Effective leadership should be the goal of any organization that desires to be efficient and competitive. The positive perception of effective leadership can enhance individual outcomes such as job satisfaction. Therefore, understanding any influences on the association between effective leadership and job satisfaction will guide leaders to relationships that are more effective. This study examined the predictive ability of leader effectiveness on employee job satisfaction and the ability of perceived organizational support and job overload to moderate that relationship. Survey data from three different economic sectors produced 70 cases for a moderated hierarchical multiple regression. A significant main effect for leader effectiveness on job satisfaction was found, but neither moderator provided an influence on that relationship. Although leader effectiveness is most often used as an organizational outcome in leadership studies, this research supports the variable as a predictor of organizational outcomes.

Understanding what makes a leader effective is one of many perspectives in leadership research. It is also important to examine the influences on and outcomes of effective leadership. Specifically, examining these influences and outcomes provides information on how leaders may best guide and direct their personnel and organizations (Sadeghi & Pihie, 2012). The majority of studies examining leader effectiveness appear to focus on the antecedents of this leadership phenomenon (Decker & Rotondo, 2001; Deluga, 1991; Hassan, Mahsud, Yukl & Prussia, 2013; Van Emmerick & Euwema, 2007). There seems to be less of a focus on what outcomes result from effective leadership and the influence of situational variables on outcomes. This research focus may change or expand due to an increasing emphasis on the subordinate side of the leader-subordinate relationship.

Examining the subordinate’s perspective on the leader builds on a history of leader-centric research. Although the concept of leadership is an ancient one, only since the 1930s has the phenomenon of leadership been the subject of academic research (House & Aditya, 1997). A majority of this research is leader-centric and specifically the behaviors and traits attributed to the leader that persuade or influence the behavior of subordinates (Fields, 2007). How subordinates perceive the leader whether from a behavioral, trait, emotional, or other aspect may influence subordinate outcomes that in turn may have consequences for the organization.
Research Problem

Organizations across the economic sectors of profit, non-profit, government and military would likely include leader effectiveness and employee job satisfaction as important personnel related organizational objectives. In a study of 51 county level social service organizations, Miles and Petty (1977) found that satisfaction with the supervisor was significantly related to subordinate job satisfaction. Deluga (1991) found satisfaction with the leader was positively and significantly correlated with leader effectiveness. An important organizational outcome of effective leadership is increased employee performance and job satisfaction. Additionally, studies have found a negative relationship between job satisfaction, role ambiguity, and role conflict; the latter two being undesirable organizational outcomes (Brown & Peterson, 1993; Wood & Field, 2007). Since role ambiguity and role conflict are factors in job overload, this outcome suggests job overload may negatively influence relationships between job satisfaction and other variables. Organizational pressures are also the main cause of job overload and leaders may reflect these pressures on employees through the factors that define job overload such as increased work hours and unrealistic performance goals (Altaf & Awan, 2011).

Adding to organizational pressure is the flattening and interconnection of the global economy across industries; it is one cause of increased competition, which has the potential to increase pressure on the organization to become or remain competitive (Buckley & Yamin, 2011). Job overload may negatively moderate the relationship between effective leadership and job satisfaction. In order to mitigate the negative influence of job overload, it is important to understand what factors are most important to that end. One potential situational variable is perceived organizational support. Perceived organizational support may positively moderate the relationship between effective leadership and job satisfaction. A proposed model of the relationship between subordinate perceptions of effective leadership and job satisfaction includes the examination of perceived organizational support and the potential negative influence of job overload. Specifically, the objective of this study was the examination of the relationship between employee perception of leader effectiveness and employee job satisfaction. Additionally, and as shown in Figure 1, the study also examined the moderation effect of perceived organizational support and job overload on the relationship between employee perception of leader effectiveness and employee job satisfaction.
Literature Review

Job overload can potentially affect employees in any economic sector. The terms work overload and role overload are seen in the literature with a similar constellation of characteristics (Altaf & Awan, 2011; Blackmore & Kuntz, 2011; Friend, 1982). For the purpose of this study, job overload includes all similarly referenced variables. Although most of the causes of job overload result in negative outcomes, research indicates that some individuals may view taking on more work and responsibility as a challenge (Altaf & Awan, 2011). This condition appears to be outside the normal reaction to job overload. There are three main concerns with job overload: cause, symptoms, and outcomes with organizational factors being a frequently studied cause of job overload (Altaf & Awan, 2011; Blackmore & Kuntz, 2011; Thomas Adler, & Castro, 2005).

