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Abstract

The current study aims to provide a greater understanding into the relationship between emotional intelligence and job satisfaction. The study examined the differences reported between males and females on outcomes of emotional intelligence and job satisfaction. The study also examined the moderating effect of gender on emotional intelligence and job satisfaction. Participants were recruited via social media using convenience sampling combined with snowball sampling technique \((N = 222)\). The survey administered the Trait Emotional Intelligence Questionnaire–Short Form and the Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire Short Form. The results of this study indicate higher levels of emotional intelligence are associated with higher levels of job satisfaction. There was no significant difference in the job satisfaction levels of males and females. There was a significant difference in the emotional intelligence levels of males and females, with females reporting higher levels of emotional intelligence compared to males. Findings indicated that gender moderated the relationship between emotional intelligence and job satisfaction. While males had lower emotional intelligence, their emotional intelligence was more strongly correlated with job satisfaction than females, who had greater emotional intelligence. The current study expands on previous research while contributing to the literature on the relationship between emotional intelligence and job satisfaction. Efforts should be made by companies to encourage and incorporate emotional intelligence in the workplace in order to enhance employees job satisfaction.
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Introduction

Emotional Intelligence

Emotional Intelligence was first proposed by Salovey and Mayer (1990), as: “the ability to monitor one’s own and others’ emotions, to discriminate among them, and to use the information to guide one’s thinking and actions” (p. 189). Subsequently Salovey and Mayer (1997) redefined this explanation and conceptualised emotional intelligence, as a four-branch model. 1 - Being able to correctly perceive emotions. The ability to precisely determine specific emotions in others by their tone, language used and the way in which they behave. 2 - Using emotions to facilitate thought. The ability to use emotions as an aid to make better judgements and to prioritise important thoughts. Feeling somewhat sad helps people perform tasks in a methodical and meticulous manner. Contrarily, feeling happy can motivate creative and inventive thought (Isen, Johnson, Mertz, & Robinson, 1985). An emotionally intelligent person will avail of their alternating feelings so as to successfully complete the prospective task (Salovey & Grewal, 2005). 3 - Understanding emotions, is the ability to label emotions correctly and understand the nuanced relationship between different emotions. For example, the difference between hatred and resentment. 4 - Managing emotions. The ability to control one’s emotions and manage others. The emotionally intelligence person has the ability to be receptive to feelings, both pleasant (such as, compliments) and unpleasant (such as, criticism). These four levels of abilities form a hierarchical skillset ranging from molecular skills to molar, with branch three and four (understanding and management), which engage higher-order (strategic) cognition, building upon the first two abilities (perception and facilitation), which engage experiential emotion information processes (Mayer, Caruso, & Salovey, 1999).
Joseph and Newman (2010), proposed a cascading model of emotional intelligence that substantiated Salovey and Mayer’s (1997), hierarchical structure, a model of EI wherein, three out of the four EI subdimensions are related to job performance in a sequential manner.

This cascading model of emotional intelligence possesses three not four branches of emotional intelligence associated within the workplace. In their meta-analysis Joseph and Newman (2010), observed that the third branch (understanding emotions) interceded the relationship between the first and fourth branch, accurately perceiving emotions and managing emotions. A meta-analysis of the factorial structure of the Mayer-Salovey-Caruso Emotional Intelligence Test (MSCEIT) (Mayer, Salovey, & Caruso, 2002) by Fan, Jackson, Yang, Tang and Zhang, (2010), included perceiving emotions understanding emotions and managing emotions and excluded emotional facilitation of thought. The principal findings of this study observed that while the four-factor model of ability EI had admirable measures on four different indices, it was not favoured due to a high correlation \((r = .90, p < .01)\) between the branches one and two. As a result, a three-factor solution was proposed as best-fitting alternative model of MSCEIT structure.

