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ABSTRACT

This study, based on the ASA theory, examined the relationships of perceived person organizational (PO) fit and perceived person supervisor (PS) fit with organizational commitment (affective commitment (AC) and normative commitment (NC)). These relationships were assessed with the mediation of perceived organizational support (POS) and perceived supervisor support (PSS). It was predicted that PO fit would be positively related to AC and NC through POS. It was also predicted that PS fit would be positively related to AC and NC by way of PSS. Two hundred and twenty four participants who had been employed by their organization for at least six months, were asked to complete a survey posted on www.qualtrics.com. Results based on the 224 participants indicated that both PO fit and PS fit were directly positively related to AC and NC, and that POS and PSS were significant mediators of the those relationships. Employee fit working in accordance with employee perceptions of support influenced both forms of organizational commitment. The results provide an opportunity for future person environment (PE) fit researchers to further explore PS fit and its influences on work attitudes.
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CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION

In every workplace, there exists the psychological contract. A psychological contract is an unwritten agreement between an employer and an employee. Employees have certain expectations about what they should provide to their employers and about what they should receive in return, and the employer has such expectations as well (Ng, Lam, & Feldman, 2010). If commitment from the employee is important to the employer, the employer must make sure the expectations for both parties are understood. For example, Ng et al. (2010) conducted a 6-month long study on psychological contract breaches on the part of the employer and its influence on employee commitment, and discovered that psychological contract breaches are associated with poorer performance and negative attitudes, such as lower affective commitment.

Ultimately, employees' commitment to their organization is a concern for employers because they want employees to feel supported and for the employees to support the organization in return. In terms of goals and expectations from the organization and employees, a match or fit between the two are important in creating a
cohesive relationship. The way employees fit in with their organization will help determine what their level of commitment to the organization may be.

The concept of fit or match between employees and their work environments is a well researched area within organizational behavior. This match between individuals’ characteristics and their work environments is known as person-environment (PE) fit. Edwards and Shipp (2007) explain PE fit as the congruence, similarity, match, and correspondence between the person and their work environment. PE fit is important for organizations to understand because it has an influence on attitudinal and behavioral outcomes at each stage of an employee’s organizational life cycle, which includes: decisions to join the organization, attitudes and behaviors of the employee during employment, as well as intentions to leave the organization (Greguras & Diefendorff, 2009).

Two of the various sub-forms of PE fit are person-organization (PO) fit and person-supervisor (PS) fit. Perceptions of PO fit are most commonly known as judgments of congruence between employees' values and the organizational culture (Cable & DeRue, 2002). Whereas, perceptions of PS fit, represent a felt compatibility between leaders and followers (Atwater & Dionne, 2007).
For the present study we are primarily interested in these two types of PE fit. The current study’s aim was to integrate and build upon the PE fit literature by investigating the relationship between various forms of PE fit (i.e., PO fit and PS fit) and two forms of organizational commitment (affective and normative commitment) with a proposed mediation of perceived organizational support (POS) for PO fit and perceived supervisor support (PSS) for PS fit. POS represents beliefs that are developed by employees regarding the extent to which the organization values their efforts and cares about their well-being (Eisenberger, Stinglhamber, Vandenberghhe, Sucharski, & Rhoades, 2002). PSS can be explained as the development of holistic views by employees regarding the degree in which supervisors value their effort and care about their overall well-being. Thus, the mediation of POS and PSS helped to explain the relationships between PO fit and PS fit in predicting organizational commitment. Perceived support was utilized as the mediating variable and not the fit types because perceived fit can be assessed at the onset of employment. Therefore, perceiving support will occur after an individual has determined if they are a match with their supervisor and organization. 1 provides a
visual depiction of the proposed set of relationships among variables.

Review of Person-Environment Fit

The beginnings of person-environment (PE) fit originated from the study of the attraction-selection-attrition (ASA) cycle. Schneider (1987) helped to introduce this cycle and explained that work environments are functions of persons behaving in them.
People behave the way they do because they were first attracted to the work environment, were selected by it, and stayed within it. Schaubroeck, Ganster, and Jones (1998) followed up by describing the cycle as depicting organizations as moving toward member homogeneity. The "personality profile," or the values of the organization, is what attract individuals who share a likeness to that profile. In other words, the work environment that individuals join is attributable to the individuals who join them. Schneider (1987) believed that the attraction of parallel types to the same work environment is what starts to define the workplace.

Following attraction is the action of selection by the organization. Schneider (1987) believes that an organization has a set of goals that were established by the founders and have been carried on throughout the existence of the organization. In turn, the organization will look to select individuals who will help accomplish such established organizational goals. In addition, the environment will call for the selection of employees with certain competencies that will aid to their success in the organization.

Finally, the cycle is completed by attrition. Attrition refers to restricting the range of employees who
fit the organization. That is, individuals who feel they do not fit will leave, and this will create a workforce of similar individuals who all relate to each other in terms of the organization's values as well as their own (Schneider, 1987). Although an individual may be attracted to the organization, revelations may occur where the individual discovers that they actually do not fit and will leave. After all is said and done, a more homogeneous group (containing similar attitudes, goals, commitment levels, and values) will be formed by the employees who remain and who were initially attracted to the organization. These homogeneous groups, in turn, will then influence organizational processes and structure (Schaubroeck et al., 1998). Thus, the ASA cycle provides a solid foundation into explaining why PE fit is important to organizations and reinforces the notion that attracting and retaining employees are important factors in building a cohesive workforce.

**Person-Environment Fit as a Theory**

Yu (2009) considers PE fit to be a commonly used theoretical framework which aids to better understanding employee thought and behavior within the organizational sciences. Specifically, PE fit is a theoretical concept that helps us to understand individual's work-related
decisions, thinking, and behaviors. Therefore, this concept provides many important decision-making resources for employers to access. To begin with, PE fit is a complex theory with many sub-forms and distinctions.

Person Environment (PE) fit has two distinctions in terms of assessing the level of fit between the individual and the environment. These distinctions (objective fit and perceived or subjective fit) are key points of emphasis in the literature. Objective fit requires gathering separate information regarding the organization and the individual, and then determining their congruence. For example, to assess an individual's fit, one could collect and evaluate: past performance reports on the individual, feedback on the individual, personality assessments, organizational goals, and the individual's output compared to other similar employees. On the other hand, perceived fit employs the process of directly asking individuals whether or not they believe they are a strong match with an organization and its members (Resick, Shantz, & Baltes, 2007). Many researchers conceptualize this latter form of fit as either perceived or subjective fit. Research shows perceived fit has larger effect sizes than objective fit because perceived fit is more proximal to attitudes and decisions than objective fit. In accordance, the objective
match between an individual and a workplace must first pass through that individual’s perceptions (Kristoff-Brown, Zimmerman, & Johnson, 2005). As a result, the focus in the present study was on perceived fit.

PE fit, or the theory that individuals will have positive work experiences when the work environment provides compatibility with their personal characteristics, is achieved through either a fit of needs fulfillment or a fit of value congruence (Kristoff-Brown, Colbert, & Jansen, 2002). Needs-fulfillment, or complementary fit, exists when an organization’s or person’s characteristics provide what the other seeks. On the other hand, value congruence, or supplementary fit, occurs when a person’s characteristics are congruent with those of the organization (Cable & Edwards, 2004). The difference between complementary and supplementary fit is that complementary fit is centered on a desired “amount,” while supplementary fit is concerned with the “importance” of an attribute. Cable and Edwards (2004) further explain that research on psychological needs fulfillment defines needs as the desired amount of an attribute; while in contrast, research on value congruence characterizes values as the importance of an attribute.
Different forms of PE fit are exemplified by either complementary or supplementary fit. For example, two of the most commonly researched types of fit allow for the understanding of this distinction. Person-organization (PO) fit perceptions are most commonly known as judgments of congruence between employees' values and the organizational culture. On the other hand, person-job (PJ) fit perceptions have been known as judgments of congruence between employee skills and job demands or needs and supplies (Cable & DeRue, 2002). Employee satisfaction and commitment weigh heavily on value congruence and/or need fulfillment. An organization's culture is founded on a set of values which forms unwritten rules and when an employee shares these values, good PO fit is created. Good PJ fit, however, exists when an employee has the necessary abilities to perform tasks appropriately or the position meets the employee's needs (Kristoff-Brown, Colbert, & Jansen, 2002). PJ fit is commonly studied as two parts: Needs-supplies fit (NS fit) and demands-abilities fit (DA fit).

NS fit perceptions are judgments of congruence between an employee's needs and rewards that are received in exchange for services and contributions on the job (e.g., benefits, vacation time, salary). When there is a
high congruence between an employee's needs and the supplies of the job, their job satisfaction should be positive. NS fit has also been shown to influence career satisfaction and occupational commitment (Cable & DeRue, 2002). Meanwhile, DA fit perceptions are known as judgments between the demands of a job and an employees' abilities to perform the job. DA fit influences job performance, in that, if an employee's abilities are low in relation to the job demands then performance will decline (Greguras & Diefendorff, 2009). From an organizational perspective, understanding the consequences of poor fit will assist in the selection of employees who will thrive the most in the work environment and in knowing how to motivate them.

