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Abstract
The present study aims to fill gaps in the existing fit and turnover intention (TI) literature by investigating a more comprehensive model, in which TI is proposed to be influenced by the interplays of three multidimensional types of fit including, person-organization (P-O) fit, person-group (P-G) fit, and person-job (P-J) fit. Using a sample of 385 permanent employees working in Mansoura University medical centers (Egypt), results showed that P-O fit, P-G fit, and P-J fit were positively related to each other and negatively related to TI. Furthermore, the negative relationship between P-O fit and TI is partially mediated by P-G fit and P-J fit. The theoretical and practical implications of these findings were discussed.

1. Introduction

The concept of fit at work has drawn substantial attention during the past several decades as an important workplace variable (Lauver & Kristof-Brown, 2001; Verquer, Beehr, & Wagner, 2003). This wide interest could be attributed to its association with many positive workplace outcomes, including job satisfaction, organizational commitment, and work performance (Lauver & Kristof-Brown, 2001; Cable & DeRue, 2002; HoVman & Woehr, 2006).

Retention of employees is of critical importance for organizational success (Barrick & Zimmerman, 2005). Organizations, therefore, make every effort to hire and retain employees who perform well on the job and who are unlikely to quit the organization (Astakhova, 2016). Higher TI, however, has been shown to be related with negative outcomes (e.g., low job satisfaction and low organizational commitment). Identifying TI antecedents and predictors makes it easier for organizations to determine whether their potential candidates are likely to contribute effectively and be highly committed (Bretz & Judge, 1994). Researchers, therefore, continue in their attempts to understand the different factors that cause employees wanting to quit their organizations.
Nevertheless, there are still a number of research gaps and significant limitations. First, researchers have recently been calling for more integrative research that investigates multiple types of fit within the same study (Edwards & Shipp, 2007; Jansen & Kristof-Brown, 2006), however, most of previous fit studies have largely focused on the relationship between a single rather than multiple types of fit perceptions (e.g., P-O fit, P-J fit, or person-vocation (P-V) fit) with outcomes. Furthermore, no previous studies have investigated the relationships among multiple fit perceptions with perhaps few exceptions. Tak (2011), for example, has investigated the relationships between various person-environment (P-E) fit types; however, a need for additional research analyzing the effects of different fit subconstructs on outcomes appears to exist, which delivers us to the second limitation.

Second, despite the rich history of research, different fit perceptions are usually assessed as single conceptualizations. Previous research on P-O fit, for example, have traditionally focused on value congruence (e.g., Cable & DeRue, 2002; Lauver & Kristof-Brown, 2001; Valentine, Godkin, & Lucero, 2002) and have mostly ignored the importance of an alternative form of congruence between individuals and their organizations—that of goal congruence.

Finally, as individuals interact in multiple interdependent environmental levels (e.g., job, group, and organization) and perceive multiple dimensions of fit simultaneously (Kristof-Brown, Zimmerman, & Johnson, 2005); this interdependence suggests the need for an integrative model in which a fit dimension mediates the relationship between another fit dimension and outcomes (Edwards & Shipp, 2007). The majority of fit studies, however, employ an additive rather than interactive approach assuming fit dimensions are independent predictors of work outcomes (Jansen & Kristof-Brown, 2006). While this approach may be appropriate for comparing the relative influences of different fit dimensions, it fails to account for interdependence among these same dimensions (Astakhova, 2016).

In order to fill these research gaps, the present study simultaneously examines the multidimensional effects of different fit perceptions on TI. More specifically, the present study examines the relationships among P-O fit (conceptualized as value congruence and goal congruence), P-G fit (conceptualized as supplementary fit and complementary fit), and P-J fit (conceptualized as needs-supplies fit and demand-abilities fit) along with their impact on TI. In doing so, we
identify which of the fit perspectives influence TI more intensely. We chose P-O fit, P-G fit, and P-J fit as predictors of TI because employees’ attitudinal and behavioral outcomes are better predicted as a function of personal and situational attributes in interaction (Livingstone, Nelson, & Barr, 1997). Moreover, we advance current insights by investigating the mediating roles of P-G fit and P-J fit in the relationship between P-O fit and TI. This might enhance our understanding of how individuals who fit well with their organizations prefer to stay especially when they fit well with their working groups as well as their jobs. Virtually no previous research has examined this area.

2. Theoretical background

Considerable attention has been directed toward the construct of fit for many years (Lewin, 1935; Murray, 1938). It broadly refers to the match between individual’s interests, values, needs, and self-cognitions and the attributes of the environment (Edwards, Caplan, & Harrison, 1998). According to Holland's theory of fit, individuals are happier and more successful in their work when their personality matches characteristics of the environment (Holland, 1985).

2.1. Person-organization fit

P-O fit is defined as the compatibility between people and the organization that occurs when at least one entity provides what the other needs, both entities share similar fundamental characteristics, or both (Kristof, 1996). P-O fit is a branch of research within the larger P-E fit domain. Central to this domain is the idea that human behavior is a function of the interaction between individuals and the environments in which they find themselves (Lewin, 1935; Kristof, 1996). Therefore, researchers examine the congruence between individuals and their organizations when trying to understand and predict their attitudes and behaviors (De Clercq, Fontaine, & Anseel, 2008).

