

 Open access • Journal Article • DOI:10.1108/02683940410526127

How can managers reduce employee intention to quit — [Source link](#)

Lucy Firth, David Mellor, Kathleen A. Moore, Claude Loquet

Institutions: University of Melbourne, Deakin University

Published on: 01 Jan 2004 - Journal of Managerial Psychology (Emerald Group Publishing Limited)

Topics: Job satisfaction, Job attitude and Occupational stress

Related papers:

- [A Meta-Analysis of Antecedents and Correlates of Employee Turnover: Update, Moderator Tests, and Research Implications for the Next Millennium](#)
- [Job satisfaction, organizational commitment, turnover intention, and turnover: Path analyses based on meta-analytic findings.](#)
- [Review and Conceptual Analysis of the Employee Turnover Process](#)
- [The measurement and antecedents of affective, continuance and normative commitment to the organization](#)
- [Evaluating Structural Equation Models with Unobservable Variables and Measurement Error](#)

Share this paper:    

View more about this paper here: <https://typeset.io/papers/how-can-managers-reduce-employee-intention-to-quit-2n26jofw35>

Deakin Research Online

This is the authors' final peer reviewed (post print) version of the item published as:

Firth, Lucy, Mellor, David, Moore, Kathleen A and Loquet, Claude 2004, How can managers reduce employee intention to quit?, *Journal of managerial psychology*, vol. 19, no. 2, pp. 170-187.

Available from Deakin Research Online:

<http://hdl.handle.net/10536/DRO/DU:30008720>

Reproduced with the kind permission of the copyright owner.

Copyright : 2004, Emerald Group Publishing

How can managers reduce employee intention to quit?

Lucy Firth, *Department of Information Systems, University of Melbourne, Melbourne, Australia*

David J. Mellor, *School of Psychology, Deakin University, Melbourne, Australia*

Kathleen A. Moore, *School of Psychology, Deakin University, Melbourne, Australia*

Claude Loquet, *School of Psychology, Deakin University, Melbourne, Australia*

Abstract

This paper reports on an investigation of the variables that may be predictive of intentions to leave a job, and tests a model that includes mediating variables. A total of 173 retail salespeople completed questionnaires measuring commitment to the organization for which they worked, job satisfaction, stress, supervisor support, locus of control, self-esteem, the perceived stressors in the job and their intention to quit. Path analysis was used to test the relationships hypothesized in the model. The majority of hypotheses were supported, with the variables included accounting for 52 per cent of the variance in intention to quit. Emotional support from supervisors and self-esteem mediated the impact of stressors on stress reactions, job satisfaction, commitment to the organization and intention to quit. It is suggested that to ameliorate intention to quit and in turn reduce turnover, managers need to actively monitor workloads, and the relationships between supervisors and subordinates in order to reduce and manage stress. Managers also need to monitor both the extrinsic and intrinsic sources of job satisfaction available to employees. These activities could assist in maintaining and increasing job satisfaction and commitment to the organization.

“What determines employee turnover?” The answer to this question has great relevance to the individual who may be thinking about quitting a job, and for the manager who is faced with lack of employee continuity, the high costs involved in the induction and training of new staff, and, not least, issues of organizational productivity. While actual quitting behaviour is the primary focus of interest to employers and researchers, intention to quit is argued to be a strong surrogate indicator for such behaviour. Job stressors and lack of job satisfaction are among the factors that contribute to people's intention to quit their jobs (Moore, 2002); however, it is important both from the manager's and the individual's perspective to understand the factors that mediate the relationship between job stress and intention to quit. This study had three aims:

1. We aimed to investigate the effect of job stressors on job engagement (job satisfaction, job commitment and feelings of job stress), and to relate all of these variables to intention to quit.
2. We aimed to investigate whether people's dispositional factors (locus of control, self-esteem and perceptions of social support) were mediators of intention to quit.
3. We aimed to provide a comprehensive model of intentions to quit that could be extrapolated to inform quitting behaviour.

Intentions are, according to researchers such as Ajzen and Fishbein (1980) and Igbaria and Greenhaus (1992), the most immediate determinants of actual behaviour. They are also of

practical merit from a research perspective, as once people have actually implemented the behaviour to quit, there is little likelihood of gaining access to them to understand their prior situation. The validity of studying intentions in the workplace can also be drawn from Sager's (1991) longitudinal study of salespeople, in which intention to quit was found to discriminate effectively between leavers and stayers. However, while it is reasonable to argue that intentions are an accurate indicator of subsequent behaviour, we still do not know what determines such intentions.

Numerous researchers (e.g. Bluedorn, 1982; Kalliath and Beck, 2001; Kramer *et al.*, 1995; Peters *et al.*, 1981; Saks, 1996) have attempted to answer the question of what determines people's intention to quit by investigating possible antecedents of employees' intentions to quit. To date, there has been little consistency in findings, which is partly due to the diversity of constructs included by the researchers and the lack of consistency in their measurements but also relates to the heterogeneity of populations sampled. Further, some authors have reported validity co-efficients (read factor loadings) for the variables under investigation but, while statistically significant, these are often of little practical utility. Such authors have also failed to report the amount of variance in intention to quit explained by the factors in their models.

