

The Impact of Person-Organization Fit on Employee Attitudes  
in the Hospitality Industry\*

Mustafa Tepeci

Celal Bayar University

Received (in revised form): November 2010

---

**Abstract**

The purpose of this study is to investigate whether person-organization (P-O) fit contributes to the explanations of employee job satisfaction and intent to remain with the organization beyond that explained by perceived organizational culture and preferred culture (individual values) in the hospitality industry in Turkey. The data were collected from 174 junior and senior hospitality and tourism management students by a self-administrated survey. Factor analysis yielded a seven-factor perceived and preferred organizational culture dimensions. The proposed Attention to Detail factor did not emerge as a perceived culture dimension, and Fair Compensation factor did not emerge as an individual value dimension. The results indicate that, for job satisfaction, individual and organizational value factor dimensions explained %25 percent of the variance. Addition of the calculated P-O fit (correlation between individual and organizational value profiles, i.e., Q) into the regression equation increased the explained variance by 2%. For, intent to remain, individual and organizational characteristics explained %27.5 of the variance; adding the calculated (the sum of absolute value of the differences, |D|, or the sum of squared differences,  $D^2$ ) and perceived P-O fit scores into the equation increased the explained variance further for all three measures of fit. The results advance our understanding of person-organization fit and possible applications to the industry.

**Keywords:** person-organization fit, job satisfaction, intent to remain, culture, values.

---

**INTRODUCTION**

Employee attitudes and their behavioral intentions are directly related to their demonstrated behaviors (Chatman, 1991; Harter et al., 2002). That is, satisfied employees were likely to stay with their organization and contribute to its financial performance and that employees' "intent to quit," predicted actual turnover behavior. Employee attitudes and intentions have impacts on employee effectiveness, customer satisfaction and organizational performance (Heskett et al., 1994; Ostroff, 1992). Further, Schneider et al. (2003) found that job satisfaction predicted return on asset and earnings per share. Therefore, understanding the critical factors that shape employees' attitudes and behavioral

---

\* An earlier version of this manuscript has been presented at the sixth International Conference on Business, Management, and Economics, October 07–09 2010, Çeşme, Izmir, TURKEY.

intentions could provide a valuable competitive advantage for hospitality and tourism industry managers.

It has been widely recognized that employees play a major role for the success of operations in the hospitality industry, but the factors that influence employee attitudes have not been investigated in detail. Although there are several studies conducted for employee satisfaction and behavioral intentions in the hospitality industry (Pavesic & Brymer, 1990; Pizam & Neumann, 1988), they were outdated and had some limitations for generalizability. Besides, the most of the studies that have been conducted were limited to the evaluation of either individual-level or organization-level factors, whereas an increasing number of recent research findings offer a better understanding of employee satisfaction and behavioral intentions by inquiring the combined effect of individual and organizational elements (Hoffman and Woehr, 2006; Ostroff et al., 2005).

Organizational researchers have long been trying to explain employee attitudes and behaviors in terms of either organizational or individual characteristics. That is, either the person or the situation has the greatest impact on attitudes and behaviors (Chatman 1991; Kristof, 1996). The organizational perspective emphasizes measurement of the environment as a method of predicting attitudes and behaviors. Individual characteristics researchers state that such individual characteristics as personality traits, norms, values and beliefs affect attitudes and actions across situations and over time (Staw et al., 1986).

However, many researchers agree that neither perspective sufficiently explains behavior in organizations (House et al., 1996; Schneider et al., 1995). These authors believe that behavior in organizations cannot be explained either in terms of variance accounted for dispositional or situational variables alone. The need for a full understanding of the relationship between individuals and their organizations created interest in the integration of individual and organizational theories. This integration, the interactional perspective, suggests that individuals' behavior is a function of personal attributes and situational attributes in interaction (Schneider et al., 1995). This approach emphasizes the reciprocal relationship between people and situations and the subsequent consequences of their behavior; persons are not only influenced by situations, but they actively change them. In sum, most organizational researchers were convinced that the complex interaction between features of the organizational context and characteristics of individuals helps us understand behaviors better in organizations. Research oriented this way has evolved into an interactional perspective based on a person-organization (P-O) fit (Chatman, 1991; Kristof, 1996; O'Reilly et al., 1991).

Theories of person-environment fit and interactional research have been prevalent in the management literature for almost 100 years in the West (Lewin, 1936). However, very few and limited studies were conducted in the area of P-O fit in Turkey (Arbak ve Özmen, 2000; Sığrı, 2007; Yahyagil, 2005) and obviously more studies are needed for better understanding of the impacts of P-O fit on employees and organizations. Therefore, the purpose of this study is to investigate whether P-O fit contributes to the explanations of employee job satisfaction and intent to remain with the organization in the hospitality industry in Turkey. More importantly, the study examines whether P-O fit contributes to explanations of employee job satisfaction and intent to remain beyond that explained by organizational culture and individual values.

## PERSON-ORGANIZATION FIT

The concept of P-O fit has not been clearly defined because of its multiple conceptualizations and operationalizations; therefore, most researchers broadly define P-O fit as the compatibility (match or congruence) between individuals and organizations (Kristof, 1996); compatibility occurs when: a) at least one entity provides what the other needs, or b) they share similar fundamental characteristics, or c) both (p.4).

Powell (1998) discusses the different perspectives of P-O fit. One is the "reinforcing fit" that develops the firm's existing strengths. The second, "extending fit," favors organizational diversity to extend the range of the firm's strengths. When the selection process achieves P-O fit, the result is a strong organizational culture and cohesive workforce. However, high cohesiveness has its limitations such as conformity, homogeneity, and lowered innovation. Therefore, Powell points out that both reinforcing fit and extending fit may be appropriate for the selection process. Bretz et al., (1989) investigated whether the match between internal needs and external environments drives the organizational choice process and whether the people attracted to particular organizations are more homogenous than the applicant pool in general. The study found that the people attracted to the different organizations were substantially similar. Differences were found in need for achievement between the groups of subjects attracted to two organizations. The authors suggested further study of the homogeneity question.

