

The Influence of Context Orientation on Recruitment in the Hospitality Industry

Chih-Lun (Alan) Yen

Dissertation submitted to the faculty of the Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University
in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

Doctor of Philosophy
In
Hospitality and Tourism Management

Suzanne K. Murrmann, Chair
Ken W. McCleary
Kent F. Murrmann
Richard R. Perdue

March 30, 2011
Blacksburg, Virginia

Keywords: Context Orientation, Recruitment Messages, Person-Organization Fit,
College Recruitment

Copyright 2011, Chih-Lun (Alan) Yen

UMI Number: DP19246

All rights reserved

INFORMATION TO ALL USERS

The quality of this reproduction is dependent on the quality of the copy submitted.

In the unlikely event that the author did not send a complete manuscript and there are missing pages, these will be noted. Also, if material had to be removed, a note will indicate the deletion.



UMI DP19246

Copyright 2012 by ProQuest LLC.

All rights reserved. This edition of the work is protected against unauthorized copying under Title 17, United States Code.



ProQuest LLC.
789 East Eisenhower Parkway
P.O. Box 1346
Ann Arbor, MI 48106 - 1346

The Influence of Context Orientation on Recruitment in the Hospitality Industry

Chih-Lun (Alan) Yen

ABSTRACT

The hospitality industry continuously seeks to recruit available talents from a variety of sources in order to provide uniquely satisfying services to customers. This has become a more challenging task with companies expanding their business into markets where cultures are dissimilar to those of the US, and the customers are more diversified. Although various studies have discussed different aspects of recruitment, they have not examined the relationship between recruitment messages and cultural difference extensively. Additionally, the current understanding with regard to person-organization (PO) fit perception is limited as well. This study aims to investigate the influence of context orientation, which is defined as the level of information explicitness in the transmitted communications (Hall, 1977), on job seekers' preference for recruitment messages, PO fit, and job application intention.

Measurement items were developed based on a review of the literature. Using a paper-based questionnaire, a total of 350 college students majoring in hospitality and tourism management from three universities located in US and Taiwan, were sampled. Factor analysis was employed to identify the underlying structure among measurement items. Overall, eleven factors were extracted: six factors measured context orientation, three factors measured recruitment messages preference, and two factors measured PO fit. Structural equation modeling and multiple regression analysis were then incorporated to examine proposed relationships between constructs.

Results from the statistical analysis indicated the relationships between context orientation, preferences for recruitment messages, PO fit, and job application intention were all positively related. Additionally, individuals who exhibited the qualities of low-context orientation were found more likely to prefer recruitment messages that incorporated a higher level of detail, precision, and directness. However, the proposed theoretical model was validated with the US group only. This study did not find support with the Taiwan group and with both groups combined.

The findings provided some insight into the study of recruitment in the hospitality industry and its relationship with cultural differences. Further, the managerial implications were explored and a discussion of both the limitations of and suggestion for future research were discussed.

DEDICATION

To my wife Jessie, who stands behind me every day, accepts who I am and what I have been through. It was your unconditional support and patience that motivated me to keep challenging myself.

To my parents and sister, who support me with no reservations. It was your love and understanding that encouraged me to pursue my dream.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

This dissertation would not have been possible without the guidance from my chair advisor, Dr. Suzanne Murrmann. She has been a great mentor to me since my first day at Virginia Tech by sharing her experience in research, teaching, and career without reservation. I am lucky to have been her student and with her guidance I have transformed from a student who knows nearly nothing about research into a professional who has fallen in love with research. I would like to first express my sincere gratitude to her because although there is still much to be learned and improved upon I would like to follow her steps to be a better researcher and a teacher.

I would also like to express my gratitude to Dr. Kent Murrmann, who inspired me to explore cultural differences and assess its influence on recruitment. We sat through numerous meetings in the fall of 2009 just to establish the right framework for concept and scale development. I wouldn't have been able to establish a foundation for my dissertation without his advice. I am grateful to Dr. Ken McCleary for his input on research design and Dr. Richard Perdue for his commentary on statistical analysis. Their valuable advice and constructive comments assisted me in navigating my dissertation and defense successfully. I also want to thank Dr. Kay Chu, Dr. Hsu-I Huang, and Dr. Manisha Singal for assisting me in data collection. Additionally, I want to extend my appreciation to individuals who participated in my dissertation. Their participations enabled me to explore the influence of context orientation and acquire a better understanding on cultural difference and its influence on recruitment in the hospitality industry.

I would like to express my appreciation as well to a few people who have made my journey at Virginia Tech interesting and colorful: Pierre Couture, who showed me how to think differently and who always challenged me to do a better job; France Belanger, who provided a good example of working hard and enjoy life to the fullest; Jim Sexton, and Howard Feiertag, who always make each gathering filled with laughter, jokes, and wisdom. I know I will miss you all very much.

I have enjoyed the friendship that my fellow graduate students have provided throughout my time in Blacksburg. Especially John Lee, thank you for being my big brother. I want to express my special thanks to current and previous HTM departmental staff for their assistance and faculty members for their teaching and support during my doctoral study. Special thanks go to Ms. Barbara Macri for her help in making revisions and comments on my dissertation.

Last, but never the least, I am fortunate to be the son of my parents, Yung-Tzu Yen and Li-Ying Chen, and the brother of my sister, Dr. Wan-Ju Yen. Thank you for supporting me all these years to pursue my goals and encouraging me to do a better job. Although we are far away from each other, the bond is always there. And I am the luckiest man in this world to be the husband of my wife, Yen-Hui Jessie Wu. You just know how to cheer me up when I feel low. I cannot recall how many nights that you stayed up while I was busy on my dissertation just to make sure I have food to eat and coffee to drink. We share the good and the bad times together. Now we will share the great times for the rest of our lives.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTERS	Page
I. INTRODUCTION	
1.1 Research Background	1
1.2 Research Objective	8
1.3 Proposed Theoretical Model And Construct Definitions	11
1.4 Contribution of the Study	13
1.5 Research Boundary	15
1.6 Organization of the Study	16
II. LITERATURE REVIEW	
2.1 Introduction	17
2.2 Recruitment	17
2.2.1 Players	18
2.2.2 Recruitment Activity	19
2.2.3 Recruitment Messages	21
2.2.4 Summary	23
2.3 Review of Key Constructs in the Theoretical Model	23
2.3.1 Individual Perception	23
2.3.2 Culture	25
2.3.3 Context Orientation	26
2.3.4 The Culture's Impact on Recruitment	29
2.3.5 Person-Organization Fit	30
2.3.6 Job Application Intention	32
2.3.7 Summary	33
2.4 Conclusion	34
III. METHODOLOGY	
3.1 Introduction	36
3.2 Research Questions and Hypotheses	36
3.2.1 Research Questions	36
3.2.2 Research Hypotheses	37
3.2.2.1 Hypothesis 1	37
3.2.2.2 Hypothesis 2	38
3.2.2.3 Hypothesis 3	39
3.3 Research Design	40
3.3.1 The Development of Scale Items	40
3.3.1.1 Reliability and Validity	40
3.3.1.2 Measurement Development	43
3.3.1.3 Context Orientation Scale Items	45
3.3.1.4 Recruitment Messages Measurement Items	48
3.3.1.5 Person-Organization (PO) Fit Scale Items	53
3.3.1.6 Job Application Intention Measurement Items	55
3.3.1.7 Demographic Information	56
3.3.2 The Pre-Test	56

3.3.3 The Pilot Study	56
3.3.4 The Main Study	60
3.3.4.1 Population and Sample	60
3.3.4.2 Data Collection	61
3.4 Data Analysis	61
3.4.1 Factor Analysis	61
3.4.2 Structural Equation Modeling	62
3.4.3 Multiple Regressions	65
3.5 Summary	67
3.6 Conclusion	67

IV. ANALYSIS AND RESULTS

4.1 Introduction	68
4.2 Background Information of Respondents	68
4.3 Scale Reliability	69
4.4 Hypothesis Testing	70
4.4.1 Exploratory Factor Analysis	70
4.4.1.1 Context Orientation	70
4.4.1.2 Recruitment Messages Preference	72
4.4.1.3 Person-Organization Fit Perception	73
4.4.1.4 Initial Examination on Extracted Factors	74
4.4.2 Structural Equation Modeling	77
4.5 Results of Hypothesis Testing	84
4.5.1 SEM Model Result Assessment	84
4.5.2 Hypothesis 1	84
4.5.3 Hypothesis 2	87
4.5.4 Hypothesis 3	88
4.6 Alternative Study on the US Group	89
4.6.1 Scale Reliability	89
4.6.2 Hypothesis Testing	90
4.6.2.1 Exploratory Factor Analysis	90
4.6.2.1.1 Context Orientation	90
4.6.2.1.2 Recruitment Messages	92
4.6.2.1.3 Person-Organization Fit Perception	93
4.6.2.1.4 Initial Examination on Extracted Factors	94
4.6.2.2 Structural Equation Modeling	96
4.6.3 Results of Hypothesis Testing	97
4.6.3.1 SEM Model Result Assessment	97
4.6.3.2 Hypothesis 1	97
4.6.3.3 Hypothesis 2	101
4.6.3.4 Hypothesis 3	101
4.7 Alternative Study on the Taiwan Group	102
4.7.1 Scale Reliability	102
4.8 Summary	103

V. DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

5.1 Introduction	104
5.2 Discussion	104
5.2.1 Research Results Review	104
5.2.2 Research Constructs	105
5.2.2.1 Context Orientation	105
5.2.2.2 Preference for Recruitment Messages	107
5.2.2.3 Person-Organization Fit	108
5.2.2.4 Job Application Intention	109
5.2.3 Context Orientation – Preference of Recruitment Messages	109
5.2.4 Preference of Recruitment Messages – PO Fit Perception	111
5.2.5 PO Fit Perception – Job Application Intention	112
5.3 Implication of the Research Findings	112
5.3.1 Theoretical Contribution to the Present Body of Literature	113
5.3.2 Managerial Implications	114
5.4 Limitations and Suggestions for Future Research	116
Reference	120
Appendix	
A. Hypothesis Summary and Hypothesis Testing	128
B. Pretest Questionnaire	129
C. Final Questionnaire (English Version)	136
D. Final Questionnaire (Taiwanese Version)	141
E. Exploratory Factor Analysis (With Combined Groups)	146
F. Exploratory Factor Analysis (With US Group)	149
G. IRB Exempt Approval Letter	152

LIST OF TABLES

TABLES	Page
3.1 Context Orientation – Directness of Communication.....	47
3.2 Context Orientation – Management of Information.....	48
3.3 Recruitment Messages – Directness of Communication.....	50
3.4 Recruitment Messages – Management of Information.....	50
3.5 Recruitment Messages – Values and Beliefs about Work and Relationship.....	51
3.6 Recruitment Messages – Communication Channel Preference.....	52
3.7 Recruitment Messages – Recruiters’ Status in the Organization.....	52
3.8 Recruitment Messages – Reflection on Organizational Values.....	53
3.9 PO Fit – Directness of Communication.....	54
3.10 PO Fit – Communication Channel Preferences.....	55
3.11 PO Fit – Organizational Structure and Characteristics.....	55
3.12 Job Application Intention.....	56
4.1 Respondents Background Information.....	68
4.2 Measurement Reliability Initial Assessment.....	69
4.3 Measurement Reliability Final Assessment.....	70
4.4 EFA Result of Context Orientation.....	71
4.5 EFA Result of Recruitment Messages Preference.....	72
4.6 EFA Result of PO Fit Perception.....	73
4.7 Descriptive Statistics of Extracted Factors.....	75
4.8 Bivariate Correlation Results.....	76
4.9 Independent Samples T-tests.....	76
4.10 Fit Indexes of the Initial Model.....	78
4.11 The Fit Indexes of the First Improved Model.....	79
4.12 The Fit Indexes of the Second Improved Model.....	80
4.13 The Fit Indexes of the First Revised Model.....	82
4.14 Fit Indexes of the Second Revised Model.....	83
4.15 Correlation Analysis Results.....	85
4.16 Regression Model Summary.....	86
4.17 The Regression Model ANOVA Result.....	86
4.18 Beta Coefficients and Other Coefficients for the Model.....	87
4.19 Summary of Hypotheses Testing with the SEM Results.....	88
4.20 Measurement Reliability Initial Assessment with the US Group.....	89
4.21 Measurement Reliability Initial Assessment with the US Group.....	90
4.22 EFA Result of Context Orientation with the US Group.....	91
4.23 EFA Result of Recruitment Messages Preference with the US Group.....	92
4.24 EFA Result of Recruitment Messages Preference with the US Group.....	94
4.25 Descriptive Statistics of Extracted Factors with the US Group.....	95
4.26 Correlation Analysis Results among Extracted Factors with the US Group.....	95
4.27 The Fit Indexes of the Initial Model with the US Group.....	96
4.28 Context Orientation Factors in the SEM model with the US Group.....	98
4.29 Regression Model Summary.....	99
4.30 The Regression Model ANOVA Result.....	100
4.31 Beta Coefficients and Other Coefficients for the Model.....	100

4.32 Summary of Hypotheses Testing with the SEM Results.....	102
4.33 Measurement Reliability Initial Assessment with the TW Group.....	102
4.34 Summary of Hypotheses Testing.....	103

LIST OF FIGURES

FIGURES	Page
1.1 Proposed Theoretical Model.....	11
2.1 Proposed Theoretical Model and Hypotheses.....	34
4.1 Initial Model.....	77
4.2 First Improved Model.....	79
4.3 Second Improved Model.....	80
4.4 CFA of PO Fit Perception.....	81
4.5 Revised Model after CFA Result.....	82
4.6 Second Revised Model after CFA result.....	83
4.7 Initial Model with the US Group.....	96

THE INFLUENCE OF CONTEXT ORIENTATION ON RECRUITMENT IN THE HOSPITALITY INDUSTRY

CHAPTER ONE INTRODUCTION

1.1 RESEARCH BACKGROUND

The hospitality industry is known for its service-oriented nature, and successful organizations are under pressure to provide uniquely satisfying services to customers; therefore, recruitment remains a critical issue. Organizations in the industry are in dire need of hiring employees who can provide the kind of experience their customers will want to enjoy time and again. Attracting and acquiring employees who can deliver services which can generate memorable experiences to customers is an important human resource management (HRM) objective.

As previous studies have defined, recruitment encompasses all organizational practices which may affect the number and quality of individuals who are attracted to particular job openings (Rynes, 1991). These decisions include: selecting appropriate recruitment pools, developing recruitment activities, and delivering recruitment messages. These selections would impact recruitment effectiveness by directing job seekers' attention to job opportunities and the organization. Some studies also addressed the importance of the early stage of recruitment, which is the key moment when job seekers start assessing opportunities with an employer. The sooner an organization can reach a job seeker and promote the company image along with

employment opportunities, the stronger the effect it will have influencing an individual's decision to apply for a position with the organization.

Recruitment activities are “the specific tasks, procedures, and actions undertaken for purposes of recruitment” (Barber, 1998, p. 9). Allison Barber (1998) suggest that they are executed by organizations for following purposes: (1) to define the target population for satisfying organizations' personnel need; (2) to select labor market segments and geographic regions for conducting recruitment campaigns; (3) to choose the medium for reaching the target population; (4) to deliver messages for disseminating information through the selected medium; (5) to prepare final offers for acquiring qualified applicants; and (6) to create general policies and actions for managing the overall recruitment function. Previous studies also suggest that the selected medium and the disseminated messages would affect the type and the number of applicants that hiring organizations can reach (Jablin, Putnam, Roberts, & Porter, 1987; Barber, 1998; Breaugh, 2008).

Recruitment messages refer to the information related to the job opening and the organization, such as: job descriptions, organization's characteristics, values, culture, and attributes (Barber, 1998; Roberson, Collins, & Oreg, 2005). The array of information gives job seekers some understanding about the job and the organization, which would serve as the foundation for individuals to consider the possibility of applying for job openings with hiring organizations.

As previous studies suggest, recruitment activities and messages affect job seekers' intentions to apply for jobs. When participating in recruitment activities, job seekers would pay attention to the nature, execution of delivery, and the types of information included in the messages (Breaugh & Billings, 1988; Barber, 1998; Breaugh & Starke, 2000). Therefore, the planning and delivery of recruitment messages are critical factors when organizations attempt to develop a favorable image to attract job seekers.

Additionally, an individual's decision to apply for a job could be affected by examining the congruence, or "the fit", between themselves and the observed organizational characteristics (Cable & Judge, 1994, 1996; Kristof-Brown, Zimmerman, & Johnson, 2005). Job seekers use information from recruitment messages as the foundation for developing fit perception with hiring organizations.

The concept of fit has received extensive attention in the recruitment and selection literature because it provides a theoretical foundation for understanding individuals' evaluation of their working environment (person-environment (PE) fit). When further examining the congruence between individuals and various aspects of the working environment, other types of fit would emerge: organizations (PO fit), jobs (PJ fit), groups (PG fit), and vocations (PV fit). These studies have assisted researchers in exploring individuals' behaviors and decisions in organizations: job application, job offer acceptance, work performance, job satisfaction, and turnover intentions (Kristof-Brown et al., 2005).

Among these types of fit, PO fit emphasizes the comparison between an individual's values, personality, and goals and those of the hiring organization (Bretz & Judge, 1994; Kristof, 1996). Previous studies suggest that PO fit can be differentiated into two types of fit (Latham, 2007; Kristof, 1996; Muchinsky & Monahan, 1987). Complementary fit exists when a person's psychological need is fulfilled (needs-supplies fit) and an individual's skills meet environment needs (demands-ability fit). Supplementary fit exists "when an employee and an organization attach similar importance to the same values, that is, the importance a person and an organization place on a particular attribute" (Latham, 2007, p. 163). Thus, PO fit is the most direct comparison done by job seekers in the early stage of recruitment because job seekers would form their first assumptions about their potential fit with a particular organization and start to pay serious attention to information about potential hiring organizations.

PO fit is an important consideration to organizations because there is a degree of self selection that occurs with potential applicants. When job seekers perceive that there is a lack of fit between themselves and hiring organizations, they may decide to drop out from the recruitment process. This process is good for organizations because they can avoid hiring the wrong person and avoid the potential waste of organizational resources. Those who remain in the recruitment process would have a strong perception of PO fit. These are more desirable candidates because they would be more likely to have higher levels of job satisfaction and commitment to an organization, and be less likely to voluntarily leave an organization (Verquer, Beehr, & Wagner, 2003; Hoffman & Woehr, 2006). Therefore, hiring individuals with a strong PO fit perception would be advantageous to an organization in gaining its competitive advantages in a given industry.

Previous studies have provided a wide variety of discussions regarding recruitment: the recruiter's role, recruiting sources, and realistic-job preview (RJP) (Breaugh, 1992, 2008; Barber, 1998; Breaugh & Starke, 2000; Rynes & Cable, 2003). However, little has been revealed about how applicants perceive recruitment messages at the early stage of recruitment (Barber, 1998; Roberson, Collins & Oreg, 2005). The continuous growth of international business and the expansion of foreign operations have made this a critical question to U.S. hospitality organizations.

Companies, such as Marriott International and Starwood Hotels & Resorts Worldwide, have increased their market share in Asia by establishing new properties in various regions. Globalization has brought significant opportunities for U.S. hospitality organizations to grow and become more prosperous. However, globalization has also brought complex challenges to these overseas operations because customers in the global market have dissimilar preferences and behaviors than their U.S. counterparts. U.S. hospitality organizations need to recruit local talent from these regions in order to assist them in responding to customer demand in a more rapid and appropriate manner to overcome the cultural differences between employees and clientele.

Cultural differences, as Edward Hall (1959) described, can relate to different dimensions: time, space, things, relationships, and agreements. These dimensions could influence an individual to either pay attention to or ignore potentially important details relating to their decision to apply for a particular position. Since recruitment "encompasses all organizational practices and decisions that affect either the number, or types, of individuals who are willing to apply for, or to accept, a given vacancy" (Rynes, 1991, p. 429), cultural differences may

influence an individual to pay attention to certain aspects instead of the entirety of messages when participating in recruitment activities and interacting with recruiters.

Hall (1977), in order to further understand how individuals differ in their behaviors and interpretations of events, compared cultural differences based on the concept of context orientation and labeled cultures on a continuum. One end of this continuum contains high-context (HC) cultures, where individuals communicate with most of the information “either in the physical context or internalized in the person, while very little is in the coded, explicit, transmitted part of the message” (p. 91). The other end of the continuum is labeled low-context (LC), where most of the information is in the coded, explicit, and transmitted part of the message.

Previous studies incorporated the concept of context orientation suggesting various dimensions which reflect the difference between two orientations. One example is the review done by Donghoon Kim, Yigang Pan and Heung Soo Park (1998) in which they examined Hall’s works and summarized six dimensions in which HC and LC cultures differ. The first dimension is social orientation, where “high-context cultures make greater distinctions between insiders and outsiders” (Hall, 1977, p. 113). Individuals from HC cultures would place stress on the conformity and group orientation because “people are deeply involved with one another” (Kim et al., 1998, p. 510). The second dimension is commitment, which emphasizes “a person’s word is his or her bond and a promise for others to take” (Keegan, 1989, p. 117). The third dimension is responsibility, where HC cultures stress a hierarchy in the organization that “people in places of authority are personally and truly responsible for the actions of subordinates, down to the lowest man” (Hall, 1977, p. 113), whereas responsibility is spread throughout the system in LC cultures.

The fourth dimension is confrontation, where people in HC cultures attempt to avoid direct confrontation to sustain a sense of social harmony and initiate bonds among people. People in LC cultures, in contrast, are not afraid to encounter direct and open confrontation. The fifth dimension is communication, where most communication relies on the physical context or is internalized in HC cultures, while the mass of the information is vested in the explicit mode in LC cultures. The last dimension represents dealing with new situations. People in HC cultures are less creative and flexible in new situations than their LC counterparts.

Existing studies have further examined the concept of context orientation and suggest HC cultures rely significantly on non-verbal aspects of communication: personal backgrounds, values, and status in the society (Shao, Bao & Gray, 2004; Mintu-Wimsatt, & Gassenheimer, 2000; Simintiras & Thomas, 1998). LC cultures emphasize the use of words when communicating because “the message receiver is expected to derive most of the meaning from the written or verbalized statements” (Shao, Bao, & Gray, 2004, p. 70) and formal communication is preferred (Simintiras & Thomas, 1998).

Recruitment is a mutual interaction and communication process between job seekers and organizations, which implies that any differences between context orientations could affect individuals’ perceptions and preferences regarding recruitment messages. Revealing the true meaning in a recruitment message therefore is challenging because individuals from LC cultures are assumed to prefer explicit statements, while individuals from HC cultures are presumed to prefer statements that are less explicit. These contextual cultural differences are theorized to

cause challenges in successfully filling positions when individuals interpret information in different ways, and thereby influence the development of fit perception with hiring organizations.

1.2 RESEARCH OBJECTIVE

Although various studies have discussed recruitment from different aspects, they have not examined the relationship between recruitment messages and cultural difference extensively. In addition, the current understanding of the extended impact of PO fit perception is limited as well. Therefore, this study attempts to fill in the gap in existing literature by exploring culture's impact on recruitment. Specifically, this study will examine job seekers' preferences for recruitment messages based on their context orientation, the development of PO fit perception, and the job application intentions with hiring organizations.

Previous studies have also supported this direction of study, which address culture's impact on HRM. Ann Marie Ryan, Lynn McFarland, Helen Baron and Ron Page (1999) examined whether or not staffing practices vary in different regions due to national and cultural differences. They suggest that "both empirical and anecdotal evidence suggested variability in selection practices across nations" (p. 361). They also commented that a further examination of culture's impact on this issue is necessary because there is a lack of understanding as to why differences exist across nations. Their work suggests that culture may be a key factor in driving such variability because "nations differ in culture, political structures, and economic factors, all of which contribute to observed differences" (p. 361). They further questioned "can the variance in selection practices due to national differences be explained by national standing on cultural dimensions?" (p. 362). Their research findings partially support their assumptions on the effects

of two cultural dimensions (uncertainty avoidance and power distance) with some mixed and counterintuitive results. They recommended a further examination on cross-cultural studies in order to clarify the relationship among staffing practices due to cultural differences.

Dirk Steiner and Stephen Gilliland (2001) focused on the relationships between culture and reactions to personnel selection procedures during their examination of personnel selection practices. It was hypothesized that context orientation had certain impacts on procedural rules, especially with regard to information processing and decision justification. They suggest that future studies should continuously compare personnel practices cross-culturally because existing studies only provided a glance at this issue.

Bradley Kirkman, Kevin Lowe and Cristina Gibson (2006) reviewed studies which incorporated Geert Hofstede's cultural dimensions. Among the 64 studies that focused at the individual level, 12 studies incorporated cultural values in addition to or besides the individualism (IND) and the collectivism (COL). All 12 studies found that cultural values had significant effects. It was suggested that "such consistent findings suggest that including cultural values other than IND-COL in the other 52 studies would have led to important insights" (Kirkman et al., 2006, p. 296). They recommended that future studies should incorporate other cultural dimensions into this level of study.

Per earlier discussion, recruitment can be viewed as a mutual interaction and communication process between job seekers and potential employers. Hiring organizations engage in various recruitment activities and deliver recruitment messages with an attempt to hire

individuals, who would not only meet the personnel needs of organization but also possess a strong sense of PO fit. Thus, this study has two objectives to achieve. The first is to analyze culture's influence on individuals' preference for recruitment messages. During the recruitment process, job seekers receive recruitment messages directly from hiring organizations, and based on Hall's (1977) concept of context orientation, it is assumed that individuals with dissimilar context orientations would perceive these messages differently. However, what are the major differences based on their context orientations? If there is any difference, how significant it is? How do job seekers respond differently, in terms of dimensions of context orientation, when receiving recruitment messages from hiring organizations?

Secondly, this study aims to explore individuals' perceptions of fit with hiring organizations based on their context orientations. As indicated earlier, job seekers' job application intentions would depend on whether or not they have developed a sense of PO fit. Since the early stage of recruitment would be the initial communication between individuals and organizations, individuals will develop their perceptions of PO fit based on their preferences and interpretations of recruitment messages. If the perceived fit with the organization is high, job seekers should have a strong intention to apply for job openings with a hiring organization. Therefore, organizations can evaluate their recruitment efforts by assessing whether they have successfully encouraged the right candidates to apply for job openings.

Based on the two objectives this study attempts to achieve, the research questions are posed as follows:

RQ1: How does the cultural background of an applicant influence his/her preference for recruitment messages?


RQ2: How do applicants' dissimilar cultural backgrounds affect their perceived person-organization fit with hiring organizations?

RQ3: How do applicants' perceived person-organization fit, based on their cultural backgrounds, influence their intentions to apply for positions with hiring organizations?

