

## Variability of Employees' Behaviour during Disaffection<sup>1</sup>

Lucie LINHARTOVÁ\*

---

### Abstract

*The aim of the article is modelling of impacts of employee turnover on efficiency of organisations. Variability of employees' behaviour during disaffection was modelled based upon identification of factors affecting employee turnover revealed by deduction method and verified by quantitative survey. Formulation of problematic phenomenon and its verification leads to formulation of critical variables in order to lower disaffection and its costs in organisations. Different responses to impulses determine the level of dependence between the primary impulse (factors influencing employee turnover) and a reaction which is further elaborated according to the significance for the organisation. Differences in behaviours of employees in small national companies and large multinationals and their reactions to impulses are also described. The questionnaires were focused on revealing internal organisational factors leading to turnover. Respondents were part of a survey only if they left their previous job willingly. Thus, results can help to predict internal organisation causes leading to employee turnover and employee behaviour during disaffection.*

**Keywords:** *efficiency, behaviour, human resources, disaffection, turnover, organisation, management*

**JEL Classification:** J63

---

### Introduction

Employee turnover seriously affects organisations. It is an undue burden for a company's costs and budget. Employees do not leave the organisation based on an immediate one-off decision; usually it is a gradual process requiring time. The

---

\* Lucie LINHARTOVÁ, Czech University of Life Sciences in Prague, Faculty of Economics and Management, Department of Management, Kamýcká 129, 165 00 Prague 6, Czech Republic; e-mail: linhartoval@pef.czu.cz

<sup>1</sup> This paper resulted from contribution to an institutional research project IGA PEF CZU 201011140016 *Factors Affecting Staff Turnover*.

process of an employee's alienation, i.e. the intention to leave the organization, can take days, weeks and sometimes even years before the employee finally reaches the point of leaving (Branham, 2009). In the initial stages leading to the employee's leaving, employees use cognitive, emotional and evaluation processes. Employees are balancing between the urge to stay and the urge to leave the job. At this stage they consider the support provided by their current employer such as work conditions, commitments, unexpected facts, environment and backing (Transtheoretical Model, 2010). Often an employee is already estranged from the organisation or has already made a decision to leave, nevertheless for a variety of reasons remains with the organisation. These reasons are, for example, fear of not finding a job, insufficient self-confidence, fear of change, few corresponding jobs in the region, etc. (Armstrong, 2007). A survey carried out by the Gallup organization reveals that only 25% of employees are loyal to the organization by which they are employed; 60% of the respondents characterised their attitude as "not loyal, alienated" and 15% even said they were actively working against the targets of their organization (Branham, 2009; Hájek, 2007).

The article deals with the variability of employees' behaviour in the process of deciding whether to leave the organisation or stay. On the basis of the collected secondary sources and the associated primary research, factors determining an employee's leaving have been identified. These factors were subsequently used as a stimulus to make employees consider whether they are willing to continue to work for the organisation under the current conditions. Reactions to these impulses were examined according to the findings of the research focusing on the reasons for employees' leaving of work positions in organisations. The findings reveal a relationship between the primary impulse (factors determining the employee's leaving of the work position) and a reaction that is further analysed according to its significance for the organisation.

## **Litetrature Review**

Employee turnover is the level of movement of employees inside and outside the organization (Reiß, 2008). Turnover has both positive and negative aspects, however, it is in the interest of organizations to eliminate its negative impacts and an excessive (negative) level of turnover that threatens knowledge continuity in organizations (Branham, 2009; Ertl, 2005; Reiß, 2008; Zahorsky, 2010) and is an undue burden for a company's budget and human resources, i.e. time dedicated to employee prospecting, advertisements, interviews, initial training, supervision, motivation, evaluation, familiarization with the new job, mentoring, coaching, substitution while the position is vacant (Armstrong, 2007; Bowes,

---

2010; Reiß, 2008). The aim of the article is therefore to describe, following the identification of reasons for employees' decisions to leave their job, individual problematic elements within the frame of personnel activities of the organization and to formulate recommended procedures to eliminate these negative phenomena.

The reasons an employee has to leave his job have a connection to the hierarchy of basic human needs, such as the need for trust, hope, esteem and recognition (Deci and Ryan, 1985; Deiblová, 2005; Herzberg, Mausner and Synderman, 2004; Maslow, 1943; McClelland, 1987; McGregor, 2006; Vroom, 1990). People spend a large part of each week at their workplace and they wish to feel at least reasonably well during this time. They long for appreciation of the effort they invest in creating values for society; they need to know that their work is beneficial and that there is a future for them in the organisation (Branham, 2009; Brémond and Brémond, 1988; Collins, 2001; Finnegan, 2010; Hroník, 2006; Katcher and Snyder, 2009; Koubek, 2004; Pauknerová, 2006).

