

Person-Organization Fit And It's Operationalization: A Review

Nawaz Ali^{1*} & Dr. Parvez Ahmad Shah²

^{1*}Ph.D. Scholar SRF, Department of Commerce, University of Kashmir Hazratbal Srinagar J&K India

²Sr. Assistant Professor, Department of Commerce, University of Kashmir Hazratbal Srinagar J&K India

ABSTRACT

Many studies have been investigating the notion of person-organization congruence on various dimensions with respect to its operationalization and conceptualization but still, investigators in this field have no genuine accord with respect to its operationalization and conceptualization. The present study along these lines introduce a thorough audit of person-organization congruence and has modestly attempted to explore the various operationalization of this domain in order to reach at a universal consensus. This paper has used Person-Organization Fit and Person-Organizational Congruence interchangeably.

KEYWORDS: *person-environment, person-organization congruence, conceptualization*

Date of Submission: 02-01-2021

Date of Acceptance: 15-01-2021

I. INTRODUCTION

The idea of person organization congruence has been examined and assessed by numerous researchers; besides, the numerous conceptualizations of person-organization congruence uncovers that no genuine accord exists with respect to this idea. At present, person-organization congruence is characterized as the compatibility of the personnel's and the organization (Chatman, 1989; Kristof, 1996). Past research has conceptualized and operationalized Person-organization congruence in diverse manners. Rooted back to the Person-environment congruence which have been consistently a famous domain of research in the field of interactional psychology and industrial research from which the main idea of the person-organization congruence has emerged. The idea that individuals are distinctively well-matched in a specific workplace is very much acknowledged that (Alan M. Saks B. A., 1997) labelled the subject as a foundation to the various branches of psychology like interactional, industrial and organizational psychology. The significant difficulties which is standing up to in congruence studies is deciding precisely what sort of conditions with reference to environment and the person distinguishes the various divisions of Person-environment congruence. After an exhaustive writing audit of the person-environment congruence domain, the only one all around settled upon condition that shows up is that person-environment congruence requires a collection of person and environment traits that impact consequences. Essentially in light of the fact that both person and environment are incorporated as indicators doesn't suggest that person-organization congruence is grinding away at work (Amy L. Kristof-Brown, 2005). Researchers over the world differ broadly on the characterization of different parameters of congruence between person and the environment. One common condition for measuring the congruity of person with the environment due to its different operationalization is that that measurement ought to be equivalent (Caplan, 1987; Edward, 2008). Which mirrors directly that whatever the measurements be it values, goals, personality, interest, demand abilities, need supplies, KSA's knowledge, skills and abilities), it must be characterized regarding a similar element for both person and the environment. To make theoretical pertinence of person environment congruence clearer. Caplan (1987) opined that similar estimation or commensurate measurement as an important requisite, further Edward, Caplan and Harrison (1988) dispersed this opinion that to measure person-environment congruence and to estimate the closeness of person and its environment where it works cannot be achieved without the commensurate dimensions. Another condition for congruence, which has frequently started discussions, is on the argument that whether congruence happens just when there is an indistinguishable degree of compatibility between person and the environment (Chatman, 1989; Kristoff, 1996). Which has been further supported by Edward (2007) where, he argued to utilize the closeness of person and the environment to predict the state of congruence. His opinion further mirrors different terms that have frequently been utilized in the writings on person-environment congruence, for example, "match", "similarity", "congruence" of the person-environment congruence variables. All together to understand better the logical inconsistency gripped over the commensurate measurement of person-organization congruity, one ought to explore the various operationalizations and conceptualizations of the construct person environment congruence along a continuum, navigating the definition from the most confined definition to the least restricted (Amy L. Kristof-Brown, 2005; Laura Parks, 2009). Moreover, person-environment congruence definition which are most confined are those which necessitates that congruence should be flawlessly agreeable to the person-environment

