

## HEXACO Personality Traits and Organizational Culture as Predictors of P-O Fit in Indian Organizations

Ranjith T.P.<sup>1\*</sup>, Dr. Richa Gupta<sup>2</sup>

### ABSTRACT

Person–organization fit and organizational culture are widely studied in the field of organizational psychology. However, research examining the relationship between HEXACO personality and P–O fit remains limited. This study examines the relationship of HEXACO factors, Organizational culture and P-O Fit. 187 employees working for four organization types in India participates in this study. Each respondent completes a survey based on the HEXACO model, seven-item version of the Organizational Culture Profile (OCP), and a scale measuring perceived fit with the organization. Analysis using three-block hierarchical regression with Benjamini-Hochberg correction for multiple comparisons serves as the analysis strategy. Perceptions of culture emerge as the factor that contributed significantly to predicting P-O Fit ( $\beta = .72, p < .001$ ). The full model explains 55.9% of variance ( $R^2 = .559, \text{Adj. } R^2 = .526$ ). Honesty-Humility shows a small, non-significant positive association with P-O Fit. A one-way ANOVA identifies significant differences in P–O fit across organization types ( $F[3, 175] = 4.82, p = .003, \eta^2 = .08$ ), with enterprises established in India showing the lowest mean fit among the groups. Perceived organizational culture is a stronger lever for improving P-O fit than personality-based selection in Indian corporate organizations.

**Keywords:** *Person-Organization Fit, HEXACO, Organizational Culture, India, Corporate Organizations*

Person–organization fit (P-O fit) is a term used to indicate the compatibility of an employee and the organization in which the employee works. This typically is the combination of different factors such as employee’s attributes (e.g., values, goals, personality) and the organization’s characteristics (e.g., culture, norms, rewards). P-O fit has attracted sustained research attention because it is consistently associated with employee attitudes, retention and employee effectiveness. Although it has been researched extensively throughout the history of Organizational Psychology, there are areas which require attention, like the utilization of personality measures and geographic/cultural context.

Nearly all existing research in regards to personality as a determinant to P-O fit have utilized the Five Factor Model (McCrae & Costa, 1997). However, researchers have recently proposed

<sup>1</sup>MSc Psychology student Department of Psychology, Centre for Distance and Online Education Jain (Deemed-to-be University), Bengaluru 560069, India

<sup>2</sup>Associate Professor Department of Psychology, Centre for Distance and Online Education Jain (Deemed-to-be University), Bengaluru 560069, India

\*Corresponding Author

Received: April 13, 2026; Revision Received: April 22, 2026; Accepted: April 26, 2026

## HEXACO Personality Traits and Organizational Culture as Predictors of P-O Fit in Indian Organizations

a second model known as the HEXACO model (Ashton & Lee, 2007), which was established via larger scale lexical studies that involved over a dozen languages. It contains six distinct dimensions including Honesty-Humility, which is a completely distinct factor in addition to five factors. Honesty-Humility refers to the extent to which an individual is honest and sincere, fair-minded, modest, and unwilling to take unfair advantage of others. Researchers have demonstrated that Honesty-Humility is able to predict both general performance-related behaviors (i.e., citizenship behaviour) and workplace ethics/integrity (Zettler & Hilbig, 2010); further, researchers have also demonstrated that Honesty-Humility is able to predict unique variance in these organizational outcome variables beyond the Big Five. In spite of its theoretical relevance and demonstrated predictive validity, Honesty-Humility appears to be underexamined. Research evidence linking it to P-O fit remains limited.

Another area of unexplored research concerning P-O Fit pertains to geographic context. Almost all research has been done in North America and Europe. Therefore, the relationships observed in the European and American contexts could not be generalized to countries in the developing world, such as India. India's unique cultural context makes it even more complex. P-O fit could be influenced by national culture, as described by Hofstede (2001) - for instance Hofstede found that Indian organizations exhibit substantially higher levels than do Western organizations of power distance index scores; thus, indicating a greater tolerance for authority-oriented organizational cultures. In addition, Hofstede identified that Indians tend toward collectivist attitudes. It results in accepting hierarchy-oriented style of authority. Additionally, India has undergone rapid development in terms of its industrialization and globalization. It resulted in the creation of various types of corporate organizations including large multinational IT corporations; startups developing businesses primarily using non-traditional business model designs; and off-shore global capability centres. As a result, the culture factors within the organization affecting fit could be different than what is present in other cultures.

Thus, the current research fills these gaps. It examines how employees' perception of their work organization's culture (and their HEXACO personality) relates to an employee-person-organization fit. The study is conducted among 187 employees from four different forms of India based corporations. The research focus was – 1) among employees in Indian corporate organizations, do HEXACO personality traits explain variance in perceived person-organization fit? 2) Do culture perceptions explain incremental variance beyond personality? A three-block hierarchical regression was utilized for the purpose of answering this. Block 1 included demographic controls; Block 2 added HEXACO traits; Block 3 added organizational-culture perceptions. Since many relationships between personality and fit were investigated, to control the false discovery rate across the six HEXACO-fit tests, p-values were adjusted using the Benjamini-Hochberg procedure. Additionally, an exploratory assessment of whether there are differences in employee-person-organization fit across corporation type was completed.

### *Hypotheses*

Six theoretical predictions were developed from research.

- **H1:** Conscientiousness will be positive in its relationship with P-O Fit.
- **H2:** Openness to Experience will be positive in its relationship with P-O Fit.
- **H3:** Honesty-Humility will be positive in its relationship with P-O Fit and provide a significant amount of additional explained variance beyond the remaining dimensions of the HEXACO.

