

Copyright is owned by the Author of the thesis. Permission is given for a copy to be downloaded by an individual for the purpose of research and private study only. The thesis may not be reproduced elsewhere without the permission of the Author.

**Person-Job Fit and its Relationship with Work Attitudes: A Study
of Christian Missionaries from Australasia**

A thesis presented in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

Master of Science in Psychology

At Massey University,

Albany, New Zealand

Jennifer Margaret Manson

2007

ABSTRACT

Do Christian missionaries who exhibit good person-job fit, ('aligned' with host nation colleagues and 'in harmony' with expatriate colleagues), experience more positive work attitudes? Person-job fit was conceptualized in terms of competencies. Perspectives on what competencies the role of missionary requires were obtained from 3 groups of subject matter experts: host nation colleagues, missionaries, and mission agency leaders. In Study I, subject matter experts (host nation colleagues, $n=22$, missionaries, $n=25$, and agency leaders, $n=23$) rated the 'Universal Competency Framework' (SHL) 20-level competencies. Host nation colleagues differed significantly on 3 of the competencies, suggesting that in this sample, the perspective of expatriates on the role of a missionary was not fully aligned with that of host nation colleagues.

In Study 2, a sample of 130 current overseas missionaries self-assessed their performance and provided their own ratings of the importance of the competencies used in Study 1. Measures of Person-Job fit (Demands-Abilities fit, Supplies-Values fit and Perceived Performance) were regressed against outcome variables (job satisfaction, work engagement and satisfaction with life). Results indicated that a person's fit with the job as described by both host nation colleagues (Alignment) and other expatriates (Harmonization) is positively associated with job satisfaction, work engagement and satisfaction with life. These results offer support for competencies as an effective method of describing missionary roles. Possible implications for enhancing the effectiveness and well-being of missionaries, and other aid and development workers, are discussed.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to thank the many missionaries and agency leaders in and from New Zealand and Australia who have helped me by taking time to complete the survey and who have passed it on to others on my behalf. Without the time and effort they gave, this study could not have been completed.

My supervisor, Dr Stuart Carr has been unfailingly enthusiastic. I would like to acknowledge and thank him for his interest and support, in asking great questions and offering wisdom from his wide experience. Drs Dianne Gardner and Barry McDonald have also given me expert advice in specific areas which was timely and invaluable.

I am so thankful to my family, especially to Paul, for his support and helpfulness through months when I was preoccupied and busy. His encouragement, belief in me and willingness to pick up the slack in many ways have made this year so much easier than I expected.

I would like to thank BRCSS, (Building Research Capability in the Social Sciences) for a scholarship in support of this research. This also has been an encouragement and a very practical help. Finally I would like to acknowledge Massey University, represented by people in the Psychology Department, the Library, and the Administration services, who have always been available to provide advice and assistance. The discipline of undertaking this project has been a rewarding and enjoyable journey. I have learnt much along the way and I am grateful to all who have contributed towards making it possible.

ABSTRACT.....	2
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS.....	3
CHAPTER 1- INTRODUCTION.....	7
1.1 Study Rationale.....	7
1.2 A Global Context.....	8
1.3 Effectiveness in Expatriate Roles.....	11
1.4 Early Return in Expatriate Roles.....	12
1.5 Facets of Performance.....	14
1.6 Job Analysis.....	18
1.7 Cross-Cultural Adjustment.....	22
1.8 Adjustment to the job.....	23
1.9 Work adjustment and cross-cultural adjustment.....	23
1.10 Work Adjustment and Person-Job Fit.....	24
1.11 Person-Environment Fit.....	24
1.11.1. Person-organization fit.....	25
1.11.2. Person-job fit.....	26
1.12. Measurement of Person-Job Fit.....	30
1.13. Aspects of Person-Job Fit.....	33
1.14. Outcomes of Person-Job Fit.....	35
HYPOTHESES.....	39
CHAPTER 2 - STUDY I.....	41
Method.....	41
2.1 Participants.....	41
2.2.Measures.....	43
2.3. Procedure.....	46
Results.....	48
Discussion.....	54
CHAPTER 3 - STUDY 2: METHODOLOGY.....	57
3.1 Participants.....	57
3.2. Measures.....	57
3.2.1. Competency ratings.....	57
3.2.2. Performance.....	58
3.2.3. Person-job fit measures.....	58

3.2.4. <i>Job satisfaction</i>	61
3.2.5. <i>Work Engagement</i>	61
3.2.6 <i>Satisfaction with life</i>	62
3.2.7. <i>Social desirability</i>	62
3.3. <i>Demographic data.</i>	63
3.4. <i>Procedure</i>	63
CHAPTER 4 - STUDY 2: RESULTS	66
4.1 <i>Data Reduction</i>	66
4.1.1 <i>Job-Affective Wellbeing Scale (JAWS).</i>	66
4.1.2 <i>Utrecht Work Engagement Schedule</i>	67
4.1.3 <i>Satisfaction with Life Scale</i>	67
4.1.4 <i>The Marlowe-Crown Social Desirability Scale</i>	68
4.1.5. <i>Competency ratings.</i>	68
4.1.6. <i>Self-rated performance</i>	69
4.2 <i>Person-Job Fit Measures</i>	69
4.2.1. <i>Demands-abilities fit:</i>	69
4.2.2. <i>Supplies-values fit.</i>	70
4.2.3. <i>Perceived performance.</i>	71
4.2.5 <i>Inter-measure correlations</i>	72
<i>Note: Non significant correlations have been omitted.</i>	73
4.2.6. <i>Social Desirability</i>	74
4.3 <i>Results for Hypotheses 2-4</i>	74
4.4 <i>Multivariate Regression</i>	79
4.4.1 <i>Assumptions for multiple regression.</i>	79
4.4.2 <i>Hypothesis 5a).</i>	79
<i>Hypothesis 5b). Following the same procedure, t</i>	81
4.5 <i>Demographic Data</i>	84
CHAPTER 5: DISCUSSION.....	86
5.1 <i>Competencies to describe the role of missionary</i>	86
5.2 <i>Validity of the ‘Universal Competency Framework’ in a missionary population</i>	86
5.3 <i>Perspectives of different subject matter experts.</i>	87
5.4 <i>Measuring person-job fit using competencies</i>	88
5.5 <i>Objective versus subjective measures of fit</i>	88

5.6 *Person-Job fit measures*..... 89

 5.6.1 *Demands-Abilities fit* 89

 5.6.2 *Supplies-Values fit* 90

 5.6.3. *Perceived Performance*..... 90

5.7 *Person-job fit and outcome measures*..... 91

5.8 *Predictive power of measures of fit in combination* 93

5.9 *Traditional ‘predictors’ of missionary success*..... 94

5.10 *Alignment and Harmonization and outcome measures* 94

5.11 *Limitations of the study*..... 96

5.12 *Suggestions for future research and practice* 97

5.13 *Conclusions*..... 99

REFERENCES 100

APPENDICES 111