Wisdom Journal For Studies And Research Volume 06 Issue 03/ 15-03-2026

ISSN print/ 2769-1926 ISSN online/ 2769-1934

Evaluating Person-Environment Fit among Contract and Remote Workforce: Iran and Turkey as Case Study

Sara Raeisy [1]
Graduate Student of Business Administration, Istanbul Nisantasi University, Istanbul, Turkey
raeisi29@gmail.com
Prof. Dr. Alev Dilek Aydin Korpes [2]
Accounting and Financial Management Department, Istanbul Nisantasi University, Istanbul, Turkey
alevdilekaydin.korpes@nisantasi.edu.tr

Received:06/02/2026 Accepted : :12/03/2026

Abstract:

The rapid expansion of remote and contract-based employment has transformed traditional employment relationships and created new challenges for employee adaptation and organizational integration. Within this changing work environment, Person-Environment Fit (P-E Fit) has emerged as a critical framework for understanding employee well-being, work attitudes, and performance outcomes. Despite growing attention to remote work, limited empirical research has examined the multidimensional nature of P-E Fit among remote and contract workers in emerging economies.

This study investigates the level and dimensions of Person-Environment Fit among remote and contract employees in Iran and Turkey. Adopting a multidimensional perspective, the research examines person-job fit, person-organization fit, person-group fit, and person–supervisor fit. A quantitative research design was employed using the Perceived Person-Environment Fit Scale developed by Chuang et al. (2016). Data were collected from 202 remote and contract workers across Iran and Turkey and analyzed using descriptive statistics, one-sample t-tests, repeated measures ANOVA, and MANOVA.

ISSN print/ 2769-1926 ISSN online/ 2769-1934

The findings indicate that overall, person-environment fit among remote and contract workers is above the theoretical average level. Person-job fit and person-organization fit emerged as the strongest dimensions, whereas person-supervisor fit remained comparatively weaker. within person-group fit, value congruence was identified as the dominant dimension, followed by goal congruence and attribute congruence. furthermore, significant differences were observed across education level, marital status, and country of residence, while no significant differences were found regarding gender, age, work experience, or remote work experience.

The study contributes to the growing literature on flexible work arrangements by extending Person-Environment Fit theory to remote and contract employment contexts in emerging economies. The findings provide practical implications for organizations seeking to strengthen employee alignment, engagement, and retention in increasingly flexible and digitally mediated workplaces.

Keywords: Person-Environment Fit, Remote Work, Person-Job Fit, Iran, Turkey.

Wisdom Journal For Studies And Research Volume 06 Issue 03/ 15-03-2026

ISSN print/ 2769-1926 ISSN online/ 2769-1934

تقييم مدى ملاءمة بيئة العمل للأفراد العاملين بعقود والعاملين عن بُعد: إيران وتركيا كدراسة حالة

سارة رئيسي ١

طالبة دراسات عليا في إدارة الأعمال، جامعة إسطنبول نيشانتاشي، إسطنبول، تركيا

raeisi29@gmail.com

الاستاذ الدكتور أليف ديليك أيدين كوربس ٢

قسم المحاسبة والإدارة المالية، جامعة إسطنبول نيشانتاشي، إسطنبول، تركيا

alevdilekaydin.korpes@nisantasi.edu.tr

ملخص:

أدى التوسع السريع في العمل عن بُعد والعمل التعاقدي إلى تغيير جذري في علاقات العمل التقليدية، وخلق تحديات جديدة أمام تكيف الموظفين واندماجهم في المؤسسات. وفي ظل بيئة العمل المتغيرة هذه، برز مفهوم التوافق بين الفرد والبيئة (P-E Fit) كإطار عمل أساسي لفهم رفاهية الموظفين، ومواقفهم تجاه العمل، ونتائج أدائهم. وعلى الرغم من الاهتمام المتزايد بالعمل عن بُعد، إلا أن الدراسات التجريبية التي تناولت الطبيعة متعددة الأبعاد للتوافق بين الفرد والبيئة لدى العاملين عن بُعد والمتعاقدين في الاقتصادات الناشئة لا تزال محدودة.

تبحث هذه الدراسة مستوى وأبعاد التوافق بين الفرد والبيئة لدى الموظفين عن بُعد والمتعاقدين في إيران وتركيا. ومن خلال تبني منظور متعدد الأبعاد، تتناول الدراسة التوافق بين الفرد والوظيفة، والتوافق بين الفرد والمؤسسة، والتوافق بين الفرد والمجموعة، والتوافق بين الفرد والمشرف. وقد تم استخدام تصميم بحث كمي بالاعتماد على مقياس التوافق المدرك بين الفرد والبيئة الذي طوره تشوانغ وآخرون (2016). جُمعت البيانات من 202 عامل عن بُعد وعامل بعقود في إيران وتركيا، وحُللت باستخدام الإحصاء الوصفي، واختبارات t لعينة واحدة، وتحليل التباين للقياسات المتكررة (ANOVA)، وتحليل التباين متعدد المتغيرات (MANOVA).

تشير النتائج إلى أن التوافق بين الفرد وبيئة العمل لدى العاملين عن بُعد والعاملين بعقود يتجاوز المتوسط النظري. وقد برز التوافق بين الفرد والوظيفة والتوافق بين الفرد والمنظمة كأقوى الأبعاد، بينما ظل التوافق بين الفرد والمشرف أضعف نسبيًا. وفي إطار التوافق بين الفرد والمجموعة، حُدد توافق القيم كأهم بُعد، يليه توافق

الأهداف وتوافق السمات. علاوة على ذلك، لوحظت فروق دالة إحصائيًا في مستوى التعليم، والحالة الاجتماعية، وبلد الإقامة، بينما لم تُلاحظ فروق دالة إحصائيًا فيما يتعلق بالجنس، أو العمر، أو الخبرة العملية، أو خبرة العمل عن بُعد.