The theory of work adjustment (Dawis & Lofquist, 1984) is arguably the most popular theoretical approach to P-O fit. According to this theory, fit is a reciprocal relationship in which individuals and work environment are mutually responsive. That is, individuals fulfill the requirements of the work environment and the work
environment fulfills the needs of the individuals. The continuous and dynamic process by which individuals seek to achieve and maintain correspondence with the work environment is called work adjustment. While researchers have used several different dimensions along which to conceptualize P-O fit, values and goals are the most commonly used dimensions (Piasentin & Chapman, 2006; HoVman & Woehr, 2006). Hence, we adopt this conceptualization in the present study.

By far, the dominant way of conceptualizing P-O fit was value congruence because values are considered fundamental to self-identity and they play a strong role in guiding attitudes, judgments, and behaviors (Chatman, 1991; Piasentin & Chapman, 2006; HoVman & Woehr, 2006; Verquer et al., 2003). These studies suggested that there would be higher levels of P-O fit to the extent that values of the individual are congruent with those of the organization. In this vein, individuals who display value preferences similar to the value orientations of their organization are more likely to show favorable work attitudes.

An important aspect of fit between individuals and their organizations is the convergence of individual and organizational goals (Supeli & Creed, 2013). Goal congruence is central to the Attraction-Selection-Attrition (ASA) theory, where Schneider (1987) argued that a key determinant of the relationship between the individual and the organization is the degree of congruence between individual goals and those of the organization (HoVman & Woehr, 2006). Moreover, Individuals’ behavior is influenced by personal goals and their perceptions of the opportunities for goal attainment provided by the situation. Such arguments suggest that individuals will be attracted to and remain members of organizations that allow them to accomplish their goals (Pervin, 1989).

Defines as a conflict of interest inherent in any relationship, agency problem can occur when the parties have different, or even conflicting, goals and is likely to affect the efficiency and performance within the organization (Eisenhardt, 1989). When employees’ personal goals are in line with those of the organization, they feel more in control of their work and empowered to allocate personal efforts to activities that benefit their organization and less likely to violate organizational norms (Cropanzano & Mitchell, 2005; Vancouver & Schmitt, 1991), which should mitigate any agency problem that may exist between their personal interests and those of their organization (Eisenhardt, 1989). Conversely, because low levels of goal
congruence create uncertainty about what is expected from employees, it becomes more likely that employees direct their efforts on activities that contribute to their own welfare (Kristof-Brown & Stevens, 2001), and ultimately cause harm to the organization (Witt, 1998).

2.2. Person-group fit

It is important for the members of any new or on-going team to have appropriate attributes to work effectively with each other (Werbel & Johnson, 2001). Defined as the compatibility between an individual and other members of the work group (Judge & Ferris, 1992; Kristof, 1996; Werbel & Gilliland, 1999), P-G fit is one of the most under-researched areas of P-E fit (Seong & Kristof-Brown, 2012). The attainment of P-G fit influences both individual and group performance. These, in turn, are likely to influence organizational effectiveness. Therefore, selection of employees for team-oriented environments must go beyond the traditional job analysis, which emphasizes P-J fit (Werbel & Johnson, 2001).

The distinction between supplementary and complementary fit was first proposed by Muchinsky and Monahan (1987). In their conceptualization, supplementary P-G fit occurs when an individual shares similar qualities with other group members, whereas complementary P-G fit occurs when a weakness of the working group is offset by the strength of the individual, and vice versa. Muchinsky and Monahan argued that complementary fit provides the logic behind most of employment selection decisions. As such, people often are selected for work groups because they possess unique skills or abilities that the other group members lack.

2.3. Person-job fit

P-J fit is one of the most well studied types of fit, it focuses on the individual level of analysis and assures that employees have the technical expertise to perform their assigned jobs and make valuable contributions (Werbel & Johnson, 2001; Werbel & DeMarie, 2005). P-J fit refers to the match between job requirements (i.e., knowledge, skills, and abilities) and employees’ qualifications, or the match between the needs of employees and the supplies from the job (Edwards, 1991). As such, two distinct types of P-J fit have been identified. The first type, needs-supplies
fit, is the congruence between employees’ needs and the supplies that emanate from their work. The second type, demands-abilities fit, denotes the congruence between an individual’s knowledge, skills, and abilities and job demands (Kristof-Brown, 2000; Cable & DeRue, 2002; Vogel & Feldman, 2009; Piasentin & Chapman, 2006).

2.4. Turnover intention

Turnover intention refers to a conscious and deliberate willfulness to leave one’s organization (Tett & Meyer, 1993). Jung, Namkung, & Yoon (2010) also defined TI as a preceding factor for effectively forecasting an employee’s propensity for changing occupations. Most theoretical models of turnover regard one or more turnover cognitions (e.g., intent to quit, or propensity to leave) as direct antecedents of actual turnover. The validity of this assumption has frequently been confirmed in the literature (Herrbach & Mignonac, 2007; Lewin & Sager, 2010). Nonetheless, the present study focused on TI given its wide range relationships with job satisfaction, organizational commitment, and job performance (DeConinck & Stilwell, 2004; Vidal, Valle, & Aragon, 2007). In addition, even when it does not end up with actual turnover, individuals who desire to leave are often less likely to contribute meaningfully to the organization than those who want to stay (Christian & Ellis, 2014).

