fit is proposed as a valid, reliable, and distinct concept that will further add to the explanatory power of both the work and family and fit research areas.

This project will evaluate F-O fit along Kristof's (1996) model of P-O fit. In fact, drawing from Kristof's comprehensive definition of P-O fit, the following definition of F-O fit is proposed: F-O fit is the compatibility between families and organizations that occurs when: (a) at least one entity provides what the other needs (complementary fit), or (b) they share similar

fundamental characteristics (supplementary fit), or (c) both. Again, the ideal F-O fit will occur under the "both" condition, when supplementary and complementary fit are present. Accordingly, the F-O fit scale created for this project incorporates both supplementary and complementary fit items.

Outcome Variables and Hypotheses

As stated earlier, P-O fit has been shown to predict desirable organizational outcomes such as increased organizational commitment and job satisfaction and decreased stress and turnover intentions (Bretz & Judge, 1994; Cable & Judge, 1996; Kristof, 1996). Relatedly, recall that FSOP also predicts organizational commitment, job satisfaction, turnover intentions, and WFC. Given these established criteria, both P-O and F-O fit are proposed to predict stress, organizational commitment, job satisfaction, and turnover intentions, while F-O fit is proposed to predict WFC. Lauver and Kristof-Brown (2001) suggest that "researchers should assess multiple types of fit in single studies" (p. 467). As this sentiment has been repeated by other researchers, this proposal will also examine the relationship between P-O and F-O fit, and F-O

fit is proposed to explain additional variance in outcome criteria above and beyond that explained by P-O fit. F-O fit is also proposed to moderate the relationship between P-O fit and predicted outcome criteria. Finally, P-O fit is proposed to moderate the relationship between F-O fit and WFC.

Work-Family Conflict

The P-O fit literature has not addressed WFC as a criterion variable, and the work-family fit literature has focused on work-family facilitation and balance as positively related criteria (as noted earlier, this literature questions the appropriateness of WFC). Kreiner (2006) notes the "curious" lack of research examining fit as a predictor of WFC and proceeds to show that when workplace supplies fit individual-level preferences related to work and family, work-home conflict (the author's term for WFC inclusive of different types of families) is reduced. The FSOP and work-family policy literature accepts WFC as a key criterion, and it is negatively related to FSOP (Allen, 2001). Given their similarity to F-O fit, these same relationships are expected to hold true, so as F-O fit increases, WFC is expected to decrease:

Hypothesis 1a: F-O fit will be negatively related to work to family interference.

Hypothesis 1b: F-O fit will be negatively related to family to work interference.

As noted earlier, recognizing both the additive and moderating effects of different forms of fit is critical to improving and expanding understanding of this construct (Kristof, 1996; Kristof-Brown et al., 2005; Janson & Kristof-Brown, 2006). This proposal asserts that similar to Scroggins' (2007) findings of additive effects, F-O fit will also have an additive effect in explaining significantly more variance in the criterion variables (stress, job satisfaction, organizational commitment, and turnover intentions) after considering the effects of P-O fit.

Stress

As one of the first outcomes studied in the fit research and a key player in the P-E fit theory development (Edwards & Rothbard, 1999), stress is a key criterion for the fit literature. Additionally, stress is related to role conflict and strain theory (Kahn et al., 1964), another building block of the work and family literature. In general, as fit increases, stress is expected to decrease.

Further, F-O fit is expected to significantly improve the prediction of stress above and beyond that predicted by P-O fit:

Hypothesis 2: F-O fit will explain additional variance in stress after considering the effects of P-O fit.

Organizational Commitment

Organizational commitment can be generally defined as "a psychological link between the employee and his or her organization that makes it less likely that the employee will voluntarily leave the organization" (Allen & Meyer, 1996, p. 252). However, organizational commitment is complex, and much research exists trying to define types of organizational commitment and other theoretical questions (e.g., Allen & Meyer 1990, 1996; Jaros, 1997). Relevant to this proposal is that organizational commitment is an accepted criterion in both the fit and work-family literature, and it is positively related to P-O fit (e.g., O'Reilly et al., 1991; Scroggins, 2007) and FSOP (Allen, 2001).

Organizational commitment has three sub-facets— affective, continuance, and normative commitment. According to Allen and Meyer (1990), "employees with strong affective

commitment remain because they want to, those with strong continuance commitment because they need to, and those with strong normative commitment because they feel they ought to do so" (p. 3). Some fit researchers (e.g., Scroggins, 2007) have only studied affective commitment as a criterion, as fit is sometimes viewed as a concept more conceptually related to this type of organizational commitment (as opposed to normative or continuance commitment).

This proposal views fit as more comprehensive, drawing upon supplementary and complementary fit indices, so overall organizational commitment will be assessed. In general, as fit increases, organizational commitment is expected to increase. Further, F-O fit is expected to significantly improve the prediction of organizational commitment above and beyond that predicted by P-O fit:

Hypothesis 3: F-O fit will explain additional variance in organizational commitment after considering the effects of P-O fit.

Job Satisfaction

Job satisfaction is defined here as satisfaction with multiple facets of one's workplace (e.g., pay, fringe benefits) creating an overall sense of satisfaction with one's job (Spector, 1985). Again, job satisfaction is an

accepted criterion in both the fit and work-family literatures, and it is positively related to P-O fit (Kristof, 1996; Scroggins, 2007) and FSOP (Allen, 2001). Accordingly, as fit increases, job satisfaction is expected to increase. Further, F-O fit is expected to significantly improve the prediction of job satisfaction above and beyond that predicted by P-O fit:

Hypothesis 4: F-O fit will explain additional variance in job satisfaction after considering the effects of P-O fit.

Turnover Intentions

Turnover intentions should not be confused with actual turnover. Sometimes researchers measure turnover intentions because of time constraints. However, intentions do not always reflect actual turnover and instead should be viewed as reflecting "specific withdrawal-related attitudes [such as] thinking of quitting, search intentions, [and] intent to quit" (Jaros, 1997, p. 325). Turnover intentions is also an accepted criterion in the fit and work-family literature, and it is negatively related to P-O fit (Kristof, 1996; Cable & Judge, 1996) and FSOP (Allen, 2001). Therefore, as fit increases, turnover intentions are expected to decrease. Further, F-O fit is expected to

significantly improve the prediction of turnover intentions above and beyond that predicted by P-O fit:

Hypothesis 5: F-O fit will explain additional variance in turnover intentions after considering the effects of P-O fit.

Interaction Effects

Additionally, this proposal explores a potential explanation for the mixed results found in the P-O fit research regarding the relationship between P-O fit and outcome criteria. For example, if an employee has high P-O fit, research would predict this employee to have high organizational commitment. However, in the literature, this relationship is not always consistent or as strong as expected (Kristof, 1996). Continuing with the example, consider that the employee's family may not fit with the organization. This conflict or interaction may weaken the employee's organizational commitment or even change the direction of the relationship. As the research has not fully explored this possibility, its mixed results may be partially due to missing this moderated relationship.

As another example, if an employee has low P-O fit, research would expect the employee to report low organizational commitment. However, what if the employee

has high F-O fit that somehow compensates for the low P-O fit? The employee may report higher organizational commitment than might otherwise be expected.

Kristof-Brown, Jansen, and Colbert (2002), in a policy-capturing study, showed that interactive effects explained significant additional variance in work satisfaction over the significant main effects of P-J, P-G, and P-O fit. In fact, "these results suggest that individuals may compensate for low fit in some areas with high fit in others, and that high fit in multiple areas intensifies the overall effects on work satisfaction" (p. 991). These results compel fit researchers to begin considering the whole picture of fit, rather than just pieces in isolation (Kristof-Brown et al., 2002).

Accordingly, Resick, Baltes, and Shantz (2007) found that demands-abilities P-J fit moderated the relationship between P-O fit and job choice intentions, showcasing how different forms of fit can moderate each other's relationships with outcome criteria. Janson and Kristof-Brown (2006) agree that few studies have addressed how the different types of fit combine, and they suggest further research consider these effects.

Consequently, F-O fit is expected to moderate the relationship between P-O fit and outcome criteria. In other words, the relationships between P-O fit and outcome criteria should depend on level of F-O fit. For example, for employees high on F-O fit, organizational commitment is expected to be low when P-O fit is low and high when P-O fit is high. Alternatively, for employees low on F-O fit, organizational commitment is expected to be low regardless of level of P-O fit. Figure 1 provides a visual depiction of anticipated results for organizational commitment.

Figure 1. Proposed interaction between family-organization and person-organization fit on organizational commitment.

Anticipated results for job satisfaction are expected to present a similar interaction pattern. Stress and turnover intentions are better represented by Figure 2, which depicts another negative outcome (WFC).

The following hypotheses are proposed:

Hypothesis 6a: F-O fit will moderate the relationship between P-O fit and stress.

Hypothesis 6b: F-O fit will moderate the relationship between P-O fit and organizational commitment.

Hypothesis 6c: F-O fit will moderate the relationship between P-O fit and job satisfaction.

Hypothesis 6d: F-O fit will moderate the relationship between P-O fit and turnover intentions.

Moreover, F-O fit is proposed to be negatively related to WFC, but P-O fit is not predicted to be related to WFC. However, the presence of a conflict between P-O and F-O fit would be expected to increase WFC. P-O fit is expected to moderate the relationship between F-O fit and WFC. In other words, the relationships between F-O fit and WFC should depend on level of P-O fit. For example, for employees high on P-O fit, WFC (both directions) is expected to be high when F-O fit is low and low when F-O fit is high.

Figure 2. Proposed interaction between person-organization and family-organization fit on work-family conflict.

Alternatively, for employees low on P-O fit, WFC is expected to be high regardless of level of F-O fit. Figure 2 provides a visual depiction of anticipated results for WFC. The following hypotheses are proposed:

Hypothesis 7a: P-O fit will moderate the relationship between F-O fit and work interference with family.

Hypothesis 7b: P-O fit will moderate the relationship between F-O fit and family interference with work.

CHAPTER TWO

METHODS

Participants

Participants were a nonrandom, convenience sample of 159 working adults from various occupations (e.g., Science Teacher, Administrative Assistant, Software Consultant). See Tables 1 and 2 for complete demographic statistics. The sample consisted of 62 men and 97 women aged 22 to 63 years (mean age = 38.39 years). Most of the participants were married or living together (69.8 percent), while the remainder reported being separated, divorced, widowed, or single never married. The mean number of earners in the household was 1.67, and the mean number of individuals living in the household was 2.81.

The mean number of dependents was 1.12, and the mean age of youngest dependent was 130.57 months or about 10.88 years old (median = 108 months or 9 years old). Most of the participants were Caucasian (84.81 percent), while the rest were Asian, African-American, Hispanic, or Other (e.g., Bosnian).

Table 1

Demographic Statistics-Categorical

Variable	Freq.	%
Gender		
Female	97	61.0
Male	62	39.0
Marital Status		
Married	98	61.6
Living Together	13	8.2
Separated	3	1.9
Divorced	16	10.1
Widowed	1	0.6
Single, Never Married	28	17.6
Ethnic Origin ^a		
Caucasian	134	84.8
Hispanic	6	3.8
African-American	5	3.2
Asian	8	5.1
Other	5	3.2
Education ^a		
Less than 9th grade	0	0.0
Grade 9-11	0	0.0
Completed High School	1	0.6
Addl. Non-College Training	6	3.8
Some College	14	8.9
Completed Associate's Degree	13	8.2
Completed Bachelor's Degree	60	38.0
Completed College with Advanced Degree	64	40.5

Variable	Freq.	%
Religious/Community Support ^a		
Not Applicable/None	29	18.4
Weak	25	15.8
Average	40	25.3
Strong	35	22.2
Very Strong	29	18.4

^aN = 158.

