

Intention to quit as precursor of voluntary turnover: Person–organisation fit and the psychological contract – a talent management quandary

by Anton Grobler* and Sonja Grobler**

Abstract

The purpose of this study was to determine the relationship between person–organisation fit and an individual's intention to leave the organisation (turnover intention) as a precursor to voluntary turnover. The impact the psychological contract has on the individual's intention to leave the organisation (turnover intention) was also determined. The study included an analysis of specific groups in the organisation that pose a higher risk of voluntary turnover. The sample for the study consisted of 1920 participants, with 60 randomly selected employees from 32 organisations. The person–organisation fit instrument consisted of three factors, namely indirect fit, direct fit and person–job fit (nine items in total). The instrument that measures psychological contract consisted of two factors, namely self and organisational items (six items). The turnover intention measure consisted of four items. All three instruments reported acceptable psychometric properties. Indirect fit (organisation fit as values congruence) and direct fit (needs–supplies fit) each explain 15% of the variance in turnover intention, with psychological contract adherence – organisation/ employer explaining 3%, the total variance explained by the model being 33%. Significant differences between groups were also reported, with the higher risk groups (for leaving the organisation) being the support/non-core employees, the non-management group and the professionally qualified, experienced specialists. The results of this study were converted into practical recommendations in terms of proposed interventions on the part of the HR fraternity to retain high-performing employees, with specific reference to the person–organisation fit and subsequent adherence to the psychological contract.

Key words: *Interactionist approach, talent management, retention, turnover intention, person–organisation fit, complementary fit, supplementary fit and psychological contract*

1 Introduction

Talent management and specifically the retention of high-performing employees have been standing agenda points on many board and council meetings throughout the

* Prof. Anton Grobler is the Area Head: Leadership and Organisational Behaviour in the Graduate School of Business Leadership (SBL) at the University of South Africa.

** Dr Sonja Grobler is a Senior Lecturer in Industrial and Organisational Psychology at the College of Economic and Management Sciences at the University of South Africa.

world (Scott, McMullen & Royal 2012). In order to have a competitive advantage, not only in terms of organisational staff composition, but also in terms of return on employee investment, the retention of high-performing employees is regarded as a high priority. Based on the annual HR survey (2012) results of the South African Board for People Practices (SABPP), talent retention is a major concern for many organisations (46%) (Erasmus, Grobler & Van Niekerk 2015).

High recruitment, selection and on-boarding costs in organisations can be prevented or reduced through the retention of high-performing employees or “best professional talent” (Tymon, Stumpf & Smith 2011:293). Retention is an effort by employers to hold onto talented and high-performing employees in order to realise organisational objectives (Fatima 2011).

This study is based on the interactionist perspective highlighted by Terborg (1981). He stated that the specific match between the interactional variables (person–situation; person–organisation) or congruence between the individual and the corresponding characteristics of the environment will largely determine the individual’s behaviour. Employers as well as employees are therefore obliged to fulfil expectations that are consistent with the basic propositions of the interactionist approach, based on continuous, multi-directional interaction between the parties (employees and organisation) (Grobler 2014). These obligations (expectations or actual undertakings) are considered to be binding in the working relationship and if these obligations are not met the psychological contract is breached, impacting on individual organisational behaviour.

This study therefore investigated the impact that the typical interactionist, multi-directional construct of perceived person–organisational fit (P–O fit) has on an individual’s turnover intention (or intention to quit the organisation), and whether and how this relationship is mediated by the psychological contract.

2 Rationale

Studies have been conducted to determine the relationship between P–O fit and individual behavioural outcomes, such as employee engagement, citizenship behaviour and turnover intention. These studies were mostly done in the USA, Europe and Asia, focusing on a specific occupation or organisation. Very few South African studies, and specifically studies that could be used as references for generalisation, were found. The sample for this study is comprehensive and provides a sound basis for generalisation. The study furthermore included an analysis of specific groups in the sample that pose a higher risk of voluntary turnover due to a higher turnover intention. The results will be converted into practical recommendations to the HR fraternity on proposed interventions for retaining high-performing employees, with specific reference to the P–O fit and subsequent adherence to the psychological contract.

3 Turnover intention as precursor of turnover

Van Zyl (2011) emphasises that turnover represents a decision on the part of employees to leave the organisation whereas other researchers place greater emphasis on the role of the employer in retaining high-performing employees (Frank, Finnegan & Taylor 2004). Even when an employee merely starts contemplating leaving an organisation, turnover (intent) has already increased (Taylor, Murphy & Price 2006). Masoga (2013) agrees with Van Zyl (2011), indicating that the decision and control lie

with the employee. Turnover intention is defined as the mediating factor between attitudes affecting intent to quit and actually quitting (Glissmeyer, Bishop & Fass 2008).

Voluntary turnover can be categorised as functional (exit of substandard or poor performers) and dysfunctional turnover (exit of high-performing employees) (Mitiku 2010). Brown (2009) categorised retrenchment, dismissal, retirement, ill health and death as involuntary turnover based on reasons beyond the employee's control. This is in contrast to Mitiku's (2010) description of dysfunctional turnover, where employees choose to leave the organisation and voluntarily terminate the working relationship (i.e. resign). Dysfunctional turnover is undesirable, disruptive and costly to the organisation and furthermore it negatively influences the morale and productivity of remaining employees (Buck & Watson 2002).

The need to measure and ultimately prevent employee turnover (especially the loss of high-performing employees) as a predictor of organisational effectiveness is regarded as a challenge for most organisations (Masoga 2013).

Erasmus et al (2015) reported that various organisational climate factors, such as the way employees perceive their work (including leadership), the treatment they receive from their line manager, as well as the compensation they receive, were positive predictors of the employees' intention to stay. This largely complements the work of Walker (2001), who identified seven factors that encourage retention-competition and appreciation of the work performed. These factors are: the provision of challenging work, opportunities to learn, positive relationships with colleagues, recognition of capabilities, performance contributions, good work-life balance and good communication within the organisation. These, together with other factors, influence the individual's reactions and behaviour relating to the individual's characteristics and needs (person-situation; person-organisation), where good fit will generally lead to satisfaction and poor fit will result in frustration (Ostroff & Schulte 2007).

4 Person-organisation fit (P-O fit)

Chatman (1989), Kristof-Brown (1996) and Kristof-Brown, Zimmerman and Johnson (2005) defined person-organisation fit (P-O fit) as the similarity between the organisation's norms and values and the individual's norms and values and the compatibility of these two environments. According to Cable and DeRue (2002), P-O fit occurs even when employees just believe that their values match those of others in the organisation and the values of the organisation itself, resulting in their wanting to be involved with the broader mission of the organisation.

Cable and Edwards (2004) refine this description of P-O fit to include complementary fit, which is defined apart from the inhabitants (e.g. work demands and requirements) and supplementary fit, which is obtained when employees' characteristics are harmonised with the characteristics of the organisation. Muchinsky and Monahan (1987:269) state that supplementary fit occurs when the employee "supplements, embellishes or possesses characteristics" similar to those of others in the specific environment. Hassan, Akram and Naz (2012) indicate that complementary fit is achieved when employees' psychological needs are fulfilled or "made whole" (Muchinsky & Monahan 1987:271) by the conditions of the workplace. Grobler (2014:5) defines complementary fit as the satisfaction of both parties' needs; and supplementary fit as the matching of characteristics of the employee and the organisation. Supplementary fit would therefore be high if both the employee and the organisation hold and endorse the same values and norms and complementary fit would be high

when one entity has the characteristics needed by the other (Arbour, Kwantes, Kraft & Boglarsky 2014).