When employees decide whether to stay in the organization or leave, they are influenced by both internal and external factors. Among internal conditions that motivate an employee to leave, i.e. conditions at the workplace, there are: relationships with colleagues and superiors, payment conditions, sanitary, technical, technological and other factors of the working environment, mobbing, bossing length and flexibility of working hours as well as employee benefits. External conditions that influence an employee's intention to leave the organization, include, for example, current personal and family reasons (family, friends, moving, initiation of studies, retirement, launch of one's own business), demographic, economic, technological and social factors (Branham, 2009).

In conclusion, the most important retention recommendations are the following (Bowes, 2010; Branham, 2000; Finnegan, 2010; Heathfield, 2010; Katcher and Snyder, 2009; Zahorsky, 2010):

- Good coaching and interaction between employee and supervisor (communication).
- Opportunity to learn new skills, recognition for a well done job (recognition).
- Good compensation and benefits package (remuneration).
- Challenging, rewarding, interesting work (corporate culture).
- Friendly co-workers (relationships).
- Talent and vision of company management team, strategic mission of the company (future certainty).
- Respectful treatment (expectations).

Staff turnover is an extreme example of dissatisfaction and demotivation characterised by one (or a combination) of the above-mentioned reasons. When

basic working conditions expected by an employee are not satisfied, the employee becomes frustrated (Bělohávek, 2008; Deiblová, 2005; Kocianová, 2010). The accumulated motivational energy remains unexploited and this leads to the following (Bělohávek, 2008):

- Increase in efforts (energization),
- Moving away from intentions (escape),
- Venting the unused energy in a violent way (aggression),
- Searching for a compensatory goal (sublimation),
- Self-convincing that the goal was not worth it and that it is alright that it has not been achieved (rationalization),
- Returning to lower-level needs (regression).

Bělohávek (2008), Jenkins (2009) and Ramlall (2004) describe the causes of turnover as disharmony with internal motivation. If a need on a higher hierarchical level of Maslow's pyramid is not satisfied, an individual attempts to satisfy a need on a lower hierarchical level. The most frequent case is that an employee's unsatisfied expectations in the form of self-development shift to the development of relationship needs. If the workplace does not offer satisfactory relationships either, the employee leaves the job (unless conditions can be changed). Self-development within organizations is determined by corporate culture. Culture supporting employee development is characterised by the possibilities of training, education and working positions with complex tasks and responsibilities. Working role is yet another intrinsic motivational factor that influences self-actualisation. Employees require respect in relation to their work position, associated responsibilities and importance for the functioning of the organisation (Jenkins, 2009).

## **Methods and Materials**

Paper describes inadequate behaviour inside organisations. The aim of the article is to point-out critical variables in order to lower disaffection in organisations. It is essential for modern knowledge-based organisation to be aware of the main causes and consequences of employee fluctuation to maintain competitiveness.

The data for the evaluation of reasons for employees' leaving of their jobs has been collected in two successive quantitative surveys by means of questionnaire investigation. The questionnaires were focused on revealing internal organisational factors leading to turnover. Respondents were part of a survey only if they left their previous job willingly. Thus, results can help to predict internal organisation causes leading to employee turnover. Both questionnaires were completed by 100 employees each (different respondents were chosen for the first and second

questionnaire) who had already left their jobs. The method used for the collection of data in the first survey was an electronic questionnaire that automatically recorded and pre-categorised respondents' answers. The second, control questionnaire was based on the CATI method (computer-assisted telephone interviewing). The selection of a representative sample of employee population across sectors was carried out by a random selection of telephone numbers, which incorporates the advantages of multilevel random selection (Disman, 2008). The sample was selected solely for the purposes of the survey and included employees in the age category from 20 to 50 who left their job in the course of the past twelve months. Following an introduction, respondents were included in the survey provided they had satisfied the predefined conditions. Their answers were categorised according to identification questions that formed the first part of the questionnaire. In the first survey, the measurement was based on closed questions with one or several possible answer(s) that had been selected based on the study of literature, documents and other related surveys carried out by the following authors: Branham (2009), Hackman and Oldham (1980), Meyer and Allen (1991) and Katcher and Snyder (2009). In the second survey a semantic differential was applied that permitted the identification of nuances in respondents' attitudes through the questionnaire. Respondents' reactions to target statements and their attitudes to the given matter were restricted by offering a set of several statements (Hayes, 1998). The extremes of the seven-point scale represented bipolar concepts of the evaluation dimension. Using a scale of 1 to 7 respondents expressed their inclination towards one of the preset extreme statements or, provided it was not possible to favour either of the sides, selected a median, neutral value (the median value was characterised by number 4). The scale permitted not only the specification of respondents' attitudes, but also their intensity. The analysis was carried out using the Microsoft Excel 2007 and SPSS programmes. The conclusiveness of the outputs and relationships obtained were supported by the tools of descriptive statistics, the analysis of dispersion, parametric tests and correlation, and regression and determination were used to review the outcomes.

