

2.0 CHAPTER TWO: LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1 Introduction

This chapter elaborates on earlier studies where the construct of organizational strategy, employee outcomes from the context of organizational commitment, intention to stay, firm's attractiveness and P-O Fit is studied in depth. It presents the theories, previous studies on the construct as well as the conceptualization of the research framework.

2.2 Constructs

The constructs related are person-organization fit, organizational strategy, organizational commitment, intention to stay and firm attractiveness are to be analyzed.

2.2.1 Organizational strategy

Firms must continuously evaluate their environments and decide on the appropriate strategy. Strategy is an integrated and coordinated set of commitments and actions designed to exploit core competencies and gain a competitive advantage (Hitt, Ireland and Hoskisson, 2003). According to Porter (1996), strategy is the creation of a unique and valuable position, involving a different set of activities.

Levy *et al.* (2001) define strategy as an organizational process which has significant political ramifications within organizations and the broader society. They introduce strategy as a set of practices and discourses which promotes instrumental rationality, reproduces hierarchical relations of power and systematically privileges the interests and viewpoints of particular groups. Friga *et al.* (2003) introduce the development of a vision of the end result - or setting specific goals for a particular institution - as the first element of the strategy.

In other words, strategy concerns with making choices among two or more alternatives. Each strategy the organization uses specifies desired outcome and how they are to be achieved. A properly developed strategy also rationalizes the organization's strategic intent and strategic mission along with the actions taken to achieve them.

Since organizations need to continually adjust to their environment in order to achieve an effective position within their chosen environment, this study will examine strategy toward organizational adaptation (Miles & Snow, 1978). There have been different typologies for strategy (a few has been outlined in the introduction chapter) and among all the typologies, the most frequently used by researchers is that proposed by Miles and Snow. It shows that the typology has been regarded as a broad yet comprehensive model and has been well received by the academic community. The typology is parsimonious and is rich in the detailed descriptions of each of the strategic type (Kabanoff and Brown, 2008). Dent (1990) concludes that the Miles and Snow typology provides the most comprehensive of organizational arrangements associated with particular business strategies.

Various studies that have applied Miles and Snow's model have lent it strong support in different environments (Zahra and Pearce, 1990). In furtherance to that, this typology has been recognized as having good codification and prediction strengths (Snow and Hambrick, 1980; Hambrick, 1983; Shortell and Zajac, 1990; Abernethy and Guthrie, 1994; James and Hatten, 1994). The typology has also been used in predicting organizational performance (Zahra and Pearce, 1990).

In their 1978 book *Organization Strategy, Structure, and Process*, Raymond E. Miles and Charles C. Snow argued that different company strategies arise from the way companies decide to address three fundamental problems: entrepreneurial, engineering (or operational), and administrative problems. The entrepreneurial problem is perhaps most visible in new or rapidly growing organizations. It deals with how a company should manage its market share. The engineering problem involves how a company should implement its solution to the entrepreneurial problem. It is closely related to the creation of a system which puts into the actual operation management's solution to the entrepreneurial problems. To select the appropriate technology for producing and distributing the chosen products and services and to form new information, communication and proper operation of the technology chosen is the main hurdle. The administrative problem considers how a company should structure itself to manage the implementation of the solutions to the first two problems. On top of that it also involves formulating and implementing processes to innovate the product or services rendered to customers.

Although businesses choose different solutions to these problems, Miles and Snow suggested that many companies develop similar solutions. As a result, they

concluded that there are four general strategic types of organizations: defender, prospector, analyzer, and reactor organizations. They were of the opinion that though there are similar typologies of various aspects of organizational behavior are available (e.g., Ansoff, 1965; Rogers, 1971; Segal, 1974; Anderson and Paine, 1975), their proposed organization types specifies relationships among strategy, structure and process to the point where the entire organizations can be portrayed as integrated wholes in dynamic interaction with the organization's environments (Miles and Snow, 1978).

Defenders are organizations which have narrow and stable product-market domains. Top managers in this type of organizations are highly expert in their own field. Managers in defenders usually restrict their perceptions to a narrow range of external factors and they do not intend to search outside of their domains for new opportunities. Due to their narrow focus, the defender's primary attention is geared toward improving the efficiency of their current operations. They grow by penetrating deeper into their current markets. They seldom make major adjustments in their technology, structure, or methods of operation. Product development in a defender is usually a simple extension of the current product line or expansion into closely related areas.

