

The Mediating Role of Job Satisfaction in the Relationship Between Servant Leadership and Organizational Commitment: A Systematic Literature Review

Denish Sonani

Campbellsville University, Kentucky, United States

Abstract — This paper synthesizes the multidimensional relationships between servant leadership, job satisfaction, and organizational commitment across various industries. This study conducts a systematic review of conceptual and empirical literature to synthesize existing knowledge in developing an integrated conceptual model outlining how servant leadership influences employee outcomes. Primary results show that servant leadership positively affects organizational commitment and job satisfaction, while job satisfaction is a significant mediator for this relationship. The significance of these relationships varies in industrial environments, where some aspects of servant leadership (particularly authenticity and empowerment) exhibit stronger effects. This theoretical work addresses key gaps in the literature by providing an extensive cross-industry analysis and identifying key mediating mechanisms that explain how servant leadership manifests itself in enhanced employee outcomes.

Keywords: Servant Leadership; Job Satisfaction; Organizational Commitment; Employee Outcomes; Leadership Effectiveness; Cross-Industry Organizational Behavior;

I. INTRODUCTION

A. Background and Rationale

Servant leadership as a distinct model of leadership essentially turns the power imbalance between leaders and followers around. While Robert K. Greenleaf originally introduced the term "servant leadership" in his seminal essay, *The Servant as Leader* (1970), the ideal of leadership has developed into a progressively multidimensional construct more concerned with followers' needs than with the self-interest of leaders (Greenleaf, 1970; Sendjaya, 2015). Servant leadership begins with the leader's very fundamental desire to serve others first, placing it in a unique position to address the human element in organizational settings (Greenleaf, 1970).

The importance of organizational commitment and job satisfaction to organizational effectiveness has been widely reported in the management literature (Meyer & Allen, 1991; Eva et al., 2019). Job satisfaction, a positive affective state experienced by an employee after his/her job experience, has been linked with improved productivity, reduced turnover (Eva et al., 2019), and better organizational citizenship behaviors. Similarly, organizational commitment, psychological attachment that workers experience with their firm has also been associated with improved performance, lower absenteeism, and more effective organizations (Godbersen et al., 2024).

Understanding the theoretical mechanisms through which servant leadership impacts these salient employee outcomes is particularly important during today's complex business landscape wherein organizations are faced with staff retention and participation challenges. Though these relationships have been examined by empirical studies within

certain contexts, an integrated complete theory that generalizes findings to several industries is undeveloped (Eva et al., 2019). This theoretical analysis proves to be most helpful where empirical data cannot be gathered directly since it brings known facts together to establish patterns, contradictions, and potential boundary conditions.

B. Problem Statement

While numerous studies have shown positive correlations between servant leadership and several employee outcomes such as job satisfaction and organizational commitment, few studies have systematically synthesized these findings across different industrial contexts to develop a comprehensive theoretical framework. The literature remains fragmented in nature, with the majority of studies targeting specific industries or contexts without considering the potentiality of these relationships varying across organizational settings (Eva et al., 2019). Additionally, the boundary conditions and mediating processes by which and when servant leadership influences these outcomes should be further developed through theory.

C. Research Question and Objectives

This study addresses the following primary research question: How does servant leadership influence employee job satisfaction and organizational commitment across different industries? The specific objectives of this research include:

- 1) Synthesizing existing theoretical and empirical literature on servant leadership, job satisfaction, and organizational commitment.
- 2) Developing a conceptual model that integrates mediating mechanisms (e.g., trust, prosocial identity) and moderating factors (e.g., industry context) to explain the relationships between these constructs.
- 3) Identifying patterns, inconsistencies, and boundary conditions across different industrial contexts.
- 4) Providing recommendations for future research and practice based on the integrated theoretical framework.

II. LITERATURE REVIEW

A. Conceptualization and Dimensions

Servant leadership represents a leadership philosophy that prioritizes the needs of followers above the self-interest of the leader. Sendjaya (2015) developed a comprehensive definition of servant leadership as a "holistic approach to leadership that engages both leaders and followers through its (1) service orientation, (2) authenticity focus, (3) relational emphasis, (4) moral courage, (5) spiritual motivation, and (6) transforming influence, such that they are both transformed into what they are capable of becoming". This definition captures the multidimensional nature of servant leadership that extends beyond mere behavioral attributes to encompass the leader's fundamental orientation toward service.