Table 2

Demographic Statistics—Continuous

Variable	M	SD	Min	Max
Age ^a	38.39	10.43	22	63
Number of Earners	1.67	0.59	0	3
Number in Household	2.81	1.37	1	6
Number of Dependents	1.12	1.19	0	5
Age of Youngest Dependent (months) ^b	130.57	110.87	0	732
Organizational Tenure (months)	89.94	80.14	12	370
Job Tenure (months)	61.56	70.34	1	390
Hours Worked Per Week (avg.)	46.31	9.14	30	90

^aN=158.

^bN=91. This variable is highly skewed due to extreme maximum (likely a dependent parent). A more appropriate measure of central tendency is the median (108 months).

Religious/community support ranged from "Not Applicable/None" to "Very Strong," with fairly even disbursement across categories (mode was average support = 25.32 percent). The majority of participants reported having a bachelor's degree or higher (78.48 percent), so this sample is well-educated. Organizational tenure ranged from 12 to 370 months (1 to 30.83 years), with average tenure being 89.94 months (7.50 years). Job tenure ranged from 1-390 months, with average tenure being 61.56 months (5.13 years). Finally, participants reported working 30 to 90 hours each week, with an average of 46.31 hours each week.

Participants were recruited from a general working adult population via e-mail, social networking websites, and word of mouth. The researcher initially contacted friends, family, co-workers, and other acquaintances primarily living in California, Arkansas, and Missouri. Some of these participants forwarded the link to their own contacts, furthering the reach of the survey. The participants were required to be currently working 30 hours or more per week for organizations in which they have worked for at least one year (Allen & Meyer, 1996, report higher reliabilities on organizational commitment for those

employees nearing one year of employment as compared to being a new hire).

Apparatus

Participants were asked to complete the study using a web-based survey format (<http://www.surveymonkey.com>). A "snowball" request ("Help us reach our goal! You can help us by either a) forwarding your survey invitation or b) distributing the following link to your co-workers, family, or friends.") was included at the end of the web surveys to further broaden the sample's diversity.

Materials

The measures (self-report surveys) included in the study were adapted into one web-based electronic survey format. In addition to the pre-existing valid and reliable surveys chosen, a demographics section and a new F-O fit scale were created for this project. Appendix A includes all final measures. In the appendix, subscales are noted, where applicable, but when the surveys were distributed, the subscales were not labeled. In fact, the survey questions were ordered randomly within each scale using a SurveyMonkey randomization feature.

Demographics

Participants were asked to report basic demographic information (gender, age, marital status, number of wage earners helping with expenses, number of people in household, number of dependents, age of youngest dependent, level of community or religious support, ethnic origin, education level, length of employment at current organization, current position title, length of employment in current position, average hours worked per week, and shifts worked) on a 15-item questionnaire. An example item asks "What is your marital status?" to which participants must mark "Married," "Living together," "Separated," "Divorced," "Widowed," or "Single, never married."

Person-Organization Fit

P-O fit was assessed using Gilbert and Rodgers (2002) person-organization fit scale. This 19-item questionnaire was created by combining four sub-scales: value congruence (5 items), goal congruence (3 items), personality/climate congruence (6 items), and needs/supplies fit (5 items). P-O fit was measured by averaging the sub-scales, as recommended by Gilbert and Rodgers. Example items are "Overall, to what degree do you feel your values match the organization's values?" (value congruence) and "To what

degree do you strive for what the organization strives for?" (goal congruence).

Participants were asked to rate agreement with statements by using a 7-point Likert-type scale where 1 = *Not at all* and 7 = *Completely*. Internal consistency reliability (Coefficient alpha) was acceptable for all sub-scales and the overall scale (value congruence $\alpha = .92$, goal congruence $\alpha = .95$, personality/climate congruence $\alpha = .92$, needs/supplies fit $\alpha = .87$, and overall P-O fit $\alpha = .96$).

Gilbert and Rodgers (2002) report evidence of criterion-related validity for the P-O fit measure. Responses to all items were averaged to form the overall P-O fit score, computing a score for participants having answered at least 18 of the 19 total items. Higher scores correspond with better fit.

This measure was especially appropriate for the current study because its content includes both supplementary (value congruence, goal congruence, and personality/climate congruence sub-scales) and complementary (needs/supplies fit sub-scale) items.

Person-Job Fit

P-J fit was assessed using Gilbert and Rodgers (2002) 5-item scale. An example item asks "To what degree do your skills match the task requirements of the job?" Responses were obtained on a 7-point, Likert-type scale, where 1 = *Not at all* and 5 = *Completely*.

Responses to all items were averaged to form the P-J fit score, computing a score for participants having answered at least 4 of the 5 total items. Higher scores correspond with better fit. Internal reliability was acceptable, as Coefficient alpha = .88.

Family-Organization Fit

F-O fit was assessed using a measure developed for this project. This measure is comprised of both supplementary and complementary items. The supplementary F-O fit scale items were developed using existing supplementary P-O fit measures (i.e., Gilbert & Rodgers, 2002; Lovelace & Rosen, 1996) as guides. The complementary F-O fit scale items were developed based on theoretical understanding of the construct, with emphasis on WFP. Teng's (1999) "My Fit" measure of work-family fit (a complementary scale) and Gilbert and Rodgers' measure of P-O fit (the complementary items) were used as guides.

The final F-O fit scale included 33 items (15 supplementary and 18 complementary), and responses were collected via a 5-point, Likert-type scale, where 1 = *Very poor fit* and 5 = *Very good fit*. Example supplementary fit items are "How do your family's dress preferences 'fit' with your organization's dress code?" and "How does your family's work ethic 'fit' with your organization's work ethic?" Example complementary fit items are "How do your organization's overtime requirements 'fit' with your family's needs?" and "How do your organization's health benefits 'fit' with your family's needs?"

Responses to all items were averaged to form the overall F-O fit score, computing a score for participants having answered at least 31 of the 33 total items. Higher scores correspond with better fit. Internal reliability was excellent for both the complementary items (Coefficient alpha = .92) and supplementary items (Coefficient alpha = .94), as well as the full scale (Coefficient alpha = .95).

Work-Family Conflict

Carlson et al.'s (2000) 18-item measure was used to assess 6 dimensions of WFC: time-based, strain-based, and behavior-based (type) by work to family interference and family to work interference (direction). Confirmatory

factor analysis suggests support for a 6-factor model (Carlson et al., 2000; LaPierre et al., 2005).

Example items are "I have to miss work activities due to the amount of time I must spend on family responsibilities" (time-based family to work interference), "I am often so emotionally drained when I get home from work that it prevents me from contributing to my family" (strain-based work to family interference), and "The behaviors that work for me at home do not seem to be effective at work" (behavior-based family to work interference).

Responses were collected via a 5-point, Likert-type scale, where 1 = *strongly disagree* and 5 = *strongly agree*. Responses to all items were averaged to form the overall work to family interference and family to work interference scores, computing a score for participants having answered at least 8 of the 9 total items for each respective direction. Higher scores correspond with more conflict/interference. Internal reliability was acceptable for both directions of WFC (work to family interference $\alpha = .89$ and family to work interference $\alpha = .85$).

Stress

Stress was assessed using House and Rizzo's (1972) 7-item Work Tension Scale. An example item is "I have felt fidgety or nervous as a result of my job." Responses were obtained on a 5-point, Likert-type scale, where 1 = *strongly disagree* and 5 = *strongly agree* (Netemeyer, Johnston, & Burton, 1990).

Responses to all items were averaged to form the stress score, computing a score for participants having answered at least 6 of the 7 total items. Higher scores correspond with more stress. Internal reliability was acceptable, as Coefficient alpha = .90.

Organizational Commitment

Organizational commitment was assessed using Meyer and Allen's (1997) 18-item, 3-dimensional scale measuring affective, continuance, and normative commitment. The measure has been validated on a criterion basis as well as by confirmatory factor analysis (Fields, 2002).

Sample items are "I really feel as if this organization's problems are my own" (affective scale), "Too much in my life would be disrupted if I decided I wanted to leave my organization now" (continuance scale), and "I would feel guilty if I left my organization now" (normative

scale). Responses were collected with a 7-point, Likert-type scale where 1 = *strongly disagree* and 7 = *strongly agree*.

Responses to all items were averaged to form the organizational commitment score, computing a score for participants having answered at least 17 of the 18 total items. Higher scores correspond with more commitment. Internal reliability was acceptable, as Coefficient alpha = .89. Internal reliabilities for all 3 dimensions were also acceptable (affective α = .87, normative α = .84, and continuance α = .83).

Job Satisfaction

Job satisfaction was measured using Agho, Price, and Mueller's (1992) 6-item measure. An example item asks respondents to rate "I find real enjoyment in my job" on a 5-point, Likert-type rating scale, where 1 = *Strongly disagree* and 5 = *Strongly agree*.

Responses to all items were averaged to form the job satisfaction score, computing a score for participants having answered at least 5 of the 6 total items. Higher scores correspond with more satisfaction. Internal reliability was acceptable, as Coefficient alpha = .93.

Turnover Intentions

Turnover intentions was assessed using Jaros' (1997) 3-item measure. An example question asks, "How likely is it that you will leave your organization in the next year?" to which participants respond using a 5-point, Likert-type scale, where 1 = *Not at all likely* and 5 = *Very likely*. Responses to all items were averaged to form the turnover intentions score. Higher scores correspond with higher turnover intentions. Internal reliability was acceptable, as Coefficient alpha = .85.

Procedure

All data was collected via the Internet. Participants completed the surveys using personal computers and the Web site, <http://www.surveymonkey.com>. The informed consent (see Appendix B) and instructions were included in the modules before the surveys began. The first page was the informed consent, and the participants were required to answer "yes" or "no." Those who answered "yes" were directed to the next page. Those who answered "no" were redirected to a thank you page and not allowed to answer any further questions.

The second and third pages of the survey required participants to answer "yes" to the demographic requirements ("Do you work at least 30 hours each week?" and "Have you worked for your organization for at least one year?") to move forward in the survey. Once participants answered these questions appropriately, they were directed to the first page of the survey, the demographics scale. From this point on, answers were not required, as per ethical guidelines.

This online method of survey research ensured anonymity, because participants' identifying information (names, e-mails, IP addresses) were not tracked by the researcher. Further, Survey Monkey's privacy statement assures that survey results are not tracked, saved, or in any way used by the company.

Measures of demographics, F-O fit, P-O fit, P-J fit, stress, job satisfaction, turnover intentions, organizational commitment, and work-family conflict were assessed. Bretz and Judge (1994) recommend that "future research should consider balancing the administration and testing [of fit measures] for possible priming effects" (p. 50). To address potential carryover effects, four different measure orders were selected at random, and four survey

collection links were created. The researcher distributed each survey order evenly across her initial contacts. The number of responses to each survey order (1 to 4) was somewhat balanced (27, 84, 28, and 132 total participants, respectively). From the final set of complete cases only ($N = 162$), the breakdown by survey order was 18, 57, 14, and 73, respectively). See Appendix C for survey order information.

At the end of the surveys, participants were directed to a "debriefing screen" that is printable, if they choose to do so (See Appendix D for full text). Finally, the participants were shown a screen that states, "Thank you again for participating in this survey! Help us reach our goal! You can help us by either a) forwarding your survey invitation or b) distributing the following link to your co-workers, family, or friends." A link to one of the survey orders was included after that sentence.

CHAPTER THREE

RESULTS

This results section first summarizes the data screening process that was used to prepare the dataset for analysis and then presents the hypotheses testing results. The variables of interest to this particular analysis are gender, marital status, number of dependents, work to family interference, family to work interference, stress, organizational commitment, job satisfaction, turnover intentions, P-J fit, P-O fit, and F-O fit. Sequential regression was used to test all hypotheses.

