

TRANSFORMATIONAL AND TRANSACTIONAL LEADERSHIP STYLE
PREFERENCE AND ITS INFLUENCE ON TURNOVER INTENTION

KAVINDRRA DEVAN CHANDRAN

UNIVERSITI TEKNOLOGI MALAYSIA

TRANSFORMATIONAL AND TRANSACTIONAL LEADERSHIP STYLE
PREFERENCE AND ITS INFLUENCE ON TURNOVER INTENTION

KAVINDRRA DEVAN CHANDRAN

A dissertation submitted in partial fulfilment of the
requirements for the award of the degree of
Master of Human Resource Development

Faculty of Management
Universiti Teknologi Malaysia

OCTOBER 2017

To my beloved parents,

Mr Chandran Samiveloo & Mdm Maharletchumy Soosaimany

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

All praise to God Almighty!

To my parents, Mr & Mrs Chandran Maharletchumy: because I owe it all to you. Many thanks for all the emotional support and encouragement.

Not to forget my supervisors, Dr. Irmawati binti Norazman and Dr. Halimah binti Mohd Yusof who had never get tired of my mistakes and unknowns. I can never thank both of you enough for all the guidance and knowledge that were shared throughout the process of completing this thesis. I am very fortunate to be supervised by the both of you for the amount of commitment shown in educating me.

I am grateful to my siblings Miss Kasturi Devi and Hemaniswarri Dewi for being my motivator in initiating postgraduate studies, experiences that were shared and the emotional support. Never would I have succeeded without any of those.

I would also like to take this opportunity to thank my brilliant examiners Dr. Rabeatul Husna Abdull Kohar and Dr. Nurul Farhana Noordin for all the constructive critics and comments during both proposal defence and final viva session which successfully refurbished the contents of the thesis and further elevated the quality of this piece.

A special thanks goes to Puan.Zaidah binti Ramli for providing me with all the sufficient information about the program in general and thesis specifically. Finally, a sincere thanks to Malaysian Army for the permission to carry out the study.

Thanks for all your encouragement! Thank you everyone!

ABSTRACT

Organisations today must implement the creation of a more conducive and favourable working environment for their employees which will in return be a guarantee for their competitive advantages. The positive orientation held by employees towards their job and the organisation to which they belong is often evident through the increase in productivity and services offered, behaviour of the employee and their loyalty towards the organisation. Thus, it is critical to keep them motivated and engaged at all times. One of the most common approach to achieve all the above mentioned is an effective practice of leadership. However, several studies conducted in the past by numerous researches across various fields reported an inconsistent and inconclusive finding about the association between leadership styles and turnover intention especially when transformational and transactional leadership is concerned. Therefore, this study investigates transformational and transactional leadership style preferences and its influence on turnover intention within a military setting. About 160 servicemen were drawn out of the population of 271 servicemen through a stratified random sampling method. Descriptive analysis were conducted using Statistical Package for Social Sciences software version 21 to discover the preferred leadership style and level of turnover intention while series of multiple analysis were carried out to investigate the influence of leadership style preference on turnover intention. The finding of the study revealed high preference towards transformational leadership style generally and inspirational motivation dimension of transformational leadership specifically while turnover intention was found to be at a moderate level. However no significant influence discovered to be held by the preference of leadership style towards turnover intention held by servicemen serving Malaysian Army. In conclusion, this study is believed to nurture better leadership practice within the army as well as to prevent servicemen from leaving the force.

ABSTRAK

Organisasi hari ini haruslah mampu menghasilkan persekitaran kerja yang lebih kondusif untuk menarik minat pekerja disamping mengekalkan daya saing masing-masing. Persepsi positif yang dimiliki oleh para pekerja terhadap kerjaya dan organisasi mereka boleh diukur melalui peningkatan produktiviti dan perkhidmatan yang ditawarkan, tingkah laku pekerja dan kesetiaan mereka terhadap organisasi. Oleh itu, adalah penting untuk memastikan pekerja mempunyai tahap motivasi yang tinggi. Salah satu pendekatan yang paling biasa diaplikasikan ialah amalan kepemimpinan yang berkesan. Walau bagaimanapun, beberapa kajian yang dijalankan pada masa lampau oleh pelbagai penyelidik melaporkan penemuan yang tidak konsisten dan tidak meyakinkan tentang hubungan antara gaya kepemimpinan dan niat pusing ganti terutamanya dari segi kepemimpinan transformasi dan transaksi. Oleh itu, kajian ini mengkaji pilihan gaya kepemimpinan transformasi dan transaksi serta pengaruhnya terhadap niat pusing ganti dalam aspek ketenteraan. Seramai 160 anggota tentera daripada populasi seramai 271 orang telah dijadikan sampel melalui kaedah pensampelan rawak berstrata. Analisis deskriptif telah dijalankan menggunakan perisian *Statistical Package for Social Sciences* Versi 21 untuk mengetahui gaya kepemimpinan yang dipilih dan tahap niat pusing ganti sementara analisis regresi berganda telah dijalankan untuk mengkaji pengaruh pilihan gaya kepemimpinan terhadap niat untuk meninggalkan kerja. Hasil kajian menunjukkan keutamaan yang tinggi terhadap gaya kepemimpinan transformasi secara amnya dan dimensi motivasi inspirasi kepemimpinan transformasi khususnya manakala niat pusing ganti didapati berada pada tahap yang sederhana. Bagaimanapun, tiada pengaruh yang didapati wujud antara pilihan gaya kepemimpinan ke arah niat pusing ganti oleh anggota-anggota yang berkhidmat di dalam Tentera Darat Malaysia. Kesimpulannya, kajian ini dipercayai dapat menambahbaik amalan kepemimpinan di dalam tentera serta mengelakkan para anggota dari meninggalkan kerja

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER	TITTLE	PAGE
	DECLARATION	ii
	DEDICATION	iii
	ACKNOWLEDGEMENT	iv
	ABSTRACT	v
	ABSTRAK	vi
	TABLE OF CONTENTS	vii
	LIST OF TABLES	xiii
	LIST OF FIGURES	xvii
	LIST OF ABBREVIATION	xviii
1	INTRODUCTION	1
	1.1 Overview	1
	1.2 Background of Study	1
	1.3 Statement of Problem	6
	1.4 Research Questions	9
	1.5 Objectives of Study	9
	1.6 Purpose of Study	10
	1.7 Scope of Study	10
	1.8 Significance of Study	11
	1.9 Limitations of Study	12
	1.10 Conceptual Definition	12

CHAPTER	TITTLE	PAGE
	1.10.1 Leadership	12
	1.10.2 Transformational Leadership	13
	1.10.3 Transactional Leadership	14
	1.10.4 Turnover Intention	15
1.11	Operational Definition	16
	1.11.1 Leadership	16
	1.11.2 Transformational Leadership	16
	1.11.3 Transactional Leadership	18
	1.11.4 Turnover Intention	19
1.12	Summary	19
2	LITERATURE REVIEW	20
2.1	Overview	20
2.2	Leadership	20
	2.2.1 Leadership Styles	24
	2.2.1.1 Transformational Leadership	25
	2.2.1.2 Transactional Leadership	27
	2.2.1.3 Differences between Transformational and Transactional Leadership	30
2.3	Turnover Intention	33
2.4	Leadership and Turnover Intention	36
2.5	Related Theories and Models	38
	2.5.1 Path Goal Theory	38
	2.5.2 Turnover Intention Theories and Models	40
	2.5.2.1 March and Simon Model of Turnover (1958)	40

CHAPTER	TITTLE	PAGE
	2.5.2.2 Mobley (1977) Intermediate Linkages Model	42
2.6	Conceptual Framework	48
2.7	Previous Studies	49
2.8	Summary	54
3	METHODOLOGY	55
3.1	Overview	55
3.2	Research Design	56
3.3	Population and Sample	58
3.4	Data Collection	61
	3.4.1 Primary Data	62
	3.4.2 Questionnaire	62
3.5	Pilot Study	67
	3.5.1 Reliability and Validity Test	68
3.6	Data Analysis Method	70
	3.6.1 Quantitative Analysis	70
	3.6.2 The Mean Range	71
	3.6.3 Multiple Regression Analysis	73
3.7	Summary	74
4	ANALYSIS AND FINDING	75
4.1	Overview	75
4.2	Data Screening Process	75
4.3	Preliminary Data Analysis	76
	4.3.1 Normality Test	76
	4.3.2 Q-Q Plot Analysis	77
	4.3.3 Multicollinearity	81
4.4	Overview of Data	82

CHAPTER	TITTLE	PAGE
4.5	Respondents Profile	82
4.6	The Level of Transformational Leadership Style Preferences by Dimension	85
	4.6.1 Level of Idealised Influence Dimension Preferences	85
	4.6.2 Level of Inspirational Motivation Dimension Preferences	87
	4.6.3 Level of Intellectual Stimulation Dimension Preferences	89
	4.6.4 Level of Individualised Consideration Dimension Preferences	90
4.7	Level of Overall Transformational Leadership Preferences	92
4.8	Level of Transactional Leadership Style Preferences by Dimension	93
	4.8.1 Level of Contingent Reward Dimension Preferences	93
	4.8.2 Level of Management by Exception Dimension Preferences	95
4.9	Overall Transactional Leadership Style Preferences	98
4.10	Leadership Style Preference of Malaysian Army Servicemen	99
4.11	Degree of Turnover Intention Held by Servicemen of Malaysian Army	100
4.12	Influence of Leadership Style Preferences on Turnover Intention	101

