

**AN ANTECEDENT OF SATISFACTION FROM SUPERVISOR:
CONGRUENCE IN ORGANIZATIONAL CONTEXT****Isik Cicek¹, Ismail Hakki Bicer²**¹Akdeniz University. icicek@akdeniz.edu.tr²Istanbul Technical University, ihbicer@itu.edu.tr**Keywords**

Congruence,
relational
demography,
supervisory
satisfaction.

JEL Classification

M10, M12, M14

ABSTRACT

The importance of human is becoming more apparent in today's competitive environment. Considering the effects of technology on work and organizations, significant factor for human-oriented issues is to have employees congruent with group. Focusing on fit as a tool for keeping this desired employee profile has become research topic for a while in human resource management. In the light of developing technology, increasing of technology-based organizations cause project-based work and working groups that are commonly occurred in these organizations increase in number. Besides person-organization fit, the result of employee's fit/misfit with the group gain importance for organizations. One of the effects caused by fit/misfit is employees' perception about their supervisors. The effects of value congruence of personal values with organizational values and group values, demographic similarity with group members and employee perception about job execution, attitude similarity with group members/supervisor on supervisor satisfaction are investigated in this research. 293 employees are selected at technology based organizations. Congruence is considered as similarity between components and measured via absolute difference. According to findings, person-organization value congruence, person-group value congruence, perceptual similarity with group in terms of age, and perceptual job attitude similarity with supervisor influence supervisor satisfaction, positively. Contrary to expectations, being different with group members in terms of job tenure explains the variance in supervisor satisfaction, positively. The findings highlight complementary fit concerning job tenure for the group apart from supplementary fit.

1. INTRODUCTION

Intellectual capital gain importance in today's environment. Awareness of demographic, dispositional and socio-cultural differentiations that employees face is a critical phenomenon for managers so as to utilize differentiations and minimize their adverse effects (George and Chattopadhyay, 2002; Erdoğan et. al, 2004). Depending on technological development, the nature of jobs in technology-based organizations highlights group working. Therefore, the antecedents of fit between group and intellectual capital that is a critical input for groups are paid attention, beside to fit with organization. The project-type works commonly executed in technology based organizations highlight the role of project leader in the structure that leader organize. The employees' perception about leader can depend on values congruence with organization and group, demographic similarity fit with working group members, and similarity of job execution attitude with group members/leader.

Person-environment fit is defined as congruence and correspondence degree between individual and environmental variables (Muchinsky and Monahan, 1987; Sekiguchi, 2004). Depending on concepts defined for environmental factors, several fit categorizations are developed (Kristof, 1996; Yang et al., 2008), and then person-environment fit is investigated in the light of environment dimension considered. Fit is examined with the concept of supplementary fit/complementary fit in the literature. Supplementary fit involves employees sharing similar attributes among their group members, whereas complementary fit is concerned with providing the skills and abilities that are not widely shared by other group members (Muchinsky and Monahan, 1987; Werbel and DeMarie, 2005)

Supplementary fit occurs when individual has the same features as other employees in work environment (Muchinsky and Monahan, 1987, Werbel and DeMarie, 2005). Complementary fit occurs when individual's features constitute the environment or complement a component that is missing in work environment (Muchinsky and Monahan, 1987 Werbel and DeMarie, 2005). Therefore, complementary fit depends on determining human resource inadequacy in a working group and diagnosing necessary human resource features to develop (Edwards & Cooper, 1990; Werbel & Johnson, 2001).

2. LITERATURE SURVEY

2.1. Values Congruence

Formally, values can be defined as serious and deeply held normative principles which guide a person's beliefs, attitude and behavior (Lawson, 1989). Rokeach (1973) defined the value concept as "an enduring belief that a specific mode of conduct or end-state of existence is personally or socially preferable to an opposite or converse mode of conduct or end-state of existence". Values are beliefs, have motivational constructs, transcend specific actions and situations, guide selection or evaluation of actions, policies; people and events and are ordered in their importance (Swhartz 1994, 2005a, 2006; Allport 1961; Feather, 1995; Inglehart, 1997; Kohn, 1969; Kluckhohn, 1951; Morris, 1956 and Rokeach, 1973). Types of values include ethical/moral values, doctrinal/ideological (religious, political) values, social values, and aesthetic values. Values can be looked upon as being hierarchical in nature, leading to the idea of a value system. A set of rank ordered values is called a value system. Values are heavily intertwined and therefore looking at a

person's values separately and independently of one another cannot meaningfully explain attitudes and behaviors. Value systems tend to form early in life and are very stable. Major longitudinal studies of values have in general showed their remarkable stability (Rokeach and Ball-Rokeach, 1989; Krishan, 2008); however, people's motivation and consciousness are contingent and hence people re-order their values and this makes it dynamic and this enables an individual to align his/her values to the organizational values. Change in value system requires rearrangement of the relative importance given to various values (Krishnan, 2008). The stable yet dynamic nature of values makes them foundation of behavior and identity (Dose, 1999; Meglino & Ravlin, 1998). They have substantial influence on behavioral responses (Locke, 1976; Rokeach, 1973; Postman, Bruner & McGinnies, 1948; Williams, 1979; Epstein, 1979) and dictate socially desirable conduct (Kabanoff, Waldersee, & Cohen, 1995, p. 1076) by creating compulsion to conform to the social values (Kluckhohn, 1951; Krishan, 2008)

Value in organizational level is determined by most of organization employees who are aware of organizational support for creating value (Chatman, 1989). Organizational value is defined as criterion for employees' evaluation about events, activities, and individuals desirably or undesirably. Organizational values form subjective and internal side of culture. It indicates solving way seen as acceptable and convenient for organizational issues. Organizational values reflect general aims and standards for an organization. Organization makes employees' individual values fit with organizational values and enable individual to complement or supplement with organization. It affects individual behaviour in this way. Organization causes employees to want to imitate the behaviours which serve reaching aims. Organization rewards the employees behaving parallel to organizational aims, whereas it punishes the behaviours contrary to organizational aims and values. Therefore, the possibility of fulfilling individual values increase when employees adopt organizational values and behave in accordance with these values (Eren, 2000).