Several frameworks have been proposed to conceptualize the dimensions of servant leadership.

Sendjaya's (2015) Servant Leadership Behavior Scale (SLBS) identifies six key dimensions: voluntary subordination, authentic self, covenantal relationship, responsible morality, transcendental spirituality, and transforming influence. Similarly, Larry Spears, Executive Director of the Robert K. Greenleaf Center for Servant-Leadership, defined servant leadership as emphasizing "increased service to others; a holistic approach to work; promoting a sense of community; and the sharing of power in decision-making" (Spears, 1995). Recent research by Eva et al. (2019) proposes a three-component definition of servant leadership as: "an other-oriented approach to leadership manifested through one-on-one prioritizing of follower individual needs and interests, and outward reorienting of their concern for self towards concern for others within the organization and the larger community (Eva et al., 2019). This definition highlights the fundamental shift in focus from self to others that distinguishes servant leadership from other leadership approaches.

B. Theoretical Foundations

Servant leadership draws upon several theoretical foundations, including social exchange theory, social learning theory, and ethical leadership frameworks. From a social exchange perspective, servant leadership creates high-quality exchange relationships between leaders and followers based on trust, respect, and mutual obligation (Eva et al., 2019; Greenleaf, 1970). When leaders prioritize followers' needs and well-being, followers reciprocate with increased commitment, effort, and loyalty. Social learning theory provides another theoretical lens, suggesting that followers learn and adopt the servant leader's prosocial, other-oriented behaviors through observation (Sendjaya, 2015), modeling, and reinforcement (Sendjaya, 2015). This explains how servant leadership can create a cascading effect throughout an organization, fostering a culture of service and support. Ethical leadership frameworks also inform servant leadership theory, emphasizing the moral dimensions of leadership. Servant leaders demonstrate strong ethical principles, authenticity, and moral courage, which create psychological safety and ethical climate within organizations (Sendjaya, 2015; Greenleaf, 1970).

C. Employee Job Satisfaction - Conceptualization and Importance

Job satisfaction is a positive effect that an employee feels due to their assessment of their job experiences. It has a number of dimensions, including satisfaction with the work itself, supervision, co-workers, pay, and opportunities for advancement (Meyer & Allen, 1991). As an important workplace attitude, job satisfaction has been linked to several desirable outcomes, including increased productivity, organizational citizenship behaviors (Eva et al., 2019), and reduced turnover intentions (Asgar & Oino, 2017). The importance of job satisfaction extends beyond individual well-being to organizational effectiveness. Satisfied employees tend to be more engaged, productive, and committed to organizational goals (Eva et al., 2019). Conversely, low job satisfaction can lead to increased absenteeism, turnover, and reduced performance, ultimately affecting organizational success and sustainability.

D. Leadership Influences on Job Satisfaction

Research consistently demonstrates that leadership style significantly impacts employee job satisfaction. Servant leadership has been associated with higher job satisfaction via a number of mechanisms (Eva et al., 2019). Servant leaders, according to recent studies, drive job satisfaction in the workplace through values alignment, empowerment, open communication, personal and professional growth, recognition and appreciation (Eva et al., 2019). Comparative studies reveal that servant leadership can have a superior track record than other leadership forms in promoting job satisfaction. While transformational leadership has been shown to positively impact job satisfaction, particularly through intellectual stimulation and inspiration (Asgar & Oino, 2017), servant leadership's focus on individual followers' needs and well-being may provide other channels for enhancing job satisfaction (Eva et al., 2019).