Despite these limitations, among the variables consistently found to relate to intention to quit are:

- the experience of job-related stress (job stress);
- the range of factors that lead to job-related stress (stressors);
- lack of commitment to the organization; and
- job dissatisfaction (e.g. Greenhaus and Beutell, 1985; Igbaria and Greenhaus, 1992; Kahn *et al.*, 1964; Leong *et al.*, 1996; Lum *et al.*, 1998; Peters *et al.*, 1981; Rahim and Psenicka, 1996).

These variables can be mediated by personal or dispositional factors and by environmental or organizational factors. Among the personal factors that mediate between stressors and intention to quit are aspects of personal agency, self-esteem and social support (e.g. Avison and Gotlib, 1994; Coyne *et al.*, 1990; Coyne and Downey, 1991; Turner and Roszell, 1994).

Personal agency refers to concepts such as a sense of powerlessness, locus of control and personal control. Research findings strongly suggest that a greater sense of personal agency is associated with a reduced risk of negative outcomes following major negative life events and role-related stress (see Turner and Roszell, 1994). One of the personal agency variables, locus of control, which refers to the extent to which people believe they or external factors such as chance and powerful others are in control of the events that influence their lives (Levenson, 1974; Rotter, 1966), has been studied in relation to the work place. Rahim and Psenicka (1996) found that an internal locus of control mediated the relationship between job stressors and the intention to leave a job. More specifically, internal locus of control was found to be positively related to job satisfaction (Sujan, 1986) and to being employed (Waters and Moore, 2002), while an external orientation was found to be negatively related to job satisfaction (Behrman and Perreault, 1984) and was higher among unemployed versus employed people (Waters and Moore, 2001).

Self-esteem refers to the evaluation that individuals make and customarily maintain with regard to themselves. Reviews by Kaplan (1975, 1980) and subsequent studies by other researchers (e.g. Silverstone, 1991; Waters and Moore, 2002) have consistently shown that low self-esteem is related to psychological problems, unemployment and maladaptive behaviours. A number of other studies have provided support for the contention that high self-esteem is correlated with job satisfaction (e.g. Greenhaus and Badin, 1974; Inkson, 1978; Kohli, 1985; Teas, 1981, 1982). In a study by Moore (2002), a related construct, self-efficacy (assessed specifically among nurses in relation to their professional abilities), was associated with reduced intention to quit ($\beta = -0.23$).

Social support has been shown to play an important role in mitigating intention to quit, although not all findings have been in agreement. For example, Moore (2002) found that social support from supervisors reduced the level of nurses' burnout and indirectly, through reduced levels of burnout, reduced nurses' intention to quit. A similar result was reported by Kalliath and Beck (2001) when they tested the impact of social support on two components of burnout, namely depersonalization and emotional exhaustion, and found that supervisory support reduced not only those symptoms of burnout but also directly and indirectly nurses' intention to quit. On the other hand, Munn *et al.* (1996), in a study of American child life specialists, found lack of supervisor support was the best predictor of job dissatisfaction and intention to leave a job, while Hatton and Emerson (1998) found that actual staff turnover was predicted in part by low levels of support from superiors. However, other studies (e.g. Rahim and Psenicka, 1996) have failed to find a moderating effect for social support in the relationship between job stressors and intention to quit.

Other researchers (e.g. Coghlan, 1984; Kelly and Cross, 1985) have found that rather than supervisors' support, it is the support gained from talking with peers, family and friends that is frequently cited as a source of stress reduction. Consistent with these findings, Freddolino and Heaney (1992) found that peer social support was associated with higher job satisfaction among direct care staff and home managers for intellectually disabled clients, while intention to quit was associated with the presence of social undermining by co-workers and provider agencies. However, the bulk of evidence suggests that it is situation-specific support, that is, work-supervisor/home-family (e.g. Tinker and Moore, 2001), that is most effective. Accordingly, in this study we examined the role of supervisors' support in employees' intention to quit.

Other variables important in the continuity of employment are employees' job satisfaction and their commitment to the organization. The relationships between these variables and intention to quit have been found to prevail across a range of occupations. For instance, Wunder *et al.* (1982) found that job stressors had a direct, negative effect on job satisfaction among managers of a large international manufacturer, which led to a reduced commitment to the organization and to intention to quit and actual quitting behaviour. However, several other studies (e.g. Armstrong-Stassen *et al.*, 1994; Igbaria and Greenhaus, 1992; Koeske and Koeske, 1993; Tinker and Moore, 2001) have found no direct effect of stressors on intention to quit, but rather indirect effects through the experience of job stress, social support, job satisfaction and lack of commitment to the organization. For example, Igbaria and Greenhaus (1992) reported that among management information systems personnel, the most immediate determinants of turnover intentions were lack of job satisfaction and lack of commitment to the organization. It is important, therefore, to evaluate both the direct and indirect effects of job stressors on intention to quit.