According to supplementary fit aspect, value congruence is fit between individual values and values in prevailing in organization. Congruence between personal values and organizational values is also called as person-culture fit (Kristof, 1996).

Organizational working groups (i.e. geographical sub-units) have unique norms and values different from organizations in which there are (Schein, 1992; Werbel and Johnson, 2001). Therefore, fit between person and sub-units will be different from person-organization fit (Kristof, 1996). The effects of local culture and frequent communication among the employees working in the same location mean for person-group value congruence more than person-organization congruence (Metzler, 2005).

Sub-cultures in the organization are affected by hierarchical levels and functional/departmental structure (Rousseau, 1990). These differences cause to consider a new approach by researchers to evaluate person-organization fit regardless of consistency among perceived organizational values. The necessity becomes more important due to increment in the number of sub-cultures depending on differentiations in the workplace (Warren, 1996; Verquer, 2002). The groups share common values. The value dimension of person-group fit is congruence between personal values and values prevailing in the group or shared by group members.

2.2.Relational Demography

Pfeffer (1983) stated that demographic similarity with group affects organization related outputs such as creativity, performance, and managerial success. According to Pfeffer, to investigate synchronous demographic features such as age, gender and education level have more valuable effects instead of individual effects (O'Reilly et al, 1989; Surgevil,

2008). Therefore, the term relational demography is introduced. Relational demography posits regular interaction among employees due to their positions in groups. Comparing demographic similarity among group members can explain attitude and behaviors of employees. That is to say, the demographic characteristics affecting work outputs are appeared (Tsui and O'Reilly, 1989). Lots of demography researchers focused on variables of age and tenure for investigating effect on turnover. However, when analyzing the effects of demography, all characteristics should be considered, together. Demographic profile for the group is made, afterwards (Tsui and O'Reilly, 1989; Surgevil, 2008). Perceptual similarity is a fit type that can be investigated in relational demography. Self categorization process describe group attractiveness in the light of psychological group emerged via perceptual similarity/differentiation with group members. These features can be related vocational and functional categories, as well (Surgevil, 2008).The employees different from counterparts attribute psychological meanings to these differentiations (Turner et al, 1989; Riordan, 2000). Williams and O'Reilly (1989) highlighted adverse effects of differentiations on team process depending on the degree of feeling about similarity/dissimilarity with group members. Attraction among people due to similarity of attitudes and experiences (Byrne, 1971) strengthen communication among employees (Roberts and O'Reilly, 1979; Surgevil, 2008). When group members have common attitudes regarding job execution, it is strongly possible to collaborate. Otherwise, conflict occurs (Molleman and Slomp, 2006). Therefore, similarity of employees attitudes regarding job execution with those of coworkers/supervisors can be research in this study.

Three dimensions of congruence (value, actual demographic similarity and perceptual attitude similarity) cause desired positive outputs in accordance with similarity-attraction theory and social categorization theory. Similarity/attraction theory (Byrne, 1971) posits that people like and are attracted to others who are similar, rather than dissimilar, to themselves. Before explaining self categorization theory, it is useful to mention about the term social identity. A social identity is the portion of an individual's self-concept derived from perceived membership in a relevant social group (Tajfel and Turner 1979). Social identity theory is best described as a theory that predicts certain intergroup behaviors on the basis of perceived group status differences, the perceived legitimacy and stability of those status differences, and the perceived ability to move from one group to another. Self-categorization process describes the circumstances under which a person will perceive collections of people (including themselves) as a group, as well as the consequences of perceiving people in group terms. Although the theory is often introduced as an explanation of psychological group formation, it is more accurately thought of as general analysis of the functioning of categorization processes in social perception and interaction that speaks to issues of individual identity as much as group phenomena. Social categorization theory was in part developed to address questions that arose in response to social identity theory about the mechanistic underpinnings of social identification. People divided the world into "them" and "us" based through a process of social categorization. This is known as in-group (us) and out-group (them). Social identity theory states that the in-group will discriminate against the out-group to enhance their self-image. According to these propositions, the employee who is fit with organization, group and leader in terms of values, demographic similarity and perceptual attitudinal features will carry out social categorization with his or her organization and group.

2.3. The Effect of Value Congruence and Relational Demography on Supervisor Satisfaction

Group members' job satisfaction, commitment to organizational and group, and group performance can be directly linked to supervisor in a project organization inasmuch as a project leader coordinates group members carrying out roles depending on functional competencies in project. The level of task interdependency for works executed is high in technology-based organizations. Task interdependency requires effective interaction among members in light of their functional roles. Similar working values, norms, personality traits and demographic similarity for effective communication with other employees can be associated with successful project organization leader. Therefore; it can be obviously expressed that value congruence between person and organization, value congruence, demographic similarity and similarity of job execution attitude between person and group are antecedents of supervisor satisfaction.