The causes of job overload appear mainly to be the result of organizational pressure (Altaf & Awan, 2011). These organizational pressures include long, difficult working hours, pressure to work overtime, few holidays, vacation days or breaks, unreasonable workload, an unreasonable expectation of performance within the time allowed, role ambiguity, role conflict, and one non-organizational cause, interpersonal conflict (Altaf & Awan, 2011; Cullen, Silverstein, & Foley, 2008). Job overload is often expressed through physical symptoms such as fatigue from lack of sleep and overwork, headache, nausea, insomnia, anxiety, and stress (Altaf & Awan, 2011). These physical symptoms have the
potential to become longer-term health issues and could result in a variety of negative outcomes.

Research indicates that job overload outcomes can affect the person, the organization, or both. Individuals can have poor work-life balance or develop physical problems such as cardio-vascular disease (Altuf & Awan, 2011; Cullen et al., 2008; Ilies, Dimotakis, & De Pater, 2010). Job overload affects the organization through employee dissatisfaction, greater absenteeism, and job turnover (Altuf & Awan, 2011; Cullen et al., 2008). Both the organization and employees are affected by accidents caused when employees are dissatisfied and consequently less engaged and attentive in their work (Altuf & Awan, 2011; Cullen et al., 2008; Ilies et al., 2010).

Other studies lend support to the negative outcomes associated with job overload. Cullen et al. (2008) found that high job demands fully explained the relationship between workload and job burnout. Friend (1982) found that higher workload and greater time urgency led to lower levels of job performance. In a study of military personnel, role overload was inversely related to job performance (Thomas, Adler, & Castro, 2005). In addition, negative affective reactions to high workloads can decrease employee well-being and cause greater affective distress on high workload days (Ilies et al, 2010).

Job overload appears to have an inverse relationship with job satisfaction. Supporting this contention, job burnout, an extreme case of job overload, fully explained the relationship between job demands and job satisfaction in a study by Cullen et al., (2008). Counter to this trend, a study of 76 non-randomly selected employees from a variety of organizations in Pakistan by Altuf and Awan (2011) found no relationship between job overload and job satisfaction.

Perceived Organizational Support

Perceived organizational support (POS) is an expression of the employee’s belief that the organization values their contribution and provides for their welfare (Blackmore & Kuntz, 2011). Theorists also consider POS as a transaction between the employee who provides effort and loyalty and the organization that provides socioeconomic support (Aselage & Eisenberger, 2003). This type of transaction is fundamental to social exchange theory that emphasizes the importance of the employee’s motivation and the relation of that motivation to achieving organizational goals (Eisenberger, Huntington, Hutchison, & Sowa, 1986).

A number of outcomes are positively related to POS including organizational commitment, organizational citizenship behavior, retention in the organization, and job satisfaction (Allen, Shore, & Griffith, 2003; Blackmore, & Kuntz, 2011; Dawley, Houghton, & Bucklew, 2010; Harris, Harris, & Harvey, 2007; & Rhoades & Eisenberger, 2002). Perceived organizational support is also associated with increased affective commitment.
Perceived Organizational Support and Job Overload as Moderators

(Blackmore & Kuntz, 2011), and related factors such as participation in decision-making (Allen, Shore, & Griffith, 2003), reduced turnover, supervisor support and personal sacrifice (Dawley et al., 2010). Perceived organizational support is a significant predictor of employee job performance and satisfaction (Rhoades & Eisenberger, 2002; Harris et al., 2007). Harris et al. (2007) found POS was positively related to job satisfaction, pay satisfaction, and negatively related to turnover intention, role conflict, and job strain.

