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Emotional Intelligence and the Job Demands-Resources Model

**ABSTRACT:** Occupational stress research has consistently demonstrated negative effects for employees. Research also describes potential moderators of this relationship. While research has revealed some positive effects of emotional intelligence (EI) on employee adjustment, it has neglected investigation of their potential stress buffering effects. Based on the Job-Demand Resources model, it was predicted that higher trait emotional intelligence would act as a buffer to the potential negative effects of stressors on employee adjustment. Hierarchical multiple regression analyses with a sample of 306 nurses found no main effects of EI but revealed eight moderating effects. While some interactions support the buffering hypothesis, others revealed buffering for those with low EI. Findings are discussed in terms of theoretical and practical implications.
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Occupational stress is a world-wide issue with implications for employees, organizations, and economies. This is particularly the case for nurses whose work involves emotional work due to pressures relating to the display and regulation of emotions when dealing with difficult situations in their daily work (see Hochschild, 2003). At the individual level the costs of stress are vast ranging from poor attitudes (e.g., low satisfaction and intentions to leave), to health-related effects (e.g., poor psychological health and risk of morbidity and mortality). Indeed, research has highlighted the importance of effective management of occupational stress to human resource practitioners, who are increasingly concerned with ensuring that human resource practices promote employee health, positive job-related attitudes, and performance (e.g. Ngo, Foley, & Loi, 2005). Thus, it is imperative that organizational leaders and managers understand the occupational stress process and integrate this knowledge into their strategic and operational decision-making.

As a result of the vast consequences of stress, researchers have invested considerable efforts into identifying variables that directly impact employee adjustment, or that moderate, or buffer, the negative effects of work stressors on employee adjustment. Many buffers of stress have emerged, adding to the complexity, but necessary relevance, of occupational stress theories. One construct that has received little attention by researchers in a job demand - employee adjustment context is the role of emotional intelligence (EI; one’s ability to understand and manage their own and others’ emotions).

**The Job-Demand Resources Model**

The Job-Demand Resource (JDR) model (Bakker & Demerouti, 2007) asserts the characteristics of a job can be broadly classified into two categories: job demands and job resources. Job demands require...
sustained physical and/or psychological effort from employees (Demerouti, Bakker, Nachreiner & Schaufeli, 2001). Examples of job demands include time pressure, role conflict, and emotional labour. Conversely, job resources refer to job characteristics that are functional in achieving work goals, and that simulate personal growth and development (Demerouti et al., 2001). Examples of job resources include performance feedback and participation in decision making.

The JDR proposes that job demands and job resources evoke two independent processes. Job demands act to exhaust employees’ physical and psychological resources, leading to strain symptoms such as fatigue and burnout (Demerouti, et.al, 2001; Ilies, Dimotakis, & De Pater, 2010).

Furthermore, high job demands are also negatively related to a number of job-related outcomes, including job performance (LePine, Podsakoff, & LePine, 2005) and job satisfaction (Humphrey, Nahgang, & Morgeson, 2007). A meta-analysis by Örtqvist and Wincent (2006) found that role ambiguity was generally associated with increased tension, indicators of burnout (i.e., emotional exhaustion, low personal accomplishment) and worse job-related attitudes (i.e., job satisfaction, turnover). Higher levels of emotional exhaustion and less favourable levels of job related attitudes were related to role conflict. Role overload was also found to be related to increased tension, exhaustion, intentions to quit, and lower organisational commitment. In this study, we focus on overload (e.g., too much work), underload (e.g., too little work), management disagreement (e.g., conflicts with managers), and job ambiguity (e.g., lack of role clarity) as job demands that are likely to have direct negative effects on measures of employee adjustment.

Hypothesis 1 (H1): Nurses who perceive higher levels of the stressors (overload, management disagreement, underload, and ambiguity) will perceive lower levels of job satisfaction (job satisfaction characteristics, job satisfaction relational, and well-being).