P-O fit is interactional in nature because it takes into account both situational and personal factors (Chatman, 1991). Situational (environmental) factors are attributes of the work setting. These factors are external to the employee in that the employee is placed in the midst of these influences. On the other hand, personal factors are what a person brings to the work setting. These factors, such as predispositions, knowledge, skills, and past experiences, are internal to the person. There are a number of reactions or responses that are not inherent in either the person or the situation, but are a result of the reciprocal interaction between these parts. Therefore, individual attitudes and behaviors and organizational outcomes may be a result of P-O fit.

Person-organization fit has been operationalized in several ways including value congruence (Chatman, 1989, 1991; O'Reilly et al., 1991), goal congruence (Vancouver & Schmitt, 1991), the match between the employee's needs (and preferences) and reinforces available in the work environment (Cable & Judge, 1994), and the match between the personality of the individual and the culture of the organization (Bowen, Ledford, & Nathan, 1991).

Most of the researchers use value congruence as the operationalization of P-O fit because values are fundamental and steady characteristics of both individuals and organizations (Chatman, 1991), and value congruence of fit were more strongly related to individual outcomes than other operationalization of fit (Verquer et al., 2003).

Thus, P-O fit is defined as congruence between the values of organizations (their culture) and the values of individuals (Chatman, 1991; Jung et al., 2010). Values—for people and organizations—are generalized ideological justifications both for appropriate behaviors and for the activities and functions of the organizational system (Chatman, 1991). Schneider, Goldstein and Smith (1995) assert that individuals tend to achieve and maintain correspondence with their organization, and organizations use organizational entry and

socialization practices to contribute to P-O fit. Correspondence or match between the employee's values and the organization's value system represents a measure of P-O fit, and this correspondence or match can predict behavior and performance in organizations.

### **Measurement of Person-Organization Fit**

Human behavior is not a simple process drawing from heredity and environment; rather behavior is a dynamic blending of the person's various attributes (e.g., heredity and learned factors), and an array of environmental elements (e.g., work tasks and climate). Therefore, Chatman (1989) suggests that in order to predict behavior one must possess knowledge of both characteristics of persons and characteristics of situations. Thus, describing both person and organization with the same content dimensions is recommended for assessing fit (Kristof, 1996). However, previous interactional studies resulted in a situation in which people were described with one language, and situations were described with a totally different language. O'Reilly et al. (1991) developed an instrument, the organizational culture profile (OCP) that represents both the individual and the situation in the same conceptual dimensions. Karren and Graves (1994) suggest that techniques for assessing P-O fit should provide comprehensive measures of persons and organizations on commensurate dimensions. They should be resilient to systematic and unsystematic error. The OCP is demonstrated to be covering core values of individuals and organizations and successfully represents both individuals and organizations (Kristof, 1996).

To assess correspondence or match between individuals and organizations, researchers need to use "commensurate measurement" that utilizes a common standard or measure of both (Chatman, 1991; Kristof, 1996). There are several P-O fit instruments to assess value congruence including the organizational culture profile (OCP; O'Reilly et al., 1991), the comparative emphasis scale (CES; Meglino et al., 1989), and the organizational values congruence scale (OVCS; Enz, 1988). These instruments operationalize organizational culture as respondents' perception of the extent to which a set of value dimensions exist in their current organization. Then, to enable comparisons, they assess individual values by asking whether the same dimensions would exist in respondents' "ideal or preferred" organization.

Tepeci (2001) developed the Hospitality Industry Culture Profile (HICP) to assess work values in the hospitality industry by using the OCP. To correctly assess hospitality industry employees' values and to further decrease the number of items in the questionnaire, Tepeci conducted three sets of pilot studies. These studies resulted with the Hospitality Industry Culture Profile (HICP) that includes 36 value items to measure 9 organizational culture and individual value dimensions in the hospitality industry. These dimensions include (1) honesty orientation (2) people orientation, (3) attention to detail, (4) valuing customers, (5) innovation, (6) fair compensation, (7) employee development, (8) team orientation and (9) results orientation. Although in Tepeci (2001) study Fair Compensation and Employee Development factors proposed as two separate factors, they combined together to form a factor structure as happened with Honesty Orientation and People Orientation factors. In Tepeci (2002) study, Team Orientation and People Orientation combined together to form a joint factor structure again, and resulting a 8-factor structure for organizational culture.

The adaptation of the HICP instrument to Turkish was detailed in Tepeci (2005; 2010). These studies report that the Turkish version of HICP instrument psychometrically similar to the original English version of the scale with similar factor structures for both organizational and individual values. Organizational culture and individual value factor dimensions significantly predicted individual outcomes across languages (Tepeci, 2001; 2002; 2010). Thus, providing justifications to use the assessment of person-organization fit in the hospitality and tourism industry.

Researchers have operationalized and measured P-O fit as a complex and multidimensional concept. As a result, several different conceptualization and measurement of P-O fit have evolved: (1) direct (perceived) and indirect (calculated) fit, (2) individual and cross-level measures of indirect fit, and (3) alternative methods for calculating indirect fit (Tepeci, 2009).

### **Direct and indirect fit**

Direct (or perceived) measurement involves asking people whether they believe that a good fit exist. Using this subjective or perceived fit conceptualization, good fit is said to exist if it is perceived to exist, regardless of whether or not the person has similar characteristics to organization. Employees' direct measures of P-O fit perceptions significantly predicted individual attitudes and behaviors (Cable & Judge, 1996). Further, perceived fit has been shown to influence the evaluation of job applicants, even when actual fit was calculated by a comparison of individual and organizational values showed no influence (Cable & Judge, 1996).

The use of direct fit measurement has been criticized by several researchers (Kristof, 1996; Edwards, 2008) at least for two reasons: (1) if the value characteristics to be considered are not explicitly described, one cannot be sure that commensurate dimensions are being compared; and (2) direct measurement of fit as a predictor of employee attitudes may lead to a consistency bias (for example, "I think that I fit well, so I must stay in this organization").

