

## **CHAPTER 4: RESEARCH RESULTS**

This chapter focuses on analysing the data collected. Firstly the data collected were prepared for analysis. Then the data was assessing the frequency distribution of demographic variables, the mean and standard deviation of the dependent and independent variables.

This was followed Descriptive Statistics for Variables, the Crobach's coefficient alpha for results. Subsequently, the correlation analysis for variable will be discussed.

Finally, the results of regression analysis will present using organizational commitment as dependent variable (DV), 2 factors of PE Fits will be factors influencing Organizational Commitment (IV), and another 2 factors of Personality will be moderating the relationship between IV and DV. The result of the study will be discussed in accordance to hypothesis of the study.

### **4.1 RESPONSE RATE**

The survey questionnaires were sending out using various channels to the target respondents. A total of 300 hardcopies of questionnaires were distributed out to the target respondents, out of which 119 responses were received back and total usable responses were 71.

Subsequently, a total of 257 softcopies were distributed through email, out of which 142 responses were received. 30 sets of questionnaire were not usable, as they were either incomplete or duplicate in the selection. Therefore not include in the analysis.

**Table 4.1: Research Response Rate**

Method of Questionnaire	Number of Questionnaires		
	Sent	Returned	Usable
Hardcopy by hand	300	119	71
Softcopy by email	257	142	112
<b>Total</b>	<b>557</b>	<b>261</b>	<b>183</b>
<b>Rate of usable response</b>	<b>32.85%</b>		

## 4.2 SUMMARY OF STATISTICS

The questionnaire was self-administered and interviewer was present to clarify any doubts and queries. The sample is divided between 45.4% Male and 54.6% female. The largest group responded to 30 –39 years age group (45.9%) and follow by 20 –29 years age group at 44.3% the age bracket of 40-49 year old (6.0%). There are only 3.8% of the respondents are above 50 year old. This indicant that, majority of our respondents is in middle and younger age.

As for the number of years in current organization, the results shows that majority of them (39.3%) have been with present organization for less than 2 years. And follow by the group of with present organization for more than 2 years but less than 5 years (35.0%). For the group of work more than 5 years but less than 10 years with present organization in the third place (21.3%). Only 4.4% have been with their present organization for more than 10 years.

In the demographic ethnic group, the respondents' mainly consist of Chinese ethic group (44.8%), follow by Indian ethic group (23.5%) and Malay ethic group (22.4%).

In refer to the sample, the educational level our respondents are mainly degree/professional qualifications holders comprising of 68.3%, 23.5% have post graduate qualifications, 7.1% have certificates, while 1.1% were educated up to secondary level only. These indicate our respondents are mainly with tertiary education.

Majority of the respondents are Malaysian workforce whom currently works in Malaysia (63.4%). Then it follow with category of Malaysian whom currently work abroad (24.6%), most of these respondents are computer programmer, financial analyst and engineer who are presently working in China, Singapore and Japan. And lastly is the category of expatriate workforce who is presently working in Malaysia (12.0%). The respondents are mainly from China, Japan, India and Vietnam. Majority of them are involved in IT industry, where it is an emerging industry in Malaysia. Lots of IT industry in Malaysia has aggressively recruited IT talents from abroad countries.

The respondents are from various industries to reduce biases of sampling. The majority was from services industry (26.8%), manufacturing industry (24.0%), Property Development and Construction (10.9%). Follow by government/government agencies (8.7%), Education (7.1%) and Plantation (3.8%). The remaining of 18.6% is categories in others industry.

The sample distributions were distributed to fellow colleagues, classmates and friends who are work at various types' organization. The type of organization, our respondents are from private limited comprising of 31.7%, follow by multinational organizations comprising of 29.5%, and 19.1% of the respondents are from public listed companies.

For current job position, the largest group was from other management (47.5%), follow by skilled professional group (22.4%), non management (10.9%), technical employee (7.1%), top management (1.1%), own business (1.1%) and others (3.8%).

As for the respondents' current job function, a majority of them are in IT/technical/production function (31.7%). Follow by accounting/finance function (18.0%), sales/marketing/customer service (16.9%), human resource (8.2%), general management (7.7%), and the smallest group is legal & compliance (2.7%). The remaining of 14.8% is in others functions.