Employees who believe the organization is supporting them may also have positive feelings for other aspects of their employment (Blackmore & Kuntz, 2011). Webber et al. (2012) found that POS was significantly and positively related to trust in top management. In a study related to this outcome, Dawley et al. (2010) found that employees who viewed the organization’s support as a matter of leader discretion valued the support to a greater extent than if the support were mandated by rules or regulations. Conversely, but supportive of the positive influence of POS, Karatepe (2012) posits that a lack of organizational support creates job dissatisfaction leading to overall dissatisfaction with the employee’s career, although the temporal nature of this relationship was not tested.

Perceived organizational support may also mitigate some negative organizational outcomes. Cullen et al. (2008) found that aspects of POS such as a people-oriented culture and inclusion of subordinates in decision-making mitigated the emotional and physical demands of the job. Studies indicate that most employees are interested in higher levels of participative decision-making, a factor in POS and research results support that proposition (Wood, & Fields, 2007). This may explain the strength of this particular aspect of POS. Perceived organizational support was found to mitigate the effects of job demands in a study of employees at a large Mid-Western university (Ilies et al, 2010). It is also possible that POS can mitigate the negative effects of aversive physical, psychological, and behavioral reactions to stressors (Cullen et al., 2008).

Research also supports a moderating and mediating role for POS. Loi, Hang-yue and Foley, (2006) found that perceived organizational support mediates the relationship between procedural and distributive justice and organizational commitment and intention to leave. Suazo and Turnley (2010) found POS fully mediated the relationship between psychological contract breach (PCB) and four individual differences: positive affectivity, reciprocation wariness, equity sensitivity, and Protestant work ethic. The influence of the leader was also an important factor in how employees viewed organizational support (Dawley et al., 2010). Simosi (2012) found POS moderated the relationship between two categories of organizational support influenced employee outcomes: perceived supervisor support and training transfer, and perceived colleague support and employee affective commitment toward the organization. These results support the use of POS as a potential moderator.
Leader Effectiveness

The effectiveness of an organization’s leaders should be a desirable characteristic and outcome for any organization, company, or agency in any economic sector. Researchers hypothesize that leader behaviors and subordinate outcomes are dependent upon how subordinates perceive leader effectiveness (Miles & Petty, 1977). Deluga (1991) found that a subordinate’s extra effort was positively and significantly correlated with leader effectiveness for naval officers. This research indicates that leaders perceived to be effective, positively influence subordinate outcomes. Research has also revealed a number of additional factors that contribute to effective leadership and influence subordinate perceptions (Awamleh & Gardner, 1999; Decker & Rotondo, 2001; Gardner, 2003; Hassan et al., 2013; Hovatter, 2009; Jaussi & Dionne, 2004; Van Emmerick & Euwema, 2007). These factors include leader behaviors, characteristics, and leadership styles.

Perceptions of leader effectiveness are associated with a number of variables such as empowering leadership (Hassan et al., 2013); the leader’s use of humor (Decker & Rotondo, 2001), the use of transformational yet unconventional behavior (Jaussi & Dionne, 2004); and communicating a strong vision (Awamleh & Gardner, 1999). Gardner (2003) found that leader exemplification, the modeling of behaviors, was related to perceived leader effectiveness. Effective leaders can also behave in a way that provides a buffer for subordinates from negative consequences and influences subordinate leadership perceptions (Van Emmerick & Euwema, 2007). An effective leader is likely empathic, sociable, loyal to subordinates, and appropriately emotional (Hovatter, 2009). Openness to experience is also a quality related to perceptions of effective leadership (Van Emmerick & Euwema, 2007).

