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Abstract

This study examines the direct relationship between person-job fit, person-organization fit, person-group fit, person-supervisor fit and work engagement. A total of 500 questionnaires were distributed to respondents who had agreed to participate in this study. At the end of the survey period, 140 questionnaire were returned, yielding a return rate of 28%. However, only data from 137 respondents are usable for further analyses. Hypotheses for direct effect were tested using multiple regression analyses. Results showed that only person-supervisor fit was significantly positively associated with work engagement. Implications of the findings, potential limitations, and directions for future research are discussed.
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Abstrak

Kajian ini mengkaji hubungan langsung antara kesesuaian pekerja dengan kerja, kesesuaian pekerja dengan organisasi, kesesuaian pekerja dengan kumpulan, kesesuaian pekerja dengan penyelia dan keterlibaan kerja. Sebanyak 500 soal selidik telah diedarkan kepada responden kajian yang telah bersetuju untuk terlibat dalam kajian ini. Namun begitu, sebanyak 140 soal selidik telah diterima semula dengan kadar maklum balas sebanyak 28%. Namun begitu hanya 137 data daripada responden boleh digunakan untuk analisis seterusnya. Hipotesis ke atas kesan langsung diuji menggunakan analisis regresi berganda. Dapatan kajian menunjukkan bahawa hanya kesesuaian pekerja penyelia mempunyai hubungan yang positif dan signifikan dengan keterlibatan kerja. Implikasi dapatan kajian, limitasi dan cadangan kajian pada masa hadapan turut dibincangkan.

Kata kunci: Keterlibatan kerja; Kesesuaian pekerja dengan kerja; Kesesuaian pekerja dengan organisasi; Kesesuaian pekerja dengan kumpulan; Kesesuaian pekerja dengan penyelia
Acknowledgement

Alhamdulillah, praise to Allah for giving me the strength, inspiration and good health in completing this study. Without the dedication and support from these people, the completion of this research paper would not have been possible.

Firstly, I would like to express my sincere gratitude to my research supervisor Dr. Siti Zubaidah Othman for her continuous support, patience, motivation, enthusiasm, and immense knowledge. Her guidance helped me in finishing my research paper.

To my loving and supporting parents, En. Rosli B. Harun and Pn. Norliza Bt. Ali and all my siblings (Muadz, Irfan, Hanini, Naim and Luthfil), thank you for all your prayers, patience, support, and word of encouragement for me to keep going till the final end of this journey. Not forgetting my supportive husband, Mohd Zulhairi B. Hadani for his love and care.

Not forgetting, all my postgradute friends especially Umi Kalsom, Aqilah, Ain, and Nurul Syazana, thank you for the kindness, support, friendship and memories.

Finally, yet importantly, I would like to express my gratitude to all respondents from various manufacturing companies in Batu Kawan Industrial Park for their involvement in this study. Without their sincere participations, this study will not be as successful as today.
# Table of Contents

Permission to Use ......................................................................................... i
Abstract ........................................................................................................ ii
Abstrak ......................................................................................................... iii
Acknowledgement ........................................................................................ iv
Table of Contents ........................................................................................ v
List of Tables ............................................................................................... viii
List of Figures ............................................................................................... ix
List of Appendices ......................................................................................... x

CHAPTER 1 ..................................................................................................... 1
INTRODUCTION .............................................................................................. 1
1.1 Background of the Study ......................................................................... 1
1.2 Problem Statement .................................................................................. 2
1.3 Research Question ................................................................................... 7
1.4 Research Objectives ................................................................................ 8
1.5 Significance of Study .............................................................................. 8
1.6 Scope of Study ......................................................................................... 9
1.7 Organization of Chapter ......................................................................... 10

CHAPTER 2 ..................................................................................................... 12
LITERATURE REVIEW ................................................................................... 12
2.1 Introduction .............................................................................................. 12
2.2 Work Engagement ................................................................................... 12
2.3 Person-Job Fit ......................................................................................... 15
2.4 Person-organization Fit .......................................................................... 16
2.5 Person-group Fit ..................................................................................... 18
2.6 Person Supervisor Fit ............................................................................. 19
2.7 Research Framework .............................................................................. 21
2.8 Development of Hypotheses ................................................................... 22
  2.8.1 Relationship between Person-job fit and Work Engagement .......... 22
  2.8.2 Relationship between Person-organization fit and Work Engagement .... 23
  2.8.3 Relationship between Person-group fit and Work Engagement .......... 23
  2.8.4 Relationship between Person-supervisor fit and Work Engagement .... 24
5.3 Relationship between Person-job Fit and Work Engagement..................48
5.4 Relationship between Person-organization Fit and Work Engagement........49
5.5 Relationship between Person-group Fit and Work Engagement ................49
5.6 Relationship between Person-supervisor Fit and Work Engagement ........50
5.7 Implications for Practice ........................................................................50
5.8 Limitations and Direction for Future Study ...........................................51
5.9 Conclusions ..........................................................................................52
REFERENCES ..........................................................................................53
Table 3.1 Work engagement items 28
Table 3.2 Person-job fit items 29
Table 3.3 Person-organization fit items 30
Table 3.4 Person-group fit items 31
Table 3.5 Person-supervisor fit items 32
Table 3.7 The Cronbach’s Alpha for each research measures from the pilot study (n = 30) 33
Table 4.1 Demographic characteristics of participants (n=137) 45
Table 4.2 Descriptive statistics, scale reliabilities and correlations of variables 50
Table 4.3 Regression results of person-job fit, person-organization fit, person-group fit, and person-supervisor fit on work engagement 52
Table 4.4 Summary of hypotheses testing 53
## List of Figures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Figure 2.1</th>
<th>Research framework</th>
<th>21</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
**List of Appendices**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Appendix</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Appendix A-1</td>
<td>Sample of Questionnaire (English version)</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appendix A-2</td>
<td>Sample of Questionnaire (Bahasa Malaysia version)</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appendix B</td>
<td>SPSS Output</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CHAPTER 1
INTRODUCTION

1.1 Background of the Study

Today’s employees are not only considering the pay and benefits that they will gain but the most important thing is the environment of the workplace itself. The relationships with the collegues, supervisors, and tasks itself contributes to the quality of the association with the work. With those relationships and the environment in which workers interact are positive, workers feel valued and respected. Workers take pride in what they do, perform better and care about the employer’s future. In other words, workers become engaged and connected to the organization, customers and coworkers.

Many agree that workers who were engage in their work tend to stay longer in the organization rather than disengaged workers. However, highly engaged individuals were often found in the high performance units. According to Harter (2001), employees want to engage with work that has meaning and is an extension of their personalities and dreams. Previous studies regarding work engagement have focused on the reliability and validity of measuring instruments (Barkhuizen & Rothmann, 2006; Storm & Rothmann, 2003), the relationship between burnout and work engagement (Coetzer & Rothmann, 2007), and the effect of job demands and job resources on work engagement (Rothmann & Jordaan, 2006). This study attempts to explore the workplace factors that contribute to the work engagement among employees. Particularly, this study focuses on employees perceived of fit such as
person-job fit, person-organisation fit, person-group fit and person-supervisor fit and their impact on work engagement.

1.2 Problem Statement

Due to the rapid changing in the business environment and not exception the financial crisis, work engagement has been seen as a major concern in every organization. Business environment is global and competitive, and to bring a necessary business results, companies are trying hard to increase their performance in order to place their company ahead of their competitors. In order to compete effectively, employers must find the best ways to inspire their employees to apply their full potential and capabilities to their work, and if they do not, part of the valuable employees’ resources remains unavailable for the company (Bakker and Leiter, 2010).