## HEXACO Personality Traits and Organizational Culture as Predictors of P-O Fit in Indian Organizations

- **H4:** Emotionality will be negative in its relationship with P-O Fit.
- **H5:** Perceptions of organizational culture will be positive and predictive of P-O Fit.
- **H6:** The total model will account for a significant amount of variance in P-O Fit.

### *Research objectives*

Three main goals have been set for this research. These include (a) to evaluate the dependability and descriptive features of every measure among an Indian working population sample; (b) to identify which of the six dimensions of the HEXACO personality factors and how people perceive their culture is predictive of P-O fit when accounting for demographic characteristics; and (c) to test if Honesty-Humility provides a significant amount of incremental predictive value beyond the other dimensions of the HEXACO.

## LITERATURE REVIEW

### *P-O Fit: Definition, theory and measurement*

P-O fit is commonly defined as the compatibility between individuals and organizations that occurs when at least one entity provides what the other needs, when they share similar characteristics, or when both conditions are present (Kristof, 1996, p. 4). In terms of form, researchers distinguish three types of P-O fit in the literature. These are Complementary Fit (when both parties provide what the other requires), Needs-Supplies/Demands-Abilities Fit (when each party meets some specific need for the other) and Supplementary Fit (when both parties have similar values). Supplementary Fit has produced the greatest amount of research on P-O Fit and also has been shown to be directly related to personality as an antecedent.

At its core, Schneider's (1987) Attraction-Selection-Attrition (ASA) Model provides the theoretical foundation for understanding how and why P-O Fit is formed. Specifically, the ASA Model states that people will be attracted to an organization based upon similarities between the organization's culture and their individual personality profiles. Organizations select applicants that have personalities that fit their organization's culture. Once selected into an organization, those applicants that do not fit culturally will ultimately leave the organization — resulting in a homogeneous work environment for all employees over time. Therefore, the ASA Model clearly outlines the relationship between personality traits and perceived P-O Fit.

Research studies have demonstrated that P-O Fit has many significant implications. Most notably, Kristof-Brown et al. (2005) conducted a meta-analytic review of 172 separate research studies. This research examined the relationship between P-O Fit and job-related outcomes such as job satisfaction, commitment to the organization, and job-related turnover intentions. Results indicated that there was a high level of positive correlation between these variables.

Historically, researchers measured P-O Fit using Profile-Similarity Indices, i.e., through the use of Q-Sort methodology by Chatman (1989) for the model and O'Reilly et al. (1991) for the OCP/profile-comparison method. Currently, however, the predominant method used to measure P-O Fit is through Perceived or Subjective Measures of Fit (i.e., employees' self-reported perceptions regarding whether they believe their values and/or personality type align with those of their employer (Cable & DeRue, 2002)).

## HEXACO Personality Traits and Organizational Culture as Predictors of P-O Fit in Indian Organizations

### *HEXACO Personality and Honesty-Humility*

Ashton & Lee (2007) developed the HEXACO Personality Inventory based on lexical studies of personality conducted across over a dozen languages. They identified six factors: Honesty-Humility (H), Emotionality (E), Extraversion (X), Agreeableness (A), Conscientiousness (C), and Openness to Experience (O). A key theoretical contribution of HEXACO is the identification of Honesty-Humility as a new sixth factor of personality which is independent of the other five Big Five dimensions. Honesty-Humility involves being honest in interpersonal interactions, fair in exchange relations, modest about one's own standing or position, and giving up something personally valuable for someone else's benefit.

Lee et al. (2005) provided empirical evidence that honesty-humility is related to organizational delinquency/integrity measures. Individuals who score higher on Honesty-Humility are more likely to act in accordance with their organizational values even if acting in accordance would reduce their own self-interest (Zettler & Hilbig, 2010). Furnham, Richards & Paulhus (2013) also provide empirical evidence that honesty-humility is negatively correlated with all three aspects of the dark triad of personality: Narcissism, Machiavellianism, and Psychopathy. All three of the dark triad of personality have been shown to relate to organizational misbehavior. Values congruence theory (Kristof-Brown et al., 2005) provides the conceptual rationale for why a positive relationship between employee honesty-humility and perceptions of fit between person and organization exists. Individuals scoring high on honesty-humility have values that prioritize fairness/justice and ethical behavior. Therefore, individuals who are high in honesty-humility will perceive organizations with cultural norms/values consistent with those they hold as more appropriate/fitting for them. Empirical research directly examining HEXACO personality traits in relation to person–organization fit remains limited. The present study extends this literature by focusing on Honesty–Humility. This study considers Honesty-Humility as a focal predictor and examines whether HEXACO traits contribute to the prediction of fit. It also accounts for perceived organizational culture in a sample drawn from Indian corporate organizations.

### *Organizational culture as a predictor of P-O Fit*

The theoretical basis for Organizational Culture being the immediate structural determinant of P-O fit is that an employee's own personal values profile is matched with an organization's own value profile through comparison to each other. Schein (2010) defined culture as the "pattern of basic assumptions learned by a group as it solved its problems of external adaptation and internal integration, which has worked well enough to be considered valid and, therefore, to be taught to new members as the correct way to perceive, think, and feel."

