Investigation of positive affect and emotional intelligence effect on Job satisfaction among oil refinery personnel of Isfahan
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Abstract
Research has shown relationship between personality and job satisfaction in two domains namely core self-theory and genetic theories related to personality. The aim of the current research was to investigate relationship of emotional intelligence and positive affect with job satisfaction and then respond to question which variable has the most contribution to job satisfaction. Statistical population was total personnel, formal or informal persons in the Isfahan Oil Distribution and Refinery Company including 1429 persons who were working in 2009 (1388 s. c.). A simple random sample of 230 personnel was chosen. Job Satisfaction Questionnaire of Judge and Bono (2000) Emotional Intelligence Questionnaire of Human and Health Capabilities Institution (2006), and Positive Affects in Job Questionnaire of Fox and Spector (1999) were used as instruments to measure the variables. Result indicate that affect and emotion play role in job satisfaction.
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Introduction
The relationship between job satisfaction and different individual and organizational variables as antecedent and consequent variables has been evaluated several times in different studies. For example, cases such as job absenteeism (Farrell and Stamm, 1988; Punnett, Greenidge, Ramsey, 2007), job quitting (Crampton and Wagner, 1994; Yang, 2010; Lee, Magnini, Kim, 2011), job burnout (Lee and Ashforth, 1996; Reissner et al, 2008; Scalrik and Scalrik, 2009; Senter et al; 2010), psychological and physical health (O'Driscoll and Beehr, 1994), aggressive behavior and theft in workplace (Chen and Spector, 1992) and life satisfaction (Hugick and Leonard,1991; Ramazannian et al, 2010; Shafqat, Hashmi, Hussain Naqvi, 2010; Zhao, Qu, Ghiselli, 2011) can be implied. Therefore have gained importance in organizations. But which features do affective job satisfaction? In the present study, positive affect, emotional intelligence, and personality dimensions were examined to predict job satisfaction.

Job satisfaction is the individual’s negative or positive evaluative judgment about his/her job (Weiss, 2002, p: 175). The importance of this concept refers to its main role in job design, leadership and employee’s quitting (Rogelberg, 2007). Three main approaches have been proposed in relation to effective factors on job satisfaction. The proponents of the first approach are some organizational psychologists that pay attention to individual’s moods and tends that have determinant effect on his job attitudes (George, 1992; Judge and Locke, 1993; Staw and Ross, 1985, Watson and Slack, 1993). In the second approach (Davis-Blake and Pfeffer, 1989) the role and effect of individual differences on job attitudes has been denied and the focus is on situational factors. The third approach is a combination of the first two approaches that focuses on both individual and situational factors. (Staw and Cohen-Charash, 2005; Parker, 2007). The present study by the support of the first approach has paid attention
to three variables of positive affect (temperament), emotional intelligence and personality for determining job satisfaction. Plenty of studies examined general and facet job satisfaction by positive affect approach (Bowling, Hendricks and Wagner, 2008; Huang, 2009). Job satisfaction like all attitudes involves three components that has been studied in researches (Brief and Roberson, 1989; Weiss, Nicholas, and Daus, 1999). These components are affect (or emotional), cognitive (or evaluative) and behavioral components (Eagly and Chaiken, 1993). Some studies affect aspect (Locke, 1969, 1976; Weiss and Cropanzano, 1996; Oreyzi and Golparvar, 1388) and some paid attention to its cognitive aspect (Smith, Kendall and Hulin, 1969) and introduced instruments for its evaluation. Some useful questionnaires such as job descriptive index (JDI) and Minnesota satisfaction questionnaire (MSQ) just evaluate the cognitive aspect of job satisfaction and as a result lack of affective questions in questionnaires leads to ignore some relations. Therefore, Judge and Bono (2000) during the revision of job satisfaction instruments made an instrument that involves all the job satisfaction components and it has been used in the present study.

Lock (1976) defines job satisfaction as a positive or pleasant affect that derives from job experience or evaluation that each individual have about his job. Individuals with high job satisfaction experience a positive and pleasant affect when think about their job. In other words, they love their jobs. Vis also defines job satisfaction as individual’s positive or negative evaluative judgment about his job (Weiss, 2002).

