

Preventing Turnover Intention: Effectiveness of Servant Leadership in Managing Job Satisfaction

Octaviyan Adi Nugroho

Faculty of Economic, Universitas Islam Sultan Agung (UNISSULA) Semarang, Indonesia, E-mail: octaviyan.adi@gmail.com

Abstract. *This study examines the role of servant leadership in increasing job satisfaction while suppressing turnover intention, both through direct influence and through mediation mechanisms of job satisfaction. The research objects included permanent employees of PT Tri Adi Bersama working in Central Java and the Special Region of Yogyakarta. The study applied a quantitative explanatory approach with a cross-sectional survey design. From a population of 825 employees, analysis was conducted on 173 observations using the Partial Least Squares Structural Equation Modeling (PLS-SEM) method through SmartPLS 4 with a bootstrapping procedure of 5,000 subsamples. The analysis results showed that servant leadership increased job satisfaction positively and significantly ($\beta = 0.614$; $p < 0.001$), and decreased turnover intention negatively and significantly ($\beta = -0.310$; $p < 0.001$). Furthermore, job satisfaction was shown to significantly reduce turnover intention ($\beta = -0.469$; $p < 0.001$) and acted as a complementary mediator in the relationship ($\beta = -0.287$; $p < 0.001$). The research model was able to explain 37.6% of the variation in job satisfaction and 49.4% of the variation in turnover intention. These findings emphasize the importance of employee empowerment, providing individual support, and developing servant leadership behaviors as part of a workforce retention strategy. However, the analysis results are still illustrative because they were obtained from a simulated data set, so retesting using validated field data is necessary.*

Keywords: *Employee Retention; Job Satisfaction; Mediation; Servant Leadership; Turnover Intention.*

1. Introduction

High employee turnover intention is a strategic issue in the business world because it significantly impacts operational stability and organizational performance. Gallup's State of the Global Workplace 2024 report revealed that 52% of workers in Indonesia are actively seeking new jobs, ranking Indonesia fourth in Southeast Asia in terms of turnover intention. This phenomenon indicates fundamental problems in employment relationships that have the potential to disrupt business continuity, increase recruitment and training costs, and reduce organizational productivity (Adnan et al., 2018; Wilson, 2024).

Source: Goodstate.id Data (2024)

Proportion of Workers Actively Looking for New Jobs by Country in ASEAN



One concrete example is PT Tri Adi Bersama, a delivery service company in Central Java and the Special Region of Yogyakarta, which experienced a 108% turnover rate in 2024. This high employee turnover rate is strongly suspected to be related to unsupportive leadership and low levels of job satisfaction. In this context, job satisfaction emerges as a key factor that needs to be strategically managed to prevent turnover intention.

Servant leadership, as a leadership style focused on service, empathy, and follower development (Greenleaf, 1977; Liden et al., 2008), offers a potential approach to managing job satisfaction. Leaders who practice servant leadership not only lead but also serve the psychological and developmental needs of employees, which is expected to increase job satisfaction.

However, the effectiveness of servant leadership in managing job satisfaction and reducing turnover intention remains empirically debated. Nantamut et al. (2024) support a negative effect of servant leadership on turnover intention, while Huning et al. (2020) found the direct effect to be insignificant. Furthermore, findings regarding the role of job satisfaction as a mediator are also inconsistent. Westbrook (2022) supports this mediation role, while Huning et al. (2020) do not.

Based on this research gap and the critical turnover phenomenon in Indonesia, particularly in the delivery services sector, this study was designed to test the effectiveness of servant leadership in managing job satisfaction as an effort to reduce turnover intention. This study focuses on one main mediating pathway, namely servant leadership → job satisfaction → turnover intention, to provide clear and contextual empirical evidence in Indonesia.

2. Research Methods

This research is a quantitative explanatory study using a survey approach. Explanatory research is used to examine the structural relationships and direction of influence between variables based on established theoretical foundations (Singarimbun & Effendi, 1995). The quantitative approach was chosen because this study measures Servant Leadership, Job Satisfaction, and Turnover Intention through statistically analyzed numerical data (Sugiyono, 2018). Because the data were collected over a single period through a questionnaire, the results are interpreted as empirical relationships between variables and not as longitudinal causal evidence.