In addition to behaviors and characteristics, leadership styles contribute to perceptions of leader effectiveness. Transformational and transactional leadership behaviors highly correlate with leader effectiveness, although transactional leadership had a weaker correlation compared to transformational leadership (Deluga, 1991). Ethical leadership is also positively associated with perceptions of effective leadership (Hassan et al., 2013). Relationships are important to the leadership dynamic and subordinates may perceive leader effectiveness as a function of that relationship through the leader’s activation of self-concepts, schemas, or implicit theories of leadership (Gerstner & Day, 1997; Lord et al., 1999).

Certain leader roles are also associated with leader effectiveness and Hooijberg, Lane, and Diverse (2010) found that for superiors and direct reports goal orientation was the most important predictor of leader effectiveness, while the facilitator role was a significant predictor among peers. Hooijberg et al. (2010) also found a leader’s direct reports valued flexibility as a strong indicator of leader effectiveness in a study of 175
bureau chiefs and directors of state government agencies in the Northeastern United States.

**Job Satisfaction**

Job satisfaction is the response from a worker when desired outcomes in a job are closely matched by actual job outcomes (Wood & Fields, 2007). This is likely why job satisfaction is often studied as a leadership behavior outcome. Supporting this contention is the generally consistent relationship between leadership behaviors and job satisfaction in studies using job satisfaction as an outcome (Chiok Foong Loke, 2001). The popularity of this outcome variable in leadership research recognizes its relevance as a major factor in organizational performance (Lok & Crawford, 2004). Since job satisfaction is well studied, it appears to be an appropriate variable to examine the relationship between leadership effectiveness and the moderating variables of perceived organizational support and job overload.

Job satisfaction is generally a prime concern for leaders and subordinates. The reason may be that researchers consider job satisfaction as an emotional response by an individual to job conditions and experiences (Bushra, Usman, & Naveed, 2011; Locke, 1976). Research suggests that employees who experience job satisfaction are more likely to be productive and remain with the organization (Chiok Foong Loke, 2001). Additionally, job satisfaction tends to be a global attitude based on the perception of overall job conditions (Jernigan & Beggs, 2010). This view has come under some scrutiny with proposals suggesting that job satisfaction may be multi-dimensional (Darvish & Rezaei, 2011). Howard and Frink (1996) propose job satisfaction combines both intrinsic and extrinsic job elements supporting the multidimensionality of the variable.

Job satisfaction is also related to several leader-influenced outcomes. Two such variables are employee voice and psychological ownership (Avey, Wernsing, & Palanski, 2012). Employee voice stems from the assertion in Hirschman (1970) that dissatisfied employees will either leave an organization or voice their concerns about conditions at the organization. Psychological ownership means employees feel part of the organization and will likely make decisions in the long-term interest of the organization (Wood, 2003). Job satisfaction is also positively related to higher levels of shared leadership (Wood & Fields, 2007). When a transformational leader uses positive but unconventional leadership, employee job satisfaction increases (Jaussi & Dionne, 2004). These studies of job satisfaction support a role for the leader and a specific influence role on that variable from leaders perceived as effective.
Hypotheses

H1: Leader effectiveness is positively related to job satisfaction as measured by the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire, the Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire-Short Form and analyzed by linear multiple regression.

H2: Job overload moderates the relationship between leader effectiveness and job satisfaction as measured by the Job Overload Scale, the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire, the Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire-Short Form and analyzed by hierarchical multiple regression.

H3: Perceived organizational support moderates the relationship between leader effectiveness and job satisfaction as measured by the Scale of Perceived Organizational Support, the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire, the Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire-Short Form and analyzed by hierarchical multiple regression.

Method

A quantitative survey-based research method was used to conduct an examination of the relationship between employee perception of leader effectiveness and job satisfaction and the moderation effect of two situational variables, perceived organizational support and job overload. Specifically, a within-subjects, three factor (perception of effective leadership, perceived organizational support, and job overload) research design was utilized since all participants were exposed to all levels of each independent variable (Cabanda, Fields, & Winston, 2011).

The study employed a cross-sectional survey method to collect data on the independent variables of perception of effective leadership, perceived organizational support, and job overload and the dependent variable of job satisfaction. Survey instruments were specific to each variable.