Prospectors are organizations which constantly search for market opportunities and they regularly experiment with potential responses to emerging environmental trends. Their product domain is usually broad and in a continuous state of development. They often are creators of change and uncertainty to which their competitors must respond. The growth of such an organization primarily results

from the location of new markets and the development of new products. Prospectors minimize long-term capital investment in production processes. A considerable portion of the technological core is frequently engaged in the production of proto-type products. Hence, its main technologies are embedded in people, not routine or machines. However, the organization may overextend itself in terms of products and markets. It may be technologically inefficient as well.

Analyzers are organizations that minimize risk while maximizing the opportunity for profits. It operates in two types of product – market domains, one relatively stable whilst the other is changing. In their stable areas, these organizations operate routinely and have formalized structures and processes. In their unstable market, the organization will watch their competitor closely for new ideas and they will rapidly adopt those which appear to be the most promising. Analyzers are avid followers of change. Hence, analyzers constantly watch the market and assess their competition. They will rapidly adopt and adapt to innovations that they deem most promising. Much of analyzer's growth occurs through market penetration since the organization's basic strength comes from its traditional product-market base.

Reactors are organizations which are slow to make adjustments to the market. Only strong environmental pressure will force a reactor organization to adopt innovations or changes. Miles and Snow are of the opinion that Reactor is an unstable organization type because it lacks a set of consistent response mechanisms. They further added that the inconsistency may stem from at least three sources:

- i) management fails to articulate a viable organizational strategy;
- ii) a strategy is articulated but technology, structure and process are not linked to it in an appropriate manner; or
- iii) management adheres to a particular strategy-structure relationship even though it is no longer relevant to environmental conditions.

But Hrebiniak and Joyce (1985) consider it to be an appropriate strategy in an extremely placid environment. Some scholars suggest that this type of strategy may be suitable to environments characterized by a low degree of movement or change among their components and by the lack of connection amongst these components (Zahra and Pearce, 1990).

Several empirical studies have found that defenders, protectors and analyzers outperformed reactors (Parnell and Wright, 1993; Zahra and Pearce, 1990; Conan, Mokwa and Varadarajan, 1990; Smith, Guthrie and Chen, 1986) but there are mixed findings as to whether defenders, prospectors and analyzers are equally effective (see Zahra and Pearce, 1990; Conan, Mokwa and Varadarajan, 1990; Smith, Guthrie and Chen, 1986). The relationship between strategy and performance depends on the environment the organization is in and the type of performance being sought is one of the reasons for the mixed findings (Hambrick, 1983). No matter what, the key dimensions underlying Miles and Snow's (1978) typology is the rate at which an organization alters its products or markets (Hambrick, 1983).

Prospector organizations face the entrepreneurial problem of locating and exploiting new product and market opportunities. To solve the entrepreneurial

problem, these organizations moves towards becoming a broad and continuously developing domain and they monitor wide range of environmental conditions and events. Moreover, prospector organizations have broad product or service lines and often promote creativity over efficiency and they create changes in the industry. As a result of it, its product and market innovation protects the organization from a changing environment, but the organizations runs the risk of low profitability and overextension of its resources. Prospector organizations face the operational or engineering problem of not being dependent on any one technology. Hence, these organizations create flexible, prototyping technologies or they use multiple technologies with low degree of routinization and mechanization. In other words their technology is embedded in people. The administrative problem of these companies is how to coordinate diverse business activities and promote innovation. Prospector organizations solve this problem by being decentralized, employing generalists (not specialists), having few levels of management, and encouraging collaboration among different departments and units.

Defender organizations face the entrepreneurial problem of how to “seal off” a stable share of the market, and hence they function best in stable environments. A common solution to this problem is cost leadership, and so these organizations achieve success by specializing in particular areas and using established and standardized technical processes to maintain low costs. They have the tendency to ignore developments outside of its domain. Therefore, it is difficult for competitors to dislodge the organization from its small niche in the industry, but major shift in the market could threaten survival. In addition, defender organizations tend to be vertically integrated in order to achieve cost efficiency. Continuous improvements in

technology are also a solution to its operational or engineering problem in order to maintain efficiency. Defender organizations face the administrative problem of having to ensure efficiency, and thus they require centralization, formal procedures, and discrete functions. Because their environments change slowly, defender organizations can rely on long-term planning.