E. Organizational Commitment

- Type and Significance: Organizational obligation refers to psychological involvement that employees feel to the organization. The three-component model of Meyer and Allen (1991) distinguishes between affective commitment (emotional attachment), continuance commitment (cost-based attachment), and normative commitment (obligation-based attachment). Of these, affective attachment has been directly associated with more organizational consequences than any other type of commitment, such as lower turnover, enhanced performance, and organizational citizenship behaviors. What is significant about organizational commitment is the fact that it is a predictor of many behaviors of employees that are advantageous for the organization. Highly committed workers are more prone to identify with organizational goals, apply extra effort on behalf of the organization, and have stronger intentions to remain in the organization (Godbersen et al., 2024). With the current day competitive business environment, where retaining talent is a major challenge, the determinants that enhance organizational commitment are more so necessary than ever before.
- Servant Leadership and organizational commitment: Recent research suggests that Servant Leadership is very effective for organizational commitment through various mechanisms. Meyer and Allen (1991) identify affective commitment as having the strongest association with servant leadership among the three commitment types (Eva et al., 2019). A study by Godbersen et al. (2024) suggests that dimensions of servant leadership influence commitment to supervisors, which in turn affects organizational commitment. These findings suggest a hierarchy among servant leadership dimensions in their influence on organizational commitment:
 - 1) First Priority Dimensions: Empowerment and stewardship have been shown the most important impact on engagement. Enablement and facilitation of subordinates' development by servant leaders who achieve higher organizational visions reflect stronger commitment (Godbersen et al., 2024).
 - 2) Second Priority Aspects: Humility, honesty, and forgiveness—qualities that entailed leaders

exposing themselves and embracing subordinates' and their own flaws—explain the second influence level (Godbersen et al., 2024).

- 3) Third Priority Aspects: Responsibility and return, where duties emphasize and avoid credit for performance, forming the third effect level (Godbersen et al., 2024).

This hierarchical model suggests that organizations seeking to increase commitment through servant leadership should prioritize the development of empowerment and stewardship behaviors in their leaders (Godbersen et al., 2024).

F. Integration of Theoretical Frameworks

- Mediating Mechanisms: A number of theoretical structures explain how Servant Leadership, job satisfaction and organizational commitment are linked at the same time. By demonstrating authenticity, ethical conduct, and genuine concern for followers, servant leaders build trust, which in turn enhances job satisfaction and organizational commitment (Godbersen et al., 2024). Such high-quality relationships increase job satisfaction and, in turn, organizational commitment. Social exchange theory also explains this interaction such that workers react positively to being treated well by servant leaders in terms of more satisfaction and commitment. Since the leader prioritizes employees' needs and well-being, the workers are obligated to reciprocate the same in the form of good behavior and attitude towards the leader and the organization.
- Cross-Industry Evidence: Empirical evidence from different industries suggests that the relationship between Servant Leadership, job satisfaction and organizational commitment may be different in different contexts. Within the health care system, the Servant Leadership has particularly performed well in relation to improving job satisfaction and commitment, possibly because the Servant Leadership leads the climate with morale of the health care system. Similarly, in education, servant leadership has been linked to stronger teacher commitment and job satisfaction, creating beneficial outcomes for both educators and institutions (Eva et al., 2019). In manufacturing and retail sectors, the effects of servant leadership are more modest, with organizational culture and industry-specific expectations potentially serving as moderating conditions (Asghar & Oino, 2017), suggesting the need for context-specific understanding of servant leadership's influence on employee outcomes.

G. Identified Research Gaps

Despite growing interest in servant leadership and its effect on employee outcomes, there are some noteworthy gaps in the literature:

- 1) Limited Cross-Industry Comparison: There are primarily studies on servant leadership in specific settings without comparing the impacts from various industries or sectors (Eva et al., 2019).
- 2) Lack of concern for mediating processes: Although the relationships between servant leadership and outcomes like job satisfaction and commitment have been

established, underlying psychological processes by which these associations are created still require investigation (Eva et al., 2019).

- 3) Lack of account for moderating influences: Limited research that performs mass checks of how organizational and individual factors can moderate in different references (Godbersen et al., 2024).
- 4) Methodological Limitations: Most research has been organized using designs across departments that limit the causes of conclusions on Servant Leadership results (Eva et al., 2019).

This review addresses these gaps by synthesizing evidence across industries to identify mediating mechanisms and boundary conditions, and by developing an integrative conceptual model.

III. THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK AND CONCEPTUAL MODEL

A. Development of the Conceptual Model

Based on the literature review, an integrated conceptual model is proposed to explain how Servant Leadership affects job satisfaction and organizational commitment in industries. This comprehensive model outlines key relationships, mediating processes, and moderating variables describing the complex dynamic among these variables. The model posits that servant leadership dimensions influence job satisfaction via different mediating processes, including trust, psychological empowerment, and prosocial identity. Job satisfaction, conversely, mediates the relationship between servant leadership and organizational commitment. Industry-specific and individual-level moderator variables, which augment or diminish such relations, are also included in the model.

