



INSAN

Jurnal Psikologi dan Kesehatan Mental

<http://e-journal.unair.ac.id/index.php/JPKM>

p-ISSN 2528-0104 | e-ISSN 2528-5181



RESEARCH ARTICLE / ARTIKEL PENELITIAN

The Role of Stress Coping as a Moderator between Toxic Leadership and Turnover Intention in Millennial Workers

CHERYL GRACIANA YULIANTO, FAJRIANTHI, & SAMIAN

Fakultas Psikologi, Universitas Airlangga, Surabaya, Indonesia

ABSTRACT

Currently, the turnover intention rate among millennial employees is high. Toxic leadership is one of the reasons for this high turnover intention rate. Toxic leadership can lead to a depletion of employee resources, encouraging them to leave the workplace. Based on the Conservation of Resources theory, this research aims to determine the role of coping stress as a moderator in the influence of toxic leadership on turnover intention. Participants consisted of 43 employees from PT X. The sampling technique used was purposive sampling. The instruments used were the toxic leadership scale, the Brief COPE, and the turnover intention scale. The results of the data analysis using the PROCESS MACRO by Hayes model 1 indicate that coping with stress does not moderate the influence of toxic leadership on Turnover Intention. This research is expected to provide information regarding the impact of toxic leadership on turnover intention, especially among millennial workers.

Keywords: coping stress, millennial worker, toxic leadership, turnover intention

ABSTRAK

Saat ini, tingkat *turnover* di kalangan karyawan milenial cukup tinggi. *Toxic Leadership* menjadi salah satu penyebab tingginya tingkat *turnover intention* ini. Oleh karena itu, merujuk pada *Conservation of Resource theory*, penelitian ini bertujuan untuk mengetahui peran *coping stress* sebagai moderator dalam pengaruh *toxic leadership* terhadap *turnover intention*. Partisipan dalam penelitian ini adalah karyawan PT X (N=43). Teknik sampling yang digunakan adalah *purposive sampling*. Instrumen yang digunakan adalah *toxic leadership scale*, *Brief COPE*, dan *turnover intention scale*. Analisis data menggunakan PROCESS MACRO by Hayes model 1. Hasil penelitian menunjukkan bahwa *coping stress* tidak memoderasi pengaruh *toxic leadership* terhadap *turnover intention*. Temuan penelitian ini menunjukkan bahwa *toxic leadership* dapat meningkatkan *turnover intention* sehingga organisasi perlu untuk memperhatikan hal ini. Penelitian ini diharapkan dapat memberikan informasi mengenai dampak *toxic leadership* terhadap *turnover intention*, khususnya pada karyawan milenial.

Kata kunci: karyawan milenial, kepemimpinan toksik, coping stres, turnover intention

INSAN Jurnal Psikologi dan Kesehatan Mental, 2024, Vol. 9(1), 59-81, doi: 10.20473/jpkm.v9i12024.59-81

Submitted: 02/03/24 Accepted: 24/04/24 Published: 28/06/2024

Editor: Rahkman Ardi

*Corresponding Author's Email: fajrianthi@psikologi.unair.ac.id



This manuscript is under the open access policies and the Creative Common Attribution License (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0>); therefore, any use, distribution, and reproduction of this article, in any media, is not restricted as long as its original source is properly cited.

INTRODUCTION

Employee turnover is a complex phenomenon that can be natural, healthy, and even beneficial to the organization, especially when the employees who leave are those who failed to achieve targets or have poor performance. Conversely, losing important and critically talented employees can be problematic or even devastating to an organization (Ju & Li, 2019). Employee turnover refers to the situation in which an employee leaves the organization. Employee turnover can be voluntary when they voluntarily resign and leave the former organization (Hung et al., 2018). Meanwhile, turnover intention is the process of an individual evaluating their current job, weighing the costs and benefits, and deciding whether they have to leave or not (Mobley, 1977). Researchers often use turnover intention to measure actual employee turnover (Fazio et al., 2017; Lazzari et al., 2022).

Although turnover can be beneficial, high turnover rates have been a major problem for the industry for years (Alias et al., 2018). For several years, most employees in Southeast Asia have reported increasing turnover rates, especially at the mid-career level (Mercer, 2021). According to the State of the Global Workplace: 2023 Report, Southeast Asian respondents had a turnover intention rate of 51%, with 55% of respondents under the age of 40 (Gallup, 2023). In addition, businesses are currently facing challenges in retaining millennial or generation Y employees (Campioni, 2015). The Dale Carnegie Indonesia survey (2018) was conducted with more than 1,200 respondents (more than 600 millennial employees and 600 non-millennial employees) located in six major cities, namely Surabaya, Balikpapan, Medan, Jakarta, Makassar, and Bandung. The survey aims to determine the level of employee engagement in Indonesia, particularly in big cities. The survey results showed that only one in four millennials feel engaged, and 64% of them would stay for the upcoming year. Conversely, 60% of millennial employees planned to resign if they no longer feel engaged.

This issue occurred at PT X, namely a decrease in the number of employees and an increase in turnover. PT X is a company engaged in the gas sector located in Gresik, Indonesia. Based on annual headcount data obtained from their Human Capital, there has been an increase in turnover over the past three years (2021 – 2023). Data on the number of employees in 3 years can be seen in Table 1.

Table 1. Data on the number of employees at PT X

Year	Number of Employees	Number of Employee Exits	Turnover rate (%)
2021	61	5	8,4%
2022	58	4	6,9%
2023	57	7	12,7%

Source: PT. X Human Capital

The ideal turnover rate, according to Gallup, is 10% (Smith & Rutigliano, 2002), while in 2023 the turnover rate reached 12.7%. We need to scrutinize the turnover rate at PT X in 2023 in relation to the ideal rate.

Research by Wong et al. (2015) showed that employees who want to leave the company have poor performance. For some companies, turnover intention is more harmful than actual turnover because employees who want to leave the company become unfocused on their work and do not have the enthusiasm to stay with the company (Suyono et al., 2020). In addition, companies must bear the time and material costs of advertising, recruiting, and training replacements. High turnover rates can also negatively affect the morale of remaining employees, especially if positive team dynamics are important at work (Ertas, 2015).

Leadership style is one of the reasons for turnover intentions. Not everyone is a good leader. Many studies have examined the relationship between leadership and turnover intention in employees

(Hattab et al., 2022). Positive leadership contributes to lowering turnover intention (Ariyabuddhiphongs & Kahn, 2017; Park & Pierce, 2020). Conversely, poor leadership exemplifies non-productive behavior in organizations (Hadadian & Zarei, 2016) and can increase turnover intention among employees (Hattab et al., 2022).

Toxic leadership is a poor leadership style that contributes to the development of turnover intention (Hattab et al., 2022; Labrague et al., 2020; Paltu & Brouwers, 2020; Sim et al., 2021). Schmidt and Hanges (2008) defined toxic leadership as narcissistic, self-promoting, exhibiting abusive and authoritarian supervisory patterns, and unpredictable. PT X was known for its toxic leadership practices. According to one of the employees of PT X, during their work, they encountered the practice of toxic leadership, which became one of the factors for them to quit their jobs. The behavior included demeaning their subordinates and expressing anger for no reason.

For millennial employees, avoiding toxic leaders in their job preferences is crucial. Bhandarker and Rai (2019) stated that respondents working under toxic leadership reported higher levels of anger, resentment, and frustration, followed by insecurity and even detachment from work. To cope with stress and negative emotions caused by toxic leadership, employees develop stress coping skills (Bhandarker & Rai, 2019). Stress coping is defined as efforts to prevent or reduce threats, dangers, and losses, or to reduce the distress often associated with such experiences (Carver, 2013). People employ coping mechanisms to handle stressful situations, specifically those brought on by toxic leadership.

When people believe there are constructive actions or steps they can take, they tend to use problem-focused coping (Carver, 2013). This coping appears to reduce stress experience (Harney & Lerman, 2021) and the desire to quit the job (Xie & Zheng, 2022). Webster et al. (2014) found that the most frequently used ways to cope with toxic leadership were seeking social support, taking time off, contemplating, and even confronting their leaders. Webster et al. (2014) found that employees commonly use emotion-focused coping, even though it may be considered maladaptive when they feel powerless to prevent continuous toxic behavior, which can lead to losses if not addressed. In addition, it was also found that when employees do not feel supported by the organization and are in an uncontrollable situation, they tend to focus on avoidance, such as taking time off. Employees who choose to remain at work and are unable to face or leave leader toxicity report serious health problems, feelings of helplessness, and long-term impacts (Webster et al., 2014).

According to the Conservation of Resource Theory, continuous toxic leadership can threaten and even erode subordinates' psychological resources, so employees must accept high psychological losses. Exposure to toxic leadership can trigger employees' desire to withdraw and even leave their current work environment (Hsu et al., 2021). However, according to CoR Theory, some individuals take active steps to protect their resources in the face of threats, especially those who have a lot of resources. Individuals with few resources, on the other hand, prefer to save or reserve their resources rather than invest them (Hobfoll & Ford, 2007). This is the basis for seeing whether coping can moderate the effect of toxic leadership on turnover intention. While there have been many studies and empirical evidence on the resource gains received from positive leadership, there is only a small amount of research using CoR Theory to explain the impact of negative leadership behaviors (Schmidt, 2014).

Although several studies have examined the effect of toxic leadership on turnover intention, the relationship between these variables still requires further research. In addition, there are still very few studies that use moderators in their analysis, especially variables that can reduce the impact of toxic leadership on victims (Pradhan & Jena, 2016). According to Müller-Bloch & Kranz (2015), there exists a gap in the application theory, particularly when it comes to explaining phenomena. This study's purpose is to look at how toxic leadership affects employee's plans to leave, using coping stress as a moderator and the Conservation of Resource Theory to support this.

