



University of the
West of England

Faculty of Business and Law

The impact of the quality of the work environment on employees' intention to quit

Ray Markey

Department of Marketing and Management, Macquarie University, Australia

Katherine Ravenswood

Auckland University of Technology, Auckland, NZ

and Don J. Webber,

Department of Accounting, Economics and Finance

University of the West of England, Bristol, UK

Economics Working Paper Series

1220



University of the
West of England

bettertogether

The impact of the quality of the work environment on employees' intention to quit

Abstract

A substantial body of research has linked job satisfaction with employees' quitting intentions. That research predominantly analyses individual-level determinants rather than organisational-level or work environment antecedents of quitting. This study investigates the concept of the quality of the work environment (QWE) in relation to employees' quitting intentions and argues that QWE will influence a manager's ability to shape their employees' quitting intentions. We illustrate this proposition using a small survey of employees across four different industries in New Zealand. The results support the extant literature findings only if employees perceive their QWE is good; if an employee perceives their QWE is poor then extant policy implications could be toothless. This suggests QWE is an important focus of policy to shape quitting intentions.

Keywords: quitting intentions, labour turnover, work environment, job satisfaction, work stress

Introduction

This study investigates the impact on quitting intentions of an employee's perception of their workplace. It uses a quality of the work environment (QWE) approach and finds, as expected, that the probability of quitting is greater when the workplace is perceived to be a bad place to work. A 'good workplace' is characterised by low levels of stress, employees feeling appreciated by management and not feeling threatened at work. Within 'good workplaces,' some key attributes of the QWE have a greater impact on the quitting intention than when the workplace is perceived to be bad.

We set out to identify what impact the QWE has on quitting behaviour and what aspects of the working environment characterise 'good workplaces.' In particular, we focus on three research questions:

1. What characterises a 'good workplace environment' for employees?
2. What impact does the overall QWE have on employees' quitting intentions?
3. Do specific components of the QWE have a greater impact on quitting intentions than others?

This research is important because it develops the concept of multiple, connected workplace practices and its influence on employee commitment. There is a growing literature on the influence of the QWE on turnover, and on quitting in particular. The role that certain attributes of the QWE have on influencing employees' quitting behaviour has received increasing attention in the academic literature (see Boxall *et al.*, 2003; Cottini *et al.*, 2009;

Delfgauw, 2007; Hom and Ellis, 2008; Scott *et al.*, 2003; Simons and Jankowski, 2008; Taplin and Winterton, 2007). However, this literature has focused largely on individual employee or job attributes rather than on the broader context of the work environment. Levels of stress and information about important decisions and changes, along with changes in the level of job satisfaction, are all embedded in the literature as important contributory factors behind the quitting decision. Our empirical results illustrate that these factors are important *only* if the QWE is perceived to be good; if the QWE is perceived to be bad then they appear to have no significant influence. This particular finding runs counter to concepts and norms established to this date, and suggest further research is necessary.

The remainder of this paper is organized as follows. The next section outlines the existing research defining QWE, and how this relates to a significant body of literature on employees' quitting intentions. The following sections describe the data set and outline the methodology employed. Subsequently, the results obtained are discussed and the article concludes with an assessment of the broader significance of these results.

Quality of the work environment: what is a good workplace?

The central concern of the QWE perspective is the wellbeing of employees. In contrast to the literature on quitting, QWE does *not* focus on individual employee or job characteristics (Boxall *et al.* 2003; Cottini *et al.*, 2009; Delfgauw, 2007; Hom *et al.*, 2008; Scott *et al.*, 2006; Simons and Jankowski, 2008; Taplin and Winterton, 2007) but, instead, is a concept that encompasses the physical aspects, psycho-social and organisational surroundings of work (Busck *et al.*, 2010; Sell and Cleal, 2011). The QWE is a central concern of employees and employers that has often been linked with productivity as well as with the wellbeing of

employees, notably in the High Performance Workplace (HPWP) approach to human resource management (Godard, 2004; Harley *et al.*, 2007; Macky and Boxall, 2007; Macky and Boxall, 2008; Boxall and Macky, 2009). These connections have been a strong tradition in Scandinavian and socio-technical literature (Emery and Thorsrud, 1976; Gustavsen and Hunnius, 1981).

The QWE concept has its origins in Scandinavia where, since the 1970s it largely replaced the narrower concept of ‘occupational health and safety,’ which was associated mainly with physical risks and hazards at work. Specifically, QWE encompasses the concept of the ‘psycho-social work environment,’ which denotes how job demands and social structures and interactions in the organisation influence the psychological wellbeing of employees, thus allowing a broad understanding of how people are affected by their employment, including experience of job satisfaction and stress (Hvid and Hasle, 2003). Measures often used to capture QWE are those that indicate aspects of employee participation in the workplace, such as how much control employees have over their work, and include flexibility in how and when tasks are carried out (Wood and Wall, 2007; Gustaffson and Szebehely, 2009; Sell and Cleal, 2011), whether employees feel appreciated by management (Boxall *et al.*, 2003; Gustaffson and Szebely, 2009) and the amount of information about decisions in the workplace that concern employees (Sell and Cleal, 2011). Psycho-social elements of the work environment include conflicts, threats or violence at the workplace (Sell and Cleal, 2011) and workload and the levels of stress experienced (Busck *et al.*, 2010; Sell and Cleal, 2011).

Antecedents of the quitting decision

There is a substantial literature that aims to understand and predict at what point an employee decides to quit an organisation. This research has strongly linked concepts of job satisfaction and commitment with quitting intentions (Smith *et al.*, 2011). March and Simon (1993) relate an employee's desire to participate in an organisation's activities with their desire to leave an organisation, connecting concepts of commitment with turnover. Lee *et al.* (2004) link quitting intentions with the 'embeddedness' of an employee in an organisation; in other words, the strength and brittleness of connections and roles an employee has with other people and activities within and outside of an organisation.

