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Abstract

In a meta-analysis spanning 2011 to 2021, our research examines the relationship between Authentic Leadership (AL) and Job Satisfaction (JS). Drawing insights from 31 studies with 13,913 participants, we uncover a positive correlation ($r = 0.48$). Our approach, guided by a random-effect model, maintains methodological rigor. Outlier scrutiny via the Galbraith plot identifies one study, integrated cautiously into our analysis. Organizations are urged to invest in authentic leadership training for enriched job satisfaction. In summary, our research accentuates a robust connection between AL and JS, inviting future exploration into how authenticity shapes organizational dynamics.
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INTRODUCTION

Within the intricate tapestry of organizational dynamics, leadership stands as the linchpin influencing employee experiences and organizational outcomes. In this context, the paradigm of Authentic Leadership (AL) has emerged as a compelling domain of scholarly inquiry, captivating attention for its potential impact on the multifaceted construct of job satisfaction (JS). This research embarks on a methodologically rigorous journey, conducting a meta-analytical investigation into the dynamic interplay between AL and JS. Embarking on an academic exploration extending from 2011 to 2021, this study investigates the impactful correlation between AL as the independent variable and JS as the dependent variable, see Figure 1. Employing the esteemed random-effects model, our analysis seeks not merely to aggregate findings but to distill meaningful insights from 31 carefully selected primary studies. Beyond the traditional confines, this study extends its scrutiny to encompass publication bias, ensuring a meticulous exploration that transcends the ordinary and provides a nuanced understanding of the relationship in focus.
LITERATURE REVIEW

In the comprehensive exploration of the relationship between Authentic Leadership and Job Satisfaction, a meticulous literature review was conducted, guided by the rigorous Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses (PRISMA) framework, as depicted in Figure 2. The initial search across prominent databases, including Mendeley, Scopus, and Google Scholar, yielded a substantial pool of records totaling 213 (k=213). The focus of this review centered on investigating the correlation between AL and JS. The systematic process involved the elimination of duplicate records (k = 24), ensuring a refined dataset for further analysis. Subsequently, records were screened (k = 189), with particular attention to full-text articles and theses. A total of 13 records were excluded during this phase due to their non-compliance with the requisite criteria. Moving forward, primary studies were meticulously appraised for relevance (k = 176), with a keen emphasis on adherence to the inclusion criteria. Notably, 145 studies were excluded during this phase, primarily due to deviations from the specified criteria. These criteria were defined by the necessity for primary studies to present numerical data, including correlation values and participant information, and to be available in the English language.

Figure 2 - PRISMA diagram for Meta-analysis
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The culmination of this stringent screening process resulted in the inclusion of 31 primary studies for further analysis. These studies formed the foundation for the quantitative synthesis, employing a meta-analytical approach.
approach. It is imperative to underscore that the inclusion criteria were designed to ensure the inclusion of primary studies that provided numerical insights into the correlation between AL and JS, while also furnishing essential information on participant demographics. This approach guarantees a focused and methodologically robust exploration of the subject matter.

Further, Table 1 provides a comprehensive overview of the qualified primary studies, including relevant details such as the scale used for AL and JS, participant demographics, and the correlation coefficient (r) between AL and JS.