A total of 271 participants started the survey, though only 213 met the initial requirements to continue the survey (consented to participate and reported working 30 hours or more each week and having worked for current organization for at least one year). Out of the 213 qualified participants, 176 participants had useable data (e.g., some participants answered demographic questions only). A pseudo-response rate can be calculated using these numbers, and it is 82.63 percent.

Data Screening

Before beginning the hypotheses testing, the dataset was analyzed for missing data and missing data patterns, all variables were screened for univariate and multivariate outliers, skewness, and kurtosis, and standardized residuals were examined to check assumptions of multiple regression.

Missing Data

Missing data patterns were first evaluated visually by looking at the percent missing for each variable, and all the variables were missing less than 5 percent of the data. Thus, further statistical evaluation via missing value analysis (MVA) t-tests ($p < .001$) was not necessary. All of the variables are judged to be missing at random (MAR), so listwise deletion was used, leaving 162 (out of 176) complete cases (see Table 3 for descriptive statistics).

Normality of Variables

All continuous variables were assessed for normality by evaluating skewness, kurtosis, and univariate outliers. The two nominal variables were analyzed for normality on a 90/10 split percentage basis, as per recommendations from Tabachnick and Fidell (2007).

Table 3

Descriptive Statistics for Complete Cases Only

Variable	M	SD	Z _{skewness}	Z _{kurtosis}
Gender ^a				
Marital Status ^b				
Number of Dependents ^c	1.10	1.25	6.85 *	5.99 *
Work to Family Interference	2.44	0.90	1.68	-1.63
Family to Work Interference	1.99	0.68	3.93 *	2.02
Stress	2.91	1.05	0.59	-2.20
Organizational Commitment	4.17	1.10	-2.01	-0.39
Job Satisfaction	3.31	1.04	0.18	-1.64
Turnover Intentions	2.77	1.07	2.42	-1.51
Person-Job Fit ^c	5.30	1.03	-6.05 *	6.26 *
Person-Organization Fit	4.49	1.08	-1.01	-0.54
Family-Organization Fit	3.41	0.62	-0.30	-0.22

Note. N = 162.

^aThis variable is nominal (male or female), and female is the mode.

^bThis variable is nominal (married, living together, separated, divorced, widowed, or single never married), and married is the mode.

^cThis variable has one or more significant univariate outliers at $p < .001$.

* $p < .001$.

The gender variable shows normality by its 39.4 percent male and 60.6 percent female respondents. The marital status variable shows normality because 61.9 percent were married, 8.1 percent were living together, 1.9 percent were separated, 10.0 percent were divorced, .6 percent were widowed, and 17.5 percent were single never married.

See Table 3 for a summary of skewness and kurtosis statistics and notation of significant univariate outliers for all continuous variables. A criterion of $z = \pm 3.30$, $p < .001$ was used to evaluate these statistics. Out of the 10 continuous variables, 8 do not have any univariate outliers (these 8 variables do not have responses that could be considered extreme in comparison to the rest of the distribution), and 2 do have univariate outliers. Two univariate outliers with z-scores of -3.88 and -3.50 were detected on P-J fit and were removed. These z-scores correspond to raw scores of 1.20 and 1.60, respectively, which means these respondents reported exceedingly low P-J fit. One additional univariate outlier on P-J fit was considered borderline at -3.31 and was not removed from the analysis. One univariate outlier with a z-score of 4.59 was detected on number of dependents and was removed. This z-

score corresponds to a raw score of 7, which means this respondent reported an exceedingly high number of dependents.

Two variables were significantly skewed. P-J fit was negatively skewed (skewness coefficient = -1.11, $z = -5.82$, $p < .001$), meaning that most respondents reported high P-J fit, while a few respondents reported low P-J fit. This pattern is logical, as most currently employed individuals likely consider themselves capable at their jobs. P-J fit was also significantly kurtotic (kurtosis coefficient = 2.13, $z = 5.63$, $p < .001$). However, after removing the two univariate outliers (extreme scores) on this variable, the skewness dropped to an acceptable level (skewness coefficient = 0.96, $z = -4.05$, $p < .001$), and kurtosis was removed. Thus, this variable was not transformed.

Number of dependents was significantly positively skewed (skewness coefficient = 1.22, $z = 6.41$, $p < .001$), meaning that most respondents reported few number of dependents, while a few respondents reported many number of dependents. Number of dependents was also significantly leptokurtic (kurtosis coefficient = 2.05, $z = 5.40$, $p < .001$). However, after removing the univariate outlier on this variable, the skewness dropped to a more acceptable

level (skewness coefficient = .83, $z = 4.33$, $p < .001$), and the kurtosis problem was removed. Thus, this variable was not transformed. The total sample size after removing univariate outliers is $N = 159$.

A Mahalanobis distance was created for the remaining 159 cases to evaluate for significant multivariate outliers using the criterion $\chi^2 (6) = 22.458$, $p < .001$, and no multivariate outliers were found. The final total sample size is $N = 159$. The ratio of cases to IVs (predictors) in this final dataset is 159 to 6. With 6 predictors, the recommended number of cases in order to interpret both the Multiple R and the individual predictors is at least 110 (using guidelines from Green as cited in Tabachnick & Fidell, 2007). Thus, proposed analyses are appropriate for this sample.

Assumptions

The residuals were analyzed for normality, linearity, and homoscedasticity to meet assumptions. First, the standardized residual values for most dependent variables were within the ± 3.30 criterion, $p < .001$, meaning the residuals were not extreme. Organizational commitment and family to work interference had maximum residual values at

$z = 3.54$ and $z = 3.62$, respectively, which are not extreme enough to warrant concern.

Second, visual inspection of the residuals by predicted values scatterplots shows that the residuals for all dependent variables are small, centered around zero, and symmetric. Thus, the assumptions of multiple regression have been met. As the variables remained unchanged after initial analysis of assumptions, the residuals scatterplots also did not change for the final analysis, so no outliers were detected in the solution.

Additionally, the correlations between variables were inspected to check for multicollinearity (see Table 4 for correlation matrix). Though some significant correlations are present, most are not strong enough to threaten the analysis. The strongest correlation, between P-O fit and F-O fit, was $r_{(159)} = .76$, $p < .05$ and was expected. Another strong correlation existed between work to family interference and family to work interference, $r_{(159)} = .69$, $p < .05$. It is logical that those experiencing one direction of conflict would also be experiencing the other direction, at least somewhat. This correlation, though strong, shows the importance of considering both directions of conflict, as they only share 47.6 percent variance.

Table 4

Correlation Matrix

Variables	2	3	4
1. Work to Family Interference	.69 *	.64 *	-.14
2. Family to Work Interference	-	.43 *	-.07
3. Stress		-	-.08
4. Organizational Commitment			-
5. Job Satisfaction			
6. Turnover Intentions			

5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12
-.26 *	.31 *	-.05	-.42 *	-.53 *	-.02	.02	.18 *
-.34 *	.22 *	-.26 *	-.30 *	-.38 *	.05	.08	.17 *
-.31 *	.30 *	-.02	-.29 *	-.32 *	.10	-.03	.15
.49 *	-.66 *	.19 *	.58 *	.43 *	.12	-.04	.10
—	-.56 *	.53 *	.60 *	.48 *	-.06	-.07	.07
	—	-.22 *	-.57 *	-.54 *	-.10	.13	-.08

Variables	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12
7. Person-Job Fit						—	.36 *	.30 *	.05	-.03	.04
8. Person- Organization Fit							—	.76 *	-.02	-.09	.08
9. Family- Organization Fit								—	-.02	-.07	.06
10. Gender ^a									—	.19 *	-.06
11. Marital Status ^b										—	-.32 *
12. Number of Dependents ^c											—

^aCoded 0=male and 1=female. ^bCoded 0=married/living together and 1=separated/divorced/
widowed/single never married. ^cCoded 0=no dependents and 1=one or more dependents.

*p < .05.

Also of note is the correlation between P-O fit and P-J fit, $r_{(159)} = .36$, $p < .05$. This result gives further evidence that these constructs are unique. Additionally, the variables were allowed to enter the regression analysis under SPSS default tolerance levels. By nature, the variables are not singular.

Order Effects

An ANOVA was performed to evaluate any potential effects on the DVs from survey order. Only one significant result was found, indicating the survey order may have had an influence on participant responses. Potential order effects were found for P-J fit, $F(3,155) = 2.67$, $p < .05$, $\eta^2 = .049$.

Hypotheses Testing

Hypothesis 1a

The dependent variable for this sequential regression was work to family interference. The independent variables entered in the first step were demographic control variables—gender, marital status, and number of dependents. The independent variable entered in the second step was the primary predictor of interest—F-O fit.

Table 5 shows the multiple correlation (R), the R^2 and adjusted R^2 , and the incremental R^2 change ($R^2 \Delta$) for each step (or model). As shown, at the end of step 1, multiple R was not significantly different than zero. Thus, gender, marital status, and number of dependents do not significantly predict work to family interference, nor do they significantly explain unique variance in work to family interference.

Conversely, at the end of step 2, with all IVs in the equation, multiple R was significantly different than zero (Multiple $R = .57$, $R^2 = .329$, Adj. $R^2 = .311$, $F(4,154) = 18.85$, $p < .05$). Thus, work to family interference can be significantly predicted by gender, marital status, number of dependents, and F-O fit. More importantly, adding F-O fit to a model already containing gender, marital status, and number of dependents significantly explains an additional and unique 29.1 percent of the variance in work to family interference ($R^2 \Delta = .291$, $F\Delta(1,154) = 66.69$, $p < .05$). After step 2, a total of 32.9 percent of the variance in work to family interference can be explained by gender, marital status, number of dependents, and F-O fit.

Table 5

*Sequential Regression Coefficients and Test
Statistics for Work to Family Interference*

Variables	B	β	R	R ²	Adj R ²	R ² Δ
Step 1			.20	.038	.019	.038
Constant	2.21 *					
Gender	-.04	-.02				
Marital Status	.16	-.08				
Number of Dependents	.15 *	.20				
Step 2			.57 *	.329	.311	.291 *
Constant	2.22 *					
Gender	-.05	-.02				
Marital Status	.10	.05				
Number of Dependents	.17 *	.23				
Family- Organization Fit	-.49 *	-.54				

* $p < .05$.

Individual predictors and the intercept for the four-predictor model (after step 2) should be interpreted. Table

5 also showcases the unstandardized (B) and standardized (β) regression coefficients. Viewing the intercept of the regression line, work to family interference is predicted to be 2.22 when all predictors are average (for continuous variables) or coded zero (for nominal variables).

Specifically, when respondents are male, married or living together, have zero dependents, and have average F-O fit (3.43), they are predicted to report 2.22 on the work to family interference scale.

F-O fit significantly predicts work to family interference, as part of a model also containing gender, marital status, and number of dependents ($B = -.49$, $\beta = -.54$, $t(154) = -8.17$, $p < .05$). For every one unit increase in F-O fit (.63 points), predicted work to family interference decreases by .49 points. Thus, hypothesis 1a is supported.

Hypothesis 1b

The dependent variable for this sequential regression was family to work interference. The independent variables entered in the first step were demographic control variables—gender, marital status, and number of dependents. The independent variable entered in the second step was the primary predictor of interest—F-O fit.

Table 6 shows the multiple correlation (R), the R^2 and adjusted R^2 , and the incremental R^2 change ($R^2 \Delta$) for each step (or model). As shown, at the end of step 1, multiple R was significantly different than zero. Thus, gender, marital status, and number of dependents significantly predict family to work interference, and they significantly explain a unique 4.9 percent of the variance in family to work interference.

Further, at the end of step 2, with all IVs in the equation, multiple R was significantly different than zero (Multiple $R = .44$, $R^2 = .197$, Adj. $R^2 = .176$, $F(4,154) = 9.42$, $p < .05$). Thus, family to work interference can be significantly predicted by gender, marital status, number of dependents, and F-O fit. More importantly, adding F-O fit to a model already containing gender, marital status, and number of dependents significantly explains an additional and unique 13.6 percent of the variance in family to work interference ($R^2 \Delta = .147$, $F\Delta(1,154) = 28.23$, $p < .05$). After step 2, a total of 19.7 percent of the variance in family to work interference can be explained by gender, marital status, number of dependents, and F-O fit.