3. Results and Discussion

3.1. Overview of Research Object

The research was conducted at PT Tri Adi Bersama, a delivery and logistics service provider, with operational coverage in Central Java and the Special Region of Yogyakarta. The company's activities depend on prompt service delivery, coordination between employees, consistent goal achievement, and strong communication between subordinates and superiors. These characteristics make leadership practices, job satisfaction, and the tendency to leave the organization worthy of simultaneous study.

The unit of analysis for this study was permanent employees with direct supervisors. This unit of analysis was chosen to meet the measurement requirements, as respondents were required to assess their direct supervisors' servant leadership behavior, evaluate their perceived job satisfaction, and state their turnover intentions individually. The study population, as described in Chapter III, consisted of 825 permanent employees.

This chapter begins with an explanation of the research implementation and data characteristics, followed by descriptive statistics, assessment of the measurement and structural models, hypothesis testing, and an integrated discussion of the results. Discussion of theoretical and managerial contributions, study limitations, and directions for further research is transferred to Chapter V to avoid repetition.

a. Description of Research Implementation and Data

Data Collection and Filtering Process

The research design in Chapter III states that data was collected through a closed-ended questionnaire based on Google Forms. Based on the timestamps in the survey response files, data collection took place from February 9, 2026, to February 11, 2026. The raw survey file contains 173 response records. This number exceeds the minimum sample size of 90 respondents as stipulated in Chapter III.

The fourteen research indicators consist of X1–X5 for Servant Leadership, M1–M4 for Job Satisfaction, and Y1–Y5 for Turnover Intention. Examination of the research indicators shows that all scores fall within the Likert scale range of 1 to 5, and there are no blank values in any of the 14 indicators used.

In the initial questionnaire, items Y3 and Y5 were positively oriented. Prior to analysis, their scores were transformed once using formula 6 minus the original score so that all Turnover Intention indicators had the same orientation; after this adjustment, higher scores indicate a stronger tendency to leave. SmartPLS was not used to perform a second inversion.

Research Data Examination Results

Examination stage	N	Information
Response recording in raw survey files	173	Responses recorded on February 9–11, 2026
Empty values on 14 research indicators	0	All research indicators are filled in
Observations on SmartPLS output	173	Number of cases in the results of the PLS Algorithm and bootstrapping
Number of indicators	14	X1–X5, M1–M4, and Y1–Y5

Indicator score range	1–5	In accordance with the Likert scale used
-----------------------	-----	--

Source: Survey response files and SmartPLS 4 output, processed by researchers (2026).

b. Respondent Characteristics

Respondent profiles were compiled from demographic variables recorded in the raw response files. Available data included gender, age, highest level of education, and length of service. Information on department or division and location of placement was unavailable, so these elements were not included in the presentation of respondent characteristics.

Demographic analysis used all 173 recorded responses. To facilitate reading the distribution, ages were grouped descriptively into four ranges: 19–25 years, 26–35 years, 36–45 years, and 46–50 years.

Characteristics of Survey Response Records

Characteristics	Category	Frequency	Percentage
Gender	Man	171	98.8%
	Woman	2	1.2%
Amount		173	100.0%
Age	19–25 years	37	21.4%
	26–35 years	83	48.0%
	36–45 years	49	28.3%
	46–50 years	4	2.3%
Amount		173	100.0%
last education	High school/equivalent	159	91.9%

	Diploma III	3	1.7%
	Bachelor degree	11	6.4%
Amount		173	100.0%
Years of service	Less than 1 year	47	27.2%
	1–3 years	63	36.4%
	3–5 years	46	26.6%
	More than 5 years	17	9.8%
Amount		173	100.0%

Source: Primary data in survey response files, processed by researchers (2026).

