5.0 CHAPTER 5: DISCUSSION

Organizational commitment correlated positively with strategy fit where \( p<0.01 \). It means if the organizational strategy of the current employment of an employee fits his/her desired organizational type to work in, the employee’s organizational commitment is high. The present study also further supports H1 where the \( R^2 \) Change = .064, \( p<.05 \). Hence, the relationship between employees’ perceptions of organizational strategy and organizational commitment was moderated by the employees’ perception of other job alternatives.

In other words, if respondents perceive that there are numerous job alternatives, then the correlation between strategy fit and organizational commitment is positive. When there is strategy fit, employees are committed to their organizations; when there is strategy misfit, employees are not committed to their organizations. However, when respondents perceive there that there are few job alternatives, then there is no relationship between strategy fit and organizational commitment. When employees do not feel that they have other job alternatives, then their commitment to their organization is the same regardless of whether there is a fit or misfit in strategy. Thus the result of H1 confirms the findings and results of De Silva et al. (2010) and the meta-analysis for person-organization fit in relation to organizational commitment (e.g. Meglino, Ravlin and Adkins, 1989; Ostroff, Shin and Kinicki, 2005; Tziner, 1987) was supported again.

This present study also did test the relationship between employees’ perceived organizational strategy fit with their intention to stay taking into account the
effect of other job alternatives as the moderator. Elfenbein and O’Reilly (2007) and Schneider (1987) asserted that people will be more attracted to and less likely to exit organizations where they find a close match. Vandenberghe’s study (1999) of nurses in Belgium found that they were less likely to have quit after 12 months if they perceived high person-organization fit. A meta-analysis of person-organization fit literature reported a significant relationship between person-organization fit and turnover (Verquer, Beehr and Wagner, 2003). Cotton and Tuttle (1986) and Samad (2006), turnover is referred as individual’s estimated probability that they will stay in the organization.

Thus, the result obtained from this present study was other job alternatives did not moderate the relationship between employees’ perceptions of organizational strategy fit and intention to stay ($R^2$ change = .000, p>.05) and based on bivariate correlation done to see the level of significance between these variables, strategy fit and intention to stay is not significant ($r=.007$, ns), intention to stay and job alternatives ($r=-.124$, ns), strategy fit and job alternatives ($r=-.138$, ns). This present study thus finds that employees’ intention to stay was not significantly correlated with strategy fit. This study also supported the findings of previous scholars that person-organization fit was positively related to intention to stay.

The finding of present study was not the same as the finding of De Silva et al (2010). The author was of the opinion that the difference in the outcome between the present study and De Silva et al (2010) was because the difference in the respondents’ category. The latter study was done with currently employed undergraduate students in business – related courses. Thus, the respondents are
exposed to business strategy and they are fresh in the job market with 80% were the ages of 20 and 29 years.

In comparison to that, the respondents to this present study have various educational backgrounds. Only 21.9% of the respondents were the ages of 20 and 29 years. A total of 78.1% of present respondents were 30 years old and above. They were matured employees and have been long in the job market. Therefore, their intention to stay in the organization were due to other factors such as compensation and benefit, work stability or even due to the commitment given by team members and leaders in their organizations but strategy fit was not one of the reason which can makes them have intention to stay in the organization. This study also found that job alternatives did not give the moderating impact to the relationship tested.

Satisfaction and commitment, for instance, have invariably been reported to be negatively related to turnover intention and intent to leave (e.g. Arnold and Feldman, 1982; Bluedorn, 1982; Hollenbeck and Williams, 1986; Tett and Meyer, 1993). Past research findings also showed that turnover intention is negatively, significantly, and consistently related to commitment (Allen and Lee, 1993; Konovsky and Cropanzano, 1991; Yui-Tim and Wong, 2002). Thus, the finding of this research which resulted in significantly, positively related relationship between organizational commitment and intention to stay is consistent with the findings of previous researches mentioned above where p<0.05.
Kristof (1996) framed the attractiveness of organizations for prospective applicants in the context of the fit between the person and the organization. Edwards and Cooper (1990) had used the approach of person-organization fit to examine whether people are attracted to organizations that fit their own personality. There is still no literature on person-organization fit in terms of organization’s strategy. Thus, present study had explored the relationship between employees’ perceived organizational strategy fit and firm’s attractiveness being gender the moderator to this relationship.

The result of H3 was that gender did not moderate the relationship between employees’ perceptions of organizational strategy fit and firm’s attractiveness. Based on the Hierarchical Regression Analysis done on the variables, the $R^2$ Change = .004, ns. Its significant level was at .517 where $p>.05$. Thus this present study’s finding was consistent with the findings of Williams and Bauer (1994) that gender did not moderate the relationship between diversity policy and attractiveness of the organization and Fields et al. (2005) of 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.