1.3 PROPOSED THEORETICAL MODEL AND CONSTRUCT DEFINITIONS

This study focuses on culture's impact on potential applicants during the early stage of recruitment. For that reason, the concept of context orientation and the PO fit theory will serve as the theoretical foundation of this study in order to examine culture's influence on individuals' preferences for recruitment messages, the development of PO fit perception, and eventual job application intentions. This study proposes to use the following model to investigate research questions introduced in the previous section:

Figure 1.1 Proposed Theoretical Model



The constructs included in this model are defined as follows:

(1) Context Orientation:

- a. High-context communication – most of the information is either in the physical context or is an internalized part of the person, while very little is in the coded, explicit, or transmitted part of the message (Hall, 1977, p. 91).
- b. Low-context communication – the mass of the information is vested in the explicit code (Hall, 1977, p. 91).

(2) Recruitment messages: combinations of information which depict the organization's attributes, values, culture and job characteristics in order to encourage the most appropriate job applicants to apply for a position with the organization.

(3) Person-organization fit: “the compatibility between people and organizations that occurs when: (a) at least one entity provides what the other needs, or (b) they share similar fundamental characteristics, or (c) both” (Kristof, 1996, p. 4).

(4) Job Application Intention: Individual job seekers' determination to apply for openings with hiring organizations.

This study proposes a sequential interaction among constructs introduced in previous sections. As suggested before, the objective of this research is to explore how cultural differences, in terms of context orientation, will affect individual job seeker preference for recruitment messages, which include information about job characteristics and organizational attributes. Once individual job seekers receive recruitment messages, how do they develop a perception of PO fit and how does that translate to the intention to submit a job application. Recruitment is a communication process between organizations and individuals, the casual

relationship regarding cultural differences and perceived PO fit can be expressed as follows:

- (1) *Cultural differences in context orientation will affect individuals' preferences for recruitment messages:* Cultural differences with regard to context orientation will influence each individual's preferences for information presentation when interacting with potential employers. Culture serves as a screening function that builds the foundation for an individual's ability to interpret and react to their surroundings. Therefore, cultural differences with regard to context orientation will influence each individual's preferences for the way information is presented when interacting with potential employers.
- (2) *Individuals' preferences for recruitment messages will influence their perceived PO fit development:* Individuals will compare themselves to organizational attributes that they learned from recruitment messages. Such comparisons will lead individuals to decide whether or not there is a fit between themselves and organizations.
- (3) *Individuals' perception of PO fit will influence their intention to submit to the job application process:* The perception of PO fit reflects on how closely individual's perceive they align with the values, personality and goals of the organization, which will affect the decisions on whether or not they would like to apply for job openings with hiring organizations.

1.4 CONTRIBUTION OF THE STUDY

This study proposes to achieve two goals, which include exploring culture's impact on the recruitment of highly qualified candidates, and job seekers perception of PO fit with hiring organizations based on their own context orientation.

In terms of the theoretical contribution, this study contributes to the body of PO fit literature by exploring culture's impact on recruitment and individuals' perceptions of recruitment messages. The stream of PO fit studies has extensively discussed individuals' differences, in terms of their values, characteristics, personalities, needs, and skills when comparing with organizational attributes, values, goals, cultures, and characteristics. In general, the recruitment result regarding the match between individuals and organizations will be positive (Wanous, 1992). However, few studies exist which have focused on how individuals differ from each other when forming their perceptions about PO fit during the early stage of recruitment. Particularly, this study will assess how dissimilar context orientations will influence individual's development of PO fit perception. This study seeks to further explore the notion of PO fit with regard to dissimilar cultural values which has been, as suggested by previous studies, a gap in the understanding of PO fit. A proposed theoretical model will be used to examine the relationship among the key constructs, which would provide a systematic approach to test the hypotheses and answer research questions posed in this study.

In terms of the practical contribution, the result of this study could be helpful in identifying communication preferences of potential applicants during the early stage of the recruitment. This information would be valuable to hospitality organizations when developing effective recruitment strategies. Previous studies have illustrated that recruitment is a mutual interaction between job seekers and hiring organizations, which would affect the type and the number of people attracted to available positions. This study would enhance hospitality organizations' recruitment efforts in not only attracting the attention of desirable candidates but also encourage them to apply for job openings with hiring organizations.

1.5 RESEARCH BOUNDARY

A sound theory should select and clearly define constructs of interests, describe the relationship among constructs, explain the reason for choosing these constructs as the focal components of the theory, and identify the boundary in which the prediction of the theory will be sustained (Edwards, 2008; Bacharach, 1989; Dubin, 1978).

Samuel Bacharach (1989) suggests that research boundaries serve as the assumptions about values, time, and space that assist theorists to confine constructs within the specific border, which would then enable theorists to measure and examine those constructs more accurately. The theoretical foundation of this study is constructed on the PO fit theory; therefore research boundaries should establish conditions in which PO fit relationships would occur. The bounding assumption of this study and the proposed model is focused on the PO fit perception development when individuals receive recruitment messages from hiring organizations. However, the proposed model does not focus on the PO fit perception development during the selection process or after individuals have entered the organization.

The premise of this study is additionally focused on the supplementary fit, which emphasizes compatibility based on similarity between individuals and organizations that “people who are of a similar type will be attracted, not only to jobs, but to organizations of a particular sort” (Schneider, 1987, p. 442). Since this study is focused solely on the attraction during the early stage of recruitment, it will not focus on the complementary fit, which addresses the completion between individuals and organizations. Therefore, the research hypotheses, results, and discussions of this study will be confined within these boundaries.

1.6 ORGANIZATION OF THE STUDY

This study is organized into five chapters. Chapter One discusses the research background, research objective, research questions, the proposed model, potential contribution of this study, and research boundaries. Chapter Two provides the literature review on key constructs of this study, including context orientation, recruitment message, PO fit, and job application intentions. Research hypotheses will also be proposed in the same chapter after an extensive review of literature. Chapter Three presents the methodology of the study. Research design, including measurement development, sample selection, and data collection process, will be presented in this chapter. Selected statistics techniques used to test proposed hypotheses will be discussed as well. Chapter Four presents the results of the statistical analysis. Chapter Five presents the conclusion of this study, including findings of this study, discussions on implications and limitations, and suggestions for future research.

CHAPTER TWO LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1 INTRODUCTION

This chapter reviews previous studies related to the early stage of recruitment and key constructs in the proposed theoretical model. Based on the premise that recruitment is an interaction and communication process between individuals and organizations, this chapter will begin by discussing various components that are critical in the process, especially at the early stage of recruitment. The discussion is followed by a review of theories incorporated in this study: context orientation and person-organization (PO) fit. Research hypotheses will be presented in this chapter as well.

2.2 RECRUITMENT

Recruitment can be viewed as a mutual interaction and communication process between organizations and individual job seekers. From an organization's perspective, the critical issue is how to fill job vacancies in the organization effectively, efficiently, with the most qualified candidates, and with a limited amount of time and resources available. Thus, recruitment "includes those practices and activities carried on by the organization with the primary purpose of identifying and attracting potential employees" (Barber, 1998, p. 5).

Barber (1998) suggests that recruitment can be separated into different stages based on an individual's status in recruitment; the earliest stage of recruitment is generating applicants. Each stage offers different types of players who are involved and where various kinds of activities will be carried out for the purpose of recruitment. Players refer to all parties that can either influence,

or be influenced by, recruitment, while activities are defined as “specific tasks, procedures, and actions undertaken for purposes of recruitment”. (Barber, 1998, p. 9).

2.2.1 PLAYERS

Major players involved in recruitment include organizations, individuals, and organizational agents. Both seek to establish an employment relationship in their own best interest by interacting with each other.

Organizations are a union of individuals who join and function together to achieve a common goal or a set of goals (Gibson, Ivancevich, Donnelly, & Konopaske, 2008). Naturally, as the time goes by, some individuals may leave the organization either voluntarily or involuntarily. Organizations, in order to ensure that they can continue to achieve their goals, will attempt to identify and attract qualified individuals who will be able to enhance their overall performance in the market. The objective will also be to fill in these vacancies as soon as possible. Thus, organizations would “outreach to an applicant population in an attempt to persuade some portion of that population to apply for positions” (Barber, 1998, p. 13).

It has been suggested that individuals would join an organization to satisfy their needs of existence/survival, affiliation/socialization, recognition/achievement, and others (Gibson, Ivancevich, Donnelly, & Konopaske, 2008). Job seekers, upon exposure to recruiting activities and messages, attempt to finalize a list of preferred organizations in which to apply for available positions. During a job search they will approach every obtainable source to collect information about job openings and organizations that are searching for applicants. Therefore, individuals

and organizations directly influence each other with the attempt to find a “match” in the early stage of recruitment.

Besides individuals and organizations, there are other parties involved in this phase of recruitment as well. Organizational agents are individuals who “actually carry out or are responsible for the recruitment function” (Barber, 1998, p. 8). Organizations are a collective body of individuals who work together to achieve a common goal or a set of goals and therefore, cannot directly perform any actions for recruitment. As such, they must also rely on their agents in executing recruitment activities and delivering recruitment messages. Individuals actually interact with these organizational agents during recruitment as a representative of the organization. When individuals assess an organization’s attributes, they would start by evaluating the attitudes, behaviors, and decisions of these representatives in executing recruitment activities. They would also evaluate information presented by these agents as references for assessing jobs and organizations. Job seekers’ perceptions during their interaction with these agents will serve as a part of the reflection on an organization’s attributes, since these organizational agents serve as physical representations of these organizations.

2.2.2 RECRUITMENT ACTIVITY

Previous studies suggest that recruitment activities would affect job seekers’ attitude and behavior, such as: intentions toward application, job choice, and actual application behaviors (Rynes, Heneman, & Schwab, 1980; Taylor & Bergmann, 1987; Rynes, Bretz, & Gerhart, 1991; Barber, 1998; Boswell, Roehling, LePine, & Moynihan, 2003). Wendy Boswell, Mark Roehling, Marcie LePine and Lisa Moynihan (2003) examined job seekers’ decision making process and

the role of effective and ineffective recruitment activities during the process. They suggest that “specific recruiting practices may exert a significant influence, positive or negative, on job-choice decisions” (p. 23). They also found that what occurs during the course of recruitment activities would impact the results of recruitment significantly. Exposure to recruitment activities could lead potential job applicants may drop out from the application process, or individuals may feel more attracted to and confident that the organization would be a good fit for them. Individuals would then consider which information is valuable and creditable to them and then finalize their decisions in terms of submitting an application for a particular organization.

Recruitment activities that occur in the early stages are comprised of choosing mediums and delivering messages, which are directly related to applicant attraction and the exchange of information. Based on the selected target population, choosing mediums is critical for organizations to ensure that they can actually reach out to the most compatible pool of job seekers. The medium refers to “the method used to reach the target population” (Barber, 1998, p. 9). Through a variety of methods, such as: job/career fair, employee referral, and mass advertisement, organizations increase their exposure to job seekers. However, each method has its limitation in terms of the influence on the type and the number of people attracted. Meanwhile, because organizations have limited resources for their operations; they cannot afford to adopt every method for recruitment. They need to be selective in creating reasonable combinations of recruitment methods for achieving their objectives in the early stage of recruitment. For example, campus recruitment is effective when organizations are targeting at individuals with specific education backgrounds and training experiences. However, it could most likely help an organization to approach students instead of other types of individuals.

Another example is employee referral, which has been identified as one of the effective mediums for organizations to reach potential job applicants (Breaugh & Starke, 2000; Barber, 1998); however, both the number of prospects and the geographic scope would be limited to the location of the business.

2.2.3 RECRUITMENT MESSAGES

It should also be noted that each medium has its unique impact on message delivery. Message delivery is another part of recruitment activities which is critical in the early stage of recruitment, and refers to “the dissemination of information through selected sources” (Barber, 1998, p. 9). The information is mainly related to job (i.e. job characteristics, the nature of work, advancement opportunities) and organization (i.e. organizational attributes and organization cultures) (Powell, 1984; Taylor & Bergmann, 1987; Roberson, Collins, & Oreg, 2005). The inclusion of organizational attributes and various other kinds of information about job openings are designed to attract the attention of individual job seekers and engage their interest in apply for available positions with hiring organizations. Thus, recruitment messages are defined as combinations of information that reflect organizations’ attributes, values, culture, and job characteristics to attract potential applicants to apply for job with the organization.

A general assumption about job seekers during the early stage of recruitment is that they are knowledgeable about employment opportunities and other job-related issues. However, studies suggest that this is a questionable assumption, job seekers; in most cases, actually possess limited information (Rynes et al., 1980). Individuals would seek out information that could reduce a certain level of uncertainty when they try to identify any career opportunity with a

hiring organization. They would prefer to receive messages that are informative in nature, especially if these recruitment messages can provide some insights about job characteristics and organizational attributes. James Breugh and Mary Starke (2000) summarized attributes of recruitment messages that are likely to capture job seekers' attention, including the vividness of the message, the concreteness of the language used, and the conveyance of unexpected information and personally relevant information. Previous studies also suggest that recruitment messages with positive information about a hiring organization would increase applicants' intentions to apply for the job (Roberson, Collins, & Oreg, 2005). Quinetta Roberson and her colleagues also suggest that, in addition to the message itself, it is important that "the receiver has the ability, and is motivated, to think about the content of the message" (p. 322). Moreover, "message specificity has significant influence on people's cognitive and attitudinal reactions to the object of the information" (Roberson, Collins, & Oreg, 2005, p. 323).

James Breugh and Robert Billings (1988) suggest that recruitment messages should be understandable from job seekers' standpoint and be perceived as credible for better attractions. It has also been suggested that recruitment messages with specific, detailed, and realistic information would have positive effects to the benefit of organizations (Breugh, 1992; Wanous, 1992). Barber (1998) also suggested that the nature of the messenger and the timing of message delivery might affect job seekers' intentions to apply for a position with hiring organizations as well. Therefore, message delivery would be critical to both organizations and job seekers in the early stage of recruitment. Information included in these recruitment messages could assist job seekers by increasing familiarity with organizations, assessing employment opportunities, comparing their personalities with attributes of the organizations' for the development of fit

perception, and building up a prioritized list of organizations for which to submit job applications.

2.2.4 SUMMARY

The significance of recruitment activities and messages in the early stage of recruitment, have been suggested by previous studies and would indeed affect job seekers' attitudes and behaviors toward their job application decisions. This stage of recruitment is focused on the mutual connection between organizations and individuals, and whether individuals are attracted to organizations. Both individuals and organizations do share a common goal to establish an employment relationship when engaging in these recruitment activities and while exchanging recruitment messages. Therefore, the effectiveness of recruitment can be reflected by the type and the number of individuals attracted to organizations for job applications.

2.3 REVIEW OF KEY CONSTRUCTS IN THE THEORETICAL MODEL

It is the individual's decision at the early stage of recruitment which determines whether the outcome is successful or not. Hence, the attention of this study will turn to the theoretical core of the proposed model: the culture's impact on individuals' preferences for recruitment messages, the perception development of PO fit, and the eventual job application intentions.

2.3.1 INDIVIDUAL PERCEPTION

Perception refers to "the way to take in information from the world through our senses (Werker, Maurer, & Yoshida, 2010). Developing perception is a cognitive process that involves organizing, storing, and interpreting various stimuli into meaningful and consistent results.

Individuals use their senses of sight, touch, hearing, taste, and smell to collect information which creating meanings that are reasonable in which to understand their environment.

Although individuals can use all their senses to collect information, existing knowledge is used as references to create meanings. These existing knowledge and understanding can be acquired from different sources, such as: education, life experience, family, tradition, and culture. Perceptions gained from previous experiences could be the most appropriate interpretation individual use to define meanings to events. As David Krech, Richard Crutchfield, and Egerton Ballachey (1962) suggest:

“The cognitive map of the individual is not, then, a photographic representation of the physical world: it is, rather, a partial, personal construction in which certain objects, selected out by the individual for a major role, are perceived in an individual manner. Every perceiver is to some degree a nonrepresentational artist as it were, painting a picture of the world that expresses his or her individual view of reality” (Krech, Crutchfield, & Ballachey, 1962, p. 20).

Individuals who share the same background would have a similar set of past experience and knowledge, which usually would lead to comparable attributions of meanings (Varner & Beamer, 2005). This is important for individuals’ comprehension of the subject matter and to decide appropriate responses in communications. However, this would become a challenge for individuals with dissimilar backgrounds. Because of the uniqueness of each individual, to

communicate effectively, it is necessary to understand the audience with which one is speaking in order to convey the appropriate information in a way that will be perceived in the manner it is intended.

2.3.2 CULTURE

One distinctive aspect of the individual's background is culture. Individuals' specific cultural backgrounds help to define behavior patterns that can impact an employment relationship.

Scholars defined cultures and interpreted cultural differences in varying ways; some argue that culture is an adaptive system that links people to the ecological systems in the environment they are in, while others suggest that culture is an ideational system that views culture as a symbolic, structured, and cognitive system (Gundykunst & Ting-Toomey, 1996; Keesing, 1974). Although each scholar defined culture differently, an identifiable is that culture is a commonly agreed upon concept which people not only believe in but will behave under the influence of. As Roger Keesing (1974) suggests:

“Culture, conceived as a system of competence shared in its broad design and deeper principles, and varying between individuals in its specificities, is then not all of what an individual knows and thinks and feels about his world. It is his theory of what his fellows know, believe, and mean, his theory of the code being followed, the game being played, in the society into which he was born”(p. 89).

Individuals use their own rules and theories in interpreting events that have occurred in their surroundings and responding to other individuals' behaviors, even though they may not be highly aware of rules involved (Gudykunst, 2001; Keesing, 1974). William Gudykunst (2001) suggests that "the theories that members of cultures share, however, overlap sufficiently so that they can coordinate their behavior in everyday life" (p. 5).

Henry Lane, Joseph Distefano, and Martha Maznevski (2006) suggest that culture is "the set of assumptions and values that are shared by a group of people and that guide that group of people's interaction with each other" (p. 24). They emphasized that these assumptions and values are passed down from generation to generation in both formal and informal ways. Through years of aggregation, these assumptions and values help groups of people to behave in a simple and efficient way, and they serve as an important source for group members' social identities. They can also be enhanced by several types of cultural institutions, including educational, social, political, etc. Hence, an individual's cognitive perception toward the world will be shaped based on each culture's assumptions and enhanced by various types of cultural institutions.

2.3.3 CONTEXT ORIENTATION

Hall (1966) suggest that culture represents "those deep, common, unstated experiences which members of a given culture share, which they communicate without knowing, and which form the backdrop against which all other events are judged" (p. x). Communication is an important issue in Hall's studies and he emphasizes the importance of communication because "culture is communication" (Hall, 1959, p. 169; Hall & Hall, 1990, p. 3). Communication, a

combination of words, material things, and behaviors, are a direct reflection of a culture. During the process of communication, participants exchange messages and interpret the meanings attached to them with their own cultural bias. “The essence of effective cross-cultural communication has more to do with releasing the right responses than with sending the ‘right’ messages” (Hall & Hall, 1990, p. 4). Communication is only effective when both message senders and receivers perceive the meanings attached to messages in the same or similar ways (Gudykunst, 2001). Therefore, “the meanings attached to messages are a function of the messages, the channels used, the environments in which messages are transmitted, and the people who receive them” (Gudykunst, 2001, p. 4). Therefore, understanding the cultural differences by studying how one receives, interprets, and responds would assist researchers to better understand how individuals understand messages differently.

When comparing cultural differences, Hall utilized the concept of context, which is “the information that surrounds an event” (Hall & Hall, 1990, p. 6), with respect to communication. He labeled cultures on a continuum based on the idea that context orientation that is dominating in a culture. One end of the continuum is the high-context (HC) culture, where individuals communicate with most of the information “either in the physical context or internalized in the person, while very little is in the coded, explicit, transmitted part of the message” (Hall, 1977, p. 91). Individuals from a HC culture rely heavily on the context of the communication, “either the actual physical environment of communication or an internalized social context or both to convey a large part or even all of a message’s meaning” (Varner & Beamer, 2005, p. 27). When communication between HC oriented individuals, nearly everything is a form of message. The status of participants in a group (i.e. society, company), the timing of communication occurrence,

the demonstrated body languages and non-verbal gestures during the process and many other factors could be a cue for HC oriented individuals to exploit for interpreting meanings of messages.

The other end of the continuum is the low-context (LC) culture, where “the mass of the information is vested in the explicit code” (Hall, 1977, p. 91). When individuals from a LC culture communicate with each other, the meaning is “entrusted entirely to words” (Varner & Beamer, 2005, p. 27). Therefore, messages need to be fully described with precision and clarity. Individuals from a LC culture are theorized to have little tolerance to ambiguous statements; otherwise, the communication is viewed as distorted and incomprehensible.

One of the challenges in understanding communication is to “find the appropriate level of contexting needed in each situation” (Hall & Hall, 1990, p. 9). One needs to know how to interpret messages with a specific context orientation for better clarity and effectiveness during communication (Gudykunst, 2001). Although Hall discussed how high- and low- context orientation in cultures are different, he did not specify detailed dimensions in his studies when comparing cultural differences. Nevertheless, the concept of context orientation has been widely adopted in intercultural business and cross-cultural communication studies.

Peter Cardon (2008) conducted a meta-analysis on intercultural business and technical communication studies that were developed based on Hall’s context theory. In general, previous studies suggest various kinds of dimensions and related characteristics of context orientation that an individual would reflect in communications. Cardon summarized eight dimensions from

existing literature, including: *the directness of communication* (the primary message is implicitly or explicitly coded), *management of information* (personal information is widely shared or not; an ambiguous statement is preferred or less preferred), *values and beliefs about work and relationships* (the emphasis is on maintaining stability or change and mobility), *communication channel* (oral versus written communications; whether more context is required or not in the written communication to create context), *literalness and symbolism* (the task-related or artful language is preferred), *persuasion and logic* (the reasoning is holistic or linear; general or specific principles are more appealing than another), *contracts and rules* (oral or written agreements are perceived more binding than another), and *expressiveness and display of emotion* (the communication contains high or low self-disclosure).

2.3.4 THE CULTURE'S IMPACT ON RECRUITMENT

Recruitment is an interaction and communication process with various players involved. During the early stage of recruitment, organizations attempt to identify qualified individuals and attract them to apply for open positions. Thus, it is important to understand how individuals perceive recruitment messages that organizations use for attraction. Individuals' perceptions vary from one to another, and culture is one of the factors that drive such differences. How one communicates will affect how he or she develops meanings for the subject and make decisions for responses. If the information included in the message is not delivered in ways that individuals' prefer based on their context orientation, they will not be able to develop appropriate responses and take actions. If the information about job openings and organizational attributes is not stated in a way in which individuals would recognize based on their context orientation

during the early stage of recruitment, they may not be able to process and interpret information for perception development. Therefore, the following hypotheses are proposed.

Hypothesis 1a: *Context orientation will influence an individual's preference for recruitment messages.*

Hypothesis 1b: *Individuals who exhibit the qualities of a low-context orientation are likely to prefer recruitment messages that incorporate a higher level of detail, precision, and directness.*

2.3.5 PERSON-ORGANIZATION FIT

Various studies in organizational behavior and industrial/organizational psychology fields have extensively discussed the issue of congruence between individuals and their work environment (Edwards, 2008; Schneider, 2001; Saks & Ashforth, 1997). It has been defined as person-environment (PE) fit, which refers to “the congruence, match, or similarity between the person and environment” (Edwards, 2008, p. 168).

PE fit theories examine the compatibility or match between individuals and their work environment through: (1) the congruence of personal interests and vocational characteristics; (2) the similarity of individuals' personalities and values and organizational characters and cultures, and (3) the match between individual knowledge, skills and abilities (KSAs) and job requirements (Kristof-Brown & Guay, in press; Kristof-Brown et al., 2005; Schneider, 2001, 1987). Therefore, PE fit theories could be extended for further examination of the relation between individuals and various aspects of the environment, such as: vocation (person-vocation fit, PV fit), job (person-job fit, PJ fit), organization (person-organization fit), group (person-group fit, PG fit), and individual (person-individual fit, PI fit).

However, including both the person and any dimension of the working environment into the fit framework does not mean that fit will work automatically. They must work together at the same time to influence the perception of congruence. Paul Muchinsky and Carlyn Monahan (1987) suggest two types of fits in examining the process of developing congruence perception. The first one is supplementary fit which would happen when “a person fits into some environmental contexts because he or she supplements, embellishes, or possess characteristics which are similar to other individuals in this environment” (Muchinsky & Monahan, 1987, p. 269). Based on this concept, Benjamin Schneider (1987) established the Attraction-Selection-Attrition (ASA) model to analyze the interaction between individuals and organizations, which theorized that “people who are of a similar type will be attracted, not only to jobs, but to organizations of a particular sort” Schneider, 1987, p. 442). The second type of fit is complementary fit which happen when “the characteristics of an individual serve to ‘make whole’ or complement the characteristics of an environment”; therefore, “the weakness or need of the environment is offset by the strength of the individual, and vice versa” (Muchinsky & Monahan, 1987, p. 271). Models that were developed based on the concept of complementary fit, including John Wanous’s (1992) and Breugh’s (1992) matching models, theorized that compatibility is created based on completion in one’s needs being met by the environment (needs-supplies fit), or the environment’s demands being met by individuals’ KSAs (demands-abilities fit). Amy Kristof (1996) suggests that these conceptualizations of fit explain how PO fit theories could be operationized in examining the dynamic between individuals and organizations. Therefore, PO fit is defined as “the compatibility between people and organizations that occurs when: (a) at least one entity provides what the other needs, or (b) they share similar fundamental characteristics, or (c) both” (Kristof, 1996, p. 4-5).

During the early stage of recruitment, individual job seekers may possess limited knowledge about job openings and organizations. When they are engaged in recruitment activities organized by hiring organizations and receiving recruitment messages from organizational agents, individuals would then assess whether organizational attributes are similar to their characteristics. These assessments would result in the development of fit perception and be an indication as to whether or not he or she would feel comfortable to work in these organizations.

This corresponds to John Holland's (1976) vocational choice theory that "vocational choice is assumed to be the result of a person's type, or patterning of types and the environment" (p. 533). It has been suggested that people prefer and will choose to work in an organization that shares the same personality profiles as theirs, and they are convinced that they would acquire their preferred outcomes within this organization as well (Tom, 1971; Vroom, 1966). Individuals would be looking for organizations with attributes that are similar to their own characteristics. Therefore, the hypothesis between the preference for recruitment messages and the perception of PO fit is proposed as:

Hypothesis 2: *A job seeker's preference for recruitment messages will significantly affect the development of perceived PO fit.*

2.3.6 JOB APPLICATION INTENTION

Previous studies have discussed whether PO fit can contribute to the improvement of personal well-being in the organization and the overall performance of the firm. Michelle Verquer, Terry Beehr, and Stephen Wagner (2003) suggest that "individual outcome of PO fit


may be seen in reduction of role stressors such as role ambiguity and conflict which in the end may help increase performance” (p. 486). Schneider (2001) also suggests that a good PO fit may yield positive effects for the environment, which include “harmony, cooperation, high levels of morale, a climate for well-being, and low levels of turnover and absenteeism” (p. 150). Charles O’Reilly, Jennifer Chatman, and David Caldwell (1991) and Annelies Van Vianen (2000) also suggest that the fit between a person’s value and organizational values is associated with behavioral and affective outcomes, like longer tenure and better job performance. This also reflects Victor Tom’s (1971) suggestion that individuals prefer and will be most successful in organizations that share the same or similar personalities as themselves. Thus, a job seeker who develops a positive perception of PO fit with a hiring organization will be motivated to have the intention to apply for job openings. Therefore, the following hypothesis is proposed:

Hypothesis 3: *An applicant’s perception of PO fit is significantly related to his/her intention to apply for a position in an organization.*

2.3.7 SUMMARY

Based on reviewed literature of key constructs, including context orientation, recruitment messages, PO fit perception and job application intention; several hypotheses are proposed suggesting possible relationships among key constructs. They can be depicted as:

Figure 2.1 Proposed Theoretical Model and Hypotheses



2.4 CONCLUSION

In this chapter, the early stage of recruitment and relevant players, recruitment activities and recruitment messages were reviewed and discussed. Individuals' perception development, cultural differences in context orientation, and PO fit were also discussed with hypotheses proposed to examine the relationship among these key constructs.

