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Economic development and scientific and technological progress have accelerated the internationalization of the world. Liberalization and diversification have resulted in countless opportunities. Nations, corporations, and individuals, have attempted to enhance their respective competitive advantages, such as by seeking to reduce costs and focus on differentiation. This includes personality traits, socialization, and person-team fit, which were the focus of this study. This study investigated national image and the service industry by analyzing flight attendants. Only relevant personality traits associated with socialization and person-team fit were considered. The findings of this study will help people to choose occupations according to their personalities regarding teamwork, and socialization, and offer suggestions for organizations and nations that implement human resources management.
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Introduction

Globalization has increased the frequency of business travel, with air transportation often being the first choice of travelers. Thus, maintaining high quality products and services has become critical for enterprises. Air transportation is a service that involves a high degree of social contact; therefore, the presentation of first-line employees can influence its quality substantially.

Expanding team “work analysis” is beyond “teamwork” analysis. Notably, work analysis applied to work teams has sometimes focused mostly upon teamwork concepts (cooperativeness or agreeableness (e.g., Stevens & Campion, 1994) and crucial research streams this classic work prompted). However, project teams face task requirements not entirely unlike occupations or jobs. Thus, in addition to teamwork concepts, one needs traditional work skills considerations to guide team staffing decisions.

Although previous studies have explored the person-team fit of new staffs, they have predominantly emphasized organizational recruiting, focusing on the role of recruiters and the patterns of employee personality traits, including personal value, attitude, and organizational value, before employees enter an organization. Few studies have investigated the direct influence of personality traits on person-team fit. Jones (1986) determined that person-team fit may be affected by new staff members perceiving their training programs differently. Thus, the various personality traits of staff members are worth discussing. In addition, whether unique socialization distinctly influences personality traits regarding person-team fit has been rarely
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investigated in previous studies. Therefore, the current study explored the relationship among personality traits, socialization, and person-team fit to determine the influence.

**Literature Review and Hypotheses**

**Personality Traits and Person-Team Fit**

Guilford (1959) considered personality traits a consistent and unique feature, comprising the characteristics and attributes that distinguish a person from others (Cai, 2001). Allport (1961) deemed personality traits a dynamic organization within the psychological system of a person. These traits constitute, and uniquely determine “thought and behavior” and how a person “fits the external environment”. In summary, personal behavior reflects unique personality characteristics and if continuous in different situations, can be called personality traits.

Costa and McCrae (1992) classified personality traits into five categories: “agreeableness”, “conscientiousness”, “extraversion”, “neuroticism”, and “openness to experience”. Personality traits constitute a consistent feature of thought and behavior, but exhibit distinct dynamic features in different situations. Guion (1993) conceptualized the team component in making personality traits a research variable. Moynihan and Peterson (1992) predicted that personality traits may create team heterogeneity, and nervous relationships. However, such relationships might not cause destruction, but rather stimulate mediation to result in innovation and evoke team effectiveness, particularly in a complex environment. Hoffman and Maier (1961) expressed the same viewpoint as that of Moynihan and Peterson. Therefore, we posit:

H1: A relationship exists between personality traits and person-team fit.

Barrick, Stewart, Neubert, and Mount (1998) considered agreeableness an essential indicator for predicting social interaction at work. Thus, we posit the following hypotheses:

H1-1-1: Agreeableness of personality traits positively influences the participative safety of person-team fit.

H1-1-2: Agreeableness of personality traits positively influences the support for innovation of person-team fit.

H1-1-3: Agreeableness of personality traits positively influences the team vision of person-team fit.

H1-1-4: Agreeableness of personality traits positively influences the task orientation of person-team fit.

Barrick, Mount, and Judge (2001) indicated that conscientious staff members work efficiently and carefully. Enns and McFarlin (2003) proposed that conscientious staff members are excellent at persuasion and are highly influential, particularly in engineering departments. Thus, we posit the following hypotheses:

H1-2-1: Conscientiousness positively influences the participative safety of person-team fit.

H1-2-2: Conscientiousness positively influences the support for innovation of person-team fit.

H1-2-3: Conscientiousness positively influences the team vision of person-team fit.

