

# Leadership's Role in Retention: Transformational Leadership and Idealized Influence in Addressing Workforce Challenges of the Great Resignation and Silent Quitting

Eva-Yasmine Kaiser  
Macromedia University of Applied Sciences

*The ongoing Great Resignation and silent quitting movements are imposing significant costs on organizations. Half of U.S. employees are open to leaving their current jobs, with many citing poor management as a key reason (Gallup, 2024a). This study examines the role of leadership, specifically the relationship between idealized influence—a core dimension of transformational leadership—and employee retention. Idealized influence refers to leaders who serve as role models, inspiring trust, respect, and loyalty in their followers (Hall et al., 2002). Alongside other dimensions of transformational leadership, idealized influence plays a critical role in fostering employee commitment. Using a quantitative survey approach and convenience sampling, this research aims to explore how leaders' role model behaviors affect employee retention. The findings highlight the importance of effective leadership in addressing retention challenges. This in turn can improve workplace engagement, organizational learning, and a company's competitiveness and innovation.*

*Keywords: employee retention, leadership, transformational leadership, idealized influence*

## INTRODUCTION

Leadership and retention have become prominent trends in recent years. The COVID-19 pandemic initiated a wave of high employee turnover, widely known as the “Great Resignation.” This phenomenon saw approximately 47 million working Americans quit their jobs in 2021—nearly one-third of the workforce (U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics, 2022). Parker and Horowitz (2022) explain, “Widespread job losses in the early months of the pandemic gave way to tight labor markets in 2021, driven in part by what’s come to be known as the Great Resignation.” (para. 1).

Although the pandemic played a significant role in this trend, Fuller and Kerr (2022) argue that the rise in employee turnover predates COVID-19. They write,

COVID-19 spurred on the Great Resignation of 2021, during which record numbers of employees voluntarily quit their jobs. But what we are living through is not just short-term turbulence provoked by the pandemic. Instead, it’s the continuation of a trend of rising quit rates that began more than a decade ago (para 1).

Regardless of whether the trend originated during or prior to the pandemic, the issue of high turnover remains critical for organizations to address. Although some organizations hoped the Great Resignation was slowing down, PwC (2023) expects it to continue as employees feel overworked and underpaid. Similarly, Smith (2024) notes, “Nearly 50% of people are considering leaving their jobs in 2024—more

than during the Great Resignation” (para. 1). Supporting a similar outlook, Mosser (2023), reports that “51% of currently employed workers say they are watching for or actively seeking a new job” (para. 5). This indicates that organizations may face even greater retention challenges than during the initial wave of resignations. The costs of poor retention, both qualitative and quantitative, are significant.

## LITERATURE REVIEW

### Retention

Employee retention (ER) is a vital aspect to organizational success. Employees (EEs) represent the most important resource and asset in any business. Retaining talent ensures the preservation of institutional knowledge, continuity in daily operations, and the maintenance of internal and external relationships. Moreover, ER benefits the company’s competitiveness and rate of innovation.

ER can be defined in various ways. Hassan *et al.* (2011) describe it as “keeping the right people on the right jobs for every organization. There is no single definition of ER. It is all about ‘keeping good people.’ It is much to do with our culture and how we treat people” (p.10). This definition highlights the role of organizational culture in retention efforts.

The definition of retention may vary depending on the employment type, such as project-based contracts. Das and Baruah (2013) incorporate this aspect into their definition. They define retention as “encouraging employees to remain in the organization for a long period of time... or until the completion of the project” (p.8).

The Cambridge Dictionary (2025) adds that retention is “the ability of a company to keep its employees and stop them from going to work somewhere else”. That is why retention strategies are important. Hassan *et al.* emphasize the importance of leadership strategies in retention such as learning and development and career growth as well as clearly stating what is expected of the EE. This underscores the importance of proper onboarding, communicating expectations, and leadership support in fostering retention and reducing turnover.

### *Factors Affecting Employee Retention*

Organizations experience turnover for various reasons, some unavoidable. However, high turnover rates can severely affect businesses. Addressing unnecessary turnover requires understanding its root causes, which can be internal or external. While some factors are unrelated to organizations, workplace practices, leadership, and culture significantly influence retention.