Because of the shortcomings mentioned, most P-O fit research use indirect measurement instruments like the OCP to assess objective or calculated fit (Cable & Judge, 1996, 1997; Chatman, 1991; O'Reilly et al., 1991; Yahyagil, 2005). Indirect measures of fit use commensurate measurement—separate rankings for perceived (or existing) and preferred (or desired) culture using the same value-items. Perceived and preferred organizational values are then compared. Cable and Judge (1996, 1997) found that the correlation between employees' perceived fit with their calculated P-O fit was relatively small in two separate studies ( $r = .26, p < .01$ ;  $r = .25, p < .01$ ). Enz (1988) also reports only a moderate correlation ( $r = .37, p < .05$ ) between perceived fit and calculated fit.

### **Individual-level and cross-level indirect fit**

Individual-level fit involves individuals' assessments of their own values compared to these same individuals' perceptions of what is valued in the organization. Thus, calculation of individual-level indirect fit relies on the individual as the unit of analysis. In

individual-level measurement of actual fit, the organization construct is no longer verifiable organizational characteristics (Kristof, 1996, p.14).

Cross-level fit aggregates employee perceptions of the organization to form the organizational profile, and compares individual employee's preferred values to this aggregate. In cross-level studies organizational characteristics are assumed to be homogenous. For the aggregate to be used, however, interrater reliability between individual responses must be equal or higher than .70 (Chatman, 1991).

Kristof (1996) states that the use of aggregated scores for the measurement of calculated P-O fit may be more valid because when variables are measured by perceptions, an aggregate is more likely to approach an objective "reality" of the organizational characteristics. On the other hand, Nisbett and Ross (1980) claim individual-level measurement is appropriate because people's perceptions of reality drive their cognitive appraisals of and reactions to specific situations. Further, Kristof (1996) suggests individual-level fit may have a stronger effect on individual outcome variables than would a fit with the organization's aggregate because individual-level differences are more real for the individual.

### **Alternative methods of calculating indirect fit**

At the individual-level and cross-level, fit can be calculated at least four ways: (1) difference scores, (2) correlations between individual and organizational value items (profiles), (3) polynomial regression and (4) structural equation modeling (Cheung, 2009; Kristof, 1996). In the difference score method, the arithmetic difference between perceived and preferred value ratings is calculated for each of the commensurate value items. P-O fit is then calculated as the sum of differences ( $D^1$ ), the sum of absolute value of the differences ( $|DI|$ ), or the sum of squared differences ( $D^2$ ).  $D^1$  distinguishes between positive and negative differences, but when summed the positive and negative values offset each other.  $|DI|$  assigns equal weight to differences regardless of direction so the sum is more meaningful.  $D^2$  is also nondirectional (because all squares are positive) but also assigns greater weight to differences of larger magnitude (Tepeci, 2009).

An alternative to difference scores, the correlation between individual and organizational profiles known as the Q score has also been widely used in P-O fit research (Cable & Judge, 1996, 1997; Chatman, 1991; O'Reilly et al., 1991). Because individuals have indicated their perception of and preference for the same value-items, the Q method computes a correlation of each individual's scores on these paired responses. Cable and Judge (1996) claim correlation provides a conservative estimate of P-O fit and is more interpretable than difference scores because correlation represents similarity in profile distributions. Edwards (1994), on the other hand, claims the correlation method shares many of the shortcomings of difference scores (concealing the contribution of individual differences to the overall P-O fit score, low reliability, and inability to explain additional variance).

Edwards (1993, 1994) suggested using polynomial regression to assess the relative effect of person (P), organization (O), and fit. In this method, the outcome is regressed on P and O, and the P x O interaction term serves as the measure of fit. Cheung (2009) criticized the use of polynomial regression (PR) analysis in congruence research because PR

examines the joint effect of the components rather than the congruence construct itself. Kristof-Brown et al. (2005) found that only about 20 % of P-O fit research has used PR method since its introduction in 1993 by Edwards. Cheung developed a structural equation modeling-based latent congruence model (LCM) that can resolve the problems associated with previous calculation methods of P-O fit. LCM provides a framework for conducting both congruence and component analysis.

Despite the critics to summing difference scores as a measure of fit, Tisak and Smith (1994) suggest that assessment of fit should include multiple value dimensions. Since several aspects of organizations and individuals influence attitudes and behaviors, overall P-O fit is more meaningful than fit on each value dimension independently. Tisak and Smith further argue that difference scores capture something conceptually different from their component variables, and can explain more variance than individual and organizational component measures.

The method of calculating fit had differential effects on the relationship between P-O fit and attitudinal outcomes. Correlations were more strongly associated with satisfaction, organizational commitment, and turnover intentions than did difference scores on the relationship between P-O fit and the outcomes (Verquer et al., 2003).

### **Outcomes of Person-Organization Fit**

Several studies found a relationship between P-O fit and individual and organizational outcomes. Verquer et al., (2003) meta-analytically investigated the relationship between P-O fit and attitudinal outcomes and found that P-O fit was related to intent to quit, job satisfaction, and organizational commitment. Verquer et al. found (overall) mean correlations for P-O fit with satisfaction .25, commitment .27, and intent to turnover -.18. The strongest average correlations were between subjective measures of fit and the outcomes (.61 for job satisfaction, .59 for organizational commitment, and -.58 for intention to turnover). Subjective experiences are more likely to affect employees' reactions than objective reality in terms of individual outcomes.

In Hoffman and Woehr (2006) study, P-O fit was moderately related to behavioral outcomes including turnover (.26), task performance (.26), and Organizational Citizenship Behavior (.21). Subjective measures were weakly related to behavioral outcomes (.17), while perceived and objective fit measures were moderately related to behavioral outcomes (.27 and .28, respectively). The definition of fit does not generally moderates fit-outcome relationships; the relationship between value congruence and outcomes (.26) is slightly larger than the relationship between other forms of fit collapsed across outcomes (.24) (Hoffman and Woehr, 2006).

Ostroff et al. (2005) investigated relationships between employee attitudes and multiple types of value congruence—P-O fit, person-person (P-P) or individual level indirect fit, and perceptual fit. The study findings are as follow: (1) Fit is important for understanding attitudes of employees. (2) The set of congruence terms for each type of fit accounts for more variance in satisfaction and commitment than turnover intentions. (3) Both P-O fit and perceptual fit were related to attitudes, while P-P fit was not. (4) Value congruence is most strongly related to attitudes for subjective P-O fit, highlighting the importance of an individual's own perception of how well (s) he fits in with the work

environment. (5) Relationships between types of fit and attitudes differ depending on the hierarchical level or subculture investigated (manager or peers) as well as on the underlying dimensions of values being investigated. Value fit is particularly important for the rational goal dimension—a dimension that focuses largely on external customer service. (6) When congruence effects were found, the functional form indicated that congruence at higher levels of values is associated with higher employee attitudes than congruence at lower levels, supporting the notion of value importance.