H1-2-4: Conscientiousness positively influences the task orientation of person-team fit.

Enns and McFarlin (2003) indicated that extraverted people are effective at encouraging others and evoking enthusiasm and hope. Thus, we posit the following hypotheses:

H1-3-1: Extraversion positively influences the participative safety of person-team fit.

H1-3-2: Extraversion positively influences the support for innovation of person-team fit.

H1-3-3: Extraversion positively influences the team vision of person-team fit.

H1-3-4: Extraversion positively influences the task orientation of person-team fit.
Costa and McCrae (1992) indicated that neuroticism is reflective of negative emotions. Anderson, John, Keltner, and Kring (2001) proposed that neuroticism may negatively affect a person’s influence because it may diminish respect and praise from others. Thus, we posit the following hypotheses:

H1-4-1: Neuroticism positively influences the participative safety of person-team fit.
H1-4-2: Neuroticism positively influences the support for innovation of person-team fit.
H1-4-3: Neuroticism positively influences the team vision of person-team fit.
H1-4-4: Neuroticism positively influences the task orientation of person-team fit.

John and Srivastava (1999) described openness to experience as “the width, depth, creativity and complexity degree of one’s life and mental” (pp. 102-138). For example, an open person may be more creative and more willing to accept new ideas than a person who is not open. However, in related research, openness to experience has shown no relationship with work performance (Barrick & Mount, 1991; Barrick et al., 2001). To determine whether this feature is relevant to organizations, we presumed it to be one variable. The hypotheses are listed as follows:

H1-5-1: Openness to experience positively influences the participative safety of person-team fit.
H1-5-2: Openness to experience positively influences the support for innovation of person-team fit.
H1-5-3: Openness to experience positively influences the team vision of person-team fit.
H1-5-4: Openness to experience positively influences the task orientation of person-team fit.

Organizational Socialization to Personality Traits and Person-Team Fit

Organizational socialization is the induction and orientation that causes individuals to work smoothly and conform to their organizational operation (Anakwe & Greenhaus, 2000). It is a process that allows individuals to acquire the essential knowledge or skills required in their work. It can also be a switch process that includes delivery functions that convey organizational “regulations” and “values” to a staff. Bauer, Morrison, and Callister (1998) mentioned that organizational socialization is an important process because it offers new staff members the opportunity to respond to their work environment and cooperate with others. When the socialization process gradually links the “personal value” of new staff with “organizational value”, staff members are committed to the organization and are not likely to leave (Holtom, Mitchell, & Lee, 2006). This contributes to the recruiting, selecting, and training of an organization and increases profit (Daniel & Charles, 2001). According to previous, this study applied organizational socialization as the moderating variable.

We only two factors, “serial” and “investiture” as test variables to explore the relationship among personality traits, organizational socialization, and person-team fit. The term serial means that the organization arranges its senior staff to direct new staff. The term investiture means that an organization supports the ideas of new staff members. Finally, we posit the following hypotheses:

H2: Organizational socialization is a moderating variable in personality traits regarding person-team fit.
H2-1: Serial socialization is a moderating variable in personality traits regarding person-team fit and powerful relationships.
H2-2: Investiture socialization is a moderating variable in personality traits regarding person-team fit and powerful relationships.

Methodology

This research explored the relationship between personality traits and person-team fit and investigated
whether the degree of organizational socialization affects. For research subjects, we investigated flight attendants from China Airlines by using a questionnaire and data analysis. The two questionnaire designs in this investigation were verified according to the personality trait scale by Schmit, Kihm, and Robie (2000), the organizational socialization scale by Gareth R. Jones (1986), and the person-team fit scale by Giles and Neil (2004). The evaluation involved using a five-point Likert scale, where in “extremely agree” received five points and “extremely disagree” received one point. The research scheme is presented in Figure 1.

![Figure 1. Research scheme.](image)

Results

Descriptive Statistic

More than half (78.2%) of the sample were women and the rest (21.8%) were men. The most common age distribution was 31-35 years (38.6%). The most common level of education attained was a university degree (50%). The most common income bracket was NT $50,000-NT $60,000 (24.5%). The most common amount of work experience was between 10 and 15 years (40%). More than half of the sample were fly attendants (74.5%), whereas the rest were cabin service directors (17.3%).