In addition to PO fit, PJ fit, NS fit, and DA fit, PE fit encompasses other sub-fits. These additional forms of PE fit include: person-vocation (PV) fit, person-group (PG) fit, and person-supervisor (PS) fit. PG fit is represented as the perceived value congruence that exists between an employee and his/her colleagues (Greguras & Diefendorff, 2009). This level of fit is important to know as a manager because it will aid in the creation of positive-operating work groups or teams. PV fit occurs when an individual's skills and competencies fit the
requirements of the job in relation to the broader vocation (Atwater & Dionne, 2007). In addition to how well the individual’s skills fit the job, the degree to which said individual feels she is contributing to the vocation determines PV fit. PS fit is based on the compatibility between subordinate and supervisor and their shared characteristics. The relationship between subordinates and supervisors is a determinant to how effectively and efficiently organizational members complete their job tasks (Atwater & Dionne, 2007). PO fit exists when there is compatibility between people and the organization in which they work (Kim, Cable, & Kim, 2005). Compatibility may refer to the situation in which one of the entities provides what the other needs, or when both entities share similar fundamental characteristics, or both (Greguras & Diefendorff, 2009).

Overview of Organizational Commitment

Organizational commitment has historically been a major field of study within the Industrial/Organizational Psychology literature. The theory has been linked to many important work-related behaviors. Research suggests that organizational commitment is associated with behaviors, such as: withdrawal and turnover. Mathieu and Zajac (1990)
state that as an antecedent, organizational commitment has been used to predict employees' absenteeism, performance, turnover, and other work-related behaviors. Positive commitment will increase the bond that is felt with the organization and create a sense of purpose and dedication.

In addition, when looking at commitment as an antecedent we are able to see its effects as an outcome. Employee commitment levels will help explain turnover trends. This is important to all organizations, and therefore, antecedents of commitment will give employers something to explore when seeking to lower turnover rates and intentions. For example, the current study aimed to unveil Person-Supervisor (PS) fit and Person-Organization (PO) fit as positive antecedents to affective and normative organizational commitments. Employers may look for ways to better assess these forms of fit within their organizations. In doing so, they can implement better practices to form stronger perceptions of fit for employees towards the organization and supervisor(s). To add to the importance of commitment for individual members; employees' level of commitment to an organization may make them more eligible to receive extrinsic and psychological rewards linked with membership (Mathieu & Zajac, 1990).
The theory of organizational commitment exists as a three component model originally proposed by Allen and Meyer (1990), and Solinger, van Olffen, and Roe (2008) further explore this model. The three components include: affective commitment (AC), normative commitment (NC), and continuance commitment (CC). Employees with strong AC remain with the organization because they want to, those with strong CC because they need to, and those with strong NC because they feel they ought to do so. In their analysis of the three-component model, Solinger et al. (2008) suggest three aspects to be aware of when the supposed common conceptual ground of the three components is considered. First, all three components are supposed to reflect a psychological state of an employee in relation to the organization. Second, the three states are supposed to relate to the organization, reflecting the idea that organizational commitment is an attitude that has the organization as its object. Third, the three states can be present simultaneously. As a result, the total sum of the three states should be the entire total of organizational commitment. However, AC has been preferred as the core concept of organizational commitment by many authors and has been used as the sole indicator of commitment to the organization in many recent studies (Solinger et al.,
AC is the most reliable and strongly validated dimension of organizational commitment and has the greatest content and face validity.

There does exist some criticism of the three-component model that deals with two construct validity topics. First, CC generally correlates slightly negatively or not at all with AC, important affective or attitudinal correlates, and important work-related outcome variables, such as job performance and organizational citizenship behaviors. Second, NC has consistently been found to positively correlate very strongly with AC (Solinger et al., 2008). Various studies have suggested that it is hard to separate NC from AC empirically, which leads to the idea that the normative dimension is redundant. In reviewing the literature on organizational commitment, it is clear that AC is the most commonly studied of the three component model.

**Perceived Organizational Support/Perceived Supervisor Support**

Perceived organizational support (POS) has been one of the most widely researched workplace attitudes within the Industrial and Organizational Psychology literature. POS has been found to be related to many other attitudes and behaviors that exist in the organizational setting,
such as: organizational commitment, leader-member exchange (LMX), supervisor support, procedural justice, organizational citizenship behaviors, and job satisfaction. These relationships were examined by Wayne, Shore, Bommer, and Tetrick's (2002) study that explored the direct association between POS and LMX, as well as antecedents and consequences of each. They found a positive relationship between POS and LMX ($r = .29$), as well as a strong positive correlation between POS and organizational commitment ($r = .84$). In addition, the study presented evidence of supervisor support as being an antecedent of LMX, which ultimately had a positive relationship with POS. Therefore, POS is important to understanding many of the areas within the scope of Industrial and Organizational Psychology.

Shanock and Eisenberger (2006) describe POS as employees forming overall beliefs regarding how the organization values their efforts and cares for their well-being. The strength of these beliefs will affect many of the attitudes and behaviors previously noted. To further explain the theory of POS, employees apparently believe that the organization holds broad negative or positive views about them that involve both gratitude for their contributions and concern for their welfare
(Eisenberger, Stinglhamber, Vandenberghe, Sucharski, & Rhoades, 2002). The views or beliefs come from the individual based on treatment from supervisors, as well as organizational rewards and job conditions. Rhoades and Eisenberger (2002) provide examples of the strongest rewards and job conditions that influence POS: recognition, pay, promotions, job security, autonomy, role stressors, training, and organization size. These conditions are what strengthen or weaken an employee’s beliefs that their organization supports them.

Perceived supervisor support (PSS) can be understood as a "branch-out" from POS. Research suggests that employees differentiate support from the organization as a whole and from their immediate supervisor (Kottke & Sharafinski, 1988). Supervisors are agents of the organization and employees would view their supervisor’s favorable or unfavorable disposition towards them as representative of the organization’s support instead of independent actions of a particular individual (Eisenberger et al., 2002; Rhoades, Eisenberger, & Armeli, 2001). Both POS and PSS are employee beliefs and perceptions regarding how the organization values their work and efforts, but with PSS these beliefs and perceptions come about by way of the supervisor. Overall,
they are similar constructs that explain similar concepts. A study by Shanock and Eisenberger (2006) found that PSS is positively associated to POS and that through this association resulted in the employee reciprocating feelings to care about the organization's well-being. In addition, similarly to POS, Rhoades, Eisenberger, and Armeli (2001) explain that PSS has demonstrated to be a strong antecedent to affective commitment (AC).

Once understanding how POS and PSS can contribute to and help describe many attitudes within the workplace, we can now see how it may help show the relationships between the variables in the current study. POS and PSS are strongly related to organizational commitment and to other work related attitudes. Therefore, it should help to explain how PO fit and PS fit relate to commitment.

Hypothesis Development

While the person-environment (PE) fit literature has been vastly explored, there is always more to study or aspects of the research that can be viewed in a new light. Therefore, the present study continues to discover more about the effects of PE fit on important work related outcomes. Specifically, we studied the effects of person-supervisor (PS) fit simultaneously with
person-organization (PO) fit to discover how each influence commitment. When assessing their effects on commitment, affective commitment (AC) and normative commitment (NC) are the components of Allen and Meyer (1990) model that is of most interest for the present study. As explained prior, AC is the most valid and widely used of the various organizational commitment measures. NC has been demonstrated to possess a strong positive correlation to AC and the therefore we wanted to see if that holds true with the variables of this study.

Continuance commitment (CC) is negatively correlated with the other two forms of commitment and because past studies have already shown that AC (along with NC is some circumstances) is positively correlated with forms of PE fit it would be redundant and of little benefit to include it as a DV in this study (Irving, Coleman, & Cooper, 1997; Greguras & Diefendorff, 2009). Thus, this provided a complete comparison among the effects of PO fit and PS fit on commitment.

PO fit and PS fit were the chosen sub-dimensions of PE fit because there has been little research that compares the two forms of fit side-by-side. Furthermore, PO fit has been the most widely researched type of fit and its consequences are fairly well known. For example, PO
fit has a strong positive relationship with AC. On the other hand, PS fit is one of the least studied forms of fit and we wanted to see how it matched up to PO fit. Supervisors have been known to be an extension of the organization; and therefore, we examined how closely PS fit related to AC in relation to PO fit’s relation to AC. Although AC and NC have a strong relationship, PO fit and PS fit may also have different relationships to NC and the effects of the mediation on said relationship.

Although PS fit has received little attention in the realm of the PE fit literature, there have been some studies that expand on its importance. For example, a recent study by Greene-Shortridge and Wager (2011) found the relationship between satisfaction with pay and retention was partially mediated by PS fit. They also explain that employers who want to retain employees may have to put in more effort by fostering a good PS fit, or a stronger match between managers and subordinates. PO fit, on the other hand, has been a significant antecedent to affective commitment (AC) and turnover intentions, exemplified in the work by Arthur, Bell, Villado, and Doverspike (2006). In examining PO fit and PS fit, I was able to see if PS fit was a better predictor of either NC or AC or both over PO fit. The use of perceived
organizational support (POS) and perceived supervisor support (PSS) as mediators respectively to see if it helped to better explain the relationships between PO fit and PS fit with organizational commitment.