Culture was measured on four primary dimensions in the Organizational Culture Profile (OCP) developed by O'Reilly et al. (1991); an adapted seven-item culture perception scale derived for the purpose of this research, from OCP themes, ie, innovation-orientation, supportiveness, outcome-orientation, and stability. Researchers have demonstrated a strong relationship between an organization having a culture that supports innovation orientation and people-centeredness, and higher levels of P-O Fit. Conversely, researchers have also found a significant negative relationship between organizations that support hierarchical structures and/or results-based decision-making and lower levels of P-O Fit. Those employees who value autonomy and professional growth or development are significantly impacted negatively. Cameron & Quinn (2011) and Denison (1996) demonstrated these relationships.

## HEXACO Personality Traits and Organizational Culture as Predictors of P-O Fit in Indian Organizations

When using perceived culture measures to assess the P-O Fit, there is a substantial concern regarding construct overlap and common method bias (Podsakoff et al., 2003). When assessing two constructs (culture and P-O Fit) through self-report items, there is potential for overlapping method variance from asking similar questions about value alignment and cultural congruence. Therefore, some proportion of the observed relationship will likely represent method variance and not a meaningful substantive relationship. This study acknowledges this issue directly and treated the relationship between culture and P-O Fit as potentially inflated. Hence, cautioning the reader in interpreting the magnitude of effects.

### **MATERIALS & METHOD**

#### *Participants and Sampling*

A convenience sample of working professionals (N = 187) was recruited via professional networks, primarily through LinkedIn. These contacts and other direct contacts of researchers were requested to share in their networks, thus snowballing the referrals. To be eligible, participants were required to have  $\geq 3$  years of organizational work experience. The total sample size consisted of 187 participants. They represented four different forms of organizations: multinational service providers (n = 75; 40.1%), global capability centers (n = 66; 35.3%), India-established enterprises (n = 24; 12.8%), and start-ups/ emerging companies (n = 22; 11.8%). Of the total age range of 20-59 years old, participants reported their ages in the following categories: 20-29 years (20.9%), 30-39 years (34.8%), 40-49 years (34.2%), and 50-59 years (10.2%). Male participants constituted 73.8% of the sample (n = 138), and female participants constituted 24.6% (n = 46); the remaining responses were missing or undisclosed. Experience ranges for the participants' work experience were: 3-5 years (13.9%), 6-10 years (21.5%), and > 10 years (64.6%). Participants reported job levels as junior (20.3%), mid-level managers (26.7%), managers (25.7%), senior level management (23.0%), and CEO/CXO level (3.7%). Primary areas where the participants worked included engineering (31.6%), information technology (16.0%), consulting, healthcare, banking/financial services/institutional, etc., and other industries.

#### *Scientific tools*

Personality was assessed using an adapted item set based on the HEXACO-PI-R model, adapting the HEXACO-60 framework (Ashton & Lee, 2009). The administered questionnaire originally contained 30 items intended to represent the six HEXACO dimensions, but one Conscientiousness item was inadvertently omitted during survey deployment. Because of this, analyses were conducted on a 29-item adapted version. The deployed items were uniformly positively worded. The questionnaire also is different from the standard HEXACO forms. Original includes reverse-keyed items. Therefore, findings related to HEXACO traits should be interpreted cautiously. Especially, when comparing with studies using the original HEXACO-60 or HEXACO-PI-R instruments. The decision to use an adapted, abbreviated item set was primarily driven by survey length constraints. The full questionnaire included three instruments administered to working professionals who are known to have low tolerance for lengthy surveys. Full HEXACO-60 alone has 60 items, combined with the OCP and P-O Fit scales, would produce a survey exceeding 75 items. This length would have significantly reduce response rates. Increase survey fatigue could cause incorrect response. It could also increase systematic non-completion bias, particularly among senior-level respondents.

Accordingly, we adapted a 30-item short form based on the HEXACO-60 framework (Ashton & Lee, 2009), targeting five items per dimension. This approach is consistent with the practice of using abbreviated personality measures in organizational survey research when participant

## HEXACO Personality Traits and Organizational Culture as Predictors of P-O Fit in Indian Organizations

burden is a legitimate constraint (Gosling, Rentfrow, & Swann, 2003). However, we fully acknowledge that these deviations limit the construct validity of the HEXACO subscales and reduce comparability with prior HEXACO-based research.

**Organizational Culture Profile (OCP):** Employees' perception of their organizations culture was measured with seven items developed from O'Reilly et al. (1991). This instrument assessed innovation, learning orientation, decision making transparency, employee empowerment, open communication, values alignment, and culture career support. A 5-point Likert rating scale was used to assess. Internal consistency was extremely high ( $\alpha = .924$ ).

**P-O fit Scale:** Six items developed by Cable & DeRue (2002) assess how well an individual perceives they fit into their organization. Examples include "The values of this organization reflect my own values" and "My personality fits in with this organization's culture". Internal consistency was very good ( $\alpha = .865$ ). Since both measures use self-report data and there is some overlap in content between culture perception and fit perception, there exists a risk for common-method bias (Podsakoff et al., 2003).

### *Psychological Variables*

Three different psychological variables were studied within the context of this research. P-O fit represents the dependent variable. It measures an employee's perceived congruity or compatibility between their own values, goals, and personality and those of the organization they are employed with (Cable & DeRue, 2002). The two independent variables were HEXACO Personality; which consists of six subscales - Honesty-Humility, Emotionality, Extraversion, Agreeableness, Conscientiousness, and Openness to Experience - which were measured using a shortened version of the HEXACO-PI-R (Ashton & Lee, 2009), consisting of twenty-nine items. The other independent variable was Perceived Organization Culture; which is defined by employees self-reporting what they perceive the culture of their organization to be. Finally, demographic factors such as age, sex, years of work experience, job level, and type of organization were controlled for in Block 1 of the Hierarchical Regression.