This study assessed the impact of job stressors on intention to quit using the dispositional factors: locus of control, self-esteem, and perceptions of supervisor support; and mediating variables that are related to job engagement: commitment to the organization, job satisfaction, and feelings of stress. The hypothesized model is presented in Figure 1.

Method

Participants

A total of 173 salespeople were recruited from the clothing sections of a large department store in Australia. The sample consisted of 164 females and nine males, with a mean age of 35.95 years ($SD=12.66$, $R=18-61$). Education levels varied from completing some time at high school to completing a degree. In terms of years of service, 11 participants had worked at the store for less than one year, 33 for one to three years, 60 for four to six years, 27 for seven to ten years, and 42 for more than ten years.

Measures

A questionnaire adapted from the comprehensive workplace scale developed by Tate *et al.* (1997) for their tri-nation study was used in this study (see the Appendix). Tate and colleagues reported adequate internal reliability for each factor of the scale ($\alpha=0.61$ to 0.91). The factors assessed were stressors, job stress, job satisfaction, commitment to the organization, locus of control, self-esteem, support offered by supervisors and intention to quit. Each of the factors is explained below.

Stressors measured four aspects of stress. Three items measured each of the following stressors:

- role ambiguity (e.g. my job responsibilities are not clear to me);
- role conflict (e.g. to satisfy some people at my job, I have to upset others);
- work-overload (e.g. it seems to me that I have more work at my job than I can handle); and
- work-family conflict (e.g. my work makes me too tired to enjoy family life).

Items were answered on a five-point Likert scale, from agree to disagree.

Job stress was measured with three burnout items (e.g. I feel emotionally-drained by my job) and five items related to anxiety and somatic complaints (e.g. job-related problems keep me awake at night; I feel tense at my job). Participants indicated on a six-point scale the degree to which they experienced each of these symptoms.

Job satisfaction was measured using a five-point Likert scale to assess participants' agreement with four statements relating to extrinsic factors (e.g. job security, physical conditions), and four statements relating to intrinsic factors (e.g. the recognition received for work done, the freedom given to do one's best at the job).

Commitment to the organization was assessed via five items rated on a five-point scale (e.g. I really care about the fate of this store).

Locus of control (e.g. I can do just about anything at my job) and self-esteem (e.g. I feel that I have many good qualities) were each measured using four items. Participants responded to the statements on a five-point scale, ranging from not at all like me to completely like me.

Support offered by supervisors was measured by three questions answered on four-point Likert scales (e.g. How much does the person go out of his/her way to make your work-life easier for you?)

Intention to quit was measured by two questions rated on a five-point scale (i.e. How often do you think about leaving the job?; How likely are you to look for a new job within the next year?).

Procedure

Participants were provided with a plain language statement outlining the objectives of the study, the questionnaire and an invitation to participate. These packages were distributed to staff through their managers/supervisors. Each package included a reply-paid envelope to enable participants to return the questionnaire directly to the researchers. The response rate from the 200 questionnaires distributed was 86.5 per cent.

Results

The data were analyzed on an IBM/PC using SPSS/PC for Windows (Version 10) and AMOS (Version 4) using Anderson and Gerbing's (1988) recommended two-stage approach to structural equation modeling (SEM) where the first stage represents the confirmatory measurement model and the second involves testing the structural model. All factors except for the two-item intention to quit factor were entered into the measurement model and allowed to correlate. The fit of the data to this model was satisfactory (χ^2 (474, $n=173$) 842.58, $p=0.000$, C/min 1.78, GFI.900, AGFI 860, RMSEA.069, $p>0.05$). The correlations, means, standard deviations, and Cronbach's alpha for each variable are presented in Table I.

Structural model

The hypothesized model presented in Figure 1 was tested using SEM. The independence model that tested the hypothesis that the model variables were uncorrelated was rejected, χ^2 (28, $n=173$), 296.46, $p=0.000$. The data provided good support for the hypothesized model (see Table II) and the χ^2 difference test indicated a significant improvement in fit between the independence and the hypothesized models, χ^2 (20, $n=173$), 282.50, $p=0.000$.

Despite the support for the hypothesized model, the locus of control factor failed to contribute to any other endogenous variable in the model, and for parsimony, we removed it and re-ran the analysis (see Table II, model 2). This resulted in a significant improvement in the fit of the data to the model (χ^2 Diff (4, $n=173$) 11.54, $p\leq 0.001$), as well as greater parsimony. Examination of the standardized residuals co-variance matrix revealed no significant discrepancy between the sample and the implied co-variances matrices.