Glen (2006) identifies management as one of the key predictors of EE engagement. Kossivi *et al.* (2016) and Chamberlain (2017) similarly identify leadership as a critical retention factor, with compensation and benefits ranked among the least important for workplace satisfaction. Direct managers play a crucial role in fostering team engagement (Mosser, 2023) and thus making leadership pivotal in reducing turnover. Empowerment, motivation, leadership, and culture are essential retention strategies.

### *Cost of Poor Retention*

Retention challenges are costly for organizations of all sizes. Sinha and Shukla (2013) estimate that replacing an employee can cost up to two and a half times their salary. For senior-level positions, estimated replacement costs range up to 200% of annual salaries (Holland, 2024). Beyond financial costs, turnover leads to lost productivity, customer relationships, morale, and institutional knowledge.

Silent quitting, where disengaged EEs remain in roles but underperform, adds further strain. Holland (2024) reveals that 17% of EEs are actively disengaged, costing organizations approximately 34% of their salaries. Disengaged EEs increase workloads and stress for peers but may also spread negativity. According to Gallup’s (2024b) State of the Global Workplace report, the global cost of low engagement is estimated at \$8.9 trillion annually. The combined costs of poor retention impact business goals and operations, strategies, and growth opportunities. Addressing retention through improved leadership and engagement is a top priority for human resource professionals, ensuring both short- and long-term organizational success.

## **Leadership Problem Statement**

The role of a leader is very important when it comes to ER and engagement. Findings from a joint Harris poll-U.S. New survey which included 2,100 participants in 2023 showed results that a majority (59%) agree with the statement, “I don’t see any leaders at my company today that I aspire to be” (Davis Jr., para. 3). Further this study finds that 57% agree that their company “has a difficult time retaining talent due to its leadership’s decisions” and the same percentage said the values held by current leaders at their job “don’t match those of their employees” (Davis Jr., para. 7). These findings align with the challenges discussed in the previous sections and stress the leadership issues facing many organizations today.

Given these insights, it is critical to explore the reasons behind leadership’s impact on ER and to identify the specific factors contributing to this relationship. Additionally, investigating which leadership styles can positively influence retention is essential to addressing this pressing organizational challenge.

### *Cost of Poor Leadership*

Leadership has far-reaching consequences for organizations, employees (EEs), stakeholders, and shareholders. Ineffective leadership leads to reduced productivity, low morale, an unhealthy workplace culture, high turnover, and poor retention. Leaders who fail to set clear goals, inspire their teams, or provide support often foster disengagement among EEs. The financial impact of poor leadership is staggering. It diminishes profitability, market share, and organizational longevity. Managers are responsible for at least 70% of the variance in employee engagement scores, significantly influencing organizational performance (Pitonyak & Desimone, 2024) and profitability.

Disengaged EEs linked to poor leadership drive up absenteeism, reduce collaboration, and increase turnover. 65% of employees would prefer a new manager over a pay raise (McQuaid as seen in Zenger, 2015). Bad leadership exacerbates disengagement, leading 82% of workers to consider quitting due to a bad manager (Korolevich, 2022).

Beyond retention, poor leadership undermines workplace culture, EE commitment, and innovation. Effective leaders supervised the happiest, most committed employees who outperformed their peers by 92% (Zenger & Folkman, 2012). Conversely, poor leaders drive job dissatisfaction, low motivation, and poor performance, with 35% of Americans having left a job they otherwise enjoyed due to bad leadership (Medici, 2022).

Poor leadership damages company reputation, talent attraction, and profitability. In contrast, organizations with effective leadership experience higher EE satisfaction, innovation, and profitability. Gallup (2024b) reports that engaged workplaces see 23% higher profits, lower turnover, and greater customer loyalty. As such, it is critical the companies invest in leadership development.

## **Transformational Leadership**

Given the far-reaching consequences of poor leadership, adopting effective leadership models is imperative. Researchers study transformational leadership (TL) for its positive impact on organizational outcomes (Nyokabi et al., 2017). Leaders who adopt this approach articulate a clear vision, provide purpose and direction, and foster teamwork. This approach promotes trust, motivation, and organizational commitment (Bass & Riggio, 2006), which are critical for ER and long-term success.

TLs are competent at articulating a vision for the organization and inspiring others to implement it (Epitropaki et al., 2017). TL has the potential to provide a strong framework for the dynamic, complex, and change-oriented nature of modern organizations (Bass & Riggio, 2006). EEs increasingly seek leaders who not only inspire but also guide and motivate them through rapidly evolving organizational environments while fostering a sense of empowerment and challenge.