In the early stage of recruitment, both individuals and organizations possess little knowledge of and familiarity of each other. When an organization attempts to capture potential job applicants' attention, the focus tends to be toward addressing itself first then addressing other aspects like jobs and groups. Therefore, recruitment activities and recruitment messages carried out by organizational agents would shape a solid organization image with attributes that individuals may not understand in the first place. Such understanding and comprehension are highly affected by one's cultural background, which dictates that an individual pay attention to or ignore certain cues within the communication. If one cannot fully understand the meaning of recruitment messages, he or she may not be able to develop a high level of PO fit and form

enough positive intentions to apply for job openings. Therefore, this study seeks to examine culture's impact on recruitment between HC and LC orientations, the development of PO fit, and the job application intention.

CHAPTER THREE METHODOLOGY

3.1 INTRODUCTION

This chapter presents the research design and methodology adopted in this study. In the beginning of the chapter, three research questions and four hypotheses are explored. These topics are followed by a discussion of research design and conclude with the discussion of data collection, analysis, and statistical techniques used for testing the proposed hypotheses.

The study used a self-administered, paper-based questionnaire to collect data regarding individuals' preference for recruitment messages based on their cultural background, in terms of context orientation, and development of person-organization (PO) fit perception. The survey instrument consists of three major parts to identify an individual's: (1) context orientation, (2) preference for recruitment messages, and (3) PO fit perception and job application intentions. A convenience sample was used to capture the target population, individual job seekers with diversified cultural backgrounds, and was composed of undergraduate students from Taiwan and the United States. Three statistical techniques, factor analysis, structural equation modeling (SEM), and multiple regressions were employed to analyze the data in this study.

3.2 RESEARCH QUESTIONS AND HYPOTHESES

3.2.1 RESEARCH QUESTIONS

Based on the objective of this study, three research questions were proposed.

RQ1: How does the cultural background of an applicant influence his/her preference for recruitment messages?

RQ2: How do applicants' dissimilar cultural backgrounds affect their perceived person-organization fit with hiring organizations?

RQ3: How do applicants' perceived person-organization fit, based on their cultural backgrounds, influence their intentions to apply for positions with hiring organizations?

3.2.2 RESEARCH HYPOTHESES

3.2.2.1 HYPOTHESIS 1

Exploring the culture's impact on individuals have led researchers have suggested various dimensions in order to explain similarities and variability in communication across cultures. William Gudykunst and Stella Ting-Toomey (1996) suggest that Edward Hall's anthropological research with its focus on context orientation provides a theoretical foundation in studying cross-cultural communication. Hall (1966) suggest that culture can be defined as "those deep, common, unstated experiences which members of a given culture share, which they communicate without knowing, and which form the backdrop against which all other events are judged" (p. x). Therefore, one must understand that "culture is communication" (Hall, 1959, p. 169; Hall & Hall, 1990, p. 3), and the role of context in communication could be used to distinguish cultures (Hall, 1959, 1977; Gudykunst, 2001; Varner & Beamer, 2005). Iris Varner and Linda Beamer (2005) suggest that "language and nonverbal communication are products of culture" (p. 27). Not only do they put limits on the expression of concepts, but also the order of presenting thoughts. Therefore, the role of context orientation is assumed to direct how individuals perceive meanings and exchange ideas with each other.

This study attempts to explore the construct of context orientation, a dimension of cultural difference proposed by Hall (1977), and its influence on an individual's preference for certain types of recruitment messages in the early stage of recruitment. Since recruitment is viewed as a communication process between organizations and individuals; this study will also attempt to prove that individuals from different cultures demonstrate some kinds of differences based on their context orientation. The following hypotheses are proposed:

Hypothesis 1a: *Context orientation will influence an individual's preference for recruitment messages.*

Hypothesis 1b: *Individuals who exhibit the qualities of a low-context orientation are likely to prefer recruitment messages that incorporate a higher level of detail, precision, and directness.*

3.2.2.2 HYPOTHESIS 2

Kristof (1996) suggests that PO fit reflects "the compatibility between people and organizations that occurs when: (a) at least one entity provides what the other needs, or (b) they share similar fundamental characteristics, or (c) both" (p. 4-5). During the early stage of recruitment, individual job seekers would gain some understanding of compatibility through recruitment messages, which are combinations of information that reflect organizations' attributes, values, culture, and job characteristics. These messages would serve as references for individuals to compare themselves with organizational attributes. Based on Hall's (1966, 1977) concept of context orientation, individuals from dissimilar cultures would have different preferences for messages that best match their context orientation. If job seekers accept certain types of recruitment messages with organizational attributes that they feel similar to their own

characteristics, they could also develop a strong perception of PO fit with these organizations. Therefore, the following hypothesis is proposed:

Hypothesis 2: *A job seeker's preference for recruitment message will significantly affect the development of perceived PO fit.*

3.2.2.3 HYPOTHESIS 3

Schneider (1987) suggests that “people who are of a similar type will be attracted, not only to jobs, but to organizations of a particular sort” (p. 442). Kristof (1996) also suggests that the perception of PO fit by job seekers could reflect on the similarities between an organization and similar individuals. During the early stage of recruitment, individuals may possess limited knowledge about hiring organizations. Through recruitment messages, organizations attempt to attract the right candidates to apply for job openings they have. Previous studies suggest that individuals, who perceive that the level of PO fit is strong, would behave positively in the organization. Such individuals will have a higher level of job satisfaction and morale and a lower level of absenteeism and turnover intention (Schneider, 2001; O'Reilly et al., 1991; Van Vianen, 2000). These studies corresponded to Tom's (1971) suggestion that individuals would prefer and will be most successful in organizations that share the same or similar personalities as themselves. They also corresponded to Holland's (1976) vocational choice theories that argue “vocational choice is assumed to be the result of a person's type, or patterning of types and the environment” (Holland, 1976, p. 533). Therefore, the following hypothesis is proposed:

Hypothesis 3: *An applicant's perception of PO fit is significantly related to his/her intention to apply for a position in an organization.*

3.3 RESEARCH DESIGN

The following steps were taken during the preparation and development of questionnaire items as well as the collection of data, including: (1) the development of scale items, (2) the pretest, (3) the pilot study, and (4) the main study.

3.3.1 THE DEVELOPMENT OF SCALE ITEMS

3.3.1.1 RELIABILITY AND VALIDITY

When developing measurements, the major concerns are the validity and the reliability of developed variables. The importance of having a reliable and valid measurement can assist researchers in measuring the construct correctly with consistent results. Gilbert Churchill (1979) suggests that a measure would be valid “when the differences in observed scores reflect true differences on the characteristic one is attempting to measure and nothing else”, and reliable when “the extent that independent but comparable measures of the same trait or construct of a given object agree” (p. 65). He further suggests that “the analyst working to develop a measure must contend with such concepts as split-half, test-retest, and alternate forms reliability as well as with face, content, predictive, concurrent, pragmatic, construct, convergent, and discriminant validity” (Churchill, 1979, p. 66).

Reliability is “a measure of the extent to which an item, scale, or instrument will yield the same score when administered in different times, locations, or populations” (Garson, 2002, p. 190). Specifically, it has two dimensions that need to be addressed: repeatability and internal consistency (Zikmund, 2003). The first dimension, repeatability, concerns whether the measurement can yield the same result at different times. William Zikmund (2003) suggests that

“the high stability correlation or consistency between the two measures at time 1 and 2 indicates a high degree of reliability” (p. 300). Repeatability is often examined through the test-retest procedure. If the correlation is 0.8 or above, it is assumed that the measurement is reliable (De Vaus, 2002). However, the risk of using test-retest for assessing reliability is still high because participants may still remember their answers from their previous testing; the result could possibly be biased. David De Vaus (2002) suggests that it would be better if multiple items are used to measure the same construct, which could reduce the possibility of creating biased measurement. This study was developed in a manner which included multiple items for each key construct in order to obtain the desired repeatability.

Another dimension of reliability is the internal consistency, which concerns the homogeneity of measurements. In general, the split-half method can examine whether measurements possess a high level of internal consistency. In order to assess reliability, Cronbach’s alpha can be used as a benchmark for evaluation. The value of alpha can range from 0 to 1, where a higher value indicates the measurement has a better reliability. Researchers suggest that the measurement would be deemed reliable when the value is at least 0.7 or above (Garson, 2002; Zikmund, 2003). Hair et al. (2006) suggest that measurement with an alpha value at or above .60 is acceptable if the research is of exploratory nature. Since this study attempts to explore context orientation’s influence on job seekers’ preference for recruitment messages and the development of perceived fit with hiring organizations, the benchmark for assessing the internal consistency of this study is a Cronbach’s alpha value of 0.6.

Validity reflects the ability of measurements to measure what it is supposed to measure to the appropriate constructs. Although a measurement can be tested as highly reliable, it does not suggest that it is also a valid measurement. Researchers suggest that various dimensions of validity should be examined before the actual data collection is implemented.

Face validity refers to “the subjective agreement that a scale logically appears to reflect accurately what it purports to measure” (Zikmund, 2003, p. 302). Garson (2002) suggests that measurements, which may be labeled inappropriately, will lead to a different interpretation of effects than those that actually were intended. This is a major concern to cross-cultural studies because translating measurements from one language to another may lose parts of the meaning in the process (Malhotra, Agarwal, & Peterson, 1996). Thus, careful examination of the proper usage of words was performed during the development of research questions in order to avoid confusion or misunderstanding. This was achieved by using focus groups which assisted in verifying whether the measurement would be correctly understood by respondents and thereby ensuring the highest probability of face validity possible.

Construct validity relates to “the logic of items that comprise measures of social concepts” (Garson, 2002, p. 194), which is established “by the degree to which a measure confirms a network of related hypotheses generated from a theory based on the concepts” (Zikmund, 2003, p. 303). A good construct should have a clear and operational definition to assist researchers in developing measurements consistent with its theoretical foundation (Garson, 2002; Zikmund, 2003). Zikmund (2003) also suggest that “if the measure behaves the way it is supposed to, in a pattern of intercorrelation with a variety of other variables, there is evidence for construct

validity” (p. 303). Thus, construct validity is often achieved by establishing convergent validity and discriminant validity.

Convergent validity refers to “the principle that the indicators for a given construct should be at least moderately correlated among themselves” (Garson, 2002, p. 195). Therefore, “a measure of a theoretical concept has convergent validity when it is highly correlated with different measures of similar constructs” (Zikmund, 2003, p. 304). Discriminant validity refers to developed measures which have a low correlation with different measures of different constructs (Garson, 2002; Zikmund, 2003). Validity in this study was assessed by examining the correlation among measurement items to ensure indicators with the same constructs would have a high correlation, while having a low correlation with indicators measuring different constructs.

3.3.1.2 MEASUREMENT DEVELOPMENT

Churchill (1979) suggests that the first step involved in developing scales is achieved by specifying the domain of the construct. The conceptual framework for this study is mainly based on studies with a focus on context orientation (Hall, 1977; Hall & Hall, 1990; Gudykunst, 2001; Richardson & Smith, 2007; Ohashi, 2000; Kim et al., 1998; Cardon, 2008), PO fit (Kristof, 1996; Muchinsky & Monahan, 1987; Kristof-Brown et al., 2005), and recruitment (Rynes, 1991; Barber, 1998; Cable & Judge, 1996; Roberson et al., 2005).

As discussed, this study proposed a theoretical model to examine the relationship among key constructs. It is necessary to identify the context orientation of individuals first in order to understand the cultural impacts which may be indicated. Despite previous studies’ suggestions

that most European/American cultures are low-context (LC) oriented and Asian cultures are high-context (HC) oriented (Hall, 1977; Hall & Hall, 1990; Kim et al., 1998; Gudykunst, 2001), they also suggest that individuals do not always hold the same context orientation to interpret all aspects of their daily life (Hall, 1977; Gudykunst, 2001). Their use and emphasis of context in communication may depend on the relationship with whom they are communicating or the nature of that communication. Hence, a measurement was developed to identify their context orientation in general communication and in specified situations (i.e. recruitment). The comparison can yield a better understanding as to the level of influence made by cultural differences. This study followed the scale development guidelines provided by Timothy Hinkin, Bruce Tracey and Cathy Enz (1997) to develop a measurement scale by incorporating existing measurements to identify individuals' context orientation. The guidelines include following steps:

- (1) *Item generation*: Create items.
- (2) *Content adequacy assessment*: Test for conceptual consistency of items.
- (3) *Questionnaire administration*: Determine the scale for items; Determine an adequate sample size; Administer questions with other established measures.
- (4) *Factor analysis*: Exploratory to reduce the set of items; Confirmatory to test the significance of the scale.
- (5) *Internal consistency assessment*: Determine the reliability of the scale.
- (6) *Construct validity*: Determine the convergent and criterion-related validity.
- (7) *Replication*: Repeat the scale-testing process with a new data set.

During the first round of item generation, existing items from previous studies were reviewed first (Gudykunst, 2001; Richardson & Smith, 2007; Ohashi, 2000; Kim et al., 1998; Cardon, 2008). The criteria used in adopting items include (1) the item possesses face and construct validity and (2) the item received empirical support. If the item did not receive positive support from the study, the literature was consulted and the wording of the item was further refined. This process assisted in confirming the appropriateness of each item to be used in this study. During the second round of item generation, a team of scholars was consulted to review clarity and suitability of questions to be used in the study. During the third round of item generation, a focus group was used, which was composed of individuals with diversified cultural backgrounds, to examine whether the concept of each item was understood by participants. Respondents' comments were reviewed in the last round of item generation to improve upon the wording of items included in the final survey.

3.3.1.3 CONTEXT ORIENTATION SCALE ITEMS

Previous studies have developed items to measure an individual's context orientation based on Hall's (1977) context orientation studies (Gudykunst et al., 1996; Kim et al., 1998; Ohashi, 2000; Gudykunst, 2001; Richardson & Smith, 2007). Hall's cultural studies about one's context orientation reflect an individual's preference and actions with regard to communication. Individuals from an HC culture would demonstrate different preferences than individuals from an LC culture in the following aspects: the explicitness of message, the relationship with communication participants and their statuses, the timing of the communication, and the environment of the communication (Hall, 1966, 1977).

Cardon (2008) summarized dimensions that were generally adopted to differentiate HC and LC cultures from existing literature. Among these dimensions, directness of communication and management of information are the most described, and captures the major differences that Hall (1977) suggests between the HC and LC cultures. Although existing scales received mixed support from empirical studies due to limited samples or representing cultures, existing items were incorporated, which had received positive support in previous studies, and developed additional scale items to measure context orientation.

(1) *Directness of communication* – this dimension focuses on whether the primary message is coded implicitly or explicitly. In LC cultures, the primary message is coded explicitly. The information included in the message has to be clearly stated in order for listeners to have a full understanding. LC individuals would communicate directly with clarity and a directness that HC individuals would feel is rude. HC individuals, on the other hand, prefer to use indirect expressions to communicate, which sometimes leave a major portion of information unstated. However, this does not mean the information is not being transmitted. Such information is just not transmitted in a formal and observable way that a LC individual is used to or is able to understand. Directness of communication was measured with 16 items on a five-point Likert scale from 1 (not at all agree) to 5 (strongly agree).

Table 3.1: Directness of Communication (16 items)

DC1.	I prefer to know what other people want when they start a conversation ₂
DC2.	I prefer to use indirect communication styles ₃
DC3.	I prefer to communicate with messages that are explicitly stated with clearly defined words _{1,5}
DC4.	I am not able to understand the meaning of a statement by “reading between the lines” _{3,4}
DC5.	I think any issue can be openly confronted in communication ₅
DC6.	I think it is alright for people to raise questions about even the most sensitive matters ₁
DC7.	I need to know what kind of communication rules I am working with when I communicate with other people from a dissimilar culture, I do not just pay attention to the words
DC8.	Speakers should not expect listeners to understand what they really mean unless the intended message is stated clearly ₄
DC9.	What a person really means can often be different from what the person actually expresses in words ₂
DC10.	I prefer to respond with an ambiguous position when pressed for an opinion ₃
DC11.	If I have something negative to say, I will be tactful ₃
DC12.	I am able to recognize subtle and indirect messages ₃
DC13.	Even if I do not receive a clear and definite responses from others, I can still understand what they intend to express ₃
DC14.	Even if not stated clearly, a speaker’s intent will rarely be misunderstood ₄
DC15.	I prefer to use categorical words (i.e. certainly, absolutely) in communication _{3*}
DC16.	I prefer to use qualifiers (i.e. perhaps, maybe, probably) in communication _{3*}

Note: 1. Item modified from Kim et al.’s (1998) study; 2. Item modified from Ohashi’s (2000) study; 3. Item modified from Gudykunst’s (2001) study; 3*. Item modified from Gudykunst’s (2001) study, which he indicated the item was suggested by Okabe (1983); 4. Item modified from Richardson & Smith’s (2007) study; 5. Item modified from Cardon’s (2008) study.

(2) *Management of information* – as Hall (1977) suggests, an HC individual understands the context in the environment and does not require a lot of precise and detailed background information when communicating with another HC individual, whereas an LC individual requires obvious and precise information to support him/her during communication. Information needs to be widely shared in the group to understand context and physical cues will be noticed as a part of the context formation. Thus, members in HC cultures can develop a consensus of context when communicating with others. In LC cultures, however, information is not extensively shared with others and physical cues are not perceived as important to individuals.

Management of information was measured with 15 items on a five-point Likert scale ranging from 1 (not at all agree) to 5 (strongly agree).

Table 3.2 Management of Information (15 items)

MI1.	I prefer to use precise communication that contains a high level of accuracy and definiteness ₃
MI2.	It is better to risk not saying enough than to risk saying too much in a conversation ₂
MI3.	I prefer messages that emphasize the general situation rather than specific aspects
MI4.	When I engage in a conversation, I prefer to discuss all possible aspects of issues ₃
MI5.	I prefer to have precise and detailed information in communication ₅
MI6.	I am comfortable with general, non-specific messages that do not provide a lot of details
MI7.	I prefer to communicate important things through formal meetings ₅
MI8.	I pay more attention to clearly stated words than to the body language and non-verbal gesture in communication
MI9.	I prefer written communication more than spoken communication
MI10.	My choice of communication channels (i.e. phone, e-mail) depends on the status of the person with whom I am communicating
MI11.	I prefer to have people present proof for what they are saying ₃
MI12.	Usually I do not tell people very much about myself until I get to know them quite well ₃
MI13.	I think specific information is more appealing than general principles in communication ₃
MI14.	Some ideas are better understood when left unsaid _{2, 4}
MI15.	Unless one can put ideas into his/her own words, a person is not thinking in depth ₁

Note: 1. Item modified from Kim et al.'s (1998) study; 2. Item modified from Ohashi's (2000) study; 3. Item modified from Gudykunst's (2001) study; 4. Item modified from Richardson & Smith's (2007) study; 5. Item modified from Cardon's (2008) study.

3.3.1.4 RECRUITMENT MESSAGE MEASUREMENT ITEMS

In this study, it was hypothesized that individuals with different context orientations will demonstrate dissimilarities in their preference for communication formats and contents. This is particularly important in the early stage of recruitment, because this phase relies heavily on transferring information and communication between organizations and individuals. How the information is received and interpreted at this stage will influence how individuals would appraise job openings and the hiring organizations for potential employment relationships. Therefore, information included in recruitment messages, which relates to organizational

attributes and job characteristics, was assessed based on individual preferences for communication format and value relatedness.

Based on previous discussions regarding communication preferences in terms of context orientation, respondents were asked to identify their preferences for recruitment messages. Therefore, this study incorporated the following dimensions: directness of communication, management of information, values and beliefs about work and relationships, and the reflection on organizational values, in order to explore the culture's impact on an individual's preference for recruitment messages content. Additional dimensions were incorporated as well to assess an individual's preference for recruitment message delivery, such as: communication channel preference and recruiters' status in the organization. These dimensions were used to explain the possible influence on job seekers' acquirement and interpretation of information about organizational attributes in the early stage of recruitment.

(1) Directness of communication – as described in the previous section, an important difference between HC and LC cultures is directness of communication. Individuals from LC cultures would prefer to have direct communication that “embody and invoke speakers' true intentions” (Gudykunst & Ting-Toomey, 1988, p. 100). On the other hand, individuals from HC cultures would prefer to have indirect communication which “[camouflages] and [conceals] speakers' true intentions” (Gudykunst & Ting-Toomey, 1988, p. 100). Applying this dimension to recruitment messages would reflect HC and LC individuals' different preferences when receiving recruitment messages from organizational agents. This would indicate whether or not information related to organizational attributes and job characteristics is directly expressed and

explicitly stated. Directness of communication was measured by five items on a five-point Likert scale ranging from 1 (not at all agree) to 5 (strongly agree).

Table 3.3 Directness of Communication (5 items)

DC1.	A recruitment message should be direct, detailed, and clearly stated
DC2.	A recruitment message needs only provide a general idea about the organization without too many details
DC3.	I will not be able to understand the organization unless the recruitment information is stated directly and clearly in the recruitment message
DC4.	I think it is more important to describe the organization in details rather than in general terms
DC5.	I am comfortable with general, non-specific recruitment messages that do not have a lot of details

(2) Management of information – another dimension to assess recruitment messages from the perspective of context orientation is how information is prepared by organizations to attract potential job applicants' attention to job availability and organizational attributes. Management of information was measured by five items on a five-point Likert scale ranging from 1 (not at all agree) to 5 (strongly agree).

Table 3.4 Management of Information (5 items)

MI1.	A recruitment message should be tailored to precisely describe job characteristics
MI2.	A recruitment message should describe details about career and development opportunities in the organization
MI3.	General recruitment messages often do not reveal the realities of working for an organization
MI4.	If key words that I am looking for are not expressed in recruitment messages, I would not be interested in the organization
MI5.	A recruitment message should reveal all aspects of the job and the organization, whether they might be desirable or undesirable

(3) Values and beliefs about work and relationships – in addition to job availability, job applicants would also seek information about the hiring organization in terms of the work environment and relationships among employees. Such information would assist individuals in having a better understanding about the organization and what the future work life may look like. Values and beliefs about work and relationships were measured with six items on a five-point Likert scale ranging from 1 (not at all agree) to 5 (strongly agree).

Table 3.5 Values and Beliefs about Work and Relationship (6 items)

VB1.	I prefer to see a recruitment message that emphasizes the importance of relationships among employees in the organization
VB2.	I prefer to see a recruitment message that emphasizes the importance of solving problems and performing tasks in the organization
VB3.	I prefer to see a recruitment message that emphasizes that job stability is valued in the organization
VB4.	I prefer to see a recruitment message that emphasizes that job mobility and change are valued in the organization
VB5.	I prefer to see a recruitment message that reveals an organization's long term goals and vision
VB6.	I think organizational goals described in recruitment messages should have a focused and specified perspective instead of a generalized view

(4) Communication channel preference – is dependent upon the method selected by organizations; each medium has its own limitations in terms of its impact on the type and the number of people attracted. Therefore, it would be critical to find out the channel preferred by individuals to enhance the effectiveness of recruitment message delivery. Communication channel preference was measured with nine items on a five-point Likert scale ranging from 1 (not at all agree) to 5 (strongly agree).

Table 3.6 Communication Channel Preference (9 items)

CC1.	I prefer to receive recruitment messages through formal meetings organized by hiring organizations
CC2.	I prefer to receive recruitment messages through informal information sources (i.e. conversation with current employees)
CC3.	A recruitment message is more understandable in a written format than in a verbal format
CC4.	I prefer to receive recruitment messages in person rather than from impersonal sources (i.e. flyers, posters, and websites)
CC5.	Recruitment messages delivered frequently on campus are more attractive than messages offered only once or twice a year
CC6.	The frequency of recruitment messages delivered does not influence the attractiveness of an organization
CC7.	I am more interested in an organization which has recruiters personally delivering recruitment messages on campus
CC8.	The presence of recruiters on campus does not influence the attractiveness of an organization
CC9.	I am more interested in an organization which frequently delivers recruitment messages on campus through printed media (i.e. flyers, posters)

(5) Recruiters' status in the organization – as suggested in the literature review, organizations rely on organizational agents (i.e. recruiters) to execute recruitment activities and deliver recruitment messages. Therefore, recruiters' status may affect potential job applicants' perception of recruitment messages. Recruiters' status in the organization was measured with four items on a five-point Likert scale ranging from 1 (not at all agree) to 5 (strongly agree).

Table 3.7 Recruiters' Status in the Organization (4 items)

RS1.	A recruitment message is more convincing when it is delivered by school alumni
RS2.	A recruitment message is more convincing when it is delivered by someone holding a high ranking position in the organization
RS3.	A recruitment message is more convincing when it is delivered by a person who has direct personal knowledge about the position
RS4.	The recruiter's status and authority in the organization does not affect whether or not a recruitment message is convincing

(6) Reflection on organizational values – during the early stage of recruitment, organizations attempt to attract the right individual to apply for jobs. As previously cited literature suggests, individuals would look at a variety of information to assist them narrowing a list of preferred organizations for job applications. The attraction could result from the similarity between individuals’ personalities, characteristics, and values and those of the hiring organization. Reflection on organizational values was measured with four items on a five-point Likert scale ranging from 1 (not at all agree) to 5 (strongly agree).

Table 3.8 Reflection on Organizational Values (4 items)

RO1.	A recruitment message that expresses organizational values with which I agree is more appealing to me
RO2.	I do not really care whether a recruitment message expresses organizational values with which I agree
RO3.	To be effective, a recruitment message should reflect my expectations about the organization’s values
RO4.	If the recruitment message does not reflect my expectations about the organization’s values, I may need to adjust my original views to be more compatible with the organization

Developing these measurements would be helpful in comparing individuals’ perception development in normal communication and in specific situations which, in this study, is the early stage of recruitment. The comparison would provide more insights about the effects of context orientation on individuals’ perception development.