When dealing with financial crisis many organization facing problem to retain their talented talent. During the financial crisis, organization may suffer in term of lost the bonuses, wage freezes, downsizing, cutting of overtime and so on. The insistence to improve the performance during the crisis may create the unnecessary conflicts because the employers know that they might lost their talented employees due to that problem. Moreover, unwanted employee turnover is one of the biggest challenges to the organizations since it may incur a lot of cost (Taylor, 2002). When they are losing the team members it will effect major agony, increase work pressure, decreased the employee morale and might also effected the failure to achieving desired orgazanition results (Mobley, 1982). According to Schraeder et al. (2006), the unsuccessful of turnover strategy may be due to the psychological impact (Schraeder et al., 2006) on
surviving employees that may affect their level of work engagement within organization. The disengaged employees is someone who distancing from work roles (Kahn, 1990) and would not perform their job effectively. This may cause to low employees’ performance and indirectly will affect the company’s profit.

Additionally, there are studies that shown a decreasing level of work engagement among employees. For example, a recent survey that conducted in Canada by Towers Perrin’s (2005) consulting firm, have shown that only 17% of the employees are fully engaged in their job and their level of work engagement have declined significantly since 1999. The percentage of highly engaged employees has dropped 4% since 2003. In addition, a Gallup Management Journal Report (Crabtree, 2004) claimed that only 29% of employees in the United States are actively engaged in their jobs and this situation needed an action to increase the level of work engagement among employees. Thus, the needs in investigating the factors that could increase the work engagement level are crucial for organizational success, especially in Malaysia and particularly in manufacturing industries.

Manufacturing sector is one of the most important businesses in Malaysia because it is the second contributor to Malaysia’s Gross Domestic Product (GDP) after the service sector. The manufacturing sector remains the largest source of employment opportunities, accounting for 27 percent of total employment or 2.455 million persons (Economic Report 2000/2001). The growing demand for labour in the sector, growing at 9.0 percent per annum during the period, coupled with industrial restructuring towards higher value-added products and activities, resulted in labour shortages not only at the production level but also at the skilled and semi-skilled levels (Eight
Malaysian Plan, 2001-2005). This highlights the significant number of employees in Malaysia are working in manufacturing companies. In addition, the study is conducted in the manufacturing sector which are most affected by the economic crisis. According to the Malaysian Ministry of Human Resources (2009) about 13,171 employees from the manufacturing sector have been retrenched from January 2008 until February 2009. The huge number of retrenchment among employees in manufacturing company drive the study to trigger out the important factors that contribute to the extension. There are also claims in Malaysia that the level of work engagement in manufacturing companies is very low compared to other industries. The workers are not absorbed in their works, and most of them are doing their job for the purpose of earning (The Star, 2007). There is no motivation and inspirations that drives the workers to pull all their effort and give the best in performing their tasks. This proves that not only these workers are failing in becoming good employees; they are also failing in managing their psychological wellbeing and behaviour in their daily routine.

There are many factors that contribute to determine the employee’s level of engagement towards their work. Work engagement is argued to be associated with a sustainable workload, feelings of choice and control, appropriate recognition and reward, a supportive work community, fairness and justice, and meaningful and valued work (Saks, 2006). Similarly, according to a survey conducted in thirty-two countries by Walker Information, the factors that influencing more to achieve employee commitment (and one could argue work engagement) are fair, care and concern for employees, and trust (Frank, Finnegan & Taylor, 2004). However, while the debate over the existence and exact definition of work engagement continues,
there is little doubt about the importance of perception of fit in the workplace. The perception of fit for each employees towards their job will lead to the satisfaction and boosting their engagement level to perform a great performance.

Perceptions held by employees can greatly influence their engagement levels. For example, perceptions of the procedures used to determine pay raises uniquely contribute to such factors as organizational commitment and trust in supervisors which both are strongly related to work engagement. Organizations that wish to improve levels of work engagement can focus on increasing and strengthening employees’ perceptions of support they receive from the organization (Saks, 2006). Many organizations seem to have forgotten that perception begins at the onset of the employee-employer relationship with the application process. A fair application process should be the first touch-point for each and every employee. First expressions means a lot not exception while undergoing selection and application process.

Perception of fit by the employees towards their job have the relationship with their perception in the environment of organization. Environment plays an important aspects that always influence employee attitude. Research indicates that people pay attention to several aspects of their work environment including how they are treated, the relationships they form with colleagues and managers, and the actual work they perform. The fit between what we bring to our work environment and the environmental demands influences not only our behavior but also our engagement towards our work. Similarly, in the organization when there are newcomers, they should adapt the organization’s environment instead of the task itself, the subordinates, the superior and the organization in generally. When our abilities match
job demands, and when our values match company values, we tend to be more satisfied with our job and more committed to the company we work for (Kristof-Brown, Zimmerman & Johnson, 2005).

Research shows that people pay attention to several factors of their work environment, including characteristics of the job (person-job fit), how they are treated (person-organization fit) and the relationships they form with colleagues and managers (person-group & person-supervisor fit). After accepting a job, employees come to work with a set of expectations and understanding of their responsibilities and rights. In other words, they have a psychological contract. A psychological contract is an unwritten understanding about what the employee will bring to the work environment and what the company will provide in exchange. When people do not get what they expect, they experience a psychological contract which leads to low work engagement. Strong influence over employee engagement level is how fairly they are treated. People pay attention to the fairness of company policies and procedures, treatment from supervisors, and pay and other rewards they receive from the company (Cohen-Charash & Spector, 2001). The other predictors of employee’s happiness at work and engagement to their company are the relationships with co-workers and managers. The people employees interact with, how friendly they are, whether we are socially accepted in our work group, whether we are treated with respect by them are important that influence happiness at work. Research also shows that employee relationship with their manager, how considerate the manager is, and whether employee build a trust based relationship with their manager are critically important to their job satisfaction and organizational commitment (Bauer et.al, 2007). When the manager and overall management listen to employee, care about employee, and value
employee’s opinions, they tend to feel good at work. Even small actions may show employees that the management cares about them (Dvorak, 2007).

There are points presented by the researchers which are complementary and they agree that engagement creates the prospect for employees to attach closely with their managers, co-workers and organization in general. When employees engaging with their working environment it may results the positive attitude toward their job and are willing to do high-quality job. This is because when employees are fitting well with the environment of work it may motivate them to highly engaged in their work responsibilities through effectively accomplishing work goal. Unfortunately, there are limited study conducted to measure the relationship of those four perception (person-job, person-organization, person-group and person-supervisor) fit with the employee engagement in the academic line. There are less conducted empirical researches about work engagement in Asia (e.g. Bhatnagar, 2007; Koyuncu et al., 2006; Bhatnagar and Srivastava, 2007) rather than what they had done in western country. So, this study is conducted with an intention to investigate the relationship of those perceptions with work engagement, particularly in manufacturing industry in Malaysia.

1.3 Research Question

Based on the problems discussed above, the central question for this study would be “what kind of employees’ fit are considered critical in influencing individual’s work engagement.” Specifically:

1. Does person-job fit related to employee work engagement?
2. Does person-organization fit related to employee work engagement?
3. Does person-group fit related to employee work engagement?
4. Does person-supervisor fit related to employee work engagement?

1.4 Research Objectives

Generally, the study aims to examine the types of employees’ fit that might influence work engagement among employees in the manufacturing sector. Therefore, to answer the research questions posted above, the following research objectives were developed:

1. to examine the relationship between person-job fit and work engagement;
2. to investigate the relationship between person-organization fit and work engagement;
3. to examine the relationship between person-group fit and work engagement;
4. to determine the relationship between person-supervisor fit and work engagement

1.5 Significance of Study

This study is conducted to examine how person-job fit, person-organization fit, person-group fit and person-supervisor fit influence employee’s work engagement. It is hope that, the findings from this study may benefit both scholars and practitioners regarding methods for improving employees’ work engagement. From the theoretical
perspective, potential findings from this study may contribute to the current body of knowledge on work engagement.