Analyzer organizations share characteristics with prospector and defender organizations; thus, they face the entrepreneurial problem of how to maintain their shares in existing markets and how to find and exploit new markets and product opportunities. Hence, these organizations will only use surveillance mechanisms which are mostly limited to marketing; some research and development. Its cost and benefits analysis provides that low investment in research and development, combined with imitation of demonstrably successful products, minimizes risk but domain must be optimally balanced at all times between stability and flexibility. These organizations have the engineering or operational problem of maintaining the efficiency of established products or services, while remaining flexible enough to pursue new business activities. Consequently, they seek technical efficiency to maintain low costs, but they also emphasize new product and service development to remain competitive when the market changes. Therefore, dual technological core is able to serve a hybrid stable-changing domain, but the technology can never be completely effective or efficient. The administrative problem is how to manage both of these aspects. Like prospector organizations, analyzer organizations cultivate collaboration among different departments and units. Analyzers organizations are characterized by a balance between defender and prospector organizations.

Reactor organizations, as the name suggests, do not have a systematic strategy, design, or structure. They are not prepared for changes they face in their business environments. If a reactor organization has a defined strategy and structure, it is no longer appropriate for the organization's environment. Their new product or service development fluctuates in response to the way their managers perceive their environment. Reactor organizations do not make long-term plans, because they see the environment as changing too quickly for them to be of any use, and they possess unclear chains of command.

Miles and Snow argued that companies develop their adaptive strategies based on their perception of their environments. Hence, as seen above, the different organization types view their environments in different ways, causing them to adopt different strategies. These adaptive strategies allow some organizations to be more adaptive or more sensitive to their environments than others, and the different organization types represent a range of adaptive companies. Because of their adaptive strategies, prospector organizations are the most adaptive type of company. In contrast, reactor organizations are the least adaptive type. The other two types fall in between these extremes: analyzers are the second most adaptive organizations, followed by defenders.

Besides the strategy adopted by organizations, strategy actors is also important for they are the drivers to the achievement of the organization's goal. There is broad belief that (corporate and competitive) strategy is formulated by top management (Bakir, 2001, Zuboff, 1988, Zaleznik, 1977) and is a type of "game" managers play (Stacey, 1996). Some other researchers believed that functional or

operational strategy might be formulated with the help of middle line managers (Drucker, 1954). Heinen and Jacobson (1976) proposed to build specific task groups, not for strategy formulation but for strategy implementation.

On the other hand, employees as being part of internal company resources are widely accepted as key factors in strategy (Hammer and Champy, 1993, Barney, 1991). Cloete (1996) claims that strategy implementation will almost certainly fail if it lacks the support of employees. Acknowledging the importance of employees in achieving organization's goal, the author further discuss on employees' outcome in relation to organizational strategy.

2.2.2 Employee Outcomes

Employee outcomes which are significant and going to be tested in this present study are organizational commitment and intention to stay.

2.2.2.1 Organizational Commitment

Organizational commitment is the relative strength of an individual's identification with, and involvement in, a particular organization. Basically, this construct has three factors: (a) a strong belief in and acceptance of the organization's goals and values; (b) a willingness to exert considerable effort on behalf of the organization; and (c) a strong desire to maintain membership in the organization (Mowday, Porter and Steers, 1982).

Past researchers which support the notion that commitment to the organization is related to a number of desired outcomes. Organizational commitment has been linked to extra role behavior (Gregersen, 1993; Shore and Wayne, 1993), job performance (Mathieu and Zajac, 1990) and lower turnover (Bishop, Scott and Casino, 1997). As per Meyer and Allen (1991), there are three distinct forms of commitment. Affective commitment refers to identification with, involvement in, and emotional attachment to the organization. Employee who has affective commitment are those who willingly stay and remains in the organization. Continuance commitment refers to commitment based on employee's recognition of the costs associated with leaving the organization. Such an employee might remain in the organization because they have to do so due to low perceived alternatives or high personal sacrifice associated with leaving the organization. Lastly, normative commitment refers to commitment based on a sense of obligation to the organization.

2.2.2.2 Intention to Stay

Employee turnover in an organization's life cycle is an evitable process especially when it relates to skilled, experience and efficient employees. This issue has always been the critical factor analyzed in most past researchers. Employee turnover model include demographic, organizational, job characteristics and labour market factors as determinants and explanations of an employee's decision to leave his or her organization. In another perspective, researches have also conducted studies to retain employees.