3. Hypotheses development

3.1. Interaction between fit perceptions

Research has found that congruence between employees' perceptions about job assignments and situations in which they work and their personal preferences influence positive individual level outcomes (Edwards, 1996). While P-J fit is important for ascertaining individual ability to perform the technical aspects of the job, a growing number of researchers advocate that it is insufficient to hire based on job fit alone; there must also be congruence with the organization and others who work in it. Therefore, organizations tend to select employees based on P-O fit as well as P-J fit in order to maintain motivated, satisfied, and highly committed employees (Sekiguchi, 2007; Astakhova, 2016).
Kristof (1996) suggested that perceived P-J fit and P-O fit are likely to be interdependent. She also suggested that P-J fit should be more strongly correlated with work attitudes specific to the job (e.g., job satisfaction), and P-O fit should be more strongly correlated with work attitudes specific to the organization (e.g., organizational commitment). However, empirical evidence has shown that P-O fit and P-J fit are two separate constructs, which have unique effects on outcome variables (Lauver & Kristof-Brown, 2001). Moreover, Lauver & Kristof-Brown (2001) supported the hypothesis that P-O fit would be a better predictor of TI than P-J fit would be. The rationale here is that individuals who do not share the values and goals of the organization are much less likely to find their jobs to be personally rewarding.

Individuals with both high P-O fit and P-G fit are more likely to perceive strong connections between helping their colleagues and the organization as a whole. Therefore, these employees are likely to have higher levels of both in-role and extra-role performance as well (Kristof-Brown et al., 2005; Vogel & Feldman, 2009). In examining the relative importance of three fit types (P-O, Person-Supervisor (P-S), and P-G) in explaining job satisfaction, Lee & Lee (2006) showed that only P-G fit was significant. Afsar, Badir, & Khan (2015) argued that both P-O fit and P-J fit perceptions can positively influence employees' innovative work behavior only when they feel confident and safe while sharing novel ideas with their co-workers. Based on the above reasoning, a positive relationship between P-O fit and both P-G fit and P-J fit is to be expected.

Hypothesis 1a: P-O fit relates positively to P-G fit.

Hypothesis 1b: P-O fit relates positively to P-J fit.

3.2. Fit perceptions and TI

According to Schneider’s (1987) ASA model, individuals are most attracted to organizations that have characteristics similar to their own. Simultaneously, organizations strive to select individuals who share similar attributes with others in the organization and whose values and goals are congruent with the organization. The attrition process helps further establish a homogeneous environment because
individuals who fit well into the organization will choose to remain, while those who do not fit well will leave (Schneider, 1987).

Ambrose, Arnaud, & Schminke (2008) explored how the fit between the ethical values of employees and the ethical climate of the organization affects job satisfaction, organizational commitment, and TI. Their results suggest that fit between personal and organizational ethics is related to higher levels of commitment and job satisfaction and lower levels of TI. Valentine et al. (2002) also showed that corporate ethical values were positively associated with organizational commitment and P-O fit.

Two meta-analytic reviews concluded that P-O fit is positively related to employee job performance, job satisfaction, organizational commitment, and organizational citizenship behaviors, and negatively related to TI and actual turnover (Verquer et al., 2003; Kristof-Brown et al., 2005). Westerman & Cyr (2004) results supported a mediation model, where P-O fit on personality and values predicted job satisfaction, which in turn predicted intent to remain in the organization. De Clercq, Bouckenooghe, Raja, & Matsyborska (2014) also noted that goal congruence between individuals and their supervisor was found to be negatively related to individuals’ organizational deviance. Based on these arguments, it is hypothesized that:

**Hypothesis 2a**: Value congruence is negatively related to TI.

**Hypothesis 2b**: Goal congruence is negatively related to TI.

When individuals perceive they are similar to other employees in the organization, they tend to exhibit more positive work attitudes and behaviors, including higher levels of job satisfaction, job involvement, organizational commitment, work performance, as well as lower levels of TI (Westerman & Cyr, 2004; Werbel & Gilliland, 1999; Cable & DeRue, 2002). Lee and Lee (2006) examined the relative importance of three types of fit (P-O, P-S, and P-G) in explaining job satisfaction. Their results showed that only P-G fit was significant. Therefore, it is hypothesized that:

**Hypothesis 3a**: Supplementary fit is negatively related to TI.
Hypothesis 3b: Complementary fit is negatively related to TI.

The two different components of P-J fit (needs-supplies fit and demands-abilities fit) were initially studied as two separate types of fit but are now generally combined into the overall conceptualization of P-J fit (Cable & DeRue, 2002). Extensive empirical research supports the links between both types and important work attitudes and behaviors. Lu, Wang, Lu, Du, & Bakker (2014) noted that changes in both demands-abilities fit and needs-supplies fit were found to be positively related to work engagement.

Employees expect their organization to meet a large number of wide-ranging obligations as part of the official and unofficial employment contract (which corresponds to needs-supplies fit perspective). When one’s organization fails to meet what it is obligated to give in exchange for employee's contributions, psychological contract breach occurs (Hartmann & Rutherford, 2015). In this vein, Hartmann & Rutherford (2015) investigated the association between psychological contract breach and job satisfaction, organizational commitment, and TI. They found that job satisfaction and organizational commitment mediate the impact of psychological contract breach on TI.

P-J fit has been found to be strongly related to higher levels of job satisfaction, organizational commitment, organizational identification, and reduced turnover intentions (Cable & DeRue, 2002; Kristof-Brown et al., 2005; Cable & Judge, 1996; Lauver & Kristof-Brown, 2001). Therefore, it is hypothesized that:

Hypothesis 4a: Needs-supplies fit is negatively related to TI.
Hypothesis 4b: Demands-abilities fit is negatively related to TI.

