MIS Quarterly

RESEARCH ARTICLE

PERSON–ORGANIZATION AND PERSON–JOB FIT PERCEPTIONS OF NEW IT EMPLOYEES: WORK OUTCOMES AND GENDER DIFFERENCES

Viswanath Venkatesh
Walton College of Business, University of Arkansas, Fayetteville, AR 72701 U.S.A. {vvenkatesh@vvenkatesh.us}

Jaime B. Windeler
Department of Operations, Business Analytics and Information Systems, Carl H. Lindner College of Business, University of Cincinnati, Cincinnati, OH 45221 U.S.A. {Jaime.Windeler@uc.edu}

Kathryn M. Bartol
Management and Organization Department, Robert H. Smith School of Business, University of Maryland, College Park, MD 20742 U.S.A. {kbartol@rhsmith.umd.edu}

Ian O. Williamson
Melbourne Business School, 200 Leicester St. Carlton VIC 3053 AUSTRALIA {i.williamson@mbs.edu}

Appendix A

Survey Items

WORK OUTCOMES

We would like you to tell us how much of each characteristic you expect to see present in your job. For example, there is a characteristic "Friendly coworkers." You will rate on a seven-point scale how much the job will provide the opportunity for you to have "friendly coworkers."

Scale (1 = Not at All to 7 = A Great Deal)

Pay

1) ***Salary level***
2) ***The opportunity to become financially wealthy***
3) ***The amount of pay***
4) *A good salary*
5) *Receiving enough pay to live well*
6) Opportunities to receive more than my normal pay for good work
7) An opportunity to earn a high income
8) Periodic wage raises
9) Have pay increases that keep up with the cost of living
10) Opportunities to earn more than my regular paycheck

Promotion

1) ***Opportunities for advancement***
2) ***Promotion opportunities***
3) ***Chances for advancement***
4) *Opportunities to attain higher rank in the organization*
5) *Chances to climb the corporate ladder*
6) Opportunities to move up in the organization
7) Support for helping me gain a higher position in the organization
8) The possibility of promotions
9) Chances to move up the organizational hierarchy
10) Opportunities to gain a higher position in the organization

Prestige

1) ***Having others consider my work important***
2) ***Obtaining status in the eyes of others***
3) ***Being looked up to by others***
4) *Getting a good reputation for my good work*
5) *Being respected by others*
6) Being influential
7) My job bringing me prestige
8) Being held in high esteem by others
9) Having the admiration of others
10) Having the respect of others

Job Security

1) Being certain of keeping my job
2) Being sure I will always have a job
3) Being certain my job will last
4) Having a secure future
5) Having another job in the organization if my present job ends
6) Being sure my job will be around for a long time
7) Knowing that I can count on having my job in the near future
8) Knowing that I can work for my organization as long as I want
9) Knowing that my organization would find me another job if my current job were to end
10) Being sure I can count on this job lasting

Family Proximity

1) Being in the same geographic location as my immediate family (i.e., parents, brother, sister)
2) Living in the same area as my immediate family
3) Being in very close geographical proximity of my immediate family
4) Having my immediate family live close to me
5) Not living far away from my immediate family
6) Not having to travel far to see my immediate family
7) Living close to my immediate family
8) Being only a short distance from my immediate family
9) Having my immediate family close by
10) Having my immediate family in close proximity to where I live

Friendly Coworkers

1) Friendly coworkers
1) Collegial coworkers
3) Coworkers who are supportive
4) Forming friendships with coworkers
5) Having good relationships with coworkers
6) Having good connections with coworkers
7) Supportive coworkers
8) Being able to turn to my coworkers if I have a problem
9) Sharing personal information with coworkers
10) Having a good report with coworkers

Work–Life Balance

1) Being able to balance my family and work life
2) Having time for my personal life
3) A work environment that supports work/family balance
4) Providing enough leisure time off the job
5) Flexibility in balancing my personal life with my work life
6) Work policies that support me in handling personal or family concerns
7) The ability to disconnect from work when I am away from it
8) Support for balance between my work and personal life
9) Having enough time to enjoy my family and personal life
10) Work policies that let me alter my schedule so I can attend to personal or family events

Variety

1) Doing a variety of things
2) Doing something different every day
3) Doing many different things on the job
4) Having variety in duties and activities
5) Having changes in my job
6) Not doing the same thing all the time
7) Opportunities to do different types of tasks
8) Variation in the work I do
9) Having different things to do over time
10) Working on different projects or tasks

Creativity

1) Trying out new ideas and suggestions
2) Creating something new
3) Contributing new ideas
4) Originating new ideas and/or products
5) Experimenting with different ways of doing things
6) Designing new things
7) Developing original ideas
8) Using my creative talents to do things in a new way
9) Experimenting with my own ideas
10) Innovating with new ideas

Skill Development

1) Opportunities to develop new skills
2) Developing new knowledge through training
3) Acquiring new career-relevant skills
4) Improving the skills I have
5) Opportunities to increase my knowledge
6) Opportunities to acquire specialized skills
7) Adding to the abilities I already have
8) Encouraging continued development of my knowledge and skills
9) Enhancing my current skill set
10) Extending my knowledge and skills

FIT PERCEPTIONS

Scale: Seven-point Likert agreement scale

Person–Organization Fit

1) The organization will be a total fit for me.
2) Taking everything into account, the organization will be a complete fit for me.
3) I would fit right into the organization.

Person–Job Fit

1) I would fit right in to the job.
2) Taking everything into account, the job is a complete fit for me.
3) The job provides a total fit for me.

Notes:

1. For the post-organizational entry items, the present tense is used throughout. For instance, the instructions were modified to: We would like you to tell us how much of each characteristic you experience in your job. For example, there is a characteristic "Friendly coworkers." You will rate on a seven-point scale how much the job provides the opportunity for you to have "friendly coworkers."
2. Likewise, in the post-organizational entry survey, "will be" in the first two PO fit items is replaced with "is." Also, "would" is dropped in the 3rd PO fit item and 1st PJ fit item.
3. Items retained in the final survey are shown in bold italics.

Appendix B

Measurement Invariance Analysis

Prior to evaluating our structural model, we sought to establish multigroup measurement invariance. Configural and metric invariance analyses were conducted using AMOS 5.0. First, we tested for configural invariance, which checks whether groups have the same factor structure by examining the extent to which the pattern of loadings are congeneric when allowing parameters to vary freely across groups (Doll et al. 1998; Steenkamp and Baumgartner 1998). The results demonstrated that the pattern of item loadings was congeneric across the groups. Each of the baseline models showed adequate fit—all CFIs and NNFIs being between .92 and .95—thus supporting the generalizability of the factor pattern. Metric invariance testing determines whether the groups have the same factor loadings. To perform this analysis, a series of equality constraints were imposed on the item loadings. Changes in CFI between the nested models (configural and metric) should be smaller than the suggested threshold of .01 to demonstrate metric invariance (Cheung and Rensvold 2002). Changes in CFI for our model were all less than .01, providing support for metric invariance. The results indicated that the models exhibited measurement equivalence across groups, permitting meaningful comparison between the path coefficients (Cheung and Rensvold 2002).

Appendix C

Measurement Model Validity Assessment

The analysis reported here employed data from men and women IT workers prior to organizational entry. We examined the results for the constructs with reflective indicators, followed by the constructs with formative indicators. Convergent validity is established when the item loadings are high (> .70) and when the average variance extracted (AVE) is at least .50 (Fornell and Larcker 1981). Tables C1, C2, and C3 show the item loadings and crossloadings. All items exhibited high loadings on their respective factor, with the exception of prestige1 (.69) and skill development1 (.68) in Table C1 for study 1, family proximity2 (.69) and skill development2 (.69) in Table C2 for study 2, and creativity3 (.69) in Table C3 for study 3. Because these values were close to the cut-off of .70, and their corresponding AVEs were all above the threshold of .50, we retained them in the model. Moreover, Gefen and Straub (2005, pp. 93-94) note that "all the loadings of the measurement items on their assigned latent variables should be an order of magnitude larger than any other loading. For example, if one of the measurement items loads with a .70 coefficient on its latent construct, then the loadings of all the measurement items on any latent construct but their own should be below .60" (for illustrations, see Choudhury and Karahanna 2006; Siponen and Vance 2010). This was the case with our model. We compared the square root of the AVEs to the correlations among constructs. The results also supported discriminant validity as the square root of the AVEs were all greater than the inter-construct correlations (Fornell and Larcker 1981). Tables C4, C5, and C6 show the AVEs, inter-construct correlations and demonstrated that internal consistency reliability values were greater than the threshold of .70 (Nunnally and Bernstein 1994), providing support for reliability of PO and PJ fit. Thus, we concluded that the measurement model results provided evidence for reliability and validity.

Formative measures are not required to exhibit internal consistency or reliability (Petter et al. 2007). In fact, multicollinearity can be problematic for formative constructs as it can suggest that multiple indicators are tapping into the same aspect of the construct and destabilize the model (Diamantopoulos and Siguaw 2006). Thus, we used the variance inflation factor (VIF) to assess the degree of multicollinearity, with values less than 3.3 indicating that multicollinearity was not a concern. For extrinsic, social and intrinsic outcomes, we found that the VIFs were all below 3, indicating that multicollinearity was not an issue (Diamantopoulos and Siguaw 2006). For formative measures, the validity of the measurement model involves examination of the item weights (Petter et al. 2007). Nonsignificant weights may be eliminated, whereas significant weights provide insight into the relative importance of each indicator. Table C7 shows the weights of the formative indicators associated with extrinsic, social and intrinsic outcomes. When formative indicators explain all of the variance in a construct, the average of their weights is $\sqrt{(1/n)}$, where n is the number of indicators (Klein and Rai 2009). Thus, the maximum average weight is .50 for extrinsic outcomes with 4 indicators, .58 for intrinsic with 3 indicators and .58 social outcomes with 3 indicators. The observed weights, shown in Table C7, for extrinsic, social, and intrinsic outcomes indicate the relative importance of each of the formative indicators. To assess discriminant validity, we examined the item-to-item and item-to-construct correlations (Petter et al. 2007). Using PLS item weights for each formative indicator, we computed composite construct scores that were then used to calculate these correlations and evaluate discriminant validity (Ravichandaran and Rai 2000). We found that the item-to-item correlations were greater than the item-to-construct correlations and that the items had higher correlations with the composite scores of their proposed construct than they did with the scores of other constructs. We thus found support for discriminant validity of the constructs with formative indicators.