Findings of meta-analysis conducted by Kristof-Brown (2005) demonstrated middle level relationship between person-organization fit and supervisor satisfaction. Supervisor satisfaction has also significant relationship with person-group fit.

The research conducted by Fagenson-Eland et al. (2005) may be referred as a proof of the effect of relational demography on satisfaction from supervisor. The researchers investigated the effects of demographic differentiations between mentor and followers on fit in terms of developmental support and perception of communication frequency. They found that there was significant fit between mentor's perception and follower's perception regarding developmental support and communication frequency. The more the difference between mentor and followers is in terms of organizational tenure and age, the less the fit between perception is.

In the light of theoretical knowledge explained and previous research findings, the hypotheses below can be proposed for this research:

H1 : *Similarity between personal values and values prevailing in group affects supervisor satisfaction, positively.*

H2 : *Similarity between personal values and organizational values affects supervisor satisfaction, positively.*

H3 : *Actual and perceptual demographic similarity with group members and perceptual similarity of job execution attitude with group members and leader affect supervisor satisfaction, positively.*

3. DATA AND METHODOLOGY

3.1. Sample

Sampling is selected from the pool of technology-based organizations. Technology and information-systems units of banks, software companies, production firms including high-tech R&D department, communication and GSM operators are the types of firms in which the research is carried out. 293 employees participate in this research.

3.2. Method and Scales

Supplementary fit is evaluated for the dimensions of value congruence and demographic similarity with group members. Values are determined for three times: personal values, values prevailing in group, and organizational values. Value congruence is measured via absolute difference between personal values and group values/organizational values as other fit researches (i.e. Enz, 1998; Güneşer, 2007; Çiçek, 2013). Demographic similarity with group members is measured by means of absolute difference between individual features and members features determined via calculating relational demography scor. The more the difference is, the less the supplementary fit is. Job execution similarity is evaluated via employee perception. Perceptual demographic similarity and similarity of job execution attitude are evaluated by means of employee evaluation.

Values: Short version (40 items) of Organizational Culture Profile originally developed by O'Reillt et. al (1991) is utilized for determining values. Cable and Judge (1996) tested reliability and validity of 40-item scale. Seven dimensions of values are innovation, stability, respect for people, outcome orientation, attention to detail, team orientation, and aggressiveness. Items are evaluated via 5-degree Likert scale.

Actual demographic similarity (relational demography): Demographic similarity with group members is evaluated in terms of age, gender, marital status, education level, organizational tenure, and job tenure. Total six items are asked, and each of them is designed for one demographic characteristic. Euclid distance method is utilized for measuring. D score is calculated for each demographic characteristics. In this technique;

S_i : score of investigated demographic feature for individual

S_j : scores of the same feature for other group members

n : number of group member

D score presenting Euclid distance is shown in formula 1:

$$D = \sqrt{\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i,j=1}^n (S_i - S_j)^2} \quad (1)$$

(Wagner et. al., 1984). (Tsui et. al., 1992)

The higher the value of D score for demographic feature is, the more the differentiation of individual from other group members is.

D score gets increased value by starting from point "0" for variables such as age, organizational tenure and education level-in years measured via continuous numerical scale depending on variability of demographic feature. D score can be calculated for variables such as gender, race and educational level measured via nominal scale in that 1 is for individual's feature and 0 is for other members who are different for the same demographic feature. Each level is pointed through increasing number for demographic data measured via ordinal scale that has more than one-type of value. In this way, D score is higher for the categories that are not close to each other. (Tsui and O'Reilly, 1989).

D score gets values between 0 and 1 for these features evaluated via categorical measurement. Values closed to 1 mean differentiation degree is high in group for this demographic feature (O’Reilly et. al., 1989, Tsui and O’Reilly, 1989, Tsui et. al, 1992, Riordan, 1995); however, the value can never reach “1” (Tsui et. al, 1992).

Perceptual demographic similarity with group members (relational demography): Similarity of gender, age, marital status, education level and organizational tenure with group members is measured through individual perception. Total 5 items for each demographic feature are designed.

Job execution similarity with members/group leader (relational demography): Perception of job execution similarity with group members and group leader is evaluated by means of 2 items.

Satisfaction from leader: 4 items sub-scale of Spector Job Satisfaction Survey (1985), 1 item of MLQ 5X (Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire) developed and revised by Bass and Avolio (1980, 1995) and 1 item of Satisfaction from Supervisor Scale developed by Scarpello and Vandenberg’in (1987) are utilized for measuring satisfaction from team leader. Spector (1985) reported internal reliability as 0.82 for sub-scale of satisfaction from supervisor. The reliability value of original scale developed by Scarpello and Vandenberg’in (1987) is around 0,95-0,96. Internal reliability value of MLQ has reported between 0,74 and 0,91 in several researches (Bass ve Avolio, 1995). Items are evaluated via 5-degree Likert scale

4. EMPIRICAL FINDINGS

4.1. Reliability and Validity of Scales

Difference between personal values and group values:Before calculating differences, internal reliability is calculated for personal values and group values, separately. Cronbach alpha values are 0.854 and 0.925 for these scales, respectively. Exploratory factor analysis is carried out for difference scores. Dimensions and internal reliability are shown at Table 1. (Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin: 0.90;Bartlett’s Test of Sphericity: 0.00)

