The Consistency of Personal and Organizational Values
When Viewed Through the Lens of Regulatory Focus Theory

Lauren Rich, S. Gayle Baugh, John H. Batchelor

University of West Florida, Rich, 17 Highpoint Dr., Gulf Breeze, FL, 32561
lrich@uwf.edu

ABSTRACT

The current study provides a second step in the development of an alternative, two-dimensional conceptualization of person-organization fit. This conceptualization distinguishes between two motivations known to influence the way individuals define and pursue goals—promotion focus and prevention focus. Based on empirical support, we conclude that the Organizational Culture Profile's original seven dimensions, when used to profile individual value preferences, reflect different underlying motivations that are likely to be important in predicting specific work behaviors such as speed, creativity, attention to detail, and safety performance. Our conclusion challenges the common practice within person-organization fit research of predicting generic effects across any and all combinations of shared values between an individual and the respective organization. We suggest that partitioning P-O fit into two dimensions supported by regulatory focus theory will result in improved predictive power on specific work behaviors.

I.   INTRODUCTION

By and large, most scholars would agree that organizational culture has a meaningful impact on workplace behaviors; however, articulating the nature of this influence has proven to be a challenge (e.g., Davis-Blake and Pfeffer, 1989; Chatman et al., 2014; Hoffman and Woehr, 2006; Kristof-Brown et al., 2005; Mischel, 1968). Within organizational research, person-organization (P-O) fit has emerged as the predominant method for studying the influence of organizational culture on workplace attitudes and behaviors. P-O fit is a concept designed to assess the level of value congruency between an individual and an organization (Morley, 2007; O'Reilly et al., 1991; Westerman and Vanka, 2005).

Although P-O fit is often studied as a determinant of important work-related behavioral outcomes such as task performance and organizational citizenship, empirical findings in general do not support P-O fit as a meaningful predictor of behavioral outcomes. Rich, Rich, and Hair (2018) attribute this lack of empirical support to shortcomings in the traditional conceptualization of P-O fit and propose an alternative framework for assessing organizational culture (the "O" component in P-O fit). In this research, we utilize that alternative framework to determine whether the dimensions of organizational culture documented by Rich and colleagues (2018) are consistent with those underlying personal values (i.e., the "P" in P-O fit). If so, then the current research coupled with the findings of Rich and colleagues (2018) together provide support for an alternative measure of P-O fit—one that we hope leads to not only a more robust understanding of the phenomenon itself but also improved usefulness in predicting specific work behaviors such as speed, creativity, attention to detail, and safety performance.

II.   LITERATURE REVIEW

We will begin the discussion by examining personal values and organizational values as both are assessed by the Organizational Culture Profile. These issues give rise to the examination of person-organization (P-O) fit. Regulatory focus theory is introduced as a mechanism of categorizing both personal and organizational values that enhances prediction of outcomes of person-organization fit. Finally, we examine the structure of personal values as assessed by the Organizational Culture Profile to determine consistency with the structure of organizational values based on regulatory focus theory (Rich et al., 2018).

A. Personal Values

Personal values are defined as an individual's enduring beliefs that specific modes of conduct are preferable to opposing modes of conduct (Rokeach, 1973). Personal values define not only who an individual is but also who an individual is not. For instance, if an individual believes donating to charity is good, then the individual must also believe that not giving to charity is bad (or at least not as good).

Individuals use their personal values to interpret events in their personal and work lives (Hitlin and Piliavin, 2004). For example, supervisors who value novelty and innovation will encourage employees to express their suggestions for workplace

improvement. They will appreciate the opportunity for change and will evaluate subordinates offering such proposals positively. By contrast, supervisors who value stability will view such opportunities to innovate negatively and will evaluate subordinates who offer recommendations for change poorly. Thus, subordinates learn through the reactions of their supervisor whether novelty and change or stability and predictability are valued in their work unit and may well generalize those lessons to the organization as a whole.

B. Organizational Values

The Organizational Culture Profile (OCP) (see O'Reilly et al., 1991) is a popular framework used for profiling organizational values as well as personal values and has been demonstrated to be reliable and valid across a number of contexts (Ashkanasy et al., 2000). The OCP includes seven independent dimensions: innovation, outcome orientation, aggressiveness, stability, attention to detail, respect for people, and team orientation (Cable and Judge, 1996; O'Reilly et al., 1991). Each dimension is supported by a set of basic values that are noted for being descriptive, distinctive, and suitable for capturing the diversity among organizations and individuals alike (Chatman et al., 2014; O'Reilly et al., 1991). For example, the innovation dimension emphasizes values such as risk taking and experimenting, while the stability dimension reflects values including security and predictability.