Tables C8, C9, C10, and C11 present the loadings, crossloadings, and formative indicator weights for the sample of all pre-organizational entry workers. The pattern of results was highly similar to that of our results for IT workers, with the results generally providing evidence for reliability and validity. All items exhibited high loadings ($\geq$ .70) on their respective factor. Discriminant validity was supported as the square root of the AVEs were all greater than the inter-construct correlations (Fornell and Larcker 1981). Tables C12, C13, and C14 present the AVEs, descriptive statistics, and correlations, which were highly similar to our primary analysis.

Tables C15, C16, C17, and C18 present the loadings, crossloadings, and formative indicator weights for the sample of all post-organizational entry workers. The pattern of results was highly similar to the previous results, with the results generally providing evidence for reliability and validity. All items exhibited high loadings on their respective factor, with the exception of variety2 (.69) in Table C15 for study 1 and promotion3 (.69), family proximity3 (.69) and person-org fit3 (.69) in Table C16 for study 2. Based on the same reasoning given above, we elected to keep these items in the model. Discriminant validity was supported as the square root of the AVEs were all greater than the inter-construct correlations shown in Tables C19, C20, and C21 (Fornell and Larcker 1981). Thus, we concluded that all measurement model results provided evidence for reliability and validity.

Table C1. Study 1: Loadings and Crossloadings for Model with Pre-organizational Entry IT Workers

		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12
1	Pay1	**.74**	.28	.55	.57	.57	.51	.40	.52	.28	.46	.32	.56
	Pay2	**.76**	.47	.51	.39	.32	.37	.37	.33	.55	.30	.38	.49
	Pay3	**.75**	.28	.39	.35	.57	.45	.35	.48	.61	.35	.29	.55
2	Promotion1	.35	**.73**	.61	.32	.61	.61	.41	.28	.55	.56	.50	.54
	Promotion2	.51	**.77**	.37	.33	.34	.30	.38	.54	.40	.51	.46	.44
	Promotion3	.50	**.78**	.49	.48	.43	.28	.30	.42	.57	.37	.34	.56
3	Prestige1	.31	.51	**.69**	.52	.55	.46	.53	.36	.57	.56	.45	.41
	Prestige2	.54	.58	**.74**	.41	.61	.54	.62	.56	.42	.30	.56	.33
	Prestige3	.55	.55	**.73**	.31	.49	.33	.40	.46	.35	.28	.35	.41
4	Security1	.57	.56	.38	**.71**	.46	.58	.50	.57	.35	.49	.60	.38
	Security2	.48	.53	.28	**.74**	.62	.56	.34	.37	.48	.41	.45	.58
	Security3	.30	.59	.51	**.70**	.57	.56	.56	.38	.55	.38	.33	.59
5	Work–life balance1	.56	.40	.28	.44	**.77**	.49	.40	.61	.39	.39	.39	.47
	Work–life balance2	.57	.32	.40	.57	**.81**	.30	.28	.28	.44	.45	.50	.38
	Work–life balance3	.60	.59	.48	.31	**.84**	.34	.40	.37	.48	.54	.61	.47
6	Friendly coworkers1	.56	.34	.49	.56	.42	**.71**	.45	.53	.61	.36	.55	.38
	Friendly coworkers2	.51	.35	.44	.47	.57	**.70**	.29	.44	.38	.34	.55	.33
	Friendly coworkers3	.39	.37	.53	.59	.41	**.77**	.42	.61	.50	.56	.57	.59
7	Family proximity1	.31	.59	.38	.60	.50	.54	**.75**	.55	.50	.40	.62	.32
	Family proximity2	.47	.56	.58	.48	.34	.57	**.74**	.32	.48	.58	.34	.46
	Family proximity3	.39	.52	.48	.42	.57	.33	**.73**	.46	.46	.38	.56	.47
8	Variety1	.29	.34	.32	.34	.38	.54	.51	**.71**	.50	.53	.35	.44
	Variety2	.44	.33	.41	.48	.54	.57	.43	**.74**	.42	.57	.39	.54
	Variety3	.57	.60	.40	.55	.39	.50	.44	**.73**	.38	.41	.38	.59
9	Creativity1	.46	.35	.60	.38	.31	.59	.35	.29	**.71**	.34	.55	.31
	Creativity2	.40	.40	.48	.55	.35	.28	.31	.39	**.74**	.59	.38	.59
	Creativity3	.51	.51	.45	.57	.58	.34	.55	.60	**.71**	.58	.48	.61
10	Skill development1	.50	.41	.52	.52	.34	.46	.33	.35	.36	**.68**	.57	.42
	Skill development2	.59	.37	.38	.47	.52	.29	.60	.34	.50	**.70**	.46	.35
	Skill development3	.55	.43	.62	.42	.29	.58	.37	.54	.36	**.74**	.52	.62
11	Person-org fit1	.35	.42	.43	.34	.55	.55	.47	.47	.57	.53	**.71**	.28
	Person-org fit2	.36	.39	.39	.37	.30	.52	.42	.29	.62	.43	**.77**	.61
	Person-org fit3	.61	.60	.39	.52	.30	.46	.58	.45	.43	.41	**.72**	.59
12	Person-job fit1	.42	.61	.45	.56	.50	.33	.31	.54	.37	.40	.36	**.74**
	Person-job fit2	.32	.35	.55	.31	.60	.30	.50	.60	.35	.39	.29	**.75**
	Person-job fit3	.31	.34	.50	.58	.60	.43	.61	.60	.47	.56	.55	**.71**

Table C2. Study 2: Loadings and Crossloadings for Model with Pre-organizational Entry IT Workers

		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12
1	Pay1	**.74**	.61	.53	.57	.29	.43	.35	.48	.46	.60	.49	.61
	Pay2	**.75**	.58	.52	.53	.58	.61	.38	.59	.37	.54	.31	.52
	Pay3	**.72**	.31	.34	.48	.42	.61	.53	.62	.55	.41	.30	.50
2	Promotion1	.60	**.75**	.45	.34	.46	.59	.34	.41	.39	.45	.34	.45
	Promotion2	.40	**.71**	.49	.60	.59	.47	.30	.53	.50	.49	.41	.51
	Promotion3	.37	**.79**	.35	.57	.59	.32	.49	.37	.44	.34	.51	.56
3	Prestige1	.53	.34	**.79**	.28	.48	.62	.42	.37	.53	.60	.54	.46
	Prestige2	.47	.36	**.79**	.38	.37	.34	.42	.32	.52	.54	.37	.59
	Prestige3	.40	.54	**.74**	.46	.39	.52	.40	.60	.32	.47	.59	.40
4	Security1	.57	.57	.61	**.82**	.39	.58	.46	.57	.54	.45	.62	.34
	Security2	.59	.45	.33	**.82**	.37	.36	.45	.34	.45	.46	.35	.59
	Security3	.52	.28	.61	**.75**	.36	.51	.34	.48	.43	.34	.46	.42
5	Work–life balance1	.52	.44	.60	.41	**.83**	.41	.46	.50	.34	.51	.30	.49
	Work–life balance2	.28	.34	.60	.31	**.80**	.40	.57	.62	.32	.54	.58	.59
	Work–life balance3	.41	.33	.39	.50	**.81**	.38	.51	.55	.39	.49	.53	.34
6	Friendly coworkers1	.60	.28	.47	.47	.50	**.76**	.36	.48	.31	.57	.61	.40
	Friendly coworkers2	.37	.40	.36	.57	.57	**.72**	.61	.44	.60	.45	.40	.42
	Friendly coworkers3	.47	.37	.38	.61	.56	**.83**	.36	.52	.44	.44	.43	.58
7	Family proximity1	.39	.49	.33	.29	.49	.40	**.74**	.39	.37	.53	.29	.59
	Family proximity2	.29	.37	.37	.51	.56	.57	**.69**	.29	.41	.31	.29	.32
	Family proximity3	.60	.46	.44	.34	.58	.61	**.77**	.30	.46	.39	.60	.47
8	Variety1	.33	.28	.33	.50	.36	.53	.43	**.83**	.49	.30	.57	.49
	Variety2	.50	.53	.45	.61	.30	.31	.55	**.79**	.43	.59	.29	.54
	Variety3	.55	.45	.33	.43	.33	.29	.41	**.84**	.32	.40	.51	.33
9	Creativity1	.51	.52	.31	.37	.55	.37	.61	.38	**.73**	.40	.34	.39
	Creativity2	.38	.59	.29	.55	.41	.52	.60	.34	**.83**	.49	.43	.35
	Creativity3	.60	.33	.40	.28	.51	.46	.34	.60	**.76**	.28	.37	.50
10	Skill development1	.31	.43	.52	.32	.62	.53	.38	.51	.31	**.84**	.26	.52
	Skill development2	.41	.47	.43	.33	.34	.41	.52	.56	.50	**.69**	.43	.35
	Skill development3	.45	.28	.61	.46	.53	.36	.29	.57	.35	**.83**	.49	.48
11	Person-org fit1	.57	.37	.56	.58	.40	.34	.30	.44	.57	.52	**.84**	.46
	Person-org fit2	.35	.30	.54	.55	.53	.35	.62	.58	.59	.34	**.80**	.36
	Person-org fit3	.32	.36	.62	.61	.55	.35	.29	.30	.58	.41	**.76**	.37
12	Person-job fit1	.32	.46	.56	.36	.57	.61	.49	.45	.49	.30	.37	**.78**
	Person-job fit2	.52	.53	.52	.45	.51	.57	.62	.35	.49	.47	.58	**.83**
	Person-job fit3	.41	.42	.43	.52	.34	.55	.57	.48	.43	.36	.28	**.74**