CHAPTER	TITTLE	PAGE
	4.12.1 Influence of Transformational Leadership Style Preference on Turnover Intention	101
	4.12.2 Influence of Transformational Leadership Dimensions on Turnover Intention	104
	4.12.3 Influence of Transactional Leadership Style Preference on Turnover Intention	106
	4.12.2 Influence of Transactional Leadership Dimensions on Turnover Intention	108
	4.13 Summary	111
5	DISCUSSION	112
	5.1 Overview	112
	5.2 Discussion and Finding	112
	5.2.1 Leadership Style Preference of Malaysian Army Servicemen	114
	5.2.2 Level of Turnover Intention Held by Servicemen	126
	5.2.3 Influence of Leadership Style Preference on Turnover Intention	127
	5.3 Research Limitation	130
	5.4 Research Implications	131
	5.4.1 Implications for Research	131
	5.4.2 Implications for Practice	133
	5.5 Recommendations	135

CHAPTER	TITTLE	PAGE
	5.5.1 Recommendations for Future Study	136
	5.5.2 Recommendations for Malaysian Army	137
5.6	Conclusion	139
5.7	Summary	140
REFERENCES		141-158
APPENDICES		159-163

LIST OF TABLES

TABLE NO	TITTLE	PAGE
3.1	Distribution of Population by Rank	60
3.2	Distribution of Stratified Random Sampling	61
3.3	The Content of Questionnaire	64
3.4	The Five-Point Likert Scale	66
3.5	Summary of Reliability Test	69
3.6	Data Analysis Method	71
3.6	The Range of Mean	72
4.1	Results of Normality Tests	77
4.2	Result of Multicollinearity Test	81
4.3	Population and Response Rate	82
4.4	Summary of Respondents' Profile	84

TABLE NO	TITTLE	PAGE
4.5	Level of Idealised Influence Preference	86
4.6	Level of Inspirational Motivation Dimension Preference	88
4.7	Level of Intellectual Stimulation Dimension Preference	89
4.8	Level of Individualised Consideration Dimension Preference	91
4.9	Mean Score of Dimensions	92
4.10	Level of Contingent Reward Dimension Preference	94
4.11	Level of Management by Exception Dimension Preference	96
4.12	Mean Score of Dimensions	98
4.13	Mean Score of Transformational and Transactional Leadership Style Preferences	99
4.14	Level of Turnover Intention	100

TABLE NO	TITTLE	PAGE
4.15	Distribution of Finding between Transformational Leadership Style Preference and Turnover Intention	102
4.16	Significap Level of Transformational Leadership Style Preference and Turnover Intention	102
4.17	Influence of the Transformational Leadership Style Preference On Turnover Intention	103
4.18	Distribution of Finding between Transformational Leadership Style Dimension Preference and Turnover Intention	104
4.19	Significant Level of Transformational Leadership Style Dimension Preferences and Turnover Intention	105
4.20	Influence of the Preference of Transformational Leadership Style Dimensions On Turnover Intention	105
4.21	Distribution of Finding between Transactional Leadership Style Preference and Turnover Intention	106
4.22	Significant Level of Transactional Leadership Style Preference and Turnover Intention	107

TABLE NO	TITTLE	PAGE
4.23	Influence of Transactional Leadership Style Preference on Turnover Intention	107
4.24	Distribution of Finding between Preference of Transactional Leadership Style Dimensions and Turnover Intention	108
4.25	Significant Level of Transactional Leadership Style Dimension Preferences and Turnover Intention	109
4.26	Influence of Transactional Leadership Style Dimension Preferences and Turnover Intention	110
4.27	Conclusions of Research Objectives	111

LIST OF FIGURES

FIGURE NO	TITTLE	PAGE
2.1	March and Simon (1985) Model of Turnover	41
2.2	Mobley (1977) Intermediate Linkages Model	44
2.3	Mobley, Horner and Hollingsworth (1978) Model of Turnover	46
2.4	Conceptual Framework	48
3.1	Knowledge Claims, Strategies of Inquiry, and Methods Leading to Approaches and the Design Process	56
4.1	Q-Q Plot of Transformational Leadership Variable	78
4.2	Q-Q Plot of Transactional Leadership Variable	79
4.3	Q-Q Plot of Turnover Intention Variable	80

LIST OF ABBREVIATION

MBEA	Management by Exception Active
MBEP	Management by Exception Passive
Gnr	Gunner
LBdr	Lance Bombardier
Bdr	Bombardier
Sjn	Sergeant
SSjn	Staff Sergeant
WO 2	Warrant Officer 2
WO1	Warrant Officer 1
SPSS	Statistical Package for Social Science
P-P	Probability Plots
IBM	International Business Machine Corporation

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

1.1 Overview

This chapter is the introduction about the study which is about to be carried out within Malaysian Army about servicemen leadership styles preference and turnover intentions. This chapter too explains in detail about the background of the study, statement of problem, research questions, research objectives, and purpose of the study, scope of the study, significance of the study, limitation of the study, conceptual and operational definitions and finally the summary of this chapter.

1.2 Background of Study

Leadership is an intangible subject of study which is too vast thus making it almost impossible to be precisely defined (Ver, 2009). Yet, in recent years various definitions of leadership practice and behaviours has emerged and widely spread which eventually led to the claim that leadership can either be the practice of a specific individual or a group blessed with a certain set of qualities and behaviours who takes the trouble to transfer energy and efforts to their followers (or subordinates) in order

to influence them in resonating organisational vision, mission and goals (Winston & Patterson, 2006). In defining leadership, one must first capture the aim and purpose of why is it being practiced by a specific person under specific circumstances or in other words, what is trying to be accomplished through the practice (McCleskey, 2014). So, this is the myth behind the various types of beliefs, values and behaviours of leadership which eventually resulted in a diverse definition to it.

When type of leadership style and interaction of members within an organisation is concerned, there will definitely be varying outcomes as different leadership styles lie upon different beliefs and practices (Paraschiv, 2013). Interaction acts as a psychological factor that influences employee behaviours and performances. This can be related to the nature of organisations in the present where a fine practice of leadership concentrated on solving problems produces a very promising outcome in the form of elevated business performance and enhanced employee performances (Hayes, 2012). In the reality of corporate organisations, both the outcomes stated above are tightly entangled with one another.

Two major leadership styles are transformational and transactional leadership style which implies two different approaches towards the practice of leadership. However, the best leadership practice is one that has the combination of the both styles (Judge & Piccolo, 2004). Transformational leadership is the type of leadership in which the interactions between involved parties are channelled into motivational, ethical and actions of transformation to meet mutual goals (Simola, Barling, & Turner, 2012). It is widely proclaimed that transformational leadership functions with leaders initially casting a charismatic charm on their followers or employees and then motivating them by intellectual stimulation and psychological interactions towards achieving mutual goal realisation (Bass, 1990). The charismatic characteristic is essential in gaining followers' trust and confidence which is a protagonist in subsequently motivating and nurturing them towards the achievement of organisational goals and visions.

Contrary to transformational leadership is transactional leadership, a practice of leadership which focuses on fulfilling the very low level of Maslow Hierarchy of Need which is the need for satisfaction (Odumeru, 2013). Satisfaction is achieved by leaders through the practice of reward and punishment system where satisfactory performances are rewarded and dissatisfactory performances are punished (Odumeru, 2013). Transactional leadership generally revolve around the foundations of contingent reward which implies the exchange of reward for accomplishments and management by exception where interventions by the leaders occur only when standards and targets are not achieved (Xiaoxia & Jing, 2006). In simpler words, transactional leadership works with the condition of directing employees by fulfilling their own interest which emerges in various forms rewards such as benefits, monetary returns, appraisals and many other tangible ways (Nikezi, 2012).

On the other hand, when business performance is concerned, it simply implies a holistic utilisation of available resources including the workforce to secure available business opportunities to remain competitive in their respective arena despite achieving greater productivity and profits. Enhanced employee performances, on the other hand is heavily influenced by emotional and psychological factors in terms of employee behaviours and their perception towards the organisation to which they belong. This can be measured in terms of employee motivation, participation, satisfaction, and engagement (Dhladhla and John, 2011; Oehler, 2014; Thao, 2015). Serious attention and management of these factors by a leader is definitely a boost to employee performances. Failure in analysing and rectifying all the above will eventually lead to employee turnover which could result in a survival disaster for an organisation (Oehler, 2014).

Army is facing the dilemma of personnel turnover in many countries such as Belgium, UK, USA, India and Sweden (Bressler, 2008; Merkulova, 2010; Jaiswal, Dash, and Sharma, 2015; Statistics, 2015). The British Army for instance, experienced

a 4.4% deficit in their total number of personnel in the year 2015 (Defence Statistics, 2015). Similarly, flipping through recent statistics revealed the turbulence experienced by Malaysian Army in the present where a huge number of skilled personnel are opting to quit way earlier than their retirement tenure (Royal Artillery Regiment Annual Report, 2015). Apparently, the proportion of officers' withdrawal is greatly outweighed by that of servicemen.

Malaysian Army, as a result of British colonisation, adopts the British ranking hierarchy which is split into 2 main modes of entries known as the Officers and the Other Ranks (referred as servicemen in this study). The ranks of officers ascend from an Officer Cadet, Second Lieutenant, Lieutenant, Captain, Major, Lieutenant Colonel, Colonel, Brigadier General, Major General, Lieutenant General and General. On the other hand, the Other Ranks (or servicemen) ranking hierarchy ranges from a Recruit, Private, Lance Corporal, Corporal, Sergeant, Staff Sergeant, Warrant Officer 2 and Warrant Officer 1 (British Army, 2014).

Officers and servicemen are distinguished by their roles and tasks. An officer is often regarded as a commander who commands, makes decision and held liable for their decisions whereas a servicemen is known as a skilled worker or subject matter expert of their respective traits (Army Recruiting Group, 2008). Servicemen will be given respective traits at the beginning of their career in the military and that will be their field of expertise ever since. An officer on the other hand, has to know (even if not mastered) about all the traits.

Various researches conducted across the globe discovered that leadership style has a notable amount of share in the proceedings of this issue (Hekeri, 2010; Aghashahi, Davarpanah, and Oma, 2013; Kaur, 2013; Hsieh, 2015; Saleem, 2015). Leadership in general, regardless of its style or behaviour that is being held by a leader has its own consequential impact on employee motivation, commitment and performance which will influence their turnover intention (Wakabi, 2013). When

specific leadership styles are concerned, both transformational and transactional leadership styles are found to be negatively related to turnover intentions (Gul, 2012).