METHOD

Research Design

This research uses a quantitative approach based on cross-sectional survey. This approach aims to examine the impact of toxic leadership on turnover intention among millennial employees, as well as the role of coping stress as a moderator.

Participants

The population of this study consisted of employees of PT X in Gresik with inclusion criteria, namely employees born between 1980 and 2000 and who are full-time employees (Ahn & Chaoyu, 2019). All participants have signed an informed consent sheet stating their agreement to participate. Informed consent includes the purpose of the study, researcher contact information, participant rights (such as confidentiality and the right to withdraw from the study), and voluntary participation.

The calculation of the minimum sample size used G*Power 3.1 software (Faul et al., 2009). Parameter calculation using statistical test F-test: Linear Multiple Regression, Fixed Model, R-squared deviation from zero from predictor correlation and with the a priori method. It included a total of 7 predictors: toxic leadership and turnover intention of 0.27 (X to Y) (Hattab et al, 2022); problem-focused coping and turnover intention by 0.25 (Z1 to Y) (Lewin & Sager, 2010); emotion-focused coping and turnover intention by 0.2 (Z2 to Y) (Lewin & Sager, 2010); and dysfunctional coping and turnover intention by 0,469 (Z3 to Y) (Huang et al., 2018), the multiplication of X to Y and Z1 to Y is 0.067, the multiplication of X to Y and Z2 to Y is 0.05, and for the multiplication of X to Y and Z3 to Y is 0.12. The analysis was conducted by entering a power value of 0.95 and an $\alpha=0.05$ value. Based on this calculation, the estimated sample size was 39 participants. Purposive sampling was used in the study, involving 43 employees.

The study describes the participants based on several sociodemographic variables: 90.7% are male, 39.5% are between 30 and 34 years old, 69.8% are married, 69.8% have a bachelor's degree and/or diploma IV, 64.3% are permanent employees, and 41.9% earn an income (IDR) of 4,000,000 to 5,999,999.

Table 2. Sociodemographic Characteristics of Participants

Characteristics	Frequency	Percentage (%)
Sex		
Male	39	90.7 %
Female	4	9.3 %
Age		
< 25 years	3	7.0 %
25-29 years	9	20.9 %
30-34 years	17	39.5 %
35-39 years	9	23.3 %
> 39 years	5	20.9 %
Marital Status		
Single	13	30.2 %
Married	30	69.8 %
Latest Education		
High School	8	18.6 %
Diploma I/II/III	2	4.7 %
Diploma IV/Undergraduate	30	69.8 %
Magister	3	7.0 %
Employment Status		

Contract	15	35.7 %
Permanent	28	64.3 %
Income (IDR)		
4,000,000-5,999,999	18	41.9 %
6,000,000-7,999,999	15	34.9 %
>8,000,000	10	23.3 %

Note. N=43

Measurements

Schmidt & Hanges (2008) developed the Toxic Leadership Scale, and Hattab et al. adapted it for use in Indonesia. This scale measures employees' experiences with their direct leader's destructive behaviors. The scale consists of 5 dimensions (abusive supervision, authoritarian leadership, narcissism, self-promotion, and unpredictability) and 30 statements with 5 options, namely (1) never, (2) rarely, (3) sometimes, (4) often, and (5) always. This scale provides a total score. This study's Toxic Leadership Scale has a reliability coefficient of 0.988.

Carver's (1997) Brief COPE questionnaire, researched and adapted by Siaputra et al. (2023) into Bahasa Indonesia, measures a person's coping strategy. The scale consists of 3 dimensions (problem-focused coping, emotional-focused coping, dysfunctional coping), 28 statements with 4 answer options, (0) never, (1) sometimes, (2) often, and (3) very often. This study measured stress coping across multiple dimensions. and found the COPE Brief to have a reliability coefficient of 0.803.

Mobley et al. (1979) developed the Turnover Intention Scale, further developed by Sheweng (2011, in Hijriyana, 2023), and in Indonesia has been adapted and used in Hijriyana's research (2023). This scale measures employees' intention to voluntarily leave the organization or workplace in the last six months. The scale consists of 3 dimensions (thinking of quitting, intention to search for alternatives, and intention to quit), 12 statements with 6 options: (1) strongly disagree, (2) disagree, (3) disagree, (4) moderately agree, and (5) agree. For this scale, we can obtain a total score. This study's Turnover Intention Scale has a reliability coefficient of 0.951.

This study also used two attention check items to identify participants who were less attentive in completing the questionnaire. The data analysis did not include participants who failed the attention check items (Hattab et al., 2022).

Data Analysis

The researchers analyzed the data using SPSS version 23 software. The researchers conducted a simple linear regression test and a moderation regression analysis test, utilizing Andrew F. Hayes' PROCESS MACRO model 1 to see the role of coping stress as a moderator between toxic leadership and turnover intention in millennial employees.

RESULTS

The results of descriptive statistical analysis showed the mean and standard deviation of each variable. A Correlation Matrix aims to determine the relationship between variables. The results of the correlation test of the dependent, independent, and moderator variables using Pearson and the control variable using Spearman could be seen in Table 3.

Table 3. Correlation Matrix Between Variables

Variabel	Mean (SD)	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
Gender	1.91 (0.294)	1									
Marital Status	1.70 (0.465)	-0.036	1								
Edu	2.65 (0.870)	-0.360*	-0.221	1							
Work Status	1.65 (0.482)	0.102	0.156	0.070	1						
Salary	1.81 (0.794)	0.029	0.227	0.235	0.369*	1					
Age	32.95 (5.546)	0.076	0.370**	-0.179	0.287*	0.362**	1				
TL	2.8998 (1.32)	0.155	-0.304*	0.331**	0.039	0.080	0.005	1			
PFC	1.9267 (0.470)	-0.011	-0.142	0.237*	-0.218	-0.013	-0.261*	0.266	1		
EFC	1.8860 (0.6048)	-0.065	-0.267*	0.393**	-0.140	0.132	-0.176	0.467**	0.765**	1	
DC	0.9828 (0.431)	0.000	-0.310	0.295*	-0.209	-0.042	-0.286*	0.471**	0.411**	0.443**	1
TI	3.4542 (1.261)	-0.132	-0.153	0.452**	0.105	-0.052	-0.106	0.571**	0.296	0.377*	0.356*

Notes. * $p < 0.05$, ** $p < 0.01$, *** $p < 0.001$, $N = 43$, gender (1=female, 2=male), marital status (1=single, 2=married), education (1=high school to 4=Strata 2), work status (1=contract, 2=permanent), salary (1=4,000,000-5,999,999, 2=6,000,000-7,999,999, 3=above 8,000,000). Edu=education, TI=Turnover Intention, TL=Toxic Leadership, PFC=Problem-Focused Coping, EFC=Emotion-Focused Coping, DC=Dysfunctional Coping.

In Table 3, it can be seen that the last education level variable is significantly correlated with TI (0.452, $p < 0.05$). Thus, the variable is then used as a covariate/control variable.

Table 4. Linear Regression Test

Predictor	Estimate	SE	t	p	Stand. Estimate
Intercept	1.875	0.389	4.820	0.000	
Toxic Leadership	0.545	0.122	4.453	0.000	0.571

Model	R	R ²	Adjusted R ²
1	0.571	0.326	0.10

In Table 4, the results of the linear regression analysis showed the consistent value of turnover intention is 1.875, and for every one unit increase in toxic leadership, turnover intention will increase by 0.545. The positive estimate value (0.545) indicated that if toxic leadership increases, turnover intention will also increase. The p value < 0.05 indicated that there is an influence between toxic leadership and turnover intention. This suggested that toxic leadership affects turnover intention by 32.6%, while the other 67.4% is explained by other variables not examined in this study. The analysis revealed that toxic leadership has a positive and significant effect on turnover intention.

Table 5. Moderation Test Results PROCESS MACRO by Andrew F. HAYES, Problem-Focused Coping as Moderator

Model 1	β	<i>se</i>	<i>t</i>	<i>p</i>	<i>LLCI</i>	<i>ULCI</i>
<i>Constant</i>	2.76	1.52	1.81	0.08	-0.34	5.85
<i>TL</i>	0.39	0.14	2.70	0.01	0.10	0.68
<i>PFC</i>	0.50	0.52	0.96	0.34	-0.55	1.55
<i>Int_1</i>	-0.20	0.27	-0.76	0.45	-0.75	0.34
<i>Edu.</i>	0.69	0.21	3.29	0.00	0.26	1.11
<i>Age</i>	-0.01	0.03	-0.21	0.84	-0.07	0.05
<i>EFC</i>	-0.49	0.45	-1.07	0.29	-1.41	0.44
<i>DC</i>	0.03	0.43	0.08	0.94	-0.84	0.91
<i>R²</i>	0.52					
<i>F</i>	5.46					
<i>Df1</i>	7.00					
<i>Df2</i>	35.00					
<i>p</i>	0.00					
<i>Int_1</i>						
<i>R²-chng</i>	0.01					
<i>F</i>	0.57					

Note. TL=Toxic Leadership, PFC=Problem-Focused Coping, EFC=Emotion-Focused Coping, DC=Dysfunctional Coping, edu=education

Table 5 showed that the interaction between toxic leadership and problem-focused coping as a moderator on turnover intention is not significant (see *Int_1*, $\beta=-0.20$, $p>0.05$) when controlling for emotion-focused coping, dysfunctional coping, and the last level of education. The results of this moderation test indicated that problem-focused coping does not moderate the effect of toxic leadership on turnover intention.