Recently, Rich et al. (2018) consolidated the OCP's original seven cultural dimensions into two empirically supported higher-order, independent dimensions termed as promotion-focused culture and prevention-focused culture. The terms promotion and prevention are adapted from Higgins' (1997) regulatory focus theory (RFT), and the higher-order dimensions of organizational culture are structured to mirror RFT's two distinct self-regulatory orientations, which have been linked to key differences in the way individuals define and pursue goals. Ultimately, the research conducted by Rich et al. (2018) supports that the OCP's seven dimensions reflect different underlying motivations likely important in predicting individual work behavior. Notably, this conclusion challenges the common practice of predicting generic effects across all cultural dimensions.

C. Person-Organization Fit

Within organizational research, person-organization (P-O) fit has emerged as a common method for studying the influence of values on individuals within the workplace. P-O fit holds that individual-level outcomes such as work attitudes and behaviors are best predicted by the level of congruence between an individual's personal values and the culture of the organization to which the individual belongs (e.g., Morley, 2007; O'Reilly et al., 1991; Westerman and Vanka, 2005). Initially, P-O fit was developed to predict an individual's general attitudes toward a particular organization, such as organizational commitment and job satisfaction (O'Reilly et al., 1991). Over the years, however, the applications of P-O fit have been extended to predict a limited number of work behaviors including task performance, organizational citizenship behavior, and turnover (Cable and DeRue, 2002; Hoffman and Woehr, 2006; Vandenberghe, 1999). Generally speaking, it seems reasonable that values—both personal and cultural—should have a meaningful

impact on workplace behaviors; however, articulating the nature of this influence has been a challenge. A comprehensive review of the P-O fit literature suggests that the predictive ability of P-O fit on workplace behaviors is weak to moderate at best (Hoffman and Woehr, 2006).

Rich, Rich and Hair (2018) attribute the overall weak relationship between P-O fit and workplace behaviors to shortcomings in the conceptualization of P-O fit. To this point, many conceptualizations of P-O fit center only on whether values generally are shared across individuals and their respective organization, rather than focusing on which specific values are consistent across individuals and organization (Rich et al., 2018). That is, the preponderance of past research is based on the fundamental assumption that any combination of shared values between the two parties will have a positive effect across a broad range of desirable work outcomes equally.

While the undifferentiated focus on shared values is intuitively appealing, problems with such a facile approach can be highlighted by considering two examples of P-O fit. Extending the example offered in the previous paragraph, suppose employee "A" and company "A" both value stimulation and self-direction, while both employee "B" and company "B" highly regard tradition and conformity. From a unidimensional perspective on organizational values, any and all positive workplace attitudes and behaviors would be predicted for both employees—because both employees exhibit strong P-O fit with their respective organizations. Yet, Rich et al. (2018) argue that such a generic approach to establishing fit undermines a fundamental principle of values: while some values work together providing individuals with compatible cues, other values challenge one another and provide conflicting cues (Schwartz, 1992, 2012). While both employees "fit" with their respective organizations, the values reflected in example "A" (i.e., stimulation and self-direction) encourage change, whereas the values represented in example "B" (i.e., tradition and conformity) oppose change. As a result, while it is likely that both examples of fit contribute to the two employees' work behaviors, the particular work behaviors that result would be quite different in the two examples. It seems reasonable to attribute higher levels of innovative behaviors to P-O fit in example "A" but not "B", while higher levels of conservative behaviors (such as safety performance) are likely outcomes of P-O fit in example "B" but not "A".

Rich et al. (2018) developed and empirically tested an alternative framework for studying organizational culture (i.e., the "O" component in P-O fit) that recognizes the inherent conflict among values. Their model links 22 values from the OCP to two distinct, well-established motivations that contribute to the way individuals define and pursue goals—promotion focus and prevention focus. These two foci are derived from regulatory focus theory (Higgins, 1997). The current research relies on these two basic motivations to develop an alternative method for profiling personal values in a way that distinguishes between congruent and conflicting values.

D.   Regulatory Focus Theory

Higgins' (1997) regulatory focus theory (RFT) provides a framework for organizing values around commonalities that distinguish how individuals define and pursue goals. RFT is a goal pursuit theory that articulates differences in individuals' perceptions, motivation, and behavior during the decision-making process. The theory posits two independent and contrasting self-regulatory orientations—promotion focus and

prevention focus.

Promotion focus involves the motivation to approach pleasure, whereas prevention focus takes as its motivation avoiding pain (Higgins, 2002; Johnson et al., 2015; Yen et al., 2011). In turn, promotion focus and prevention focus distinguish between how approach and avoidance evoke different individual goals and strategies to achieve them. Specifically, individuals adopt distinct strategies during goal pursuit—strategies that have been found to predict different behavioral outcomes (e.g., Higgins et al., 1994; Van Dijk and Kluger, 2011).