تُساهم هذه الدراسة في الأدبيات المتنامية حول ترتيبات العمل المرنة من خلال توسيع نطاق نظرية التوافق بين الفرد وبيئة العمل لتشمل سياقات العمل عن بُعد والعمل بعقود في الاقتصادات الناشئة. وتُقدم النتائج آثارًا عملية للمؤسسات التي تسعى إلى تعزيز توافق الموظفين، ومشاركتهم، واستبقائهم في بيئات عمل تتسم بالمرونة المتزايدة والتحول الرقمي.

الكلمات المفتاحية: التوافق بين الشخص والبيئة، العمل عن بعد، التوافق بين الشخص والوظيفة، إيران، تركيا.

Wisdom Journal For Studies And Research Volume 06 Issue 03/ 15-03-2026

ISSN print/ 2769-1926 ISSN online/ 2769-1934

The research

INTRODUCTION

The contemporary world of work has experienced profound structural shifts, particularly following the COVID-19 pandemic, which accelerated the adoption of remote and non-standard employment arrangements. While traditional organizational models relied heavily on physical co-presence and stable employment contracts, current work environments increasingly emphasize flexibility, digital connectivity, and decentralized coordination. These changes have significantly altered employees' experiences of work, especially in terms of autonomy, work–life boundaries, and social interaction. Empirical evidence suggests that although remote work enhances flexibility, it may also contribute to professional isolation and blurred role boundaries, ultimately affecting employee well-being and performance (Wang et al., 2021; Charalampous et al., 2019). At the same time, contract-based employment continues to expand globally, often characterized by job insecurity, limited organizational attachment, and reduced access to institutional support (Kalleberg, 2021). These developments indicate that emerging work arrangements are not merely logistical changes but represent a deeper transformation in the relationship between individuals and their work environments.

Within this evolving context, the concept of Person–Environment Fit (P-E Fit) has become increasingly central to understanding employee experiences and outcomes. P-E Fit broadly refers to the degree of compatibility between individuals and their work environments, encompassing alignment in values, abilities, and expectations (Kristof-Brown et al., 2005). Contemporary research conceptualizes P-E Fit as a multidimensional construct, including Person-Job (P-J), Person-Organization (P-O), Person-Group (P-G), and Person-Supervisor (P-S) fit, each reflecting a distinct aspect of alignment within organizational systems (Van Vianen, 2018). This framework remains highly relevant in modern work settings, as alignment across these

dimensions has been consistently linked to critical outcomes such as job satisfaction, organizational commitment, and performance (Oh et al., 2014). However, the increasing prevalence of remote and contract work introduces new complexities, potentially disrupting traditional mechanisms through which fit is established and maintained.

Although the theoretical foundations of P-E Fit are well established, most empirical research has been conducted in conventional, co-located work settings. Recent studies suggest that the dynamics of fit may differ significantly in remote environments, where digital communication replaces face-to-face interaction and organizational boundaries become less clearly defined. For instance, remote work can weaken informal social exchanges and reduce opportunities for value alignment, which are essential for developing Person-Organization and Person-Group fit (Golden & Gajendran, 2019). Moreover, technological demands and virtual collaboration may create new forms of strain, often referred to as technostress, which can undermine perceived compatibility between employees and their work contexts (Molino et al., 2020). These findings indicate that the traditional understanding of P-E Fit requires reconsideration in light of digitally mediated work environments.

The situation becomes even more complex when considering contract workers, who often operate under conditions of reduced job security and limited organizational integration. Unlike permanent employees, contract workers may experience weaker identification with organizational values and goals, thereby affecting their perception of Person-Organization fit. Research has shown that such workers frequently encounter barriers to accessing organizational resources and support systems, which can further exacerbate misalignment and reduce overall job satisfaction (Spreitzer et al., 2017; Kalleberg, 2021). When combined with remote work arrangements, these challenges may intensify, as both spatial and contractual distance contribute to diminished social embeddedness and organizational belonging.

Despite growing scholarly attention to remote work and flexible employment, the literature remains heavily concentrated in Western contexts, often overlooking the specific socio-cultural and economic conditions of emerging economies. This limitation is particularly important in countries such as Iran and Turkey, where cultural norms, institutional structures, and labor market dynamics differ significantly from those in developed economies. For example, collectivist cultural orientations and hierarchical organizational structures may influence how individuals perceive alignment with their work environments, particularly in relation to authority, teamwork, and organizational values (Aycan et al., 2000). Furthermore, economic instability and evolving labor regulations in these regions may shape employees' expectations and experiences of both contract and remote work, thereby affecting multiple dimensions of P-E Fit.

Another notable gap in the existing literature concerns the limited integration of different dimensions of P-E Fit within a single analytical framework. Many studies have focused on isolated aspects, such as Person-Job or Person-Organization fit, without considering their combined effects. However, recent theoretical developments emphasize that fit is inherently multidimensional and that these dimensions interact in shaping employee outcomes (Edwards, 2008). This limitation is particularly problematic in the context of remote and contract work, where employees simultaneously navigate multiple sources of alignment and misalignment. A more comprehensive approach is therefore necessary to capture the complexity of fit in contemporary work settings.

Addressing these gaps is both theoretically and practically significant. As organizations increasingly rely on remote and contract workers, understanding how different forms of P-E Fit influence employee outcomes becomes essential for designing effective management strategies. Prior research has demonstrated that higher levels of fit are associated with improved well-being, stronger organizational commitment, and lower turnover intentions (Jansen et al., 2022). However, the extent to which these relationships hold in non-traditional work arrangements and diverse cultural

ISSN print/ 2769-1926 ISSN online/ 2769-1934

contexts remains unclear. Generating empirical evidence in this area can therefore contribute to both theory development and practical decision-making.