The differentiation between complementary and supplementary fit is particularly important for this study as it represents two distinct traditions within the P–O fit paradigm (Cable & Edwards 2004). Grobler (2014) postulates that researchers place too much emphasis on complementary fit and thereby neglect supplementary fit. Complementary fit is significant in terms of the theory of psychological needs fulfilment (Cable & Edwards 2004; Ostroff & Schulte 2007), where the skills, attitude and ability of the employee satisfy the needs of the organisation and consequently the organisation offers the rewards desired by the employees (regulated by the written employment contract – utilitarian domain). Supplementary fit or subjective fit (Kristof-Brown & Jansen 2007) needs to be addressed in terms of value congruence (unwritten rules) between the employee and the organisation based on the bi-directional expectations and dissonance of their values, morals and principles (Cable & Edwards 2004), related to the deontological approach and the notion of the psychological contract (Grobler 2014).

5 Psychological contract

Psychological contract refers to the mutual expectations of employers and employees and the relationship between them (Shruthi & Hemanth 2012). Armstrong (2006) refers to it as an unwritten set of expectations. Psychological contract (based on expectations) can be viewed from the perspective of expectation disconfirmation. Grobler, Joubert, Rudolph and Hajee-Osman (2012) postulate that disconfirmation is the perceived performance of a specific element, based on an individual's initial expectation. This is determined by the extent to which the individual's expectation is confirmed. They are further of the opinion that disconfirmation of expectations influences an individual's judgement and evaluation of the situation, with the result that disconfirmation may affect loyalty to the organisation, and in the context of this paper, affect the perceived person–organisation fit. The psychological contract is a dynamic and reciprocal transaction as expectations change when employees' commitment, social and emotional characteristics evolve (Sparrow 1999) and managers demonstrate their credibility and integrity. Grobler (2014) summarises various definitions of psychological contract as the obligations, rights, justice, fair play and rewards that employees believe they are owed by the employer in return for their work, commitment, responsibility and loyalty.

6 P–O fit, psychological contract and turnover intention

P–O fit bears a significant positive relation to job satisfaction (Autry & Daugherty 2003; Kasimati 2011) and a significant negative one to intention to leave the organisation. Autry and Daugherty (2003) reported that employee job satisfaction is negatively associated with escape responses as dissatisfied employees would be much more likely to leave or behave in other destructive manners.

Organisational citizenship behaviour (OCB) and ethical intent have a moderating and mediating effect on P–O fit (Ruiz-Palomino & Martinez-Cañas 2014), ultimately influencing employees' attitudes, satisfaction and commitment as well as intention to quit (turnover intent) (Sims & Kroeck 1994). Similar results have been reported by Kítapcı and Elçi (2010), Valentine, Godkin and Lucero (2002), indicating ethical climate as a significant and positive influence on P–O fit. Lamm, Shaw and Kuyumcu (2010),

Ruiz-Palomino and Martínez-Cañas (2014) (main focus on ethical climate) and Wei (2013) report significant positive relationships between P–O fit and OCB, not only regarding interpersonal relationships but also towards organisations.

Liu, Liu and Hu (2010) report a strong relationship between P–O fit, job satisfaction and turnover intention in a Chinese context. Other researchers have also found significant relationships between similar variables, which they term person–environment fit (Mafini & Dlodlo 2014) and organisational culture (Ahmad & Veerapandian 2012), as predictors of employee satisfaction and turnover intention (Hassan et al 2012).

The interactionist (and multi-directional) nature of P–O fit (as well as the psychological contract), together with the impact it has on individual work behaviour, is clear from the brief discussion of the constructs above. It is therefore necessary to study the role of congruence between the individual and the equivalent characteristics of the environment (P–O fit), as well as mutual adherence to the psychological contract, to determine whether good fit will lead to more positive work behaviour, as has been postulated by various scholars (Ostroff & Schulte 2007), and in this case, lower turnover intention. The objectives of this study are:

- To determine the relationship between P–O fit and an individual's turnover intention.
- To determine the effect of perceived adherence to the psychological contract on the relationship between P–O fit and an individual's turnover intention.
- To determine the differences between groups (core/support; management/non-management and level in the organisation) in terms of P–O fit, perceived adherence to psychological contract and turnover intention.
- To make practical recommendations to management and the human resource fraternity and suggestions for future research.

7 Methodology

7.1 Research design

This study utilised a typical positivist methodology based on an empirical approach, employing a cross-sectional design and quantitative analysis. Leedy and Ormrod (2014) emphasise that a cross-sectional design involves sampling and comparing people from several different demographic groups. This approach enables the researcher to collect the required data at the same time.

7.2 Sample

The participants ($N=1\ 917$) consisted of employees of 32 organisations in South Africa, with State-Owned Enterprises ($n=2$, including Transport and Energy), Private Sector ($n=23$, including Medical, Engineering, Retail, Construction, Financial, Telecommunications, Pharmaceutical, Information Technology) and Public Sector ($n=7$, consisting of National and Provincial Departments as well Local Government). The 32 organisations were selected by the co-researchers based on their employment, and can therefore be regarded as a convenient sample. The 60 employees per organisation selected to participate in the study were, however, randomly selected by each of the co-researchers.

The characteristics of the participants are discussed in Tables 1 and 2. Table 1 reflects race, gender as well as distribution regarding role, responsibility, highest qualification and level in the organisation, all reported as frequencies. The

characteristics of the participants in terms of their age and tenure (in years) are reported in Table 2.

Table 1
Demographics of participants (N = 1 917)

	Category	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative percent
RACE N = 1 895 Missing values = 22	Indian	275	14.5	14.5
	African	1 018	53.7	68.2
	Coloured	165	8.7	79.9
	White	437	23.1	100.0
GENDER N = 1 901 Missing values = 16	Male	1 034	54.4	54.4
	Female	867	45.6	100.0
ROLE N = 1 889 Missing values = 28	Core	1 026	54.3	54.3
	Support	863	45.7	100.0
RESPONSIBILITY N = 1 899 Missing values = 18	Management	612	32.4	32.4
	Non-management	1 277	67.6	67.6
QUALIFICATION N = 1 896 Missing values = 21	Below Gr12	78	4.1	4.1
	Gr12	482	25.4	29.5
	1st degree/diploma	794	41.9	71.4
	Higher degree/diploma	542	28.6	100.0
ORGANISATIONAL LEVEL N = 1 899 Missing values = 18	Unskilled and defined decision making.	41	2.2	2.2
	Semi-skilled and discretionary decision making.	387	20.4	22.5
	Skilled technical and academically qualified, junior management, supervisors, foremen and superintendents.	893	47.0	69.6
	Professionally qualified, experienced specialists and middle management.	447	23.5	93.1
	Top management, senior management.	131	6.9	100

Table 2
Age and tenure characteristics of the participants (N = 1 917)

	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std deviation
Age	1 883	20	68	37.92	9.66
Tenure	1 889	0	45	8.56	7.89

7.3 Measuring instruments

An existing instrument, developed by Cable and Judge (1996), was used to measure person–organisation fit, which is regarded as a multidimensional construct (not tested in this study), and consists of three factors, with three items on each of the factors. The first factor, indirect fit (organisation fit as values congruence) was developed by Cable and Judge (1996, 1997), and refined by Chatman (1989) and Lauver and Kristof-Brown (2001). It consists of three factors, of which the first is *Indirect fit* (value congruence). The items that measures this factor are “*The things that I value in life are very similar to the things that my organisation values*”, “*My personal values match my organization’s*

values and culture" and "My organization's values and culture provide a good fit with the things that I value in life". Acceptable psychometric properties are reported by the developers, with a Cronbach's alpha coefficient higher than .90. Kristof-Brown (1996) and Edwards (1991) developed the *Direct fit* (needs-supplies fit) measure with the following three items: "There is a good fit between what my job offers me and what I am looking for in a job", "The attributes that I look for in a job are fulfilled very well by my present job" and "The job that I currently hold gives me just about everything that I want from a job". Finally, the *Person-job fit* (demands-abilities fit) is based on items developed by Cable and Judge (1996). The items include "The match is very good between the demands of my job and my personal skills", "My abilities and training are a good fit with the requirements of my job" and "My personal abilities and education provide a good match with the demands that my job places on me". The scale used is a 5-point Likert-type scale, ranging from "strongly disagree" to "strongly agree". Cronbach's alpha coefficients of .89 and .84 have been reported.