levels. This opinion on congruity is called as "similar correspondence", and as indicated by this opinion, congruence happens when there is complete correspondence of the corresponding person and the organizational environment, and the degree of in-congruity in both directions clearly addresses the level of misfit. However, this relationship enables compatibility to happen over a broader choice of person and the environment levels. Accordingly, when the level of incompatibility happens to decrease when incongruence or misfit exceeds, thus fit may happen when the person and the environment are compatible. This is the view of commensurate or similar compatibility. Likewise, general compatibility is another less confined perspective of fit. Which incorporates the environment characteristics that is measurably not in commensurate to the person's characteristics, nevertheless they are related conceptually. In line with this, turban and keon (1993) projected that persons with a significant requirement for accomplishment would become fit in organizations better than those who are offered pay according to their performance. The closeness of an individual's requirement for accomplishment can't be straightforwardly measured against the organizations pay for performance strategy. In any case, it very well may be contended that an individual who gets acknowledgment through compensation is having their own requirement for accomplishment and is in this manner a solid match in the environment. Moreover, every perspective on a construct has its own pros and cons, same is the case with the person-environment congruence domain. By grasping the confined perspective of person-environment congruence as an exact match, the appropriate response of what is congruent and what isn't congruent getting very clear. Utilizing this perspective of congruity, any difference of commensurate congruence and actual match cannot be termed as congruence. In this backdrop, existing literature on person environment fit recommends that this meaning of congruence doesn't by and large reflect everyone's comprehension of congruence (Edward, Cable, Williamson, Lambert & Ship, 2006). Majority of the researcher's wants to answer the inquiry of "how exactly do you fit?" thereby enlightening the general compatibility which is less confined perspectives. Be that as it may, the limits around this domain are dubious and fit could be contended to exist in an unending cluster of persons and the environment where they work. Thus, the commensurate compatibility is the focal point of the two perspective on congruence, these perspectives has both pros and cons, rather lesser in quantum. Therefore, utilizing the commensurate measurement of person and the environment components determines the relatedness of person to the environment, thus fit could be said to happen when the person and the environment is equivalent. In this essence this paper objective is to enlighten the various conceptualizations and operationalizations of the person-organization congruence.

II. PERSON-ORGANIZATION CONGRUENCE DEFINITION

Research available on the domain of person-organization fit can be confusing and/or misleading, reason being with multiple operationalizations and/or multiple conceptualizations. There is no consensus on the conceptual definition of the person-organization congruence construct (Cheryl L. Adkins, 1994). Further, this idea of congruity has been exposed to disarray and perplexity on account of its numerous conceptualizations and operationalizations along with other dimensions of person-environment congruence (Sara L. Rynes, 1990; Timothy A. Judge G. R., 1993). At the point when befuddlement and chaos sneaks in with respect to what pops up under any domain say for example person-organization congruence, confusion, ambiguousness, misconception operationalization's are essentially open to that domain of study. Hence this study modestly leaned to the conceptualization and operationalization of person-organization congruence to define it. Maximum of the studies carried out on person-organization congruence has extensively defined person-organization congruence as the similarity of personnel's and their employing organization. Nonetheless, due to its subjectivity personnel interpret it distinctively. This paper at the previous section has raised two perspectives of congruity to explore the various conceptualizations and operationalizations of person-organization congruence that is supplementary and complimentary congruence, need-supplies and demand-abilities congruence. Supplementary congruence happens when individual "supplements or has attributes which are like others" inside the organization (Muchinsky and Monahan, 1987). As indicated by Muchinsky and Monahan (1987), Personnel's in the organization characterise the organizational environment, which consisted of goals, values, and attitudes on the individual's part whereas organizational characteristics comprises of values, goals, climate and culture (Kristoff, 1996). At the point when personnel in the organization feels the proximity of his characteristics with that of the organization, a supplementary congruence is said to be occurred. Whereas, complimentary congruence happens to exist when that person characteristics shapes the whole organization's environment or compliment to the organizational environment what it is lacking (Muchinsky and Monahan, 1987; Kristoff, 1996). This example will make it more clear, supplementary congruence is attained when the organization attract personnel's whose values, goals, interest are aligned to the organization's values, goals and interest whereas, complimentary congruence is attained when needs of personnel's in the organization are fulfilled by the tasks and resources made available by the organization to the personnel's. Another perspective on person-organizational congruence address the need-supplies and demand-abilities congruence. Kristoff (1996) reckoned that need-supplies congruence happens when the organizations fulfills their personals needs

and desires. whereas, demand-abilities happens when the personals have the capacities required to fulfill the organizational needs. No doubt the two perspectives discussed above on person-organization congruence had been utilized often by researchers and practitioners. However, studies clubbing the two perspectives is rarely available, only two models of person-organization congruence is available addressing the dimensions of person-organization congruence one by Kristoff-Brown (1996) and other by Chatman (1989) model of person-organization congruence, this study has adopted the model projected by Kristoff-Brown (1996) (see person-organization fit model by Kristoff, 1996) to enlighten the conceptualization and operationalization of person-organization congruence. Kristoff-Brown (1996) projected model the only model which in itself is headway over the past investigations and serves to fathom the issues on various conceptualization of person-organization congruence to a larger extent. Literature available on congruence is full of evidence that personal-organization congruence positively affects a wide cluster of behaviors and attitudes particularly workers job satisfaction, employee commitment, workers performance and intention to turnover. besides, this model portrays that supplementary congruence is said to exist when there is alignment of organizational characteristics viz. values, norms, structure, climate and culture with that of the personnel characteristic's values, norms, structure, climate and culture.