B. Propositions

1) Direct Relationships

- a) Proposition 1: Servant leadership has a positive relationship with employee job satisfaction.

Literature repeatedly establishes that servant leadership enhances job satisfaction through various means (Eva et al., 2019; Godbersen et al., 2024). By putting employees' needs first, providing them with development support, and fostering a positive working environment, servant leaders create heightened satisfaction among subordinates. Particularly, the elements of empowerment and authenticity of servant leadership appear to be most closely related to job satisfaction (Melinda et al., 2019; Eva et al., 2019).

- b) Proposition 2: Servant leadership is positively related to organizational commitment.

Empirical evidence confirms that servant leadership ensures organizational commitment through the growth of psychological attachment between the organization and the employees (Godbersen et al., 2024). Empowering, stewardship, and authentic servant leaders facilitate higher affective and normative commitment towards the followers, slowing down turnover intentions and loyalty boosts (Godbersen et al., 2024).

2) Mediating Relationships

- a) Proposition 3: Job satisfaction mediates the relationship between servant leadership and organizational commitment.

Even though servant leadership directly affects organizational commitment, its effect is mediated by job satisfaction to some degree (Asghar & Oino, 2017). Servant leadership enhances the job satisfaction of employees with their workplace, supervision, and growth opportunities, which eventually increases their organizational commitment.

- b) Proposition 4: Trust in leader mediates the relationship between servant leadership and job satisfaction.

Servant leadership fosters trust by demonstrating authenticity, ethical conduct, and genuine concern for followers (Greenleaf, 1970). Such trust enhances satisfaction at work by creating psychological safety and reducing workplace ambiguity.

- c) Proposition 5: Psychological empowerment acts as a mediator between servant leadership and job satisfaction.

Servant leaders empower subordinates by providing autonomy, opportunities for growth, and meaningful work (Eva et al., 2019). This psychological empowerment enhances intrinsic motivation and satisfaction at work.

3) Moderating Relationships

- a) Proposition 6: Strength and nature of servant leadership-job satisfaction relationship differ across industries.

Industry-specific factors, e.g., work demands, professional norms, and organizational culture, act as moderators for the influence of servant leadership on job satisfaction (Asghar & Oino, 2017). For example, servant leadership might be more influential in highly interactive industries (education, healthcare) compared to production-oriented industries.

- b) Proposition 7: The effects of individual difference in followers' expectations and values moderate the relationship between servant leadership and job satisfaction.

Those employees with stronger prosocial values and service orientation may respond more positively to servant leadership behavior, being more satisfied when being served by servant leaders (Eva et al., 2019).

IV. METHODOLOGY

A. Approach: Systematic Literature Review

This theoretical review uses a systematic literature review that works to synthesize existing research on Servant Leadership, job satisfaction and organizational commitment. A systematic literature review provides a structured, organized and transparent process to identify, select and evaluate relevant research studies to answer specific research questions (Tranfield et al., 2003). This approach ensures that the literature review is comprehensive, reproducible and reduces bias in selection and interpretation of studies. The review follows the Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses (PRISMA) guidelines (Page et

al., 2021), which provide a standardized framework for conducting and reporting systematic reviews (Tranfield et al., 2003). While PRISMA was originally developed for quantitative health research, the PRISMA-ScR extension supports its application to scoping and qualitative syntheses such as this leadership review (Page et al., 2021).

B. Selection Criteria

Studies were included if they met the following criteria:

- Peer-Review Journal articles or high-quality academic books published between 2000 and 2025,
- Empirical studies, theoretical articles, or meta-analyses addressing the relationship between servant leadership and job satisfaction, organizational commitment, or both,
- Studies conducted in different industrial contexts,
- Publication in English

Studies were excluded if they:

- Studies that examined other leadership styles without any comparison to servant leadership
- Non-peer-reviewed publications, conference proceedings, or unpublished dissertations
- Studies that did not address the relationship between servant leadership and at least one outcome variable (job satisfaction or organizational commitment)

The synthesis of the findings used a narrative approach, especially suitable for integrating studies with diverse functions and concepts (Tranfield et al., 2003). Studies in this approach include identifying general subjects, patterns and anomalies, as well as assessing how conclusions vary in different industrial contexts. In addition, the synthesis process involves comparing and contrasting different Servant Leadership concepts, to identify which dimensions affect the strongest job satisfaction and organizational commitment. Implementation mechanisms were particularly noted that explain how Servant Leadership affects these consequences and relevant factors that moderate these conditions.

