The hospitality industry culture profile: a measure of individual values, organizational culture, and person–organization fit as predictors of job satisfaction and behavioral intentions

Mustafa Tepeci[a], A.L. Bart Bartlett[b],*

[a] *Mersin University School of Tourism and Hotel Administration, Gazi Mustafa Kemal Bulvari, 33130, Mersin, Turkey*
[b] *School of Hotel, Restaurant and Recreation Management, The Pennsylvania State University, 201 Mateer Building, University Park, PA 16802, USA*

Abstract

This study develops the hospitality industry culture profile, an instrument to assess organizational culture and individual values in hospitality organizations. An eight-factor structure of hospitality culture is identified. The effects of organizational culture, individual values, and the fit between the two (person–organization fit) on employees' job satisfaction and behavioral intentions are assessed. Person–organization fit is shown to explain significant outcome variance. Implications are considered for assessing and enhancing person–organization fit in hospitality organizations. © 2002 Elsevier Science Ltd. All rights reserved.

Keywords: Person–organization fit; Culture; Values; Employee attitudes; Hospitality

1. Introduction

Customer contact employees have tremendous impact on customers' perceptions of service quality and on customer satisfaction (Bitner et al., 1990; Heskett et al., 1994). Not surprisingly, a growing body of evidence supports the linkage of employee satisfaction with customer satisfaction and organizational performance, in service organizations in general (Hallowell et al., 1996; O'Reilly et al., 1991; Schmit and Allscheid, 1995) and specifically in hospitality (Testa et al., 1998; LaLopa, 1997). Despite employees' influence on hospitality business's success, however, the factors

---

that influence employee's satisfaction and behavioral intentions have gone under-researched in the hospitality context. Employee satisfaction studies that have been conducted (Bartlett et al., 1999; Pavesic and Brymer, 1990; Pizam and Neumann, 1988; Mok and Finley, 1986; Pizam and Chandrasekar, 1983) have examined individual or organization level antecedents exclusively, while a growing body of research suggests employee satisfaction is based on the effects of individual and organizational factors in combination (Kristof, 1996).

Thus, the purpose of this study was twofold. First, an instrument to assess organizational culture and individual values in hospitality organizations—the hospitality industry culture profile (HICP)—was developed. Then, the instrument was used to measure the roles of (1) organizational culture, (2) individual values, and (3) the fit between the two (person–organization (P–O) fit) on hospitality employees' job satisfaction and behavioral intentions.

2. Literature review

Organizational researchers traditionally attempt to explain employee attitudes and behaviors in terms of either organizational characteristics (situationalists) or individual characteristics (personalogists). Situationalists believe one can predict behavior by assessing the characteristics of a person's situation or organization (Davis-Blake and Pfeffer, 1989; Sheridan, 1992). Personalogists suggest such individual characteristics as personality traits, values, and beliefs are primarily responsible for behavior (Weiss and Adler, 1984). Many researchers agree that neither perspective alone is sufficient, however, and conclude that the person and situation affect attitudes and behavior interactively (Chatman, 1989, 1991; O'Reilly et al., 1991; Schneider et al., 1995; Vandenberghe, 1999). This interactionist perspective has come to be known as P–O fit.

2.1. Measurement of P–O fit

Because values are fundamental and enduring characteristics of both individuals and organizations, P–O is most frequently operationalized as value congruence (Cable and Judge, 1996, 1997; Chatman, 1991; Enz, 1986, 1988; Meglino et al., 1989; O'Reilly et al., 1991; Vandenberghe, 1999). Value congruence/P–O fit can be measured "directly" and "indirectly". Direct (or perceived) P–O fit measurement asks employees whether they believe fit exists between their values and those of the organization. Because respondents themselves estimate the extent their values are similar to those of the organization, direct measurement offers a simple way of measuring fit or congruence and allows the researcher to assess value congruence at a perceptual level (Enz, 1986). Kristof (1996) criticizes direct measurement of fit, however, because when the value characteristics being compared are not explicitly described one cannot be sure that commensurate dimensions are being considered.

Instead of measuring perceived fit, most P–O fit research relies on indirect measurement or calculated fit. Indirect measures of fit use "commensurate