**Table 4.2: Demographic and Characteristics of Respondents**

<b>Characteristics</b>		<b>Sample (n=183)</b>
<b>Gender</b>	Male	45.4%
	Female	54.6%
<b>Age</b>	20-29	44.3%
	30-39	45.9%
	40-49	6.0%
	Above 50	3.8%
<b>Ethnicity</b>	Malay	22.4%
	Chinese	44.8%
	Indian	23.5%
	Others	9.3%
<b>Current Employment status</b>	Malaysian currently work in Malaysia	63.4%
	Malaysian currently working abroad	24.6%
	Foreigner currently working in Malaysia	12.0%
<b>Year in current employment</b>	Less than 2 years	39.3%
	2 - 5 years	35.0%
	More than 5 years and up to 10 years	21.3%
	More than 10 years	4.4%
<b>Education</b>	Secondary	1.1%
	Certification/Diploma	7.1%
	Degree/Professional	68.3%
	Postgraduate	23.5%
<b>Types of industry</b>	Services	26.8%
	Property Development/Construction	10.9%
	Manufacturing	24.0%
	Education	7.1%
	Plantation	3.8%
	Government/Government agencies	8.7%
	Others	18.6%
<b>Types of organization</b>	Sole proprietor	2.2%
	Partnership	4.9%
	Private Limited	31.7%
	Public Listed	19.1%
	Multinational (MNC)	29.5%
	Government/Government agencies	10.9%
<b>Job position</b>	Others	1.6%
	Top Management	1.1%
	Non Management	10.9%
	Other Management	47.5%
	Skilled professional	28.4%
	Technical employee	7.1%
	Own business	1.1%
Other	3.8%	
<b>Job function</b>	General Management	7.7%
	IT/Technical/Production	31.7%
	Sales/Marketing/Customer Service	16.9%
	Human Resources	8.2%
	Accounting/Finance	18.0%
	Legal/Compliance	2.7%
	Others	14.8%

### 4.3 ANALYSIS OF MEASURES

SPSS software was used to test the measurement scales reliability, examine the validity of the theoretical framework and test the hypothesized relationships. The p value for all test was set at conservative .05 level to minimize the type I error.

#### 4.3.1 Descriptive Statistics for variables

Table 4.2 Descriptive Statistics (Sample size = 183)

	Items	Mean	Std. Deviation	Skewness	Kurtosis	Reliability
Person-Organization Fit	4	4.406	1.298	-0.497	-0.447	0.930
Person-Group Fit	3	4.973	1.163	-0.818	1.118	0.903
Emotional Stability	5	4.110	0.847	0.187	0.060	0.409
Agreeableness	5	3.626	1.011	0.603	0.589	0.579
Conscientiousness	5	3.681	0.959	0.189	-0.319	0.498
Continuous Commitment	8	4.133	0.843	-0.218	1.221	0.632
Normative Commitment	8	4.015	0.581	-0.203	1.716	0.171

All instruments were measured on seven-point scale, hence a mid-point of 4.

The results of frequency analysis show majority of the responses of Organization Commitments mean fall within the “neutral” categories show the respondents either unsure about their opinion or they are generally neutral to the factors. This indicates the employees either unsure or they are neutral toward their organizational commitment.

The measures of PE-fits are higher than the mid points. The analysis could be inference by the demographic of respondents.

Data normality also can be comparing with skewness and kurtosis. A normal data should have skewness distribution between -2 to +2; and kurtosis distribution between -3 to +3 consider normal. The results from current analysis show the skewness of data are between -2 and +2, and kurtosis are between -3 to +3, which represent the distribution of data are normal.

### 4.3.2 Reliability Analysis

Reliability Coefficients is reliability measure to ensure consistently the items intend to measure. The data was reliable and acceptable for further analysis if the alpha coefficient is more than 0.7 (Hair et al, 2006). All alpha coefficients for PE fit are above 0.9, mean highly consistent with the scale. While all the big five personality dimension only are with lower than 0.7, mean these scales have little in common. And organizational commitment factors ; both factors are lower than 0.7.

### 4.3.3 Inter-correlations among variables

Pearson correlation coefficient was used to test the relationship between independent variable and dependent variable. Table 4.4 show the complete overview of correlation coefficients.