Figure 2 represents the final model with the standardized path coefficients. All solid paths are significant ($p<0.05$, two-tailed) while dotted paths are not significant; the Beta-weights for the non-significant paths have been suppressed. As hypothesized, stressors exerted a

direct impact on feelings of stress and a negative impact upon perceptions of supervisor support, and job satisfaction. Self-esteem negatively predicted stress and positively predicted commitment to the organization. Feelings of support were directly related to commitment and job satisfaction, while job satisfaction itself was related to higher levels of commitment and less intention to quit. Conversely, feelings of stress contributed to an intention to quit. Lack of perceived support from supervisors contributed to increased levels of stress and stress contributed to reduced levels of job satisfaction. Exploration of the path from job stressors to intention to quit revealed no significant direct effect ($\beta=0.03$, $p>0.05$).

The hypothesized relationships between stressors and self-esteem, and between esteem and satisfaction were not supported by the data. Similarly, the relationship between stress and commitment found to be non-significant. However, each of these variables contributed variously to other factors in the model. Overall, 52 per cent of the variance in intention to quit, 30 per cent in job satisfaction, 30 per cent in commitment and 12 per cent in stress were explained by the factors retained in the model.

Mediation effects

While the majority of hypothesized direct effects were significant, there were also important indirect effects that contributed to the criterion variables[1]. As the focus of this study was on intention to quit, only total effects in relation to that variable are presented (Table III). Although a direct path was predicted from stressors to intention to quit, this was not supported in the model. There were only indirect effects present in the final model through the other variables. In summary, as shown in Table III, the total effects on intention to quit were from stressors $\beta=0.16$; esteem $\beta=-0.19$; supervisor's support $\beta=-0.25$; stress $\beta=0.36$; job satisfaction $\beta=-0.41$; and commitment $\beta=-0.49$.

Discussion

The impact of job stressors on the dispositional and job engagement variables included in the current model accounted for 52 per cent of the variance in employees' intention to quit. This substantial proportion of the variance explained in intention to quit suggests that the variables included in this model have good predictive utility in understanding the intentions of the current sample with respect to quitting.

There was no direct relationship between job stressors and intention to quit in the data; rather, job stressors impacted upon intention to quit through perceived support from supervisors, and through the job engagement factors of job satisfaction, job commitment and feelings of job stress. This null direct path from stressors to an outcome variable, in this case intention to quit, replicates previous findings (e.g. Armstrong-Stassen *et al.*, 1994; Tinker and Moore, 2001) in which it was the indirect influence of job stressors that impacted upon health and related outcome variables. Clearly, as Greenglass *et al.* (2002) suggested, it is not the job demands that affect outcome, but the employee's perceptions (in the current study, with respect to esteem, support and job engagement) that determine their effect.

The majority of the hypothesized paths in the model were supported; thus, this discussion will now focus on the total standardized effects of the paths in the model and the individual and organizational implications to be derived from these. Clearly, the major impact in reducing employees' intention to quit came from a sense of commitment to the

organization ($\beta=-0.49$) and from a sense of job satisfaction ($\beta=-0.41$). Both of these factors can be interpreted to suggest that a high degree of reciprocity exists between the individual and the organization. That is, the more satisfied individuals are with the job, the more committed they will be to the organization (see also Table I).

While the current data reveal that 30 per cent of the variance in job satisfaction is explained by high levels of supervisory support, low levels of job stressors and low feelings of stress, clearly there are other factors that will need to be considered in future research. Similarly, with 30 per cent of the variance in commitment to the organization being explained by self-esteem, supervisory support and job satisfaction, future research may find that other factors, such as job-person congruent values, recognitions and rewards, are also pertinent to increasing feelings of commitment to an organization.

Feelings of stress (e.g. feeling emotionally drained; tense) not only contributed to a reduced sense of job satisfaction, but also was the variable with the next highest contribution to intention to quit (total effect $\beta=0.36$). Clearly, these emotions are a response to the level of job stressors experienced and it may be that strategies to manage or to ventilate feelings of stress need to be an important consideration in any intervention strategy. It may also be important to explore the level of communication between employees and employers with respect to job stressors, as Moore (2002) found that low levels of communication between management and subordinates contributed to increased the subordinates' feelings of stress and hence to their intention to quit.

Somewhat in line with the previous suggestion is the finding that perceptions of supervisors' support acted to reduce intention to quit ($\beta=-0.25$). While the questions related to perceived support were highly homogeneous and attempted to match the support-provider (that is, the supervisor) to the situation (that is, the workplace), they may not have provided the best match. For instance, the questions related more to perceptions that the supervisors would "go out of their way to help" than to a sense that the supervisor would provide emotional support or direct assistance with tasks. It may be that future research will benefit from the inclusion of questions that are more closely matched within the context and the source of support. Such a specificity proposal is in line with suggestions from Bandura (1986) relating to the assessment of self-efficacy, and Van der Doef and Meas's (1999) in terms of control-demand specificity.