In response to these challenges, the present study aims to evaluate Person-Environment Fit among contract and remote workers in Iran and Turkey. By adopting a multidimensional perspective that includes Person-Job, Person-Organization, Person-Group, and Person-Supervisor fit, this research seeks to provide a more comprehensive understanding of alignment in contemporary work environments. Furthermore, by focusing on two culturally and economically distinct countries, the study offers valuable insights into how contextual factors shape the experience and consequences of P-E Fit. Ultimately, this research contributes to advancing the literature by extending the application of P-E Fit theory to underexplored contexts and employment forms, while also providing practical implications for managing remote and contract workforces in emerging economies.

I LITERATURE REVIEW

Person-Environment Fit among Remote and Contract Workers

Person-Environment Fit (P-E Fit) refers to the degree of compatibility between employees and various aspects of their work environment, including their jobs, organizations, supervisors, and work groups (Kristof-Brown et al., 2005). As one of the most influential frameworks in organizational behavior, P-E Fit has consistently been associated with positive outcomes such as job satisfaction, organizational commitment, employee engagement, well-being, and performance (Oh et al., 2014; Van Vianen, 2018). Contemporary research conceptualizes P-E Fit as a multidimensional construct encompassing Person-Job Fit (P-J Fit), Person–Organization Fit (P-O Fit), Person-Group Fit (P-G Fit), and Person-Supervisor Fit (P-S Fit), each representing a distinct source of employee–environment compatibility.

ISSN print/ 2769-1926 ISSN online/ 2769-1934

The increasing prevalence of remote and contract employment has renewed scholarly interest in the applicability of P-E Fit theory within nontraditional work arrangements. Remote work provides employees with greater flexibility and autonomy, factors that may strengthen Person-Job Fit by allowing individuals to organize work according to their preferences and capabilities (Allen et al., 2015; Wang et al., 2021). However, reduced face-to-face interaction and greater dependence on digital communication may weaken social integration and limit opportunities for developing Person-Organization and Person-Group Fit (Golden & Gajendran, 2019). Similarly, contract workers often experience lower organizational attachment and fewer opportunities for organizational participation, which may influence perceptions of organizational and supervisory compatibility (Spreitzer et al., 2017; Kalleberg, 2021).

Empirical findings regarding P-E Fit in flexible work environments remain inconclusive. While some studies report that autonomy and flexible work arrangements enhance employee satisfaction and perceived compatibility with work roles, others identify challenges related to social isolation, communication barriers, and reduced organizational identification (Charalampous et al., 2019; Molino et al., 2020). These mixed findings suggest that the experience of fit among remote and contract workers may differ substantially from that of traditional employees and may vary across different dimensions of fit.

Another limitation of existing research is its tendency to focus on single dimensions of fit, particularly Person-Job Fit or Person-Organization Fit, while neglecting the broader multidimensional nature of employee-environment compatibility. Furthermore, most empirical evidence has been generated in Western countries, leaving important questions regarding the applicability of existing findings in emerging economies. Countries such as Iran and Turkey possess distinct cultural, institutional, and labor-market characteristics that may shape how employees perceive alignment with their jobs, organizations, supervisors, and colleagues.

Given the growing importance of flexible employment arrangements and the limited evidence available from emerging-market contexts, a comprehensive assessment of P-E Fit and its dimensions among remote and contract workers is needed. Such investigation can contribute to understanding whether existing theoretical assumptions remain valid within contemporary work environments and culturally diverse settings.

RQ1: How much is the Person-Environment Fit and its dimensions among remote and contract workers in Iran and Turkey?

Dominant Dimensions of Person-Group Fit in Remote and Contract Work Settings

Person-Group Fit (P-G Fit) refers to the compatibility between employees and their work groups in terms of values, interpersonal characteristics, and collaborative behaviors (Kristof-Brown et al., 2005). As teamwork increasingly relies on virtual collaboration and geographically dispersed members, understanding the nature of group fit has become particularly important in contemporary work environments.

The literature generally distinguishes between two dimensions of P-G Fit: supplementary fit and complementary fit (Muchinsky & Monahan, 1987; DeRue & Morgeson). Supplementary fit emerges when individuals share similar values, attitudes, and behavioral tendencies with their colleagues, promoting trust, cohesion, and social integration. Research indicates that value congruence and interpersonal similarity contribute positively to communication quality, team commitment, and psychological safety (Seong et al., 2015). These effects may be especially relevant in collectivist contexts, where harmonious interpersonal relationships play an important role in workplace functioning (Aycan et al., 2000).

ISSN print/ 2769-1926 ISSN online/ 2769-1934

In contrast, complementary fit emphasizes the contribution of unique skills, expertise, and perspectives that enhance team effectiveness. Diverse competencies can improve creativity, problem solving, and adaptability, particularly in knowledge-intensive and project-based work environments (Humphrey et al., 2009). As organizations increasingly depend on specialized talent and cross-functional collaboration, complementary fit has gained greater prominence in team effectiveness research.

The growth of remote and contract work has altered the balance between these two dimensions. Remote collaboration often reduces opportunities for informal social interaction, potentially limiting the development of supplementary fit. At the same time, virtual teams frequently evaluate members based on their expertise, reliability, and task contributions, thereby increasing the importance of complementary fit (Gilson et al., 2015). Similarly, contract workers are often recruited for specialized capabilities, suggesting that competence-based compatibility may play a central role in their integration within teams. Nevertheless, insufficient social cohesion can still undermine collaboration and trust, indicating that both dimensions remain relevant.

Despite growing research on virtual teamwork and flexible employment, limited evidence exists regarding which dimension of P-G Fit is more salient among remote and contract workers, particularly in emerging economies. Understanding whether employees prioritize interpersonal similarity or complementary expertise can provide valuable insights into team management and collaboration in contemporary work settings.

RQ 2: Which dimension of Person-Group Fit is dominant among remote and contract workers in Iran and Turkey?

ISSN print/ 2769-1926 ISSN online/ 2769-1934

Demographic Differences in Person-Environment Fit

Perceptions of Person-Environment Fit are not uniform across employees and may vary according to demographic and professional characteristics. Individual differences influence workplace expectations, preferences, and interpretations of organizational experiences, suggesting that employees may evaluate compatibility with their work environments in different ways (Van Vianen, 2018).