Table C3. Study 3: Loadings and Crossloadings for Model with Pre-organizational Entry IT Workers

		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12
1	Pay1	**.82**	.61	.55	.39	.35	.42	.38	.52	.29	.54	.41	.58
	Pay2	**.83**	.29	.36	.44	.42	.57	.45	.48	.33	.30	.49	.36
	Pay3	**.78**	.51	.41	.34	.28	.29	.43	.51	.40	.56	.29	.34
2	Promotion1	.36	**.79**	.32	.62	.51	.32	.37	.39	.57	.30	.50	.56
	Promotion2	.39	**.75**	.32	.59	.41	.32	.55	.42	.60	.37	.49	.46
	Promotion3	.61	**.75**	.62	.30	.45	.38	.60	.31	.57	.43	.40	.30
3	Prestige1	.58	.38	**.76**	.50	.49	.38	.55	.29	.39	.38	.52	.51
	Prestige2	.49	.54	**.78**	.53	.35	.55	.33	.49	.38	.45	.55	.51
	Prestige3	.52	.28	**.76**	.37	.41	.50	.29	.29	.31	.43	.55	.56
4	Security1	.49	.37	.40	**.78**	.61	.37	.46	.35	.47	.55	.53	.55
	Security2	.48	.32	.43	**.78**	.32	.35	.47	.48	.40	.45	.29	.30
	Security3	.59	.45	.45	**.78**	.60	.48	.55	.60	.30	.56	.47	.39
5	Work–life balance1	.56	.47	.41	.43	**.70**	.46	.39	.54	.58	.56	.50	.37
	Work–life balance2	.56	.35	.41	.52	**.71**	.55	.47	.51	.33	.49	.30	.37
	Work–life balance3	.39	.49	.45	.61	**.71**	.38	.33	.29	.41	.39	.28	.43
6	Friendly coworkers1	.54	.36	.42	.48	.61	**.78**	.29	.43	.60	.54	.38	.52
	Friendly coworkers2	.28	.54	.52	.29	.61	**.81**	.59	.49	.35	.54	.50	.44
	Friendly coworkers3	.43	.47	.37	.47	.49	**.70**	.60	.39	.57	.53	.31	.30
7	Family proximity1	.40	.45	.58	.38	.39	.60	**.71**	.53	.43	.28	.60	.31
	Family proximity2	.43	.48	.36	.48	.57	.47	**.78**	.55	.34	.36	.39	.34
	Family proximity3	.61	.42	.51	.31	.54	.38	**.71**	.51	.45	.56	.45	.56
8	Variety1	.49	.52	.54	.52	.61	.29	.28	**.81**	.34	.54	.56	.40
	Variety2	.28	.54	.40	.34	.29	.58	.59	**.74**	.28	.38	.46	.38
	Variety3	.32	.59	.33	.40	.46	.50	.33	**.75**	.35	.60	.31	.30
9	Creativity1	.30	.60	.56	.53	.41	.61	.35	.40	**.75**	.58	.30	.40
	Creativity2	.28	.53	.29	.40	.37	.42	.43	.35	**.82**	.37	.50	.33
	Creativity3	.53	.46	.30	.35	.34	.38	.50	.49	**.69**	.59	.31	.50
10	Skill development1	.38	.39	.62	.47	.56	.55	.35	.34	.56	**.83**	.56	.45
	Skill development2	.42	.42	.41	.41	.44	.49	.44	.50	.45	**.74**	.28	.41
	Skill development3	.30	.28	.56	.55	.44	.48	.32	.55	.32	**.84**	.28	.34
11	Person-org fit1	.60	.58	.38	.43	.47	.28	.40	.62	.58	.38	**.84**	.48
	Person-org fit2	.35	.42	.45	.45	.29	.56	.42	.46	.62	.28	**.81**	.37
	Person-org fit3	.35	.52	.40	.47	.28	.50	.58	.42	.31	.33	**.70**	.44
12	Person-job fit1	.47	.61	.30	.62	.40	.51	.37	.56	.43	.31	.32	**.73**
	Person-job fit2	.51	.32	.53	.43	.39	.57	.54	.57	.57	.40	.62	**.83**
	Person-job fit3	.34	.59	.28	.56	.35	.39	.57	.44	.29	.34	.41	**.81**

Table C4. Study 1: Descriptive Statistics and Correlations for Pre-organizational Entry IT Workers

		M	SD	ICR	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12
1	Pay	4.74	1.13	.73	**.70**											
2	Promotion	4.76	1.17	.75	.41***	**.73**										
3	Prestige	4.84	1.24	.77	.37***	.44***	**.75**									
4	Security	4.55	1.20	.75	.38***	.40***	.41***	**.73**								
5	Work–life balance	5.05	1.40	.74	.13*	.10	.08	.14*	**.71**							
6	Friendly coworkers	5.07	1.35	.80	.17**	.12*	.13*	.10	.44***	**.77**						
7	Family proximity	4.85	1.30	.84	.15*	.05	.12*	.07	.42***	.47***	**.76**					
8	Variety	5.15	1.23	.81	.08	.15*	.13*	.10	-.05	.14*	.05	**.75**				
9	Creativity	5.13	1.27	.83	.13*	.17**	.15*	.07	.05	.16**	.07	.37***	**.73**			
10	Skill development	4.85	1.10	.82	.15*	.20**	.16**	-.08	.13*	.10	.13*	.35***	.31***	**.70**		
11	Person-organization fit	4.84	1.06	.75	.21***	.20**	.15*	.13*	.34***	.35***	.28***	.16**	.15*	.10	**.91**	
12	Person-job fit	4.91	1.11	.77	.15*	.17**	.16**	.13*	.38***	.30***	.29***	.40***	.30***	.31***	.55***	**.92**
13	Gender	–	–	–	.31***	.30***	.28***	.25***	-.23***	-.17**	-.20**	.10	.14*	.08	.24***	.30***

Note: *p < .05; **p < .01; ***p < .001; ICR = Internal consistency reliability; Diagonal elements represent the average variance extracted (AVE); Gender was dummy-coded as 0 for women and 1 for men.

Table C5. Study 2: Descriptive Statistics and Correlations for Pre-organizational Entry IT Workers

		M	SD	ICR	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12
1	Pay	4.68	1.31	.77	**.71**											
2	Promotion	4.75	1.25	.79	.34***	**.74**										
3	Prestige	4.35	1.20	.75	.38***	.33***	**.73**									
4	Security	4.33	1.31	.76	.35***	.37***	.36***	**.71**								
5	Work–life balance	5.05	1.30	.77	.14*	.18**	.15*	.12*	**.73**							
6	Friendly coworkers	4.30	1.25	.79	.21*	.13*	.14*	.16**	.34***	**.75**						
7	Family proximity	4.27	1.06	.78	.14*	.05	.13*	-.07	.37***	.38***	**.76**					
8	Variety	5.07	0.95	.75	.17**	.07	.05	.10	.05	-.07	.14*	**.71**				
9	Creativity	5.01	1.09	.74	.19**	.16**	.13*	.14*	.06	-.13*	.13*	.37***	**.74**			
10	Skill development	4.88	1.10	.73	.23***	.15*	.14*	-.13*	.14*	.10	.14*	.35***	.33***	**.71**		
11	Person-organization fit	4.69	1.06	.76	.24***	.17**	.15*	.17**	.35***	.37***	.35***	.16**	.14*	.13*	**.89**	
12	Person-job fit	5.00	1.21	.78	.17**	.15*	.16**	.17**	.37***	.31***	.30***	.28***	.34***	.34***	.56***	**.91**
13	Gender	-	-	-	.35***	.30***	.28***	.17**	-.21***	-.20**	-.17**	.08	.05	.11*	.29***	.24***

Note: *p < .05; **p < .01; ***p < .001; ICR = Internal consistency reliability; Diagonal elements represent the average variance extracted (AVE); Gender was dummy-coded as 0 for women and 1 for men.

Table C6. Study 3: Descriptive Statistics and Correlations for Pre-organizational Entry IT Workers

		M	SD	ICR	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12
1	Pay	4.74	1.35	.73	**.71**											
2	Promotion	4.70	1.30	.71	.39***	**.74**										
3	Prestige	4.81	1.40	.75	.32***	.31***	**.73**									
4	Security	4.66	1.33	.78	.34***	.29***	.35***	**.71**								
5	Work–life balance	4.31	1.25	.82	.16**	.12*	-.07	.08	**.75**							
6	Friendly coworkers	4.91	1.27	.81	.17**	.10	.13*	.07	.37***	**.76**						
7	Family proximity	4.88	1.20	.80	.05	.07	.15*	.14*	.38***	.41***	**.77**					
8	Variety	4.35	1.28	.75	.13*	-.05	.16**	.17**	.13*	.14*	.17**	**.79**				
9	Creativity	4.30	1.25	.76	.17**	.14*	.10	.19**	.14*	.14*	.05	.44***	**.74**			
10	Skill development	4.41	1.15	.75	.19**	.17**	.14*	.10	.16**	.06	.19**	.34***	.42***	**.73**		
11	Person-organization fit	4.51	1.07	.80	.24***	.21***	.17**	.13*	.38***	.37***	.31***	.14*	.12*	.14*	**.87**	
12	Person-job fit	4.56	1.23	.79	.14*	.17**	.07	.05	.35***	.29***	.28***	.35***	.28***	.25***	.53***	**.94**
13	Gender	-	-	-	.33***	.32***	.30***	.21***	-.21***	-.17**	-.15*	.13*	.14*	.05	.25***	.23***

Note: *p < .05; **p < .01; ***p < .001; ICR = Internal consistency reliability; Diagonal elements represent the average variance extracted (AVE); Gender was dummy-coded as 0 for women and 1 for men.