“Leadership is not just the province of people at the top. Leadership can occur at all levels and with any individual. In fact, it is important for leaders to develop leadership in those below them. This notion is at the heart of the paradigm of transformational leadership” (Bass & Riggio, 2006, p.2). TLs stimulate and inspire followers to achieve exceptional results while simultaneously developing their own leadership abilities. Team members achieve this by aligning their personal goals with the organization’s vision and

mission. As role models, transformational leaders foster trust, respect, and a shared commitment to organizational goals.

The concept of TL was first introduced by James Burns in 1978 and later expanded by Bernard Bass, who identified four core components of TL: idealized influence, inspirational motivation, intellectual stimulation, and individualized consideration (Bass & Riggio, 2006). According to Nyokabi et al. (2017), “The theory explains that leaders exude higher degrees of extra effort, effectiveness, and satisfaction in followers when they apply TL behaviors related to the four dimensions” (p.21). Below is a summary of these four dimensions:

**Idealized influence.** Leaders act as ethical role models, aligning actions with organizational values and inspiring trust, respect, and admiration. Their behavior motivates others to emulate their leadership style.

**Inspirational Motivation.** Leaders inspire and energize teams by articulating a compelling vision and fostering enthusiasm and team spirit. They use motivational language to drive commitment to shared goals and challenges.

**Intellectual Stimulation.** Leaders promote creativity and critical thinking by encouraging EEs to approach problems innovatively. This culture of learning empowers adaptability and independent problem-solving.

**Individual Consideration.** Leaders provide personalized support by addressing individual EE needs, career development, and growth aspirations. Acting as mentors, they foster trust, empathy, and inclusivity, creating a supportive work environment that nurtures success.

#### *Why Transformational Leadership*

TL can positively influence ER for several reasons. Transformational leaders are goal-oriented and visionary. EEs under TL are more likely to increase their effort and work towards achieving company goals, contributing to higher levels of engagement as opposed to disengagement (Nyokabi et al., 2017). In addition to increased engagement, followers are also more innovative (Li et al., 2019).

Additionally, idealized influence, along with other components of TL, plays a role in sustaining EE performance (Mohd. Hussain et al., 2024). The research indicates that when EEs perceive their leaders as trustworthy and morally upright, they are more likely to develop strong emotional attachments to the organization, which in turn reduces turnover intentions. TLs typically cultivate more committed and satisfied followers, further supporting the positive relationship between TL and ER (Bass & Riggio, 2006).

TLs are skilled at defining and articulating a compelling vision, inspiring their followers to embrace and pursue it (Epitropaki et al., 2017). This leadership style fosters team spirit, collaboration, and teamwork, all of which are critical for achieving organizational goals.

According to the behaviors associated with TL, it improves follower performance, making it a better predictor of organizational success. TL is essential for enhancing organizational commitment and driving success. Further, long-term organizational success relies heavily on TL (Afshari, 2022).

#### *Downside of Transformational Leadership*

While TL is often associated with positive outcomes and benefits for organizations, it also has notable downsides that warrant consideration. One significant concern is the potential for misuse of TL behaviors. Leaders who manipulate, threaten, punish, or exploit their followers for personal gain are termed *pseudotransformational* leaders (Bass & Riggio, 2006). These leaders prioritize their own agenda and self-interest at the expense of their team or organization (Guo et al., 2024), ultimately exploiting their leadership position. Such leaders rely heavily on manipulation, threats, and punishment, often disregarding institutional procedures and the rights and emotional well-being of others (Bass & Riggio).

This risk of misuse highlights the importance of ethical considerations in leadership practices. To address this issue, combining TL with ethical leadership can be beneficial. This can serve as a safeguard against misuse. Ethical leadership emphasizes fairness, integrity, and the promotion of the collective welfare of followers, which helps mitigate the risks of exploitation or unethical or exploitive behavior by transformational leaders.

Additionally, leaders themselves may experience negative effects of TL. Leaders who consistently exhibit TL behaviors may face increased emotional exhaustion (Lin et al., 2019). This is particularly evident in environments where followers display traits such as unreliability, apathy, or disorganization. Over time, this emotional strain can result in higher turnover intentions among leaders.