A review of literature indicates that there are the relationship between employees perceived of fit towards work engagement. The level of employees engagement also being effected by the task, organization, colleagues and also supervisor itself. Previous studies shows that person-group fit and person-supervisor fit are relatively new topic with regard to person environment fit. Since person–group fit and person-supervisor fit are so new, limited research has been conducted to demonstrate how coworkers and supervisors influences individual outcomes in to boosting their level of work engagement. Most of the studies on work engagement were done to investigate the other perspectivers rather on the perception of employees fit.

The findings may also provide the organization especially in the manufacturing industry on ways of enhancing employees’ work engagement. Specifically, on the role of person-job fit, person-organization fit, person-group fit and person-supervisor fit on work engagement. Thus, helping the management to identify and focus on the most important and critical factors in achieving highly engaged employees. This is a broader contribution that extends beyond the manufacturing industry.

1.6 Scope of Study

The main objective of this study is to examine factors that might influence work engagement among manufacturing employees. Specifically, this study aims to identify whether factors such as person-job fit, person-organization fit, person-group fit and
person-supervisor fit have a direct relationship toward work engagement. A total of 137 manufacturing employees from clerical to managerial level participated in this study. The study adopted a quantitative research design where data for this study was collected at one point in time (cross-sectional) through distribution of questionnaire.

1.7 Organization of Chapter

This chapter is the first of five chapters in this research paper. Chapter 2 gives general review of the literature on work engagement. Discussion in Chapter 2 continues with past empirical findings on factors that might influence work engagement such as person-job fit, person-organization fit, person-group fit and person-supervisor fit. The chapter concludes with the development of the research hypotheses.

Chapter 3 describes the method for the study, namely the research design and procedure. The chapter reports the selection of participants, sample types and size, and the development of questionnaire for the research. Chapter 3 ends with a brief description of the strategies and procedures that were used to analyze data collected from the survey.

Chapter 4 reports the results and their interpretation for the study. There are reports of the descriptive statistical analysis, bivariate correlation analysis, and regressions analysis. The results are summarized in a number of tables to facilitate interpretation. The findings were compared to those found in the past research reviewed in Chapter 2. New findings were also discussed.
Chapter 5, the final chapter, presents the general discussions and conclusion of the study, and their implications for both researchers and practitioner. Chapter 5 concludes with the limitations of the study and some suggestions for future research.
CHAPTER 2
LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1 Introduction

This chapter reviews literature on work engagement and factors that might influence engagement towards the job. The chapter begins by describing the concept of work engagement, and followed by discussing the findings from past empirical findings on work engagement. The chapter then reviews how factors such as person-job fit, person-organization fit, person-group fit and person-supervisor fit related to work engagement. Lastly, the chapter concludes by discussing the research framework and the development of hypotheses.

2.2 Work Engagement

The concept of work engagement was first discovered in the mid 1990’s (Harris, 2006). The term employee engagement was first published in a Kahn’s study. Kahn (1990) described employee engagement as individuals’ attachment to their work roles. He then differentiate work engagement from others employee roles in workplace and these include how employees get involve in the job, level of commitment and the way of employees while performing the tasks. Particularly, the terms of work engagement refers to the degree in which employees within an organization are willing to perform their best in role performance with full of motivation and enthusiasm.
In the literature, work engagement has theorized to have impact on business performance (Harris, 2006), financial performance, organizational success (Demerouti and Bakker, 2006; Harter et al., 2002, Richman, 2006; Lockwood, 2007), job satisfaction, organizational commitment (Maslach et al., 2001), in-role performance (Bakker et al., 2004), willingness to do extra-role performance (Bakker et al., 2004 and Schaufeli et al., 2006), safety (Harter et al., 2002; Lockwood, 2007; Buckingham and Coffman, 1999), employees intention to quit (Schaufeli & Bakker, 2004; Sonnentag, 2003), employees productivity (Bhatnagar, 2007; Buckingham & Coffman, 1999), loyalty, and employees retention (Lockwood, 2007; Buckingham & Coffman, 1999; Bhatnagar, 2007).

Over the years, experts in HRM have defined work engagement in various ways. Engagement is not only about satisfaction and commitment towards the organization but go beyond that particular issues. Scholars such Schaufeli and Bakker (2003), Schaufeli, Salanova, Gonzalez Roma and Bakker (2001) view engagement at work as an agent to overcome burnout or getting bored while doing their task. They define work engagement as a positive attitude, fulfilling, work related state of mind that is characterized by the “vigor, dedication, and also absorption”. “Vigor refers to the concentration efforts towards the job, an exhibition of high levels of energy while working and the tendency to remain resolute in the face of task difficulty” (Schaufeli et al. 2002). Meanwhile, dedication is refers to a strong involvement in the individual’s work and experiencing a sense of significance, enthusiasm and inspiration (Schaufeli et al. 2002). Lastly, Schaufeli et al. (2002) refers “absorption as the characteristic of being full concentrated and happily engrossed in one’s work”.
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In other writing, Dernovsek (2008) define employee engagement as a positive employees’ emotional attachment and also employees’ commitment while Richard (2007) refers employee engagement as creating alignment with the organizational goals, especially in the multinational organizations. Similarly, authors such Malavika, Bishakha and Ganapathy (2010) also having similar view where they had defined employee engagement as the level of commitment and participations of employees towards the organizations. According to them, the level of employee’s engagement can be measured through employees’s degree of positive or negative emotional attachment to their job, co- workers and organization which influences their willingness and learns to perform at work. Malivika and his colleagues also stated that employee engagement give direct impacts to the employee’s productivity on their job. Employees who showed the commitment and loyalty towards their job are describe as a productive employees and they normally should perform healthy and satisfied outputs for both, themselves and also the organization.

In Malaysian manufacturing industry, engaged employees should aims their desired goals towards the job. Employee should committed to something in the organization, tried hard while perform and stayed as long as possible in the organization to show their commitment towards the organization. An engaged employees should have the passion to complete all the task with the desired result, helps the company to achieve the goals and at the end the engaging and commitment towards the job may beneficial to their career developments and their performance.

In short, various authors had been emphasized that employee engagement is kind of self attachment toward organization business plan. This indicates that employees who
are more engage towards the organization may produce higher quality of performance and will retain in the organization in a long duration and vice versa. Therefore, by realizing the importance of work engagement in the organization, creating and enhancing the level of work engagement among employees are regarded as crucial in achieving organizational’s high performance.

2.3 Person-Job Fit

Person-job fit is one of the important criteria in selecting employees for the organization (Werbel & Gilliland, 1999). In general, person-job fit can be defined as the process of matching the employee’s characteristic with the jobs or tasks that are perform at work. Many studies in the past has conceptualize person-job fit as the match between individual knowledge, skills, and abilities (KSA) and demands of the job or the needs/desires of an individual and what is provided by the job (Edwards, 1991; O’Reilly, Chatman, & Caldwell, 1991). In simple word, person-job fit is about the match between workers and their work. Applicants who perceive that their KSAs and job requirements are match will probably remain in the selection process and accept the job offer. On the other hand, applicant who didn’t find the fit between their KSA and the job will refuse or been unaccepted by the organization for that particular position. However, a growing number of practitioners and researchers argued that this is not enough (Bowen et al., 1991; Kristof, 1996; Montgomery, 1996; Werbel and Gilliland, 1999). Candidates might not accepting the job offer because of other reason than being fit with the work.
There are authors who define person-job fit as compatibility of individual’s characteristics with his or her job’s demands (Kristof, 1996; Cable and DeRue, 2002). It measures how individual characteristics meet the demands of work environment, particularly their job (Munchinsky and Monahan, 1987). In addition, Munchinsky and Monahan’s (1987) had constructed person-job fit as a complimentary fit or congruence between employee’s KSAs and their job demands. Its parallel with the definition given by Sekiguchi (2004) which conceptualized person-job fit as a congruence between the abilities of an employees and the attributes of the job.