Positive affect is an active energy high concentration and enjoyable employment (Watson and Clark, 1994, P: 402). Studies have shown that positive affect has correlation with job satisfaction (Judge and Ilies, 2004; Moë, Pazzaglia, Ronconi, 2010) and positive affect in comparison with negative affect has stronger correlation with job satisfaction (Connolly and Viswesvaran, 2000; Moë, Pazzaglia, Ronconi, 2010; Oreyzi and Golparvar, 1388). Job satisfaction is independently affected by affect experiences (temperament and emotions) and cognition. The effect of temperament on job satisfaction implies the role of affection in satisfaction (Gerhart, 2005; Spector, 2005; Staw and Cohen-Charash, 2005; Dormann, and Zapf, 2001; Staw and Ross, 1985). Plenty of studies have reported high stability in job satisfaction even after changing job (Dormann and Zapf, 2001; Staw and Ross, 1985). For researchers this stability implies that job satisfaction is based on personality moods that among them two dimensions of temperament affect that are positive and negative affect have been studied by researchers (Brief, Butcher and Roberson, 1995; Weiss and Crapanzano, 1996; Judge and Larsen, 2001). Positive affect is associated with concepts such as self-confidence and extraversion and negative affect with neurosis (Clark, Watson, Minka, 1994; Judge, Locke, Durham and Kluger, 1998). Moreover, the results of the meta-analysis done by Thoresen, Kaplan, Barsky, Warren, and de Chermont (2003) revealed that there was a positive correlation between job satisfaction and negative affect =(r= -0.34) and positive affect (r=0.34). The results of meta-analysis by Thoresen, Kaplan, Barsky and Warren (2008) on 63 studies in this area showed that positive affect and not negative one is strongly correlated with the scale of affective job satisfaction. Staw et al. perceived that the individual’s affect in his childhood can predict his job satisfaction in adulthood. In addition, they found that individual’s job satisfaction in different times and jobs is relatively stable (Staw and Ross, 1985). For instance, individuals who are most of the time in positive affect mood ignoring the workplace have been reported to have more job satisfaction and on the other hand individuals who are in negative affect mood ignoring their workplace express more negative attitudes toward their job (Baron and Baron, 2005). Accordingly, the first hypothesis of this study proposed as:

H1: positive affect and emotional intelligence are able to predict the job satisfaction variable.
Staw et al. perceived that the individual’s affect in his childhood can predict his job satisfaction in adulthood. In addition, they found that individual’s job satisfaction in different times and jobs is relatively stable (Staw and Ross, 1985). For instance, individuals who are most of the time in positive affect mood ignoring the workplace have been reported to have more job satisfaction and on the other hand individuals who are in negative affect mood ignoring their workplace express more negative attitudes toward their job (Baron and Baron, 2005).