Based on literature review determinants of reasons of employee turnover were deducted and main factors constructed. In two successive surveys 29 determinants<sup>2</sup> were used to describe 7 main factors causing employee turnover. Those factors are remuneration, certainty, relationships, recognition, communication, culture and expectations. The factors were confirmed by the method of induction based on the results of the surveys. For reasons of provable clear understanding, the factors were structured as general, analogically to the survey

---

<sup>2</sup> Statements used by the respondents to characterize the main reasons to leave.

carried out by Gosling, Rentfrow and Swann (2003), John, Naumann and Soto (2008) and Benet-Martinez and John (1998). The conclusiveness of the outcomes was supported by aggregation; by adding individual tested items the superordinate item and the whole were supported.<sup>3</sup> The conclusiveness of factors and their determinants was tested by means of a correlation analysis at the significance level of 0.01. The outcomes indicate a direct and strong dependence between employee dissatisfaction with the identified factors and the decision to leave their work position. The factors were therefore used for further analyses.

Firstly the respondents were separated into groups regarding type of their employment and type of organisation, which they worked for. Secondly, the respondents answered about reasons affecting their decision to leave and their behaviour during that period. The answers were collected in a database and aggregated according to a previously prepared construct into seven main factors, which were used as the first impulse for decision to leave an organisation. These impulses are: remuneration, future certainty, relationships, recognition, communication, corporate culture and expectations.

Variability of behaviour used six main reactions to impulses, which cause turnover. Those reactions were disaffection, search for new job, worsening of work performance, demotivation of work, demotivation of other co-workers and finally resignation and departure from the organisation. Analysis revealed connections between impulses and reactions and its frequency. Differences between variants of behaviour were tested by analysis of variance. The most common reactions and its reasons were identified. Aggregation of answers into construct is shown in Table 1.

The respondents were surveyed firstly in August and September 2010, secondly in November 2010. The ages of respondents were overall younger (20 – 50 years) because results get from such group of respondents are able to predict future employee behaviour which can be expected in next few years. Economy was focused on prediction of employee fluctuation during recession and difficult time when employees are trying to find new jobs and organisations are trying to keep the best and talented “knowledgeable” employees.

The employees were surveyed if they left job willingly to get the outcomes characterizing problematic factors inside organisations which are caused by managers or organisation conditions.

The overall return of the first questionnaire was 22%. Return of the second questionnaire is not possible to find out regarding special type of survey (CATI); 61% of respondents of the first survey were female. The second survey did not

---

<sup>3</sup> Individual items of the construct sustaining final factors were tested separately and their reliability was added up in the whole.

include question focus on sex of the respondent, because  $\chi^2$  test indicated that there is no dependence between sex and reasons to leave the organisation. As well as  $\chi^2$  test did not indicate any dependence between sexes of respondent, also sector does not affect causes of employee turnover.

Table 1

**Factors Affecting Staff Disaffection and Turnover**

<b>Factor</b>	<b>Items Used for Aggregation of Factors</b>
<i>Expectations</i>	Imbalance between work and private life; Excessive travel requirements; Lack of clear expectations; Lack of support for new ideas; Stress from overwork; Emotional imbalance; Previous knowledge and experience of workers, ideas, ways of perception and behaviour; Lack of interest in the ideas of subordinates
<i>Corporate Culture</i>	Excessive workload; Lack of necessary resources; Inconvenient organisational culture; Inflexible employment; Few opportunities for promotion and further growth; Leadership, organisation and management style; Poor working conditions; Lack of job tasks, materials, competences; Demands on time and limits of employees; Correspondence and complexity of job tasks; Lack of focus on quality
<i>Communication</i>	Lack of open communication; Lack of honesty/integrity/ethics; Concealment; Lack of support for inputs and ideas; Sufficient information about organisation; Communication is waste of time; Feedback and coaching
<i>Recognition</i>	Lack of focus on productivity; Lack of opportunities for training and development; Uninteresting or not fulfilling job position; Number of honours and awards received; Support of career development; Lack of recognition
<i>Remuneration</i>	Inadequate salary, benefits; Remuneration is not related to employee output; Unfair remuneration
<i>Relationships</i>	Lack of teamwork; Negative relationship with a colleague(s) or the supervisor(s); Disregard for good results, or for errors and mistakes; Inadequate management style; Unwillingness of managers to solve problems of subordinates; Unfair treatment; Excessive interference of manager to the power of subordinates; Autonomy of work; Gross acts or ridicule; Equal treatment within employees from different departments
<i>Future Certainty</i>	Unfair payment practices; Lack of trust in top management; Legal disputes; Uncertainty about the future of the company; Lack of interest in future growth; Uncertain stability of employment; Lack of new projects

