

**AN EMPIRICAL INVESTIGATION ON TALENT TURN OVER,
PERSON JOB FIT AND PERSON ORGANIZATION FIT –
IDENTIFICATION OF GAPS BETWEEN PERCEIVED AND
EXPECTED SKILLS AMONG THE ENGINEERING, ARTS AND
SCIENCE COLLEGE PROFESSORS IN TAMILNADU**

S. Muralidharan*

Dr. N. Santhosh Kumar**

Abstract

The notion of person-organization fit (P-O fit) is concerned with identifying the antecedents and consequences of compatibility between employees and the organizations in which they work, as part of interactional psychology. Literature on consequences of P-O fit has demonstrated significant relationships with various individual outcomes. The main purpose of the present study was to examine the effects of P-O fit as value congruence between the employee and the organization, on job satisfaction, organizational commitment and performance of employees working in engineering, arts and science college professors in Tamilnadu at both individual-level and cross-level analysis by utilizing multiple measures of fit. The secondary purpose was to compare multiple measures of fit in terms of their power in predicting individual outcome variables and investigate the level of association between direct and indirect fit and whether direct fit contributed to prediction over and above indirect fit measures by the engineering, arts and science college professors in Tamilnadu, India. Data was analyzed by using SPSS 17.0. Findings, suggestions and conclusions were made by keeping an eye on the objectives. However the researcher has given some valid suggestions to engineering, arts and science college professors and management in Tamilnadu. The engineering, arts and science college professors

* **Research Scholar, Bharathiar University, Coimbatore, Tamilnadu**

** **Assistant Professor, SRM School of Management, SRM University, Kancheepuram**

District

and management in Tamilnadulooks in to the deficient areas and implements the suggestion wherever it is applicable.

Keywords: Person-Organization Fit, Organizational Commitment, Job Satisfaction.

Introduction

The concept of psychological ownership has become an important issue because the relationship between employees and an organization has been emphasized by many scholars. For example, person-organization fit (Morley, 2007), contextual performance (Borman and Motowidlo, 1993), organizational commitment (Meyer and Allen 1997), and psychological ownership (Pierce, Kostova, and Dirks, 2001) are all related to the connection between employees and an organization. However, few studies discussed the relations among person-organization fit, person-job fit, and psychological ownership and organizational performance, revealing an important research gap that needs further investigation. Prior research demonstrated that the ownership of employees was positively related to organizational performance (Rosen and Quarrey, 1987; Wagner and Rosen 1985); however, few studies have investigated the relation between psychological ownership and organizational performance. As Pierce et al. (2001) noted, three roots - having a place, feelings of efficacy and effectance, and self-identity - may contribute to psychological ownership of employees. Employees with psychological ownership regard targets as their extension, defend the organization voluntarily, and feel responsible for organizational goals, and the result is enhancement of organizational performance. According to prior research, psychological ownership is an antecedent of organizational commitment (Van Dyne and Pierce, 2004), and altruistic spirit can be evoked by organizational commitment (Podsakoff, MacKenzie, Paine, and Bachrach, 2000) which is regarded as one of the major antecedents of organizational citizenship behaviors, within which altruism is one important element (LePine, Erez, and Johnson, 2002; Organ and Ryne, 1995). Therefore, psychological ownership is associated with organizational citizenship behaviors which contribute to organizational performance. As argued by Motowidlo and Van Scotter (1994), many elements of organizational citizenship behaviors such as helping and cooperating behaviors are captured by contextual performance; however, few studies discuss the relationship between psychological

ownership and contextual performance, thus indicating that there still is considerable room for improvement.

Review of Literature

Piasentin and Chapman (2006) suggested that present a critical examination of the literature on subjective person–organization (P–O) fit and highlight several conceptual and measurement issues that may be perpetuating confusion in this literature. Specifically, we reviewed 46 empirical studies that have measured P–O fit perceptions and identified three primary sources of inconsistency among these studies, including (a) how P–O fit is conceptualized, (b) the operational definition of ‘organization,’ and (c) the content domain used to assess P–O fit. We discuss several implications of this review, including the potential role that individual differences play in fit perceptions. We also make a case for the development and adoption of uniform, validated measures of P–O fit that incorporate the multidimensional nature of fit.