**EI as a Job Resource**

EI refers to the degree to which an ‘individual attends to, processes, and acts upon information of an emotional nature intra-personally and inter-personally’ (Kafetsios & Zampetakis, 2008). There are two distinct approaches to the conceptualization and operationalization of EI, ability EI, and trait EI. The ability EI approach stems from a cognitive-motivational framework (Mayer & Salovey, 1997; Salovey & Mayer, 1990), mainly concerned with one’s ability to perceive, appraise, and express
emotions. Ability EI tends to be measured by maximum performance measures (e.g., Mayer, Salovey, & Caruso, 2002). On the other hand, trait EI, which stems from a personality framework, relates to behavioural tendencies and self-perceived capacity regarding to one’s emotion (e.g. Petrides & Furnham, 2000). In other words, trait EI encompasses both the ability to perceive and process emotional information, as well as other motivational aspects of personal functioning (Zeidner, Matthews, & Roberts, 2004). Measurement of trait EI tends to rely on self-report measures (e.g. Petrides & Furnham, 2001; Schutte et al., 1998). As fewer studies have focussed on trait EI than ability EI, this paper adopts the trait approach to EI and investigates its role as a personal resource in predicting job satisfaction to expand understanding of this conceptualisation of EI.

The importance of EI in nursing has been widely recognized for its role in forming constructive work and nurse-patient relationships (McQueen, 2004). According to the JDR, job resources evoke an independent process that motivates and assists employees to accomplish their work goals, leading to work engagement and organisational commitment. Indeed, there is considerable research evidence for the main effect of job resources in predicting favourable outcomes for employees, such as lower levels of burnout, cynicism, higher engagement, and psychological health (Bakker, Demerouti, & Euwema, 2005; Hakanen, Bakker, & Demerouti, 2005).

In general, research has found a significant and positive relationship between EI and job satisfaction. For example, several researchers have found that EI is positively related to job satisfaction in the workplace (see Carmeli, 2003; Kafetsios & Zampetakis, 2008;). Similarly, Karimi, Leggat, Donohue, Farrell, and Couper (2014) found a significant positive relationship between EI and well-being (as defined by lower levels of feeling worn out and nervous). EI is viewed as a resource as employees with high EI are better able to perceive, appraise, and regulate their emotions and the emotions of others. This ability acts as a resource in coping with social interactions in workplaces and the emotional labour specifically associated with nursing. While results have been mixed regarding the effect of EI on job satisfaction, several studies have found a direct and positive effect of EI on job satisfaction (e.g., Sy, Tram, & O’Hara, 2006). In this research, it is proposed that EI will act as a resource that directly predicts increased job satisfaction.
Hypothesis 2 (H2): Nurses who demonstrate higher levels of EI will perceive higher levels of job satisfaction (characteristics and workplace relations) and well-being.

The JDR model also proposes that job resources have the potential to moderate the negative effect of job demands on well-being: when job resources are high, the negative effect of job demands on health outcomes are reduced (Bakker & Demerouti, 2007). Kahn & Boisie (1992) suggest two mechanisms through which resources might buffer the negative impact of stressors. First, resources might influence on individuals’ appraisal of job demands. In the case of trait EI, individuals of higher EI tend to see things from a more positive view (Schutte et al., 1998). Accordingly, when facing the same amount of demands, individuals of high trait EI might see the demands as less threatening and less effortful to cope than those of lower trait EI. Second, resources might moderate the response individuals have after the appraisal process. Individuals of higher trait EI are better with perceiving and managing their own emotions (Schutte et al., 1998). As such, they are able to manage the negative emotions evoked by job demands more effectively compared to those of low trait EI.

There is some empirical research to support an EI buffer hypothesis. First, Jordan, Ashkanasy, & Hartel (2002) found that high emotionally intelligent individuals experienced less negative emotions and adopted less negative ways of coping in the face of job insecurity. Second, in a nursing sample, Karimi, et al. (2014) found that EI moderated the relationship between emotional labour and well-being outcomes whereby those with higher EI were more protected from the potential negative effects of emotional labour on levels of job stress. Based on the JDR and limited empirical research, it is proposed that trait EI will moderate the relationship between job demands and job satisfaction.

Hypothesis 3 (H3): Higher levels of EI will buffer the potential negative effects of job stressors (overload, management disagreement, underload, and ambiguity) on job satisfaction (characteristics and relations) and well-being.