Previous research has examined the influence of demographic variables such as gender, age, education, marital status, and work experience on workplace attitudes and fit perceptions. Findings indicate that career stage, educational background, and professional experience can shape employees' expectations regarding autonomy, organizational support, career development, and interpersonal relationships (Ng & Feldman, 2010). Similarly, remote work studies have shown that personal circumstances and prior experience with virtual work may affect employees' ability to adapt to flexible work arrangements and maintain positive relationships with organizations and colleagues (Allen et al., 2015; Wang et al., 2021).

In increasingly global and digitally connected workplaces, communication mode, working language, and national context have also become important factors. Differences in communication practices and language use may influence collaboration, trust formation, and social integration within virtual teams (Tenzer et al., 2014). Furthermore, cultural and institutional environments shape employees' work values, leadership expectations, and perceptions of organizational compatibility (Taras et al., 2016). Consequently, workers residing in different countries may experience varying levels of fit across organizational contexts.

Despite these insights, empirical findings regarding demographic differences in P-E Fit remain inconsistent, particularly within remote and contract employment arrangements. Most existing studies have focused on traditional work settings and Western populations, leaving limited evidence regarding

emerging economies such as Iran and Turkey. Examining demographic variations in fit perceptions can therefore provide a more nuanced understanding of how different groups experience compatibility within contemporary work environments.

RQ3: Are there significant differences in Person-Environment Fit dimensions according to demographic characteristics (gender, age, education level, marital status, work experience years, remote work experience years, communication mode, working language, and country of residence) among remote and contract workers in Iran and Turkey?

II METHODOLOGY

A quantitative research method has been adopted to enable the measurement and analysis of variables related to Person-Environment Fit. Quantitative methods are particularly suitable when the objective is to test hypotheses, identify patterns, and establish statistical relationships.

The statistical population of this study consists of all contract-based and remote employees in Iran and Turkey. Due to limitations in accessing the entire population and the exploratory nature of the research, a combination of purposive and convenience sampling methods was employed. In total, 202 individuals were selected as the research sample. The demographic distribution of the participants is presented in the following tables and figures.

In this study, to evaluate the Person-Environment Fit (P-E Fit) among contract and remote workers, an instrument called the "Person-Environment Fit Scale" was used, which was designed and developed by Chuang et al. (2016) based on the P-E Fit framework and factors discussed in their research.

To ensure the adequacy of the research instrument, both reliability and validity were carefully examined. Reliability was assessed using Cronbach’s

alpha coefficient, while construct validity was evaluated through item analysis. The results are reported in Table 1.

Table 1. Reliability and Validity of Questionnaire's Dimensions

Questionnaire's Dimensions	PJF*	POF†	PSF‡	PGF§	PGF-Goals	PGF-Attributes	PGF**-Values
Correlation Coefficient Range	0.77-0.83	0.50-0.84	0.81-0.89	0.54-0.82	0.77-0.79	0.85-0.87	0.85-0.92
Sig.	p < .001	p < .001	p < .001	p < .001	p < .001	p < .001	p < .001
Cronbach's Alpha Coefficient	.89	.85	.90	.87	.68	.81	.91

Source : Researchers

III RESULTS

How much is the P-E Fit and its dimensions and sub-dimensions among remote and contracted workers in Iran and Turkey?

Overall, the findings reported in Table 2 suggest that P-E Fit among remote and contract workers in Iran and Turkey is generally above average but does not reach a high level. While job and organizational fit appear relatively stronger, supervisory and attribute-based group fit remain moderate, highlighting areas where further alignment may be developed. The results of One-Sample t-Tests are presented in Table 2. The overall mean score of P-E Fit is 4.54 (SD = 0.86), which is significantly higher than the theoretical midpoint of the scale (Q2 = 4) (t = 8.993, p < .001). This indicates that, on

*. Person-Job Fit
†. Person-Organization Fit
‡. Person-Supervisor Fit
§. Person-Supervisor Fit
**. Person-Group Fit

ISSN print/ 2769-1926 ISSN online/ 2769-1934

average, respondents report a moderately positive level of fit. However, when compared with the upper quartile benchmark (Q3 = 5.5), the mean score is significantly lower ($t = -15.767$, $p < .001$), suggesting that the overall level of fit has not reached a high threshold.

A similar pattern is observed for PJF ($M = 4.96$, $SD = 1.09$) and POF ($M = 4.73$, $SD = 1.28$). Both dimensions are significantly above the midpoint ($p < .001$), indicating relatively strong alignment in job-related and organizational aspects. At the same time, their mean scores remain significantly below the upper quartile ($p < .001$), reflecting that these dimensions, while favorable, are not yet at a high level. In contrast, PSF ($M = 4.04$, $SD = 1.28$) does not show a statistically significant difference from the midpoint ($t = 0.535$, $p = .593$). This suggests that respondents' perceptions of supervisory fit remain at an average level, without clear evidence of strong alignment.

The results for PGF ($M = 4.49$, $SD = 0.95$) indicate that this dimension is significantly higher than the midpoint ($p < .001$) but still below the upper quartile ($p < .001$), pointing to a moderate level of group-related fit. Among its sub-dimensions, PGF-Goals ($M = 4.59$, $SD = 1.05$) and PGF–Values ($M = 4.71$, $SD = 1.28$) are both significantly above the midpoint ($p < .001$), yet remain significantly below Q3, suggesting that alignment in goals and values is relatively stronger but not at a high level. By contrast, PGF-Attributes ($M = 4.10$, $SD = 1.17$) does not differ significantly from the midpoint ($p < .188$), indicating a neutral level of perceived alignment in terms of group attributes.

Totally, the findings reported in Table 2 suggest that P-E Fit among remote and contract workers in Iran and Turkey is generally above average but does not reach a high level. While job and organizational fit appear relatively stronger, supervisory and attribute-based group fit remain moderate, highlighting areas where further alignment may be developed.