March and Simon (1993) establish some propositions that explain employees' decisions to 'withdraw' from organisations. These were based on a framework that supposes employees will leave if they perceive that leaving is desirable when there are other satisfactory alternatives. An employee's level of job satisfaction (or dissatisfaction) relate directly to the 'desirability' to leave. According to March and Simon (1993), one factor that influences an employee's job satisfaction is the interaction between requirements at work and in other roles, now commonly referred to as either work-life balance or work-life conflict. In addition to work and other role conflict, length of service is proposed to be an influence on quitting decisions and is associated with increased specialisation in skill and knowledge, which diminish available alternatives (March and Simon, 1993).

Boxall *et al.*'s (2003) meta analysis summarises some of the key findings in the literature and indicates that job security, job satisfaction, autonomy and responsibility, how much

employees felt appreciated by their employers, and how their employers cared for their wellbeing all impact on quitting intentions. While job satisfaction has been largely referred to as resulting from workplace and personal attributes, many of the measures of job satisfaction incorporate aspects that reflect the quality of the work environment. For example, the Warr-Cooke scale of job satisfaction includes measures such as the ability to choose a method of work, the amount of responsibility, recognition for work done and the variety in work (Scott *et al.*, 2006).

Recently, scholars have broadened their perspective of turnover to include bundles of HRM practices and their effects on job satisfaction, commitment and turnover (Alfes *et al.*, 2013; Guchait and Cho, 2010; Smith *et al.*, 2011). For example, Alfes *et al.* (2013) discuss the ‘engaged’ employee and links this with turnover intentions. They draw on social exchange theory to show that employees will be more engaged when their work is meaningful, when they have connections with others and when they feel valued and trusted by their employer. Alfes *et al.* (2013) find that engaged employees are more likely to stay with an organisation but engaged employees who perceive they have low organisational support were less likely to stay with the organisation.

Employee participation is also linked both with increased job satisfaction and decreased turnover. For example, a work environment that allows participation in decision making has been shown to increase job satisfaction (Scott *et al.*, 2003) and greater involvement in care planning for nurses’ assistants has been linked with decreased turnover (Simons and Jankowski, 2008). Conversely, lack of opportunities for influence in the organization and a lack of communication with management have been associated with increased quitting

intentions (Simons and Jankowski, 2008). However, employee participation may have differing effects on the intention to quit. For instance, Landau (2009) found that positive outcomes from voicing dissatisfaction *decreased* the intention to quit, whereas a negative outcome or no change in outcomes of voicing dissatisfaction *increased* intentions to quit. Indeed, participation, in terms of strong information sharing, has been found to reduce the negative effect of physical hazards on quitting behaviour (Cottini *et al.*, 2009). The extent to which employees believe that their organization values their contribution and care about wellbeing also affect the intention to quit (Perryer *et al.*, 2010).

Where broader workplace conditions have been considered there have been connections found between general appreciation of employees and concern for their wellbeing (Mohamed *et al.*, 2006), job satisfaction (incorporating aspects of hours of work, physical conditions and influence on method of work) and quitting behaviour (Boxall *et al.*, 2003; Delfgauw, 2007; Scott *et al.*, 2006). For example, van der Aa *et al.* (2012) found that higher perceived job quality reduced employee turnover in customer contact centres. Elsewhere, adverse conditions (harm, hazard, uncertainty, emotional distress, lack of promotion and discrimination) have been shown to have variable impacts on quitting (Bockerman and Ilmakunnas, 2009; Cottini *et al.*, 2009). Lack of training and promotion opportunities also have a negative impact on satisfaction (Dickey *et al.*, 2009).

These established antecedents of quitting behaviour could be categorised into participation, physical working conditions and psycho-social conditions. In their positive employee beneficial form, these antecedents indicate a 'good' workplace. Conversely, when reversed to their negative employee adverse state, these same antecedents indicate a 'bad' workplace.

Although these antecedents correspond to aspects of QWE, most studies do not consider them collectively and tend to focus on individual or job attributes rather than QWE or organisational determinants (Reiche, 2009).

Why would a good QWE contribute to greater intentions to quit?

Why might employees who perceive they have a good quality of the work environment have intentions to quit? There is little in the literature to suggest reasons for this. Some studies indicate a ‘shine’ factor, particularly in terms of recruitment of minority groups into the workplace: ‘while effective at bringing people into the organization, [these recruitment policies] may ironically contribute to high early turnover if they raise expectations for a positive diversity climate that is not fulfilled’ (McKay and Avery, 2005, cited in Hom *et al.*, 2008: p.25). These studies suggest that any changes to QWE perceptions have greater impacts on quitting intentions when workplaces are perceived to be good relative to when workplaces are perceived to be bad. This is somewhat corroborated by studies which indicate that HPWP approaches and some types of participation can increase turnover when employees perceive workplace climates ‘in which compensation is merit based, goals are clear, and relationships between management and employees are fostered’ to be paternalistic (Simons and Jankowski, 2008: p.8).

The literature review above initially highlights a range of employee-level influences on intentions to quit. It emphasises a range of factors, often associated with changing levels of job satisfaction, that can be shaped to influence the quitting decision of employees. The literature also emphasises that the QWE is important factor in shaping quitting decisions.

However, it is less clear whether employee-level influences are important irrespective of whether the workplace is perceived to be a good working environment. For instance, it would be uncomplicated to assume either that individual-level factors would dominate the quitting decision and that the QWE is less important, or that the QWE is the main issue and that individual-level factors are simply reflections of a particular level of QWE. This is an important issue as it questions whether the QWE is a necessary or a sufficient area of attention for managers interested in the quitting decisions of their workers.