METHOD

Participants

An online research company sent an email containing a link to an online survey to 630 potential participants identified as professional nurses who were over 18 years of age and residing in Australia. Overall, 306 useable surveys were completed by nurses working in private, public, and non-profit
health care organizations. The majority were between 31-40 year of age (32.4%), followed by the 41-50 age group (25.5%). Two percent of participants were aged over 61. The remaining age groups (18-25, 26-30, and 51-60) were approximately the same size (12.4%-14.4%). The majority of the participants were female (73.9%).

Measures

Job stressors. Following Noblet et al. (2005), 34 items were used to measure context-specific administrative stressors. Member validation checks and comparisons with the occupational stress literature (e.g. Cox & Cox, 1993) indicated that the overall analysis had satisfactory levels of internal and external validity. An exploratory factor analysis (principle axis factoring with oblique rotation) conducted on the items revealed four factors: overload, management disagreement, underload, and role ambiguity.

Emotional intelligence. Petrides and Furnham’s (2006) 30-item Trait Emotional Intelligence Questionnaire – Short Form (TEIQue-SF), which has been used reliably in research previously (e.g. Burri, Cherkas, & Spector, 2009), was used to assess trait EI. Items were measured on a 5-point scale ranging from 1 (completely disagree) to 5 (completely agree). An example item is “I can deal effectively with people”. Negatively worded items were recoded so higher scores indicated more favourable levels of EI.

Job satisfaction. Warr et al.’s (1979) 15-item job satisfaction scale was used to assess job satisfaction. The items were measured on a 7-point scale, from 1 (extremely dissatisfied) to 7 (extremely satisfied). An exploratory factor analysis (principle axis factoring with oblique rotation) conducted on the items revealed two factors: satisfaction with job characteristics, and satisfaction with relations.

Psychological well-being. The General Health Questionnaire (GHQ-12: Goldberg, 1972) was used to assess perceived psychological well-being. The GHQ-12 has been advocated as a measure of psychological health in occupational contexts (Banks et al., 1980). Employees were asked about their general health over the past month by responding to a 4-point scale: response options were 0 (more so than usual), 1 (same as usual), 2 (less than usual), and 3 (much less than usual). An example item is “Have you recently felt that you’re playing a useful part in things?”. The scoring procedure was
adapted from Goldberg and Williams (1988). Scores receiving a rating of 0 or 1 were recoded to 0, while scores receiving a rating of 2 or 3 were recoded to 1. Six negatively worded items were then recoded so that a score of 1 represented favourable outcome. A global score for each participant was obtained by summing all items, resulting in a scale with a range from 0 to 12.

*Gender and age.* Gender and age were entered as covariates in regression analyses to control for difference in perceptions of focal variables as a function of both age and gender.

**RESULTS**

Exploratory factor analyses were used to establish factors to use in analyses to address the hypotheses. Descriptive data, inter-correlations, and Cronbach’s (1951) alpha coefficients for the aggregated focal variables can be seen in Table 1. The Cronbach’s alpha coefficients for all scales exceeded .70. These results indicate sufficient internal consistency, demonstrating the items are reliable at measuring the constructs. Low to moderate correlations can be seen between the independent variables, indicating that multicollinearity is not a serious threat to the analyses (Tabachnick & Fidell, 2001). The directions of the correlations indicate convergent and discriminant validity based on the variables assessed. For instance, stressor variables were correlated positively with each other and negatively with satisfaction variables.

Two analyses were conducted to assess the potential effects of common method variance (CMV). First, Harman’s single-factor test was run via an exploratory factor analysis in SPSS using varimax rotation (Podsakoff, Mackenzie, et al. 2003). The unrotated factor solution revealed that the single factor accounted for 25% of total variance. This is well below the level that could suggest a CMV problem. Second, AMOS was used to load all items onto an additional latent CMV factor. As only an additional 1% of shared variance was accounted for by this latent factor, CMV was not suggested to be a threat in the present study.

**Two-way Moderated Hierarchical Regression Analyses**

Two-way moderated hierarchical regression analyses were used to test the hypotheses (Tabachnick & Fidell, 2001). Control variables (age and gender) were entered in Step 1, mean-centred main effects,
stressors, and the moderator (EI), were entered in Step 2, and the two-way interaction variables were entered on Step 3. The results are displayed in Table 2.