Data Analysis of Reliability, Validity, and Confirmatory

According to the recommendation of Bagozzi and Yi (1988), the internal consistency of the questionnaire was tested using Cronbach’s α coefficient. After inefficient questions were removed, only the dimension of “openness to experience” was observed to lower Cronbach’s α value. The other dimensions of the personality trait scale were shown to be reliable and consistent (Table 1). For the scale of personality traits regarding person-team fit, once the inefficient questions were removed, nearly all of the dimensions were shown to be reliable, apart from the dimension of “support for innovation” (Table 2).

This study used maximum likelihood estimation to analyze the fitness test and determine whether each dimension was valid. For the personality trait measurement model, RMR = 0.034, GFI = 0.827, NFI = 0.784,
and CFI = 0.872. All of these values were above 0.7 and the factor loading was positive. The second-stage composite reliability (CR) for each dimension was 0.882, 0.855, 0.827, 0.759, and 0.661, and the average variance extracted (AVE) was 0.657, 0.598, 0.447, 0.520, and 0.400, which were higher than 0.7 and 0.4, respectively. Thus, the measurement model of personality traits fits well with convergent validity. For the person-team fit measurement model, once the questions that had standardized loading factors of under 0.5 were removed, RMR = 0.045, GFI = 0.796, NFI = 0.811, and CFI = 0.840. All of these are higher than 0.8 and the factor loading was positive. The second stage of each dimension was 0.881, 0.519, 0.914, and 0.829, and the AVE was 0.553, 0.352, 0.727, and 0.622, which were higher than 0.7 and 0.5, respectively. The dimension of “support for innovation” was slightly less than the standard; however, the measurement model of person-team fit fits well with convergent validity.

According to the principle of testing discriminate validity proposed by Gaski and Nevin (1985), this study used SPSS 15.0 and AMOS 6.0 to conduct correlation coefficient matrix analysis for each dimension. The data analysis is shown in Table 3. The results indicated that each dimension exhibited favorable discriminated validity, and each associated variable had a positive relationship; thus, it was suitable for the structural equation analysis (Table 2).

Overall Model Analysis

The model can be analyzed using theory model assessment and presumption verification. The overall model evaluation is presented in Table 4. The confirmatory factor analysis is shown in Table 5, and Table 6 lists the path coefficients and hypothesis tests.

Organizational Socialization as Moderating Variable

To test Hypothesis 2, a group analysis was performed. As presented in Table 7, a significant difference in overall structure coefficients existed between the two groups ($p < 0.001$), indicating that purchase involvement had an interfering effect on the overall structure coefficient. Further analysis was conducted to determine the difference in the construct relationship.

We then applied the group analysis to verify Hypothesis 2. In Table 6 it shows, a positive difference ($p < 0.001$) in overall structure between two groups. We conducted further analysis to determine the influence within the relationship.

To determine the moderating effect of organizational socialization, we applied an additional limitation for verification. The result indicates that the paths influenced by organizational socialization, as in Table 8.

As shown in Table 8, a moderating effect exists between personality traits and person-team fit. According to the analysis results, serial socialization is verified as the moderating variable between personality traits and person-team fit, which also creates a more powerful relationship; thus, Hypothesis 2-1 is supported. Similarly, investiture socialization is a moderating variable between personality traits and person-team fit, thereby promoting a more powerful relationship; thus, Hypothesis 2-2 is supported.
Table 1
Reliability, Validity, and Confirmatory Analysis of Personality Traits Scale