Table 6

*Sequential Regression Coefficients and Test
Statistics for Family to Work Interference*

Variables	B	β	R	R ²	Adj R ²	R ² Δ
Step 1			.22 *	.049	.031	.049 *
Constant	1.73 *					
Gender	.05	.04				
Marital Status	.20	.14				
Number of Dependents	.12 *	.21				
Step 2			.44 *	.197	.176	.147 *
Constant	1.73 *					
Gender	.05	.04				
Marital Status	.17	.12				
Number of Dependents	.13 *	.23				
Family- Organization Fit	-.25 *	-.39				

* $p < .05$.

Individual predictors and the intercept for the four-predictor model (after step 2) should be interpreted. Table

6 also showcases the unstandardized (B) and standardized (β) regression coefficients. Viewing the intercept of the regression line, family to work interference is predicted to be 1.73 when all predictors are average (for continuous variables) or coded zero (for nominal variables).

Specifically, when respondents are male, married or living together, have zero dependents, and have average F-O fit (3.43), they are predicted to report 1.73 on the family to work interference scale.

F-O fit significantly predicts family to work interference, as part of a model also containing gender, marital status, and number of dependents ($B = -.25$, $\beta = -.39$, $t(154) = -5.31$, $p < .05$). For every one unit increase in F-O fit (.63 points), predicted family to work interference decreases by .25 points. Thus, hypothesis 1b is supported.

Hypothesis 2

The dependent variable for this sequential regression was stress. The independent variables entered in the first step were demographic control variables—gender, marital status, and number of dependents. The independent variables entered in the second step were P-O fit and P-J fit. The independent variable entered in the third step was the

primary predictor of interest—F-O fit. Table 7 shows the multiple correlation (R), the R^2 and adjusted R^2 , and the incremental R^2 change ($R^2 \Delta$) for each step (or model).

As shown, at the end of step 1, multiple R was not significantly different than zero. Thus, gender, marital status, and number of dependents do not significantly predict stress, nor do they significantly explain unique variance in stress.

Conversely, at the end of step 3, with all six IVs in the equation, multiple R was significantly different than zero (Multiple $R = .40$, $R^2 = .158$, Adj. $R^2 = .125$, $F(6,152) = 4.75$, $p < .05$). Thus, stress can be significantly predicted by gender, marital status, number of dependents, P-O fit, P-J fit, and F-O fit. More importantly, adding F-O fit to a model already containing demographic control variables and two other types of fit significantly explains an additional and unique 2.4 percent of the variance in stress ($R^2 \Delta = .024$, $F\Delta(1,152) = 4.27$, $p < .05$). After step 3, a total of 15.8 percent of the variance in stress can be explained by gender, marital status, number of dependents, P-O fit, P-J fit, and F-O fit.

Table 7

*Sequential Regression Coefficients and Test
Statistics for Stress*

Variables	B	β	R	R^2	Adj R^2	$R^2 \Delta$
Step 1			.19	.036	.017	.036
Constant	2.60 *					
Gender	.25	.11				
Marital Status	-.01	-.00				
Number of Dependents	.14	.16				
Step 2			.37 *	.134	.106	.099 *
Constant	2.61 *					
Gender	.23	.11				
Marital Status	-.06	-.03				
Number of Dependents	.15 *	.17				
Person- Organization Fit	-.36 *	-.34				
Person-Job Fit	.10	.09				

Variables	<i>B</i>	β	<i>R</i>	<i>R</i> ²	Adj <i>R</i> ²	<i>R</i> ² Δ
Step 3			.40 *	.158	.125	.024 *
Constant	2.61 *					
Gender	.23	.11				
Marital Status	-.06	-.03				
Number of Dependents	.15 *	.17				
Person- Organization Fit	-.17	-.16				
Person-Job Fit	.11	.10				
Family- Organization Fit	-.25 *	-.24				

**p* < .05.

Individual predictors and the intercept for the six-predictor model (after step 3) should be interpreted. Table 7 also showcases the unstandardized (*B*) and standardized (β) regression coefficients. Viewing the intercept of the regression line, stress is predicted to be 2.61 when all predictors are average (for continuous variables) or coded

zero (for nominal variables). Specifically, when respondents are male, married or living together, have zero dependents, and have average F-O fit (3.43), P-O fit (4.53), and P-J fit (5.33), they are predicted to report 2.61 on the stress scale.

F-O fit significantly predicts stress, as part of a model also containing gender, marital status, number of dependents, P-J fit, and P-O fit ($B = -.25$, $\beta = -.24$, $t(152) = -2.07$, $p < .05$). For every one unit increase in F-O fit (.63 points), predicted stress decreases by .25 points. Thus, hypothesis 2 is supported.

Hypothesis 3

The dependent variable for this sequential regression was organizational commitment. The independent variables entered in the first step were demographic control variables—gender, marital status, and number of dependents. The independent variables entered in the second step were P-O fit and P-J fit. The independent variable entered in the third step was the primary predictor of interest—F-O fit. Table 8 shows the multiple correlation (R), the R^2 and adjusted R^2 , and the incremental R^2 change ($R^2 \Delta$) for each step (or model). As shown, at the end of step 1, multiple R was not significantly different than zero.

Table 8

*Sequential Regression Coefficients and Test
Statistics for Organizational Commitment*

Variables	B	β	R	R ²	Adj R ²	R ² Δ
Step 1			.16	.026	.007	.026
Constant	3.94 *					
Gender	.30	.13				
Marital Status	-.08	-.03				
Number of Dependents	.09	.10				
Step 2			.60 *	.355	.334	.329 *
Constant	3.93 *					
Gender	.31 *	.14				
Marital Status	.03	.01				
Number of Dependents	.06	.07				
Person- Organization Fit	.67 *	.59				
Person-Job Fit	-.04	-.04				

Variables	B	β	R	R^2	Adj R^2	$R^2 \Delta$
Step 3			.60 *	.355	.330	.000
Constant	3.93 *					
Gender	.31 *	.14				
Marital Status	.03	.01				
Number of Dependents	.06	.07				
Person- Organization Fit	.67 *	.59				
Person-Job Fit	-.04	-.04				
Family- Organization Fit	-.01	-.01				

* $p < .05$.

Thus, gender, marital status, and number of dependents do not significantly predict organizational commitment, nor do they significantly explain unique variance in organizational commitment.

Conversely, at the end of step 2, with five IVs in the equation, multiple R was significantly different than zero (Multiple $R = .60$, $R^2 = .355$, Adj. $R^2 = .334$, $F(5,153) = 16.87$, $p < .05$). Thus, organizational commitment can be

significantly predicted by gender, marital status, number of dependents, P-O fit, and P-J fit. More importantly, adding P-O fit and P-J fit to a model already containing demographic control variables significantly explains a unique 32.9 percent of the variance in organizational commitment ($R^2\Delta = .329$, $F\Delta(2,153) = 39.09$, $p < .05$). After step 2, a total of 35.5 percent of the variance in organizational commitment can be explained by gender, marital status, number of dependents, P-O fit, and P-J fit.

Unfortunately, adding F-O fit to this model does not significantly explain additional variance in organizational commitment ($R^2\Delta = .000$, $F\Delta(1,152) = .00$, $p > .05$). To further explore this result, bivariate correlations were analyzed between F-O fit and the three types of organizational commitment. Though the relationships were differential (affective $r_{(159)} = .61$, $p < .05$; normative $r_{(159)} = .44$, $p < .05$; and continuance $r_{(159)} = -.06$, $p > .05$), the regression analysis pattern of results did not differ. Hypothesis 3 is not supported.

Individual predictors and the intercept for the five-predictor model (after step 2) should be interpreted. Table 8 also showcases the unstandardized (B) and standardized (β) regression coefficients. Viewing the intercept of the

regression line, organizational commitment is predicted to be 3.93 when all predictors are average (for continuous variables) or coded zero (for nominal variables).

Specifically, when respondents are male, married or living together, have zero dependents, and have average P-O fit (4.53) and P-J fit (5.33), they are predicted to report 3.93 on the organizational commitment scale.

P-O fit significantly predicts organizational commitment, as part of a model also containing gender, marital status, number of dependents, and P-J fit ($B = .67$, $\beta = .59$, $t(153) = 8.41$, $p < .05$). For every one unit increase in P-O fit (1.08 points), predicted organizational commitment increases by .67 points.

Hypothesis 4

The dependent variable for this sequential regression was job satisfaction. The independent variables entered in the first step were demographic control variables—gender, marital status, and number of dependents. The independent variables entered in the second step were P-O fit and P-J fit. The independent variable entered in the third step was the primary predictor of interest—F-O fit. Table 9 shows the multiple correlation (R), the R^2 and adjusted R^2 , and the incremental R^2 change ($R^2 \Delta$) for each step (or model).

Table 9

*Sequential Regression Coefficients and Test
Statistics for Job Satisfaction*

Variables	B	β	R	R ²	Adj R ²	R ² Δ
Step 1			.10	.010	-.010	.010
Constant	3.38 *					
Gender	-.11	-.05				
Marital Status	-.09	-.04				
Number of Dependents	.05	.06				
Step 2			.69 *	.476	.459	.467 *
Constant	3.41 *					
Gender	-.15	-.07				
Marital Status	.02	.01				
Number of Dependents	.02	.02				
Person- Organization Fit	.49 *	.46				
Person-Job Fit	.38 *	.37				

Variables	B	β	R	R^2	Adj R^2	$R^2 \Delta$
Step 3			.69 *	.477	.456	.001
Constant	3.41 *					
Gender	-.15	-.07				
Marital Status	.02	.01				
Number of Dependents	.02	.02				
Person- Organization Fit	.46 *	.44				
Person-Job Fit	.38 *	.36				
Family- Organization Fit	.04	.04				

* $p < .05$.

As shown, at the end of step 1, multiple R was not significantly different than zero. Thus, gender, marital status, and number of dependents do not significantly predict job satisfaction, nor do they significantly explain unique variance in job satisfaction.

Conversely, at the end of step 2, with five IVs in the equation, multiple R was significantly different than zero (Multiple $R = .69$, $R^2 = .476$, Adj. $R^2 = .459$, $F(5,153) =$

27.82, $p < .05$). Thus, job satisfaction can be significantly predicted by gender, marital status, number of dependents, P-O fit, and P-J fit. More importantly, adding P-O fit and P-J fit to a model already containing demographic control variables significantly explains an additional and unique 46.7 percent of the variance in job satisfaction ($R^2\Delta = .467$, $F\Delta(2,153) = 68.16$, $p < .05$). After step 2, a total of 47.6 percent of the variance in job satisfaction can be explained by gender, marital status, number of dependents, P-O fit, and P-J fit.

Unfortunately, adding F-O fit to this model does not significantly explain additional variance in job satisfaction ($R^2\Delta = .001$, $F\Delta(1,152) = .16$, $p > .05$). Hypothesis 4 is not supported.

Individual predictors and the intercept for the five-predictor model (after step 2) should be interpreted. Table 9 also showcases the unstandardized (B) and standardized (β) regression coefficients. Viewing the intercept of the regression line, job satisfaction is predicted to be 3.41 when all predictors are average (for continuous variables) or coded zero (for nominal variables). Specifically, when respondents are male, married or living together, have zero dependents, and have average P-O fit (4.53) and P-J fit

(5.33), they are predicted to report 3.41 on the job satisfaction scale.