III. OPERATIONALIZING PERSON-ORGANIZATION CONGRUENCE

Research on conducted on person-organization congruence over a period of time has operationalized this construct in various manners (Paul M. Muchinsky, 1987; David E. Bowen, 1991; Kristoff, 1996; Werbel. James D., 1999; Schneider, 1987). The idea of congruence has numerous indicators and shapes into numerous forms based upon the degree of congruence which assist to the organizations in making available an organizational framework (David E. Bowen, 1991; Kristoff). Moreover, on the operationalization of person-organization congruence Paul M. Muchinsky (1987) illustrated a typical division which encompasses these conceptualizations into two different perspectives viz. supplementary congruence and complimentary congruence. In line with this, Kristoff (1996) revealed a total of six dimensions to operationalize person-organization congruence. based on the dimensions of supplementary and complementary congruence. These six common conceptualizations are value congruence, goal congruence, need-supplies congruence, demand-abilities congruence, interest congruence and personality congruence and this operationalizations is regularly discussed in the writing on congruity related literature. For example, person-organization congruence, person-job congruence, person-vocation congruence etc. This study has chosen to explore these various operationalizations of person-organization congruence in the following section.

A) VALUE CONGRUENCE. First and the foremost frequently operationalized dimension of person-organization congruence is the value congruence which, is based on the supplementary congruence perspective (Kristoff, 1996) and is one of the most commonly used operationalization which is defined as compatibility of the personnel's values and the organizational values. Value congruence is a profoundly respected operationalization of congruence since, "values" are enduring qualities of the personnel's and the organization (Charles A. O'Reilly III, 1991) that impact personnel's conduct and performance which directly impact performance of the organization (H. Schein, 1985). Studies carried out on this operationalization characterize value ordinarily as something that personnel accept as an important thing for the organization, for example being an innovative, cooperative, team-oriented personnel's (Chatman, 1989; Cable, 2009). Moreover, values have been referred to as steady attributes of individual's that remain unchanged over a period of time (Meglino. Bruce M., 1989) also denote the system for mediating belief with dispositional traits and selecting a preferred organizational environment (Timothy A. Judge D. M., 1997). This operationalization is exclusively used for measuring person-organization congruence and there is no sign available in the literature where this is used to operationalize the other dimensions of person-environment congruence viz. person-job congruence, person-vocation congruence.

B) GOAL CONGRUENCE. Similar to value congruence operationalization, goal congruence is another operationalization of person-organization congruence dependent on supplementary congruence dimension (Kristof, 1996). Unlike value congruence, this congruence generally has been rarely utilized in conceptualization and operationalization of person-organization congruence, which is characterized as the comparability of personnel's goals with that of the organizational goals, other co-worker's goals (Schmitt, 1991). Schneider (1987) propounded the theory of "attraction, selection and attrition wherein he projected a model known as "ASA" model which portrays that organization's attract personnel's having similar characteristics to that of organizational characteristics. Vancouver and Schmitt (1991) based on the assumption that organizational goals are part of organizational congruence examined how much a person understanding of organizational goals influenced the person-organization congruence with special focus on how goals which are non-operational by nature influenced workers intentions and attitudes and they revealed support for the Schneider (1987) model of "ASA" attraction, selection and attrition. They argued that organizational goals are

significant to compare workers and the organizations congruence. Thus, personnel consider the organization goals as portion of the organizational strategy with which they seek congruence.

C) PERSONALITY CONGRUENCE. Personality congruence is one more operationalization of person-organization congruence that is dependent on the supplementary congruence point of view (Kristof, 1996). Again, applied rarely to operationalize the person-organizational congruence this operationalization characterizes person-organization congruence as compatibility of personnel's characteristics to the organizational culture and climate (Tom, 1971) (John M. Ivancevich, 1984). When person-organization congruence is operationalized as the compatibility of workers personality and the organizational climate/culture apparently shows that certain workplace environments are progressively perfect for specific traits and has been prompted to show positive work outcomes. Hence, congruity occurs when there is proximity of the individual's characteristic's with other members of the organization or members of other profession within the organizational environment. This operationalization of person-organizational congruence like goal congruence, draws vigorously on Schneider (1987) portrayed "ASA" model of attraction, selection and attrition illustrating that personnel are pulled in to organization with same personality.