The remainder of this study starts to make inroads into this gap in the literature. It draws from a survey of employees to identify whether the importance of employee-level factors vary depending on whether they perceive their working environment to be good. Although the number of respondents in the survey is not huge ($N=118$), the key contributions of this paper are to highlight this gap in the literature and to begin to populate a new path for research that is designed to investigate further the quitting intentions of employees.

Method

Data for this research were collected via an anonymous employee survey, aimed at investigating the interrelationships between employee participation, the QWE, productivity, and quitting intentions. The specific variables used in this study are presented in Table 1. The research design for the overall project was a multi-method multiple case study approach targeting two case organisations in each of the following four dominant industries in New Zealand: education, health, hotels and food manufacturing.

{Insert Table 1 about here}

Out of a total of 240 distributed survey questionnaires across eight workplaces nested within these four industries, a total of 133 questionnaires were returned; corresponding to a response rate of 55 per cent. Due to omitted responses to questions that are employed in this empirical work, the total number of usable questionnaires here is 118. Hom *et al.* (1992) point to small sample size as an issue in establishing key findings across multiple studies in their meta-analysis. However, we characterise our study as an exploratory analysis that points to new approaches and findings, suggestive of areas for further research.

The use of a survey, of course, comes with some inherent bias in that the results come from self-reported data. Our survey is comprised of (non-managerial) employees only, and a suggestion for future research is to verify perceptions of the work environment with comparable data gathered from managerial positions. While our study is exploratory, a strength of the data set is that it includes respondents from four different industries, and we identified strong similarities across them. This aids generalisability, especially should future research corroborate our innovative findings.

The survey asked respondents three types of questions. First, they were asked if they considered their workplace to be ‘a good place to work.’ Second, they were asked how frequently they thought about leaving their workplace. Third, they were asked a set of questions about their QWE, incorporating the physical work environment, psycho-social work environment, and overall job satisfaction. The physical work environment was represented by a survey question that asked respondents if they were satisfied with the safety

and comfort of their working conditions. The psycho-social aspect of the work environment was proxied by questions on workload and stress, whether the employee thought they were appreciated by management, whether they received information on important decisions, changes and future plans in due time, what degree of influence they had over their job, and whether they felt threatened at work. Regarding the final aspect of the QWE, overall job satisfaction, respondents were asked whether their level of job satisfaction had increased or decreased recently. Demographic information on the respondents were also collected. This included data on their age, gender, and parental status. The length of service for the worker in both the organisation and industry were also gathered.

Table 2 presents a cross-tabulation of QWE with quitting intention. More specifically, it shows the extent of a relationship between the responses to questions about whether they had thought about leaving their job and whether they perceive their work environment to be either good or bad. Seventy-two per cent of respondents perceived that they work in a good environment and 64 per cent had not thought about leaving their job. There are relatively few respondents who had not thought about leaving their job but did perceive that they worked in a bad working environment (7 per cent); similarly, those individuals who reported that they worked in a good environment and that they had thought about leaving their job only accounted for 15 per cent of respondents. These descriptive data give the first indication of a possible statistical relationship between perceptions of the work environment and quitting intention.

{ Insert Table 2 about here }

Theoretically, it is possible that the link between the perceived quality of the work environment and whether the employee thinks about leaving their job may be a sequential process. Figure 1 presents a tree diagram that presents the data along this line of thought. The first issue is whether the employee perceives that the quality of the work environment is good. It can be seen that 72 per cent of the respondents perceive that they work in a good environment; out of this 72 per cent sub-sample, 78 per cent of them have *not* thought about leaving their job. This branch of the tree ends with nearly 57 per cent of the overall sample; the end probabilities correspond directly with those presented in Table 1.

{Insert Figure 1 about here}

Figure 1 also illustrates that out of the 28 per cent of respondents who perceive that they work in a bad working environment, nearly 76 per cent of them have thought about leaving their job. These clear asymmetries are worthy of further investigation and as such these two sequential dichotomous issues are the focus of the econometric analysis below. Of interest are the determinants of these two dichotomous issues.

Descriptive statistics about the independent variables used in the upcoming econometric analysis are presented in Table 1. It illustrates that 64 per cent of the respondents have children; only 14 per cent of workers in the final sample agreed with the statement that they get information on important decisions, changes and future plans in due time; 32 per cent are stressed at work; 25 per cent have experienced a reduction in their job satisfaction during the past 12 months; and 14 per cent believe that their work is not appreciated by their management.

Table 3 presents the correlation coefficients for these variables, and they are in line with *a priori* expectations. For instance, often thinking about leaving a job is positively correlated with a recent decrease in job satisfaction, a feeling that they lack information on important decisions, and feeling threatened, stressed and not appreciated by management. The perception that the quality of the work environment is good is positively correlated with being appreciated, not being stressed and experiencing a recent increase in job satisfaction.

Econometric approach

We adopt the formal model for estimating quitting probabilities according to Greene (2003). An important issue in any stochastic modelling process is to identify what influences the dependent variable. In our case we have two dependent, albeit potentially sequential, variables to model. Let y_{1i} be a latent variable that denotes the probability that a worker is thinking about quitting, which is dependent on a range of motivators, X_{1i} . Also let y_{2i} be a latent variable that denotes the probability that the worker perceives that they work in a good workplace environment, where this is also dependent upon a range of factors, X_{2i} . The model is represented as follows:

$$y_{1i} = b_1 X_{1i} + e_{1i}$$

$$y_{2i} = b_2 X_{2i} + e_{2i}$$

where the values for y_{1i} are observable and related to the following binary dependent variables, on the basis of the following conditions:

$$Quit_i = 1, \text{ if } y_{1i} > 0 \qquad \qquad \qquad Quit_i = 0, \text{ if } y_{1i} \leq 0$$

and

$$Good\ Place_i = 1, \text{ if } y_{2i} > 0 \qquad \qquad \qquad Good\ Place_i = 0, \text{ if } y_{2i} \leq 0$$

where $Quit_i = 1$ denotes that the worker is thinking about quitting their job, and

$Good\ Place_i = 1$ denotes that the worker feels that they work in a good working environment.