Job stressors and self-esteem also had direct but negligible total effects upon intention to quit ($\beta=0.16$). However, these variables are important in the model for other reasons. Job stressors are directly predictive of feelings of stress, which in turn are directly predictive of intention to quit. This suggests that there may be some individuals who will express an intention to leave a job in the face of stressors and stress, regardless of other factors. Given that supervisor support was so influential in determining job satisfaction and commitment, the role of these variables on feelings of stress and intention warrants investigation. Further, with job satisfaction being a key mediator in increasing organizational commitment and reducing turnover intention, the factors of job satisfaction that can be manipulated by employers should also be monitored.

A potential limitation of the findings of this study is that the vast majority of participants were female. While Fry and Greenfeld (1980) found no gender differences in organizational commitment, role conflict, role ambiguity and work overload amongst police officers, the

generalizability of the current results might still be limited. Further, it may be argued that intentions do not equal behaviour and therefore all reported intentions to quit are really no more than “talk” until they are acted on. However, as proposed by Igbaria and Greenhaus (1992), intentions to quit may be the best indicator of quitting behaviour, and unless longitudinal studies are undertaken, the degree to which stated quitting intentions are acted on cannot be assessed. It may be possible to conduct such longitudinal studies among those employed in industries in which, for various reasons, there is a high turnover rate.

Although the current model accounts for a substantial 52 per cent of the variability in intention to quit, it is important to acknowledge that only “push” variables were considered in the model. There may also be other factors that ameliorate intention to quit and act to hold a person in a job. For example, some employees may feel entrapped by their accrued benefits from superannuation or pension funds that may decrease in value should they change jobs. Similarly, in Australia, long service leave entitlements accrue over ten years of continuous service, entitling an employee to three months' additional paid leave. A reluctance to give up accruing benefits may reduce quitting intentions for some individuals. Further, financial and family commitments may make the possibility of quitting a fantasy rather than a real intention. Finally, there may be other factors that “pull” individuals away from a job. Such factors include the perception of better options, and being headhunted. For example, anecdotal accounts from the information technology industry suggest that high staff turnover is related to the high incidence of poaching brought about by a shortage of trained personnel. A more complex and dynamic model warrants investigation in a longitudinal study to determine the effects of these proposed push and pull factors.

Conclusion

Intention to quit is largely influenced by job dissatisfaction, lack of commitment to the organization and feelings of stress, which in the current model are influenced by job stressors. However, for managers who are concerned about the impact intention to quit and possible turnover, these variables are factors over which they may have some control. In particular, job stressors (e.g. work overload, job ambiguity), which are the factors that trigger the chain of psychological states that lead to intention to quit, can be adjusted. Supervisor support is a similarly influential mediator within the model and can reduce the impact of stressors on psychological states and intentions to quit. Monitoring workloads and supervisor-subordinate relationships by management may not only reduce stress, but increase job satisfaction and commitment to the organization. Further, given their importance in quitting intentions, managers need to monitor both the extrinsic and intrinsic sources of job satisfaction available to employees. This in turn may reduce intention to quit, and subsequent turnover, thereby saving organizations the considerable financial cost and effort involved in the recruitment, induction and training of replacement staff. However, the story does not end there, and other variables, described by us as the push-pull factors, need to be examined in longitudinal studies.

SECTION I: General Information

Please provide the following information

1. Your Gender: Male Female
2. Your age: years
3. Your highest level of completed educational
 - a. Some high school b. Completed high school c. Diploma d. Degree
4. How long have you been working for this organization? years
5. How many hours per week do you work for this organization? hours

SECTION II

Here, we would like to know how much you agree or disagree with each of the following statements related to your job. Please circle the number which best indicates your opinion about each of the following statements.

Strongly agree	= 5
Agree	= 4
Neither agree nor disagree	= 3
Disagree	= 2
Strongly disagree	= 1

1. My job responsibilities are clear to me.	5	4	3	2	1
2. My job objectives are well-defined.	5	4	3	2	1
3. It is clear to me what others expect of me at my job.	5	4	3	2	1
4. At my job, I cannot satisfy everybody at the same time.	5	4	3	2	1
5. To satisfy some people at my job, I have to upset others.	5	4	3	2	1
6. At my job, I have to do things which should be done differently.	5	4	3	2	1
7. I am given enough time to do what is expected of me at my job.	5	4	3	2	1
8. It seems that I have more work at my job than I can handle.	5	4	3	2	1
9. My job requires that I work very hard.	5	4	3	2	1
10. My job schedule interferes with my family life.	5	4	3	2	1
11. My job makes me too tired to enjoy my family life.	5	4	3	2	1
12. My job does not give me enough time for family activities.	5	4	3	2	1

SECTION III

Now, we would like to know how your immediate supervisor helps you when you face job-related problems. Please answer each question according to the following scale.

Very much	= 4
Somewhat	= 3
A little	= 2
Not at all	= 1

1. How much does your immediate supervisor go out of his/her way to make your work-life easier for you?	4	3	2	1
2. How easy is it for you to talk with your immediate supervisor about your job-related problems?	4	3	2	1
3. How much can your immediate supervisor be relied on when things get tough at your job?	4	3	2	1

(Continued)

Figure A1.
Workplace scale

Figure A1 Workplace scale

SECTION IV

When you think about yourself and your job, how much of the time do you feel each of the following ways? Please circle the number that best described your feeling for the following statements.