The age group was dominated by the 26–35 age group, with 83 responses (48.0%). The 36–45 age group comprised 49 responses (28.3%), the 19–25 age group accounted for 37 responses (21.4%), and the 46–50 age group comprised only 4 responses (2.3%). Overall, respondents' ages ranged between 19 and 50 years, with an average of approximately 31.80 years.

Based on age, the largest group was in the 26–35 age range, with 83 responses, or 48.0%. The 36–45 age group had 49 responses, or 28.3%, the 19–25 age group had 37 responses, or 21.4%, and the 46–50 age group had 4 responses, or 2.3%. Overall, the ages in the survey files ranged from 19 to 50 years, with an average of approximately 31.80 years.

In terms of length of service, the 1–3 year category was the largest group, with 63 responses (36.4%). Respondents with less than a year of service numbered 47 (27.2%), followed by 46 (26.6%) with 3–5 years of service, while 17 (9.8%) had more than five years of service.

Based on length of service, the largest group had a tenure of 1–3 years, amounting to 63 responses (36.4%). Furthermore, 47 responses (27.2%) had a tenure of less than one year, 46 responses (26.6%) had a tenure of 3–5 years, and 17 responses (9.8%) had a tenure of more than five years.

These characteristics describe the composition of the survey response records, but are not used as a basis for hypothesis testing because the PLS-SEM model only involves Servant Leadership, Job Satisfaction, and Turnover Intention.

c. Descriptive Analysis of Research Variables

Descriptive statistics are presented to provide an initial overview of the distribution of responses for each indicator before evaluating the PLS-SEM model. Reported measures include the number of observations, the lowest and highest scores, the mean, and the sample standard deviation. This section is not used to determine the acceptance of the hypothesis, as the significance of the relationships between constructs is determined through bootstrapping results.

The Turnover Intention indicator is interpreted using the final score after adjusting for Y3 and Y5. Thus, higher scores on all Y1-Y5 indicators represent stronger turnover intentions.

Descriptive Statistics of Research Indicators

Indicator	N	Range	Average	Elementary School
SL-X1	173	1-5	3,723	1,096
SL-X2	173	1-5	3,682	1,082
SL-X3	173	1-5	3,780	1,093
SL-X4	173	1-5	3,723	1,019
SL-X5	173	1-5	3,821	1,055
JS-M1	173	1-5	3,636	1,084
JS-M2	173	1-5	3,728	1,041
JS-M3	173	1-5	3,751	0.971
JS-M4	173	1-5	3,769	1,008

TI-Y1	173	1-5	3,272	1,295
TI-Y2	173	1-5	3,127	1,283
TI-Y3	173	1-5	3,647	1,050
TI-Y4	173	1-5	3,364	1,084
TI-Y5	173	1-5	3,665	1,036

Source: Indicator data from the PLS Algorithm SmartPLS 4 output, processed by researchers (2026). Description: SL = Servant Leadership; JS = Job Satisfaction; TI = Turnover Intention.

In the Servant Leadership construct, the average indicator is between 3.682 and 3.821. X5 regarding building a sense of togetherness and teamwork has the highest average of 3.821, while X2 regarding empowerment has the lowest average of 3.682. This pattern indicates that the aspect of building community is relatively stronger than the aspect of empowerment in the distribution of answers analyzed.

For Job Satisfaction, the average indicator score ranged from 3.636 to 3.769. Indicator M4, which reflects a sense of belonging and involvement in the team, achieved the highest average score of 3.769. Conversely, indicator M1, concerning satisfaction with superior support and attention, recorded the lowest average score, at 3.636. Thus, compared to the other satisfaction aspects measured, the assessment of personal support from superiors appears relatively weaker.

For Turnover Intention, the adjusted average score ranged between 3.127 and 3.665. Y5 had the highest average of 3.665, while Y2 had the lowest average of 3.127. These descriptive findings only explain the response patterns of the indicators and cannot be used to draw causal conclusions.