The original unidimensional turnover intention scale, developed by Netemeyer, Boles and McMurrian (1996), was used; it consists of four items, with a 7-point Likert-type scale, ranging from "strongly disagree" to "strongly agree". The items are "I often think about quitting my present job", "I intend to quit my job", "During the next 12 months, I intend to search for an alternative role (another job, full-time student, etc.) to my present job", and "I have searched for a new job". Brashear, Boles, Brooks and Bellenger (2003) reported a Cronbach's alpha coefficient of .91 for this instrument.

The instrument developed by Rousseau (2000) to measure the construct related to the psychological contract consists of six items, divided into three for the individual aspects and three for the organisational aspects. The scale is a 5-point Likert-type scale, ranging from "Not at all" to "To a very large extent". The items related to the individual are "To what extent has the organisation implicitly or explicitly made promises to you?", "Overall, how well does your employer fulfil its commitments to you?" and "In general, how well does your employer live up to its promises to you?" The organisation-related items are "To what extent have you made promises, implicitly or explicitly to the organisation?", "Overall, how well have you fulfilled your commitments to organisation?" and "Overall, how well have you fulfilled your promises to the organisation?" Acceptable psychometric properties have been reported for the instrument (Freese & Schalk 1997; Rousseau 2000).

7.4 Statistical analysis

The statistical analysis was performed with the aid of the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS version 23). Descriptive statistics were calculated to provide information on the distribution, with the mean score taken as either the average or as the precise centre of the amalgamated values, and with the standard deviation taken as the measure of variability (Leedy & Ormrod 2014). Skewness and kurtosis were also calculated to investigate the distribution of the data. The skewness value provides an indication of the symmetry of the distribution, while the kurtosis provides information about the peakedness of the distribution (Pallant 2010). The critical values for these two statistics are 2 and 7 respectively (West, Finch & Curran 1995).

The Cronbach's alpha coefficient (α) was calculated to test the proportional variance error and the internal consistency of the instrument. Scores of $\alpha = .60$ and $\alpha = .70$ or higher are considered acceptable by Clark and Watson (1995) and Nunnally and Bernstein (1994) respectively. Multicollinearity (tolerance and variance inflation factor [VIF]) of the items was also determined (with the main construct as dependent variable)

to test a possible inflation of the reliability coefficient. Tolerance is an indicator of the amount of variance not explained by the other independent variables (in this case item) in the model, and should preferably be greater than .10. VIF on the other hand is the inverse of tolerance, and values should be below 10. Higher values on both tolerance and VIF indicate multicollinearity (Pallant 2010).

Other correlations between the items and constructs were also calculated by means of Pearson's product moment correlations. Hierarchical multiple regression analysis was used to determine the amount of variance explained by the person–organisation fit constructs in turnover intention, when the psychological contract factors are forced into the analysis. The rationale for this forced inclusion of the psychological contract factors is to determine whether it improves the model or not. The hierarchical multiple analyses are also subjected to collinearity diagnostics and in particular to a determination of tolerance and VIF on construct level.

T-tests and one-way analyses of variance (ANOVA) between groups were conducted to explore the impact of the specific demographic variables on the total scores of the constructs. Cohen's *d* (1988) with regard to effect size was determined, with .10 being considered small, .30 medium and .50 large in terms of effect (Pallant 2010).

The focus of this study will be on non-individual related variables, namely the role (Core / Support); responsibility (management/non-management) and organisational level (unskilled and defined decision making; semi-skilled and discretionary decision making; skilled technical and academically qualified, junior management, supervisors, foremen and superintendents; professionally qualified, experienced specialists, middle management and top management, senior management).

8 Results

Table 3
Item-descriptive statistics of the person-organisation fit, psychological contract and turnover intention instruments

	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	SD	Skewness	Standardised Beta	Collinearity statistics	
								Tolerance	VIF
PoF1	1 916	1	5	3.42	1.13	-.45	.15**	.36	2.74
PoF2	1 916	1	5	3.49	1.09	-.47	.15**	.29	3.49
PoF3	1 916	1	5	3.53	1.05	-.53	.14**	.30	3.36
PoF4	1 915	1	5	3.53	1.08	-.56	.14**	.35	2.86
PoF5	1 912	1	5	3.43	1.10	-.48	.15**	.28	3.58
PoF6	1 916	1	5	3.22	1.17	-.21	.16**	.36	2.78
PoF7	1 915	1	5	3.60	1.10	-.73	.15**	.42	2.38
PoF8	1 915	1	5	3.84	1.02	-.98	.14**	.40	2.50
PoF9	1 913	1	5	3.90	1.05	-1.05	.14**	.43	2.34
PsC1	1 912	1	5	3.24	1.27	-.33	.33**	.90	1.11
PsC2	1 912	1	5	3.45	1.14	-.47	.30**	.37	2.73
PsC3	1 910	1	5	3.41	1.15	-.46	.30**	.36	2.80
PsC4	1 914	1	5	3.38	1.19	-.54	.31**	.82	1.21
PsC5	1 914	1	5	4.33	.81	-1.29	.21**	.50	2.02
PsC6	1 913	1	5	4.29	.83	-1.23	.21**	.48	2.07
TI1	1 911	1	7	3.18	2.09	.43	.28**	.36	2.81
TI2	1 914	1	7	2.75	1.98	.79	.27**	.34	2.94
TI3	1 914	1	7	3.72	2.26	.13	.30**	.37	2.70
TI4	1 912	1	7	3.57	2.34	.20	.32**	.44	2.30

***p*≤.001

The skewness and kurtosis for the items do not exceed the critical values of 2.00 and 7.00, respectively (West et al 1995:74), which is an indication of a normal distribution of the data. The majority of the values of the items on both the skewness and the kurtosis scales reported negative values ranging between -1.29 and .79, which is an indication that the distribution has relatively few small values and tails off to the left. This negative skewness contributes to the relatively high mean scores on the person–organisation fit (ranging between 3.22 and 3.90) and psychological contract items (ranging between 3.24 and 4.33), both on a 5-point Likert-type scale. Turnover intention, which is a negative construct, reported the opposite, with relatively low mean item scores (ranging from 2.27 to 3.73 on a 7-point Likert-type scale), indicating a low turnover intention.

The tolerance values were found to be relatively high, indicating non-multicollinearity. This was also the case for the VIF values, which were reported to be far below the multicollinearity value of 10. It can therefore be concluded that there is no violation of the multicollinearity assumption.

The descriptive statistics as well as the psychometric properties of the instruments are reported in Table 4.

Table 4
Descriptive statistics and Cronbach's alpha coefficient of the factors of the person-organisation fit, psychological contract and turnover intention instruments

Factor	N	Min	Max	Mean	Std deviation	Skewness	Kurtosis	α
Person–organisation Fit (5-point Likert-type scale)								
If	1 916	1.00	5.00	3.48	1.00	-.52	-.34	.91
Df	1 911	1.00	5.00	3.39	1.01	-.44	-.52	.89
Pjf	1 911	1.00	5.00	3.78	.93	-.93	.68	.85
TOTAL	1 907	1.00	5.00	3.55	.82	-.54	.04	
Psychological contract (5-point Likert-type scale)								
Org ^{adj}	1 908	1.00	5.00	3.43	1.08	-.49	-.48	.83
Sel ^{adj}	1 913	1.00	5.00	4.31	.76	-1.16	2.32	.89
TOTAL	1 907	1.00	5.00	3.87	.73	-.62	.73	
Turnover intention (7-point Likert-type scale)								
Ti	1 908	1.00	7.00	3.30	1.86	.35	-1.07	.88

Where: If = Indirect fit (organisation fit as values congruence); Df = Direct fit (needs-supplies fit); Pjf = Person-job fit (demands-abilities fit); Pof_t = Person-organisation fit total; PscOrg = Psychological contract adherence – the organisation / employer; PscSelf = Psychological contract adherence – employee himself/herself, and PsC_t = Psychological contract total and Ti = Turnover intention

The descriptive statistics in Table 4 show that the skewness and kurtosis values of the factors do not exceed the critical values of 2.00 and 7.00 respectively (West et al 1995), which is an indication that the data are normally distributed. The majority of the values of the person–organisation fit and psychological contract factors on the skewness scale were negative, ranging between -.44 and -1.12, which is an indication that the distribution has relatively few small values and tails off to the left, with a total mean score of 3.55 and 3.87 respectively. Turnover intention, which is a negative construct, reported the opposite, with a relatively low mean score of 3.30, and a positive skewness value, indicative of a distribution with relatively few small values tailing off to the right.