Another critique of TL pertains to the lack of a standardized framework for its measurement. The absence of consistent metrics leads to vagueness in both assessing the construct and interpreting findings (Lee, 2014). This inconsistency challenges the validity and reliability of research on TL and its outcome in both research and practice.

### **What Is Idealized Influence?**

Idealized Influence (II) is one of the four dimensions of TL. According to Khan et al. (2016), II refers to “the attribute of a leader which inspires followers to take their leader as a role model. Charisma is an alternate term that replaces II. II creates values that inspire, establish sense, and engender a sense of purpose amongst people” (p.4). This leadership dimension promotes confidence among followers, ultimately earning the respect and trust of those they lead.

Chebon et al. (2019) further explain that II “refers to the behaviours of a transformational leader that evokes his or her followers’ trust, admiration, respect, and their desire to emulate the leader” (p.133). Leaders who demonstrate II are ethical, trustworthy, and highly effective in communicating their organization’s vision and objectives, thereby inspiring others to follow that vision (Chebon et al.). This dimension emphasizes leading by example and creating an environment where followers are motivated to emulate the leader's behaviors and values.

#### *Why Idealized Influence?*

II, a fundamental component of TL, plays a pivotal role in fostering ER. It achieves this by cultivating trust, admiration, and respect between leaders and their teams. Leaders exhibiting II act as role models who uphold high ethical standards and demonstrate a strong commitment to organizational values and vision. This in turn inspires EEs to align themselves with the organization’s goals, mission, and vision.

This dimension focused on the ability to act as a role model, build confidence in EEs, and achieve organizational objectives, mission, and vision, thus positively inspiring EE performance (Nyokai et al., 2017). Leadership behaviors that focus on group goals and a shared vision – like those associated with inspirational motivation and II – enhance team self-efficacy, effectiveness, cohesiveness, motivation, and organizational citizenship behaviors (Epitropaki et al., 2017).

Furthermore, leaders who practice II behaviors inspire higher levels of motivation among their followers, encouraging them to perform better. Otieno et al. (2019) found that EE motivation significantly moderated the relationship between II and EE engagement, indicating a positive and important interaction. Studies have also demonstrated the broader impacts of II on EE outcomes. For instance, Afshari (2022) found that II had a significant impact on EE commitment.

### **METHODOLOGY**

This research tests the following six hypotheses. The hypotheses are formulated based upon the literature review and the overarching **research question**: *Is there a relationship between II and ER?*

**Hypothesis 1:** *EEs who rate their Leaders with higher levels of II report lower rates of intention to leave.*

**Hypothesis 2:** *EEs who rate their leaders with high levels of II rate their company as a great place to work.*

**Hypothesis 3:** *EEs who rate their leaders with higher levels of II see themselves working at the same company in three years.*

**Hypothesis 4:** *II has no correlation on how EEs feel connected to the company’s values.*

*Hypothesis 5: II has no significant influence with whether EEs aspire to be like their leaders.*

*Hypothesis 6: II has no significant Influence on whether EEs trust their leaders to make good decisions.*

### **Data Collection Procedure and Sample**

This study employs a quantitative research method to assess the correlation between II and ER. The quantitative approach enables the researcher to reach a wider audience with a varied background. Additionally, it is easier to ask EEs about their perceptions of leaders via an anonymous online survey. In comparison to a qualitative setting where there could be fear of potential backlash, this method is more straightforward. Participants for this study were recruited via the Pollfish platform. This type of recruitment allows for a wide range of audiences. This study is a correlational study. It does not seek or assume causality. The survey consisted of 20 questions, in addition to demographic questions. 18 questions were based on a Likert scale. Two questions were follow-up questions.

The data was collected using a 20-question survey. Nine of the questions focused on the participant's direct leader. The other questions were regarding intentions to stay. Primary data was collected via non-random convenience sampling using an online survey on the Pollfish platform.

In total, 165 participated in America. 51% were male, with 84 respondents. 49% were female, with 81 respondents. This study represented all age groups. The largest age group of participants was 35 – 44, with a 33% representation. This was followed by the age range of 25 to 34, with a 28% representation. Equally represented were the age groups 18 – 24 and 45 – 54 with 12% of respondents. 15% of respondents were 54 and older.