P-O fit significantly predicts job satisfaction, as part of a model also containing gender, marital status, number of dependents, and P-J fit ($B = .48$, $\beta = .46$, $t(153) = 7.34$, $p < .05$). For every one unit increase in P-O fit (1.08 points), predicted job satisfaction increases by .48 points. P-J fit also significantly predicts job satisfaction, as part of a model also containing gender, marital status, number of dependents, and P-O fit ($B = .38$, $\beta = .37$, $t(153) = 5.79$, $p < .05$). For every one unit increase in P-J fit (.97 points), predicted job satisfaction increases by .38 points.

Hypothesis 5

The dependent variable for this sequential regression was turnover intentions. The independent variables entered in the first step were demographic control variables—gender, marital status, and number of dependents. The independent variables entered in the second step were P-O fit and P-J fit. The independent variable entered in the third step was the primary predictor of interest—F-O fit.

Table 10 shows the multiple correlation (R), the R^2 and adjusted R^2 , and the incremental R^2 change ($R^2 \Delta$) for each step (or model).

As shown, at the end of step 1, multiple R was not significantly different than zero. Thus, gender, marital status, and number of dependents do not significantly predict turnover intentions, nor do they significantly explain unique variance in turnover intentions.

Conversely, at the end of step 3, with all six IVs in the equation, multiple R was significantly different than zero (Multiple $R = .61$, $R^2 = .376$, Adj. $R^2 = .351$, $F(6,152) = 15.26$, $p < .05$). Thus, turnover intentions can be significantly predicted by gender, marital status, number of dependents, P-O fit, P-J fit, and F-O fit. More importantly, adding F-O fit to a model already containing demographic control variables and two other type of fit significantly explains an additional and unique 2.5 percent of the variance in turnover intentions ($R^2 \Delta = .025$, $F\Delta(1,152) = 6.06$, $p < .05$). After step 3, a total of 37.6 percent of the variance in turnover intentions can be explained by gender, marital status, number of dependents, P-O fit, P-J fit, and F-O fit.

Table 10

*Sequential Regression Coefficients and Test
Statistics for Turnover Intentions*

Variables	B	β	R	R ²	Adj R ²	R ² Δ
Step 1			.19	.036	.017	.036
Constant	2.85 *					
Gender	-.29	-.13				
Marital Status	.33	.14				
Number of Dependents	-.04	-.05				
Step 2			.59 *	.351	.330	.315 *
Constant	2.85 *					
Gender	-.30 *	-.14				
Marital Status	.23	.10				
Number of Dependents	-.01	-.02				
Person- Organization Fit	-.61 *	-.56				
Person-Job Fit	-.00	-.00				

Variables	B	β	R	R^2	Adj R^2	$R^2 \Delta$
Step 3			.61 *	.376	.351	.025 *
Constant	2.85 *					
Gender	-.30 *	-.14				
Marital Status	.23	.10				
Number of Dependents	-.01	-.02				
Person- Organization Fit	-.41 *	-.38				
Person-Job Fit	.01	.01				
Family- Organization Fit	-.26 *	-.24				

* $p < .05$.

Individual predictors and the intercept for the six-predictor model (after step 3) should be interpreted. Table 10 also showcases the unstandardized (B) and standardized (β) regression coefficients. Viewing the intercept of the regression line, turnover intentions are predicted to be 2.85 when all predictors are average (for continuous variables) or coded zero (for nominal variables). Specifically, when respondents are male, married or living

together, have zero dependents, and have average F-O fit (3.43), P-O fit (4.53), and P-J fit (5.33), they are predicted to report 2.85 on the turnover intentions scale.

F-O fit significantly predicts turnover intentions, as part of a model also containing gender, marital status, number of dependents, P-J fit, and P-O fit ($B = -.26$, $\beta = -.24$, $t(152) = -2.46$, $p < .05$). For every one unit increase in F-O fit (.63 points), predicted turnover intentions decreases by .26 points. Thus, hypothesis 5 is supported.

Though not a specified hypothesis, note that P-O fit also significantly predicts turnover intentions, as part of a model also containing gender, marital status, number of dependents, P-J fit, and F-O fit ($B = -.41$, $\beta = -.38$, $t(152) = -3.82$, $p < .05$).

Hypothesis 6

To test hypotheses 6a-6d, the analyses for hypotheses 2-5 were repeated with one difference. In the fourth step of each analysis, the interaction between P-O fit and F-O fit was entered. Unfortunately, none of these moderation hypotheses were supported, as adding the interactions did not significantly aid prediction or explain additional variance in stress ($R^2\Delta = .001$, $F\Delta(1,151) = .22$, $p > .05$), organizational commitment ($R^2\Delta = .000$, $F\Delta(1,151) = .10$, $p >$

.05), job satisfaction ($R^2\Delta = .000$, $F\Delta(1,151) = .00$, $p > .05$), or turnover intentions ($R^2\Delta = .000$, $F\Delta(1,151) = .05$, $p > .05$).

Hypothesis 7

To test hypotheses 7a and 7b, the analyses for hypotheses 1a and 1b were repeated with a few differences. In the third step of each analysis, P-O fit was added as a predictor, and in the fourth step of each analysis, the interaction between P-O fit and F-O fit was entered. Unfortunately, none of these moderation hypotheses were supported, as adding the interactions did not significantly aid prediction or explain additional variance in work to family interference ($R^2\Delta = .002$, $F\Delta(1,152) = .51$, $p > .05$) or family to work interference ($R^2\Delta = .005$, $F\Delta(1,152) = .87$, $p > .05$).

Additional Analyses

After testing the hypotheses, some additional post-hoc analyses were completed. Three demographic variables (gender, marital status, and number of dependents) were analyzed using independent samples t-tests. Gender was coded male (0) and female (1), marital status was coded married/living together (0) and

separated/divorced/widowed/single (1), and number of dependents was coded no dependents (0) and one or more dependents (1). These grouping variables were used to analyze potential differences in F-O fit, P-O fit, P-J fit, stress, turnover intentions, work to family interference, family to work interference, job satisfaction, and organizational commitment. No significant mean differences were found for gender or marital status.

However, some notable significant results were found for number of dependents (see Table 11). There were significant mean differences in stress based on number of dependents, $t(157) = -2.36$, $p < .05$ (two-tailed), $\eta^2 = .034$. Participants with one or more dependents reported significantly more stress (mean = 3.07) than participants with no dependents (mean = 2.67). There were also significant mean differences in work to family interference based on number of dependents, $t(157) = -2.26$, $p < .05$ (two-tailed), $\eta^2 = .032$. Participants with one or more dependents reported significantly more work to family interference (mean = 2.55) than participants with no dependents (mean = 2.22).

Table 11

T-Tests for Number of Dependents

Variables	<i>t</i>	$\bar{X}_{\text{NumDep}}$		η^2
		0	1+	
Person-Organization Fit	-0.12	4.52	4.54	—
Person-Job Fit	0.67	5.39	5.29	—
Family-Organization Fit ^a	-0.80	3.38	3.46	—
Stress	-2.36 *	2.67	3.07	.034
Turnover Intentions	1.38	2.86	2.62	—
Work to Family Interference	-2.26 *	2.22	2.55	.032
Family to Work Interference	-2.14 *	1.83	2.05	.028
Job Satisfaction	0.37	3.38	3.32	—
Organizational Commitment	-1.20	4.07	4.29	—

Note. No dependents *N* = 67; one or more dependents *N* = 92.

^aEqual variances not assumed.

**p* < .05.

Finally, there were significant mean differences in family to work interference based on number of dependents, $t(157) = -2.14$, $p < .05$ (two-tailed), $\eta^2 = .028$. Participants with one or more dependents reported

significantly more family to work interference (mean = 2.05) than participants with no dependents (mean = 1.83).

CHAPTER FOUR

DISCUSSION

Researchers in the fit literature have focused primarily at the individual level of analysis (how the individual fits with his or her organization, group, co-workers, supervisor, environment, etc.). The fit literature has not fully embraced the family level of analysis. Alternatively, researchers in the work and family literature have focused primarily on how one's work and one's family conflict (WFC) and what resources are available to alleviate that conflict (WFP). While some research has focused on demographic differences, most have failed to consider the differences in individual and family preferences (i.e., fit) as primary predictors of work and family outcomes.

As noted, work-family fit has also attempted to blend these two literatures (e.g., Rothbard et al., 2005). However, the research in this area does not take full advantage of the theoretical modeling and background that exists in the fit literature. The measures of work-family fit that exist are either very specific (e.g., military

families only; Pittman, 1994) or do not consider supplementary fit (e.g., Teng, 1999).

The current research combines these two literatures by drawing from their theoretical backgrounds (e.g., fit: ASA and TWA; work and family: social exchange theory, role dynamics theory) and respective strengths, while addressing some of their weaknesses. The F-O fit scale was created using theory and existing measures from both fields, giving it a synergistic strength that makes it noteworthy in both fields.

Though not all hypotheses were supported, this study contributes to the existing literature in a variety of ways. First and foremost, the results provided encouraging evidence for the existence of F-O fit. The significant negative relationships between F-O fit and both directions of WFC, stress, and turnover intentions are evidence of sound theoretical development. For example, TWA (Dawis & Lofquist, 1984) would predict experienced stress or conflict (discontent) when needs do not match supplies (imbalance). In this study, lack of fit indicates this perceived imbalance. The significant negative relationship between F-O fit and turnover intentions provides further evidence of theory. For example, ASA (Schneider, 1987)

predicts attrition (i.e., turnover) based on employees becoming aware that they don't fit within their organization.

F-O fit explains a hefty 29.1 percent of the variance in work to family interference and 14.7 percent of the variance in family to work interference after controlling for demographic variables. These effect sizes are in line with what other researchers have found. For example, Ford et al. (2007) in their meta-analysis, found that "job involvement, job stress, work support, and work hours all were significant unique predictors of [work to family interference] when entered as a set" and explained 37 percent of the variance in work to family interference (p. 64). F-O fit may have some overlapping variance with these variables, but it is likely that F-O fit would still contribute additional unique variance on top of these work-descriptive variables. Given that WFC previously has been a difficult construct on which to capture variance (e.g., Kossek & Ozeki, 1998), this new measure will be very useful for future work in this area.

The relationships found between F-O fit and stress and between F-O fit and turnover intentions provide further evidence to support F-O fit as an important construct in

the literature. Researchers are always struggling to capture variance in these key organizational outcomes, so even small effect sizes are important. F-O fit (despite being correlated with P-O fit at $r = .76$) explains an additional 2.4 percent of the variance in stress and 2.5 percent of the variance in turnover intentions above and beyond demographic control variables, P-J fit, AND P-O fit. Lauver and Kristof-Brown (2001) addressed a noticeable gap in the literature by including different types of fit as control variables. They posit that controlling for other types of fit provides "a more realistic picture of their influence" (p. 465). This study held to that suggestion, interpreting F-O fit's influence on the outcome variables only after considering the influence of P-J and P-O fit.

Additionally, the psychometric properties of the F-O fit scale created for this project are excellent. The variable is not skewed or kurtotic, appears to be fairly normally distributed, and has strong internal reliability. Removing any of the items from the scale would have decreased coefficient alpha.

These results also add to the literature by offering additional evidence that demographics alone do not explain variance in WFC. In testing hypothesis 1a, the results show

that gender, marital status, and number of dependents do not significantly predict work to family interference. In testing hypothesis 1b, the results show that gender, marital status, and number of dependents do significantly predict family to work interference, though they only explain 4.9 percent of the variance in family to work interference. As WFP research has historically focused on demographic characteristics as a proxy for measures of WFC, this finding adds a crucial caveat to previous WFP research (Kossek & Ozeki, 1998). To the extent that WFP research makes conclusions based solely on demographic indicators, the generalizability of those studies are severely limited.