Weiss and Cropanzano, also, have rendered a job attitude theory under the name of affective events theory (which is called job events theory too) wherein on affective assessment, attitudinal antecedents of these affective assessments and the collection of various behavioral consequences of these affective attitudes (against cognitive attitude in fields such as temporal assessment and investigating behavioral antecedents as well as consequences equals to them) they have concentrated. In Affective Events Theory (AET) it is emphasized on the relationship between experienced job and affective events due to these events while working. The theory of job or affective events have proposed a supposed relationship between job affection, short-term and self-motivated behaviors such as civil-organizational behaviors and job vacation (in the place of judicious and reasonable behaviors which have cognitive aspects) and job satisfaction. The first scale behaviors which have affective orientation have been introduced as affective-oriented behaviors according to Weiss and Cropanzano (1996) and the second scale behaviors which have cognitive orientation were introduced as cognitive-oriented. In the theory of affective events, affective is applied to the individual’s emotional reaction toward his/her job or the events wherein. In fact affection in this theory points to the individual feelings while working. The above phenomenon would make affection distinguished from cognition which is a representation of individual’s assessments and attitudes toward specialties with job stability. What a person experiences every morning when he/she comes into the work is probably a relatively fixed part of his/her behavior and personality. The theories of job or affective events are different in some aspects from other current approaches in case of job satisfaction; the first difference is the emphasis on the relationship between specialties or job structure and job as well as affective events. (despite the fact that job specialties probably affect job events distribution), the second difference is related to emphasis on affection as a component of job attitude and the third difference refers to designing independent relationships between job affection and affective-oriented behaviors toward the relations between job satisfaction and cognitive assessment from the job with judgment-oriented behaviors. In this theory the behavior and nature of the person adjusts the relationship between events and affection while working. In the theory of job events, job specialties and job events are treated as an ambiguous behaviors collection ,that is, just a sub-collection of job events which takes place at enough degree and with high prediction ability would pass the boundaries between ambiguous job specialties and events and makes itself prominent. The important point is that job affection is basically dynamic, i.e. we should expect a kind of simultaneous fluctuation between individual’s mood and affective states and job events. In this theory, too, affective events act as a shock for affections levels and cycles. However practically job events might be unpredictable for each individual but it is rational to suppose that dynamicity of job events play an important role in affective dynamicity. Oregan and Ryan (1995) have well represented that mood period or positive and negative periodic states relate to civil-organizational behaviors. Oreyzi and Golparvar (2009) perceived that if the person in the time of reporting his job satisfaction is in positive mood state (like happiness and hope), he/she would report higher satisfaction. therefore according to the related theories to affection in organizations (i.e. the theory of affective events, Weiss and Cropanzano, 1996) which suggests that affective states in work,
are a key factor to the effect of personality and organization on job satisfaction and performance and it reflects positive mood affection (Kafetsios and Zampetakis, 2008). The second hypothesis of the study is formed as the following: 

H2: Positive affect is able to predict job satisfaction more than emotional intelligence.

Methodology

The population of the study was all male and female employees (formal and informal) of refinery and distribution of oil Products Company (1259 individuals) in 1388 and the sample of the study was 230 employees of this company that were chosen based on simple random sampling. Sampling framework of the employees list was based on comprehensive system of humanities force and each employee’s sampling unit was defined in levels lower than diploma in population. The data was calculated based on comprehensive system of National Refinery and Distribution Company’s humanities force and statistics units were chosen by random selection. Data analysis was done by SPSS 16.00.

Instruments

In the present study following instruments were used for data collection: Data were collected via Judge’s and Bono’s job satisfaction questionnaire, Fax’s and Spector’s job related positive affect questionnaire and humanity and hygienic capabilities institute that will be described respectively.

1. Judge and Bono’s job satisfaction questionnaire (2000): This scale has five questions and answering was based on five-degree Likert scale. Number one was given for completely agree and number 5 for completely disagree. Questions number 3 and 5 were coded in reverse.

2. Fax’s and Spector’s job-related positive affect questionnaire (1999): In comparison with other questionnaires measuring affect (see Watson et al, 1988) this questionnaire has this advantage that sentences have been designed in a way that measure affect in the work place. Subjects of the study for responding to job-related affect scale use five-degree Likert scale and select Never to Almost always. This scale includes 15 questions and does not have a reverse option. The reliability of the research instrument via split-half was equal to 0.77 and via Alpha Cronbach was 0.93 (Farahani and Oreyzi, 1384).

3. Emotional Intelligence Scale of Humanity and Hygienic Capabilities Institute (2006): This instrument includes 12 questions and each individual should answer based on his or her moods similarities to the context of question and check one of the options. Ranking of this questionnaire was number 1 for completely disagree and number 5 for completely agree.