Table 1 – Primary Study Codes and Input Data Incorporated in Meta-Analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S. No.</th>
<th>P</th>
<th>O</th>
<th>Name of the Studies</th>
<th>Participant s in the Study</th>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Publish ed</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>Scale Used for PV</th>
<th>α of PV</th>
<th>Scale Used for OV</th>
<th>α of OV</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>JS Wirawan, Jufri, &amp; Saman, (2020)</td>
<td>Employees</td>
<td>Indonesia</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>307</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>Neider &amp; Schriesheim, (2011)</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>Weiss et al., (1967)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>JS Shulga, (2020)</td>
<td>Employees</td>
<td>USA</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>235</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>Bowen &amp; Schneider, (2014)</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>Huang &amp; Rundle, (2014)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>JS Alkadash, (2020)</td>
<td>Employees</td>
<td>Palestine</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>235</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>Walumbwa et al., (2008)</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>Taylor &amp; Bowers, (1972)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>JS Wong et al., (2020)</td>
<td>Nurses</td>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>Walumbwa et al., (2008)</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>Cammann et al., (1983)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>JS Aycag, (2019)</td>
<td>Employees</td>
<td>Turkey</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>246</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>Not Found</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>Not Found</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>JS Šakić et al., (2019)</td>
<td>Employees</td>
<td>Bosnia and Herzegovina</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>201</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>Walumbwa et al., (2008)</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>Abuge, (2014)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>JS Molero et al., (2019)</td>
<td>Students</td>
<td>Spain</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>263</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>Walumbwa et al., (2008)</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>Molero et al., (2007)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>JS Novaes et al., (2019)</td>
<td>Employees</td>
<td>Brazil</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>548</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>Neider &amp; Schriesheim, (2011)</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>Silva &amp; Ferreira, (2009)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>JS Lux, Grover, &amp; Teo, (2019)</td>
<td>Employees</td>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>281</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>Neider &amp; Schriesheim, (2011)</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>Thompson &amp; Phua, (2012)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>JS Wang et al., (2018)</td>
<td>Entrepreneurs</td>
<td>Filipines</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>208</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>Emuwa, (2013)</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>Ibrahim &amp; Perez, (2014)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>JS Dick et al., (2018)</td>
<td>Employees</td>
<td>20 countries</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>5,290</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>Walumbwa et al., (2008)</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>Hackman &amp; Oldham, (1980)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>JS Rudh et al., (2018)</td>
<td>Employees</td>
<td>Pakistan</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>Walumbwa et al., (2008)</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>Weiss et al., (1967)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>JS Barbosa, (2018)</td>
<td>Nurses</td>
<td>USA</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>Walumbwa et al., (2008)</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>Charles, (1990)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>JS Vem, Gomam, &amp; Wurim,</td>
<td>Employees</td>
<td>Nigeria</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>350</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>Walumbwa et al., (2008)</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>Konrad et al., (1999)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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| No. | Author(s) | Year | Group | Country | Yes/No | N | Year | Study Group | IFS | Study Group | IFS | Study Group | IFS | Study Group | IFS | Study Group | IFS | Study Group | IFS | Study Group | IFS | Study Group |
|-----|-----------|------|-------|---------|--------|---|------|-------------|-----|-------------|-----|-------------|-----|-------------|-----|-------------|-----|-------------|-----|-------------|
| 15. | ALJS Kim, Kim, & Reid, (2017) | 2017 | Employees | USA | Yes | 227 | 0.4 5 | Neider & Schriesheim (2011) | 0.9 1 | Cammann et al., (1983) | 0.8 2 |
| 16. | ALJS Richard et al., (2017) | 2017 | Employees | USA | Yes | 323 | 0.7 2 | Walumbwa et al., (2008) | 0.9 6 | Weiss et al., (1967) | 0.9 4 |
| 17. | ALJS Susanne & Claudia, (2016) | 2016 | Employees | Germany | Yes | 121 | 0.4 8 | Walumbwa et al., (2008) | 0.9 5 | BrayFled et al., (1951) | 0.8 6 |
| 18. | ALJS Boamah et al., (2016) | 2016 | Nurses | Canada | Yes | 406 | 0.2 2 | Walumbwa et al., (2008) | 0.9 3 | Cammann et al., (1983) | 0.8 6 |
| 19. | ALJS Olaninya & Hystad, (2016) | 2016 | Employees | Norway | Yes | 402 | 0.3 3 | Walumbwa et al., (2008) | 0.9 5 | BrayFled et al., (1951) | 0.6 4 |
| 20. | ALJS Fallatah & Laschinger, (2016) | 2016 | Nurses | Canada | Yes | 93 | 0.3 6 | Avolio et al., (2007) | 0.9 2 | Scott, Engelke & Swanso, (2008) | 0.7 9 |
| 21. | ALJS Jacques et al., (2015) | 2015 | Employees | South Korea | Yes | 266 | 0.4 4 | Avolio et al., (2007) | 0.8 1 | Peter, (1979) | 0.9 1 |
| 22. | ALJS Read & Laschinger, (2015) | 2015 | Nurses | Canada | Yes | 191 | 0.8 2 | Walumbwa et al., (2008) | 0.9 5 | Shaver & Lacey, (2003) | 0.8 2 |
| 23. | ALJS Laschinger et al., (2015) | 2015 | Nurses | Canada | Yes | 723 | 0.4 6 | Walumbwa et al., (2008) | 0.9 7 | Cammann et al., (1983) | 0.7 7 |
| 24. | ALJS Černe et al., (2014) | 2014 | Employees | Slovenia | Yes | 171 | 0.3 6 | Neider & Schriesheim (2011) | 0.9 4 | Hackman & Oldham, (1980) | 0.8 9 |
| 25. | ALJS Penger & Černe, (2014) | 2014 | Employees | Slovenia | Yes | 289 | 0.3 6 | Walumbwa et al., (2008) | 0.9 0 | Hackman & Oldham, (1980) | 0.8 5 |
| 26. | ALJS Nielsen, Bergheim & Eid, (2013) | 2013 | Employees | Norway | Yes | 541 | 0.1 9 | Walumbwa et al., (2008) | 0.9 0 | Bakker & Demerouti, (2007) | 0.7 0 |
| 27. | ALJS Azanza et al., (2013) | 2013 | Employees | Spain | Yes | 571 | 0.5 6 | Walumbwa et al., (2008) | 0.9 1 | Molero et al., (2007) | 0.8 7 |
| 28. | ALJS Wong & Laschinger, (2013) | 2013 | Nurses | Canada | Yes | 280 | 0.3 5 | Avolio et al., (2007) | 0.9 7 | Quinn, (1974) | 0.9 5 |
| 29. | ALJS Spence et al., (2012) | 2012 | Nurses | Canada | Yes | 342 | 0.4 0 | Avolio et al., (2007) | 0.9 5 | Richard Hackman & Oldham, (1975) | 0.8 0 |
| 30. | JS Smith et | 2017 | Employees | USA | Yes | 121 | 0.3 | Walumbwa et al., (2008) | 0.9 | Cammann et al., (1983) | 0.8 2 |
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Note. PV = Predictor Variable; OV = Outcome Variable; AL = Authentic Leadership; JS = Job Satisfaction; n = Sample Size; r = Correlation; α = value of Cronbach’s alpha; α* = Mean value of Cronbach’s alpha of other qualified primary studies.