Table 1: Exploratory Factor Analysis for Person Values-Group Values

Factor	Items	Factor Loads	Eigenvalue	Explained variance (%)	Sub-scale reliability
1	12. people oriented	0.621	7.289	13.271	0.821
	13. fairness	0.657			
	14. tolerance	0.813			
	15. informality	0.641			
	17. supportive	0.611			
	20. being reflective	0.551			
2	29. developing friends at work	0.481	2.235	9.870	0.773
	24. opportunites for professional growth	0.510			
	25. high pay for good performance	0.796			
	26. security of employment	0.776			
	27. offers praise for good performance	0.747			

3	1. adaptability	0.770	1.657	8.570	0.192
	3.being innovative	0.598			
	6.autonomy (R)	- 0.530			
	8. Being analytical	0.580			
4	28.confronting conflict directly	0.575	1.254	8.490	0.227
	31.working long hours (R)	- 0.671			
	37.result oriented	0.467			
	40. being highly organized	0.576			
5	2.stability	0.591	1.201	8.381	0.627
	7.rule oriented	0.792			
	9.attention to detail	0.622			
6	18.being aggressive	0.758	1.113	8.148	0.660
	21. achievement oriented	0.499			
	35.having a good reputation	0.593			
	39.being competitive	0.719			
Total			56.73	0.889	

The 6th item in the 3rd factor and the 31th in the 4th factor decreased the reliability of sub-scales. Therefore, these items are deleted from sub-scales. Internal reliability increased to 0.726 for 3rd dimension, to 0.657 for 4th dimension. The dimensions are named considering the content of items loaded and adhering original sub-scale names as much as possible. 1-respect for people 2-development and attention to rewards 3- innovativeness 4-result oriented 5- detail oriented and stability 6- competitiveness.

Difference between personal values and organizational values: Before calculating differences, internal reliability is calculated for organizational values as 0,941. Exploratory factor analysis is carried out for difference scores. Dimensions and internal reliability are shown at Table 2. (Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin: 0.922; Bartlett’s Test of Sphericity: 0.00)

Table 2: Exploratory Factor Analysis for Person Values-Organizational Values

Factor	Items	Factor Loads	Eigenvalue	Explained variance (%)	Sub-scale reliability
1	10. team oriented	0,567	8,664	17,313	0,808
	11.Sharing information freely	0,579			
	12. people oriented	0,618			
	13. fairness	0,680			
	14. tolerance	0,749			
	16. being calm (R)	- 0,445			
	17. supportive	0,617			
	20. being reflective	0,559			
	38. having a clear guiding philosophy	0,591			
	40. being highly organized	0,531			
2	24.opportunities for professional growth	0,580	1,857	11,997	0,807
	25. high pay for good performance	0,773			
	26. security of employment	0,685			
	27. offers praise for good performance	0,737			
3	28. confronting conflict directly	0,509	1,358	9,214	0,667
	18. being aggressive	0,660			
	21. achievement oriented	0,500			
	39. being competitive	0,797			

4	1. adaptability	0,773	1,258	9,005	0,735
	3. being innovative	0,732			
	5. risk taking	0,681			
5	22.taking individual responsibility	0,792	1,029	8,130	0,864
	23.having high expectations for performance	0,810			
	7. rule oriented	0,843			
6	32. not being constrained by many rules	-0,566	1,008	5,034	- 0,344
Total			60,693	0,903	

The sixth factor is deleted from the scale due to unacceptable internal reliability value (<0,65). The dimensions are named considering the content of items loaded and adhering original sub-scale names as much as possible. 1-respect for people-result oriented-stability 2-development and attention to rewards 3- competitiveness 4- innovativeness 5- initiative.

Satisfaction from team leader: 6 items are loaded to one dimension as expected. Explained variance of this scale is 66,11 % and cronbach alpha is 0.889. (Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin: 0.903;Bartlett's Test of Sphericity: 0.00)

4.2.The Effects of Fit Components on Satisfaction from Supervisor

The effects of fit components (independent variables) on the variability in supervisor satisfaction (dependent variable) are diagnosed via multiple linear regression analysis at SPSS program. Prerequisite assumptions before regression analysis are confirmed: Autocorrelation (Durbin-Watson: 1,5-2,5), multicollinerativity (VIF <10; Tolerance >0,20; CI <30). Utilizing stepwise regression technique, independent variables that do not demonstrate significant effect are eliminated. In this way, artificial increment in (R²) is blocked. Significant effects are shown Table 3.

Table 3: The Effects of Fit Components on Supervisor Satisfaction

Dependent variable	Supervisor satisfaction		
	Independent variables	Standard Beta	T
Similarity of job execution attitude with leader	0,461	7,468	0,00
Person-group value difference (respect for people)	-0,233	-3,759	0,00
Person-organization value difference (innovatiness)	-0,154	-2,483	0,014
Demographic difference with group (job tenure)	0,153	2,462	0,015
Perceptual demographic similarity with group (age)	0,128	2,065	0,040
R ² : 0,412		Adj. R ² :	0,394
F :22,693		Significance value :	0,00

According to analysis results, similarity of job execution attitude with leader, the dimension of respect for people (person-group value congruence), the dimension of innovativeness (person-organization value congruence), demographic difference with group members in terms of job tenure, and perceptual demographic similarity with group in terms of age explain 39,4% of variance in supervisor satisfaction. Similarity of job execution attitude with leader has the most significant effect on supervisor satisfaction,

positively. The least meaningful effect stems from perceptual demographic similarity by group (age) on supervisory satisfaction, relatively. Differences in values by organization and group of individuals affect supervisor satisfaction, as expected, negatively. Contrary to expectations, the increment in differences in terms of job tenure among group members enhances supervisor satisfaction. According to findings, Hypotheses H₁, H₂ and H₃ are partially accepted.