3.3. Person-job fit and person-group fit as mediators

Although the above relationships between P-O fit, P-G fit, and P-J fit and TI are important, they reflect an additive approach. The present study enriches this approach by hypothesizing mediating relationships in which P-G fit and P-J fit mediate the relationship between P-O fit and TI. We base this view on research that has shown that work group characteristics and job characteristics represent
employees’ proximal work context compared to the more distal organizational environment (Edwards & Cable, 2009; Van Vianen, Shen, & Chuang, 2011). Therefore, employees' perceptions of congruence with their work group as well as their jobs will likely foster their fit perceptions with the organization as a whole, resulting in lower levels of TI.

Sekiguchi & Huber (2011) suggested that the interaction between fit perceptions could predict post-hire outcomes given the interdependence and interrelation between the organizational context and jobs embedded in the organization. We therefore hypothesize the following:

Hypothesis 5a: P-G fit mediates the relationship between P-O fit and TI.

Hypothesis 5b: P-J fit mediates the relationship between P-O fit and TI.

The full conceptual model is presented in Fig. 1.

Insert figure 1 about here

4. Method

4.1. Participants and procedure

Participants were selected from different specializations within Mansoura University medical centers, where each medical center was represented proportionately within the sample. These organizations were chosen for the purpose of creating a diverse sample of participants who represented a broad range of occupations, which was intended to generate a large amount of variance on the variables of interest and hence facilitate generalization of the study findings.

Permissions to carry out the study were obtained from management of the participating organizations. Data were collected using self-administered questionnaires within a three-week time frame. Questionnaires were provided to 850 employees who agreed to participate. Of the 850 questionnaires distributed, 385 were valid and complete (N= 385), a response rate of 45%. The present study focused on permanent employees rather than temporary employees because the nature of the variables, TI more specifically, are likely to operate differently among individuals who do not have a more formal employment contract (De Cuyper & De Witte, 2008; Hartmann & Rutherford, 2015).
The survey questions were translated into Arabic using a standard translation-back-translation procedure. To minimize as much as possible the problem of common method bias, we used some of the Podsakoff, MacKenzie, Lee, & Podsakoff’s (2003) procedural remedies. These involved (a) separation between predictors and criterion variables to make them appear to be unrelated, (b) respondents’ confidentiality and anonymity were guaranteed to diminish the social desirability bias, and, c) well-developed instruments with proven psychometric properties were utilized.

The demographic composition of the participants (Table 1) shows that around 70% of the individuals were between 25 and 45 years old, over 55% were females, as well as half of them were highly educated. More than half of the participants’ tenure exceeds 10 years, and about 75% of the participants’ salary does not exceed 1500 L.E.

4.2. Measures

Subjective measures of fit capture individuals’ perceptions about the extent to which they believe they fit into their organizations. Objective measures, however, calculate the similarity between the characteristics of an individual and his or her organization (Herrbach & Mignonac, 2007; Van Vianen, De Pater, & Van Dijk, 2007; Piasentin & Chapman, 2006). Recent studies have demonstrated that of these types of fit measures, the overall perception of fit better predicts individual outcomes (Lauver & Kristof-Brown, 2001; Meyer, Hecht, Gill, & Toplonytsky, 2010). Good fit is said to exist as long as it is perceived to exist, regardless of whether or not the individual has similar characteristics to, complements, or is complemented by the organization (Supeli & Creed, 2013). Hence, the present analyses were based on perceived fit assessments.

**Person-organization fit**

In order to capture the wide content domain of P-O fit, both value and goal congruence should be measured (Piasentin & Chapman, 2006). Therefore, P-O values fit was measured using a 7-item scale adapted from Cable and DeRue (2002). A sample item is "My values are well aligned to the guiding principles of my organization". The Cronbach’s alpha value of the scale was 0.79. Three items
adapted from Supeli and Creed (2013) were used to measure P-O goals fit. A sample item is "The goals that I set for myself are congruent with the goals of my organization". The Cronbach's alpha value of the scale was 0.8.

**Person-group fit**

P-G fit was measured using a scale adapted from Piasentin and Chapman (2006). The 6-item supplementary fit scale has a Cronbach’s alpha coefficient of .87. A sample item is “My coworkers and I share the same workplace ethics”. The 5-item complementary fit scale has a Cronbach’s alpha coefficient of .82. A sample item is “Other employees in my organization appreciate that I have distinct work-related goals”.

**Person-job fit**

P-J fit was measured using a scale adapted from Cable and DeRue (2002). The 5-item needs-supplies fit scale has a Cronbach’s alpha coefficient of .89. A sample item is “My current organization meets the needs I expect an organization to meet”. The 4-item demands-abilities fit scale has a Cronbach’s alpha coefficient of .73. A sample item is “My skills and abilities match those required by my job”.

**Turnover intention**

Turnover intention measure developed by Cammann, Fichman, Jenkins Jr., & Klesh (1983) was found to be the most frequently used measure in the literature. This measure consists of 3 items designed to assess employees' turnover intentions. Due to the measure's frequency of use and its psychometric properties, it was selected to measure TI in the present study. A sample item is “It is likely that I will actively look for a new organization to work for in the next year”. Cronbach's alpha for this scale was .91.

A 5-point Likert-type scale (1 = strongly disagree and 5 = strongly agree) was used for all substantive items.

**Control variables**

Research suggests that fit becomes greater as individuals adapt to their organizations over time. However, employees with poor initial fit are more likely to self-select out (Schneider, 1987). Hence, we controlled for organizational tenure.
We have also controlled for age, gender, and salary given their potential impact on attitudes.