3.3.1.5 PERSON-ORGANIZATION (PO) FIT SCALE ITEMS

Thirteen items were included in the survey for measuring individuals’ subjective PO fit developments based on their context orientation. Schneider (1987) suggests that attracting potential applicants to apply for jobs relies on supplementary fit, which asserts that “people who

are of a similar type will be attracted, not only to jobs, but to organizations of a particular sort” (Schneider, 1987, p. 442). Therefore, individuals would be looking for similarities between themselves and organizations in this communication process. Three of the dimensions in this study were incorporated which relate to organizational attributes, including directness of communication, management of information, as well as the organizational structure and characteristics.

(1) Directness of communication – individuals will compare themselves with organizational attributes to develop a perception of fit. Individuals who are more LC oriented will prefer to see communication in the organization with a higher level of directness and details. While individuals who are more HC oriented would prefer to see that a lower level of directness and detail exist. Directness of communication was measured with two items on a five-point Likert scale ranging from 1 (not at all agree) to 5 (strongly agree).

Table 3.9 Directness of Communication (2 items)

DC1.	I prefer to work in an organization that is attentive to details, precise and direct in their daily communications
DC2.	I prefer to work in an organization that is attentive to general perspectives without emphasizing details in their daily communications

(2) Communication channel preference – individuals who appear to be more LC oriented would prefer to have formal communication channels that extensively use written documents to transmit information among members. Individuals who are more HC oriented would prefer to have communication channels that are less formal and involved with more oral communication. Communication channel preference was measured with four items on a five-point Likert scale ranging from 1 (not at all agree) to 5 (strongly agree).

Table 3.10 Communication Channel Preference (4 items)

CC1.	I prefer to work in an organization that relies heavily on written policies and procedures
CC2.	I prefer to work in an organization that relies heavily on oral discussions and verbal instructions
CC3.	I prefer to work in an organization where the majority of communication is transmitted through spoken words
CC4.	I prefer to work in an organization where the majority of communication is transmitted through written documents

(3) Organizational structure and characteristics – a previous study suggests that HC individuals have shown differences with LC individuals in terms of social orientation (Kim et al., 1998). HC oriented individuals are more group oriented and deeply involved with other members in the group. LC individuals focus more on individual aspects of the group and are more independent from one another. Organizational structure and characteristics were measured with seven items on a five-point Likert scale ranging from 1 (not at all agree) to 5 (strongly agree).

Table 3.11 Organizational Structure and Characteristics (7 items)

OS1.	I prefer to work in an organization in which employees are not closely supervised by their immediate supervisors
OS2.	I prefer to work in an organization in which the difference in power among the members is not great
OS3.	I prefer to work in an organization that encourages its members to feel comfortable in unstructured situations
OS4.	I prefer to work in an organization that encourages its members to work cooperatively in groups
OS5.	I prefer to work in an organization that encourages its members to look after each other
OS6.	I prefer to work in an organization that is structured with a clear hierarchy of authority
OS7.	I prefer to work in an organization in which a clear difference in status among the members exists

3.3.1.6 JOB APPLICATION INTENTION MEASUREMENT ITEMS

Respondents were asked about their intentions to apply for jobs with organizations, which depend on the perceived level of fit between themselves and hiring organizations.

Additionally, respondents were also asked about their job application intention based on the

current job market regardless the level of fit they perceived with hiring organizations. Job application intention was measured with three items on a five-point Likert scale ranging from 1 (not at all possible) to 5 (very possible).

Table 3.12 Job Application Intention (3 item)

JA1.	If an organization's values and attributes, demonstrated by its recruitment messages, did not match my own, I would not apply for a position with it
JA2.	If an organization's values and attributes did not match my own, I would still apply for a position and make myself more compatible with it
JA3.	Because of the current job market, I would apply for a position with an organization regardless of whether it matched my own values and personality

3.3.1.7 DEMOGRAPHIC INFORMATION

Lastly, a series of demographic questions will be asked to understand individuals' personal backgrounds, such as: gender, age, ethnicity/race, nationality, year in school, and academic major.

3.3.2 THE PRE-TEST

In order to enhance the validity, focus groups were formed by individuals with different cultural backgrounds (i.e. ethnicity and nationality) to examine these items. Based on participants' responses, items were revised to be included in the final survey.

3.3.3 THE PILOT STUDY

A pilot study was conducted using data from 403 respondents. The main purpose was to test the reliability of survey scales. Two groups of undergraduate students, representing different ends of the national contextual continuum, were chosen for the study. They included students from a major university located in the Hong Kong Special Administrative Region (HK) and a

comparable university in the United States (US). Both universities offer bachelor degrees in the hospitality and tourism management (HTM) major and are main recruitment sources for the industry. Previous studies (Hall, 1976; Hall & Hall, 1990; Gudykunst, 2001) suggest that Europeans and Americans tend to be more LC oriented and Asians are more HC oriented. The selection of samples assisted the pilot study to explore culture's impact on recruitment with the developed measurement items for context orientation, recruitment messages, and PO fit.

The first part of the study examined context orientation through individuals' communication style preference. Five dimensions were proposed in the study, including *directness of communication, management of information, communication channel preference, contract and rules*, as well as *literalness and symbolism*, with 17 five-point Likert-type items used. The findings suggest that HK and US respondents did yield significant differences in several dimensions of context orientation, especially in directness of communication and management of information. The result was consistent with previous findings that the HK group appeared to be HC oriented and the US group was LC oriented in general. The only dimension that did not yield significant differences between the two groups is literalness and symbolism.

The second part of the study examined individuals' preference for recruitment activities and recruitment messages. Recruitment activities and recruitment messages were measured with 10 and 16 five-point Likert-type items, respectively.

Recruitment activities were measured based on the following aspects: *history of networking, frequency and variety of recruitment activities, recruiter's status in the organization,*

and *reflection on organizational values*. When comparing two groups' preferences for recruitment activities, the HK and US groups yielded significant differences in history of networking and reflection on organizational value; however, they did not have any significant differences in terms of their preference for frequency and variety of recruitment activities and recruiters' status in the organization.

Recruitment messages were measured based on the following categorization aspects: *directness of communication, management of information, recruiter's status in the organization, and reflection on organizational values*. Regarding the preference for recruitment messages, the HK and US groups yielded significant differences in every dimension, and these differences are consistent with previous studies that the HK group is more HC oriented and the US group is more LC oriented.

The third part of the study examined individuals' intentions for job application based on perceived PO fit given certain organizational attributes. Despite both the HK and US groups responding that they would not apply to organizations with attributes that do not match their own values and personalities, in general, the two groups only yielded significant differences in certain items.

The research findings from the pilot study suggested that culture indeed influences individuals' preferences for recruitment activities and recruitment messages, which also affects their development of PO fit perception. Among the dimensions incorporated in this study, both directness of communication and management of information revealed significant differences

between the two groups. These results support previous studies regarding the difference between HC and LC cultures. Also, both groups revealed similar preferences for recruitment activities and recruitment messages as indicated by existing literature. The U.S. group (LC culture) preferred more explicit expression and straightforward statements in recruitment activities and messages, while the HK group (HC culture) preferred more implicit expression and intricate and indirect statements. However, some items or dimensions did not yield significant differences between the two groups as expected.

This result corresponded to previous studies' assumptions that, due to globalization, international communication has minimized the effect of context orientation since people with dissimilar cultural backgrounds use a common business language. The increased use of a specific type of culturally oriented language may alter an individual's original cultural orientation when communicating with others (Cardon, 2008; Du-Babcock, 1999). There was small difference between the HK and US groups in this study with regard to some of the dimensions, which could be explained by the extensive use of the English language in HK. Given its long history and bonds with the United Kingdom and other western countries, the HK group may have become a hybrid with the mixture of both HC and LC cultures.

The results of the pilot study provided support and changes for the main study. First of all, the dimensions identified support the concepts of context orientation, individuals' preference for recruitment messages, PO fit, and job application intentions. Second, the results suggest a need to use samples from regions that may be less affected by the use of international communication. Selecting samples that can better represent HC cultures could enhance the

validity of measurement included in the main study, as well as offer improved understanding about the influence of context orientation, individuals' preference for recruitment messages, the development of PO fit perception, and job application intentions.

3.3.4 THE MAIN STUDY

3.3.4.1 POPULATION AND SAMPLE

The targeted locations for population selection include Taiwan (TW) and the United States (US). Samples included students from major universities located in these regions. All participating universities offer bachelor degrees in Hospitality and Tourism Management (HTM) or related majors, and are main recruitment sources for the hospitality industry. Previous studies (Hall, 1977; Hall & Hall, 1990; Gudykunst, 2001) suggest that Europeans and Americans tend to be more LC oriented and Asians are more HC oriented. Thus, choosing multiple locations will assist this study in exploring the impact of culture on recruitment in the hospitality industry.

In addition, choosing educational institutions at the college level would assist this study in two ways. First, as Lane et al. (2006) suggest, cultural institutions would enhance the culture's impact on individuals and educational institutions are one kind of cultural institution that would affect the culture's impact on individuals. Therefore, choosing educational institutions could further enhance exploration of cultural differences among individuals. Second, most college students seek job opportunities before graduating. College students are an important recruitment pool to companies (Breugh, 1992; Rynes, 1991) and not only do they closely resemble job seekers but they have similar perceptions and behaviors in the recruitment process and may be a better indicator of the early stage of recruitment.

3.3.4.2 DATA COLLECTION

Data was collected by means of a survey questionnaire completed by students during class periods. During the initial stage of research development, the official approval from the Institutional Review Board (IRB) at Virginia Tech was obtained for conducting a study involving human subjects. Before conducting the survey, faculty members at the participating school were contacted and agreed to serve as the designated liaison to distribute the surveys in classes. In addition, a consent form and a cover letter were attached to the survey which explains the research objective and instructions for completing the survey.

3.4 DATA ANALYSIS

3.4.1 FACTOR ANALYSIS

Taiwan is assumed to represent HC cultures and the United States will represent LC cultures in this study. However, the findings from the pilot study suggest that such an assumption may not always be accurate because variety of factors, such as globalization, could turn a culture into a hybrid (i.e. Hong Kong). Therefore, the study seeks to verify that the selected countries will be able to support this study in its objective to explore the influence of context orientation with a mixture of HC and LC individuals. The research underwent the process of confirmation to achieve this goal and also to ensure the theoretical assumptions of context orientation for testing proposed hypotheses in this study.

Exploratory factor analysis (EFA) was first employed in this stage of confirmation. Factors were generated to represent the underlying structure of constructs (Garson, 2002; Hair, Black, Babin, Anderson, & Tatham, 2006). The result allowed for examination of proposed

context orientation dimensions and verification of whether or not participants' responses are consistent with previous studies' findings. Additionally, since dimensions incorporated in this study for each construct are conceptually highly correlated, factor analysis was performed with all measurement items combined instead of separated so that the results would better represent the underlying structure of each construct.

A basic assumption of factor analysis is that some underlying structures do exist. The study is looking for the presence of relatedness among items; therefore, Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin (KMO) statistics were assessed to test sampling adequacy based on correlation and partial correlation. When the KMO value is above 0.6 and close to 1, it is an indication that there are more common factors among variables (Lin, 2007; De Vaus, 2002). Therefore, previous studies' suggestions were adopted and the criterion was set at 0.6 and above to examine whether or not it would be appropriate to derive factors from variables. Hair et al. (2006) also suggest that a statistically significant Bartlett's test of sphericity, at $\alpha = .05$, would indicate that "sufficient correlations exist among the variables" (p. 115). After both tests were conducted, the following criteria were used for factor analysis: each factor should have an eigenvalue that is greater than 1.0, and the factor loading should be greater than 0.50 (Hair et al., 2006). Once the factors are identified, an examination as to whether or not these factors could reflect dimensions of context orientation will be made.

3.4.2 STRUCTURAL EQUATION MODELING

After factors were extracted, structural equation modeling (SEM) analysis was applied to "test and analyze interrelationships among latent constructs and their measured variables"

(Resinger & Movondo, 2007, p. 42). Latent constructs, such as personality and attitudes, are constructs that cannot be measured directly; however, they can be measured by one or more variables. In this study, each construct was measured with a set of variables. Additionally, instead of examining the relationship among latent constructs separately and individually, SEM allows to examine the structure of interrelationships among these constructs simultaneously (Hoyle, 1995; Hair et al., 2006; Resinger & Movondo, 2007). These interrelationships are expressed through various linear paths that link among constructs, which can be either independent (exogenous) or dependent (endogenous). Each path will carry a coefficient value to indicate the “resultant change in a dependent variable as a consequence of a one unit change in an independent variable” (Resinger & Movondo, 2007, p. 42). However, previous studies suggest that SEM should be viewed as a confirmatory procedure, instead of an exploratory technique, to explore the interrelationships among constructs (Hoyle, 1995; Hair et al., 2006; Resinger & Movondo, 2007). The model building has to be based on a theoretical foundation, and the utilization of SEM only provides a means to estimate and specify the interrelationship among constructs. Therefore, the research adopted SEM to test hypotheses 1a, 2 and 3, which will simultaneously test the interrelationship between (1) context orientation and preferences for recruitment messages, (2) preference for recruitment messages and PO fit, and (3) PO fit and job application intention.

Several estimation methods are available for SEM, including maximum likelihood (ML), generalized least squares (GLS), unweighted least squares (ULS) and weighted least squares (WLS). Each estimation method has its own uniqueness, and ML is by far the most commonly used method. Garson (2010) suggests that “ML makes estimates based on maximizing the

probability (likelihood) that the observed covariances are drawn from a population assumed to be the same as that reflected in the coefficient estimates”. ML is recommended to be used because this method can provide valid results even with a small sample size, although it is sensitive to non-normality. Other estimation methods provide a better estimation when encountering a non-normality situation, yet they require a large sample size to be able to provide valid results (Hair et al., 2006).

In addition to model specifications and the selection of estimation methods, a SEM model can be assessed based on various model fit indexes, which reflects “the degree to which a hypothesized model fits the actual model derived from the sample data” (Reising & Mavondo, 2007, p.55). In general, these fit indexes can be separated in the following categories: absolute fit measures, incremental fit measures, and parsimonious fit measures. Absolute fit indexes measure “the overall goodness-of-fit for both the structural and measurement models collectively (Hair et al., 2006, p. 706), incremental fit indexes measure “how well a specified model fits relative to some alternative baseline model (Hair et al., 2006, p. 708), and parsimonious fit indexes assess “the degree of model fit per estimated coefficients to correct for any overfitting of the model and evaluate the parsimony ratio of the model compared to the goodness-of-fit” (Hair et al., 2006, p. 710).

Despite these fit indexes providing assessments on whether or not the model fit with the sample, consideration has to be given as to whether or not the results still correspond to the theoretical foundation and yield practical interpretations. However, there is little agreement on the selection of fit indexes for model evaluation and an absolute perfect value for fit indexes has

not been established to distinguish whether or not a model is good or bad (Reisinger & Movondo, 2006; Hair et al., 2006). Since there is no commonly agreed upon principles on fit indexes, Hair and his colleagues suggest that using multiple fit indexes from different categories could provide adequate assessment for model fit, so that “a model reporting the χ^2 value and degrees of freedom, the CFI [comparative fit index] and the RMSEA [root mean square error of approximation] will often provide sufficient unique information to evaluate a model” (Hair et al., p. 752).

Thus, several fit indexes were adopted for this study in order to assess the SEM model from the following categories: (1) *Absolute fit measures* – (a) Chi-square (χ^2) of estimate model and the associated degree of freedom (*df*) and (b) Root mean square error of approximation (RMSEA); (2) *Incremental fit measures* – (a) Comparative fit index (CFI) and (b) Incremental fit index (IFI); (3) *Parsimonious fit measures* – (a) Parsimony normed fit index (PNFI) and (b) Parsimony comparative fit index (PCFI). Additionally, the threshold values were adapted as suggested by Hair et al. (2006) and Reisinger & Movondo (2006): (1) *Absolute fit measures* – the value of χ^2/df should be smaller than 3 and the value of RMSEA should be smaller than 0.08; (2) *Incremental fit measures* – the value of CFI and IFI should be 0.90 or above; (3) *Parsimonious fit measures* – both the value of PNFI and PCFI should be above 0.05.

3.4.3 MULTIPLE REGRESSION

Multiple regression analysis is used to analyze the relationship between a single dependent variable and several independent variables (Hair et al., 2006). SEM can be viewed as a combination of factor analysis and multiple regressions, however, the SEM model is mainly

used to examine the interdependent relationships among constructs simultaneously and provide an overall assessment. Multiple regression analysis was used to test hypothesis 1b in order to examine the relationship between context orientation and preference for recruitment messages.

Multiple regression analysis can be used for prediction and explanation, which are not mutually exclusive when the technique is being used. Hair et al. (2006) suggest that multiple regression analysis can be used to predict “the extent to which the regression variate can predict the dependent variable” (p. 189) and “examine the regression coefficients (their magnitude, sign, and statistical significance) for each independent variable and attempts to develop a substantive or theoretical reason for the effects if the independent variables” (p. 189). The main purpose of utilizing multiple regression analysis in this study is to predict whether an individual’s context orientation would predict the preference for recruitment messages.

Estimation of the regression model and assessment of the overall model fit, it is necessary in order to select an estimation technique. Among various estimation techniques, stepwise estimation was selected in this study. This technique allows the researcher to select the independent variable that has the strongest correlation with the dependent variable into the regression equation first, and then additional independent variables will be added which “explains the largest statistically significant portion of the unexplained variance remaining from the first regression equation” (Hair et al., 2006, p. 211). This procedure will continue until none of the remaining variables would contribute to improving the predictive accuracy. After the regression equation model was established, the overall statistical significance of the model and the regression coefficients with t-tests were examined.

3.5 SUMMARY

Factor analysis will be used first to uncover the underlying structure among variables measuring constructs included in the proposed model, including context orientation preference for recruitment messages, PO fit, and job application intention.

In order to test the interrelationship among constructs, SEM was the most appropriate method to be used in this study. Instead of using multiple regression several times to test each hypothesis individually, SEM allows for better estimation of measurement errors and provide a more accurate evaluation on the structural relationship among latent variables. Thus, hypothesis 1a, 2, and 3 will be assessed by using SEM technique. Additionally, hypothesis 1b proposes that context orientation can be used to predict an individual's preference for recruitment messages containing certain characteristics and multiple regression is appropriate technique to test the hypothesis in this situation.

3.6 CONCLUSION

The chapter outlined the research design for this study. It included the design of measurement for constructs included in the proposed model, the findings from the pilot study, a description of the survey population, the method of data collection, and the statistical techniques that will be used to test the hypotheses.

CHAPTER FOUR ANALYSIS AND RESULTS

4.1 INTRODUCTION

This chapter presents the results of preliminary data analysis and hypothesis testing. Three statistical techniques were employed to analyze the data collected in this study. PASW 18.0 and AMOS 18.0 were used for descriptive statistics, reliability assessment, factor analysis, structural equation modeling (SEM), and multiple regression analysis.

4.2 BACKGROUND INFORMATION OF RESPONDENTS

Faculty members at participating institutions, including Virginia Tech in the US and Southern Taiwan University and Tunghai University in Taiwan, were contacted. A total of 350 surveys were returned (US = 205, TW = 145). Of the 350 respondents, 74.5% are females and 25.5% are males. The majority of respondents are majors in hospitality and tourism management programs (90.49%), 51.3% will graduate within a year and 79.3% will graduate within two years. The average age of participants is 21.82 years. Table 4.1 provides the complete profile of respondents' demographic backgrounds.

Table 4.1 Respondents Background Information

		US (n=205)	TW (n=145)	Overall (n=350)
Gender	Male	29.76%	19.44%	25.50%
	Female	70.24%	80.56%	74.50%
Major	HTM	85.78%	97.20%	90.49%
	Other	4.90%	1.40%	3.46%
	Double Major (with one in HTM)	9.31%	1.40%	6.05%
Year in School	Freshman	0.49%	0.69%	0.58%
	Sophomore	10.34%	34.03%	20.17%
	Junior	32.51%	21.53%	27.95%
	Senior	56.65%	43.75%	51.30%

4.3 SCALE RELIABILITY

Reliability of the instrument was assessed using Cronbach's alpha. As Hair et al. (2006) suggest that measurements with an alpha value at or above .70 are considered reliable, and at or above .60 are acceptable if the research is of exploratory nature. Per earlier discussion, this study attempts to explore context orientation's influence on job seekers' preference for recruitment messages and the development of perceived fit with hiring organizations, Cronbach's alpha value was set to be 0.6 or above as the benchmark. This process is necessary in order to conduct structural equation modeling (SEM). This process aims to make sure that all measurement items are reliable. Despite the fact that they are measuring different sub-dimensions, they still measure the same construct as a whole. Table 4.2 provides the reliability result of measurements for each constructs.

Table 4.2 Measurement Reliability Initial Assessment

Construct	Cronbach's Alpha
Context Orientation (31 items)	0.634
Preference for Recruitment Messages (33 items)	0.771
Person-Organization Fit (13 items)	0.618
Job Application Intention (3 items)	0.659

Scale reliability assessment was continued until an acceptable Cronbach's alpha value was achieved. Overall, thirteen items measuring context orientation and seventeen items measuring preference for recruitment messages were removed. The final assessment of measurement reliability is listed in Table 4.3.

Table 4.3 Measurement Reliability Final Assessment

Construct	Cronbach's Alpha
Context Orientation (18 items)	0.723
Preference for Recruitment Messages (16 items)	0.856
Person-Organization Fit (13 items)	0.618
Job Application Intention (3 items)	0.659

4.4 HYPOTHESIS TESTING

4.4.1 EXPLORATORY FACTOR ANALYSIS

Prior to testing the proposed hypotheses in this study, data was processed and prepared for the analysis. Exploratory factor analysis (EFA) was first employed to assess the underlying structure in the measurement items for each construct.

4.4.1.1 CONTEXT ORIENTATION

Exploratory factor analysis was conducted on 18 items that were kept after the reliability test. Initially, the Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin (KMO) Measure of Sampling Adequacy was 0.729 and the Bartlett's Test of Sphericity is 0.000. Thus, the data is adequate for conducting factor analysis. The criteria for EFA in this study was set with the condition that the eigenvalue should be greater than 1.0 and the factor loading should be greater than 0.50 (Hair et al., 2006). After a series of examinations, sixteen items were kept with factor loading greater than 0.50 and five factors were extracted. The KMO value slightly dropped to 0.725 and the Bartlett's Test of Sphericity remained significant. The extracted five factors can explain the 56.67% of total variance in the model. The EFA result for context orientation is depicted in Table 4.4.

Table 4.4 EFA Result of Context Orientation

<u>COF1 (Openness)</u>		<u>Factor Loading</u>
DC5.	I think any issue can be openly confronted in communication.	0.799
DC6.	I think it is alright for people to raise questions about even the most sensitive matter.	0.786
MI10.	My choice of communication channels (i.e. phone, e-mail) depends on the status of the person with whom I am communicating.	0.672
DC15.	I prefer to use categorical words (i.e. certainly, absolutely) in communication.	0.573
DC9.	What a person really means can often be different from what the person actually expresses in word.	0.532
Total percentage of variance explained = 19.800%		
Total cumulative percentage of variance explained = 19.800%		
<u>COF2 (Precision)</u>		<u>Factor Loading</u>
MI1.	I prefer to use precise communication that contains a high level of accuracy and definiteness.	0.804
MI5.	I prefer to have precise and detailed information in communication.	0.715
DC3.	I prefer to communicate with messages that are explicitly stated with clearly defined words.	0.673
Total percentage of variance explained = 13.516%		
Total cumulative percentage of variance explained = 33.316%		
<u>COF3 (Thoroughness)</u>		<u>Factor Loading</u>
MI11.	I prefer to have people present proof for what they are saying.	0.706
MI13.	I think specific information is more appealing than general principles in communication.	0.601
MI4.	When I engage in a conversation, I prefer to discuss all possible aspects of issues.	0.599
Total percentage of variance explained = 8.427%		
Total cumulative percentage of variance explained = 41.743%		
<u>COF4 (Courtesy)</u>		<u>Factor Loading</u>
DC7.	I need to know what kind of communication rules I am working with when I communicate with other people from a dissimilar culture, I do not just pay attention to the words.	0.688
DC8.	Speakers should not expect listeners to understand what they really mean unless the intended message is stated clearly.	0.636
DC11.	If I have something negative to say, I will be tactful.	0.592
Total percentage of variance explained = 7.810%		
Total cumulative percentage of variance explained = 49.553%		
<u>COF5 (Subtleness)</u>		<u>Factor Loading</u>
DC12.	I am able to recognize subtle and indirect messages.	0.819
DC13.	Even if I do not receive a clear and definite responses from others, I can still understand what they intend to express	0.807
Total percentage of variance explained = 7.114%		
Total cumulative percentage of variance explained = 56.667%		

4.4.1.2 PREFERENCE FOR RECRUITMENT MESSAGES

Exploratory factor analysis was utilized for the 16 items measuring respondents' preference for recruitment messages. The KMO value was 0.895 and the Bartlett's Test of Sphericity is 0.000, which indicates that the data is adequate for factor analysis. Since factor loading should be greater than 0.50 as the benchmark, fourteen out of seventeen items were kept. The KMO value was 0.878 and the Bartlett's Test of Sphericity remained significant. The extracted three factors can explain 49.99% of total variance in the model. The EFA result for recruitment messages is depicted in Table 4.5.

Table 4.5 EFA Result of Preference for Recruitment Messages

<u>RMF1 (Precision)</u>		<u>Factor Loading</u>
DC4.	I think it is more important to describe the organization in details rather than in general terms.	0.719
VB6.	I think organizational goals described in recruitment messages should have a focused and specified perspective instead of a generalized view.	0.692
DC3.	I will not be able to understand the organization unless the recruitment information is stated directly and clearly in the recruitment message.	0.683
MI1.	A recruitment message should be tailored to precisely describe job characteristics.	0.593
MI2.	A recruitment message should describe details about career and development opportunities in the organization.	0.567
Total percentage of variance explained = 32.968%		
Total cumulative percentage of variance explained = 32.968%		
<u>RMF2 (Appeal)</u>		<u>Factor Loading</u>
RS3.	A recruitment message is more convincing when it is delivered by a person who has direct personal knowledge about the position.	0.775
RO1.	A recruitment message that expresses organizational values with which I agree is more appealing to me	0.698
DC1.	A recruitment message should be direct, detailed, and clearly stated.	0.566
RS2.	A recruitment message is more convincing when it is delivered by someone holding a high ranking position in the organization.	
Total percentage of variance explained = 9.599%		
Total cumulative percentage of variance explained = 42.568%		

<u>RMF3 (Work Values)</u>	<u>Factor Loading</u>
VB2. I prefer to see a recruitment message that emphasizes the importance of solving problems and performing tasks in the organization.	0.688
VB4. I prefer to see a recruitment message that emphasizes that job mobility and change are valued in the organization.	0.687
VB3. I prefer to see a recruitment message that emphasizes that job stability is valued in the organization.	0.622
VB1. I prefer to see a recruitment message that emphasizes the importance of relationships among employees in the organization.	0.570
VB5. I prefer to see a recruitment message that reveals an organization's long term goals and vision.	0.504
Total percentage of variance explained = 7.416%	
Total cumulative percentage of variance explained = 49.983%	

4.4.1.3 PERSON-ORGANIZATION FIT PERCEPTION

EFA was adapted to examine the underlying structure of the 13 items measuring PO fit perception. The KMO value was 0.658 and the Bartlett's Test of Sphericity is 0.000, which suggest that the data is appropriate for factor analysis. Using the same benchmark as before, the factor loading should be greater than 0.50, thirteen items were kept and five factors were extracted. The extracted five factors can explain 65.95% of total variance in the model. The EFA result is depicted in the Table 4.6.