### *Procedure and ethical considerations*

In this research data were collected via an online survey. It was administered through SurveyMonkey, an online survey platform. Before starting the survey, participants were informed about the purpose of the survey and usage of data, and participate in survey was voluntary. Participants were also assured that their identity would remain anonymous and that no personally identifiable information would be released as part of this study. Additionally, participants could withdraw from the study at any point in time, without penalty.

### *Data analysis strategy*

All analyses were completed in Python version 3.12 with use of both NumPy and SciPy. For each scale, Cronbach's  $\alpha$  was calculated; as an aside, it is also important to note the limitation of Cronbach's alpha when measuring internal consistency (Cronbach, 1951). The Pearson product-moment correlation coefficient was calculated for all study variables; for the six correlations for HEXACO trait-to-fit, BH FDR correction was applied across the family of six tests to account for potential inflation due to multiple testing (Benjamini & Hochberg, 1995). The three-block hierarchical regression was the primary method used to analyze data for the purposes of this research, where P-O fit served as the criterion: In block 1, the demographic control variables (average age, average experience, job-level, gender and organization type) were entered into the equation. The six HEXACO traits were entered into

## HEXACO Personality Traits and Organizational Culture as Predictors of P-O Fit in Indian Organizations

the equation in block two. Finally, the OCP composite variable was entered into the equation in block three. The order of blocks represents the theoretical progression from demographic characteristics to dispositional-based predictors to situationally based predictors. List-wise deletion was used for missing values. A total of  $n=171$  complete case observations were included in the final analytical sample. Additionally, a supplemental analysis examining P-O fit by organization type via a single factor ANOVA with eta squared serving as the effect size indicator, was performed. A Harman's Single-Factor Test (Podsakoff et al., 2003) was used to evaluate whether the significant relationships found in this study may have been affected by the use of a single-source self-report for both the Organizational Culture Profile (OCP) and the Person-Organization Fit (P-O Fit) scale. Since all 42 items included in this study – the 7 Organizational Culture Profile items, the 6 Person-Organization Fit items, and the 29 HEXACO Personality items - were administered together during the same survey session, it was assumed that if there existed a considerable amount of common-method variance among the data due to using a single-source self-report measure, there would likely exist one primary or dominant factor accounting for a large portion of the total variance. Harman's single-factor test was done to assess common method bias (CMB). The results indicate that the first unrotated factor explained only 18.51% of the total variance; however, when examining all ten unrotated factors, they explain 66.68% of the total variance. This is indicative of a non-dominant single-factor, indicating that common-method variance, although cannot be eliminated while using single-source self-report methods. It most probably did not contribute to the large observed effect size between how participants perceive their organization's culture and how well those individuals feel they are a good "fit". Despite this finding, the correlation between these two constructs ( $r = .734$ ) is still quite high, and therefore should be viewed as such with the understanding that Harman's test serves as a conservative diagnostic tool and not a definitive solution to address CMB (Podsakoff et al., 2003).

### RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

#### *Reliability and descriptive statistics*

Table 1 provides Cronbach's alpha coefficients and statistical information on all variables in this study. Each scale had good to excellent reliability. The OCP had the best reliability (.924), followed closely by P-O Fit (.865), both Extraversion and Conscientiousness (.831), and Emotionality (.738). Honesty-Humility had the least reliable results (.665) that are at the lower end of the acceptable range for an OCP short personality subscale, which would reduce its predictive value. P-O Fit was scored an average of 3.48 ( $SD=0.76$ ; Range: 1.17-5.00) showing moderately positive or very positive perceptions of fit among individuals in the sample with considerable individual variation. Perceptions of organizational culture were scored an average of 3.75 ( $SD=0.81$ ; Range: 1.14-5.00). Among HEXACO dimensions, Openness to Experience was scored the highest ( $M=4.33$ ,  $SD=0.51$ ), then conscientiousness ( $M=4.20$ ,  $SD=0.65$ ) and honesty-humility ( $M=4.13$ ,  $SD=0.61$ ). Emotionality was the lowest scoring ( $M=3.48$ ,  $SD=0.70$ ). Skewness values were minorly and negatively skewed throughout (Range: -0.79 to -0.09) as is common in professional self-report samples and do not indicate problematic deviations from regression assumptions.

**Table 1 Reliability Coefficients and Descriptive Statistics for Study Variables**

Variable	Items	$\alpha$	M	SD	Min	Max	Skew
<b>Organizational Culture (OCP)</b>	7	.924	3.75	0.81	1.14	5.00	-0.79
<b>Person-Organization Fit (POF)</b>	6	.865	3.48	0.76	1.17	5.00	-0.35
<b>Honesty-Humility (H)</b>	5	.665	4.13	0.61	2.00	5.00	-0.64
<b>Emotionality (E)</b>	5	.738	3.48	0.70	1.00	5.00	-0.57

## HEXACO Personality Traits and Organizational Culture as Predictors of P-O Fit in Indian Organizations

<b>Extraversion (X)</b>	5	.831	3.87	0.69	1.80	5.00	-0.18
<b>Agreeableness (A)</b>	5	.705	3.94	0.57	2.20	5.00	-0.09
<b>Conscientiousness (C)</b>	4 <sup>a</sup>	.830	4.20	0.65	2.00	5.00	-0.73
<b>Openness (O)</b>	5	.733	4.33	0.51	3.00	5.00	-0.22

*Note.*  $\alpha$  = Cronbach's alpha; M = mean; SD = standard deviation; Min / Max = observed range; Skew = skewness. N ranges from 174–186. <sup>a</sup> Conscientiousness comprised four items due to inadvertent omission of one survey item during deployment. Published forms include reverse-keyed items; the items as deployed appear uniformly positively keyed, which may affect scale properties.