**METHODS AND RESULTS**

In Figure 3 for Galbraith plot, each study is represented as a data point, with its respective effect size plotted against its standard error. The diagonal line signifies the expected distribution in the absence of outliers, while deviations from this line suggest potential studies exerting undue influence on the overall correlation estimate. Upon careful examination of Figure 3, we observed a study positioned conspicuously outside the upper bound line, suggesting a potential outlier. Despite this notable deviation, it is imperative to highlight our commitment to methodological rigor. In exercising prudence, we made a deliberate and informed decision to include this particular study in our comprehensive analysis.

![Galbraith plot]

Figure 3 - Galbraith plot in studies related to Authentic Leadership and Job Satisfaction, (k=31)

Embarking on an intellectual journey spanning the years 2011 to 2021, our investigation unravels the intricate dance between AL and JS. This meta-analytical endeavor weaves a tapestry from the threads of 31 carefully chosen primary studies, involving a comprehensive cohort of 13,913 participants. The overarching goal is to distill the essence of the relationship between these pivotal organizational constructs.

Navigating the variegated landscape of primary studies, we employed the sophisticated random-effects model, a statistical compass adept at navigating the inherent heterogeneity within our selected corpus. This methodological choice, judiciously balancing within-study and between-study variances, ensures a nuanced exploration of the AL and JS nexus while mitigating potential biases.