### **Results**

For the hypothesis testing of the correlational research design, the significance level (p-value) was set at the standard of .05. The effect and variance were measured using the Pearson correlation. The Pearson correlation coefficient (r) is the standard approach to measuring a correlation. The component of TL was the subject of the first nine questions. This research focuses solely on correlation. Therefore, a regression and causality analysis are not conducted. The research seeks to determine whether there is a relationship between the variables and the strengths of the variables.

#### *Hypothesis Testing*

Research Question: Is there a relationship between idealized influence and employee retention?

*Hypothesis 1: leaders who have higher values of II have EEs who have lower intention of leaving*

The study examined the correlation between the collective II questions and the question 'Are you actively seeking a new job?' The hypothesis testing for H1 revealed an 'r' of -.042 and revealed a non-significant correlation (p-value > p.05) of .589. Therefore, the null hypothesis is rejected. Although there is no significant correlation, the results of the Pearson correlation coefficient show a strong negative linear relationship. H1 does not support the null hypothesis.

*Hypothesis 2: EEs who rate their leaders with high levels of II rate their company as a great place to work.*

The hypothesis testing for H2 revealed a very significant correlation, as the p-value was less than .001. Additionally, the 'r' value of .580 revealed a strong positive relationship between the variables. The significance was measured via the collective nine II questions and the participants' answers to the question 'Would you recommend your company as a great place to work?'

*Hypothesis 3: EEs who rate their leaders with higher levels of II see themselves working at the same company in three years.*

The hypothesis testing revealed a very significant p-value of less than .001. The 'r' .525 revealed a strong positive relationship among the variables. The correlation was measured between the collective nine II questions and the participants' answers to the question, 'Do you see yourself still working at your company in three years?'

**Hypothesis 4:** *II has no correlation on how EEs feel connected to the company's values*

The hypothesis testing for H4 also revealed a very significant correlation with a p-value of <.001. Moreover, H4 revealed a strong positive relationship with an 'r' of .565. The significance was measured between the collective nine II questions and the participants' answers to the question 'Do you feel connected to your company's values?'

**Hypothesis 5:** *II has no significant influence with whether EEs aspire to be like their leaders.*

The results show a significant correlation as the p-value was <.001 and a strong positive relationship among the variables with an 'r' of .658. The significance was measured between the collective nine II questions and the participants' answers to the question 'Do you aspire to be like any leaders in your company?'

**Hypothesis 6:** *II has no significant Influence on whether EEs trust their leaders to make good decisions.*

H6 hypothesis testing showed also a very strong positive relationship among the variables with a 'r' of .690. The p-value result of <.001 is very significant. The correlation was measured between the collective nine II questions and the question, 'Do you trust your direct leader to make good decisions?'. The findings support the literature that TL and II create trust among the leader and follower (Bass & Riggio, 2006; Chebon et al., 2019).

The following Table 1 shows all seven hypothesis results in a structured manner.

**TABLE 1**  
**RESULTS FROM HYPOTHESIS TESTING – PEARSON CORRELATION COEFFICIENT (R)**  
**AND P-VALUE STATISTICS**

Hypothesis	r	r - Strength	P-Value	Statistical Significance
H1	.589	strong negative	-.042	not significant
H2	.580	strong positive	<.001	very significant
H3	.525	strong positive	<.001	very significant
H4	.565	strong positive	<.001	very significant
H5	.658	strong positive	<.001	very significant
H6	.690	strong positive	<.001	very significant
H7	.706	strong positive	<.001	very significant

## DISCUSSION

ER has become a critical concern for organizations, especially following the "Great Resignation" triggered by the COVID-19 pandemic. While some believed the trend was slowing, reports suggest that turnover is still high, with over 50% of EEs considering leaving their jobs (Smith, 2024; Mosser, 2023). This trend emphasizes the need for organizations to address retention challenges, which can be costly both financially and qualitatively. High turnover can be costly to businesses, erode morale, disrupt operations, and harm productivity (Wallace, 2023). Poor leadership is a significant factor in turnover. Effective

leadership, especially TL, can mitigate turnover by fostering a supportive, engaging work environment. Transformational leaders inspire trust, align individual and organizational goals, and promote motivation, all of which are vital for retention (Bass & Riggio, 2006; Nyokabi et al., 2017). A key aspect of TL is II, where leaders act as role models, earning respect and admiration from their teams. This II dimension enhances employee loyalty and engagement, as EEs are more likely to stay with leaders they admire and trust (Bass & Riggio, 2006). Given these insights, organizations must prioritize leadership development and adopt strategies that foster EE engagement to improve retention and ensure long-term success. The findings from the study are similar to the literature review and parallel other research studies. Findings suggest that leaders who are rated with higher levels of II rate their company as a great place to work, have EEs who still see themselves working at the company in the next three years, and feel connected to the company values. Further, they aspire to be like their leaders and trust that they make good decisions. This is important for EE motivation, succession planning, work environment, and ER.