Never = 0
Once a month = 1
A few times a month = 2
Once a week = 3
A few times a week = 4
Almost every day = 5

1. I feel emotionally drained by my job.	0	1	2	3	4	5
2. I feel burned-out by my job.	0	1	2	3	4	5
3. I feel frustrated at my job.	0	1	2	3	4	5
4. I feel tense at my job.	0	1	2	3	4	5
5. I lose my appetite because of my job-related problems.	0	1	2	3	4	5
6. Job-related problems keep me awake at night.	0	1	2	3	4	5
7. Job-related problems make my stomach upset.	0	1	2	3	4	5
8. Job-related problems make my heart beat faster than usual.	0	1	2	3	4	5

SECTION V

In this section, please circle the appropriate number to indicate how satisfied or dissatisfied you are with various aspects of your job. Please answer each item.

Very satisfied = 5
Satisfied = 4
Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied = 3
Dissatisfied = 2
Very Dissatisfied = 1

1. Job security (stable work).	5	4	3	2	1
2. Physical conditions (lighting, ventilation, etc.).	5	4	3	2	1
3. Fringe benefits (company discounts, superannuation, etc).	5	4	3	2	1
4. Pay you receive for your job.	5	4	3	2	1
5. The recognition you get when you do a good job.	5	4	3	2	1
6. The freedom you have to do the best you can at your job.	5	4	3	2	1
7. Your advancement to better positions since you started working for this store.	5	4	3	2	1
8. The work you do.	5	4	3	2	1

SECTION VI

The following statements are related to your attitude, opinions, and feelings about yourself. Answer each statement quickly rather than taking a long time. It is your first impression about yourself that is the most important.

Very true of me = 5
True of me = 4
Neither true nor untrue of me = 3
Untrue of me = 2
Very untrue of me = 1

1. There is no way I can solve some of the problems at my job.	5	4	3	2	1
2. I have little control over the things that happen to me at my job.	5	4	3	2	1

Figure A1.

Figure A1continued

(Continued)

3. I can do just about anything at my job.	5	4	3	2	1
4. There is little I can do to change many things at my job.	5	4	3	2	1
5. I feel that I have many good qualities.	5	4	3	2	1
6. All in all, I feel that I am a failure.	5	4	3	2	1
7. On the whole, I am satisfied with myself.	5	4	3	2	1
8. I am able to do things as well as most people.	5	4	3	2	1

SECTION VII

Now, we would like to know how you feel about working for this store. Please circle the number that best describes your feeling for each of the following statements.

Strongly agree	= 5
Agree	= 4
Neither agree nor disagree	= 3
Disagree	= 2
Strongly disagree	= 1

1. I will work harder than I have to in order to help this store to be successful.	5	4	3	2	1
2. I am proud to work for this store.	5	4	3	2	1
3. I feel very little loyalty to this store.	5	4	3	2	1
4. I talk about this store to my friends as a great store to work for.	5	4	3	2	1
5. I really care about the fate of this store.	5	4	3	2	1

SECTION VIII

The following statements are related to your job performance and intention to stop working for this organization. Please answer each of the following items.

1. How often do you think of leaving your present job?

Very often Fairly often Sometimes Occasionally Rarely or Never

2. How likely are you to look for a new job within the next year?

Very likely Likely Not sure Unlikely Very unlikely

Figure A1.

Figure A1continued

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
1 Intention to quit	1							
2 Commitment	-.65***	1						
3 Job satisfaction	-.53***	.47***	1					
4 Stress	.43***	-.30***	-.40***	1				
5 Locus of control	-.06	.14 ^{ns}	.17*	-.16*	1			
6 Esteem	-.20**	.26***	.07	-.17*	.00 ^{ns}	1		
7 Support	-.33**	.30***	.37***	-.22**	.26**	.01 ^{ns}	1	
8 Sum of stressors	.19*	-.20**	-.35***	.23**	-.15*	.05 ^{ns}	-.15*	1
M	5.21	15.90	26.77	11.27	8.90	17.58	8.89	34.32
SD	2.06	2.90	5.43	8.04	2.80	2.41	2.57	6.77
Cronbach's alpha	0.75	0.80	0.78	0.87	0.61	0.74	0.88	0.60

Table I.
Inter-correlations, means, standard deviations and internal reliabilities

Notes: Decimals in correlations have been omitted. ns, not significant. * $p < 0.05$; ** $p < 0.01$; *** $p < 0.001$

Table Inter-correlations, means, standard deviations and internal reliabilities

	Model 1. Hypothesized model	Model 2. Deleted: locus of control
χ^2	13.96	2.42
df	8	4
p	0.083	0.654
C/Min	1.74	0.605
GFI	0.981	0.996
AGFI	0.913	0.972
IFI	0.979	0.987
CFI	0.978	0.999
RMSEA	0.066	0.000
p	0.281	0.805