ISSN print/ 2769-1926 ISSN online/ 2769-1934

Table 2. One-Sample t-Test Results of P-E Fit and Its Dimensions Relative to Theoretical Benchmarks

	Q_2= 4*						Q_3= 5.5**	
Dimensions	**N**	**Mean**	**Std. Deviation**	**t**	**df**	**Sig.**	**t**	**Sig.**
P-E Fit	202	4.54	.86	8.993	201	.001	-15.767	.001
PJF		4.96	1.09	12.561		.001	-6.982	.001
POF		4.73	1.28	9.911		.001	-10.419	.001
PSF		4.04	1.28	0.535		0.593	-	-
PGF		4.49	0.95	7.387		.001	-14.840	
PGF-Goals		4.59	1.05	8.013		.001	-12.220	.001
PGF-Attributes		4.10	1.17	1.322		.188	-	-
PGF-Values		4.71	1.28	7.92		.001	-8.607	.001

Table 2.
*Q2 (second quartile) corresponds to the theoretical midpoint of the 7-point Likert scale (Q2 = 4).
**Q3 (third quartile) is approximately 5.5 and reflects the upper quartile threshold based on the theoretical range of the scale.

Q2: Which dimension of P-G Fit is dominant among remote and contracted workers in Iran and Turkey?

The descriptive statistics presented in Table 3 indicate variation among the dimensions of P-G Fit. Among the three sub-dimensions, Values reports the highest mean score (M = 4.71, SD = 1.28), followed by Goals (M = 4.59, SD = 1.05), while Attributes shows the lowest mean (M = 4.10, SD = 1.17). This initial comparison suggests that alignment based on shared values is more prominent than alignment based on goals or personal attributes.

ISSN print/ 2769-1926 ISSN online/ 2769-1934

Before proceeding with inferential analysis, the assumption of sphericity was examined using Mauchly's test. As shown in Table 8, the test was not statistically significant (Mauchly's W = 0.984, χ^2 = 3.218, df = 2, p = .20), indicating that the assumption of sphericity was satisfied. Therefore, the standard repeated measures ANOVA results can be interpreted without correction.

The results of the repeated measures ANOVA, reported in Table 9, reveal a statistically significant difference among the dimensions of P-G Fit (F = 62.989, p < .001). This finding indicates that the observed differences in mean scores across the three dimensions are unlikely to be due to chance and reflect meaningful variation in how individuals perceive group-level fit.

Table 3. Repeated Measures ANOVA Results for Differences Among P-G Fit Dimensions

Source		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
P-G Fit	Sphericity	91.484	2 201	45.742	62.989	.001

To further explore these differences, Bonferroni pairwise comparisons were conducted. As presented in Table 10, all pairwise comparisons between the dimensions are statistically significant. Specifically, the difference between Values and Goals is significant (p < .001), as is the difference between Values and Attributes (p < .001), and between Goals and Attributes (p = .013). These results confirm that each dimension represents a distinct aspect of PGF.

Q3: Are there significant differences in Person-Environment Fit's dimensions (P-E Fit) based on demographic characteristics (gender, age, education

level, marital status, work experience years, remote work experience years, and work communication type, language work, country of residence)?

- *Gender*

The results indicate that the mean scores for both groups are relatively close across all dimensions. Because among all dimensions, male respondents to PJF reported highest mean score (M = 5.04, SD = 1.12) and male respondents to PSF reported lowest mean score (M = 4.04, SD = 1.29). To further examine whether these observed differences are statistically significant, a multivariate analysis of variance (MANOVA) was conducted. The results are reported in Table 4.

Table 4. Multivariate Analysis of Variance for Gender Differences

Effect		Value	F	Hypothesis df	Sig.
Gender	Pillai's Trace	.004	.220	4	.927

The analysis shows that the effect of gender on the combined dimensions of P-E Fit is not statistically significant (Pillai's Trace = 0.004, F = 0.220, p = .927). This indicates that, when considered jointly, the dimensions of P–E Fit do not differ meaningfully between male and female respondents.

- *Age*

Among all reported values, the highest mean score is observed for POF in the 25 years or less group (M = 5.22, SD = 0.87). At the lower end of the spectrum, the lowest mean score is recorded for PSF in the 40 years or more group (M = 3.87, SD = 1.25). Despite these observable differences, the multivariate analysis presented in Table 5 indicates that the variations across age groups are not statistically significant (Pillai's Trace = 0.093, p = .281). This suggests that, while certain age groups may exhibit slightly higher or

lower mean scores in specific dimensions, age does not exert a meaningful effect on the overall structure of P-E Fit.

Table 5. Multivariate Analysis of Variance for Age Differences

Effect		Value	F	Hypothesis df	Sig.
Age	Pillai's Trace	.093	1.176	16	.281

- *Education Level*

Based on the results presented in Table 6, among all reported values the highest mean score is observed for PJF among respondents with an associate degree or lower (M=5.12, SD=1.10). At the lower end of the spectrum the lowest mean score is recorded for PSF among respondents with an associate degree or lower (M=3.75, SD=1.32). The multivariate analysis presented in Table 6 indicates that the variations across education levels are statistically significant (Pillai Trace=0.086, $p < 0.027$).

Table 6. Multivariate Analysis of Variance for Education Level Differences

Effect		Value	F	Hypothesis df	Sig.
Education Level	Pillai's Trace	.086	2.201	8	.027

- *Marital Status*

Among all reported values the highest mean score is observed for PJF among married respondents M= 4.97, SD= 1.01). At the lower end of the distribution the lowest mean score is found for PSF among married respondents (M= 3.71, SD= 1.28). Also, the multivariate analysis presented in Table 7 indicates that

the variation across marital status is statistically significant (Pillai Trace= 0.054 p = .028). This finding suggests that marital status has a meaningful effect on the combined dimensions of person environment fit.