Source: Compiled by the researcher based on Primary data

### ***Bivariate correlations and multiple-comparison correction***

Table 2 provides the Pearson Correlation Matrix. The relationship between Organizational Culture and P-O fit ( $r = .734, p < .001, N = 178$ ) is the largest single bivariate relationship in the table. Following application of the Benjamini-Hochberg False Discovery Rate (FDR) correction to the six HEXACO dimensions-to-Person Organization fit relationships, none of the six HEXACO dimensions demonstrated statistical significance. Marginal raw (i.e., uncorrected) values were found for conscientiousness ( $r = .137, p = .072$ ) and emotionality ( $r = -.133, p = .079$ ). Each of them in the direction predicted based on theoretical models. However, neither of those marginal associations survived the adjustment process. A low level non-significant positive relationship was observed between honesty-humility and person organization fit ( $r = .072, p = .339$ ; BH adjusted  $p = .508$ ). Positive correlations were also found among several HEXACO inter-dimensional relationships including extraversion with agreeableness ( $r = .284, p < .001$ ); conscientiousness ( $r = .391, p < .001$ ); openness ( $r = .374, p < .001$ ); and honesty-humility with emotionality ( $r = .205, p = .006$ ) and conscientiousness ( $r = .211, p = .005$ ) supporting a model of a prosocial-principled personality cluster.

**Table 2 Pearson Correlation Matrix for All Study Variables**

Variable	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
<b>1. OCP</b>	—							
<b>2. POF</b>	.734***	—						
<b>3. H</b>	.021	.072	—					
<b>4. E</b>	-.144†	-.133†	.205**	—				
<b>5. X</b>	-.007	.073	-.048	-.182*	—			
<b>6. A</b>	.077	.040	.051	-.059	.284***	—		
<b>7. C</b>	.136†	.137†	.211**	-.103	.391***	.350***	—	
<b>8. O</b>	-.012	-.033	.074	-.085	.374***	.461***	.432***	—

*Note.* OCP = Organizational Culture Profile; POF = Person-Organization Fit; H = Honesty-Humility; E = Emotionality; X = Extraversion; A = Agreeableness; C = Conscientiousness; O = Openness to Experience. All correlations computed with listwise deletion per pair; N ranges from 173–178. Significance tests for HEXACO-to-fit correlations were subjected to Benjamini-Hochberg FDR correction across six tests; no HEXACO dimension reached adjusted significance. Uncorrected p-values are shown for transparency. †  $p < .10$ ; \*  $p < .05$ ; \*\*  $p < .01$ ; \*\*\*  $p < .001$  (two-tailed, uncorrected).

Source: Compiled by the researcher based on Primary data

### ***Hierarchical regression***

The regression analyses for the three-block hierarchical model were conducted on 171 participants after list-wise deletion.

Block 1: Demographics as Controls. The first block included five demographic variables and produced  $R^2 = .064, F(5, 169) = 2.30, p = .048$ . This represents a small effect size ( $f^2 = .07$ ;

## HEXACO Personality Traits and Organizational Culture as Predictors of P-O Fit in Indian Organizations

Cohen, 1988), indicating that demographic characteristics accounted for a modest but statistically significant proportion of variance in P–O fit.

**Block 2: Adding HEXACO Dimensions.** Adding the six HEXACO personality traits to Block 1 resulted in a nonsignificant increase in R-squared (.037), with a block F-Change of (6, 159) = 1.10,  $p = .367$ . Thus, adding the HEXACO dimensions did not result in a significant improvement in the prediction of the dependent variable when compared to the demographics-only model.

**Block 3: Adding Organizational Culture:** When the organizational culture scale was added to Block 2, there was a dramatic and highly significant increase in R-squared (.459), with a block F- Change of (1, 158) = 164.49,  $p < .001$ . Therefore, based on this analysis, H6 is supported.

Additionally, within the full three-block model, organizational culture was the single statistical predictor of P-O Fit ( $B = 0.684$ ,  $\beta = .720$ ,  $t = 12.825$ ,  $p < .001$ ), which supports H5. None of the HEXACO personality dimensions were statistically significant predictors. In terms of associations between HEXACO dimensions and P-O Fit, extraversion had the greatest association ( $\beta = .094$ ,  $p = .136$ ), while honesty-humility was associated positively but weakly with P-O Fit ( $\beta = .065$ ,  $p = .258$ ).

Therefore, H1, H2, H3, and H4 are not supported by these data. While H4 was directionally correct ( $\beta = -.023$ ), none of the demographic controls were significant in the full model.