An individual's predisposition to either achieve pleasure or avoid pain can be managed and thus used to predict how the individual will perform relating to behavioral work outcomes. For instance, promotion-focused employees, who perceive achieving positive outcomes as being more important than avoiding negative outcomes (Higgins, 2002), tend to choose goals emphasizing achievement and positive outcomes. By contrast, prevention-focused employees tend to focus their goal directed behaviors on minimizing discomfort and avoiding negative outcomes (Crowe and Higgins, 1997; Liberman et al., 1999).

RFT is a relatively comprehensive theory of motivation given the theory's ability to identify more proximal stimuli associated with approach and avoidance motivations—to the point of being able to predict specific outcomes based on how individuals respond to these proximal influences (Higgins, 1997, 1998, 2000). With respect to outcomes, promotion focus and prevention focus have been used to predict contrasting individual behavioral outcomes such as speed/accuracy, creativity/timeliness, risk/conservatism, persistence/readiness to quit, and productivity/safety (e.g., Boldero and Higgins, 2011; Crowe and Higgins, 1997; Forster et al., 2003; Hamstra et al., 2011; Wallace and Chen, 2006).

E.   Regulatory Focus Theory and Individual Values

Based on regulatory focus theory, Rich et al. (2018) integrated the OCP's original seven dimensions of organizational values (i.e., innovation, outcome orientation, aggressiveness, attention to detail, stability, teamwork, and respect for others) into the two regulatory foci (i.e., promotion focus and prevention focus). A similar integration has not yet been accomplished for individual values. However, there is good reason to expect that individual values will exhibit a similar structure.

The regulatory focus framework links the OCP dimensions of innovation, aggressiveness, and outcome orientation to promotion focus, indicated in Rich and colleagues (2018). Promotion-focused individuals are more attuned to positively framed goals and outcomes; notably, elevated sensitivity to positive outcomes is a hallmark condition associated with promotion focus (Higgins, 1997). In response to this sensitivity, promotion-focused individuals aggressively take on goals associated with beneficial outcomes (Crowe and Higgins, 1997). As previously noted, studies within RFT support that sensitivity to positive outcomes contributes to behaviors such as productivity, change, speed, risk, and creativity (Boldero and Higgins, 2011; Friedman and Förster, 2001; Hamstra et al., 2011; Liberman et al., 1999).

Rich et al.'s (2018) framework associates the remaining OCP dimensions—attention to detail, stability, team orientation, and respect for others—to prevention focus. Prevention-focused self-regulation is fueled by one's sensitivities to loss, security, and

obligation (Higgins, 1997, 1998). In response to these sensitivities (and as previously noted), prevention-focused individuals adopt behavioral strategies that reinforce accuracy, safety, and resistance to change (Boldero and Higgins, 2011; Crowe and Higgins, 1997; Hamstra et al., 2011; Liberman et al., 1999).

Research within RFT indicates that avoidance strategies associated with prevention focus stimulate feelings of interdependence, interpersonal relationships, and a collective mindset (Higgins, 1997, 1998). Prevention-focused individuals rely heavily on feelings of obligation to guide their actions; within the workplace, these feelings motivate them to develop strong relationships with co-workers and to fulfill various roles throughout the organization (Lee at al., 2000).

III.   HYPOTHESES

To summarize the basic tenet in the framework developed by Rich et al. (2018), the OCP's seven original dimensions of culture can be consolidated into two independent, higher-order dimensions that reflect the stimuli associated with promotion focus and prevention focus. Specifically, promotion focus encompasses three of the OCP's original seven dimensions (aggressiveness, innovation, and outcome orientation). Likewise, the remaining four OCP dimensions (stability, attention to detail, teamwork, and respect for people) can be linked to prevention focus. We propose that this reconfigured, higher-order factor structure proposed by Rich et al. (2018) can be used to represent not only organizational culture but also personal values in a way that recognizes the inherent conflict and congruency among values. The following hypotheses are proposed:

H1:   Value statements measuring an individual's personal preferences toward innovation, outcome orientation, and aggressiveness dimensions will consolidate into a single higher-order factor – termed promotion-focused value orientation.

H2:   Value statements measuring an individual's personal preferences toward stability, attention to detail, respect for people, and team orientation dimensions will consolidate into a single, higher-order factor – termed prevention-focused value orientation.

If hypotheses 1 and 2 are supported, these findings combined with those of Rich et al. (2018) together provide support that both personal values (the "P" side of P-O fit) and organizational values (the "O" side of P-O fit) can be conceptualized as higher order factors that parallel the underlying motivations associated with promotion focus and prevention focus. Ultimately these findings would justify moving forward with testing to see if the specific two-dimensional model of P-O fit differentially predicts behavioral outcomes (e.g. speed, attention to detail, creativity, safety performance, etc.) as suggested by regulatory focus theory.