The Cronbach's alpha coefficients of the factors are acceptable if the guideline of $\alpha > .70$ (Nunnally & Bernstein 1994) is applied. It would thus appear that the factors possess acceptable levels of internal consistency. The original psychological contract instrument was adjusted, however, with items 1 and 4 being removed. These items are

related to the deletion of the questions “*To what extent has the organisation implicitly or explicitly made promises to you?*”, and “*To what extent have you made promises, implicitly or explicitly, to the organisation?*”, which increased the reliability coefficients of the two psychological contract factors, namely psychological contract adherence – the organisation/employer and psychological contract adherence – employee himself/herself, from .50 to .89 and .60 to .89 respectively.

The strength and direction of the linear relationship between the factors person–organisation fit, psychological contract as well as turnover intention are reported in Table 5.

Table 5
Correlation matrix of the factors of the person–organisation fit, psychological contract and turnover intention constructs

	If	Df	Pjf	Pof_t	PscOrg	PscSelf	PsC_t	Ti
If	1.00							
Df	.57**	1.00						
Pjf	.45**	.66**	1.00					
Pof_t	.81**	.89**	.83**	1.00				
PscOrg	.45**	.49**	.38**	.52**	1.00			
PscSelf	.12**	.15**	.20**	.18**	.23**	1.00		
PsC_t	.40**	.44**	.38**	.49**	.86**	.69**	1.00	
Ti	-.38**	-.54**	-.38**	-.52**	-.43**	-.09**	-.37**	1.00

** Correlation is significant at $p \leq .001$

Where: If = Indirect fit (organisation fit as values congruence); Df = Direct fit (needs–supplies fit); Pjf = Person–job fit (demands–abilities fit); Pof_t = Person–organisation fit total; PscOrg = Psychological contract adherence – the organisation/employer; Psc self = Psychological contract adherence – employee himself/herself; PsC_t = Psychological contract total and Ti = Turnover intention

The relationship between the person–organisation fit, psychological contract factors and the turnover intention construct was investigated using the Pearson product-moment correlation coefficient. Preliminary analysis was performed to ensure that there was no violation of the assumptions of normality and multicollinearity. Strong, positive correlations between person–organisation fit factors, with direct fit having a large correlation ($r > .50$, Pallant 2010) with person–job fit, and indirect fit with $r = .66$ and $r = .57$ respectively. A small positive correlation ($r = .23$) was reported between the psychological contract factors (psychological contract adherence–the organisation, psychological contract adherence– employee himself/herself).

Positive correlations were also reported between the person–organisation fit factors and the psychological contract factors (including the respective total scores of the constructs).

Negative correlations were reported between the turnover intention construct and all the factors (and total scores) of the person–organisation fit and psychological contract. The strongest negative correlation was found between direct fit and the person–organisation total score and turnover intention, with $r = -.54$ and $-.52$ respectively (large correlation) (Pallant 2010). Further medium correlations ($.30 < r < .50$) (Pallant 2010) were reported between turnover intention and psychological contract adherence – the organisation ($r = -.43$), indirect fit ($r = -.38$), person–job fit ($r = -.38$) and the total score of psychological contract ($r = .37$).

The results of the hierarchical multiple regression analysis (between the person–organisation fit factors and turnover intention) and the psychological contract factors are reported in Tables 6, 7 and 8.

Table 6
Results of hierarchical multiple regression analysis – model summary
with turnover intention as dependent variable and the person–organisation fit
and psychological contract factors

Model	R	R square	Adjusted R square	Std error of the estimate	Change Statistics				
					R square change	F change	df1	df2	Sig. F change
1	.38 ^a	.15	.15	1.72	.15	326.96	1	1 900	.00
2	.54 ^b	.30	.30	1.56	.15	405.15	1	1 899	.00
3	.55 ^c	.30	.30	1.56	.00	.61	1	1 898	.44
4	.57 ^d	.33	.33	1.52	.03	87.81	1	1 897	.00
5	.57 ^e	.33	.33	1.52	.00	2.62	1	1 896	.11

a Predictors: (constant), indirect fit (organisation fit as values congruence)

b Predictors: (constant), indirect fit (organisation fit as values congruence); direct fit (needs–supplies fit)

c Predictors: (constant), indirect fit (organisation fit as values congruence); direct fit (needs–supplies fit); person–job fit (demands–abilities fit)

d Predictors: (constant), indirect fit (organisation fit as values congruence); direct fit (needs–supplies fit); person–job fit (demands–abilities fit); psychological contract adherence – organisation / employer

e Predictors: (constant), indirect fit (organisation fit as values congruence); direct fit (needs–supplies fit); person–job fit (demands–abilities fit); psychological contract adherence – organisation/employer; psychological contract adherence – employee himself/herself

Dependent variable: turnover intention.

The hierarchical multiple regression analysis, with turnover intention as dependent variable, yielded significant results and the addition of each factor except for person–job fit (demands–abilities fit) and psychological contract adherence – himself/ herself improved the model. Indirect fit (organisation fit as values congruence), $F(1, 1\ 901) = 326.96$, $p < .001$, and direct fit (needs–supplies fit), $F(2, 1\ 901) = 400.83$, $p < .001$, each explain 15% of the variance in turnover intention, followed by the 3% explained by psychological contract adherence – organisation/employer $F(4, 1\ 901) = 231.65$, $p < .001$. All of these contributions are statistically significant. The model as a whole (including all the person–organisation fit and the psychological contract factors) explains 33% of turnover intention, with $F(5, 1\ 901) = 186.00$, $p < .001$.

Table 7
Results of hierarchical multiple regression analysis - ANOVA with turnover
intention as dependent variable and the person–organisation fit and
psychological contract factors

Model		Sum of squares	Df	Mean square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	963.51	1	963.51	326.96	.00 ^b
	Residual	5 599.09	1 900	2.95		
	Total	6 562.60	1 901			
2	Regression	1 948.03	2	974.01	400.83	.00 ^c
	Residual	4 614.57	1 899	2.43		
	Total	6 562.60	1 901			
3	Regression	1 949.50	3	649.83	267.37	.00 ^d
	Residual	4 613.10	1 898	2.43		
	Total	6 562.60	1901			
4	Regression	2 153.58	4	538.40	231.65	.00 ^e
	Residual	4 409.02	1 897	2.32		
	Total	6 562.60	1 901			

continued/

	Model	Sum of squares	Df	Mean square	F	Sig.
5	Regression	2 159.67	5	431.93	186.00	.00 ^f
	Residual	4 402.93	1 896	2.32		
	Total	6 562.60	1 901			

Dependent variable: turnover intention

a Predictors: (constant), indirect fit (organisation fit as values congruence)

b Predictors: (constant), indirect fit (organisation fit as values congruence); direct fit (needs–supplies fit)

c Predictors: (constant), indirect fit (organisation fit as values congruence); direct fit (needs–supplies fit); person–job fit (demands–abilities fit)

d Predictors: (constant), indirect fit (organisation fit as values congruence); direct fit (needs–supplies fit); person–job fit (demands–abilities fit); psychological contract adherence –organisation/employer

e Predictors: (constant), indirect fit (organisation fit as values congruence); direct fit (needs–supplies fit); person–job fit (demands–abilities fit); psychological contract adherence –organisation/employer; psychological contract adherence – employee himself/herself

Table 8
Results of hierarchical multiple regression analysis – coefficients with turnover intention as dependent variable and the person–organisation fit and psychological contract factors

	Unstandardised coefficients		Standardised coefficients	T	Sig.	Correlations			Collinearity statistics	
	B	Std. Error	Beta			Zero-order	Partial	Part	Tolerance	VIF
Model (constant)	7.18	.24		30.51	.000					
Indirect fit	-.12	.04	-.06	-2.67	.008	-.38	-.06	-.05	.63	1.58
Direct fit	-.72	.05	-.39	-13.8	.000	-.54	-.30	-.26	.44	2.26
Person–job fit	-.02	.05	-.01	-.47	.638	-.38	-.01	-.01	.54	1.84
Psychological contract adherence – organisation	-.37	.04	-.21	-9.51	.000	-.43	-.21	-.18	.69	1.44
Psychological contract adherence – employee himself/herself	.08	.05	.03	1.62	.106	-.09	.04	.03	.93	1.07

Dependent variable: turnover intention

The results in Table 8 indicate acceptable levels of tolerance (> .10) and VIF (< 10), and all variables could be retained in the analysis, as multicollinearity was not found to exist.