**Table 3 Three-Block Hierarchical Regression Predicting Person-Organization Fit**

Block / Predictor	B	SE B	$\beta$	t	p
<b>Block 1: Demographic Controls</b>					
Age (midpoint)	0.007	0.010	.079	0.658	.511
Experience (midpoint)	-	0.014	-	-0.277	.782
	0.004		.033		
Job level	0.048	0.046	.073	1.049	.296
Gender (female = 1)	0.047	0.097	.028	0.488	.626
GCC indicator (1 = yes)	0.064	0.087	.041	0.741	.460
<b>Block 1 R<sup>2</sup> = .064; F(5, 169) = 2.295, p = .048</b>					
<b>Block 2: + HEXACO Dimensions</b>					
Honesty-Humility (H)	0.085	0.074	.065	1.136	.258
Emotionality (E)	-	0.062	-	-0.412	.681
	0.026		.023		
Extraversion (X)	0.105	0.070	.094	1.497	.136
Agreeableness (A)	-	0.084	-	-0.567	.572
	0.047		.035		
Conscientiousness (C)	0.013	0.078	.011	0.166	.868
Openness (O)	-	0.099	-	-0.741	.460
	0.073		.049		
<b><math>\Delta R^2 = .037</math>; Block F-change(6, 159) = 1.096, p = .367</b>					
<b>Block 3: + Organizational Culture</b>					
OCP (culture perceptions)	0.684	0.053	.720	12.825	< .001 ***
<b><math>\Delta R^2 = .459</math>; Block F-change(1, 158) = 164.491, p &lt; .001</b>					

## HEXACO Personality Traits and Organizational Culture as Predictors of P-O Fit in Indian Organizations

---

**Full model:  $R^2 = .559$ ; Adj.  $R^2 = .526$ ;  
N = 171**

---

*Note.* B = unstandardized coefficient; SE B = standard error;  $\beta$  = standardized coefficient; GCC = Global Capability Center. Listwise deletion applied. Block and summary rows are shown in italics for readability. \*\*\*  $p < .001$ .

Source: Compiled by the researcher based on Primary data

### ***Supplementary analysis: P-O Fit by organization type***

One-way ANOVA of P-O Fit was conducted to determine if there are differences in P-O Fit among the four organizational types. The mean for each type of organization was: GCC (mean=3.58, S.D.=0.66, N=64); multinational corporation services (mean=3.52, S.D.=0.73, N=74); India-established enterprise (mean=2.94, S.D.=0.85, N=23); and startup (mean=3.63, S.D.=0.75, N=18). The overall F-statistic from this ANOVA was statistically significant,  $F(3,175) = 4.818$ ,  $p = .003$ ,  $\eta^2 = .076$  (moderate effect size). The exploratory ANOVA indicates that P-O fit differed across organization types. India-established enterprises showed the lowest mean fit score among the four groups. These results are exploratory and intended to be used for developing hypotheses. This could be tested formally through use of post-hoc comparisons using sufficient numbers of participants per group.

This study is among the very few to investigate HEXACO personality characteristics and perceived organizational culture as joint predictors of Person-Organization (P-O) Fit in India's large corporations. Across analyses, results indicate that perceived organizational culture was the strongest predictor of perceived fit in this sample – contributing over 45% of the total variation explained by a single block of variables ( $\Delta R^2 = .459$ ). A non-significant block of variation was attributed to HEXACO personality; and none of the six dimensions of HEXACO – including the focus of this study, Honesty-Humility - met either conventional or BH-adjusted criteria for statistical significance.

### ***Organizational culture***

The significant and positive relationship between Organizational Culture Perceptions (OCP) and Person-Organization Fit (P-O Fit), ( $r = .734$ ,  $\beta = .720$  in the full model) has two interpretative dimensions. This demonstrates the long-standing theory proposed by Schneider (1987) and O'Reilly et al. (1991), which states that employees' perceptions of the culture they work in will determine whether employees have a fit within the organization. Therefore, organizations that allow employees to experience an open-innovative, transparent, empowering and aligned to their values, will result in significantly higher fit perceptions among its employees.

Methodologically speaking, however, the relationship must be viewed with caution. Podsakoff et al. (2003) indicate that when predictors and criteria are measured through a single source self-report item with overlapping content (as is the case with the OCP and P-O Fit scale used in this study), the observed correlation is likely to be exaggerated. It is due to the presence of shared method variance and conceptual overlap. For example, if a company uses questions on their survey that inquire about the alignment of employees' values and their perception of how well those values are supported in their workplace (culture); and at the same time asking how well their personal values align with the company's values (value congruence). A portion of the correlation may represent the fact that individuals who report high levels of person-organization fit will also report high levels of organizational culture perceptions. In other words, there may be some degree of reverse causality where employees who believe they fit

## HEXACO Personality Traits and Organizational Culture as Predictors of P-O Fit in Indian Organizations

into an organization better tend to perceive the culture more favorably. To better distinguish substantive effects from methodological artifacts, future studies should use multiple sources or objective measures of organizational culture.

### *HEXACO Personality*

The contribution of personality to P–O fit was substantially reduced once employees' perceptions of organizational culture were included in the model. When organizational culture was included in the regression model, the unique contributions of the six personality dimensions to P–O fit became negligible and statistically non-significant. This indicates that there is no unique effect of each personality dimension beyond what can be explained by an employee's view of their work environment. However, at the individual item level, trends in the direction of expectations were observed for conscientiousness ( $r=0.137$ ) and emotionality ( $r=-.133$ ). However, it is only after controlling for the effect of organizational culture did these relationships become statistically insignificant. These results support both a situationism perspective that suggests powerful environmental influences will greatly reduce the ability to observe the effects of personality (Mischel, 1977). Also, it suggests that a cultural mediation model may help to explain the nature of the relationship between personality and P-O Fit. A potential explanation is that the personality traits influence the type or degree of organizational culture employees select, as well as how employees interpret their work environments. Thus, if employees perceive themselves working within an organization with a culture that matches their personality characteristics, then they are likely to report higher levels of P-O Fit than those who do not see such similarities. To test whether culture plays a mediating role in the personality- P-O Fit relationship, researchers could include culture as the mediator of the relationship between personality and P-O Fit. Including culture as a co-predictor of P-O Fit in a regression equation should reduce the magnitude of personality effects regardless of sample size. Therefore, testing a mediated model will provide a more theoretically meaningful conclusion than simply testing incremental validity.