| Variable                                      | Item-total correlation | Alpha if item deleted | Cronbach’s α | Estimative parameter of MLE | CR  | AVE  |
|----------------------------------------------|------------------------|-----------------------|---------------|-----------------------------|-----|------|
| Agreeableness                               | 0.863                  | 0.621***              | 0.614         | 0.882                       | 0.657|
| 1. Other’s felling as a priority            | 0.785                  | 0.798                 | 0.865***      | 0.252                       |
| 2. I will consider other’s felling and position before making any decision | 0.777                  | 0.8                  | 0.882***      | 0.222                       |
| 3. Before making any decision, considering other’s viewpoint and ideas is critical | 0.782                  | 0.799                 | 0.869***      | 0.245                       |
| 4. I believe anybody treats me with honesty | 0.553                  | 0.906                 | 0.589***      | 0.653                       |
| Conscientiousness                           | 0.851                  | 0.732***              | 0.464         | 0.855                       | 0.598|
| 5. I will finish every detail job according to working plan | 0.742                  | 0.786                 | 0.854***      | 0.271                       |
| 6. My business behavior obey the code of ethics | 0.715                  | 0.8                  | 0.815***      | 0.336                       |
| 7. Everything what I do can be trust        | 0.693                  | 0.808                 | 0.743***      | 0.448                       |
| 8. Work performance is my first goal       | 0.616                  | 0.842                 | 0.667***      | 0.555                       |
| Extraversion                                | 0.826                  | 0.909***              | 0.174         | 0.827                       | 0.447|
| 9. I am looking forward to change the work content | 0.517                  | 0.815                 | 0.518***      | 0.732                       |
| 11. I would like to reach a challenge goal   | 0.647                  | 0.788                 | 0.682***      | 0.535                       |
| 12. I hope one day can be promoted to highest level | 0.569                  | 0.803                 | 0.569***      | 0.676                       |
| 13. I always keep vitality to my job       | 0.632                  | 0.789                 | 0.738***      | 0.455                       |
| 14. I will encourage others and give them some suggestions about work direction | 0.642                  | 0.789                 | 0.774***      | 0.401                       |
| 15. I can easily make friend with other and break the deadlock | 0.574                  | 0.802                 | 0.695***      | 0.517                       |
| Neuroticism                                 | 0.742                  | 0.919***              | 0.155         | 0.759                       | 0.52 |
| 16. Despite the frustration I feel, it still easily to manage my emotions | 0.479                  | 0.768                 | 0.533***      | 0.716                       |
| 18. I enthuse for my job                   | 0.642                  | 0.564                 | 0.822***      | 0.324                       |
| 19. I have confident with my ability       | 0.602                  | 0.631                 | 0.775***      | 0.399                       |
| Openness to Experience                     | 0.651                  | 0.660***              | 0.564         | 0.661                       | 0.4  |
| 21. I tend to finish the job by myself even the others give voluntary assistance | 0.436                  | 0.584                 | 0.533***      | 0.716                       |
| 22. I can quickly realize the cause-effect of something | 0.534                  | 0.436                 | 0.767***      | 0.412                       |
| 23. I have keen insight into something before them happen | 0.4                    | 0.592                 | 0.573***      | 0.672                       |

Notes. GFI = 0.827, NFI = 0.813, CFI = 0.872, RMR = 0.034, Factor loading is standardized value, *** represents p < 0.001
| Variable                     | Item-total correlation | Alpha if item deleted | Cronbach’s α | Estimative parameter of MLE | CR  | AVE  |
|------------------------------|------------------------|-----------------------|--------------|-----------------------------|-----|------|
|                              |                        |                       |              | Factor loading (λ<sub>x</sub>) | Measurement error (δ) |     |      |
| Participative Safety         |                        |                       |              |                             |     |      |
| 1. My partners and I will share information with each others | 0.684 | 0.856 | 0.876 | 0.784*** | 0.385 | 0.881 | 0.553 |
| 2. My partners and I will discuss the problem what we met during the work | 0.682 | 0.855 | 0.756*** | 0.428 |
| 3. My partners and I will accept each other’s mistake | 0.67 | 0.856 | 0.733*** | 0.463 |
| 4. My partners and I have the consensus of a team | 0.749 | 0.843 | 0.751*** | 0.436 |
| 5. I will keep in touch with my partners | 0.7 | 0.852 | 0.816*** | 0.334 |
| 6. I have well interaction with my partners | 0.634 | 0.865 | 0.818*** | 0.563 |
| Support for Innovation       | 0.492 | 1.165*** | -0.357 | 0.519 | 0.352 |
| 7. My partners and I like to learn the newest thing | 0.344 | 0.344 | 0.541*** | 0.707 |
| 9. My partners and I consider the standard operation process (SOP) is appropriate and useful | 0.349 | 0.325 | 0.642*** | 0.588 |
| Team Vision                  | 0.911 | 0.828*** | 0.314 | 0.914 | 0.727 |
| 10. My partners and I identify with the SOP | 0.8 | 0.885 | 0.837*** | 0.299 |
| 11. My partners and I actually obey the SOP | 0.745 | 0.904 | 0.811*** | 0.342 |
| 12. My partners and I consider the SOP is appropriate | 0.847 | 0.868 | 0.903*** | 0.185 |
| 13. My partners and I consider the SOP can be actually done in reality | 0.815 | 0.882 | 0.856*** | 0.267 |
| Task Orientation             | 0.814 | 0.886*** | 0.215 | 0.829 | 0.622 |
| 14. My partners and I put focused on achieving service quality | 0.719 | 0.687 | 0.882*** | 0.222 |
| 15. My partners and I will assist each other to achieve the optimize service quality | 0.721 | 0.697 | 0.820*** | 0.328 |
| 17. My partners and I will rigorous review the job mistake to achieve the optimize service quality | 0.571 | 0.847 | 0.645*** | 0.584 |