IV.   METHOD

A. Research Design and Data Collection

Data for this study were obtained as part of a larger study on person-organization fit. Twenty-two public accounting firms in the United States agreed to participate in the study.

Among the 22 firms, the average annual revenue was $30 million, with a range from $15 million to $74 million in annual revenue. The use of accounting firms has precedence in this body of literature as O'Reilly et al. (1991) used accounting firms to validate the OCP.

In the larger research project, separate samples of accountants were employed to assess organizational and personal values. In this study, we will focus only on personal values. To measure employees' personal values, self-reported data was collected electronically via the Qualtrics Survey platform from an average of 12 staff accountants within each firm—with a range of 7 to 20 accountants across firms. All respondents were full-time employees who had worked a minimum of one full tax season.

B.   Measures

All respondents in the study provided information on the same set of 22 values from the OCP that we used in the research reported by Rich et al. (2018). These 22 items were selected for the research because of their use in previous studies (e.g., Cable and Judge, 1996) and their consistency with the promotion focus or prevention focus dimensions of regulatory focus theory. Refer to Table 1 for a list of the 22 items.

C.   Analysis

Partial least squares confirmatory composite analysis (PLS-CCA) was used to test the measurement of the proposed factors and structure theorized in the hypotheses (Hair et al., 2018; Henseler et al. 2014; Henseler et al., 2016). Version 3.2.7 of Smart PLS structural equation modeling software was used to conduct this analysis (Ringle et al., 2015).

The preponderance of research in this area has used exploratory factor analysis (EFA) to modify and test theories related to OCP structure (e.g., Baird et al., 2011; Chatman and Jehn, 1994; Chatman et al., 2014; Lee and Yu, 2004; Wang et al., 2010). However, EFA is not appropriate for the current study because EFA is not designed to evaluate higher-order factor structures. Hair, Hult, Ringle, and Sarstedt (2017) and Hair et al. (2018) argue that PLS-CCA is better equipped for studies engaged in assessing measurement models, explaining variance, and theory development than other methods, such as covariance-based confirmatory factor analysis.

Table 1
Organizational Culture Profile Items

Item	Extremely Uncharacteristic	Uncharacteristic	Somewhat Uncharacteristic	Neutral	Somewhat Characteristic	Characteristic	Extremely Characteristic
Stability	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
Adaptability	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
Being innovative	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
Quick to take advantage of opportunities	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
Risk taking	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
Being results oriented	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
Paying attention to detail	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
Controlling conflict directly	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
Being team oriented	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
Being people oriented	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
Fairness	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
Tolerance	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
Being competitive	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
Being highly organized	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
Achievement oriented	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
High performance expectations	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
Being aggressive	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
Security of employment	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
Being calm	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
Developing friends at work	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
Having a good reputation	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
An emphasis on quality	○	○	○	○	○	○	○

Instructions: The statements listed on the next two pages are used to describe personal values that are commonly held by individuals. Please read each statement and then fill in the bubble that best indicates how important that value is to you personally. For example, if you determine that "Stability" is "Somewhat Characteristic" of you in terms of what you value personally, then please fill in the corresponding bubble on the form. Please respond to all of the statements.

V.   RESULTS

Both hypotheses in this study proposed that a higher-order dimensional model (promotion focus and prevention focus) will be supported based on the hypothesized grouping of the seven dimensions of the OCP. To begin, the measurement model for personal values was tested using PLS software. We followed contemporary methodological guidelines (similar to those of Brammer et al., 2015; Hair et al., 2017; Ringle et al., 2015). Table 2 shows the outer loadings between indicators and first-order constructs to test reliability. Problematic indicators were identified by using the guidelines established by Hair and colleagues (2017) and MacKenzie and colleagues (2011). Three indicators were considered for removal based on having marginal outer loadings, which include outer loadings lower than Hair and colleagues' (2013) recommended 0.708 but above the minimum standard of 0.40. Outer loadings for indicators "developing friends at work", "having a good reputation", and "adaptability" were 0.614, 0.601, and 0.562, respectively. For each of these indicators, we considered the impact of its deletion based on the respective measurement model's composite reliability and average variance extracted (AVE) (shown in Table 2). In the end, however, all three indicators were retained because, despite the marginal outer loadings, each indicator strengthened the measurement validity and unidimensionality of its respective construct and corresponding first order cultural composite (i.e., AVEs for innovation, respect for people, and team orientation had already exceeded the desired .50 standard without eliminating the three indicators). Additionally, t-values obtained through bootstrapping support that the outer loadings for all first order indicators are significant at the <.01 level.

Composite reliability was used to test internal consistency reliability (Hair et al., 2017). Table 2 shows the results for all first-order constructs. Each reached acceptable reliabilities above .70, which is generally considered appropriate (Nunnally and Bernstein, 1994), with a range of .785 to .842.