### **Limitations**

This study had a sample size of 165 participants, which limits the representation and the generalizability of the findings to all leaders in America. The study employed a non-random convenience sampling method using an online survey, which introduces several limitations. The use of an online platform tends to restrict participation to individuals, which may exclude certain demographic groups and thus limit the representativeness of the sample. Additionally, since convenience sampling is not random, there may be selection bias, as participants may share certain characteristics that do not reflect the broader population. Furthermore, the reliance on self-reported data may introduce response bias. The study was not longitudinal, as the survey was administered only once.

### **Suggestions for Future Research**

Based upon the findings and limitations, there are a few suggestions for future research. The topic of leadership and retention offer several possibilities to build upon this study. One suggestion would be to ask more detailed questions, such as how long the EE has been at the company and how long they have worked with their direct leader. This provides more insight and adds another dimension to the findings. Another follow-up study could include measurements from other leadership styles to create comparative results. Lastly, a causality study may provide further insight on this topic. Further research utilizing random sampling and mixed-methods approaches would provide a deeper understanding of the underlying mechanisms driving ER.

### **Implications**

The findings provide valuable insights into the topic of leadership and ER. The results underscore the importance of leadership in fostering retention. Organizations can use these insights to include in the development of strategies aimed at reducing turnover and enhancing leadership effectiveness. Additionally, the study's findings may prompt organizations to reconsider how leadership training and development programs are designed, focusing more on TL styles and fostering II to strengthen EE loyalty and retention. This may also have an influence on succession planning since other non-management may feel inspired to become leaders. This leadership style may also create an environment where EEs can feel empowered to be creative and innovative, leading to a workplace culture where EEs enjoy coming to work. This ultimately reduces EE turnover but also increases employer reputation and creates a positive organizational culture.

### **CONCLUSION**

ER has become a critical concern for organizations, especially following the “Great Resignation” triggered by the COVID-19 pandemic. While some believed the trend was slowing, reports suggest that turnover is still high, with over 50% of EEs considering leaving their jobs (Smith, 2024; Mosser, 2023). This trend underscores the need for organizations to address retention challenges, as poor leadership can lead to lower ER. Effective leadership, especially TL, can mitigate turnover by fostering an engaging work

environment. Transformational leaders inspire trust, align individual and organizational goals, and promote motivation, all of which are vital for retention (Nyokabi et al., 2017). A key aspect of TL is II. This dimension enhances EE loyalty and engagement, as EEs are more likely to stay with leaders they admire and trust (Bass & Riggio, 2006). This study surveyed the relationship between the dimensions of TL – II – and ER. Highlighted findings include a very significant correlation between these variables. Given these insights, organizations should prioritize leadership development and adopt strategies that foster ER to ensure long-term success. Ultimately, the study shows that leadership styles and the culture of the organization are important levers for addressing the EE retention challenges. This provides more insight for both academic research and practical applications in human resource management.