V. SYNTHESIS OF LITERATURE AND DISCUSSION OF FINDINGS

A. Aggregate Findings Across Studies

This systematic review reveals consistent evidence of positive relationships between servant leadership and both job satisfaction and organizational commitment across industries. However, the strength of these relationships and the specific mechanisms through which they operate vary by context.

B. Servant Leadership and Job Satisfaction

Throughout research, servant leadership demonstrates a consistently positive relationship with job satisfaction, with moderate to large effect sizes being reported in most empirical studies. The most influential dimensions of servant leadership in enhancing job satisfaction appear to be empowerment, authenticity, and interpersonal acceptance (Melinda et al., 2019). These dimensions create work environments with autonomy, psychological safety, and support, which satisfy employees' basic psychological needs. The relationship between servant leadership and job satisfaction appears quite strong in-service sectors such as education and healthcare. This may reflect the alignment of

servant leadership values with the service-oriented culture that permeates these sectors. In manufacturing and retail settings, while the relationship is positive, its strength appears to be somewhat dampened, suggesting the presence of contextual effects (Asghar & Oino, 2017).

C. Servant Leadership and Organizational Commitment

Similarly, servant leadership has uniformly positive associations with organizational commitment across studies (Godbersen et al., 2024). The relationship is strongest with affective commitment, moderate with normative commitment, and weakest with continuance commitment (Godbersen et al., 2024). This pattern suggests that servant leadership primarily enhances emotional attachment to the organization but not calculative or obligation-based attachment. Those servant leadership aspects that are most strongly related to organizational commitment are empowerment, stewardship, and authenticity (Godbersen et al., 2024). These aspects foster psychological ownership, align employees with organizational missions, and reinforce authentic connections that enhance commitment. Similar to job satisfaction, the connection between servant leadership and organizational commitment varies across industries. In knowledge-based industries (such as education, technology), servant leadership is most significantly linked with commitment, maybe indicating the value of autonomy and training in such settings (Godbersen et al., 2024).

VI. THEORETICAL INTEGRATION

A. Mediating Mechanisms

Literature synthesis describes a number of mediating mechanisms that are instrumental in explaining servant leadership's effects on job satisfaction and organizational commitment:

- 1) **Trust:** Trust is fostered by servant leadership through evidenced authenticity, ethical leadership, and heartfelt care for the followers (Greenleaf, 1970). This trust helps in establishing psychological safety and eliminates uncertainty, resulting in increased job satisfaction and thus organizational commitment.
- 2) **Psychological Empowerment:** By autonomy, meaning, competence, and impact, servant leaders enhance followers' psychological empowerment (Eva et al., 2019). This empowerment satisfies fundamental psychological needs and increases intrinsic motivation and job satisfaction.
- 3) **Prosocial Identity:** Servant leadership activates and deepens followers' prosocial identities by modeling and encouraging helping behavior (Eva et al., 2019). This prosocial identity increases meaning and purpose in work that generates satisfaction and commitment.
- 4) **Leader-Member Exchange Quality:** Servant leadership yields high-quality exchange relationships with mutual respect, trust, and obligation (Greenleaf, 1970). High-quality relationships enhance job satisfaction and commitment by offering more support, resources, and consideration.

The integrated model suggests that these mediating processes operate sequentially in a way that servant leadership builds trust and psychological empowerment first,

which enhance job satisfaction, consequently increasing organizational commitment. This sequential mediation model is enlightening in delineating the complex psychological processes through which servant leadership indirectly influences organizational commitment.

B. Industry-Specific Factors

The integration reveals strong industry-specific factors that moderate the relationships between servant leadership, job satisfaction, and organizational commitment:

- 1) **Service-Oriented Sectors:** Servant leadership in education, healthcare, and hospitality demonstrates particularly remarkable effects on commitment and satisfaction (Eva et al., 2019). It may be the alignment of servant leadership values with service ethics or the focus on interpersonal relationships within these environments.
- 2) **Knowledge-Intensive Industries:** In technology services, research, and professions, servant leadership boosts commitment and satisfaction primarily due to development and empowerment (Godbersen et al., 2024). Development and independence become particularly precious in these kinds of scenarios.
- 3) **Production-Oriented Industries:** At the production and manufacturing levels, servant leadership influences satisfaction and commitment by different mechanisms, where procedural justice and fair treatment are given more importance (Asghar & Oino, 2017). The emphasis on tangible outcomes in such industries may compel servant leaders to demonstrate how their style brings about performance and fairness.
- 4) **Public vs. Private Sectors:** The servant leadership-employee outcome relationship is more evident in public sector organizations, possibly a reflection of the service orientation and community focus typical of public service (Godbersen et al., 2024).