After controlling for demographic variables, P-J fit, and P-O fit, the relationships between F-O fit and organizational commitment and between F-O fit and job satisfaction were not significant. However, these variables are more distal to the construct. In fact, the individual predictors that are the strongest are what one would expect. For example, P-O fit and P-J fit together explain a unique 32.9 percent of the variance in organizational commitment, though P-J fit is not a significant individual predictor. Though a peripheral result to this study, this effect size in explaining organizational commitment is

large and provides evidence of the quality and comprehensiveness of the P-O fit measure used (Gilbert & Rodgers, 2002).

Further, P-O fit and P-J fit together explain a unique 46.7 percent of the variance in job satisfaction. As I-O Psychology struggles to get a handle on explaining this construct, this result is impressive. Logically, given the nature of the outcome variable, both P-O fit and P-J fit are significant individual predictors. Note that job satisfaction is the only outcome variable for which P-J fit was a significant predictor.

In addition to the significantly related outcomes (WFC, turnover intentions, and stress), other proximal outcomes may be important pieces of the puzzle. For example, Lauver and Kristof-Brown (2001) found evidence that P-O fit predicts contextual performance. Contextual performance is a similar concept to organizational citizenship behaviors (OCBs), and it is defined by Lauver and Kristof-Brown as performance that "contributes to organizational effectiveness in ways that shape the organizational, social, and psychological context that serves as the catalyst for task activities and processes" (p. 458). P-O fit may either directly or indirectly

(through WFC) affect the employee's contextual performance or participation in OCBs.

F-O fit may also directly or indirectly (through stress or WFC) affect other on-the-job behaviors. Presumably an employee distracted by the lack of F-O fit or experiencing WFC because of low F-O fit would not perform at his or her best; task performance may be positively related to F-O fit. Additionally, given the relationship between F-O fit and turnover intentions, absenteeism could also be a critical outcome. Perhaps F-O fit indirectly affects absenteeism through family to work interference.

These additional outcomes are not limited to those experienced by the organization. There are other attitudes or behaviors that may be more proximal for the employee than broadly defined job satisfaction. For example, another outcome that could be explored is job choice intentions (e.g., Gilbert & Rodgers, 2002). It is highly probable that potential employees would include F-O fit in their employment decisions in the same manner as they include P-O fit. Further, many of the outcomes addressed in the work and family literature involve the home life or family. Marital tension is just one example of an outcome that may

be negatively related to F-O fit, perhaps directly or indirectly through WFC.

The moderation hypotheses were not supported in this project. The relationships between P-O fit and outcome variables studied are not different based on level of F-O fit. Again, these two variables were highly correlated, so perhaps most people are similar to their families in terms of fit. This point is revisited in the limitations section. An alternative explanation could be that interaction effects aren't relevant for the outcomes studied. The findings of this study should not preclude further investigation of interaction effects. When looking at other relevant outcomes, addressing limitations of this study, and studying other types of fit, interaction hypotheses should still be included, especially considering the infancy of this construct.

Finally, the additional analyses have shown that individuals with dependents report more stress and WFC than those individuals with no dependents (even if they have partners). Researchers should be aware of these potential differences both in data collection planning and in generalizing findings beyond the population studied.

Limitations

As with all research, results must be interpreted in light of the study's limitations. First, data was collected from a convenience sample (acquaintances of the researcher), rather than a random sample. The researcher was able to expand the sample beyond personal acquaintances by asking that the survey link be forwarded. Several of the initial contacts indicated to the researcher that they did forward the link to their own contacts. However, as the sample is non-random, generalizability of the findings is limited. A second limitation related to the sample is its relative homogeneity. As noted already, the majority of the sample reported being Caucasian. This limitation also affects the generalizability to other populations, especially minority workers.

Third, participants filled out the F-O fit scale by answering questions about their families' fit. The accuracy of their responses would depend on the accuracy of their perceptions of their families' fit. The findings of this study may be different than if a family member had filled out the scale. This limitation may also explain the high correlation between P-O and F-O fit and the lack of significant interactions.

Fourth, the current economic state may have played a role in survey responses. Individuals may be looking for other jobs given the fragility of the job market, when they otherwise would be content. Also, a range restriction effect could have occurred on the job satisfaction measure, as people could be satisfied to even have a job in this economy. However, the data indicate a normal distribution on this scale, with scale scores ranging from 1 to 5, so this effect is not likely in play.

Fifth, some significant order effects were found. When all variables are collected one right after the other with no time break, responses on the later questions may be unduly affected by responses from the beginning of the survey. For example, perhaps a respondent's answers on the job satisfaction scale were influenced after becoming aware of his or her low responses (lack of fit) on the P-O fit scale. The researcher distributed four random survey orders to partially alleviate these potential effects.

Finally, this study is correlational in nature. All data was collected at the same time, so the direction of the relationships presented stems from theory only. It is possible, for example, that level of stress predicts responses to F-O fit, rather than fit predicting stress.

Implications and Future Directions

As highlighted by the previous discussion, this research has critical academic and practical implications. First, in both the work-family and fit literatures, demographic characteristics should not be used as a substitute for quality measures of the constructs of interest. In this day and age, we simply cannot make sweeping generalizations about demographic groups while claiming high research and ethical standards. From a practical standpoint, many organizations attempt to combat WFC by enacting "family friendly" policies, which tend to be based on demographic characteristics of the workforce (Kossek & Ozeki, 1998). F-O fit in an adapted form may find a practical use in organizational policy making, providing employees with benefits more suited to their needs while saving the company money on unnecessary benefits.

Second, the F-O fit measure is a psychometrically sound instrument that can easily be used in further research. The current study has successfully merged the fit and work-family literatures and has established F-O fit as a viable construct with noteworthy explanatory power. F-O fit should continue to be explored in more depth. Additional outcomes should be explored in accordance with

common outcomes of the fit and work-family literatures. Some outcomes of interest are as follows: OCBs (Lauver & Kristof-Brown, 2001), job choice intentions (Gilbert & Rodgers, 2002), psychological well-being (Edwards & Rothbard, 1999), burnout (Barnett et al., 1999), marital quality (Pittmann, 1994), work productivity (Teng, 1999), and family functioning (Teng, 1999).

Third, given the limitations of the current project, the findings presented are truly substantial. Addressing some of these limitations in future research will provide stronger evidence for this construct and further expand two bodies of literature. In terms of study design, future researchers should conduct longitudinal studies, especially considering the economic state now versus the future (i.e., how does fit vary with economic conditions?), and specifically target more diverse samples to include minority and low-income workers.

Much of the work and family literature has focused on homogenous groups, such as married or co-habiting couples with children and sometimes dual careers (Kossek & Ozeki, 1998; Kreiner, 2006). The current project expands the concept of "family" to include those employees without direct dependents (i.e., extended family, parents, etc.).

Diverse populations in terms of race, family size, job title, marital status, and gender, were relevant to this study. Participants were not limited on any characteristics other than requiring a minimum employment status, the ability to read English, and the ability to navigate click-through Web site screens with a computer mouse.

However, the final sample was not as diverse as expected. If researchers are truly interested in achieving broad, diverse samples in work and family studies, they must use targeted approaches, rather than convenience sampling. The web-based survey format further limited the population, as minority populations have been shown to be underrepresented both in internet use and in internet study participation (Wilson et al., 2006).

Future research should also consider collecting data on F-O fit from both the employee's perspective and the family's perspective. Are employees cognizant of their families' fit with their organizations? If these perceptions differ, what does that mean for F-O fit's relationship with outcomes? Perhaps the family's perspective is more predictive of WFC and other work attitudes, regardless of the employee's awareness. The interaction effects may exist if the construct is measured

differently. Future researchers could assess F-O fit from a 360 degree feedback perspective, collecting data from the employee, multiple family members, and even the organization.

Fourth, Janson and Kristof-Brown (2006) propose that the salience of different types of fit may differ based on individual (e.g., personality) or environmental (e.g., strength of the organizational culture) differences, as well as temporal stage of the hiring process (e.g., "pre-recruitment" through "long-term tenure"; Figure 3, p. 202). For example, future research on F-O fit could address whether individuals high on narcissism place less importance on F-O fit than individuals low on narcissism. Exploring these caveats is important, as Janson and Kristof-Brown warn that "increasing our understanding of single dimensions of fit, in isolation of time and context, is no longer sufficient" (p. 206).

Finally, and from a more practical perspective, F-O fit could have implications for selection and pre-hire assessment. P-O fit (sometimes termed "culture fit" by practitioners) is now being used in selection contexts, though notably the legal issues can be daunting. Some organizations have chosen to use this information to

provide a "realistic culture preview," similar to a realistic job preview, in hopes that employees will self-select out of organizations in which they may not fit (Greene-Shortridge, Kantrowitz, Ross, & Schmidt, 2009). F-O fit could certainly be included in a similar manner, providing the employee with information about organizational goals, family values, and WFP, for example. Organizations could even design a packet written directly for the employee's family, providing direct information about the culture of the organization and a list of frequently asked questions.

APPENDIX A
FINAL SCALES

Demographics

Please answer the following 15 questions regarding basic demographic information. For questions with multiple choices, please choose the one that best applies to you.

1. What is your gender?

- ☐ Male
- ☐ Female

2. What is your age? _____

3. What is your marital status?

- ☐ Married
- ☐ Living together
- ☐ Separated
- ☐ Divorced
- ☐ Widowed
- ☐ Single, never married

4. How many wage-earners in your household help with expenses? _____

5. How many individuals live in your household? _____

6. How many dependents (*e.g.*, children, parents) do you have? _____

7. What is the age of your youngest dependent? _____

8. How strong are your connections to a religious or community support network?

- ☐ Not applicable/None
- ☐ Weak
- ☐ Average
- ☐ Strong
- ☐ Very strong

9. What is your ethnic origin?

- ☐ Native American
- ☐ Asian
- ☐ African American
- ☐ Hispanic
- ☐ Caucasian
- ☐ Other _____

10. What is your education level?

- ☐ Less than 9th grade
- ☐ Grade 9–11
- ☐ Completed high school
- ☐ Additional non-college training (*e.g.*, technical or trade school)
- ☐ Some college
- ☐ Completed associate's degree
- ☐ Completed bachelor's degree
- ☐ Completed college with advanced degree (M.S., M.A., Ph.D., M.D., etc.)

11. How long have you worked for your current organization?

_____ years _____ months

12. What is your current position title? _____

13. How long have you worked in your current position?

_____ years _____ months

14. On average, how many hours (including overtime) do you work each week? _____

15. What types of shift(s) do you work (check all that apply)?

- ☐ Daytime working hours (9–5 or similar)
- ☐ Morning shift (7–3 or similar)
- ☐ Evening shift (3–11 or similar)
- ☐ Night shift (11–7 or similar)
- ☐ Rotating 12-hour shifts (*e.g.*, nursing)
- ☐ Flexible scheduling (*e.g.*, set hours, flexible start/end time or days worked)
- ☐ Telecommuting
- ☐ Other _____

Person–Organization Fit (Gilbert & Rodgers, 2002)

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Not at all	Very small degree	Small degree	Moderate degree	Great degree	Very great degree	Completely

Values Congruence. This section measures the degree to which your values match or “fit” the values of your organization. Both you and your organization are going to have values around honesty, fairness, concern for others, and achievement.

1. Honesty can be referred to as the refusal to mislead others for personal gain and/or acting in accordance with one’s true feelings. According to this definition, to what degree do your values of honesty match your organization’s values of honesty?
2. Fairness can be defined as a state of impartiality, for example, judging disagreements in an impartial fashion, or considering different points of view before acting. According to this definition, to what degree do your values of fairness match your organization’s values of fairness?
3. Concern for others can be defined as having a caring, compassionate demeanor. Often times this is shown through helping others perform difficult jobs or encouraging others who are having a bad day. According to this definition, to what degree do your values of concern for others match your organization’s concern for others?
4. Achievement can be referred to as the concern for the advancement of one’s career, or willingness to work hard and take upon additional responsibilities. According to this definition, to what degree do your values of achievement match your organization’s values of achievement principles?
5. Overall, to what degree do you feel your values match your organization’s values?