Participants and Procedure

Participants were drawn from three economic sectors through an initial random selection and follow-up snowball sample to increase external reliability and the ability to generalize to the population. The government sample, including civilians and military members, accounted for 50% (35) of the sample, a non-profit organization 10% (7) and two private sector businesses 40% (28). Participants were 68.6% male (48) and 31.4% female (22) with a mean age of 49 and with 54.3% (38) reporting more than 10 years of tenure at their current organization. Leadership level was self-reported and is relative to the workplace. An upper level leader at a store would be the store manager, and a department manager would be a mid-level leader while the shift manager would be a lower level leader. On a naval vessel, the upper level leader would be the commanding
officer while the officer in charge of a squadron of ships would also be an upper level leader. Upper level leaders represented 17.1% (12) of the participants, mid-level leaders 27.1% (19), lower level leaders 32.9% (23), and 22.9% (16) of the participants reported no leadership responsibility.

Organizations were contacted in advance and agreed to participate with an individual at each organization distributing the survey link. An initial random sample was utilized and 150 survey links were E-mailed to potential participants. One organization then declined to participate after initial agreement and a follow-on snowball sampling procedure was employed with the remaining organizations using an additional 30 survey links. A total of 74 surveys were returned producing 70 complete surveys for analysis for a 38.8% response rate.

**Instruments**

Data on leader effectiveness was collected using the Leadership Effectiveness Measure (LEM) developed by Chua and Iyengar (2011). The LEM was developed to support a study examining how latitude in decision making affects employee perceptions of a leader’s personality and effectiveness (Chua & Iyengar, 2011). The LEM is a 4-item instrument using a 7-point scale (1 = Not at all, 4 = To some extent, 7 = To a great extent). The instrument has produced a Cronbach's alpha between 0.87 and 0.90.

The items were adapted from the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (Bass & Avolio, 1997). The MLQ contains five scales with three scales, charisma, individualized consideration, and intellectual stimulation, measuring the transformational leadership construct, and two scales, contingent reward, and management-by-exception, measuring the transactional leadership construct (Lowe et al., 1996). In addition to measuring behaviors associated with these two leadership constructs, the MLQ-5X also measures three leadership outcomes: the leader’s extra effort, a leader’s satisfaction, and a leader’s effectiveness (Hovatter, 2009). Several studies have used the MLQ-5X to examine leader effectiveness (Gardner, 2003; Hovatter, 2009; Jaussi, & Dionne, 2004). The development of the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire proposes the perspective that a follower’s ratings of leader behaviors are reflections of their ability to observe the behavior of a leader and have been in a position to observe those behaviors (Bycio et al., 1995).

An examination of the factor structure and scale of the MLQ-5X revealed an overall internal reliability and scale reliability from .63 to .92 with all scales above .70 except active management by exception (Avolio, Bass, & Jung, 1999). The results of a meta-analysis by Lowe et al. (1996) found support for the three transformational scales as viable measures of leadership effectiveness. The transactional scales were also found to correlate with effective leadership but the results were ambiguous (Lowe et al., 1996). Other studies also provide support for the use of the transformational scales to measure leadership effectiveness (Douglas, 2012; Epitropaki & Martin, 2005; Erkutlu, 2008).
Perceived organizational support

Eisenberger et al. (1986) developed an instrument to measure a conception of perceived organizational support that uses social exchange theory to explain the relationship between subordinate work and loyalty, and the organization’s reciprocity for that commitment. Eisenberger and Sowa (1986) report a Cronbach’s alpha for the Scale of Perceived Organizational Support (SPOS) as 0.93. Simosi (2012) reported a Cronbach’s alpha of .83. Blackmore and Kuntz (2011) measured perceived organizational support using a nine-item version of the scale developed by Eisenberger et al. (1986). The SPOS was also used by Ilies et al. (2010); Gillet et al., 2012; Harris et al, 2007; Karatepe, 2012; Simosi, 2012; Suazo & Turnley, 2010; and Webber et al., 2012). Additionally, in two studies of POS using workers from small, medium, and large French companies Gillet et al. (2012) found supervisor autonomy support predicted employee need satisfaction and that POS also predicts hedonic and eudemonic need satisfaction.