Studies conducted by Idaszak and Drasgow (1987); Pil and Macduffie (1996); Price and Mueller (1981); Udo *et al.* (1997); Workman and Bommer (2004) involving technical workers have found that employee who are offered challenging, exciting and interesting work tend to be more involved and satisfied, and are in turn more committed to their organization and tend to stay longer with their organization. When training and needs of an employees and employers are met, employees tend to stay longer with the organizations (Bassi and Van Buren, 1999; Sheridan, 1992; Wood, 1999). Adding on to the above factors, intention to stay was related to perceived ease of movement and perceived desirability of movement (job satisfaction) - Mobley *et al.*, (1979a).

2.2.2.3 Firm Attractiveness

Recruitment efforts of most organizations are to influence an individual's behavior, whether in applying, recommending the organization to others or attending a site visit. Job characteristics such as salary, benefits and promotional opportunities have been identified as important determinants of organizational attractiveness (Barber and Roehling, 1993; Cable and Judge, 1994; Rynes *et al.*, 1983; Turban *et al.*, 1993).

Earlier studies used Vroom's expectancy theory (Connolly and Vines, 1977; Greenhaus, Sugalski and Crispin, 1978; Vroom, 1966) or decision theories (Herriot, Ecob and Hutchison, 1980; Hill, 1974; Soelberg, 1967) to examine attractiveness. More recent studies framed the attractiveness of a firm for prospective applicants in the context of the fit between the person and the organization (Kristof, 1996;

Schneider, Smith, Taylor and Fleenor, 1998). Both Burke and Descza (1982) and Schein and Diamante (1988) reported that individuals were attracted to an organization whose culture reflected their own personality characteristics.

Present study will focus on firm's attractiveness from the perspective of potential employees. Previous studies used varieties of predictors to study firm attractiveness from this perspective. The influence of company web pages (Williamson *et al.*, 2003), the predictive role of organizational and job fit perceptions (Dinnen *et al.*, 2002, Robertson *et al.*, 2005) the influence of employment interviews orientation (Barber *et al.*, 1994), or the messages used in recruitment (Reeve *et al.*, 2006) are clear examples of this diversification.

2.2.3 Person – Organization Fit (P-O Fit)

The organizational behavior scientists have introduced the concept of Person – Organization Fit into management science in 1950s. The construct of Person-Organization fit originates from interactional psychology, which assumes that behavior is caused by the continuous interaction between the person and the environment (Pervin, 1968; Terborg, 1981). Within this framework, an individual's organizational behavior is posited to result from the interaction between the person and the organization. Schneider, Smith and Paul (2001) identified two approaches to Person-Environment theory and research. One approach focuses on the environment as a moderator of the relation between the person and some individual-level criterion. The second approach views the fit between the individual and the

environment as a predictor of specified outcomes. Hence, this study adopted the second approach of viewing the fit between the individual and the organization.

Kristof (1996) in her integrative review defines P-O fit as the “compatibility between people and organizations that occurs when at least one entity provides what the other needs or they share similar fundamental characteristics or both”. The characteristics that are typically examined are the individual’s and the environment’s values, goals and traits (Cable and Judge, 1997; Ferris, Youngblood and Yates, 1985; Furnham and Walsh, 1991; Judge and Cable, 1997; Muchinsky and Monahan, 1987; O’Reilly, Chatman and Caldwell, 1991).

It is also important to note that person-organization fit focuses on the fit between the person and the organization rather than a fit with specific job, group or vocation. An important distinction is between complementary and supplementary fit (Cable and Edwards, 2004; Van Vianen, 2000). When a person or the organization provides attributes that the other party needs, then, it is referred to complementary fit. Supplementary fit occurs when a person “supplements, embellishes or possesses characteristics which are similar to other individuals” in an environment or organization (Muchinsky and Monahan, 1987). Most researches done on supplementary fit has examined value congruence as values are a fundamental characteristic of both individuals and organizations (Cable and Edwards, 2004; Chatman, 1991; Kristof, 1996; O’Reilly, Chatman and Caldwell, 1991; Werbel and Gilliland, 1999).