Source: Author's processing.

The respondents were mainly from tertiary sector (65%), 27% were from primary and secondary sector and 8% were from public administration. Respondents did not answer questions about high of their salary, because it is considered as a personal questions regarding Czech law 101/2000. The job position of respondents was both managerial and subordinates. But all respondents were employees; 90% of respondents worked full-time, 10% as part-timers or other employment agreement.

Differences were found between small and large organisations. Employees of small organisations (up till 19 employees) act differently during disaffection and turnover than large organisations' (over 250 employees). Outcomes revealed different reasons to leave, different impulses and different behaviour and reactions. Therefore employee attitudes were sorted according to the size of an organisation.

Employees were mainly (44%) from large multinational organisations (over 250 employees), 40% were from small national organisations (up till 19 employees) and 16% from medium-sized organisations. The classification of sizes of organisations was settled according to Czech statistical office.

## Results and Discussion

Using the factors that conclusively influence an employee's decision to leave the organisation, the variability of behaviour to an identical impulse has been examined. Factors that have proven significant pursuant to Pearson's coefficient and the analysis of linear regression and determination were used as the impulse. An employee's decision-making about leaving his/her job is determined by seven factors (remuneration, future certainty, quality of interpersonal relationships at the workplace, satisfaction with their role and position, style and state of communication within the organisation, type of organizational culture and expectations) that most significantly impact the personal decision of the employee regarding whether to stay or leave. A correlation analysis has shown the importance of the above-listed factors composed on the basis of the induction of aggregation of statements characterizing impulses triggering the reaction of dissatisfaction and alienation and ending with the employee's leaving of the job.

For the possible prediction and calculation of an employee's inclination to leave the position the table provided below has been developed.

Table 2

### Coefficients of Variables of Behaviour Formula in the Process of Deciding about Leaving the Organisation

Factor	% turnover			R <sup>2</sup>	Coefficient of variable		
	SUM	SMEs	Large org.		SUM	SMEs	Large org.
<i>x<sub>1</sub> – remuneration</i>	21	23	19	0.942	19.78	21.66	17.90
<i>x<sub>2</sub> – future certainty</i>	17	18	16	0.976	16.59	17.57	15.62
<i>x<sub>3</sub> – relationships</i>	16	16	26	0.847	13.55	13.55	22.02
<i>x<sub>4</sub> – recognition</i>	14	14	10	0.914	12.80	12.80	9.14
<i>x<sub>5</sub> – communication</i>	14	10	16	0.778	10.89	7.80	12.45
<i>x<sub>6</sub> – culture</i>	11	12	6	0.982	10.80	11.78	5.89
<i>x<sub>7</sub> – expectations</i>	7	7	7	0.914	6.40	6.40	6.40
$\Sigma$	100	100	100	–	90.81	91.56	89.42

Source: Author's survey.

Releasing reactions leading to employees' leaving have been collected and aggregated in the first part of Table 2. The first column shows the proportional division of reasons for leaving for all organizations. A statistically significant difference between the reasons for leaving communicated by employees of small national companies and multinationals has been discovered; therefore Table 2