The average variance extracted (AVE) of each first-order construct was used to assess convergent validity. Hair et al. (2018) established a threshold of .50 for this measure. As shown in Table 2, all the constructs examined possessed AVEs that surpassed this threshold, ranging from .553 to .654.

Next, discriminant validity was assessed to determine if the constructs are distinct. Fornell-Larcker's (Fornell and Larcker, 1981) criterion method, where the square roof of the construct's AVE must be greater than its correlation with another construct, was used. All first-order constructs were found to be distinct.

The results presented in Table 2 suggest that the seven composites previously identified by Rich et al. (2018) were also found as first-order composites in the present partial least square analysis using data on personal values (rather than organizational values). These seven composites were innovation, outcome orientation, aggressiveness, attention to detail, stability, team orientation, and respect for people.

Table 2
Theorized Higher-order Factor Structure and PLS Results

2nd Order Factors	1st Order Factors	Constructs & Indicators	Outer Loadings	Composite Reliability	AVE
Promotion-focused	Innovation	Innovation:		0.831	0.557
		Being innovative	0.795		
		Risk taking	0.793		
		Adaptability	0.562		
		Quick to take advantage of opportunities	0.807		
	Aggressiveness	Aggressiveness:		0.837	0.633
		Being competitive	0.754		
		Being aggressive	0.894		
		Confronting conflict directly	0.729		
	Outcome Orientation	Outcome Orientation:		0.832	0.623
		Being results oriented	0.755		
		Achievement orientation	0.834		
		High performance expectations	0.776		
Prevention-focused	Stability	Stability:		0.834	0.626
		Stability	0.821		
		Security of employment	0.809		
		Being calm	0.742		
	Attention to Detail	Attention to Detail:		0.795	0.565
		Paying attention to detail	0.747		
		Being highly organized	0.740		
		An emphasis on quality	0.767		
	Respect for People	Respect for People:		0.785	0.553
		Fairness	0.821		
		Tolerance	0.789		
		Having a good reputation	0.601		
	Team Orientation	Team Orientation:		0.842	0.645
		Being team oriented	0.919		
		Being people oriented	0.846		
		Developing friends at work	0.614		

Note: OCP items adapted from Cable & Judge (1996) and factor structure adapted from Rich et al. (2018).

All criteria relating to reliability and validity recommended to evaluate the acceptability of data for use with confirmatory composite analysis for this study are met, thus we continued with confirmatory composite analysis. Our findings support hypotheses 1 and 2. The first three of the seven first-order composites—innovation, aggressiveness, and outcome orientation—comprised a higher-order composite that was consistent with promotion focus. Thus, Hypothesis 1 was supported. The remaining four dimensions—stability, attention to detail, respect for people, and team orientation—comprised a second higher order composite that was consistent with prevention focus. Hypothesis 2 was also supported. Wetzels and colleagues' (2009) approach was used for the development of these two higher order composites.

VI.   DISCUSSION

A.   Findings

This research represents a step in a program of empirical work to improve both research and practice with respect to organizational culture and organizational values. The results of the current study represent a step away from a monolithic model of P-O fit that implies that fit on any dimension of organizational culture is considered equally desirable. These findings combined with those of Rich et al (2018) suggest that organizations, like people, vary in their relative emphasis on differing sets of values—specifically those related to a promotion focus as compared to those related to a prevention focus (Johnson et al., 2015). As a result, congruence between person and organization with respect to the dominant values of a firm suggests better P-O fit than agreement with respect to values that receive less emphasis within the firm. While this approach may seem intuitively appealing, most research on P-O fit has not employed that perspective (e.g., Cable and DeRue, 2002; Cable and Judge, 1996; Hoffman and Woehr, 2006; Kristof-Brown et al., 2005; Vandenberghe, 1999).

The two-dimensional approach of promotion focus and prevention focus with their underlying values may render research on P-O fit more effective. The two diverging orientations suggest differing patterns of emphasis on the underlying value structure of the OCP. The different values that organizations choose to emphasize have implications for desired behavior on the part of employees. The employees, in turn, will have varying behavioral and emotional responses to the organizational setting (Beus et al., 2020; Johnson et al., 2015; Yen et al. 2011). Based on the attraction-selection-attrition paradigm (Schneider, 1987), we suggest that individuals whose personal orientation (promotion or prevention) is consistent with the organization's orientation will find the organization's behavioral requirements to better match their own inclinations than an individual with the opposing orientation (Schneider, 1987).

B.   Implications for Practice

This study investigated the person (employee) aspect of P-O fit. We found support for a nuanced view of value agreement, thus offering direction to determining how personal values may influence P-O fit. Previous research by Rich et al. (2018) found support for the same nuanced view for organizational level values. Taken together, this study and the one by Rich et al. (2018) provide support to the proposition that when one is investigating P-O fit, especially fit based on OCP model, such fit should be viewed and investigated as comprised of two higher-order dimensions.