Table C7. Formative Construct Weights for Model with Pre-organizational Entry Workers

	Extrinsic Outcomes				Social Outcomes			Intrinsic Outcomes		
	Pay	Promotion	Prestige	Security	Work–life bal	Friendly cwrk	Fam prox	Variety	Creative	Skill dev
Study 1	.30***	.28***	.25***	.29***	.25***	.28***	.27***	.28***	.32***	.27***
Study 2	.32***	.26***	.28***	.31***	.29***	.27***	.30***	.28***	.28***	.25***
Study 3	.31***	.28***	.29***	.30***	.30***	.27***	.31***	.28***	.30***	.26***

Note: *p < .05; **p < .01; ***p < .001.

Table C8. Study 1: Loadings and Crossloadings for Model with Pre-organizational Entry Workers

		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12
1	Pay1	**.76**	.55	.49	.39	.49	.53	.35	.61	.56	.52	.36	.48
	Pay2	**.70**	.31	.28	.58	.37	.37	.31	.42	.44	.59	.52	.43
	Pay3	**.70**	.35	.51	.59	.59	.31	.40	.49	.58	.53	.47	.43
2	Promotion1	.44	**.80**	.51	.48	.31	.47	.49	.39	.33	.34	.58	.43
	Promotion2	.48	**.77**	.57	.62	.55	.48	.45	.36	.41	.52	.45	.35
	Promotion3	.47	**.82**	.38	.39	.44	.50	.61	.35	.38	.52	.38	.29
3	Prestige1	.32	.29	**.81**	.53	.45	.57	.39	.45	.61	.42	.37	.39
	Prestige2	.28	.41	**.73**	.37	.45	.43	.56	.38	.62	.37	.51	.46
	Prestige3	.61	.44	**.80**	.35	.35	.55	.52	.46	.42	.32	.28	.52
4	Security1	.43	.31	.52	**.79**	.58	.31	.48	.53	.36	.41	.36	.41
	Security2	.41	.37	.40	**.80**	.51	.34	.46	.35	.41	.42	.58	.49
	Security3	.30	.59	.46	**.84**	.43	.44	.35	.32	.40	.43	.56	.56
5	Work–life balance1	.51	.62	.61	.61	**.78**	.56	.39	.36	.36	.35	.51	.31
	Work–life balance2	.38	.60	.52	.46	**.80**	.33	.42	.43	.34	.61	.53	.38
	Work–life balance3	.46	.50	.41	.53	**.74**	.38	.62	.46	.59	.46	.47	.31
6	Friendly coworkers1	.52	.53	.33	.49	.34	**.71**	.38	.47	.60	.48	.47	.31
	Friendly coworkers2	.42	.40	.46	.61	.47	**.84**	.44	.57	.30	.56	.61	.55
	Friendly coworkers3	.43	.61	.56	.30	.43	**.71**	.51	.49	.53	.37	.34	.48
7	Family proximity1	.30	.36	.40	.47	.58	.51	**.71**	.43	.53	.38	.60	.43
	Family proximity2	.56	.39	.51	.41	.33	.34	**.71**	.60	.48	.49	.51	.56
	Family proximity3	.39	.47	.33	.41	.37	.48	**.77**	.57	.36	.57	.49	.36
8	Variety1	.41	.59	.38	.58	.57	.46	.59	**.70**	.56	.55	.49	.50
	Variety2	.58	.28	.41	.58	.53	.49	.45	**.82**	.54	.54	.62	.33
	Variety3	.32	.37	.28	.58	.57	.31	.43	**.82**	.37	.57	.47	.44
9	Creativity1	.36	.54	.42	.56	.34	.47	.29	.41	**.77**	.38	.36	.30
	Creativity2	.29	.44	.54	.35	.51	.33	.54	.54	**.71**	.46	.60	.29
	Creativity3	.33	.41	.60	.49	.43	.57	.53	.48	**.73**	.61	.44	.48
10	Skill development1	.45	.38	.57	.55	.54	.54	.36	.52	.62	**.75**	.42	.43
	Skill development2	.52	.30	.59	.36	.41	.38	.50	.37	.47	**.83**	.47	.51
	Skill development3	.29	.36	.48	.60	.36	.32	.62	.33	.62	**.81**	.40	.58
11	Person-org fit1	.35	.58	.44	.47	.56	.28	.55	.38	.32	.33	**.82**	.53
	Person-org fit2	.46	.34	.30	.34	.58	.36	.42	.50	.29	.50	**.84**	.43
	Person-org fit3	.54	.58	.41	.42	.35	.59	.52	.50	.28	.32	**.84**	.59
12	Person-job fit1	.44	.52	.45	.29	.50	.46	.62	.33	.51	.37	.28	**.74**
	Person-job fit2	.52	.56	.33	.38	.60	.38	.33	.38	.38	.50	.40	**.73**
	Person-job fit3	.42	.48	.45	.33	.58	.50	.38	.40	.36	.32	.54	**.70**

Table C9. Study 2: Loadings and Crossloadings for Model with Pre-organizational Entry Workers													
		1	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**	**6**	**7**	**8**	**9**	**10**	**11**	**12**
1	Pay1	**.71**	.52	.56	.35	.51	.48	.43	.48	.47	.52	.49	.34
	Pay2	**.73**	.42	.59	.49	.50	.47	.59	.49	.32	.57	.38	.61
	Pay3	**.81**	.34	.37	.61	.47	.30	.53	.44	.54	.45	.61	.33
2	Promotion1	.31	**.78**	.42	.29	.60	.44	.56	.39	.41	.39	.56	.42
	Promotion2	.32	**.71**	.28	.49	.46	.59	.32	.59	.60	.35	.48	.49
	Promotion3	.31	**.73**	.43	.59	.29	.49	.60	.51	.28	.61	.59	.56
3	Prestige1	.28	.44	**.73**	.37	.30	.52	.28	.49	.57	.40	.51	.35
	Prestige2	.31	.38	**.73**	.32	.48	.46	.58	.31	.50	.53	.32	.30
	Prestige3	.44	.31	**.76**	.57	.59	.49	.31	.39	.32	.61	.53	.39
4	Security1	.40	.40	.50	**.76**	.44	.42	.50	.46	.40	.59	.29	.49
	Security2	.61	.54	.59	**.83**	.42	.57	.52	.37	.58	.46	.54	.60
	Security3	.51	.37	.40	**.80**	.50	.56	.51	.39	.60	.35	.29	.56
5	Work–life balance1	.32	.41	.34	.45	**.80**	.41	.54	.39	.55	.34	.56	.38
	Work–life balance2	.59	.31	.29	.62	**.79**	.56	.32	.45	.41	.49	.47	.39
	Work–life balance3	.32	.28	.37	.48	**.78**	.38	.61	.54	.37	.30	.41	.39
6	Friendly coworkers1	.37	.40	.44	.47	.54	**.73**	.52	.31	.56	.48	.28	.55
	Friendly coworkers2	.37	.59	.55	.56	.36	**.70**	.55	.46	.39	.50	.54	.40
	Friendly coworkers3	.52	.41	.43	.30	.45	**.74**	.54	.34	.35	.30	.46	.28
7	Family proximity1	.30	.37	.55	.28	.54	.49	**.71**	.35	.43	.44	.32	.49
	Family proximity2	.52	.42	.39	.32	.39	.57	**.77**	.54	.54	.35	.48	.55
	Family proximity3	.39	.50	.31	.60	.38	.60	**.77**	.50	.53	.42	.32	.28
8	Variety1	.28	.38	.41	.38	.50	.31	.30	**.76**	.32	.47	.30	.55
	Variety2	.43	.32	.54	.50	.54	.28	.62	**.76**	.58	.43	.35	.28
	Variety3	.43	.58	.46	.41	.51	.62	.34	**.79**	.55	.31	.59	.52
9	Creativity1	.42	.49	.58	.45	.28	.29	.34	.33	**.83**	.44	.28	.34
	Creativity2	.57	.60	.56	.45	.38	.50	.59	.32	**.72**	.39	.30	.49
	Creativity3	.61	.44	.35	.44	.45	.55	.48	.38	**.83**	.56	.54	.54
10	Skill development1	.35	.35	.55	.40	.47	.38	.53	.29	.38	**.78**	.46	.61
	Skill development2	.61	.60	.33	.32	.39	.60	.37	.55	.39	**.78**	.44	.47
	Skill development3	.62	.31	.62	.50	.37	.57	.58	.36	.29	**.79**	.59	.37
11	Person-org fit1	.61	.60	.38	.29	.42	.61	.58	.35	.45	.58	**.76**	.43
	Person-org fit2	.58	.61	.57	.39	.51	.43	.59	.51	.33	.40	**.81**	.39
	Person-org fit3	.56	.59	.33	.61	.35	.42	.29	.37	.44	.37	**.79**	.54
12	Person-job fit1	.50	.38	.53	.60	.35	.31	.39	.55	.31	.38	.28	**.73**
	Person-job fit2	.30	.58	.46	.60	.29	.51	.44	.56	.42	.41	.57	**.84**
	Person-job fit3	.42	.40	.58	.33	.36	.54	.45	.34	.34	.49	.36	**.77**

