SOCIO-DEMOGRAPHIC PREDICTORS OF PERSON–ORGANIZATION FIT

DOROTA MERECZ-KOT and ALEKSANDRA ANDYSZ

Nofer Institute of Occupational Medicine, Łódź, Poland
Department of Health and Work Psychology

Abstract
Objectives: The aim of this study was to explore the relationship between socio-demographic characteristics and the level of complementary and supplementary person–organization fit (P–O fit). **Material and Methods:** The study sample was a group of 600 Polish workers, urban residents aged 19–65. Level of P–O fit was measured using the Subjective Person–Organization Fit Questionnaire by Czarnota-Bojarska. The binomial multivariate logistic regression was applied. The analyzes were performed separately for the men and women. **Results:** Socio-demographic variables explained small percentage of the outcome variability. Gender differences were found. In the case of men shift work decreased complementary and supplementary fit, while long working hours decreased complementary fit. In the women, age was a stimulant of a complementary fit, involuntary job losses predicted both complementary and supplementary misfit. Additionally, relational responsibilities increased probability of supplementary P–O fit in the men. **Conclusions:** Going beyond personality and competences as the factors affecting P–O fit will allow development of a more accurate prediction of P–O fit. Int J Occup Med Environ Health 2017;30(1):133–149

Key words:
Shift work, Socio-demographic factors, Work, Gender, Well-being at work, Person–organization fit

INTRODUCTION

The issue of person–organization fit (P–O fit) studied within person–environment fit paradigm has intrigued researchers and practitioners already since the 1950s. Their interest was primarily focused on finding optimal criteria of matching the right candidates with conditions and requirements of employment. Generally, early theories of P–O fit were aimed primarily at recruitment and selection. The selection was aimed at employing people with adequate qualifications and committed to the performed job. The criteria of matching the person with the job were also supposed to help to employ satisfied and efficient workers.

Over the time, the problem of P–O fit vs. P–O misfit has also become the subject of interest among specialists in the field of health and work psychology, as well as among those involved in the protection of workers' health. It is more and more known that the P–O fit level influences workers' general well-being. Over time, concepts of occupational stress [1,2] have evolved from this approach. New ideas emerged from previous theories as an independent field of empirical studies, and researchers started to focus on identifying the relationships between stress caused by P–O misfit and its health outcomes.

Many researchers and practitioners underline the importance of the P–O fit for an organization. It is related to

such phenomena as: work performance and work attitudes [3,4], turnover [5], teamwork effectiveness [6], organizational citizenship behaviors [7,8], creativity [9], stress and well-being [10].

In the theory, 2 core dimensions of P–O are distinguished: supplementary and complementary fit [11]. Supplementary P–O fit is defined as the congruence of goals, values and norms of an organization with goals, values and norms of an employee. In turn, the complementary P–O fit takes place when an employee and work environment complement one another by addressing each other's needs, e.g., an employee has skills valued by the organization and the organization rewards him/her with the resources he/she needs [12,13].

Rationale of the study

Studies on the predictors of P–O fit have mostly focused on the role of individual characteristics – personal traits, values, professional competences, etc. [4,14,15]. We undertook the problem that is rarely explored within the P–O fit paradigm – we focused on socio-demographic antecedents of a good P–O fit such as: age, family situation, number of employers and education.

We believe that inclusion of socio-demographic characteristics into the theoretical model of potential predictors of P–O fit will expand our knowledge on this issue. We also believe that exploration of this topic will have practical implications – it will enrich the profile of an employee well-adjusted to an organization, and will allow for better prediction of his/her professional career, well-being and job satisfaction. Another possible advantage of studying this issue is further development of work socialization practices which address: special needs of people of different genders, different work history, family situation and employed in different work environments.

Although congruence between individual and organizational attributes is the essence of supplementary fit, and "perceived similarity" is a core factor in how people

evaluate their P–O fit, this relationship is studied mostly at the stage of entering organizations but not in employees with some job tenure within an organization [13].

The studies on the role of socio-demographic characteristics in shaping the level of P–O fit are vague [16–20] and have brought confounding results. For example, Posner [17] has failed to find the effects of socio-demographics on the supplementary fit, while Lovelace and Rosen [16], and Seong et al. [19] have suggested significant differences in P–O fit related to a gender and an employment contract. In the qualitative study of Cooper-Thomas and Wright [20] 4 dimensions of misfit have been found: socio-demographic, individual differences, structural and social, which means that people actively use these categories while describing their fit or misfit to an organization.

Socio-demographic attributes, as we believe, may influence every adaptation process to various demands of environment. Taking into account that P–O fit is one of many kinds of person–environment fits, the same rule should operate also here. Gender, age, education, specific family situation, etc., can both facilitate and hinder supplementary and complementary fit to an organization.

Current stage of art in the field did not allow to formulate justified hypotheses on the role of particular socio-demographic characteristics in shaping P–O fit, thus, our study has an explorative character. We formulated one general question, i.e., Is there any predictive value of socio-demographic characteristics for good P–O fit? We focused on 2 categories of socio-demographic attributes, which we arbitrarily named: a) personal (age, gender, education, family situation), and b) work-related (tenure, time demands of work, multi-employment, shift work vs. regular hours, full time vs. other types of contract, voluntary and involuntary job changes and congruence between possessed education and currently performed job). The variables were chosen based on analyses of literature on factors affecting adaptability to various environmental demands.