Table 4.6 EFA Result of PO Fit Perception

<u>POF1 (Formality)</u>	<u>Factor Loading</u>
CC1. I prefer to work in an organization that relies heavily on written policies and procedures	0.783
OS7. I prefer to work in an organization in which a clear difference in status among the members exist	0.689
CC4. I prefer to work in an organization where the majority of communication is transmitted through written document	0.667
OS6. I prefer to work in an organization that is structured with a clear hierarchy of authority	0.565
Total percentage of variance explained = 19.467%	
Total cumulative percentage of variance explained = 19.467%	

<u>POF2 (Group-orientation)</u>		<u>Factor Loading</u>
OS5.	I prefer to work in an organization that encourages its members to look after each other	0.862
OS4.	I prefer to work in an organization that encourages its members to work cooperatively in groups	0.811
Total percentage of variance explained = 16.682%		
Total cumulative percentage of variance explained = 36.150%		
<u>POF3 (Autonomy)</u>		<u>Factor Loading</u>
OS2.	I prefer to work in an organization in which the difference in power among the members is not great	0.801
OS1.	I prefer to work in an organization in which employees are not closely supervised by their immediate supervisors	0.653
OS3.	I prefer to work in an organization that encourages its members to feel comfortable in unstructured situations	0.553
Total percentage of variance explained = 12.373%		
Total cumulative percentage of variance explained = 48.523%		
<u>POF4 (Verbal communication)</u>		<u>Factor Loading</u>
CC3.	I prefer to work in an organization where the majority of communication is transmitted through spoken words	0.838
CC4.	I prefer to work in an organization that relies heavily on oral discussions and verbal instructions	0.782
Total percentage of variance explained = 9.647%		
Total cumulative percentage of variance explained = 58.170%		
<u>POF5 (Indirectness)</u>		<u>Factor Loading</u>
DC2.	I prefer to work in an organization that is attentive to general perspectives without emphasizing details in their daily communication	0.793
DC1.	I prefer to work in an organization that is attentive to details, precise and direct in their daily communications.	-0.618
Total percentage of variance explained = 7.777%		
Total cumulative percentage of variance explained = 65.946%		

4.4.1.4 INITIAL EXAMINATION ON EXTRACTED FACTORS

Assessing the influence of context orientation on an individual's preference for recruitment messages and the development of fit with hiring organizations, required this study to adapt independent samples t-tests first to examine whether or not the selected samples do have some differences in their responses. This adaptation ensures the adequacy to explain the proposed model with the appropriate theoretical foundation. Prior to the independent samples t-tests, a series of descriptive statistics were conducted. Table 4.7 provides the results of the

descriptive statistics on extracted factors. Each factor was calculated by adding included items for a composite score. Normality of the data was verified by a thorough review of Skewness and Kurtosis (Hair et al., 2006); none of the factors have a value larger than 2 or smaller than -2. The results suggest the data is normally distributed.

Table 4.7 Descriptive Statistics of Extracted Factors

	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation	Skewness		Kurtosis	
						Statistic	Std. Error	Statistic	Std. Error
COF1	350	4.00	25.00	17.07	4.06	-.36	.13	-.52	.26
COF2	350	4.00	15.00	11.54	2.01	-.69	.13	1.16	.26
COF3	350	20.00	30.00	27.25	1.40	-.42	.13	1.70	.26
COF4	349	5.00	15.00	10.83	1.99	-.32	.13	.14	.26
COF5	349	3.00	10.00	7.12	1.42	-.30	.13	-.14	.26
RMF1	350	4.00	25.00	18.86	3.25	-.62	.13	1.58	.26
RMF2	350	9.00	20.00	16.31	2.35	-.50	.13	-.02	.26
RMF3	350	11.00	25.00	18.97	2.79	.08	.13	-.20	.26
POF1	349	6.00	20.00	12.82	2.78	.34	.13	-.33	.26
POF2	349	3.00	10.00	8.39	1.44	-.75	.13	.48	.26
POF3	349	3.00	15.00	10.38	2.28	-.34	.13	-.14	.26
POF4	349	3.00	10.00	7.05	1.53	-.22	.13	-.24	.26
POF5	349	2.00	9.00	4.98	1.38	.21	.13	.04	.26

Additionally, bivariate correlation analysis was conducted on extracted factors. Table 4.8 provides the results of correlation among factors, which suggests those for context orientation and measuring preferences for recruitment messages factors are associated. However, factors measuring the PO fit perception were not strongly associated with other factors.

Table 4.8 Bivariate Correlation Results

	COF1	COF2	COF3	COF4	COF5	RMF1	RMF2	RMF3	POF1	POF2	POF3	POF4	POF5
COF1	1												
COF2	.183**	1											
COF3	-.010	.288**	1										
COF4	.123*	.285**	.196**	1									
COF5	.222**	.159**	.111*	.141**	1								
RMF1	.046	.367**	.354**	.358**	.067	1							
RMF2	.239**	.367**	.256**	.244**	.206**	.509**	1						
RMF3	.163**	.382**	.268**	.255**	.194**	.465**	.520**	1					
POF1	-.183**	.318**	.245**	.147**	.060	.275**	.228**	.245**	1				
POF2	.099 ⁺	.333**	.131*	.201**	.198**	.343**	.400**	.406**	.149**	1			
POF3	.240**	.077	.075	.216**	.138*	.155**	.237**	.143**	-.097*	.282**	1		
POF4	.239**	.071	.026	.092 ⁺	.104 ⁺	.118*	.204**	.284**	-.042	.205**	.190	1	
POF5	-.154**	-.165**	-.162**	.003	-.090 ⁺	-.139**	-.191**	-.127*	-.020	-.186**	.080	-.051	1

Note: + p<0.10, * p<0.05, ** p<0.01

After the assessment of normality and the bivariate correlation, independent samples t-tests were conducted to determine whether the US and Taiwan groups demonstrated some differences in their responses. Table 4.9 presents the results of independent samples t-tests. Based on the initial examinations, it could be concluded that both the US and the Taiwan groups have some differences in terms of their context orientation, preferences for recruitment messages, and the PO fit perception. Data analysis was conducted by the building of an SEM model.

Table 4.9 Independent Samples T-tests


Factor Items	US Mean	TW Mean	t-value
COF1	19.35	13.84	16.66*
COF2	11.59	11.48	0.47
COF3	27.06	27.52	-3.03*
COF4	10.82	10.86	-0.17
COF5	7.38	6.75	4.14*
RMF1	18.76	19.01	-0.70
RMF2	16.74	15.70	4.15*
RMF3	19.16	18.70	1.50
POF1	11.88	14.15	-8.18*
POF2	8.57	8.13	2.80*
POF3	10.82	9.74	4.46*
POF4	7.42	6.51	5.63*
POF5	4.70	5.38	-4.68*

Note: * p<0.05

4.4.2 STRUCTURAL EQUATION MODELING

Structural equation modeling (SEM) was used to examine the relationship among constructs. Based on the proposed theory and the results of the EFA result, the initial findings are depicted below in Figure 4.1:

Figure 4.1 Initial Model



Each SEM model needs to be assessed based on the fit indexes to see if the result is valid. Further adjustments are needed when the model possesses a low model fit with the data. Additionally, this study adopted the model development strategy suggested by Hair et al. (2006), which “enables exploration of alternative model formulations that may be supported by theory” (p. 709). A basic model framework with a theoretical foundation needs to be established first

which will “improve the framework through modification of the structural and/or measurement models” (Hair et al., 2006, p. 709) The fit indexes for the initial model are listed as follows

(Table 4.10):

Table 4.10 The Fit Indexes of the Initial Model

Absolute Fit Measures	Result	Benchmark
Chi-square (χ^2) of estimate model	376.952	
Normed Chi-square (CMIN/DF)	3.732	≤ 3.0
Root mean square error of approximation (RMSEA)	0.088	≤ 0.08
Incremental Fit Measures		
Incremental fit index (IFI)	0.750	≥ 0.90
Comparative fit index (CFI)	0.742	≥ 0.90
Parsimonious Fit Measures		
Parsimony normed fit index (PNFI)	0.511	≥ 0.50
Parsimony comparative fit index (PCFI)	0.551	≥ 0.50

Initial evaluation of the model suggests that it did not possess a high fit with the data. Improving the model fit required the removal of factors that had low factor loadings, including POF5 (-0.23) and COF1 (0.26). The revised model is depicted below in Figure 4.2 and the results are listed in Table 4.11:

Figure 4.2 First Improved Model:




Table 4.11 The Fit Indexes of the First Improved Model

	Result	Benchmark
Absolute Fit Measures		
Chi-square (χ^2) of estimate model	239.705	
Normed Chi-square (CMIN/DF)	3.239	≤ 3.0
Root mean square error of approximation (RMSEA)	0.080	≤ 0.08
Incremental Fit Measures		
Incremental fit index (IFI)	0.828	≥ 0.90
Comparative fit index (CFI)	0.822	≥ 0.90
Parsimonious Fit Measures		
Parsimony normed fit index (PNFI)	0.542	≥ 0.50
Parsimony comparative fit index (PCFI)	0.579	≥ 0.50

A continued examination of the model required the removal of factors that had low factor loadings, including POF3 (0.27), POF4 (0.27) and COF5 (0.28). The revised model is depicted below in Figure 4.3 and the results are listed in Table 4.12:

Figure 4.3 Second Improved Model





Table 4.12 The Fit Indexes of the Second Improved Model

Absolute Fit Measures	Result	Benchmark
Chi-square (χ^2) of estimate model	139.499	
Normed Chi-square (CMIN/DF)	3.402	≤ 3.0
Root mean square error of approximation (RMSEA)	0.083	≤ 0.08
Incremental Fit Measures		
Incremental fit index (IFI)	0.883	≥ 0.90
Comparative fit index (CFI)	0.879	≥ 0.90
Parsimonious Fit Measures		
Parsimony normed fit index (PNFI)	0.523	≥ 0.50
Parsimony comparative fit index (PCFI)	0.546	≥ 0.50

However, a negative error variance was identified (r2: -0.360) in the last model modification, which suggests the model is inadmissible. Hair et al. (2006) suggest that a potential cause for a negative error variance is because some factors may only contain only two measurement items. When a latent construct is represented by several factors with some having only two measurement items, it is possible that the result will preclude the model estimation.

The PO fit construct, in this case, was measured with two factors and POF2 included only two measurement items. Thus, all measurement items regarding PO fit were examined with confirmatory factor analysis (CFA). The initial result for CFA is presented below in Figure 4.4:

Figure 4.4 CFA of PO fit perception



As depicted in the figure above, only DC1, OS3, OS4, and OS5 had higher loadings than other items. Therefore, these four items were included into the model as depicted in the Figure 4.5 and the fit indexes for the second improved model are listed in the Table 4.13.

Figure 4.5 Revised Model after CFA result




Table 4.13 The Fit Indexes of the First Revised Model

Absolute Fit Measures	Result	Benchmark
Chi-square (χ^2) of estimate model	168.053	
Normed Chi-square (CMIN/DF)	2.711	≤ 3.0
Root mean square error of approximation (RMSEA)	0.070	≤ 0.08
Incremental Fit Measures		
Incremental fit index (IFI)	0.899	≥ 0.90
Comparative fit index (CFI)	0.896	≥ 0.90
Parsimonious Fit Measures		
Parsimony normed fit index (PNFI)	0.578	≥ 0.50
Parsimony comparative fit index (PCFI)	0.610	≥ 0.50

Factor loading was found to be lower than other variables measuring PO fit perception, therefore, PO9 was removed from the model and the SEM model was reassessed (Figure 4.6) with the results presented in Table 4.14.

Figure 4.6 Second Revised Model after CFA result




Table 4.14 Fit Indexes of the Second Revised Model

	Result	Benchmark
Absolute Fit Measures		
Chi-square (χ^2) of estimate model	148.245	
Normed Chi-square (CMIN/DF)	2.711	≤ 3.0
Root mean square error of approximation (RMSEA)	0.070	≤ 0.08
Incremental Fit Measures		
Incremental fit index (IFI)	0.899	≥ 0.90
Comparative fit index (CFI)	0.896	≥ 0.90
Parsimonious Fit Measures		
Parsimony normed fit index (PNFI)	0.578	≥ 0.50
Parsimony comparative fit index (PCFI)	0.610	≥ 0.50

4.5 RESULTS OF HYPOTHESIS TESTING

4.5.1 SEM MODEL RESULT ASSESSMENT

The results of the structural model show that the Chi-square value was 148.245 with 51 degrees of freedom ($p = .00$), which indicated that the model has a poor fit with the samples. However, given the known sensitivity of the Chi-square test to the sample size, previous studies suggest that it is necessary to utilize other fit indexes to help model evaluation (Hair et al., 2006; Reisinger & Mavondo, 2006). The review of various fit indexes, including absolute fit measures, incremental fit measures, and parsimonious fit measures, indicated that the proposed model was well-fitted to the data and suggested that this model could be the structural model to be tested for the proposed hypotheses in this study. The indices were listed in Table 4.14, and the results all fit the acceptance level set in the parameter of this study: $CMIN/DF = 2.711$, $RMSEA = 0.070$, $IFI = 0.899$, $CFI = 0.896$, $PNFI = 0.578$, $PCFI = 0.610$.

4.5.2 HYPOTHESIS 1

Hypothesis 1a was proposed that context orientation will influence an individual's preference for recruitment messages. Testing this hypothesis first required the utilization of the results of the structural equation modeling. The relationship between the constructs were examined based on t-values associated with path coefficients between the constructs. If an estimated t-value is greater than 1.96 ($p < 0.05$), the null hypothesis that the associated estimated relationship does not exist was rejected. Based on the results from the SEM model, an individual's context orientation is significantly related to his/her preference for recruitment messages ($t\text{-value} = 6.730$, $p < 0.01$). Therefore, the hypothesized relationship in hypothesis 1a was supported. Testing hypothesis 1b required multiple regression analysis in order to further estimate whether individuals who demonstrated a low-context orientation indeed do have a

preference for recruitment messages that incorporate a higher level of detail, precision, and directness.

The multiple regression equation established independent variables as context orientation factors and the dependent variables represented the preference for recruitment messages. As described previously the multiple regression equation can contain one dependent variable and one or more independent variable, the dependent variable in this study was represented using the composite score from extracted factors measuring preference for recruitment messages. Thus, the regression equation is depicted as follows:

$$\text{Preference for Recruitment Messages} = \alpha_0 + \alpha_1 \text{CO}_{\text{Precision}} + \alpha_2 \text{CO}_{\text{Thoroughness}} + \alpha_3 \text{CO}_{\text{Courtesy}}$$

The first assessment was the correlation among variables included in the regression equation (Table 4.15). The correlation matrix below shows the significance and the sample size of each variable. All correlations were significant at the .05 level, which suggests that all variables were highly correlated to each other.

Table 4.15 Correlation Analysis Results

	RMSCORE ^a	CO _{Precision}	CO _{Thoroughness}	CO _{Courtesy}
RMSCORE ^a	1.000			
CO _{Precision}	.463**	1.000		
CO _{Thoroughness}	.365**	.298**	1.000	
CO _{Courtesy}	.357**	.285**	.196**	1.000

Note: a. RMSCORE: Dependent Variable - Preference for Recruitment Messages Accumulative Score; ** p<0.01

The following assessment of the model was examining overall model summary as depicted in Table 4.16. R-square is the percent of the dependent variable explained by the

independent variables. In the proposed model, in which the preference for recruitment messages is the dependent variable, three independent variables measuring context orientation were included: precision, thorough, and courtesy. The results suggest that three independent variables explained 31.4% of the variance, which indicates that the model can explain the variance of preference for recruitment messages resulted from the influence of context orientation.

Table 4.16 Regression Model Summary

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate	Change Statistics				Durbin-Watson	
					R Square Change	F Change	df1	df2		Sig. F Change
1	.560 ^a	.314	.308	5.69689	.314	52.641	3	345	.000	1.903

a. Predictors: (Constant), CO_{Precision}, CO_{Thoroughness}, CO_{Courtesy}

b. Dependent Variable: RMSCORE

In addition to the above assessment of the regression model, the ANOVA table below also presents the examination results of the overall significance of the model. The result is depicted in Table 4.17; the significance of the F value was below 0.05, which indicates the model was statistically significant and the preference for recruitment messages could be explained by all independent variables, including Precision, Thoroughness, and Courtesy.

Table 4.17 The Regression Model ANOVA Result

Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
3	Regression	5125.287	3	1708.429	52.641	.000 ^a
	Residual	11196.833	345	32.455		
	Total	16322.120	348			

Note: a. Predictors: (Constant), CO_{Precision}, CO_{Thoroughness}, CO_{Courtesy};

b. Dependent Variable: RMSCORE

Since the overall model appeared to be statistically significant, an examination of the regression model with each independent variable was conducted. All independent variables had a statistically significant impact on the dependent variable as depicted in Table 4.18. Additionally, the model did not appear to have a significant multicollinearity issue; with each independent variable having a close-to-one tolerance and VIF value. As the result, the regression equation model can be demonstrated as:

$$\text{Preference for Recruitment Messages} = 2.894 + 1.156 \text{CO}_{\text{Precision}} + 1.091 \text{CO}_{\text{Thoroughness}} + 0.753 \text{CO}_{\text{Courtesy}}$$

Table 4.18 Beta Coefficients and Other Coefficients for the Model

Model	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.	Correlations			Collinearity Statistics	
	B	Std. Error	Beta			Zero-order	Partial	Part	Tolerance	VIF
1 (Constant)	2.894	5.978		.484	.629					
CO _{Precision}	1.156	.167	.334	6.934	.000	.463	.350	.309	.858	1.166
CO _{Thoroughness}	1.091	.230	.223	4.736	.000	.365	.247	.211	.898	1.114
CO _{Courtesy}	.753	.161	.219	4.664	.000	.357	.244	.208	.905	1.105

Note: a. Dependent Variable: RMSCORE

Based on the results from the multiple regression analysis, hypothesis 1b received support that an individual's context orientation can predict his or her preference for recruitment messages containing certain characteristics.

4.5.3 HYPOTHESIS 2

The second hypothesis proposed that the greater acceptance of recruitment messages would lead to the greater likelihood of PO fit. Based on the results from the SEM analysis, the preference for recruitment messages was significantly and positively correlated to PO fit perception (t-value = 6.371, p<0.01). This result supported the idea that if job applicants accept

recruitment messages with certain characteristics based on their context orientation, they would develop a fit perception with hiring organizations.

4.5.4 HYPOTHESIS 3

The third hypothesis proposed that an applicant's perception of PO fit is significantly related to his/her intention to apply to an organization. Based on the results of SEM analysis, the PO fit perception was significantly and positively correlated to the job application intention (t-value = 2.04, $p < 0.05$). This result supported the idea that job applicants' perception of PO fit will affect their intention to apply for jobs. Table 4.19 presents the summary of the hypotheses testing results.

Table 4.19 Summary of Hypotheses Testing with the SEM Results

Hypothesis	Hypothesized Path	Standardized Coefficients	t-value	Results
H1 _a	CO – RM	0.86	6.730**	Supported
H2	RM – PO	0.69	6.371**	Supported
H3	PO – JAI	0.16	2.040*	Supported

Note: * $p < 0.05$ (t-value = 1.96), ** $p < 0.01$ (t-value = 2.58)

CO: Context orientation; RM: Preference for recruitment messages; PO: Person-organization fit perception; JAI: Job application intention

However, the result did not gain theoretical support. Only three of the original thirteen items measuring PO fit were kept in the SEM model. These clearly did not represent the PO fit dimensions proposed in this study and failed to yield a meaningful interpretation for the relationships among preference for recruitment messages, PO fit perception, and job application intention. The US and Taiwan groups were then separated in order to examine the proposed model individually.

4.6 ALTERNATIVE STUDY ON THE US GROUP

The SEM model in the main study shed some light on the influence of context orientation on an individual's preference for recruitment messages and the development of PO fit perception. However, the model did not provide a sound theoretical support in interpreting the relationships among key constructs. An alternative analysis was performed with each sample group, the US and the Taiwan group, separately. The alternative analyses adopted the same procedure as the main study.

4.6.1 SCALE RELIABILITY

Reliability of the instrument was assessed using Cronbach's alpha. Hair et al. (2006) suggest that measurements with an Cronbach's alpha value at or above .70 is preferred as reliable, and at or above .60 is acceptable if the research is of exploratory nature. Table 4.20 provides the reliability result of measurements for each constructs. In this study, Cronbach's alpha value should be 0.6 or above in order to continue the data analysis.

Table 4.20 Measurement Reliability Initial Assessment with the US Group

Construct	Cronbach's Alpha
Context Orientation (3 items)	0.575
Preference for Recruitment Messages (33 items)	0.650
Person-Organization Fit (13 items)	0.522
Job Application Intention (3 items)	0.809

Since measurement items measuring context orientation and PO fit had a lower Cronbach's value, they were removed from the study, with an attempt to have a higher reliability result. After evaluations, nineteen items were kept which measure context orientation, along with 17 items measuring preference of recruitment messages and six items measuring PO fit perception. Table 4.21 presents the final assessment of measurement reliability.

Table 4.21 Measurement Reliability Initial Assessment with the US Group

Construct	Cronbach's Alpha
Context Orientation (19 items)	0.729
Preference for Recruitment Messages (17 items)	0.818
Person-Organization Fit (6 items)	0.609
Job Application Intention (3 items)	0.809

4.6.2 HYPOTHESIS TESTING

4.6.2.1 EXPLORATORY FACTOR ANALYSIS

Exploratory factor analysis was first employed to assess the underlying structure in the measurement of items for each construct.

4.6.2.1.1 CONTEXT ORIENTATION

Initially, the KMO Measure of Sampling Adequacy was 0.709 and the Bartlett's Test of Sphericity was 0.000. Thus, the data is adequate for conducting factor analysis. The criteria for EFA in this study were set that the eigenvalue should be greater than 1.0 and the factor loading should be greater than 0.50 (Hair et al., 2006). Fourteen items were kept after a series of examinations, with factor loading greater than 0.50, and six factors were extracted. The KMO value dropped to 0.642 with the Bartlett's Test of Sphericity remained significant. The extracted six factors can explain 63.89% of total variance in the model. The EFA result for context orientation is depicted in Table 4.22.

Table 4.22 EFA Result of Context Orientation with the US Group

<u>COF1 (Precision)</u>	<u>Factor Loading</u>
MI1. I prefer to use precise communication that contains a high level of accuracy and definiteness.	0.787
MI5. I prefer to have precise and detailed information in communication.	0.749
DC3. I prefer to communicate with messages that are explicitly stated with clearly defined words.	0.686
Total percentage of variance explained = 19.873%	
Total cumulative percentage of variance explained = 19.873%	
<u>COF2 (Communication Patterns)</u>	<u>Factor Loading</u>
DC11. If I have something negative to say, I will be tactful.	0.737
DC7. I need to know what kind of communication rules I am working with when I communicate with other people from a dissimilar culture, I do not just pay attention to the words.	0.695
DC8. Speakers should not expect listeners to understand what they really mean unless the intended message is stated clearly.	0.555
Total percentage of variance explained = 10.281%	
Total cumulative percentage of variance explained = 30.154%	
<u>COF3 (Subtleness)</u>	<u>Factor Loading</u>
DC12. I am able to recognize subtle and indirect messages.	0.819
DC13. Even if I do not receive a clear and definite response from others, I can still understand what they intend to express.	0.785
Total percentage of variance explained = 9.557%	
Total cumulative percentage of variance explained = 39.712%	
<u>COF4 (Openness)</u>	<u>Factor Loading</u>
DC6. I think it is alright for people to raise questions about even the most sensitive matters.	0.853
DC5. I think any issue can be openly confronted in communication.	0.798
Total percentage of variance explained = 9.221%	
Total cumulative percentage of variance explained = 48.932%	
<u>COF5 (Formality)</u>	<u>Factor Loading</u>
MI7. I prefer to communicate important things through formal meetings.	0.696
MI11. I prefer to have people present proof for what they are saying.	0.693
Total percentage of variance explained = 7.607%	
Total cumulative percentage of variance explained = 56.539%	
<u>COF6 (Trust)</u>	<u>Factor Loading</u>
MI12. Usually I do not tell people very much about myself until I get to know them quite well.	0.745
DC1. I prefer to know what other people want when they start a conversation.	0.725
Total percentage of variance explained = 7.353%	
Total cumulative percentage of variance explained = 63.892%	

4.6.2.1.2 RECRUITMENT MESSAGES

Exploratory factor analysis was used for the 17 remaining items measuring the preference for recruitment messages. The KMO value was 0.825 and the Bartlett's Test of Sphericity was 0.000, which indicates that the data is adequate for factor analysis. The benchmark for this study required that the factor loading should be greater than 0.50 therefore, thirteen items were kept and three factors were extracted. The KMO value was 0.818 and the Bartlett's Test of Sphericity remained significant. The extracted three factors can explain 47.58% of total variance in the model. The EFA result for context orientation is depicted in Table 4.23.

Table 4.23 EFA Result of Preference for Recruitment Messages with the US Group

<u>RMF1 (Directness)</u>	<u>Factor Loading</u>
DC4. I think it is more important to describe the organization in detail rather than in general terms.	0.677
DC3. I will not be able to understand the organization unless the recruitment information is stated directly and clearly in the recruitment message.	0.662
DC1. A recruitment message should be direct, detailed, and clearly stated.	0.648
MI1. A recruitment message should be tailored to precisely describe job characteristics.	0.641
MI2. A recruitment message should describe details about career and development opportunities in the organization.	0.618
VB6. I think organizational goals described in recruitment messages should have a focused and specified perspective instead of a generalized view.	0.557

Total percentage of variance explained = 29.345%

Total cumulative percentage of variance explained = 29.345%

<u>RMF2 (Relationship)</u>		<u>Factor Loading</u>
VB3.	I prefer to see a recruitment message that emphasizes that job stability is valued in the organization.	0.810
RS3.	A recruitment message is more convincing when it is delivered by a person who has direct personal knowledge about the position.	0.652
RS2.	A recruitment message is more convincing when it is delivered by someone holding a high ranking position in the organization.	0.527
VB1.	I prefer to see a recruitment message that emphasizes the importance of relationships among employees in the organization.	0.513
Total percentage of variance explained = 10.106%		
Total cumulative percentage of variance explained = 39.452%		

<u>RMF3 (Reflection of organizational values)</u>		<u>Factor Loading</u>
MI5.	A recruitment message should reveal all aspects of the job and the organization, whether they might be desirable or undesirable.	0.722
RO3.	To be effective, a recruitment message should reflect my expectations about the organization's values.	0.613
VB2.	I prefer to see a recruitment message that emphasizes the importance of solving problems and performing tasks in the organization.	0.526
Total percentage of variance explained = 8.132%		
Total cumulative percentage of variance explained = 47.583%		

4.6.2.1.3 PERSON-ORGANIZATION FIT PERCEPTION

Per previous discussion, EFA was adapted to examine the underlying structure of six items measuring PO fit perception. The KMO value was 0.624 and the Bartlett's Test of Sphericity was 0.000, which suggest that the data is appropriate for factor analysis. The benchmark remained the same as the earlier where factor loading should be greater than 0.50, therefore five of seven items were kept. The extracted two factors can explain 47.58% of total variance in the model. The EFA result is depicted in the Table 4.24.