Goal Congruence. This section measures the degree to which your goals match your organization’s goals. Using the example of an academic setting, goals may include 1) increase student’s basic skills, 2) increase breadth of courses, or 3) increase staff development, etc.

1. To what degree are your goals similar to your organization’s goals?
2. To what degree do you strive for what your organization strives for?
3. To what degree do you agree with the goals of your organization?

Personality/Climate Congruence. This section measures the degree to which your personality matches the personality of your organization (*i.e.*, organizational climate). Organizational climate is usually made up of the physical work environment, communication patterns, and expectations of employees. Individual personality as well as organizational climate can be thought of in terms of flexibility, sociability, creativity, cooperativeness, and conscientiousness.

1. To what degree does your level of flexibility meet your organization's level of flexibility?
2. To what degree does your level of sociability meet your organization's level of sociability?
3. To what degree does your level of creativity meet your organization's level of creativity?
4. To what degree does your level of cooperativeness meet your organization's level of cooperativeness?
5. To what degree does your level of conscientiousness meet your organization's level of conscientiousness?
6. Overall, to what degree does your personality match the personality of your organization?

Needs/Supplies Fit. This section measures the degree to which you perceive your needs will be fulfilled by the organization's supplies. For example, individuals are likely to have financial and growth needs in which they expect organizations to fulfill those needs through pay, bonuses, challenging work, etc. On the other hand, the organization is also looking for needs to be fulfilled (*e.g.*, productivity, skills, etc.) by individual supplies (*e.g.*, time, effort, knowledge, skills, and abilities, etc.).

1. To what degree do you feel your organization will supply you with what you need?
2. To what degree do you feel your organization will give you the rewards you need (*e.g.*, pay promotional opportunities, recognition, etc.)
3. To what degree do you feel your organization will meet your needs for achievement? (Need for achievement is defined as the degree to which you need to be challenged at work, focus on individual effort, and have a competitive disposition).
4. To what degree do you feel you supply something that your organization needs, that others do not have?
5. To what degree do you feel your needs will be supplied by your organization as well as your organization's needs be met by your supplies?

Person–Job Fit

(Gilbert & Rodgers, 2002)

This section measures the degree to which you feel your knowledge, skills, and abilities meet the task requirements of your job. Knowledge can be thought of in terms of your education or “what you know” (e.g., knowledge of mathematics or accounting). Your skills, for example, may include typing, giving presentations, or working on car engines. Abilities reflect what you can do (e.g., ability to work in team settings or work outside). The task requirements of the job include the specific duties that are required (e.g., tasks for an administrative job include typing, taking notes, answering phones, etc.).

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Not at all	Very small degree	Small degree	Moderate degree	Great degree	Very great degree	Completely

1. To what degree does your knowledge match the task requirements of the job?
2. To what degree do your skills match the task requirements of the job?
3. To what degree do your abilities meet the task requirements of the job?
4. To what degree are you attracted to the tasks of the job?
5. To what degree are the tasks on the job similar to the tasks you want to perform?

Family–Organization Fit

When answering the following questions about your organization and your family, please keep the following definitions in mind:

“Your organization”—made up of co-workers, work groups, supervisors, as well as the organization as a whole.

“Your family”—may include your immediate family (e.g., spouse and children), your extended family (e.g., parents or siblings), or even your household (e.g., roommates).

Supplementary Family–Organization Fit

Using the scale below, please describe the way your family and the organization you work for "fit" or "match" (i.e., similarities) on the following items.

1	2	3	4	5
Very Poor Fit	Poor Fit	Moderate Fit	Good Fit	Very Good Fit

1. How do your family's values "fit" with your organization's values?
2. How do your family's ethics "fit" with your organization's ethics?
3. How do your family's goals and objectives "fit" with your organization's goals and objectives?
4. How do your family's ways of reaching out to the community (charity) "fit" with your organization's charitable giving?
5. How do your family's attitudes "fit" with your organization's overall attitude?
6. How does your family's sociability "fit" with your organization's sociability?
7. If your family had to interact with your co-workers, how would they "fit" with them?
8. How do your family's outside interests "fit" with your organization's outside interests?
9. How does your family's work ethic "fit" with your organization's work ethic?
10. How does your family's view on politics "fit" with your organization's view on politics?
11. How do your family's religious beliefs "fit" with your organization's view on religion?
12. How does your family's definition of career success "fit" with your organization's definition of career success?
13. How do your family's dress preferences "fit" with your organization's dress code?
14. How would your family's personal style "fit" within your organization?
15. How does your family's communication style "fit" with your organization's communication style?

Complementary Family–Organization Fit

Using the rating scale below, please describe the “fit” or “match” between your family’s needs or expectations and what your organization supplies or demands.

1	2	3	4	5
Very Poor Fit	Poor Fit	Moderate Fit	Good Fit	Very Good Fit

1. How does your average work load “fit” with your family’s needs?
2. How does your required time at work “fit” with your family’s needs?
3. How does your work schedule (*i.e.*, hours or shifts worked) “fit” with your family’s needs?
4. How do your tasks at work “fit” with your family’s needs?
5. How does your control over your schedule “fit” with your family’s needs?
6. How does your income (base pay) “fit” with your family’s needs?
7. How does your other income (*e.g.*, incentive pay, bonuses) “fit” with your family’s needs?
8. How do your available promotion opportunities “fit” with your family’s needs?
9. How do your organization’s health benefits “fit” with your family’s needs?
10. How do your organization’s retirement or pension plans “fit” with your family’s needs?
11. How do your organization’s dependent care benefits “fit” with your family’s needs?
12. How do your organization’s financially-based benefits (*e.g.*, flexible spending accounts, financial planning) “fit” with your family’s needs?
13. How do your benefit choices (*e.g.*, number of available plans) “fit” with your family’s needs?
14. How does the physical energy required of you at work “fit” with your family’s needs?
15. How does the mental energy required of you at work “fit” with your family’s needs?
16. How do your organization’s overtime requirements “fit” with your family’s needs?
17. How does your organization’s policy on completing personal tasks at work (or “on the clock”) “fit” with your family’s needs?
18. How does your organization’s policy on taking work home “fit” with your family’s needs?

Work–Family Conflict
(Carlson, Kacmar, & Williams, 2000)

Using the scale below, please indicate the extent to which you agree or disagree with each statement.

1	2	3	4	5
Strongly Disagree				Strongly Agree

Time-Based Work Interference with Family

1. My work keeps me from my family activities more than I would like.
2. The time I must devote to my job keeps me from participating equally in household responsibilities and activities.
3. I have to miss family activities due to the amount of time I must spend on work responsibilities.

Time-Based Family Interference with Work

4. The time I spend on family responsibilities often interfere with my work responsibilities.
5. The time I spend with my family often causes me not to spend time in activities at work that could be helpful to my career.
6. I have to miss work activities due to the amount of time I must spend on family responsibilities.

Strain-Based Work Interference with Family

7. When I get home from work I am often too frazzled to participate in family activities/responsibilities.
8. I am often so emotionally drained when I get home from work that it prevents me from contributing to my family.
9. Due to all the pressures at work, sometimes when I come home I am too stressed to do the things I enjoy.

Strain-Based Family Interference with Work

10. Due to stress at home, I am often preoccupied with family matters at work.
11. Because I am often stressed from family responsibilities, I have a hard time concentrating on my work.
12. Tension and anxiety from my family life often weakens my ability to do my job.

Behavior-Based Work Interference with Family

13. The problem-solving behaviors I use in my job are not effective in resolving problems at home.
14. Behavior that is effective and necessary for me at work would be counterproductive at home.
15. The behaviors I perform that make me effective at work do not help me to be a better parent and spouse.

Behavior-Based Family Interference with Work

16. The behaviors that work for me at home do not seem to be effective at work.
17. Behavior that is effective and necessary for me at home would be counterproductive at work.
18. The problem-solving behavior that works for me at home does not seem to be as useful at work.

Stress

(Work Tension; House & Rizzo, 1972)

Using the scale below, please indicate the extent to which you agree or disagree with each statement.

1	2	3	4	5
Strongly Disagree				Strongly Agree

1. My job tends to directly affect my health.
2. I work under a great deal of tensions.
3. I have felt fidgety or nervous as a result of my job.
4. If I had a different job, my health would probably improve.
5. Problems associated with my job have kept me awake at night.
6. I have felt nervous before attending meetings in the company.
7. I often "take my job home with me" in the sense that I think about it when doing other things.

Organizational Commitment

(Meyer & Allen, 1997)

Using the scale below, please indicate the extent to which you agree or disagree with each statement.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Strongly Disagree			No Opinion			Strongly Agree

Affective Organizational Commitment

1. I would be very happy to spend the rest of my career with this organization.
2. I really feel as if this organization's problems are my own.
3. I do not feel like "part of the family" at my organization. (R)
4. I do not feel "emotionally attached" to this organization. (R)
5. This organization has a great deal of personal meaning for me.
6. I do not feel a strong sense of belonging to my organization. (R)

Normative Organizational Commitment

7. I do not feel any obligation to remain with my current employer. (R)
8. Even if it were to my advantage, I do not feel it would be right to leave my organization now.
9. I would feel guilty if I left my organization now.
10. This organization deserves my loyalty.
11. I would not leave my organization right now because I have sense of obligation to the people in it.
12. I owe a great deal to this organization.

Continuance Organizational Commitment

13. It would be very hard for me to leave my organization right now, even if I wanted to.
14. Too much in my life would be disrupted if I decided I wanted to leave my organization now.
15. Right now staying with my organization is a matter of necessity as much as desire.
16. I feel that I have too few options to consider leaving this organization.
17. One of the few serious consequences of leaving this organization would be the scarcity of available alternatives.
18. One of the major reasons I continue to work for this organization is that leaving would require considerable personal sacrifice—another organization may not match the overall benefits that I have here.

(R) = Reverse Coded

Job Satisfaction
(Agho, Price, & Mueller, 1992)

Using the following rating scale, please indicate your agreement with each statement.

1	2	3	4	5
Strongly Disagree				Strongly Agree

1. I like my job better than the average person.
2. I find real enjoyment in my job.
3. I would not consider taking another kind of job.
4. I feel fairly well satisfied with my job.
5. Most days I am enthusiastic about my job.
6. I am seldom bored with my job.

Turnover Intentions

(Jaros, 1997)

Considering your current organization, please use the scales below to state your opinion about each statement. For each statement, indicate your answer by clicking on the appropriate circle.

1. How often do you think about quitting your organization?

1	2	3	4	5
Never	Rarely	Sometimes	Often	Always

2. How likely are you to search for a position with another employer?

1	2	3	4	5
Definitely Will Not	Probably Will Not	Not Sure	Probably Will	Definitely Will

3. How likely are you to leave the organization in the next year?

1	2	3	4	5
Definitely Will Not	Probably Will Not	Not Sure	Probably Will	Definitely Will

APPENDIX B
INFORMED CONSENT

Informed Consent

The study in which you are being asked to participate is designed to investigate how employees and/or their families fit or match with organizations. This study is being conducted by Rebekah Massmann under the supervision of Dr. Janelle Gilbert, Associate Professor of Psychology, California State University, San Bernardino. This study has been approved by the Department of Psychology Institutional Review Board Sub-Committee, California State University, San Bernardino. A copy of the Psychology Department IRB stamp should appear somewhere on this form.

In this study you will be asked to respond to several questions about you, your family, and your workplace. Most of the questions will ask you to respond on a rating scale about your agreement with or attitudes about given statements. Further instructions specific to each set of questions will be provided and should be read closely. The complete survey should take about 20 to 30 minutes to complete. Your responses will remain completely anonymous, as we do not receive nor track any personally identifying information. All data will be reported in group form only. Additionally, the data collected in this survey will never be used in any way by the survey host site. You may receive the group results of this study upon completion in September 2009 by contacting Dr. Janelle Gilbert at the following location: SB 539, 5500 University Parkway, San Bernardino, CA 92407.