The covariates did not significantly account for variance in any of the outcome variables: job characteristics ($\text{Adj. } R^2 = -.00, F(2, 303) = 0.50, \text{ns}$); workplace relations ($\text{Adj. } R^2 = .01, F(2, 303) = 0.40, \text{ns}$); and well-being ($\text{Adj. } R^2 = .00, F(2, 303) = 0.41, \text{ns}$).

**Main effects.** To test hypotheses 1 and 2, the main effects were examined and can be seen in Table 3. After partialling out the effects of the covariates, results indicated that inclusion of EI and job stressor variables on Step 2 accounted for a significant increase in variance on job characteristics ($R^2 \text{ Ch.} = .26, F(6, 297) = 20.52, p < .001$) and workplace relations ($R^2 \text{ Ch.} = .22, F(6, 297) = 16.33, p < .001$). However, no significant increase was found for well-being ($R^2 \text{ Ch.} = .3, F(6, 297) = 1.54, \text{ns}$). More specifically, job characteristics were negatively associated with overload ($\beta = -.20, p < .01$), management disagreement ($\beta = -.27, p < .001$), and ambiguity ($\beta = -.15, p < .01$). No significant relationships were found between job characteristics and underload ($\beta = -.05, \text{ns}$), or EI ($\beta = -.03, \text{ns}$). Workplace relations was negatively associated with overload ($\beta = -.28, p < .001$), management disagreement ($\beta = -.17, p < .05$), and ambiguity ($\beta = -.13, p < .05$). No significant associations were found between workplace relations and underload ($\beta = -.04, \text{ns}$) or EI ($\beta = -.09, \text{ns}$). No significant main effects were found for well-being and EI or the job stressors: EI ($\beta = -.06, \text{ns}$), overload ($\beta = -.07, \text{ns}$), management disagreement ($\beta = -.10, \text{ns}$), underload ($\beta = -.05, \text{ns}$), and ambiguity ($\beta = .05, \text{ns}$), and underload ($\beta = -.07, \text{ns}$).

**Interactions.** Four interactions were entered as a set in each regression analysis, explaining significant variance on job characteristics ($R^2 \text{ ch.} = .03, F(4,294) = 2.64, p = .03$), and workplace relations ($R^2 \text{ ch.} = .05, F(4,294) = 4.59, p = .001$). While no significant variance was found for well-being ($R^2 \text{ ch.} = .03, F(4,294) = 1.92, \text{ns}$), it can be noted that one significant interaction was revealed. These interactions were plotted at one standard deviation above and below the mean (Aiken & West, 1991).
Two significant interactions were found relating to EI and job characteristics (See Figures 1 – 2). As can be seen in Table 2, significant interactions were revealed between overload and EI on job characteristics ($\beta = -.15, p = .048$), and underload and EI on job characteristics ($\beta = -.15, p = .005$). A marginally significant interaction (Figure 3) was found between management disagreement and EI on job characteristics ($\beta = -.13, p = .091$). Figure 1 shows (that those with higher levels of EI did not experience changes in levels of satisfaction with job characteristics as role overload increased ($B = -.00, t(284) = -0.56, ns$), however, levels of job characteristics were significantly reduced for those with low EI as role overload increased ($B = -.03, t(284) = -4.42, p < .001$). Contrary to Hypothesis 3, Figure 2 shows that those with higher levels of EI experienced lower levels of job characteristics as role underload increased ($B = -.27, t(284) = -2.91, p = .004$), but job characteristics did not significantly differ for those with low job control as role overload increased ($B = .05, t(284) = 0.67, ns$). Similarly, contrary to H3, Figure 3 shows that those with higher levels of EI experienced significantly lower levels of job characteristics as management disagreement increased ($B = -.38, t(284) = -4.24, p < .001$), but job characteristics were did not significantly differ for those with low EI as management disagreement increased ($B = -.15, t(284) = -1.52, ns$).

