

CHAPTER IV RESULTS

Descriptive statistics, including means, standard deviations, scale reliabilities, number of subjects, and intercorrelations among all study variables are presented in the Table 4.1. According to the intercorrelations, the correlation of different instruments of the same construct is significantly high, such as, .69 for subjective P-O fit, and .86 for application intention. The reliability between different measurements of the same construct was acceptable.

Table 4.1 *Descriptive Statistics and Intercorrelations among Study Variables*

	M (SD)	α	N of items	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Time 1 (N=83)										
1. OA	.46 (.50)	N/A	N/A							
2. O P-O fit	.02 (.22)	.99	40	-.06						
3. S P-O fit	11.12 (3.13)	.92	3	.37***	.40**					
4. Application intention	24.30 (7.78)	.97	6	.42***	.11	.58***				
5. PFC	34.66 (5.72)	.77	8	.12	-.16	-.02	.16			
Time 2 (N=60)										
6. S P-O fit	14.40 (3.78)	.90	4	.48***	.20	.69***	.62***	.09		
7. Application intention	20.97 (5.62)	.95	5	.49***	.05	.51***	.86***	.18	.69***	
8. Organization attraction	19.97 (5.67)	.94	5	.54***	.01	.60***	.83***	.16	.74***	.90***

Note. OA referred to the manipulation of organization attraction which is dummy coded, 0=low and 1=high organization attraction, therefore, α and N were unavailable. O P-O fit=objective P-O fit; S P-O fit=subjective P-O fit; PFC=preferece for consistency.

* $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$, *** $p < .001$

Manipulation Check

To check the effects of manipulation, an independent samples t-test was conducted. The results indicated that the mean difference was statistically significant ($t=6.31, p<0.001$). On average, respondents indicated a high level of organization attraction among the participants reading the high attraction information ($M=22.84, SD=4.57$), but a low level of organization attraction among the participants reading the low attraction information ($M=15.80, SD=5.45$). Therefore, the manipulation succeeded. The result was presented in Table 4.2.

Table 4.2 *Independent Samples T-test*

	OA		df	t
	Low	High		
	M (SD)	M (SD)		
Time 1 (N=83)				
S P-O fit	10.07 (3.04)	12.37 (2.78)	81	3.57***
Organization Attraction	15.80 (5.45)	22.84 (4.57)	81	6.31***

Note. OA referred to the manipulation of organization attraction; S P-O fit=subjective P-O fit.

* $p<.05$, ** $p < .01$, *** $p<.001$

Hypotheses Tests

In this section, data collected at Time1 were used for hypotheses testing. Data collected at both Time1 and Time2 were used to examine the longitudinal effects in next section.

For Hypothesis 1, organization attraction would influence the subjective P-O fit, an independent samples t-test was conducted to test this hypothesis. The results indicated that the mean difference was statistically significant ($t=3.57, p<0.001$); thus, hypothesis 1 was supported. On average, respondents indicated a high level of

subjective P-O fit among the participants reading the high attraction information ($M=12.37, SD=2.78$), but a low level of organization attraction among the participants reading the low attraction information ($M=10.07, SD=3.04$). The result was presented in Table 4.2. In table 4.3, data from the regression analysis also showed the evidence ($\beta=.37, p < .001$) supporting hypothesis 1.

For hypothesis 2, subjective P-O fit would mediate the relationship between organization attraction and application intention, Baron and Kenny's (1986) procedures were conducted to test this hypothesis. The results were shown in table 5.3. First, OA was significantly related to subjective P-O fit ($\beta=.37, p < .001$). Second, OA was significantly related to application intention ($\beta=.42, p < .001$). Third, subjective P-O fit was significantly related to application intention ($\beta=.58, p < .001$). Fourth, both OA and subjective P-O fit were significantly related to application intention (for OA, $\beta=.24, p < .05$; for subjective P-O fit, $\beta=.49, p < .001$), but the effects of OA was reduced. The results indicated that subjective P-O fit partially mediated the relationship between OA and application intention; thus, hypothesis 2 was partially supported. These results were presented in Table 4.3.

