3580 Why They Leave What It Costs and What the Research Confirms

People Book · https://kb.jeffreysummers.com/docs/3580-why-they-leave-what-it-costs-and-what-the-research-confirms/

The Myth

One of the most repeated phrases in this industry is "we have a retention problem." Every ownership meeting, every trade conference, every franchise call. Retention, retention, retention. As if naming the symptom is the same as understanding the disease.

It is not a retention problem. It is a growth problem dressed up as a retention problem — and the distinction matters because they require completely different responses.

Think about what "retention problem" actually says. It says people who took a job here were planning to stay and something went wrong. It frames the operator as the victim of mysterious workforce trends. It points outward — at the labor market, the generation, the economy — when the honest question points inward: what did we fail to offer them?

You don't retain good people. You deserve them.

The Only Real Reason

No one took a job to stand still.

That is the complete thesis on departure. Everything else — the dollar more at the place down the street, the schedule, the difficult manager, the better opportunity across town — is the door. The absence of growth is the reason they were already looking for one.

The cast member who left for more money didn't leave for more money. They left because the growth they expected wasn't happening and the money was the first tangible offer of something better. The cast member who left because of a difficult manager didn't leave because of a difficult manager. They left because nobody was developing them through that difficulty — and without growth on the other side of the friction, the friction stopped being worth it.

Every departure traces back to one root: no one took a job to stand still. The operator who understands this stops managing retention and starts managing growth. Because retention is the outcome, not the strategy.

The Five Faces

There is not a different reason for every departure. There is one reason with five faces — and every one of them is a dimension of the same failure.

No personal growth. The job stopped making them better. They are not learning anything new, not being challenged, not developing skills they didn't already have. When someone stops growing personally, they stop caring — about the shift, about the Guest, about the outcome. You see it before they say a word. Every shift looks identical to the last. Nobody pulls them aside to teach them something new. The job has a ceiling so low they hit it in the first month and spend the rest of their time there.

No professional growth. They cannot see a future here. No development conversations, no talk of next roles, no signal that anyone is thinking about where they are headed. The operator who never promotes from within is telling their entire cast the same thing every time they go outside to fill a leadership role: there is no future for you here. They hear it. They act accordingly.

No financial growth. The work is hard and the pay never changes. In an industry that asks a lot — physically, emotionally, on nights and weekends and holidays — people need to see that their contribution is recognized in concrete terms. When the connection between performance and reward is invisible, the message received is that the work doesn't matter. Your best and worst performers earn roughly the same, which means your best are subsidizing your worst. They do the math.

No investment in their development. Nobody is teaching them anything. No coaching, no feedback, no mentorship, no training beyond the first two weeks. Leadership shows up to manage tasks and disappear. The cast member is left to figure it out alone — and what they figure out is that the operation doesn't care whether they get better. Untrained cast members make more mistakes, deliver inconsistent Guest experiences, and require more management time to correct. A trained cast member runs independently. An untrained one is a recurring expense.

No sense that they matter. They do their job. Nobody notices. They have a hard shift. Nobody asks. They come up with a good idea. Nobody listens. Over time the message accumulates: you are replaceable, interchangeable, and unimportant. This one is the hardest to quantify and the

most expensive to ignore. A cast member who doesn't feel they matter delivers a Guest experience that reflects exactly that. It shows up in your review scores, in your repeat visit rate, in the slow erosion of regulars who stop coming as often and eventually stop coming at all.

Five faces. One root. No growth.

What It Costs

The restaurant industry has averaged 79.6% annual turnover over the last decade. The average cast member lasts 110 days. Restaurant industry turnover runs at 204% of the national average — nearly double every other industry in the country.

Here is what 110-day average tenure actually means on the floor. Your server is still learning your menu at day 30. They are starting to find their rhythm around day 60. By day 90 they are finally someone a Guest might recognize and ask for by name. And then they are gone. The Guest who was starting to build a connection with that server now gets a new face. Then another. The experience never deepens because the people delivering it never last long enough to develop the kind of relationship that turns a Guest into a regular. Consistency is the foundation of loyalty. Turnover destroys consistency.

The hard dollar cost — separation, replacement, training — runs $2,305 per hourly cast member replaced, $10,518 per non-GM manager, and $16,770 per General Manager (Black Box Intelligence, 2024 State of the Restaurant Workforce). A 20-person operation running at industry-average turnover replaces roughly 15 people a year. At $2,305 per head, that is over $34,000 a year in hard costs — and those numbers do not include productivity loss while the new hire gets up to speed, or the drain on your existing cast carrying the load in the meantime. That cost never appears as a single line item on a P&L. It is distributed invisibly across recruiting, onboarding, training, and the compounding cost of a floor that is always partially staffed with people who are still learning.

A 50-person limited-service restaurant operating at industry average replaces its entire cast 1.35 times per year — nearly $393,000 annually. Not spent on building the operation. Not on developing the cast. Not on the Guest experience. On replacing people who left because nobody gave them a reason to stay.

That is not a labor cost. It is a leadership tax.