Brockner and Higgins (2001) argue that organizational culture can be viewed as a set of situational cues that will influence employee responses. This argument coupled with the current findings and those of Rich et al. (2018) implies that the congruence of promotion and prevention focused cultures with individual level foci should relate to important behavioral outcomes. Whereas promotion focus agreements should relate to innovation, outcome orientation, and aggressiveness, prevention focus agreement should relate to accuracy, safety and adherence to standard operating procedures.

The more nuanced view of P-O fit advocated here has implications for organizational practice. Based on the attraction-selection-attrition paradigm,

organizations may benefit by directing their selection practices toward finding fit with the organizational values related to the primary focus of either promotion or prevention. Person-organization fit has sometimes been considered in selection practice as an ambiguous construct that could only be assessed by human intuition. Organizations have also assessed value congruence with a more quantitative approach to determining fit. This approach is normally predicated on the presumption that fit on each individual value is equally important to fit on any the others (Kristoff-Brown et al., 2005; O'Reilly et al., 1991). We suggest, however, that P-O fit should be viewed as consistency with the overall dimension of promotion or prevention using the underlying dimensions of the OCP to develop a quantitative selection approach.

Organizations that adopt this perspective on P-O fit should be rewarded with both stronger individual performance and higher personnel retention rates. Individuals selected for fit with the organization's primary focus, promotion or prevention, will be predisposed to produce behaviors consistent with that focus. Thus, the behaviors desired within the firm are the behaviors that "flow naturally" for incumbents. In order to use this approach, the current research to confirm the commonality of underlying structure for both the organizational and individuals values represented in the OCP is required. However, further evidence of measurement equivalence may be necessary in order to be completely confident in implementing this method.

Training and performance evaluation systems may also be influenced by consistency of personal and organizational values. Many companies invest in training without considering carefully how the behaviors to be trained should be enacted within the organization's culture. The emphasis and tone of training programs should reflect the organization's primary cultural dimension. Performance appraisal should also be attuned to promotion or prevention focus. Performance appraisal dimensions should be consistent with the organization's primary focus—promotion or prevention. That is, the behaviors associated with the primary focus are those that should comprise the performance appraisal measurement. The dimensions for performance appraisal should be based on the behaviors related to the primary focus of the primary focus of the organization.

C.   Implications for Future Research

Finally, future research in the area of P-O fit should modify the common practice of using generic values congruence as an indicator of value alignment between an individual and an organization. Rather, future research should partition P-O fit into two dimensions that parallel the distinct motivations associated with promotion focused and preventions focused fit as these two dimensions provide a better conceptualization of value agreement than generic methods and are relevant to understanding how individuals define and pursue goals.

Future research adopting this model of organizational and personal values will facilitate prediction of outcomes. To date, P-O fit has been disappointing as a predictor of individual outcomes (Kristoff-Brown et al., 2005). However, the more nuanced approach suggests particular behavioral outcomes associated with the primary focus of the organization that should be predictable and should lead to organizational success.

D. Limitations and Conclusion

Generally speaking, RFT is considered appropriate for use when analyzing motivational effects from a wide array of sources (Higgins, 1997; 2000). Yet RFT has its limitations. In this study, the two proposed foci are considered orthogonal, having no correlation, when in reality, at an individual level, one could engage in self-regulatory strategies that encompass both foci simultaneously. Further, it also seems logical that organizational cultures may exhibit characteristics of both foci simultaneously (Beus et al., 2020). The methodology used in the present study does not account for this phenomenon.

The time has come for a nuanced approached to better understand the implications related to individual and organizational level value congruence. Many agree that organizational level cultural values do influence individual level values and vice versa, yet there is very little research that empirically tests these phenomena. This study, combined with the work of Rich et al. (2018), empirically support a regulatory focused framework for conceptualizing person-organization fit as a two-dimensional construct, consisting of prevention and promotion foci, at both the individual (person) and organizational level. Future studies should use this conceptualization when investigating the link between value congruence and work outcomes.

REFERENCES

Ashkanasy, N.M., L.E. Broadfoot, and S.A. Falkus, 2000, "Questionnaire Measures of Organizational Culture. In N.M. Ashkanasy, C.P.M. Wilderom, and M.F. Peterson (Eds.), *Handbook of Organizational Culture and Climate*, Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, 131-145.

Baird, K., K.J. Hu, and R. Reeve, .2011, "The Relationships Between Organizational Culture, Total Quality Management Practices and Operational Performance. *International Journal of Operations & Production Management,* 31, 789–814.

Beus, J.M., L. Lucianetti, and W. Arthur, Jr., 2020, "Clash of the Climates: Examining the Paradoxical Effects of Climates for Promotion and Prevention," 73, 241-269.