Overall, three interactions were found with respect to satisfaction with workplace relations. Firstly, supporting H3, the interaction between overload and EI interaction predicted satisfaction with workplace relations ($\beta = .31, p < .001$). Figure 4 shows participants with low EI experienced lower levels of workplace relations as overload increased ($B = -.52, t(284) = -6.23, p < .001$), while those with high EI experienced a significant increase in workplace relations ($B = .16, t(284) = 2.13, p < .05$). Additionally, management disagreement ($\beta = -.19, p < .05$) and underload ($\beta = -.09, p = .08$) interacted with EI on satisfaction with workplace relations. Contrary to H3, Figure 5 shows that satisfaction with workplace relations reduced as management disagreement increased for those with high EI ($B = -.29, t(284) = -4.08, p < .001$), while those with low EI were buffered against this stressor ($B = -.07, t(284) = -0.77, ns$). Similarly, Figure 6 reveals that satisfaction with workplace relations for those high on EI reduced as underload increased ($B = -.24, t(284) = -2.38, p = .02$), while no significant change was found for low EI as the stressor increased ($B = -.00, t(284) = -0.01, ns$).
Lastly, two significant interactions were found for psychological well-being. First, the interaction of underload and EI was significant on psychological well-being ($\beta = -.12$, $p < .05$). Contrary to H3, Figure 7 shows decreased levels of psychological well-being in those with high EI as underload increases ($B = -.45$, $t(284) = -2.30$, $p = .022$), whereas those with low EI were buffered ($B = .09$, $t(284) = 0.60$, $ns$). Second, role ambiguity interacted with EI in the prediction of psychological well-being ($\beta = .12$, $p = .06$). Supporting H3, those with low EI did not experience significantly different levels of psychological well-being as role ambiguity increased ($B = -.16$, $t(284) = -0.86$, $ns$), while those with high EI showed higher levels of psychological well-being as ambiguity increased ($B = .34$, $t(284) = 2.12$, $p = .03$).

**DISCUSSION AND IMPLICATIONS**

This study used the JDR model to hypothesise and investigate the interactive relationship between job demands and trait EI on employee adjustment and well-being. It was expected that there would be a negative main effect between job stressors and employee adjustment, and a positive main effect between EI and employee well-being. Further, it was predicted that higher levels of EI would operate as a resource to buffer the potential negative effects of job stressors on employee adjustment.

First, inspection of the main effects reveals mixed results. Supporting H1 and considerable existing stress research (e.g., Newton & Teo, 2014), role overload, management disagreement, and role ambiguity were related to lower levels of satisfaction with job characteristics and workplace relations. Significant main effects were not found for role underload on either satisfaction variables. Moreover, no significant effects were found for any stressors on psychological well-being. These latter non-significant results could reflect that the other stressors were of more importance to satisfaction, meaning the effect underload was relatively less important. Further, the non-significant results on psychological well-being have been found in other research (e.g., Newton & Jimmieson, 2009). It should be noted, however, that testing of the main effects of each stressor independent of the remaining stressors revealed significant results on all outcome variables.

Interestingly, the results revealed no support for H2, as EI was not significantly related to either satisfaction outcome or psychological well-being. Testing of EI independent of other main effect variables also revealed non-significance. This result does not support the findings of previous
research, which suggest a significant and positive relationship between emotional intelligence and employee adjustment (e.g., Kafetsios & Zampetakis, 2008). However, the research into EI and job satisfaction is somewhat unclear about the relationship between them. On the one hand there is evidence to suggest that the two are related (e.g., Sy, Tram and O’Hara, 2006), while others find that the relationship is indirect (Lee and Ok, 2012). There is also research suggesting that the connection between EI and job satisfaction is more complex than first assumed. In their study of nurses, Guleryuz, Guney, Aydn, and Asan (2008) found that only some dimensions of EI were positively related to job satisfaction (namely regulation of emotion and use of emotion) while others had no connection (others’ emotional appraisal) or had a negative relationship (self emotional appraisal). Trivellas, Gerogiannis, and Svarna (2013), in their study of nurses, concluded that only the dimensions of self-emotional appraisal and use of emotion are related to job satisfaction. Our results support the importance of paying attention to how the various dimensions of EI are connected to different measures of employee adjustment.