This study focused on perceived fit rather than objective fit because perceived fit is more proximal to attitudes and has larger effect sizes (Resick et al., 2007). In addition, fit in this study was best understood in the form of supplementary fit because we were looking at the value congruence between individuals and their organizations and their supervisors. Complementary fit would be more appropriate if person-job (PJ) fit were used as a predictor variable.

**Person-Organization Fit Perceptions and Perceived Organizational Support**

Shanock and Eisenberger (2006) explain POS as an overall belief developed by employees pertaining to the extent to which the organization appreciates them and cares about their interests. When an employee develops a perceived match with the organization, the employee will develop positive attitudes toward the organization. In accordance with the person-environment (PE) fit literature, person-organization (PO) fit is strongly related to attitudes focused on the organization.
Kristoff-Brown and Jansen (2007), as well as Cable and DeRue (2002) have found PO fit to have the greatest influence on perceived organizational support (POS) when compared to other forms of fit. Cable and DeRue's (2002) study set out to differentiate different forms of fit (PO fit: need-supplies (NS) fit, and demands-abilities (DA) fit) as separate constructs based on their consequences. They found that PO fit best predicts organizational attitudes, especially POS. Therefore, with the gained evidence, we hypothesized in this study PO fit would have a positive relationship with POS (see Figure 1).

**Hypothesis 1:** Perceived PO fit will positively relate to POS.

**Person Supervisor Fit Perceptions and Perceived Supervisor Support**

Based on the PE fit literature, we know very little about the effects PS fit has on PSS. Therefore, we supported the hypotheses with research from the POS and PSS, as well as the supervisor support literatures. When employees have a match with their supervisor, they will possess a positive work-relationship with one another. They will be compatible and share similar characteristics. Employees have stronger perceptions of organizational climate when they possessed high-value relationship with
their supervisors (Atwater & Dionne, 2007). In addition, when supervisors and subordinates share perceptions that the organization’s climate is positive, the subordinates may have greater reverence for the organization because of the interdependent and fluid relationship with their supervisor.

Leader-member exchange (LMX) theory suggests that the quality of exchange amongst subordinate and supervisor is based on the degree of emotional support and exchange of valued resources (Wayne, Shore, Bommer, & Tetrick, 2002). In other words, the one party will exchange valued levels of emotional support if the other warrants the same valued levels. In terms of PS fit and PSS, LMX explains that the stronger the match between employee and manager emotional support levels and exchange of said support, the more each member will perceive support from the other. This is also supported by the norm of reciprocity, which explains that people that are treated favorably by others will feel an obligation to respond in a positive manner or return the favorable treatment (Wayne et al., 2002).

Rhoades and Eisenberger (2002) explain that since supervisors act as agents to the organization, the employees who receive favorable treatment from immediate supervisors will not only possess high PSS, but also have
high POS. Shanock and Eisenberger's (2006) study surveyed full-time retail employees and supervisors to examine the relationships between the supervisors’ POS and the employees’ POS and their perceptions of support from the supervisors. They found that perceptions of supervisors’ support have a positive relationship with subordinates’ POS. In addition, Eisenberger, Stinglhamber, Vandenberghe, Sucharski, and Rhoades (2002) conducted a study that suggested supervisors contribute to subordinate POS and job retention, to the degree they are identified with the organization. Specifically, employees in the study appeared to infer POS from their perceived supervisor support based on their perceptions of their supervisors’ position in the organization, leading to reduced turnover intentions. High levels of PSS translate into high POS and similar outcomes. Because employees who perceive their supervisors as supportive are more likely to have fewer thoughts of turnover, with relation to organizational attitudes it was predicted that PS fit would be positively related to PSS (see Figure 1).

Hypothesis 2: Perceived PS fit will positively relate to PSS.
Perceived Organizational Support and Commitment

Perceived organizational support (POS) influences various organizational attitudes. One organizational attitude that it strongly influences is affective commitment (AC). Many researchers have studied this relationship. Wayne, Shore, Bommer, and Tetrick (2002), for example, researched treatment rewards and outcomes of POS. In their results, they found a correlation of .84 between POS and AC. To add to the previous researchers, Rhoades, Eisenberger, and Armeli's (2001) study found POS to be an antecedent to AC. Their results demonstrated that POS should increase AC due to social identity by way of organizational membership, which included: needs for esteem, approval, and affiliation. To further express; the obligation to exchange caring for caring should enhance employees' AC to the personified organization.

In a study in 2002, Rhoades and Eisenberger found that one of the strongest consequences of POS to be AC, when compared with other work-related attitudes. They found an average weighted correlation of .65 between POS and AC. POS was also a promising consequence for other attitudes related to AC: an average weighted correlation of .59 with desire to remain with the organization and an average weighted correlation of -.45 with turnover.
intentions were found. Therefore, with evidence that POS results in a felt duty to concern oneself about the organization's welfare and assist it in reaching its objectives, I expected POS to be positively associated with AC (see Figure 1).

Hypothesis 3a: Perceived POS will have a positive relationship with AC.

In addition, the present study assessed a more complete level of organizational commitment. In order to do so, NC was also examined through the mediation of POS as well. NC's inclusion was to test if it was still highly similar to AC with the current independent variables, and for this hypothesis the independent variable is POS. While NC is related to AC, I expected POS to have a positive relationship with NC. (see Figure 1).

Hypothesis 3b: Perceived POS will have a positive relationship with NC.

Perceived Supervisor Support and Commitment

Perceived support, or match of exchanges between employee and supervisor, has been found to positively relate with work attitudes, such as commitment. Research by Wayne, Shore, Bommer, and Tetrick (2001) on leader-member exchange (LMX) theory, found evidence for individuals who are treated in a positive light will
perceive an obligation to return positive behavior back to the supervisor and ultimately the organization. Perceived support actually acted as a mediator between LMX and organizational commitment within their study. This demonstrates evidence that employees treat the fulfillment of the exchange relationship with their superior as a basis to form their work attitudes.

Meyer and Allen (1997) have found that along with organizational rewards and procedural justice, supervisor support is a strong predictor of AC. When the employee perceives support from their supervisor, they will respond with positive obligatory feelings toward their supervisor. Rhoades, Eisenberger, and Armeli (2001) explain that perceived support will increase an individual's level of AC by fulfilling needs of esteem and affiliation. The fulfillment of sociemotional needs will create strong positive feelings by the employee towards their supervisor and towards their organization. With evidence supporting PSS as an antecedent to AC, I predicted PSS to be positively associated with AC (see Figure 1).

**Hypothesis 4a:** Perceived PSS will have a positive relationship with AC.

NC has been found to relate to AC, and it would be of interest to explore the relationship further in terms of
their relationships to PSS. Irving, Coleman, and Cooper (1997) explain through their research that AC and NC are positively associated in terms of their consequences. Hoping to cover a more extensive and complete relationship of PSS with organizational commitment, it will be beneficial to add NC to AC. Therefore, I expected PSS to positively relate to NC (see Figure 1).

*Hypothesis 4b:* Perceived PSS will have a positive relationship with NC.

**Linking Person-Organization Fit Perceptions Directly to Organizational Commitment**

The PE fit literature has explored outcomes of work-related attitudes; one of the more frequently examined of these attitudes is affective commitment (AC). Perceptions of PO fit have often been explained as one of the antecedents to AC. Gregarus and Diefendorff (2009) hypothesized model that incorporated the aspects of PO fit, person-group (PG) fit, and demands-abilities (DA) fit on AC by way of a mediation of self-determination theory (SDT). SDT explains that individuals possess three basic psychological needs: needs for autonomy, need for competence, and a need for relatedness. Gregarus and Diefendorff’s (2009) hypotheses towards PO fit were supported, in that PO fit related to all three
psychological needs. In addition, their study also confirmed the hypotheses of the three psychological needs relating to AC. Therefore, by way of SDT, PO fit relates to AC. The study also looked at PO fit's direct relationship with AC. This hypothesis was also supported in the study. In fact, when compared to the direct effects of PG fit and DA fit, PO fit's relationship was much stronger with a correlation of .40; while PG fit and DA fit had correlations of .03 and .27 respectively.

Arthur, Bell, Villado, and Doverspike (2006) explain that PO fit is predicted on the basis of the likeness between an organization and the individual member's values, interests, beliefs, and needs are related to the outcome of interest. Therefore, the theory of PO fit describes congruence or a match that exists among the individual and the organization. In comparison, AC is formed in part by an individual's goals and values equal to those of the organization. This shows that the two theories, PO fit and AC, explain similar patterns in one's perceptions and attitudes. In addition, based on Arthur et al. (2006), attitudinal consequences (job satisfaction, organizational commitment, and turnover intentions) have been the most commonly used criteria in PO fit research. With the commonality of PO fit being paired with AC, and
the similarity that exists within each of the two theories, I predicted PO fit to be positively related to AC (see Figure 1).