MATERIAL AND METHODS

Participants and procedure

The group under the study (N = 600) was a Polish, random sample of workers, city dwellers, aged 19–65 years. The sample drawing was based on the General Electronic Population Register database. Stratified sampling with proportional allocation was applied. The sample was representative in terms of age, gender, education and place of residence – voivodeship and size of the city (excluding village). The following exclusion criteria were employed in the sampling procedure: being on parental leave, receiving disability payment or pension and being a full-time student. The respondents were blue and white collar workers who represented various occupations. Data were collected at the respondents' homes during a face to face interview. Interviews from 13 persons were excluded from the analyses due to a high level of missing data. Fifty two point five percent of the study group comprised women and 47.5% men. The mean age was 39.5 years (standard deviation (SD) = 11), mean overall job tenure was 17.4 years (SD = 11.2) and the mean tenure in a current position was 9.5 years (SD = 9.4).

Measures

Dependent variable

Person–organization fit was measured using the Subjective Person–Organization Fit Questionnaire by Czarnota-Bojarska [21]. It is a self-reported 50-item tool. It measures 2 core dimensions of P–O fit: supplementary and complementary fit, an employee's identification with an organization and work satisfaction. In the study we used score of the 2 scales – complementary and supplementary fit.

The exemplar statements of the questionnaire are: "It is required from me as much as I can give" for the Complementary fit scale and "I fit to my organization" for the Supplementary fit scale. All the items were rated by the participants on a 6-point scale ranging from 1 (definitely don't agree) to 6 (definitely agree). The higher the score

obtained in the subscales, the better the P–O fit. Internal consistency reliability of the subscales was: $\alpha = 0.92$ for the Complementary fit, $\alpha = 0.90$ for the Supplementary fit, which is similar to the coefficients obtained by the author of the questionnaire ($\alpha = 0.94$ and $\alpha = 0.96$, respectively) [22].

Independent variables

Socio-demographic data was collected by means of the questionnaire designed for the study. Two categories of the data were collected a) personal characteristics of the respondents such as: age, gender, education, family situation (single, in a relationship, having children), and b) work-related: job tenure, number of working hours on an average working day, length of a working week, current number of employers (including self-employment and contracting), shift-work vs. regular hours, full time employment vs. other types of employment, number of voluntary job changes and numbers of laid-offs. Because a growing number of people work for several employers and/or combine different forms of employment, the assessment of fit applied to the main place of employment indicated by the respondents.

The index of congruence between acquired education and job performed was a comparison between the type of education and the current job post. The congruence vs. incongruence was assessed by experts who referred in their evaluations to an official description of occupations and specialities. As a result we distinguished 3 categories of the respondents: a) having acquired education consistent with the job performed; b) having acquired education inconsistent with the job performed and c) having general education only.

Analysis

Statistical analyses were performed by the use of the SPSS version 22 (IBM Polska). To assess significance of the socio-demographic predictors of P–O fit we used the binomial multivariate logistic regression. For this

method we recorded the scores from the Complementary and Supplementary fit scales into dichotomous variables. As there are no norms for the raw scores of P–O fit to divide respondents into unfit and fit, we used medians and calculated them for the whole sample as a cut off value. In the Complementary fit scale median was 3.25, in the Supplementary fit scale it was 3.78. Scores below this measure indicated low fit, scores above this measure indicated high fit. The median value was incorporated in the lower scores. Results of the logistic regression were presented as odds ratios (OR) with 95% confidence intervals (CI). The following indices were presented: Negelkerke R^2-index of variance of the outcome explained by the independent variables; Chi^2 value-index of significance of the variables in the model and the value of Hosmer-Lemeshow test-index of goodness of fit of the model. The statistical software ran logistic regression models only for the complete data sets. Thirteen records were excluded due to the missing data.

In the introduction we referred to the research of Seong et al. [19], Lovelace et al. [16] who have suggested significant differences in P–O fit related to gender. Matching between a worker and his/her environment is a process – time plays its role. We assume that since women's life and career courses are disrupted by periods of pregnancy and maternity leaves, such events have to have some impact on P–O fit. We assumed, that some factors may have stronger impact on P–O fit in one gender than in another (e.g., family situation). Therefore, the analyses were performed for the women and men separately.

The p value < 0.05 was set as statistically significant.

RESULTS

The indices of significance and fit of the model explaining the complementary P–O fit were satisfying both for the women and men. In the women and men, all the variables explained 17% of variance of a high complementary P–O fit (Table 1).

In the case of men, shift work, working up to 10 h/day were associated with lower odds of good complementary P–O fit. The odds of outcome in the group of shift workers was lower by 64% than for the non-shift workers (OR = 0.36, 95% CI: 0.20–0.62). The odds of outcome in the group of men working up to 10 h/day were almost less than a half compared to those who have been working up to 8 h/day (OR = 0.51, 95% CI: 0.27–0.97). In the model calculated for men no demographic and family-related variables were significant.

In the case of women, age and being laid off were significant predictors of complementary P–O fit. The odds of outcome in the group of women aged 25–44 years old were almost 4 times higher than for the women up to 24 years old (OR = 3.96, 95% CI: 1.28–12.30), and the odds of the women aged > 44 years old were more than 6 times higher (OR = 6.39, 95% CI: 1.85–22.05). The odds of good complementary fit in the group of women who have been laid off in the past were reduced by 87% compared with those of the women who have never been sacked (OR = 0.13, 95% CI: 0.02–0.08). No variable associated with the family situation was significant in the model.

The indices of significance and fit of the model explaining supplementary P–O fit were satisfying for the men. The model of women was not significant, therefore, this result should be treated with caution. Model for the women explained 10% of variance of good supplementary fit, for the men – 16% (Table 2).