Table 4.24 EFA Result of Preference for Recruitment Messages with the US Group
POF1 (Cooperation) Factor Loading

OS5.	I prefer to work in an organization that encourages its members to look after each other.	0.834
OS4.	I prefer to work in an organization that encourages its members to work cooperatively in groups.	0.750
OS3.	I prefer to work in an organization that encourages its members to feel comfortable in unstructured situations.	0.684

Total percentage of variance explained = 38.911%

Total cumulative percentage of variance explained = 38.911%

POF2 (Oral Communication) Factor Loading

CC3.	I prefer to work in an organization where the majority of communication is transmitted through spoken words.	0.865
CC2.	I prefer to work in an organization that relies heavily on oral discussions and verbal instructions.	0.850

Total percentage of variance explained = 26.345%

Total cumulative percentage of variance explained = 65.256%

4.6.2.1.4 INITIAL EXAMINATION ON EXTRACTED FACTORS

After factors were extracted, a series of descriptive statistics were conducted. Table 4.25 provides the results of the descriptive statistics on extracted factors. Both Skewness and Kurtosis were consulted in order to assess the normality of the data and only RMF1 had a slightly higher Kurtosis value that was larger than 2, which suggests that it may slightly violate the normality assumption.

Table 4.25 Descriptive Statistics of Extracted Factors with the US Group

	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation	Skewness		Kurtosis	
						Statistic	Std. Error	Statistic	Std. Error
COF1	205	4.00	15.00	11.59	1.86	-.55	.17	1.35	.34
COF2	204	5.00	15.00	10.82	2.00	-.42	.17	.24	.34
COF3	204	3.00	10.00	7.38	1.28	-.45	.17	.42	.34
COF4	204	2.00	10.00	7.30	1.76	-.57	.17	.22	.34
COF5	205	3.00	10.00	6.78	1.49	-.05	.17	-.03	.34
COF6	205	2.00	10.00	7.07	1.66	-.28	.17	-.50	.34
RMF1	205	5.00	25.00	19.54	2.83	-.69	.17	2.41	.34
RMF2	205	10.00	20.00	16.10	2.14	-.02	.17	-.24	.34
RMF3	205	5.00	15.00	10.97	1.72	-.13	.17	-.03	.34
POF1	205	6.00	15.00	12.62	1.87	-.69	.17	.69	.34
POF2	205	4.00	10.00	7.42	1.40	-.25	.17	-.18	.34

After descriptive analysis was conducted, a bivariate correlation analysis was conducted on extracted factors. Table 4.26 provides the result of correlation among factors.

Table 4.26 Correlation Analysis Results Among Extracted Factors with the US Group

	COF1	COF2	COF3	COF4	COF5	COF6	RMF1	RMF2	RMF3	POF1	POF2
COF1	1										
COF2	.287**	1									
COF3	.155*	.148*	1								
COF4	.183**	.053	.066	1							
COF5	.273**	.130 ⁺	.150*	.048	1						
COF6	.290**	.121 ⁺	.030	.112	.252**	1					
RMF1	.321**	.279**	.060	.127 ⁺	.110	.217**	1				
RMF2	.336**	.097	.167*	.235**	.237**	.285**	.395**	1			
RMF3	.141*	.145*	-.037	.11	.175*	.209**	.372**	.419**	1		
POF1	.125 ⁺	.170*	.191**	-.029	.04	.043	.102	.291**	.151*	1	
POF2	.085	.113	.037	.012	.084	-.069	.047	.194**	.137*	.193**	1

Note: + p<0.10, * p<0.05, ** p<0.01

4.6.2.2 STRUCTURAL EQUATION MODELING

Structural equation modeling (SEM) was used to examine the relationship among constructs. Based on the proposed theory and the EFA results, the initial findings are depicted below in Figure 4.7:

Figure 4.7 Initial Model with the US Samples




Table 4.27 The Fit Indexes of the Initial Model with the US Group

Absolute Fit Measures	Result	Benchmark
Chi-square (χ^2) of estimate model	121.935	
Normed Chi-square (CMIN/DF)	1.648	≤ 3.0
Root mean square error of approximation (RMSEA)	0.056	≤ 0.08
Incremental Fit Measures		
Incremental fit index (IFI)	0.902	≥ 0.90
Comparative fit index (CFI)	0.895	≥ 0.90
Parsimonious Fit Measures		
Parsimony normed fit index (PNFI)	0.552	≥ 0.50
Parsimony comparative fit index (PCFI)	0.631	≥ 0.50

4.6.3 RESULTS OF HYPOTHESIS TESTING

4.6.3.1 SEM MODEL RESULT ASSESSMENT

Similar to the main study, the Chi-square value for the SEM model with the US samples was 121.935 with 74 degrees of freedom ($p = .00$), which again indicated that the model was not sufficient to support the hypothesis. However, the known sensitivity of the Chi-square test, given the sample size of the US group was 205, it is necessary to utilize additional fit indexes to assist in model evaluation. Based on the results of the SEM model, all fit indexes match the acceptance level as suggested by previous study (Hair et al., 2006): CMIN/DF = 1.648, RMSEA = 0.056, IFI = 0.902, CFI = 0.895, PNFI = 0.552, PCFI = 0.631.

4.6.3.2 HYPOTHESIS 1

The hypothesis 1a proposed that context orientation will influence an individual's preference for recruitment messages. The results of structural equation were utilized in order to test this hypothesis. The relationship between constructs was examined based on t-values associated with the path coefficients. Based on the results from the SEM model, an individual's context orientation is significantly related to his/her preference for recruitment messages (t-value = 4.474, $p < 0.01$). Therefore, the relationship put forth in hypothesis 1a was supported. Multiple regression analysis was used to test hypothesis 1b and further estimate whether individuals who demonstrated a low-context orientation indeed do have a preference for recruitment messages that incorporate a higher level of detail, precision, and directness.

The regression equation utilized the independent variables of context orientation factors along with the dependent variable of the preference for recruitment messages. As described

previously, the multiple regression equation can contain one dependent variable and one or more independent variable, the dependent variable in this study was represented using the composite score of factors measuring preference for recruitment messages. Thus, the regression equation is depicted as follows:

$$\text{Preference for Recruitment Messages} = \alpha_0 + \alpha_1 \text{CO}_{\text{Precision}} + \alpha_2 \text{CO}_{\text{Communication Patterns}} + \alpha_3 \text{CO}_{\text{Subtleness}} + \alpha_4 \text{CO}_{\text{Openness}} + \alpha_5 \text{CO}_{\text{Formality}} + \alpha_6 \text{CO}_{\text{Trust}}$$

Additionally, stepwise estimation was used in this study. The first assessment examined the correlation among variables included in the regression equation (Table 4.28). The correlation matrix below shows the significance and the sample size of each variable. All correlations were significant at the .05 level, which suggests that most variables are highly correlated.

Table 4.28 Correlation Analysis Results with the US Group

	RMSCORE	CO _{Precision}	CO _{Communication Patterns}	CO _{Subtleness}	CO _{Openness}	CO _{Formality}	CO _{Trust}
RMSCORE	1.000						
CO _{Precision}	.376**	1.000					
CO _{Communication Patterns}	.239**	.287**	1.000				
CO _{Subtleness}	.089	.155*	.148*	1.000			
CO _{Openness}	.202**	.183**	.053	.066	1.000		
CO _{Formality}	.220**	.250**	.130*	.150*	.048	1.000	
CO _{Trust}	.307**	.278**	.121*	.030	.112 ⁺	.243**	1.000

Note: a. RMSCORE: Dependent Variable - Preference for Recruitment Messages Accumulative Score; + p<0.10, * p<0.05, ** p<0.01

The following assessment examined the overall model. The results were summarized in Table 4.29. R-square is the percent of the dependent variable explained by the independent variables. The proposed model, in which the preference for recruitment messages is the

dependent variable, includes six independent variables representing context orientation, including precision, patterns, subtleness, openness, formality, and courtesy. The results suggest that only three independent variables should be kept in the multiple regression analysis, which include: Precision, Communication Patterns, and Trust. These three independent variables explained 20.3% of the variance, which indicates that the model can explain the relationship between preferences for recruitment messages as influenced by the context orientation.

Table 4.29 Regression Model Summary

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate	Change Statistics					Durbin-Watson
					R Square Change	F Change	df1	df2	Sig. F Change	
1	.376 ^a	.142	.137	4.83893	.142	33.352	1	202	.000	2.098
2	.432 ^b	.186	.178	4.72339	.045	11.003	1	201	.001	
3	.450 ^c	.203	.191	4.68757	.016	4.084	1	200	.045	

- a. Predictors: (Constant), CO_{Precision}
b. Predictors: (Constant), CO_{Precision}, CO_{Trust}
c. Predictors: (Constant), CO_{Precision}, CO_{Trust}, CO_{Communication Patterns}
d. Dependent Variable: RMSCORE

The ANOVA table below also represents an examination of results with regard to the overall model significance. The results indicate that the model was statistically significant and the preference for recruitment messages could be explained by three independent variables, including Precision, Communication Patterns, and Trust.

Table 4.30 The Regression Model ANOVA Result

Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	780.952	1	780.952	33.352	.000 ^a
	Residual	4729.886	202	23.415		
	Total	5510.838	203			
2	Regression	1026.438	2	513.219	23.004	.000 ^b
	Residual	4484.400	201	22.310		
	Total	5510.838	203			
3	Regression	1116.168	3	372.056	16.932	.000 ^c
	Residual	4394.671	200	21.973		
	Total	5510.838	203			

Note: a. Predictors: (Constant), CO_{Precision},
 b. Predictors: (Constant), CO_{Precision}, CO_{Trust},
 c. Predictors: (Constant), CO_{Precision}, CO_{Trust}, CO_{Communication Patterns},
 d. Dependent Variable: RMSCORE

Evaluation of the regression model continued with each independent variable. All three independent variables have a statistically significant impact on the dependent variable as depicted in Table 4.31. The model did not appear to have a significant multicollinearity issue as each independent variable had a close-to-one tolerance and VIF value. Therefore, the regression equation model can be demonstrated as:

$$\text{Preference for Recruitment Messages} = 28.713 + 0.806 \text{ CO}_{\text{Precision}} + 0.674 \text{ CO}_{\text{Trust}} + 0.348 \text{ CO}_{\text{Communication Patterns}}$$

Table 4.31 Beta Coefficients and Other Coefficients for the Model

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.	Correlations			Collinearity Statistics	
		B	Std. Error	Beta			Zero-order	Partial	Part	Tolerance	VIF
3	(Constant)	28.713	2.596		11.060	.000					
	CO _{Precision}	.806	.197	.279	4.089	.000	.376	.278	.258	.858	1.166
	CO _{Trust}	.674	.207	.214	3.249	.000	.307	.224	.205	.921	1.086
	CO _{Communication Patterns}	.348	.172	.133	2.021	.045	.239	.141	.128	.916	1.092

Note: a. Dependent Variable: RMSCORE

Based on results from the multiple regression analysis, hypothesis 1b received support in that an individual's context orientation can predict his or her preference for recruitment messages containing certain characteristics.

4.6.3.3 HYPOTHESIS 2

The second hypothesis of the study proposed that a greater acceptance of recruitment messages would lead to a greater likelihood of PO fit. The result of the SEM analysis suggested that the preference for recruitment messages was significantly and positively correlated to PO fit perception (t-value = 3.438, $p < 0.01$). This result supported the idea that if job applicants accept recruitment messages with certain characteristics based on their context orientation, they would develop a positive fit perception with hiring organizations.

4.6.3.4 HYPOTHESIS 3

The third hypothesis proposed that an applicant's perception of PO fit is significantly related to his/her intention to apply to an organization. The SEM analysis results suggested that PO fit perception was significantly and positively correlated to the job application intention (t-value = 2.126, $p < 0.05$). This result supported the idea that job applicants' perception of PO fit would affect their intention to apply for jobs. Table 4.32 presents the summary of the hypotheses testing results.

Table 4.32 Summary of Hypotheses Testing with the SEM Results

Hypothesis	Hypothesized Path	Standardized Coefficients	t-value	Results
H1 _a	CO – RM	0.86	4.474**	Supported
H2	RM – PO	0.69	3.438**	Supported
H3	PO – JAI	0.16	2.126*	Supported

Note: * p<0.05(t-value = 1.96), ** p<0.01 (t-value = 2.58)

CO: Context orientation; RM: Preference for recruitment messages; PO: Person-organization fit perception; JAI: Job application intention

4.7 ALTERNATIVE STUDY ON THE TAIWAN GROUP

Using similar steps adopted in the main study with the US group, and an examination of the proposed theoretical model and hypotheses was performed with the Taiwan group.

4.7.1 SCALE RELIABILITY

As discussed before, the reliability of the instrument was assessed using Cronbach's alpha, and this study adopted a benchmark of a Cronbach's alpha value at or above .60 as the acceptable level. Table 4.33 provides the reliability result of measurements for each of the constructs.

Table 4.33 Measurement Reliability Initial Assessment with the Taiwan Group

Construct	Cronbach's Alpha
Context Orientation (31 items)	0.749
Preference for Recruitment Messages (33 items)	0.856
Person-Organization Fit (13 items)	0.732
Job Application Intention (3 items)	0.216

Due to low reliability of measurement items with regard to measuring job application intentions, the analysis could not be proceed. The reasons for this are further discussed in chapter 5.

4.8 SUMMARY

This chapter presented the data analysis and the test results of the proposed hypotheses. The first section provided a description of the demographic profiles of the participants. The second section presented the data analysis results, including reliability tests, exploratory factor analysis, and structural equation modeling. The third section presented the results from the factor analysis and SEM, followed by a test of the proposed structural equation model and hypotheses. The analysis supported four hypotheses. Table 4.34 presents a summary of the hypothesis testing.

Table 4.34 Summary of Hypotheses Testing

<u>Hypotheses</u>	<u>Results</u>
H1a: Context orientation will influence an individual's preference for recruitment messages.	Supported
H1b: Individuals who exhibit the qualities of a low-context orientation are likely to prefer recruitment messages that incorporate a higher level of detail, precision, and directness.	Supported
H2: A job seeker's preference for recruitment message will significantly affect the development of perceived PO fit.	Supported
H3: An applicant's perception of PO fit is significantly related to his/her intention to apply for a position in an organization.	Supported

CHAPTER FIVE DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

5.1 INTRODUCTION

The purpose of this study was to propose a model exploring the influence of context orientation on recruitment in the hospitality industry. Specifically, the study investigated the following questions: (1) How does the cultural background of an applicant influence his/her preference for recruitment messages? (2) How do applicants' dissimilar cultural backgrounds affect their perceived person-organization fit with hiring organizations? and (3) How do applicants' perceived person-organization fit, based on their cultural backgrounds, influence their intentions to apply for positions with hiring organizations?

This chapter discusses the data analysis results of the research regarding the relationships among context orientation, preference for recruitment messages, PO fit perception, and job application intention. The potential theoretical contributions and managerial implications from the findings are presented as well. Lastly, the limitations of the study are noted and the suggestions for future research are recommended.

5.2 DISCUSSION ON RESEARCH FINDINGS

5.2.1 RESEARCH RESULTS REVIEW

The study was designed to examine the relationship among four key constructs, including context orientation, preference for recruitment messages, PO fit perception, and job application intention. The model developed in this study was based on the literature review regarding context orientation studies (Hall, 1977; Hall & Hall, 1990; Gudykunst, 2001; Cardon,2008),

which suggests that individuals from different context orientations would have different communication patterns and preferences when interacting with others. Additionally, this study proposed that the preference for recruitment messages would affect an individual's development of perceived fit with hiring organizations and, ultimately, the intention to apply for job. The model, which contained four hypotheses, was tested using structural equation modeling (SEM) and multiple regressions analysis. Data from two different groups of students was collected from both the United States (US) and Taiwan. The model received statistical support with the US group, yet the model did not receive statistical support with the Taiwan group. Additionally, the model was validated using the combined samples; however, the result did not support the theoretical hypothesis. The following discussions are based on the validated model from the US samples.

5.2.2 RESEARCH CONSTRUCTS

5.2.2.1 CONTEXT ORIENTATION

Context orientation is defined as the level of information explicitness in the transmitted part of a message (Hall, 1977). Hall suggests that context orientation is a continuum. One end of the continuum is represented by the high-context (HC) culture, where individuals communicate with most of the information “either in the physical context or internalized in the person, while very little is in the coded, explicit, transmitted part of the message” (Hall, 1977, p. 91). The other end of the continuum represents the low-context (LC) culture, where “the mass of the information is vested in the explicit code” (Hall, 1977, p. 91).

Two dimensions were proposed from a review of the literature, directness of communication (DC) and management of information (MI), in order to measure context orientation. Directness of communication focuses on whether the primary message is coded implicitly or explicitly, while management of information focuses on whether or not information is widely shared. Sixteen items measuring directness of communication and fifteen items measuring management of information were incorporated from previous studies (Cardon, 2008; Richardson & Smith, 2007; Gudykunst, 2001; Ohashi, 2000; Kim et al., 1998). After a series of reliability tests and factor analysis, six factors were extracted measuring context orientation, including: precision, communication patterns, subtleness, openness, formality, and trust.

The inconsistency between the number of proposed dimensions and the number of extracted factors warrant further discussion. First of all, these extracted factors still capture the concept of context orientation. Precision, as an example, reflects on the use of words in the communication, which relates to the management of information. Communication patterns, along with openness and subtleness, represent the directness of communication. Additionally, previous literature suggests that the number of existing dimensions developed to distinguish context orientation may not be sufficient (Cardon, 2008). Existing dimensions, such as directness of communication, have been developed and widely used in previous literatures. However, sub-dimensions or additional dimensions could exist without yet being refined. Cardon (2008) suggests that limited attention has been paid to areas other than directness of communication. The results of this study suggest that sub-dimensions exist under directness of communication and management of information.

5.2.2.2 PREFERENCE FOR RECRUITMENT MESSAGES

Recruitment messages are combinations of information that reflect organization's attributes, values, culture and job characteristics in order to attract the right job applicants to apply for jobs with the organization. The main purpose of including various kinds of information in recruitment messages is to draw job seekers' attention to job availabilities and to familiarize them with organizational attributes, with the expectation that individual job seekers would develop an interest in applying for available positions with hiring organizations. Previous studies have found that the content and the delivery of recruitment messages would affect job seekers' application intentions. In order to explore the influence of context orientation on the preference for recruitment messages, this study proposed six dimensions, with a total of 33 measurement items, to measure recruitment message preferences, including: directness of communication (DC) (five items), management of information (MI) (five items), values and beliefs about work and relationship (VB) (six items), communication channel preference (CC) (nine items), recruiters' status in the organization (RS) (four items), and reflection on organizational values (RO) (four items).

After a series of factor analysis, three factors were extracted for measuring preferences for recruitment messages, including: directness, relationship, and reflection of organizational values. Again, the inconsistency between the number of extracted factors and the number of proposed dimensions warrants further discussion. The results indicate that the dimensions incorporated in this study are highly correlated conceptually. However, extracted factors still reflect upon the influence of context orientation with regard to individuals' preference for recruitment messages. Directness is related not only to directness of communication but also

management of information; both are the key dimensions of context orientation. Relationship pertains to recruiters' status in the organization and values and beliefs about work and relationships. Hall (1977) suggests that the use of context orientation often depends on the relationship between individuals, which would affect the use of words and the delivery of information. Therefore, the results of factor analysis suggest that preferences for recruitment messages can be measured with a few distinct dimensions, which is the result of combinations of dimensions.

5.2.2.3 PERSON-ORGANIZATION FIT

Person-organization (PO) fit is defined as “the compatibility between people and organizations that occurs when: (a) at least one entity provides what the other needs, or (b) they share similar fundamental characteristics, or (c) both” (Kristof, 1996, p. 4). Organizations would prefer to recruit individuals with a higher level of PO fit since these individuals tend to have a better job performance, higher job satisfaction, and fewer intentions to leave the organization (Morley, 2007; Kristorf-Brown, Zimmerman, & Johnson, 2005; Kristorf, 1996; O'Reilly, Chatman, & Caldwell, 1991). Three dimensions with 13 measurement items measuring PO fit, such as: directness of communication (DC) (two items), communication channel preference (CC) (four items) and organizational structure and characteristics (OS) (seven items) were incorporated into this study.

Two factors were extracted after a series of factor analysis was completed: cooperation and oral communication. Cooperation is related to organizational structure and characteristics while oral communication relates to communication channel preference. The literature indicates

that a high level of perceived PO fit could be the result of both organizations and individuals sharing similar characteristics or one providing what the other needs or both. These two factors reflect the similar characteristics that an individual looks for from the hiring organizations.

5.2.2.4 JOB APPLICATION INTENTION

Job application intention is defined as individual job seekers' intention to apply for job openings with hiring organizations. Previous studies found that an individual's application intention is influenced by information provided by the organization and the perceived fit with the organization (Collins, 2007; Collins & Han, 2004; Stevens, Dragoni, & Collins, 2001). Three measurement items were incorporated in this study. The results of reliability testing suggest that these measurement items were appropriate when measuring an individual's job application intention.

5.2.3 CONTEXT ORIENTATION – PREFERENCE FOR RECRUITMENT MESSAGES

Context orientation is defined as the level of information explicitness in the transmitted communications (Hall, 1977), and recruitment messages are defined as combinations of information that reflect upon an organization's attributes, values, culture and job characteristics to attract the right applicants to apply for jobs with the organization. The main purpose of this study was to investigate the influence of context orientation on individuals' preferences for recruitment messages. Structural equation modeling techniques used in this study found that that an individual's context orientation positively influences his/her preferences for recruitment messages. This is consistent with previous research findings (Hall, 1977; Gudykunst, 2001) whereas individuals will be affected by their context orientation when communicating with

others, which would influence their management of information and the directness of communication. Individuals who demonstrate a low-context orientation tend to pay attention to explicitly coded messages, while individuals with a high-context orientation would be more aware of information that is internalized in the person or in the physical context. Thus, hypothesis 1a was supported, which proposed that cultural differences in context orientation would affect individuals' preferences for recruitment messages. Since recruitment is a mutual communication process between hiring organizations and job seekers, the use of context orientation in assessing preferred communication patterns by job seekers would be appropriate. Additionally, this result also corresponded to previous research findings (Ryan, McFarland, Baron, & Page, 1999; Steiner & Gilliland, 2001) in that cultural difference influences various staffing practices.

Hypothesis 1b received validation in this study, which proposed that individuals who exhibited the qualities of a low-context orientation were more likely to prefer recruitment messages that incorporated a higher level of detail, precision, and directness. Based on the research results, six of fourteen factors measuring context orientation and three of thirteen factors measuring the preference for recruitment messages were extracted. When extracted factors were incorporated into the proposed model, the research findings supported that context orientation is positively related to the preference for recruitment messages. Using multiple regressions analysis, the research findings suggest that context orientation could explain the preference for recruitment messages. Additionally, only three of six extracted factors (precision, trust, and pattern) were kept in the equation. To conclude, the level of precision and trust, as well as communication patterns, were found to partially predict an individual's preference for recruitment messages in

terms of the level of directness, the reflection of organizational values, and the extent to which the relationship in the organization is emphasized.

5.2.4 PREFERENCE FOR RECRUITMENT MESSAGES – PO FIT PERCEPTION

PO fit is defined as the perceived congruence between individuals and organizations where either one provides what another needs or they share similar characteristics or both (Kristof, 1996). It is hypothesized in this study that a job seeker's preference for recruitment messages will significantly affect the development of perceived PO fit. The research findings provide statistical support that the preference for recruitment messages was significantly and positively correlated to the PO fit perception, which indicate that job applicants who accept recruitment messages containing certain characteristics based on their context orientation would also develop a positive fit perception with hiring organizations. This result corresponds to Roberson et al.'s (2005) suggestions that the characteristics and specificity of recruitment messages would influence job applicants' attention and their development of fit perception with hiring organizations. Additionally, the research findings provide insights with regard to understanding the concept of PO fit in the early stage of recruitment. Since individual job seekers may possess limited knowledge about job opening and hiring organizations, it is critical for them to acquire tailored information to make the application decision. During this initial interaction with hiring organizations, recruitment messages serve as an important source in assessing whether organizational attributes are similar to characteristics of individual job seekers. Thus, the preference for recruitment messages in terms of the level of directness, the degree of revelation, and the extent to which the relationship in the organization is emphasized would influence the development of PO fit with hiring organizations.

5.2.5 PO FIT PERCEPTION – JOB APPLICATION INTENTION

Job application intention is defined as individual job seekers' determination to apply for job openings with hiring organizations. Hypothesis 3 proposed that an applicant's perception of PO fit is significantly related to his/her intention to apply to an organization. The research findings provide statistical support that PO fit perception was significantly and positively correlated to the job application intention. The research findings corresponded to previous studies which indicated that individuals with a stronger perceived congruence with organizations would develop a stronger intention to apply for job openings. The study also supports earlier work which found that a higher level of perceived fit with organizations contributes to a reduced level of work stress and turnover intention (Verquer, Beehr, & Wagner, 2003; Schneider, 2001) and better job performance (Van Vianen, 2000; O'Reilly, Chatman, & Caldwell, 1991). Thus, it is concluded that an individual's job application intention is positively influenced by the PO fit perception.

5.3 IMPLICATIONS OF THE RESEARCH FINDINGS

The research objective of this study was to explore the sequential relationship among key constructs, including: context orientation, preference for recruitment messages, PO fit perception and job application intention. The results from this study indicate that context orientation is positively associated with an individual's preference for recruitment messages. Additionally, the preference for recruitment messages has a significant and positive influence on the development of PO fit perception and, ultimately, influences an individual's intention to apply for job openings.

5.3.1 THEORETICAL CONTRIBUTIONS TO THE PRESENT BODY OF LITERATURE

The theoretical model of this study was derived from the literature review. The construct of context orientation was introduced to the model as the antecedent for the preference for recruitment messages. Despite the concept of context orientation being proposed by Edward Hall in the 1970's, it is fairly new to be incorporated into the human resources management field, especially in the context of recruitment. The findings suggest that context orientation indeed was significantly related to the preference for recruitment messages. This may generate interests to further explore the importance of context orientation, its associated influence, and the extended awareness of cultural differences in future recruitment studies.