5. Data analysis and results

The present study employed partial least squares (PLS) analysis, Warp PLS version 5.0 more specifically. PLS is a powerful and robust statistical procedure that allows for causal analysis in situations of high complexity (Henseler, Ringle, & Sinkovics, 2009). As a structural equation modeling (SEM), PLS is well suited to test mediation hypotheses (James, Mulaik, & Brett, 2006). Further, PLS does not require demanding assumptions regarding the distribution of the variables and sample size. Moreover, it is the only SEM technique that allows the inclusion of both reflective and formative measures in the same analysis (Henseler et al., 2009). PLS builds on a set of nonparametric evaluation criteria to assess the measurement and structural model results (Hair, Hult, Ringle, & Sarstedt, 2014). The present study employed nonparametric bootstrapping to test the research hypotheses. The nonparametric bootstrapping method runs based on 500 subsamples and no sign change (Hair et al., 2014). Before looking at the results of the structural model, the measurement model is described in more detail.

**Measurement model**

The first stage of the analysis aims to assess the quality of the instruments in terms of item factor loadings, internal consistency, and discriminant validity. As shown in Table 2, except for the item POFV6, the factor loading for the items were well above the recommended threshold of 0.70 (Henseler et al., 2009). In addition, Cronbach’s alpha (α) and composite reliability (CR) for each of the constructs are greater than the recommended 0.70 threshold. This indicates the measures were reliable (Hair et al., 2014).

**Insert table 2 about here**

Table 3 summarizes each variable’s mean, standard deviation, correlations, and reliability alpha. It is noteworthy that all fit indices correlated significantly and positively with each other. Moreover, all fit indices correlated significantly and negatively with TI.
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To evaluate convergent validity, Fornell & Larcker (1981) recommended average variance extracted (AVE) should be equal or greater than 0.50. Table 2 shows that AVE is above 0.50 for all constructs, thus indicating adequate convergent validity. In support of discriminant validity, Table 4 shows that the average variance extracted for each of the focal constructs is greater than the variance shared with the remaining constructs (Henseler et al., 2009). Therefore, the measures adopted in our study were valid and internally consistent.

The structural model and hypotheses testing

After verification of the measurement model, the last step of the analysis examines the relationships in the structural model. Table 5 shows the findings related to our specific hypotheses. The results can be divided into two models, as follows: the first model shows the direct effects of sub variables (first order) on TI. The second model shows the direct and indirect effects of main variables (second order) on TI. In addition, effect sizes ($f^2$) are used to assess the extent to which the predictor latent variables affect the dependent variable. The following formula is employed to calculate the effect size for each path coefficient.

$$f^2 = \frac{(R^2_{included} - R^2_{excluded})}{(1 - R^2_{included})}$$

The values of effect sizes could be 0.02, 0.15, and 0.35, which indicates the effect of a predictor latent variable on an endogenous variable to be small, medium, or large, respectively. Effect size coefficients ($f^2$) below 0.02 are considered too small for relevancy (Cohen, 1988, p.80-81).

Table 5 shows the findings related to our specific hypotheses. As anticipated, H1a and b were supported in that P-O fit is directly and positively related to both P-G fit ($\beta = 0.891, p < 0.001$) and P-J fit ($\beta = 0.910, p < 0.001$). Both value congruence and goal congruence have almost equal effect on TI ($\beta = -0.176, p < 0.001; \beta = -0.181, p < 0.001$, respectively) thereby providing support for H2a and b. Likewise, both supplementary fit and complementary fit were negatively related to TI ($\beta = -0.251, p < 0.001; \beta = -0.193, p < 0.001$, respectively) thereby providing support for H3a and b. As for P-J fit, needs-supplies fit related significantly and negatively to TI ($\beta = -0.106, p < 0.018$), whereas the negative relationship between demands-abilities fit and TI
was not significant ($\beta = -0.032, p < 0.266$). Thus, H4a was supported; however, H4b did not receive support. Finally, H5a and b predicted that the relation between P-O fit and TI would be mediated by P-G fit and P-J fit. Results of Model 2 indicated that the coefficient for the relation between P-O fit and TI is still significant when P-G fit and P-J fit entered the equation ($\beta = 0.427, p < 0.001; \beta = 0.304, p < 0.001$, respectively). Thus, consistent with H5a and b, the relation between P-O fit and TI was partially mediated by both P-G fit and P-J fit.

The magnitudes of the direct effect of values, goals P-O fit, and complementary P-G fit on TI were medium effect sizes ($f^2 = 0.139; 0.138; 0.155$, respectively). The effect size was above medium for the relationship between supplementary P-G fit and TI ($f^2 = 0.204$), small for the relationship between needs-supplies P-J fit and TI ($f^2 = 0.085$), and the smallest effect size was ($f^2 = 0.024$) related to demands-abilities P-J fit.

Insert table 5 about here

6. Discussion

Despite the substantial progress that has been achieved in examining the effects of fit in workplace, most past studies tend to focus on the independent effects of a limited subset of fit indices (e.g., P-J fit, P-S fit, P-G fit, P-O fit, or P-V fit) on various individual and organizational outcomes. Recognizing the need for the simultaneous consideration of various types of fit perspectives, the present study examined an integrative mediation model; in which P-G fit and P-J fit mediate the effect of P-O fit on TI. Moreover, the application of different fit sub-variables (e.g., values, goals, supplementary, complementary, needs-supplies, and demands abilities) to predict employees' intentions has been largely unexplored. The present study was an initial attempt to investigate how each of these sub-variables contributes to the explanation of variance in TI.