2.4 Person-organization Fit

In general, person-organization fit refers to the compatibility between individu and the employing organization. Kristof (1996) define person-organization as the matches between individuals and organization that occurs when at least one entity provides the other requirement or they shared similar basis charecteristics or both. In other writing, person-organization fit has been defined as the congruence between patterns of organizational values and patterns of individual values (Chatman, 1989). Sekiguchi (2004) refers person-organization fit as the extend to which sharing of value and characteristics by employee and also the organization where they tried to meet each other’s need and requirement. From the given definition, it can be said that person-organization fit can be both either complementary or supplementary fit. Kristof (1996) argued that the definition of person-organization fit can be divided into two dimensions which are demand-abilities and need-supply fit. Person-organization demand-abilities fit occur when employees KSA are matches with the requirement of organizations. While, the need-supply fit is the degree when individual’s
psychological needs are fulfill by the organizations. Win-win situation are being practice in this definition when these two entities fulfill each other requirement. Through demand-abilities fit, employees shows their skills, abilities and knowledge that help organization to achieve their mission and vision. While in retaliation, organization give salary and other benefits to fulfill employees psychological needs.

Furthermore, the term person-organization fit describes the connection between individual and organizational values instead of whether their goal congruence with the organizational leaders, the individual preferences or needs or with the organizational systems, structure and organizational climate (Kristof, 1996). Following the Schneider’s (1987) theory of attraction-selection-attrition, researchers have found that individuals tend to work in long duration in the organization which have the goals as theirs (Cable & Judge, 1996). Thus, researchers and practitioners found that person-organization fit is the key to maintaining the flexible and committed workforce that is necessary in the competitive business environment and a tight labor market (Sekiguchi, 2004).

In addition, studies on person-organization fit by Louis (1980), O’Reilly, Chatman and Caldwell, (1991), and Verquer et al., (2003) had collectively agreed that person-organization fit can be described as a value congruence between individual and their respective employing organization. Person-organziation fit reflects the extend to which individual and organization values match each other (Louis, 1980). While Verquer et al., (2003) argued that the value congruence from both entities can be a better prediction in measuring employees attitudes, such as job performance, commitment and intention to leave.
2.5 Person-group Fit

Person-group fit focuses on the interpersonal compatibility between individuals and their work groups (Kristof, 1996). Past reserachers have claimed that person-group fit is experienced when one person interpersonally feel matched with other members of his or her workgroup concerning on their different criteria (Judge and Ferris, 1992; Werbel & Gillaland, 1999). Among all the types of fit that being discussed by the researchers, person-group fit can be categorized as one of the most under researched areas (Kristof-Brown et al., 2005).

Despite high levels of interest in coworker similarity on demographic variables (Riordan, 2000), person-group fit also based on deep-level characteristics which include values, personality and also abilities of each person. According to the previous studies, only a handful of published studies have examined the fit on characteristics such as goals (Kristof-Brown & Stevens, 2001; Witt, 1998) or values (Adkins, Ravlin, & Meglino, 1996; Becker, 1992; Good & Nelson, 1971). There are, however, several studies that have examined person-group fit on personality traits (Barsade, Ward, Turner, & Sonnenfeld, 2000; Hobman, Bordia, & Gallois, 2003; Kristof-Brown, Barrick, & Stevens, in press; Slocombe & Bluedorn, 1999; Strauss, Barrick, & Connerley, 2001). These studies are distinct from research on team similarity or homogeneity (e.g., Barry & Stewart, 1997; Jehn, Northcraft, & Neale, 1999) and studies that aggregate individuals’ fit to the unit level (e.g., Harrison, Shaffer, & Bhaskar, 2002; Ostroff, 1993; Salvaggio, 2004).
Generally, the characteristics are being distinguished whether it meets complementary or supplementary fit. Supplementary fit refers to the person supplements or possesses characteristics which are similar to others in the same environment whereas, complementary fit is the weakness or need of the environment if offset by the strength of the individual or vice versa (Muchinsky and Monahan, 1987). For example, person-group fit can exist when people shares their values and traits with their team members (supplementary fit), or when the person possesses some abilities that help the team to perform their task (complementary fit). Regardless the characteristics are values, abilities or personality, person who assessed compatibility on these characteristics on their group members will produce positive outcomes to the organization (Kristof-Brown and Seong, 2012).

2.6 Person Supervisor Fit

Person-supervisor fit concern the perceived match between employees’ and supervisors’ characteristics instead of their values, personality, and also the behavioral styles. An organization’s culture and values and supervisors’ characteristics are both highly significant impacts on the employees. Not only person-supervisor fit perceptions but those of their supervisor (supervisor’s fit with an employee) may affect employee perceptions and outcomes as well (Liden, Wayne, & Stilwell, 1993). Person-supervisor fit perceptions refer to the perceived fit between employee and supervisor characteristics. Supervisor characteristics and attitudes are important to employees in order to lead to their perceptions towards their work. Moreover, supervisors are the important key factors that will lead the organizational’s culture turns into practices by their employees. Employees who perceived fit with the culture
will transmit that to their daily working environment. Therefore, supervisors are the one who are able to further strengthen or weaken these positive perceptions. It has been shown that if employees feel that their values match with those of the supervisor, they are more satisfied with the job and general work environment (Wexley, Alexander, Greenawalt, & Couch, 1980).

In addition, in a research conducted in China, the researcher had found that the supervisor and employee relationship in a Chinese culture is a paternalistic with supervisors having high authority over their employees and employees being loyal to their supervisor (Farh & Cheng, 2000). The employee-supervisor relationship is particular importance for employees in Chinese cultures (Cheng, Jiang, & Riley, 2003). Supervisors in the Chinese culture not only have high power over their employees but they also have personalized relationships with them where personnel decisions depend on the personal bonds that supervisors have with their employees (Farh, Earley, & Lin, 1997). Chinese employees’ organizational life’s are, therefore, particularly dependent on the relationship with their supervisor (e.g., Aycan, 2008). Hence, although employees may experience fit with the values of the organization they also may need a good relationship with their supervisor in order to develop strong emotional ties with their organization. An early study in Chinese culture also shown that employee perceived similarity with the supervisor was directly related to employee loyalty towards the supervisor (Huang & Iun, 2006).

According to similarity-attraction hypothesis, it shown that people are drawn to similar with others because they are looking for consensual validation of their opinions and abilities and try to seek for the consistency of their belief systems
(Byrne, 1971). In organizations environment, employees depend to their supervisor in order to gain rewards and career opportunities that makes them to appreciate and make a strong bond with their supervisors. Employees who perceive similarities with their supervisor tend to have positive perception about their leader (Eagle & Lord, 1970). Leader-Employee Exchange (LMX) theory positively contribute to the employee’s effective reactions towards the supervisor such as satisfaction with the supervisor (Gerstner and Day, 1997) and also commitment to the supervisor (Law et.al., 2000; Vandernberghe., 2004).

2.7 Research Framework

The research framework for this study shows the relationship between person-job fit, person-organization fit, person-group fit, person-supervisor fit and work engagement. In this study, person-job fit, person-organization fit, person-group fit and person-supervisor fit are the independent variables, while work engagement is the dependent variable.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Independent variables</th>
<th>Dependent variable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Person-job fit</td>
<td>Work engagement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Person-organization fit</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Person-group fit</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Person-supervisor fit</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2.8 Development of Hypotheses

2.8.1 Relationship between Person-job fit and Work Engagement

Though there are numerous studies been conducted on work engagement, there are still limited studies conducted on the relationship between person-job fit and work engagement (Scroggins, 2008). Based on the study conducted by Scroggins (2008), he found that one way to achieve meaningful work is through self-concept-job fit. He further argued that a meaningful work experience is the foundation for employee engagement in the organizations. In other words, when the tasks match the individual’s self concept, the individual will perceive the task as meaningful and this will them more engage with the organization in a long period. Apart from that, employees who perceived their self-concept-job fit, where the have the abilities in adjusting their skills towards the work implementation, will experience a meaningful feeling towards their work accomplishment and will feel that all their sacrifice in terms of energy, time and effort in performing the task are worthwhile.