5. CONCLUSIONS

Factors related to working environment mostly stem from manager. Meaningful job presenting increment opportunities that increase the level of satisfaction and commitment for employees, fair salary, comfortable working environment, training and development opportunities, and respect for people are usually under control of manager (Doğan and Kılınc, 2007). Previous research demonstrates that even if the level of motivation resource such as salary is not sufficient for employees, the level of job satisfaction will be high due to supervisor and company management style (Erdil et al., 2004; Erkutlu, 2008). Therefore, it can be expressed that the responsible of emerging group cohesiveness among members is group leader (Stanley, 2001). It is an expected result that possessing similar values, efficient level of communication among members and developing relations cause the level of supervisor satisfaction to increase. Employees cognitively organize their own values using the knowledge that organization presents for internalization of values in the process of value congruence (O'Reilly and Chatman, 1986). Managers take active role in this process by stating desirable values obviously, forcing values via reward and awareness, demonstrating value-consistent behaviors (Kouzes and Posner, 1995; O'Reilly and Chatman, 1986; Ostroff et. al, 2005). Therefore; the significant effect of person-group value congruence and person-organization value congruence on supervisor satisfaction emerges as expected, positively.

In this research, the dimension of respect for people (person-group value congruence) has significant effect. It is appreciated that leader develops the group culture in which respect for people prevails. Sampling in technology-based organizations consists of qualified workforce such as computer engineers and electronics engineers in this research. Value of respect for people should gain importance for employees' intention to remain in group in technology-based organizations where turnover rate is high. The person who develops this type of group culture is seen as leader. The most significant component of person-organization value congruence occurs with the dimension of innovativeness. Due to the fact that speed of information changing is increasingly high, innovativeness should be the main value of organization. Selecting an employee having this type of value and retaining in organization are linked to achievement of project leader.

Another remarkable point related to value congruence is collective climate created via sharing values. Collective climates are created by people who have similar working values, aims, and needs or in the same/interactive working group (Schenider and Reicher, 1983). Young and Parker (1999) reported collective climate was related to employees working in interactive groups.

Strong organizational cultures and sharing perceptions by members in working group make environments that have meaningful effects on employees' reactions regarding

working conditions (Kozlowski and Klein, 2000; Pfeffer and Salanuk, 1978; Kristof-Brown et. al., 2005). For this reason, it can be expressed that congruence of individual values with group values and organizational values means sharing of dominated values, in turn emerging collective climate. The role of organizational leaders in creating collective climate is significant. Kozlowski and Doherty (1989) demonstrated that the interaction between leader and subordinates has meaningful effect on perception of climate (Gil, et. al, 2005). In this way, collective climates can be created through value congruence with group and organization depending on leader.

Individual's congruence with group and organization in terms of values, demographic similarity with group members, and attitude similarity of job execution with group members and leader are linked to supervisor satisfaction. In this research, perceptual age similarity with group members for individuals affect his/her satisfaction from leader, positively. Harrison et. al (2002) showed that actual differentiations in group are related to perceptions. Group differentiations perceived by members is meaningfully associated with group's social integration (Cunnigham, 2007). Therefore, remarkable role of leader for emerging social integration in group influences satisfaction from leader due to demographic similarities. Employees are mostly young men in technology-based organizations. Comfortable communication in working environment is attributed the success of project leader forming group with these members.

According to research findings, if the employees perceive themselves as similar with project leader, the level of satisfaction from leader increases. Similar job execution attitude with supervisor develop communication and relations between supervisor and employees. Employees will identify with their supervisors regarding job execution attitude. However, attitude similarity of job execution with group members does not have significant effect on satisfaction from leader. Another supportive finding for this result is that differing in job tenure for employee among group members enhance the level of satisfaction from leader. Job description for each employee in project is determined, and each group member takes active role depending on his/her own functional competency. For this reason, there are a few employees who execute the same work as other members in the project. Employees are appointed to job in which they gain functional expertise depending on their job tenure by project leader. Therefore, the fact that project leader organizes and coordinates project operations in the light of different job tenures of employees in group is appreciated by individuals.

6. MANAGERIAL IMPLICATIONS AND FURTHER STUDY SUGGESTIONS

The effect of fit dimensions is considered for function of personnel selection/recruitment and retain employees in human resource management.

Traditional job analysis is not enough to select an employee for group-oriented work environments. Traditional job analysis is utilized for determining the level of knowledge, skill, and ability so as to execute job. This type of analysis is carried out at individual level, it ignores analysis at group level for group-oriented works in personnel selection process. Therefore, evaluating person-job fit, person-group fit, and person-organization fit synchronously is a robust approach in personnel selection process (Barber,1998). In this way, the relative importance of perception about person-job fit, person-group fit, and

person-organization fit can be evaluated in job choice (Carless, 2005). When turnover is a substantial issue, it is essential that managers consider measurement of person-organization fit and person-group fit simultaneously in personnel selection battery.

Employees' proactive role in organizations is becoming more apparent in today's competitive environment. When individuals have the same values hierarchy as group and organization, they do not have difficulty in proactive initiatives. The employees know what value should be sacrificed for the sake of desirable values (Erdoğan and Baurer, 2005).