Results indicated a strong correlation between perceiving emotion and emotional facilitating of thought and omitted the second branch, (emotions facilitating thought) as a result of its empirical redundancy. Daniel Goleman (1995), advanced upon Salovey and Mayer’s (1990) work but he also proposed new concepts. For example, Goleman (1995) connected emotional intelligence to the amygdala which is a part of the limbic system. Emotional responses are generated by the limbic system. Particularly, stimulation of the amygdala and the hypothalamus (Rajmohan & Mohandas, 2007). Amygdaloid stimulation instigates aggression and fear responses to a greater extent than pleasure (Goddard, 1964). Goleman (1995), argues as people mature emotionally, they acquire the ability to regulate basic emotional reactions, such as the fight or flight response to differing extents.
Regarding gender, society influences the development and socialisation of males and females (Duckelt & Raffalli, 1989; Sandhu & Mehrotra, 1999). Moreover, higher emotional intelligence in females is often referred to in terms of their personality traits. This is consistent with previous studies (Dunn, 2002; Stuijfzand, 2016), with females scoring higher on levels of empathy, social responsibilities and interpersonal relationships compared to males. Females are proficient at correctly perceiving emotions and understanding and interpreting them. Ahmad, Bangash and Khan (2009), suggest these characteristics provoke elevated emotional intelligence levels in females compared to males.

Bar-On (2000) takes the trait emotional intelligence approach. Identifying five domains, such as intrapersonal skills, these skills include self-regard, assertiveness, independence, self-awareness and self-actualisation. Interpersonal skills, which include, having interpersonal relationships, showing empathy to other, and being socially responsible Bar-On (2000), utilises a self-report measure called the Bar-On Model of Emotional-Social Intelligence (ESI). The ESI is a mixed model, which combines concepts of emotional intelligence and behavioural characteristics. Trait emotional intelligence is the optimum operational definition that acknowledges the key distinction of emotional intelligence in an individual (Bhatt, 2016). Trait emotional intelligence incorporates numerous dispositions from the personality domain, for instance: social intelligence, which Thorndike (1920), defines as the ability to understand and deal with others, and conduct human relations, astutely. Comparably, Moss and Hunt (1927) termed social intelligence as “the ability to get along with others” (p. 108). In addition to rudiments of personal intelligence such as ‘interpersonal’ intelligence. Individuals with high levels of interpersonal intelligence are proficient at understanding and interacting with others. These individuals are competent at evaluating and appraising the emotions, requirements, motivations and intended behaviours of the other people in their lives (Gardner, 1983; Sternberg, 2012).
Additionally, trait emotional intelligence includes Goleman’s (1995) decisiveness and empathy, and ability emotional intelligence which is the ability to understand, use, and manage one’s own emotions in a manner so as to relieve stress, communicate efficiently, empathise with others, conquer challenges and resolve conflict.

(Mayer and Salovey, 1997). Furthermore, the construct of trait EI has been indicated in adaptive goal orientation and life satisfaction (Martinez-Pons, 1997). Trait EI contains dispositional qualities such as emotional self-efficacy. Job satisfaction is also believed to be dispositional in nature. This dispositional viewpoint postulates that measuring emotional characteristics can aid in the prediction of job satisfaction (Staw & Ross, 1985). The dispositional nature of job satisfaction has been supported by research that exhibits strength and stability in job satisfaction, throughout different experiences (Ilies & Judge, 2003).

**Job Satisfaction**

Job satisfaction can be described as a positive or enjoyable emotional condition as a result of appraisal at work or experiences within their workplace (Locke, 1976). Job satisfaction is multi-faceted and is made up of emotional and cognitive elements and behavioural patterns (Hulin & Judge, 2003).

Core self-evaluations embody traits which incorporate a person’s subconscious, fundamental evaluations about themselves, their aptitudes and their individual sense of control (Judge, Locke, Durham, & Kluger, 1998). Judge et al. (1998), postulated four variables that predispose people to be satisfied with their job and their life, these are: self-esteem, which is the individuals subjective appraisal of their own self-worth and general self-efficacy, stemming from Bandura’s (2010) ideal of subjective judgement on how well one can carry out a task. Internal locus of control refers to the extent to which people they have control over their own lives (Rotter,2011). Non-neuroticism, which refers to emotional stability and the ability to overcome stress in a non-reactive manner. Individuals who are
inclined to have job satisfaction general have a high-level self-esteem with emotional stability and an internal locus of control (Baumeister, Campbell, Krueger, & Vohs, 2003).