Another notable person-organization fit research is the use of different methodologies for assessing person-organization fit. Actual or sometimes known as objective person-organization fit measures the similarity between the characteristics of a person and his or her organization. Empirical research suggests that objective measures of person-organization fit are more strongly related to behavioral outcome (Hoffman and Woehr, 2006; Van Vianen, De Pater and Van Dijk, 2007). Subjective or perceived person-organization fit measures of fit capture persons' perception about the extent to which they feel like they fit into the organization. Subjective person-organization fit more prone to measurement problems such as common method variance and reliability issues (Edwards, 1991; Piasentin and Chapman, 2006).

In this present study, person-organization fit will be in the context of supplementary fit. Objective or actual person-organization fit reflects the current study. Since different types of individuals are attracted to different types of organizations (Kristof, 1996; Schneider, 1987), person-organization fit emphasizes the importance of fit between employees and work processes and the importance of creating an organizational identity through the institutionalization of consistent values that permeate an organization's culture (Werbel and DeMarie, 2005). Value congruence has become "widely accepted as the defining operationalization of P-O fit" (Kristof-Brown *et al.*, 2005, p.285). Chatman (1989) describes P-O Fit as "the congruence between the norms and values of organizations and of persons" because P-O Fit focuses on the values of the individual and the organization. Value congruence between the individual and the organization can be achieved through the determining of good fit when making the employment decision is the central

plank of a person-organization fit (Chatman, 1989; Ostroff *et al.*, 2005), and during the recruitment and selection process as potential employees explore and develop perceptions of fit with the organization in terms of a congruence between their own values and the organization values, they will withdraw in the recruitment process if they perceived that a misfit of values between themselves and the organization exists, vice versa.

Carless (2005) found that person-organization fit was related to a candidate's perception of organizational attractiveness, but not related to intentions to accept a job. From recruiter's perspective, Chuang and Sackett (2005) examined P-O Fit from recruiters' perspectives and found that, while person-job fit is a constant and important factor in hiring decisions, person-organization fit became more important to recruiters across interview stage. Beyond the selection process, person-organization fit has been shown to influence work attitudes and career decisions (Bretz and Judge, 1994; Verquer *et al*, 2003). Person-organization fit has been examined from newcomers' perspective as well as employees acceptance of socialization, organizational messages and own behavior (Cooper-Thomas *et al*, 2004; Kim *et al*, 2005).

Therefore, person-organization fit has been studied from all perspective – recruiters, future employee, employee in employment and organization's strategists in planning for moving the organization towards obtaining its goal with the help of its most valuable asset – employees.

2.3 P-O Fit in terms of Organizational Strategy and Organizational Commitment

Numerous studies have examined person-organization fit and its relation to organizational commitment (e.g., Boxx, Odom and Dunn, 1991; Cable and Judge, 1996; Meglino, Ravlin and Adkins, 1989; O'Reilly *et al*, 1991; Ostroff, Shin and Kinicki, 2005; Tziner, 1987; Van Vianen, 2000; Vancouver and Schmitt, 1991; Rousseau and Parks, 1992). Different definition of person-organization fit has been used in these researches. Boxx *et al*, (1991); Meglino *et al*,(1989); O'Reilly *et al*, (1991) relates person-organization fit to value congruence; goal congruence (Vancouver and Schmitt, 1991) or direct perceptions of fit (Cable and Judge, 1996; Tziner, 1987; Rousseau and Parks, 1992). In all these studies, person-organization fit is positively related to organizational commitment.

Changing work environments have led to more independence of employees and redefinition of the psychological contract (Hall and Moss, 1998). Hence, this study assumes that employees have preference for the type of strategy the organization adopts. Therefore, the greater the fit between the employee's ideal strategy and the organization's strategy, the more committed the employee will be to the organization. It is also hypothesized that this relationship is moderated by employee's perceptions of available job alternatives. If there is a misfit between the employee's personal ideal strategy with the organization's strategy but the employee has a limited alternative job options due to certain reasons, example would be the employee's nature of job is so specific and not much organization in Malaysia

needed such talent, then, the employee will be committed to the organization compared to employees who has numerous job alternative to choose from.