Job overload

Caplan, et al. (1980) developed the Job Overload Scale (JOS) to focus on employee perceptions of job overload in a quantitative manner as opposed to affective measures such as mental strain or psychological pressure. The JOS is an 11-item, 5-point Likert scaled instrument developed by Caplan et al. (1980). Questions require participants to quantify their responses by perceived pace and amount of work (Fields, 2002). Coefficient alpha values range from 0.72 to 0.81 (Fields, 2002). Altaf and Awan (2011) reported a Cronbach’s alpha for the JOS of 0.89.

Job satisfaction

Weiss, Dawis, England and Lofquist (1967) developed the Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire-Short Form. The original Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire (MSQ) was a 100-item instrument that included 20 subscales (Fields, 2002). Subsequent to the development of the long form, Weiss et al. (1967) developed a frequently used 20-item instrument known as the MSQ-Short Form (Fields, 2002). The short form is a reliable measure with Cronbach’s alpha values between 0.85 and 0.91. The instrument correlates positively with life satisfaction, non-work satisfaction, job involvement, and performance expectancy (Fields, 2002). While the instrument’s design incorporates measures of both intrinsic and extrinsic job satisfaction, some research suggests assigning items to extrinsic and intrinsic subscales may affect construct validity (APA, n.d.). Hirschfeld (2000) tested both the original MSQ –Short Form and a revised MSQ-Short Form to assess construct validity problems. Hirschfeld found construct validity scores on the original MSQ-Short Form were not inferior to the subscales on the revised form.
Results

A hierarchical multiple regression was used to assess the predictive ability of leader effectiveness on job satisfaction after controlling for participant age. Additionally, the moderation effects of job overload and perceived organizational support on the relationship between leader effectiveness and job satisfaction were also examined. Descriptive statistics for the variables are presented in Table 1.

Table 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Min</th>
<th>Max</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
<th>Skewnessb</th>
<th>Kurtosisc</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Job Satisfaction</td>
<td>48.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>78.87</td>
<td>10.67</td>
<td>-.57</td>
<td>.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leader Effectiveness</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>24.0</td>
<td>19.36</td>
<td>4.06</td>
<td>-1.23</td>
<td>1.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Overload</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>45.0</td>
<td>36.43</td>
<td>4.51</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>-.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational Support</td>
<td>51.0</td>
<td>112.0</td>
<td>68.47</td>
<td>8.00</td>
<td>2.44</td>
<td>12.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leader Effectiveness/perceived Organizational Support</td>
<td>536.0</td>
<td>2688.0</td>
<td>1330.6</td>
<td>349.71</td>
<td>.27</td>
<td>2.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leader Effectiveness/ Job Overload</td>
<td>232.0</td>
<td>1080.0</td>
<td>711.79</td>
<td>194.36</td>
<td>-.44</td>
<td>-.16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

aN = 70
bStandard Error = .29
cStandard Error = .57

A preliminary analysis was conducted to assess the normality and multicollinearity of the data. Skewness and kurtosis range between -1.23 and 1.19 for all variables except perceived organizational support and the interaction term, leader effectiveness/perceived organizational support as presented in Table 1. Job satisfaction and the interaction term leader effectiveness/job overload reach significance on the Kolmogorov-Smirnov test and the Shapiro-Wilk test while job overload reaches significance on just the Shapiro-Wilk test as presented in Table 2.
Table 2
Tests of Normality for Independent, Dependent and Moderator Variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Kolmogorov-Smirnov</th>
<th>Shapiro-Wilk</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Statistic</td>
<td>df</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Satisfaction</td>
<td>.105</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leader Effectiveness</td>
<td>.179</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Overload</td>
<td>.124</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational Support</td>
<td>.147</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effectiveness/Org Support</td>
<td>.146</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effectiveness/Job Overload</td>
<td>.134</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Lilliefors Significance Correction