**Hypothesis 5a:** Perceived PO fit will positively relate to AC.

It was also important to examine NC’s relationship with PO fit. Arthur et al. (2006) explain that PO fit is commonly paired with organizational commitment as a whole; and therefore, this study also assessed NC to use a more complete examination of organizational commitment. Similarly to POS’s relationship with AC, I predicted a positive relationship between PO fit and NC. (see Figure 1).

**Hypothesis 5b:** Perceived PO fit will positively relate to NC.

**Linking Person Supervisor Fit Perceptions Directly to Organizational Commitment**

Based on the literature, fair treatment from supervisor to subordinate has displayed positive outcomes. Rhoades, Eisenberger, and Armeli (2001) conducted a study examining the relationships of procedural justice and supervisor support on AC. The outcomes revealed that both procedural justice and supervisor support formed strong positive associations with AC. Therefore, in interest for
the present study, Rhoades et al. (2001) have shown that strong support from a supervisor will have positive effects on the subordinate's level of AC. To further illustrate, organizational support theory dictates that employees return positive treatment with higher performance and higher commitment. In relating supervisor support with PS fit, I predicted PS fit to be positively related to AC (see Figure 1).

Hypothesis 6a: Perceived PS fit will positively relate to AC.

In addition to AC, Meierhans, Rietmann, and Jonas (2008) agree that NC is a related to fair and supportive leadership behaviors. Their study looked to assess how fair leadership behaviors relate to organizational citizenship behaviors (OCB's) with a mediation of organizational commitment. Therefore, to further explore organizational commitment in a more complete fashion, I predicted PS fit to be positively related to NC (see Figure 1).

Hypothesis 6b: Perceived PS fit will positively relate to NC.
Mediating Effects of Perceived Organizational Support on Person-Organization Fit and Organizational Commitment

Findings suggest a positive relationship between PO fit and POS. As discussed for hypothesis 1, researchers such as Cable and DeRue (2002) discovered PO fit to have the strongest relationship to POS when it is being compared to other types of PE fit. A positive match between an employee and their organization will lead to positive perceptions of support by the organization. In addition, Greguras and Diefendorff (2009) conducted a study which indicated PO fit has a strong influence on AC. To continue, Shanock and Eisenberger's (2006) study revealed that POS has a strong positive relationship with AC as well; which is common in the POS literature.

Therefore, while the literature displays positive correlations between PO fit and POS, PO fit and AC, as well as POS and AC, I predicted POS will provide a better explanation for the relationship between PO fit and AC.

Hypothesis 7a: POS will mediate the relationship between perceptions of PO fit and AC.

Although AC has been the more widely used form of commitment, it is important for this study to assess NC's relationship with PO fit when a mediator is involved. NC typically has a similar relationship to attitudinal...
variables as AC, and that is why AC receives the stronger focus. To delve more into NC, based on research by O’Reilly III, Chatman, and Caldwell (1991), PO fit has a positive correlation of .25 with NC. Therefore, PO fit relates to NC; however, a mediation of POS may provide more explanation into the relationship. Furthermore, with POS having a strong relationship with AC, it will have a positive relationship with NC as well. I predict POS to mediate the relationship between POS and NC.

Hypothesis 7b: POS will mediate the relationship between perceptions of PO fit and NC.

Mediating Effects of Perceived Supervisor Support on Person Supervisor Fit and Organizational Commitment

Employees’ perceptions of fit with their supervisors can explain levels of other workplace attitudes. For instance, supervisors serve as representatives of the organization; therefore, with positive perceptions of their supervisor employees will form positive attitude towards their organization. Eisenberger et al. (2002) demonstrated that supervisors aid to employee POS through first establishing PSS, and towards attitudes towards job retention. Positive perceptions of supervisor fit will lead to positive perceptions of support by the organization. In addition, PSS should increase AC by
fulfilling such socio-emotional needs as affiliation and emotional support (Rhoades & Eisenberger, 2002). PSS should then contribute to employees' sense of purpose and meaning. To add, supervisor support has been explained to have a positive relationship with AC as well. Specifically, through a mediation of POS, Hutchison (1997) found reliable evidence to the relationship between supervisor support and AC. There was an association to AC with measures of caring and supportive treatment by subordinates' immediate supervisor. These measures of association included leader consideration and high-quality leader-member exchanges. In other words, favorable treatment from the supervisors positively relates to work behaviors and attitudes. With this research by Hutchison (1997) and evidence that PSS relates to AC and PS fit relates to PSS, I predicted PSS to mediate the relationship between PS fit and POS.

*Hypothesis 8a:* PSS will mediate the relationship between perceptions of PS fit and AC.

Explained earlier for hypothesis 5b, Meierhans et al. (2008) explained that NC relates to just and supportive leadership behaviors. In addition, with PSS's strong association with AC, it should also relate to NC. PSS as a mediator may show new insight to the relationship of PS
fit and NC. I predicted PSS to have a mediating effect on the relationship among PS fit and NC.

*Hypothesis 8b:* POS will mediate the relationship between perceptions of PS fit and NC.
CHAPTER TWO

METHOD

Participants

The sample was comprised of 224 individuals. All participants were 18 years of age or older, with an average age of 24.8, and had been currently employed for their organization/supervisor for at least 6 months. A large portion of the participants had been employed for less than two years. Participants who had work for their employer for more than 6 months, but less than 1 year was comprised of 22.3%. Whereas, participants employed by their employer for more than 1 year, but less than 2 years was comprised of 20.1%. The majority of participants, at 72.2%, were first level non-supervisory employees. The participants were made up of 86.6% women and 12.9% men. Although participant consisted of a range of different ethnic backgrounds, Hispanic/Latino and Caucasian were highly represented at 45.1% and 34.4% respectively. In order to obtain the desired sample size, participants were recruited via email and the CSUSB Sona-Systems research credit website to complete a survey at www.qualtrics.com. All participation was voluntary. (See Table C for
frequencies and descriptive statistics for the demographic items.)

Measures

*Demographics* included age, gender, ethnicity, length of current employment, job title, and current level of employment. Ethnicity and current level of employment had an "other" selection option that allowed respondents to provide answers that were not available within the answer options. Age and job title were open-ended questions. See Appendix A for all items on this scale.

Responses to person-organization (PO) fit and person-supervisor (PS) fit items were made on a 5-point Likert-type scale where 1 = not at all and 5 = completely. Responses to perceived organizational support (POS), affective commitment (AC), normative commitment (NC), and continuance commitment (CC) were made on a 7-point Likert-type scale where 1 = *strongly disagree* and 7 = *strongly agree*.

PO fit was measured with Cable and Judge’s (1996) three-item scale (α = .87). For the present study, the alpha reliability for the PO fit scale was .876. Perceived PO fit correlated positively with employee perceptions of organizational commitment, their person-job fit, job
satisfaction, and willingness to recommend the organization to others. An example item is "My values match those of the current employees in this organization." See Appendix for all items on this scale.

PS fit was also be measured with Cable and Judge’s (1996) three-item scale (α = .87). For the present study, the alpha reliability for the PS fit scale was .817. In this instance, the word “organization” in the items was replaced with the word “supervisor.” An example item is “To what degree do you feel your values match or fit those of your supervisor?” See Appendix for all items on this scale.

POS was measured with eight items from Eisenberger, Huntington, Hutchinson, and Sowa’s (1986) original thirty six-item scale (α = .74 - .95). For the present study, the alpha reliability for the POS scale was .943. The eight-item scale followed the recommendations of Rhoades and Eisenberger (2002), in which they explain; the shorter version does not appear problematic because the original scale is unidimensional and has high internal reliability. The eight items were: 1, 3, 7, 9, 17, 21, 23, and 27. Sample items include “The organization values my contributions” and “The organization takes pride in my
accomplishments at work.” See Appendix for all items on this scale.

PSS was measured with the same eight-item scale by Eisenberger, Huntington, Hutchinson, and Sowa's (1986) (Ω = .74 - .95). For the present study, the alpha reliability for the PSS scale was .962. However, the word “organization” was replaced with “supervisor.” The eight items were: 1, 3, 7, 9, 17, 21, 23, and 27. A sample item is “my supervisor values my contributions.”

Affective Commitment (AC) was measured with Allen and Meyer's (1990) eight-item scale (Ω = .77 - .88). For the present study, the alpha reliability for the AC scale was .858. The items assessed the emotional attachment of employees to their organization. A sample item is “I would be very happy to spend the rest of my career with this organization.” See Appendix for all items on this scale.