Edwards et al., (2006) distinguished 3 approaches to the study of perceived person–environment fit (P-E fit): (a) atomistic, which examines perceptions of the person and environment as separate entities; (b) molecular, which concerns the perceived comparison between the person and environment; and (c) molar, which focuses on the perceived similarity, match, or fit between the person and environment. Distinctions among these approaches have fundamental implications for theory, measurement, and the subjective experience of P-E fit, yet research has treated these approaches as interchangeable. This study investigated the meaning and relationships among the atomistic, molecular, and molar approaches to fit and examined factors that influence the strength of these relationships. Results showed that the relationships among the approaches deviate markedly from the theoretical logic that links them together. Supplemental analyses indicated that molar fit overlaps with affect and molecular fit gives different weight to atomistic person and environment information depending on how the comparison is framed. These findings challenge fundamental assumptions underlying P-E fit theories and have important implications for future research.

Research Objectives

- To examine the effects of P-O fit as value congruence between the employee and the organization, on job satisfaction, organizational commitment and performance of employees working in engineering, arts and science college professors in Tamilnadu, India at both individual-level and cross-level analysis by utilizing multiple measures of fit.
- To compare multiple measures of fit in terms of their power in predicting individual outcome variables and investigate the level of association between direct and indirect fit and whether direct fit contributed to prediction over and above indirect fit measures by the engineering, arts and science college professors in Tamilnadu, India.
- To provide suitable suggestions and conclusion for the study.

Research Hypothesis

(H₁): There is a significant positive relationship between P-O fit (as measured by direct and indirect fit) and overall performance as rated by supervisors beyond the effects of control variables.

(H₁): There is a significant positive relationship between P-O fit (as measured by direct and indirect fit) and task performance as rated by supervisors beyond the effects of control variables.

(H₁): There is a significant positive relationship between P-O fit (as measured by direct and indirect fit) and contextual performance as rated by supervisors beyond the effects of control variables

Research Methodology

Types of Research Design – Descriptive and Exploratory Research Design

Data Collection Method – Primary Data Collection Method (Questionnaire)

Sampling Method – Convenience Sampling

Sample Size – 180 employees of Engineering, Arts and Science college professors in Tamilnadu

Analysis and Interpretations

Independent Variables	α (Alpha)	Mean	Standard Deviation	Possible Range
-----------------------	---------------------	------	-----------------------	-------------------

Job Satisfaction		0.90	2.96	0.62	1-5
Overall Organizational Commitment		0.81	2.82	0.73	1-5
Affective Commitment		0.76	3.19	0.95	1-5
Continuance Commitment		0.77	2.91	0.93	1-5
Normative Commitment		0.79	2.37	1.01	1-5
Overall Self-Rated Performance		0.85	3.61	0.60	1-5
Self Rated Task Performance		0.81	3.85	0.62	1-5
Overall Heads-Rated Performance		0.80	3.32	0.89	1-5
Heads Rated Task Performance		0.93	4.32	0.60	1-5
Heads-Rated Contextual Performance		0.89	4.39	0.62	1-5

Source: Primary Data.

Package Used : SPSS 17.0

Suggestions and Conclusion

The notion of person-organization fit (P-O fit) is concerned with identifying the antecedents and consequences of compatibility between employees and the organizations in which they work, as part of interactional psychology. Literature on consequences of P-O fit has demonstrated significant relationships with various individual outcomes. One hundred and eighty employees of an engineering, arts and science college professors in Tamilnadu, filled out the questionnaire. Cross-level analysis could not be performed because of inadequate level of agreement between respondents. Results revealed that both direct and indirect fit measures were significant predictors of individual outcome variables at individual-level analysis except for supervisor ratings of task performance and overall performance, which were solely predicted by direct fit. Direct fit was the most consistent and effective predictor of individual outcome variables and made a consistent unique contribution to prediction of outcome variables over and above indirect

fit measures. The engineering, arts and science college professors and management in Tamilnadulooks in to the deficient areas and implements the suggestion wherever it is applicable.