Table 6. Moderation Test PROCESS MACRO by Andrew F. HAYES, Emotion-Focused Coping as Moderator

Model 1	β	<i>se</i>	<i>t</i>	<i>p</i>	<i>LLCI</i>	<i>ULCI</i>
<i>Constant</i>	0.48	1.31	0.37	0.71	-2.17	3.14
<i>TL</i>	0.41	0.14	2.83	0.01	0.11	0.70
<i>EFC</i>	-0.46	0.45	-1.04	0.31	-1.37	0.44
<i>Int_1</i>	-0.21	0.22	-0.95	0.35	-0.65	0.23
<i>Edu.</i>	0.68	0.21	3.26	0.00	0.25	1.10
<i>Mar.</i>	0.18	0.35	0.51	0.61	-0.53	0.88
<i>PFC</i>	0.46	0.50	0.92	0.36	-0.55	1.48
<i>DC</i>	0.06	0.41	0.15	0.88	-0.77	0.90
<i>R²</i>	0.53					
<i>F</i>	5.60					
<i>Df1</i>	7.00					
<i>Df2</i>	35.00					
<i>p</i>	0.00					
<i>Int_1</i>						
<i>R²-chng</i>	0.01					
<i>F</i>	0.91					

Note. TL=Toxic Leadership, PFC=Problem-Focused Coping, EFC=Emotion-Focused Coping, DC=Dysfunctional Coping, edu=education, mar=marital status

Table 6 showed that the interaction between toxic leadership and emotion-focused coping as a moderator on turnover intention is not significant (see Int_1, $\beta=-0.21$, $p>0.05$) when controlling for problem-focused coping, dysfunctional coping, and the last level of education. The results of this moderation test indicated that emotion-focused coping does not moderate the effect of toxic leadership on turnover intention.

Table 7. Moderation Test Results PROCESS MACRO by Andrew F. HAYES, Dysfunctional Coping as a Moderator

Model 1	β	se	t	p	LLCI	ULCI
Constant	1.52	1.47	1.03	0.31	-1.46	4.49
TL	0.42	0.15	2.78	0.01	0.11	0.72
DC	-0.24	0.53	-0.46	0.65	-1.31	0.83
Int_1	0.29	0.33	0.88	0.38	-0.38	0.97
Edu.	0.73	0.21	3.47	0.00	0.30	1.15
Age	-0.01	0.03	-0.30	0.77	-0.07	0.05
PFC	0.46	0.51	0.90	0.38	-0.58	1.50
EFC	-0.34	-0.77	0.44	0.44	-1.24	0.55
R ²	0.52					
F	5.52					
Df1	7.00					
Df2	35.00					
p	0.00					
Int_1						
R ² -chng	0.01					
F	0.78					

Note. TL=Toxic Leadership, PFC=Problem-Focused Coping, EFC=Emotion-Focused Coping, DC=Dysfunctional Coping, edu=education

Table 7 showed that the interaction between toxic leadership and dysfunctional coping on turnover intention is not significant (see Int_1, $\beta=0.29$, $p>0.05$) when controlling for emotion-focused coping, problem-focused coping, and the last level of education. The results of this moderation test indicated that dysfunctional coping does not moderate the effect of toxic leadership on turnover intention.

DISCUSSION

The purpose of this study was to determine the effect of toxic leadership on turnover intention and whether the role of coping stress can moderate the effect of toxic leadership on turnover intention. After testing the hypothesis, the results showed that toxic leadership has a positive and significant influence on turnover intention. In line with previous studies, if a leader is considered toxic, the greater the potential for turnover intention (Hattab et al., 2022; Paltu & Brouwers, 2020; Sim et al., 2021). Sim et al. (2021) stated that toxic leadership has a significant positive effect on turnover intention. A study by Hattab et al. (2022) also showed that participants who worked for toxic supervisors had lower job satisfaction, higher stress levels, higher absenteeism, and higher intentions to quit their nursing profession. Also supported by Paltu and Brouwers (2020), which stated that the toxic leadership dimension is significant in relation to turnover intention. Schmidt (2014) also stated that employees become less trusting of the organization and less committed to it. Therefore, in the end, many employees want to leave their current team, department, or organization even though there are no other job opportunities (Hattab et al., 2022; Milosevic et al., 2020; Sim et al., 2021).

The analysis of sociodemographic characteristics revealed that married male employees with mature age, with the latest education level of undergraduate, permanent employee status, and relative income above the Gresik minimum wage (Rp4,500,000-5,999,999), dominated the sample. However, the

correlation results indicated that only the latest education level significantly affects the turnover intention. Based on Emiroğlu et al. (2015), employees with lower education levels (elementary school, junior high school, and high school) tend to have lower turnover intention than those with higher education levels. This is because highly educated employees have greater expectations of the work environment, compensation, and capabilities (Emiroğlu et al., 2015). According to CoR Theory, this is due to the fact that employees with lower education have more limited resources compared to those with higher education. Consequently, they prefer to keep their jobs despite the stressful conditions. However, Hattab et al. (2022) stated that employees with higher education have a lower intention to change jobs.

The results of the interaction test between toxic leadership and problem-focused coping (PFC) on turnover intention are not significant. The results of this study differed from previous research by Xie & Zheng (2022), Harney & Lerman (2021), and Huang et al. (2018), which stated that employees with a good PFC coping style have a lower turnover intention rate. Based on CoR Theory, individuals strive to build and protect valuable resources. Threats that occur for a long time can cause loss of resources (Hobfoll et al., 2018). As a result, individuals will look for ways to protect their resources, one of which is with PFC. However, in this study, the moderation test result shows that PFC cannot significantly moderate the influence of toxic leadership on turnover intention.

The theory of coping by Lazarus & Folkman (1984) and Carver et al. (1989) explained the insignificant moderation test result, revealing that the effectiveness of stress coping depends on the situation's flexibility. Situations that are considered controllable and changeable tend to use PFC more than those involving toxic leadership. As a result, PFC is no longer effective in weakening the impact of toxic leadership (Nandkeolyar et al., 2014).

Employees working under toxic leaders have less power, indicating that they lack the ability to stop or limit bullying. Because the toxic leader is a senior figure, employees may not have the opportunity to demonstrate assertive behavior due to the power dynamic (Van den Brande et al., 2018). More specifically, it may be considered inappropriate to use assertive behavior towards someone with higher authority (Van den Brande et al., 2018).

In addition to the PFC variable, emotion-focused coping (EFC) is also unable to moderate the effect of toxic leadership on turnover intention. Milosevic et al. (2020) found that not many victims of toxic leadership seek solutions with their coworkers, including avoiding toxic bosses, establishing positive relationships to gain employee support, and protecting work from danger (Milosevic et al., 2020). Employees who are victims of toxic leadership form support and reinforcement, which in turn weakens the effect of toxic leadership.

Dysfunctional coping (DC) is also unable to moderate the effect of toxic leadership and turnover intention. In contrast with Harney & Lerman (2021) who found that employees with an avoidant coping style (i.e., alcohol abuse), a form of DC, were significantly associated with higher turnover intention. Initially, we believed that toxic leadership induced the use of DCs as a coping mechanism, primarily due to the unchangeable nature of the situation. DCs such as positive reframing and self-distraction was used to cope with the negative impact.

The insignificant effect of DC as a moderator may be explained from the CoR perspective, where individuals who use avoidance coping (defensive) become highly vulnerable to stress because avoidant coping uses a large investment of resources without addressing the stressor, namely toxic leadership. As a result, employees can experience a resource crisis (Nandkeolyar et al., 2014). As a result, one way to avoid resource loss is the desire to leave the current job.

This research has several limitations. First, this study only uses one company as the object of research.

Therefore, in order to broaden the generalization, it is recommended that future research use diverse organizations. Second, this study does not discuss perceived co-workers specifically, so the role of collective support from coworkers who are also victims of toxic leadership is unknown. Furthermore, this study does not discuss individuals' coping process (primary appraisal and secondary appraisal) when dealing with toxic leadership.

CONCLUSION

This study aimed to examine the effect of toxic leadership on turnover intention by including stress coping (problem-focused coping, emotion-focused coping, and dysfunctional coping) as a moderator. This study's findings suggested that toxic leadership has a positive and significant effect on turnover intention. Three dimensions of stress coping do not moderate the effect of toxic leadership on turnover intention.

The findings of this study can be used as a reference for companies to immediately take firm action against toxic leadership practices within the company due to their effect on turnover intention. Pradhan et al. (2022) mentioned that organizations must have a strict zero-tolerance policy against toxic leadership behavior. The employee handbook and internal communication channels can effectively convey this regulation (Pradhan et al., 2022). The study's results suggest that reinforcement and support from coworkers who are also victims of toxic leadership can weaken the influence of toxic leadership. Future research can consider using other moderator variables, such as perceived co-worker support (Pradhan & Jena, 2016). Future research can also consider examining individuals' coping process (primary appraisal and secondary appraisal) when dealing with toxic leadership to ultimately develop turnover intention.

Peranan Koping Stres sebagai Moderator antara *Toxic Leadership* terhadap *Turnover Intention* pada Pekerja Milenial

Employee turnover merupakan fenomena rumit yang dapat menjadi hal yang alami dan sehat, bahkan dapat menguntungkan organisasi, khususnya ketika karyawan yang keluar merupakan karyawan yang tidak mencapai target atau memiliki performa kinerja yang buruk. Sebaliknya, kehilangan karyawan yang penting dan memiliki bakat kritis dapat menjadi masalah atau bahkan menghancurkan organisasi (Ju & Li, 2019). *Employee turnover* mengacu pada situasi di mana seorang karyawan meninggalkan organisasi. *Employee turnover* dapat diklasifikasikan sebagai *voluntary*, ketika karyawan tersebut secara sukarela kehilangan jabatan dan sepenuhnya keluar dari organisasi semula (Hung dkk., 2018). Sedangkan *turnover intention* adalah proses evaluasi individu atas pekerjaannya saat inidengan menimbang kelebihan, kekurangan, dan membuat keputusan untuk keluar atau tidak (Mobley, 1977). *Turnover intention* sering digunakan untuk mempelajari *turnover karyawan* yang sebenarnya (Fazio dkk., 2017; Lazzari dkk., 2022).