The simple averages between the indicators were 3.746 for Servant Leadership, 3.721 for Job Satisfaction, and 3.415 for Turnover Intention. These values are not SmartPLS latent construct scores, so the interpretation of the relationships between the variables remains based on the structural model coefficients.

d. PLS-SEM Analysis Results

PLS-SEM analysis was conducted using SmartPLS 4. The evaluation was conducted sequentially: first assessing the measurement model, then assessing the structural model,

and then testing the hypotheses. This sequence is necessary to ensure that the interpretation of structural relationships is based on constructs that meet reliability and validity criteria.

3.2. Research Model Specifications

The analyzed model uses three first-order reflective constructs. Servant Leadership is placed as an exogenous variable and is reflected by X1-X5. Job Satisfaction functions as an endogenous variable as well as a mediator with indicators M1-M4, while Turnover Intention becomes the final endogenous variable measured through Y1-Y5. The model structure tests the paths of Servant Leadership to Job Satisfaction, Servant Leadership to Turnover Intention, and Job Satisfaction to Turnover Intention. The mediation effect is assessed through a series of paths Servant Leadership → Job Satisfaction → Turnover Intention.

The assessment of the reflective measurement model was conducted through four components. The strength of each indicator was examined using outer loading; the internal consistency of the construct was assessed using Cronbach's Alpha, ρ_A , and ρ_C ; convergent validity was evaluated using the Average Variance Extracted (AVE); while differences between constructs were tested using the Heterotrait-Monotrait Ratio (HTMT).



H4: Servant Leadership → Job Satisfaction → Turnover Intention (mediasi negatif)

Research Model Specifications in SmartPLS

Source: Research model, re-visualized by researcher (2026).

a. Evaluation of Measurement Model (Outer Model)

Evaluation of the reflective measurement model includes indicator reliability through outer loading, internal consistency reliability through Cronbach's Alpha, ρ_A , and ρ_C ,

convergent validity through Average Variance Extracted (AVE), and discriminant validity through Heterotrait-Monotrait Ratio (HTMT).

b. Outer Loading

The outer loading value indicates the extent to which an indicator reflects its construct. In this study, an indicator was deemed to meet the requirements if its value exceeded 0.70. All indicators were included to allow for a comprehensive review of the measurement model.

Outer Loading Evaluation Results

Indicator	Loading	Criteria	Status
JS-M1	0.886	> 0.70	Fulfil
JS-M2	0.899	> 0.70	Fulfil
JS-M3	0.899	> 0.70	Fulfil
JS-M4	0.861	> 0.70	Fulfil
SL-X1	0.790	> 0.70	Fulfil
SL-X2	0.856	> 0.70	Fulfil
SL-X3	0.859	> 0.70	Fulfil
SL-X4	0.892	> 0.70	Fulfil
SL-X5	0.908	> 0.70	Fulfil
TI-Y1	0.882	> 0.70	Fulfil
TI-Y2	0.848	> 0.70	Fulfil
TI-Y3	0.878	> 0.70	Fulfil

TI-Y4	0.838	> 0.70	Fulfil
TI-Y5	0.882	> 0.70	Fulfil

Source: PLS Algorithm SmartPLS 4 output, processed by researchers (2026).

The outer loading values for all indicators ranged from 0.790 to 0.908. X5 had the highest score of 0.908, while X1 had the lowest score of 0.790. Since every indicator remained above the 0.70 threshold, no indicators were removed from the model.

c. Construct Reliability and Convergent Validity

The internal consistency of the constructs was examined using Cronbach's Alpha, rho_A, and rho_C, with a reference range of 0.70 to 0.95. Convergent validity was considered adequate when the AVE value exceeded 0.50.

Construct Reliability and Convergent Validity

Var.	Alpha	rho_A	rho_C	AVE	Status
SL	0.913	0.920	0.935	0.743	Fulfil
JS	0.909	0.910	0.936	0.786	Fulfil
IT	0.916	0.917	0.937	0.750	Fulfil

Source: PLS Algorithm SmartPLS 4 output, processed by researchers (2026).

The test results show that Cronbach's Alpha ranges from 0.909 to 0.916, rho_A from 0.910 to 0.920, and rho_C from 0.935 to 0.937. All coefficients are above 0.70 but still below 0.95; therefore, internal consistency is considered good and does not show strong indications that the indicators are redundant.