In the men, shift work and 2 variables referring to the family situation (being in a relationship and having children) were significant predictors of high supplementary P–O fit. The odds of outcome for the shift workers were lower by 63% than for the non-shift workers (OR = 0.37, 95% CI: 0.21–0.64). The odds of outcome of the men being in a relationship were more than twice higher compared to those who were not (OR = 2.38, 95% CI: 1.04–5.49).

In the women, the history of being laid off was a significant predictor of high supplementary P–O fit. The odds

Table 1. Socio-demographic predictors of the complementary person–organization fit (P–O fit) – results of the binary multivariable logistic regression

Variable	Men[b] (N = 280)			Women[c] (N = 307)		
	n	OR	95% CI	n	OR	95% CI
Demography						
age						
< 24 years[a]	29	1.00		26	1.00	
25–44 years	155	0.48	0.18–1.33	165	3.96	1.28–12.30*
> 44 years	96	0.46	0.14–1.49	116	6.39	1.85–22.05**
level of education						
secondary[a]	126	1.00		121	1.00	
primary/basic vocational	87	0.77	0.41–1.45	63	1.30	0.65–2.58
high	67	1.39	0.70–2.76	123	1.63	0.88–3.04
Occupational situation						
profession consistent with the education						
no[a]	154	1.00		160	1.00	
yes	100	0.80	0.45–1.42	97	0.97	0.54–1.75
general education only	26	1.97	0.70–5.54	50	1.37	0.63–2.98
tenure in the main place of employment						
< 3 years[a]	93	1.00		120	1.00	
4–10 years	95	1.70	0.83–3.49	97	1.32	0.71–2.43
> 10 years	92	1.86	0.79–4.38	90	0.95	0.46–1.95
employment status						
1 employer[a]	258	1.00		284	1.00	
> 1 employer	16	0.78	0.22–2.77	17	1.75	0.50–6.15
being self-employed, casual work and/or own business	6	0.17	0.02–1.69	6	0.39	0.06–2.54
the same employer during the course of the career						
no[a]	194	1.00		218	1.00	
yes	86	0.71	0.13–3.71	89	1.40	0.35–5.55

Table 1. Socio-demographic predictors of the complementary person–organization fit (P–O fit) – results of the binary multivariable logistic regression – cont.

Variable	Men[b] (N = 280)			Women[c] (N = 307)		
	n	OR	95% CI	n	OR	95% CI
Occupational situation – cont.						
voluntary job change						
not once[a]	97	1.00		111	1.00	
≤ 2 times	94	0.71	0.15–3.40	128	0.98	0.27–3.53
> 2 times	89	0.97	0.19–4.91	68	1.19	0.30–4.75
being laid off						
not once[a]	235	1.00		247	1.00	
1 time	33	1.01	0.41–2.51	45	0.52	0.23–1.21
> 1 time	12	0.64	0.16–2.59	15	0.13	0.02–0.08*
shift work						
no[a]	177	1.00		193	1.00	
yes	103	0.36	0.20–0.62***	114	0.66	0.37–1.17
working time						
part time	22	1.00		45	1.00	
full time	258	0.37	0.12–1.14	262	0.83	0.40–1.72
average length of the working day						
< 8 h[a]	162	1.00		236	1.00	
8–10 h	85	0.51	0.27–0.97*	50	0.68	0.33–1.39
> 10 h	33	0.49	0.20–1.24	21	0.51	0.18–1.49
working week						
≤ 5 days[a]	164	1.00		238	1.00	
> 5 days	86	0.84	0.46–1.56	69	0.83	0.41–1.67
Family situation						
living alone						
no[a]	241	1.00		257	1.00	
yes	39	1.81	0.65–5.07	50	0.66	0.26–1.68

Family situation – cont.

Variable	Men (N = 280)			Women (N = 307)		
	n	OR	95% CI	n	OR	95% CI
being in a relationship						
no[a]	76	1.00		102	1.00	
yes	204	2.04	0.92–4.56	205	0.89	0.45–1.76
having children						
no[a]	176	1.00		172	1.00	
yes	104	1.38	0.77–2.47	135	0.83	0.48–1.44

OR – odds ratio; CI – confidence interval.

[a] Reference category for the independent variable.

[b] Nagelkerke R^2 = 0.177, $Chi^2_{(df=23)}$ = 39.806, p < 0.05, Hosmer-Lemeshow $Chi^2_{(df=8)}$ = 6.839, p = 0.554.

[c] Nagelkerke R^2 = 0.173, $Chi^2_{(df=23)}$ = 42.65, p < 0.01, Hosmer-Lemeshow $Chi^2_{(df=8)}$ = 8.608, p = 0.376.

* p < 0.05; ** p < 0.01; *** p < 0.001.

Table 2. Socio-demographic predictors of the supplementary person–organization fit (P–O fit) – results of the binary multivariable logistic regression

Variable	Men[b] (N = 280)			Women[c] (N = 307)		
	n	OR	95% CI	n	OR	95% CI
Demography						
age						
< 24 years[a]	29	1.00		26	1.00	
25–44 years	155	0.90	0.34–2.39	165	1.54	0.57–4.16
> 44 years	96	1.03	0.33–3.24	116	2.51	0.83–7.60
level of education						
secondary[a]	126	1.00		121	1.00	
primary/basic vocational	87	0.81	0.43–1.51	63	0.72	0.36–1.42
high	67	1.48	0.74–2.92	123	1.26	0.69–2.31
Occupational situation						
profession consistent with education						
no[a]	154	1.00		160	1.00	
yes	100	1.27	0.71–2.27	97	0.88	0.50–1.57
general education only	26	1.56	0.58–4.26	50	0.87	0.41–1.86

Table 2. Socio-demographic predictors of the supplementary person–organization fit (P–O fit) – results of the binary multivariable logistic regression – cont.