Meskipun *turnover* dapat menguntungkan, tingkat *turnover* yang tinggi telah menjadi masalah utama bagi industri selama bertahun-tahun (Alias dkk., 2018). Selama beberapa tahun, sebagian besar karyawan di Asia Tenggara melaporkan tingkat *turnover* yang meningkat, terutama pada tingkat pertengahan karier (Mercer, 2021). Berdasarkan hasil survei *State of the Global Workplace: 2023 Report*, partisipan Asia Tenggara memiliki *turnover intention* sebesar 51%, dengan 55% partisipan berusia di bawah 40 tahun (Gallup, 2023). Selain itu, saat ini bisnis sedang menghadapi tantangan dalam mempertahankan karyawan milenial atau generasi Y (Campione, 2015). Survei Dale Carnegie Indonesia (2018) dilakukan pada lebih dari 1.200 partisipan (lebih dari 600 karyawan milenial dan 600 karyawan non-milenial) yang berlokasi di 6 kota besar, yaitu Surabaya, Balikpapan, Medan, Jakarta, Makassar, dan Bandung. Survei ini bertujuan untuk mengetahui tingkat keterlibatan karyawan/*employee engagement* di Indonesia, khususnya pada kota-kota besar. Hasil survei menunjukkan, hanya satu dari empat milenial yang merasa memiliki keterikatan dan 64% diantaranya setidaknya akan bertahan selama satu tahun ke depan. Sebaliknya, 60% karyawan milenial berencana untuk mengundurkan diri apabila tidak merasa terikat lagi.

Masalah penurunan jumlah karyawan dan peningkatan *turnover* ini juga terjadi di PT X. PT X merupakan sebuah perusahaan yang bergerak pada bidang gas dan berlokasi di Gresik. Berdasarkan data jumlah karyawan tahunan yang diperoleh melalui *Human Capital* (HC), terdapat peningkatan *turnover* selama tiga tahun terakhir (2021– 2023). Data jumlah karyawan dalam 3 tahun dapat dilihat pada tabel 1.

Tabel 1. Data Jumlah Karyawan pada PT X

Tahun	Jumlah Karyawan	Jumlah Karyawan Keluar	Turnover rate (%)
2021	61	5	8,4%
2022	58	4	6,9%
2023	57	7	12,7%

Sumber: *Human Capital* PT X

Angka *turnover rate* yang ideal mengacu pada Gallup adalah 10% (Smith & Rutigliano, 2002), sedangkan pada tahun 2023 *turnover rate* mencapai 12,7%. Apabila mengacu kepada *turnover rate* yang ideal, maka tingkat *turnover* PT X di tahun 2023 perlu mendapatkan perhatian.

Penelitian Wong dkk. (2015) menunjukkan bahwa karyawan yang ingin keluar dari perusahaan menunjukkan performa kinerja yang rendah. Bagi beberapa perusahaan, *turnover intention* lebih berbahaya dibandingkan *actual turnover* karena karyawan yang ingin keluar dari perusahaan menjadi tidak fokus pada pekerjaannya dan tidak memiliki semangat untuk tetap bekerja di perusahaan (Suyono dkk., 2020). Selain itu, perusahaan harus menanggung biaya waktu dan materi untuk iklan, perekrutan,

dan pelatihan pengganti. Angka *turnover* yang tinggi juga dapat berdampak negatif terhadap moral karyawan yang tersisa, terutama jika dinamika tim yang positif merupakan hal utama dalam pekerjaan (Ertas, 2015).

Salah satu alasan meningkatnya *turnover intention* adalah gaya kepemimpinan. Banyak penelitian yang telah meneliti keterkaitan antara kepemimpinan dan *turnover intention* pada karyawan (Hattab dkk., 2022). Kepemimpinan yang positif berkontribusi dalam menurunkan *turnover intention* (Ariyabuddhiphongs & Kahn, 2017; Park & Pierce, 2020). Sebaliknya, kepemimpinan yang buruk dapat menjadi contoh perilaku non-produktif dalam organisasi (Hadadian & Zarei, 2016) dan dapat meningkatkan *turnover intention* pada karyawan (Hattab dkk., 2022).

Toxic leadership merupakan salah satu kepemimpinan buruk yang menjadi salah satu alasan berkembangnya *turnover intention* (Hattab dkk., 2022; Labrague dkk., 2020; Paltu & Brouwers, 2020; Sim dkk., 2021). Schmidt dan Hanges (2008) mendefinisikan *toxic leadership* sebagai kepemimpinan yang narsis, suka mempromosikan diri sendiri, menunjukkan pola pengawasan yang kasar dan otoriter, serta tidak dapat diprediksi. *Toxic leadership* ini ditemui pada PT X. Berdasarkan keterangan salah satu karyawan PT X, informan menemui adanya praktik *toxic leadership* saat ia bekerja, yang menjadi salah satu faktor penyebab karyawan atau rekan kerjanya keluar dari pekerjaan. Contoh tindakan *toxic leader* tersebut mencakup merendahkan karyawan dan mengungkapkan kemarahan tanpa sebab.

Bagi karyawan milenial, salah satu hal yang dihindari dalam preferensi pekerjaan adalah *toxic leaders*. Bhandarker dan Rai (2019) menyatakan bahwa partisipan yang bekerja di bawah kepemimpinan yang *toxic* melaporkan tingkat kemarahan, kekesalan, dan frustrasi, diikuti dengan rasa tidak aman, bahkan keterpisahan yang lebih tinggi dari pekerjaan. Untuk mengatasi stres dan emosi negatif akibat *toxic leadership*, karyawan mengembangkan koping stres (Bhandarker & Rai, 2019). Koping stres didefinisikan sebagai upaya untuk mencegah atau mengurangi ancaman, bahaya, dan kehilangan, atau untuk mengurangi *distress* yang sering dikaitkan dengan pengalaman tersebut (Carver, 2013). Dalam konteks ini, individu menggunakan strategi koping untuk mengelola pengalaman stres akibat *toxic leadership*.

Penggunaan *problem-focused coping* umumnya diterapkan ketika individu merasa terdapat hal konstruktif atau langkah-langkah yang dapat dilakukan untuk mengatasi masalah (Carver, 2013). Penggunaan koping ini tampaknya dapat mengurangi pengalaman stres (Harney & Lerman, 2021) dan mengurangi keinginan untuk meninggalkan pekerjaan (Xie & Zheng, 2022). Pada penelitian Webster dkk. (2014) mengenai karyawan yang bekerja di bawah kepemimpinan yang *toxic*, ditemukan bahwa cara untuk mengatasi *toxic leadership* yang paling sering digunakan ialah mencari *social support*, mengambil jatah cuti, merenungkan, bahkan menantang pemimpin. Meskipun *emotion-focused coping* mungkin dianggap maladaptif, penelitian Webster dkk. (2014) menemukan bahwa strategi koping ini umum digunakan ketika karyawan merasa tidak berdaya untuk mencegah perilaku *toxic* yang berkelanjutan dan dapat berujung pada kerugian apabila tidak ditangani. Selain itu, ditemukan juga bahwa ketika karyawan tidak merasa didukung oleh organisasi dan berada dalam situasi yang tidak terkendali, mereka cenderung berfokus pada perilaku *avoidance*, seperti mengambil jatah cuti. Karyawan yang memilih untuk tetap bekerja dan tidak dapat menghadapi atau meninggalkan *leader toxicity*, melaporkan masalah kesehatan yang serius, perasaan tidak berdaya, dan menanggung dampak jangka panjang (Webster dkk., 2014).

Berdasarkan *Conservation of Resource theory* (Teori CoR), *toxic leadership* yang berkelanjutan dapat menjadi ancaman bahkan mengikis sumber daya psikologis bawahan sehingga karyawan harus menerima kerugian psikologis yang cukup tinggi. Paparan *toxic leadership* dapat memicu keinginan karyawan untuk menarik diri dan bahkan keluar dari lingkungan kerjanya saat ini (Hsu dkk., 2021). Namun, berdasarkan teori CoR, dalam menghadapi ancaman beberapa individu melakukan langkah-

langkah aktif untuk melindungi sumber daya yang dimiliki, terutama pada individu yang memiliki sumber daya yang banyak. Sedangkan individu dengan sumber daya sedikit lebih memilih untuk menyimpan atau mencadangkan sumber daya yang dimiliki, daripada menginvestasikannya (Hobfoll & Ford, 2007). Hal ini menjadi dasar untuk melihat apakah koping dapat memoderasi pengaruh *toxic leadership* terhadap *turnover intention*. Meskipun telah banyak studi dan bukti empiris mengenai perolehan sumber daya yang diterima dari kepemimpinan positif, masih sedikit penelitian yang menggunakan teori CoR untuk menjelaskan dampak perilaku kepemimpinan negatif (Schmidt, 2014).

Meski beberapa penelitian telah mempelajari mengenai pengaruh *toxic leadership* terhadap *turnover intention*, keterkaitan antara variabel ini masih membutuhkan penelitian lanjutan. Selain itu, masih sangat sedikit penelitian yang menggunakan moderator dalam analisisnya, khususnya variabel yang dapat mengurangi dampak *toxic leadership* terhadap korban (Pradhan & Jena, 2016). Adanya *theory application void gap* (menganalisis teori untuk menjelaskan fenomena) (Müller-Bloch & Kranz, 2015) menjadi landasan penelitian dan tujuan dari penelitian ini, yaitu untuk menguji pengaruh *toxic leadership* terhadap *turnover intention*, dengan *coping stress* sebagai moderator, dan menggunakan teori CoR.

METODE

Desain Penelitian

Penelitian ini menggunakan pendekatan kuantitatif berbasis survei *cross-sectional*. Pendekatan ini ditujukan untuk menguji *toxic leadership* terhadap *turnover intention*, serta peran *coping stress* sebagai moderator pada *millennial worker*.