**Table 4.4 Correlation Coefficients (sample size = 183)**

	Items	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
<u>Person-Environment Fit</u>								
1. PO-FIT	4	1.000						
2. PG-FIT	3	0.424(**)	1.000					
<u>Big Five (Personality)</u>								
3. EMOTIONAL STABILITY	5	0.129(**)	0.143*	1.000				
4. AGREEABLENESS	5	-0.076	-0.141*	-0.192*	1.000			
5. CONSCIENTIOUNESS	5	-0.175**	-0.155*	-0.143*	0.453**	1.000		
<u>Organizational Commitment</u>								
6. CONTINUOUS COMMITMENT	8	0.443**	0.152*	0.091	0.034	0.007	1.000	
7. NORMATIVE COMMITMENT	8	0.218**	0.002	-0.038	-0.048	0.001	0.226**	1.000

\*\* Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (1-tailed).

\* Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (1-tailed).

Correlation result for each dimension of independent variables of Person-Environment Fit, moderating variables of big five personality and dependent variables of organisational commitment.

The coefficient correlation collected was above zero. The closer the correlation to either +1 or -1, indicates the stronger the correlation is. The positive and negative mean the relationship between variables, either it is positive related or negative related.

From the display of results in table 4.4, it evidence there are strong relationship between Person-Organization fit with both Normative Commitment and Continuous Commitment. And it noted that, there is significant relationship between Person-Group fit and Continuous Commitment. However, there are no significant relationship between Person-Group fit and Normative Commitment.

#### **4.4 Regression Analysis**

Person-Environment Fits were computed from two separate independent variables, person-organization fit and person-group fit, and measure each effect on organizational commitment. For the dependent variables, it has measure by normative commitment & continuous commitment. Both the variables were computed together, to see entire interactions.

##### **4.4.1 Regression between Person-Organization Fit and Organizational Commitment**

H1a stated that, Person-Organization Fit has significant relationship with continuous commitment. From the analysis, the Person-Organization Fit explained 19.6% of the variance ( $R^2$ ) in Continuous Commitment and it's significant by indicated by p-value ( $p < 0.5$ ).

H1b stated that, Person Organization Fit has significant relationship with normative commitment. From the analysis, the Person-Organization Fit explained 4.7% of the variance ( $R^2$ ) in Normative Commitment and it's significant by indicated by p-value ( $p < 0.5$ )

Therefore, the null hypothesis of H1 is rejected.

This finding is consistent with previous study (C. Jeffrey. McConnell, 2003; Mohamed, H.B 2009; Janet, C et. al. 2008), where PO fit is positive associated with both normative commitment and continuance commitment. The same result also appeared in Colin Silverthorne’s (2004) research in Taiwan context.

#### 4.4.2 Regression between Person-Group Fit and Organizational Commitment

H2a stated that, Person-Group Fit has significant relationship with continuous commitment. From the analysis, the Person-Organization Fit explained 23% of the variance (R<sup>2</sup>) in Continuous Commitment and it’s significant by indicated by p-value (p <0.5).

In contrast H2b stated that, Person-Group Fit has significant relationship with normative commitment. From the analysis, the Person-Organization Fit explained 0% of the variance (R<sup>2</sup>) in Normative Commitment and it’s significant by indicated by p-value (p>0.5)

Therefore, the null hypothesis of H2 is partially rejected. Person-Group has generally significant relationship with Organizational Commitment.

**Table 4.5 Regression Result between PE Fit and Organizational Commitment**

Independent variables	Dependent variables	B	p-value	R <sup>2</sup>	t-test
Person-Organisation Fit	Continuance Commitment	0.58	0	0.2	6.65
	Normative Commitment	0.2	0	0.05	3
Person-Group Fit	Continuance Commitment	0.3	0.04	0.23	2.08
	Normative Commitment	0	0.98	0	0.03

Note: \*p<0.05, \*\*p<0.01

#### 4.5 Moderated Multiple Regression Analysis (MMR)

The moderated multiple regression (MMR) analysis s to examine the effect of a moderator variable on the relation between independent variables and dependent variables.



### Step 1

Moderator effects are tested with regression analyses by first entering the predictor and moderator, the product of the two variables.

### Step 2

The next step, a restricted model comprised of independent variables – (PO Fit & PG fit) and hypothesized moderators (emotional stability, agreeableness and conscientiousness) have been created by entering both terms blocks by using the method of enter.

### Step 3

Next a full MMR model had been constructed, adding the focal interaction term (Independent variable X moderator variable) to the restricted model and by using the method of stepwise.