When an organisation is concerned, employee's attitude and behaviours, both in good and bad ways are the outcome of leadership practice of the top brass to a very influential extent (Agarwal, 2012). Turnover is certainly the negative outcome of employee behaviour which has to be avoided by the management at any course. Based on the argument of Agarwal (2012), an organisation must at all cost ensure that the leadership practice within the organisation is in such a manner that it deviates employees far from the intention of leaving the organisation. It is very disastrous to have trained and skilled employees to leave an organisation as the productivity and efficiency of the organisation rely on them to a certain level (Ugboro, 2006).

As well as other organisations and fields, turnover does occur in military forces around the world (Merkulova, 2010). Various countries across the globe are facing the dilemma of military personnel turnover. Turnover or the separation of a serviceman from the armed forces is a very disastrous phenomenon when armed forces are concerned as it resembles the security and sovereignty of a country (Jaiswal, Dash, & Sharma, 2015).

1.3 Statement of Problem

Being a successful organisation has always been the aim of everyone. Organisations today must implement the creation of a more conducive and favourable working environment for their employees which will in return be a guarantee for their competitive advantages (Matovac, Bilas, & Fra, 2010). The positive orientation held by employees towards their job and the organisation to which they belong is often evident through the increase in productivity and services offered, behaviour of the employee and their loyalty towards the organisation (Gabčanová, 2011). Thus, it is critical to keep the workforce as close as they could or in other words keeping them motivated and engaged at all times.

A specific branch of the Malaysian Army which is currently comprised of 3825 active servicemen, experiences high rate of turnover where it has lost about 8% of its active servicemen in the year of 2015 due to voluntary withdrawal. A servicemen upon the completion of their 6 months recruit training in the Army Basic Soldiering School, Port Dickson has to serve a compulsory 13 years in the force. They must then request to extend their service tenure to 15 years upon the completion of their 13 years of compulsory service period and then to 18 years upon the completion of the 15 years tenure and finally 21 years which is the typical serving period for them to be entitled for pension. However, quite a number of servicemen are opting to quit at the 15th or 18th year of service, refusing to extend till 21 years complete tenure. The separation of these servicemen results in the lack of experts and expertise within the organisation since these skilful servicemen are only replaced with very few newcomers and also the amount of courses and training they have attended (Royal Artillery Regiment Annual Report, 2015).

In addition to above details, Malaysian Army generally has two distinct nature of job which requires servicemen to possess a great degree of versatility in the service. The first is the wartime or operational duties which requires an intense degree of tactical proficiency, physical and mental endurance and high adaptability to almost all

kind of weather and terrain. Another is the peacetime duties and trainings which has a more fluid nature. Unlike the operational duties, peacetime duties do not require a tensed atmosphere. When dealing with high degree of versatility and adaptability, a good practice of leadership is a necessity (The Army, 2010).

Several studies conducted in the past by numerous researches across various fields reported an inconsistent and inconclusive finding about the association between transformational leadership style, transactional leadership style and turnover intention. It is claimed that, personnel serving in a more stable organisation is less likely to retrieve compared to those serving in a less stable ones (Polich, 2013). Cheng *et al.* (2016), in a study conducted on nurses proposed that the relationship between transformational leadership and turnover intentions of nurses are mediated by social identity. The study conducted by Gyensare *et al.* (2016) on the other hand found that transformational leadership is an effective influence that hinders employee's turnover intention mediated by affective commitment. However, Caillier (2016) conducted a research on employees of local, state and federal agencies in United States through a web based survey and discovered that transformational leadership has a direct negative relationship towards turnover intention.

In a separate study conducted by Ariyabuddhiphongs & Kahn (2017) on Thai immediate managers, it was learned that transformational leadership practice results in the reduction of turnover intention with trust and job performance being mediators. The study conducted by Sun & Wang (2016) on employees of public organizations suggested that the practice of transformational leadership develops an organisational culture that creates strong social bonding between individuals and through that prevents employees from having turnover intentions. The study too claimed that transformational leadership can directly mitigate turnover intentions. Unlike other studies, the study by Green, Miller, & Aarons (2013) claimed that transformational leadership moderates the association between emotional exhaustion and turnover intention which is a positive association. It was added that greater influence of transformational leadership practice weakens the positive association. It's learned that

the outcome of all the studies, despite reporting similar findings still left room for scrutiny.

When transactional leadership is concerned, Hamstra *et al.* (2011) reported that transactional leadership is negatively related to turnover intentions for highly prevention-focused followers while a similar study conducted by Sithole & Sudha (2014) inferred that transactional leadership has association with turnover intention of employees serving in IT organisations. However, no further explanation was provided about the said association leaving it as a subject of scrutiny. The outcome of a study by Yadav & Misra (2015) which reported that transactional leadership has no significant correlation with employee turnover completely contradicts the outcome of other studies said above and hence making the need for scrutiny more obvious.

With regard to the above mentioned roles of an officer, the core responsibility of a military leader (or an officer) is to successfully carry out the mission that is assigned and also to look after the welfare of the servicemen under command (Army, 1965). However, when both responsibilities conflict one another, the succession of the mission is of highest priority. This requires both officers and servicemen to be highly motivated, devoted and selflessly serve the organisation.

A military leader, according to Kumar (2015) must at all times must possess complete control over surrounding and circumstances with no compromise. This creates a tense setting within the organisation when the relationship between officer and servicemen is concerned. It was also added by Kumar (2015) that under certain conditions, military commanders must practice an effective rewarding and punishment system to ensure that servicemen get stronger and tougher.

Contrasting both of the arguments above, it is understood that a military leader at all times needs to achieve a balance between the mission that is assigned and the servicemen they lead. In order to achieve that, devotion, selflessness and rewards are

of considerable importance. Thus, this study intends to investigate the transformational and transactional leadership styles preferences held by servicemen serving Malaysian Army and its influence on their turnover intention.

1.4 Research Questions

The statement of problem is translated into following research questions:

- i. What is the type of leadership style preferred by Malaysian Army servicemen?
- ii. What is the degree of turnover intention held by Malaysian Army servicemen?
- iii. What is the influence of the leadership style preference of Malaysian Army servicemen towards their turnover intentions?

1.5 Objectives of the Study

The primary objective of this study is to discover the leadership style preference of Malaysian Army servicemen between transformational and transactional leadership styles. On the other hand, the specific objectives of this study are:

- i. to identify the leadership style preference of Malaysian Army servicemen.
- ii. to identify the degree of turnover intention held by Malaysian Army servicemen.
- iii. to examine the influence of leadership style preference of Malaysian Army servicemen towards their turnover intentions.

1.6 Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study is to identify the leadership style preferred by the servicemen of Malaysian Army as a part of the effort to investigate their turnover intentions. The outcome of this study will be reflected with the current leadership practice within Malaysian Army to harmonise and reduce the gaps between practice and preference by opting for a more harmonious leadership practice as an effort to combat turnover intentions of the servicemen.

1.7 Scope of the Study

The study focuses on the leadership style preference among servicemen of Malaysian Army and its influence on their turnover intention. The leadership styles which are investigated in this study include transformational and transactional leadership style based on the Full Range Leadership Model proposed by Bass and Avolio (2004). The investigation on transformational leadership style is done on the basis of 4 dimensions which are Idealised Influence, Intellectual Stimulation, Individualised Consideration and Inspirational Motivation. Transactional leadership style on the other hand is investigated on the basis of Contingent Reward and Management by Exception. Turnover intention of the servicemen are analysed in the perspective of the thoughts of quitting present job, intention to look for new job and intention of leaving the present organisation as outlined by Foon, Leong, and Osman (2010).

The study reflects the transformational and transactional leadership style preference of the Malaysian Army servicemen and its relationship with their turnover intentions. The respondents who are involved throughout this study are the active servicemen of the Malaysian Army of various traits and service periods based in one

of the unit which has high rates of turnover. The population involved in this study is 270 active servicemen whereas the samples involved is 157 servicemen excluding 30 servicemen taken for pilot test.

1.8 Significance of Study

This research is intended to highlight the transformational and transactional leadership practices in the Malaysian Army. It is also intended to reinforce leadership and turnover intention studies from a Malaysian Army perspective.

The study on servicemen's preferences of leadership style and its influence on their turnover intention in Malaysian Army is significant and will be able to contribute to a deeper understanding on the concept of transformational and transactional leadership style from a military perspective. The outcome of this study is expected to provide insights on the practice of leadership within the organisation. This is vital in order to maintain the combat readiness and the operational efficiency of the force. This research is believed to be a guideline and outline the revolution or change in the leadership practice within Malaysian Army if necessary in order to serve the servicemen better and eliminate their turnover intentions.

1.9 Limitation of Study

There are several limitations associated with this study which is doubted to have effect on the outcome and influence the findings. The research is only done within Malaysian Army. Thus the results of the findings are not expected to be generalised to organisations of other nature. Answers provided by respondents were merely based on their personal perception which is prone to be influenced by their personal feelings and dissatisfactions held against the organisation. Respondents might feel hostile to disclose or reveal information about their leadership style preference and turnover intentions due to the tensed setting (regimental setting) within the organisation.

1.10 Conceptual Definition

Conceptual definition is a definition that is developed with the aid of basic principles upon which a term rests (Church, 2004). Thus, this section conceptually defines the variables that are involved in this study.

1.10.1 Leadership

Leadership is the act of driving an organisation towards a mutual goal which is the outcome of visions and missions shared by a group of people (Elhajj, 2013). Leadership too is an act of influencing others by channelling their activities, efforts and commitments of individuals towards the attainment of the organisational

intentions (Malik S. H., Relationship between Leader Behaviors and Employees' Job Satisfaction: A Path-Goal Approach, 2013).