Additionally, measurement items used to identify context orientation were also examined in this study. These items were derived and developed based on several studies (Kim et al., 1998; Ohashi, 2000; Gudykunst, 2001; Richardson & Smith, 2007; Cardon, 2008), which showed good reliability and validity. This study is a continuous effort for the improvement of the generalizability of these measurement items to explore the influence of context orientation on an individual's communication preference and patterns.

Meanwhile, this study also confirmed the significant relationship between recruitment messages and PO fit established in the early stage of recruitment. Additionally, the incorporation of context orientation would also assist in validating the findings of Roberson and her colleagues, which suggested that the specificity of recruitment messages would influence job applicants' perception of organizational attributes and PO fit. Their study, Roberson et al. (2005), suggested that the specificity of recruitment advertisements would lead to the generation of a favorable

perception of fit between hiring organizations and their cultures. The research findings in this study not only support their findings, but also provide a different aspect for assessing the preference for recruitment messages with certain characteristics with regard to the development of PO fit. They also provide additional explanations and potential clarifications for inconsistency in previous research on recruitment.

5.3.2 MANAGERIAL IMPLICATIONS

Since the research findings of this study suggest that context orientation could influence an individual job seeker's preference for recruitment messages and the development of fit perception with hiring organizations, there are some managerial implications that are suggested in this section in an attempt to create improved recruitment efforts and ultimately enhance the recruitment results in the hospitality industry.

Industry recruiters should consider adjusting their current delivery of recruitment messages to capture the attention of college graduates. Research findings suggest that college graduates in this study demonstrated several context orientation characteristics when communicating with recruiters or potential employers. Some of these characteristics, including: precision, trust, and communication patterns, would affect how messages are received and information is interpreted. These characteristics correspond to previous studies regarding to low-context orientation in which most Americans with European ancestry would demonstrate with regard to communication (Hall, 1977; Hall & Hall, 1990; Kim et al., 1998; Gudykunst, 2001). This study also identified three factors that reflect college graduates' preferences for recruitment messages, such as: directness, relationship, and reflection of organizational values. The trend in

this study illustrated that, for US, graduates are mainly of low-context orientation and would prefer to receive recruitment messages that directly describe and reveal all aspects of the job and the organization. Additionally, they would prefer to receive recruitment messages from individuals who have a direct relationship with the position or from a high-ranking person who represents the organization.

Recruitment messages themselves should be designed to include more current and realistic information, such as: job characteristics, work conditions, as well as career and development opportunities in the organization. This will allow for a higher level of effectiveness when delivering recruitment messages. They should be delivered in certain communication patterns, such as a high level of directness, which would allow individual job seekers to process information accurately. This is especially important for those who demonstrate a stronger level of low-context orientation with regard to communication. Additionally, since the role of recruiter influences the job seeker's preference for recruitment messages, it is critical that recruiters have direct knowledge about the job and can present it appropriately to interested candidates.

The research findings also suggest that the preference for recruitment messages would influence the development of fit perception with hiring organizations. Realistic and specific information included in recruitment messages could serve as a foundation for college graduates to consider whether they would be a good fit with hiring organizations. This presumption of fit would assist them in beginning to make a determination about their intention to apply for job opening. As stated earlier, research has determined that individuals who have a positive fit

perception with hiring organizations have better job performance and a lower turnover intention, therefore, the creation of tailored recruitment messages would be a critical advantage to hospitality companies who are managing operations in an atmosphere of high turnover and limited resources. This practice, in turn, would provide companies with a better committed work force that possess the desired skills and experience to provide quality service to satisfy customers' needs.

However, it should be noted that some college graduates in this study also demonstrated a few characteristics of high-context orientation when communicating with recruiters and potential employers. This has corresponded to previous studies that no society is at the extreme end of the context orientation continuum. Each group is a mixture of high- and low-context oriented individuals, although, collectively, the group may lean toward one end of the continuum than another. Therefore, recruiters should take this into account when approaching college graduates for recruitment. Several considerable options, including campus visit, work site tours or guest speaker opportunities in classes, should be adapted to have more opportunities to communicate with college graduates, which would assist in familiarizing with their context orientation and developing better recruitment strategies.

5.4 LIMITATIONS AND SUGGESTIONS FOR FUTURE RESEARCH

Although this study provides support in assessing the influence of context orientation in recruitment, some limitations regarding sampling issues must be noted. First, using college students may raise the concern of external validity, since their responses may not serve as a solid foundation for prediction of other populations (Cunningham, Anderson, & Murphy, 1974).

Although college graduates have been identified as one of the major recruitment pools to

organizations, Sears (1986) suggest that using students as research subjects may produce systematic biases in portraying human nature, which may not accurately reflect real world experience. Additionally, , with one in the US and two in Taiwan to participate in the research, the study only provides a glance on the recruitment issue involving key constructs developed in this research.

The proposed model also only received both statistical and theoretical support with the US participant. When incorporating the Taiwan group to validate the model, the study did not receive statistical and/or theoretical supports. Upon further examination of these constraints, there were some significant differences in college recruitment between Taiwan and the US. As an example: hospitality management students in Taiwan do not have a similar recruiting dynamic as their US counterparts, in which recruiters would participate in on-campus career fairs and actively approach college graduates. Instead, students in Taiwan often need to actively approach hotels or restaurants for job applications. Despite the pretest results suggesting that students were not misled by the wording, their job application intentions could not be directly measured with regard to the concept of perceived fit with hiring organizations as incorporated in this study.

The results of this research also question the influence of context orientation on the communication patterns of the study's two groups. Six factors were extracted from the data measuring context orientation and there were some statistical differences between the US and the Taiwan groups. However, the differences between these two groups were not large when comparing the mean scores for each factor, which indicate that both group had similar responses.

Previous studies suggest that international communication has influenced the effect of context orientation since people with different cultural backgrounds use a common business language i.e. English to exchange information (Cardon, 2008; Du-Babcock, 1999). Such use of a specific language could alter an individual's use of words and speech patterns in order to achieve effective communication. It is possible that the life styles and ways of speech in a society are influenced by other cultures as well, which would influence the use of context orientation in daily communication. Both might explain the small arithmetical difference between the US and the Taiwan group. Although the results of this research suggest that the influence of context orientation was not apparent on every dimension of communication and participants' preference for recruitment messages, each group still demonstrated the context orientation suggested by previous studies.

Future studies should address these limitations by incorporating more educational institutions in the United States to allow for a more accurate analysis of the influence of context orientation on college graduates' preference for recruitment messages. Also, when incorporating educational institutions located outside the United States, common recruitment phenomenon should be incorporated into the study to enhance the generalizability and understanding of recruitment issues in the hospitality industry outside of the United States.

Based on the research findings, future studies should also incorporate additional dimensions and characteristics of recruitment messages to assess job seekers' preferences. The delivery of recruitment messages as well as the detail and thoroughness of information regarding various aspects of job openings and the hiring organizations should also be included and

expanded upon. These would enhance the current understanding on the influence of context orientation on individual job seekers' preference for recruitment messages at the early stage of recruitment.

References

- Bacharach, S. B. (1989). Organizational theories: Some criteria for evaluation. *The Academy of Management Review*, 14(4), 496-515.
- Barber, A. E. (1998). *Recruiting employees: Individual and organizational perspectives*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Boswell, W., Roehling, M., Lepine, M., & Moynihan, L. (2003). Individual job-choice decisions and the impact of job attributes and recruitment practices: A longitudinal field study. *Human Resource Management*, 42(1), 23-37.
- Breaugh, J. A. (1992). *Recruitment: Science and practice*. Boston, MA: PWS-KENT Publishing.
- Breaugh, J. A. (2008). Employee recruitment: Current knowledge and important areas for future research. *Human Resource Management Review*, 18(3), 103-118.
- Breaugh, J., & Billings, R. (1988). The realistic job preview: Five key elements and their importance for research and practice. *Journal of Business and Psychology*, 2(4), 291-305.
- Breaugh, J., & Starke, M. (2000). Research on employee recruitment: So many studies, so many remaining questions. *Journal of Management*, 26(3), 405-434.
- Bretz Jr, R., & Judge, T. (1994). Person-organization fit and the theory of work adjustment: Implications for satisfaction, tenure, and career success. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 44(1), 32-54.
- Cable, D., & Judge, T. (1994). Pay preferences and job search decisions: A person-organization fit perspective. *Personnel psychology*, 47(2), 317-348.
- Cable, D., & Judge, T. (1996). Person-organization fit, job choice decisions, and organizational entry. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 67(3), 294-311.

- Cardon, P. W. (2008). A critique of hall's contexting model. *Journal of Business and Technical Communication, 22*(4), 399-428.
- Churchill, G. A., Jr. (1979). A paradigm for developing better measures of marketing constructs. *Journal of marketing research, 16*(1), 64-73.
- De Vaus, D. (2002). *Surveys in social research*. London: Routledge.
- Dubin, R. (1978). *Theory building*. New York: Free Press
- Edwards, J. (2008). To prosper, organizational psychology should?Overcome methodological barriers to progress. *Journal of Organizational Behavior, 29*(4), 469-491.
- Garson, G. D. (2002). *Guide to writing empirical papers, theses, and dissertations*. New York: Marcel Dekker.
- Garson, G. D. (2010). *Statnotes: topics in multivariate analysis*. Retrieved from <http://faculty.chass.ncsu.edu/garson/PA765/structur.htm>
- Gibson, J. L., Ivancevich, J. M., Donnelly, J. H. J., & Konopaske, R. (2008). *Organizations: Behaviors, structure, processes* (13 ed.). New York, NY: McGraw-Hill/Irwin.
- Gudykunst, W. (2001). *Asian American ethnicity and communication*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Gudykunst, W., Matsumoto, Y., Ting-Toomey, S., Nishida, T., Kim, K., & Heyman, S. (1996). The influence of cultural individualism-collectivism, self construals, and individual values on communication styles across cultures. *Human communication research, 22*(4), 510-543.
- Gudykunst, W., & Nishida, T. (1986). Attributional confidence in low-and high-context cultures. *Human communication research, 12*(4), 525-549.
- Gudykunst, W., & Ting-Toomey, S. (1988). *Culture and interpersonal communication*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.

- Gudykunst, W., & Ting-Toomey, S. (1996). Communication in personal relationships across cultures: An introduction. In W. Gudykunst, S. Ting-Toomey & T. Nishida (Eds.), *Communication in personal relationships across cultures*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Hair, J. F., Black, B., Babin, B., Anderson, R. E., & Tatham, R. L. (2006). *Multivariate data analysis* (6 ed.). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Hall, E. T. (1959). *The silent language*. Garden City, NY: Doubleday Anchor.
- Hall, E. T. (1966). *The hidden dimension*. Garden City, NY: Doubleday.
- Hall, E. T. (1977). *Beyond culture*. Garden City, NY: Anchor Press.
- Hall, E. T. & Hall, M. R. (1990). *Understanding cultural differences: Germans, French, and Americans*. Yarmouth, ME: Intercultural Press.
- Hinkin, T., Tracey, J., & Enz, C. (1997). Scale construction: Developing reliable and valid measurement instruments. *Journal of Hospitality and Tourism Research*, 21, 100-120.
- Hoffman, B., & Woehr, D. (2006). A quantitative review of the relationship between person-organization fit and behavioral outcomes. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 68(3), 389-399.
- Hofstede, G. (2001). *Culture's consequences: Comparing values, behaviors, institutions and organizations across nations* (2 ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Holland, J. L. (1976). Vocational preference. In M. D. Dunnette (Ed.), *Handbook of industrial and organizational psychology* (pp. 521-570). Chicago, IL: Rand, McNally.
- Hoyle, R. (1995). The structural equation modeling approach: Basic concepts and fundamental issues. In R. H. Hoyle (Ed.), *Structural Equation Modeling: Concepts, Issues, and Applications* (pp. 1-15). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Jablin, F., Putnam, L., Roberts, K., & Porter, L. (1987). *Handbook of organizational communication: An interdisciplinary perspective*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

- Keegan, W. (1989). *Global marketing management* (4 ed.). Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Keesing, R. (1974). Theories of culture. *Annual review of anthropology*, 3(1), 73-97.
- Kim, D., Pan, Y., & Park, H. (1998). High-versus low-context culture: A comparison of Chinese, Korean, and American cultures. *Psychology and Marketing*, 15(6), 507-521.
- Kirkman, B. L., Lowe, K. B., & Gibson, C. B. (2006). A quarter century of "Culture's consequences": A review of empirical research incorporating Hofstede's cultural values framework. *Journal of International Business Studies*, 37(3), 285-320.
- Kluckhohn, F. R., & Strodtbeck, F. L. (1961). *Variation in value orientation*. New York: Row Peterson.
- Krech, D., Crutchfield, R., & Ballachey, E. (1962). *Individual in society*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Kristof, A. L. (1996). Person-organization fit: An integrative review of its conceptualizations, measurement, and implications. *Personnel Psychology*, 49(1), 1-49.
- Kristof-Brown, A., & Guay, R. (in press). Person-Environment Fit. In S. Zedeck (Ed.), *APA Handbook of Industrial and Organizational Psychology*. Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.
- Kristof-Brown, A., Zimmerman, R., & Johnson, E. (2005). Consequences of individuals' fit at work: A meta-analysis of person-job, person-organization, person-group, and person-supervisor fit. *Personnel psychology*, 58(2), 281-342.
- Lane, H. W., Distefano, J. J., & Maznevski, M. (2006). *International management behavior: Text, readings and cases* (5 ed.). Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishing.
- Latham, G. P. (2007). *Work motivation: History, theory, research, and practice*. Thousand Oak, CA: Sage.

- Lebra, T. (1987). The cultural significance of silence in Japanese communication. *Multilingua*, 6(4), 343-357.
- Lin, R. (2007). *Multivariate analysis: SPSS operation and application*. Taipei City: BestWise Co.
- Malhotra, N., Agarwal, J., & Peterson, M. (1996). Methodological issues in cross-cultural marketing research. *International Marketing Review*, 13(5), 7-43.
- Mintu-Wimsatt, A., & Gassenheimer, J. (2000). The moderating effects of cultural context in buyer-seller negotiation. *Journal of Personal Selling and Sales Management*, 20(1), 1-10.
- Muchinsky, P., & Monahan, C. (1987). What is person-environment congruence? Supplementary versus complementary models of fit. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 31(3), 268-277.
- Norton, R. (1978). Foundation of a communicator style construct. *Human communication research*, 4(2), 99-112.
- Ohashi, R. (2000). *High/low-context communication: Conceptualization and scale development*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Michigan State University, East Lansing.
- Okabe, R. (1987). Indirect speech acts of Japanese. In D. Kincaid (Ed.), *Communication theory: Eastern and western perspectives*. New York: Academic Press.
- O'Reilly, C., Chatman, J., & Caldwell, D. (1991). People and organizational culture: A profile comparison approach to assessing person-organization fit. *Academy of Management Journal*, 34(3), 487-516.
- Powell, G. (1984). Effects of job attributes and recruiting practices on applicant decisions: A comparison. *Personnel psychology*, 37(4), 721-732.

- Powell, S., & Wood, D. (1999). Is recruitment the millennium time bomb for the industry worldwide? *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management*, 11(4), 138-141.
- Reisinger, Y., & Mavondo, F. (2006). Structural equation modeling. *Journal of Travel & Tourism Marketing*, 21(4),41-71.
- Richardson, R. M., & Smith, S. W. (2007). The influence of high/low-context culture and power distance on choice of communication media: Students' media choice to communicate with professors in Japan and America. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, 31(4), 479-501.
- Roberson, Q. M., Collins, C. J., & Oreg, S. (2005). The effects of recruitment message specificity on applicant attraction to organizations. *Journal of Business & Psychology*, 19(3), 319-339.
- Ryan, A. M., McFarland, L., Baron, H., & Page, R. (1999). An international look at selection practices: Nation and culture as explanations for variability in practice. *Personnel Psychology*, 52(2), 359-391.
- Rynes, S. (1991). Recruitment, job choice, and post-hire consequences: A call for new research directions. In M. D. Dunnette & L. M. Hough (Eds.), *Handbook of industrial and organizational psychology* (2 ed., Vol. 2, pp. 399-444). Palo Alto, CA: Consulting Psychologists Press.
- Rynes, S. L., Bretz Jr, R. D., & Gerhart, B. (1991). The importance of recruitment in job choice: A different way of looking. *Personnel psychology*, 44(3), 487-521.

- Rynes, S. L., & Cable, D. M. (2003). Recruitment research in the twenty-first century. In W. C. Borman, D. R. Ilgen & R. J. Klimoski (Eds.), *Handbook of psychology: Industrial and organizational psychology* (Vol. 12, pp. 55-76). Hoboken, NJ: John Wiley & Sons.
- Rynes, S., Heneman, H., & Schwab, D. (1980). Individual reactions to organizational recruiting: A review. *Personnel psychology*, 33(3), 529-542.
- Saks, A., & Ashforth, B. (1997). A longitudinal investigation of the relationships between job information sources, applicant perceptions of fit, and work outcomes. *Personnel psychology*, 50(2), 395-426.
- Saks, A., & Ashforth, B. (2002). Is job search related to employment quality? It all depends on the fit. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 87(4), 646-654.
- Schneider, B. (1987). The people make the place. *Personnel psychology*, 40(3), 437-453.
- Schneider, B. (2001). Fits about fit. *Applied psychology: an international review*, 50(1), 141-152.
- Shao, A. T., Bao, Y., & Gray, E. (2004). Comparative advertising effectiveness: A cross-cultural study. *Journal of Current Issues & Research in Advertising*, 26(2), 67-80.
- Simintiras, A. C., & Thomas, A. H. (1998). Cross-cultural sales negotiations a literature review and research propositions. *International Marketing Review*, 15(1), 10-28.
- Steiner, D., & Gilliland, S. (2001). Procedural justice in personnel selection: International and cross-cultural perspectives. *International Journal of Selection and Assessment*, 9(1&2), 124-137.
- Taylor, M., & Bergmann, T. (1987). Organizational recruitment activities and applicants' reactions at different stages of the recruitment process. *Personnel psychology*, 40(2), 261-285.

- Triandis, H. C. (1988). Collectivism vs. individualism: A reconceptualization of a basic concept in cross-cultural psychology. In G. Verma & C. Bagley (Eds.), *Cross-cultural studies of personality, attitudes, and cognition* (pp. 66-95). London: Macmillan.
- Triandis, H. C. (1995). *Individualism & collectivism*. Boulder, CO: Westview Press.
- Tom, V. (1971). The role of personality and organizational images in the recruiting process. *Organizational Behavior and Human Performance*, 6(5), 573-592.
- Van Vianen, A. (2000). Person-organization fit: The match between newcomers'and recruiters' preferences for organizational cultures. *Personnel psychology*, 53(1), 113-149.
- Varner, I., & Beamer, L. (2005). *Intercultural communication in the global workplace* (3 ed.). New York, NY: McGraw-Hill Irwin.
- Verquer, M., Beehr, T., & Wagner, S. (2003). A meta-analysis of relations between person-organization fit and work attitudes. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 63(3), 473-489.
- Vroom, V. (1966). Organizational choice: A study of pre-and post-decision processes. *Organizational Behavior and Human Performance*, 1(2), 12-225.
- Wanous, J. P. (1992). *Organizational entry: Recruitment, selection, orientation, and socialization of newcomers* (2 ed.). Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley Publishing.
- Werker, J. F., Maurer, D. M., & Yoshida, K. A. (2010). Perception. In M. H. Bornstein (Ed.), *Handbook of cultural developmental science* (pp. 89-125). New York, NY: Psychology Press.
- Zikmund, W. G. (2003). *Business research methods* (7 ed.). Mason, OH: South-Western College Publication.

APPENDIX A HYPOTHESIS SUMMARY AND HYPOTHESIS TESTING

Hypotheses	Testing Method	Hypothesis will be supported when
H1a: Context orientation will influence an individual's preference for recruitment messages.	SEM	Path coefficient is positive and significant
H1b: Individuals who exhibit the qualities of a low-context orientation are likely to prefer recruitment messages that incorporate a higher level of detail, precision, and directness.	MR	Interaction effect explains a significant proportion of the variance in preference
H2: A job seeker's preference for recruitment messages will significantly affect the development of perceived PO fit.	SEM	Path coefficient is positive and significant
H3: An applicant's perception of PO fit is significantly related to his/her intention to apply for a position in an organization.	SEM	Path coefficient is positive and significant

APPENDIX B PRETEST QUESTIONNAIRE

1. What is (was) your time frame that you started searching for employment information regarding companies and jobs in the hospitality industry? (Please select one)

- A. Before attending college
- B. During the first two years of college education
- C. During the third year of college education
- D. 12 months before college graduation
- E. 6 months before college graduation
- F. Other _____

2. How do you collect information about the employment opportunities and organizations in the hospitality industry? (Please check all that apply)

- A. Self research on the Internet
- B. Family recommendation
- C. Co-worker/friend recommendation
- D. School's career-oriented resources
- E. Faculty's announcement/teaching in the class
- F. Recruitment activities held by organizations (company day, information session, etc.)
- G. Mass media (Television, Newspaper)
- H. Other _____

3. Which of the following career-oriented resources have you utilized that are offered by your school? (Please check all that apply)

- A. Career fair
- B. Career development office
- C. Career counseling
- D. Career library/Job list postings
- E. Career development workshops
- F. Resume workshops
- G. On-campus recruitment by companies
- H. Cooperative education (Co-Op)/Internship
- I. Other _____
- J. I have not used any career-oriented resources offered by my school

4. What kind of recruitment activities, held by hospitality organizations, have you participated so far? (Please check all that apply)

- A. Information session
- B. Company Day
- C. Guest Speaker
- D. Other _____
- E. I have not participated in any recruitment activity held by hospitality organizations

5. Do you plan to use any other resource(s) for finding your first position upon graduation? (Please check all that apply)

- A. No additional resources will be utilized except those offered by the school
- B. Networking with industry people
- C. Networking through friends/co-workers
- D. Networking through family members
- E. Self-search on the Internet
- F. Self-search on the mass media (e.g. Television, Newspapers)
- G. Other _____

6. How familiar are you with the career opportunities in the following hospitality industry segments?

	Hospitality Industry Segments	Not at all Familiar				Very Familiar
		1	2	3	4	5
1	Lodging (e.g. Hotel/Motel)					
2	Food and Beverage					
3	Transportation (e.g. Airline)					
4	Conference/Event Planning					
5	Travel Agency/Tourism					

7. What segment of the hospitality industry do you mostly feel interested in working in after graduation? (Please select one)

- A. Lodging
- B. Food and Beverage
- C. Transportation
- D. Conference/Event Planning
- E. Travel Agency/Tourism
- F. I do not plan to work in the hospitality industry

8. Which grouping of attributes is important to you when reviewing a recruitment message? (Please rank them with **1** as the **most important** factor in a descending order, each grouping can only be ranked once)

	Grouping of Attributes	Your Ranked Order
A	Organizational attributes (company culture, reputation)	
B	Monetary factors (salary, benefits)	
C	Position attributes (job characteristics, job requirements)	
D	Working environment (co-workers, supervisors)	
E	Career aspects (advancement opportunity, professional responsibility)	
F	Life style (work-life balance, flexible schedule)	
G	Work format (collaboration, independence)	

9. Which grouping of attributes is important to you, yet mostly missing from recruitment messages based on your experience? (Please rank them with **1** as the most important missing factor in a descending order, each grouping can only be ranked once)

	Grouping of Attributes	Your Ranked Order
A	Organizational attributes (company culture, reputation)	
B	Monetary factors (salary, benefits)	
C	Position attributes (job characteristics, job requirements)	
D	Working environment (co-workers, supervisors)	
E	Career aspects (advancement opportunity, professional responsibility)	
F	Life style (work-life balance, flexible schedule)	
G	Work format (collaboration, independence)	

10. Please indicate your level of agreement on following statements about the communication style you like to have when communicating with others

	Communication style	Not at all Agree				Strongly Agree
		1	2	3	4	5
1	I am used to indirect communication styles					
2	I am open to disclosing personal information					
3	I prefer to use precise communication					
4	I am comfortable with general, non-specific messages that do not have a lot of details					
5	I think information should be widely shared					
6	Informal communication networks transmit the most important information					
7	I prefer general information					
8	I prefer precise, detail information					
9	I prefer oral communication					
10	I prefer written communication					
11	I prefer to use task-related language					
12	The meaning of words varies greatly					
13	Oral agreements are binding					
14	I need to know what rules I am working with when I communicate with other people					
15	I prefer message emphasizes more about the overall situation rather than individual aspects					
16	The status of a message sender increases the importance of the communication					
17	The status of a message sender increases the credibility of the communication					

11. Please indicate your level of agreement on following statements about recruitment activities

	Recruitment Activities	Not at all Agree				Strongly Agree
		1	2	3	4	5
1	I am more interested to know an organization which has established a history of networking with my current school					
2	The history of networking with my current school does not impact my interest to know the organization					
3	I am more interested to know an organization which has frequently held recruitment activities on campus in a calendar year					
4	The frequency of recruitment activities does not impact my interest to know the organization					
5	The variety of recruitment activities does not impact my interest to know the organization					
6	I am more interested to know an organization when it sends high-ranked managers to participate in recruitment activities					
7	The rank of recruiter in the organization does not impact my interest to know the organization					
8	A recruitment activity that carries values I agree with is more attractive to me					
9	The quality and quantity of a recruitment activity does not matter to me, I'll go attend it anyway					
10	To be effective, a recruitment activity needs to reflect my expectation about the organization					

12. Please tell us what you look for when interpreting recruitment messages received from recruitment activities and recruiters

	Recruitment Messages	Not at all Agree				Strongly Agree
		1	2	3	4	5
1	A recruitment message should be direct, detail and explicit about the organization					
2	A recruitment message should be delivered by a person who is directly related to the position					
3	A recruitment message is more understandable in the written format					
4	A recruitment message should be tailored to clearly reflect job characteristics					

	Recruitment Messages	Not at all Agree				Strongly Agree
		1	2	3	4	5
5	A recruitment message just needs to provide the general idea about the organization and the position					
6	A recruitment message should reflect details about career promotions and development for individuals					
7	A recruitment message is more convincing when it is delivered by high-ranked managers					
8	A recruitment message is more convincing when it is delivered by school alumni					
9	A recruitment message is more convincing when it is delivered by someone from the human resource department					
10	General recruitment messages often do not mirror the realities of working for an organization					
11	A recruitment message that carries values I agree with is more attractive to me					
12	Regardless of whether or not a recruitment message is detailed, if key words that I am looking for are not there, I am not interested in the organization					
13	To be effective, a recruitment message needs to reflect my expectation about the organization					
14	If the recruitment message does not reflect my expectation about the organization, I may need to adjust my original views to be more realistic					
15	Recruitment messages should assist job applicants in clarifying some myths about the organization					
16	A recruitment message that reflects an organization image/reputation that I admire with is more attractive to me					

13. Please indicate how likely it would be for you to *apply to an organization* based on the following characteristics

	Types of Organizations	Not at all Possible				Strongly Possible
		1	2	3	4	5
1	One that is attentive to detail, precise, and direct in their daily operation and communication					
2	One that relies heavily on written policies and procedures					
3	One that is attentive to general perspectives without demanding details in their daily operation and communication					
4	One that relies heavily on oral communication and verbal instructions					
5	One that emphasizes the hierarchical order of organizational structure and the status of members					
6	One that makes its member feel comfortable in unstructured situations					
7	One that possesses a flat organization structure and its members share similar power in the organization					
8	One that makes individuals integrated into groups and look after each other					

14. If an organization's values and attributes, demonstrated by its recruitment activity and the recruitment message, did not match your own value and personality, would you still apply for a position with this organization?