#### 4.5.1 Regression Analysis on PE fit on organizational commitment with moderator of Emotional Stability

**Table 4.6 Regression result using emotional stability variable as Moderator in the Relationship between Independent Variables and Dependent Variables**

		Dependent Variable 1			Dependent Variable 2			
		Continuance Commitment			Normative Commitment			
		Step 1	Step 2	Step 3	Step 1	Step 2	Step 3	
<b>Independent Variable 1</b>	<b>Model Variable</b>							
	PO Fit	0.572	0.566	Not Significant	0.197	0.204	-0.445	
	<b>Moderating Variable</b>							
	Emotional Stability	0.055			-0.073	-0.614		
	<b>Interaction Variable</b>							
	PO Fit * Emotional Stability				0.032			
	R <sup>2</sup>	0.196	0.197		0.048	0.053	0.085	
	Adj R <sup>2</sup>	0.191	0.188		0.043	0.042	0.070	
	DR <sup>2</sup>		0.003			-0.001	0.028	
	F value	44.015	22.049		9.217	5.019	5.539	
Sig	0.000	0	0.003		0.008	0.001		
Sig F Change	0.000	0.000	0.040	0.008	0.013			
<b>Independent Variable 2</b>	<b>Model Variable</b>							
	PG Fit	0.294	0.274	1.485	0.003	0.011	Not Significant	
	<b>Moderating Variable</b>							
	Emotional Stability	0.114		0.951	-0.041			
	<b>Interaction Variable</b>							
	PG Fit * Emotional Stability	-0.056						
	R <sup>2</sup>	0.023	0.028	0.055	0.000	0.001		
	Adj R <sup>2</sup>	0.018	0.017	0.039	-0.006	-0.010		
	DR <sup>2</sup>		-0.001	0.022	-0.004			
	F value	4.278	2.603	3.44	0.001	0.126		
Sig	0.040	0.077	0.018	0.974	0.881			
Sig F Change	0.003	0.077	0.027	0.974	0.881			

H3a is moderated regression analysis are used to assess the degree of emotional stability variable moderate the effect between PO Fit and Continuance Commitment

In this case, the moderation interaction PO Fit \* Emotional Stability is not included in the model. Thus the hypothesis is not accepted. Emotional Stability does not moderate the effect of PO fit and Continuance commitment.

H3b is moderated regression analysis are used to assess the degree of emotional stability variable moderate the effect between PO Fit and Normative Commitment.

When the normative commitment variable were entered into the regression equation in the first step, the coefficient of determination ( $R^2$ ) was found to be 0.048 indicating 4.8% of organizational commitment is explained by the PO fit variable. In the second step, emotional stability was entered into the equation in order to gauge its impact as independent predictor. The  $R^2$  increased from 4.8 % to 5.3% indicating a change of 0.5%. In the final step, the interaction terms were entered into the model. It can be seen that the additional variance explained by the interaction terms (8.5%) was significant ( $p < 0.01$ ), indicating there is moderating effect.

H3c is moderated regression analysis are used to assess the degree of emotional stability variable moderate the effect between PG Fit and Continuance Commitment.

When the organizational commitment variables were entered into the regression equation in the first step, the coefficient of determination ( $R^2$ ) was found to be 0.023 indicating 2.3% of organizational commitment is explained by the PO fit variable. In the second step, emotional stability was entered into the equation in order to gauge its impact as independent predictor. The  $R^2$  increased from 2.3 % to 2.8% indicating a change of 0.5%. In the final step, the interaction terms were entered into the model. It can be seen that the additional variance explained by the interaction terms (5.5%) was significant ( $p < 0.05$ ), indicating there is moderating effect.

H3d is moderated regression analysis are used to assess the degree of emotional stability variable moderate the effect between PG Fit and Normative Commitment

In this case, the moderation interaction PG Fit \* Emotional Stability is not included in the model. Thus the hypothesis is not accepted. Emotional Stability does not have moderate effect of PG fit and normative commitment.

Therefore, Emotional Stability has partial moderator effect on the relationship Person-Environment Fit and Organizational Commitment.

