

Work and Organizational Psychology

MECC Maastricht, The Netherlands

25 – 28 May 2011

eawop

European Association of Work
and Organizational PsychologyFCT Fundação para a Ciência e a Tecnologia
MINISTÉRIO DA CIÊNCIA, TECNOLOGIA E ENSINO SUPERIOR

Grant: SFRH / BD / 43315 / 2008

Developing a Person-Organization Fit questionnaire considering the contextualization of organizational values

Teresa Morais^{1,2}, Valentina Ramos^{1,2} & Filomena Jordão^{1,2}

lpsi06109@fpce.up.pt

¹ Psychology Center, University of Porto, Portugal² Faculty of Psychology and Educational Sciences, University of Porto, Portugal

ABSTRACT

The purpose of this study is to develop and validate an instrument to measure the relationship between individual and organizational values. We found that there wasn't any instrument available in Portugal that could be used to measure in a general way the culture and values of any organization and its relationship with the individual values. This questionnaire would assess three different dimensions: the acknowledgement about organizational values, person-organization fit, and conflict between individual and organizational values. Based on a review of literature, we defined a 19 item scale and displayed it on-line for people to answer (n=102). After applying statistical procedures we obtained a scale composed by 16 items grouped into 3 factors with a high internal consistency: *person-organization fit* ($\alpha = .909$), *conflict between individual and organizational values* ($\alpha = .891$) and *acknowledgement of organizational values* ($\alpha = .901$).

I. INTRODUCTION

A fundamental and enduring aspect of both organizations and people is their values (Katz & Kahn, 1978). According to Rokeach (1973), individual values are defined as enduring beliefs through which a specific mode of conduct or end-state is personally preferable to its opposite. "On the organization side, value systems provide an elaborate and generalized justification both for appropriate behaviors of members and for the activities and functions of the system" (Enz, 1988; Katz & Kahn, 1978; McCoy, 1985 *cit in* Chatman, 1989, p. 339).

"Person-organization fit is defined here as the congruence between the norms and values of organizations and the values of persons" (Chatman, 1989, p. 339). In order to determine the effects that organizational membership will have on an individual's values and behaviors and the effects that an individual will have on an organization's norms and values, we must assess the extent of agreement between the person's values and the organization's values (Chatman, 1989).

In fact, we've developed an instrument with this goal of exploring the relationship between both individual and organizational values, as a way of assessing Person-organization fit. Moreover, we were also interested in measuring value *conflict*, which can be understood as an incongruence between these two types of values. The existence of this conflict can create an illness with consequences like dissatisfaction with the worker's activity (Bouckenoghe *et al*, 2005; Oliveira *et al*, 2002).

II. GOAL OF THE STUDY

To develop an instrument that could be used to assess the relationship between individual and organizational values and validate it for the Portuguese population.

III. METHOD

a) Procedure

After an extensive research about this subject, we constructed a 19-item scale. Five of these items were based on a scale of value conflict form Bouckenoghe and collaborators (2005) and in the "scale of perceived fit" (Cable & deRue, 2002). We translated them into Portuguese and integrated it in our instrument.

We aimed to measure three different variables: acknowledgement about the organizational values; P-O fit and conflict between individual and organizational values. We presented the questionnaire to the team of the Psychology Center and also to several experts of the University of Porto and University of Coimbra. These feedbacks were considered in the final version of the questionnaire that was validated.

b) Gathering data

We displayed the instrument on-line. To answer, the person should be employed and we could control this information by the demographic data displayed.

c) Sample

Table 1 – Sample Distribution

| Employees personal Information | | | | Employee's organizational info. | | |
|-----------------------------------|-------|-------|--------|---------------------------------|--------------|-------|
| Sex | | | | Legal Form | | |
| Men | Women | | Public | Private | | |
| 39 | 63 | | 49 | 53 | | |
| Age (years) | | | | Antiquity (years) | | |
| 20-30 | 31-40 | 41-50 | >51 | <10 | 10-50 | >50 |
| 31 | 27 | 30 | 14 | 25 | 60 | 17 |
| Qualifications | | | | Size | | |
| < Bs | Bs | Ms | PhD | Small | Medium | Large |
| 14 | 50 | 35 | 3 | 29 | 29 | 44 |
| Years of work in the organization | | | | Type | | |
| <4 | 4-10 | >10 | | Familiar | Non-familiar | |
| 31 | 32 | 39 | | 15 | 87 | |

(n = 102)

Other data of our sample aren't displayed here. We have more information about the marital status and profession of the subjects. We also have data about the organizations' economic sector, and the working years that people have.

d) Data Analysis

We obtained 102 answers and we applied several statistical procedures such as Principal Component Analysis with Varimax rotation and Cronbach's alpha to analyze the data.

IV. RESULTS AND CONCLUSION

Table 2 – List of items included in the pre-test (answers in a 7-item Likert Scale (1= I totally disagree; 7= I totally agree))

* The original items are in Portuguese and the instrument was validated only for Portugal. This is a translation only to make the understanding possible.