has been extended to include this division as well. To adjust the final coefficient showing the relationship between the factors and leaving of the organization, the calculated determination coefficient for individual factors was used. Thus the final coefficients of variables are directly dependent on the level to which they determine an employee's decision to leave the organisation. The following applies to the aggregate of organizations: when leaving the organization, employees are most influenced by remuneration (19.78%), followed by certainty (16.59%) and relationships (13.55%). This no longer applies if companies are categorised into small and large ones. In the course of the survey, employees of large multinationals showed lower affectivity and higher satisfaction, which was projected in generally lower values of final coefficients as well as the overall lowest sum of all reasons of dissatisfaction. It is therefore possible to confirm the opinion that employees in large multinationals are treated in a better way. Employees of large companies are, according to their own observation, shown more appreciation (only 9.14% are not satisfied compared to the average of 12.80%), they find the culture more suited (employee's dissatisfaction is by 5.78% lower, which, compared to small companies, represents a 50% difference) and have higher certainty both as regards their position and their future (dissatisfaction lower by 2%). With the exception of the factor of relationships which is significantly higher (22.02%) than the average value in other organizations (13.55%), multinationals demonstrate lower causality of conflict occurrence. On the contrary, large companies can "learn" from smaller ones how to deal with the factor of relationships (in small firms employees are 8.47% more satisfied, which is almost a 40% difference compared to large companies) and communication (dissatisfaction lower by 4.65%). The overall sum of coefficients, when recalculated using the determination coefficient, does not amount to 100%. The remaining percentage can be attributed to external factors and the lower sum as a weaker inclination of employees to leave the organization. The lower values of both types of organizations form a pattern of ideal values. The closer organizations get to these ideal values, the lower the turnover.

The variability of behaviour to an identical impulse is modelled according to the following formula:

$$X = Y_1, Y_2, \dots Y_n$$

$X$  – impulse – “turning-point” situation in the organization (based upon factors which are related to decision to leave),

$Y_1, Y_2, \dots Y_n$  – reaction.

Table 4 shows the significance of expectations as a releasing impulse triggering the reaction of resignation from the job. The highest values in columns and lines and in the sums of individual impulses and reactions are shown in bold. It

is possible to notice that the highest values apply to the impulses of the factor of expectations, more specifically to the expected level of stress and requirements exceeding or, on the contrary, not reaching the expected framework. Another important factor is relationships dominated by conflicts between subordinates and superiors and between peer employees.

Table 3  
Description of Variables

Impulse		Reaction	
$x_1$	Remuneration	$Y_1$	Disaffection
$x_2$	Future certainty	$Y_2$	Search for new job position
$x_3$	Relationships	$Y_3$	Worsening of work performance
$x_4$	Recognition	$Y_4$	Self-demotivation
$x_5$	Communication	$Y_5$	Demotivation of colleagues
$x_6$	Corporate culture	$Y_6$	Final turnover
$x_7$	Expectations		

Source: Author's survey.

Table 4  
Reactions to Impulses Leading to Working Dissatisfaction

	$x_1$	$x_2$	$x_3$	$x_4$	$x_5$	$x_6$	$x_7$	$\Sigma$
$Y_1$	1.1	1.5	2.2	2.0	2.3	2.4	<b>2.8</b>	14.1
$Y_2$	1.1	1.3	2.8	1.5	2.2	1.7	<b>3.2</b>	13.7
$Y_3$	1.4	2.1	3.2	2.3	2.7	2.5	<b>4.2</b>	18.4
$Y_4$	<b>1.6</b>	<b>2.7</b>	<b>4.0</b>	<b>3.2</b>	<b>3.9</b>	<b>3.2</b>	<b>4.6</b>	<b>23.1</b>
$Y_5$	0.4	0.7	1.3	1.3	1.3	1.2	<b>2.1</b>	8.2
$Y_6$	<b>1.6</b>	2.5	<b>4.0</b>	2.9	3.8	3.1	<b>4.5</b>	22.4
$\Sigma$	7.1	10.7	17.6	13.1	16.1	14.1	<b>21.3</b>	100

Source: Author's survey.

Individual impulses lead to work demotivation or leaving of the work position. This trend is present in all factors (as impulses). The highest values in columns always apply to  $Y_4$  – *self-demotivation*, followed by  $Y_6$  – *leaving the organization*. Above-average values are also proven by  $Y_3$  – *worsening of work performance*. Problems at workplaces affect employees' performance. Column  $x_7$  – *expectations* demonstrates the highest values compared to all other columns. Furthermore, it is possible to notice a significant influence of all factors on the intrinsic demotivation of employees.

### Responses to Impulses Leading to Leaving of National Companies and Multinationals by Employees

As shown in Tables 5 and 6, behavioural responses to impulses in small national companies and multinational institutions were different. In large companies (Table 5) the most frequent impulse precipitating reaction that leads to

decision-making about leaving the work position or the organisation is the factor of communication. A specific event, such as unethical behaviour, concealing facts or discovering that they have not been provided with correct and sufficient information regarding work, firm, self-development and further development, make employees of large companies think about leaving. Expectations, as a factor precipitating thinking and deciding about leaving the job, ranked second (behind communication) for employees of large multinationals. We can notice a difference in perception and behaviour of employees according to the type of company. Employees of large companies show lower dissatisfaction and affectivity than employees of smaller national companies. This trend was also demonstrated in responses to impulses. As in the case of all employees, the most frequent reaction to impulses is employee's demotivation at work followed by resignation.