Normative Commitment (NC) was measured with Allen and Meyer's (1990) eight-item scale (Ω = .65 - .86). For the present study, the alpha reliability for the NC scale was .704. The items assessed the felt obligation employees had to their organization. A sample item is “I was taught to believe in the value of remaining loyal to one organization.” See Appendix for all items on this scale.
Procedure

The data was collected by administering a survey via www.qualtrics.com. The survey assessed PO fit, PS fit, POS, AC, NC, and CC. Participants were mostly comprised of college students from California State University, San Bernardino (CSUSB). This group was initially targeted because of the ease of contacting them through university systems, such as the CSUSB Sona-Systems research credit website. Other participants were comprised by a list of colleagues and peers via email that included a link to the survey. These emailed participants were also asked to forward the survey link to other individuals that they knew were at least 18 years or older and had been employed by a single organization/supervisor for longer than a period of 6 months. (See Appendix C for a copy of the email). A debriefing message was presented to participants at the conclusion of the survey.
CHAPTER THREE

RESULTS

Before analyzing the hypotheses, the results were examined for missing data and outliers. Missing data was addressed by running frequencies for all variables. Of the 250 original participants, 26 did not complete the entire survey and were ultimately removed from the data set. Outliers were assessed by histograms and box plots at the item-level. Five items contained outliers; however, the comparisons of the trimmed means with the means indicated that the outliers were not detrimental to the results (Table A- Outliers: 5% Trimmed Means and Means). With no harmful outliers existing there was no need to delete any data due to outliers. Therefore, the final participant count totaled 224.

Normality of residuals was assessed by scatter plots, histograms, and residual plots. The residual plots indicated that all residuals were centered around zero. The scatter plots and histograms showed that the residuals are symmetric and there is no evidence of skewness ($z \leq \pm 3.3$). This indicates that the residuals are normal and no further transformations are required.
Testing Hypotheses 1 to 6

A bivariate correlation was used to assess whether person-organization (PO) fit was positively associated with perceived organizational support (POS). A significant positive correlation was found, $r = 0.63$, $p < 0.05$, between PO fit and POS. Therefore, hypothesis 1 was supported. A bivariate correlation was conducted to determine if person-supervisor (PS) fit was related to perceived supervisor support (PSS). A significant positive correlation was found, $r = 0.62$, $p < 0.05$, between PS fit and PSS, which supported hypothesis 2. Bivariate correlations were used to assess the relationships of POS with affective commitment (AC) (hypothesis 3a) and normative commitment (NC) (hypothesis 3b). A significant positive correlation was found between POS and AC, $r = 0.80$, $p < 0.05$. A significant positive correlation was also found between POS and NC, $r = 0.41$, $p < 0.05$. Therefore, both hypotheses 3a and 3b were supported.

Bivariate correlations were also used to determine the relationships of PSS with AC (hypothesis 4a) and NC (hypothesis 4b). A significant positive correlation was found between PSS and AC, $r = 0.69$, $p < 0.05$. A significant positive correlation was also discovered
between PSS and NC, \( r = 0.35, p < 0.05 \). Therefore, both hypotheses 4a and 4b were supported.

Bivariate correlations were conducted to assess the relationships of PO fit with AC (hypothesis 5a) and NC (hypothesis 5b). A significant positive correlation was found between PO fit and AC, \( r = 0.62, p < 0.05 \). A significant positive correlation was also uncovered for PO fit and NC, \( r = 0.41, p < 0.05 \). Therefore, both hypotheses 5a and 5b were supported.

Bivariate correlations were used to determine the relationships of PS fit with AC (hypothesis 6a) and NC (hypothesis 6b). A significant positive correlation was found between PS fit and AC, \( r = 0.55, p < 0.05 \). A significant positive correlation was also found between PS fit and NC, \( r = 0.31, p < 0.05 \). Therefore, both hypotheses 6a and 6b were supported.
Testing Hypotheses 7 and 8

Three hierarchical regressions were conducted to gather the appropriate values for the Sobel test equation \((a, sa, b, sb)\). The first regression for PO fit predicting POS displayed a positive linear relationship \((F(1, 222) = 144.74, p < 0.05)\). The second regression of POS predicting AC also showed a positive linear relationship \((F(1, 222) = 392.69, p < 0.05)\). The third regression also showed a positive linear relationship.
between POS and NC ($F(1, 222) = 45.26, p \leq 0.05$).

Hypothesis 7a used values $a$, $sa$, $b$, and $sb$ from the first and second regressions to compute the Sobel test that examines the mediation of POS on the relationship of PO fit and AC. The values were: $a = 2.48$, $sa = 0.21$, $b = 0.73$, and $sb = 0.04$. When these values were entered into the equation for the Sobel test ($z\text{-value} = \frac{a \times b}{\sqrt{b^2 \times sa^2 + a^2 \times sb^2}}$), significance for the mediation was found with a test statistic of 9.91, $p \leq 0.05$. By using the Preacher and Hayes (2004) SPSS procedure for estimating indirect effects in simple mediation models, we found an indirect effect of 1.53 with a 95% confidence interval of 1.20 to 1.87. Therefore hypothesis 7a was supported.

Hypothesis 7b used values $a$, $sa$, $b$, and $sb$ from the first and third regressions to compute the Sobel test that examines the mediation of POS on the relationship of PO fit and NC. The values were: $a = 2.48$, $sa = 0.21$, $b = 0.25$, and $sb = .04$. When these values were entered into the equation for the Sobel test ($z\text{-value} = \frac{a \times b}{\sqrt{b^2 \times sa^2 + a^2 \times sb^2}}$), significance for the mediation was found with a test statistic of 5.52, $p \leq 0.05$. Again, using the Preacher and Hayes (2004) SPSS procedure for estimating indirect effects in simple mediation models, an indirect
effect of .37 with a 95% confidence interval of 0.14 to 0.61 was obtained. Therefore hypothesis 7b was supported.

Three hierarchical regressions were administered to gather the appropriate values for the Sobel test equation \((a, sa, b, sb)\). The first regression of PS fit predicting PSS showed a positive linear relationship \((F(1, 222) = 136.24, \ p \leq 0.05)\). The second regression of PSS predicting AC displayed a positive linear relationship \((F(1, 222) = 198.16, \ p \leq 0.05)\). The third regression of PSS predicting NC also showed a positive linear relationship \((F(1, 222) = 30.45, \ p \leq 0.05)\). Hypothesis 8a used values \(a, sa, b, \text{ and } sb\) from the first and second regressions to use for the Sobel test that examines the mediation of PSS on the relationship of PS fit and AC. The values were: \(a = 2.54, \ sa = 0.22, \ b = 0.60, \text{ and } sb = 0.04\). When these values were entered into the equation for the Sobel test \((z-value = a*b/SQRT (b^2*sa^2+a^2*sb^2))\), significance for the mediation was found with a test statistic of 9.15, \(p \leq 0.05\). Using the Preacher and Hayes (2004) SPSS procedure for estimating indirect effects in simple mediation models, an indirect effect of 1.25 with a 95% confidence interval of 0.92 to 1.59 was found.

Therefore hypothesis 8a was supported.
Hypothesis 8b used values a, sa, b, and sb from the first and third regressions to use for the Sobel test that tests the mediation of PSS on the relationship of PO fit and NC. The values were: a = 2.54, sa = 0.22, b = 0.20, and sb = 0.04. When these values were entered into the equation for the Sobel test (z-value = a*b/SQRT (b^2*sa^2+a^2*sb^2)), significance for the mediation was found with a test statistic of 4.59, p ≤ 0.05. Using the Preacher and Hayes (2004) SPSS procedure for estimating indirect effects in simple mediation models, an indirect effect of .36 with a 95% confidence interval of 0.13 to 0.60 was found. Therefore hypothesis 8b was supported.
CHAPTER FOUR

DISCUSSION

Person-Environment (PE) fit is one of the most studied areas within the Industrial/Organizational Psychology literature. Early works by Schneider (1987) explained the attraction-selection-attrition (ASA) cycle and what it means for organizations. The ASA cycle gave way to PE fit research because it helped to develop the foundation which explains how individuals are drawn into an organization based upon values, how the organization notices the match between the individuals and the organization, and finally what it means to keep these individuals around. Later into the 21st century, researchers focused their attention on PE fit. For example, researchers such as Kristof et al. (2005) studied person-organization (PO) fit, person-job (PJ) fit, person-group (PG) fit, and person-supervisor (PS) fit. PO fit has been studied by many researchers, while PS fit has not seemed to garner as much attention. This study brought some fresh ideas into the PE fit realm in that PO fit and PS fit have not been studied as IVs within the same study before.
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Therefore, this research explored PO fit and PS and compared them in terms of their relationships to affective commitment (AC) and normative commitment (NC). The study investigated these relationships in two variations. First, the relationships of PO fit and PS fit with AC and NC directly were examined. Second, with mediations of perceived organizational support (POS) and perceived supervisor support (PSS), the study examined indirect effects of PO fit and PS fit on AC and NC. POS and PSS were the chosen mediators because perceiving support is an attitude that would be determined after assessing fit with the organization and supervisor. Employees differentiate support from both their direct supervisor and from the organization (Kottke & Sharafinski, 1988). This study found that PO fit was positively correlated with POS, AC, and NC, as did prior research (Greguras & Diefendorff, 2009). However, the study explored new relationships of PS fit with PSS, AC, and NC. In terms of these new relationships, the present research found (a) PS fit was an antecedent of PSS, (b) PSS was an antecedent to AC and NC, (c) PS fit was an antecedent to AC and NC directly, and (d) PSS as a mediator better explained the relationships of PS fit to AC and NC.
Prior to this study, past researchers had explained the powerful effects PO fit has on POS and organizational commitment. Therefore, one aim of this study was to explore the effects of PS fit on PSS and organizational commitment in comparison to PO fit. PS fit, in the PE fit literature, has been researched very rarely compared to PO fit, which is the most studied sub-form of PE fit. Even though I was able to find support for the relationships between PS fit with PSS, AC, and NC, there was no evidence that PS fit was a stronger predictor than PO fit. In fact, in alignment with past research, PO fit had stronger relationships than PS fit. However, both forms of fit had significant positive relationships with POS/PSS and organizational commitment, which does not provide much distinction of which is a stronger predictor.