Partisipan

Populasi penelitian ini adalah karyawan PT X di Gresik dengan kriteria inklusi, yaitu karyawan yang lahir antara tahun 1980—2000 dan merupakan karyawan penuh waktu (Ahn & Chaoyu, 2019). Seluruh partisipan telah menyatakan kesetujuan untuk berpartisipasi melalui lembar *informed consent*. *Informed consent* berisi tujuan penelitian, kontak peneliti, hak-hak partisipan, seperti kerahasiaan data, hak untuk mengundurkan diri dari penelitian, serta partisipasi secara sukarela. Penghitungan jumlah minimal sampel menggunakan bantuan *software G*Power 3.1* (Faul dkk., 2009).

Perhitungan parameter menggunakan *statistic test F-test: Linear Multiple Regression, Fixed Model, R-squared deviation from zero from predictor correlation* dan metode *a priori* dengan jumlah 7 prediktor, yaitu masing-masing korelasi: *toxic leadership* dan *turnover intention* sebesar 0,27 (X terhadap Y) (Hattab dkk., 2022), *problem-focused coping* dan *turnover intention* sebesar 0,25 (Z1 terhadap Y) (Lewin & Sager, 2010), *emotion-focused coping* dan *turnover intention* sebesar 0,2 (Z2 terhadap Y) (Lewin & Sager, 2010), serta *dysfunctional coping* dan *turnover intention* sebesar 0,469 (Z3 terhadap Y) (Huang dkk., 2018), perkalian X terhadap Y dan Z1 terhadap Y sebesar 0,067, perkalian X terhadap Y dan Z2 terhadap Y sebesar 0,05, dan untuk perkalian X terhadap Y dan Z3 terhadap Y sebesar 0,12. Analisis dilakukan dengan memasukkan nilai *power* sebesar 0,95 dan nilai $\alpha=0,05$. Berdasarkan perhitungan ini, didapatkan perkiraan hasil jumlah sampel sebesar 39 partisipan. Teknik *sampling* yang digunakan adalah *purposive sampling* dengan jumlah partisipan yang terlibat dalam penelitian ini sebanyak 43 karyawan.

Berdasarkan beberapa variabel sosiodemografis, partisipan penelitian ini dideskripsikan sebagai berikut; 90,7% berjenis kelamin laki-laki, 39,5% dalam rentang usia 30-34 tahun, 69,8% telah menikah, 69,8% merupakan lulusan sarjana dan/atau diploma IV, 64,3% berstatus karyawan tetap, dan 41,9% menghasilkan pendapatan (Rp) sebesar 4.000.000 hingga 5.999.999.

Tabel 2. Karakteristik Sosiodemografi Partisipan

Karakteristik	Frekuensi	Persentase (%)
Jenis Kelamin		
Laki-laki	39	90,7 %
Perempuan	4	9,3 %
Usia		
< 25 tahun	3	7,0 %
25 - 29 tahun	9	20,9 %
30 - 34 tahun	17	39,5 %
35 - 39 tahun	9	23,3 %
> 39 tahun	5	20,9 %
Status Perkawinan		
Lajang	13	30,2 %
Menikah	30	69,8 %
Pendidikan Terakhir		
SMA	8	18,6 %
Diploma I/II/III	2	4,7 %
Diploma IV/S1	30	69,8 %
S2	3	7,0 %
Status Pekerjaan		
Kontrak	15	35,7 %
Tetap	28	64,3 %
Penghasilan		
4.000.000 - 5.999.999	18	41,9 %
6.000.000 - 7.999.999	15	34,9 %
>8.000.000	10	23,3 %

Note. N=43

Pengukuran

Toxic leadership diukur menggunakan *Toxic Leadership Scale* oleh Schmidt & Hanges (2008) dan telah diadaptasi untuk digunakan di Indonesia oleh Hattab dkk. (2022). Skala ini mengukur pengalaman karyawan dengan perilaku destruktif pemimpin mereka. Skala terdiri atas 5 dimensi (*Abusive supervision, Authoritarian Leadership, Narcissism, Self-Promotion, dan Unpredictability*), 30 pernyataan dengan 5 pilihan, yaitu (1) tidak pernah, (2) jarang, (3) kadang-kadang, (4) sering, dan (5) selalu. Untuk mendapatkan skor total dari skala ini, *Toxic Leadership Scale* pada penelitian ini memiliki koefisien reliabilitas 0,988.

Kuesioner Brief COPE dari Carver (1997) yang diteliti dan diadaptasi oleh Siaputra dkk. (2023) ke dalam Bahasa Indonesia digunakan untuk mengukur strategi koping individu. Skala ini terdiri dari 3 dimensi (*problem-focused coping, emotional-focused coping, dan dysfunctional coping*), 28 pernyataan dengan 4 pilihan jawaban, (0) belum pernah, (1) kadang-kadang, (2) sering, (3) sangat sering. Dalam penelitian ini, *coping stress* diukur secara multidimensi. Brief COPE pada penelitian ini memiliki koefisien reliabilitas 0,803.

Turnover intention diukur dengan *Turnover Intention Scale* oleh Mobley dkk. (1979) yang kemudian dikembangkan lebih lanjut oleh Sheweng (2011, dalam Hijriyana, 2023) dan di Indonesia telah diadaptasi dan digunakan dalam penelitian milik Hijriyana (2023). Skala ini mengukur niat karyawan untuk secara sukarela meninggalkan organisasi atau tempat kerja dalam enam bulan terakhir. Skala terdiri atas 3 dimensi (*thinking of quitting, intention to search for alternatives, dan intention to quit*), 12 pernyataan dengan 5 pilihan, yaitu (1) sangat tidak setuju, (2) tidak setuju, (3) kurang setuju, (4) cukup setuju, dan (5) setuju. Pada skala ini, dilakukan skor total dengan koefisien reliabilitas sebesar 0,951.

Penelitian ini juga menggunakan dua *attention check items* untuk mengidentifikasi partisipan yang kurang fokus saat mengisi kuesioner. Data partisipan yang gagal pada *attention check items* tidak dimasukkan pada analisis data (Hattab dkk., 2022).

Analisis Data

Analisis data menggunakan *software* SPSS versi 23. Uji hipotesis melalui uji regresi linear sederhana dan uji analisis regresi moderasi menggunakan PROCESS MACRO *by* Andrew F. Hayes, model 1 untuk melihat peran *coping stress* sebagai moderator antara *toxic leadership* terhadap *turnover intention* pada *millennial worker*.

HASIL PENELITIAN

Berdasarkan data yang telah dikumpulkan melalui metode survei, data diolah menggunakan uji statistik. Dari hasil analisis statistik deskriptif, dapat dilihat masing-masing *mean* dan standar deviasi dari masing-masing variabel. *Correlation Matrix* adalah analisis yang bertujuan untuk mengetahui hubungan antar variabel. Hasil uji korelasi variabel dependen, independen, dan moderator menggunakan *Pearson* dan variabel kontrol menggunakan *Spearman* (dapat dilihat pada tabel 3).

Tabel 3. *Correlation Matrix* Antar Variabel

Variabel	Mean (SD)	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
Gender	1,91 (0,294)	1									
Status nikah	1,70 (0,465)	-0,036	1								
Pend	2,65 (0,870)	-0,360*	-0,221	1							
Staker	1,65 (0,482)	0,102	0,156	0,070	1						
Gaji	1,81 (0,794)	0,029	0,227	0,235	0,369*	1					
Usia	32,95 (5,546)	0,076	0,370**	-0,179	0,287*	0,362**	1				
TL	2,8998 (1,32)	0,155	-0,304*	0,331**	0,039	0,080	0,005	1			
PFC	1,9267 (0,470)	-0,011	-0,142	0,237*	-0,218	-0,013	-0,261*	0,266	1		
EFC	1,8860 (0,6048)	-0,065	-0,267*	0,393**	-0,140	0,132	-0,176	0,467**	0,765**	1	
DC	0,9828 (0,431)	0,000	-0,310	0,295*	-0,209	-0,042	-0,286*	0,471**	0,411**	0,443**	1
TI	3,4542 (1,261)	-0,132	-0,153	0,452**	0,105	-0,052	-0,106	0,571**	0,296	0,377*	0,356*

Catatan. * $p < 0,05$, ** $p < 0,01$, *** $p < 0,001$, $N=43$, gender (1=perempuan, 2=laki-laki), status perkawinan (1=lajang, 2=menikah), pendidikan (1=SMA hingga 4=Strata 2), status kerja (1=kontrak, 2=tetap), gaji (1=4.000.000-5.999.999, 2=6.000.000-7.999.999, 3=di atas 8.000.000). TI=Turnover Intention, TL=Toxic Leadership, PFC=Problem-Focused Coping, EFC=Emotion-Focused Coping, DC=Dysfunctional Coping, pend = pendidikan, staker = status kerja

Pada tabel 3, dapat dilihat variabel tingkat pendidikan terakhir berkorelasi secara signifikan dengan TI (0,452, $p < 0,05$). Sehingga, variabel tersebut kemudian dijadikan sebagai variabel kovariat/kontrol.