**Notes.** GFI = 0.796, NFI = 0.811, CFI = 0.840, RMR = 0.045; Factor loading is standardized value; *** represents p < 0.001
### Table 3

**Discriminate Validity Analysis and Relative Coefficient**

| Dimension                  | Agreeableness | Conscientiousness | Extraversion | Neuroticism | Openness to Experience | Serial | Investiture | Participative Safety | Support for Innovation | Team Vision | Task Orientation | CR | AVE |
|----------------------------|---------------|-------------------|--------------|-------------|------------------------|--------|-------------|----------------------|------------------------|-------------|-------------------|----|-----|
| Agreeableness              | 0.534         |                   |              |             |                        |        |             |                      |                        |             |                   |    |     |
| Conscientiousness          | 0.407         | 0.572             |              |             |                        |        |             |                      |                        |             |                   |    |     |
| Extraversion               | 0.309         | 0.398             | 0.594        |             |                        |        |             |                      |                        |             |                   |    |     |
| Neuroticism                | 0.331         | 0.387             | 0.414        | 0.561       |                        |        |             |                      |                        |             |                   |    |     |
| Openness to Experience     | 0.588         | 0.532             | 0.394        | 0.388       | 0.327                  |        |             |                      |                        |             |                   |    |     |
| Serial                     | 0.247         | 0.065             | 0.085        | 0.201       | 0.047                  | 0.237  |             |                      |                        |             |                   |    |     |
| Investiture                | 0.652         | 0.552             | 0.490        | 0.368       | 0.522                  | 0.268  |             |                      |                        |             |                   |    |     |
| Participative Safety       | 0.479         | 0.513             | 0.306        | 0.261       | 0.195                  | 0.472  | 0.209       | 0.582                |                        |             |                   |    |     |
| Support for Innovation     | 0.467         | 0.592             | 0.423        | 0.321       | 0.272                  | 0.461  | 0.103       | 0.527                | 0.552                  |             |                   |    |     |
| Team Vision                | 0.541         | 0.562             | 0.394        | 0.314       | 0.292                  | 0.540  | 0.257       | 0.672                | 0.663                  | 0.673       |                   |    |     |

**Notes.** Diagonal Value is Square Root of AVE; CR means Composite Reliability; AVE means Average Variance Extracted. Triangle is the Relationship of Potential Dimensions; Lower Triangular is Pearson Relationship.
Table 4

| Variable                          | Estimative parameter of MLE | Measurement error (δ/ε) | CR  | AVE |
|----------------------------------|----------------------------|-------------------------|-----|-----|
| Personality Traits               |                            |                         |     |     |
| Agreeableness                   | 0.621***                   | 0.614                   | 0.701 | 0.501 |
| Conscientiousness               | 0.732***                   | 0.464                   |     |     |
| Extraversion                    | 0.909***                   | 0.174                   |     |     |
| Neuroticism                     | 0.919***                   | 0.155                   |     |     |
| Openness to Experience          | 0.660***                   | 0.564                   |     |     |
| Person Team Fit                 |                            |                         | 0.722 | 0.512 |
| Participative Safety            | 0.784***                   | 0.385                   |     |     |
| Support for Innovation          | 1.165***                   | -0.357                  |     |     |
| Team Vision                     | 0.828***                   | 0.314                   |     |     |
| Task Orientation                | 0.886***                   | 0.215                   |     |     |