Judge, Locke, Durham and Kluger’s (1998), results showcased a significant univariate relationship between the four core evaluations and job satisfaction and life satisfaction. A fundamental observation of this study is, one’s core evaluations of oneself has reliable effects on job satisfaction free from the characteristics of the respective job.

Research conducted at the University of Minnesota deduced that job satisfaction has 20 different elements: ability utilization, achievement, activity, advancement, authority, company policies, compensation, co-workers, creativity, independence, moral values, recognition, responsibility, security, social status, social service, supervision-human relations, supervision-technical, variety and working conditions (Weiss, Dawis, & England, 1967). From these elements Weiss et al. developed the Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire (MSQ) used to measure job satisfaction.

Emotions play an important role in job satisfaction. If an employee is feeling negative emotions in the workplace, and the negative emotions are not addressed correctly they can begin to have an impact on those around them, this effects the whole workforce’s morale (Ashkanasy, & Daus, 2002).

This is when emotional intelligence intervenes. Emotional intelligence consists of four features called emotional competencies. The first being self-awareness, the ability to recognise your own personal emotional states. The second being self-management which is the ability to control your own emotional states. The third is social awareness how people handle others emotions and feelings. The fourth is, social/relationship management the ability to handle conflict and negotiations and support positive relationships (Goleman, Boyatzis, & McKee, 2002). It is apparent that these emotional competencies are vital in all aspects of life including one’s job.
In theory, emotionally intelligent people should be able to manage those emotions which characteristically, intensify stress and the likelihood of burnout and reduce one’s job satisfaction (Brackett, Palomera, Mojsa-Kaja, Reyes, & Salovey, 2010). Individuals at work should possess both intrapersonal and interpersonal skills and have the ability to manage their stress in order to augment their own job satisfaction and that of their colleagues. Emotional intelligence is imperative and has influential results for themselves and their workplace (Troth, Lawrence, Jordan, & Ashkanasy, 2018).

A study on school principals found that the higher the emotional intelligence the higher the job satisfaction (Suleman, Syed, Mahmood, & Hussain, 2020). This study on school principals is not without limitations. For example, they did not take into account demographical information such as gender, and the effect this may have. As there are more female school principals than male school principals (Department of Education, 2020), Also, some studies have shown that females are more emotionally intelligent than males (Fernández-Berrocal, Cabello, Castillo & Extremera, 2012; Venkatappa, Shetty, Manjunath, & Parakandy, 2012). Furthermore, Grund and Sliwka (2001) also found that workers who are emotionally intelligent report greater job satisfaction, as a result of their emotional intelligence they can manage and overcome stress inducing job conditions. Workers with low levels of emotional intelligence are unable to manage arduous workplace conditions. In direct contrast, studies by El Badawy and Magdy (2015), and Chiva and Alegre (2008) found that different workplace situations such as, those who have overbearing ‘micromanagers’ and lack emotional intelligence, report job satisfaction. It is crucial to be aware that there are different patterns of job satisfaction and dissatisfaction associated with the type of job and the work concerned (Weaver, 1980). When reading previous research, it is important to take into account job satisfaction in different industries and the effect it has upon satisfaction levels.
Gender

One factor affecting emotional intelligence is gender. This effect could be as a result of social factors. Socially, females are recognised as having greater emotional intelligence than males (Ryff, Singer, Wing & Love, 2001). Petrides and Furnham (2000) depict gender as a social process, whereby certain behaviours are deemed to be masculine or feminine. There are desirable characteristics for one gender but not the other. For instance, assertiveness is viewed as desired a male characteristic, while empathy is viewed as a desired female characteristic (Siegling, Furnham, & Petrides, 2015).