Tabel 4. Hasil Uji Regresi Linear

<i>Predictor</i>	<i>Estimate</i>	<i>SE</i>	<i>t</i>	<i>p</i>	<i>Stand. Estimate</i>
<i>Intercept</i>	1,875	0,389	4,820	0,000	
<i>Toxic Leadership</i>	0,545	0,122	4,453	0,000	0,571

Model	R	R²	Adjusted R²
1	0,571	0,326	0,10

Pada tabel 4, dapat dilihat bahwa nilai konsisten *turnover intention* sebesar 1,875 dan setiap terjadi peningkatan satu satuan *toxic leadership*, maka *turnover intention* akan mengalami peningkatan sebesar 0,545. Nilai *estimate* (0,545) yang positif menunjukkan bahwa apabila *toxic leadership* mengalami peningkatan, maka *turnover intention* juga akan meningkat. Nilai $p < 0,05$ menunjukkan bahwa terdapat pengaruh antara *toxic leadership* dan *turnover intention*. Hal ini dapat diartikan bahwa besarnya pengaruh *toxic leadership* terhadap *turnover intention* sebesar 32,6%, sedangkan 67,4% lainnya dijelaskan oleh variabel-variabel lain yang tidak diteliti dalam penelitian ini. Berdasarkan hasil analisis yang sudah dilakukan, *toxic leadership* berpengaruh secara positif dan signifikan terhadap *turnover intention*.

Tabel 5. Hasil Uji Moderasi PROCESS MACRO by Andrew F. HAYES, *Problem-Focused Coping* sebagai Moderator

Model 1	β	<i>se</i>	<i>t</i>	<i>p</i>	<i>LLCI</i>	<i>ULCI</i>
<i>Constant</i>	2,76	1,52	1,81	0,08	-0,34	5,85
<i>TL</i>	0,39	0,14	2,70	0,01	0,10	0,68
<i>PFC</i>	0,50	0,52	0,96	0,34	-0,55	1,55
<i>Int_1</i>	-0,20	0,27	-0,76	0,45	-0,75	0,34
<i>Pend</i>	0,69	0,21	3,29	0,00	0,26	1,11
<i>Usia</i>	-0,01	0,03	-0,21	0,84	-0,07	0,05
<i>EFC</i>	-0,49	0,45	-1,07	0,29	-1,41	0,44
<i>DC</i>	0,03	0,43	0,08	0,94	-0,84	0,91
<i>R²</i>	0,52					
<i>F</i>	5,46					
<i>Df1</i>	7,00					
<i>Df2</i>	35,00					
<i>p</i>	0,00					
<i>Int_1</i>						
<i>R²-chng</i>	0,01					
<i>F</i>	0,57					

Catatan. TL=*Toxic Leadership*, PFC=*Problem-Focused Coping*, EFC=*Emotion-Focused Coping*, DC=*Dysfunctional Coping*, pend=pendidikan

Pada tabel 5, dapat dilihat bahwa interaksi antara *toxic leadership* dan *problem-focused coping* sebagai moderator terhadap *turnover intention* tidak signifikan (lihat pada *Int_1*, $\beta = -0,20$, $p > 0,05$) dengan mengontrol *emotion-focused coping*, *dysfunctional coping*, dan tingkat pendidikan terakhir. Hasil uji moderasi ini menandakan bahwa *problem-focused coping* tidak memoderasi pengaruh *toxic leadership* terhadap *turnover intention*.

Tabel 6. Uji Moderasi PROCESS MACRO by Andrew F. HAYES, *Emotion-Focused Coping* sebagai Moderator

Model 1	β	se	t	p	LLCI	ULCI
Constant	0,48	1,31	0,37	0,71	-2,17	3,14
TL	0,41	0,14	2,83	0,01	0,11	0,70
EFC	-0,46	0,45	-1,04	0,31	-1,37	0,44
Int_1	-0,21	0,22	-0,95	0,35	-0,65	0,23
Pend	0,68	0,21	3,26	0,00	0,25	1,10
Kawin	0,18	0,35	0,51	0,61	-0,53	0,88
PFC	0,46	0,50	0,92	0,36	-0,55	1,48
DC	0,06	0,41	0,15	0,88	-0,77	0,90
R ²	0,53					
F	5,60					
Df1	7,00					
Df2	35,00					
p	0,00					
Int_1						
R ² -chng	0,01					
F	0,91					

Catatan. TL=Toxic Leadership, PFC=Problem-Focused Coping, EFC=Emotion-Focused Coping, DC=Dysfunctional Coping, pend=pendidikan, kawin = status perkawinan

Pada tabel 6, dapat dilihat bahwa interaksi antara *toxic leadership* dan *emotion-focused coping* sebagai moderator terhadap *turnover intention* tidak signifikan (lihat pada Int_1, $\beta=-0,21$, $p>0,05$) dengan mengontrol *problem-focused coping*, *dysfunctional coping*, dan tingkat pendidikan terakhir. Hasil uji moderasi ini menandakan bahwa *emotion-focused coping* tidak memoderasi pengaruh *toxic leadership* terhadap *turnover intention*.

Tabel 7. Hasil Uji Moderasi PROCESS MACRO by Andrew F. HAYES, *Dysfunctional Coping* sebagai Moderator

Model 1	β	se	t	p	LLCI	ULCI
Constant	1,52	1,47	1,03	0,31	-1,46	4,49
TL	0,42	0,15	2,78	0,01	0,11	0,72
DC	-0,24	0,53	-0,46	0,65	-1,31	0,83
Int_1	0,29	0,33	0,88	0,38	-0,38	0,97
Pend	0,73	0,21	3,47	0,00	0,30	1,15
Usia	-0,01	0,03	-0,30	0,77	-0,07	0,05
PFC	0,46	0,51	0,90	0,38	-0,58	1,50
EFC	-0,34	-0,77	0,44	0,44	-1,24	0,55
R ²	0,52					
F	5,52					
Df1	7,00					
Df2	35,00					
p	0,00					
Int_1						
R ² -chng	0,01					
F	0,78					

Catatan. TL=Toxic Leadership, PFC=Problem-Focused Coping, EFC=Emotion-Focused Coping, DC=Dysfunctional Coping, pend=pendidikan

Pada tabel 7, dapat dilihat bahwa interaksi antara *toxic leadership* dan *dysfunctional coping* terhadap *turnover intention* tidak signifikan (lihat pada Int_1, $\beta=0,29$, $p>0,05$) dengan mengontrol *emotion-focused coping*, *problem-focused coping*, dan tingkat pendidikan terakhir. Hasil uji moderasi ini

menandakan bahwa *dysfunctional coping* tidak memoderasi pengaruh *toxic leadership* terhadap *turnover intention*.

DISKUSI

Tujuan penelitian ini adalah untuk mengetahui pengaruh *toxic leadership* terhadap *turnover intention*, serta untuk mengetahui apakah peran *coping stress* dapat memoderasi pengaruh *toxic leadership* terhadap *turnover intention*.

Setelah melakukan uji hipotesis, hasil menunjukkan bahwa *toxic leadership* memiliki pengaruh yang positif dan signifikan terhadap *turnover intention*. Sejalan dengan penelitian-penelitian terdahulu, jika seorang pemimpin dianggap semakin *toxic*, maka semakin besar pula potensi *turnover intention* (Hattab dkk., 2022; Paltu & Brouwers, 2020; Sim dkk., 2021). Hasil penelitian Sim dkk. (2021) menyatakan *toxic leadership* berpengaruh positif secara signifikan terhadap *turnover intention*. Pada penelitian oleh Hattab dkk. (2022), juga menunjukkan bahwa partisipan yang bekerja untuk atasan yang *toxic*, memiliki kepuasan kerja yang lebih rendah, tingkat stres yang lebih tinggi, perilaku *absenteeism*, dan niat yang lebih tinggi untuk meninggalkan profesi keperawatan. Didukung pula dalam penelitian Paltu dan Brouwers (2020), yang menyatakan bahwa dimensi *toxic leadership* signifikan dalam kaitannya dengan *turnover intention*. Schmidt (2014) juga menyatakan bahwa karyawan menjadi merasa kurang percaya terhadap organisasi dan kurang berkomitmen terhadap organisasi. Oleh sebab itu, pada akhirnya banyak karyawan yang ingin keluar dari tim, departemen, atau organisasi saat ini meskipun tidak ada kesempatan kerja lainnya (Hattab dkk., 2022; Milosevic dkk., 2020; Sim dkk., 2021).

Berdasarkan hasil analisis karakteristik sosiodemografis, partisipan didominasi oleh karyawan dengan jenis kelamin laki-laki, berusia matang, telah menikah, dengan tingkat pendidikan terakhir D4/S1, berstatus karyawan tetap, dan berpenghasilan relatif diatas UMR Gresik (Rp4.500.000 – 5.999.999). Namun, berdasarkan hasil korelasi, hanya tingkat pendidikan terakhir yang berhubungan secara signifikan dengan variabel *turnover intention*. Berdasarkan penelitian oleh Emiroğlu dkk. (2015), karyawan dengan tingkat pendidikan lebih rendah (Sekolah Dasar, Sekolah Menengah Pertama, dan Sekolah Menengah Atas) cenderung memiliki keinginan berpindah lebih rendah daripada mereka dengan tingkat pendidikan lebih tinggi. Hal ini dikarenakan karyawan yang berpendidikan tinggi memiliki ekspektasi yang lebih besar akan lingkungan kerja, kompensasi, dan kemampuan (Emiroğlu dkk., 2015). Berdasarkan teori CoR, karyawan dengan tingkat pendidikan rendah, memiliki sumber daya yang lebih terbatas dibandingkan dengan karyawan dengan tingkat pendidikan lebih tinggi sehingga mereka cenderung mempertahankan pekerjaan meski dalam kondisi tertekan. Namun, pada penelitian oleh Hattab dkk. (2022), karyawan yang berpendidikan lebih tinggi memiliki keinginan berpindah kerja yang lebih rendah.