The relationship between person-job fit and work engagement can also be explained by Ajzen’s (1991) Theory of Planned Behavior (TPB). According to TBP, employees who have high KSA’s tend to have more control on the implementation of their job. In return, employees who feel that they have the skill to carry out the job will be more engaged. Hence, the below hypothesis was proposed:

H1: There is positive relationship between person-job fit and work engagement
2.8.2 Relationship between Person-organization fit and Work Engagement

A study conducted by Scroggins (2008) found that employees who are highly engaged in their job are almost twice as likely to remain in the organization and engage in discretionary or organizational citizenship behavior. In other writing, Lewin (1951) with his Field Theory has proposed that the interaction between person and the environment surrounding them will lead to certain behavior. In other words, theory argued that the environment will influence people behavior in certain ways. If the person perceived the environment surrounding them as positive, the person will show a positive work behavior. Similarly, people tend to be more engaged in the roles and responsibilities by performing the job effectively when employees perceived fit with their organization. Thus, the following hypothesis was proposed:

H2: There is positive realationship between person-organization fit and work engagement.

2.8.3 Relationship between Person-group fit and Work Engagement

According to the previous study, the relationship between employees and their group members are important in assimilation and retention for new organization members (Ferris et al., 1985). Employees can work efficiently towards their job and work colleagues if they found it matched their abilities and talents (Kristof, 1996).

Person-group fit has becoming a more relevant construct due to the increased number of teams operating in the work environment. Vancouver (1991) used group cohesiveness theories and member constituency goal congruence person-
environment fit” to explain the relationship between person-group fit and job engagement. Member group constituency goal congruence is related to the concept of group cohesion. Group cohesion is a multidimensional construct comprised of agreement with norms, similarity of goals, member attraction, and intention to remain as a member. The research indicates a significance relationship between person-group fit and work engagement. Therefore, the following hypothesis is proposed:

H3: There is positive relationship between person-group fit and work engagement

2.8.4 Relationship between Person-supervisor fit and Work Engagement

According to Nancy (2007), employee engagement become the complex concept nowadays, with many issues arises that will influence the levels. So, to combat the problem, Nancy (2007), emphasized that communication between manager and employee is important in order to enhance the level of “work engagement”. The relationship between manager/supervisor and their employee can be built by well planned communication strategic.

A recent study shows that employees who have trust in their managers tend to have more pride in the organization and are likely to apply their KSAs for their own success and achieve organization’s mission and vision (Blessing, 2006). Furthermore, the characteristics of the supervisor himself/herself will promote the work engagement among employees (Corporate Leadership Council, 2004). Through the report, they found eight characteristics of supervisors that may boost employees level of engagement and these include supervisors who show commitment to enforce diversity, take responsibility for successes and failures, demonstrate honesty and
integrity, help finding solutions to problems, respects and care for employees as individuals, set realistic performance expectations, demonstrate passion for success and defend direct reports. In short, the report shows the importance of connection between supervisor-employee relationship to boost levels of employees work engagement. Hence, the following hypothesis was proposed:

H4: There is positive relationship between person-supervisor fit and work engagement.

2.9 Conclusion

This chapter has discussed literature on work engagement, person-job fit, person-organization fit, person group fit and person supervisor fit. Discussion on the research framework has also been presented. The following chapter, Chapter 3, describes the method for the study.
CHAPTER 3

METHOD

3.1 Introduction

Chapter 3 describes the method used in this study. In this chapter, the research design, the population and sampling design, operational definition and measurement, layout of the question, pilot test, and data collection procedure are described. The chapter ends with the technique of data analysis.

3.2 Research Design

The study employed quantitative research design. As argued by many authors, quantitative research design allows the researcher to test the relationship between selected research variables (Kreuger & Neuman, 2006); can reliably determine if one idea or concept is better than the alternatives (Anderson, Sweeney & Williams, 2000); and to answer questions regarding the relationships between the tested variables with the purpose of explaining, predicting, and controlling phenomena (Leedy & Ormrod, 2005). Therefore, adopting quantitative research design was regarded as appropriate as it allows the testing of relationship between person-job fit, person-organization fit, person-group fit”, person-supervisor fit and work engagement. Also, such design allows for analysis to be conducted on a large sample and allows for the usage of questionnaire to be distributed to the respondent.

In this study, individual was taken as the unit of analysis as respondents’ perceptions about person-job fit, person-organization fit, person-group fit and person-supervisor
fit become the basis to understand their influence towards work engagement. Finally, cross-sectional design was adopted, where the data is collected at one point of time, as the design is simple, inexpensive and allows for the collection of data in a relatively short period.

3.3 Population and Sampling Design

3.3.1 Population

The population of this study includes all employees employed in manufacturing companies at Batu Kawan Industrial Park. There are 9 manufacturing companies located at Batu Kawan Industrial Park. Out of 9 manufacturing companies contacted, only 4 of them were willing to participate in the study. The total number of employees in these four manufacturing companies is 4000 (Federal of Malaysian Manufacturer, 2012).

3.3.2 Sampling Size and Technique

Sampling is the process of selecting a numbers of units for a study and that selected units represent the larger group from the populations that were selected (Gay & Diehl, 1996). According to them, to determine the sample size, the researcher needs to identify the population, determine the required sample and lastly, sample is selected.

In this study, the population is 4000. According to Krejcie and Morgan (1970), only 351 was needed for the sample. This means 351 manufacturing employees are needed to represent the whole study population. This sample size fit with Roscoe’s rule of
thumb where a sample that is larger than 30 and less than 500 is appropriate for most research. However, the researcher has decided to distribute 500 questionnaires with the intention to receive high response rate. Since, the exact number of technical employees from each of the 4 companies was not known, the distribution of questionnaire was depended on the HR representative. Thus, the sampling technique of proportionate sampling could not be conducted. Table 3.1 shows the distribution of questionnaire for the four companies

Table 3.1
*Distribution of questionnaire*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Companies</th>
<th>Total of questionnaire distributed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Company 1</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Company 2</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Company 3</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Company 4</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>500</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.3 **Operational Definitions and Measurements**

3.3.1 **Work Engagement Measures**

Work engagement is the dependent variable in this study. In this study, work engagement is operationalized as a positive attitude, fulfilling, work related state of mind that is characterized by the vigor, dedication, and also absorption (Schaufeli & Bakker, 2003). Work engagement was measured by 17 items developed by Schaufeli and Baker (2003). Several studies have reported that the scale has adequate internal consistency (the Cronbach alphas ranging from .70 to .95) (Schaufeli & Bakker Schaufeli & Salanova, 2003) Based on a five-point scale whereby, 1 = strongly
disagree, and 5 = strongly agree, participants rated their degree of agreement with the work engagement statements.

Table 3.2
Work engagement items

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Operational definition</th>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Authors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Work engagement   | A positive, fulfilling, and work-related state of mind that is characterized by the vigor, dedication and absorption. | 1. At my work, I feel that I am bursting with energy  
2. I find the work that I do full of meaning and purpose  
3. Time flies when I’m working  
4. At my job, I feel strong and vigorous  
5. I am enthusiastic about my job  
6. When I am working, I forget everything else around me  
7. My job inspires me  
8. When I get up in the morning, I feel like going to work  
9. I feel happy when I am working intensely  
10. I am proud of the work that I do  
11. I am immersed in my work  
12. I can continue working for very long periods at a time  
13. To me, my job is challenging  
14. I get carried away when I’m working  
15. At my job, I am very resilient, mentally  
16. It is difficult to detach myself from my job  
17. At my work I always persevere, even when things do not go well | Schaufeli & Baker (2003) |

3.3.2 Person-job fit

Person-job fit is the independent variable in this study. Person-job fit is operationalized as employees’ perception whether their competencies such as their knowledge, skills, and abilities congruence with the demands of the job (Lauver & Kristof-Brown, 2001; Cable & DeRue, 2002). Person-job fit is measured by 6 items developed by Lauver and Kristof-Brown (2001) and Cable and DeRue (2002). The original three items developed by Lauver and Kristof-Brown (2001) only measured the level of employees’ skills and abilities. Therefore, to measure employees’
knowledge, another three items developed by Cable and DeRue (2002) were included. Several studies have reported that the scale has adequate internal consistency (the Cronbach alphas ranging from .80 to .89) (Cable & Rue, 2002; Lauver & Kristof-Brown, 2001). Based on a five-point scale whereby, 1 = strongly disagree and 5 = strongly agree, participants rated their degree of agreement with the person-job fit statements.