### *Honesty-Humility*

The findings show a very weak positive correlation between Honesty-Humility and Person-Organization fit ( $\beta = .065$  in the full model and  $r = .072$  bivariate), which are in line with what was hypothesized. However, the association is not statistically significant. Therefore, it could be described as "inconclusive" instead of "disconfirming", due to three reasons. Firstly, given that there were four factors being tested in this study (with culture accounting for a majority of the variance in those factors), the "four factor power constraint" limits how much variation can be attributed to each factor. Second, the relatively low reliability of the Honesty–Humility subscale ( $\alpha = .665$ ) may have attenuated its observed association with P–O fit. Thirdly, while the data collected do not allow testing for moderation effects, it is possible that the H-to-fit relation may be conditioned upon organizational culture (i.e., that H predicts fit most clearly when an organization has an ethics-based/transparent culture).

To help understand the results of this study in terms of power, we ran a power analysis on our research question. Based on Cohen's definition of a small increment ( $f^2 = .02$ ) for a one-predictor addition to a model with eleven predictors with an alpha level of .05 and 80% power, it would take approximately 700 participants to detect such an effect. Therefore, our current sample size of  $N = 171$  is well below the necessary amount of participants to have sufficient power to test whether small amounts of personality predict organizational outcomes.

## HEXACO Personality Traits and Organizational Culture as Predictors of P-O Fit in Indian Organizations

Therefore, replication studies need to include a minimum of 400 – 700 participants, use either the full HEXACO-60 or HEXACO-100, and have explicit preregistration to test the hypotheses regarding Honesty-Humility.

### *Limitations*

Several major limitations in this study require explicit recognition. First, the cross-sectional nature of the data collected precludes drawing conclusions about causality. It is possible that the strong relationship observed here between employee perceptions of fit and favorable evaluations of workplace culture reflects an artifact of perception. Those employees who believe they fit with their organizations will tend to evaluate the cultures of those organizations more positively; or that there is some reciprocal process by which fit influences culture perceptions and vice versa. Alternatively, that some other factors influence both (e.g., years of organization membership, general positive outlook on life). To address these issues, longitudinal studies tracking individuals through time from initial employment would provide evidence for temporal precedence.

A second issue and arguably the most critical issue, is that all of the data in this study was collected via self-report instruments. More importantly, the measures used to assess Organizational Culture Perceptions (OCP) and P-O fit, while differentially phrased, represent related constructs dealing with perceived values alignment and degree of cultural compatibility. The large correlation between culture perceptions and person-organization fit likely includes at least some variance due to method and construct overlap (Podsakoff et al., 2003). In fact, given the size of the correlations observed, this represents one of the primary limitations of interpreting the magnitude of the culture effect. Therefore, future researchers should use either multiple source assessment methods for the objective assessments of workplace culture. In this study, a post hoc Harman one factor analysis was performed on all 42 items. The results showed that the first factor accounted for 18.51% of the total variance among the items. The results indicate there is no single "method" factor. However, it does not completely eliminate the possibility of common-method bias. Podsakoff et al. (2003) stated that Harman's test may be considered to be an overly conservative measure of whether CMB exists.

Another key limitation concerns the personality measure. Although the questionnaire was based on the HEXACO-PI-R model, the instrument used in this study was not a standard validated HEXACO form. One Conscientiousness item was omitted during administration, and the deployed item set used uniformly positive wording rather than the standard mix of regular and reverse-keyed items. These departures from original questionnaire may have affected internal consistency, construct validity, and comparability with prior HEXACO-based research.

The fourth concern relates to sampling characteristics. The participants in this study were identified mostly via a LinkedIn search and personal contacts. The sample significantly over-represents males (approximately 75% male) and professional workers with substantial experience (mid-level to senior level). As a result, junior employees and female employees - who may experience person-organization fit phenomena differently - are under-represented, thereby limiting generalization to all potential members of the Indian corporate workforce.

Finally, based upon sample size alone, this study has insufficient statistical power to detect even moderate relationships between personality dimensions and P-O fit. Therefore, although

## HEXACO Personality Traits and Organizational Culture as Predictors of P-O Fit in Indian Organizations

no significant relationships were found between any of the individual HEXACO subscales and either P-O fit ratings, the lack of statistically significant results should be viewed cautiously as indicative of limited detection ability rather than absolute absence.

### CONCLUSION

The research supports the view of organizational culture as the strongest predictor of employee fit among corporate employees in India. Among the demographic variables and personality traits examined, perceived organizational culture was found to be the best predictor of P-O Fit, accounting for 45.9% additional explained variance beyond personality and demographics ( $\beta = .720$ ,  $P < .001$ ). Rather than relying solely on personality-based hiring methods, investment in these areas related to organizational culture will provide increasing employee fit. Personality dimensions do not independently predict P-O Fit. When controlling for organizational culture, there were no significant findings regarding individual personality dimensions and their relationship to P-O Fit. This finding supports a culture mediation model. Personality may influence an employee's preferences for organizations with matching culture and perceptions of what they believe are ideal working environments. However, personality may not have a direct effect on P-O Fit. Honesty-Humility hypothesis remains indeterminate. Although the relationship between honesty-humility and P-O Fit has a positive direction ( $\beta = .065$ ), this result is theoretically supported; however, based upon sample size limitations, the results cannot fully accept or refute the hypothesis. Therefore, a future replication should be preregistered with the use of the complete HEXACO-60 measure and include a sample size of approximately 400 – 700 participants prior to acceptance or rejection of the hypotheses. Indian enterprise organizations have the lowest average levels of P-O fit among four organization types examined. Results indicated that the average levels of P-O fit in organizations established in India were lower compared to all other three categories. These results warrant further research to determine if structural characteristics or cultural characteristics of each category contribute to differing levels of P-O fit.