Notes. $\chi^2 = \text{d.f.}, \text{GFI} = 0., \text{RMR} = 0., \text{RMSEA} = 0., \text{AGFI} = 0., \text{NFI} = 0., \text{CFI} = 0., \text{PNFI} = 0., \text{PGFI} = 0.$, factor loading is standardized value, *** represents $p < 0.001.$
Table 5

Confirmatory Factor Analysis Standard (Bagozzi & Yi, 1988)

| Evaluation item | Standard value |
|-----------------|----------------|
| Preliminary Fit Criteria: The specification error, question identification or error input... etc. in examination model | |
| 1. Does there are no negative error variances | Yes |
| 2. Does the error variances positive | Yes |
| 3. Does the absolute values among the parameters are not approached | Yes |
| 4. Does the factor loading from 0.5~0.95 | Yes |
| 5. Does there are no significant standard error | Yes |

B. Overall Model Fit: Fitness evaluation of overall model and observation data

| Model Fit | Standard value |
|-----------|----------------|
| 1. Model Fit → CMIN: positive relation of χ²; p > 0.05 (p greater than 0.05) | Smaller P value is much better; Bigger Samples are much better |
| 2. Model Fit → CMIN → CMIN/DF: χ²/df (Chi-square ratio: chi-square value/degree of freedom) | < 3 |
| 3. Model Fit → RMR, GFI → RMSR (< 0.05) Root Mean Square Residual (RSMR) | < 0.05 |
| 4. Model Fit → RMR, GFI → GFI (> 0.9) Goodness of Fit Index (GFI) | > 0.9 |
| Hu and Bentler (1999) | |
| 5. Model Fit → RMR, GFI → AGFI (> 0.9) Adjusted Goodness of Fit Index (AGFI) | > 0.9 |
| Hu and Bentler (1999) | |
| 6. Model Fit → Baseline Comparisons → NFI (> 0.9) Normed Fit Index (NFI) | > 0.9 |
| 7. Model Fit → Baseline Comparisons → TLI (> 0.9) Non-normed Fit Index (NNFI) | > 0.9 |
| 8. Model Fit → Baseline Comparisons → CFI (> 0.9) Comparative Fit Index (CFI) | > 0.9 |
| 9. Model Fit → RMSEA (< 0.05) Root Mean Square Error of Approximation (RMSEA) | < 0.05 (0.08 also available) |
| McDonald and Ho (2002) | |

C. Fit of Internal Structure of Model: Evaluating the positive degree of estimative parameter and the reliability of each index and potential variance in the model

| Degree | Standard value |
|--------|----------------|
| 1. The reliability of each item (reliability analysis) | > 0.5 |
| 2. The composite reliability (CR) of potential variance (measurement model) | > 0.6 |
| 3. The average variance extracted (AVE) of potential variance | > 0.5 |
| 5. The standardization of absolute error | < 1.96 |
| 6. Modification Indices (M. I.) | < 3.84 |

Table 6

Path Coefficient and Hypotheses Verification of Overall Model

| Path | Relationship | Path coefficient | Hypothesis | Result |
|------|--------------|------------------|------------|--------|
| γ_{11} | Personality Traits | Person-Team Fit | 0.004** | H1 | Support |

Table 7

Moderating Effect Testing of Personality Traits and Person-Team Fit

| Estimation Model | Limitation Model | Δχ² | Degrees of freedom |
|-----------------|-----------------|-----|-------------------|
| 570.24          | 613.35          | 43.11*** | 144 |
| 145             |                 |      |                   |