The errors (e_{1i}, e_{2i}) are assumed to have the standard bivariate normal distribution, with

$E(e_{1i}) = 0 = E(e_{2i})$, $V(e_{1i}) = 1 = V(e_{2i})$ and $Cov(e_{1i}, e_{2i}) = r$. Thus the worker's quitting

probability can be written as:

$$\begin{aligned} P(Quit) &= P(Quit_i = 1, Good\ Place_i = 1) \\ &= P(X_{1i} < x_{1i}, X_{2i} < x_{2i}) \\ &= \int_{-\infty}^{x_{2i}} \int_{-\infty}^{x_{1i}} f_2(z_{1i}, z_{2i}; r) dz_{1i} dz_{2i} \\ &= F(b_1 X_{1i}, b_2 X_{2i}; r) \end{aligned}$$

where F denotes the bivariate standard normal distribution function with correlation coefficient r . The bivariate probit model has full observability if $Quit_i$ and $Good\ Place_i$ are both observed in terms of all their four possible combinations (i.e.

‘ $Quit_i = 0, Good\ Place_i = 1$ ’, ‘ $Quit_i = 1, Good\ Place_i = 0$ ’, ‘ $Quit_i = 0, Good\ Place_i = 1$ ’ and ‘ $Quit_i = 0, Good\ Place_i = 0$ ’); this is the case in our study and full observability naturally leads to the most efficient estimates (Ashford and Sowden, 1970; Zellner and Lee, 1965).

Results

The results of seemingly unrelated bivariate probit estimations are presented in Table 4 and represent the most parsimonious model. The econometric estimation controlled for possible differences across industries through the application of a clustering algorithm to allow for greater similarity between workers in the same industry and greater differences between workers in different industries.

{Insert Table 4 about here}

Table 4 presents two columns of results which correspond to the biprobit estimation. The first column corresponds to the dichotomous (i.e. yes/no) response to the statement that ‘I often think of leaving my job.’ These results are in line with *a priori* expectations that are ingrained in the literature: those respondents who report that they are stressed at work and have experienced a recent reduction in their level of job satisfaction are more likely to think about leaving their job. However, those respondents who are parents are less likely to think about leaving their job, as are those who have recently experienced an increase in their level of job satisfaction.

The second column of results corresponds to the dichotomous response to the statement that they perceive that their workplace ‘is a good place to work’. These results are also in line with *a priori* expectations which were discussed above: perceiving that the workplace is a good place to work is positively influenced by being appreciated by management and not being stressed, and negatively influenced by being threatened or stressed at work and by not being appreciated by management.

Although there is nothing particularly new or surprising about these results, the important thing to note from Table 4 is that there is strong negative correlation between these two sets of regressions, as illustrated through the Rho coefficient and its respective statistical significance. Given the proposed sequential nature of these two issues, it is worth pursuing this line of thought and attempting to identify whether the (direct or indirect) influence of the variables on the quitting regression vary depending on whether the quality of the work environment is perceived to be good. Accordingly, the marginal effects of the variables under the conditions that the QWE variable is equal to 1 and 0 (zero) are presented in Table 5.

{Insert Table 5 about here}

Table 5 displays the regression estimates of the determinants of quitting intentions having controlled for the determinants of the quality of the work environment; this is tantamount to comparing routes A to C with B to E on Figure 1. Most importantly, and the main result of this paper, these *conditional* marginal effects of the variables influencing the probability of quitting do vary substantially depending on whether the respondent perceives that they work in a good working environment. This means that the factors that contribute to thinking about

leaving the job are sensitive to the quality of the work environment. High stress levels, lack of information on important decisions, and decreases in job satisfaction have a statistically significant impact on employees' intention to quit in workplaces perceived as being a good workplace environment. Importantly, and the crux of this paper, these issues are *not* statistically significant in influencing employees' intention to quit if employees perceive that they work in a bad workplace environment, which is most likely to be the case if they are stressed, threatened and not appreciated by management.

Rather than simply reporting on the statistical significance of the variables' marginal effects, it is important to emphasise the differences in magnitudes of the marginal effects. Several issues are worth emphasising. First, the influence of being stressed on the thought of leaving is substantially greater in a good workplace than in a bad workplace; it increases the probability of quitting by 25.4 per cent if employees work in a good workplace, compared with merely 0.02 per cent in a bad workplace. This strongly suggests that managers in workplaces with good QWE should reduce stress levels to reduce quitting behaviour.

Interestingly, *not* being stressed has similar effects on the thought of leaving in good and bad workplaces. The effect of not being stressed on the probability of quitting is 20 per cent larger in a bad workplace; it increases the probability of thinking about quitting by 16.6 per cent if employees work in a good workplace, compared with 19.9 per cent in a bad workplace. This suggests that workers want some stress or challenge at work.

Second, the effect of not receiving information about important decisions on the thought of quitting is 76 times larger if employees are in a good workplace. It increases the probability

that the worker will think about quitting by 51.5 per cent if employees work in a good workplace, compared with 0.6 per cent in a bad workplace.

Third, the influence of changes in job satisfaction on the thought of leaving is 48 times greater in a good workplace for reductions, and 21 times greater for increases. Reductions in the level of job satisfaction increase the probability of thinking about quitting by 36.1 per cent if employees work in a good workplace, compared with 0.8 per cent in a bad workplace. The effect of an increase in the level of job satisfaction on the thought of quitting is 21 times smaller if employees perceive they work in a bad working environment; it decreases the probability of thinking about quitting by 10.4 per cent if employees work in a good working environment, compared with 0.5 per cent in a bad working environment. Satisfaction, therefore, is important but not the only influence on quitting behaviour.