#### 4.5.2 Regression Analysis on PE fit on organizational commitment with moderator of Agreeableness

**Table 4.7 Regression Result Using Agreeableness variable as Moderator in the Relationship between Independent Variables and Dependent Variables**

		Dependent Variable 1			Dependent Variable 2			
		Continuance Commitment			Normative Commitment			
		Step 1	Step 2	Step 3	Step 1	Step 2	Step 3	
<b>Independent Variable 1</b>	<b>Model Variable</b>							
	PO Fit	0.572	0.579	Not Significant	0.197	0.194	0.765	
	<b>Moderating Variable</b>							
	Agreeableness	0.088			-0.029	0.521		
	<b>Interaction Variable</b>							
	PO Fit * Agreeableness				-0.031			
	R <sup>2</sup>	0.196	0.2		0.048	0.049	0.091	
	Adj R2	0.191	0.191		0.043	0.039	0.076	
	DR <sup>2</sup>	0			-0.004	0.037		
	F value	44.015	22.497		9.217	4.681	5.959	
Sig	0.000	0	0.003		0.01	0.001		
Sig F Change	0.000	0	0.040	0.01	0.005			
<b>Independent Variable 2</b>	<b>Model Variable</b>							
	PG Fit	0.294	0.309	-0.806	0.003	-0.006	Not Significant	
	<b>Moderating Variable</b>							
	Agreeableness	0.075		-0.829	-0.044			
	<b>Interaction Variable</b>							
	PG Fit * Agreeableness	0.061						
	R <sup>2</sup>	0.023	0.026	0.055	0	0.002		
	Adj R2	0.018	0.015	0.04	-0.006	-0.009		
	DR <sup>2</sup>	-0.003		0.025	-0.003			
	F value	4.278	2.417	3.504	0.001	0.206		
Sig	0.040	0.092	0.017	0.974	0.814			
Sig F Change	0.003	0.092	0.02	0.974	0.814			

H4a is moderated regression analysis are used to assess the degree of Agreeableness variable moderate the effect between PO Fit and Continuance Commitment.

In this case, the moderation interaction PO Fit X Agreeableness is not included in the model. Thus the hypothesis is not accepted. Agreeableness does not moderate the effect of PJ fit and organizational commitment.

H4b is moderated regression analysis are used to assess the degree of Agreeableness variable moderate the effect between PO Fit and Normative Commitment.

When the organizational commitment variables were entered into the regression equation in the first step, the coefficient of determination ( $R^2$ ) was found to be 0.048 indicating 4.8% of organizational commitment is explained by the PO fit variable. In the second step, Agreeableness was entered into the equation in order to gauge its impact as independent predictor. The  $R^2$  increased from 4.8 % to 4.9% indicating a change of 0.1%. In the final step, the interaction terms were entered into the model. It can be seen that the additional variance explained by the interaction terms (9.1%) was significant ( $p < 0.01$ ), indicating there is moderating effect.

H4c is moderated regression analysis are used to assess the degree of emotional stability variable moderate the effect between PG Fit and Continuance Commitment.

When the continuance commitment variable was entered into the regression equation in the first step, the coefficient of determination ( $R^2$ ) was found 2.3% of continuance commitment is explained by the PG fit variable. In the second step, Agreeableness was entered into the equation in order to gauge its impact as independent predictor. The  $R^2$  increased from 2.3 % to 2.6 % indicating a change of 0.3%. In the final step, the interaction terms were entered into the model. It can be seen that the additional variance explained by the interaction terms (5.5%) was significant ( $p < 0.05$ ), indicating there is moderating effect.

H4d is moderated regression analyses are used to assess the degree to which indirect indicators of Agreeableness of independence moderate the effect between PG Fit and Continuance Commitment.

In this case, the moderation interaction PG Fit X Agreeableness is not included in the model. Thus the hypothesis is not accepted. Agreeableness does not have moderate effect of PG fit and normative commitment.

Therefore, Agreeableness has partial moderator effect on the relationship Person-Environment Fit and Organizational Commitment.

#### 4.5.3 Regression Analysis on PE fit on organizational commitment with moderator of Conscientiousness

**Table 4.8 Regression Result Using Conscientiousness variable as Moderator in the Relationship between Independent Variables and Dependent Variables**