The effect of value congruence in strong/weak cultures is a considerable factor for human resource management. Acceptance or rejection of individual behavior is prominent in strong cultures. Individuals in the organization having strong cultures have similar perception about organization (group)'s operations and the tool/way of pursuit goals (DelCampo, 2006). There is agreement about values among employees. Diagnosing cultural values is more difficult for individuals in weak cultures, and they have opportunity to shape cultural values. For this viewpoint, turnover rate is lower. Consistent with these views, Ashfort (1987) stated that the organizations (groups) having strong culture enhance culture. The researcher investigated the moderators of power of culture on the relationship between person-organization fit and turnover. Strong cultures react for values harder than weak cultures. Therefore, management should consider power of culture in the organization in addition to value congruence.

Another point regarding value congruence to consider, the adverse effect of person-organization fit in high level. Literature for person-organization fit points out adverse potential results of person-organization fit in very high level and remarks incompetency for adaptation to environment and decrease in organizational innovation (Meglino and Ravlin, 1998; Schneider, 1987; Erdoğan and Bauer, 2005). Homogeneity of working values that employees adopt causes homogeneity for interpreting organizational events and for reacting. This situation blocks organizational performance in case adaptation to change and innovativeness need (Meglino and Ravlin, 1998; Schneider, 1987, Erdoğan et. al, 2004). Walsh (1987) asserted that fit in high level trigger organizational saturation. Accordingly, managers are faced with necessity to balance adverse effects of differentiations for blocking and useful effects of these differences for utilizing (Tsui et. al, 1992; Sürgevil, 2008).

Diagnosing moderators of the relationship congruence-satisfaction from leader is a questionable research field to minimize the effects of misfit and to utilize the different viewpoints stemming from heterogeneity of working values and demographic features (Erdogan, et. al, 2004). Kristof-Brown et al. (2005) suggested that moderator variables such as dispositional/individual and environmental characteristics and mediation variables having the same importance as moderator variable should be diagnosed.

Some researchers propose that the density of interactive communication and collective structure relations can diminish depending on increasing in the number of group members (Whitman, et. al., 2010). Therefore, the number of employees in group can be added to research model as moderator variable for diagnosing effects of unit size in further study.

Another moderator variable for considering in fit research can be time. Harrison et. al (1998) investigated the effect of surface-level (demography) differences and deep-level (attitudinal) differences on group social integration. Researchers reported that the time group members work together reduce the effect of surface-level differences and enhance the effect of deep-level differences in case group members have opportunities to participate in interactions.

Group identity can moderate occurring conflict depending on the effect of value and demographic dissimilarities on interactions among individuals. Group identity enables individuals who are different from each other to behave regarding group norms. In that way, acceptability of individuals in group strengthens (Hobman and Bordia, 2006) and unfavorable effects of differences diminish (Surgevil, 2008). The effect of group identity can be considered for value differences that closely direct interactions among individuals, but do not have significant effect on satisfaction in this research. Group identity also regulate the association of dissimilarities (age, gender, race) with task conflict and association of dissimilarities (gender and vocational) with relationship conflict (Hobman and Bordia, 2006). Participants' perception about group identity can be questioned for insignificant relational demography variables in this research as further study.

REFERENCES

- Ashforth, B.E. (1987). Organizations and the petty tyranny: An exploratory study, *The Annual Meeting of the Academy of Management*, New Orleans, LA.
- Barber, A. E. (1998). *Recruiting employees: Individual and organizational perspectives*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Bass, B. ve Avolio, B. (1995). *Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire Leader Form (5x-short)*. Mind Garden, Redwood City, CA.
- Byrne, D. (1971). *The attraction paradigm*. Academic Press, New York.
- Byrne, D., Clore, G. ve Smeaton, G. (1986). The attraction hypothesis: Do similar attitudes affect anything? *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*. 51, 1167-1170.
- Cable, D. M. ve Judge, T. A. (1996). Person-organization fit, job choice decisions, and organizational entry. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Process*, 67, 294-311.
- Carless, S. A. (2005). Person-job fit versus person-organization fit as predictors of organizational attraction and job acceptance intentions: a longitudinal study. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, Cilt 78, Sayı 3, 411-429.
- Cunningham, G. B. (2007). Perceptions as reality: The influence of actual and perceived demographic dissimilarity. *Journal of Business Psychology*, 22, 79-89.
- Çiçek, I. (2013). *The effects of job characteristics fit, person-organization fit, person-group fit, and relational demography on employees*, (doctoral thesis), Istanbul Technical University, Faculty of Management, Istanbul
- DelCampo, R. G. (2006). Influence of culture strength on person-organization fit and turnover. *International Journal of Management*, September, Cilt 23, Sayı 3, Kısım 1, 465-471.
- Doğan, S. ve Kılıç, S. (2007). Örgütsel bağlılığın sağlanmasında personel güçlendirmenin yeri ve önemi. *Erciyes Üniversitesi İktisadi ve İdari Bilimler fakültesi Dergisi*, 29, 37-61.
- Edwards, J. R. ve Cooper, C. L. (1990). The person-environment fit approach to stress: Recurring problems and some suggestions. *Journal Of Organizational Behavior*, 11, 293-307.