Mixed results were received for the buffer hypothesis relating to EI. First, high EI was found to buffer the negative effect of stressors on satisfaction with job characteristics and workplace relations as role overload increased, and also for role ambiguity on psychological well-being. These three results provide support for the JDR model and the notion that resources, in this case, the human capital resource of EI, can act to mitigate the negative effects of stressors on the experience of strain. As such, high EI employees may develop an understanding of the environment that facilitates more positive and fewer negative emotional responses that pave the way for more adaptive coping. Such a process is supported by a transactional approach to understanding stress (Lazarus & Folkman, 1984).

However, five other interactions relating to role underload and management disagreement found that high EI acted more to amplify the negative effects of these stressors on outcomes. Moreover, these interactions revealed more buffering effects for those with low EI. These findings, contrary to what was hypothesised, could be indicative of the differing natures of specific stressors. One possible explanation is related to the nature of the stressors and how EI causes individuals to perceive, appraise, and cope with different stressors. High role overload may impact those with low EI as they do not have the resources to effectively cope with what is perceived as too much or too
difficult work. On the other hand, low EI may mean that individuals do not even start to feel frustration or boredom caused by underload, or the tension caused by conflict with supervisors.

While both overload and underload have been found to be stressors in previous research, overload is associated with higher levels of strain than underload (Schultz, Wang, & Olson, 2010). Individuals with different levels of EI may perceive and appraise underload differently. Indeed, it may be that low EI individuals perceive underload as a resource rather than a stressor, either as paid downtime, an opportunity to relax, or an opportunity to socialise with colleagues. It could be that high EI could increase perceptions of the potential drawbacks of underload, including reduced performance figures, reduced hours, and potential redundancies. With respect to management disagreement, it is possible that employees with lower EI may be worse at perceiving, appraising, and expressing emotions around conflict or unfair treatment than those with high EI. Employees with low EI might not perceive the disagreement. This relative inability to perceive or appraise conflicts with supervisors may negate the direct effect of this stressor as a job demand, or may buffer the negative impacts of the stressor. As a result, these conflicts may not negatively affect workplace satisfaction as they do in employees with high EI.

Another explanation can be offered with respect to differing results relating to the interactive effects. In an effort to explain inconsistencies in the relationship between work stressors and employee performance, Lepine, Podsakoff, and Lepine (2005) conducted a meta-analysis of the Challenge Stressor-Hindrance Stressor Framework. Lepine et al. outline a framework differentiating between hindrance stressors (e.g., resource inadequacy, hassles, and constraints), which produce negative direct and indirect effects on performance via increased strain and decreased motivation, and challenge stressors (e.g., urgency, high workload, and role demands) which are positively and directly associated with performance via increased motivation and decreased employee strain. This framework differentiates potential positive and negative effects of stressors on employee adjustment. If we consider underload and management disagreement as hindrance stressors, it is possible that high EI facilitates a better perception of these stressors, thus preventing employees from achieving performance goals. Further, conceptualising overload as a challenge stressor assists in explaining why higher EI individuals were buffered against this stressor.
The current study has implications for human resource managers and senior management in health care organizations. One implication is to focus on selective staffing as the way to appoint new staff, with the aim of minimizing turnover intentions. Selection tests can be used to identify those staff who are characterised by higher trait EI for roles where overload and ambiguity are endemic to the job performed. Another potential implication for managers is training in self awareness and dealing with emotional behaviours. This would, hopefully, better arm employees to deal with role pressures that are common to any nursing roles.

Limitations and Future Research Implications
In the current study, we relied on self-complete questionnaire in a cross sectional sample. Hence, there is a possibility that our findings could be affected by common method bias, however, two independent analyses have suggested that this threat is not likely. Future studies could minimise this potential effect by collecting data from multiple sources and/or across different time periods. Other statistical analyses, such as structural equation modelling with a larger sample, may have revealed different results. A further limitation of this study is it is limited to the context of nurses in Australia. Future studies could extend and replicate this study by collecting data from other countries and occupations, as well as using different statistical methods to analyse the data, to explore the generalisability of the findings of the present study.