Your participation in this study is completely voluntary. You are free not to answer any questions and withdraw at any time during this study without penalty. When you have completed the survey, a debriefing statement will be provided, which describes the study in more detail. In order to ensure to validity of the study, we ask that you not discuss this study with other participants. Finally, participation in this project is not considered to have any foreseeable risks. Both job applicants (having more information about what to look for from an organization) and organizations (having more information about what benefits employees are seeking) can potentially benefit from the aggregate research results.

If you have any questions or concerns about this study or your rights as a research participant, please feel free to contact me (Dr. Janelle Gilbert) at (909) 537-5587 or at janelle@csusb.edu. By clicking the "Yes" box below, I acknowledge that I have been informed of, and that I understand, the nature and purpose of this study, and I freely consent to participate. I also acknowledge that I am at least 18 years of age.

CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY, SAN BERNARDINO
PSYCHOLOGY INSTITUTIONAL REVIEW BOARD SUB-COMMITTEE
APPROVED 3 /5 /09, VOID AFTER 3 /5 /10
IRB# H-09WI-22 CHAIR Christy De

APPENDIX C
SURVEY ORDERS

Survey Orders

Order 1

1. Demographics
2. Person-Organization Fit
3. Stress
4. Turnover Intentions
5. Work-Family Conflict
6. Organizational Commitment
7. Person-Job Fit
8. Family-Organization Fit
9. Job Satisfaction

Order 3

1. Demographics
2. Family-Organization Fit
3. Person-Job Fit
4. Work-Family Conflict
5. Turnover Intentions
6. Job Satisfaction
7. Stress
8. Person-Organization Fit
9. Organizational Commitment

Order 2

1. Demographics
2. Person-Job Fit
3. Work-Family Conflict
4. Job Satisfaction
5. Organizational Commitment
6. Family-Organization Fit
7. Stress
8. Turnover Intentions
9. Person-Organization Fit

Order 4

1. Demographics
2. Organizational Commitment
3. Family-Organization Fit
4. Person-Organization Fit
5. Stress
6. Work-Family Conflict
7. Person-Job Fit
8. Turnover Intentions
9. Job Satisfaction

APPENDIX D
DEBRIEFING STATEMENT

Debriefing Statement

This survey you have just completed was designed to investigate employees' and their families' "fit" or match with their organizations. In this study, family–organization (F–O) fit is predicted to be positively related to job satisfaction and organizational commitment, and it is predicted to be negatively related to stress, turnover intentions, and work–family conflict). Person–job and person–organization fit were also measured, and interactions among types of fit will be explored.

Thank you for your participation and for not discussing the contents of this survey with other participants. If you have any questions about the study, please feel free to contact Rebekah Massmann or Dr. Janelle Gilbert at (909) 537–5587. If you would like to obtain a copy of the group results of this study, please contact Dr. Gilbert at the end of Summer Quarter of 2009.

REFERENCES

- Agho, A. O., Price, J. L., & Mueller, C. W. (1992). Discriminant validity of measures of job satisfaction, positive affectivity and negative affectivity. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, 65, 185-196.
- 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.
- Allen, N. J., & Meyer, J. P. (1996). Affective, continuance, and normative commitment to the organization: An examination of construct validity. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 49, 252-276.
- Allen, T. D. (2001). Family-supportive work environments: The role of organizational perceptions. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 58, 414-435.
- Allen, T. D., Herst, D. E., Bruck, C. S., & Sutton, M. (2000). Consequences associated with work-to-family conflict: A review and agenda for future research. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, 5, 278-308.
- Barnett, R. C., Gareis, K. C., & Brennan, R. T. (1999). Fit as a mediator of the relationship between work hours

- and burnout. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology, 4*, 307-317.
- Batt, R., & Valcour, P. M. (2003). Human resources practices as predictors of work-family outcomes and employee turnover. *Industrial Relations, 42*, 189-220.
- Blau, P. M. (1964). *Exchange and power in social life*. New York: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.
- Bretz, R. D., Jr., & Judge, T. A. (1994). Person-organization fit and the theory of work adjustment: Implications for satisfaction, tenure, and career success. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 44*, 32-54.
- Brough, P., O'Driscoll, M. P., & Kalliath, T. J. (2005). The ability of 'family friendly' organizational resources to predict work-family conflict and job and family satisfaction. *Stress and Health, 21*, 223-234.
- Cable, D. M., & Judge, T. A. (1996). Person-organization fit, job choice decisions, and organizational entry. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes, 67*, 294-311.
- Carless, S. A. (2005). 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, 411-429.
- Carlson, D. S., Kacmar, K. M., & Williams, L. J. (2000). Construction and initial validation of a multidimensional measure of work-family conflict. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 56, 249-276.
- Dawis, R. V., & Lofquist, L. H. (1984). *A psychological theory of work adjustment: An individual-differences model and its applications*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Eaton, S. C. (2003). If you can use them: Flexibility policies, organizational commitment, and perceived performance. *Industrial Relations*, 42, 145-167.
- Edwards, J. R., & Rothbard, N. P. (1999). Work and family stress and well-being: An examination of person-environment fit in the work and family domains. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 77, 85-129.
- Fields, D. L. (2002). *Taking the measure of work: A guide to validated scales for organizational research and diagnosis*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.
- Ford, M. T., Heinen, B. A., & Langkamer, K. L. (2007). Work and family satisfaction and conflict: A meta-analysis

- of cross-domain relations. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 92, 57-80.
- Gilbert, J. A., & Rodgers, C. (2002, April). *Person-Job Fit and Person-Organization Fit as Predictors of Job Choice Intentions*. Paper presented at the annual conference of the Society for Industrial and Organizational Psychology, Toronto, Canada.
- Greene-Shortridge, T. M., Kantrowitz, T., Ross, R. A., & Schmidt, G. R. (2009, April). *Advances in the assessment of culture fit for personnel selection*. Panel discussion presented at the annual conference of the Society for Industrial and Organizational Psychology, New Orleans, LA.
- Greenhaus, J. H., & Beutell, N. J. (1985). Sources of conflict between work and family roles. *Academy of Management Review*, 10, 76-88.
- House, R. J., & Rizzo, J. R. (1972). Role conflict and ambiguity as critical variables in a model of organizational behavior. *Organizational Behavior and Human Performance*, 7, 467-505.
- Janson, K. J., & Kristof-Brown, A. (2006). Toward a multidimensional theory of person-environment fit. *Journal of Managerial Issues*, 18, 193-212.

- Jaros, S. J. (1997). An assessment of Meyer and Allen's (1991) three-component model of organizational commitment and turnover intentions. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 51, 319-337.
- Kahn, R. L., Wolfe, D. M., Quinn, R. P., Snoek, J. D., & Rosenthal, R. A. (1964). *Organizational stress: Studies in role conflict and ambiguity*. New York: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.
- Kanter, R. M. (1977). *Work and family in the United States: A critical review and agenda for research and policy*. New York: Russell Sage Foundation.
- Kossek, E. E., & Ozeki, C. (1998). Work-family conflict, policies, and the job-life satisfaction relationship: A review and directions for organizational behavior-human resources research. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 83, 139-149.
- Kossek, E. E., & Ozeki, C. (1999). Bridging the work-family policy and productivity gap: A literature review. *Community, Work & Family*, 2, 7-32.
- Kreiner, G. E. (2006). Consequences of work-home segmentation or integration: A person-environment fit perspective. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 27, 485-507.

- Kristof, A. L. (1996). Person-organization fit: An integrative review of its conceptualizations, measurement, and implications. *Personnel Psychology*, 49, 1-49.
- Kristof-Brown, A. L., Jansen, K. J., & Colbert, A. E. (2002). A policy-capturing study of the simultaneous effects of fit with jobs, groups, and organizations. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 87, 985-993.
- 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.
- Lapierre, L. M., & Allen, T. D. (2006). Work-supportive family, family-supportive supervision, use of organizational benefits, and problem-focused coping: Implications for work-family conflict and employee well-being. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, 11, 169-181.
- Lapierre, L. M., Allen, T. D., Spector, P. E., O'Driscoll, M., Cooper, C. L., Poelmans, S., & Sanchez, J. I. (2005). Further validation of Carlson, Kacmar, and

- Williams' (2000) work-family conflict measure. *Academy of Management Proceedings*, J1-J6.
- Lauver, K. J., & Kristof-Brown, A. (2001). Distinguishing between employees' perceptions of person-job and person-organization fit. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 59, 454-470.
- Lovelace, K., & Rosen, B. (1996). Differences in achieving person-organization fit among diverse groups of managers. *Journal of Management*, 22, 703-722.
- Luk, D. M., & Shaffer, M. A. (2005). Work and family domain stressors and support: Within- and cross-domain influences on work-family conflict. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, 78, 489-508.
- Meyer, J. P., & Allen, N. J. (1997). *Commitment in the workplace: Theory, research, and application*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Muse, L., Harris, S. G., Giles, W. F., & Feild, H. S. (2008). Work-life benefits and positive organizational behavior: Is there a connection? *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 29, 171-192.
- Netemeyer, R. G., Johnston, M. W., & Burton, S. (1990). Analysis of role conflict and role ambiguity in a

- structural equations framework. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 75, 148-157.
- O'Reilly, C. A., III, 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.
- Orthner, D. K., & Pittman, J. F. (1986). Family contributes to work commitment. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, 48, 573-581.
- Pittman, J. F. (1994). Work/family fit as a mediator of work factors on marital tension: Evidence from the interface of greedy institutions. *Human Relations*, 47, 183-210.
- Pittman, J. F., Kerpelman, J. L., & McFadyen, J. M. (2004). Internal and external adaptation in army families: Lessons from Operations Desert Shield and Desert Storm. *Family Relations*, 53, 249-260.
- Resick, C.J., Baltes, B. B., & Shantz, C. W. (2007). Person-organization fit and work-related attitudes and decisions: Examining interactive effects with job fit and conscientiousness. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 92, 1446-1455.

- Rothbard, N. P., Phillips, K. W., & Dumas, T. L. (2005). Managing multiple roles: Work-family policies and individuals' desires for segmentation. *Organization Science*, 16, 243-258.
- Schneider, B. (1987). The people make the place. *Personnel Psychology*, 40, 437-453.
- Scroggins, W. A. (2007). An examination of the additive versus convergent effects of employee perceptions of fit. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 37, 1649-1665.
- Smith, J., & Gardner, D. (2007). Factors affecting employee use of work-life balance initiatives. *New Zealand Journal of Psychology*, 36, 3-12.
- Spector, P. E. (1985). Measurement of human service staff satisfaction: Development of the job satisfaction survey. *American Journal of Community Psychology*, 13, 693-713.
- Tabachnick, B. G., & Fidell, L. S. (2007). *Using multivariate statistics* (5th ed.). Boston: Allyn and Bacon.
- Teng, W. (1999). Assessing the work-family interface: An empirical test of a new measure of work-family fit.

Dissertation Abstracts International, 60, 4199. (UMI No. 9949613).

Voydanoff, P. (2005). Toward a conceptualization of perceived work-family fit and balance: A demands and resources approach. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 67, 822-836.

Westerman, J. W., & Cyr, L. (2004). An integrative analysis of person-organization fit theories. *International Journal of Selection and Assessment*, 12, 252-261.

Wilson, J. J., Mick, R., Wei, S. J., Ruslgi, A. K., Markowitz, S. D., Hampshire, M., & Metz, J. M. (2006). Clinical trial resources on the internet must be designed to reach underrepresented minorities. *The Cancer Journal*, 12, 475-481.