

**THE PERSONAL ORIENTATION-PERCEIVED
ORGANIZATIONAL CLIMATE FIT AND MANAGERIAL
CAREER SUCCESS**

by

THEVARANI RAMASAMY

**Research report in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the
degree of Masters of Business Administration**

APRIL 2001

2.3	Personal Orientations	13
	2.3.1 <i>Need for Achievement</i>	14
	2.3.2 <i>Need for Power</i>	17
	2.3.3 <i>Need for Affiliation</i>	18
	2.3.4 <i>Need for Autonomy</i>	19
2.4	Perceived Organizational Climate	20
	2.4.1 <i>Organizational Climate</i>	20
	2.4.2 <i>Group or Sub-unit Climate</i>	20
	2.4.3 <i>Psychological Climate</i>	21
2.5	Personal Orientation-Perceived Organizational Climate <u>Fit</u> (P-O <u>Fit</u>)	23
	2.5.1 <i>Theories of P-O fit</i>	23
	2.5.2 <i>Definition of P-O fit</i>	25
2.6	Gender	28
2.7	Theoretical Framework	30
2.8	Hypotheses	32
2.9	Summary	34

Chapter 3: METHODOLOGY

3.1	Introduction	35
3.2	Research Site	35
3.3	Sample and Procedure	37
	3.3.1 <i>Sample Profile</i>	37
3.4	Measures	39
	3.4.1 <i>Criterion Measures</i>	40

3.4.1.1	<i>Objective Career Success</i>	40
3.4.1.2	<i>Subjective Career Success</i>	40
3.4.2	<i>Predictor Measures</i>	41
3.4.2.1	<i>Assessment of P-O fit</i>	41
3.4.2.2	<i>Personal Orientation</i>	41
3.4.2.3	<i>Perceived Organizational Climate</i>	42
3.4.3	<i>Biographical Data</i>	42
3.5	Statistical Analyses	43
3.6	Summary	45
Chapter 4:	RESULTS OF THE STUDY	
4.1	Introduction	46
4.2	Goodness of Measures	46
4.2.1	<i>Reliability of Measures</i>	46
4.2.2	<i>Inter-Correlation</i>	48
4.3	Hypotheses Testing	48
4.3.1	<i>Test for Hypothesis H1</i>	49
4.3.2	<i>Test for Hypothesis H2</i>	51
4.3.3	<i>Test for Hypothesis H3</i>	53
4.3.4	<i>Test for Hypothesis H4</i>	56
4.4	P-O Fit and Career Success--Supplementary Analyses	62
4.5	Summary	68
Chapter 5:	DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION	
5.1	Introduction	70

5.2	Recapitulation	70
5.3	Discussion	71
	5.3.1 <i>Career Success</i>	71
	5.3.2 <i>P-O Fit: Main Hypotheses</i>	72
	5.3.3 <i>P-O Fit: Moderating Impact of Management Level</i>	74
	5.3.4 <i>P-O Fit: Moderating Impact of Gender</i>	77
	5.3.5 <i>Supplementary Fit Analyses</i>	78
5.4	Implications	79
5.5	Limitations	81
5.6	Suggestions for Future Research	82
5.7	Conclusion	83
	BIBLIOGRAPHY	85
	APPENDICES	91

LIST OF TABLES

		<u>Page</u>
Table 3.1:	Demographic Profile of Respondents	39
Table 3.2:	Distribution of Items to Measure Need Orientation	42
Table 4.1:	Descriptive Statistics, Cronbach's Alpha, and Zero-order Correlation of Personal Orientation, Perceived Organizational Climate, and Career Success	47
Table 4.2:	Summary of Hierarchical Regression Analysis for P-O <u>Fit</u> : Main Hypothesis	50
Table 4.3:	Summary of Mean Scores in a High-Low Achievement Oriented P-O <u>Fit</u> --Subjective Career Success	52
Table 4.4:	Summary of Hierarchical Regression Analysis for P-O <u>Fit</u> : Moderating Impact of Gender	54
Table 4.5:	Summary of Hierarchical Regression Analysis for P-O <u>Fit</u> : Moderating Impact of Management Level	57
Table 4.6:	Summary of Mean Scores in a High-Low Autonomy Oriented P-O <u>Fit</u> --Subjective Career Success	60
Table 4.7:	Summary of Mean Scores in a High-Low Power Oriented P-O <u>Fit</u> --Objective Career Success	61
Table 4.8:	Summary of Hierarchical Regression Analysis --Supplementary <u>Fit</u> hypothesis	63
Table 4.9:	Summary of Mean Scores in a High-Low Autonomy-Achievement P-O <u>Fit</u> --Subjective Career Success	66
Table 4.10:	Summary of Mean Scores in a High-Low Power-Achievement P-O <u>Fit</u> --Objective Career Success	67

