

**IOWA WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT  
UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE APPEALS**

68-0157 (9-06) - 3091078 - EI

**DAPHNE R HADENFELDT**  
Claimant

**APPEAL NO. 08A-UI-08923-JTT**

**ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE  
DECISION**

**DOTHAN SECURITY INCORPORATED  
DSI SECURITY SERVICES**  
Employer

**OC: 07/27/08 R: 01  
Claimant: Appellant (1)**

Iowa Code Section 96.5(1) – Voluntary Quit

**STATEMENT OF THE CASE:**

Daphne Hadenfeldt filed a timely appeal from the September 25, 2008, reference 01, decision that denied benefits. After due notice was issued, a hearing was held on October 20, 2008. Ms. Hadenfeldt participated. Operations Manager Mary Clarke represented the employer and presented additional testimony through Branch Manager Jason Dalbey. Exhibits One, Two and Three were received into evidence.

**ISSUE:**

Whether the claimant's voluntary quit was for good cause attributable to the employer.

**FINDINGS OF FACT:**

Having reviewed all of the evidence in the record, the administrative law judge finds: Daphne Hadenfeldt was employed by Dothan Security Incorporated/DSI Security Services as a full-time site supervisor from October 9, 2006 until July 25, 2008, when she voluntarily quit. Ms. Hadenfeldt was assigned to the Tyson Fresh Meats production plant in Storm Lake. Ms. Hadenfeldt's immediate supervisor was Mary Clarke, Operations Manager.

On July 25, 2008, Ms. Clarke directed Ms. Hadenfeldt to issue a disciplinary warning to a security guard who had allowed persons into the Tyson production plant without proper authorization. Ms. Hadenfeldt was the other security guard's immediate supervisor. Ms. Hadenfeldt expressed concern that Ms. Clarke had not said anything about disciplining Ms. Hadenfeldt in connection with the same incident, when Ms. Hadenfeldt had been equally culpable. Ms. Clarke told Ms. Hadenfeldt that she would deal with disciplining Ms. Hadenfeldt later. In short, Ms. Hadenfeldt was upset that the employer had not disciplined her too and prodded the employer to discipline her. This situation of Ms. Hadenfeldt's peculiar sense of fairness is what primarily prompted Ms. Hadenfeldt to quit.

Ms. Hadenfeldt's quit was also based on problems she and the Operations Manager had with recruiting and retaining security guards to work at the Tyson plant. Both Ms. Hadenfeldt and Ms. Clarke had responsibility for recruiting. Ms. Hadenfeldt thought that employees did not stay

because the job did not pay especially well, \$8.50 per hour. Ms. Hadenfeldt made \$10.50 per hour. At full staff, the employer had eight security guards at the Tyson plant. At the time Ms. Hadenfeldt quit, the employer had six security guards at the Tyson plant. Throughout Ms. Hadenfeldt's employment, it was not uncommon for the security guard staff to operate at less than full staff. Throughout Ms. Hadenfeldt's employment, it was not uncommon for the security guards to work overtime hours, for which they received 1.5 times their regular pay. Ms. Hadenfeldt quit when she decided that the working conditions were never going to improve.

Ms. Hadenfeldt did not think the employer cared enough about its employees at the Tyson plant. Ms. Hadenfeldt felt that she did not receive appropriate guidance from the employer regarding her duties and authority. The employer provided regular supervision and support to Ms. Hadenfeldt, but did not micro-manage Ms. Hadenfeldt's responsibilities as site supervisor.

### **REASONING AND CONCLUSIONS OF LAW:**

Iowa Code section 96.5-1 provides:

An individual shall be disqualified for benefits:

1. Voluntary quitting. If the individual has left work voluntarily without good cause attributable to the individual's employer, if so found by the department.

In general, a voluntary quit requires evidence of an intention to sever the employment relationship and an overt act carrying out that intention. See Local Lodge #1426 v. Wilson Trailer, 289 N.W.2d 698, 612 (Iowa 1980) and Peck v. EAB, 492 N.W.2d 438 (Iowa App. 1992). In general, a voluntary quit means discontinuing the employment because the employee no longer desires to remain in the relationship of an employee with the employer. See 871 IAC 24.25.

Quits due to intolerable or detrimental working conditions are deemed to be for good cause attributable to the employer. See 871 IAC 24.26(4). The test is whether a reasonable person would have quit under the circumstances. See Aalbers v. Iowa Department of Job Service, 431 N.W.2d 330 (Iowa 1988) and O'Brien v. Employment Appeal Bd., 494 N.W.2d 660 (1993). Aside from quits based on medical reasons, prior notification of the employer before a resignation for intolerable or detrimental working conditions is not required. See Hy-Vee v. EAB, 710 N.W.2d (Iowa 2005).

The evidence in the record fails to establish intolerable and/or detrimental working conditions that would have prompted a reasonable person to quit the employment. The evidence fails to support Ms. Hadenfeldt's assertion that the employer failed to give her appropriate guidance and support. The evidence indicates, instead, that Ms. Hadenfeldt identified too closely with the other security guards as a peer, rather than as a supervisor assigned to carry forward the interests of the employer. The evidence provides no indication of any significant change in the conditions of Ms. Hadenfeldt's employment at any point in the employment. The evidence does not indicate that Ms. Hadenfeldt was unreasonably overworked.

The weight of the evidence indicates that Ms. Hadenfeldt voluntarily quit due to general dissatisfaction with the work environment. Quits for such a reason are presumed to be without good cause attributable to the employer. See 871 IAC 24.25(21).

Based on the evidence in the record and application of the appropriate law, the administrative law judge concludes that Ms. Hadenfeldt voluntarily quit the employment without good cause

attributable to the employer. Accordingly, Ms. Hadenfeldt is disqualified for benefits until she has worked in and been paid wages for insured work equal to ten times her weekly benefit amount, provided she is otherwise eligible. The employer's account shall not be charged for benefits paid to Ms. Hadenfeldt.

**DECISION:**

The Agency representative's September 25, 2008, reference 01, decision is affirmed. The claimant voluntarily quit the employment without good cause attributable to the employer. The claimant is disqualified for benefits until she has worked in and been paid wages for insured work equal to ten times her weekly benefit amount, provided she is otherwise eligible. The employer's account shall not be charged.

---

James E. Timberland  
Administrative Law Judge

---

Decision Dated and Mailed

jet/pjs