These sector-specific findings suggest that the effectiveness of servant leadership may be context-specific, with the necessity of adapting its application to specific industrial environments instead of using a one-size-fits-all solution.

VII. IMPLICATIONS FOR THEORY AND PRACTICE

A. Theoretical Implications

This theoretical combination and systematic review contribute to leadership theory in the following primary ways:

- 1) **Contextual Insight:** The synthesis of findings across industries encourages adaptation of servant leadership approaches to industry-specific dynamics rather than applying a uniform model.
- 2) **Mediational Mechanism:** The discovery of many mediating mechanisms gives a more complete account of the mechanism, which the Servant Leadership affects the employees' results, and fulfills the former knowledge intervals on these psychological processes.
- 3) **Dimensional Meaningfulness:** Some dimensions of Servant Leadership (especially empowerment, authenticity and stewardship) have more impact on employees, which means that the Servant Leadership needs to embrace a more sophisticated leadership.

- 4) **Theoretical Refinement:** The synthesized findings support a sequential mediation model in which job satisfaction acts as a mediator of the servant leadership–organizational commitment relationship, refining existing theoretical frameworks.

B. Practice Implications

For organizations and leaders, this theoretical integration offers different practical implications:

- 1) **Leadership Behavior Prioritization:** Organizations should prioritize the development of servant leadership behaviors most impactful in influencing employee outcomes, most notably empowerment, authenticity, and stewardship (Godbersen et al., 2024).
- 2) **Industry-Specific Implementations:** Implementation of servant leadership should be adapted to specific industrial management, prefer different dimensions based on industry characteristics and requirements (Asghar & Oino, 2017).
- 3) **Mediating Mechanisms Development:** In addition to developing service behavior, organizations must develop mediating mechanisms (psychological empowerment, trust) to translate behavior into better employee results (Eva et al., 2019; Godbersen et al., 2024).
- 4) **Leadership Selection Considerations:** Organizations may consider individual characteristics associated with servant leadership (organizational identification, self-esteem, agreeableness) when selecting leaders, particularly where servant leadership excels (Godbersen et al., 2024).
- 5) **Measurement and Evaluation:** The differentiated outcomes of servant leadership dimensions suggest the need for more nuanced measurement and evaluation of leadership effectiveness in terms of particular behaviors and not mere general perceptions.

VIII. LIMITATIONS AND FUTURE RESEARCH DIRECTIONS

A. Limitations

Theoretical study has some limitations that should be mentioned:

- 1) **Dependence on Secondary Data:** Being a literature-based review, this research depends solely on secondary data and existing research, which can exhibit publication bias in favor of positive results and meaningful associations (Eva et al., 2019).
- 2) **Methodological Variety:** The synthesized studies employ varied methodological approaches and measurement instruments for servant leadership, job satisfaction, and organizational commitment, making direct comparisons across studies challenging (Eva et al., 2019).
- 3) **Causal Inferences:** Most synthesized studies rely on cross-sectional designs (Eva et al., 2019), which limits the ability to draw causal conclusions about servant leadership's effects on employee outcomes.
- 4) **Contextual Limitations:** Although this review aims to integrate findings across industries, the available literature is disproportionately concentrated in healthcare and education, with fewer studies in other sectors.
- 5) **Cultural Factors:** This review does not fully account for potential cultural differences in the effectiveness of

servant leadership, which may influence its relationship with employee outcomes.