Table 3
Correlation Matrix for Independent, Dependent and Moderator Variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Job Satisfaction</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Gender</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Leader Effectiveness</td>
<td>.55</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Job Overload</td>
<td>.37</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.37</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Organizational Support</td>
<td>.37</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>-.16</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Effectiveness and Organizational Support</td>
<td>.62</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.88</td>
<td>-.38</td>
<td>.61</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Effectiveness and Job Overload</td>
<td>.57</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.90</td>
<td>.74</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>.82</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There are no multicollinearity problems among the independent and dependent variables as presented in Table 3. The exception is the moderator interaction products that are highly correlated with leader effectiveness and the relevant moderator variables. Both leader effectiveness/perceived organizational support and leader effectiveness/job overload have tolerance levels of .01 and a VIF of 170 indicating collinearity with the independent variable of leader effectiveness. This high correlation with another predictor variable by the moderator variables indicates a potential for lack of moderation affect
since low correlations are recommended between independent variables (Hair et al., 2010).

Subsequent to testing the data for normality and multicollinearity, hypothesis testing was conducted using hierarchical multiple regression by first entering the control variable of gender in block 1. Decker and Rotondo (2001) did find a moderating role for leader gender in a study of leader effectiveness. The control variable had no effect on the model and explained no variance as presented in Table 4. The predictor variable of leader effectiveness and the two moderator variables were entered in block 2 and explained 41.2% of the variance F(4, 65) = 11.41, p = .000 < .05. In block 3 the two interaction terms, leader effectiveness/perceived organizational support and leader effectiveness/job overload were entered and explained a further .5% of the variance and the overall model explained 41.7% of the variance and was significant F(6, 63) = 7.50, p = .80 > .05.

In model 2, only leader effectiveness (beta = .454, p = .000 < .05) and organizational support (beta = .271, p = .007 < .05) were statistically significant. There were no statistically significant variables in model 3.

Table 4

Hierarchical Multiple Regression Analyses Predicting Job Satisfaction From Leader Effectiveness and Moderated by Job Overload and Perceived Organizational Support

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>R Square</th>
<th>Adjusted R Square</th>
<th>R Square Change</th>
<th>F Change</th>
<th>df1</th>
<th>df2</th>
<th>Sig. F Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.006</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>.64</td>
<td>.41</td>
<td>.38</td>
<td>.40</td>
<td>15.21</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>.65</td>
<td>.41</td>
<td>.36</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.226</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>.80</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Predictors: (Constant), Gender
b. Predictors: (Constant), Gender, Organizational Support, Job Overload, Leader Effectiveness
c. Predictors: (Constant), Gender, Organizational Support, Job Overload, Leader Effectiveness, Effectiveness/Job Overload, Effectiveness/Organizational Support

Discussion

The present study had two objectives. The first objective was an examination of the predictive value of leadership effectiveness on job satisfaction. The second, was to determine the ability of perceived organizational support and job overload to act as moderators on that relationship. Results at the individual level of analysis indicate that
leader effectiveness has a positive effect on job satisfaction. This supports findings that job satisfaction is the result of congruence between expectations and outcomes on the job and the consistency of the relationship between leader behaviors and job satisfaction (Chiok Foong Loke, 2001; Wood & Field, 2007).

Leader effectiveness is most often used as an outcome variable in organizational studies (Amundsen & Martinsen, 2014; Ewen et al., 2013). Research generally examines variables that influence the effectiveness of leaders such as behaviors, traits, and leadership styles (Bass, 2008). Studies have examined a number of leader effectiveness predictors such as transformational and transactional leadership (Ewen et al., 2013), the effect of vocal attraction (DeGroot et al., 2011), overconfidence (Shipman & Mumford, 2011), spiritual values (Reave, 2005), and political skill (Douglas & Ammeter, 2004). The significance of this study is the use of leader effectiveness as a predictor of job satisfaction resulting in support for a positive relationship between leader effectiveness and an employee’s job satisfaction.