Table 3.3  
*Person-job fit items*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Operational definition</th>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Authors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Person-job fit</td>
<td>Employees’ perception whether their competencies such as knowledge, skills, and abilities congruence with the demands of the job</td>
<td>1. My abilities fit the demands of my job</td>
<td>Cable &amp; DeRue (2002); Lauver &amp; Kristof-Brown (2001)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2. I have the right skills and abilities to perform in my job</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3. There is a good match between the requirement of my job and my skills</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4. The match is very good between the demands of my job and my personal skills.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5. My abilities and training are a good fit with the requirements of my job.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6. My personal abilities and education provide a good match with the demands that my job places on me</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.3.3 **Person-organization fit**

The second independent variable for this study is person-organization fit. Person-organization fit is operationalized as the compatibility between individual and the employing organization (Kristof, 1996). In this study, person-organization fit is
measured by 4 items developed by Cable and Judge (1996) and Sekiguchi (2004). The four items had satisfactory internal consistency with Cronbach alphas value ranging from .75 to .85 (Hutcheson, 1999; Sekiguchi, 2004). In this study, a five-point scale whereby, 1 = strongly disagree and 5 = strongly agree, was used to measure participants’ degree of agreement with the person-organization fit statements.

Table 3.4
Person-organization fit items

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Operational definition</th>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Authors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Person-organization fit | The compatibility between individual and the employing organization | 1. I possess the skills and abilities to succeed at this organization.  
2. I believe my skills and abilities “match” those required by this organization in general.  
3. I have knowledge and skills that meet the company’s demands.  

3.3.4 Person-group fit Measures

Person-group fit is the third independent variables. In this study, person-group fit operationalized as the compatibility between individuals and their work groups (Kristof, 1996). Person-group fit is measured by 8 items with three subscales namely values, personality traits and abilities that were developed by Cable and DeRue (2002) and Cable and Judge (1996). The adapted items have satisfactory internal consistency (Cronbach Alpha ranging from .91 to .92) (Cable & DeRue, 2002; Cable & Judge, 1996). Based on a five-point scale whereby, 1 = strongly disagree, and 5 =
strongly agree, participants rated their degree of agreement with the person-group fit statements.

Table 3.5
Person-group fit items

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Operational definition</th>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Authors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Person-group fit</td>
<td>the compatibility between individuals and their work groups</td>
<td>1. The things that I value in life are very similar to the things that my team members value.</td>
<td>Cable &amp; DeRue (2001); Cable &amp; Judge (1996)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2. My personal value match my team’s values and culture.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3. My team’s value and culture provide a good fit with the things that I value in life.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4. I feel that my personality matches my team’s personality.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5. My personality provides a good fit with my team’s personality.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6. The match is very good between the demands of my team’s task and my personal skills.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7. My abilities and training are a good fit with the requirements of the team’s task.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8. My abilities and education provide good fit with the demands that my teams tasks place on me.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.3.5 Person-supervisor fit Measures

Person-supervisor fit is the fourth and the last independent variables for this study. In this study, person-supervisor fit is operationalized as the match between employees’ and supervisors’ characteristics instead of in terms of their values, personality, and also the behavioral styles. The 8-items with three subscale namely values, personality traits and abilities were adapted from Cable and Judge (1996) and Cable and DeRue (2002). The items were develop from the person-group fit items with the word group being replace with the work supervisor. In this study, a five-point scale whereby, 1 =
strongly disagree and 5 = strongly agree, was used to measure participants’ degree of agreement with the person-supervisor fit statements.

Table 3.6
Person-supervisor fit items

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Operational definition</th>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Authors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Person-supervisor fit</td>
<td>The match between employees’ and supervisors’ characteristics in terms of values, personality and behavioral styles</td>
<td>1. The things that I value in life are very similar to the things that my supervisor value.</td>
<td>Cable &amp; DeRue (2001); Cable &amp; Judge (1996)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2. My personal value match my supervisor’s values and culture.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3. My supervisor’s value and culture provide a good fit with the things that I value in life</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4. I feel that my personality matches my supervisor’s personality</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5. My personality provides a good fit with my supervisor’s personality</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6. The match is very good between the demands of my supervisor’s task and my personal skills</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7. My abilities and training are a good fit with the requirements of the task given by my supervisor.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8. My abilities and education provide good fit with the demands that my supervisor tasks place on me</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.4 Structure of the Questionnaire

Acknowledging the cultural differences all materials prepared for the participants were provided in both English and Bahasa Malaysia. Participants were given the choice between the two versions so that they could express their ideas freely. Both versions of the questionnaires are shown in Appendix A. Out of 137 respondents, 107 were answering the Bahasa Malaysia version of questionnaires.
The nine-page questionnaire consisted of six sections. Section 1 asked about the work engagement and there are 17 items. Section 2 asked about person-job fit and consists of 6 questions. Questions for person-organization fit were asked in Section 3 and there are 4 items. In Section 4 of the questionnaire, there are 8 items on person-group fit. Section 5 consists of 8 items on person-supervisor fit. The final section of the questionnaire, Section 6, is the demographic variables. A number of demographic variables were also measured for descriptive and control purposes. These include gender, age, ethnic, marital status, highest academic qualifications, total of basic salary received, number of years with the present organization, number of years with present position and type of current position. This information is necessary to show that the sample is representative and to ensure that generalizations to the wider population of firms and employees can be made.

3.5 Pilot Test

Pilot test is carry out before handling the actual data collection where the questionnaire is test and check on a small of subjects (Saunder, Lewis & Thornhill, 2003). It is performed to correct any inadequacies in the instrument prior to data collection. Thus, helping the researcher to find out all the necessary alteration and modification required after the pilot test was implemented (Sekaran, 2000). In other words, the researcher would have a sufficient time to check the reliability, validity and viability of the research instrument and can determine the time needed for conducting the actual study. Since the purpose of conducting pilot test is to determine how well the new test performs, it is essential that the pilot test be determined in a similar situation to the one that the test will actually be utilized in.
For this study, the pilot test was conducted from 15th to 26th September 2013. The questionnaire was distributed to 30 staff from various levels such as operators, clericals, technical, engineers, and executives. Results from the pilot test indicate that no changes in the wording of the questionnaire is needed, and no items to be deleted. All the items used in pilot test is similar to the items that being used in the actual data collection. The internal consistency reliabilities (Cronbach’s Alpha) of the research measures from the pilot study are reported in Table 3.6. As shown in Table 3.16, all variables have satisfactory reliability values ranging from 0.73 to 0.91.

Table 3.7
*The Cronbach’s Alpha for each research measures from the pilot study (n = 137)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>No. of items</th>
<th>Cronbach's Alpha</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Work engagement</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>0.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Person-job fit</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Person-organization fit</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Person-group fit</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Person-supervisor fit</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0.91</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.6 Data Collection Procedure

The process of actual data collection starts once the letter of permission to conduct the study is granted from the Othman Yeop Graduate School of Business. The letter of permission is asked to ensure that the organization under study will give their cooperation in providing with the required data.