In the final model, three factors made a statistically significant contribution, namely direct fit, psychological contract adherence–organisation and indirect fit, with beta values of -.39, -.21 ($p < .001$) and -.06 ($p = .008$) respectively.

In order to determine the differences between the categories of participants, not in terms of their individual characteristics or attributes, such as age, gender and race, but in terms of their function, responsibility and level in the organisation, t-tests and ANOVA were conducted. The results are reported in Tables 9 to 12, firstly with the difference between participants involved in the core function of the organisation compared to the support functions, secondly in terms of the responsibility of the participants (management compared to non-management) and lastly the organisational level of the participants (in terms of five categories).

Table 9
T-test (between group differences) with the function in the organisation
(core/support) as grouping variable and the person–organisation fit, psychological
contract and turnover intention as dependent variables

	Mean	SD	Levene's test for equality of variances		t-test for Equality of means							Effect size (d)
			F	Sig.	t	Df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean diff	Std. error dif	95% Confidence interval of the difference		
										Lower	Upper	
Indirect fit	3.56 ^a 3.39 ^b	.98 1.02	2.97	.09	3.73	1 886	.00	.17	.05	.08	.26	.17
Direct fit	3.45 ^a 3.34 ^b	.98 1.04	3.36	.07	2.27	1 882	.02	.11	.05	.01	.20	.11
Person– job fit	3.83 ^a 3.74 ^b	.91 .95	5.14	.02	2.11	1 881	.04	.09	.04	.01	.17	.39
Psychological contract adherence– organisation	3.47 ^a 3.39 ^b	1.07 1.10	2.29	.13	1.61	1 878	.11	.08	.05	-.02	.18	.07
Psychological contract adherence– employee himself/herself	4.30 ^a 4.32 ^b	.76 .76	.00	.96	-.72	1 883	.47	-.03	.04	-.09	.04	.03
Turnover intention	3.21 ^a 3.40 ^b	1.87 1.85	.29	.59	-2.17	1 878	.03	-.19	.09	-.35	.29	.10

a Core

b Support

The results of the t-tests reported in Table 9 indicate that there are statistically significant differences between the categories of participants performing core functions (core group) and those performing support functions (support group), on all three person–organisation fit factors.

The differences between the groups are on indirect fit, with the core group reporting $M = 3.56$ and $SD = .98$ and the support group $M = 3.39$ and $SD = 1.02$, and $t(1\ 889) = 2.97$, $p < .05$ (two-tailed) (small effect, as $d = .17$). The same pattern was also reported for direct fit, core group reporting $M = 3.45$ and $SD = .98$ and the support group $M = 3.34$ and $SD = 1.04$, and $t(1\ 881) = 3.36$, $p < .05$ (two-tailed) (small effect, as $d = .11$). The only factor that reported a statistically significant difference with a medium effect ($d = .39$), was person–job fit. The core group reported $M = 3.83$ and $SD = .91$ and the support group $M = 3.74$ and $SD = .95$, and $t(1\ 881) = 5.14$, $p < .05$.

Lastly, the two groups also differ significantly on the turnover intention construct, with the support group measuring a higher score with $M = 3.40$ and $SD = 1.85$, compared to the core group, which reported $M = 3.21$ and $SD = 1.87$, $t(1\ 878) = .29$, $p < .05$ (two-tailed) (small effect, as $d = .10$).

Statistically significant differences were reported between the participants with a management responsibility (management group) compared to those not in a management capacity (non-management group), on all the person–organisation fit factors, as well as the psychological contract factors, as reported in Table 10. All these differences are on a small effect level, with $.10 < d < .30$.

Table 10
T-test (between group differences) with the managerial responsibility
(management/non-management) as grouping variable and the person–organisation
fit, psychological contract and turnover intention as dependent variable

	Mean	SD	Levene's test for equality of variances		t-test for Equality of means							Effect size (<i>d</i>)
			F	Sig.	t	Df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean diff	Std. error diff	95% Confidence interval of the difference		
										Lower	Upper	
Indirect fit	3.58 ^a 3.44 ^b	1.01 1.00	.09	.77	2.74	1 886	.01	.13	.05	.04	.23	.14
Direct fit	3.57 ^a 3.31 ^b	.97 1.02	3.82	.05	5.27	1 882	.00	.26	.05	.16	.36	.26
Person– job fit	3.95 ^a 3.70 ^b	.86 .95	14.57	.00	5.63	1 881	.00	.26	.05	.17	.34	.23
Psychological contract adherence–organisation	3.57 ^a 3.37 ^b	1.07 1.08	1.35	.25	3.80	1 878	.00	.20	.05	.10	.31	.14
Psychological contract adherence–employee himself/herself	4.36 ^a 4.28	.73 .77	1.23	.27	2.13	1 883	.03	.08	.04	.01	.15	.11
Turnover intention	3.21 ^a 3.34 ^b	1.91 1.84	1.85	.17	-1.45	1 878	.15	-.13	.09	-.31	.05	.10

a Management

b Non-management

The differences between the participants on the person–organisation fit factors are firstly discussed. On the indirect fit factor, the management group reported a significant higher score ($M = 3.58$ and $SD = 1.01$) compared to the non-management group ($M = 3.44$ and $SD = 1.00$, and $t(1\ 886) = .09$, $p < .05$ (two-tailed) ($d = .14$). For direct fit, the management group also reported a significant higher score compared to the non-management group, with $M = 3.57$ and $SD = .97$ and $M = 3.31$ and $SD = 1.02$, respectively, with $t(1\ 882) = 3.82$, $p < .05$ (two-tailed) ($d = .26$). On the last factor of the person–organisation fit construct, namely the person–job fit, the management group reported $M = 3.95$ and $SD = .86$ and the non-management group $M = 3.70$ and $SD = .95$, and $t(1\ 881) = 5.14$, $p < .05$.

The same pattern was evident in the analysis of differences between the two groups on the psychological contract factor. On psychological contract adherence–organisation, the management group reported $M = 3.57$ and $SD = 1.07$ and the non-management group $M = 3.37$ and $SD = 1.08$, and $t(1\ 878) = 1.35$, $p < .05$ (two-tailed) (small effect, as $d = .14$). The management group also reported a significantly higher mean score on psychological contract adherence–employee himself/herself ($M = 4.36$ and $SD = .73$) compared to the non-management group ($M = 4.28$ and $SD = .77$), with $t(1\ 873) = 1.23$, $p < .05$ (two-tailed) (small effect, as $d = .11$).

Lastly, the turnover intention was significantly higher with the non-management group ($M = 3.34$ and $SD = 1.84$) compared to the management group ($M = 3.21$ and $SD = 1.91$), with $t(1\ 878) = 1.85$, $p < .05$ (two-tailed) (small effect, as $d = .10$).