Table C10. Study 3: Loadings and Crossloadings for Model with Pre-organizational Entry Workers

		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12
1	Pay1	**.73**	.33	.34	.28	.36	.50	.44	.35	.49	.51	.51	.43
	Pay2	**.74**	.54	.42	.50	.45	.32	.39	.55	.29	.37	.33	.57
	Pay3	**.84**	.32	.32	.55	.43	.36	.53	.59	.54	.35	.38	.41
2	Promotion1	.32	**.84**	.38	.55	.58	.55	.52	.46	.35	.54	.52	.37
	Promotion2	.37	**.71**	.31	.54	.41	.32	.51	.56	.60	.33	.59	.50
	Promotion3	.38	**.70**	.44	.43	.37	.48	.55	.50	.50	.56	.40	.47
3	Prestige1	.50	.29	**.80**	.46	.59	.45	.50	.40	.48	.42	.52	.52
	Prestige2	.50	.44	**.75**	.31	.39	.43	.28	.57	.36	.57	.60	.38
	Prestige3	.45	.35	**.83**	.46	.39	.37	.43	.33	.51	.62	.41	.31
4	Security1	.45	.52	.53	**.84**	.60	.36	.39	.54	.51	.61	.58	.37
	Security2	.39	.39	.32	**.80**	.51	.50	.57	.47	.53	.55	.44	.60
	Security3	.56	.35	.44	**.75**	.33	.39	.40	.51	.29	.35	.36	.42
5	Work–life balance1	.56	.31	.62	.39	**.83**	.33	.49	.53	.43	.42	.59	.61
	Work–life balance2	.33	.33	.29	.46	**.82**	.35	.58	.38	.50	.60	.47	.33
	Work–life balance3	.57	.46	.51	.45	**.75**	.38	.41	.33	.36	.48	.43	.39
6	Friendly coworkers1	.54	.40	.59	.38	.29	**.71**	.58	.56	.36	.40	.61	.48
	Friendly coworkers2	.48	.47	.37	.34	.42	**.84**	.58	.37	.53	.54	.50	.58
	Friendly coworkers3	.42	.46	.38	.50	.45	**.71**	.41	.29	.38	.33	.30	.28
7	Family proximity1	.43	.36	.28	.45	.35	.31	**.70**	.52	.48	.40	.59	.53
	Family proximity2	.38	.49	.45	.40	.61	.30	**.74**	.61	.50	.28	.49	.53
	Family proximity3	.43	.38	.40	.43	.40	.44	**.70**	.58	.40	.52	.34	.59
8	Variety1	.36	.55	.43	.57	.41	.33	.57	**.74**	.48	.35	.41	.55
	Variety2	.58	.44	.49	.60	.50	.47	.59	**.83**	.60	.42	.44	.58
	Variety3	.60	.29	.39	.58	.31	.55	.29	**.77**	.48	.32	.36	.29
9	Creativity1	.37	.31	.60	.38	.34	.38	.43	.57	**.70**	.31	.47	.58
	Creativity2	.62	.49	.57	.33	.44	.33	.47	.42	**.82**	.37	.31	.33
	Creativity3	.48	.46	.33	.33	.38	.51	.28	.35	**.82**	.59	.53	.33
10	Skill development1	.56	.61	.43	.56	.37	.32	.59	.35	.44	**.76**	.57	.49
	Skill development2	.59	.59	.41	.32	.35	.56	.36	.61	.60	**.74**	.61	.40
	Skill development3	.58	.43	.46	.45	.59	.36	.29	.48	.31	**.83**	.30	.61
11	Person-org fit1	.49	.40	.39	.43	.39	.37	.28	.54	.39	.29	**.79**	.37
	Person-org fit2	.31	.38	.59	.43	.37	.34	.51	.38	.61	.56	**.80**	.28
	Person-org fit3	.56	.31	.39	.42	.59	.39	.46	.36	.45	.39	**.75**	.40
12	Person-job fit1	.29	.46	.34	.37	.52	.55	.36	.46	.48	.42	.44	**.78**
	Person-job fit2	.39	.59	.50	.57	.54	.32	.50	.33	.38	.61	.37	**.78**
	Person-job fit3	.59	.29	.37	.47	.36	.37	.44	.60	.48	.59	.44	**.72**

Table C11. Formative Construct Weights for Model with Pre-organizational Entry Workers

	Extrinsic Outcomes				Social Outcomes			Intrinsic Outcomes		
	Pay	Promotion	Prestige	Securty	Work-life bal	Friendly cwrk	Fam prox	Variety	Creative	Skill dev
Study 1	.30***	.28***	.26***	.29***	.26***	.28***	.27***	.28***	.32***	.27***
Study 2	.32***	.26***	.28***	.31***	.29***	.27***	.30***	.28***	.28***	.25***
Study 3	.31***	.28***	.29***	.30***	.30***	.27***	.31***	.28***	.30***	.26***

Note: *p < .05; **p < .01; ***p < .001.

Table C12. Study 1: Descriptive Statistics and Correlations for Pre-organizational Entry Workers

		M	SD	ICR	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15
1	Pay	5.07	1.21	.73	**.71**														
2	Promotion	5.13	1.25	.75	.43***	**.74**													
3	Prestige	4.95	1.29	.77	.44***	.41***	**.77**												
4	Security	4.90	1.16	.75	.40***	.38***	.35***	**.77**											
5	Work–life balance	4.75	1.38	.74	.08	.10	.15*	.15*	**.75**										
6	Friendly coworkers	4.85	1.42	.75	.14*	.11*	.20**	.16**	.41***	**.72**									
7	Family proximity	4.80	1.40	.75	.13*	.14*	.17**	.19**	.40***	.37***	**.75**								
8	Variety	4.51	1.21	.76	.13*	.15*	.21***	.15*	.18**	.17**	.15**	**.74**							
9	Creativity	4.64	1.20	.79	.15*	.17**	.20**	.17**	.11*	.11*	.14*	.35***	**.73**						
10	Skill development	4.60	1.28	.82	1.9**	.19**	.17**	.19**	.11*	.13*	.13*	.38***	.39***	**.70**					
11	Person-organization fit	5.03	1.11	.73	.13*	.10	.14**	.07	.25***	.26***	.29***	.07	.05	.13*	**.91**				
12	Person-job fit	5.21	1.11	.84	.11*	.12*	.07	.14*	.28***	.21***	.20**	.21***	.20**	.15*	.57***	**.92**			
13	Gender	–	–	–	.28***	.31***	.32***	.25***	-.26***	-.31***	-.24***	.25***	.30***	.31***	.30***	.29***	–		
14	Domain: Quantitative	–	–	–	.24***	.21***	.17**	.15*	-.16**	-.21***	-.24***	.08	.01	.05	.07	.16*	.25***	–	
15	Domain: People-oriented	–	–	–	-.16**	-.13*	-.10	-.14*	.20**	.15*	.16**	.13*	.19**	.17**	.19**	.03	-.07	.15*	–
16	Domain: IT	-	-	-	-.16**	.15*	.15*	.01	.1`5*	.14*	.12*	.21***	.20**	.15*	.15*	.15*	.02	.07	.07

Note: *p < .05; **p < .01; ***p < .001; ICR = Internal consistency reliability; diagonal elements represent the average variance extracted (AVE); gender was dummy-coded as 0 for women and 1 for men.

Table C13. Study 2: Descriptive Statistics and Correlations for Pre-organizational Entry Workers

		M	SD	ICR	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15
1	Pay	5.12	1.24	.80	**.73**														
2	Promotion	5.16	1.29	.73	.44***	**.75**													
3	Prestige	5.08	1.30	.74	.42***	.41***	**.77**												
4	Security	5.10	1.29	.82	.38***	.37***	.35***	**.79**											
5	Work–life balance	4.88	1.40	.85	.15*	.16**	.15*	.21***	**.78**										
6	Friendly coworkers	4.87	1.38	.74	.08	.05	.13*	.20**	.47***	**.75**									
7	Family proximity	4.80	1.35	.77	.14*	.19**	.21***	.15*	.47***	.44***	**.77**								
8	Variety	4.70	1.29	.74	.24***	.17**	.20**	.07	.08	.40***	.41***	**.75**							
9	Creativity	4.71	1.30	.77	.21***	.15*	.21***	.15*	.15*	.10	.13*	.45***	**.77**						
10	Skill development	4.60	1.20	.78	.20**	.19**	.24***	.16**	.08	.15*	.15*	.40***	.38***	**.75**					
11	Person-organization fit	5.12	1.09	.78	.11*	.14*	.07	.05	.34***	.31***	.25***	.10	.08	.14*	**.91**				
12	Person-job fit	5.25	1.06	.73	.08	.10	.13*	.08	.29***	.25***	.26***	.19**	.21***	.24***	.55***	**.92**			
13	Gender	–	–	–	.25***	.30***	.28***	.29***	-.25***	-.26***	-.29***	.30***	.31***	.24***	.30***	.24***	–		
14	Domain: Quantitative	–	–	–	.24***	.20**	.21***	.17**	-.25***	-.24***	-.17**	.10	.08	.10	.04	.16**	.26***	–	
15	Domain: People-oriented	–	–	–	-.20**	-.17**	-.15*	-.13*	.20**	.19**	.15*	.17**	.15*	.13*	.19**	.04	-.07	.17**	–
16	Domain: IT	-	-	-	.15*	.13*	.07	.14*	.15*	.10	.15*	.24***	.17**	.20**	.17**	.14*	.10	.04	.08

Note: *p < .05; **p < .01; ***p < .001; ICR = Internal consistency reliability; diagonal elements represent the average variance extracted (AVE); gender was dummy-coded as 0 for women and 1 for men.