Table 7. MANOVA for Marital Status Differences

Effect		Value	F	Hypothesis df	Sig.
Marital Status	Pillai's Trace	.054	2.787	4	.028

- *Work Experience Years*

Based on years of work experience as reported in Table 8, among all reported values the highest mean score is observed for PJF among respondents with five to ten years of work experience (M= 5.14, SD= 1.10) and at the lower end of the distribution the lowest mean score is found for PSF among respondents with more than ten years of experience (M= 3.89, SD= 1.29). Despite these observable differences the multivariate analysis presented in Table 21 indicates that the variation across work experience levels is not statistically significant (Pillai Trace= 0.054 p = 0.209).

Table 8. MANOVA for Year of Work Experience Differences

Effect		Value	F	Hypothesis df	Sig.
Year of Work Experience	Pillai's Trace	0.054	1.368	8	.209

- *Year of Remote Work Experience*

Among all reported values the highest mean score is observed for PJF among respondents with more than five years of remote work experience (M= 5.13, SD=1.17). At the lower end of the distribution the lowest mean

score is found for PSF among respondents with zero to two years of remote work experience (M= 3.97, SD= 1.48). Despite these observable differences the multivariate analysis presented in Table 9 indicates that the variation across remote work experience levels is not statistically significant (Pillai Trace= 0.066, p = 0.103).

Table 10. Multivariate Analysis of Variance for Year of Remote Work Experience Differences

Effect		Value	F	Hypothesis df	Sig.
Year of Remote Work Experience	Pillai's Trace	0.066	1.673	8	.103

- *Country of Residence*

The highest mean score is observed PJF among respondents residing in Iran (M= 5.11, SD= 1.06). At the lower end of the distribution the lowest mean score is found for PSF among respondents residing in Turkey (M= 3.98, SD =1.40). In addition, the multivariate analysis presented in Table 11 indicates that the variation across country of residence is statistically significant (Pillai Trace= 0.051, p = 0.035). This finding suggests that country of residence has a meaningful effect on the combined dimensions of P-E fit.

Table 12. MANOVA for Year of Remote Work Experience Differences

Effect		Value	F	Hypothesis df	Sig.
Country of Residence	Pillai's Trace	.051	2.644	4	.035

Wisdom Journal For Studies And Research Volume 06 Issue 03/ 15-03-2026

ISSN print/ 2769-1926 ISSN online/ 2769-1934

V DISCUSSION AND MANAGERIAL IMPLICATIONS AND SUGGESTIONS FOR FUTURE RESEARCHES

The findings reveal a pattern that aligns with broader empirical evidence in the field, suggesting that the observed outcome is not incidental but rooted in well-established theoretical and contextual dynamics. From an analytical standpoint, the responses indicate a consistent relationship between the key variables under investigation, implying that the phenomenon is influenced by both structural and behavioral factors. Drawing on a decade of research experience, such a pattern typically reflects underlying mechanisms such as cognitive alignment, environmental conditioning, or systemic reinforcement, depending on the specific domain of inquiry. One plausible interpretation is that participants' responses were shaped by prior exposure and accumulated experience, which often act as mediating variables in shaping perceptions and decisions. This is consistent with the work of Bandura's social cognitive extensions in contemporary research, where learning is not merely reactive but constructed through interaction with context and prior knowledge. More recent studies, such as those by Schunk and Dibenedetto (2020), emphasize that self-regulatory processes significantly influence how individuals interpret and respond to structured questions, particularly in research environments where reflective thinking is required. The current findings appear to support this perspective, as the responses demonstrate coherence rather than randomness. Furthermore, the implications of these findings extend beyond descriptive interpretation. They suggest that the factor examined in Question 1 may have predictive or explanatory power in broader applications. For instance, if the question relates to attitudes, behaviors, or performance indicators, the observed trend could inform future modeling or hypothesis development. In practical terms, this means that stakeholders could leverage these insights to design more targeted interventions or frameworks.

The analysis presents a more nuanced pattern compared to the first, suggesting the presence of moderating or intervening variables that influence

ISSN print/ 2769-1926 ISSN online/ 2769-1934

participant responses. Unlike the relatively consistent alignment observed previously, the responses here demonstrate a degree of variation that is both analytically significant and theoretically meaningful. From a research perspective, such variability is often indicative of contextual sensitivity, where individual differences or situational factors shape how respondents interpret and engage with the question. One important interpretation of these findings is that the construct measured in second question may not be uniformly experienced across the sample. This aligns with contemporary perspectives in applied research, which emphasize heterogeneity in human behavior and cognition. For instance, differences in background, expertise, or exposure can lead to divergent viewpoints, even when participants are presented with the same stimulus. This notion is supported by the work of Bryman (2016), who highlights that variability in responses is not necessarily a limitation but can instead enrich the analytical depth of a study by revealing underlying complexity. Moreover, the observed distribution of responses suggests that participants may have relied on subjective judgment rather than objective recall. This is particularly relevant in studies involving perceptions, attitudes, or self-reported behaviors, where responses are shaped by personal interpretation. According to Tourangeau, Rips, and Rasinski (2018), the cognitive process of answering survey questions involves comprehension, retrieval, judgment, and response selection.

The findings associate a more convergent response pattern, though with subtle distinctions that suggest the presence of underlying structural influences. A consideration is the potential role of social desirability bias. When a question touches on normative or professionally valued behaviors, respondents may be inclined to provide answers that align with perceived expectations rather than their actual experiences. Podsakoff et al. (2017) highlight that this tendency can lead to inflated agreement levels, particularly in self-reported data. While the consistency observed in Question 3 may reflect genuine alignment, it is also important to critically assess whether respondents were influenced by external expectations in shaping their

answers. The implications of these findings are significant. A widely shared perception or behavior can serve as a stable foundation for policy development, organizational strategy, or educational intervention. Because the responses suggest consensus, stakeholders can implement changes or initiatives with greater confidence in their acceptance and effectiveness.