## REFERENCES

- Afshari, L. (2022). Idealized Influence and Commitment: A Granular Approach in Understanding Leadership. *Personnel Review*, 51(2), 805-822. <https://doi.org/10.1108/PR-03-2020-0153>.
- Bass, B.M., & Riggio, R.E. (2006). *Transformational Leadership*. Hove, Psychology Press.
- Cambridge Dictionary Online. (2025). *Retention*. Cambridge Dictionary. Retrieved from <https://dictionary.cambridge.org/dictionary/english/retention>
- Chamberlain, A. (2017, January 17). *What Matters More to Your Workforce than Money*, Harvard Business Review. Retrieved from <https://hbr.org/2017/01/what-matters-more-to-your-workforce-than-money>
- Chebon, S.K., Aruasa, W.K., & Chirchir, L. (2019). Effect of Inspirational Motivation and Idealized Influence on Employee Performance at Moi Teaching and Referral Hospital, Eldoret, Kenya. *International Journal of Business and Social Science*, 10(7), 131–140. DOI:10.30845/ijbss.v10n7p14
- Das, B.L., & Baruah, M. (2013). Employee Retention: A Review of Literature. *IOSR Journal of Business and Management (IOSR-JBM)*, 14(2), 8–16. e-ISSN: 2278-487X
- Davis, E., Jr. (2023, December 14), *Survey: Americans Are Down on Corporate Leadership*, U.S. News & World Report. Retrieved from <https://www.usnews.com/news/leaders/articles/2023-12-14/americans-see-leadership-crisis-in-the-corporate-world-survey-finds>
- Epitropaki, O., Kark, R., Mainemelis, C., & Lord, R.G. (2017). Leadership and Followership Identity Processes: A Multilevel Review. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 28(1), 104–129.
- Gallup. (2024a, May). *Indicators Retention & Attraction*. Gallup. Retrieved from <https://www.gallup.com/467702/indicator-employee-retention-attraction.aspx#:~:text=1%20in%20%20U.S.%20Employees%20Are%20Open%20to%20Leaving%20Their%20Organization&text=In%20the%20latest%20reading%2C%20from,actively%20seeking%20a%20new%20job>
- Gallup. (2024b). *State of the Global Workplace*. Gallup. Retrieved from <https://www.gallup.com/workplace/349484/state-of-the-global-workplace.aspx>
- Fuller, J., & Kerr, W. (2022, March 23). *The Great Resignation Didn't Start with the Pandemic*. Harvard Business Review. Retrieved from <https://hbr.org/2022/03/the-great-resignation-didnt-start-with-the-pandemic>
- Glen, C. (2006). Key Skills Retention and Motivation: The War for Talent Still Rages and Retention Is the High Ground. *Industrial and Commercial Training*, 38(1), 37–45. <https://doi.org/10.1108/00197850610646034>
- Guo, W., Cui, J., Arendt, L., & O'Brien, J. (2024). Limitations and Potential Dark Sides of Transformational Leadership: The Case of the Founder and Former CEO of Theranos. *Management Teaching Review*, 10(4), 477–490. <https://doi.org/10.1177/23792981241267758>
- Hall, J., Johnson, S., Wsocki, A., & Kepner, K. (2002). Transformational Leadership: The Transformation of Managers and Associates. *EDIS*, (2), 1–3. DOI:[doi.org/10.32473/edis-hr020-2002](https://doi.org/10.32473/edis-hr020-2002)

