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ABSTRACT

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.

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 employees' characteristics and those of a specific occupation 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 few study'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 result feelings 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 employee’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 forecast the 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; Krishman, 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
contributiong 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), & Person-Group Fit Scale (PGFS) 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 adequate. 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^2_{327} = 8.957 >
2.37; p = 0.000 < 0.01), Person-Organization Fit Scale (F^2_{327}
= 17.645 > 2.37; p = 0.000 < 0.01), Person-Group Fit Scale
(F^2_{327} = 14.783 > 2.37; p = 0.000 < 0.01), and Person-
Supervisor Fit Scale (F^2_{327} = 21.188 > 2.37; p = 0.000 < 0.01).
The table value F^2_{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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Qualification</th>
<th>Experience</th>
<th>Income Level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>df</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Sig.</td>
<td>df</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PJFS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.G</td>
<td>327</td>
<td>8.957</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6.237</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W.G</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POFS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.G</td>
<td>327</td>
<td>17.645</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11.081</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W.G</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PGFS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.G</td>
<td>327</td>
<td>14.783</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9.298</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W.G</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSFS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.G</td>
<td>327</td>
<td>21.188</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>16.417</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W.G</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

B.G – Between Groups; W.G – Within Groups
The computed value for Person-Job Fit Scale ($F^2_{330} = 6.237 > 3.84$; $p = 0.01 < 0.01$), Person-Organization Fit Scale ($F^2_{330} = 11.081 > 3.84$; $p = 0.001 < 0.01$), Person-Group Fit Scale ($F^2_{330} = 9.298 > 3.84$; $p = 0.002 < 0.01$), and Person-Supervisor Fit Scale ($F^2_{330} = 16.417 > 3.84$; $p = 0.000 < 0.01$). The table value $F^2_{330}$ 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 ($F^2_{327} = 12.532 > 2.37$; $p = 0.000 < 0.01$), Person-Organization Fit Scale ($F^2_{327} = 40.866 > 2.37$; $p = 0.000 < 0.01$), Person-Group Fit Scale ($F^2_{327} = 31.357 > 2.37$; $p = 0.000 < 0.01$), and Person-Supervisor Fit Scale ($F^2_{327} = 32.864 > 2.37$; $p = 0.000 < 0.01$). The table value $F^2_{327}$ 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 ($F^2_{327} = 3.716 > 2.37$; $p = 0.006 < 0.01$), Person-Organization Fit Scale ($F^2_{327} = 20.346 > 2.37$; $p = 0.000 < 0.01$), Person-Group Fit Scale ($F^2_{327} = 15.728 > 2.37$; $p = 0.000 < 0.01$), and Person-Supervisor Fit Scale ($F^2_{327} = 13.496 > 2.37$; $p = 0.000 < 0.01$). The table value $F^2_{327}$ 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**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Test Statistics*</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>332</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chi-Square</td>
<td>38.009</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Df</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asymp. Sig.</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Friedman Test</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table No 3 Mean Ranks**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ranks</th>
<th>Mean Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Person-Job Fit Scale</td>
<td>2.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Person-Organization Fit Scale</td>
<td>2.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Person-Group Fit Scale</td>
<td>2.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Person-Supervisor Fit Scale</td>
<td>2.64</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**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**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fit Scale</th>
<th>Normed $\chi^2$</th>
<th>GFI</th>
<th>AGFI</th>
<th>NFI</th>
<th>CFI</th>
<th>TLI</th>
<th>RMR</th>
<th>RMSEA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Value</td>
<td>4.905</td>
<td>0.947</td>
<td>0.842</td>
<td>0.899</td>
<td>0.906</td>
<td>0.956</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.046</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criteria</td>
<td>&lt; 5</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>0.80</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**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 ($p < 0.001$), 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**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Unstandardized Coefficients</th>
<th>Standardized Coefficients</th>
<th>$p$</th>
<th>Supported /Not Supported</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Perceived Person-Environment Fit</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Person-Job Fit</td>
<td>0.505</td>
<td>0.045</td>
<td>0.683</td>
<td>11.175</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Person-Group Fit</td>
<td>0.623</td>
<td>0.053</td>
<td>0.739</td>
<td>11.824</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Person-Supervisor Fit</td>
<td>0.450</td>
<td>0.047</td>
<td>0.579</td>
<td>9.579</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Person-Environment Fit</td>
<td>0.334</td>
<td>0.064</td>
<td>0.274</td>
<td>5.188</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intention to Stay (H3)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived Person-Environment Fit</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Person-Job Fit</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>5.195</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Person-Organization Fit</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>11.175</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Person-Group Fit</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>11.824</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Person-Supervisor Fit</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>9.579</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Perceived Person-Environment Fit is influenced by Person-Supervisor Fit ($p = 0.000 < 0.01$; CR= 5.195 > 2.58; $\beta= 0.80$), Person-Group Fit ($p = 0.000 < 0.01$; CR= 11.175 > 2.58; $\beta= 0.68$), Person-Organization Fit ($p = 0.000 < 0.01$; CR= 11.824 > 2.58; $\beta= 0.73$), Person-Job Fit ($p = 0.000 < 0.01$; CR= 9.579 > 2.58; $\beta= 0.58$) 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 Scale (PPEF) is a significant impact on the Employees’ Turnover Intention with the current organization ($p = 0.01 < 0.05$; CR= 5.188 > 1.96; $\beta= 0.334$) 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 textile 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.
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