	<u>Page</u>
Table 4.11: Summary of Hypothesis Testing	69

LIST OF FIGURES

Figure 1: Personal Orientation-Perceived Organizational Climate <u>Fit</u> and Career Success	31
Figure 2: Relationship between Achievement-Oriented P-O <u>Fit</u> And Subjective Career Success	52
Figure 3: Relationship between Autonomy-Oriented P-O <u>Fit</u> and Subjective Career Success among Lower-Level Managers	60
Figure 4: Relationship between Power Oriented P-O <u>Fit</u> and Objective Career Success among Middle-Level Managers	61
Figure 5: Relationship between Autonomy-Achievement Oriented P-O <u>Fit</u> and Subjective Career Success	66
Figure 6: Relationship between Power-Achievement Oriented P-O <u>Fit</u> and Objective Career Success	67

LIST OF APPENDICES

	<u>Page</u>
Appendix 1: Questionnaire	91
Appendix 2: Coding Structure	95
Appendix 3: SPSS Output--Hypotheses 1 and 2	97
Appendix 4: SPSS Output--Hypothesis 3	102
Appendix 5: SPSS Output--Hypothesis 4	111

ABSTRAK

Dua teori am mengenai kejayaan kerjaya mendominasi kesusasteraan pengurusan umum. Pertama "human capital," yang mengandaikan aset individu, seperti pendidikan, kemahiran, dan ciri-ciri individu menentukan kejayaan kerjaya. Teori kedua, "struktur organisasi," mengandaikan bahawa faktor-faktor yang terkandung dalam organisasi yang menyokong atau menyekat kemajuan kerjaya seseorang. Kajian ini bertujuan menggabungkan kedua-dua pendekatan tersebut iaitu, individu dan faktor organisasi, dan penyuaian kedua-duanya menentukan kejayaan kerjaya seseorang individu. Oleh itu, kajian ini mendalami penyuaian antara orientasi peribadi dan tanggapan iklim organisasi (penyuaian P-O) sebagai anteseden kepada kejayaan kerjaya. Data telah dikumpul daripada 300 eksekutif dan pengurus yang berkerja di institusi pengilangan dan kewangan. Penemuan kajian dapat menerima sebahagian daripada hipotesis yang telah dicadangkan. Walau bagaimanapun, bukti-bukti terkumpul menunjukkan keputusan-keputusan lain yang amat menarik. Penemuan menunjukkan penyuaian orientasi pencapaian P-O lebih menonjolkan kejayaan kerjaya yang bersifat subjektif. Lebih menarik lagi, didapati pembolehubah lain seperti jantina dan tahap pengurusan mempengaruhi perhubungan tersebut. Pengetahuan ini boleh membantu individu dan organisasi untuk memperoleh pencapaian terbaik dalam meningkatkan prestasi kejayaan kerjaya di antara individu dan mencapai objektif organisasi yang efektif.

ABSTRACT

Two general theories of career success dominate the generic management literature. The first, "human capital," hypothesizes that individual's assets, such as education, skill, and personal characteristics determines career success. The second theory, "organization structure," holds that there are factors built into the fabric of organizations that work either for or against the career success of an individual. This study attempted to bring together the two constructs, namely the individual and the organization, and how the right match between them determines career success for the individual. Hence, this study explored the fit between personal orientation and perceived organizational climate (P-O fit) as an antecedent of career success. Data were gathered from 300 respondents comprising executives and managers employed in the manufacturing and financial institutions. The findings have resulted in only partial acceptance of the hypotheses proposed. Nevertheless, the evidence accumulated has revealed some interesting results. The findings indicate that, in general, achievement-oriented P-O fit predicts subjective career success significantly. Interestingly, other variables such as gender and level of management were found to moderate the relationship between P-O fit and career success. This contribution to the body of knowledge can help the individual and the organization alike to milk the best efforts from one another, in order to promote career success among the individuals and effective achievement of goals for the organizations.

Chapter 1

INTRODUCTION

1.1 Introduction

The quest for career success has been a prime objective for many. For some, career success means seeking higher job competency and mastery to achieve their life time dreams; for others, career success is seen as an end to the means, and it would be interesting to find out the salient factors affecting one's career success or failure. Immense research activity (e.g., Greenhaus, Parasuraman, & Wormley, 1990; Judge, Cable, Baudreau, & Bretz, 1995; Poole, Langan-Fox, & Omodei, 1993) has been witnessed on the concept of career success, with the objective to identify factors that account for differential career success of organizational members. The present research is an attempt in this direction. Possession of knowledge on these factors would aid organizations to design more effective career management systems and to individuals to develop career management (advancement) strategies.

Career success is one of the known ways for individuals to fulfill their needs for achievement and power. As it improves one's quality of life, the study of "who succeeds and why" is of interest. Despite comparable qualification and experience, some individuals are seen to be more successful than others.

In Malaysia, growth and positive changes are taking place at a rapid pace, as the country is moving toward an industrialized nation, offering abundant career opportunities. But very few individuals are able to reap the full benefits of the

country's industrial development plans. It is evident that there may be other factors, which are not observable, but that may influence career success.

Individuals are unique, demanding satisfaction of different needs. The organizational climate should be conducive in order to meet those differing needs. Striking a right match between the organizational and members' needs is creating an interesting and challenging working environment that satisfies both parties. Traditional selection techniques ignored evaluating personal characteristics, interest, and values of individuals with that of the organization. Quite often, individuals get themselves into a job without realizing their inner needs and whether the organization is able to promote those needs to achieve their desired career success in the organization. As a result a mismatch occurs, resulting in the individual being dissatisfied and leaving the organization. On the other hand, organizations, too, fail to take the effort to identify the real drivers of the valuable employees, resulting in negative outcomes both for the individuals and for the organization.

1.2 Purpose of the Study

While career success dimensions are influenced by different variables, individual-organizational value congruity has emerged as one of the most consistent antecedents of career success (Aryee, Chay, & Tan, 1994). The aim has been to study how the fit between personal orientation and perceived organizational climate influences career success (Ansari, Baumgartel, & Sullivan, 1982). Fit refers to the agreement or similarities between two conceptually distinct constructs (Edwards, 1994). Typically, fit is considered a predictor of outcomes relevant to the individual or the organization, such as job satisfaction (Edwards, 1991). Fit, in this context, is

indicated by the interaction between the individuals' needs and the perceived climate and/or the objective of the organization. Argyris (1964), in his theory of personality and organization, proposed that effective organizations are structured in accordance with members' characteristics. Since organizations exist as a result of individuals working together, their individual needs must be studied jointly. Incongruence between organizational climate and members' needs leads to organizational ineffectiveness and members' career dissatisfaction, which can lead to too many adverse consequences.

Majority of researchers subscribe to some form of interactionist perspective, in that the two conceptually distinct sets of career success predictors--for example, personal characteristics and organization climate--be jointly studied (Ansari et al., 1982; Aryee et al., 1994; Posner, 1992; Schein, 1978). Interactionists assume that human behavior is continually influenced by the interaction of person and situational factors (Terborg, 1981) which leads to enhanced job attitudes and behavior (Chatman, 1989; Dawis & Lofquist, 1984), which in turn influences job satisfaction and high performance (Downey, Hellriegel, & Slocum, 1975). Many diversified and global firms are now hiring employees based on "fit" with the characteristics and culture of the organizations, besides the required skills and knowledge aptitude. Hiring purely on the basis of meeting the required skills and experience for a particular position is declining.

As researchers have long proposed, that a fit between individual needs and organizational climate could result in greater job satisfaction (Wanous, 1980), it is the intent of the present research to study the impact of fit between personal orientations

and perceived organizational climate on managerial career success, in the Malaysian context.

Needs theory posits that individual motivated behavior is substantially driven by the strength of various intrinsic needs, namely, needs for achievement, affiliation, autonomy, and power. The theory (McClelland, Atkinson, Clark, & Lowell, 1953) suggests that motivation to exert effort in the quest to attain success is driven by the relative needs level. It has been reported that some of the above needs correlate more positively with career success than others (Ansari et al., 1982; Downey et al., 1975).

In order to succeed, support from the organization is rather important. Employees form a link to organizations in more than an employer-employee relationship. Organizations that treat their employees well are seen to build pride in their workers, make them feel more committed to drive the long- and short-term objectives of the organization. Moreover, employees' perception of a conducive organizational climate may lead to employee innovation and pro-social behavior as well as further commitment to the organization (Shore & Tetrick, 1991).

Past research (e.g., Ansari et al., 1982; Downey et al., 1975) has indicated that managers who are achievement and power oriented are more successful than those who are inclined toward need for affiliation. Despite the rapid rise of globalization with the attendant drive toward standardization and the predominance of Western management theories, the belief that what works in the West should also work in other parts of the world has met with some growing skepticism (Hofstede, 1994; Triandis, 1989). Each culture must be studied within its own unique context in order

to understand the important determinants of managerial performance in a particular organization. Studies using Asian samples have shown that the positive association between need for achievement and individualism may not be universal and that need for achievement may be associated with need for affiliation and concern for interdependence (Hui & Villareal, 1989). Among Asians, achievement related behavior is seen as an expansion of a motive within a socially interdependent context with values emphasizing collectivism.

Malaysia is regarded as a collectivist society, where the organization is perceived as a collectivity of people and authority attached to individuals in senior and leading positions. Malaysia is also categorized as being a large power distance and high context culture society (Hofstede, 1980). Therefore, hierarchy is valued and superiors are normally unchallenged. The value orientation in the Malaysian society seems to be relationship building, with order and respect for elders, group harmony, modesty, and loyalty and group spirit. Simply put, Malaysians are motivated by their affiliation to groups (Abdullah, 1996).

Most studies on person-organization fit (P-O fit) have been gender blind. It is assumed that achieving P-O fit is uniform across gender (Lovelace & Rosen, 1996). Even though some women have evidently shown success in non-traditional career environment such as management, yet majority hold positions of relatively low pay and authority. They are not entering the highest leadership positions despite having comparable qualifications and experience with their male counterparts. Evidence exists that women tend to be modest about their success and take more responsibility for failure, which might be a reason for the small number of women holding high

managerial positions (Rosenthal, 1995). The same may hold true among Malaysian women.

Owing to many reasons relating to socialization and organizational environment, self-confidence remains a problem for women. Women tend to de-emphasize their abilities as compared to men (Rosenthal, 1995). Their behavior tends to damage confidence building and subsequently career progression. Many organizations tend to have a distinct personality when more men are present, resulting in a male culture behavior. Such a culture would make women feel left out and as such they become the out-groups. As a result, many women tend to escape to safer, less challenging support functions.

Having considered the cultural characteristics of the Malaysian society in general, and the gender stereotype of women in particular, the extent to which P-O fit determines career success was sought through this study.

Fundamentally, the intent of this study was to answer the following questions:

- (1) Does the presence of fit between personal orientation and perceived organizational climate influence career success?
- (2) Which among the four types of need orientation-climate fit is most significant to contributing to career success?
- (3) Are there any differential effects of P-O fit across gender?
- (4) Are there any differential effects of P-O fit across different management levels?

1.3 Scope

This study was carried out on the Malaysian managers employed in profit-oriented organizations located predominantly in the States of Penang and Kedah. The study focused mainly on manufacturing-based companies and financial institutions.

Samples were drawn from both male and female managers at various managerial levels: lower, middle, and upper. Reason for confining the study to the States of Penang and Kedah was merely for purposes of convenience, as the researcher has a wide circle of respondents in these two States. As there is much cross commuting between the two States, similar patterns of behavior is expected from the samples, with a balanced mix of male and female managers.

1.4 Summary and Organization of the Remaining Chapters

This study was aimed at identifying predictors of objective and subjective career success among Malaysian managers. The fit between personal orientation and perceived organizational climate has been found to influence managerial career success (Ansari et al., 1982) and this study purports to confirm the findings in the Malaysian context.

The remaining chapters have been organized in the following manner: Chapter 2 encompasses a review of the past literature on career success, fit between personal orientation and perceived organizational climate, and gender. The theoretical framework and formulation of hypotheses for investigation are included in this chapter. Chapter 3 outlines the research methodology, comprising sampling procedure, instruments, and statistical analyses. Chapter 4 presents the various

analyses of data collected and the respective findings. Chapter 5 discusses the results of the findings, highlights the limitations, implications, and some suggestions for future research.

Chapter 2

LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1 Review of Relevant Literature

This chapter looks at the relevant literature that forms the basis for this study. The prime objective of this study was to examine how the fit between personal orientation and perceived organizational climate influences career success among Malaysian managers. This chapter comprises four sections. Sections 2, 3, 4, 5, and 6 present a review of the past literature on career success, personal orientation, organizational climate, fit between personal orientation and perceived organizational climate, and gender respectively. Section 7 presents a theoretical framework of this study to be carried out followed by the formulation of hypotheses in section 8. Section 9 concludes with a summary of this chapter.

2.2 Career success

There is a long history of interpretation for the term "career success." Super (1957) stated that earnings and output were used to judge attainment after World War I. This was followed by advancement or progress in the company or position during the 1920's and the 1930's. In the late 1930's, occupational stability became a popular criterion of success, followed by supervisor rating. Career success is not only a social or objective matter, but it is also a personal or subjective matter. Success is meaningless unless the individual perceives himself or herself to be successful. Herriot (1992) has suggested "career in the head" as it introduces the internal perspective, the subjective approach, which recognizes that beliefs and values, expectations, and aspirations are just as important as sequences of positions held.

Career success has been looked upon three angles: professional, organizational, and work-non-work expectations. From the professional angle, career success could mean holding of patents, publication of articles, recognition of work, and other related measures, while in work-non-work area, career success could result from balancing both activities and being paid according to the amount of effort put in (Stephens & Szajna, 1998). Those engaged in organizations view career success as the real or perceived achievements resulting from an accumulation of work experiences (Judge et al., 1995). It relates to the satisfaction derived from both intrinsic and extrinsic aspects, including salary, promotion and growth opportunities, and feeling good about oneself (Judge et al., 1995; Poole et al., 1993).

2.2.1 Objective Career Success

Objective career success is extrinsic or measurable which encompasses pay and promotions, occupational status and authority, responsibility and class among others (Jaskolka, Beyer, & Trice, 1985). Occupational status is regarded with importance in terms of career success, as it relates to contribution to society, community, and welfare organization (Korman, Mahler, & Omran, 1983). As occupational status results in increased responsibilities and rewards (Poole et al., 1993) and higher job satisfaction (Ronen & Sadan, 1984), it is included in the definition of extrinsic or objective career success. Among the objective measures, occupational status is regarded as the most important in the eyes of sociologists (Judge & Higgins, 1999)

In the past, managers have been assumed to be satisfied in both job and non-job aspects, as they have societal prestige, wide range and challenging job activities,

and greater autonomy. This assumption does not hold true anymore, as individuals rated high on objective measures of career success (such as money and status) do not perceive their career as successful (Korman, Wittig-Berman, & Lang, 1981).

2.2.2 Subjective Career Success

Subjective career success is regarded as an individual or phenomenological phenomenon (Poole et al., 1993) and involves intrinsic measures such as satisfaction on the job, interests and feeling good about one's achievement (Gattiker & Larwood, 1988; Judge et al., 1995). Other researchers have found subjective career success to be linked to objective career success, as it is an outcome of objective achievements (Greenhaus et al., 1990). Subjective career success includes both current job satisfaction and career satisfaction.

Subjective career success is a boundryless construct found within a person's mind; therefore, it is important to find out if the individual really considers himself or herself as being successful (Gattiker & Larwood, 1988). An individual's perspective of career success may not be in sync with socially defined success criteria alone (Gattiker & Larwood, 1988; Schein, 1978). For example, successful managers were found to be dissatisfied with their careers, as they perceived themselves as not being successful (Poole et al., 1993).

Job satisfaction is viewed as the most salient aspect of career success, as those who are dissatisfied with their present job would regard their careers as unsuccessful. Job satisfaction is a function of the perceived relationship between what one wants from one's job and what one perceives it is offering. According to Greenhaus et al.

(1990), career satisfaction is the satisfaction that one obtains from intrinsic and extrinsic aspects.

Subjective or intrinsic factors such as job satisfaction are more important in determining perceived success as opposed to objective factors (Poole et al., 1993). Judge and Bretz (1994) suggested that many of the variables that influence objective career success do not necessarily influence subjective career success. As subjective and objective career success are weakly correlated, measuring each variable as independent outcomes, is necessitated (Judge & Higgins, 1999).

2.2.3 Determinants of Career Success

Determinants of career success have been widely researched. Past literature on two such main categories are briefly provided below.

2.2.3.1 Human Capital

Human capital refers to the cumulative educational, personal, and professional experiences that might enhance an individual's value to the employer. Research has indicated that educational attainment and content (e.g., field of study) influences career success (Judge & Cable, 1995). Similarly, job tenure and total time spent in one's occupation are positively related to career success (Judge & Bretz, 1994). Along with amount of experience, type of experience also predicts career success (Judge & Cable, 1995).

2.2.3.2 Psychological Capital

A person's psychological capital is likely to govern motivation and general

attitude toward work. A person's mental health status can be regarded as an exogenous determinant of career success. Several personality attributes, characterized by a high expectation and belief to acquire preferred outcomes, (e.g., locus of control, self-monitoring, self-esteem, and optimism) are postulated to be determinants of person-environment fit, job performance, and ultimately career success (Lau & Shaffer, 1999). Other researchers like Judge and Higgins (1999) found conscientiousness, one of the five traits from the 5-factor model of personality ("Big Five"), to predict career success strongly, among adults. The impact of improved psychological capital on career success is large relative to the influence of a corresponding expansion of human capital (Goldsmith, Veum, & Darity, 1997).

Therefore, there are two competing dimensions, the individualistic and structural perspectives, influencing career success. Managerial performance and career success is a combined function of situational or organizational factors, motivational and ability factors, and is best studied in totality.

2.3 Personal Orientations

Personal orientation can be regarded as a dynamic set of characteristics, which influences individuals' cognition, behavior, and motivation (Ryckman, 1997). Personality or behavior is learned or acquired through one's experiences and interactions, which continually influence one another (Bandura, 1977). Judge and Locke (1993) found that employees prone to negative emotions were likely to experience dysfunctional job-related thought processes and lower job satisfaction. A person becomes motivated when a strong need is present. This reaction in turn leads the individual to strive hard toward satisfying the needs. Bhal and Ansari (2000) have

defined need as "a force within the individual which organizes the individual's perceptual and other process, on the one hand, and on the other may get provoked by the external environment" (p. 94). They have identified four of McClelland's (1961) social acquired needs as being most significant in relation to work behavior. These are needs for achievement (n Ach), power (n Pow), affiliation (n Aff), and autonomy (n Aut). The assessment of the separate needs has been done in a variety of context by using the Manifest Needs Questionnaire (MNQ) developed by Steers and Braunstein (1976). The MNQ has been used to examine the need profiles of college students (Geiger & Cooper, 1995; Harrell & Stahl, 1983), managers (Bhal & Ansari, 2000; Rasch & Tasi, 1992), and clerical and service professionals (Chusmir, 1985). A review of the literature on MNQ and the underlying needs theory has documented evidence of the relative strength of the MNQ in accurately capturing individual needs across diverse populations (Rasch & Tasi, 1992).

2.3.1 Need for Achievement

Need for achievement refers to the desire to excel and do better than others. Individuals who are achievement oriented set their own performance goals, as they like to be fully responsible for goal achievement (Hellriegel, Slocum, & Woodman, 1992). They choose situations where they are in control of the outcome, as they do not believe in chance. Most individuals with need for achievement prefer to work alone as they feel they are in better control and would not want to risk the outcome by sharing the workload with others. Such individuals are not team players. People with need for achievement like situations and goals, which are challenging, yet within their reach. The goals that they set are reasonable, not too easy and not too difficult to attain. They want some amount of challenge in their work environment, but nothing too much

which might result in their failure. These individuals enjoy doing tasks where feedback is encouraged along the way. As they are so determined to achieve their goals, they want to keep track of their progress to ensure success.

Need for achievement has been historically recognized as a personality tendency with a focus on continued achievement, success, and goal accomplishment (McClelland, 1961). Because individuals vary in their cognitive maps of a career, it seems reasonable to expect certain individuals to have career concepts that are closely aligned with achievement and advancement in organizations (Elsass & Ralston, 1989). The patterns that link achievement with continual promotion breed career concepts that equate success with promotion and reinforce achievement-seeking behaviors.

High achievers rate monetary incentives at the top of their list. As they have a lot of self-confidence, they believe that they can perform in any work environment. As a result, if they feel that they are not being rewarded as expected, they will leave the organization in search of better opportunities. High achievers always look for ways of doing things better through creativity and innovation. They tend to perform better when they perceive a good chance of probability for success.

Steers and Porter (1987) reported high achievers could be successful as entrepreneurs or managing self-contained units within an organization, but they do not necessarily make effective managers in large organizations as they are less effective in managing people. They are interested in their own performance and do not take much effort in sharing the organization's goal with the rest of the members. However,

Ansari et al. (1982) reported that need for achievement was a strong predictor of managerial success.

Orpen (1985) found that need for achievement predicted 5-year salary growth in a sample of South African managers. Ratings of achievement orientation effectively predict promotions. In a study conducted on career coping strategies (Rotondo, 1999), it was found that achievement oriented individuals use more positive coping strategies, mentoring of younger employees and pursuit of functional or technical expert career paths.

Weiner (1985) maintained that need for achievement is linked with perceived causes of success and failure. People who have a high need for achievement attribute more to internal factors, such as ability and effort, under success conditions and more to external factors, such as luck and task difficulty, under failure conditions, than people who had a low need for achievement (Wiener & Kukla, 1970). Scapinello (1989) indicated that research participants who had a high need for achievement were less accepting of failure than participants who had a lower need for achievement. Low need for achievement is thought to be associated with a sense of low competencies, low expectations, and low aspirations (Atkinson, Batain, Earl, & Litwin, 1960).

Rasch and Tasi (1992) had reported a general positive association between an individual's need for achievement and performance on specific tasks or specific goals. In the student context, the higher the need for achievement, the higher the performance in terms of grades (Harrell & Stahl, 1983).

2.3.2 Need for Power

Need for power is a desire to influence and lead others toward the attainment of organizational goals and eventually organizational success. Such individuals feel a need to be in control of the environment. One of the characteristics of successful managers in this category is their high need for power (Hellriegel et al., 1992). Need for power can be regarded as a concept of inferiority complex and compensation where a person's lifestyle is characterized by striving to compensate for a feeling of incompetence, which are combined with the innate drive for power (Luthans, 1985). High need for power is associated with the need to control events, influence other members, and have a strong impact on situations. Such characteristics are seen as effective managerial behaviors and morale boosters (Luthans, 1985). Individuals with power orientation are very vocal in presenting their views and ready to assume leadership positions (Bhal & Ansari, 2000).

McClelland (1961) identified two types of need for power, namely, institutionalized or socialized power, and personalized power. Managers who are inclined toward institutional power demonstrate a more socially accepted need for power. Such managers help to create a conducive work environment, which encourages employees to have a better understanding of the organization, which results in subordinate satisfaction and improved productivity. Such characteristics result in the employees showing loyalty and commitment to the organization as a whole and not to any one individual.

Ragins and Sundstrom (1989) indicated that female managers often subscribe more to institutionalized power than personalized power. Male managers, on the other

hand, are said to demonstrate more personalized power. Such managers like to dominate other members, resulting in loyalty to themselves and not to the organization. This results in discontinuity when the manager leaves an organization, as a void is created in the minds of the members. Personal achievements take importance, which leads to organizational dysfunction. However, managers who subscribe to institutionalized power have been seen to be more successful than those with personalized power (McClelland, 1970). More recent studies by Bahniuk and Hill (1996) reported that power orientation has significant relationship to career success. They found that “Power as Good” orientation contributed to perceived career success while “Power as Political” added unique variance to career attainment.

2.3.3 Need for Affiliation

Individuals with need for affiliation desire to be liked and accepted by the rest of the organizational members (Hellriegel et al., 1992). Managers with need for affiliation strive for friendship among peers and subordinates. They prefer a cooperative situation without any competition, driving the team toward common objectives. Individuals with high need for affiliation seek relationships which involve high level of mutual understanding (McClelland & Winter, 1969).

Managers with high need for social interaction and teamwork experienced promotion and salary increases in organizations with humanitarian climates (Downey et al., 1975). Best managers are, however, seen to have high need for power and low need for affiliation (Hellriegel et al., 1992). It would be contradicting to have both high need for power and high need for affiliation as both these needs work in opposite directions. McClelland (1970) has noted that managers with high affiliation needs

occasionally fail to clarify organizational goals and responsibilities with subordinates, thus limiting the support required to enhance organizational and career success.

2.3.4 Need for Autonomy

Need for autonomy is defined as a desire for independence from work related constraints (Steers & Porter, 1987). Individuals with need for autonomy prefer working alone, with minimum rules and regulations so that they can be in control of the outcome (Bhal & Ansari, 2000). They will not accept goals, which, they had no influence over nor conform to group norms because of external pressures (Steers & Porter, 1987). Managers who have a high need for autonomy are not so successful as they are not team players. It has been evidenced in other studies that working together collectively is important for career success (Vroom, 1964).

Autonomy has been operationalized as the power to control the method and scheduling by which a person completes his or her work as well as controlling the criteria upon which the work is evaluated (Breugh, 1989). Implicit within the increased emphasis on the concept of both autonomous work groups and empowerment in industry today is the acceptance that increased job autonomy leads to increased productivity.

Personality measures, however, cannot be studied in isolation. The behavior of individuals is highly influenced by certain molar characteristics of the organization, which takes us to the next section to review the past literature on perceived organizational climate.

2.4 Perceived Organizational Climate

Taguiri and Litwin (1968) have defined climate as an enduring quality of organizational environment that is experienced by its members, influences their behavior, and described in terms of similar characteristics of the organization. Even though the definition is seemingly straightforward, it applies differently to the individual level, group, and organization as a whole. It has been recommended by James and Jones (1974) that psychological climate be employed when relating to the individual's perception and organizational climate be used when the attributes of the system as a whole is in play. Ansari and Rub (1980) proposed that the term climate be referred to the attributes of the organization as a system, including individual perceptions or attributes of a group within an organization. Based on the unit of analysis, the following categorization applies: Individual--Psychological Climate; Sub-units--Group Climate; and Organization--Organizational Climate.

2.4.1 Organizational Climate

Organizational climate can be referred to as the shared perceptions of the members towards the practices and procedures of an organization. (James & Jones, 1974). It is an organizational attribute and represents the equilibrium position toward which all the psychological climates are seen to end. Organizational climate represents the attitudes and beliefs collectively held by the organizational members, where the individual differences are averaged out.

2.4.2 Group or Sub-unit Climate

Group or sub-unit climate is the elaboration of organizational climate that allows team members to reinterpret the organization in a manner similar to their own

particular goals and similarity (James & Jones, 1974). It is manifested in the various beliefs and attitude structures held by the different groups. As a result, a variety of perspectives surface, each viewing the organization from a different vantage point. The group and organizational climate can thus be regarded as an aspect of a social system, unlike psychological climate, which is an aspect of a cognitive system.