Erdil, O., Keskin, H., İmamoğlu, S. Z. ve Erat, S. (2004). Yönetim tarzı ve çalışma koşulları, arkadaşlık ortamı ve takdir edilme duygusu ile iş tatmini arasındaki ilişkiler: Tekstil sektöründe bir uygulama. *Doğuş Üniversitesi Dergisi*, Cilt 5, Sayı 1, 17-26.

Erdoğan, B., Kraimer, M.L. ve Liden, R. C. (2004). Work value congruence and intrinsic career success: the compensatory roles of leader-member exchange and perceived organizational support. *Personnel Psychology*, 57, 305-332.

Erdoğan, B. ve Bauer, T. N. (2005). Enhancing career benefits of employee proactive personality: The role of fit with jobs and organizations. *Personnel Psychology*, 58, Sayı 4, 859-891.

Ercutlu, H. (2008). The impact of transformational leadership on organizational and leadership effectiveness: The Turkish Case. *Journal of Management Development*, Cilt 27, No 7, 708-726.

Fields, D. L. (2002). *Taking the Measure of Work: A Guide to Validated Scales for Organizational Research and Diagnosing*. Sage Publications, Thousand Oaks, London.

George, E. ve Chattopadhyay, P. (2002). Do differences matter? Understanding demography-related effects in organization. *Australian Journal of Management*, 27, 47-54.

Gil, F., Rico, R., Alcover, C. M. ve Barrasa, A. (2005). Change-oriented leadership, satisfaction and performance in work groups: effects of team climate and group potency. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, Cilt 20, Sayı 3 / 4, 312-328.

Harrison, D. A., Price, K. H., Gavin, J. H. ve Florey, A. T. (2002). Time, teams, and task performance: Changing effects of surface and deep level diversity on group functioning. *Academy of Management Journal*, 45, 1029-1046.

Hellriegel, D. ve Slocum, J. W. Jr. (1974). Organizational climate: Measures, research and contingencies. *Academy of Management Journal*, Cilt 17, Sayı 2, 255-280.

Harrison, D. A., Price, K. H. ve Bell, M. (1998). Beyond relational demography: Time and the effects of surface-and deep diversity on work group cohesion. *Academy of Management Journal*, Cilt 41 Sayı 1, 96-107.

Hobman, E. V., Bordia, P. ve Gallois, C. (2004). Perceived dissimilarity and work group involvement: The moderating effects of group openness to diversity. *Group & Organization Management*, Cilt 29, Sayı 5, 560-579.

Hobman, E. V. ve Bordia, P. (2006). The role of team identification in the dissimilarity-conflict relationship. *Group Processes & Intergroup Relations*, 9, 483-508.

Howell, J. M. ve Hall-Marenda, K. (1999). The ties that bind: The leaders-member exchange, transformational and transactional leadership and distance on predicting follower performance. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, Cilt 84, Sayı 5, 680-694.

Krishan, V. (2008). Does management education make students better actors? A longitudinal study of change in values and self-monitoring? *Great Lakes Herald*, Vol2, No1, 36-48.

Kouzes, J. M. ve Posner, B. Z. (1995). *The Leadership Challenge: How to Keep Getting Extraordinary Things Done in Organizations*. Jossey-Bass, California.

Kozlowski, S. W. J. ve Doherty, M.L. (1989). Integration of climate and leadership: Examination of a neglected issue. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 74, 546-553.

Kristof, A.L. (1996). Person-organization fit: An integrative review of its conceptualizations, measurement, and implications. *Personnel Psychology*, 49, 1-49.

Kristof-Brown, Amy L., Zimmerman, Ryan D. ve Johnson, E. N. (2005). Consequences of individual's fit at work: A meta analysis of person-job, person-organization, person-group, and person-supervisor fit. *Personnel Psychology*, 58, 281-342.

Louis, M. R. (1990). Acculturation in the workplace: Newcomer as lay ethnographers. In B. Schneider (Ed.), *Organizational climate and culture*, (sf: 85-129). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

McCulloch, M. C. ve Turban, D.B. (2007). Using person-organization fit to select employees for high-turnover jobs. *International Journal of Selection and Assessment*, 15, 63-71.

Meglino, B. M. ve Ravlin, E. C. (1998). Individual values in organizations: concepts, controversies, and research. *Journal of Management*. 24, 351-389.

Metzler, V. L. (2005). Organizational culture: Finding the right fit. (Yayımlanmamış doktora tezi), Temple University.

Meşe, G. (1999). *Sosyal kimlik ve yaşam stilleri*, (yayımlanmamış doktora tezi), Ege Üniversitesi.

Molleman, E. ve Slomp, J. (2006). The impact of team and work characteristics on team functioning. *Human Factors and Ergonomics in Manufacturing*, Cilt 16, Sayı 1, 1-15.

Moynihan, L.M. ve Peterson, R. S. (2001). A contingent configuration approach to understanding the role of personality in organizational groups. *Research in Organizational Behavior*, Cilt 23, 327-378.

Muchinsky, P. M. ve Monahan, C. J. (1987). What is person-environment congruence? Supplementary versus complementary models of fit. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 31, 268-277.

O'Reilly, C. A. ve Chatman, J. (1986). Organizational commitment and psychological attachment: The effects of compliance, identification and internalization on prosocial behavior. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 71, 492-499.

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

O'Reilly, C. A., Caldwell, D. F. ve Barnett, W. P. (1989). Work group demography, social integration, and turnover. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 34, 21-37.