Hasil uji interaksi antara *toxic leadership* dan *problem-focused coping* (PFC) terhadap *turnover intention* tidak signifikan. Hasil penelitian ini berbeda dengan penelitian terdahulu oleh Xie & Zheng (2022), Harney & Lerman (2021), serta Huang dkk. (2018) yang menyatakan bahwa karyawan dengan gaya *coping* PFC yang baik memiliki tingkat *turnover intention* yang lebih rendah. Berdasarkan teori CoR, individu berusaha untuk membangun dan melindungi sumber daya yang berharga. Ancaman yang terjadi dalam waktu lama dapat menyebabkan hilangnya sumber daya (Hobfoll dkk., 2018). Oleh sebab itu, individu akan mencari cara untuk melindungi sumber daya mereka, salah satunya dengan PFC. Namun, dalam penelitian ini, hasil uji moderasi menunjukkan bahwa PFC tidak dapat memoderasi pengaruh *toxic leadership* terhadap *turnover intention* secara signifikan.

Hasil uji moderasi yang tidak signifikan ini dapat dijelaskan dengan teori *coping* oleh Lazarus & Folkman (1984) dan Carver dkk. (1989) yang mengungkapkan bahwa efektivitas coping stres

bergantung pada apakah situasi dapat diubah atau tidak. PFC lebih banyak digunakan dalam situasi yang dianggap dapat dikontrol dan diubah, berbeda dengan *toxic leadership*. Akibatnya, koping tidak lagi efektif untuk melemahkan dampak *toxic leadership* (Nandkeolyar dkk., 2014).

Karyawan yang bekerja di bawah *toxic leader* memiliki kekuasaan lebih rendah, yang ditandai dengan kurangnya kemampuan untuk menghentikan atau membatasi penindasan. Dikarenakan *toxic leader* merupakan figur yang lebih senior, karyawan mungkin tidak memiliki kesempatan untuk menunjukkan perilaku asertif karena perbedaan kekuasaan (Van den Brande dkk., 2018). Menggunakan sikap asertif mungkin dianggap kurang tepat terhadap seseorang yang memiliki otoritas lebih tinggi (Van den Brande dkk., 2018).

Selain variabel PFC, *emotion-focused coping* (EFC) juga tidak dapat memoderasi pengaruh antara *toxic leadership* terhadap *turnover intention*. Tidak sedikit korban dari *toxic leadership* yang mencari solusi bersama rekan kerja mereka, seperti menghindari atasan yang *toxic*, menjalin hubungan yang positif untuk mendapat dukungan dari karyawan, dan melindungi pekerjaan dari bahaya (Milosevic dkk., 2020). Dikarenakan dukungan dan penguatan terbentuk antar karyawan korban *toxic leadership*, maka EFC melemahkan pengaruh *toxic leadership*.

Dysfunctional coping (DC) juga tidak dapat memoderasi pengaruh antara *toxic leadership* terhadap *turnover intention*. Hal ini bertentangan dengan penelitian Harney & Lerman (2021) yang menemukan bahwa karyawan dengan gaya koping *avoidant coping*, salah satu bentuk DC, secara signifikan dikaitkan dengan *turnover intention* yang lebih tinggi. Penggunaan DC awalnya dapat digunakan sebagai koping akibat *toxic leadership*, terutama jika situasi tersebut tidak dapat diubah. DC seperti *positive reframing* dan *self distraction* digunakan untuk mengatasi dampak negatif tersebut.

Pengaruh DC yang tidak signifikan sebagai moderator mungkin dapat dijelaskan dari perspektif CoR, dimana individu yang menggunakan *avoidance coping* (*defensive*) menjadi sangat rentan terhadap stres karena *avoidance coping* menggunakan investasi sumber daya yang besar tanpa mengatasi stresor, yaitu *toxic leadership*. Akibatnya, karyawan dapat mengalami krisis sumber daya (Nandkeolyar dkk., 2014). Oleh karena itu, salah satu upaya untuk menghindari hilangnya sumber daya adalah dengan mempertimbangkan untuk keluar dari pekerjaan saat ini.

Penelitian ini memiliki beberapa keterbatasan. Pertama, penelitian ini hanya menggunakan satu perusahaan sebagai objek penelitian. Dengan demikian, guna memperluas generalisasi, disarankan penelitian selanjutnya dapat menggunakan organisasi yang berbeda. Kedua, penelitian ini tidak membahas mengenai *perceived co-worker* secara khusus sehingga peran dukungan kolektif rekan kerja yang juga menjadi korban dari *toxic leadership* tidak diketahui. Selain itu, penelitian ini tidak membahas mengenai proses *coping* (*primary appraisal* dan *secondary appraisal*) individu dalam menghadapi *toxic leadership*.

SIMPULAN

Penelitian ini bertujuan untuk menguji pengaruh *toxic leadership* terhadap *turnover intention*, dengan menyertakan koping stres (*problem-focused coping*, *emotion-focused coping*, dan *dysfunctional coping*) sebagai moderator. Kesimpulan dari hasil penelitian ini adalah *toxic leadership* berpengaruh secara positif dan signifikan terhadap *turnover intention*. Tiga dimensi dari koping stres tidak memoderasi pengaruh *toxic leadership* terhadap *turnover intention*.

Temuan dari penelitian ini dapat menjadi acuan bagi perusahaan untuk segera menindak tegas praktik *toxic leadership* yang terjadi di perusahaan karena *toxic leadership* dapat memengaruhi peningkatan *turnover intention* pada karyawan. Pradhan dkk. (2022) menyebutkan bahwa organisasi harus memiliki

“zero-tolerance policy” yang ketat terhadap perilaku atasan yang *toxic*. Peraturan ini dapat disampaikan melalui buku pegangan karyawan dan dikomunikasikan melalui saluran komunikasi internal (Pradhan dkk., 2022). Dari hasil penelitian ini diduga bahwa penguatan dan dukungan dari rekan kerja yang juga menjadi korban *toxic leadership* dapat melemahkan pengaruh dari *toxic leadership*. Penelitian selanjutnya dapat mempertimbangkan penggunaan variabel moderator lain, seperti *perceived co-worker support* (Pradhan & Jena, 2016). Pada penelitian selanjutnya juga dapat mempertimbangkan untuk meneliti mengenai proses koping (*primary appraisal* dan *secondary appraisal*) individu dalam menghadapi *toxic leadership* hingga pada akhirnya mengembangkan *turnover intention*.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS / UCAPAN TERIMA KASIH

Praise and gratitude to God Almighty, family, relatives, teachers, friends, and all those who provide support and are involved in this research until it is carried out as planned. / *Puji dan syukur kami panjatkan kepada Tuhan YME, keluarga, kerabat, pengajar, sahabat, dan seluruh pihak yang memberikan dukungan dan turut terlibat dalam penelitian ini hingga terlaksana sesuai rencana.*

DECLARATION OF POTENTIAL CONFLICTS OF INTEREST / DEKLARASI POTENSI TERJADINYA KONFLIK KEPENTINGAN

Cheryl Graciana Yulianto, Fajrianthi, and Samian do not work for, consult, own shares in, or receive funding from any company or organization that might profit from the publication of this manuscript. / *Cheryl Graciana Yulianto, Fajrianthi, dan Samian tidak bekerja, menjadi konsultan, memiliki saham, atau menerima dana dari perusahaan atau organisasi manapun yang mungkin akan mengambil untung dari diterbitkannya naskah ini.*

REFERENCE / REFERENSI

- Ahn, J. Y., & Chaoyu, W. (2019). Job stress and turnover intention revisited: Evidence from Korean firms. *Problems and Perspectives in Management*, 17(4), 52–61. [http://dx.doi.org/10.21511/ppm.17\(4\).2019.05](http://dx.doi.org/10.21511/ppm.17(4).2019.05)
- Alias, N. E., Hazieqah Rohmanan, N., Ismail, S., Koe, W.-L., & Othman, R. (2018). Factors Influencing Turnover Intention in a Malaysian Manufacturing Company. *KnE Social Sciences*, 3(10), 771. <https://doi.org/10.18502/kss.v3i10.3171>
- 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 and Tourism*, 16(2), 215–233. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15332845.2016.1202730>
- Bhandarker, A., & Rai, S. (2019). Toxic leadership: emotional distress and coping strategy. *International Journal of Organization Theory and Behavior*, 22(1), 65–78. <https://doi.org/10.1108/IJOTB-03-2018-0027>
- Campione, W. A. (2015). Corporate offerings: Why aren't Millennials staying? *Journal of Applied Business and Economics*, 17(4), 60–76. <https://www.proquest.com/scholarly-journals/corporate-offerings-why-arent-millennials-staying/docview/1764139218/se-2>
- Carver, C. (2013). Coping. In M. D. Gellman & J. R. Turner (Eds.), *Encyclopedia of Behavioral Medicine* (pp. 496–500). Springer New York.
- Carver, C. S. (1997). You Want to Measure Coping But Your Protocol's Too Long: Consider the Brief COPE. In *International Journal of Behavioral Medicine* (Vol. 4, Issue 1). Lawrence Erlbaum Associate., Inc.