Table 4.3 *Mediators Regressed on Independent Variables*

	S P-O fit	Application Intention		
OA	.37***	.42***		.24*
S P-O fit		.58***		.49***
F	12.75***	17.76***	41.68***	25.61***
df	(1,81)	(1,81)	(1,81)	(2,80)

Note. OA referred to the manipulation, 0=low and 1=high organization attraction; S P-O fit=subjective P-O fit.

* $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$, *** $p < .001$

For hypothesis 3, the level of objective P-O fit would moderate the relationship between organization attraction and subjective P-O fit, the hierarchical moderated regression analysis was conducted to test this hypothesis. In step one, the subjective P-O fit was regressed on OA and objective P-O fit. In step two, the subjective P-O fit was regressed on OA, objective P-O fit, and the interaction item (OA × objective P-O fit). The results indicated the main effects of both OA and objective P-O fit were significant, but the interaction effect was not significant ($\beta=-.08$, n.s.). Thus, hypothesis 3 was not supported. These results were presented in Table 4.4.

Table 4.4 *Hierarchical Moderated Regression Analysis*

	S P-O fit	
	M1	M2
OA	.39***	.39***
O P-O fit	.42***	.47***
OA × O P-O fit		-.08
ΔR^2		.00
Adj. R^2	.29	.29
F	18.1***	12.1***
df	(2,80)	(3,79)

Note. OA referred to the manipulation, 0=low and 1=high organization attraction; O P-O fit=objective P-O fit; S P-O fit=subjective P-O fit.

* $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$, *** $p < .001$

For hypothesis 4, the level of PFC would moderate the relationship between organization attraction and subjective P-O fit, the hierarchical moderated regression analysis was conducted to test this hypothesis. In step one, the subjective P-O fit was regressed on OA and PFC. Then, the subjective P-O fit was regressed on OA, PFC, and the interaction item (OA × PFC). The results indicated the main effects of OA were significant, but PFC. Also, the interaction effect was not significant ($\beta=.09$, n.s.). Thus, hypothesis 4 was not supported. These results were presented in Table 4.5.

Table 4.5 Hierarchical Moderated Regression Analysis

	S P-O fit	
	M1	M2
OA	.36***	.36***
PFC	-.06	-.12
OA × PFC		.09
ΔR^2		.00
Adj. R ²	.10	.10
F	5.84**	3.98**
df	(2,80)	(3,79)

Note. OA referred to the manipulation, 0=low and 1=high organization attraction; S P-O fit=subjective P-O fit; PFC=preference for consistency.

* $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$, *** $p < .001$

Longitudinal Effects

The statistical data used for investigating the longitudinal effects were collected at both Time1 and Time2. The results were presented in Table 4.6.

First, in order to find out whether the manipulation of OA had long-term effects at Time 2, regression analysis was conducted. Results indicated that subjective P-O fit (Time 2) ($\beta=.48$, $p < .001$), application intention (Time 2) ($\beta=.49$, $p < .001$), and organization attraction (Time2) ($\beta=.54$, $p < .001$) were all statistically significant related to OA.

Secondly, to investigate the mediating effects of subjective P-O fit on those dependent variables, Baron and Kenny's (1986) mediation analysis procedures were conducted. Because the effects of OA was reduced on M4, the results indicated subjective P-O fit (Time1) partially mediated the relationship between OA and these three dependent variables, including application intention (Time2) ($\beta=.39$, $p < .001$), organization attraction (Time2) ($\beta=.37$, $p < .01$), and subjective P-O fit (Time2) ($\beta=.29$, $p < .01$).

Table 4.6 Mediators Regressed on Independent Variables

	M1	M2	M3	M4	M2	M3	M4	M2	M3	M4
	S P-O fit (Time 1)	Application Intention (Time 2)			Organization Attraction (Time 2)			S P-O Fit (Time 2)		
OA	.37***	.49***		.39***	.54***		.37**	.48***		.29**
S P-O fit (Time1)			.60***	.47***		.51***	.39***		.69***	.60***
F	12.75***	18.70***	32.03***	27.178***	23.55***	20.37***	17.51***	17.42***	53.82***	35.46***
df	(1,81)	(1,58)	(1,58)	(2,57)	(1,58)	(1,58)	(2,57)	(1,58)	(1,58)	(2,57)

Note. OA referred to the manipulation, 0=low and 1=high organization attraction; S P-O fit=subjective P-O fit.

* $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$, *** $p < .00$