References

1. Adkins, C. L., Russell, C. L., & Werbel, J. D. (1994). Judgements of fit in the selection process: The role of work value congruence. *Personnel Psychology*, 47, 605–623.
2. Ajzen, I. (1991). The theory of planned behaviour. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 50, 179–211.
3. Ajzen, I. (2001). Nature and operation of attitudes. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 52, 27–58.
4. Ajzen, I., & Fishbein, M. (1980). *Understanding attitudes and predicting social behavior*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
5. Barber, A. E. (1998). *Recruiting employees: Individual and organizational perspectives*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
6. Barber, A. E., & Roehling, M. V. (1993). Job postings and the decision to interview. A verbal protocol analysis. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 78, 845–856.
7. Baron, R. H., & Kenny, D. A. (1986). The moderator-mediator variable distinction in social psychological research: Conceptual, strategic, and statistical considerations. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 51, 1173–1182.
8. Breugh, J. A. (1992). *Recruitment: Science and practice*. Boston: PWS-Kent.
9. Breugh, J. A., & Billings, R. S. (1988). The realistic job preview: Five elements and their importance for research and practice. *Journal of Business and Psychology*, 2, 291–305.
10. Breugh, J. A., & Starke, M. (2000). Research on employee recruitment: So many studies, so many remaining questions. *Journal of Management*, 26, 405–434.
11. Bretz, R. D., Jr, 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.
12. Bretz, R. D., & Judge, T. A. (1994). Person-organization fit and the theory of work adjustment: Implications for satisfaction, tenure, and career success. *Journal of Vocational Behaviour*, 44, 32–54.

13. Bretz, R. D., Rynes, S. L., & Gerhart, B. (1993). Recruiter perceptions of applicant fit: Implications for individual career preparation and job search behavior. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 43, 310–327.
14. Cable, D. M., & DeRue, D. S. (2002). The convergent and discriminant validity of subjective fit perceptions. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 87, 875–884.
15. Cable, D. M., & Judge, T. A. (1996). Person-organization fit, job choice decisions, and organizational entry. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 67, 294–311.
16. Cable, D. M., & Judge, T. A. (1997). Interviewers' perceptions of person-organization fit and organizational selection decisions. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 82, 546–561.
17. Caplan, R. D. (1987). Person-environment fit theory and organizations: Commensurate dimensions, time perspectives, and mechanisms. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 31, 248–267.
18. Carless, S. A. (2003). A longitudinal study of applicant reactions to selection procedures and job and organizational characteristics. *International Journal of Selection and Assessment*, 11, 345–351.
19. Chatman, J. A. (1991). Matching people and organizations: Selection and socialization in public accounting firms. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 36, 459–484.
20. Dawis, R. V., & Lofquist, L. H. (1984). *A psychological theory of work adjustment*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
21. Dineen, B. R., Ash, S. R., & Noe, R. A. (2002). A web of applicant attraction: Person-organization fit in the context of web-based recruitment. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 87, 723–734.
22. Edwards, Jeffrey, Cable and Daniel (2006), "The phenomenology of fit: Linking the person and environment to the subjective experience of person-environment fit", *Journal of Applied Psychology*, Vol 91, issue 4, pages 802-827.
23. Edwards, J. R. (1991). Person-job fit: A conceptual integration, literature review, and methodological critique. In C. L. Cooper & I. T. Robertson (Eds.), *International review of industrial and organizational psychology*, (Vol. 6, pp. 283–357). New York: Wiley
24. Piasentin and Chapman (2006), "Subjective person-organization fit: Bridging the gap between conceptualization and measurement", *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, Volume 69, Issue 2, Pages 202–221.