D) INTEREST CONGRUENCE. Fourth, operationalization of P-O Fit is interest congruence which is based on the supplementary congruence point of view (Paul M. Muchinsky, 1987). Theory of vocational choice propounded by Holland (1973) support the interest congruence and upheld that personnel would be more satisfied in the organization which is full of personnel's sharing similar interest. This operationalization unlike the other congruences is used to operationalize the person-vocation congruence and is rarely used to operationalize the person-organization congruence (Holland, 1997).

E) NEED-SUPPLIES CONGRUENCE. Needs-supplies Fit operationalization is grounded on complementary congruence. This operationalization characterizes congruence as fulfilment of person's need's, preferences or desires by a particular element like, organization, job and vocation. Ecological supplies like pay, financial resources, psychological and physical resources are considered in correspondence to person's need like pay, training and benefits to decide the level of congruence. Rooted back to the need-press theory propounded by Murray (1938), and "TWA" theory of work adjustment by Dawis and Lofquist (1964), (Bretz. Robert D., 1994) researched the TWA on the basis of this operationalization as a method for measuring person-organization congruence and profession achievement and (Caplan, 1987) revealed that person and the environment force necessities on each other, and that "effective work relations" are an aftereffect of the congruence between the person-environment attributes.

F) DEMAND-ABILITIES CONGRUENCE. Demand-abilities Fit is the second common operationalization of congruence dependent on the complementary congruence. This operationalization characterizes congruence as person's possession of abilities needed to perform a specific job and vocation, required to fulfill organizational demands, job demands and vocational demands for example, knowledge skill and abilities KSA, time, efforts, commitment, are considered in accordance to person's characteristics that fulfill these demands (Kristof, 1996). Personnel's abilities are ordinarily characterized as surrogate measures of aptitudes, for example quantum of experience and level of education (Jhoh R. P. French, 1982). Job demands typically refers to necessities for satisfactory employee performance.

IV. CONCLUSION

Person-organization congruence has been operationalized from numerous points of view, (Muchinsky and Monahan, 1987; Edwards; 1991; Werbel and Gilliland, 1999; Kristof, 1996; Schneider, 2001). Muchinsky and Monahan (1987), Kristoff (1996) have assembled these operationalizations into two perspectives like supplementary congruence and complementary congruence to improve the clearness of dialogs encompassing the utilization of congruence operationalizations. In the present corporate world, where withholding skilled and knowledge workforces is a challenge. In this backdrop, having a workforce congruent to the organization in every aspect is highly significant for the organizations. The phenomenon of person-organization congruence has pulled in the consideration of the researcher, practitioner and manager throughout the world to examine this construct. Due to various conceptualization and operationalization associated to this domain a careful consideration towards these conceptualizations and operationalization methodologies is the need of the hour in order to portray a valid, reliable and persuading conclusion to reach on a common consensus on various operationalization of this phenomenon. Hence, imminent studies are needed to excel the investigation on the person-organization congruence and its operationalization models.

REFERENCES

- [1]. Alan M. Saks, B. A. (1997). Organizational socialization: Making sense of the past and present as a prologue for the future. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 51(2), 234-279.
- [2]. Alan M. Saks, B. E. (2006). A Longitudinal Investigation of the Relationships between Job Information Sources, Applicants Perceptions of Fit, and Work Outcomes. *Personnel Psychology*, 50(2), 395-426.
- [3]. Amy L. Kristof-Brown, R. D. (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). doi:10.1111/j.1744-6570.2005.00672.x