What the Research Confirms

The Novak Leadership Institute's 2025 Young Employee Survey — 1,521 full-time employees across all sectors — identified four universal drivers of employee flourishing. Not generational. Universal. The same things that engage young workers engage all workers. The research confirmed what 44 years on the floor already knew — and put correlation coefficients behind it.

Meaningful work is the strongest predictor of flourishing (R = 0.837). The single most powerful driver of engagement — stronger than compensation, benefits, or job security. Employees who see their daily work as personally significant, tied to their values, contributing to something larger, report the highest levels of engagement. Currently 72% of young employees find their work meaningful. The 28% who don't are already at risk of leaving.

In a 20-person operation, that is five or six people whose connection to the work is already broken. You know who they are. So does everyone else on the floor.

Leadership communication and recognition function as an integrated partnership (R = 0.793). The second most influential factor — and the one most operators get half right. Recognition without communication builds appreciation but not trust. Communication without recognition builds clarity but not commitment. The combination — responsive, respectful communication integrated with timely, specific recognition — is what creates the environment where everything else works. The research found 87.6% of employees receive recognition from supervisors. Only 74.6% are satisfied with their supervisor's communication. The gap is where trust erodes and people start looking.

Development opportunities are the biggest driver of job satisfaction (R = 0.763). Learning, mentorship, and advancement paths are more closely associated with job satisfaction than compensation or perks. Currently 75% of young employees are satisfied with their growth opportunities. The remaining 25% presents a significant retention risk. Employees with consistent development opportunities are twice as likely to stay for their career compared to those without — not slightly more likely, twice. And companies with highly engaged workforces show 23% higher profitability and 18% higher productivity (Gallup, 2023).

Team safety and respect create the foundation for performance (R = 0.680). High-performing teams are built on psychological safety — the freedom to speak up, take risks, and admit mistakes without fear. Currently 78% of employees feel respected by colleagues and 70.5% report experiencing psychological safety. The weak dimension is tolerance for mistakes — the specific area where a leader's response to failure either opens the culture or closes it. The cast that is afraid to fail stops recovering Guests, stops flagging problems, stops doing the things the operator

cannot script.

The research calls these universal drivers. The book calls them fundamentals. They are the same argument — confirmed now by data from 1,521 employees and four correlation coefficients above 0.68.

What You're Actually Measuring

Turnover rate as a standalone metric is nearly useless. High turnover could mean the operator is developing people so well they keep getting recruited — a success metric reported as a failure metric. Low turnover could mean nobody is growing and the people who stayed did so because they had nowhere better to go — a failure metric reported as a success metric. The number without context is noise.

The metric worth tracking is turnover composition. What percentage of your departures were growth departures — the cast member who outgrew the role because you developed them well? Neglect departures — the cast member who left because the growth they were promised never materialized? Character departures — the no-show on day two whose motivation the hiring filter missed? Circumstance departures — life, relocation, family, nothing you controlled?

Growth departures are proof the development worked. Neglect departures are a leadership report card. Character departures are a hiring filter failure. Circumstance departures require a genuine goodbye and nothing more.

The operator who can answer honestly which type each departure was is the one whose next hire is better than their last one.

The Reward for Getting This Right

The operator who develops people continuously — who builds a verifiable record of departure by growth — earns the most powerful recruiting tool available in this business. Not a job posting. Not a signing bonus. Proof.

A track record of people who walked in, got developed, and left better than they arrived. Who went on to lead other restaurants, open their own concepts, get promoted into roles the market recognized them for. Who talk about where they came from with pride — because the operator they worked for made them someone worth talking about.

That reputation compounds. The first generation of cast members you develop becomes the referral network for the next generation. The candidate pool self-selects for belief and ambition. The hiring filter gets stronger because the reputation does the filtering before the interview starts.

The reward for constantly developing people to the point of their growth departure is a self-filling pipeline of people worth developing. And the culture that builds inside the operation — for the people who are still growing toward their own departure — is the one Guests feel the moment they walk in.

That is what people first actually builds. Not a cast that stays. A cast that grows.

The Chain Harvard Named

Harvard Business School researcher James Heskett spent decades studying the relationship between culture, people, and financial performance. His Service-Profit Chain — validated across organizations, industries, and decades — states the sequence plainly: invest in your people, they deliver a better experience, Guests become loyal, and the building grows. The chain runs through the operator. Always.

Heskett quantified what the floor already knew. Culture — the way people are treated, developed, and led — accounts for 20 to 30 percent of the performance differential between organizations. Some of his field research puts that number higher. This is not a soft argument. It is a measurable, repeatable, citable performance gap produced by a single variable: whether the operator builds the conditions for people to do their best work or does not.

His Four Rs name the financial mechanism precisely. Referrals — the building that treats its cast well does not have to recruit; the best people come to it. Retention — the cost of not growing your people is not just turnover expense, it is the compounding loss of everything the departing person carried. Returns to Labor — the operator who invests in development gets more productivity per dollar than the one who pays more and develops less. Relationships — the Guest who feels the culture in the room becomes the Guest who comes back and brings someone.

Heskett called the culture the asset. Jeffrey calls it the product. Both names point to the same thing: the building that takes care of its people produces the experience that keeps Guests coming back. There is no shortcut between those two points, and no amount of marketing replaces the work of building it.