B. Directions for Future Research

Based on this review's results and limitations, some suggestions for future research directions are made:

- 1) **Longitudinal Studies:** Future studies should include longitudinal designs to detect the cause between Servant Leadership, job satisfaction and organizational commitment, and how they vary over time (Meyer & Allen, 1991).
- 2) **Comparative Industry Studies:** Using similar measures and functions will provide stronger evidence of the relevant differences that compare the effectiveness of Servant Leadership in industries.
- 3) **Multi-Level Analyses:** Studies that examine how organizational, team, and individual variables simultaneously affect the effectiveness of servant leadership at the same time will provide a more comprehensive picture of these complex conditions.
- 4) **Dimensional Effects:** The study of the effect of specific dimensions of Servant Leadership and their differences in different employees' results will deepen our understanding that the dimensions of Servant Leadership are the most important in different contexts.
- 5) **Cultural Variations:** The study of cultural criteria and values will increase the efficiency of Servant Leadership; the server will increase the cross-cultural generality of leadership theory.
- 6) **Negative Effects:** More research on potential negative or unexpected results of Servant Leadership, e.g. .
- 7) **Integration with Other Theories:** How servant leadership can be integrated with other leadership approaches (e.g., transformational, authentic leadership), its study will provide practical recommendations to create extensive management models.

IX. CONCLUSION

The findings of this theoretical analysis highlight the enormous capacity of Servant Leadership to strengthen employees' satisfaction and involvement in various organizational contexts. By prioritizing followers, empowering others, and modeling authenticity, servant leaders create organizational environments that meet basic psychological needs and stimulate high levels of emotional commitment to organizations. The contextual variations that were identified in this review, however, suggest that servant leadership does not need to be thought of as a panacea but adapted for industrial contexts and organizational needs. Organizations that intend to implement servant leadership need to be attentive to their unique context, prioritize the most important dimensions, and build the mediating mechanisms that can convert the leader behaviors into improved employee outcomes. With the evolving business landscape, with increasing focus on employees' well-being, purpose, and meaning at work, servant leadership has tremendous potential for creating more humane, satisfying, and committed workplaces. Further empirical examination of the model integrated in this review would better inform us on how servant leadership should be practiced in different organizational contexts.

REFERENCES

- [1] Asghar, S., & Oino, I. (2017). *Leadership styles and job satisfaction*. MPRA Paper No. 91137. University Library of Munich, Germany. <https://mpra.ub.uni-muenchen.de/91137/>
- [2] 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. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.leaqua.2018.07.004>
- [3] Greenleaf, R. K. (1970). The servant as leader. The Greenleaf Center for Servant Leadership.
- [4] Godbersen, H., Dudek, B., & Ruiz Fernández, S. (2024). The relationship between organizational commitment, commitment to supervisor and servant leadership. *Frontiers in Organizational Psychology*, 2, Article 1353959. <https://doi.org/10.3389/forgp.2024.1353959>
- [5] Melinda, T., Antonio, T., & Sihaloho, C. T. (2019). Servant leadership dimension in higher education. *Advances in Economics, Business and Management Research*, 100, 677–681. <https://doi.org/10.2991/icoi-19.2019.118>
- [6] Meyer, J. P., & Allen, N. J. (1991). A three-component conceptualization of organizational commitment. *Human Resource Management Review*, 1(1), 61-89. [https://doi.org/10.1016/1053-4822\(91\)90011-Z](https://doi.org/10.1016/1053-4822(91)90011-Z)
- [7] Page, M. J., McKenzie, J. E., Bossuyt, P. M., Boutron, I., Hoffmann, T. C., Mulrow, C. D., Shamseer, L., Tetzlaff, J. M., Akl, E. A., Brennan, S. E., Chou, R., Glud, C., Mayo-Wilson, E., McDonald, S., McGuinness, L. A., Stewart, L. A., Thomas, J., Tricco, A. C., Welch, V. A., & Moher, D. (2021). The PRISMA 2020 statement: An updated guideline for reporting systematic reviews. *BMJ*, 372, Article n71. <https://doi.org/10.1136/bmj.n71>
- [8] Sendjaya, S. (2015). Personal and organizational excellence through servant leadership: Learning to serve, serving to lead. *Springer*.
- [9] Spears, L. C. (Ed.). (1995). Reflections on leadership: How Robert K. Greenleaf's theory of servant-leadership influenced today's top management thinkers. Wiley.
- [10] Tranfield, D., Denyer, D., & Smart, P. (2003). Towards a methodology for developing evidence-informed management knowledge by means of systematic review. *British Journal of Management*, 14(3), 207–222. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1467-8551.00375>