Boldero, J.M., and E.T. Higgins, 2011, Regulatory Focus and Political Decision Making: When People Favor Reform Over the Status Quo. *Political Psychology,* 32, 399-418.

Brammer, S., H. He, and K. Mellahi, 2015, "Corporate Social Responsibility, Employee Organizational Identification, and Creative Effort: The Moderating Impact of Corporate Ability. *Group & Organization Management*, 40, 323-352.

Brockner, J., and E.T. Higgins, 2001, "Regulatory Focus Theory: Implications for the Study of Emotions at Work," *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes,* 86, 35-66.

Cable, D.M., and D.S. DeRue, 2002, "The Convergent and Discriminant Validity of Subjective Fit Perceptions," *Journal of Applied Psychology,* 87, 875–884.

Cable, D.M., and T.A. Judge, 1996, "Person–Organization Fit, Job Choice Decisions, and Organizational Entry," *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes,* 67, 294–311.

Chatman, J.A., D.F. Caldwell, C.A. O'Reilly, and B. Doerr, 2014, "Parsing Organizational Culture: How the Norm for Adaptability Influences the Relationship Between Culture Consensus and Financial Performance in High-Technology Firms.

Journal of Organizational Behavior, 35, 1-24.

Chatman, J.A., and K.A. Jehn, 1994, "Assessing the Relationship Between Industry Characteristics and Organizational Culture: How Different Can You Be? *Academy of Management Journal*, 37, 522-553.

Crowe, E., and E.T. Higgins, 1997, "Regulatory Focus and Strategic Inclinations: Promotion and Prevention in Decision-Making. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes,* 60, 117–132.

Davis-Blake, A., and J. Pfeffer, 1989, "Just a Mirage: The Search for Dispositional Effects in Organizational Research. *Academy of Management Review,* 14, 385-400.

Fornell, C., and D.F. Larcker, 1981 "Evaluating Structural Equation Models with Unobservable Variables and Measurement Error. *Journal of Marketing Research*, 18, 39-50.

Förster, J., E.T. Higgins, and A.T. Bianco, 2003, "Speed/Accuracy Decisions in Task Performance: Built-in Trade-off or Separate Strategic Concerns? *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes,* 90, 148–164.

Friedman, R.S., and J. Förster, 2000, "The Effects of Promotion and Prevention Cues on Creativity," *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 81, 1001-1013.

Hair, J.F., W. Black, B. Babin, and R. Anderson, 2018, *Multivariate Data Analysis* (8th ed.). London, UK: Cengage.

Hair, J.F., T.M. Hult, C.M. Ringle, and M. Sarstedt, 2017, *A Primer on Partial Least Squares Structural Equation Modeling (PLS-SEM)* (2nd Ed.), Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Hair, J.F., M. Sarstedt, and C. Ringle, 2013 "Partial Least Squares Structural Equation Modeling: Rigorous Applications, Better Results and Higher Acceptance," *Journal of Long Range Planning*, 46, 1 -12.

Hamstra, M.R., J.W. Bolderdijk, and J.L. Veldstra, 2011, "Everyday Risk Taking as a Function of Regulatory Focus," *Journal of Research in Personality,* 45, 134-137.

Henseler, J., T.K. Dijkstra, M. Sarstedt, C.M. Ringle, A. Diamantopoulos, D.W. Straub, D.J. Ketchen, Jr., J.F.Hair, G.T.M. Hult, and R.J. Calantone, 2014, "Common Beliefs and Reality About PLS: Comments on Rönkkö & Evermann (2013)", *Organizational Research Methods*, 27, 182-209.

Henseler, J., G. Hubona, and P.A. Ray, 2016, "Using PL Path Modeling in New Technology Research: Updated Guidelines," *Industrial Management and Data Systems*, 116, 2-20.

Higgins, E.T., 1997, "Beyond Pleasure and Pain," *American Psychologist,* 52, 1280-1300.

Higgins, E.T., 1998, "Promotion and Prevention: Regulatory Focus as a Motivational Principle." *Advances in Experimental Social Psychology*, 30, 1–46.

Higgins, E.T., 2000, "Does Personality Provide Unique Explanations for Behavior? Personality as Cross-Person Variability in General Principles," *European Journal of Personality,* 14, 391-406.

Higgins, E.T., 2002, "How Self-Regulation Creates Distinct Values: The Case of Promotion and Prevention Decision Making," *Journal of Consumer Psychology,* 12, 177–191.

Higgins, E.T., C.J. Roney, E. Crowe, and C. Hymes, 1994, "Ideal Versus Ought Predilections for Approach and Avoidance Distinct Self-Regulatory Systems," *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology,* 66, 276-286.

Hitlin, S., and J.A. Piliavin, 2004, "Values: Reviving a Dormant Concept," *Annual*

Review of Sociology, 30, 359-393.