This study provides important results to the area of organizational commitment. The results explain that perceived support is a strong antecedent to AC and NC. Regarding the PO fit and PS fit with AC and NC, POS and PSS indirectly impacted the relationships. PO fit and PS fit are precursors to POS and PSS. POS and PSS are strong antecedents of AC and NC. Therefore, perceived support acting indirectly creates stronger relationships than the direct relationships of PO fit and PS fit to AC and NC.
Hypotheses 1-6

PO fit predicted POS, indicating that the stronger employees fit with the organization the higher they perceived support from the organization. PO fit has been known to predict organizational attitudes; and therefore, this study demonstrated that perceived support from employees’ organizations is fostered from how well they fit in with the organization (Kristoff-Brown & Jansen, 2007). That is, when an individual feels a bond with their place of work, they are likely to feel support from the organization as a whole. PO fit has been known to have the largest influence on POS compared to other forms of PE fit (Cable & DeRue, 2002).

In the present study, PS fit predicted PSS, indicating that the stronger employees fit with their supervisor the higher the perceived support from them. Supervisors act as agents of the organization and the degree of perceived fit employees have with their supervisor will influence how strongly they perceive their supervisor will support (Rhoades & Eisenberger, 2002). When individuals have a connection with their supervisor, they will believe that their supervisor will show them support. Also, the stronger an employee perceives support from their supervisor the lower their turnover intentions.
Job retention is greater when the employee has a higher degree of identification with the organization (Eisenberger et al., 2002).

POS also predicted both AC and NC. This explained that when employees believe that their organization supports them, their sense of commitment to the organization is stronger. POS increases employee commitment due to discovering a social identity through membership with the organization (Eisenberger & Armeli, 2001). PSS also predicted both AC and NC. Therefore, when an employee perceived support from their supervisor, they ultimately expressed higher commitment to the supervisor (Meyer & Allen, 1997, p. 45). PO fit predicted both AC and NC, although it had a stronger association with AC. This presented the evidence that the stronger an employee's fit is with their organization the stronger their emotional attachment to the organization, and to a lesser level, the stronger their attachment to the organization based on reciprocal attachment. PO fit explained that the employee's value congruence with the organization relates to the employee forming goals and values that are equivalent to those of the organization, which explain the employee's organizational commitment (Arthur et al., 2006).
PS fit predicted both AC and NC, and similarly to PO fit, it had a more powerful association with AC than NC. Therefore, the more similarity between the employee and their supervisor the more committed they become to their supervisor. Strong support displayed from a superior created positive effects on the employee’s level of commitment (Rhoades et al., 2001). Strong fit to an employee’s supervisor has implications for their feelings of obligation to their supervisor.

Hypotheses 7-8

In the present study, POS helped to describe the relationship of PO fit with AC and NC by indirectly impacting the relationship. The indirect effect of POS on the relationship of PO fit and AC was on the sizable with an effect size of 1.53. Thus, POS did indirectly impact PO fit’s relationship with AC. The indirect effect of POS on the relationship of PO fit with NC was considerably smaller, with an effect size of .38.

PO fit positively predicted POS; whereas, an employee’s strong sense of fit to the organization resulted in the employee perceiving support from the organization. Thusly, when an employee perceives support from the organization, their emotional attachment and
obligatory attachment to the organization increases. POS provided a link between PO fit and organizational commitment by strengthening relationship.

Achieving perceived support from feelings of fitting in with the organization showed a way to achieve employee commitment. The stronger an employee’s fit with the organization they will ultimately perceive more support from the organization. AC and NC are already consequences of both PO fit and POS; therefore, two predictors of organizational commitment working together will be even more powerful in predicting AC and NC than either alone. The more positive feelings and attitude the employee has towards the organization the more committed they will feel towards the organization.

In addition, PSS aided in the explanation of the relationship of PS fit with AC and NC by impacting it indirectly. The indirect effect of PSS on the relationship of PS fit and AC was again sizable with an effect size of 1.25. Thus, PSS did indirectly impact PS fit’s relationship with AC. The indirect effect of PSS on the relationship of PS fit with NC was somewhat smaller, with an effect size of .36.

PS fit positively predicted PSS; therefore, when an employee has a strong feeling of fit with their supervisor
they will ultimately perceive that their supervisor supports them. To further explain, when an employee perceives support from their supervisor, their emotional attachment and obligatory attachment to their supervisor increases. PSS explained the connection between PS fit and organizational commitment by strengthening the relationship.

PSS working as a combined predictor of organizational commitment with PS fit demonstrated positive results. PS fit is a precursor to PSS. Employees who feel a sense of fit with their supervisor will perceive that their supervisor supports them in their job and emotionally. The feeling of fit with and support of a supervisor will create feelings of attachment towards that supervisor. Although PS fit and PSS predict AC and NC independently, together they will help to explain organizational commitment even better. Two positive predictors of organizational commitment interacting with each other explains the strength of the relationship the employee has with their supervisor. PSS connects PS fit with AC and NC by acting on AC and NC with the strength of both itself as well as PS fit.
Practical Implications

A high degree of fit between employees and their place of work is important to both themselves and their organization. For the organization, it means the employees will have positive work attitudes that will foster strong work ethic and effectiveness. Such a work attitude is organizational commitment. Organizations want their employees to be committed because they will work harder and more effectively if they feel a positive connection to their organization. For the employee, having a match of goals and values with their organization will increase their energy and effort that they put into their work.

Retention is a key concept within the business world. Employers are constantly searching to find more methods of retaining their top performing employees. The results from this study can help organizations understand that they should seek out employees who appear to fit in with the organizational goals and attitudes. In addition, identifying these individuals who are currently in the organization will assist management in further nurturing the similar attitudes and goals to develop a stronger sense of commitment by these employees. Stronger commitment levels by the employees to the organization
will most likely encourage them to remain at the
organization.

The results from this study explain how perceived
support is important in achieving organizational
commitment. Organizations can use this information to
enhance the effects of PO fit and PS fit. These findings
suggest that organizations may benefit from focusing on
creating a supportive environment, both from the
organization as well as the side of the supervisor.
Supervisors who fostered perceived support within their
employees may cause their employees develop stronger
levels of emotional attachment to the organization
(Rhoades et al., 2001). Supervisors can achieve this by
providing employees with an open-door policy. Creating a
relationship where the employee feels involved and part of
a positive working relationship may help develop a sense
of support and togetherness. Giving employees the chance
to provide insight and thoughts in the decision-making
process may also assist supervisors in gaining that
support from their employees.

In addition, organizations will want to foster
perceived notions that its employees feel it supports
them. The organization can develop support by acting
through its supervisors. Supervisors act as agents for the
organization, and when they treat employees favorably, employees are increasingly likely to develop positive attitudes towards both the supervisor and the organization (Rhoades & Eisenberger, 2002). Other than acting through supervisors, organization as an entity will want to develop perceived feelings of support from its employees. This can be done by enacting help forums, such as: therapy groups, career advancement workshops, and counseling. Employee-help services such as these will show employees that the organization supports them and cares for their well-being. The supportive environment will lead to positive attitudes by employees towards their work organization, such as organizational commitment. Thusly, both parties will benefit from high employees perceiving support. POS and PSS showed a high correlation with AC and NC. Therefore, the existence of perceived support by the employee will most likely create stronger attachment to the organization.

Theoretical Implications

Although the topic of PE fit has been widely researched, the results from this study provide some interesting new ways to look at these concepts. This study introduced some new comparisons among the PE fit sub-fits.
The side-by-side comparisons of PO fit and PS fit on two dimensions of organizational commitment lays a new path in the literature. PO fit has long been determined the best predictor of affective commitment (AC) of all other forms of sub-fit except for PS fit. Although PO fit had a slightly stronger relationship with AC and NC than PS fit had in this study, there was not enough evidence to truly support that it is superior to PS fit in predicting organizational commitment.