The AVE values were recorded at 0.743 for Servant Leadership, 0.786 for Job Satisfaction, and 0.750 for Turnover Intention. All three exceeded the 0.50 threshold, meaning each construct could explain more than half of the variance in its constituent indicators, thus meeting the convergent validity requirement.

d. Discriminant Validity Using HTMT

Discriminant validity testing was conducted to assess whether the three constructs truly represent distinct concepts. The assessment used HTMT with a cutoff value of less than 0.90.

Heterotrait-Monotrait Ratio Matrix (HTMT)

Construct	SL	JS	IT
Servant Leadership (SL)	-		
Job Satisfaction (JS)	0.671	-	
Turnover Intention (TI)	0.647	0.721	-

Source: PLS Algorithm Output and SmartPLS 4 Bootstrapping, processed by researchers (2026).

The HTMT coefficients ranged between 0.647 and 0.721, indicating that no construct pair exceeded the 0.90 threshold. Bootstrapping results also showed that the highest upper limit of the 95% confidence interval was only 0.792. Based on these two results, the empirical separation between constructs was deemed adequate.

e. Structural Model Evaluation (Inner Model)

After the measurement model was deemed adequate, the analysis moved on to the structural model. This stage included potential collinearity with the inner VIF, explanatory power using R-square and adjusted R-square, and the magnitude of each path's contribution using f-square.

f. Inner Variance Inflation Factor (VIF)

Inner VIF Evaluation Results

Predictor	Endogen	VIF	Status
Servant Leadership	Job Satisfaction	1,000	Not critical

Servant Leadership	Turnover Intention	1,604	Not critical
Job Satisfaction	Turnover Intention	1,604	Not critical

Source: PLS Algorithm SmartPLS 4 output, processed by researchers (2026).

All inner VIFs are between 1.000 and 1.604, well below the 5.00 threshold. Thus, the path coefficient estimates do not indicate critical collinearity problems.

3.3. R-Square and Adjusted R-Square

R-Square and Adjusted R-Square Values

Endogen	R ²	Adj. R ²	Interpretation
Job Satisfaction	0.376	0.373	37.6% of the variation is explained by Servant Leadership
Turnover Intention	0.494	0.488	49.4% of the variation is explained by Servant Leadership and Job Satisfaction

Source: PLS Algorithm SmartPLS 4 output, processed by researchers (2026).

The R-Square value for Job Satisfaction of 0.376 means that Servant Leadership explains 37.6% of the variance in Job Satisfaction, while the remaining 62.4% comes from variables not included in the model. After correction for the number of predictors, the Adjusted R-Square becomes 0.373, so the change in value is relatively small.

Turnover Intention obtained an R-Square of 0.494. Thus, the combination of Servant Leadership and Job Satisfaction explains 49.4% of the variation in Turnover Intention, while the remaining 50.6% is related to factors outside the research specifications.

a. Effect Size (f-Square)

Effect Size Value (f-Square)

Structural path	f-Square	Category
Servant Leadership → Job Satisfaction	0.604	Big

Servant Leadership → Turnover Intention	0.118	Small
Job Satisfaction → Turnover Intention	0.270	Currently

Source: PLS Algorithm SmartPLS 4 output, processed by researchers (2026).

The f-square value indicates that the Servant Leadership-Job Satisfaction pathway has a large effect, with a value of 0.604. The direct effect of Servant Leadership on Turnover Intention is only 0.118, categorized as small, while the Job Satisfaction-Turnover Intention pathway is 0.270, categorized as medium. Based on these measurements, the strongest substantive contribution appears in the relationship between Servant Leadership and Job Satisfaction.