According to Ver (2009), leadership is the utilisation of workforce and other resources in such a way to meet particular aims and targets of an organisation.

On the other hand, Gerald (2009) claims that the Army Field Manual, FM 6-22 of the United States Army defines leadership as the act of providing direction and guidance in order for the sub-ordinates to operate in such a way that facilitates the success of a specific mission.

1.10.2 Transformational Leadership

Transformational leadership is a practice of leadership which amplifies the desires of followers to greater achievements, performance and self-development as well as the group development (Avolio B. M., 1990). In addition to this, Bass (1990) stated that transformational leadership enables an individual to stretch beyond their self-interests for the development and good of their group or organisation.

There are 4 main dimensions of transformational leadership (Avolio B. M., 1990).

- i. **Idealised influence** is the capability of a leader to successfully influence a follower to selflessly devote themselves to the need and requirements of the group or organisation in achieving goals.

ii. **Individualised consideration** is the ability of a leader to attend to the needs and analyse the capabilities of a co-worker to maximise their output. This too revolves around the guidance and coaching which can be provided by a leader to elevate the performance of a co-worker in achieving organisational goals.

iii. **Intellectually stimulating** refers to the abilities of the leader to develop new ways or methods in carrying out certain tasks especially when problem solving is concerned. This further enables a co-worker to be creative and innovative in performing their duties even at the absence of their leader.

iv. **Inspirational motivation** implies the influential capabilities of a leader in motivating and inspiring their co-workers in concentrating their efforts and resources towards the achievement of a mutual goal more often by providing reasonable visions.

1.10.3 Transactional Leadership

Transactional leadership is the leadership style which is defined as the rewards for good performance and punishment for the opposite kind of leadership practice (Bass, 1990). The practice of transactional leadership style works in such a way that it fulfils the personal requirements of co-workers that it as well involves economic transactions (Men, 2010).

According to Bass (1990), transactional leadership comprises of 2 different dimensions which are the following:

i. **Contingent Reward** which is the practice of reward exchanges for the success of a co-worker in conforming to the achievement of organisational goals.

ii. **Management by Exception** refers to the degree supervision provided by a leader to co-workers. A leader who transmits this behaviour either constantly checks on the performance of co-workers to locate deviations from conformity and rectifies them immediately or wait for violations or deviations to take place before rectifying it.

1.10.4 Turnover Intention

Turnover intention is defined as the intention held by an employee to leave his or her present job in order to obtain employment in a different place within 12 months period (Medina, 2012). In another study, turnover is perceived as the voluntary idea of an individual to leave the organisation they belong to (Berry, 2010).

There are 3 main constructs of turnover intention which seem to be the main cause of turnover to happen known as psychological, cognitive and behavioural constructs (Ncedo, 2013). Intention of quitting one's present job is the state of mind held by an individual and often displayed through behavioural manner before actual turnover happens (Elangovan, Causal ordering of stress, satisfaction and commitment, and intention to quit: a structural equations analysis, 2001). Turnover intention is also defined as the intention held by an individual about leaving the present job (Simon & Hasselhorn, 2010). Turnover intention is the intention of an individual to leave present organisation within the upcoming one year (Medina, 2012).

1.11 Operational Definition

Operational definition is the approach in quantifying subjects of interest (Church, 2004). Thus, the variables involved in this study is quantified in this section.

1.11.1 Leadership

The operational definition of leadership is that it is an act of influencing individuals of a specific group or organisation in the attempt of achieving organisational goals. As far as this research is concerned, leadership refers to the set of activities preferred by the servicemen of Malaysian Army to be carried out by the leaders in influencing them to carry out their duties in achieving organisational missions and task accomplishments.

1.11.2 Transformational Leadership

The operational definition of transformational leadership refers to the practice of leadership which intends to influence and inspire co-workers with the expectations of performance and input elevation in order to facilitate organisational goals attainments.

A detailed operational definition of transformational leadership is as follows:

- i. **Idealised influence** is the act of instilling pride within servicemen to serve under the command of a particular leader and influencing them to go beyond their self needs for the wellness of the organisation. It is also influenced by the capability of the ability of a leader in acquiring their respect by considering the ethics that rests behind each of their decision.
- ii. **Inspirational motivation** on the other hand outlines the optimism of the leader about future undertakings and challenges, and enthusiasm associated about carrying tasks in present. The capability of the leader to create vision and developing conviction about achieving those visions are also included.
- iii. **Intellectual stimulation** is the act of a leader where critical assumptions are re-examined to assure validity and openness in seeking for different outlooks in problem solving. Developing servicemen's ability to have different perception on emerging problems and how to solve is also associated with the definition.
- iv. **Individualised consideration** reflects on the ability of the leader to guide servicemen in carrying out their tasks and treating them as distinct individuals instead of just a group member. It is also linked with building respect and developing servicemen's individual strength.

Thus in this study, transformational leadership preference will be examined based on the preference of the Malaysian Army servicemen with respect to the four above stated dimensions of transformational leadership.

1.11.3 Transactional Leadership

The operational definition of transactional leadership is such that the leader fulfils the desire or what is wanted by the co-worker in return to their efforts and commitment in achieving organisational goals. In this study, the operational definition of transactional leadership is:

- i. **Contingent Reward** refers to the exchange of assistance expected by servicemen in return for their efforts and discussions about who is responsible for achieving performance targets. In addition to that, it is also operationally defined as a clear understanding of what can servicemen expect as they complete a specific task and the expression of satisfaction when servicemen meet targets.
- ii. **Management by Exception** is defined operationally as the attention focused on irregularities, mistakes, exceptions, and deviations from standards made by servicemen concentration of leaders in dealing with mistakes, complaints, and failures. Apart from that, the definition well includes the failure of the leader in interfering until problems arise and waiting for the things to go wrong before intervening.

Thus in this study, transactional leadership preference will be examined based on the preference of the Malaysian Army servicemen with respect to both of the dimensions stated above.

1.11.4 Turnover Intention

The operational definition of turnover intention refers to the intentions held by an individual to leave his or her current job. In the context of this study, turnover intention relates to the thoughts about quitting their job, looking for a new job to settle

for in the nearest future or to simply leave the organisation they are attached now at present as soon as possible as more and more servicemen are opting to quit at the 15th or 18th year of their service instead of 21 years complete tenure.

1.12 Summary

In short, this chapter discussed about the background of the study, statement of problem, research questions, objectives and scopes of the study, the significance of the study and as well outlined the conceptual and operational definitions of all the related variables. This chapter is intended to provide a basic understanding about the issue that is going to be discussed in the subsequent chapters throughout the study. Upon having a brief understanding about the cause and significance of the study, the parameters and variables that are being investigated and the scope of the study, the paper will move into discussing its literature in Chapter 2.

References

- A. Gregory Stone, K. P. (August, 2005). The History of Leadership Focus. *Servant Leadership Research Roundtable*.
- Aabdeen, Z. U., Khan, M. N., Khan, H. G., Farooq, H. Q., Salman, M., & Rizwan, M. (2016). The Impact of Ethical Leadership, Leadership Effectiveness, Work Related Stress and Turnover Intention on the Organizational Commitment. *International Journal of Economics and Business Administration*, Vol. 2, No. 2, 2016, pp. 7-14.
- Aarons, G. A. (2006). Transformational and Transactional Leadership: Association with Attitudes Toward Evidence-Based Practice. *PSYCHIATRIC SERVICES*, Vol. 57 No. 8.
- Abdali, F. (2011). Impact of Employee Turnover on Sustainable Growth of Organization in Computer Graphics Sector of Karachi, Pakistan. *Afro Asian Journal of Social Sciences*, Volume 2, No. 2.4 Quarter IV .
- Abouraia, M., & Othman, S. (2017). Transformational Leadership, Job Satisfaction, Organizational Commitment, and Turnover Intentions: The Direct Effects among Bank Representatives. *American Journal of Industrial and Business Management*, 404-423.
- Acharya, B. (2010). *Questionnaire Design*. Lalitpur: Tribhuvan University.
- Adobor, H., & McMullen, R. S. (2010). Bridge Leadership: A Case Study of Leadership In A Bridging Organization. *Leadership & Organization Development Journal*, Vol. 32 Iss 7 pp. 715 - 735.
- Afshari, L., & Gibson, P. (2016). How to increase organizational commitment through transactional leadership. *Leadership & Organization Development Journal*, Vol. 37 Iss 4 pp. 507 - 519.
- Agarwal, U. A. (2012). Linking LMX, innovative work behaviour and turnover intentions The mediating role of work engagement. *Career Development International*, Vol. 17 No. 3, pp. 208-230.
- Aghashahi, B., Davarpanah, A., & Oma, R. (2013). The Relationship between Leadership Style and Organizational Commitment: a survey in a Malaysian Contact Centre. *Interdisciplinary Journal of Research in Business*, Vol. 2, Issue. 11 (pp01-07).
- Ahuja, M., Chudoba, K., & George, J. (2006). IT Road Warriors: Balancing Work-Family Conflict, Job Autonomy, and Work Overload to Mitigate Turnover Intentions. *MIS Quarterly*, Vol. 30 No. 3, pp. 1-18.