https://doi.org/10.1207/s15327558ijbm0401_6

- Carver, Scheier, M. F., & Weintraub, J. K. (1989). *Assessing Coping Strategies: A Theoretically Based Approach* (Vol. 56, Issue 2). Psychological Association, Inc. <https://doi.org/10.1037//0022-3514.56.2.267>
- Dale Carnegie Editor. (2018, Januari 8). Minimnya Milenial Terlibat Penuh dengan Perusahaan. *Dale Carnegie*. <https://www.dalecarnegie.id/sumberdaya/media/media-coverage/minimnya-milenial-terlibat-penuh-dengan-perusahaan/>
- Emiroğlu, B. D., Akova, O., & Tanrıverdi, H. (2015). The Relationship Between Turnover Intention and Demographic Factors in Hotel Businesses: A Study at Five Star Hotels in Istanbul. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 207, 385–397. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2015.10.108>
- Ertas, N. (2015). Turnover Intentions and Work Motivations of Millennial Employees in Federal Service. *Public Personnel Management*, 44(3), 401–423. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0091026015588193>
- Faul, F., Erdfelder, E., Buchner, A., & Lang, A.-G. (2009). Statistical power analyses using G*Power 3.1: Tests for correlation and regression analyses. *Behavior Research Methods*, 41(4), 1149–1160. <https://doi.org/10.3758/BRM.41.4.1149>
- Fazio, J., Gong, B., Sims, R., & Yurova, Y. (2017). The role of affective commitment in the relationship between social support and turnover intention. *Management Decision*, 55(3), 512–525. <https://doi.org/10.1108/MD-05-2016-0338>
- Gallup, I. (2023). *State of the global workplace report*. Gallup.Com. <https://www.gallup.com/workplace/349484/state-of-the-global-workplace.aspx>
- Hadadian, Z., & Zarei, J. (2016). Relationship between Toxic Leadership and Job Stress of Knowledge Workers. *Studies in Business and Economics*, 11(3), 84–89.
- Hair, J. F., Black, W. C., Babin, B. J., & Anderson, R. E. (2019). *Multivariate Data Analysis Eighth Edition*.
- Harney, J., & Lerman, A. E. (2021). Clarifying the role of officer coping on turnover in corrections. *Criminal Justice Studies*, 34(4), 397–422. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1478601X.2021.1999117>
- Hattab, S., Wirawan, H., Salam, R., Daswati, D., & Niswaty, R. (2022). The effect of toxic leadership on turnover intention and counterproductive work behaviour in Indonesia public organisations. *International Journal of Public Sector Management*, 35(3), 317–333. <https://doi.org/10.1108/IJPSM-06-2021-0142>
- Hijriyana, C. P. (2023). *Pengaruh Work Life Balance terhadap Turnover Intention dengan Kompensasi sebagai Variabel Moderasi pada Generasi Milenial di Perusahaan Startup Jakarta*. [Unpublished Master's Thesis], Universitas Airlangga.
- Hobfoll, S. E., & Ford, J. S. (2007). Conservation of Resources Theory. In *Encyclopedia of Stress (Second Edition)* (pp. 562–567).
- Hobfoll, S. E., Halbesleben, J., Neveu, J.-P., & Westman, M. (2018). Annual Review of Organizational Psychology and Organizational Behavior Conservation of Resources in the Organizational Context: The Reality of Resources and Their Consequences. *Annu. Rev. Organ. Psychol. Organ. Behav*, 5, 103–131.
- Hsu, C.-T., Liao, H.-Y., & London, M. (2021). Coping with abusive supervision: The alleviating effect of self-efficacy and the perception of authenticity on the negative consequences of abusive supervision 不當督導的因應之道：以自我效能與信賴知覺緩解不當督導的負面效應 Meng-Han

- Huang. *Corporate Management Review*, 41(1), 83–123.
<http://dx.doi.org/10.3966/102873102021064101003>
- Huang, S. (Sam), van der Veen, R., & Song, Z. (2018). The impact of coping strategies on occupational stress and turnover intentions among hotel employees. *Journal of Hospitality Marketing and Management*, 27(8), 926–945. <https://doi.org/10.1080/19368623.2018.1471434>
- Hung, L.-M., Lee, Y.-S., & Lee, D.-C. (2018). The Moderating Effects of Salary Satisfaction and Working Pressure on the Organizational Climate, Organizational Commitment to Turnover Intention. In *International Journal of Business and Society* (Vol. 19, Issue 1).
- Jha, S. (2009). Determinants of Employee Turnover Intentions: A Review. *Management Today*, 9(2). <http://ssrn.com/abstract=2442689>
- Ju, B., & Li, J. (2019). Exploring the impact of training, job tenure, and education-job and skills-job matches on employee turnover intention. *European Journal of Training and Development*, 43(3/4), 214–231.
- Labrague, L. J., Nwafor, C. E., & Tsaras, K. (2020). Influence of toxic and transformational leadership practices on nurses' job satisfaction, job stress, absenteeism and turnover intention: A cross-sectional study. *Journal of Nursing Management*, 28(5), 1104–1113. <https://doi.org/10.1111/jonm.13053>
- Lazarus, R. S., & Folkman, S. (1984). *Stress, Appraisal, and Coping*. Springer.
- Lazzari, M., Alvarez, J. M., & Ruggieri, S. (2022). Predicting and explaining employee turnover intention. *International Journal of Data Science and Analytics*, 14(3), 279–292. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s41060-022-00329-w>
- Lewin, J. E., & Sager, J. K. (2010). The influence of personal characteristics and coping strategies on salespersons' turnover intentions. *Journal of Personal Selling and Sales Management*, 30(4), 355–370. <https://doi.org/10.2753/PSS0885-3134300405>
- Mercer. (2021, September 22). Key drivers of employee turnover in ASEAN. Mercer. [https://www.mercer.com/en-my/about/newsroom/key-drivers-of-employee-turnover-in-asean/#:~:text=55%25 of the employers listed,limited career advancement \(43%25\)](https://www.mercer.com/en-my/about/newsroom/key-drivers-of-employee-turnover-in-asean/#:~:text=55%25%20of%20the%20employers%20listed,limited%20career%20advancement%20(43%25)).
- Milosevic, I., Maric, S., & Lončar, D. (2020). Defeating the Toxic Boss: The Nature of Toxic Leadership and the Role of Followers. *Journal of Leadership and Organizational Studies*, 27(2), 117–137. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1548051819833374>
- Mobley, W. H. (1977). Intermediate Linkages in the Relationship Between Job Satisfaction and Employee Turnover. In *Journal of Applied Psychology* (Vol. 62, Issue 2). <https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.62.2.237> <https://psycnet.apa.org/doi/10.1037/0021-9010.62.2.237>
- Mobley, W. H., Griffeth, R. W., Hand, H. H., Meglino, B. M., & Mobley, H. (1979). Review and Conceptual Analysis of the Employee Turnover Process. In *Psychological Bulletin* (Vol. 86, Issue 3). <https://doi.org/10.1037/0033-2909.86.3.493%0A>
- Müller-Bloch, C., & Kranz, J. (2015). A Framework for Rigorously Identifying Research Gaps in Qualitative Literature Reviews. *International Conference on Information Systems 2015*.
- Nandkeolyar, A. K., Shaffer, J. A., Li, A., Ekkirala, S., & Bagger, J. (2014). Surviving an abusive supervisor: The joint roles of conscientiousness and coping strategies. In *Journal of Applied Psychology* (Vol. 99, Issue 1, pp. 138–150). American Psychological Association. <https://psycnet.apa.org/doi/10.1037/a0034262>

- Paltu, A., & Brouwers, M. (2020). Toxic leadership: Effects on job satisfaction, commitment, turnover intention and organisational culture within the South African manufacturing industry. *SA Journal of Human Resource Management*, 18, 1–11. <https://hdl.handle.net/10520/EJC-1fa457614d>
- Park, T., & Pierce, B. (2020). Impacts of transformational leadership on turnover intention of child welfare workers. *Children and Youth Services Review*, 108, 104624. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chilyouth.2019.104624>
- Pradhan, S., Agrawal, S., & Nigam, S. (2022). Abusive supervision and coping strategies among Indian professionals. *IIMB Management Review*, 34(4), 303–314.
- Pradhan, S., & Jena, L. K. (2016). The Moderating Role of Neutralizers on the Relationship between Abusive Supervision and Intention to Quit: A Proposed Model. *Journal of Human Values*, 22(3), 238–248. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.iimb.2022.11.001>
- Schmidt, A. A. (2014). *An Examination of Toxic Leadership, Job Outcomes, and the Impact of Military Deployment*.
- Schmidt, A. A., & Hanges, P. J. (2008). *Development and Validation of the Toxic Leadership Scale*. University of Maryland, College Park.
- Siaputra, I. B., Rasyida, A., Ramadhanty, A. M., & Triwijati, N. K. E. (2023). Exploring the usefulness of the Brief COPE in clinical and positive psychology: A discriminant content validity study. *Psikohumaniora*, 8(1), 163–180. <https://journal.walisongo.ac.id/index.php/Psikohumaniora/article/view/15063>
- Sim, B. Y. H., Lee, M. C. C., Kwan, S. S. M., & Tuckey, M. R. (2021). The Relationship Between Toxic Leadership, Job Insecurity, Workplace Bullying and Turnover Intention in the Malaysian Context: A Multilevel Mediation Perspective. In P. D’Cruz, E. Noronha, & A. Mendonca (Eds.), *Asian Perspectives on Workplace Bullying and Harassment* (pp. 181–210). Springer Singapore. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-981-16-2362-2_7
- Smith, B., & Rutigliano, T. (2002). *The Truth About Turnover*. Gallup. <https://news.gallup.com/businessjournal/316/truth-about-turnover.aspx>
- Suyono, J., Eliyana, A., & Ratmawati, D. (2020). The nightmare of turnover intention for companies in Indonesia. *Opción: Revista de Ciencias Humanas y Sociales*, 91, 871–888.
- Van den Brande, W., Bernstein, C., Reknes, I., & Baillien, E. (2018). *The Moderating Effects of Coping Mechanisms and Resources in the Context of Workplace Bullying, Emotional Abuse and Harassment* (pp. 1–24). https://doi.org/10.1007/978-981-13-0935-9_7
- Webster, V., Brough, P., & Daly, K. (2014). Fight, Flight or Freeze: Common Responses for Follower Coping with Toxic Leadership. *Stress and Health*, 32(4), 346–354. <https://doi.org/10.1002/smi.2626>
- Wong, Y., Wong, Y.-W., & Wong, C. (2015). An integrative model of turnover intention. *Journal of Chinese Human Resource Management*, 6(1), 71–90. <https://doi.org/10.1108/JCHRM-06-2014-0015>
- Xie, L., & Zheng, Y. (2022). Masculinity contest culture and turnover intentions: The roles of work stress and coping styles. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 199, 111836. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.paid.2022.111836>