Cable and Judge (1996) found that the availability of employment opportunities may 'swamp other variables as influences on job choice and retention'. Wheeler *et al* (2007) research resulted in significant relationship between person-organization fit and job satisfaction. Perceived job mobility is found to moderate the relationship between job satisfaction and intention to turnover. Thus, decreases in person-organization fit will leads to decreases in job satisfaction and are more likely to result in increases in intent to turnover if the employee also perceives alternative job opportunities. Similarly, perceived job alternatives are moderators affecting job attitudes, including satisfaction and commitment (Mitchell *et al*, 2001). Therefore, the first hypothesis for this study would be as follows:

Hypothesis 1 (H1): The relationship between employees' perceptions of organizational strategy fit and organizational commitment is moderated by the employees' perceptions of other job alternatives.

2.4 P-O Fit in terms of Organizational Strategy and Intention to Stay

Practitioners (Branham, 2001; Herman, 1999) as well as scholars (Barrick and Zimmerman, 2005; Schmitt and Chan, 1998) noted that retention of employees is a critical importance for organizational success. Therefore, despite examining work attitudes, researches have also examined the relationship between person-organization fit with employees' intention to leave. Vancouver and Schmitt (1991)

suggest that personal goals and values (Pervin, 1989; Cable and Judge, 1996; Chatman, 1991; Lovelace and Rosen, 1996; O'Reilly *et al.*, 1991) that match the goals and values of the organization resulted in lower intention to leave the organization. Some evidence indicates that actual person-organization fit is negatively related to intentions to quit or leave an organization (Bretz and Judge, 1994; Kristof-Brown *et al.*, 2005; Saks and Ashforth, 1997; Verquer *et al.*, 2003; Ostroff and Rothausen, 1997).

Chew and Chan (2007) study resulted in significantly positive related relationship between person-organization fit with organizational commitment and intention to stay. The study was consistent with previous researches of Abbott *et al.*, (2005); Finegan (2000); Schneider (1987) that individuals may be drawn to exert more organizational commitment when they perceive that their values are more aligned with the organization's values. Person-organization fit also increases an employee's intention to stay (Chatman, 1991; Lauver and Kristof-Brown, 2001); Vandenberghe, 1999).

Based on previous research findings, the present study predicts a relationship between organizational strategy and intention to stay based on person-organization fit perspective. Job attitudes combined with job alternatives predict intent to leave, which is the direct antecedent to turnover (Mitchell *et al.*, 2001). Taking into account job alternatives as the moderator in this relationship, when there are a few job alternatives, an employee who perceives a misfit in organizational strategy and own values will be more likely to stay in the organization compared to an employee who has more job alternatives. Thus, the second hypothesis is as follows:

Hypothesis 2 (H2): The relationship between employees' perceptions of organizational strategy fit and intention to stay is moderated by the employees' perceptions of other job alternatives.

2.5 P-O Fit in terms of Organizational Strategy and Firm's Attractiveness

Judge and Bretz (1992) showed that final-year students preferred jobs in organizations with organizational values similar to their own values. This notion has been supported by Bretz and Judge (1994) when they concluded that the fit between characteristics of human resource systems in organizations and individual characteristics was an important determinant of job acceptance. Turban and Keon (1993) also demonstrated that specific personality aspects (self-esteem and need for achievement) moderated the effects of organizational characteristics on organizational attractiveness. Judge and Cable (1997) further concluded that objective as well as subjective measures of person-organization fit significantly correlated with organizational attractiveness. Lievens *et al.*, (2007) found that employee perceptions of instrumental and symbolic organizational attributes are positively associated with organizational attractiveness.

Schein (1990) suggested that applicant's job choices are strongly affected by individual context factors, as they are related to their professional development stage. Hence, the present study predicts a relationship between the person i.e. the applicant and the organization's attractiveness factor i.e. its strategy. Williams and Bauer (1994) found that gender did not moderate the relationship between diversity

policy and attractiveness of the organization. The likelihood of an employee leaving their current job and taking another type of job with a different organization did not correlate significantly with job stress or even gender of employee (Fields *et al.*, 2005). Not to ignore of previous results on gender and job attractiveness and job alternatives, this study will try taking gender as the moderator to see the relationship between future employees' perception on organizational strategy and firm's attractiveness in particular to Malaysian context. Hence, the third hypothesis will be as follows:

Hypothesis 3 (H3): The relationship between employees' perceptions of organizational strategy fit and firm's attractiveness is moderated by gender.

2.6 Conceptual Framework

Based on the conceptual framework of this present study, organizational commitment, intention to stay and firm's attractiveness would be the independent variables whilst organizational strategy is the dependent variable. Both job alternatives and gender would be the moderator for this study.