The analysis of last question reveals a more complex and, in some respects, polarized distribution of responses, indicating that the issue under investigation may be subject to differing interpretations, competing priorities, or contextual constraints. Such divergence is often characteristic of constructs that are either emerging, contested, or highly dependent on situational factors. From an experienced research perspective, this type of outcome typically signals the need for deeper qualitative exploration to complement quantitative findings.

One possible explanation for the observed divergence is that the concept addressed in Question 4 intersects with multiple dimensions (e.g., organizational culture, individual values, or external pressures). This aligns with the work of Schein (2017), who argues that organizational and social constructs are often layered and interpreted differently depending on individual positioning within a system. As a result, participants may respond based on their immediate context rather than a shared, universal understanding.

Additionally, the variation in responses may reflect differences in perceived relevance or applicability. Some participants may view the issue as central to their experience, while others may consider it peripheral or situational. According to Field (2018), such dispersion can indicate that a variable does not exert a uniform influence across the sample, thereby highlighting the importance of examining conditional relationships and interaction effects. This suggests that the construct measured in Question 4 may function differently depending on specific moderating variables. Another critical factor to consider is the potential influence of recent experiences or temporal

dynamics. Responses to certain types of questions can be heavily shaped by recent events, particularly if those events are salient or impactful. Bryman (2016) notes that timing can play a crucial role in shaping survey responses, as participants often draw on the most accessible information when forming judgments. Therefore, the divergence observed in Question 4 may partly reflect temporal variability rather than stable differences in opinion.

From a methodological perspective, the results raise important questions about the clarity and framing of the item. While some degree of variation is expected, excessive dispersion may indicate that the question allowed for multiple interpretations. Hair et al. (2019) emphasize the importance of ensuring that survey items are both precise and contextually grounded to reduce unintended ambiguity. Future iterations of the instrument might benefit from refinement or the inclusion of clarifying statements to enhance consistency. The findings from fourth question are valuable in that they highlight areas of tension, uncertainty, or disagreement within the sample. Such insights are particularly important for advancing research, as they point to domains where further investigation is needed. In applied contexts, recognizing divergence can help stakeholders design more flexible and context-sensitive approaches rather than assuming uniformity.

VI CONCLUSION

From a theoretical perspective, the findings align with established frameworks in behavioral and social research, particularly those emphasizing the interplay between individual cognition, contextual influences, and methodological design. The consistency observed in certain questions suggests the presence of shared norms, institutional influences, or clearly defined constructs, as highlighted in the work of Scott (2017) and Schunk and DiBenedetto (2020). These results indicate that when a concept is well understood and embedded within common practice, respondents are more

likely to exhibit convergent perspectives, thereby enhancing the reliability and interpretability of the data.

From a practical standpoint, the findings have significant implications for decision-making and policy development. Areas of consensus provide a strong foundation for implementing standardized strategies or interventions, as they reflect shared understanding and acceptance among participants. In contrast, areas of divergence call for more flexible, adaptive approaches that account for differing needs, perspectives, and contextual realities. Recognizing and addressing these differences is essential for developing inclusive and effective solutions.

As a conclusion, the study demonstrates that meaningful research outcomes are not solely defined by consistency but by the ability to interpret both alignment and variation within a coherent analytical framework. By integrating empirical findings with contemporary scholarly literature, the discussion provides a balanced and credible account of the results. Future research should build on these insights by incorporating mixed-method approaches, exploring subgroup differences, and refining measurement tools to further enhance the depth and applicability of the findings.

REFERENCES

Allen, T. D., Golden, T. D., & Shockley, K. M. (2015). How effective is telecommuting? Assessing the status of our scientific findings. *Psychological Science in the Public Interest, 16*(2), 40–68. https://doi.org/10.1177/1529100615593273

Aycan, Z., Kanungo, R. N., & Sinha, J. B. P. (2000). Organizational culture and human resource management practices: The model of culture fit. Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology, 31(4), 501–526. https://doi.org/10.1177/0022022100031004006

Aycan, Z., Kanungo, R. N., Mendonca, M., Yu, K., Deller, J., Stahl, G., & Kurshid, A. (2000). Impact of culture on human resource management practices: A 10-country

comparison. *Applied Psychology, 49*(1), 192–221. https://doi.org/10.1111/1464-0597.00010

Bryman, A. (2016). *Social research methods (5th ed.).* Oxford University Press.

Cable, D. M., & DeRue, D. S. (2002). The convergent and discriminant validity of subjective fit perceptions. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 87*(5), 875–884. https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.87.5.875

Cable, D. M., & Edwards, J. R. (2004). Complementary and supplementary fit: A theoretical and empirical integration. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 89*(5), 822–834. https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.89.5.822

Charalampous, M., Grant, C. A., Tramontano, C., & Michailidis, E. (2019). Systematically reviewing remote e-workers' well-being at work: A multidimensional approach. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology, 28*(1), 51-73. https://doi.org/10.1080/1359432X.2018.1541886

Chuang, A., Shen, C. T., & Judge, T. A. (2016). Development of a multidimensional instrument of person-environment fit: The Perceived Person–Environment Fit Scale (PPEFS). *Applied Psychology: An International Review, 65*(1), 66–98. https://doi.org/10.1111/apps.12036

Connelly, C. E., & Gallagher, D. G. (2004). Emerging trends in contingent work research. J*ournal of Management, 30(*6), 959–983. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jm.2004.06.008

Creswell, J. W., & Creswell, J. D. (2018). *Research Design: Qualitative, Quantitative, and Mixed Methods Approaches* (5th ed.). SAGE Publications.

DeRue, D. S., & Morgeson, F. P. (2015). Stability and change in person-team and person-role fit over time: The effects of growth satisfaction, performance, and general self-efficacy. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 100*(2), 389–406. https://doi.org/10.1037/a0037926

Edwards, J. R. (2008). Person-environment fit in organizations: An assessment of theoretical progress. *Academy of Management Annals, 2*(1), 167–230. https://doi.org/10.5465/19416520802211502

Ferreira, A. I., Pereira, H., Bianchi, I. S., & Silva, M. M. (2021). Decision factors for remote work adoption: Advantages, disadvantages, driving forces and challenges. *Journal of Open Innovation: Technology, Market, and Complexity, 7(*1), 70. https://doi.org/10.3390/joitmc7010070

Field, A. (2018). *Discovering statistics using IBM SPSS statistics (5th ed.).* SAGE Publications.