The significance of the mediations provided evidence to an under researched area of Industrial/Organizational Psychology. The effects of PO fit and PS fit with the assistance of POS and PSS respectively, are associated with positive work attitudes, such as organizational commitment. Comparing PE fit sub-dimensions with work attitudes can be enhanced or explained further through mediation of perceived support levels from organizations and supervisors. The present study found that PSS is as powerful a variable as POS. PSS is typically seen as a subset or version of POS. However, this study helped to explain that PSS has as strong a correlation with supervisor-related variables as POS has with organizational-related variables. Thus, PSS can be researched on its own, independent from POS.
Perceived support acts a powerful agent in predicting employee levels of organizational commitment. POS and PSS create more avenues for PO fit and PS fit to explain organizational commitment. Not only do PO fit and PS fit predict AC and NC, but so do POS and PSS. In fact, perceived support had stronger relationships with organizational commitment than did fit. This is in accordance with LMX theory (Wayne et al., 2002). LMX has a positive association with POS and with organizational commitment. Therefore, this provides background to explaining that POS will have a strong relationship with organizational commitment. Perceived support demonstrated that it helps explain the relationships of PO fit and PS fit with AC and NC. POS and PSS provide more options and attitudes to explore that generate the wanted attitudinal outcome of organizational commitment. Therefore, perceived support is an important mediator to the relationships between PO fit and PS fit with organizational commitment.

Future Research

It would be of interest to the field of Industrial/Organizational psychology to compare PS fit’s comparability to PO fit in terms of outcomes that PO fit has already been proven to predict. Their relationships
with the consequences in this study are relatively comparable and may demonstrate some interesting results on different consequences. For example, organizational citizenship behaviors (OCBs) have been known to positively relate to positive organizational attitudes and to perceived support from higher levels within the organization (Wayne et al., 2002). Therefore, it may further extend the research to examine whether PS fit or PO fit will better predict OCBs. Aside from its comparisons with PO fit, PS fit is not widely researched within the PE fit literature. Therefore, this study opens more doors to placing emphasis on PS fit. Specifically, PS fit should be researched further in its relationship with continuance commitment (CC). Out of interest, CC was tested ad hoc and the only significantly positive relationship it had was with PS fit, r = .16, p < .05, which was much lower than NC or AC.

Researchers may also be interested in testing to see if PS fit can be determined during an interview. The supervisor is typically the individual who interviews incoming subordinates. It would be practical for both the interviewee as well as the supervisor if the possible level of the interviewee’s PS fit can be assessed during the interview process. In order to assess PS fit at such
an early stage in the relationship, surveys may be implemented as part of the interview process. These surveys can be developed to assess characteristics of the interviewee, such as: personality, work ethics, and goal setting. These qualities can then be compared to those of the interviewer, and the interviewer would be able to come to some conclusion to whether or not the interviewee will match with them in some form or another. If PS fit can affect the relationship that early, then it would be interesting to see the probability that once hired the employee will become committed and demonstrate positive work efforts and attitudes.

Limitations

One potential limitation of the present study could be common method variance. Common method variance refers to variance that is attributable to the measurement method rather than the constructs the measures represent (Podsakoff, Mackenzie, Lee, & Podsakoff, 2003). One potential cause was that items may have been written in a way that reflected attitudes, behaviors, or perceptions that were socially desirable. Another cause could have been related to the length of the scales. The scales were not necessarily very long and responses to previous items
in short scales are more readily accessible in working memory. When previous responses are in working memory, they may be recalled while responding to other items. However, the alphas for the scales were consistent, and this working memory issues is just a potential limitation and nothing more (Spector, 1987). One more cause stems from the fact that items from different constructs were strung together and this may decrease intraconstruct correlations while increasing interconstruct correlations (Podsakoff et al., 2003).

Another potential limitation to mention about this study is the fact that the majority of participants were college students. Typically, college students do not hold permanent-level positions and are working because they have to earn money. A student's decision to choose a specific part-time job is not necessarily based on enjoyment and this may alter their impression of their supervisor and their organization. Furthermore, the students were completing the survey for extra credit for their classes. This reasoning may encourage them to complete the survey hastily and carelessly with the intentions to just finish. More accurate data may be collected if the participant pool had varied more to include a larger amount of individuals with career-level
positions. The perceptions and work attitudes of career-level participants could possibly be more representative of the working population as a whole.
These findings contribute to a growing field of research that takes a multidimensional approach to studying PE fit. In this study, I have explained the importance of only considering sub-types of PE fit, but also incorporating perceived support into determining attitudinal variables. Specifically, I was able to demonstrate that the predictions of work attitudes, such as AC and NC, can be strongly influenced by PO fit and PS fit with a mediating effect of POS and PSS respectively. The procedures used in this study to explore PO fit and PS fit relationships with the mediating variables of POS and PSS could be applied to other sub-types of PE fit to test further attitudinal relationships.

This study provided a model to explain how weak employee commitment is a precursor to turnover by demonstrating the role of POS and PSS in the PO fit and PS fit relationships. Employers should consider applying knowledge of employee fit and perceptions of supportive behavior to create environments in which their high performing employees will wish to remain working in.
Therefore, it is important when employees fit in and feel strongly towards remaining with their organization.
APPENDIX A

DEMOGRAPHIC MEASURES AND SCALES
Demographic Measures and Scales

Demographic Measures

1. What is your gender?
   a. Male
   b. Female

2. What is your age? ______

3. What is your race/ethnicity?
   a. Hispanic or Latino
   b. American Indian or Alaskan Native
   c. Non-Latino Black or African American
   d. Caucasian
   e. Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander
   f. Asian
   g. Other _____________

4. What is your job Title? ______

5. What is the length of your current employment?
   a. 6 months to 1 year
   b. 1 year to 2 years
   c. 2 years to 3 years
   d. 3 years to 4 years
   e. 4 years to 5 years
   f. 5 years or more

6. What is your current level within the organization?
   a. Nonsupervisory Employee
   b. First Level Supervisor
   c. Middle Management
   d. Top Management
   e. Executive
   f. Other

Developed by Steven Crocker
PO Fit Survey

Responses are gathered on a 5-point Likert scale where 1 = not at all and 5 = completely.

PO Fit items:

1. To what degree do you feel your values “match” or fit this organization and the current employees in this organization?

2. My values match those of the current employees in this organization.

3. Do you think the values and “personality” of this organization reflect your own values and personality?

PS Fit Survey

Responses are gathered on a 5-point Likert scale where 1 = not at all and 5 = completely.

PS Fit items:

1. To what degree do you feel your values “match” or fit those of your supervisor?

2. My values match those of other employees under my supervisor’s watch.

3. Do you think the values and “personality” of your supervisor reflect your own values and personality?

POS Survey

Responses are gather on a 7-point Likert type scale where 1 = strongly disagree and 7 = strongly agree.

*R denotes a reverse scored item

POS items:

1. The organization values my contribution to its well-being.
3. The organization fails to appreciate any extra effort from me. (R)
7. The organization would ignore any complaint from me. (R)
9. The organization really cares about my well-being.
17. Even if I did the best job possible, the organization would fail to notice. (R)
21. The organization cares about my general satisfaction at work.
23. The organization shows very little concern for me. (R)
27. The organization takes pride in my accomplishments at work.

PSS Survey

Responses are gathered on a 7-point Likert type scale where 1 = strongly disagree and 7 = strongly agree.

*R denotes a reverse scored item

PSS items

1. My supervisor values my contribution to its well-being.
3. My supervisor fails to appreciate any extra effort from me. (R)
7. My supervisor would ignore any complaint from me. (R)
9. My supervisor really cares about my well-being.
17. Even if I did the best job possible, my supervisor would fail to notice. (R)
21. My supervisor cares about my general satisfaction at work.
23. My supervisor shows very little concern for me. (R)
27. My supervisor takes pride in my accomplishments at work.

Affective Commitment Survey

Responses are gather on a 7-point Likert type scale where 1 = strongly disagree and 7 = strongly agree.

*R denotes a reverse scored item

AC items:

1. I would be very happy to spend the rest of my career with this organization.
2. I enjoy discussing my organization with people outside of it.
3. I really feel as if this organization’s problems are my own.
4. I think that I could easily become as attached to another organization as I am to this one.
5. I do not feel like “part of the family” at my organization. (R)
6. I do not feel “emotionally attached” to this organization. (R)
7. This organization has a great deal of personal meaning for me.
8. I do not feel a strong sense of belonging to my organization. (R)

Normative Commitment Survey

Responses are gather on a 7-point Likert type scale where 1 = strongly disagree and 7 = strongly agree.

*R denotes a reverse scored item

NC items:

1. I think that people these days move from company to company too often.

2. I do not believe that a person must always be loyal to his or her organization. (R)

3. Jumping from organization to organization does not seem at all unethical to me. (R)

4. One of the major reasons I continue to work for this organization is that I believe that loyalty is important and therefore feel a sense of moral obligation to remain.

5. If I got another offer for a better job elsewhere I would not feel it was right to leave my organization.

6. I was taught to believe in the value of remaining loyal to one organization.

7. Things were better in the days when people stayed with one organization for most of their careers.

8. I do not think that wanting to be a “company man” or “company woman” is sensible anymore. (R)

Continuance Commitment Survey:

Responses are gathered on a 7-point Likert type scale where 1 = strongly disagree and 7 = strongly agree.