- Hassan, M., Hassan, S., Din Khan, K.U., & Naseem, A. (2011). Employee Retention as a Challenge in Leather Industry. *Global Journal of Human Social Science*, 11(2), 9 – 13. ISSN: 0975-587x
- Holland, W. (2024, 19. March). *Total Cost of Disengaged Employees to Your Organization*. Threewill. Retrieved from <https://threewill.com/total-cost-of-disengaged-employees-to-your-organization/>
- Khan, A.Z., Khan, I.U., & Nawaz, A. (2016). Leadership Theories and Styles: A Literature Review. *Journal of Resources Development and Management*, 16, 1-7.
- Korolevich, S. (2022, January 11). *Horrible Bosses: Are American Workers Quitting Their Jobs or Quitting Their Managers?* GoodHire. Retrieved from <https://www.goodhire.com/resources/articles/horrible-bosses-survey/>
- Kossivi, B., Xu, M., & Kalgora, B. (2016). Study on Determining Factors of Employee Retention. *Open Journal of Social Sciences*, 4, 261–268. DOI:10.4236/jss.2016.45029
- Lee, M-Y. (2014). Transformational Leadership: Is It Time for A Recall? *The International Journal of Management*, 1, 17–29. DOI:10.18646/2056.11.14-002
- Li, H., Sajjad, N., Wang, Q., Ali, A.M., Khaqan, Z., & Amina, S. (2019). Influence of Transformational Leadership on Employees' Innovative Work Behavior in Sustainable Organizations: Test of Mediation and Moderation Processes. *Sustainability*, 11(6), 1–21. DOI:10.3390/su11061594
- Lin, S-H., Scott, B.A., & Matta, F.K. (2019). The Dark Side of Transformational Leader Behaviors for Leaders Themselves: A Conservation of Resources Perspective. *Academy of Management Journal*, 62(5), 1556–1582. <https://doi.org/10.5465/amj.2016.1255>
- Medici, A. (2022, February 22). There's a Cost to Keeping Bad Bosses Around – and It's Rising. *St. Louis Business Journal*. Retrieved from <https://www.bizjournals.com/stlouis/news/2022/02/22/workers-hate-boss-price-retention-recruitment.html>
- Mosser, M. (2023, July 27). *Half of Your Employees Are Looking to Leave*. Gallup. Retrieved from <https://www.gallup.com/workplace/506819/half-employees-looking-leave.aspx>
- Mohd Hussain, N.H., Nazari, P.N.A., & Husin, N. (2024). Transforming Performance: The Significance of Transformational Leadership: Transformasi Prestasi: Kepentingan Kepimpinan Transformational. *e-Jurnal Penyelidikan dan Inovasi*, 11(2), 177–195. <https://doi.org/10.53840/ejpi.v11i2.200>
- Nyokabi, M.S., K'Aol, G.O., & Njenga, K. (2017). Effect of Idealized Influence and Inspirational Motivation of the CEO on Performance in the Private Sector in Kenya. *American Journal of Leadership and Governance*, 1(2), 16–38. DOI:10.47672/ajlg.304
- Ntshangase, S.C., & Brijball Parumasur, S. (2013). Using Staff Retention Strategies to Secure A Happier and More Productive Workforce. *Corporate Ownership and Control*, 10(3), 325-337. DOI:10.22495/cocv10i3c4art1
- Otieno, C.D., Linge, T., & Sikalieh, D. (2019). Influence of Idealized Influence on Employee Engagement in Parastatals in the Energy Sector in Kenya. *International Journal of Research in Business and Social Sciences*, 8(5), 123–135. DOI:10.20525/ijrbs.v8i5.476
- Parker, K., & Horowitz, J.M. (2022, March 9). *Majority of Workers Who Quit a Job in 2021 Cite Low Pay, No Opportunities for Advancement, Feeling Disrespected*. Pew Research Center. Retrieved from <https://www.pewresearch.org/short-reads/2022/03/09/majority-of-workers-who-quit-a-job-in-2021-cite-low-pay-no-opportunities-for-advancement-feeling-disrespected/>
- Pitonyak, J., & Desimone, R. (2024, January 19). *How to Engage Frontline Managers*. Gallup. Retrieved from <https://www.gallup.com/workplace/395210/engage-frontline-managers.aspx>
- PwC. (2024, 20. June). *The Great Resignation Continues: PwC Hopes & Fears Global Workforce Survey*. PwC. Retrieved from [www.pwc.com/bm/en/press-releases/workforce-hopes-and-fears.html](http://www.pwc.com/bm/en/press-releases/workforce-hopes-and-fears.html)
- Sinha, D.A., & Shukla, S.K. (2013). Study of Employee Retention in the Pharmaceuticals Sector in Dehradun City. *International Journal of Education and Psychological Research*, 2(1), 30–39.

- Smith, M. (2024, May 8). *Nearly 50% of People Are Considering Leaving Their Jobs in 2024—More Than During the ‘Great Resignation’*. CNBC. Retrieved from <https://www.cnbc.com/2024/05/08/nearly-50percent-of-people-are-considering-leaving-their-jobs-in-2024.html>
- U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics. (2022, June). *Job Openings and Quits Reach Record Highs in 2021, Layoffs and Discharges Fall to Record Lows*. Monthly Labor Review. Retrieved from <https://www.bls.gov/opub/mlr/2022/article/job-openings-and-quits-reach-record-highs-in-2021.htm>
- Wallace, L. (2023, March 21). *Five hidden costs of employee attrition*. Forbes EQ. Retrieved from <https://www.forbes.com/sites/forbeseq/2023/03/21/five-hidden-costs-of-employee-attrition/>
- Zenger, J. (2015, March 6). *New Research: To Reach Full Work Potential, Hone in on Your Strengths*. Forbes. Retrieved from <https://www.forbes.com/sites/jackzenger/2015/03/06/new-research-to-reach-full-work-potential-hone-in-on-your-strengths/>
- Zenger, J., & Folkman, J. (2012, July 16). *How Damaging Is a Bad Boss, Exactly?* *Harvard Business Review*. Retrieved from <https://hbr.org/2012/07/how-damaging-is-a-bad-boss-exa>