Data analysis

in order to answer to the first hypothesis, a step-wise regression and for answering to the second one, Glass and stanley’s (1970) formula were applied which are rendered in the following part:

\[
z = \frac{\sqrt{n}(r_{xy} - r_{xz})}{\sqrt{(1-r_{xy}^2)(1-r_{xz}^2) - (2r_{yz} - r_{xy}r_{xz})(r_{xy} - r_{xz} - r_{yz}^2)}} = 7 / 5
\]
Results

TABLE 1-MEAN, STANDARD DEVIATION AND RELIABILITY, SEPARATED BY SUB-SCALES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>reliability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Job satisfaction</td>
<td>230</td>
<td>16.86</td>
<td>4.10</td>
<td>0.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotional intelligence</td>
<td>230</td>
<td>47.10</td>
<td>12.27</td>
<td>0.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive affect</td>
<td>230</td>
<td>44.55</td>
<td>6.44</td>
<td>0.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extraversion</td>
<td>230</td>
<td>31.15</td>
<td>6.73</td>
<td>0.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Introversion</td>
<td>230</td>
<td>2.67</td>
<td>1.39</td>
<td>0.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sensing</td>
<td>230</td>
<td>2.65</td>
<td>1.72</td>
<td>0.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intuition</td>
<td>230</td>
<td>3.27</td>
<td>1.20</td>
<td>0.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thinking</td>
<td>230</td>
<td>1.83</td>
<td>1.36</td>
<td>0.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feeling</td>
<td>230</td>
<td>5.35</td>
<td>1.57</td>
<td>0.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judging</td>
<td>230</td>
<td>3.15</td>
<td>2.70</td>
<td>0.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceiving</td>
<td>230</td>
<td>3.27</td>
<td>1.02</td>
<td>0.60</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TABLE 2: INTRA-CORRELATION COEFFICIENT BETWEEN RESEARCH VARIABLES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Job satisfaction</th>
<th>Emotional intelligence</th>
<th>Positive affect</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Job satisfaction</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotional intelligence</td>
<td>0.314**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive affect</td>
<td>0.693**</td>
<td>0.201**</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* p< 0.05. ** p< 0.01. N=230

TABLE 3. MODIFIED CORRELATION COEFFICIENT BETWEEN JOB SATISFACTION, EMOTIONAL INTELLIGENCE AND POSITIVE AFFECT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable(s)</th>
<th>Job satisfaction</th>
<th>Emotional intelligence</th>
<th>Positive affect</th>
<th>Z</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Job satisfaction</td>
<td>0.79</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotional intelligence</td>
<td>0.487</td>
<td>0.80</td>
<td></td>
<td>7.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive affect</td>
<td>0.913</td>
<td>0.261</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>7.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The numbers on diameter are reliability coefficients and the amount of Z in the last column was calculated through Glass and Stanley’s (1970) formula.

TABLE 4. MULTI-COEFFICIENT CORRELATION AND VARIANCE REGRESSION ANALYSIS TO PREDICT JOB SATISFACTION VARIABLE BASED ON RESEARCH VARIABLES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Step</th>
<th>Variable(s)</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>R²</th>
<th>Δ R²</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
<th>F change</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>SEb</th>
<th>β</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Positive affect</td>
<td>0.693</td>
<td>0.480</td>
<td>210.537</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>210.537</td>
<td>0.232</td>
<td>0.016</td>
<td>0.693</td>
<td>14.510</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Positive affect emotional intelligence</td>
<td>0.715</td>
<td>0.512</td>
<td>0.32</td>
<td>118.938</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>14.694</td>
<td>0.220</td>
<td>0.016</td>
<td>0.656</td>
<td>13.862</td>
<td>0.001</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In table 4 the results of step-wise regression to predict job satisfaction from the variables of positive affect and emotional intelligence have been rendered. As it is indicated from table 4, positive affect would predict 0.84 of variance of job satisfaction. Through adding emotional...
intelligence this amount increases to 0.512. From the amount of P it is recognized that the
effect of the variables of positive affect and emotional intelligence has been significant on
$\alpha=0.05$, and all variables are effective in predicting job satisfaction. Considering the amount
of Beta it is clear that job satisfaction, sequentially, increases up to 0.60, 0.166. It can be
noted that regarding Beta being positive it can be concluded that the effect of positive affect
and emotional intelligence on job satisfaction is direct. Therefore the first and second
hypotheses were confirmed.