Variable	Men[b] (N = 280)			Women[c] (N = 307)		
	n	OR	95% CI	n	OR	95% CI
Occupational situation – cont.						
tenure in the main place of employment						
< 3 years[a]	93	1.00		120	1.00	
4–10 years	95	1.45	0.71–2.96	97	1.21	0.66–2.22
> 10 years	92	1.68	0.72–3.92	90	0.88	0.43–1.79
employment status						
1 employer[a]	258	1.00		284	1.00	
> 1 employer	16	1.31	0.38–4.54	17	1.46	0.44–4.80
being self-employed, casual work and/or own business	6	0.60	0.09–3.85	6	1.78	0.29–10.94
the same employer during the course of the career						
no[a]	194	1.00		218	1.00	
yes	86	1.89	0.35–10.10	89	0.51	0.13–1.99
voluntary job change						
not once[a]	97	1.00		111	1.00	
≤ 2 times	94	0.99	0.20–4.83	128	0.39	0.11–1.41
> 2 times	89	1.02	0.20–5.23	68	0.44	0.11–1.73
being laid off						
not once[a]	235	1.00		247	1.00	
1 time	33	1.17	0.48–2.87	45	0.38	0.16–0.90*
> 1 time	12	0.70	0.17–2.95	15	0.15	0.03–0.78*
shift work						
no[a]	177	1.00		193	1.00	
yes	103	0.37	0.21–0.64***	114	1.08	0.61–1.90
working time						
full-time[a]	22	1.00		45	1.00	
part-time	258	0.96	0.34–2.76	262	0.69	0.34–1.41

	n	OR	95% CI	n	OR	95% CI
average length of the working day						
< 8 h[a]	162	1.00		236	1.00	
8–10 h	85	0.78	0.41–1.47	50	0.90	0.45–1.81
> 10 h	33	0.69	0.28–1.71	21	0.70	0.25–1.95
working week						
≤ 5 days[a]	164	1.00		238	1.00	
> 5 days	86	0.81	0.44–1.50	69	0.80	0.40–1.57
Family situation						
living alone						
no[a]	241	1.00		257	1.00	
yes	39	2.20	0.77–6.28	50	0.87	0.35–2.16
being in a relationship						
no[a]	76	1.00		102	1.00	
yes	204	2.38	1.04–5.49*	205	1.41	0.72–2.76
having children						
no[a]	176	1.00		172	1.00	
yes	104	1.65	0.92–2.94	135	0.92	0.54–1.57

OR – odds ratio; CI – confidence interval.

[a] Reference category for the independent variable.

[b] Nagelkerke R^2 = 0.162, $Chi^2_{(df=23)}$ = 36.302, $p < 0.05$, Hosmer-Lemeshow $Chi^2_{(df=8)}$ = 5.896, $p = 0.659$.

[c] Nagelkerke R^2 = 0.103, $Chi^2_{(df=23)}$ = 24.675, $p = 0.37$, Hosmer-Lemeshow $Chi^2_{(df=8)}$ = 10.387, $p = 0.239$.

* $p < 0.05$; ** $p < 0.01$; *** $p < 0.001$.

of outcome in the group of women who have been laid off once were reduced by 62% compared to the women who have never been laid off, the odds of the women who have been laid off more than once were even more reduced – by 85% compared to the women without the history of being laid off (OR = 0.15, 95% CI: 0.03–0.78).

DISCUSSION

In our sample, demographic variables in general were not an important predictor of good P–O fit both in the men and women. The percentage of variance of the outcome was not big. The significant socio-demographic predictors of good P–O fit were gender dependent. We failed to find any relationships between multiple-employment, job-education congruence, education, continuous work for one employment for the whole career and P–O fit.

No significant relationship between the level of education and P–O fit level (both supplementary and complementary) may be surprising as in many other studies higher level of education was proven to be a resource helping in adaptation to changes and environmental demands [22–24]. This means, that in our sample, the level and kind of education were not essential for feeling congruent to the organization. It might have happened that our results were affected by uncontrolled overeducation effect. The recent data from different European countries show that around 25% of working population has higher skills and competences than their job demands. There is evidence that perceived overeducation is negatively related to job satisfaction, affective and continuance of organizational commitments [25–27].

We assumed that job–education congruence should foster good P–O fit [26]; however, the results of our study did not prove it. It might be related to the temporal aspect of different kind of fit, which has been recently discussed in the literature [28]. Probably job–education congruence plays an important role at the first stages of career in the organization – it can be significant during the selection

process and when a person learns how to perform tasks assigned to him/her. Thus, at the beginning of a career in a given organization, job–education congruence may affect especially needs–supplies aspects of P–O fit, and lose its meaning at later stages when work processes and procedures are acquired and to some extent routinized.

In our sample, the mean job tenure at a current work post was 9.5 years and the mean general job tenure was slightly over 17 years with standard deviation over 11 years, which means that our respondents' minimal work experience was 6 years. Our results also did not show any relationship between having the same employer since the beginning of one's occupational life and any aspects of P–O fit. It was a puzzling result as a long tenure at the same employer, in our opinion, should generally be related to better P–O fit – as a voluntary decision on quitting job is usually related to a low level of perceived fit or prospects for better P–O fit in another workplace. Of course, perception of actual and future P–O fit is not the only factor affecting job tenure in a given organization – economic factors such as an employer's labour market (which is still a case in Poland) can be moderators of the analyzed relationship.