- Ajmal, S., Farooq, M., Sajid, N., & Awan, D. (2012). Role of Leadership in Change Management Process. *Abasyn Journal of Social Sciences*, Vol. 5 No. 2, 111-124.
- Albrecht, S. L., & Andretta, M. (2012). The Influence of Empowering Leadership, Empowerment and Engagement on Affective Commitment and Turnover Intentions in Community Health Service Workers: Test of a Model. *Leadership in Health Services*, Vol. 24 Issue: 3, pp. 228-237.
- Al-Hummadi, B. A. (2013). *Leadership, Employee Satisfaction and Turnover in the UAE Public Sector*. Dubai: The British University.
- Almandeel, S. (2017). The Mediating Role of Transformational Leadership Style on Relationship between Personality Type and Turnover Intention in Saudi Arabian Banking Context. *International Journal of Organizational Leadership*, 109-136.
- Amanchukwu, R. N., Stanley, G. J., & Ololube, N. P. (2015). A Review of Leadership Theories, Principles and Styles and Their Relevance to Educational Management. *Journal of Management*, 6-14.
- Anderson, J., & Milkovich, G. (2013). Propensity to Leave: A Preliminary Examination of March and Simon's Model. *Industrial Relations*, Vol. 35 p. 279-294.
- Aranganathan, P., & Sivarethinamohan, R. (2016). A Study on Impact of Perceived Organizational Support (POS), Job Satisfaction and Organizational Commitment towards Turnover Intentions of Information Technology Professionals at Chennai City. *International Journal of Pharmaceutical Sciences Review and Research*, Article No. 17, Pages: 89-96.
- Ariyabuddhiphongs, V., & Kahn, S. I. (2017). Transformational Leadership And Turnover Intention: The Mediating Effects of Trust and Job Performance on Café Employees in Thailand. *Journal of Human Resources in Hospitality & Tourism*, VOL. 16, NO. 2, 215–233.
- Arkkelin, D. (2014). *Using SPSS to Understand Research and Data Analysis*. Indiana: Psychology Curricular Materials.
- Army Recruiting Group. (2008). *Are You Ready to Become an Army Officer*. United Kingdom: Crown Copyright.
- Army, M. (2010). *The Army Doctrine*. Kuala Lumpur: Malaysian Army.
- Artillery, D. (2015). *Annual Report*. Kuala Lumpur: Malaysian Army Headquarters.

- Avolio, B. (2004). Examining the FULL Range Model of Leadership: Looking Back to Transform Forward. In D. Day, S. Zaccaro, & S. Halpin, *Leader Development for Transforming Organizations: Growing Leaders for Tomorrow* (pp. 71-98). Psychology Press.
- Avolio, B. (2010). *Full Range Leadership Development*. SAGE.
- Avolio, B. M. (1990). Developing Transformational Leadership: 1992 and Beyond. *Journal of European Industrial Training*, Vol. 14 Iss 5 pp.
- Azanza, G., Moriano, J., Molero, F., & Mangin, J.-P. L. (2015). The effects of authentic leadership on turnover intention. *Leadership & Organization Development Journal*, Vol. 36 Issue: 8, pp.955-971.
- Barbuto, J. (2007). Full Range Leadership. *The Board of Regents of the University of Nebraska*.
- Bass, B. (1990). From Transactional to Transformational Leadership: Learning to Share the Vision. *Elsevier Science Publishing*.
- Bass, B. (2000). The Future of Leadership in Learning Organizations. *Journal of Leadership & Organizational Studies*, Vol 7, No 3, pp 18-40.
- Bass, B. M. (1985). *Leadership and Performance Beyond Expectations*. New York: The Free Press.
- Bass, B. M. (1990). From Transactional to Transformational Leadership: Learning to Share the Vision. *Organizational Dynamics*, Volume 18, Issue 3, Winter 1990, Pages 19-31.
- Bass, J. S. (1990). Transformational Leadership: Beyond Initiation and Consideration. *Journal of Management*, Vol 16, No 4, pp 693-703.
- Belias, D., & Koustelios, A. (2014). Leadership and Job Satisfaction – A Review. *European Scientific Journal*, Vol.10, No.8 pp. 24-46.
- Berry, M. L. (2010). *Predicting Turnover Intent: Examining the Effects of Employee Engagement, Compensation Fairness, Job Satisfaction, and Age*. University of Tennessee, Knoxville.
- Bhutto, T., & Shaikh, H. (2017). Transformational Leadership and Its Impact on Employees' Turnover Intention, A Study In Private Mid-Growing Banks in Pakistan. *International Journal of Business Quantitative Economics and Applied Management Research*, Volume-3, Issue-8; pp 10-21.
- Bolden, R. (2004). *What is Leadership*. London: Leadership South West.
- Branham, L. (2005). *The 7 Hidden Reasons Employees Leave*. Pennsylvania: Soundview Executive Book Summaries.

- Breevaart, K., Bakker, A., Hetland, J., Demerouti, E., Olsen, O. K., & Espevik, R. (2014). Daily transactional and transformational leadership and daily employee engagement. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, 138–157.
- Bressler, M. (2008). Planning and Projecting Critical Human Resource Needs: The Relationship between Hope, Optimism, Organizational Commitment, and Turnover Intention Among U.S. Army Reserve Soldiers. *Journal of Behavioural Studies in Business*.
- British Army. (2014). A Guide for Army Families Edition 4.
- Brown, J. (1997). *Skewness and Kurtosis*. Manoa: JALT Testing & Evaluation SIG Newsletter.
- Burns, J. S. (1996). Defining Leadership: Can We See the Forest for the Trees? *The Journal of Leadership Studies*, 149-157.
- Caillier, J. G. (2016). Do Transformational Leaders Affect Turnover Intentions and Extra-Role Behaviors Through Mission Valence? *American Review of Public Administration*, Vol. 46(2) 226–242.
- Campbell, D., & Campbell, S. (2008). Introduction to Regression and Data Analysis. *StatLab Workshop Series*. Connecticut: Yale University.
- Chartered Management Institute. (2013). *Understanding Leadership Styles*. Corby: Chartered Management Institute Management House.
- Chartered Management Institute. (2015). *Understanding Leadership Styles*. Corby: Chartered Management Institute Management House.
- Chaudhry, A. Q., & Javed, H. (2012). Impact of Transactional and Laissez Faire Leadership Style on Motivation. *International Journal of Business and Social Science*, Vol. 3 No. 7.
- Chen, G. (2005). Collinearity. *Encyclopedia of Statistics in Behavioral Science*, Volume 1, pp. 327–328.
- Cheng, C., Bartram, T., Karimi, L., & Leggat, S. (2016). Transformational leadership and social identity as predictors of team climate, perceived quality of care, burnout and turnover intention among nurses. *Personnel Review*, Vol. 45 Issue: 6, pp. 1200-1216.
- Childs, M. (2010). *Learners' Experience of Presence in Virtual Worlds*. Warwick: University of Warwick, Institute of Education.
- Church, M. C. (2004). *The Conceptual and Operational Definition of Quality of Life: A Systematic Review of the Literature*. Texas: Texas A&M University.

- Clarke, R. (2005). *Research Models and Methodologies*. HDR Seminar Series.
- Cohen, J. (1968). Multiple Regression as A General Data-Analytic System. *Psychological Bulletin*, Vol. 70, No. 6, 426-443.
- Cohen, L., Manion, L., & Morrison, K. (2007). *Research Methods in Education*. New York: Taylor & Francis e-Library.
- Cossin , D., & Caballero, J. (2013). *Transformational Leadership: Background Literature Review*. IMD Global Board Center.
- Coverdale, S., & Terborg, J. (1980). *A Re-Examination of The Mobley, Horner & Hollingsworth Model Of Turnover: A Useful Replication*. Houston: Department of Psychology, University of Houston.
- Covey, S. (2007). *The Transformational Leadership Report*. Transformational Leadership Publication.
- Creswell, J. (2014). Research Design. In J. W. Creswell, *Qualitative, Quantitative, and Mixed Methods Approaches*. California: SAGE Publications, Inc.
- Dartey-Baah, K. (2015). Resilient leadership: a transformational-transactional leadership mix. *Journal of Global Responsibility*, Vol. 6 Iss 1 pp. 99 - 112.
- Daryl J. Hoobs, R. C. (1962). Leadership. What is it? Its Dimensions. *Corporate Extension Powers*.
- Das, K. R., & Imon, A. (2016). A Brief Review of Tests for Normality. *American Journal of Theoretical and Applied Statistics*, 5-12.
- DeCarlo , L. (1997). On the Meaning and Use of Kurtosis. *American Psychological Association*, Vol. 2, No. 3,292-307.
- Defence Statistics. (2015). *UK Armed Forces Quarterly Personnel Report*. London: Ministry of Defence UK.
- Dhladhla, & John, T. (March 2011). The Influence of Leader Behaviour, Psychological Empowerment, Job Satisfaction, and Organizational Commitment on Turnover Intention. Stellenbosch University.
- Dimaculangan, E., & Aguilin, H. (2012). The Effects of Transformational Leadership on Salesperson's Turnover Intention. *International Journal of Business and Social Science*, Vol. 3 No. 19; pp 197-210.
- Drost, E. (2011). Validity and Reliability in Social Science Research. *Education Research and Perspectives*, Vol.38, No.1.

- Dumdum , U. R., Lowe , K. B., & Avolio, B. J. (2015). A Meta-Analysis of Transformational and Transactional Leadership Correlates of Effectiveness and Satisfaction: An Update and Extension. *Transformational and Charismatic Leadership: The Road Ahead 10th Anniversary Edition*, pp 39-70.
- Duque, L. (2015). *The Relationship between Leadership Styles and Employee Turnover Intentions in Higher Education*. Louisville, Kentucky: Sullivan University.
- Dutta , S., & Khatri, P. (2017). Servant Leadership and Positive Organizational Behaviour: The Road Ahead to Reduce Employees' Turnover Intentions. *On the Horizon* , Vol. 25 Iss 1 .
- Eeden, R. v., Cilliers, F., & Deventer, V. v. (2003). Leadership styles and associated personality traits: Support for the conceptualisation of transactional and transformational leadership. *South African Journal of Psychology*, pp.253-267.
- Elangovan, A. (2001). Causal ordering of stress, satisfaction and commitment, and intention to quit: a structural equations analysis. *Leadership & Organization Development Journal*, Vol. 22 Iss: 4, pp.159 - 165.
- Elangovan, A. (2001). Causal ordering of stress, satisfaction and commitment, and intention to quit: A structural equation analysis. *Leadership & Organization Development Journal*, 159.
- Elhajj, S. A. (2013). Importance of Leadership in Administration. (pp. 701-756). Research Gate.
- Emerson, D. J. (2013). *Organizational Culture, Job Satisfaction and Turnover Intentions: The Mediating Role of Perceived Organizational Support*. Richmond, Virginia: Virginia Commonwealth University.
- Fairholm, M. R. (2004). Different Perspectives on the Practice of Leadership. *Public Administration Review*, Vol. 64, No. 5 (Sep. - Oct., 2004), pp. 577-590.
- Fienberg, S. (2003). *Notes on Statistics*. Pennsylvania: Carnegie Mellon University.
- Filho, D. F., Paranhos, R., Rocha, E., Silva Jr, J., Santos, M., & Marino, J. (2013). When is statistical significance not significant? *Brazilian Political Science Review*, pp. 31-55.
- Firth, L. (2004). How Can Managers Reduce Employee Intention To Quit? *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, Vol. 19, No. 2, pp. 170-187.
- Foon, Y., Leong, L., & Osman, S. (2010). An Exploratory Study on Turnover Intention among Private Sector Employees. *International Journal of Business and Management*, Vol. 5, No. 8; pp 57-64.