		Dependent Variables 1			Dependent Variables 2				
		Continuance Commitment			Normative Commitment				
		Step 1	Step 2	Step 3	Step 1	Step 2	Step 3		
<b>Independent Variable 1</b>	<b>Model Variable</b>								
	PO Fit	0.572	0.591	Not Significant	0.197	0.203	Not Significant		
	<b>Moderating Variable</b>								
	Conscientiousness	0.12			0.041				
	<b>Interaction Variable</b>								
	PO Fit * Conscientiousness								
	R <sup>2</sup>	0.196	0.203			0.048		0.05	
	Adj R2	0.191	0.194			0.043		0.04	
	DR <sup>2</sup>		0.003					-0.003	
	F value	44.015	22.88			9.217		4.759	
Sig	0.000	0			0.003	0.01			
Sig F Change	0.000	0		0.040	0.01				
<b>Independent Variable 2</b>	<b>Model Variable</b>								
	PG Fit	0.294	303	-0.783	0.003	0.004	Not Significant		
	<b>Moderating Variable</b>								
	Conscientiousness	0.046			-0.891				
	<b>Interaction Variable</b>								
	PG Fit * Conscientiousness	0.06							
	R <sup>2</sup>	0.023	0.024	0.045	0	0			
	Adj R2	0.018	0.013	0.029	-0.006	-0.011			
	DR <sup>2</sup>		-0.005	0.016		-0.005			
	F value	4.278	2.225	2.809	0.001	0.003			
Sig	0.040	0.111	0.041	0.974	0.997				
Sig F Change	0.003	0.111	0.05	0.974	0.997				

H5a is moderated regression analysis are used to assess the degree to which indirect indicators of Conscientiousness of independence moderate the effect between PO Fit and Continuance Commitment.

In this case, the moderation interaction PO Fit X Conscientiousness is not included in the model. Thus the hypothesis is not accepted. Conscientiousness does not have moderate effect of PO fit and continuance commitment.

H5b is moderated regression analysis are used to assess the degree to which indirect indicators of Conscientiousness of independence moderate the effect between PO Fit and Normative Commitment.

In this case, the moderation interaction PO Fit X Conscientiousness is not included in the model. Thus the hypothesis is not accepted. Conscientiousness does not have moderate effect of PO fit and normative commitment.

H5c is moderated regression analysis are used to assess the degree of conscientiousness variable moderate the effect between PG Fit and Continuance Commitment.

When the continuance commitment variable was entered into the regression equation in the first step, the coefficient of determination ( $R^2$ ) was found 2.3% of continuance commitment is explained by the PG fit variable. In the second step, Conscientiousness was entered into the equation in order to gauge its impact as independent predictor. The  $R^2$  increased from 2.3 % to 2.4 % indicating a change of 0.1%. In the final step, the interaction terms were entered into the model. It can be seen that the additional variance explained by the interaction terms (4.5%) was significant ( $p < 0.05$ ), indicating there is moderating effect.

H5d is moderated regression analysis are used to assess the degree to which indirect indicators of Conscientiousness of independence moderate the effect between PG Fit and Normative Commitment.

In this case, the moderation interaction PG Fit X Conscientiousness is not included in the model. Thus the hypothesis is not accepted. Conscientiousness does not have moderate effect of PG fit and normative commitment.

Therefore, Emotional Stability has partial moderator effect on the relationship Person-Environment Fit and Organizational Commitment.

The overall result found moderating effect of personality is insignificant to all relationship between PE Fit and affective commitment. And moderating factors of extroversion and openness to experience are also insignificant to all relationship of PE Fit and organisational commitment.

#### **4.6 SUMMARY OF RESEARCH RESULT**

The statistical analysis showed

Hypothesis 1 the person-organization fit has positive relationship on organizational commitment was supported. Both the sub-hypotheses H1a & H1b were supported.

Hypothesis 2 the person-group fit has positive relationship on organizational commitment was supported.

Hypothesis 3 the emotional stability has moderating effect toward was partial supported. Where 4 sub hypotheses, only 2 of it were supported. The rest of were not significant.



Hypothesis 4 the agreeableness has moderating effect toward was partial supported. Where 4 sub hypotheses, only 2 of it were supported. The rest of were not significant.

Hypothesis 5 the conscientiousness has moderating effect toward was partial supported. But, it has weak moderating effect. From 4 sub hypotheses, only one of it was supported. The rest of were not significant.

There are growing of literature shows there are relationship exists between PE fits and Organizational Commitment. The objective of this study was to include additional variables factor (personality) to test on the relationship between PE fits and Organizational Commitment.

This research establishes Person-Organizational Fit do influence all the factors in organizational commitment. The Person-Group Fit does influence all the Continuous Commitment variables but not the normative commitment.

The moderating variables of Emotional Stability, Agreeableness & Conscientiousness do influence the relationship of PE Fit and Organizational Commitment.