The findings reported herein make several contributions to the literature. First, the study empirically tested the relationships among three fit perceptions (P-O fit, P-G fit, and P-J fit); second, it investigated the effects of each fit sub-constructs on TI; and third, the study assessed the mediating roles of P-G fit and P-J fit in the relationship between P-O fit and TI. The first hypothesis proposed that employees' perceptions of P-O fit relate positively to their P-G fit and P-J fit perceptions. This
was supported by the highly significant relationship between P-O fit and both P-G fit ($\beta = 0.891, p < 0.001$) and P-J fit ($\beta = 0.910, p < 0.001$). This result suggests that when individuals are skilled at their jobs and their characteristics are congruent with those of their work group members, they are much likely to experience high levels of congruence with the organization as a whole.

The second hypothesis proposed that employees' perceptions of P-O fit relate negatively to TI. This hypothesis was fully supported. This result suggests that any inconsistency between individual and organization with regards to values and goals leads to higher TI. Despite considerable research on the relationship between P-O fit and TI, the effect of goal congruence on TI has not been adequately examined. Our results demonstrated that goal congruence showed an almost equal sized relationship with TI as for value congruence ($\beta s = -0.176; -0.181$ respectively), suggesting that goal congruence might be as important as value congruence in predicting TI. This result lends support to Schneider, Goldstein, & Smith's (1995) revised ASA framework, which proposes that goal congruence is an important dimension of P-O fit.

As for P-G fit and TI, our results revealed a significant negative effect for P-G fit on TI ($\beta = -0.435, p = 0.001$), suggesting that people are willing to stay with an organization to the extent that they share similar characteristics with other group members and also their weaknesses are offset by the strengths of the working group, and vice versa. There is a need therefore to consider P-G fit for employment selection purposes.

Regarding P-J fit and TI, both needs-supplies fit and demands abilities fit related negatively to TI. However it was only needs-supplies fit, and not demands-abilities fit, that showed significant negative effect on TI. The strength of the relationship between P-J fit sub-variables and TI suggests that perceptions of needs-supplies fit ($\beta = -0.106, p = 0.018$) are more important than demands-abilities fit ($\beta = -0.032, p = 0.266$) in shaping individuals' intention to quit.

Interestingly, our results show that P-G fit was more strongly associated with TI. This result suggests that a fit with work group members may be more important in employee retention than a fit in the other two areas (P-O fit and P-J fit). The results of this investigation not only provide support for the conjecture that employees are able to distinguish between fit with their organization, work group, and jobs, but
also provide further evidence that employees' perceptions of P-O fit, P-G fit, and P-J fit should be treated as distinct constructs. Additionally, our results suggest that multiple conceptualizations should be considered in fit assessment.

The present study is the first to examine the mediating role of P-G fit and P-J fit, thereby shedding light on the mechanism by which P-O fit impact TI. Our results indicate that P-G fit and P-J fit partially mediate the effect of P-O fit on TI. This mediation suggests that when employees whose values and goals match those of the organization are likely to display lower levels of TI especially when they perceive congruence with their work group as well as with the job characteristics.

6.2. Theoretical and practical implications

Our study contributes to existing fit literature by attempting to examine the relationship among different multidimensional types of fit and how they influence TI. Prediction of individual consequences can be improved by considering individuals’ fit with various aspects of their work environment, including their organization, work group, and job. The present study is the first, to our knowledge, to examine the mediating roles of P-G fit and P-J fit in the relationship between P-O fit and TI. The supported mediating role of P-G fit and P-J fit further validates the interdependent nature of fit dimensions. Specifically, it appears that such relationships are not additive. Instead, P-G fit and P-J fit are important considerations for why P-O fit influence TI. Another benefit of capturing multiple forms of fit in a single study is that it allows us to compare the relative importance of certain types of fit as TI predictors.

Regarded as a formal control and feedback tool, management control system (MCS) is employed to monitor organizational outcomes and correct deviations from preset criteria of performance (Henri, 2006). While goal congruence is considered the central element in designing management control systems (Itami, 1975), the findings of the present study, therefore, contribute to management control system literature. When employees share similar goals with the organization, colleagues, and their supervisors, they are more likely to show favorable outcomes; however, when goals are incongruent, individuals may only work toward their personal goals (Chen & Tjosvold, 2005; Pattie, Benson, Casper, & McMahan, 2013). As such, the alignment of goals influence how employees interact with supervisors, organization
and each other. Likewise, maintaining high levels of goal congruence within the organization helps mitigate as much of the negative impacts of agency problem.

These results also have implications for management practices. Organizations allocate significant resources to developing and maintaining fit between employees, the tasks they perform, and the organization as a whole, because this compatibility is linked to favorable employee attitudes and positive organizational outcomes. Our results show that all three fit types correlated significantly with TI. Managers, therefore, need to focus on various fit types for training, development, and selection. Our results also demonstrate that managers need to consider P-O goal congruence as well as value congruence for training, development, and selection. Managers can avert employee's TI by selecting and retaining those individuals who fit well with the organizational values and goals. However, they must be mindful of the fact that opting for employees based on their organizational match alone will not guarantee lower levels of TI. The mediating role of P-G fit and P-J fit perceptions on the relationship between perceived P-O fit and TI suggests that, in order to minimize TI among employees, in addition to selecting applicants based on value congruence and goal congruence, managers should also keep in view the knowledge, skills, abilities, and personality traits of the individuals performing those particular jobs.