- Gabčanová, I. (2011). Employees The Most Important Asset In The Organizations. *Human Resources Management & Ergonomics*.
- Galletta, M., Portoghese , I., & Battistelli , A. (2011). Intrinsic Motivation, Job Autonomy and Turnover Intention in the Italian Healthcare: The Mediating Role of Affective Commitment. *Journal of Management Research* , Vol. 3, No. 2.
- Gibson, J. L., Ivancevich, J. M., Donnelly, Jr., J. H., & Konopaske, R. (2012). *Organization, Behaviour, Structure and Processes (14th Edition)*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Gilbert , S. (1991). Model Building and A Definition of Science. *Journal Of Research In Science Teaching*, VOL. 28, NO. 1, PP. 73-79 .
- Goodwin, V. L., Wofford , J., & Whittin, J. L. (2001). A Theoretical and Empirical Extension to the Transformational Leadership Construct. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, Vol. 22, No. 7 (Nov., 2001), pp. 759-774.
- Green, A., Miller, E., & Aarons, G. (2013). Transformational Leadership Moderates the Relationship Between Emotional Exhaustion and Turnover Intention Among Community Mental Health Providers. *Community Mental Health Providers*, 373–379.
- Gul, S. (2012). Leadership Styles, Turnover Intentions and the Mediating Role of Organizational Commitment. *Information and Knowledge Management* , Vol 2, No.7, 2012 .
- Gyensare, M., Tsede, O., Sanda, M.-A., & Okpoti, C. (2016). Transformational leadership and employee turnover intention: The mediating role of affective commitment. *World Journal of Entrepreneurship, Management and Sustainable Development*, Vol 12 Issue: 3, pp.243-266.
- Hamstra, M., Yperen, N., Wisse, B., & Sassenberg, K. (2011). Transformational-Transactional Leadership Styles and Followers' Regulatory Focus. *Journal of Personnel Psychology* , Vol. 10(4):182–186.
- Harrell, M., & Bradley, M. (2009). *Data Collection Methods: Semi-Structured Interviews and Focus Groups*. Pittsburgh: RAND National Defense Research Institute.
- Hassan, R. (2014). Factors Influencing Turnover Intention Among Technical Employees in Information Technology Organization: A Case of XYZ (M) SDN. BHD. *International Journal of Arts and Commerce* , Vol. 3 No. 9 .
- Hayes, J. (2012). *Leadership & Management In The Uk - The Key To Sustainable Growth*. London: Department for Business, Innovation & Skills Leadership and Management Network Group (LMNG).

- Hazzi, O., & Maldaon, I. (2015). A Pilot Study: Vital Methodological Issues. *Business: Theory and Practice*, 53–62.
- Headquarters, A. (1965). *Military Leadership Field Manual 22-100*. Washington: Department of the Army Field Manual.
- Hekeri, E. (2010). *Roots and Consequences Of The Employee Disengagement Phenomenon*. Saimaa University of Applied Sciences.
- Holtom , B. C., Mitchell, T. R., & Lee, T. W. (2008). Turnover and Retention Research: A Glance at the Past, a Closer Review of the Present, and a Venture into the Future. *The Academy of Management Annals*, Vol. 2, No. 1, 2008, 231–274.
- Horner, M. (1997). Leadership Theory: Past, Present and Future. *MCB University Press*, pp. 270-287.
- House, R. (1996). Path Goal Theory of Leadership: Lesson, Legacy and A Reformulated Theory. *Leadership Quarterly*, pp 323-352.
- House, R., & Mitchell, T. (1975). *Path Goal Theory of Leadership*. Seattle, Washington: University of Washington.
- Hox, J., & Boeije, H. (2005). Data Collection: Primary vs Secondary. *Encyclopedia of Social Measurement*, Vol 1 pp. 593-599.
- Hsieh, H. Y. (July 2015). The Relationship of Manager’s Leadership Style, Job Stress and Job Satisfaction – A Study of Interns in 5 - Star Hotels in Tainan City. *Proceedings of the Third Asia - Pacific Conference on Global Business, Economics, Finance and Banking (AP15Singapore Conference)* . www.globalbizresearch.org.
- Hughes, L. W., Avey, J. B., & Nixon, D. R. (2010). Relationships Between Leadership and Followers’ Quitting Intentions and Job Search Behaviors. *Journal of Leadership & Organizational Studies*, 351–362.
- Ivey , G. W., & Kline, T. J. (2010). Transformational and active transactional leadership in the Canadian military. *Leadership & Organization Development Journal*, Vol. 31 Iss 3 pp. 246 - 262.
- Jaiswal, R. K., Dash, S., & Sharma. (2015). Antecedents of Turnover Intentions of Officers in the Indian Military: A Conceptual Framework. *VIKALPA The Journal for Decision Makers*, 145-164.
- James, O. A., & Ogbonna, I. G. (2013). Transformational vs. Transactional Leadership Theories: Evidence in Literature. *International Review of Management and Bussiness Research*, Vol 2, Issue 2.

- Jensen, U. T., Andersen, L. B., Bro, L. L., Bøllingtoft, A., Eriksen, T. L., Holten, A.-L. Würtz, A. (2016). Conceptualizing and Measuring Transformational and Transactional Leadership. *Journal of Administration & Society*, 1-31.
- John Hayes. (2012). *Leadership & Management in the Uk - The Key to Sustainable Growth*. London: Department for Business, Innovation & Skills Leadership and Management Network Group (LMNG).
- Jordan, P. J., & Troth, A. (2011). Emotional intelligence and leader member exchange: The relationship with employee turnover intentions and job satisfaction. *Leadership & Organization Development Journal*, Vol. 32 Issue: 3, pp. 260-280.
- Judge, , T., & Piccolo, R. (2004). Transformational and Transactional Leadership: A Meta-Analytic Test of Their Relative Validity. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 2004, Vol. 89, No. 5, 755–768.
- Judge, T. A., & Piccolo, R. F. (2004). Transformational and Transactional Leadership: A Meta-Analytic Test of Their Relative Validity. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 2004, Vol. 89, No. 5, 755–768.
- Jung, D. I., & Avolio, B. J. (2000). An Experimental Investigation of the Mediating Effects of Trust and Value Congruence on Transformational and Transactional Leadership. *Journal of Organizational Behavior* , Vol. 21, No. 8 (Dec., 2000), pp. 949-964.
- Kaur, B. (2013). Antecedents of Turnover Intentions: A Literature Review. *Global Journal of Management and Business Studies*, Volume 3, Number 10 (2013), pp. 1219-1230.
- Kaur, B., Mohindru, & Pankaj. (2013). Antecedents of Turnover Intentions: A Literature Review. *Global Journal of Management and Business Studies*, Volume 3, Number 10 (2013), pp. 1219-1230.
- Kelly, D., Harper, D., & Landau, B. (2008). Questionnaire mode effects in interactive information retrieval experiments. *Information Processing and Management*, 122–141.
- Khan, Z. A., Nawaz, A., & Khan, I. (2016). Leadership Theories and Styles: A Literature Review. *Journal of Resources Development and Management*, Vol.16.
- King, A. J. (2009). The Origins and Evolution of Leadership. *Current Biology*, R911-R916.
- Kirkbride, P. (2006). Developing Transformational Leaders: The Full Range Leadership Model in Action. *Industrial and Commercial Training*, Volume 38, No.1 pp 23-32.

- Kirkpatrick, S., & Locke, E. (1991). Leadership: do traits matter? *Academy of Management Executive.*, Vol. 5 No. 2.
- Klagge, J. (1996). Defining, Discovering and Developing Personal Leadership in Organizations. *Leadership & Organization Development Journal*, Vol. 17 Iss 5 pp. 38 - 45.
- Kocher, M., Pogrebna, G., & Sutter, M. (2009, March). Other-Regarding Preferences and Leadership Styles. *Discussion Paper No. 4080*.
- Kothari, C. (2004). Research Methodology Methods and Techniques. In C. Kothari, *Research Methodology Methods and Techniques*. Jaipur: New Age International Publishers.
- Kotter, J. P. (1990). A force for change: How leadership differs from management. *The Free Press*.
- Krejcie , R., & Morgan, D. (1970). Determining Sample Size For Research Activities. *Educational and Psychological Measurement* , 607-610.
- Krishnan, V. R. (2012). Transformational leadership and personal outcomes: empowerment as mediator. *Leadership & Organization Development Journal*, Vol. 33 Iss: 6 pp. 550 - 563.
- Kumar, N. (2015). Military Leadership: A Vital National Strategic Asset. *Scholar Warrior*, pp 8-13.
- Lai, A. (2011). Transformational-Transactional Leadership Theory. *AHS Capstone Projects at Digital Commons*.
- Laker, D. (2011). Job Search, Perceptions of Alternative Employment and Turnover. *The Journal of Applied Business Research* , Vol 7, No 1, pp 6-15.
- Landman, E. (2012). *The relationship between transformational leadership, employee engagement, job characteristics and intention to quit*. Stellenbosch : Stellenbosch University.
- LaRocca, M. A., & Groves, K. S. (2011). An Empirical Study of Leader Ethical Values, Transformational and Transactional Leadership, and Follower Attitudes Toward Corporate Social Responsibility. *Journal of Business Ethics*, Vol. 103, No. 4 (November 2011), pp. 511-528.
- Lester, C. N. (1975). Leadership Styles - Key to Effectiveness. *Journal of Extension*.
- Leung, W.-C. (2001). How to design a questionnaire. *STUDENT BMJ* , VOLUME 9 pp.187-189.
- Levine, M. F. (2000). *The Importance of Leadership: An Investigation of Presidential Style at Fifty National Universities*. Texas: University of North Texas.