- A. I would not apply for any position with this organization
 B. I would apply for the position anyway

15. Do you think schools provide frames, shaped by institutional history, physical settings, norms, traditions and values, as references for students to interpret the meanings of events and actions that happened on and off campus?

- A. Yes
 B. No

16. How significant do you think that the frames of reference for interpreting the meanings of events and actions provided by schools impact your perception of recruitment activities and messages?

Not at all Significant				Extremely Significant
1	2	3	4	5

17. What is your nationality? _____

18. What is your ethnicity?

- A. White
- B. Black or African American
- C. American Indian and Alaska Native
- D. Asian
- E. Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander
- F. Hispanic/Latino
- G. Other _____

19. What is your year of birth? 19_____

20. What is your gender?

- A. Male
- B. Female

21. What year are you in your college/university?

- A. Freshman/1st year
- B. Sophomore/2nd year
- C. Junior/3rd year
- D. Senior/4th year
- E. Other _____

22. What is your major in your university? _____

23. Do you have any work experience in the hospitality industry?

- A. None
- B. Less than 1 year
- C. Equal to or more than 1 year but less than 2 years
- D. Equal to or more than 2 year but less than 3 years
- E. Equal to or more than 3 year but less than 4 years
- F. Equal to or more than 4 year but less than 5 years
- G. 5 years or above

APPENDIX C FINAL QUESTIONNAIRE (ENGLISH VERSION)

1. Please indicate your level of agreement on following statements about the communication style you like to have when communicating with others.

	Communication Style	Strongly Disagree			Strongly Agree	
		1	2	3	4	5
1	I prefer to know what other people want when they start a conversation.	1	2	3	4	5
2	I prefer to use indirect communication styles.	1	2	3	4	5
3	I prefer to communicate with messages that are explicitly stated with clearly defined words.	1	2	3	4	5
4	I am not able to understand the meaning of a statement by “reading between the lines”.	1	2	3	4	5
5	I think any issue can be openly confronted in communication.	1	2	3	4	5
6	I think it is alright for people to raise questions about even the most sensitive matters.	1	2	3	4	5
7	I need to know what kind of communication rules I am working with when I communicate with other people from a dissimilar culture, I do not just pay attention to the words.	1	2	3	4	5
8	Speakers should not expect listeners to understand what they really mean unless the intended message is stated clearly.	1	2	3	4	5
9	What a person really means can often be different from what the person actually expresses in words.	1	2	3	4	5
10	I prefer to respond with an ambiguous position when pressed for an opinion.	1	2	3	4	5
11	If I have something negative to say, I will be tactful.	1	2	3	4	5
12	I am able to recognize subtle and indirect messages.	1	2	3	4	5
13	Even if I do not receive a clear and definite response from others, I can still understand what they intend to express.	1	2	3	4	5
14	Even if not stated clearly, a speaker’s intent will rarely be misunderstood.	1	2	3	4	5
15	I prefer to use categorical words (i.e. certainly, absolutely) in communication.	1	2	3	4	5
16	I prefer to use qualifiers (i.e. perhaps, maybe, probably) in communication.	1	2	3	4	5
17	I prefer to use precise communication that contains a high level of accuracy and definiteness.	1	2	3	4	5
18	It is better to risk not saying enough than to risk saying too much in a conversation.	1	2	3	4	5
19	I prefer messages that emphasize the general situation rather than specific aspects.	1	2	3	4	5
20	When I engage in a conversation, I prefer to discuss all possible aspects of issues.	1	2	3	4	5

	Communication Style	Strongly Disagree			Strongly Agree	
21	I prefer to have precise and detailed information in communication.	1	2	3	4	5
22	I am comfortable with general, non-specific messages that do not provide a lot of details.	1	2	3	4	5
23	I prefer to communicate important things through formal meetings.	1	2	3	4	5
24	I pay more attention to clearly stated words than to the body language and non-verbal gesture in communication.	1	2	3	4	5
25	I prefer written communication more than spoken communication.	1	2	3	4	5
26	My choice of communication channels (i.e. phone, e-mail) depends on the status of the person with whom I am communicating.	1	2	3	4	5
27	I prefer to have people present proof for what they are saying.	1	2	3	4	5
28	Usually I do not tell people very much about myself until I get to know them quite well.	1	2	3	4	5
29	I think specific information is more appealing than general principles in communication.	1	2	3	4	5
30	Some ideas are better understood when left unsaid.	1	2	3	4	5
31	Unless one can put ideas into his/her own words, a person is not thinking in depth.	1	2	3	4	5

2. Please indicate your level of agreement on following statements about recruitment messages.

	Recruitment Messages	Strongly Disagree			Strongly Agree	
1	A recruitment message should be direct, detailed, and clearly stated.	1	2	3	4	5
2	A recruitment message needs only provide a general idea about the organization without too many details.	1	2	3	4	5
3	I will not be able to understand the organization unless the recruitment information is stated directly and clearly in the recruitment message.	1	2	3	4	5
4	I think it is more important to describe the organization in detail rather than in general terms.	1	2	3	4	5
5	I am comfortable with general, non-specific recruitment messages that do not have a lot of details.	1	2	3	4	5
6	A recruitment message should be tailored to precisely describe job characteristics.	1	2	3	4	5
7	A recruitment message should describe details about career and development opportunities in the organization.	1	2	3	4	5
8	General recruitment messages often do not reveal the realities of working for an organization.	1	2	3	4	5

	Recruitment Messages	Strongly Disagree			Strongly Agree	
		1	2	3	4	5
9	If key words that I am looking for are not expressed in recruitment messages, I would not be interested in the organization.	1	2	3	4	5
10	A recruitment message should reveal all aspects of the job and the organization, whether they might be desirable or undesirable.	1	2	3	4	5
11	I prefer to see a recruitment message that emphasizes the importance of relationships among employees in the organization.	1	2	3	4	5
12	I prefer to see a recruitment message that emphasizes the importance of solving problems and performing tasks in the organization.	1	2	3	4	5
13	I prefer to see a recruitment message that emphasizes that job stability is valued in the organization.	1	2	3	4	5
14	I prefer to see a recruitment message that emphasizes that job mobility and change are valued in the organization.	1	2	3	4	5
15	I prefer to see a recruitment message that reveals an organization's long term goals and vision.	1	2	3	4	5
16	I think organizational goals described in recruitment messages should have a focused and specified perspective instead of a generalized view.	1	2	3	4	5
17	I prefer to receive recruitment messages through formal meetings organized by hiring organizations.	1	2	3	4	5
18	I prefer to receive recruitment messages through informal information sources (i.e. conversation with current employees).	1	2	3	4	5
19	A recruitment message is more understandable in a written format than in a verbal format.	1	2	3	4	5
20	I prefer to receive recruitment messages in person rather than from impersonal sources (i.e. flyers, posters, and websites).	1	2	3	4	5
21	Recruitment messages delivered frequently on campus are more attractive than messages offered only once or twice a year	1	2	3	4	5
22	The frequency of recruitment messages delivered does not influence the attractiveness of an organization.	1	2	3	4	5
23	I am more interested in an organization which has recruiters personally delivering recruitment messages on campus.	1	2	3	4	5
24	The presence of recruiters on campus does not influence the attractiveness of an organization.	1	2	3	4	5
25	I am more interested in an organization which frequently delivers recruitment messages on campus through printed media (i.e. flyers, posters).	1	2	3	4	5
26	A recruitment message is more convincing when it is delivered by school alumni.	1	2	3	4	5
27	A recruitment message is more convincing when it is delivered by someone holding a high ranking position in the organization.	1	2	3	4	5
28	A recruitment message is more convincing when it is delivered by a person who has direct personal knowledge about the position.	1	2	3	4	5
29	The recruiter's status and authority in the organization does not affect whether or not a recruitment message is convincing.	1	2	3	4	5
30	A recruitment message that expresses organizational values with which I agree is more appealing to me.	1	2	3	4	5

Recruitment Messages		Strongly Disagree			Strongly Agree	
31	I do not really care whether a recruitment message expresses organizational values with which I agree.	1	2	3	4	5
32	To be effective, a recruitment message should reflect my expectations about the organization's values.	1	2	3	4	5
33	If the recruitment message does not reflect my expectations about the organization's values, I may need to adjust my original views to be more compatible with the organization.	1	2	3	4	5

3. Please indicate your level of agreement on following statements about organization attributes you like to see in an organization in which you would like to work.

Person-Organization Fit		Strongly Disagree			Strongly Agree	
1	I prefer to work in an organization that is attentive to details, precise and direct in their daily communications.	1	2	3	4	5
2	I prefer to work in an organization that is attentive to general perspectives without emphasizing details in their daily communications.	1	2	3	4	5
3	I prefer to work in an organization that relies heavily on written policies and procedures.	1	2	3	4	5
4	I prefer to work in an organization that relies heavily on oral discussions and verbal instructions.	1	2	3	4	5
5	I prefer to work in an organization where the majority of communication is transmitted through spoken words.	1	2	3	4	5
6	I prefer to work in an organization where the majority of communication is transmitted through written documents.	1	2	3	4	5
7	I prefer to work in an organization in which employees are not closely supervised by their immediate supervisors.	1	2	3	4	5
8	I prefer to work in an organization in which the difference in power among the members is not great.	1	2	3	4	5
9	I prefer to work in an organization that encourages its members to feel comfortable in unstructured situations.	1	2	3	4	5
10	I prefer to work in an organization that encourages its members to work cooperatively in groups.	1	2	3	4	5
11	I prefer to work in an organization that encourages its members to look after each other.	1	2	3	4	5
12	I prefer to work in an organization that is structured with a clear hierarchy of authority.	1	2	3	4	5
13	I prefer to work in an organization in which a clear difference in status among the members exists.	1	2	3	4	5

4. Please indicate your level of agreement on following statements about job application intention.

Job Application Intention		Strongly Disagree			Strongly Agree	
1	If an organization's values and attributes, demonstrated by its recruitment messages, did not match my own, I would not apply for a position with it.	1	2	3	4	5
2	If an organization's values and attributes did not match my own, I would still apply for a position and make myself more compatible with it.	1	2	3	4	5
3	Because of the current job market, I would apply for a position with an organization regardless of whether it matched my own values and personality.	1	2	3	4	5

5. What is your ethnicity/race (select the one that best describes you).

<input type="checkbox"/>	White
<input type="checkbox"/>	Black or African American
<input type="checkbox"/>	American Indian or Alaska Native
<input type="checkbox"/>	Asian
<input type="checkbox"/>	Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander
<input type="checkbox"/>	Some Other Races
<input type="checkbox"/>	Two or More Races

6. Which country issues you a passport for traveling (select the one that you use primarily).

<input type="checkbox"/>	The United States of America
<input type="checkbox"/>	Other *Please specify ()

7. What is your gender?

<input type="checkbox"/>	Male
<input type="checkbox"/>	Female

8. What is your year of birth? 19 _____

9. What is your major?

<input type="checkbox"/>	Hospitality & Tourism Management
<input type="checkbox"/>	Other *Please specify ()

10. What year are you in your college/university?

<input type="checkbox"/>	Freshman/1st Year
<input type="checkbox"/>	Sophomore/2nd Year
<input type="checkbox"/>	Junior/3rd Year
<input type="checkbox"/>	Senior/4th Year or more

APPENDIX D FINAL QUESTIONNAIRE (TAIWANESE VERSION)

1. 請對下面有關溝通與表達方式的陳述表達你的同意程度

	溝通與表達方式	非常不同意 非常同意				
		1	2	3	4	5
1	我比較喜歡在對話一開始的時候就知道其他人想要講什麼.	1	2	3	4	5
2	我比較喜歡間接的表達方式.	1	2	3	4	5
3	我比較喜歡用涵義明確的文字明白地傳達訊息.	1	2	3	4	5
4	我不能理解其他人別有用意的話.	1	2	3	4	5
5	我認為任何話題都可以公開討論.	1	2	3	4	5
6	我認為提到令人敏感的問題沒有什麼大不了的.	1	2	3	4	5
7	當我跟不同文化背景的人溝通的時候,我並不會只注重文字,我必需知道我要以什麼樣的溝通方式跟規則來表達.	1	2	3	4	5
8	發言的人並不應該期望和他們講話的對象可以完全理解所有的對話內容,除非他們想表達的事情是很清楚明確地陳述表達出來.	1	2	3	4	5
9	一個人想表達的概念往往和用文字表達的不太一樣.	1	2	3	4	5
10	當別人要我表達我的意見時,我比較喜歡模擬兩可地回應.	1	2	3	4	5
11	當我有一些負面消極的事情要說的時候,我會委婉的表達出來.	1	2	3	4	5
12	在溝通的時候,我能夠辨別間接細微的訊息.	1	2	3	4	5
13	儘管我沒有接收到很明確直接的回答,我還是可以理解其他人想表達的事情.	1	2	3	4	5
14	即使沒有很明確地陳述,一個人真正的意圖是很少會被誤解的.	1	2	3	4	5
15	我比較喜歡用很明確的字(例如:一定,絕對)來跟別人溝通.	1	2	3	4	5
16	我比較喜歡用模擬兩可的字(例如:大概 可能)來跟別人溝通.	1	2	3	4	5
17	我比較喜歡跟別人溝通的時候是用很明確的方式表達.	1	2	3	4	5
18	在對話的時候,輕描淡寫比講過多的細節要來的好.	1	2	3	4	5
19	我比較喜歡強調整體的概念而不是個別的細節.	1	2	3	4	5
20	當我跟人家說話的時候,我比較喜歡涵蓋所有可能發生的議題.	1	2	3	4	5
21	我比較喜歡在溝通的時候得到明確且詳細的訊息.	1	2	3	4	5

溝通與表達方式		非常不同意 非常同意				
22	我可以接受粗略大概且沒有包含很多細節的訊息.	1	2	3	4	5
23	我比較喜歡透過正式的會議來討論重要的議題.	1	2	3	4	5
24	在對話的過程中,我比較注意別人所講的內容勝於他們的肢體語言.	1	2	3	4	5
25	溝通的時候,我比較喜歡書面文字更甚於言語的表達.	1	2	3	4	5
26	我選擇的溝通管道(例如:電話, e-mail)取決於對方的身分與地位.	1	2	3	4	5
27	我比較喜歡別人說話是有根據的.	1	2	3	4	5
28	除非我跟這個人已經很熟了,不然我不會提到很多有關自己的事情.	1	2	3	4	5
29	在與人溝通的時候,我認為詳細具體的內容比粗略大概的概念更吸引人.	1	2	3	4	5
30	有些想法只能意會不能言傳.	1	2	3	4	5
31	除非一個人能用自己的方式來闡述一個概念,不然他就不算是有深思熟慮過.	1	2	3	4	5

2. 請對下面有關徵才訊息的陳述表達你的同意程度

徵才訊息		非常不同意 非常同意				
1	徵才訊息應該要很直接,詳細,且明確的陳述.	1	2	3	4	5
2	徵才訊息應該只提到跟公司有關的一般消息,並不需要提供太多的細節內容.	1	2	3	4	5
3	我沒有辦法了解一間公司,除非徵才訊息是直接且明確地被陳述出來.	1	2	3	4	5
4	我認為詳細的描述一間公司比大略的介紹來的重要.	1	2	3	4	5
5	我可以接受沒有提供很多細節的徵才訊息.	1	2	3	4	5
6	徵才訊息應該要很精確地描述工作性質.	1	2	3	4	5
7	徵才訊息應該要很明確地陳述有關公司組織內晉升與發展的機會.	1	2	3	4	5
8	一般來說,徵才訊息通常不會描述公司組織內實際工作狀況.	1	2	3	4	5
9	徵才訊息中如果沒有出現我所在意的關鍵字,我將不會對這間公司有興趣.	1	2	3	4	5

	徵才訊息	非常不同意 非常同意				
		1	2	3	4	5
10	徵才訊息應該要充分表達所有有關工作與公司組織的資訊, 不管這些資訊是不是令人嚮往滿意的.	1	2	3	4	5
11	我比較想要看到在徵才訊息中強調員工之間人際關係的重要性.	1	2	3	4	5
12	我比較想要看到在徵才訊息中強調解決問題與完成工作的重要性.	1	2	3	4	5
13	我比較想要看到在徵才訊息中強調公司組織重視工作的穩定性.	1	2	3	4	5
14	我比較想要看到在徵才訊息中強調公司組織重視工作職務的變動.	1	2	3	4	5
15	我比較想要看到在徵才訊息中有包括一間公司組織的長期目標與遠景.	1	2	3	4	5
16	在徵才訊息中應該提供一個很明確專注的組織目標, 而不只是大概的描述.	1	2	3	4	5
17	我比較喜歡經由人力聘用機構或組織所籌辦的正式活動來獲得徵才訊息.	1	2	3	4	5
18	我比較喜歡經由其他非正式的管道來獲得徵才訊息(例如: 跟在職員工閒聊).	1	2	3	4	5
19	書面文字比口頭陳述的徵才訊息更容易了解.	1	2	3	4	5
20	我比較喜歡直接面對面的方式, 而不是經由其他轉達的方式 (例如: 海報, 傳單, 網站), 來得到徵才訊息.	1	2	3	4	5
21	頻繁出現的徵才訊息會比一年只有出現一兩次的徵才訊息更吸引我的注意.	1	2	3	4	5
22	徵才訊息傳達的頻率並不會影響一間公司的吸引力.	1	2	3	4	5
23	我對有專人來校宣傳徵才訊息的公司比較有興趣.	1	2	3	4	5
24	有無專人到校宣傳徵才訊息並不會影響一間公司的吸引力.	1	2	3	4	5
25	我會對一間經常在校園用平面媒體(如海報與傳單)宣傳徵才訊息的公司有興趣.	1	2	3	4	5
26	徵才訊息若由校友來傳達更具說服力.	1	2	3	4	5
27	徵才訊息若由公司位階很高的人來傳達更具說服力.	1	2	3	4	5
28	徵才訊息若由與職務工作直接相關和了解的人來傳達更具說服力.	1	2	3	4	5
29	招募人員在公司的職務地位與職權並不會影響徵才訊息的說服力.	1	2	3	4	5
30	假如徵才訊息所表達的組織價值觀是我認同的, 那麼這間公司比較吸引我.	1	2	3	4	5
31	我並不是很在乎徵才訊息中所表達的組織價值觀是否和我相同.	1	2	3	4	5

徵才訊息		非常不同意 非常同意				
32	一個有效的徵才訊息應該要很明確地反映我對組織價值的期望.	1	2	3	4	5
33	假如徵才訊息並沒有反應我對組織價值的期望, 或許我需要調整自己的觀點使我更能夠相容於公司組織當中.	1	2	3	4	5

3. 請對下面組織特質的陳述表達你的同意程度.

個人與組織之契合度 我較喜歡在....		非常不同意 非常同意				
1	溝通上重視所有細節並很精確直接的公司工作.	1	2	3	4	5
2	溝通上重視整體性而不強調所有細節的公司工作.	1	2	3	4	5
3	重視書面規章和流程的公司工作.	1	2	3	4	5
4	重視口頭命令與討論的公司工作.	1	2	3	4	5
5	大部分經由口語傳達訊息的公司工作.	1	2	3	4	5
6	大部分經由書面文件傳達訊息的公司工作.	1	2	3	4	5
7	沒有直屬上司緊密督導的公司工作.	1	2	3	4	5
8	沒有太多職權差異的公司工作.	1	2	3	4	5
9	沒有明確指示情況下員工能感到自在的公司工作.	1	2	3	4	5
10	鼓勵小組分工合作的公司工作.	1	2	3	4	5
11	鼓勵員工相互照料的公司工作.	1	2	3	4	5
12	組織架構明確與職權劃分明確的公司工作.	1	2	3	4	5
13	有明確階級地位區分的公司工作.	1	2	3	4	5

4. 請對下面有關應徵工作意願的陳述表達你的同意程度.

應徵工作意願.		非常不同意 非常同意				
1	如果一間公司在徵才訊息中所表達的組織價值與特徵並不符合我的價值觀, 我不會應徵這份工作.	1	2	3	4	5
2	如果一間公司在徵才訊息中所表達的組織價值與特徵並不符合我的價值觀, 我還是會去應徵這份工作, 並且會試著調整自己去接受公司的組織價值與特徵.	1	2	3	4	5
3	考量現在的就業市場, 無論一間公司在徵才訊息中所表達的組織價值與特徵是否符合我的價值觀, 我都會去應徵這份工作.	1	2	3	4	5

5. 請問你的性別是?

	男性
	女性

6. 請問你在西元哪一年出生? 19____

7. 請問你在大學裡面的主修科系是?

	餐飲與旅館管理學系
	其他 *請詳述你的主修科系()
	雙主修 (餐飲與旅館管理學系是主修之一)

8. 請問你在大學裡現在是幾年級?

	大一
	大二
	大三
	大四

APPENDIX E EXPLORATORY FACTOR ANALYSIS (WITH COMBINED GROUPS)

Table 1: Context Orientation EFA Results

Rotated Component Matrix^a

	Component				
	1	2	3	4	5
CO5	.799	-.021	.020	-.152	.083
CO6	.786	-.032	.123	-.019	.082
CO9	.532	.062	.137	.454	.109
CO15	.573	.372	-.069	.026	-.015
CO26	.672	-.019	-.192	.140	.105
CO17	.059	.804	.070	.023	.201
CO21	.100	.715	.261	.088	-.019
CO3	-.057	.673	.146	.152	-.041
CO27	-.151	.036	.706	.098	.099
CO29	-.032	.198	.601	.068	.007
CO20	.274	.281	.599	-.007	.085
CO7	.014	.078	.067	.688	.048
CO8	.032	.016	.339	.636	-.170
CO11	-.049	.217	-.264	.592	.264
CO12	.143	.080	-.011	.113	.819
CO13	.105	.016	.162	-.019	.807

Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis.

Rotation Method: Varimax with Kaiser Normalization.

a. Rotation converged in 6 iterations.

Table 2: Preference for Recruitment Messages EFA Results

Rotated Component Matrix^a

	Component		
	1	2	3
RM3	.683	.061	.012
RM4	.719	.131	.120
RM6	.593	.483	.097
RM7	.567	.276	.273
RM16	.692	.083	.226
RM1	.421	.566	.097
RM27	.125	.543	.167
RM28	.084	.775	.194
RM30	.107	.698	.176
RM11	.200	.219	.570
RM12	.125	.017	.688
RM13	.172	.383	.622
RM14	-.037	.136	.687
RM15	.320	.205	.504

Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis.

Rotation Method: Varimax with Kaiser

Normalization.

a. Rotation converged in 5 iterations.

Table 3: PO Fit EFA Results

Rotated Component Matrix^a

	Component				
	1	2	3	4	5
PO3	.783	-.078	.067	-.007	-.125
PO6	.667	-.040	.265	-.293	.080
PO12	.565	.359	-.379	.115	.206
PO13	.689	.150	-.360	.118	.085
PO10	.101	.811	.071	.124	-.070
PO11	-.004	.862	.093	.023	-.053
PO7	.101	.077	.653	.094	.315
PO8	-.034	.061	.801	.040	-.042
PO9	-.142	.462	.553	.108	.005
PO4	.098	.120	.081	.782	-.166
PO5	-.155	.052	.064	.838	.160
PO1	.326	.313	.162	.242	-.618
PO2	.188	.014	.239	.090	.793

Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis.

Rotation Method: Varimax with Kaiser Normalization.

a. Rotation converged in 11 iterations.

APPENDIX F EXPLORATORY FACTOR ANALYSIS (WITH US GROUP)

Table 1: Context Orientation EFA Results

Rotated Component Matrix^a

	Component					
	1	2	3	4	5	6
CO17	.787	.052	.263	-.042	.105	.031
CO21	.749	.138	-.058	.109	.117	.002
CO3	.686	.101	-.015	.130	.049	.297
CO11	.059	.737	.111	.017	-.222	.038
CO7	.126	.695	.125	-.020	.119	.102
CO8	.132	.555	-.184	.061	.442	-.117
CO12	.058	.188	.819	.009	-.085	-.012
CO13	.065	-.030	.785	.059	.199	-.010
CO6	-.026	.119	.067	.853	.157	-.038
CO5	.216	-.108	.002	.798	-.156	.131
CO23	.286	.012	.009	-.011	.696	-.003
CO27	-.045	-.022	.190	.017	.693	.314
CO28	.034	-.108	-.004	.016	.155	.745
CO1	.223	.271	-.027	.063	.000	.725

Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis.

Rotation Method: Varimax with Kaiser Normalization.

a. Rotation converged in 6 iterations.

Table 2: Preference for Recruitment Messages EFA Results

Rotated Component Matrix^a

	Component		
	1	2	3
RM4	.677	-.028	.268
RM3	.662	.081	-.066
RM1	.648	.244	-.095
RM6	.641	.137	.284
RM7	.618	.279	.268
RM16	.557	.116	.232
RM13	.186	.810	-.074
RM28	.068	.652	.101
RM27	.229	.527	.243
RM11	.130	.513	.312
RM10	.215	.055	.722
RM32	.161	.093	.613
RM12	-.037	.366	.526

Extraction Method: Principal Component

Analysis.

Rotation Method: Varimax with Kaiser

Normalization.

a. Rotation converged in 5 iterations.

Table 3: PO Fit EFA Results

Rotated Component Matrix^a

	Component	
	1	2
PO11	.834	-.044
PO10	.750	.184
PO9	.684	.076
PO5	.006	.865
PO4	.155	.850

Extraction Method: Principal

Component Analysis.

Rotation Method: Varimax with

Kaiser Normalization.

a. Rotation converged in 3 iterations.



DATE: February 10, 2009

MEMORANDUM

TO: Suzanne K. Murrmann
Chih-Lun Yen

FROM: David M. Moore

SUBJECT: **IRB Exempt Approval:** "The Impact of Culture on Recruitment in the Hospitality Industry", IRB # 09-046

I have reviewed your request to the IRB for exemption for the above referenced project. The research falls within the exempt status. Approval is granted effective as of February 10, 2009.

As an investigator of human subjects, your responsibilities include the following:

1. Report promptly proposed changes in the research protocol. The proposed changes must not be initiated without IRB review and approval, except where necessary to eliminate apparent immediate hazards to the subjects.
2. Report promptly to the IRB any injuries or other unanticipated or adverse events involving risks or harms to human research subjects or others.

cc: File