Conclusion
This study set out to extend the understanding of the occupational stress-strain process, particularly in expanding the role of trait EI as a buffer of stress in this process. While this study largely supports the negative effect of most of the stressors’ measures on job satisfaction, it revealed mixed results for EI as a buffer of these negative impacts, and no support was found for EI as increasing workplace satisfaction in the high emotional labour work of nurses. Contradictory to what was hypothesised, low EI was found to buffer against the negative impact of stressors. Further research into the role of EI in the stress-strain process could assist in understanding differing psychological processes individuals use when faced with different stressors.
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### Table 1: Descriptive data for focal variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Mean (SD)</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Overload</td>
<td>3.14 (1.12)</td>
<td>.55**</td>
<td>(.90)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Man. Disagreement</td>
<td>2.23 (1.06)</td>
<td>.32**</td>
<td>.44**</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>(.84)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Underload</td>
<td>3.63 (0.79)</td>
<td>.39**</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>(.76)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ambiguity</td>
<td>2.80 (0.89)</td>
<td>.32**</td>
<td>.44**</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>(.84)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emo. Intelligence</td>
<td>3.58 (.66)</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>-.16**</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>-26**</td>
<td>(.89)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Characteristics</td>
<td>4.87 (1.06)</td>
<td>-.41**</td>
<td>-.45**</td>
<td>-.15</td>
<td>-.33**</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>(.87)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workplace Relations</td>
<td>3.77 (1.29)</td>
<td>-.41**</td>
<td>-.37**</td>
<td>-.16**</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.70**</td>
<td>(.86)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Well-being</td>
<td>9.25 (2.23)</td>
<td>-.12</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>.14*</td>
<td>.13*</td>
<td>(.84)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>-0.02</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>-.00</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* Cronbach’s (1951) alpha reliability coefficients appear in the diagonals. Man. Disagreement = Management Disagreement; Emo. Intelligence = Emotional Intelligence.

### Table 2: Hierarchical multiple regression analyses on retention outcomes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Independent Variables</th>
<th>Job Satisfaction Characteristics ($\beta$)</th>
<th>Job Satisfaction Relational $\beta$</th>
<th>Well-being $\beta$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Step 1 – Control variables</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>-.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>-.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adj R²</td>
<td>-.00</td>
<td>-.00</td>
<td>-.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Step 2 – Main effects</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overload</td>
<td>-.20**</td>
<td>-.28***</td>
<td>-.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Man. Disagr.</td>
<td>-.27***</td>
<td>-.17*</td>
<td>-.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Underload</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>-.4</td>
<td>-.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ambiguity</td>
<td>-.15*</td>
<td>-.13*</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EI</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>-.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$R^2$ Change</td>
<td>.26***</td>
<td>.22***</td>
<td>.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Step 3 – Two-way interactions</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overload X EI</td>
<td>.15*</td>
<td>.31***</td>
<td>-.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Man. Disagr. X EI</td>
<td>-.13†</td>
<td>-.19†</td>
<td>.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Underload X EI</td>
<td>-.15**</td>
<td>-.09†</td>
<td>-.12*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ambiguity X EI</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>-.12†</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$R^2$ Change</td>
<td>.03*</td>
<td>.05**</td>
<td>.03</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

† $p < .1; * p < .05; ** p < .01; *** p < .001.
Figure 1: Two-way interaction of overload with emotional intelligence on satisfaction with job characteristics.

Figure 2: Two-way interaction of underload with emotional intelligence on satisfaction with job characteristics.
Figure 3: Two-way interaction of management disagreement with emotional intelligence on satisfaction with job characteristics.

Figure 4. Two-way interaction of overload with emotional intelligence on satisfaction with workplace relations.
Figure 5. Two-way interaction of management disagreement with emotional intelligence on satisfaction with management disagreement.

Figure 6: Two-way interaction of underload with emotional intelligence on satisfaction with workplace relations.
Figure 7: Two-way interaction of underload with emotional intelligence on well-being.

![Graph showing the interaction of underload with emotional intelligence on well-being](image)

Figure 8: Two-way interaction of role ambiguity with emotional intelligence on psychological well-being.
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