Managers could periodically survey workers concerning their job attitudes, commitment, and satisfaction with various aspects of their jobs, work group, and the organization as a whole. Not only will these surveys provide insight into the level of TI, but will also have benefits in terms of employee perceptions of fit, which should ultimately reduce TI. Furthermore, managers could also employ good selection processes in order to establish P-J fit when hiring new employees. In addition, it is also important that P-J fit be monitored after individuals are employed. This way, managers and employees can closely monitor changes in demands-abilities and needs-supplies that can be addressed. Managers should also direct their recruitment and selection efforts toward increasing P-G fit among employees. Increasing P-G fit may have an important impact on employees' attitudes and on some types of performance.

6.3. Limitations and suggestions for future research
The present study is not without limitations. First, we were unable to establish causality due to the cross-sectional nature of data, which hindered the investigation of possibility of reverse causality among constructs. It is plausible that employees’ TI might influence their fit perceptions. We encourage researchers to continue this line of research by conducting longitudinal studies to explore the causal relationships implied in this study. The present study was also limited in scope by including only TI as an outcome variable. Researchers may want to examine other outcome variables such as job engagement and organizational identification. Another limitation of the present study is that the study data were collected from hospital employees, so conclusions regarding the generalizability of the results to organizations outside this sector should be approached with caution. A promising direction for future research would be to test whether the proposed model holds across different job types in other sectors.
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Figure 1: Conceptual model

Table 1. Demographic characteristic profile of respondents (n = 385).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristic</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Age</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Younger than 25 years</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 – 35 years</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>35.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35 – 45 years</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45 – 55 years</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>17.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Older than 55 years</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>5.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sex</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>171</td>
<td>44.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>214</td>
<td>55.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Tenure</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than a year</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 – 5 years</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>13.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 – 10 years</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>26.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 – 15 years</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>31.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 years and more</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>26.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Salary</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 1000 L.E.</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>29.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1000 – 1500 L.E.</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>43.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1500 – 2000 L.E.</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000 – 2500 L.E.</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>4.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than 2500 L.E.</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constructs, dimensions, and indicators</td>
<td>Loading</td>
<td>CR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Person-organization fit (second order)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Value congruence*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POFV1</td>
<td>0.803</td>
<td>0.898</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POFV2</td>
<td>0.814</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POFV3</td>
<td>0.745</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POFV4</td>
<td>0.739</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POFV5</td>
<td>0.753</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POFV7</td>
<td>0.775</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goal congruence</td>
<td>0.870</td>
<td>0.691</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POFG1</td>
<td>0.847</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POFG2</td>
<td>0.847</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POFG3</td>
<td>0.798</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Person-group fit</td>
<td>0.952</td>
<td>0.909</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supplementary fit</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PGFS1</td>
<td>0.741</td>
<td>0.886</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PGFS2</td>
<td>0.757</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PGFS3</td>
<td>0.814</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PGFS4</td>
<td>0.719</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PGFS5</td>
<td>0.823</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PGFS6</td>
<td>0.746</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complementary fit</td>
<td>0.886</td>
<td>0.609</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PGFC1</td>
<td>0.804</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PGFC2</td>
<td>0.791</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PGFC3</td>
<td>0.717</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PGFC4</td>
<td>0.841</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PGFC5</td>
<td>0.743</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Person-job fit</td>
<td>0.958</td>
<td>0.919</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Needs-supplies fit</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PJFNS1</td>
<td>0.684</td>
<td>0.871</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PJFNS2</td>
<td>0.728</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PJFNS3</td>
<td>0.717</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PJFNS4</td>
<td>0.806</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PJFNS5</td>
<td>0.833</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demands-abilities fit</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PJFDA1</td>
<td>0.833</td>
<td>0.868</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PJFDA2</td>
<td>0.792</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PJFDA3</td>
<td>0.780</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PJFDA4</td>
<td>0.750</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turnover intention</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TI1</td>
<td>0.864</td>
<td>0.868</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TI2</td>
<td>0.919</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TI3</td>
<td>0.857</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
*POFV6 was excluded because of low standardized loading (<.70)

Table 3. Means, standard deviations, and inter-correlations of study variables.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Construct</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. POV</td>
<td>3.03</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>(0.86)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. POG</td>
<td>2.89</td>
<td>0.80</td>
<td>0.721</td>
<td>(0.78)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. PGS</td>
<td>2.99</td>
<td>0.74</td>
<td>0.838</td>
<td>0.746</td>
<td>(0.84)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. PGC</td>
<td>3.02</td>
<td>0.78</td>
<td>0.799</td>
<td>0.767</td>
<td>0.818</td>
<td>(0.84)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. PJNS</td>
<td>2.99</td>
<td>0.76</td>
<td>0.834</td>
<td>0.795</td>
<td>0.822</td>
<td>0.847</td>
<td>(0.82)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. PJDA</td>
<td>2.95</td>
<td>0.78</td>
<td>0.826</td>
<td>0.778</td>
<td>0.841</td>
<td>0.787</td>
<td>0.838</td>
<td>(0.80)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. TI</td>
<td>3.02</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>-0.783</td>
<td>-0.758</td>
<td>-0.804</td>
<td>-0.797</td>
<td>-0.792</td>
<td>-0.763</td>
<td>(0.86)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

POV = P-O value fit; POG = P-O goal fit; PGS = supplementary P-G fit; PGC = complementary P-G fit; PJNS = needs-supplies P-J fit; PJDA = demands-abilities P-J fit; TI = Turnover intention; reliability alpha values are on the diagonal.