With regard to the relationship between holding multiple employment and P–O fit, we believed, based on limited number of research [29,30], that multiple employment holders would suffer from poorer P–O fit, which is a result of mental and physical overload, conflicting demands of two or more jobs and stress affecting work performance. We also assumed that holding multiple employment will be related to a lower level of emotional engagement and will affect identification with an organization as a social group. However, data obtained in our study did not allow for confirmation of our assumptions. Holding multiple employment did not increase the risk of poorer supplementary and complementary P–O fit. It might be that in the case of secondary employment in Poland people take up secondary jobs not for pleasure and individual development. They treat it mainly as an additional source of

income. Thus, an additional job as an economic necessity does not affect their dedication and fit to the main place of employment. This issue should be studied more deeply in the future.

A significant role of shift work and long working hours in shaping the men's P–O fit and the experience of being laid-off in the women's P–O fit is what we consider to be an important result.

Our analyses showed that the men working shifts reported a worse level of supplementary and complementary P–O fit than the men who worked regular hours. A long working day (up to 10 h) also negatively affected complementary P–O fit in the men. It seems that the effort of the shift work and long working hours is not properly gratified – the fit between needs and supplies or between demands and abilities is generally not met. Additionally, efforts made to meet demands of shift work in some way prevent men to experience the feeling of a sense of community with other workers and an organization as a whole (similarity between workers and organization – supplementary fit is not met). These results are not very surprising considering that shift work itself is highly demanding physically, mentally and socially.

It has been demonstrated in the study on police employees that effort–reward imbalance was a significant predictor of psychological adjustment to shift work [30]. For this reason, we assume that the ratio between effort and reward in shift work for many employees may be at least subjectively unbalanced. What is surprising in our results is the fact that shift work did not affect the level of P–O fit in the women. This result might be the effect of different shifts schedules in men and women and differences in characteristics of female and male workers' work environment.

For example, Bara and Arber [31] and Rouch et al. [32] have found that female shift workers compared to male shift workers work in more favorable environments (less exposure to physical and psychosocial risks), which are more similar to that of day workers. Thus, they may

perceive the effort–reward ratio as more fair than man do. Other studies show that men more frequently work in rotating shift schedule systems, which is considered the most demanding and related to a wide range of negative outcomes [33,34].

Unfortunately, we were not able to clarify the differences in shift work – neither information on work environment nor on the type of shifts schedule was collected in our study. Thus, this issue demands further studies.

Other time demands of work performed that were analyzed in the study were not related to any aspects of P–O fit. We also did not observe any relationship between voluntary job changes and P–O fit both in the men and women; however, job loss was the factor affecting P–O fit in the women.

In the women, the risk of complementary and supplementary misfit was related to the experience of being dismissed from a job. The possible mechanism of the results referring to the complementary P–O fit is that the experience of layoffs may be a burden in the future job searching. There is a lot of evidence that an involuntary job loss results in depression, poor health and functioning [35–37]. During negotiating terms of new employment, the experience of an involuntary job loss is a strong disadvantage. An employee with such an experience in his or her employment history may tend to agree to worse terms and conditions of a new job than in the previous one – therefore, the needs–supplies dimension of P–O fit is unlikely to be complementary. When searching for a new job after dismissal, such a person may accept a position below his or her competences – therefore, the demands–abilities dimension of P–O fit is not complementary.

Moreover, in contrast to men who have more instrumental attitude to social relationships, women are less likely to be embedded in social networks, which give opportunities for career development, income and status advancement. Thus, in a situation of unemployment, women have less access to significant, decisive persons who might direct

them towards new job opportunities and they have fewer chances for quick re-employment.

The effect of multiple involuntary job losses on women has been previously confirmed in the study of Nuttman-Shwartz and Gadot [37]. It has been proven that women who lost their job more than once have significantly stronger desire to return to work than the women who were laid off only once, thus, they are at greater risk of performing low paid and unsatisfactory jobs.

Losing a job is not just the loss of economic security. It also affects sense of belonging and identity of a person. Significance of the experience of being laid off in predicting P–O fit (especially supplementary fit) in women but not in men can be explained in terms of the theory of gender differences. Studies on gender differences in social behaviors show that women are more sensitive to other people, place more value to social relationships, give and seek social support to a greater extent than men do [38]. Job loss entails a detachment from a larger social context, affects both self-confidence and self-efficacy and produces feeling of insecurity.

If we add the fact that women have tendency to evaluate themselves in term of skills and competences worse than men, we can see a vicious circle: job loss and detachment from peers affect self-esteem, increase the perceived gap between own and other people's competences, which is the engine of further social withdrawal and problems with effective socialization in the new work environment.

There is still not much research on gender differences in the context of job loss and the existing studies bring inconclusive results. Some show a vulnerable position of women on the job market, especially in the countries (Poland is one of them) during transition [39]. Other suggest that findings on the gender differences are rather a result of the research methodology (e.g., types of jobs into which men and women are selected) [40]. Anyway, the negative consequences of a job loss may be greater for women since still, even in modern societies, there are discrepancies in power, position and economic resources between men and women.

The research on managers has shown that after a job loss women need more assistance in job searching [41]. If this has been observed in a group of educated women in managerial positions, the situation of the uneducated women performing unspecialized work must be even more difficult. As another study has shown [42] the time of unemployment is longer for women – during this time their qualifications and skills expire and they become less attractive employees. In a new job, women tend to accept lower salaries – the correspondence between salary and the expectations is an important component of the complementary aspect of P–O fit.

Age and family situation were other factors we took into consideration in our study. Age and family factors' effects on P–O fit were gender related.