- [4]. Bretz, Robert D., J. 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.
- [5]. Cable, J. R. (2009). The Value of Value Congruence. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 94(3), 654-677.
- [6]. Caplan, R. D. (1987). Person-environment fit theory and organizations: Commensurate dimensions, time perspectives, and mechanisms. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 31(3), 248-267.
- [7]. Charles A. O'Reilly III, J. C. (1991). People and Organizational Culture: A Profile comparison approach to assessing Person-organization fit. *Academy of Management Journal*, 24(3), 487-516.
- [8]. Chatman, J. A. (1989). Improving Interactional Organizational Research: A Model of Person-Organization Fit. *Academy of Management Journal*, 14(3), 333-349.
- [9]. Cheryl L. Adkins, C. J. (1994). Judgements of Fit in the Selection Process: The Role of Work Value Congruence. *Personnel Psychology*, 47(3), 605-623.
- [10]. David E. Bowen, G. E. (1991). Hiring for the Organization, Not the Job. *Academy of Management*, 5(4), 35-51.
- [11]. Edwards, Jeffrey R., S. A. (2007). The relationship between person-environment fit and outcomes: An integrative theoretical framework. In C. Ostraff & T. A. Judge (Eds>), *Perspectives on organizational fit* (pp. 209-258). San Francisco: jossey-Bass.
- [12]. H., S. E. (1985). *Organizational Culture and Leadership*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey Bass.
- [13]. Holland, J. L. (1973). *Making vocational choices: a theory of careers*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ.: Prentice-Hall.
- [14]. Holland, J. L. (1997). *Making vocational choices: A theory of vocational personalities and work environments* (Vol. 3rd edition). Psychological Assessment Resources.
- [15]. Ivancevich, John M., M. M. (1984). A Type A-B person-work environment interaction model for examining occupational stress and consequences. *Human Relations*, 37(7), 491-513.
- [16]. Jeffrey R. Edwards, A. J. (2006). *The Relationship Between Person-Environment Fit and Outcomes: An Integrative Theoretical Framework*. Chapel Hill, NC 27599: University of North Carolina.
- [17]. Jhoh R. P. French, J. R. (1982). *The mechanism of job stress and strain* (Vol. 7). Chichester (Sussex); New York J.: Wiley.
- [18]. John M. Ivancevich, M. T. (1984). A Type A-B Person-Work Environment Interaction Model for Examining Occupational Stress and Consequences. *Human Relations*, 37(7), 467-505.
- [19]. Kristoff, A. L. (1996). Person-Organization Fit: An Integrative Review of its Conceptualizations, Measurements, and Implications. *Personnele Psychology*, 49(1), 1-49.
- [20]. Laura Parks, R. P. (2009). Personality, values, and motivation. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 47(7), 675-684.
- [21]. Meglino, Bruce M., R. E. (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.
- [22]. Murray, H. A. (1938). *Explorations in Personality*. Boston, MA: Houghton Mifflin.
- [23]. Paul M. Muchinsky, C. J. (1987). What is person-environment congruence? Supplementary versus complementary models of fit. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 31(3), 268-277.
- [24]. R., E. J. (1991). Person-job fit: A conceptual integration, literature review, and methodological critique. *International review of industrial and organizational psychology*, 6, 283-357.
- [25]. Rene V. Dawis, G. W. (1964). *A Theory of Work Adjustment* (Vol. XV). Minnesota studies in vocational rehabilitation.
- [26]. Ronald J Burke, E. D. (1982). Preferred organizational climates of Type A individuals. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 21(1), 50-59.
- [27]. Sara L. Rynes, R. D. (1990). The Importance of Recruitment in Job Chocice : A Different Way of Looking. (*Working Paper*) Center for Advanced Human Rsource Studies, 90(24).
- [28]. Schmitt, J. B. (1991). An Exploratory Examination of Person-Organization Fit: Organizational Goal Congruence. *Personnel Psychology*, 44(2), 333-352.
- [29]. Schneider, B. (1987). The People make the Place. *Personnel Psychology*, 40(3).
- [30]. Timothy A. Judge, D. M. (1997). Applicant Personality, Organizational Culture, and Organization Attraction. *Personnel Psychology*, 50(2).
- [31]. Timothy A. Judge, G. R. (1993). The Elusive Criterion of Fit in Human Resources Staffing Decisions. *Human Resource Planning*, 15(4).
- [32]. Tom, V. R. (1971). The role of personality and organizational images in the recruiting process. *Tom, V. R. (1971)*, 6(5), 573-592.
- [33]. Turban, D. B. (1993). Organizational attractiveness: An interactionist perspective. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 78(2), 184-193.
- [34]. Werbel, James D., G. S. (1999). Person-environment fit in the selection process. *Research in human resources management*, 17, 209-243.

Nawaz Ali. "Person-Organization Fit And It's Operationalization: A Review." *International Journal of Business and Management Invention (IJBMI)*, vol. 10(01), 2021, pp. 49-53. Journal DOI- 10.35629/8028