In a meta analysis study, Kristof-Brown et al. (2005) found that P-O fit had strong correlations with job satisfaction (.44) and organizational commitment (.51), and more moderate for intent to quit (-.35). The relationships between P-O fit and other attitudes were moderate: .39 with coworker satisfaction, .33 with supervisor satisfaction, .43 with the employees' trust in their managers. The correlation with organizational satisfaction was substantially higher, .65. P-O fit had low correlations with overall job performance (.07) and task performance (.13), but moderate correlations with contextual performance (.27).

Tepeci (2001: 88, 92) found that both individual and cross level calculated P-O fit significantly explained employee job satisfaction, intent to remain and willing to recommend the organization to others in table-service restaurants in the US. Fit measured by perceptual level had more impact on employee attitudes than did calculated fit measures. Tepeci and Bartlett (2002: 165) reported similar results, but this time higher levels of variance explained on the same dependent variables with a hospitality management student sample in a northeastern university in the US. It would be interesting to test and compare these results in another country setting, such as Turkey.

## **METHODOLOGY**

### **Sample and Data Collection**

The data were collected from 174 junior and senior hospitality and tourism management students in the School of Tourism and Hotel Management, in a southeastern university in Turkey. The majority of the students were single (%98,9) and in the ages of between 21 to 24 (mean 22,7). Over two-thirds of the respondents (72%) were male, 28% of the sample were female. The students had hospitality and tourism industry work experience as a requirement of the major. The students worked about 4 years in the hospitality and tourism industry on average and 1 year with their current employers. The questionnaire was distributed and collected in class which took about 10 to 15 minutes of the students' time. Participants were asked to fill out the survey for their current job or for the latest job they had.

### **Measures**

#### **Dependent variables**

Job satisfaction- Job satisfaction was measured using a three-item global satisfaction scale adapted from Tepeci and Bartlett (2002). An example is "I am satisfied with my job." Participants were asked to indicate the extent to which they agreed with the three

statements by using a 5-point likert-type scale. Cronbach's alpha for 3-item overall job satisfaction was .6409. Elimination of the "In general, I do not like working here" item from the overall satisfaction scale increased the scale reliability to .6978.

Intent to remain- Three items intent-to-remain with the organization scale was adapted from Tepeci and Bartlett (2002). An example is "If I were to have my own way, I would be working for this organization three years from now." Participants were asked to indicate the extent to which they agreed with the three statements by using a 5-point likert-type scale. Reliability calculations with items deleted justified elimination of one item from the intent to remain scale, increasing the scale reliability from .7684 to .8031.

### **Independent variables**

This study used the adapted (Turkish) version of the Hospitality Industry Culture Profile (HICP) instrument developed by Tepeci (2001) in the US. As it was detailed in Tepeci (2005) adaptation study, the culture part of the instrument has compatible factor dimensions with the original instrument. The desired culture part of the instrument also measures the similar individual value dimensions with the original instrument used in the US. Dimensions of organizational culture and desired culture (individual values) determined by factor analysis of the 36-value-items, and calculated and perceived fit scores will be used in the regression analysis as independent variables to predict employee job satisfaction and intent to remain.

Calculated P-O fit was assessed using difference scores and correlations of organizational and individual value profiles. In other words, the sum of absolute value of the differences ( $|DI|$ ), the sum of squared differences ( $D^2$ ) and the correlation between individual and organizational profiles known as the Q score were utilized. Perceived P-O fit measured with an adapted version of the three-item 7-point Likert type scale developed by Cable and Judge (1996).

Demographic and organizational variables included gender, age, marital status, industry and organizational tenure, number of hours worked per week, industry segment, and department employed.

## **ANALYSIS AND RESULTS**

### **Factor Analysis of Perceived and Preferred Culture**

Factor analyses were conducted for both 36 perceived (culture) and preferred culture (individual values) items separately, and 7 factor dimensions were emerged in both analysis (see Tepeci, 2010 for detailed factor analysis tables). Table 1 is provided here to make comparisons with the perceived and preferred organizational culture dimensions. The close examination of organizational and individual value factor structures indicates that there are slight differences for the compatibility of factor structures of organizations and individuals. While Attention to Detail factor did not emerge for the organizational culture, Fair Compensation factor was not formed for the individual values. In the original HICP all proposed 9 organizational and individual value factor dimensions were emerged (though four dimensions were combined to form 2 factors, thus formed 7 factors for both) (Tepeci, 2001).

In both factor analyses, over two-thirds of the variance among the data were explained and 26 (individual values) and 27 (organizational culture) of 36 items loaded on proposed factor dimensions. The factor dimensions demonstrated fairly good internal consistencies for both individual and organizational values. Honesty and People Orientation dimension emerged the most important factor in both analyses. Obviously, more studies are needed to evaluate the usefulness of the adapted version of HICP instrument in P-O fit research.

Table 1 Seven Perceived and Preferred Culture Dimensions Identified in the Study

| <u>Perceived Culture Dimensions</u> <sup>1</sup> | <u>Preferred Culture Dimensions</u> <sup>2</sup> |
|--------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------|
| (1) Honesty and people orientation <sup>3</sup>  | (1) Honesty and people orientation <sup>3</sup>  |
| (2) Team orientation                             | (2) Team orientation                             |
| (3) Innovation                                   | (3) Innovation                                   |
| (4) Valuing customers                            | (4) Valuing customers                            |
| (5) Employee development                         | (5) Employee development                         |
| (6) Fair Compensation                            |                                                  |
| (7) Results orientation                          | (6) Results orientation                          |
|                                                  | 7) Attention to detail                           |

<sup>1</sup>Attention to detail items were not loaded together to constitute Attention to detail factor. <sup>2</sup>Fair Compensation items were not loaded together to compose Fair Compensation factor. <sup>3</sup> While Honesty and People orientation factors were expected to emerge separately, they combined together in perceived and preferred culture.