*R denotes a reverse scored item

CC items:

1. I am not afraid of what might happen if I quit my job without having another one lined up. (R)

2. It would be very hard for me to leave my organization right now, even if I wanted to.

3. Too much in my life would be disrupted if I decided I wanted to leave my organization now.

4. It wouldn’t be too costly for me to leave my organization right now. (R)

5. Right now staying with my organization is a matter of necessity as much as desire.

6. I feel that I have too few options to consider leaving this organization.

7. One of the few serious consequences of leaving this organization would be the scarcity of available alternatives.

8. 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.

APPENDIX B

INFORMED CONSENT, DEBRIEFING STATEMENT,

AND SURVEY
Informed Consent, Debriefing Statement, and Survey

Informed Consent

This study in which you are being invited to participate is designed to explore organizational attitudes. The study is being conducted by Steven Crocker under the supervision of Dr. Kenneth Shultz. The University requires that you give your consent before participating in this study.

In this study you will be asked to answer questions that assess various attitudes that you hold towards your work-life. The entire survey should take approximately 15 minutes to complete. Although no identifying information will be collected on the survey itself, your computer may leave a trace to your identity because the information is submitted electronically. However, participant anonymity will exist between my research team and myself to avoid any biases or risks to you when analyzing the data by deleting this information before any analyses are conducted. Summary results of this study will be available from Dr. Shultz (909-537-5484) after December 31, 2011.

Your participation in this study is completely voluntary. You are free not to answer any questions and withdraw at any time during the survey. This study involves no risks beyond those routinely encountered in daily life. Although there are no direct benefits of this study, if you are a CSUSB student, you may receive 1 unit of extra credit in a selected Psychology class at your instructor’s discretion.

If you have any questions or concerns about this study, please feel free to contact Professor Kenneth Shultz at (909) 537-5484.

By entering the date in the box below, I acknowledge that I have been informed of, and that I understand, the nature and purpose of this study, that I freely consent to participate, and that at the conclusion of the study, I may ask for additional explanation regarding the study. I also acknowledge that I am at least 18 years of age.
Survey

Note: This survey was created and organized by the author

1. What is your gender?
   a. Male
   b. Female

2. What is your age? ______

3. What is your race/ethnicity?
   a. Hispanic or Latino
   b. American Indian or Alaskan Native
   c. Non-Latino Black or African American
   d. Caucasian
   e. Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander
   f. Asian
   g. Other _____________

4. What is your job Title? ______

5. What is the length of your current employment?
   a. 6 months to 1 year
   b. 1 year to 2 years
   c. 2 years to 3 years
   d. 3 years to 4 years
   e. 4 years to 5 years
   f. 5 years or more

6. What is your current level within the organization?
   a. Nonsupervisory Employee
   b. First Level Supervisor
   c. Middle Management
   d. Top Management
   e. Executive
   f. Other
7. Please respond to the following with how well you match the following statements. With “Not at all” representing no match and “completely” representing a complete match. 1 = Not at all, 2 = Disagree, 3 = Neutral, 4 = Agree, 5 = Completely.

- To what degree do you feel your values “match” or fit your organization and the current employees in this organization?
- My values match those of the current employees in my organization.
- Do you think the values and “personality” of your organization reflect your own values and personality?
- To what degree do you feel your values “match” or fit those of your supervisor?
- My values match those of other employees under my supervisor’s watch.
- Do you think the values and “personality” of your supervisor reflect your own values and personality?

8. Please respond with the strength to which you agree or disagree with each of the following statements. 1 = Strongly Disagree, Disagree, 3 = Somewhat Disagree, 4 = Neither Agree or Disagree, 5 = Somewhat Agree, 6 = Agree, 7 = Strongly Agree.

- My organization values my contribution to its well-being.
- My organization fails to appreciate any extra effort from me.
- My organization would ignore any complaint from me.
- My organization really cares about my well-being.
- Even if I did the best job possible, my organization would fail to notice.
- My organization cares about my general satisfaction at work.
- My organization shows very little concern for me.
- My organization takes pride in my accomplishments at work.
- My supervisor values my contribution to its well-being.
- My supervisor fails to appreciate any extra effort from me.
- My supervisor would ignore any complaint from me.
- My supervisor really cares about my well-being.
- Even if I did the best job possible, my supervisor would fail to notice.
- My supervisor cares about my general satisfaction at work.
- My supervisor shows very little concern for me.
- My supervisor takes pride in my accomplishments at work.
9. Please respond with the strength to which you agree or disagree with each of the following statements. 1 = Strongly Disagree, Disagree, 3 = Somewhat Disagree, 4 = Neither Agree or Disagree, 5 = Somewhat Agree, 6 = Agree, 7 = Strongly Agree.
   - I would be very happy to spend the rest of my career with this organization.
   - I enjoy discussing my organization with people outside of it.
   - I really feel as if my organization's problems are my own.
   - I think that I could easily become as attached to another organization as I am to this one.
   - I do not feel like "part of the family" at my organization.
   - I do not feel "emotionally attached" to my organization.
   - This organization has a great deal of personal meaning for me.
   - I do not feel a strong sense of belonging to my organization.

10. Please respond with the strength to which you agree or disagree with each of the following statements. 1 = Strongly Disagree, Disagree, 3 = Somewhat Disagree, 4 = Neither Agree or Disagree, 5 = Somewhat Agree, 6 = Agree, 7 = Strongly Agree.
   - I think that people these days move from company to company too often.
   - I do not believe that a person must always be loyal to his or her organization.
   - Jumping from organization to organization does not seem at all unethical to me.
   - One of the major reasons I continue to work for my organization is that I believe that loyalty is important and therefore feel a sense of moral obligation to remain.
   - If I got another offer for a better job elsewhere I would not feel it was right to leave my organization.
   - I was taught to believe in the value of remaining loyal to one organization.
   - Things were better in the days when people stayed with one organization for most of their careers.
   - I do not think that wanting to be a "company man" or "company woman" is sensible anymore.

Developed by Steven Crocker
Debriefing Statement

Thank you for participating in this study. If you have any questions or concerns about this study, please feel free to contact Professor Kenneth Shultz at (909) 537-5484.
APPENDIX C

EMAIL SURVEY INVITATION
Email Survey Invitation

Hello,

I would really appreciate it if you can please take some time to complete my survey about work attitudes. This will help me in collecting data for my thesis. The only requirement is that you are currently employed at an organization that you have worked at for at least 6 months or longer. Please follow the link below to take the survey:

https://qtrial.qualtrics.com/SE/?SID=SV_6eO7F4pL3Rxxo3y

If convenient for you, please forward this link to any individuals that are 18 years of older and have been employed by the same organization/employer for at least 6 months.

Thank you all so much.

Steven Crocker
Table A - Outliers: 5% Trimmed Means and Means for Outliers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>5% Trimmed Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>To what degree do you feel your values &quot;match&quot; or fit this organization and the current employees in this organization?</td>
<td>3.42</td>
<td>3.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My values match those of the current employees in this organization.</td>
<td>3.29</td>
<td>3.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My values match those of other employees under my supervisor's watch.</td>
<td>3.36</td>
<td>3.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Things were better in the days when people stayed with one organization for most of their careers.</td>
<td>3.59</td>
<td>3.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I do not think that wanting to be a &quot;company man&quot; or &quot;company woman&quot; is sensible anymore</td>
<td>3.64</td>
<td>3.62</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table B – Correlation Matrix of IV’s, DV’s, and Mediators

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std Dev</th>
<th>PO Fit</th>
<th>PS Fit</th>
<th>POS</th>
<th>PSS</th>
<th>AC</th>
<th>NC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PO Fit</td>
<td>10.04</td>
<td>3.013</td>
<td>.876</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PS Fit</td>
<td>9.63</td>
<td>3.01</td>
<td>.633</td>
<td>.817</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POS</td>
<td>38.08</td>
<td>11.91</td>
<td>.628</td>
<td>.544</td>
<td>.943</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AC</td>
<td>32.20</td>
<td>10.82</td>
<td>.618</td>
<td>.564</td>
<td>.799</td>
<td>.687</td>
<td>.858</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NC</td>
<td>31.71</td>
<td>7.11</td>
<td>.410</td>
<td>.312</td>
<td>.412</td>
<td>.347</td>
<td>.511</td>
<td>.704</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Italicized diagonal values represent alpha reliabilities. All correlation coefficients significant at p<.001. N=224.
Table C – Frequency and Percentage values for nominal demographic variables and means and standard deviation values for continuous demographic variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>12.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>194</td>
<td>86.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>223</td>
<td>99.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnicity</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic or Latino</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>45.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Indian/Alaskan Native</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Latino Black or African American</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>8.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caucasian</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>34.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>7.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>223</td>
<td>99.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>Median</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>24.78</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>8.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>20.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>17.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>8.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>7.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>5.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>224</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Current Length of Employment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Employment Length</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6 months to less than 1 year</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>22.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 year to less than 2 years</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>20.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 years to less than 3 years</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>13.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 years to less than 4 years</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>13.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 years to less than 5 years</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>11.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 years or more</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>19.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>224</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Current Level within the Organization

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Current Level</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Non-supervisory employee</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>72.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Level Supervisor</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>12.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle Management</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>6.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Top Management</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Executive</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>7.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>224</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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