Table C14. Study 3: Descriptive Statistics and Correlations for Pre-organizational Entry Workers

		M	SD	ICR	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15
1	Pay	4.57	1.40	.83	**.73**														
2	Promotion	4.91	1.43	.82	.38***	**.74**													
3	Prestige	4.98	1.45	.77	.37***	.35***	**.75**												
4	Security	5.10	1.38	.75	.36***	.39***	.38***	**.76**											
5	Work–life balance	4.80	1.40	.77	.17**	.15*	.16**	.17**	**.77**										
6	Friendly coworkers	4.85	1.41	.79	.15*	.14*	.13*	.19**	.38***	**.78**									
7	Family proximity	4.69	1.35	.78	.21***	.20**	.21***	.23***	.35***	.34***	**.75**								
8	Variety	4.17	1.35	.75	.16**	.19**	.21***	.20**	.08	.17**	.13*	**.74**							
9	Creativity	4.44	1.20	.74	.17**	.15*	.19**	.22***	.11*	-.05	.15*	.41***	**.73**						
10	Skill development	4.38	1.17	.78	.17**	.14*	.24***	.20**	.11*	.08	.19**	.40***	.38***	**.74**					
11	Person-organization fit	4.60	1.12	.74	.14*	.13*	.17**	.15*	.08	.15*	.20**	.08	.10	.07	**.88**				
12	Person-job fit	4.63	1.13	.79	.10	.11*	.12*	.07	.28***	.25***	.30***	.21***	.24***	.25***	.50***	**.93**			
13	Gender	–	–	–	.29***	.38***	.30***	.24***	-.26***	-.30***	-.31***	.21***	.24***	.29***	.26***	.29***	–		
14	Domain: Quantitative	–	–	–	.30***	.30***	.25***	.21***	-.20**	-.24***	-.20**	.05	.08	.08	.07	.17**	.25***	–	
15	Domain: People-oriented	–	–	–	-.29***	-.25***	-.20**	-.21***	.24***	.21***	.24***	.21***	.22***	.20***	.21***	.15*	-.08	.17**	–
16	Domain: IT	–	–	–	.17**	.15*	.16**	.13*	.20**	.21***	.17**	.24***	.17**	.16**	.17**	.19**	.10	.01	.03

Note: *p < .05; **p < .01; ***p < .001; ICR = Internal consistency reliability; diagonal elements represent the average variance extracted (AVE); gender was dummy-coded as 0 for women and 1 for men.

Table C15. Study 1: Loadings and Crossloadings for Model with Post-organizational Entry Workers													
		1	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**	**6**	**7**	**8**	**9**	**10**	**11**	**12**
1	Pay1	**.75**	.60	.58	.50	.39	.60	.61	.59	.39	.44	.54	.42
	Pay2	**.74**	.39	.38	.32	.50	.41	.35	.39	.38	.36	.29	.53
	Pay3	**.81**	.56	.58	.42	.34	.39	.51	.60	.62	.53	.46	.50
2	Promotion1	.62	**.80**	.30	.36	.40	.40	.58	.49	.33	.41	.45	.59
	Promotion2	.58	**.71**	.39	.32	.52	.30	.48	.49	.53	.37	.55	.34
	Promotion3	.51	**.76**	.47	.35	.57	.31	.32	.35	.37	.34	.32	.44
3	Prestige1	.42	.45	**.73**	.45	.48	.56	.39	.59	.58	.42	.41	.52
	Prestige2	.40	.30	**.76**	.50	.30	.57	.58	.49	.61	.54	.51	.47
	Prestige3	.46	.57	**.70**	.51	.47	.46	.37	.33	.35	.32	.49	.38
4	Security1	.49	.40	.39	**.71**	.61	.50	.39	.56	.35	.34	.35	.36
	Security2	.57	.36	.42	**.82**	.54	.55	.46	.61	.58	.46	.49	.33
	Security3	.59	.40	.41	**.70**	.55	.47	.59	.44	.29	.55	.57	.46
5	Work–life balance1	.35	.28	.59	.36	**.71**	.39	.54	.28	.60	.43	.38	.30
	Work–life balance2	.47	.30	.38	.38	**.78**	.38	.57	.42	.30	.61	.45	.45
	Work–life balance3	.48	.48	.39	.56	**.71**	.38	.59	.31	.49	.38	.48	.31
6	Friendly coworkers1	.40	.31	.52	.45	.59	**.72**	.52	.31	.59	.52	.39	.34
	Friendly coworkers2	.52	.57	.28	.61	.49	**.72**	.58	.55	.40	.32	.35	.50
	Friendly coworkers3	.29	.51	.33	.48	.35	**.83**	.62	.41	.31	.60	.48	.47
7	Family proximity1	.39	.41	.33	.28	.41	.51	**.72**	.49	.62	.50	.50	.44
	Family proximity2	.58	.30	.35	.53	.52	.49	**.75**	.47	.55	.58	.30	.40
	Family proximity3	.43	.59	.48	.37	.43	.35	**.78**	.38	.57	.43	.46	.52
8	Variety1	.51	.59	.49	.38	.38	.52	.33	**.76**	.53	.58	.48	.34
	Variety2	.36	.40	.42	.33	.37	.39	.38	**.69**	.50	.49	.42	.28
	Variety3	.41	.37	.38	.54	.51	.32	.46	**.74**	.41	.30	.54	.42
9	Creativity1	.50	.55	.61	.57	.28	.36	.34	.34	**.73**	.55	.40	.57
	Creativity2	.53	.57	.54	.47	.57	.61	.36	.33	**.77**	.41	.51	.49
	Creativity3	.38	.49	.41	.60	.53	.38	.51	.28	**.76**	.51	.30	.50
10	Skill development1	.61	.28	.35	.62	.31	.47	.53	.33	.37	**.83**	.61	.33
	Skill development2	.41	.32	.46	.40	.34	.41	.29	.37	.34	**.73**	.36	.32
	Skill development3	.39	.57	.44	.47	.28	.44	.50	.54	.36	**.79**	.49	.46
11	Person-org fit1	.37	.46	.37	.45	.45	.62	.40	.55	.34	.51	**.84**	.28
	Person-org fit2	.55	.36	.52	.31	.43	.45	.61	.38	.28	.60	**.77**	.30
	Person-org fit3	.51	.40	.60	.28	.52	.34	.43	.49	.36	.43	**.76**	.60
12	Person-job fit1	.47	.57	.42	.30	.42	.51	.44	.48	.60	.61	.29	**.81**
	Person-job fit2	.41	.46	.41	.32	.47	.36	.58	.39	.31	.31	.40	**.72**
	Person-job fit3	.59	.54	.61	.29	.47	.48	.59	.53	.32	.53	.32	**.82**

Table C16. Study 2: Loadings and Crossloadings for Model with Post-organizational Entry Workers

		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12
1	Pay1	**.74**	.53	.46	.28	.53	.30	.29	.29	.37	.55	.45	.54
	Pay2	**.74**	.32	.55	.53	.62	.45	.40	.35	.49	.50	.42	.61
	Pay3	**.84**	.30	.28	.58	.31	.31	.60	.34	.36	.45	.59	.32
2	Promotion1	.60	**.71**	.56	.53	.29	.32	.60	.56	.29	.29	.43	.28
	Promotion2	.59	**.77**	.37	.48	.36	.34	.59	.61	.30	.62	.35	.59
	Promotion3	.42	**.69**	.30	.53	.46	.43	.54	.33	.35	.48	.28	.43
3	Prestige1	.40	.59	**.82**	.42	.46	.62	.53	.50	.28	.50	.42	.43
	Prestige2	.37	.33	**.78**	.47	.28	.41	.56	.56	.51	.32	.53	.33
	Prestige3	.46	.35	**.79**	.28	.33	.38	.52	.61	.41	.57	.36	.49
4	Security1	.28	.28	.38	**.82**	.46	.48	.34	.50	.38	.42	.37	.54
	Security2	.29	.56	.59	**.70**	.49	.59	.30	.53	.36	.36	.35	.29
	Security3	.32	.30	.50	**.74**	.59	.36	.50	.52	.28	.50	.40	.46
5	Work–life balance1	.39	.58	.39	.50	**.82**	.61	.61	.40	.37	.39	.58	.41
	Work–life balance2	.44	.60	.46	.46	**.76**	.52	.57	.41	.35	.58	.28	.44
	Work–life balance3	.56	.60	.48	.52	**.71**	.38	.55	.37	.31	.35	.38	.52
6	Friendly coworkers1	.51	.54	.49	.55	.52	**.71**	.50	.59	.31	.49	.41	.60
	Friendly coworkers2	.53	.40	.58	.47	.42	**.74**	.30	.55	.51	.54	.40	.35
	Friendly coworkers3	.58	.58	.62	.47	.34	**.74**	.58	.31	.62	.57	.47	.48
7	Family proximity1	.51	.53	.60	.45	.52	.48	**.73**	.62	.35	.62	.53	.50
	Family proximity2	.45	.43	.40	.53	.62	.56	**.77**	.49	.48	.45	.48	.51
	Family proximity3	.32	.45	.40	.48	.46	.39	**.69**	.31	.59	.34	.59	.40
8	Variety1	.42	.55	.62	.51	.53	.62	.35	**.73**	.37	.56	.50	.44
	Variety2	.55	.31	.40	.28	.51	.59	.35	**.83**	.33	.32	.51	.55
	Variety3	.29	.48	.56	.31	.33	.48	.30	**.73**	.38	.48	.39	.60
9	Creativity1	.44	.55	.29	.54	.46	.45	.29	.31	**.77**	.36	.33	.43
	Creativity2	.52	.51	.38	.29	.45	.35	.54	.51	**.84**	.42	.33	.42
	Creativity3	.53	.57	.47	.36	.51	.34	.29	.56	**.73**	.50	.55	.35
10	Skill development1	.53	.34	.29	.60	.53	.36	.41	.36	.41	**.84**	.57	.32
	Skill development2	.58	.61	.56	.44	.28	.60	.47	.58	.43	**.75**	.41	.58
	Skill development3	.48	.52	.58	.38	.58	.34	.50	.48	.61	**.82**	.55	.48
11	Person-org fit1	.34	.30	.46	.36	.37	.48	.38	.61	.32	.62	**.78**	.42
	Person-org fit2	.38	.28	.35	.29	.55	.61	.40	.36	.59	.53	**.79**	.53
	Person-org fit3	.38	.52	.40	.51	.45	.53	.55	.47	.53	.41	**.69**	.55
12	Person-job fit1	.36	.45	.59	.47	.28	.42	.30	.60	.55	.31	.32	**.84**
	Person-job fit2	.31	.40	.36	.50	.47	.51	.52	.30	.31	.44	.62	**.80**
	Person-job fit3	.46	.43	.33	.39	.37	.39	.35	.36	.47	.48	.54	**.80**