Finally, the effect of being a parent on the probability of thinking about quitting is 33 times larger if employees are in a good workplace. Being a parent is associated with a decrease the probability of thinking about quitting by 18 per cent if employees work in a good (bad) workplace, compared with 0.5 per cent in a bad workplace. Hence, being a parent in a good working environments means employees are very unlikely to quit.

Additional drivers of quitting intentions

The results presented above hold even once we have controlled for a range of socioeconomic variables including age; gender; carer, smoker and alcohol drinking status; job status (permanent, part-time, casual, seasonal, contractor); training status (on-the-job, industry,

tertiary, other); the amount of time the employee has worked in the industry (1 year or less; 1 to 2 years; 2 to 5 years, more than 5 years), organisation (3 months or less, 1 year or less, 1 to 2 years, more than 2 years) and in their current job (3 months or less, 1 year or less, 1 to 2 years, more than 2 years); and whether the respondent wanted to have more influence at their place of work. These pseudo-stability test results are not included for brevity.

The data set also included six further questions that relate to QWE, and these variables were used to conduct sensitivity analyses (see Table A1). Their inclusions in the model had no significant impacts on the key results. First, three questions relating to influence on work organisation failed to elicit statistically significant responses and did not affect the qualitative inference of the other results. Second, feeling really tired from work did not affect the probability of thinking about quitting. Third, working a significant degree of overtime lowered the probability of thinking about quitting; this was statistically significant and changed slightly the marginal effects of other variables. This counter-intuitive result could be explained as employees feeling that they are more valued if they work more overtime, in which case this variable captures a similar issue as the feeling appreciated variable and inclusion of this extra variable may be confounding the model. Fourth, there was a very small though statistically significant marginal effect of satisfaction with the safety and comfort of working conditions on the probability of thinking about quitting (0.009, $p=0.07$). On inspection this variable had the smallest marginal effect and its inclusion did not appear to bias the observed marginal effects of the other variables on the probability of thinking about quitting. Analysis of a larger data set is encouraged to corroborate these findings.

Conclusion

This exploratory research shows three important findings. Firstly, it confirms the importance of the quality of the work environment in the quitting decision. Employees are significantly less likely to intend to quit their job if they perceive it to be a good working environment. The majority of employees who thought of leaving their job perceived their workplace to not be a good place to work. Good quality of the work environment was indicated by low stress levels, feeling appreciated by management and not feeling threatened. This is consistent with what is suggested by separate sources in the literature (Bockerman and Ilmakunnas, 2009; Boxall *et al.*, 2003; Cottini *et al.*, 2009; Gustaffson and Szebely, 2009). Secondly, the research confirmed that an employee is more likely to want to leave if they are not a parent, believe that they do not receive enough important information in time, are stressed and experience a reduction in the level of job satisfaction.

Thirdly, the impact of these factors on the desire to quit differs in magnitude depending on whether the QWE is rated as being good or bad. In workplaces with a good QWE, the impact of high stress levels, lack of information on important decisions, and decreases in satisfaction are much greater on employees' intention to quit. This finding is interesting, and there are few explanations for this phenomenon in the extant literature because of the paucity of research on quitting decisions within the framework of the QWE.

The results reported here could be compared to another study showing that employees who come to a workplace because of a reputation of a 'good employer' may be disappointed when they discover practice differs from policy or reputation (Hom *et al.*, 2008). However, that study relates to turnover in the first year of tenure, and our results suggest that length of

tenure/service in the organisation has no effect on the intention to quit. Furthermore, the study by Hom *et al.* (2008) does not account for the impact of a *lack* of information on the quitting intentions of employees in a good workplace. Landau's (2009) explanation of the impact of the *outcomes* of employee voice on dissatisfaction and quitting intentions provides a stronger basis for our results, by linking employees' expectations and experience, potentially explaining why a workplace perceived as good is more impacted by decreases in job satisfaction, stress and lack of information from management.

Conversely, the results indicate that if the QWE is considered bad by employees, then high levels of stress, information on important decisions and job satisfaction decreases have less of an effect on probability that the respondent will think about leaving. Low stress levels decrease the probability of quitting bad workplaces only slightly more than in good workplaces. Elsewhere it has been suggested that employees feel resigned to staying and perceive that they have few other opportunities in a poor quality work environment (Taplin and Winterton, 2007). This could imply that in a workplace where employees already feel they are not appreciated by management, suffer stress and feel threatened at work, there is a concurrent sense of resignation and disempowerment manifested in lesser reaction to stress, negative changes in the QWE and lack of information about changes and other issues.

This paper contributes to the literature in a number of areas. First, it has corroborated earlier evidence that an employee is more likely to feel that they work in a good place if they are appreciated, not threatened and not stressed (Bockerman and Ilmakunnas, 2009; Boxall *et al.*, 2003; Cottini *et al.*, 2009; Gustafsson and Szebely, 2009). Secondly, it confirms that a bad work environment has a negative impact on quitting behaviour. More importantly, it has

shown that the effects on quitting of some key factors that are associated with the QWE are greater in a workplace with good QWE. The factors with greater impact in workplaces with good QWE are high levels of stress, decreased job satisfaction and not receiving information about important decisions. On the other hand, the impact of not being stressed reduces the likelihood of quitting in all workplaces.

Consequently, if the employee perceives that they work in a good work environment then a business can dissuade them from thinking about quitting their job by ensuring that their level of job satisfaction does not decrease; by continually providing the employee with information about important decisions, changes and future plans in due time; and by ensuring that the employee is not overly stressed with work issues. Organisations that wish to retain their quality workforce should adopt a two-stage approach. They should focus initially on achieving a good QWE without high stress levels and with perceptions of appreciation by management and a lack of threats at work. These prior interventions are essential to reduce later quitting intentions and should be implemented before expending effort on adjusting factors that contribute to job satisfaction and increasing the provision of information to employees of important decision making processes. Retaining low levels of stress remain important in the second stage.