- Lim, A., Loo, J., & Lee, P. (2017). The Impact of Leadership on Turnover Intention: The Mediating Role of Organizational Commitment and Job Satisfaction. *Journal of Applied Structural Equation Modelling*, 27-41.
- Long, C. S., Ajagbe, M. A., Nor, K. M., & Suleiman, E. S. (2012). The Approaches to Increase Employees' Loyalty: A Review on Employees' Turnover Models. *Australian Journal of Basic and Applied Sciences*, 282-291.
- Long, C., Thean, L., Ismail, W., & Jusoh, A. (2012). Leadership Styles and Employees' Turnover Intention: Exploratory Study of Academic Staff in a Malaysian College. *World Applied Sciences Journal*, 575-581.
- Malik, S. (2013). Relationship between Leader Behaviors and Employees' Job Satisfaction: A Path-Goal Approach. *Pakistan Journal of Commerce and Social Sciences*, Vol. 7 (1), 209-222.
- Malik, S. H. (2012). A Study of Relationship between Leader Behaviors and Subordinate Job Expectancies: A Path-Goal Approach. *Pak. J. Commer. Soc. Sci.*, Vol. 6 (2), 357-371.
- Malik, S. H. (2013). Relationship between Leader Behaviors and Employees' Job Satisfaction: A Path-Goal Approach. *Pakistan Journal of Commerce and Social Sciences*, Vol. 7 (1), 209-222.
- Malik, S., Aziz, S., & Hassan, H. (2014). Leadership Behavior and Acceptance of Leaders by Subordinates: Application of Path Goal Theory in Telecom Sector. *International Journal of Trade, Economics and Finance*, Vol. 5, No. 2 pp 170-175.
- Malik, S., Hassan, H., & Aziz, S. (2011). Path Goal Theory: A Study of Employee Job Satisfaction in Telecom Sector. *International Conference on Management and Service Science* (pp. vol.8 pp 127-134). Singapore: IACSIT Press, Singapore.
- Martin, J. (2008). Transformational and Transactional Leadership: An Exploration of Gender, Experience, and Institution Type. *Johns Hopkins University Press*, Vol. 15, No. 2, pp. 331–351.
- Matovac, V. A., Bilas, V., & Fra, S. (2010). Understanding the Importance of Human Capital and Labor Market Competitiveness in The EU Candidate Countries And Selected EU Members. *Ekon. Misao Praksa DBK*, 359-382.
- Mbah, S., & Ikemefuna, C. (2012). Job Satisfaction and Employees' Turnover Intentions in total Nigeria plc. in Lagos State. *International Journal of Humanities and Social Science*, Vol. 2 No. 14.
- McCleskey, J. A. (2014). Situational, Transformational, and Transactional Leadership and Leadership Development. *Journal of Business Studies Quarterly*, 2014, Volume 5, Number 4.

- McElroy, J. C. (1982). Attribution Theory: A leadership Theory for Leaders. *Leadership & Organization Development Journal*, Vol. 3 Iss 4 pp. 27 - 30.
- Medina, E. (2012). *Job Satisfaction and Employee Turnover Intention: What does Organizational Culture Have to Do with It?* Columbia University.
- Memon, M. A., Salleh, R., & Baharom, M. R. (2016). The link between training satisfaction, work engagement and turnover intention. *European Journal of Training and Development*, Vol. 40 Issue: 6, pp. 407-429.
- Men, L. R. (2010). *Measuring the Impact of Leadership Style and Employee Empowerment on Perceived Organizational Reputation*. Miami: School of Communication.
- Merkulova, N. (2010). *Why do they leave? A study of turnover in the Swiss Armed Forces focusing on officers and NCO's*. Brussels, Belgium: Swiss Military Academy.
- Min, M. (2015). *Turnover Intention among Malaysia Private Higher Education Institutions Generation Y Academicians: The Mediating Effect of Employee Engagement*. Kampar: Universiti Tunku Abdul Rahman.
- Mittal, S. (2016). Effects of transformational leadership on turnover intentions in IT SMEs. *International Journal of Manpower*, Vol. 37 Issue: 8, pp. 1322-1346.
- Moore, J. E. (2000). One Road to Turnover: An Examination of Work Exhaustion In Technology Professionals. *MIS Quarterly* , Vol. 24 No. 1, pp. 141-168.
- Morrell , K. M. (2002). *Modelling Employee Turnover*. United Kingdom: Loughborough University.
- Mostovicz, E. I., Kakabadse, N. K., & Kakabadse, A. P. (2009). A Dynamic Theory of Leadership Development. *Leadership & Organization Development Journal*, Vol. 30 Iss 6 pp. 563 - 576.
- Ncede, N. (2013). *Factors Contributing To Employee Turnover Intention at a Selected Company in The Cape Town Clothing Industry*. Cape Town: Cape Peninsula University of Technology.
- Neuman, W. (2014). *Social Research Methods: Qualitative and Quantitative Approaches*. Edinburgh: Pearson Education Limited.
- Ng'ethe, J. M., Namusonge, & Iravo, M. A. (2012). Influence of Leadership Style on Academic Staff Retention in Public Universities in Kenya. *International Journal of Business and Social Science*, Vol. 3 No. 21.
- Nikezi, S. (2012). Transactional and Transformation Leadership: Development through Changes. *International Journal for Quality research*, Vol 6, No. 3,.

- O'Brien, R. (2007). A Caution Regarding Rules of Thumb for Variance Inflation Factors. *Quality & Quantity*, 673–690.
- Odumeru, J. (2013). Transformational vs. Transactional Leadership Theories: Evidence in Literature. *International Review of Management and Business Research*, Vol 2, Issue 2.
- Oehler, K. (2014). *2014 Trends in Global Employee Engagement*. Aon Hewitt.
- Oluwafemi, O. J. (2013). Predictors of Turnover Intention among Employees in Nigeria's Oil Industry. *Organizations and Markets in Emerging Economies*, VOL. 4, No. 2(8).
- Pallant, J. (2013). *SPSS Survival Manual: A step by step guide to data analysis using IBM SPSS 5th Edition*. New York: McGraw Hill.
- Paraschiv, D. (2013). A review of leadership. *An. St. Univ. Ovidius Constanta*, Vol. 21(2), 2013, 253{262.
- Peachey, J. W., Burton, L. J., & Wells, J. E. (2014). Examining the influence of transformational leadership, organizational commitment, job embeddedness, and job search behaviors on turnover intentions in intercollegiate athletics. *Leadership & Organization Development Journal*, Vol. 35 Issue: 8, pp. 740-755.
- Peersman, G. (2014). Overview: Data Collection and Analysis Methods in Impact Evaluation. *Methodological Brief No.10: Overview: Data Collection and Analysis Methods in Impact Evaluation*. Florence: UNICEF Office of Research - Innocenti .
- Pierre Casse, P. C. (2011). Leadership styles: A Powerful Model. *www.trainingjournal.com*, 46-51.
- Pieterse, A. N., Knippenberg, D. V., Schippers , M., & Stam, D. (2010). Transformational and transactional leadership and innovative behavior: The moderatingrole of psychological empowerment. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, Vol. 31, No. 4, pp. 609-623.
- Polich, T. F. (2013). *Leadership Stability in Army Reserve Component Units*. Pittsburgh: NATIONAL SECURITY RESEARCH DIVISION.
- Puni , A., Agyemang , C., & Asamoah , E. S. (2016). Leadership Styles, Employee Turnover Intentions and Counterproductive Work Behaviours. *International Journal Of Innovative Research & Development* , Vol 5 Issue 1 .
- Rahman, W., & Nas, Z. (2013). Employee development and turnover intention: theory validation. *European Journal of Training and Development*, Vol. 37 Issue: 6, pp. 564-579.

- Ramesh, A. (2007). *Replicating and Extending Job Embeddedness Across Cultures: Employee Turnover in India And The United States*. College Park: University of Maryland,.
- Ray, D. (2003). *Analysis of the Theoretical Relationships between Work Exhaustion, Job Satisfaction, and Turnover Intention of Air Force Information Systems Managers*. Ohio: Air Force Institute of Technology.
- Redmond, S., Wilcox, S., Campbell, S., Kim, A., Finney, K., Barr, K., & Hassan, A. (2015). *A brief introduction to the military workplace culture*. Los Angeles: University of Southern California.
- Rodger W. Griffeth, P. W. (2000). A Meta-Analysis of Antecedents and Correlates of Employee Turnover: Update, Moderator Tests, and Research Implications for the Next Millennium. *Journal of Management*, Vol 26, No. 3, 463–488.
- Rost, J. C. (2014). *Leadership for the Twenty-First Century*.
- Russell , C., & Sell, M. V. (2012). A closer look at decisions to quit. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes* , 125–137.
- Sadeghi, A., & Pihie, Z. L. (2012). Transformational Leadership and Its Predictive Effects on Leadership Effectiveness. *International Journal of Business and Social Science* , Vol. 3 No. 7.
- Saeed, I., Waseem, M., Sikander, S., & Rizwan, M. (2014). The relationship of Turnover intention with job satisfaction, job performance, Leader member exchange, Emotional intelligence and organizational commitment. *International Journal of Learning & Development*, Vol. 4, No. 2, pp 242-256.
- Saleem, H. (2015). The impact of leadership styles on job satisfaction and mediating role of perceived organizational politics. *Global Conference on Business & Social Science 2014, GCBSS- 2014, Kuala Lumpur* (pp. pp 563 – 569). Kuala Lumpur: Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences 172 (2015) .
- Samad, S. (2012). The Influence of Innovation and Transformational Leadership on Organizational Performance. *International Conference on Asia Pacific Business Innovation and Technology Management* (pp. pp 486 – 493). Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences 57.
- Sandhar, S. K., & Verma, S. (2015). A Relationship between Job Satisfaction and Turnover Intention in Information Technology Sector. *International Journal of Information Technology & Computer Sciences Perspectives* © Pezzottaite Journals, Volume 4, Number 3, pp 1521-1531.
- Seltzer, J., & Bass, B. M. (1990). Transformational Leadership: Beyond Initiation and Consideration. *Journal of Management*, 693-703.