For this study, the distribution of the questionnaire was done onsite by either the researcher or by the representative of the organization. They were given ample time to
complete answering the questionnaire where they are given one week to complete the questionnaire. Respondents were assured that all the information given will remain confidential at all times and will be used for only for the purpose of study. They were not requested to identify themselves in that they do not put their names on the survey forms. After a week, the researcher make a telephone call to respondents and the representative of the organization, reminding them about returning the questionnaires.

3.7 Technique of Data Analysis

Data collected for this were analyzed using SPSS (version 20) program for Windows. Analyses were conducted using descriptive statistics, factor analysis, correlation analysis and hypotheses were tested using regression analysis

3.7.1 Descriptive Analysis

Descriptive analysis is referred to as the basic feature of the data in a study. The purpose of conducting descriptive analysis is to provide simple summaries about the sample and about the observations that have been made. The summaries may be either in a quantitative form like summary of statistics, or visual such as simple graphs. Descriptive analysis also helps researcher to simplify a large amount of data in a sensible way. Thus, the researcher is able to present quantitative description in a better, manageable form. In this study, descriptive analysis was conducted to provide simple summaries of the samples and measures.
3.7.2 Correlation Analysis

Correlation analysis determine the relationship between two or more variables (dependent and independent variables). The symbol for correlation is stated as ‘r’ and is ranging from -1.00 to +1.00. The value of -1.00 represents the perfect negative correlation while the value of +1.00 represents the perfect positive correlation. On the other hand, the value of 0.0 represents a lack of correlation. According to Muchinsky (1993), the closer the measure to 1.00, the more likely the relationship is statically significant. The strength of correlation based on the “Guilford Rule of Thumb” (Guilford, 1956) was shown below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Value of Coefficient</th>
<th>Relationship between variables</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-0.30</td>
<td>Very Low Relationship</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.30 - 0.50</td>
<td>Low Relationship</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.50 – 0.70</td>
<td>High Relationship</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-1.00</td>
<td>Very High Relationship</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.7.3 Regression Analysis

According to Pallant (2010), multiple regression is a technique that used to explore the relationship between one continuous dependent variable and a number independent variables. This type of statistical analysis enable to tell the researcher how well is set of variables in predicting a particular outcome. Apart from that, this
statistical analysis will also be able to provide information about the model as a whole and the relative contribution of each variable that makes up the model. As for this study, multiple regression will tell the researcher which of the independent variables (person-job fit, person-organization fit, person-group fit and person-supervisor fit) are able to predict work engagement among the manufacturing employees.

3.8 Conclusions

This chapter has explained the research method and strategy for the study. It described the selection of the respondents, development of the questionnaire, the research materials, and the survey procedure. This chapter also briefly explains the adoption of several analyses such as descriptive, correlation and regression analysis to answer the research objectives. The following chapter, Chapter 4, will discuss the results of the study.
CHAPTER 4
FINDINGS

4.1 Introduction

Chapter 4 reports results of the study. The chapter begins by reporting the response rate and the demographic characteristics of the participants. It then presents the data screening process. The discussions continue with a report on correlation analysis. The chapter concludes with a discussion on regression analysis.

4.2 Response Rate

A total of 500 questionnaires were distributed between early of August and end of October 2013. Respondents were given a week to complete the questionnaire. At the end of the survey period, a total of 140 were returned, yielding a return rate of 28%. However, only data from 137 participants are usable for further analysis.

Table 4.1
Respondents’ response rate

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Companies</th>
<th>Total questionnaire distributed</th>
<th>Total questionnaire received</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Company 1</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Company 2</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Company 3</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Company 4</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>500</strong></td>
<td><strong>140</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.3 Demographic Characteristics of the Participants

Table 4.2 presents the detailed descriptive statistics of the participants’ demographic characteristics. It is noted that 59.10% of the 137 participants in this survey were males. Most of the respondents were below 25 years old. Out of 137 participants, 91.2% were Malay and 52.6% were married. With regards to highest academic qualification, most of the respondents (36.5%) were holding a SPM. Most of the participants (39.4%) received a salary of RM1001 and RM2000. Out of 137 participants, 33.6% had been with the organization between 1 to 3 years. Most of the participants (30.7%) in this study are working as an operator and most of the participants (35%) had been with their current positions for 1 to 3 years.

Table 4.2
Demographic characteristics of the participants (n=137)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Descriptive</th>
<th>Frequencies</th>
<th>(%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>59.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>40.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Below 25</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>36.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26 – 35 years</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>32.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36 – 45 years</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>12.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46 – 55 years</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>13.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56 years and above</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnics</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malay</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>91.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chinese</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marital Status</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>Percentage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>45.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>52.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Divorce/ Separated</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Highest Academic Qualification</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PMR</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPM</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>36.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Certificate</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>11.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diploma</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Degree</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>25.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Monthly Salary</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Below RM1000</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>18.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RM1001- RM2000</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>39.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RM2001 – RM3000</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>22.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RM3001 – RM4000</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>11.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RM4001 – RM5000</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RM5001 – Above</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Years With Current Organization</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than a year</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>24.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-3 Years</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>33.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-7 Years</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>24.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than 7 Years</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>18.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Years with current position</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than a year</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>26.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-3 Years</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experience</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>Percentage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-7 Years</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>21.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than 7 Years</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>17.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Current Position**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Administration</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>12.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant Administration</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manager</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant Manager</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisor</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant Supervisor</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clerk</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineer</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Executive</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>13.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Officer</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operator</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>30.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QC</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safety Officer</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technician</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>14.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical Assistant</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 4.4 Data Screening

The data were examined for data entry accuracy, outliers, and distributional properties before conducting the primary analyses. In this study, data screening was conducted by examining basic descriptive statistics and frequency distributions to identify missing data, outliers, normality, linearity and homoscedasticity.
Descriptive data results showed that there was no missing data found from the 137 returned questionnaires. Fourteen cases were found to be outlier (12, 15, 17, 21, 28, 40, 50, 62, 70, 94, 98, 120, 124, and 129). However, all the cases were retained as the mean values of these cases were similar, and the values were not too different to the remaining distribution.

Normality test is conducted using histograms, skewness and kurtosis. The data appeared to have a normal distribution as the results show none of the variables had skewness greater than .207 or a kurtosis index greater than .411. Besides, all histograms used to check for normality showed that the scores have reasonably normally distributed, implying that data was approximated for all variables at a normal curve.

Lastly, the scatter plot diagrams indicates no evidence of nonlinear patterns for all variables tested in this study and a visual inspection of the distribution of residuals suggested an absence of heteroscedasticity for the variables.

4.5 Correlation Analysis

Table 4.3 presents the means, standard deviations, and Pearson correlations of variables for the 137 participants who participated in the study. The internal consistency reliabilities (Cronbach’s Alpha) of the research measures are reported in parenthesis along the diagonal of the correlation table. As shown in Table 4.3, the Cronbach’s alpha for all the independent variables (person-job fit, person-organization fit, person-group fit and person-supervisor fit) have shown high
reliability value ranging from .70 to .89. It is also noted that work engagement also has high reliability value of .75.

The correlation results in Table 4.3 shows significant positive relationship between person-job fit and work engagement (r = .523, p < .01). This finding implies that the higher the fit between person and his / her job, the higher the engagement towards the job.

There was also significant positive correlation between person-organization fit and work engagement (r = .388, p < .01). This finding indicates that the higher the fit between person and his / her organization, the higher the engagement towards work.

Table 4.3 also revealed significant positive correlation between person-group fit and work engagement (r = .493, p < .01). This finding implies that the higher the fit between person and his / her group, the higher the engagement towards work.