Larger samples are required to fully test the relationships between variables indicated here and a panel of data could substantiate causation. However, this study is highly suggestive of a new approach to research over the issue of quitting behaviour and highlights the need for further research into 'good' *and* 'bad' workplaces, and their differential impact on quitting intentions.

References

- Alfes, K., Shantz, A.D., Truss, C., and Soane, E.C. (2013), 'The link between perceived human resource management practices, engagement and employee behaviour: a moderated mediation model', *The International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 24, 330-351.
- Ashford, J.R., and Sowden, R.R. (1970), 'Multivariate Probit Analysis', *Biometrics*, 26, 535-546.
- Bockerman, P., and Ilmakunnas, P. (2009), 'Job disamenities, job satisfaction, quit intentions, and actual separations: Putting the pieces together', *Industrial Relations*, 48, 73-96.
- Boxall, P., Macky, K., and Rasmussen, E. (2003), 'Labour turnover and retention in New Zealand: The causes and consequences of leaving and staying with employers', *Asia Pacific Journal of Human Resources*, 41, 195-214.
- Boxall, P., and Macky, K. (2009), 'Research and theory on high-performance work systems: Progressing the high-involvement stream', *Human Resource Management Journal*, 19, 3-23.
- Busck, O., Knudsen, H., and Lind, J. (2010), 'The transformation of employee participation: Consequences for the work environment', *Economic and Industrial Democracy* 31, 285-305.
- Cottini, E., Kato, T., and Nielsen, N.W. (2009), 'Adverse workplace conditions, high-involvement work practices and labor turnover: Evidence from Danish linked employer-employee data' (Discussion paper no.4587), Bonn, Germany: The Institute for the Study of Labor (IZA).
- Delfgaauw, J. (2007), 'Where to go? Workers' reasons to quit and intra- vs. interindustry job mobility', *Applied Economics*, 39, 2057-2067.
- Dickey, H., Watson, V., and Zangelidis, A. (2009), 'Job satisfaction and quit intentions of offshore workers in the UK North Sea oil and gas industry' (MPRA Paper No. 18666.), Munich Personal RePEc Archive. Retrieved from <http://mpra.ub.uni-muenchen.de/18666>
- Emery, F.E. and Thorsrud, E. (1976), *Democracy at work*, Leiden: Nijhoff.
- Godard, J. (2004), 'A critical assessment of the high-performance paradigm', *British Journal of Industrial Relations*, 42, 349-78.
- Greene, W.H. (2003), *Econometric Analysis* (5th ed.), London: Prentice Hall.
- Guchait, P., and Cho, S. (2010), 'The impact of human resource management practices on intention to leave of employees in the service industry in India: the mediating role of

- organizational commitment', *The International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 21, 1228-1247.
- Gustafsson, R.A. and Szebehely, M. (2009), 'Outsourcing of elder care services in Sweden: effects on work environment and political legitimacy', in *Paid Care in Australia. Politics, profits practices*, eds D. King and G. Meagher, Sydney: Sydney University Press, pp. 81-112.
- Gustavsen, B. and Hunnius, G. (1981), *New patterns of work reform. The case of Norway*, Oslo: Oslo University Press.
- Harley, B., Allen, B.C., and Sargent, L.D. (2007), 'High performance work systems and employee experience of work in the service sector: The case of aged care', *British Journal of Industrial Relations*, 45, 607-633.
- Hom, P. W., Caranikas-Walker, F., Prussia, G. E., and Griffeth, R. W. (1992), 'A meta-analytical structural equations analysis of a model of employee turnover', *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 77, 890-909.
- Hom, P., Roberson, L., and Ellis, A.D. (2008), 'Challenging conventional wisdom about who quits: Revelations from corporate America', *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 93, 1-34.
- Hvid, H. and Hasle, P. (2003), *Human development and working life*, Aldershot: Ashgate Publishing Limited.
- Landau, J. (2009), 'When employee voice is met by deaf ears', *SAM Advanced Management Journal*, Winter, 4-12.
- Lee, T.W., Mitchell, T.R., Sablinski, C.J., Burton, J.P., and Holtom, B. C. (2004), 'The effects of job embeddedness on organizational citizenship, job performance, volitional absences and voluntary turnover', *The Academy of Management Journal*, 47, 711-712.
- Macky, K. and Boxall, P. (2007), 'The relationship between 'high-performance work practices' and employee attitudes: An investigation of additive and interaction effects', *The International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 18, 537-567.
- Macky, K. and Boxall, P. (2008), 'High-involvement work processes, work intensification and employee wellbeing: A study of New Zealand worker experiences', *Asia Pacific Journal of Human Resources*, 46, 38-55.
- March, J.G., and Simon, H.A. (1993), *Organizations* (2nd ed.), Cambridge, MA: Blackwell.
- Mohamed, F., Taylor, S.G., and Hassan, A. (2006), 'Affective commitment and intent to quit: The impact of work and non-work related issues', *Journal of Managerial Issues*, 18, 512-529.