The meta-analysis results, elegantly presented in Table 2, paint a portrait of a positive correlation between AL and JS, as evidenced by a robust r-value of 0.47. Our refined analysis, incorporating the corrected positive correlation (ρ+C) of 0.58, bespeaks a compelling moderate to strong positive impact, delicately adjusting for the nuances of sampling and measurement errors. The confidence interval (CI), a range of 0.56 to 0.52, offers a panoramic view of the correlation’s steadfastness, while the predicted interval (PI), a refined estimate oscillating between 0.52 and 0.63, adds an extra layer of reliability.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>k</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>r</th>
<th>ρ_L</th>
<th>ρ_L_C</th>
<th>χ²</th>
<th>χ²_L</th>
<th>χ²_L_C</th>
<th>Q</th>
<th>F_0</th>
<th>F_0_L</th>
<th>F_0_L_C</th>
<th>ρ ER</th>
<th>P BMT</th>
<th>TFM</th>
<th>IS TF</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AL→JS</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>13,9</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>45.1</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>33.52</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0.82</td>
<td>0.63</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2 - Meta-Analysis Results
Delving into the heterogeneity terrain, our scrutiny reveals a significant Q-value of 45.13 (p = 0.038) and an $I^2$ of 33.52%, hinting at a nuanced variability across studies. Robustness is further attested by p-values derived from the Egger regression test ($P_{ERT}$) and Begg and Mazumdar test ($P_{BMT}$) (0.82 and 0.825, respectively), countering suspicions of publication bias. The Trim and Fill method ($TFM$), an exquisite touch to our analysis, introduces 5 imputed studies ($IS_{TFM} = 5$). 

This methodological ballet, orchestrated with finesse, not only illuminates the elusive relationship between AL and JS but elevates our scholarly pursuit to a realm of analytical sophistication. As we tread forward, this nuanced understanding forms the crux for an in-depth interpretation and discussion of our findings, marking the onset of a scholarly discourse that transcends the ordinary.

**DISCUSSION**

In simpler terms, our research uncovered a positive connection between Authentic Leadership (AL) and Job Satisfaction (JS). This indicates that when leaders exhibit authenticity in their actions, decisions, and interactions, it tends to have a positive effect on the satisfaction levels of employees in their jobs.

To break it down further, think of it this way: Imagine a leader who genuinely communicates, listens, and acts with integrity. Employees in such an environment tend to feel more valued, understood, and supported, leading to increased satisfaction with their work.

Now, the significance of this finding goes beyond academic interest. It’s essentially a message to organizational leaders, urging them to adopt authentic leadership practices. Why? Because our results suggest that doing so is likely to contribute to a happier and more satisfied workforce. It’s like saying, "Hey leaders, being authentic isn’t just a good idea for the books; it’s a practical strategy for creating a workplace where employees are content and fulfilled in what they do."

**FUTURE RECOMMENDATION**

In the realm of future recommendations, we propose a strategic direction for organizations: invest in authentic leadership training. This recommendation is rooted in the idea that by providing leaders with the tools and insights to embody authentic leadership principles, organizations can actively contribute to the creation of workplaces that foster and enhance job satisfaction among employees. Authentic leadership training can take various forms, encompassing workshops, seminars, mentorship programs, and ongoing professional development. The goal is to equip leaders with the skills and understanding necessary to cultivate an authentic leadership style. This includes emphasizing transparency, fostering genuine connections, and promoting ethical decision-making.

**CONCLUSION**

In wrapping up our research endeavor encompassing 31 illuminating studies, the harmony struck between AL and JS emerges as a compelling melody. As the final note lingers, it beckons both scholars and organizational practitioners to delve into the rich tapestry woven by authenticity in leadership, resonating in the corridors of job satisfaction.

The culmination of insights gleaned from this meta-analysis extends beyond a mere academic coda; it serves as a prelude to further investigations. Our concluding findings, etched from the collective wisdom of these studies, prompt a call to action for continued exploration into the nuanced interplay of authenticity and job satisfaction.
The research cresendo, rather than a denouement, sets the stage for an encore—a deeper dive into the realms where authentic leadership shapes the very soul of organizational ethos. As our research baton lowers, it isn’t a finale but an invitation. The spotlight remains, inviting stakeholders to join in the ongoing symphony of understanding how authenticity, when conducted by leaders, orchestrates a symphony of job satisfaction within the workplace.
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