Table C17. Study 3: Loadings and Crossloadings for Model with Post-organizational Entry Workers													
		1	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**	**6**	**7**	**8**	**9**	**10**	**11**	**12**
1	Pay1	**.83**	.41	.62	.43	.61	.49	.29	.29	.47	.35	.57	.30
	Pay2	**.80**	.30	.28	.31	.50	.51	.40	.44	.49	.53	.36	.37
	Pay3	**.71**	.49	.57	.58	.46	.53	.34	.48	.60	.61	.56	.32
2	Promotion1	.51	**.80**	.62	.59	.33	.41	.35	.45	.31	.56	.42	.50
	Promotion2	.39	**.81**	.45	.54	.41	.54	.59	.29	.43	.54	.55	.57
	Promotion3	.37	**.79**	.58	.59	.54	.33	.54	.39	.28	.45	.47	.40
3	Prestige1	.41	.61	**.73**	.44	.29	.58	.53	.40	.52	.47	.36	.40
	Prestige2	.58	.32	**.70**	.33	.50	.48	.50	.57	.44	.29	.42	.41
	Prestige3	.52	.35	**.73**	.30	.36	.50	.52	.61	.60	.32	.32	.34
4	Security1	.60	.58	.50	**.72**	.54	.57	.41	.34	.49	.61	.56	.52
	Security2	.50	.59	.62	**.72**	.57	.33	.56	.30	.51	.32	.31	.62
	Security3	.40	.46	.41	**.78**	.32	.55	.50	.55	.37	.57	.62	.30
5	Work–life balance1	.53	.47	.54	.61	**.75**	.60	.56	.37	.49	.48	.30	.37
	Work–life balance2	.29	.34	.53	.56	**.73**	.40	.46	.33	.34	.32	.47	.61
	Work–life balance3	.53	.44	.62	.33	**.74**	.38	.62	.41	.33	.54	.49	.54
6	Friendly coworkers1	.34	.40	.37	.49	.38	**.81**	.54	.61	.45	.44	.46	.58
	Friendly coworkers2	.59	.53	.46	.62	.62	**.73**	.43	.42	.52	.56	.46	.43
	Friendly coworkers3	.37	.53	.32	.30	.28	**.73**	.61	.61	.28	.35	.60	.43
7	Family proximity1	.37	.38	.38	.34	.59	.29	**.78**	.37	.46	.41	.30	.52
	Family proximity2	.45	.55	.50	.59	.38	.56	**.70**	.56	.59	.45	.36	.56
	Family proximity3	.32	.46	.52	.40	.61	.29	**.79**	.36	.52	.31	.62	.62
8	Variety1	.45	.56	.41	.40	.29	.39	.53	**.73**	.34	.42	.39	.47
	Variety2	.55	.50	.38	.29	.41	.36	.44	**.71**	.61	.49	.39	.49
	Variety3	.49	.33	.59	.30	.46	.32	.59	**.74**	.41	.45	.54	.47
9	Creativity1	.61	.34	.31	.29	.45	.56	.43	.37	**.71**	.28	.57	.58
	Creativity2	.32	.30	.54	.49	.45	.54	.30	.58	**.82**	.46	.48	.29
	Creativity3	.29	.35	.58	.45	.51	.51	.59	.57	**.83**	.52	.55	.32
10	Skill development1	.42	.36	.59	.59	.50	.30	.49	.62	.48	**.72**	.60	.52
	Skill development2	.49	.47	.60	.28	.55	.51	.43	.52	.39	**.71**	.28	.60
	Skill development3	.40	.38	.28	.32	.42	.28	.38	.30	.39	**.72**	.32	.46
11	Person-org fit1	.40	.51	.62	.58	.62	.40	.51	.51	.36	.40	**.73**	.30
	Person-org fit2	.53	.59	.45	.43	.33	.35	.47	.33	.41	.45	**.74**	.57
	Person-org fit3	.45	.60	.44	.38	.54	.44	.39	.53	.46	.59	**.79**	.31
12	Person-job fit1	.37	.40	.40	.38	.60	.51	.38	.42	.62	.28	.45	**.75**
	Person-job fit2	.39	.60	.58	.52	.49	.33	.43	.47	.53	.51	.58	**.82**
	Person-job fit3	.56	.40	.53	.47	.58	.56	.39	.61	.61	.38	.46	**.81**

Table C18. Formative Construct Weights for Model with Post-organizational Entry Workers

	Extrinsic Outcomes				Social Outcomes			Intrinsic Outcomes		
	Pay	Promotion	Prestige	Security	Work–life bal	Friendly cwrk	Fam prox	Variety	Creative	Skill dev
Study 1	.28***	.31***	.26***	.25***	.26***	.29***	.34***	.25***	.30***	.28***
Study 2	.26***	.24***	.28***	.28***	.29***	.25***	.31***	.28***	.33***	.30***
Study 3	.28***	.28***	.31***	.25***	.30***	.26***	.38***	.30***	.31***	.32***

Note: *p < .05; **p < .01; ***p < .001.

Table C19. Study 1: Descriptive Statistics and Correlations for Post-organizational Entry Workers

		M	SD	ICR	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15
1	Pay	4.74	1.24	.77	**.73**														
2	Promotion	4.76	1.21	.84	.40***	**.77**													
3	Prestige	4.66	1.20	.85	.41***	.32***	**.75**												
4	Security	4.65	1.24	.87	.35***	.33***	.32***	.71											
5	Work–life balance	4.85	1.41	.80	.23***	.20**	.22***	.14*	**.74**										
6	Friendly coworkers	4.60	1.38	.75	.21***	.21***	.17**	.13*	.35***	**.70**									
7	Family proximity	4.66	1.35	.76	.20**	.22***	.19**	.17**	.32***	.37***	**.73**								
8	Variety	3.77	1.24	.77	.17**	.17**	.14*	.13*	.07	.05	.13	*.74*							
9	Creativity	3.94	1.25	.79	.15*	.13*	.16**	.17**	.13*	.12*	.07	.32***	**.70**						
10	Skill development	3.70	1.17	.82	.16**	.14*	.24***	.16**	.13*	.08	.05	.31***	.29***	**.74**					
11	Person-organization fit	4.67	1.07	.74	.29***	.21***	.20**	.17**	.40***	.35***	.30***	.24***	.15*	.15*	**.89**				
12	Person-job fit	4.85	1.04	.79	.14*	.14*	.19**	.10	.35***	.28***	.25***	.19**	.15*	.16**	.56***	**.90**			
13	Gender	–	–	–	.37***	.34***	.31***	.33***	-.48***	-.27***	-.35***	.28***	.25***	.24***	.30***	.28***	–		
14	Domain: Quantitative	–	–	–	.21***	.20**	.17**	.15*	-.22***	-.24***	-.15*	.10	.08	.17**	.04	.17**	.31***	–	
15	Domain: People-oriented	–	–	–	.19**	.19**	.21***	.15*	.14*	.19**	.20***	.15*	.10	.13*	.20**	.08	-.10	-.19**	–
16	Domain: IT	–	–	–	.16**	.15*	.14*	.10	.24***	.21***	.14*	.14*	.21***	.20**	.14*	.16**	.08	.06	.05

Note: *p < .05; **p < .01; ***p < .001; ICR = Internal consistency reliability; diagonal elements represent the average variance extracted (AVE); gender was dummy-coded as 0 for women and 1 for men.