Conclusion

interests of researchers and managers of organizations in understanding the functional
features of employees has been led to ample of studies regarding effective factors on
employees’ job satisfaction and it is increasing day by day. However, there is no general
consensus about this factor. According to the results of the study, the first hypothesis that was
based on the ability to predict individual’s job satisfaction referring to their positive affect
was confirmed. This result is in parallel with the studies done by staw and Ross (1985),
weiss, Nicholas and Daus (1991), Weiss, Nicholas and Daus (1999), Connolly and
Viswesvaran (2000), Tresen, Kaplan, Bareski, Varen and Decherment (2003), Judge and Ilies
Temperament hypothesis (Isen and Patrik, 1983) is referred to in order to keep this
relationship. This hypothesis states that individuals in a positive affective state tend to keep
their positive affects and avoid negative affects. Researchers by putting individuals in
pleasant situations such as finding money in pay phone (Isen and Levin, 1972) and thinking
about positive events (Isen et al, 1985) found that when happiness of positive temperament is
stimulated by an event this pleasant state is continued until 20 minutes. Since people enjoy
having good feeling they try to continue their pleasant state more than 20 minutes. Therefore
they expand their positive temperament in different ways. As a result an individual with
positive temperament perceive his job with satisfaction and think it as positive (Isen, 1987).
Individuals with higher positive affect in comparison with individuals with lower positive
affect express more positive states and dynamic emotions, have positive viewpoint about
themselves and concentrate on positive aspects of situation (Moyle, 1995; Watson, Clark
and Tellgen, 1988). Positive affect is considered as an important source for interpreting the
situation and cause individuals with positive affect in comparison with those with negative
affect to have feelings, understanding, and more measured actions in their personal and social
relationships (Hough et al, 1990; Lyubomirsky, King and Diener, 2005).
Studies by Gardner and Stog (2003), Dong and Howard (2006), Findler, Windol and
Morbarak (2007), Guleryaz, Guney, Miski Aydin, Asan (2008), Koootzork and Deniz (2008),
Lordanaglou (2008), Hosseinian, Monavar yazdi, Zahrafe and Fatehi- Ashtiani (2008),
Othman and Anugerah (2009), Sener, Demirel and Sarlak (2009) can be pointed out
regarding the relationship between emotional intelligence and job satisfaction which results
are in parallel with the results of this research. It can be stated that employees with higher
emotional intelligence in comparison with those with lower emotional intelligence are more
compatible in evaluation and adjusting their special affects and it causes more job
satisfaction. Also emotional intelligence can bring a pleasant work environment and affects
employees’ job satisfaction, effective management, and organization improvement. The
reason is that high emotional intelligence increases function, strategic understanding, and job
satisfaction and as a result orientations play positive role and employees’ problems decrease
(Schelechter, 2008). In this regard Baron’s view (2000) can be stated. His view include five
areas that two areas state that emotional intelligence includes stress management area
(bearing stress and controlling tension, bearing challenges and tensions) and temperament
area (stable happiness, optimism, life satisfaction). As a result individuals with higher
emotional intelligence interpret the environment events more positive and are more resistant confronting problems and have been reported to have higher job satisfaction in comparison with individuals without this capability. Moreover according to the achieved results of investigations from Glass and Stanley’s (1970) formula, the second research hypothesis suggesting the ability of positive affect to predict job satisfaction more than emotional intelligence was confirmed. Weiss and Cropanzano’s affective events theory (1996) considers affect as dynamic during working. This dynamicity causes temperament states create oscillation in congruence with its orientation and context for job satisfaction. These oscillations highly depend on events that individuals confront while working. The theory of job events proposes an assumed relationship between different job affect states (run due to events while working) and short-term and spontaneous behaviors such as organization civil behaviors, job quitting and obstructionism. Generally speaking, if we assume momentary satisfaction in a job as a stimulus factor for behaviors while working it is natural to assume that individual’s affective dynamic states during the work facilitate or debilitate this procedure. In fact when people are asked about their job satisfaction their attitudes are formed on the spot. Therefore, since positive affect highly predicts affect aspect it reflects affective state better than emotional intelligence. Moreover, in this research Judge’s and Bono’s job satisfaction questionnaire (2000) was used that evaluates affective job satisfaction and it increases the affectivity of job satisfaction by positive affect. It is a reason for a relatively high predicted variance value by positive affect.
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