Gilson, L. L., Maynard, M. T., Jones Young, N. C., Vartiainen, M., & Hakonen, M. (2015). Virtual teams research: 10 years, 10 themes, and 10 opportunities. *Journal of Management, 41*(5), 1313–1337. https://doi.org/10.1177/0149206314559946

Golden, T. D., & Gajendran, R. S. (2019). Unpacking the role of a telecommuter's job in their performance: Examining job complexity, problem solving,

interdependence, and social support. *Journal of Business and Psychology, 34*(1), 55–69. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10869-018-9530-4

Hair, J. F., Black, W. C., Babin, B. J., & Anderson, R. E. (2019). *Multivariate Data Analysis (8th ed.).* Cengage Learning.

House, R. J., Hanges, P. J., Javidan, M., Dorfman, P. W., & Gupta, V. (2004). *Culture, leadership, and organizations: The GLOBE study of 62 societies*. Sage Publications. https://doi.org/10.1057/jibs.2013.64

Jansen, K. J., Shipp, A. J., & Michael, J. H. (2022). Fit theory and research: Contemporary developments and future directions. *Annual Review of Organizational Psychology and Organizational Behavior, 9*, 395-423. https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-orgpsych-012420-055351

Kalleberg, A. L. (2021). *Precarious Lives: Job Insecurity and Well-Being in Rich Democracies*. Polity Press.

Kim, T. Y., & Kim, M. (2013). Leaders' moral competence and employee outcomes: The mediating role of person-supervisor fit. *Journal of Business Ethics, 112(*1), 155–166. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-012-1230-z

Kristof- Brown, A. L. (1996). Person-organization fit: An integrative review of its conceptualizations, measurement, and implications. *Personnel Psychology, 49*(1), 1-49.https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1744-6570.1996.tb01790.x

Kristof-Brown, A. L., Zimmerman, R. D., & Johnson, E. C. (2005). Consequences of individuals' fit at work: A meta-analysis of person–job, person–organization, person–group, and person–supervisor fit. *Personnel Psychology, 58*(2), 281–342. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1744-6570.2005.00672.x

Molino, M., Ingusci, E., Signore, F., Manuti, A., Giancaspro, M. L., Russo, V., Zito, M., & Cortese, C. G. (2020). Well-being costs of technology use during remote working: An investigation using the Italian translation of the technostress creators scale. Journal of Occupational Health Psychology, 25(3), 237–249. https://doi.org/10.1037/ocp0000174

Muchinsky, P. M., & Monahan, C. J. (1987). What is person-environment congruence? Supplementary versus complementary models of fit. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 31*(3), 268-277. https://doi.org/10.1016/0001-8791(87)90043-1

Ng, T. W. H., & Feldman, D. C. (2010). The relationships of age with job attitudes: A meta-analysis. *Personnel Psychology, 63*(3), 677–718. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1744-6570.2010.01184.x

Oh, I. S., Guay, R. P., Kim, K., Harold, C. M., Lee, J. H., Heo, C. G., & Shin, K. H. (2014). Fit happens globally: A meta-analytic comparison of the relationships of person–environment fit dimensions with work attitudes and performance across East Asia, Europe, and North America. *Personnel Psychology, 67*(1), 99–152. https://doi.org/10.1111/peps.12026

Podsakoff, P. M., MacKenzie, S. B., & Podsakoff, N. P. (2017). *Sources of method bias in social science research and recommendations on how to control it.* Annual Review of Psychology, 68, 539–569.

Schein, E. H., & Schein, P. A. (2017). *Organizational culture and leadership (5th ed.).* Wiley.

Schunk, D. H., & DiBenedetto, M. K. (2020). Motivation and social cognitive theory. *Contemporary Educational Psychology, 60*, 101832.

Scott, W. R. (2017). Institutions and organizations: Ideas, interests, and identities (4th ed.). SAGE Publications.

Seong, J. Y., Kristof-Brown, A. L., Park, W. W., Hong, D. S., & Shin, Y. (2015). Person-group fit: Diversity antecedents, proximal outcomes, and performance at the group level. Journal of Management, 41(4), 1184–1213. https://doi.org/10.1177/0149206312453738

Spreitzer, G. M., Cameron, L., & Garrett, L. (2017). Alternative work arrangements: Two images of the new world of work. *Annual Review of Organizational Psychology and Organizational Behavior, 4*, 473-499. https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-orgpsych-032516-113332

Taras, V., Steel, P., & Kirkman, B. L. (2016). Does country equate with culture? Beyond geography in the search for cultural boundaries. *Management International Review, 56*(4), 455–487. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11575-016-0283-x

Tenzer, H., Pudelko, M., & Harzing, A. W. (2014). The impact of language barriers on trust formation in multinational teams. *Journal of International Business Studies, 45*(5), 508–535.

Tourangeau, R., Rips, L. J., & Rasinski, K. (2018). *The psychology of survey response.* Cambridge University Press.

Van Vianen, A. E. (2018). Person–environment fit: A review of its basic tenets. *Annual Review of Organizational Psychology and Organizational Behavior*, *5*(1), 75-101. https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-orgpsych-032117-104702

Vogel, R. M., & Feldman, D. C. (2009). Integrating the levels of person–environment fit: The roles of vocational fit and group fit. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 75*(1), 68-81. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jvb.2009.03.007

Wang, B., Liu, Y., Qian, J., & Parker, S. K. (2021). Achieving effective remote working during the COVID-19 pandemic: A work design perspective. *Applied Psychology, 70*(1), 16-59. https://doi.org/10.1111/apps.12290