Amundsen and Martinsen (2014) found a significant, negative, and moderate correlation between leader effectiveness and job satisfaction. This study found a significant, positive, and moderate correlation between job satisfaction and leader effectiveness. The current study collected data on U. S. employee ratings of their direct leader’s effectiveness while the study by Amundsen and Martinsen used a superior’s ratings of a junior leader’s effectiveness in a Norwegian sample. This may indicate the influence of different perspectives or culture on the perceptions of leader effectiveness.

Job overload did not moderate the relationship between leader effectiveness and job satisfaction. The lack of a moderating role for job overload may be attributable to the participant sample. Ng, Ang, and Chan (2008) examined military leaders and subordinates and found a moderating role for job demands, a variable that includes workload, but only when job demands were high. When job demands were low, there was no effect (Ng et al., 2008). The sample in this study included military members who have high job demands but job overload was the most normally distributed of all the variables. Therefore, the high job demands experienced by military members may not be reflected across every economic sector and the influence of job overload may have been lessened by the deliberate research design that sought to sample from a variety of economic sectors.

While this design might increase external validity, it did not provide support for a moderation effect from job overload. This could also mean that job overload in the sampled organizations are less than other organizations or are at such a low level as to dilute the effect from the military sample. Another possible reason could be sample size. While the sample was above the minimum suggested by Hair et al. (2010) for the conduct of a moderated hierarchical multiple regression, sample size did not achieve the recommended 20 cases per variable. This low sampling could also have influenced the
lack of moderation from perceived organizational support. Perceived organizational support was only moderately correlated with job satisfaction and had a small, positive correlation with leader effectiveness.

The lack of a moderation effect for perceived organizational support (POS) aligns with findings by Rahaman (2012) that attributes POS actions as an independent predictor of organizational outcomes. Bogler and Nir (2010) also found that POS acts as a predictor variable in relation to job satisfaction and is subject to a mediation effect from employee empowerment. Poon et al. (2007) also found that the predictive influence of POS was moderated by propensity to trust in its relationship to job satisfaction. Muse and Stamper (2007) found support for job satisfaction as a mediator between POS and work performance. Both variables were highly correlated and the correlation for the current study was moderate, which may also have influenced the result. An additional factor was the larger sample obtained by Muse and Stamper in a single organization while the current study used a smaller sample across three economic sectors.

Perceived organizational support also was the only variable that was well outside normal range with a large, positive kurtosis and a negative skew. The results of the study support other studies that found a positive relationship between job satisfaction and perceived organizational support (Harris et al., 2007; Rhoades & Eisenberger, 2002). However, the lack of a moderation effect may indicate that leader effectiveness is either not dependent on the employee’s perception of organizational support or organizational support acts best as a predictor variable and has a separate influence on employee job satisfaction. It is also possible that both suppositions are correct given that only leader effectiveness and perceived organizational support were the only significant coefficients in the model.

While the research by Decker and Rotondo suggested a role for gender in rating leader effectiveness and the analysis controlled for gender, there was no support for this contention. A lack of gender influence on leader effectiveness ratings does support the finding by Van Velsor et al. (1993) in a study of self-perception accuracy on leader effectiveness that gender had little influence on leader ratings. Van Velsor et al. proposed that the increase in female role confidence might be one contributing factor to underrating female performance.

Since it may be possible that the influence of job overload will be specific to certain economic sectors, examining this variable in relationship to those sectors of the economy may provide additional information for leaders in how to properly manage the broader concept of job demands that includes workload. Further, the precise influence path of perceived organizational support should be investigated to determine if this variable is more properly identified as a separate variable outside the direct influence of the employees’ first line leader. It is possible that employees will view POS as separate and parallel factor influencing job satisfaction. Future research should include the examination of superior and subordinate perceptions of leader effectiveness in a single
study that would aid in resolving the differences in these perceptions found by Amundsen and Martinsen (2014), and this study.
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