All correlations are significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

Table 4. Construct Correlations and Square Root of Average Variance Extracted

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Construct</th>
<th>P-O fit</th>
<th>P-G fit</th>
<th>P-J fit</th>
<th>TI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>P-O fit</td>
<td>0.928</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-G fit</td>
<td>0.890</td>
<td>0.954</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-J fit</td>
<td>0.909</td>
<td>0.902</td>
<td>0.959</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TI</td>
<td>-0.831</td>
<td>-0.839</td>
<td>-0.811</td>
<td>0.880</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5. Path coefficients for the different models

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Path</th>
<th>Model 1 (without Mediator)</th>
<th>Model 2 (with Mediator)</th>
<th>Results</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Path coefficient</td>
<td>Effect size</td>
<td>Path coefficient</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control variables</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenure</td>
<td>-0.067 (0.09)</td>
<td></td>
<td>-0.064 (0.10)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>-0.033 (0.25)</td>
<td></td>
<td>-0.033 (0.25)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>0.010 (0.42)</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.006 (0.45)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salary</td>
<td>-0.019 (0.35)</td>
<td></td>
<td>-0.016 (0.38)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interaction among fit perceptions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H1a: P-O fit → P-G fit</td>
<td>0.891 (0.001)</td>
<td>0.795</td>
<td>Accepted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H1b: P-O fit → P-J fit</td>
<td>0.910 (0.001)</td>
<td>0.828</td>
<td>Accepted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fit perceptions and TI</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-0.351 (0.001)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H2a: Values → TI</td>
<td>-0.176 (0.001)</td>
<td>0.139</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H2b: Goals → TI</td>
<td>-0.181 (0.001)</td>
<td>0.138</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H3: P-G fit → TI</td>
<td>-0.435 (0.001)</td>
<td>0.370</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
H3a: Supplementary $\rightarrow$ TI  
-0.251 (0.001)  
0.204  
Accepted

H3b: Complementary $\rightarrow$ TI  
-0.193 (0.001)  
0.155  
Accepted

H4: P-J fit $\rightarrow$ TI  
-0.100 (0.023)  
0.082  
Accepted

H4a: Needs-Supplies $\rightarrow$ TI  
-0.106 (0.018)  
0.085  
Accepted

H4b: Demands-Abilities $\rightarrow$ TI  
-0.032 (0.266)  
0.024  
Rejected

Indirect effect

H5a: P-O fit $\rightarrow$ P-G fit $\rightarrow$ TI  
-0.427 (0.001)  
0.427  
Accepted

H5b: P-O fit $\rightarrow$ P-J fit $\rightarrow$ TI  
-0.304 (0.001)  
0.255  
Accepted

Appendix: Measurement Items

Value congruence (adapted from Cable and DeRue, 2002):

1) The things that I value in life are very similar to the things that my organization values.
2) My personality matches the “personality” or image of my organization.
3) The attributes that I look for in an organization are fulfilled by my present organization.
4) My personal values are different from my organization’s values.
5) My values make me feel unique because they add something different to my work place.
6) My values are well aligned to the guiding principles of my organization.
7) My values match those of current employees in my organization.

Goal congruence (adapted from Supeli and Creed, 2013):

1) There is a lot of similarity between the collective goals of my organization and my personal goals.
2) The goals that I set for myself are congruent with the goals of my organization.
3) Thus far, I feel I have been able to achieve my organization’s goals.

Supplementary fit (adapted from Piasentin and Chapman, 2006):

1) There are many other people in my organization who share my attitudes about work.
2) I possess the overall 'employee qualities' that are necessary to succeed in my organization.
3) I share the same work goals as people that I work with in my organization.
4) All in all, I would say that I share a lot in common with other members of my organization.
5) My coworkers and I share the same workplace ethics.
6) I am similar to many other employees in my organization in terms of my personality traits.

Complementary fit (adapted from Piasentin and Chapman, 2006):

1) I would say that I stand out in my organization (in a good way) because of my personality.
2) Other employees in my organization appreciate that I have distinct work-related goals.
3) I feel that I am a unique piece of the puzzle that makes my organization work.
4) People in my organization seem to value that I am different from the “typical” employee.
5) I feel like I stand out (in a good way) in my organization.

Needs-supplies fit (adapted from Cable and DeRue, 2002):


1) My current organization meets the needs I expect an organization to meet.
2) The organization I currently work for gives me just about everything I could ask out of an organization.
3) Generally speaking, my organization fails to meet my needs. (reverse coded)
4) There is a good fit between what my organization offers me and what I am looking for in an organization.
5) Few organizations could meet my needs better than my current organization.

Demands-abilities fit (adapted from Cable and DeRue, 2002):

1) My skills and abilities match those required by my organization.
2) My work-related skills and abilities are well suited to the needs and direction of my company.
3) I possess the requisite knowledge, skills, and abilities to help my organization get ahead.
4) My skills and abilities match the skills and abilities my company looks for in employees.

Turnover intention (adapted from Cammann et al., 1983):

1) It is likely that I will actively look for a new organization to work for in the next year.
2) I often think about quitting my job.
3) I intend to leave this organization for another organization as soon as I can.