### Calculation of Person-Organization Fit

P-O fit is calculated four different ways in this study. (1) the sum of absolute value of the differences (|DI|), (2) the sum of squared differences ( $D^2$ ), (3) the correlation between individual and organizational profiles, the Q score and (4) direct (or perceived) P-O fit. Table 2 reports means, standard deviations, and minimum and maximum values for each of the P-O fit measures.

Table 2 Descriptive Statistics for Person-Organization Fit Scores

|                    | DI    | $D^2$  | Q    | Perceived Fit |
|--------------------|-------|--------|------|---------------|
| Mean               | 67.50 | 271.79 | .18  | 3.63          |
| Standard deviation | 36.66 | 316.62 | .16  | 1.39          |
| Minimum            | 2     | 10     | -.30 | 1             |
| Maximum            | 178   | 3661   | .68  | 7             |

For |DI| and  $D^2$  smaller numbers indicate greater fit.

The direct or perceived fit was assessed by a three-item scale from the survey. The internal consistency reliability of the three-item perceived fit scale was .74. The responses to the three items were averaged to obtain a composite score for perceived fit. The mean perceived fit scores of 3.63 in the sample indicating (student) employees perceive lower levels of fit than neutral point of four in a 7-point Likert type scale with their organizations.

Indirect P-O fit was calculated three ways (i.e.,  $|DI|$ ,  $D^2$  and  $Q$ ) at the individual level. For  $|DI|$  and  $D^2$ , larger numbers indicate lower fit, while for  $Q$  larger numbers indicate higher fit. Squaring the differences before summing led to large differences between the  $|DI|$  and  $D^2$  fit scores. Minimum and maximum values of fit are also provided in the table to show the range or how the largest and smallest values differ.

### Correlations Among Variables in the Study

Table 3 indicates correlation matrices of all twenty-four variables (4 demographics, 7 perceived culture and 7 ideal culture dimensions, 4 P-O fit scores, and 2 dependent variables) with one another. Correlations indicate both the strength and the direction of the relationship between variables. For example, job satisfaction and intent to remain are moderately and positively correlated (.60). That is, high values on job satisfaction are associated with moderately high values on employees' intent to remain. Because larger  $|DI|$  and  $D^2$  values indicate a lower degree of fit, however, the relationships between these two measures and the other variables are interpreted in reverse in the analysis. For example, the -.48 correlation between  $|DI|$  and intent to remain is actually a positive association.

In general, demographic variables are not significantly correlated with the dependent variables in this study. Only demographic variable of organizational tenure significantly ( $p < .05$ ), but in a small scale ( $r = .19$ ), correlated with intent to remain. The relationships among the different measures of P-O fit reveal important results since limited studies are reported these relationships together. Because  $|DI|$  and  $D^2$  are derivations of the same numbers, the correlation between them is moderately high ( $r = .59$ ). P-O fit calculated by the  $Q$  method had no significant correlations with  $|DI|$  and  $D^2$  ( $p > .05$ ).

Perceived fit correlated low to moderately with  $|DI|$  ( $r = -.44$ ,  $p < .01$ ) and  $D^2$  ( $r = .25$ ,  $p < .01$ ), but did not significantly correlated with  $Q$  ( $r = .04$ ,  $p > .05$ ). Cable and Judge (1996, 1997) found a limited correlation between perceived fit and the  $Q$  measurement of calculated fit ( $r = .26$ ,  $p < .01$ ;  $r = .25$ ,  $p < .01$  respectively). Enz (1988) used the  $|DI|$  method to calculate P-O fit and found a correlation of .37 between perceived and calculated fit ( $p < .05$ ). The findings of  $Q$  method had no significant correlations with  $|DI|$  and  $D^2$  and no significant correlations with perceived fit and  $Q$  in this study indicate a continuing question about the relationship of perceived and calculated fit.

The correlation between P-O fit scores and dependent variables provide interesting insight.  $|DI|$  is low to moderately correlated with job satisfaction ( $r = -.25$ ,  $p < .01$ ) and intent to remain ( $r = -.48$ ,  $p < .01$ ).  $D^2$  did not significantly correlated with job satisfaction, but the correlation between  $D^2$  and intent to remain was significant ( $r = -.40$ ,  $p < .01$ ). There was no significant relationship between  $Q$  method of calculated fit with the dependent variables. Thus, the  $Q$  method did not provide meaningful prediction about P-O fit. Perceived P-O fit again was low to moderately correlated with job satisfaction ( $r = .21$ ,  $p < .01$ ) and intent to remain ( $r = .43$ ,  $p < .01$ ).

Table 3 - Correlations Among Demographics, Perceived and Ideal Culture, P-O fit and Dependent Variables