Table 5  
**Reactions to Impulses Leading to Dissatisfaction in the Work Position in Large Multinationals**

	$x_1$	$x_2$	$x_3$	$x_4$	$x_5$	$x_6$	$x_7$	$\Sigma$
$Y_1$	0.8	1.7	1.7	<b>3.3</b>	2.5	0.8	<b>3.3</b>	14.0
$Y_2$	1.7	0.8	1.7	1.7	<b>4.1</b>	1.7	<b>3.3</b>	14.9
$Y_3$	1.7	1.7	<b>4.1</b>	3.3	<b>5.8</b>	1.7	<b>3.3</b>	21.5
$Y_4$	1.7	1.7	<b>4.1</b>	<b>4.1</b>	<b>6.6</b>	1.7	4.1	<b>24.0</b>
$Y_5$	0.0	0.8	0.8	2.5	0.8	0.0	<b>1.7</b>	6.6
$Y_6$	1.7	0.8	3.3	1.7	<b>5.8</b>	<b>2.5</b>	<b>3.3</b>	19.0
$\Sigma$	7.4	7.4	15.7	16.5	<b>25.6</b>	8.3	19.0	100

Source: Author's survey.

Table 6  
**Reactions to Impulses Leading to Dissatisfaction in the Work Position in SMEs**

	$x_1$	$x_2$	$x_3$	$x_4$	$x_5$	$x_6$	$x_7$	$\Sigma$
$Y_1$	0.8	1.3	1.4	1.4	2.1	2.2	<b>3.4</b>	12.6
$Y_2$	1.1	1.1	3.2	1.4	2.4	1.9	<b>3.8</b>	15.0
$Y_3$	1.6	1.8	3.5	2.2	2.6	3.7	<b>4.5</b>	18.8
$Y_4$	<b>1.8</b>	<b>2.7</b>	<b>3.7</b>	<b>2.4</b>	<b>4.0</b>	<b>3.2</b>	<b>5.1</b>	<b>22.8</b>
$Y_5$	0.6	0.6	1.4	0.8	1.6	1.3	<b>2.4</b>	8.8
$Y_6$	1.6	2.6	4.3	1.9	3.7	2.9	<b>5.0</b>	21.9
$\Sigma$	7.5	10.1	17.6	10.2	16.3	14.2	<b>24.1</b>	100

Source: Author's survey.

The most common response to the impulse that makes employees in small companies think about leaving the organisation is the demotivation by their own work. Table 6 shows that in all precipitating factors the most frequently mentioned output is self-demotivation and the subsequent leaving of the work position. The factor of expectations proved extremely significant, reaching the highest values for all possible reactions. Dissatisfaction with expectations as an

impulse leads to different reactions ranging from alienation, looking for new job opportunities, demotivation in work behaviour and worsening of performance to the leaving of organization. Another impulse mentioned above is the problem of communication within a company. Like in large companies, employees in small firms start to consider leaving the organization if they find out that the company does not behave ethically and that information is concealed or otherwise biased.

## **Conclusion**

The impact of a “turning-point” situation that makes the majority of employees think, for the first time, about leaving their work position has been proven. The decision-making process when the employee considers the idea of whether to leave or stay consists of six crucial stages. Initially, after the first negative impulse, the employee contemplates the costs of leaving (availability of another job, worries accompanying the search for a new job, indolence, being trained for the current job, good relations with colleagues, etc.). This is followed by a stage of waiting to see whether or not the situation will change and if there is no change, the employee’s dedication to work starts to slacken leading to demotivation by their own work occurs. The employee makes an attempt to change the situation and if no change is possible, s/he starts to look for a new job and leaves (or stays, but his/her performance is below average).

Employees’ behaviour in the process of decision-making on leaving the job is most significantly determined by the factor of expectations. This impulse most frequently triggers the process of leaving the organisation (21.5%). Other possible reactions to the impulse are: alienation, search for a new job, deterioration of work performance, self-demotivation, demotivation of the surroundings, and finally leaving of the organisation. The most common reaction to a negative experience is the demotivation by one’s own work (23%), leaving of the position (22.5%) and worsening of work performance (18.5%). Another important impulse that triggers reaction, i.e. the process of alienation and leaving, is relationships (17.5%).