Table 11
Descriptive statistics of all the categories related to the level in the organisation (on five distinct levels), on each of the person–organisation fit, psychological contract and turnover intention variables.

		N	Mean	Std deviation	Std error	95% Confidence interval for mean	
						Lower bound	Upper bound
Indirect fit	Cat ^a	41	3.35	1.01	.16	3.03	3.67
	Cat ^b	386	3.48	1.04	.05	3.38	3.58
	Cat ^c	893	3.50	1.00	.03	3.44	3.57
	Cat ^d	447	3.49	1.01	.05	3.39	3.58
	Cat ^e	131	3.39	.94	.08	3.23	3.55
Direct fit	Cat ^a	41	3.29	1.05	.16	2.96	3.63
	Cat ^b	384	3.30	1.05	.05	3.19	3.40
	Cat ^c	892	3.36	.99	.03	3.30	3.43
	Cat ^d	446	3.54	1.02	.05	3.44	3.63
	Cat ^e	131	3.48	.96	.08	3.31	3.64
Person–job fit	Cat ^a	41	3.66	.91	.14	3.37	3.94
	Cat ^b	384	3.66	.99	.05	3.56	3.76
	Cat ^c	891	3.76	.92	.03	3.70	3.82
	Cat ^d	447	3.91	.90	.04	3.83	4.00
	Cat ^e	130	3.91	.81	.07	3.77	4.05
Psychological contract adherence –organisation	Cat ^a	41	3.26	1.16	.18	2.89	3.62
	Cat ^b	384	3.41	1.12	.06	3.30	3.52
	Cat ^c	887	3.40	1.09	.04	3.33	3.47
	Cat ^d	447	3.49	1.05	.05	3.39	3.59
	Cat ^e	131	3.60	1.03	.09	3.43	3.78
Psychological contract adherence –employee himself/herself	Cat ^a	41	4.30	.93	.14	4.01	4.60
	Cat ^b	386	4.27	.78	.04	4.19	4.35
	Cat ^c	890	4.27	.78	.03	4.22	4.32
	Cat ^d	447	4.40	.67	.03	4.34	4.46
	Cat ^e	131	4.37	.69	.06	4.25	4.49
Turnover intention	Cat ^a	41	3.35	1.73	.27	2.81	3.90
	Cat ^b	386	3.13	1.82	.09	2.95	3.32
	Cat ^c	886	3.36	1.84	.06	3.24	3.48
	Cat ^d	446	3.34	1.91	.09	3.16	3.51
	Cat ^e	131	3.28	1.93	.17	2.94	3.61

* The mean difference is significant at the 0.05 level.

Where: **Cat^a** = Unskilled and defined decision making; **Cat^b** = Semi-skilled and discretionary decision making; **Cat^c** = Skilled technical and academically qualified, junior management, supervisors, foremen and superintendents; **Cat^d** = Professionally qualified, experienced specialists and middle management, and **Cat^e** = Top management, senior management

Table 12
ANOVA (between group differences) with the level in the organisation (on five distinct levels) as grouping variable and the person–organisation fit, psychological contract and turnover intention as dependent variable (Omnibus test)

	Sum of squares	df	Mean square	F	Sig.
Indirect fit	2.14	4	.54	.53	$p = .71$
Direct fit	14.92	4	3.73	3.68	$p < .05$
Person–job fit	16.97	4	4.24	4.96	$p < .05$
Psychological contract adherence–organisation	7.64	4	1.91	1.63	$p = .16$
Psychological contract adherence–employee himself/herself	5.92	4	1.48	2.59	$p < .05$
Turnover intention	14.23	4	3.56	1.03	$p = .39$

The ANOVA omnibus test yielded three factors that show statistically significant differences ($p < .05$) between the participants at the different levels of the organisation. The factors are direct fit, person–organisational fit and psychological contract adherence–employee himself/herself. In order to determine the specific differences, a Scheffe *post hoc* test was performed and the results related to these factors are reported in Tables 13 and 14.

Table 13
Descriptive statistics of all the categories related to the level in the organisation (on five distinct levels), on each of the person–organisation fit, psychological contract and turnover intention variables.

		N	Mean	Std. deviation	Std. error	95% Confidence interval for mean	
						Lower bound	Upper bound
Indirect fit	Cat ^a	41	3.35	1.01	.16	3.03	3.67
	Cat ^b	386	3.48	1.04	.05	3.38	3.58
	Cat ^c	893	3.50	1.00	.03	3.44	3.57
	Cat ^d	447	3.49	1.01	.05	3.39	3.58
	Cat ^e	131	3.39	.94	.08	3.23	3.55
Direct fit	Cat ^a	41	3.29	1.05	.16	2.96	3.63
	Cat ^b	384	3.30	1.05	.05	3.19	3.40
	Cat ^c	892	3.36	.99	.03	3.30	3.43
	Cat ^d	446	3.54	1.02	.05	3.44	3.63
	Cat ^e	131	3.48	.96	.08	3.31	3.64
Person–job fit	Cat ^a	41	3.66	.91	.14	3.37	3.94
	Cat ^b	384	3.66	.99	.05	3.56	3.76
	Cat ^c	891	3.76	.92	.03	3.70	3.82
	Cat ^d	447	3.91	.90	.04	3.83	4.00
	Cat ^e	130	3.91	.81	.07	3.77	4.05
Psychological contract adherence –organisation	Cat ^a	41	3.26	1.16	.18	2.89	3.62
	Cat ^b	384	3.41	1.12	.06	3.30	3.52
	Cat ^c	887	3.40	1.09	.04	3.33	3.47
	Cat ^d	447	3.49	1.05	.05	3.39	3.59
	Cat ^e	131	3.60	1.03	.09	3.43	3.78
Psychological contract adherence –employee himself/herself	Cat ^a	41	4.30	.93	.14	4.01	4.60
	Cat ^b	386	4.27	.78	.04	4.19	4.35
	Cat ^c	890	4.27	.78	.03	4.22	4.32
	Cat ^d	447	4.40	.67	.03	4.34	4.46
	Cat ^e	131	4.37	.69	.06	4.25	4.49
Turnover intention	Cat ^a	41	3.35	1.73	.27	2.81	3.90
	Cat ^b	386	3.13	1.82	.09	2.95	3.32
	Cat ^c	886	3.36	1.84	.06	3.24	3.48
	Cat ^d	446	3.34	1.91	.09	3.16	3.51
	Cat ^e	131	3.28	1.93	.17	2.94	3.61

* The mean difference is significant at the 0.05 level.

Where: **Cat^a** = Unskilled and defined decision making; **Cat^b** = Semi-skilled and discretionary decision making; **Cat^c** = Skilled technical and academically qualified, junior management, supervisors, foremen and superintendents; **Cat^d** = Professionally qualified, experienced specialists and middle management, and **Cat^e** = Top management, senior management

Table 14
ANOVA (between group differences) with the level in the organisation (on five distinct levels) as grouping variable and the person–organisation fit, psychological contract and turnover intention as dependent variable (Scheffé post hoc test)

Dependent variable	(I)	(J)	Mean difference (I-J)	Std error	Sig.	95% Confidence interval		Effect size (d)
						Lower bound	Upper bound	
Direct fit	Cat ^b	Cat ^d	-.24*	.07	.02	-.46	-.02	.23
	Cat ^c	Cat ^d	-.18**	.06	.06	-.36	.00	.18
Person–job fit	Cat ^b	Cat ^d	-.26*	.06	.00	-.45	-.06	.27
	Cat ^c	Cat ^d	-.15**	.05	.09	-.32	.01	.17
Psychological contract adherence–employee himself/herself	Cat ^c	Cat ^d	-.13**	.04	.08	-.26	.01	.18

* The mean difference is significant at the 0.05 level.