|                     | 1    | 2   | 3    | 4    | 5    | 6    | 7    | 8    | 9    | 10   | 11   | 12  | 13  | 14  | 15  | 16  | 17  | 18  | 19   | 20   | 21  | 22  | 23  | 24 |
|---------------------|------|-----|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|------|------|-----|-----|-----|----|
| 1.Age               | —    |     |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |      |      |     |     |     |    |
| 2.Organiz. tenure   | .04  | —   |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |      |      |     |     |     |    |
| 3.Indust. tenure    | .06  | .28 | —    |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |      |      |     |     |     |    |
| 4.Work hours        | .09  | .10 | .02  | —    |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |      |      |     |     |     |    |
| 5.People Honesty    | -.09 | .13 | .06  | .11  | —    |      |      |      |      |      |      |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |      |      |     |     |     |    |
| 6.Team Orientation  | -.06 | .19 | .09  | -.16 | .53  | —    |      |      |      |      |      |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |      |      |     |     |     |    |
| 7.Innovation        | -.05 | .06 | .13  | .04  | .51  | .41  | —    |      |      |      |      |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |      |      |     |     |     |    |
| 8.Service Quality   | -.19 | .14 | .06  | .00  | .63  | .52  | .44  | —    |      |      |      |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |      |      |     |     |     |    |
| 9.Emp. Develop      | .09  | .03 | .09  | -.25 | .48  | .40  | .49  | .34  | —    |      |      |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |      |      |     |     |     |    |
| 10.Fair Compensa    | .07  | .07 | -.10 | .04  | .54  | .35  | .32  | .34  | .31  | —    |      |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |      |      |     |     |     |    |
| 11.Result Orient.   | .05  | .16 | .04  | -.08 | .56  | .59  | .45  | .57  | .35  | .32  | —    |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |      |      |     |     |     |    |
| 12.IdHonesty Peop   | .03  | .00 | -.11 | -.08 | .10  | .10  | .05  | .13  | .09  | .05  | .27  | —   |     |     |     |     |     |     |      |      |     |     |     |    |
| 13.IdServqual       | .08  | .08 | .04  | -.08 | .21  | .29  | .05  | .25  | .15  | .10  | .31  | .50 | —   |     |     |     |     |     |      |      |     |     |     |    |
| 14.IdEmp.Develop    | .08  | .00 | -.14 | -.08 | .06  | .04  | .13  | .03  | .08  | .07  | .05  | .45 | .19 | —   |     |     |     |     |      |      |     |     |     |    |
| 15.IdAtten.Detail   | .08  | .01 | .08  | -.06 | .15  | .17  | .19  | .15  | .04  | .13  | .19  | .27 | .53 | .06 | —   |     |     |     |      |      |     |     |     |    |
| 16.IdTeam Orient.   | .03  | .02 | .09  | -.09 | .04  | .09  | .05  | .07  | .08  | .01  | .13  | .50 | .46 | .32 | .40 | —   |     |     |      |      |     |     |     |    |
| 17.IdInnovation     | .01  | .15 | .06  | -.10 | .02  | .11  | .01  | .09  | .03  | .10  | .23  | .42 | .51 | .34 | .37 | .48 | —   |     |      |      |     |     |     |    |
| 18.IdResult Orient. | .00  | .18 | .12  | .03  | .16  | .28  | .11  | .14  | .05  | .13  | .29  | .28 | .38 | .10 | .39 | .32 | .35 | —   |      |      |     |     |     |    |
| 19. IDI             | .12  | .14 | .07  | .10  | -.79 | -.64 | -.68 | -.67 | -.59 | -.52 | -.57 | .24 | .09 | .23 | .08 | .22 | .20 | .02 | —    |      |     |     |     |    |
| 20. D <sup>2</sup>  | .07  | .08 | .11  | .05  | -.42 | -.37 | -.39 | -.38 | -.28 | -.26 | -.32 | .05 | .05 | .07 | .02 | .07 | .06 | .00 | .59  | —    |     |     |     |    |
| 21. Q               | .19  | .08 | .02  | .04  | .07  | .02  | .03  | -.10 | .00  | .01  | .06  | .05 | .06 | .11 | .07 | .05 | .03 | .13 | .06  | .00  | —   |     |     |    |
| 22.Perceived fit    | .01  | .16 | .04  | .05  | .38  | .45  | .23  | .32  | .24  | .21  | .27  | .04 | .00 | .07 | .08 | .07 | .04 | .03 | -.44 | -.25 | .04 | —   |     |    |
| 23.Satisfaction     | .05  | .15 | .03  | .07  | .33  | .33  | .13  | .27  | .25  | .18  | .29  | .10 | .30 | .07 | .23 | .11 | .22 | .03 | -.25 | -.13 | .11 | .22 | —   |    |
| 24.Intent to Remain | -.11 | .19 | .10  | .04  | .50  | .36  | .28  | .41  | .36  | .26  | .29  | .00 | .15 | .00 | .11 | .03 | .04 | .04 | -.48 | -.40 | .00 | .43 | .60 | —  |

Correlations greater than .21 are significant at the 0.01 level and those greater than .15 are significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

### Regression Analysis

The purpose of this study was to ascertain whether P-O fit contributes to the explanations of employee job satisfaction and intent to remain with the organization beyond that explained by organizational culture and individual values. To explore these relationships the demographic variables were entered into the equation first, culture dimensions second and individual values third as a set. Then, individual level indirect calculated fit scores (i.e. IDI,  $D^2$ , Q) and perceived fit were added into the equation separately for both dependent variables.

The results indicate that, for job satisfaction, demographics did not significantly explain the variance ( $p > .05$ ). Individual and organizational value dimensions together explained about %25 of the variance. Addition of the IDI,  $D^2$  calculated and perceived P-O fit scores into the regression equation did not increase the explained variance on job satisfaction ( $p > .05$ ). P-O fit measured by Q method added to explained variance only 2% ( $p < .05$ ). Organizational culture dimensions were more influential than individual value dimensions in explaining employee job satisfaction.

Table 4 Regression analysis results for the effects of P-O fit on employee attitudes

| Dependent Variables | Predictors             | R    | R-square (Adjusted) | R Square Change | F change | Sig.F change |
|---------------------|------------------------|------|---------------------|-----------------|----------|--------------|
| Job Satisfaction    | Demographics           | ,158 | ,025 (.000)         | ,025            | 1,006    | ,406         |
|                     | Organizational culture | ,445 | ,198 (.140)         | ,173            | 4,636    | ,000         |
|                     | Preferred culture      | ,574 | ,329 (.245)         | ,131            | 3,977    | ,001         |
|                     | IDI                    | ,574 | ,329 (.240)         | ,000            | ,048     | ,827         |
|                     | $D^2$                  | ,574 | ,329 (.239)         | ,000            | ,014     | ,906         |
|                     | Q                      | ,590 | ,349 (.261)         | ,020            | 4,271    | ,041         |
|                     | Perceived fit          | ,576 | ,331 (.241)         | ,000            | ,019     | ,891         |
|                     |                        |      |                     |                 |          |              |
| Intention to Remain | Demographics           | ,239 | ,057 (.033)         | ,057            | 2,395    | ,053         |
|                     | Organizational culture | ,569 | ,324 (.275)         | ,267            | 8,520    | ,000         |
|                     | Preferred culture      | ,590 | ,348 (.267)         | ,024            | ,763     | ,619         |
|                     | IDI                    | ,609 | ,370 (.287)         | ,022            | 4,996    | ,027         |
|                     | $D^2$                  | ,625 | ,391 (.310)         | ,043            | 10,000   | ,002         |
|                     | Q                      | ,596 | ,355 (.269)         | ,007            | 1,484    | ,225         |
|                     | Perceived fit          | ,628 | ,394 (.313)         | ,045            | 10,466   | ,002         |
|                     |                        |      |                     |                 |          |              |