The results showed that the men being in relationships, therefore, having obligations to someone else or having family responsibilities other than caring for children, are much more likely to obtain a high level of supplementary P–O fit. The interference hypothesis popular in work-life balance studies provides some explanation of this result [43]. According to this hypothesis, both positive and negative experiences gained in a private domain can be transferred to the professional domain and vice versa. Thus, we may assume that men having relational responsibilities learn how to find and maintain a good sense of community with others.

These abilities are transferred to work domain and facilitate socialization within a working group, which may result in a perception of similarity between an individual and his social work environment. In our opinion, the hypothetical mechanism of acquiring better supplementary P–O fit through the spillover of social skills between private and occupational spheres is a very interesting issue for the future research.

We found gender related relationship between age and complementary fit. Generally, the probability of being

complementary fit to an organization among the women increased along with the age of the respondents. Probably the older women perceived the effort–reward ratio as more fair than the younger women.

The study design does not allow for a clear explanation of this result. We only may point at several possible reasons for this relation. One of them refers to the studies on gender and age related differences in personality profiles of men and women [44,45]. Research has shown that women are more agreeable than men and, on average, older adults are more agreeable than middle-aged and younger adults. Agreeableness is considered as the superordinate trait group along with such subtraits as: trust, morality, altruism, cooperation, modesty and sympathy. It describes individual differences in being likeable, pleasant, and harmonious in relations with others [46]. People with these qualities of character socialize easily, avoid confrontation with others and are more likely to give up their needs for the general good.

Taking into account what has been said before, one can assume that older women are more tolerant for discrepancy between their needs and supplies (the complementary fit) offered by an organization than younger ones and thus, they feel complementarily fit to an organization, even when some of their needs are not satisfied.

On the other hand, age can be seen as an indirect indicator of work experience, which is not only characterized by a high level of expertise but also by a higher level of socialization in different work environments and more realistic expectations about working life. From this perspective, the increase of probability of achieving good complementary fit with age is not surprising. The youngest age category of women (up to 24 years of age) corresponds with the earliest stage of a professional career where the gap between the ideal state and reality is the biggest. Discrepancies between the needs of employees and supplies provided by an organization may be a cause of disappointment and a lower probability of assessing the complementary P–O fit as high.

Age related differences in the complementary fit were not observed in the men. Why? We address this question referring to gender differences in a labour market status. Although gender gap in wages has decreased recently, women still end up in poorly paid jobs much more often than men do [47]. It is especially evident in the case of young women at the beginning of their professional life. Poor wages are accompanied by poor work environment, which usually neither provides possibilities for carrier development nor enough social security. For many women such a situation evokes a sense of injustice and exploitation and does not allow experience of a fair level of complementary P–O fit.

Limitations

Although the research reached its aim and pointed at some socio-demographic characteristics that affected the level of P–O fit, it has also some limitations, which should be considered. The study design that employed exclusively self-rating instruments may have had influenced the obtained results. In our study, the perceived P–O fit was measured. It is defined as "the judgment that a person fits well in the environment" [48, p. 181] and it is usually measured by asking people if they believe that such fit exists and to what extent. The perceived P–O fit is contrasted with the so called actual or objective fit, which is a comparison of separately taken measures of an individual and environment. The subjective measure of P–O fit employed in the study may suffer from common method bias [49,50]. Another limitation related to the measurement issue is the fact that indices of the perceived P–O fit capture a general affective attitude of an individual towards contextual environment. Thus, it does not bring reliable information on direction of possible misfit. On the other hand, subjective measures of P–O fit are still commonly used in research. There is a believe that despite its' flaws, subjective measures of P–O fit reflect human reality the best – as people can be affected only by reality as it is perceived by them. As our study was conducted in a random sample of

Polish employees, the choice of subjective P–O fit measure was the procedural necessity – we did not have the possibility to analyze features of various organizations which employed our respondents.

CONCLUSIONS

Although of the 15 analyzed socio-demographic variables and work characteristics only a few were significantly associated with P–O fit, the results of our study showed some specific gender related factors contributing to the level of workers' P–O fit. The value of the notion that different socio-demographic and work characteristics contribute to P–O fit of women and men cannot be underestimated. Knowledge on the risk groups for low P–O fit may be used as important background for organizational interventions, which address special needs of employees. Going beyond personality and competences as factors affecting P–O fit through addressing the issues of age, gender, work history and time demands of work (shift work, long hours) will allow development of better socialization practices within an organization. These practices should be aimed at maintaining sense of importance for an organization, commitment and belonging to an organization as a social group. In our study, the men working shifts or long hours experienced a lower level of P–O fit than the men working regular hours. Thus, the question arise how to overcome or neutralize the burden of shift/long working hours and how to provide conditions for developing better congruence between an employee and an organization? Research has already brought a lot of evidence on the relationship between P–O fit and turnover. The core conclusion from these studies is that an optimal P–O fit level supports employment stability. Knowing that, for example, women with multiple involuntary job losses are at risk of poorer P–O fit and because of that may suffer further failure in maintaining a job can be also a valuable clue for agencies responsible for vocational activation of unemployed people. These agencies could include such topics as: self-reliance and self-efficacy, overcoming burden of multiple job losses, development of more

adequate self-assessment of skills and competences, etc., into their training curricula.

The pattern of obtained results may be also some inspiration for further scientific investigations. In our opinion, there are at least 3 issues demanding exploration: a) temporal nature of fit and predictors of P–O fit at particular stages of career development, b) problem of more and more frequent overeducation and its relationship with P–O fit, and c) determinants of good P–O fit in multiple job holders, and other group of employees working irregular hours, or performing part time or telework.