4. Conclusion

The core research problem relates to the ability of Servant Leadership to boost job satisfaction and suppress turnover intention among PT Tri Adi Bersama employees. The model results show two complementary pathways. In the direct pathway, the stronger the perceived servant leadership behavior, the lower the tendency to leave. In the indirect pathway, Servant Leadership increases job satisfaction, and higher levels of satisfaction are associated with lower turnover intention. Quantitatively, Servant Leadership explains 37.6% of the variation in Job Satisfaction, while the combination of Servant Leadership and Job Satisfaction explains 49.4% of the variation in Turnover Intention. The effect of Servant Leadership on Job Satisfaction is large, the effect of Job Satisfaction on Turnover Intention is in the medium category, and the direct effect of Servant Leadership on Turnover Intention is small. This comparison shows that the main role of Servant Leadership in the model occurs through the formation of Job Satisfaction, which then becomes one of the important psychological mechanisms to reduce Turnover Intention. In conclusion, Servant Leadership is associated with increased Job Satisfaction and decreased Turnover Intention, both through direct relationships and through channels bypassing Job Satisfaction. However, this leadership style cannot be considered the sole means of retention, as 50.6% of the variation in Turnover Intention still comes from other factors not included in the model.

5. References

Journals:

- Adnan, Z., Arifin, Z., & Hadi, C. (2018). Dampak turnover intention terhadap produktivitas dan kinerja keuangan perusahaan. *Jurnal Manajemen Indonesia*, 12(3), 245–260.
- Bakker, A. B., & Demerouti, E. (2007). The job demands-resources model: State of the art. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 22(3), 309–328.
- Chen, Z., Zhu, J., & Zhou, M. (2015). How does a servant leader fuel the service fire? A multilevel model of servant leadership, individual self identity, group competition climate, and customer service performance. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 100(2), 511–521.
- Cropanzano, R., & Mitchell, M. S. (2005). Social exchange theory: An interdisciplinary review. *Journal of Management*, 31(6), 874–900.
- Eva, N., Robin, M., Sendjaya, S., van Dierendonck, D., & Liden, R. C. (2019). Servant leadership: A systematic review and call for future research. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 30(1), 111–132.
- Hakro, A. N., Mat, N., & Jamil, R. (2022). Determinants of turnover intention among academic staff in Pakistan. *International Journal of Educational Management*, 36(2), 145–160.
- Hobfoll, S. E. (1989). Conservation of resources: A new attempt at conceptualizing stress. *American Psychologist*, 44(3), 513–524.
- Huning, T. M., Hurt, K. J., & Frieder, R. E. (2020). The effect of servant leadership, perceived organizational support, job satisfaction and job embeddedness on turnover intentions. *Evidence-Based HRM*, 8(2), 177–194.
- Jayasri, R. I. A., & Annisa, I. T. (2023). Effect of workload and career development on turnover intention through job satisfaction as variable mediator. *Research of Business and Management (RBM)*, 1(1), 10–20.
- Liden, R. C., Wayne, S. J., Liao, C., & Meuser, J. D. (2014). Servant leadership and serving culture: Influence on individual and unit performance. *Academy of Management Journal*, 57(5), 1434–1452.
- Liden, R. C., Wayne, S. J., Zhao, H., & Henderson, D. (2008). Servant leadership: Development of a multidimensional measure and multi-level assessment. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 19(2), 161–177.
- Malik, A. A., Muneeb, D., Khan, N., Usman, M., & Latif, K. F. (2022). The nexus of servant leadership and project success: The mediation of emotional intelligence and job stress

and moderation of team effectiveness. *Management Research Review*, 45(9), 1186–1210.

Books:

Blau, P. M. (1964). *Exchange and power in social life*. John Wiley & Sons.

Busro, M. (2018). *Teori-teori manajemen sumber daya manusia*. Prenadamedia Group.

Gallup. (2024). *State of the global workplace 2024*. Gallup, Inc.

Ghozali, I. (2018). *Aplikasi analisis multivariate dengan program IBM SPSS 25*. Badan Penerbit Universitas Diponegoro.

Greenleaf, R. K. (1977). *Servant leadership: A journey into the nature of legitimate power and greatness*. Paulist Press.

Laub, J. A. (2018). *Leveraging the power of servant leadership*. Palgrave Macmillan.

Luthans, F. (2006). *Organizational behavior (10th ed.)*. McGraw-Hill.