** The mean difference is significant at the 0.1 level.

Where: **Cat^b** = Semi-skilled and discretionary decision making; **Cat^c** = Skilled technical and academically qualified, junior management, supervisors, foremen and superintendents, and **Cat^d** = Professionally qualified, experienced specialists and middle management

The category Professionally qualified, experienced specialists and middle management (Cat^d) reported significantly lower scores on the direct fit and person–job fit factors compared to the semi-skilled and discretionary decision making (Cat^b) and the skilled technical and academically qualified, junior management, supervisors, foremen and superintendents (Cat^c) categories. The difference between the categories on the direct fit is $-.24$ ($p < .05$) and $-.18$ ($p < .1$) (small effect, $.10 < d < .30$) respectively, and on the person–job fit factor $-.26$ ($p < .05$) and $-.15$ ($p < .1$) respectively.

A difference in mean score is also reported on the psychological contract adherence – employee himself/herself factor between the Professionally qualified, experienced specialists and middle management (Cat^d) and the Skilled technical and academically qualified, junior management, supervisors, foremen and superintendents category (Cat^c). The Professionally qualified, experienced specialists and middle management category (Cat^d) reported a significantly lower score, with a mean difference of $-.13$ ($p < .1$), small effect ($d = .18$).

9 Conclusion and recommendations

Retention as one of the talent management pillars is extremely important, and needs investigation from various perspectives and approaches. The approach adopted in this study is the interactionist approach, which is based on the interaction between the organisation and the individual. Throughout this relationship, certain expectations are created and undertakings are made. These are regarded as binding in the work relationship and if these obligations are not met the psychological contract is breached, impacting on individual organisational behaviour. This study also considered the person–organisation fit and the relationship it has with the psychological contract. This study placed considerable emphasis on whether these factors impact on an employee's intention to leave the organisation.

Relatively high mean scores on the person–organisation fit and psychological contract items, both individually and as composite (or total) constructs, were reported. The turnover intention, which is a negative construct, reported the opposite, with relatively low mean scores on the items, resulting in low turnover intention.

The empirical results of this study further indicate that a strong positive relationship exists between the person–organisation fit factors (direct fit, person–job fit and indirect fit), while a positive relationship (although small) exists between the psychological contract factors (psychological contract adherence–organisation and psychological contract adherence–employee himself/herself). A positive relationship was also identified between the person–organisation fit factors and the psychological contract factors, which supports the literature presented in this article. Negative correlations were reported between the turnover intention construct and all the factors (and total scores) of the person–organisation fit and psychological contract.

Indirect fit (organisation fit as values congruence) and direct fit (needs–supplies fit) each explain 15% of the variance in turnover intention, with psychological contract adherence–organisation/ employer explaining 3% of the variance in turnover intention. The model as a whole (including all the person–organisation fit factors and the psychological contract factors) therefore explains 33% of turnover intention.

Inferential statistics (t-tests and ANOVAs) were used to differentiate between the categories of participants performing core functions (core group) and those performing support functions (support group), on all three person–organisation fit factors.

The participants performing core functions reported significantly higher mean scores on all the person–organisation fit factors (indirect fit, direct fit and person–job fit). The two groups also differ significantly on the turnover intention construct, with the support group reporting a higher score compared to the core group. In other words, the support group has a higher intention to leave the organisation.

The participants tasked with management responsibility as compared to those not in a management capacity reported significantly higher means scores on indirect fit, direct fit, person–job fit as well as psychological contract adherence–organisation, and a lower mean score on turnover intention.

In terms of the hierarchical level in the organisation the professionally qualified, experienced specialists reported significantly lower scores on direct fit and person–job fit as well as on the psychological contract adherence–employee himself /herself factor.

The HR functionaries should take note of the fact that the constructs of person–organisational fit, as well as psychological contract and turnover intention, are affected by the level in the organisation, the function the employees are involved in and by whether they are in a management capacity. The support/non-core employees feel less positive regarding their person–organisation fit and psychological contract, and have a higher propensity to leave the organisation. This also applies to the non-management group, and the professionally qualified, experienced specialists. These groups should receive special attention to enhance the perceived fit and reduce intention to leave the organisation.

It should nevertheless be asked how organisations ensure a better fit, meet the expectations of the employee and uphold the undertakings made by the organisation. The relationship between person–organisation fit, psychological contract and the individual's intention to leave the organisation, specifically in terms of value congruence, needs–supplies and the organisation's adherence to the psychological contract suggests the following practical recommendations:

- Continuous communication between employees and the organisation (management / leadership) in terms of their values.
- Career discussions to enhance not only goal alignment but also value congruence.

- The organisation (management/leadership) should always operate in accordance with organisational values.
- Ensure effective communication between the organisation (management/leadership) in terms of what the job/organisation can offer and what is expected by the employees. Realistic and honest expectations should be created during the selection interview, and during the on-boarding or orientation of a newly appointed employee.
- Ensure a good person–job fit with continuous development and empowerment to achieve a state in which employees feel fulfilled and see their work as meaningful.
- Ensure that employees are rewarded and compensated for work well done and given both monetary and non-monetary rewards.
- Ensure that the organisation honours the commitments and promises made to employees.

The results of this study confirm the opinion of various scholars that the interactionist construct of P–O fit in terms of the perceived congruence between the individual (employee) and the environment or situation (organisation) is of the utmost importance for behavioural outcomes, in this case intention to leave the organisation. Perceived adherence to the psychological contract is related to P–O fit (as it is also interactionist and multi-directional). The psychological contract not only correlates with P–O fit, but also, in combination with P–O fit, explains approximately a third of an individual's intention to leave an organisation. It is for this reason that managers and HR practitioners should strategise and implement interventions to strengthen P–O fit as well as perceived adherence to the psychological contract.

It is recommended that the results of this study be used as a point of reference for more in-depth, organisation- and/or occupation-specific studies because this sample was drawn from 32 organisations, across industries and sectors, and was not specific to a particular, well-demarcated population. It is further recommended that the impact of demographical variables (such as age, tenure and gender) on the relationship between P–O fit and an individual's intention to leave an organisation should be determined in future research, as it might have a mediating effect. The last recommendation is that further research be conducted on the instruments, especially in terms of construct validity, to determine whether the instruments display the expected structure internally. Convergent and discriminant validity, in support of construct validity, is also recommended.

A possible limitation of this study is the fact that the sectors included in the sample were not evenly represented, with the private sector being overly represented by 23 of the 32 organisations ($\pm 72\%$) while the public sector and state-owned enterprises were less strongly represented. This might skew the results towards the private sector, and could be addressed in future, more sector-specific research.

List of references

- Ahmad, KZ & Veerapandian, K. 2012. The mediating effect of person-environment fit on the relationship between organisational culture and job satisfaction. *International Journal of Psychological Studies* 4(1) 91-100. Available at: doi:10.5539/ijps.v4n1p91.
- Arbour, S, Kwantes, C, Kraft, J & Boglarsky, C. 2014. Person-organization fit: Using normative behaviors to predict workplace satisfaction, stress and intentions to stay. *Journal of Organizational Culture, Communications and Conflict* 18:41-63.