1. I know the values and culture of the organization that I belong to.
2. I identify myself with the values and culture of the organization that I belong to.
3. In the organization I belong to, I consider that the values and culture are implicit in the people's behavior.
4. My personal values sometimes conflict with the values in my job or function.
5. In the organization I belong to, I consider that the values and culture are explicitly defined.
6. My personal values sometimes conflict with the organizational values.
7. I see myself reflected in the values and culture of the organization I belong to.
8. The people that belong to my organization know its values and culture.
9. If the values of the organization that I belong to were contradictory to those that exist actually, I would hardly identify myself with them.
10. I must compromise my values at work .
11. The people that work in my department know the values and culture of the organization .
12. The people outside the organization that I belong know it by its values and culture.
13. The behaviors that my organization values are in conflict with my personal values.
14. The things that I value in my life are similar to the things that are valued by the organization that I belong to.
15. I must forget my personal goals to accomplish my organization's goals.
16. My personal values match my organization's values and culture.
17. The reason why I prefer my organization is the values that it stands for.
18. I have to stop being me as a way to adapt myself to the organization that I belong to.
19. My organization's goals are consonant with my personal goals.

After analyzing the data by statistical procedures (see table 3), the items number 1, 5 and 19 were excluded from our final version.

Table 3 – First Principal Component Analysis

| | Rotated Component Matrix | | |
|-------|--------------------------|----------|---------|
| | P-O fit | Conflict | Aknowl. |
| VAR02 | .806 | -.330 | .174 |
| VAR09 | .803 | -.276 | .091 |
| VAR07 | .795 | -.235 | .347 |
| VAR01 | .714 | -.176 | .248 |
| VAR17 | .676 | -.221 | .401 |
| VAR16 | .650 | -.217 | .344 |
| VAR05 | .624 | -.198 | .557 |
| VAR14 | .569 | -.300 | .437 |
| VAR15 | -.180 | .842 | -.283 |
| VAR06 | -.356 | .772 | -.162 |
| VAR10 | -.077 | .757 | .044 |
| VAR04 | -.155 | .716 | -.319 |
| VAR18 | -.443 | .703 | -.044 |
| VAR13 | -.408 | .667 | -.166 |
| VAR19 | .493 | -.497 | .455 |
| VAR11 | .183 | -.095 | .875 |
| VAR08 | .233 | -.188 | .851 |
| VAR12 | .242 | -.208 | .777 |
| VAR03 | .419 | -.056 | .755 |

Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis.
Rotation Method: Varimax with Kaiser Normalization.

Table 4 – Final Principal Component Analysis and Cronbach's alpha

| | Rotated Component Matrix | | | Cronbach's alpha | |
|-------|--------------------------|----------|---------|------------------|------|
| | P-O fit | Conflict | Aknowl. | | |
| VAR09 | .807 | -.265 | .092 | .909 | |
| VAR07 | .769 | -.237 | .342 | | |
| VAR02 | .762 | -.346 | .185 | | |
| VAR16 | .727 | -.173 | .314 | | |
| VAR17 | .719 | -.191 | .380 | | |
| VAR14 | .637 | -.260 | .419 | | |
| VAR15 | -.184 | .844 | -.288 | | |
| VAR10 | -.045 | .777 | -.029 | | |
| VAR06 | -.388 | .749 | -.154 | | |
| VAR04 | -.187 | .704 | -.305 | | |
| VAR18 | -.460 | .703 | -.043 | | |
| VAR13 | -.441 | .656 | -.142 | | |
| VAR11 | .168 | -.106 | .888 | | .901 |
| VAR08 | .227 | -.199 | .858 | | |
| VAR12 | .252 | -.209 | .773 | | |
| VAR03 | .440 | -.039 | .753 | | |

Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis.
Rotation Method: Varimax with Kaiser Normalization.

*The shade items were excluded

The items number 5 and 19 were excluded because the correlation coefficient was similar in two factors. The item number 1 was excluded due to a lack of semantic comprehension. After exploratory factor analysis and internal consistency analysis of the factors extracted, which collectively explain 71.9% of total variance, the final scale is composed by 16 items grouped into three factors: Values acknowledgement, P-O fit and Value Conflict – all of them with an high internal consistency. This fact shows that the items that define these factors can be used as independent scales.

VI. REFERENCES

- Bouckenoghe, D.; Buelens, M.; Fontaine, J. & Vanderheyden, K. (2005). The prediction of stress by values and value conflict. *The Journal of Psychology*, 139 (4), 369 – 382;
Cable, D. & DeRue, S. (2002) The convergent and discriminant validity of subjective fit perceptions. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 87(5), 875-884;
Chatman, A. (1989). Improving Interactional Organizational Research: A Model of Person-Organization Fit. *Academy of Management Review*, 14(3), 333-349;
Stevens, J. (1986). *Applied multivariate statistics for the social sciences*. New jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum;