International Journal of Current Advanced Research
ISSN: O: 2319-6475, ISSN: P: 2319-6505, Impact Factor: SJIF: 5.995
Available Online at www.journalijcar.org
Volume 6; Issue 8; August 2017; Page No. 5218-5224
DOI: http://dx.doi.org/10.24327/ijcar.2017.5224.0675

Research Article

PERCEIVED PERSON-ENVIRONMENT FIT AND EMPLOYEES' TURNOVER INTENTION

Gokula Krishnan S*[1]., Reeves Wesley J[2] and Renjitha Bhaskaran[3]

[1]Nehru School of Management, Nehru College of Engineering and Research Centre, Pampady, Thiruvilwamala, Thrissur-680 588, Kerala, India
[2] VIT Business School, VIT University-Chennai Campus, Chennai-600 127, Tamilnadu, India
[3]IT Recruiter, Teksystems, Allegis Group, Bangalore, Karnataka, India

A R T I C L E I N F O

Article History:

Received 15[h] May, 2017
Received in revised form 14[th] June, 2017 Accepted 26[th] July, 2017
Published online 28[th] August, 2017

Key words:

Perception, Person-Environment Fit, Person-Supervisor Fit, Person-Group Fit, Person-Organization Fit, Person-Job Fit and Employers' Turnover Intention.

A B S T R A C T

This article primarily aimed to examine the level of influence by Perceived Person-Environment Fit Scale (PPEFS) on Employees' Turnover Intention with their present employers through analyzing the predictors of Perceived Person-Environment Fit Scale (PPEFS), i.e. Person-Supervisor Fit Scale (PSFS), Person-Group Fit Scale (PGFS), Person-Organization Fit Scale (POFS) and Person-Job Fit Scale (PJFS). Data are collected from 332 employees, has been tested with KMO sampling adequacy (0.862) and Bartlett's sphericity test (p = 0.000). Data Analysis has been done through Descriptive Statistics, Analysis of Variance (ANOVA), Friedman Rank Test and Structural Equation Model. Results were revealed that the PPEFS is significantly predicted by PSFS, PGFS, POFS and PJFS. Further, results were revealed that Perceived Person-Environment Fit Scale is influencing Employees' Turnover Intention with their present employers.

INTRODUCTION

A process by which individuals organize and interpret their sensory impressions in order to give meaning to their environment is known as perception. In everyone's life decisions have been made based on the individual's perception on the factors which they come across in their life. In the business world, this perceive-ness yields the satisfactory level to the employees of the concern. If an employee, perceives that his/her organization and environment is comfortable to them, the satisfactory level might be high or higher, which will ensure the decrease in attrition level or low employee turnover; i.e. employees those who have higher satisfactory level, they might be having intention to stay with the present organization for the near future or at least for another 3 to 5 years. In this study we are considering four major factors PJFS, POFS, PGFS, and PSFS. Person job fit scale (PJFS) is evaluated to see how far the employees is fit with their job, person organization fit scale (POFS) is evaluated to see whether the employees are fit in the organization, person group fit scale (PGFS) is evaluated to see how far the employee is fit within the group of other employees working in the organization, person supervisor fit scale (PSFS) is evaluated to see the depth of relationship that exist between supervisor and employees in the organization.

Corresponding author:* **Gokula Krishnan S
Nehru School of Management, Nehru College of Engineering and Research Centre, Pampady, Thiruvilwamala, Thrissur-680 588, Kerala, India

LITERATURE REVIEW

Person-Environment fit is generally stated as the compatibility between an individual and the respective work environment when their characteristics are well harmonized (Kristof-Brown *et al.*, 2005). Schneider, (2001) has defined PE Fit as, "so certain as to be one of, if not the staggering connected powers in the field". Furthermore, it can be known as a type of person-situation interaction which comprises the match between respective individual and the dimensions of the environment. Muchinsky & Monahan, (1987) stated that PE Fit has several dominant themes, like Person-Person fit, Person-Group fit, and Person-Organization fit, follow the concept of supplementary fit. Organizational employees who perceives high quality of PE fit may result in their work related attitudes and behaviors. (Schneider, 1987).The favorable attitude relating to their occupations will result in psychological attachment to their roles and/or to their entity (Kanungo, 1979). Still, it is mostly assumed that PE fit leads to positive outcomes, such as performance, satisfaction, and overall well-being (Lee and Ramaswami, 2013). Deeply contextualized information about PE fit can incredibly help supervisors to configuration, evaluate, and convey these HRM hones in socially viable ways. To date, just a couple of observational reviews have expressly consolidated culture into the heart of their request.

Person-job fit, alludes to the similarity between employeescharacteristics and those of a specificoccupation or job (Kristof-Brown and Guay, 2011). Edwards (1991) sketched out two fundamental conceptualizations of the PJ fit. The first is incorporates the conventional perspective of choice that stresses the harmonizing worker KSAs and different qualities to employment requirements (Ployhart, Schneider, and Schmitt, 2006). The second type of PJ fit happens when representatives' needs, wishes, or inclinations are met by the occupations that they perform (Kristof-Brown *et al*., 2005). These are currently coordinate in the general idea of individual occupation fit (PJ-Fit) (Cable and DeRue, 2002; Vogel& Feldman, 2009)

Person-group fit, is a comparatively new area with respect to person-environment fit. *Person-group* (PG), which focuses on the interpersonal compatibility between person and their work groups (Judge & Ferris, 1992; Kristof, 1996; Werbel & Gilliland, 1999). Kristof-Brown *et al*., (2005) stated person-group fit is so new, a very fewstudy's has been conducted to exhibit how the psychological compatibility between colleagues impacts individual results in group situations. Still, a study by Boone & Hartog (2011) discovered that person-group fit is most strongly associated to group-oriented resultsfeelings of consistency and co-worker satisfaction.

Person-organization fit is mostly defined as the compatibility between individuals and organizations (Kristof, 1996). Further, Kristof-Brown, Zimmerman & Johnson (2005) that P-O fit happens when at least one object delivers what the other needs or they share similar fundamental characteristics or both". Also P-O fit is the correlation between preferences or needs of employees and systems and structures of firms (Bretz, Ash, & Dreher, 1989; Cable & Judge, 1994; Turban & Keon, 1993). Further it lies between the individual personality and climate of workplace (Bowen *et al*., 1991; Burke &Deszca, 1982; Ivancevich & Matteson, 1984; Tom, 1971). P-O fit is a type of Person-environment (P-E) fit in the organization in which people may fit or misfit (Judge and Kristof-Brown, 2004). Van Vianen, De Pater and Van Dijk (2007) states that P-O fit allies with emplyee's personality, vision and morals of the firm. P-O fit was found to be associated with work attitudes such as Organizational commitment and job satisfaction (Postner, Kouzes & Schmidt, 1985; Bretz & Judge, 1994; Boxx *et al*., 1991; Chatman, 1991; Downey, Hellriegel, & Slocum, 1975; O'Reilly, Chatman & Caldwell, 1991; Tziner, 1987& Vancouver & Schmitt, 1991). P-O fit also was found to forecastthe intention of quit and turnover (Chatman, 1991; O'Reilly *et al*., 1991; Vancouver *et al*., 1994).

It is the match of a staff with his/her boss. The significance of "P-S fit" had been recently conceptualized, various earlier studies which have been suitable for the specific boss and subordinate associations. Given the predetermined number of studies on different sorts of dyadic fit and the significance of supervisor-subordinate influences on work results (Griffeth, Hom, & Gaertner, 2001), the last zone we meta-break down is person-supervisor (PS) fit. Investigations of boss-subordinate esteem compatibility (e.g., Colbert, 2004; Krishnan, 2002), supervisor-subordinate identity closeness (Schaubroeck & Lam, 2002), and manager-employee objective harmoniousness (e.g., Witt, 1998) are incorporated into this class. For each situation, the administrators' close to home attributes spoke to the earth. Examines in which chiefs detailed work gathering or hierarchical attributes (e.g., Becker, 1992; Becker, Billings, Eveleth, and Gilbert, 1996) were delegated either PG or PO fit, individually (Kristof-Brown *et al*., 2005).

Employees bring distinctive necessities, needs, and inclinations to the association and will be pulled in to, chosen by and remain with the condition that has individuals like them (Chung and Sackett, 2005). Turnover has been a top research subject for right around a century (Tse and Lam, 2008), and numerous scientists demonstrated that it can create exceedingly negative results to the organizations (Abbasi and Hollman, 2000; Waltrous, *et al*, 2006). (Abbasi and Hollman, 2000) anticipated that turnover taken a toll around 11 billion dollars to the organizations consistently. By and by, it influences in fiscal terms as well as abatements the impacts the association with clients, (Abbasi and Hollman, 2000), low adequacy, low resolve and furthermore brings about low execution of the organization (Waltrous, Huffman, and Pritchard, 2006).

Relationship between Person-Environment Fit and Employee Turnover Intention

There are additionally many reviews that found that the fit between the person and environment (i.e., P-E fit) was an essential indicator of business related results, for example, work fulfillment, authoritative responsibility and staff turnover (Cable and Judge, 1996; Kristof, 1996; Kristof Zimmerman and Johnson, 2005). Recently started to find the interceding and directing factors that exist inside this relationship (Jelinek and Ahearne, 2010; DaSilva, 2010).

Vogel and Feldman (2009), and Lyons and O'Brien (2006), both regarded P-E fit as an indicator of turnover goals. Ahmad, K.Z. (2012) have found that P-E Fit has critical relationship and negative association with staff turnover intentions. P-E fit was observed to be a critical go between of the connection between organizational culture and staff turnover goals (Abbas, A., *et.al* (2015). There will be high turnover rate if a man is discontent and have contradiction over employees' and organizational goals (Lee, Mitchell, Wise, and Fireman, 1996). Likewise, (Bretz and Judge, 1994) additionally found that it has positive association with employment fulfillment and has extensively negative association with turnover intention with P-J Fit.

Specialists who are enormously fitted in their organization have a tendency to be committed and would stay with the organization however will unquestionably lean toward changing the positions at association on the off chance that they don't feel finish in current position (Saks and Ashforth, 1997). (Hollenbeck, 1989)Done an exact examination and figured lacking individual occupation fit can prompt vocation turnover.He inferred that low execution and turnover will come about if fit is observed to be low. (Mathis and Jackson, 2003). This compatibility amongst manager and subordinates identity measurements (neuroticism, extraversion, openness to experiment with, reliability, and pleasantness), qualities, and objectives are estimated to relate with essential result factors, for example, subordinates 'hierarchical duty to remain with association, and the subordinates' occupation fulfillment.

P-E fit from a mix of every one of the three viewpoints, P-J, PG and P-O, as Edwards and Billsberry (2010) focused on that P-E fit is a multidimensional idea, and ought to be dealt

with all things considered. In the ebb and flow look into, it could be contended that employees would accomplish more noteworthy fit with their occupations (P-J fit), associates (P-G fit) and the association all in all (P-O fit), when presented to preparing that decreases that hole. Employees would unmistakably accomplish more noteworthy P-G fit if when presented to teambuilding preparing. It can be guessed that enhanced hierarchical correspondence, would enhance the fit between the employee and his/her association (P-O fit), and this will likewise overflow into alternate regions of fit, for example, the fit between the specialist and his/her partners (P-G fit), and between the specialist and his/her employment (P-J fit).Thus, it can be speculated that enhanced prizes and acknowledgment will bring about the worker seeing himself/herself as fitting into the workplace all in all, and this thus will prompt positive work outcomes.

Research Objectives and Hypotheses

H1: There is a significant different perception on PJFS, POFS, PGFS, and PSFS across Age, Gender, Qualification, Experience and Monthly Income

H2: Person-Organization Fit Scale (POFS), Person-Group Fit Scale (PGFS), Person-Organization Fit Scale (POFS) and Person-Supervisor Fit Scale (PSFS) are equally contributing to Perceived Person-Environment Fit.

H3: Perceived Person-Environment Fit Scale has a significant impact on Employees' Turnover Intention with their employers.

METHODOLOGY

A Descriptive study conducted among the workers (full-time) of private companies in textile industry across Kerala, South India, with the sample size 332 through convenience sampling technique. For this, the authors constructed a questionnaire by adapted 27 items from Perceived Person-Environment fit Scale (PPEFS) by Chuang *et al*., (2016), which includes Person- Job Fit Scale (PJFS), Person-Organization Fit Scale (POFS), Person-Group Fit Scale (PGFS), & Person-Supervisor Fit Scale (PSFS) and 4 items from Intention to Stay by Ma, (2010). Responses for these scales were in to 7 point scale is 1=No Match to 7=Complete Match for PPEFS and 1=Strongly Disagree to 7=Strongly Agree for IS. The reliability of the questionnaire was tested using the Cronbach's alpha test and the alpha values for the PJF (0.564), POF (0.760), PGF (0.691), PSF (0.880) and Intention to stay (0.896) are greater than 0.05, which shows that the instrument is reliable. The number of sampling adequacy has been tested by KMO test and the value was found to be 0.862. Further, the high value obtained in the Bartlett's test and the value of p (0.000 <0.05) indicated that the data is appropriate.

Data analysis has been done through Descriptive Statistics, Analysis of Variance (ANOVA), Friedman Rank Test and Structural Equation Model.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONS

Descriptive Analysis

In this survey, the researcher has covered all important demographic variables among the employees in concern industry. 57.5% of the respondents are belongs to 25 years -45 years, which is an ideal group to analyze the Perceived Person Environment Fit, since the mentioned age group of the employees are going to serve in the industry in long term. Further, this study have almost balanced response from the both the gender, hence it is free from the gender bias. All level of employees have been survey in this study, with respect to their educational qualification. Around 62% of the employees are having the average experience level between 2 years -9 years, so we may assume that the responses are valuable and trustworthy. Addition to this, researcher has covered all cluster responses with respect to the employees' income level.

70.2%, 76.7%, 68.9% and 66.6% of employees have responded that they are fits with their job, with their organization, with their working group/ team, and with their supervisors respectively. Meanwhile, 61.4% of the employees told that, they have intention to stay back in the organization for another few years, whereas 23.5% have reported that they have not decided anything regard their stay in the organization. It is clearly proved that, maximum number of employees are has no intention to quit in the near future. When we are considering the mean score of the scales Person-Organization fit has highest mean score (5.2018), and followed by Person-Supervisor fit (5.0693), Person-Group fit (4.9337) and Person-Job fit (4.9187). Standard deviation describes the how far it is around the mean of each scale.

Analysis of Variance -one way

H1: There is a significant different perception on PJFS, POFS, PGFS, and PSFS across Age, Gender, Qualification, Experience and Monthly Income.

The computed value for Person-Job Fit Scale (F^4_{327} = 8.957 > 2.37; p = 0.000 < 0.01), Person-Organization Fit Scale (F^4_{327} = 17.645 > 2.37; p = 0.000 < 0.01), Person-Group Fit Scale (F^4_{327} = 14.783 > 2.37; p = 0.000 < 0.01), and Person-Supervisor Fit Scale (F^4_{327} = 21.188 > 2.37; p = 0.000 < 0.01). The table value F^4_{327} with 1 per cent level of significance equals 2.37. As the computed F statistic is greater than the corresponding tabulated value. Hence PJFS, POFS, PGFS and PSFS are significantly differs across the age group of the employees.

Table No 1 Combined ANOVA Table

		Age			Gender			Qualification			Experience			Income Level		
		df	F	Sig.	df	F	Sig.	df	F	Sig.	df	F	Sig.	df	F	Sig.
PJFS	B.G	4	8.957	.000	1	6.237	.010	4	12.532	.000	4	3.716	.006	4	2.493	.043
	W.G	327			330			327			327			327		
POFS	B.G	4	17.645	.000	1	11.081	.001	4	40.866	.000	4	20.346	.000	4	0.699	.593
	W.G	327			330			327			327			327		
PGFS	B.G	4	14.783	.000	1	9.298	.002	4	31.357	.000	4	15.728	.000	4	1.064	.374
	W.G	327			330			327			327			327		
PSFS	B.G	4	21.188	.000	1	16.417	.000	4	32.864	.000	4	13.496	.000	4	0.804	.523
	W.G	327			330			327			327			327		

B.G – Between Groups; W.G – Within Groups

The computed value for Person-Job Fit Scale (F^1_{330} = 6.237 > 3.84; p = 0.01 < 0.01), Person-Organization Fit Scale (F^1_{330} = 11.081 > 3.84; p = 0.001 < 0.01), Person-Group Fit Scale (F^1_{330} = 9.298 > 3.84; p = 0.002 < 0.01), and Person-Supervisor Fit Scale (F^1_{330} = 16.417 > 3.84; p = 0.000 < 0.01). The table value F^1_{330} with 1 per cent level of significance equals 3.84. As the computed F statistic is greater than the corresponding tabulated value. Hence PJFS, POFS, PGFS and PSFS are significantly differs across the gender of the employees.

The computed value for Person-Job Fit Scale (F^4_{327} = 12.532 > 2.37; p = 0.000 < 0.01), Person-Organization Fit Scale (F^4_{327} = 40.866 > 2.37; p = 0.000 < 0.01), Person-Group Fit Scale (F^4_{327} = 31.357 > 2.37; p = 0.000 < 0.01), and Person-Supervisor Fit Scale (F^4_{327} = 32.864 > 2.37; p = 0.000 < 0.01). The table value F^4_{327} with 1 per cent level of significance equals 2.37. As the computed F statistic is greater than the corresponding tabulated value. Hence PJFS, POFS, PGFS and PSFS are significantly differs across the employees educational qualification level. The computed value for Person-Job Fit Scale (F^4_{327} = 3.716 > 2.37; p = 0.006 < 0.01), Person-Organization Fit Scale (F^4_{327} = 20.346 > 2.37; p = 0.000 < 0.01), Person-Group Fit Scale (F^4_{327} = 15.728 > 2.37; p = 0.000 < 0.01), and Person-Supervisor Fit Scale (F^4_{327} = 13.496 > 2.37; p = 0.000 < 0.01). The table value F^4_{327} with 1 per cent level of significance equals 2.37. As the computed F statistic is greater than the corresponding tabulated value. Hence PJFS, POFS, PGFS and PSFS are significantly differs across the employees' experiences. Hence, the researcher may accept the hypothesis (H1), i.e. there is a significant different perception on PJFS, POFS, PGFS, and PSFS across Age, Gender, Qualification, Experience and Monthly Income.

Friedman Test

H2: Person-Job Fit, Person-Organization Fit, Person-Group Fit and Person-Supervisor Fit are not equally contributing to Perceived Person-Environment Fit Scale

Friedman test is used for one-way repeated measures analysis of variance by ranks (Milton Friedman, 1940). The results revealed that Person-Organization fit scale has highest mean rank (2.72) and followed by Person-Supervisor fit scale (2.64), Person-Group fit scale (2.34) and Person-Job fit scale (2.30). Hence the Person-Job Fit scale, Person-Organization Fit scale, Person-Group Fit scale and Person-Supervisor Fit scale are not equally contributing to Perceived Person-Environment Fit Scale (p = 0.000 > 0.005). H2 has been accepted.

Table No 2 Test Statistics

Test Statistics[a]	
N	332
Chi-Square	38.009
Df	3
Asymp. Sig.	.000
a. Friedman Test	

Table No 3 Mean Ranks

Ranks	
	Mean Rank
Person-Job Fit Scale	2.30
Person-Organization Fit Scale	2.72
Person-Group Fit Scale	2.34
Person-Supervisor Fit Scale	2.64

Structural Equation Model:

H3: Perceived Person-Environment Fit Scale has a significant impact on Employees' Turnover Intention with their employers.

Goodness of Fit index (GFI) obtained is 0.947 as against the recommended value of above 0.90, The Adjusted Goodness of Fit Index (AGFI) is 0.842 as against the recommended value of above 0.80 as well. The Normed fit Index (NFI), Comparative Fit index (CFI), Tucker Lewis Index (TLI) are 0.899, 0.908, 0.956 respectively as against the recommended level of above 0.90. RMSEA is 0.03 and is well below the recommended limit of 0.05, and Root Mean Square Residual (RMR) is also well below the recommended limit of 0.046 at 0.05. It's has been found that the model, which the researcher arrived shows an overall acceptable fit.

Table No 4 Fit Indices

Model	Fit Scale	Normed χ^2	GFI	AGFI	NFI	CFI	TLI	RMR	RMSEA
	Value	4.905	0.947	0.842	0.899	0.908	0.956	0.03	0.046
	Criteria	< 5	0.90	0.80	0.90	0.90	0.90	0.05	0.05

Regression Estimates

The hypothesized research model exhibited good fit with observed data as mentioned above. Of greater interest for nomological validity is the path estimates in the structural model and variance explained (R^2 value) in each dependent variable. Each hypothesized path is significant (p value <0.001), and hence supported. The standardized regression weights of the output and result of the hypotheses testing providing support for hypothesis is presented in table 5.11.

Table No 5 Regression Estimates

Model	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients		P	Supported /Not Supported
	B	Std. Error	B	CR		
Person-Supervisor Fit→ Perceived Person-Environment Fit	0.335	0.064	0.801	5.195	0.000	Supported
Person-Group Fit→ Perceived Person-Environment Fit	0.505	0.045	0.683	11.175	0.000	Supported
Person-Organization Fit→ Perceived Person-Environment Fit	0.623	0.053	0.739	11.824	0.000	Supported
Person-Job Fit→ Perceived Person-Environment Fit	0.450	0.047	0.579	9.579	0.000	Supported
Perceived Person-Environment Fit → Intention to Stay (H3)	0.334	0.064	0.274	5.188	0.010	Supported

Perceived Person-Environment Fit is influenced by Person-Supervisor Fit (p= 0.000 < 0.01; CR= 5.195 > 2.58; β= 0.80), Person-Group Fit (p= 0.000 < 0.01; CR= 11.175 > 2.58; β=0.68), Person-Organization Fit (p= 0.000 < 0.01; CR= 11.824 > 2.58; β=0.73), Person-Job Fit (p= 0.000 < 0.01; CR= 9.579 > 2.58; β=0.58) at 99 percent significant level (Byrne, 2001; Biswas, Giri& Srivastava, 2006). Hence the four perceived scales namely Person-Supervisor Fit scale, Person-Group Fit Scale, Person-Organization Fit Scale and Person-Job Fit Scale are predicted the Perceived Person-Environment Fit Scale. Perceived Person-Environment Fit (PPEF) is a significant impact on the Employees' Turnover Intention with the current organization (p= 0.01 < 0.05; CR= 5.188 > 1.96; β=0.334) at 95 percent significant level. Hence the Hypothesis (H3) accepted.

CONCLUSION

Our study revealed that perceived Person-Environment Fit (person-job fit, person-organization fit, person-supervisor fit and person-group fit) has a significant impact on Employees' Turnover Intention with their employers. The person-supervisor fit, person-group fit, person-organization fit and person-job fit has a significant relationship with perceived Person-Environment Fit. Further this study has found that Person-Job Fit scale, Person-Organization Fit scale, Person-Group Fit scale and Person-Supervisor Fit scale are not equally contributing to Perceived Person-Environment Fit.

Limitations of the study

Our study only focuses the impact of person-group fit, person-job fit, person-supervisor fit and Person-organization fit on Employees' Turnover Intention with their employers only among the employees of textiles industry in Kerala, India. Further insights and results can be deduced by using the relationship of these variables in other sectors of economy. Additional work is needed to be done for a continued progress to measure fit that includes other dimensions of person-environment fit like person-vocation fit. More research can be done to investigate different type of fit on different employee and organizational outcomes within a longitudinal design at different point of time in future. Future study should examine the effects of fits with other employee outcomes like organizational citizenship behavior, and employee performance. Our study is conducted within the boundaries of Kerala, India, and sample size was 332.

Theoretical Implications

One of our contribution to person-environment fit and Employees' Turnover Intention literature is the implication that person-environment fit with different facets of work settings are regarded as vital predecessor of their job satisfaction and turnover intention in past research and studies.

References

Ahmad, K.Z. (2012). The Mediating effect of Person-Environment Fit on the relationship between Organizational Culture and Staff Turnover. *Asian Social Science*, 8(2), 62-71.

Abbas, A., Shah, S.H.A., & Deen, K.A. (2015). The Effect of Person-Environment Fit on Turnover Intentions of Employees with the Mediating Role of Job Satisfaction in Banking Sector of Pakistan. *European Journal of Business and Management*, 7(31), 47-61.

Becker, T.E. (1992). Foci and bases of commitment: Are they distinctions worth making? *Academy of Management Journal, 35*(1), 232-244.

Becker, T.E., Billings, R.S., Eveleth, D.M., & Gilbert, N.L. (1996). Foci and bases of employee commitment: Implications for job performance. *Academy of Management Journal, 39*(2), 464-482.

Boon, C., Hartog, D. N. D., Boselie, P., & Paauwe, J. (2011). The relationship between perceptions of HR practices and employee outcomes: examining the role of person-organisation and person-job fit. *The International Journal of Human Resource Management, 22*(1), 138.

Bowen, D.E., Ledford, G.E Jr., & Nathan, B.R. (1991). Hiring for the organization, not the job. *Academy of Management Executive, 5*(4), 35-52.

Boxx, W.R., Odom, R.Y., & Dunn, M.G. (1991). Organizational values and value congruency and their impact on satisfaction, commitment, and cohesion: An empirical examination within the public sector. *Public Personnel Management, 20*(2), 195-205.

Bretz, R.D., & Judge, T.A. (1994). Person-organization fit and the theory of work adjustment: Implications for satisfaction, tenure, and career success. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 44*(1), 32-54.

Bretz, R. D., Ash, R. A., & Dreher, G. F. (1989). Do people make the place? An examination of the attraction-selection-attrition hypothesis. *Personnel Psychology*, 42, 561-581.

Burke, R. I., & Deszca, E. (1982). Preferred organizational climates of Type A individuals. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 21, 50-59.

Cable, D.M., & Judge, T. A. (1994). Pay preferences and job search decisions: A person-organization fit perspective. *Personnel Psychology*, 47, 317-348.

Cable, D.M., & Judge, T. A. (1997). Interviewers' perceptions of person-organization fit and organizational selection decisions. *Journal of applied psychology, 82*, 546-561.

Cable, D.M., & Judge, T. A. (1996). Person-organization fit, job choice decisions, and organizational entry. *Organizational Behaviour and Human Decision Processes, 67*(3), 294-311.

Cable, D.M., & DeRue, D.S. (2002). The convergent and discriminant validity of subjective fit perceptions. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 87*(5), 875-884.

Cable, D.M., Judge, T.A. (1996). Person-organization fit, job choice decisions, and organizational entry. *Organizational Behavior& Human Decision Processes, 67*(3), 294-311.

Chatman, J.A. (1991). Matching people and organizations: Selection and socialization in public accounting firms. *Administrative Science Quarterly, 36*(3), 459-484.

Chuang, A., Shen, C. T., & Judge, T. A. (2016). Development of a multidimensional instrument of person-environment fit: The Perceived Person-Environment Fit Scale (PPEFS). *Applied Psychology: An International Review*, 65, 66-98.

Colbert AE. (2004). Understanding the effects of transformational leadership: The mediating role of leader-follower value congruence. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Iowa.

DaSilva, N., Hutcheson, J., & Wahl, G. D. (2010). Organizational strategy and employee outcomes: a person-organization fit perspective. *The Journal of Psychology*, 144(2), 145-161.

Downey, K., Hellriegel, D., & Slocum, J. (1975). Congruence between individual needs, organizational climate, job satisfaction and performance. *Academy of Management Journal*, 18, 149-155.

Edwards, J.R. (1991). Person-job fit: A conceptual integration, literature review, and methodological critique. *International review of industrial andorganizational psychology*, 6, 283-357.

Edwards, J. R., & Billsberry, J. (2010). Testing a Multidimensional Theory of Person-Environment Fit. *Journal of Managerial Issues*, 22(4), 476-493.

Griffeth, R.W., Hom, P.W., &Gaertner, S. (2001). A meta-analysis of antecedents and correlates of employee turnover: Update, moderator tests, and research implications for the next millennium. *Journal of Management, 26,* 463-488.

Hollenbeck, J.R. (1989). Control theory and the perception of work environments: The effects of focus of attention on affective and behaviors reactions to work. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Process, 43,* 406-430.

Ivancevich, J. M., & Matteson, M. T. (1980). Stress and work: A managerial perspective. *Work stress: Health care systems in the workplace.* 27-49.

Jelinek, R., & Ahearne, M. (2010). Be careful what you look for: the effect of trait competitiveness and long hours on salesperson deviance and whether meaningfulness of work matters. *Journal of Marketing Theory andPractice*, 18(4), 303-321.

Judge, T.A., & Ferris, G.R. (1992). The elusive criterion of fit in human resource staffing decisions. *Human Resource Planning, 15*(4), 47-67.

Judge. T.A., & Kristof, A. (2004). Personality, Interactional Psychology, and Person-Organization Fit in *Personality and Organizations*, eds. B. Schneider and D.B. Smith, Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, New Jersey.

Kanungo, R.N. (1979). The concepts of alienation and involvement revisited. *Psychological Bulletin.* 86, 119-138

Krishnan, V.R. (2002). Transformational leadership and value system congruence. *International Journal of Value-Based Management, 15*(1), 19-33.

Kristof, A., Zimmerman, R. D. & Johnson, E. C. (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.

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

Kristof, A., & Guay, R. P. (2011). Person-environment fit. In S. Zedeck (Ed.), (Vol. 3, pp. 3-50). Washington DC: American Psychological Association

Lee, T., Mitchell, T., Wise, L., & Fireman, S. (1996). An Unfolding Model of Voluntary Employee Turnover. *The Academy of Management Journal, 39*(1), 5-36.

Lee, Y.-T. &Ramaswami, A. (2012) Fitting Person-Environment Fit Theories into a National Cultural Context, in Organizational Fit: Key Issues and New Directions (eds A. L. Kristof-Brown and J. Billsberry), John Wiley & Sons, Ltd, Chichester, UK.

Lyons, H. Z. & O'Brien, K. M. (2006). The role of person-environment fit in the job satisfaction and tenure intentions of African American employees. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 53*(4), 387-396.

Ma, E. J. (2010). A cross-culture study on the motivational mechanism of hotel employees' organizational citizenship behavior. Oklahoma State University. ProQuest Dissertations and Theses, 217. Retrieved from *http://search.proquest.com/docview/927910799?accountid=27932.* (927910799).

Mathis, R., & Jackson, J. (2003). *Human resource management*, 13 Edition, Ohio.

Friedman, M. (1940). A comparison of alternative tests of significance for the problem of m rankings. The Annals of Mathematical Statistics, 11 (1), 86-92.

Muchinsky, P.M., & Monahan, C.J. (1987). What is person-environment congruence? Supplementary versus complementary models of fit. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 31*(3), 268-277.

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

Ployhart, R. E., Schneider, B., & Schmitt, N. 2006. *Staffing organizations: Contemporary practice and theory* (3rd ed.). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Posner, B.Z., Kouzes, J. M., & Schmidt, W. H. (1985). Shared values make a difference: An empirical test of corporate culture. *Human Resource Management*, 24, 293-309.

Saks, A.M., &Ashforth, B.E. (1997). A longitudinal investigation of the relationships between job information sources, applicant perceptions of fit, and work outcomes. *Personnel Psychology, 50*(2), 395-426.

Schaubroeck, J., & Lam, S.S.K. (2002). How similarity to peers and supervisor influences organizational advancement in different cultures. *Academy of Management Journal, 45*, 1120-1136.

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

Schneider, B. (2001). Fits about fit. *Applied Psychology: An International Review, 50*(1), 141-152.

Tom, V.R. (1971). The role of personality and organizational images in the recruiting process. *Organizational Behavior and Human Performance, 6*, 573-592.

Turban, D.B., & Keon, T.L. (1993). Organizational attractiveness: An interactionist perspective. *Journal of Applied Psychology,* 78(2), 184-193.

Tziner, A. (1987). Congruency issue retested using Fineman's achievement climate notion. *Journal of Social Behavior and Personality, 2*(1), 63-78.

Vianen, V., Pater, D., &Dijk, V. (2007). Work value fit as predictor of turnover intention: Same-source or different-source fit. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 22, 188-202.

Vancouver, J.B., & Schmitt, N.W. (1991). An exploratory examination of person-organization fit: Organizational goal congruence. *Personnel Psychology, 44*(2), 333-352.

Vancouver, J.B., Millsap, R.E., & Peters, P.A. (1994). Multilevel analysis of organizational goal congruence. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 79*(5), 666-679.

Vogel, R. M., & Feldman, D. C. (2009). Integrating the levels of person-environment fit. The roles of vocational fit and group fit. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 75*, 68-81.

Werbel, J.D., & Gilliland, S.W. (1999). Person-environment fit in the selection process. In FerrisGR (Ed.), *Research in Personnel and Human Resource Management*, 17, 209-243.

Witt, L.A. (1998). Enhancing goal congruence: A solution to organizational politics. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 83*, 666-674.

How to cite this article:

Gokula Krishnan S *et al* (2017) 'Perceived Person-Environment Fit and Employees' Turnover Intention ', *International Journal of Current Advanced Research,* 06(08), pp. 5218-5224. DOI: http://dx.doi.org/10.24327/ijcar.2017.5224.0675

****