Table II.
Goodness-of-fit statistics for models on intention to quit

Table II Goodness-of-fit statistics for models on intention to quit

1 Stressors	1	2	4	5	6	7	
2 Esteem	0.046						
4 Support	-0.147	0.000					
5 Stress	0.227	-0.181	-0.194				
6 Satisfaction	-0.350	0.094	0.333	-0.277			
7 Commitment	-0.158	0.274	0.280	-0.185	0.368		
8 Intention to quit	0.164	-0.191	-0.252	0.356	-0.410	-0.485	

Table III.
Standardized total
direct effects

Table III Standardized total direct effects

References

- Ajzen, I., Fishbein, M. (1980), *Understanding Attitudes and Predicting Social Behaviour*, Prentice-Hall, Englewood Cliffs, NJ, .
- Anderson, J.C., Gerbing, D.W. (1988), "Structural equation modeling in practice: a review and recommended two-step approach", *Psychological Bulletin*, Vol. 103 pp.411-23.
- Armstrong-Stassen, M., al-Ma'Aitah, R., Cameron, S., Horsburgh, M. (1994), "Determinants and consequences of burnout: a cross-cultural comparison of Canadian and Jordanian nurses", *Health Care for Women International*, Vol. 15 pp.413-21.
- Avison, R., Gotlib, I.H. (1994), "Introduction and overview", in Avison, R., Gotlib, I.H. (Eds), *Stress and Mental Health: Contemporary Issues and Prospects for the Future*, Plenum, New York, NY, pp.3-14.
- Bandura, A. (1986), *Social Foundations of Thought and Action: A Social Cognitive Theory*, Prentice-Hall, Englewood Cliffs, NJ, .
- Behrman, D.N., Perreault, W.D. (1984), "A role stress model of the performance and satisfaction of industrial salespersons", *Journal of Marketing*, Vol. 48 No.Fall, pp.9-21.
- Bluedorn, A.C. (1982), "A unified model of turnover from organizations", *Human Relations*, Vol. 35 pp.135-53.
- Coghlan, J.A. (1984), "An analysis of stress in intensive care units in Melbourne", *The Australian Journal of Advanced Nursing*, Vol. 1 pp.27-32.
- Coyne, J.C., Downey, G. (1991), "Social factors and psychopathology", in Rosenzweig, M.R., Porter, L.W. (Eds), *Annual Review of Psychology*, Annual Reviews, Stanford, CA, Vol. Vol. 42 pp.401-25.
- Coyne, J.C., Burchill, S.A.L., Stiles, W.B. (1990), "An interactional perspective on depression", in Snyder, C.R., Forsyth, D.O. (Eds), *Handbook of Social and Clinical Psychology: The Health Perspective*, Pergamon, New York, NY, pp.327-49.
- Freddolino, P.P., Heaney, C.A. (1992), "Staffing issues in group homes for people labeled mentally ill: an empirical investigation of job satisfaction and intention to quit", *Adult Residential Care Journal*, Vol. 6 pp.115-29.

- Fry, L.W., Greenfeld, S. (1980), "An examination of attitudinal differences between policewomen and policemen", *Journal of Applied Psychology*, Vol. 65 pp.123-6.
- Greenglass, E.R., Burke, R.J., Moore, K.A. (2002), "Impact of hospital restructuring on anger, depression and job satisfaction in nurses", *Stress Medicine*, .
- Greenhaus, J., Badin, I.J. (1974), "Self-esteem, performance, and satisfaction: some tests of a theory", *Journal of Applied Psychology*, Vol. 59 pp.722-6.
- Greenhaus, J.H., Beutell, N.J. (1985), "Sources of conflict between work and family roles", *Academy of Management Review*, Vol. 10 pp.76-88.
- Hatton, C., Emerson, E. (1998), "Brief report: organisational predictors of actual staff turnover in a service for people with multiple disabilities", *Journal of Applied Research in Intellectual Disabilities*, Vol. 11 pp.166-71.
- Igbaria, M., Greenhaus, J.H. (1992), "Determinants of MIS employees' turnover intentions: a structural equation model", *Communications of the ACM*, Vol. 35 No.2, pp.35-49.
- Inkson, K.J.H. (1978), "Self-esteem as a moderator of the relationship between job performance and job satisfaction", *Journal of Applied Psychology*, Vol. 63 pp.243-7.
- Kahn, R.L., Wolfe, D.M., Quinn, R., Snoek, J.D., Rosenthal, R.A. (1964), *Organisational Stress: Studies in Role Conflict and Ambiguity*, Wiley, New York, NY, .
- Kalliath, T.J., Beck, A. (2001), "Is the path to burnout and turnover paved by a lack of supervisory support: a structural equations test", *New Zealand Journal of Psychology*, Vol. 30 pp.72-8.
- Kaplan, H.B. (1975), *Self-attitudes and Deviant Behavior*, Goodyear, Pacific Palisades, CA, .
- Kaplan, H.B. (1980), *Deviant Behavior in Defense of Self*, Academic Press, New York, NY, .
- Kelly, J.G., Cross, D.G. (1985), "Stress, coping behaviors, and recommendations for intensive care and medical surgical ward registered nurses", *Research Nursing and Health*, Vol. 8 pp.321-8.
- Koeske, G.F., Koeske, R.D. (1993), "A preliminary test of a stress-strain-outcome model for reconceptualizing the burnout phenomenon", *Journal of Social Science Research*, Vol. 17 No.3/4, pp.107-35.
- Kohli, A.A. (1985), "Some unexplored supervisory behaviors and their influences on salespeople's role clarity, specific self-esteem, job satisfaction, and motivation", *Journal of Marketing Research*, Vol. 22 pp.424-33.
- Kramer, M.W., Callister, R.R., Turban, D.B. (1995), "Information-receiving and information-giving during job transitions", *Western Journal of Communication*, Vol. 59 pp.151-70.