For, employee intention to remain on the job, demographics did not significantly explain the variance ( $p > .05$ ). Organizational value dimensions explained %27.5 of the variance. Individual values did not add to the explanations of intention to remain ( $p > .05$ ). Adding the IDI P-O fit scores into the equation increased the explained variance by %2.2 ( $p < .05$ ). P-O fit calculated by  $D^2$  raised the explained variance by 4.3%. Calculated Q method P-O fit scores did not increase the explained variance on intent to remain. Including perceived fit scores into the equation increased the explained total variance to %31.3 on intention to remain ( $p < .01$ ). Perceived fit contributed more to the explanation of variance (4.3%) on intention to remain than did calculated fit as found in Tepeci (2001) study.

## CONCLUSION

In the context of hospitality and tourism industry, there have been limited studies on person-organization fit. This study results fill in this gap for understanding of P-O fit and possible contribution to theory and applications to the industry. Tepeci (2005) reported the adaptation of a quantitative instrument for assessing organizational (perceived) culture. In Tepeci (2010) study, using the same data set and value-items, individual value (preferred culture) factor dimensions were explored. The compatibility between culture and individual value dimensions increases the validity of the scale to assess P-O fit. Thus, perceived and preferred organizational value items are then compared to calculate indirect P-O fit and its impact on employee attitudes and behavioral intentions.

Considering both perceived and preferred culture factor dimensions, item loadings, explained variance, and internal consistencies, one can conclude that the Turkish version of HICP instrument psychometrically similar to the original English version of the scale. Organizational culture and individual value factor dimensions and P-O fit significantly predicted employee attitudes both in the US and in Turkey. Thus, the Turkish version of HICP instrument can be used to assess organizational culture, individual values and P-O fit in the hospitality and tourism industry.

Factor analysis revealed seven culture and individual value dimensions of hospitality and tourism organizations (see details of the factor analysis in Tepeci, 2010). The seven culture and individual value dimension structures found in this study is very similar to those found in Tepeci (2001) and Tepeci and Bartlett (2002). Only difference is that Attention to Detail factor did not emerge in cultural values and Fair Compensation factor was not formed in individual values in this study.

The study findings reveal that the method used to measure and calculate P-O fit is an important determinant of the fit-outcome relationship. P-O fit calculated by Q method contributed to the explained variance on employee job satisfaction and IDI,  $D^2$  and perceived P-O fit contributed to the explained variance on intent to remain beyond that explained by organizational culture and individual value factor dimensions. This finding contributes to the P-O fit research and supports the idea of the congruence effects in explaining behavior in addition to the joint effects of the components. Perceived fit had stronger influence on intent to remain than calculated fit (but not for job satisfaction), which is in accordance with the previous study findings (Enz, 1988; Kristof, 1996; Tepeci, 2001). Inconsistent results have been found in this study with regard to which type of fit relates more strongly to individual outcomes call further studies for understanding these relationships.

This study has implications for both researchers and managers. For research, the study adapted a quantitative instrument to assess P-O fit in the hospitality and tourism industry. A seven-factor structure of organizational culture and individual value dimensions were identified that represents the critical P-O fit assessments that influence employee attitudes. Similar factor structures of the HICP scale and predictive power in explaining employee attitudes both in the US and Turkey denote that the HICP may be used in other countries. The results showed that P-O fit is an important predictor of employee attitudes. Further research is needed to explore the impacts of P-O fit on individuals and organizations.

Organizations can benefit from examining P-O fit; they can identify specific characteristics or dimensions that are particularly important in shaping the attitudes and fit/misfit of their employees. Efforts that focus on these characteristics can lead to specific goals and changes in the culture, policies, and training that meet the overall needs of employees. To function effectively hospitality and service organizations may need to focus on obtaining a match between the characteristics of the organization and characteristics of employees. Research on P-O fit theory offers the potential for a more flexible approach to selection and socialization, employing people whose values and norms match to a broader spectrum of organizational characteristics. Behavior in organizations and organizational performance are multidimensional and cannot be measured in absolute standards. Evaluating behaviors from multiple perspectives (i.e. personal, situational, and interactional), would be more meaningful for understanding antecedents, processes, and the outcomes of those behaviors.

### References

- Arbak, Y. and Özmen Ö.N.T. (2000). Eleman seçiminde kişi-kültür uyumunu belirlemeye yönelik üç görgül çalışma. İçinde *Türkiye’de Yönetim, Liderlik ve İnsan Kaynakları Uygulamaları*, Editör Z. Aycan, (s.91-118). Türk Psikologlar Derneği Yayınları.
- Bretz, R. D. Jr., and Ash, R. A., & Dreher, G. F. (1989). Do people make the place? An examination of the attraction-selection-attrition hypothesis. *Personnel Psychology*, 42, 561-581.
- Cable, D., and Judge, T. A. (1994). Pay preferences and job search decisions: a person-organization fit perspective. *Personnel Psychology*, 47, 317-348.
- Cable, D., & Judge, T. A. (1996). Person-organization fit, job choice decisions, and organizational entry. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 67 (3), 294-311.
- Cable, D., and Judge, T. A. (1997). Interviewers’ perceptions of person-organization fit and organizational selection decisions. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 82 (4), 546-561.
- Chatman, J. A. (1991). Matching people and organizations: selection and socialization in public accounting firms. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 36, 459-484.
- Cheung, G.W. (2009). A multiple-perspective approach to data analysis in congruence research. *Organizational Research Methods*, 12 (1), 63-68.
- Davis-Blake, A., and Pfeffer, J. (1989). Just a mirage: the search for dispositional effects in organizational research. *Academy of Management Review*, 14 (3), 385-400.
- Edwards, J. R. (1993). Problems with the use of profile similarity indices in the study of congruence in organizational research. *Personnel Psychology*, 46, 641-665.
- Edwards, J. R. (1994). Regression analysis as an alternative to difference scores. *Journal of Management*, 20 (3), 683-689.
- Edwards, J.R. (2008). Person-environment fit in organizations: an assessment of theoretical progress. *The Academy of Management Annals*, 2 (1), 167-229.
- Enz, C. A. (1988). The role of value congruity in intraorganizational power. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 33, 284-304.