- Armstrong, M. 2006. *Handbook of human resource management practice*. 10th edition. Philadelphia: Kogan Page.
- Autry, C & Daugherty, P. 2003. Warehouse operations employees: Linking person-organization fit, job satisfaction and coping responses. *Journal of Business Logistics* 24(1):171-197.
- Brashear, T, Boles, JS, Brooks, C & Bellenger, DN. 2003. Trust building processes and outcomes in sales manager-salesperson relationships: An empirical test and comparison. *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science* 31(2):189-200.
- Brown, C. 2009. Why South African engineers choose to leave companies: A replication in the developing world. MBA dissertation. University of Pretoria.
- Buck, JM & Watson, JL. 2002. Retaining staff employees: The relationship between human resource management strategies and organisational commitment. *Innovative Higher Education* 26(3):175-193.
- Cable, DM & Edwards, JR. 2004. Complementary and supplementary fit: A theoretical and empirical integration. *Journal of Applied Psychology* 89(5):822-834.
- Cable, D & DeRue, D. 2002. The convergent and discriminant validity of subjective fit perceptions. *Journal of Applied Psychology* 87:875-884.
- Cable, DM & Judge, TA. 1996. Person-organization fit, job choice decisions, and organizational entry. *Organizational Behaviour and Human Decision Processes* 67:294-311.
- Cable, DM & Judge, TA. 1997. Interviewers' perceptions of person- organization fit and organizational selection decisions. *Journal of Applied Psychology* 82:546-61.
- Clark, LA & Watson, D. 1995. Constructing validity: Basic issues in objective scale development. *Psychological Assessment* 7:309-319.
- Chatman J. 1989. Improving interactional organizational research: A model of person-organization fit. *Academy of Management Review* 14:333-349.
- Cohen, J. 1988. *Statistical power analysis for behavioural science*. Revised edition. Orlando: Academic Press.
- Edwards, J. 1991. Person-job fit: A conceptual integration, literature review, and methodological critique. *International Review of Industrial and Organizational Psychology* 6:283-357.
- Erasmus, BJ, Grobler, A & Van Niekerk, M. 2015. Employee retention in a higher education institution from an organisational development perspective. *Progressio – South African Journal for Open and Distance Learning Practice* 37(1):33-63.
- Fatima, H. 2011. Does employee retention affect organisational competence? *Industrial Engineering* 1(1):24-39.
- Frank, FD, Finnegan, RP & Taylor, CR. 2004. The race for talent: Retaining and engaging workers in the 21st century. *Human Resource Planning* 27(3):12-25.
- Freese, C & Schalk, R. 1997. How to measure the psychological contract? A critical criteria-based review of measures. *South African Journal of Psychology* 38(2): 269-286.
- Glissmeyer, M, Bishop JW & Fass, RD. 2008. Role conflict, role ambiguity and intention to quit the organization: The case of law enforcement. *Academy of Management Journal* 40(1):82-111.

- Grobler, A. 2014. Workplace alternatives – confront, conform, capitulate. *African Journal of Hospitality, Tourism and Leisure* 3(2).
- Grobler, A, Joubert, Y, Rudolph, EC & Hajee-Osman, M. 2012. Utilisation of the Expectation Disconfirmation Model: EAS Rendered in the SAPS. *Journal of Contemporary Management*, 9 (29):324-340.
- Hassan, MUI, Akram, A & Naz, S. 2012. The relationship between person organisation fit, person-job-fit and turnover intention in banking sector of Pakistan: The mediating role of psychological climate. *International Journal of Human Resources Studies* 2(3):172-188.
- Kasimati, M. 2011. Job satisfaction and turnover under the effect of person-organization fit in Albanian public organizations. *Journal for East European Management Studies* 4:315-337.
- Kıtapçı, H & Elçi, M. 2010. *Quality culture, ethical climate, person-organisation fit and organisational commitment: An empirical investigation*. Gebze Institute of Technology:142-150.
- Kristof-Brown, AI. 1996. Person-organization fit: An integrative review of its conceptualizations, measurement and implication. *Personnel Psychology* 49(1):1-49.
- Kristof-Brown, LA & Jansen, KJ. 2007. Issues of person-organisation fit. In Ostroff, C & Judge, TA (Eds). *Perspectives on organisational fit*. New York, NY: Erlbaum:3-170.
- Kristof-Brown, AL, Zimmerman, RD & Johnson, EC. 2005. Consequences of individuals-fit at work: A meta-analysis of person-job, person-organisation, person-group and person-supervisor fit. *Personnel Psychology* 58(2):281-342.
- Lamm, MS, Shaw, GE & Kuyumcu, D. 2010. The effect of person-organisation fit on the display of organisational-citizenship behaviours directed towards the organisation (OCB-OS). *TCNJ Journal of Student Scholarship* 12:1-8.
- Lauver, K & Kristof-Brown, A. 2001. Distinguishing between employees' perceptions of person-job and person-organization fit. *Journal of Vocational Behavior* 59:454-470.
- Leedy, PD & Ormrod, JE. 2014. *Practical research, planning and design*. 9th edition. New Jersey, NJ: Pearson Education.
- Liu, B, Liu, J & Hu, J. 2010. Person-organisation fit, job satisfaction and turnover intention: An empirical study in the Chinese public sector. *Social Behaviour and Personality* 38(5):615-626. Available at: doi:10.2224/sbp.2010.38.5.615.
- Mafini, C & Dlodlo, N. 2014. The linkage between work-related factors, employee satisfaction and organisational commitment: Insight from Public Health Professionals. *South African Journal of Human Resources Management* 12(1).
- Masoga, L. 2013. The role of personality and organisational climate in employee turnover. DLit thesis. University of South Africa, Pretoria.
- Mitiku, M. 2010. An investigation of the nature of academic staff turnover: The case of Addis Ababa University. MBA thesis. Addis Ababa University, Ethiopia.
- Muchinsky, PM & Monahan, CJ. 1987. What is person-environment congruence? Supplementary versus complementary models of fit. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 31:268-277.
- Netemeyer, RG, Boles, JS & McMurrian, R. 1996. Development and validation of work-family conflict and family-work conflict scales. *Journal of Applied Psychology* 81:400-410.

- Nunnally, JC & Bernstein, IH. 1994. *Psychometric theory*. 3rd edition. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Ostroff, C & Schulte, M. 2007. Multiple perspectives of fit in organisations across levels of analysis. In Ostroff, C & Judge, TA (Eds). *Perspectives on organisational fit*. New York, NY: Erlbaum:3-70.
- Pallant, J. 2010. *SPSS survival manual: A step-by-step guide to data analysis using SPSS for Windows*. 4th edition. Open University Press.
- Rousseau, DM. 2000. *Psychological contract inventory: Technical report*. Pittsburgh, PA: Carnegie Mellon University.
- Ruiz-Palomino, P & Martínez-Cañas, R. 2014. Ethical culture, ethical intent, and organisational citizenship behaviour: The moderating and mediating role of person–organisation fit. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 120:95-108. Available at: doi:10.1007/s10551-013-1650-1.
- Scott, D, McMullen, T & Royal, M. 2012. *Retention of key talent and the role of rewards*. Available at: <https://www.worldatwork.org/waw/adimLink?id=62016> (accessed on 21 January 2016).
- Shruthi, VK & Hemanth, KP. 2012. Influence of *psychological contract* on employee–employer relationship. *Journal of Exclusive Management Science* 1(7):1-10.
- Sims, RL & Kroeck, KG. 1994. The influence of ethical fit on employee satisfaction, commitment and turnover. *Journal of Business Ethics* 13:939-947.
- Sparrow, PR. 1999. Strategy and cognition: Understanding the role of management knowledge structures, organisational memory and information overload. *Creativity and Innovation Management* 8(2):140-148.
- Taylor, LJ, Murphy, B & Price, W. 2006. Goldratt's thinking process applied to employee retention. *Business Process Management Journal* 12(5):646-670.
- Terborg, JR. 1981. Interactional psychology and research on human behaviour in organisations. *The Academy of Management Review* 6(4):569-576.
- Tymon, WG, Stumpf, SA & Smith, RR. 2011. Manager support predicts turnover of professionals in India. *Career Development International* 16(3):293-312.
- Valentine, S, Godkin, L, & Lucero, M. 2002 Ethical context, organisational commitment, and person–organisation fit. *Journal of Business Ethics* 41:349-360.
- Van Zyl, MA. 2011. Employee turnover in a financial institution. MBA dissertation. North-West University, Potchefstroom.
- Walker, JW. 2001. The impact of increased employee retention on performance in a customer contact centre. *Manufacturing and Service Operations Management* 8:235-252.
- Wei, Y. 2013. Person–organisation fit and organisational citizenship behaviour: Time perspective. *Journal of Management & Organisation* 19(1):101-114.
- West, SG, Finch, JF & Curran, PJ. 1995. Structural equation models with non-normal variables: Problems and remedies. In Hoyle, RH (Ed). *Structural equation modelling: concepts, issues, and applications*. Thousand Oaks: Sage.