Notes. *** means p < 0.001, ** means p < 0.01, * means p < 0.05.
Table 8

Moderating Effect Testing of Structural Coefficient

| Path of restriction model                          | $\chi^2$  | $\Delta \chi^2$ (df = 1) | p value |
|---------------------------------------------------|-----------|--------------------------|---------|
| Agreeableness $\rightarrow$ Participative Safety  | 7,672.694 | 5.472                    | $p < 0.01^{**}$ |
| Agreeableness $\rightarrow$ Support for Innovation| 7,674.660 | 5.386                    | $p < 0.05^*$ |
| Agreeableness $\rightarrow$ Team Vision           | 7,649.238 | 4.772                    | $p < 0.05^*$ |
| Agreeableness $\rightarrow$ Task Orientation      | 7,657.808 | 8.533                    | $p < 0.000^{***}$ |
| Conscientiousness $\rightarrow$ Participative Safety| 7,649.397 | 6.453                    | $p < 0.01^{**}$ |
| Conscientiousness $\rightarrow$ Support for Innovation| 7,654.301 | 5.027                    | $p < 0.01^{**}$ |
| Conscientiousness $\rightarrow$ Team Vision       | 7,654.627 | 5.353                    | $p < 0.000^{***}$ |
| Conscientiousness $\rightarrow$ Task Orientation  | 7,649.549 | 5.275                    | $p < 0.000^{***}$ |
| Extraversion $\rightarrow$ Participative Safety   | 7,653.651 | 4.357                    | $p < 0.05^*$ |
| Extraversion $\rightarrow$ Support for Innovation | 7,657.677 | 5.334                    | $p < 0.05^*$ |
| Extraversion $\rightarrow$ Team Vision            | 7,654.849 | 5.435                    | $p < 0.000^{***}$ |
| Extraversion $\rightarrow$ Task Orientation       | 7,658.846 | 8.872                    | $p < 0.01^{**}$ |
| Neuroticism $\rightarrow$ Participative Safety    | 7,658.459 | 9.382                    | $p < 0.05^*$ |
| Neuroticism $\rightarrow$ Support for Innovation  | 7,669.696 | 7.664                    | $p < 0.01^{**}$ |
| Neuroticism $\rightarrow$ Team Vision             | 7,667.827 | 6.558                    | $p < 0.000^{***}$ |
| Neuroticism $\rightarrow$ Task Orientation        | 7,650.046 | 3.772                    | $p < 0.000^{***}$ |
| Openness to Experience $\rightarrow$ Participative Safety | 7,659.237 | 4.216                    | $p < 0.05^*$ |
| Openness to Experience $\rightarrow$ Support for Innovation | 7,632.722 | 5.722                    | $p < 0.05^*$ |
| Openness to Experience $\rightarrow$ Team Vision  | 7,633.122 | 4.288                    | $p < 0.01^{**}$ |
| Openness to Experience $\rightarrow$ Task Orientation | 7,669.483 | 8.909                    | $p < 0.05^*$ |

**Conclusion**

To verify effectively the relationship between personality traits and person-team fit, this study, based on relevant studies, built a measurement model and investigated flight attendants as subjects. We determined that a positive relationship exists between personality traits and person-team fit. This result agrees with the conclusions of previous studies, such as Harrison, Price, Gavin, and Florey (2002).

Each dimension, agreeableness, conscientiousness, extraversion, neuroticism, and openness to experience, was verified to influence person-team fit positively. Additionally, the results indicated that organizational socialization plays a moderating role. Regarding flight attendants, employee with a high degree of organizational socialization can perform well despite inconsistent policy, uncertain obligations, and lack of essential information if the organization can provide appropriate training program and deliver the essential knowledge, technology, and concept. On the other hand, the staff with high socialization is also seldom encountered with the problem of interpersonal; thus, has stable performance.

In summary, we found there actually has positive relationship among the personality traits and person-team fit; thus, how the organization can deliver the accurate or appropriate professional knowledge, service technique…etc. and the staff is sure to acceptance becomes the critical issue for enterprise. If the organization can put more focused on it and try to decline unfitness felling of staff, their performance will be and surely can be enhanced.
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