Hoffman, B. J., and D.J. Woehr, 2006, "A Quantitative Review of the Relationship Between Person–Organization Fit and Behavioral Outcomes," *Journal of Vocational Behavior,* 68, 389–399.

Johnson, P. D., M.B. Smith, J.C. Wallace, A.D. Hill, and R.A. Baron, 2015, "A Review of Multilevel Regulatory Focus in Organizations. *Journal of Management*, 41, 1501-1529.

Kristof-Brown, A., R. Zimmerman, and E. Johnson, 2005, "Consequences of Individuals' Fit at Work: A Meta-Analysis of Person-Job, Person-Organization, Person-Group, and Person-Supervisor Fit," *Personnel Psychology,* 58, 281-342.

Lee, A.Y., J.L. Aaker, and W.L. Gardner, 2000, "The Pleasures and Pains of Distinct Self-Construals: The Role of Interdependence in Regulatory Focus," *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology,* 78, 1122-1134.

Lee, S.K.J., and K. Yu, 2004, "Corporate Culture and Organizational Performance," *Journal of Managerial Psychology,* 19, 340-359.

Liberman, N., L.C. Idson, C.J. Camacho, and E.T. Higgins, 1999, "Promotion and Prevention Choices Between Stability and Change," *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology,* 77, 1135-1145.

MacKenzie, S.B., P.M. Podsakoff, and N.P. Podsakoff, 2011, "Construct Measurement and Validation Procedures in MIS and Behavioral Research: Integrating New and Existing Techniques," *MIS Quarterly,* 35, 293-334.

Mischel, W., 1968, *Personality and Assessment*, New York, NY: Wiley.

Morley, M., 2007, "Person-Organization Fit," *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 22 109-117.

Nunnally, J.C., and I.H. Bernstein, 1994, *Psychometric Theory*, New York, NY: McGraw-Hill.

O'Reilly, C A., J. Chatman, and D.F. Caldwell, 1991, "People and Organizational Culture: A Profile Comparison Approach to Assessing Person-Organization Fit," *Academy of Management Journal,* 34, 487–516.

Rich, L.L., J. Rich, J., and J.F. Hair, 2018, "The Influence of Organizational Culture on How We Define and Pursue Goals," *Journal of Organizational Effectiveness, People and Performance*, 5, 259-277.

Ringle, C.M., S. Wende, and J.M. Becker, 2015, *SmartPLS 3.2.7*, www.smartpls.de.

Rokeach, M., 1973, *The Nature of Human Values*, New York, NY: Free Press.

Schneider, B., 1987, "The People Make the Place," *Personnel Psychology*, 40 437-453.

Schneider, B., M.G. Ehrhart, and W.H. Macey, 2013, "Organizational Climate and Culture," *Annual Review of Psychology,* 64, 361–388.

Schwartz, S.H., 1992, "Universals in the Content and Structure of Values: Theoretical Advances and Empirical Tests in 20 Countries," *Advances in Experimental Social Psychology,* 25, 1–65.

Schwartz, S.H., 2012, "An Overview of the Schwartz Theory of Basic Values," *Online Readings in Psychology and Culture,* 2, 1-20.

Van Dijk, D., and A.N. Kluger, 2011. "Task Type as a Moderator of Positive/Negative Feedback Effects on Motivation and Performance: A Regulatory Focus Perspective," *Journal of Organizational Behavior,* 32, 1084-1105.

Vandenberghe, C., 1999. "Organizational Culture, Person-Culture Fit, and Turnover: A Replication in the Health Care Industry," *Journal of Organizational Behavior,* 20,

175-184.

Wallace, C., and G. Chen, 2006, "A Multilevel Integration of Personality, Climate, Self-Regulation, and Performance," *Personnel Psychology,* 59, 529–557.

Wang, S., R.M. Guidice, J.W. Tansky, and Z.M. Wang, 2010, "When R& D Spending is not Enough: The Critical Role of Culture When You Really Want to Innovate," *Human Resource Management,* 49, 767–792.

Westerman, J.W., and S. Vanka, 2005, "A Cross-Cultural Empirical Analysis of Person-Organization Fit Measures as Predictors of Student Performance in Business Education: Comparing Students in the United States and India," *Academy of Management Learning & Education,* 4, 409–420.

Wetzels, M., G. Odekerken-Schroder, and C. van Oppen, 2009, "Using PLS Path Modeling for Assessing Hierarchical Construct Models: Guidelines and Empirical Illustration," *MIS Quarterly*, 33, 177-195.

Yen, C.-L., S.-H. Chao, and C.-Y. Lin, 2011, "FieldTtesting of Regulatory Focus Theory," *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, *41*, 1565-1581.

Yu, K.Y.T., 2014. "Person–Organization Fit Effects on Organizational Attraction: A Test of an Expectations-Based Model," *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 124, 75-94.