Leong, C.S., Furnham, A., Cooper, C.L. (1996), "The moderating effect of organizational commitment on the occupational stress outcome relationship", *Human Relations*, Vol. 49 pp.1345-63.

Levenson, H. (1974), "Activism and powerful others: distinctions within the concept of internal-external control", *Journal of Personality Assessment*, Vol. 38 pp.377-83.

Lum, L., Kervin, J., Clark, K., Reid, F., Sirola, W. (1998), "Explaining nursing turnover intent: job satisfaction, pay satisfaction, or organizational commitment?", *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, Vol. 19 pp.305-20.

Moore, K.A. (2002), "Hospital restructuring: impact on nurses mediated by social support and a perception of challenge", *Journal of Health and Human Services Administration*, .

Munn, E.K., Barber, C.E., Fritz, J.J. (1996), "Factors affecting the professional well-being of child life specialists", *Children's Health Care*, Vol. 25 pp.71-91.

Peters, L., Bhagat, R., O'Connor, E.J. (1981), "An examination of the independent and joint contribution of organizational commitment and job satisfaction on employee intention to quit", *Group and Organization Studies*, Vol. 6 pp.73-82.

Rahim, M., Psenicka, C. (1996), "A structural equation model of stress, locus of control, social support, psychiatric symptoms, and propensity to leave a job", *Journal of Social Psychology*, Vol. 136 pp.69-84.

Rotter, J. (1966), "Generalized expectancies for internal versus external control of reinforcement", *Psychological Monographs*, Vol. 80 No.1, .

Sager, J.K. (1991), "The longitudinal assessment of change in sales force turnover", *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, Vol. 19 pp.25-36.

Saks, A.M. (1996), "The relationship between the amount of helpfulness of entry training and work outcomes", *Human Relations*, Vol. 49 pp.429-51.

Silverstone, P.H. (1991), "Low self-esteem in psychiatric conditions", *British Journal of Clinical Psychology*, Vol. 30 pp.185-8.

Sujan, H. (1986), "Smarter versus harder: an exploratory attributional analysis of sales people's motivation", *Journal of Marketing Research*, Vol. 23 pp.41-9.

Tate, U., Whatley, A., Clugston, M. (1997), "Sources and outcomes of job tension: a three-nation study", *International Journal of Management*, Vol. 3 pp.350-8.

Teas, R.K. (1981), "An empirical test of models of salespersons' job expectancy and instrumentality perceptions", *Journal of Marketing Research*, Vol. 18 pp.209-26.

Teas, R.K. (1982), "Performance-reward instrumentalities and motivation of retail salespeople", *Journal of Retailing*, Vol. 58 pp.4-26.

Tinker, S., Moore, K.A. (2001), "The impact of long work hours on the family-work relationship and health", paper presented at the Inaugural Conference of APS Relationships Interest Group, Melbourne, 17-18 November, .

Turner, R.J., Roszell, P. (1994), "Psychosocial resources and the stress process", in Avison, R., Gotlib, I.H. (Eds), *Stress and Mental Health: Contemporary Issues and Prospects for the Future*, Plenum, New York, NY, pp.179-212.

Van der Doef, M., Meas, S. (1999), "The job demand-control (-support) model and psychological well-being: a review of 20 years of empirical research", *Work and Stress*, Vol. 13 pp.87-114.

Waters, L.E., Moore, K.A. (2001), "Coping with economic deprivation during unemployment", *Journal of Economic Psychology*, Vol. 22 pp.461-82.

Waters, L.E., Moore, K.A. (2002), "Self-esteem and coping: a comparison of unemployed and re-employed people", *Journal of Organizational Behaviour*, Vol. 23 pp.1-12.

Wunder, R.S., Dougherty, T.W., Welsh, M.A. (1982), "A causal model of role stress and employee turnover", *Proceedings: Academy of Management*, Vol. 42 pp.297-301.

Appendix

Figure A1