Differences have been detected in reactions to impulses of employees of small and large organisations. In large organisations the most frequent releasing factor is communication, followed by expectations. As in the case of all employees, the most frequent reaction to the impulse is demotivation by one’s own work and the subsequent leaving of the work position. On the contrary, employees in small organisations place major emphasis on the factor of expectations that generates the highest values for all possible reactions.

The key point for reducing turnover and its costs is to change the style of working with employees in compliance with the outcomes of the survey. Employees willingly leave job position after impulse which firstly makes them consider the situation inside organisation; whether it is according to their personal needs, position and expectations. Secondly they wait for the reason to leave and thirdly there are six possible ways how employees react to the impulse or cause of turnover (those are: disaffection, search for new job position, worsening of work performance, self-demotivation, demotivation of colleagues and turnover). Employees react on impulse mainly by self-demotivation (over 23%), than lowering of their performance (18%) and also by immediate leave (22%).

Resulted factors revealed problematic communication inside organisations which often (16%, in large organisations over 25% of causes of turnover) leads to turnover of qualified employees.

Results also shows that remuneration is important (21% of employees leave because of remuneration), but overall outputs of the survey revealed that attention is paid to other factors as above stated communication, future certainty (17%), relationships (16%) and also recognition (14% of all respondents). Concrete statements of respondents describing causes of turnover, which verify factors, are:

- *Communication*: lack of teamwork (16%), lack of ethic and integrity (16%)
- *Future certainty*: trust in top-management (32%), unfair payment practices (16%)
- *Relationships*: unfair treatment (27%), problematic relationship with supervisor (19%) and also colleagues (15%), overload (19%)
- *Recognition*: lack of recognition (19%)

Factor which causes turnover is also factor of expectations. The results show, that expectations are the main problem which leads to the first thinking about leaving or staying in the organisation. Concrete “impulses” were found as follows: imbalance between work and private life, lack of clear expectations, lack of support for new ideas and stress from overwork. Stated outputs verified that it is crucial to hire employees carefully, according to the organisational needs, but also culture, way of work, time schedules, collective of co-workers and the climate which prevails.

Summary often overlooked and problematic are the needs of solidarity, friendship, safety and security, fulfilment, recognition by a team and self-fulfilment. The perceived difference between the desired and real situation causes dissatisfaction and employees tend to leave their job. Managers, especially line managers are responsible for the most of stated problematic factors or they can affect stated factors. But line managers often overlook these issues or do human resource

management as formal work with no interest and outputs. Thus deeper involvement of line managers into human resource practices is suggested. Especially into the most problematic factors stated above, because most of those causes can be avoided just by its detection (lack of communication, teamwork, recognition etc.).