- Perryer, C., Jordan, C., Firms, I. and Travaglione, A. (2010), 'Predicting turnover intentions. The interactive effects of organizational commitment and perceived organisational support', *Management Research Review*, 33, 911-923.
- Reiche, S.B. (2009), 'To quit or not to quit: organizational determinants of voluntary turnover in MNC subsidiaries in Singapore', *The International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 20, 1362-1380.
- Scott, A., Gravelle, H., Simoens, S., Bojke, C. and Sibbald, B. (2006), 'Job satisfaction and quitting intentions: A structural model of British general practitioners', *British Journal of Industrial Relations*, 44, 519-540.
- Scott, D., Bishop, J.W. and Chen, X. (2003), 'An examination of the relationship of employee involvement with job satisfaction, employee cooperation, and intention to quit in U.S. invested enterprise in China', *The International Journal of Organizational Analysis*, 11, 3 - 19.
- Sell, L. and Cleal, B. (2011), 'Job satisfaction, work environment, and rewards: Motivational theory revisited', *Labour*, 52, 1-23.
- Simons, K.V. and Jankowski, T.B. (2008), 'Factors influencing nursing home social workers' intentions to quit employment', *Administration in Social Work*, 32, 5-21.
- Smith, A., Oczkowski, E., and Smith, C. S. (2011), 'To have and to hold: modelling the drivers of employee turnover and skill retention in Australian organisations', *The International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 22, 395-416.
- Taplin, I.M. and Winterton, J. (2007), 'The importance of management style in labour retention', *International Journal of Sociology and Social Policy*, 27, 5-18.
- van der Aa, Z., Bloemer, J., and Henseler, J. (2012), 'Reducing employee turnover through customer contact center job quality', *The International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 23, 3925-3941.
- Wood, S.J. and Wall, T.D. (2007), 'Work enrichment and employee voice in human resource management-performance studies', *The International Journal of Human Resource Management* 18, 1335-1372.
- Zellner, A. and Lee, T.H. (1965), 'Joint Estimation of Relationships Involving Discrete Random Variables', *Econometrica* 33, 382-394.

Figure 1: Sequential Process of Perceived QWE and Quitting Intentions




Table 1: Variable description and Summary Statistics

Variable	Description	Mean	Min	Max
Quit job	Dummy variable: 1 = Agree with statement ‘I often think of leaving my job’; 0 = otherwise	0.364	0	1
Good place	Dummy variable: 1 = Agree with statement that your workplace ‘is a good place to work’; 0 = otherwise	0.720	0	1
Parent	Dummy variable: 1 = have children; 0 = otherwise	0.636	0	1
Info lacking	Dummy variable: 1 = Agree / Strongly agree with ‘I get information on important decisions, changes and future plans in due time’; 0 = otherwise	0.144	0	1
Satisfaction increased	Dummy variable: 1 = Satisfaction with job increased in last 12 months; 0 = otherwise	0.288	0	1
Satisfaction decreased	Dummy variable: 1 = Satisfaction with job decreased in last 12 months; 0 = otherwise	0.246	0	1
Threatened	Dummy variable: 1 = Having ever felt threatened at work; 0 = otherwise	0.297	0	1
Stressed	Dummy variable: 1 = Always / Often feeling stressed; 0 = otherwise	0.322	0	1
Not stressed	Dummy variable: 1 = Rarely / Never feeling stressed; 0 = otherwise	0.254	0	1
Appreciated	Dummy variable: 1 = Agree / Strongly agree that ‘my work is appreciated by management’; 0 = otherwise	0.729	0	1
Not appreciated	Dummy variable: 1 = Disagree / Strongly disagree that ‘my work is appreciated by management’; 0 = otherwise	0.144	0	1

Note: N = 118. Respondents who provided the answer ‘not sure’ were omitted from the analyses.

Table 2: Relationship between Quitting Intention and Good or Bad QWE

		Good QWE?		Total
		No	Yes	
Intention to quit?	No	8 6.78%	67 56.78%	75 63.56%
	Yes	23 21.19%	18 15.25%	43 36.44%
	Total	33 27.97%	85 72.03%	118 100%

Table 3: Perceived QWE and Quitting Intentions: Correlation coefficients of independent variables

	Quit job	Good place	Satisfaction increased	Satisfaction decreased	Parent	Info lacking	Threatened	Appreciated	Not appreciated	Stressed	Not stressed
Quit job	1.000	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
Good place	-0.509***	1.000	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
Satisfaction increased	-0.248***	0.230**	1.000	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
Satisfaction decreased	0.508***	-0.434***	-0.363***	1.000	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
Parent	-0.232**	0.117	-0.101	-0.099	1.000	–	–	–	–	–	–
Info lacking	0.442***	-0.497***	-0.261***	0.495***	-0.091	1.000	–	–	–	–	–
Threatened	0.241***	-0.339***	-0.044	0.233**	-0.202**	0.103	1.000	–	–	–	–
Appreciated	-0.410***	0.597***	0.220**	-0.449***	0.093	-0.618***	-0.105	1.000	–	–	–
Not appreciated	0.241***	-0.605***	-0.261***	0.495***	-0.040	0.656***	0.262***	-0.673***	1.000	–	–
Stressed	0.420***	-0.460***	-0.078	0.365***	-0.307***	0.337***	0.307***	-0.314***	0.285***	1.000	–
Not stressed	-0.199**	0.364***	0.187**	-0.288***	0.078	-0.240	-0.294***	0.269***	-0.240***	-0.402***	1.000

Notes: ***, ** and * signify statistical significance at the 1%, 5% and 10% confidence level, respectively.

Table 4: Quitting Intentions and Perceived QWE: Coefficient estimates in biprobit model

	(1)	(2)
	Quit	QWE
Constant	-0.668 (0.313)**	0.719 (0.318)*
Parent	-0.477 (0.175)***	– –
Info lacking	1.403 (0.675)**	– –
Satisfaction increased	-0.279 (0.172)	– –
Satisfaction remains the same	<i>Control variable</i>	– –
Satisfaction decreased	0.931 (0.388)**	– –
Threatened	0.253 (0.246)	-0.737 (0.389)*
Stressed	0.687 (0.277)**	-0.661 (0.168)***
Neither stressed nor not stressed	– –	<i>Control variable</i>
Not stressed	– –	6.972 (0.216)***
Appreciated	– –	0.793 (0.365)**
Neither appreciated nor not appreciated	– –	<i>Control variable</i>
Not appreciated	– –	-1.933 (0.331)***
<i>N</i>		118
Log pseudo likelihood		-79.908
Rho		-0.789 (0.086)***

Notes: ***, ** and * represent statistical confidence at the 1%, 5% and 10% levels. Rho suggests strong negative correlation between regressions ($\chi^2(1)=22.091$, $p<0.000$).