### REFERENCES

- American Psychological Association. (2017). Ethical principles of psychologists and code of conduct (2002, amended effective June 1, 2010, and January 1, 2017). <https://www.apa.org/ethics/code>
- Ashton, M. C., & Lee, K. (2007). Empirical, theoretical, and practical advantages of the HEXACO model of personality structure. *Personality and Social Psychology Review*, 11(2), 150–166. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1088868306294907>
- Ashton, M. C., & Lee, K. (2009). The HEXACO-60: A short measure of the major dimensions of personality. *Journal of Personality Assessment*, 91(4), 340–345. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00223890902935878>
- Benjamini, Y., & Hochberg, Y. (1995). Controlling the false discovery rate: A practical and powerful approach to multiple testing. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society: Series B (Methodological)*, 57(1), 289–300. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.2517-6161.1995.tb02031.x>
- 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>
- Cameron, K. S., & Quinn, R. E. (2011). *Diagnosing and changing organizational culture: Based on the competing values framework* (3rd ed.). Jossey-Bass.

## HEXACO Personality Traits and Organizational Culture as Predictors of P-O Fit in Indian Organizations

- Chatman, J. A. (1989). Improving interactional organizational research: A model of person-organization fit. *Academy of Management Review*, 14(3), 333–349. <https://doi.org/10.5465/amr.1989.4279063>
- Cohen, J. (1988). *Statistical power analysis for the behavioral sciences* (2nd ed.). Lawrence Erlbaum Associates. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203771587>
- Cronbach, L. J. (1951). Coefficient alpha and the internal structure of tests. *Psychometrika*, 16(3), 297–334. <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF02310555>
- Denison, D. R. (1996). What is the difference between organizational culture and organizational climate? A native's point of view on a decade of paradigm wars. *Academy of Management Review*, 21(3), 619–654. <https://doi.org/10.5465/amr.1996.9702100310>
- Furnham, A., Richards, S. C., & Paulhus, D. L. (2013). The Dark Triad of personality: A 10-year review. *Social and Personality Psychology Compass*, 7(3), 199–216. <https://doi.org/10.1111/spc3.12018>
- Gosling, S. D., Rentfrow, P. J., & Swann, W. B., Jr. (2003). A very brief measure of the Big-Five personality domains. *Journal of Research in Personality*, 37(6), 504–528. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0092-6566\(03\)00046-1](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0092-6566(03)00046-1)
- Hofstede, G. (2001). *Culture's consequences: Comparing values, behaviors, institutions, and organizations across nations* (2nd ed.). Sage Publications.
- Kristof, 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>
- Lee, K., Ashton, M. C., & de Vries, R. E. (2005). Predicting workplace delinquency and integrity with the HEXACO and five-factor models of personality structure. *Human Performance*, 18(2), 179–197. [https://doi.org/10.1207/s15327043hup1802\\_4](https://doi.org/10.1207/s15327043hup1802_4)
- McCrae, R. R., & Costa, P. T., Jr. (1997). Personality trait structure as a human universal. *American Psychologist*, 52(5), 509–516. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0003-066X.52.5.509>
- Mischel, W. (1977). The interaction of person and situation. In D. Magnusson & N. S. Endler (Eds.), *Personality at the crossroads: Current issues in interactional psychology* (pp. 333–352). Lawrence Erlbaum.
- O'Reilly, C. A., III, Chatman, J., & Caldwell, D. F. (1991). People and organizational culture: A profile comparison approach to assessing person-organization fit. *Academy of Management Journal*, 34(3), 487–516. <https://doi.org/10.5465/256404>
- Podsakoff, P. M., MacKenzie, S. B., Lee, J.-Y., & Podsakoff, N. P. (2003). Common method biases in behavioral research: A critical review of the literature and recommended remedies. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 88(5), 879–903. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.88.5.879>
- Schein, E. H. (2010). *Organizational culture and leadership* (4th ed.). Jossey-Bass.
- Schneider, B. (1987). The people make the place. *Personnel Psychology*, 40(3), 437–453. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1744-6570.1987.tb00609.x>
- Zettler, I., & Hilbig, B. E. (2010). Honesty-humility and a person-situation interaction at work. *European Journal of Personality*, 24(7), 569–582. <https://doi.org/10.1002/per.757>

## HEXACO Personality Traits and Organizational Culture as Predictors of P-O Fit in Indian Organizations

### ***Acknowledgment***

Authors acknowledge the support of 187 working professionals across Indian organizations who voluntarily participated in this study, and no external funding was received for this research.

### ***Conflict of Interest***

The authors declared no conflict of interest.

***How to cite this article:*** Ranjith, T.P. & Gupta, R. (2026). HEXACO Personality Traits and Organizational Culture as Predictors of P-O Fit in Indian Organizations. *International Journal of Indian Psychology*, 14(2), 436-450. DIP:18.01.043.20261402, DOI:10.25215/1402.043