## References

- ARMSTRONG, M. (2007): Řízení lidských zdrojů: Nejnovější trendy a postupy. Praha: Grada Publishing. ISBN 978-80-247-1407-3.
- BENET-MARTINEZ, V. – JOHN, O. P. (1998): Los Cinco Grandes across Cultures and Ethnic Groups: Multitrait Multimethod Analyses of the Big Five in Spanish and English. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 75, No. 3, pp. 729 – 750.
- BĚLOHLÁVEK, F. (2008): Jak vést a motivovat lidi. Brno: Computer Press. ISBN 978-80-251-2235-8.
- BOWES, B. J. (2010): Legacy Bowes Group [Online.] Cit. 2010-06-30. A Competitive Employee Market Compels Companies to Manage High Turnover. Available at: <<http://legacybowesgroup.com/component/content/article/43-retention/183-a-competitive-employee-market-compels-companies-to-manage-high-turnover.html>>.
- BRANHAM, L. (2009): 7 skrytých důvodů, proč zaměstnanci odcházejí z firem. Praha: Grada. ISBN 978-80-247-2903-9.
- BRANHAM, L. (2000): Keeping the people who keep you in business: 24 Ways to Hang on to Your Most Valuable Talent. New York: AMACOM. ISBN 9780814405970.
- BRÉMOND, J. – BRÉMOND, G. (1988): L'économie Française: face aux défis mondiaux. Paris: Hatier. ISBN 2-218-01691-5.
- COLLINS, J. (2001): Good to Great. London: Random House Business Books. ISBN 9780712676090.
- DECI, E. L – RYAN, R. M. (1985): Intrinsic Motivation and Self-Determination in Human Behaviour. New York: Plenum Press. 332 p. ISBN 0-306-42022-8.
- DEIBLOVÁ, M. (2005): Motivace jako nástroj řízení. Praha: Linde. 126 p. ISBN 80-902105-8-9.
- DISMAN, M. (2008): Jak se vyrábí sociologická znalost. Praha: Karolinum. ISBN 978-80-246-0139-7.
- ERTL, J. (2005): Personall Consulting. [Online.] Cit. 2010-03-28. Fluktuace – diagnóza a léčba. Available at: <[http://www.personall.cz/Fluktuace\\_I.html](http://www.personall.cz/Fluktuace_I.html)>.
- FINNEGAN, D. (2010): Rethinking Retention. 1. ed. New York: Book Excerpt.
- GOSLING, S. D. – RENTFROW, P. J. – SWANN, W. B. (2003): A Very Brief Measure of the Big-Five Personality Domains. *Journal of Research in Personality*, 37, No. 6, pp. 504 – 528.
- HACKMAN, J. R. – OLDFHAM, G. R. (1980): Work Redesign. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.
- HAYES, N. (1998): Základy sociální psychologie. Praha: Portál. ISBN 80-7178-198-3.
- HÁJEK, M. (2007): Vedeme.cz [Online.] Cit. 2010-06-07. Fluktuace bez závoje. Available at: <[http://www.vedeme.cz/index.php?option=com\\_content&view=article&id=346:fluktuace&catid=13:inspirace-pro-vedeni&Itemid=181](http://www.vedeme.cz/index.php?option=com_content&view=article&id=346:fluktuace&catid=13:inspirace-pro-vedeni&Itemid=181)>.
- HERZBERG, F. – MAUSNER, B. – SYNDERMAN, B. B. (2004): The Motivation to Work. 7. ed. New Jersey: Transaction Publishers. 159 p. ISBN 1-56000-634-X.
- HRONÍK, F. (2006): Hodnocení pracovníků. Praha: Grada. ISBN 80-274-1458-2.
- JENKINS, A. K. (2009): Keeping the Talent: Understanding the Needs of Engineering and Scientists in the Defense Acquisition Workforce. *Defense A R Journal*, No. 1, pp. 164 – 170.
- JOHN, O. P. – NAUMANN, L. P. – SOTO, C. J. (2008): Paradigm Shift to the Integrative Big-Five Trait Taxonomy: History, Measurement, and Conceptual Issues. In: *Handbook of personality: Theory and Research*. New York: Guilford Press, pp. 114 – 158.

- 
- KATCHER, B. L. – SYNDER, A. (2009): 30 důvodů, proč zaměstnanci nenávidí své vedoucí. Brno: Computer Press. ISBN 978-80-251-1922-8.
- KOČIANOVÁ, R. (2010): Personální činnosti a metody personální práce. Praha: Grada. ISBN 978-80-247-2497-3.
- KOUBEK, J. (2004): Řízení pracovního výkonu. Praha: Management Press. ISBN 80-7261-116-X.
- MASLOW, A. (1943): A Theory of Human Motivation. *Psychological Review*, 50, No. 4, pp. 370 – 396.
- McCLELLAND, D. C. (1987): *Human Motivation*. 1. ed. New York: Press Syndicate of the University of Cambridge. 609 p. ISBN 0-521-36951-7.
- McGREGOR, D. (2006): *The Human Side of Enterprise*. New York: McGraw-Hill. 361 s. ISBN 0-07-146222-8.
- MEYER, J. P. – ALLEN, N. J. (1991): A Three-component Conceptualization of Organizational Commitment. *Human Resource Management Review*, 1, No. 1, pp. 61 – 89.
- PAUKNEROVÁ, D. (2006): *Psychologie pro ekonomy a manažery*. Praha: Grada. ISBN 80-247-1706-9.
- RAMLALL, S. (2004): A Review of Employee Motivation Theories and their Implications for Employee Retention within Organizations. *The Journal of American Academy of Business*, 5, No. 1, pp. 52 – 63.
- REIB, Ch. (2008): *Fluktuation*. [Online.] Cit. 2010-03-30. Available at: <<http://www.personaler-online.de/typo3/nc/personalthemen/suche-in-artikeln/detailansicht/artikel/fluktuation.html>>.
- VROOM, V. H. (1990): *Manage People, not Personnel: Motivation and Performance Appraisal*. Boston: Harvard Business Review. 271 p. ISBN 0-87584-228-3.
- Transtheoretical Model (2004): *The Change Zone*. [Online.] Cit. 2010-06-28. Available at: <<http://www.changezone.co.uk/STEVE/Transtheoretical%20Model.html>>.
- ZAHORSKY, D. (2010): *Fighting Employee Turnover Costs: Reduce Employee Turnover*. About.com: Small Business Information. 1. ed. [Online.] Cit. 2010-06-16. Available at: <<http://sbinformation.about.com/od/hiringfiring/a/reduceturnover.htm>>.