Table 5: Determinants of Quitting Intentions and Perceived QWE: Marginal effects

	(1)		(2)	
	<i>Quit given</i>		<i>Quit given</i>	
	<i>QWE = 1</i>		<i>QWE = 0</i>	
Parent	-0.184	(0.071)***	-0.005	(0.011)
Info lacking	0.515	(0.193)***	0.007	(0.015)
Satisfaction increased	-0.104	(0.063)*	-0.005	(0.011)
Satisfaction decreased	0.361	(0.142)**	0.008	(0.015)
Threatened	0.082	(0.098)	-0.005	(0.016)
Stressed	0.254	(0.104)**	0.002	(0.008)
Not stressed	0.166	(0.036)***	0.199	(108.06)

Notes: ***, ** and * represent statistical confidence at the 1%, 5% and 10% levels.

Appendix: Table A1: Specific Questions Asked of Respondents

General QWE and quitting intention

Do you agree with the statement that your workplace 'is a good place to work'?

Do you agree with the statement 'I often think of leaving my job'?

Specific Quality of The Work Environment Questions

Do you have more work to do than you can accomplish in one shift?

How often have you felt stressed?

My work is appreciated by management

I get information on important decisions, changes and future plans in due time

Have you ever felt threatened at work?

Has your satisfaction with your job changed during the past 12 months?

Additional Drivers

Do you have significant influence on how much work you have to do?

I have significant influence on how my work is done

I should have more influence at my place of work

How often have you felt really tired from work?

Are you required to work overtime?

Are you satisfied with the safety and comfort of your working conditions?

Recent UWE Economics Papers

See <http://www1.uwe.ac.uk/bl/bbs/bbsresearch/economics/economicpapers.aspx> for a full list

2012

- 1220 **The impact of the quality of the work environment on employees' intention to quit**
Ray Markey, Katherine Ravenswood and Don J. Webber
- 1219 **Understanding student attendance in Business Schools: an exploratory study**
Andrew Mearman, Don J. Webber, Artjoms Ivļevs, Tanzila Rahman and Gail Pacheco
- 1218 **What is a manufacturing job?**
Felix Ritchie, Andrew D. Thomas and Richard Welpton
- 1217 **Rethinking economics: Logical gaps – empirical to the real world**
Stuart Birks
- 1216 **Rethinking economics: Logical gaps – theory to empirical**
Stuart Birks
- 1215 **Rethinking economics: Economics as a toolkit**
Stuart Birks
- 1214 **Rethinking economics: Downs with traction**
Stuart Birks
- 1213 **Rethinking economics: theory as rhetoric**
Stuart Birks
- 1212 **An economics angle on the law**
Stuart Birks
- 1211 **Temporary versus permanent employment: Does health matter?**
Gail Pacheco, Dominic Page and Don J. Webber
- 1210 **Issues in the measurement of low pay: 2010**
Suzanne Fry and Felix Ritchie
- 1209 **Output-based disclosure control for regressions**
Felix Ritchie
- 1208 **Sample selection and bribing behaviour**
Timothy Hinks and Artjoms Ivļevs
- 1207 **Internet shopping and Internet banking in sequence**
Athanasios G. Patsiotis, Tim Hughes and Don J. Webber
- 1206 **Mental and physical health: Reconceptualising the relationship with employment propensity**
Gail Pacheco, Dom Page and Don J. Webber

- 1205 **Using student evaluations to improve individual and department teaching qualities**
Mary R. Hedges and Don J. Webber
- 1204 **The effects of the 2004 Minority Education Reform on pupils' performance in Latvia**
Artjoms Ivļevs and Roswitha M. King
- 1203 **Pluralist economics curricula: Do they work and how would we know?**
Andrew Mearman
- 1202 **Fractionalization and well-being: Evidence from a new South African data set**
Timothy Hinks
- 1201 **The role of structural change in European regional productivity growth**
Eoin O'Leary and Don J. Webber
- 2011**
- 1112 **Trusting neighbours or strangers in a racially divided society: Insights from survey data in South Africa**
Dorrit Posel and Tim Hinks
- 1111 **A comment on Tobias Kronenberg's "Construction of regional input-output tables using nonsurvey methods: The role of cross-hauling"**
Anthony T. Flegg and Timo Tohmo
- 1110 **Measuring the policymaker's credibility: The Bank of England in 'nice' and 'not-so-nice' times**
Iris Biefang-Frisancho Mariscal, Woon Wong and Peter Howells
- 1109 **Paradigm shift? A critique of the IMF's new approach to capital controls**
Daniela Gabor
- 1108 **Happiness, meaning of life and income**
Lois Duff and Artjoms Ivļevs
- 1107 **The effect of monetary policy on investors' risk perception: Evidence from the UK and Germany**
Dan Luo, Iris Biefang-Frisancho Mariscal and Peter Howells
- 1106 **Military Keynesianism: An assessment**
J Paul Dunne
- 1105 **Military spending, growth, development and conflict**
J Paul Dunne
- 1104 **The changing military industrial complex**
J Paul Dunne and Elisabeth Skons
- 1103 **Corruption, military spending and growth**
Giorgio d'Agostino and Luca Pieroni and J Paul Dunne
- 1102 **Defence spending and economic growth in the EU15**
J Paul Dunne and Eftychia Nikolaidou