The presented results also contribute to the research efforts aimed at development of a more complex model for prediction of P–O fit where apart from workers' personality, competences and features of an organization also more general factors, like individual experiences at labor market, and a wider social context are taken into account.

REFERENCES

1. Siegrist J. Effort-reward imbalance at work and health. In: Perrewe PL, Ganster DC, editors. Historical and current perspectives on stress and health. Research in occupational stress and well-being. Vol. 2. Bingley: Emerald Group Publishing Limited; 2002. p. 261–91, https://doi.org/10.1016/S1479-3555(02)02007-3.

2. Karasek RA. Job demands, job decision latitude, and mental strain: Implications for job redesign. Adm Sci Q. 1979;24(2):285–308, https://doi.org/10.2307/2392498.

3. Demir M, Demir SS, Nield K. The relationship between person-organization fit, organizational identification and work outcomes. J Bus Econ Manage. 2015;16(2):369–86, https://doi.org/10.3846/16111699.2013.785975.

4. Oh IS, Guay RP, Kim K, Harold CM, Lee JH, Heo CG, et al. Fit happens globally: A meta-analytic comparison of the relationships of person-environment fit dimensions with work attitudes and performance across East Asia, Europe, and North America. Personnel Psychol. 2014;67(1):99–152, https://doi.org/10.1111/peps.12026.

5. Moynihan DP, Pandey S. The ties that bind: Social networks, person-organization value fit, and turnover intention. J Public Adm Res Theory. 2008;18(2):205–27, https://doi.org/10.1093/jopart/mum013.

6. Hoffman BJ, Bynum BH, Piccolo RF, Sutton AW. Person-organization value congruence: How transformational leaders influence work group effectiveness. Acad Manage J. 2011;54(4):779–96, https://doi.org/10.5465/AMJ.2011.64870139.

7. Wei Y-C. Person–organization fit and organizational citizenship behavior: Time perspective. J Manage Organ. 2013;19(1):101–14, https://doi.org/10.1017/jmo.2013.7.

8. Farzaneh J, Frashah AD, Kazemi M. The impact of person-job fit and person-organization fit on OCB: The mediating and moderating effects of organizational commitment and psychological empowerment. Personnel Rev. 2014;43(5):627–91, https://doi.org/10.1108/PR-07-2013-0118.

9. Livingstone LP, Nelson DL, Barr SH. Person-environment fit and creativity: An examination of supply-value and demand-ability versions of fit. J Manage. 1997;23(2):119–46, https://doi.org/10.1177/014920639702300202.

10. Arbour S, Kwantes CT, Kraft JM, Boglarsky CA. Person-organization fit: Using normative behaviors to predict workplace satisfaction, stress and intentions to stay. J Organ Cult Commun Confl. 2014;18(1):41–64.

11. Muchinsky PM, Monahan CJ. What is person-environment congruence? Supplementary versus complementary models of fit. J Vocat Behav. 1987;31(3):268–77, https://doi.org/10.1016/0001-8791(87)90043-1.

12. Cable DM, Edwards JR. Complementary and supplementary fit: A theoretical and empirical integration. J Appl Psychol. 2004;89(5):822–34, https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.89.5.822.

13. Piasentin KA, Chapman DS. Perceived similarity and complementarity as predictors of subjective person–organization fit. J Occup Organ Psychol. 2007;80(2):341–54, https://doi.org/10.1348/096317906X115453.

14. Greguras GJ, Diefendorff JM. Different fits satisfy different needs: Linking person-environment fit to employee commitment and performance using self-determination theory. J Appl Psychol. 2009;94(2):465–77, https://doi.org/10.1037/a0014068.

15. Gardner WL, Reithel BJ, Cogliser CC, Walumbwa FO, Foley RT. Matching personality and organizational culture: Effects of recruitment strategy and the five-factor model on subjective person-organization fit. Manage Commun Q. 2012;26(2):585–622, https://doi.org/10.1177/0893318912450663.

16. Lovelace K, Rosen B. Differences in achieving person-organization fit among diverse groups of managers. J Manage. 1996;22(5):703–22, https://doi.org/10.1177/014920639602200502.

17. Posner BZ. Person-organization values congruence: No support for individual differences as a moderating influence. Hum Relat. 1992;45(4):351–61, https://doi.org/10.1177/001872679204500403.

18. O'Reilly CA, Chatman J, Caldwell DF. People and organizational culture: A profile comparison approach to assessing person-organization fit. Acad Manage J. 1991;34(3):487–516, https://doi.org/10.2307/256404.

19. Seong JY, Hong DS, Park WW. Work status, gender, and organizational commitment among Korean workers: The mediating role of person-organization fit. Asia Pac J Manage. 2012;29(4):1105–29, https://doi.org/10.1007/s10490-011-9248-6.

20. Cooper-Thomas HD, Wright S. Person-environment misfit: The neglected role of social context. J Managerial Psychol. 2013;28(1):21–37, https://doi.org/10.1108/02683941311298841.

21. Czarnota-Bojarska J. [Questionnaire to measure subjective Person-Organization fit]. Psych Edu Spol. 2006;3(2):151–63. Polish.

22. Reeve CL, Heggestad ED. Differential relations between general cognitive ability and interest-vocation fit. J Occup Organ Psychol. 2004;77:385–402, https://doi.org/10.1348/0963179041752673.

23. Frankenberg E, Sikoki B, Sumantri C, Suriastini W, Thomas D. Education, vulnerability, and resilience after a natural

disaster. Ecology Soc. 2013;18(2):16, https://doi.org/10.5751/es-05377-180216.