Table C20. Study 2: Descriptive Statistics and Correlations for Post-organizational Entry Workers

		M	SD	ICR	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15
1	Pay	4.78	1.15	.75	**.73**														
2	Promotion	4.66	1.16	.71	.31***	**.70**													
3	Prestige	4.65	1.05	.77	.33***	.32***	**.71**												
4	Security	4.61	1.30	.73	.30***	.25***	.26***	**.74**											
5	Work–life balance	4.75	1.35	.75	.24***	.15*	.14*	.24***	**.73**										
6	Friendly coworkers	4.77	1.37	.76	.17**	.16**	.17**	.21***	.26***	**.75**									
7	Family proximity	4.80	1.30	.85	.15*	.15*	.18**	.22***	.30***	.27***	**.77**								
8	Variety	4.01	1.25	.84	.14*	.17**	.19**	.20**	.16**	.24***	.19**	**.71**							
9	Creativity	4.03	1.20	.73	.16**	.08	.14*	.17**	.13*	.21***	.13*	.28***	**.74**						
10	Skill development	3.90	1.20	.72	.13*	.10	.13*	.15*	.14*	.10	.14*	.21***	.28***	**.74**					
11	Person-organization fit	4.65	1.04	.73	.29***	.21***	.24***	.26***	.41***	.40***	.30***	.24***	.17**	.17**	**.86**				
12	Person-job fit	4.77	1.05	.78	.10	.14*	.08	.10	.37***	.30***	.28***	.20**	.14*	.13*	.53***	**.91**			
13	Gender	–	–	–	.37***	.35***	.30***	.28***	-.30***	-.32***	-.28***	.28***	.25***	.23***	.32***	.29***	–		
14	Domain: Quantitative	–	–	–	.24***	.27***	.20**	.20**	-.17**	-.24***	-.20**	.25***	.08	.01	.08	.21***	.30***	–	
15	Domain: People-oriented	–	–	–	-.17**	-.13*	-.07	-.15*	.22***	.20**	.17**	.17**	.10	.12*	.21***	.03	-.10	-.20**	–
16	Domain: IT	–	–	–	.14*	.13*	.10	.12	.16**	.14*	.13*	.20**	.15*	.15*	.14*	.16**	.03	.02	.03

Note: *p < .05; **p < .01; ***p < .001; ICR = Internal consistency reliability; diagonal elements represent the average variance extracted (AVE); gender was dummy-coded as 0 for women and 1 for men.

Table C21. Study 3: Descriptive Statistics and Correlations for Post-organizational Entry Workers

		M	SD	ICR	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15
1	Pay	4.41	1.35	.77	**.73**														
2	Promotion	4.57	1.39	.83	.28***	**.72**													
3	Prestige	4.80	1.41	.82	.24***	.27***	**.71**												
4	Security	4.75	1.30	.85	.21***	.24***	.26***	**.74**											
5	Work–life balance	4.74	1.44	.77	.20**	.08	.14*	.06	**.77**										
6	Friendly coworkers	4.73	1.43	.79	.15*	.13*	.17**	.08	.29***	**.70**									
7	Family proximity	4.65	1.35	.75	.14*	.14*	.14*	.13*	.31***	.34***	**.73**								
8	Variety	4.04	1.24	.77	.16**	.05	.10	.14*	.14*	.17**	.15	**.74**							
9	Creativity	3.98	1.20	.78	.17**	.07	.07	.17**	.15*	.20**	.04	.31***	**.75**						
10	Skill development	3.97	1.23	.78	.19**	.13*	.05	.19**	.19**	.21***	.10	.37***	.36***	**.70**					
11	Person-organization fit	4.31	1.07	.73	.29***	.21***	.20**	.17**	.34***	.30***	.28***	.28***	.23***	.20**	**.87**				
12	Person-job fit	4.25	1.08	.75	.15*	.13*	.17**	.10	.34***	.38***	.24***	.21***	.21***	.17**	.46***	**.92**			
13	Gender	–	–	–	.39***	.35***	.37***	.32***	-.32***	-.30***	-.27***	.30***	.25***	.27***	.31***	.29***	–		
14	Domain: Quantitative	–	–	–	.29***	.28***	.21***	.23***	-.27***	-.21***	-.20**	.20**	.13*	.10	.03	.19**	.31***	–	
15	Domain: People-oriented	–	–	–	-.16**	-.14*	-.13*	-.07	.24***	.21***	.13*	.13*	.14*	.16**	.18*	.13*	-.10	-.17**	–
16	Domain: IT	–	–	–	.17**	.14*	.13*	.12*	.13*	.14*	.16**	.20**	.21***	.12*	.18**	.14*	.05	.07	.06

Note: *p < .05; **p < .01; ***p < .001; ICR = Internal consistency reliability; diagonal elements represent the average variance extracted (AVE); gender was dummy-coded as 0 for women and 1 for men.

Appendix D

Common Method Bias Assessment

The various *post hoc* techniques used to assess CMB each have their strengths and weaknesses (for a review, see Richardson et al. 2009). We assessed CMB using multiple methods to avoid drawing a conclusion that may be influenced by the weakness of one particular method. First, we conducted Harman's single factor test (Harman 1976). More than one factor emerged from the unrotated solution. Additionally, the first factor explained only about 20% of the variance, suggesting that CMB was not a major concern. Second, we used the marker-variable technique (Lindell and Whitney 2001; Malhotra et al. 2006). We selected the second-smallest positive correlation among constructs as a conservative estimate of CMB (Lindell and Whitney 2001; Malhotra et al. 2006). We then produced a CMB-adjusted correlation matrix and used it to estimate CMB-adjusted path coefficients and explained variances for all models. If the CMB-adjusted path coefficients and explained variances were substantially different, then CMB may be a threat. Our results, however, showed that the path coefficients did not change by more than .03. The explained variance in PO fit and PJ fit in the various models did not change substantially (i.e., it changed by 1%, at most). These results indicate that CMB is not a major influence on the results.

References

Cheung, G. W., and Rensvold, R. B. 2002. "Evaluating Goodness-of-Fit Indexes for Testing Measurement Invariance," *Structural Equation Modeling* (9:2), pp. 233-255.

Chin, W. W., Marcolin, B. L., and Newsted, P. R. 2003. "A Partial Least Squares Latent Variable Modeling Approach for Measuring Interaction Effects: Results from a Monte Carlo Simulation Study and an Electronic-Mail Emotion/Adoption Study," *Information Systems Research* (14:2), pp. 189-217.

Choudhury, V., and Karahanna, E. 2008. "The Relative Advantage of Electronic Channels: A Multidimensional View," *MIS Quarterly* (32:1), pp. 179-200.

Cohen, J. 1988. *Statistical Power Analysis for the Behavioral Sciences* (2nd ed.), Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Earlbaum Associates.

Diamantopoulos, A., and Siguaw, J. A. 2006. "Formative Versus Reflective Indicators in Organizational Measure Development: A Comparison and Empirical Illustration," *British Journal of Management* (17:4), pp. 263-282.

Doll, W. J., Hendrickson, A., and Deng, X. 1998. "Using Davis's Perceived Usefulness and Ease-of-Use Instruments for Decision Making: A Confirmatory and Multigroup Invariance Analysis," *Decision Sciences* (29:4), pp. 839-869.

Fornell, C., and Larcker, D. F. 1981. "Evaluating Structural Equation Models with Unobservable Variables and Measurement Error," *Journal of Marketing Research* (18:1), pp. 39-50.

Gefen, D., and Straub, D. 2005. "A Practical Guide to Factorial Validity Using PLS-Graph: Tutorial and Annotated Example," *Communications of the Association for Information Systems* (16:1), pp. 91-109.

Harman, H. H. 1976. *Modern Factor Analysis*, Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

Irving, G., and Meyer, J. P. 1994. "Reexamination of the Met-Expectations Hypothesis: A Longitudinal Analysis," *Journal of Applied Psychology* (79:6), pp. 937-949.

Jarvis, C. B., MacKenzie, S. B., and Podsakoff, P. M. 2003. "A Critical Review of Construct Indicators and Measurement Model Misspecification in Marketing and Consumer Research," *Journal of Consumer Research* (30:2), pp. 199-218.

Klein, R. and Rai, A. 2009. "Interfirm Strategic Information Flows in Logistics Supply Chain Relationships," *MIS Quarterly* (33:4), pp. 735-762.

Konrad, A. M., Ritchie, Jr., J. E., Lieb, P., and Corrigall, E. 2000. "Sex Differences in Job Attribute Preferences: A Meta-Analysis," *Psychological Bulletin* (126:4), pp. 593-641.

Konrad, A. M., Corrigall, E., Lieb, P., and Ritchie, Jr., J. E. 2000. "Sex Differences in Job Attribute Preferences among Managers and Business Students," *Group & Organization Management* (25:2), pp. 108-131.

Lindell, M. K., and Whitney, D. J. 2001. "Accounting for Common Method Variance in Cross-Sectional Research Designs," *Journal of Applied Psychology* (86:1), pp. 114-121.

Malhotra, N. K., Kim, S. S., and Patil, A. 2006. "Common Method Variance in IS Research: A Comparison of Alternative Approaches and a Reanalysis of Past Research," *Management Science* (52:12), pp. 1865-1883.

Moore, G. C., and Benbasat, I. 1991. "Development of an Instrument to Measure the Perceptions of Adopting an Information Technology Innovation," *Information Systems Research* (2:3), pp. 173-191.

Nunnally, J. C., and Bernstein, I. H. 1994. *Psychometric Theory* (3rd ed.), New York: McGraw-Hill.

Petter, S., Straub, D., and Rai, A. 2007. "Specifying Formative Constructs in IS Research," *MIS Quarterly* (31:4), pp. 623-656.

Ravichandran, T., and Rai, A. 2000. "Quality Management in Systems Development: An Organizational Systems Perspective," *MIS Quarterly* (24:3), pp. 381-415.

Richardson, H. A., Simmering, M. J., and Sturman, M. C. 2009. "A Tale of Three Perspectives: Examining Post Hoc Statistical Techniques for Detection and Correction of Common Method Variance," *Organizational Research Methods* (12:4), pp. 762-800.

Siponen, M., and Vance, A. 2010. "Neutralization: New Insights into the Problem of Employee Information Systems Security Policy Violations," *MIS Quarterly* (34:3), pp. 487-502.

Steenkamp, J., and Baumgartner, H. 1998. "Assessing Measurement Invariance in Cross-National Consumer Research," *Journal of Consumer Research* (25:1), pp. 78-90.