Ostroff, C., Shin, Y. ve Kinicki, A. (2005). Multiple perspectives of congruence: Relationships between value congruence and employee attitudes. *Journal of Organizational Behaviour*, Cilt 26, Sayı 6, 591-623.

Patsfall, M. R. ve Feimer, N. R. (1985). The role of person-environment fit. In H. J. Bernardin, D. A. Bownas (Eds.), *Job Performance and Satisfaction Personality Assessment In Organizations*. (sf: 53-81). New York: Praeger.

Pfeffer, J. ve Salancik, G. (1978). *The External Control of Organizations*. Harper & Row, New York.

Riordan, C. M. (1995). *The empirical comparison of three operationalizations of the construct of demographic similarity through the test of a theoretical model of relational demography*, (yayımlanmamış doktora tezi), Georgia State University.

Riordan, C.M. (2000). Relational demography within groups: Past developments, contradictions, and new directions. In G.R. Ferris (Ed.), *Research in Personnel and Human Resource Management*. Cilt 19, (sf:131-173). Stamford, CT: JAI Press

Roberts, D. H. ve O'Reilly III, C. A. (1979). Some correlates of communication roles in organizations. *Academy of Management Journal*, 22, 42-57.

Rokeach, M. (1973). *The Nature of Human Values*. The Free Press, New York.

Rosenbaum, M.E. (1986). The acquaintance process: Looking mainly backward. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 51, 1156-1166.

Rousseau, D. M. (1990). New hire perception of their own and their employer's obligations: A study of psychological contracts. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, Cilt 11, 389-400.

Scarpello, V. ve Vandenberg, R.J. (1987). The satisfaction with my supervisor scale: Its utility for research and practical applications. *Journal of Management*, Cilt 13, Sayı 3, 447-466

Schein, E. (1992). *Organizational Culture and Leadership*. Jossey-Bass, San Francisco, CA.

Schneider, B. ve Reichers, A. (1983). On the etiology of climates. *Personnel Psychology*, 36, 19-39.

Schneider, B. (1987). The people make the place, *Personnel Psychology*, 40, 437-453.

- Soylu, S. (1999). *İşletmelerde Sosyal Kategorizasyon ve Sosyal Kimlik; Gruplar Arası İlişkiler ve Sosyal Kimlik Teorileri*. (Ed.: Sibel A. Arkonaç); Alfa Yay; İstanbul.
- Schneider, B. (1987). The people make the place, *Personnel Psychology*, 40, 437-453.
- Spector, P. E. (1985). Measurement of human service staff satisfaction: Development of the job satisfaction survey. *American Journal of Community Psychology*, Cilt 13, Sayı 6, 693-713.
- Stanley, C. L. (2001). *Examination of group supervision: Cohesiveness and supervisor leadership as predictors of intern performance*, (yayımlanmamış doktora tezi), Seattle Pacific University, Clinical Psychology
- Sürgevil, O. (2008). Farklılık kavramına ve farklılıkların yönetimine temel oluşturan sosyo-psikolojik kuramlar. *Balıkesir Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Dergisi*, 20, 111-124
- Trice, H. M. ve Beyer, J.M. (1993). *The Culture Of Work Organizations*. Englewood Cliffs, Prentice Hall
- Tsui, A. S. ve O' Reilly III, C. A. (1989). Beyond simple demographic effects: The importance of relational demography in superior-subordinate dyads. *Academy of Management Journal*, Cilt 32, Sayı 2, 402-423.
- Tsui, A.S., Egan, T.D. ve O'Reilly III, C.A. (1992). Being different: Relational demography and organizational attachment. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, Cilt 37, Sayı 4, 549-579.
- Turgut, T. (1998). Örgütsel davranışta değerlerin yeri. S. Tevruz (Ed.) *Endüstri ve Örgüt Psikolojisi*. Cilt 2, (sf: 35-48). Ankara: Türk Psikologlar Derneği.
- Turner, B. A., Pidgeon, N., Blockley, D. ve Toft, B. (1989). Safety culture: its importance in future risk Management. *The 2nd World Bank Workshop on Safety Control and Risk Management*, Karlstad, Sweden.
- Tziner, A. E. (1988). Effects of team composition on ranked team effectiveness: The blocked fractional design. *Small Group Behavior*, 19, 363-378.
- Verquer, M, L. (2002). *Fitting in at work: A comparison of the relationships between person-organization fit and person-group fit with work attitudes*, (yayımlanmamış doktora tezi), Central Michigan University, Department of Psychology.
- Wagnerr, W. G., Pfeffer, J. ve O'Reilly, C. A. (1984). Organizational demography and turnover in top management groups. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 29, 74-92.
- Walsh, W. B. (1987). Person-environment congruence: A response to the Moos perspective. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 31, 347-352.
- Warren, T. R. (1996). *P-O fit and organizational outcomes*, (doktora tezi), Georgio Institute of Technology, Psychology.
- Werbil, J. D. ve Johnson, D. J. (2001), The use of person-group fit for employment selection: A missing link in person-environment fit. *Human Resource Management*, Cilt 40, Sayı 3, 227-240.
- Whitman, D. S., Van Rooy, D. L. ve Viswesvaran, C. (2010). Satisfaction, citizenship behaviors, and performance in work units: A meta-analysis of collective construct relations, *Personnel Psychology*, Cilt 63, Sayı 1, 41-81.
- Young, S. A. ve Parker, C. P. (1999). Predicting collective climates: assessing the role of shared work values, needs, employee interaction and work group membership. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 20, 1199-1218.