- Shalev, M. (2007). Limits and Alternatives to Multiple Regression in Comparative Research. *Comparative Social Research*, Volume 24, 261–308.
- Sharma, D. K., & Jain, S. (2013). Leadership Management: Principles, Models and Theories. *Global Journal of Management and Business Studies*, Volume 3, Number 3 (2013), pp. 309-318.
- Siew, L. (2016). Analysis of the Relationship between Leadership Styles and Turnover Intention within Small Medium Enterprise in Malaysia. *Journal of Arts & Social Sciences*, Vol 1, Issue 1, 1-11.
- Simola, S. K., Barling, J., & Turner, N. (2012). Transformational leadership and leader moral orientation: Contrasting an ethic of justice and an ethic of care. *The Leadership Quarterly*, pp179–188.
- Simola, S., Barling, J., & Turner, N. (2012). Transformational Leadership and Leaders' Mode of Care. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 229–237.
- Simola, S., Barling, J., & Turner, N. (2012). Transformational Leadership and Leaders' Mode of Care. *Journal of Business Ethics*, J Bus Ethics (2012) 108:229–237.
- Simon, M., & Hasselhorn, H. M. (2010). Leaving the organization or the profession – A multilevel analysis of nurses' intentions. *Journal of Advanced Nursing*.
- Sinclair, A. (2008). Bodies and Identities in Constructing Leadership Capital. In J. U. Paul 't Hart, *Public Leadership* (pp. 83-92). ANU Press.
- Sithole, A. K., & Sudha. (2014). Transactional Leadership Style and Employees' Turnover Intention in Information Technology Organizations. *Case Studies Journal*, Volume 3, Issue 10, pp 78-82.
- Spector, B. A. (2015). Carlyle, Freud, and the Great Man Theory more fully considered. *Cambridge University Press*.
- Stone , A. G., Russell , R. F., & Patter, K. (2004). Transformational versus servant leadership: a difference in leader focus. *Leadership & Organization Development Journal*, Vol. 25 Iss 4 pp.349 - 361.
- Stone, A. G., & Patterson, K. (2005). The History of Leadership Focus. *Servant Leadership Research Roundtable*.
- Subasic, E., Reynolds, K. J., & Turner, J. C. (2008). Identity Confers Power: The New View of Leadership in Social Psychology. In J. Uhr, & P. ' . Hart, *Public Leadership* (pp. 57-72). ANU Press.
- Sun , R., & Wang, W. (2016). Transformational leadership, employee turnover intention, and actual voluntary turnover in public organizations. *Public Management Review*, DOI: 10.1080/14719037.2016.1257063.

- Swensen, S., Gorringer, G., Caviness, J., & Peters, D. (2016). Leadership by Design: Intentional Organization Development of Physician Leaders. *Journal of Management Development*, Vol. 35 Iss 4 pp. 549 - 570.
- Tang, G., Cai, Z., Liu, Z., Zhu, H., Yang, X., & Ji Li. (2014). The Importance of Ethical Leadership in Employees' Value Congruence and Turnover. *Cornell Hospitality Quarterly*, Vol. 56(4) 397–410.
- Taormina , R., & Gao, J. (2013). Maslow and the Motivation Hierarchy: Measuring Satisfaction of the Needs. *American Journal of Psychology*, Vol.126,No. 2 pp.155–177.
- Tavanti, M. (2008). Transactional Leadership. *Selected Works*.
- Teddlie, C., & Yu, F. (2007). Mixed Methods Sampling: A Typology With Examples. *Journal of Mixed Methods Research*, Volume 1 Number 1 pp. 77-100.
- Thabane, L., Ma, J., Chu, R., Cheng, J., Ismaila, A., Rios, L. Goldsmith, C. (2010). A tutorial on pilot studies: the what, why and how. *BioMed Central Ltd*.
- Thao, L. T. (2015). Factors Affecting Employee Performance - Evidence From Petrovietnam Engineering Consultancy J.S.C.
- Ton, Z., & Huckman, R. S. (2008). Managing the Impact of Employee Turnover on Performance: The Role of Process Conformance. *Organization Science* , 19(1), pp. 56–68.
- Tranmer, M., & Elliot, M. (2006). *Multiple Linear Regression*. Cathie Marsh Centre for Census and Survey Research.
- Tyssen, A. K., Wald, A., & Heidenreich, S. (2014). Leadership in the Context of Temporary Organizations: A Study on the Effects of Transactional and Transformational Leadership on Followers' Commitment in Projects. *Journal of Leadership & Organizational Studies*, Vol. 21(4) 376–393.
- Ugboro, I. O. (2006). Organizational Commitment, Job Redesign, Employee Empowerment and Intent to Quit Among Survivors of Restructuring and Downsizing. *Institute of Behavioral and Applied Management*.
- Ullah, I., & Rehman , K. u. (2015). Effect of Gender of Leader (Transformational/ Transactional), Satisfaction with the Leader on Employee Turnover Intention. *Global Advanced Research Journal of Educational Research and Review* , Vol. 4(6) pp. 097-104.
- Ver, H. L. (2009). *Conceptions of Leadership*. Australia: The Developmental Leadership Program.
- Ver, H. L. (2009). *Conceptions of Leadership*. Developmental Leadership Program.

- Wakabi, B. M. (2013). Leadership Style and Staff Retention in Organisations. *International Journal of Science and Research*, Volume 5 Issue 1.
- Waldman, D. A., Carter, M. Z., & Hom, P. W. (2015). A Multilevel Investigation of Leadership and Turnover Behavior. *Journal of Management*, Vol. 41 No. 6, 1724–1744.
- Wallace, C. L. (2011). *Turnover intentions of wilderness therapy staff*. Iowa: University of Iowa.
- Wart, M. V. (2003). Public Sector Leadership Theory: An Assessment. *Public Administration Review*, Vol 63. No 2.
- WeiBo, Z., Kaur, S., & Zhi, T. (2010). A critical review of employee turnover model (1938-2009) and development in perspective of performance. *African Journal of Business Management*, Vol. 4(19), pp. 4146-4158.
- Weiss, H., Macdermid, S., Strauss, R., Kurek, K., Benjamin Le, & Robbins, D. (2003). *Retention in the Armed Forces: Past Approaches and New Research Directions*. Purdue: Military Family Research Institute.
- Wells, C., & Wollack, J. (2003). *An Instructor's Guide to Understanding Test Reliability*. Madison: University of Wisconsin.
- Wells, J. E., & Peachey, J. W. (2011). Turnover intentions: Do leadership behaviors and satisfaction with the leader matter? *Team Performance Management: An International Journal*, Vol. 17 Issue: 1/2, pp.23-40.
- Whitley, & Kite. (2013). *Principles of Research in Behavioral Science (Third Edition)*. Taylor & Francis.
- Winston, B. E., & Patterson, K. (2006). An Intergrative Defintion of Leadership. *International Journal of Leadership Studies*, Vol. 1 Iss. 2, 2006, pp. 6-66.
- Winston, B., & Patterson, K. (2006). An Intergrative Defintion of Leadership. *International Journal of Leadership Studies*, Vol. 1 Iss. 2, 2006, pp. 6-66.
- Wittmer, J., Shepard, A., & Martin, J. (2014). An application of Mobley's intermediate linkages turnover model to a full-time employee group typology. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*.
- Wren, J. T. (1995). The Problem of Cultural Leadership: The Lessons of the Dead Leaders Society and A New Definition of Leadership. *Journal of Leadership Studies*, 123-139.
- Xiaoxia, P., & Jing, W. (2006). *Transformational Leadership VS. Transactional Leadership: The Influence of Gender and Culture on Leadership Styles of SMEs in China and Sweden*. Kristianstad University, 2006.

- Xiaoxia, P., & Jing, W. (2006). *Transformational Leadership VS. Transactional Leadership: The Influence of Gender and Culture on Leadership Styles of SMEs in China and Sweden*. Kristianstad University, 2006.
- Yadav, V., & Misra, N. (2015). Effect of Perceived Leadership and Organizational Commitment on Turnover Intention of Semi-Skilled Workers in Small Scale Industries. *International Journal of Research in Business Studies and Management*, Volume 2, Issue 8, PP 8-16.
- You-De, D., You-Yu, D., Kuan-Yang, C., & Hui-Chun, W. (2013). Transformational vs transactional leadership: which is better?: A study on employees of international tourist hotels in Taipei City. *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management*, Vol. 25 Iss 5 pp. 760 - 778.
- Yukl, G. (1989). Managerial Leadership: A Review of Theory and Research. *Journal of Management*, Vol. 15, No. 2, 251-289.
- Zaccaro, S. (2007). Trait-Based Perspectives of Leadership. *American Psychological Association*, Vol. 62, No. 1, 6–16.
- Zheng, W., & Muir, D. (2014). Embracing Leadership: A Multi-Faceted Model of Leader Identity Development. *Leadership & Organization Development Journal*, Vol. 36 Iss 6 pp. 630 - 656.