Harter, J.K., Schmidt, F.L., and Hayes, T.L. (2002). Business-unit-level relationship between employee satisfaction, employee engagement, and business outcomes: a meta analysis. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 87, 268-279.

Heskett, J. L., Jones, T. O., Loveman, G. W., Sasser, W.E., and Schlesinger, L.A. (1994). Putting the service-profit chain to work. *Harvard Business Review*, 72 (2), 164-174.

Hoffman, B.J. and Woehr, D.J. (2006). A quantitative review of the relationship between person-organization fit and behavioral outcomes. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 68, 389-399.

House, R. J., Shane, S. A. and Herold, D. M. (1996). Rumors of the death of dispositional research are vastly exaggerated. *Academy of Management Review*, 21 (1), 203-224.

Jung, H.S., Namkung, Y., and Yoon, H.H. (2010). The effects of employees' business ethical value on person-organization fit and turnover intent in the foodservice industry. *International Journal of Hospitality Management*, 29, 538-546.

Karren RJ, Graves LM. (1994). Assessing person-organization fit in personnel selection: Guidelines for future research. *International Journal of Selection and Assessment*,

2(3), 146-156.

Kristof-Brown, A.L., Zimmerman, R.D., and Johnson, E.C. (2005). Consequences of individuals' fit at work: a meta-analysis of person-job, person-organization, person-group, and person-supervisor fit. *Personnel Psychology*, 58, 281-342.

Lewin, K. (1936). *Principles of topological psychology*. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Meglino, B. M., Ravlin, E. C., and Adkins, C. L. (1989). A work values approach to corporate culture: a field test of the value congruence process and its relationship to individual outcomes. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 74 (3), 424-432.

Nisbett, R. E., and Ross, L. (1980). *Human inference: strategies and shortcomings of social judgment*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall, Inc.

O'Reilly, C. A., Chatman, J. A., and Caldwell, D. F. (1991). People and organizational culture: a profile comparison approach to assessing person-organization fit. *Academy of Management Journal*, 34 (3), 487-516.

Ostroff, C. (1992). The relationship between satisfaction, attitudes, and performance: an organizational level analysis. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 77, 963-974.

Ostroff, C., Shin, Y., and Kinicki, A.J. (2005). Multiple perspectives of congruence: relationships between value congruence and employee attitudes. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 26, 91-623.

Powell, G. N. (1998). Reinforcing and extending today's organizations: The simultaneous pursuit of *person-organization fit* and diversity, *Organizational Dynamics* 26 (3), 50-61.

Pavesic, D. V., and Brymer, R. A. (1990). Job satisfaction: what's happening to the young managers? *Cornell Hotel and Restaurant Administration Quarterly*, 30 (4), 90-96.

Pizam, A., and Neumann, Y. (1988). The effect of task characteristics on hospitality employees' job satisfaction and burnout. *Hospitality Education & Research Journal*, 12, 99-105.

Schneider, B., Goldstein, H. W., and Smith, D. B. (1995). The ASA framework: an update. *Personnel Psychology*, 48, 747-773.

Schneider, B., Hanges, P.J. Smith, B., and Salvaggio A.N.(2003). Which comes first: employee attitudes or organizational financial and market performance. *Journal of Applied Pscyhology*, 88, 836-851

Sıgı, Ü. (2007). Kamu ve özel sektördeki kişisel ve örgütsel değerlerin uyumlaştırılması üzerine karşılaştırmalı bir çalışma. *Muğla Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Dergisi (İLKE)*, 18, 49-62.

Staw, B. M., Bell, N. E., and Clausen, J. A. (1986). The dispositional approach to job attitudes: a lifetime longitudinal test. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 31, 56-77.

Tepeci (2001). The effect of personal values, organizational culture, and person-organization fit on individual outcomes in the restaurant industry. *Yayınlanmamış Doktora Tezi*. The Pennsylvania State University. A.B.D.

Tepeci, M. and A.L. Bartlett (2002). The hospitality industry culture profile: A measure of individual values, organizational culture, and person organization fit as predictors of job satisfaction and behavioral intentions. *International Journal of Hospitality Management*, 21 (2), 154-170.

Tepeci, M. (2005). The dimensions and impacts of organizational culture on employee job satisfaction and intent to remain in the hospitality and tourism industry in Turkey. *Journal of Travel and Tourism Research*, 5 (1/2), 21-39.

Tepeci, M. (2009). *Person Organization Fit in the Restaurant Industry*. VDM Verlag Dr. Müller Aktiengesellschaft & Co. KG. Almany.

Tepeci, M. (2010). The effects of person-organization fit on employee job attitudes in the hospitality industry in Turkey. 6th *International Conference On Business, Management, and Economics*, ed. O.İçöz, Çeşme, İzmir, TURKEY. October 07–09.

Tisak, J., and Smith, C.S. (1994). Defending and extending difference score methods. *Journal of Management*, 20 (3), 675-682.

Vancouver, J. B., & Schmitt, N. W. (1991). An exploratory examination of personorganization fit: organizational goal congruence. *Personnel Psychology*, 44, 333-352.

Verquer M.L., Beehr, T.A., and Wagner, S.H.(2003). A meta-analysis of relations between person organization fit and work attitudes. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 63, 473-489.

Weiss, H., and Adler, S. (1984). Personality and organizational behavior. In B. M. Staw & L. L. Cummings (Eds.), *Research in Organizational Behavior*, 4 (1), 1-50. Greenwich, CT: JAI Press.

Yahyagil, M. (2005). Birey ve organizasyon uyumu ve çalışanların iş tutumlarına etkisi. *Öneri*, 6 (24), 137-149.

---

**Mustafa Tepeci, Ph.D.** Associate Professor, School of Applied Sciences, Celal Bayar University, Turkey.