2.4.3 Psychological Climate

Psychological climate or perceived organizational climate, as used interchangeably in this study, is a multidimensional construct which is operationalized at the individual level (Glick, 1985). It is the individual member's cognitive representation of an organization, and is composed of the values and attitudes that reflect his or her perception of the prevalent values and expectations in the organizational environment. It is a reflection of how the organization impresses upon each member. Employees develop perception of how the organization functions based on their experiences (Schneider, 1983). The individuals' perception of the climate condense individuals' description of their organizational experiences, which are relatively stable over time and are widely shared among members of an organizational unit. These perceptions reflect the way in which an employee describes the workplace.

Perceived organizational climate can be regarded as the personality of an organization, as seen by the employees (Toulson & Smith, 1994). It has been evidenced that perceived organizational climate does have an influence on job performance and satisfaction (Lawler, Hall, & Oldham, 1974). Another perspective of

climate by Litwin and Stringer (1968) refers to organizational climate as a set of measurable properties of the organization, which influence motivation and behavior.

The present study explores perceived organizational climate, specifically psychological climate, in the same vein as personal orientation, viewing it in terms of achievement, power, affiliation, and autonomy.

An achievement-oriented climate is performance oriented and it gives employees the liberty to set goals, which in turn stimulates innovation and experimentation (Ansari et al., 1982). Such a climate is seen to institute many performance standards on the employees. The employees are measured by their attainment of goals and a lot of pressure is applied on the subordinates to achieve them. A lot of focus is put on achieving the target and bottom line results.

Power oriented organizational climate, on the other hand, is perceived to have a lot of control over the employees. The organization is governed by many rules and regulations, which limit employees' freedom in goal setting and innovative behavior.

Affiliation oriented organizations exhibit a lot of openness and assistance toward employees. Such organizations encourage their employees to bring up their issues and problems for discussion. Such climates induce motivation by encouraging participation while creating interpersonal trust.

An autonomous organizational climate can be operationalized as lack of closeness of superior supervision and individual responsibility delegated to managers

(Lawler et al., 1974). Autonomy is a primary constituent of the psychological climate that prevails within an organization (Reisman, 1986). Workers operating in autonomy supporting environments were found to exhibit less trust in their management (Deci & Ryan, 1989). Realization of autonomy should cultivate feelings of greater security within those who receive it. Organizations perceived to be autonomous encourage empowerment among the employees. There is generally a flexible system in place, enabling freedom of goal setting.

2.5 Personal Orientation-Perceived Organizational Climate Fit (P-O Fit)

There has been a lot of interest in the study of interaction between personal and organization variables, as neither of them can explain organizational behavior adequately (Ansari et al., 1982; Schneider, 1983). Successful careers are dependent upon job and organizational success. Though career success is an individual outcome, it is both dependent upon and contributes back to organization's success. Accordingly, traits that make individuals successful in their careers are likely to be the same ones that make individuals successful in their jobs and help organizations succeed. Theories on fit have their roots in Lewin's (1951) classic equation of $B = f(P, E)$, where B is behavior; P and E are person and environment, respectively. This equation explains that behavior is a function of the interplay between person and environment.

2.5.1 Theories of P-O fit

Early interactionist perspectives on motivational psychology viewed person-environment fit in terms of need-pressure association (Murray, 1938). Needs refers to the determinants of individual behavior and is inferred from how the individual feels and

behaves. Press refers to the environmental determinants of behavior and implies what the environment can do for an individual, to facilitate and hinder the fulfillment of needs or the accomplishment of goals. When individual's characteristics fit organizational environment, work motivation increases (Steers & Porter, 1987). Expectancy theory (Vroom, 1964), on the other hand, posits that individuals will tend to engage in activities perceived most likely to yield valued outcomes. Individuals who meet some level of satisfaction will subsequently be rewarded for possessing those characteristics.

Dawis and Lofquist (1984) related fit to the theory of work adjustment (TWA), where successful work relations result from a state of congruence between individuals and the perceived organizational climate. Individuals will find comfort and perform well in environments that support their specific needs. It has been induced that those who fit well will perceive receiving support to perform well, resulting in objective career success, such as salary progression and job level (Bretz & Judge, 1994). TWA posits that individuals and environment impose requirements on each other and that "successful" work relations are the result of adjustments intended to create a state of correspondence between individuals and environmental characteristics (Dawis & Lofquist, 1984). Those who fit are attracted to the organization, are favorably evaluated by organizational members, displaying high motivation and perform better. That is, increased fit results in increased career success. In other words, individuals who fit over time achieve higher levels of success--fit implies a state of congruence between individual and environmental characteristics (Dawis & Lofquist, 1984). Schneider's (1987) attraction-selection-attrition hypothesis is consistent with TWA in that, individuals self-select in and out