Finally, significant correlation between person-supervisor fit and work engagement (r = .471, p < .01) was also shown in Table 4.3. This finding indicates that the higher the fit between person and his / her supervisor, the higher the engagement towards work.
Table 4.3
Descriptive statistics, scale reliabilities and correlations of variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std Dev</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Person-job fit</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>3.78</td>
<td>.48</td>
<td>.85</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Person-organization fit</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>3.78</td>
<td>.54</td>
<td>.451**</td>
<td>.70</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Person-group fit</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>.51</td>
<td>.570**</td>
<td>.363**</td>
<td>.86</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Person-supervisor fit</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>.57</td>
<td>.418**</td>
<td>.353**</td>
<td>.574**</td>
<td>.89</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Work engagement</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>3.70</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td>.523**</td>
<td>.388**</td>
<td>.493**</td>
<td>.471**</td>
<td>.75</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: **Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed)

4.6 Regression Analysis

To test hypotheses H1, H2, H3 and H4, multiple regression analysis were conducted. Results in Table 4.4 showed that 60.8% \((R^2 = 0.370, F = 19.36 \ p < .000)\) of the variance in work engagement was significantly explained by person-job fit, person-organization fit, person-group fit and person-supervisor fit. In the model, only person-supervisor fit was found positively associated with work engagement \((\beta = .217, p < .005)\) and be the most significant predictor of work engagement. Therefore, only hypothesis H4 was supported. The results demonstrate that employees tend to be more engaged with their work when their characteristics, values, personality and behavioral styles match with their supervisor. Thus, this variable was proved to be significantly affecting work engagement.
Table 4.4
Regression results of person-job fit, person-organization fit, person-group fit and person-supervisor fit on work engagement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dependent variable (Work engagement) (Standardized Beta)</th>
<th>Significant (p)</th>
<th>Tolerance</th>
<th>VIF</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Independent variables</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Person - job fit</td>
<td>.195</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.460</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Person - organization fit</td>
<td>.148</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.540</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Person - group fit</td>
<td>.199</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.481</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Person - supervisor fit</td>
<td>.217</td>
<td>.02*</td>
<td>.619</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

F value 19.36  
R² .370  
Adjusted R² .351

Note. *p <0.05, **p <0.01

In conclusion, the analysis techniques used in this study such as multiple regressions has able to answer the research objectives and test the proposed hypotheses. Table 4.5 presents the summary of the hypotheses testing.

Table 4.5
Summary of hypotheses testing

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hypotheses</th>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Findings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>H1</td>
<td>There is a positive relationship between person-job fit and work engagement</td>
<td>Not supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H2</td>
<td>There is a positive relationship between person-organization fit and work engagement</td>
<td>Not supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H3</td>
<td>There is a positive relationship between person-group fit and work engagement</td>
<td>Not supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H4</td>
<td>There is a positive relationship between person-supervisor fit and work engagement</td>
<td>Supported</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.7 Conclusions

This chapter described the demographic characteristics of the 137 participants and the results of correlation and regression analyses. The results indicate that only person-supervisor fit was found to be positively associated with work engagement. The research implications, limitations and direction for future research are discussed in the next chapter, Chapter 5.
CHAPTER 5

DISCUSSIONS, RECOMMENDATIONS AND CONCLUSIONS

5.1 Introduction

In this chapter, findings of the study are discussed in light of the literature reviewed on work engagement and the hypotheses developed in Chapter 2. The findings, as presented in Chapter 4, are discussed in the sections below. The discussion that follows is organized around the hypotheses presented in Chapter 2.

5.2 Summary of Research

The study was conducted with the aim to investigate the relationship between person-job fit, person-organization fit, person-group fit, person-supervisor fit and work engagement. Multiple regressions analysis were conducted to test hypotheses 1, 2, 3, and 4 which is to test the direct relationship between person-job fit, person-organization fit, person-group fit, person-supervisor fit and work engagement. The findings revealed that only person-supervisor fit was positively related to work engagement.

5.3 Relationship between Person-job Fit and Work Engagement

In this study, person-job fit is referred to as the employees’ perception whether their competencies such as their knowledge, skills, and abilities congruence with the demands of the job. It is expected that person-job fit will positively related to work
engagement. However, the current research findings indicate that person-job fit was not related to work engagement. One possible explanation for this result might be due to the demographic factors of the respondents. Most of the respondents in this study were operator where skill and education background were not that important for the job. In fact, on the job training will normally conducted for new employees. Thus, the respondents did not regard fitting to job were important to determine work engagement.

5.4 Relationship between Person-organization Fit and Work Engagement

In this study, person-organization fit was found not related to work engagement. Person-organization fit in this study is referring to the compatibility between individual and the employing organization. Thus, it is not surprising to find that the respondent didn’t regard the issue of compatibility with the organization as the main factor that motivate them to engage with their work as majority of them are lower level employees. Most of the time, they received instruction from their immediate supervisor in terms of target that they need to achieve instead of trying to understand the strategic direction of the organization. This might explain why the respondent did not find fitting with organization would influence their work engagement.

5.5 Relationship between Person-group Fit and Work Engagement

In this study, it was hypothesized that person-group fit was positively related to work engagement. However, the results show the opposite. One of the reasons might be due to the nature of work that the respondents involved. Person-group fit is referred to as
the compatibility between individuals and their work groups. Since most of the respondents are operator (30%) and technician (15%), their job did not involve much of teamwork. Their engagement towards work is more on self rather than the influence of the group members. Thus, they didn’t see the significant fit of him / her and their group in terms of engagement towards their work.

5.6 Relationship between Person-supervisor Fit and Work Engagement

Person-supervisor fit was found positively associated with work engagement. The current findings support previous studies conducted by Blessing (2006) and Corporate Leadership Council (2004). The result indicates that supervisor’s values, characteristics, personality and behavioral styles are important for respondents to be engaged or not with the work. One possible explanation for this might be because supervisor is the one who normally giving out work instruction, and communicate the target to be achieved. Thus, the relationship between respondents and their supervisors are important in determining whether they willing to engage with work or not.

5.7 Implications for Practice

The present findings have several implications for management of the organizations. The research results revealed that relationship with supervisor has been regarded to be the most important factor that influence work engagement in the organization. Therefore, in order to increase work engagement among the employees, the management should foster good relationship between the supervisor and their
subordinate. This can be done by creating positive working environment and friendly culture that can enhance trust between superior and subordinate.

### 5.8 Limitations and Direction for Future Study

There are limitations in the design of this study that might influence the interpretations and generalizations of the findings. These issues are discussed next.

The study was aimed at understanding the influence of person-job fit, person-organization fit, person-group fit and person-supervisor fit on work engagement but the study was conducted on manufacturing companies located in Batu Kawan industrial estate only. The study does not include employees from manufacturing companies in other geographical areas and from other sectors. Thus, the findings only captured perceptions of manufacturing employees from one geographical area regarding factors that might influence their work engagement. Thus, future research needs to extend the exploration of the influence of on other sectors and in other locations which might offers greater understanding on the issues of work engagement among manufacturing employees. Conducting the study in different sectors with different sizes might lead to different results as issues relating to person-job fit, person-organization fit, person-group fit and person-supervisor fit might be different in these settings.

Another limitation is that the study only tested four independent variables, namely person-job fit, person-organization fit, person-group fit and person-supervisor fit in an effort to understand their relation to work engagement. Other situational factors that
beyond the scope of this study such as individual factors and working environment were not included in this study. This provides another direction for future research.

In conclusions, despite the limitations in the approach used here and given the exploratory nature of the study, the results provide useful findings that should be of interest both researchers and practitioners.

5.9 Conclusions

This study was conducted with intention to investigate factors that might influence work engagement among manufacturing employees. The main interest is on the role of person-job fit, person-organization fit, person-group fit and person-supervisor fit on work engagement. The results indicate only person-supervisor fit is related with work engagement. By examining all these factors, it is hoped that both scholars and management of the organization can have a more complete understanding of factors that might influence work engagement among manufacturing companies.
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