24. Gonzalez-Mulé E, Mount M, Oh I. A meta-analysis of the relationship between general mental ability and non-task performance. J Appl Psychol. 2014;99(6):1222–43, https://doi.org/10.1037/a0037547.

25. Verhaest D, Omey E. The impact of overeducation and its measurement. Soc Indicators Res. 2006;77(3):419–48, https://doi.org/10.1007/s11205-005-4276-6.

26. Allen J, van der Velden R. Educational mismatches versus skill mismatches: Effects on wages, job satisfaction, and on-the-job search. Oxf Econ Pap. 2001;53(3):434–52, https://doi.org/10.1093/oep/53.3.434.

27. Saravanabawan A, Uthayatharshika MJ. Examining the impact of overqualification on employees' job attitudes and behaviour: Evidence from banking sector employees in Sri Lanka. Int J Econ Commerce Manage. 2014;2(5):1–14.

28. Jansen KJ, Shipp AJ. A review and agenda for incorporating time in fit research. In: Kristof-Brown AL, Billsberry J, editors. Organizational fit: Key issues and new directions. John Wiley & Sons; 2013. p. 195–221, https://doi.org/10.1002/9781118320853.ch9.

29. Sliter MT, Boyd EM. Two (or three) is not equal to one: Multiple jobholding as a neglected topic in organizational research. J Organ Behav. 2014;35(7):1042–6, https://doi.org/10.1002/job.1944.

30. Willis TA, O'Connor DB, Smith L. Investigating effort–reward imbalance and work–family conflict in relation to morningness–eveningness and shift work. Work Stress. 2008;22(2):125–37, https://doi.org/10.1080/02678370802180558.

31. Bara AC, Arber S. Working shifts and mental health – Findings from the British Household Panel Survey (1995–2005). Scand J Work Environ Health. 2009;35(5):361–7, https://doi.org/10.5271/sjweh.1344.

32. Rouch I, Wild P, Ansiau D, Marquié J-C. Shiftwork experience, age and cognitive performance. Ergonomics. 2005;48(10):1282–93, https://doi.org/10.1080/00140130500241670.

33. Tucker P, Smith L, Macdonald I, Folkard S. Effects of direction of rotation in continuous and discontinuous 8 hour shift systems. Occup Environ Med. 2000;57(10):678–84, https://doi.org/10.1136/oem.57.10.678.

34. Grosswald B. Shift work and negative work-to-family spillover. J Sociol Soc Welfare. 2003;30(4):31–57.

35. Price RH, Choi JN, Vinokur AD. Links in the chain of adversity following job loss: How financial strain and loss of personal control lead to depression, impaired functioning, and poor health. J Occup Health Psychol. 2002;7(4):302–12, https://doi.org/10.1037/1076-8998.7.4.302.

36. Noelke C, Beckfield J. Recessions, job loss, and mortality among older US adults. Am J Public Health. 2014;104(11):e126–34, https://doi.org/10.2105/AJPH.2014.302210.

37. Nuttman-Shwartz O, Gadot L. Social factors and mental health symptoms among women who have experienced involuntary job loss. Anxiety Stress Coping. 2012;25(3):275–90, https://doi.org/10.1080/10615806.2011.583644.

38. Greenglass ER. Work stress, coping, and social support: Implications for women's occupational well-being. In: Nelson DL, Burke RJ, editors. Gender, work stress and health. Washington (DC): APA Books; 2002. p. 85–96, https://doi.org/10.1037/10467-006.

39. Glass CM. Gender and work during transition: Job loss in Bulgaria, Hungary, Poland, and Russia. East Eur Polit Soc. 2008;22(4):757–83, https://doi.org/10.1177/0888325408316530.

40. Wilkins R, Wooden M. Gender differences in involuntary job loss: Why are men more likely to lose their jobs? Ind Relat (Berkeley). 2013;52(2):582–608, https://doi.org/10.1111/irel.12024.

41. Malen EA, Stroh LK. The influence of gender on job loss coping behavior among unemployed managers. J Employment Couns. 1998;35(1):26–39, https://doi.org/10.1002/j.2161-1920.1998.tb00473.x.

42. Phelps S, Mason M. When women lose their jobs. Personnel J. 1991;70(8):64–9.

43. Bakker AB, Geurts SAE. Toward a dual-process model of work-home interference. Work Occup. 2004;31(3):345–66, https://doi.org/10.1177/0730888404266349.

44. Allemand M, Zimprich D, Hendriks AA. Age differences in 5 personality domains across the life span. Dev Psychol. 2008;44(3):758–70, https://doi.org/10.1037/0012-1649.44.3.758.

45. Weisberg YJ, DeYoung CG, Hirsh JB. Gender differences in personality across the ten aspects of the Big Five. Front Psychol. 2011;2:178, https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2011.00178.

46. Graziano W, Tobin R. Agreeableness. In: Leary M, Hoyle R, editors. Handbook of individual differences in social behavior. New York: Guilford Press; 2009. p. 46–61.

47. Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development. Report on the gender initiative: Gender equality in education, employment and entrepreneurship. Paris: The Organisation; 2011.

48. Sekiguchi T. Person-Organization fit and Person-Job fit in employee selection: A review of the literature. Osaka Keidai Ronshu. 2004;54(6):179–96.

49. Kristof-Brown AL, Jansen KJ. Issues of Person-Organization fit. In: Ostroff C, Judge T, editors. Perspectives on organizational fit. New York: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates; 2007. p. 123–53.

50. Podsakoff PM, MacKenzie SB, Lee JY, Podsakoff NP. Common methods biases in behavioral research: A critical review of the literature and recommended remedies. J Appl Psychol. 2003;88:879–903, https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.88.5.879.