Mixed findings have been observed regarding gender differences with regards to emotional intelligence and job satisfaction. Findings from studies, show that women have higher levels of emotional intelligence compared to men (Harrod and Scheer, 2005; Salguero, Extremera, & Fernández-Berrocal, 2012). In contrast, Chiva, and Alegre (2008), found no difference between genders on levels of emotional intelligence or job satisfaction. Clark (1997), observes women tend to be more satisfied compared to men this gap stays even when factors such as personal, job and family are taken into consideration. However, the gap lessens when job preferences were incorporated, results showed females value work-life balance and the intrinsic desirability of their job (Redmond & McGuinness, 2019).

The Current Study

After reviewing the literature, it clearly suggests that emotional intelligence and job satisfaction are the two essential elements necessary for organisational progression in addition to one’s overall emotional wellbeing (Lee, 2019). Emotional intelligence can be applied to one’s job and can have a positive effect on one’s job satisfaction and relationships in the workplace and has shown to be a useful ability to possess (Chiva, & Alegre, 2008). Emotional intelligence is also linked with socials skills necessary for effective teamwork (Sjoberg, 2001). Managers with emotional intelligence better understand their employees...
emotions. They are also more adept at generating eagerness and enthusiasm in the workplace. This in turn, has an effect on their own personal and their employees job satisfaction (George, 2000). The link between emotional intelligence and job satisfaction is captivating and the weight that emotional intelligence may hold is cause for further research (Khalili, 2012).

The rationale of the current study is to identify emotional intelligence as a predictor of job satisfaction and to compare differences between genders on outcomes of emotional intelligence and job satisfaction. Emotional intelligence affects every aspect of our lives, and jobs can at times be inspiring or provocative ‘arenas of emotion’ (Fineman, 2000). The more adept one is at: correctly perceiving emotions, using emotions to facilitate thought, and understanding and managing emotions, particularly those from one’s personal and work life, the higher their job satisfaction and performance will be with, greater prospects of promotion and professional advancement (Koubova & Buchko, 2013). The current study investigates the predictive ability of emotional intelligence and job satisfaction. Often emotional intelligence and job satisfaction studies concentrate on a specific occupation or work position. Therefore, the generalisability of these results is relatively poor. The current study examined the role of gender in emotional intelligence and job satisfaction corroborating previous research and addressing a gap will add to the field of organisational psychology.

The current study aimed to provide a greater understanding into the relationship between emotional intelligence and job satisfaction. The study examined the differences reported between males and females on outcomes of emotional intelligence and job satisfaction. Research Question 1: Does emotional intelligence predict job satisfaction?. Research Question 2: Are their differences between males and females on outcomes of emotional intelligence and job satisfaction?. Hypothesis 1: Emotional intelligence predicts job satisfaction. Hypothesis 2: Females will have higher levels of emotional intelligence and job satisfaction, compared to males.
Methods

Participants

Participants were recruited using convenience sampling joined with snowball sampling. The study was uploaded to social media platforms such as Twitter, Instagram and Facebook along with a brief description. Through these platforms people could share the study and were invited to share the link with others who were eligible to participate. The sample size was calculated using a G*Power: Statistical Power Analyses (Faul, Erdfelder, Buchner, & Lang, 2009). No inducements were applied in order to promote participation. Demographic information such as age and gender was taken. The sample consisted of 222 individuals, over 18 years old who were currently employed, (137 females and 85 males), with a mean age of 39 years (SD = 13.46), ranging in age from 18 to 73.

Measures

Demographics: Participants were asked to indicate their gender (female, male or other) and to provide their age.

The Trait Emotional Intelligence Questionnaire–Short Form (TEIQue–SF) is a 30-item scale. It incorporates two items from every one of 15 facets of the TEIQue (Petrides, 2009), which originates from the psychological concept that combines the notion of emotional intelligence in established frameworks of differential psychology (Cooper & Petrides, 2010). Participants are presented with a statement. They then select one of the seven response ranging from, 1 (Completely Disagree) to 7 (Completely Agree). Examples of items from the TEIQue-SF are as follows: “On the whole, I am able to deal with stress” and “I normally find it difficult to keep myself motivate”. Items 2, 4, 5, 7, 8, 10, 12, 13, 14, 16,
18, 22, 25, 26 and 28 were negatively keyed items, and as a result were reverse scored. Higher scores on this scale indicate higher levels of emotional intelligence.

The Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire short form (MSQ-SF) is a 20-item scale, which encompasses each one of the 20 scales present in the MSQ long form. (Weiss, Dawis, & England, 1967). The MSQ-SF quantifies diverse factors, both extrinsic and intrinsic job satisfaction. Intrinsic job satisfaction, signifies the way in which the person feels about their occupation and the tasks they perform that make up their job, while extrinsic job satisfaction, refers to external features that effect the persons job satisfaction such as working conditions, colleagues, managers and pay (O'Reilly & Caldwell, 1980; Hirschfield, 2000). When completing the MSQ-SF the participant reads a statement relating to their job satisfaction. They are asked how they feel about each statement on their current job. The participant then select one of these five responses: not satisfied, somewhat satisfied, satisfied, very satisfied and extremely satisfied. Examples of items from the MSQ-SF are as follows: “The chances for advancement on this job” and “the feeling of accomplishment I get from this job”. Higher scores on this scale indicate higher levels of job satisfaction.

**Design**

The researcher has chosen a quantitative methodology approach to the current study. This quantitative method makes available improved access to a larger sample size, whereby the researcher was able to employee the most possible participants rather than a qualitative approach to the study. The current study is a correlation analysis with a cross-sectional design. This sort of design was chosen, as a cross-sectional study is advised to ascertain the occurrence of specific factors within a group at a given point of time. A correlation study was chosen to investigate the relationship that might occur between the variables. Correlation analysis took place in order to explore the nature of the relationship between the two
variables and the strength and direction of the relationship. The data in this study was
gathered from participants at one point in time. This sort of design was chosen, as a cross-
sectional study is advised to ascertain the occurrence of specific factors within a group at a
given point of time. A correlation study was chosen to investigate the relationship that may
exist between the variables.

Procedure

Participants were enlisted via social media: Twitter, Facebook and Instagram. The
social media post contained a concise description of the study, the requirements for
participations, and the link to the survey. The survey took approx. 10 minutes to complete.
Once participants clicked the link, they were taken to the Google Forms survey. Participants
then were given the Participant Information Form, which detailed: the nature of the study,
their involvement in the study, inclusion and exclusion criteria, such as participants must be
employed and over 18 years of age and the researcher details and supervisors’ details should
they wish to enquire about the study (see Appendix I).

The participant is then given the Consent Form (see Appendix II), participants must
confirm that they are over 18 years of age and give consent to taking part in the survey it also
briefed them about the nature of the survey. Ethical concerns and details of the participants
anonymity is shown at the beginning. The participants were told of their right to withdraw at
any time during the study, but as a result of anonymization of the data, they could not
withdraw their data after the study is finished. To guarantee the participants have given their
consent, an option to tick was included to ensure the participant has read the brief.
Demographical information was taken, age and gender. The questionnaire then begins as
soon as the participants agree with the terms of the study. The Minnesota Satisfaction
Questionnaire Short Form (MSQ-SF) (see Appendix III) will be administered to measure job
satisfaction and the Trait Emotional Intelligence Short Form (TEIQue-SF) (see Appendix IV). After the survey is completed the participant will then fill in a Debriefing Form (see Appendix V).

**Results**

**Descriptive Statistics**

Descriptive statistics were performed for all variables including age, job satisfaction and emotional intelligence. Means (M), Standard Deviations (SD) and Range were obtained, along with tests of normality. Preliminary analysis was performed on the data set and this indicated that all continuous variables did not follow the assumptions of normality. The results for all continuous variables are presented below in Table 1. Histograms were also obtained and indicated that the data was non-normally distributed. Histograms for all continuous variables are presented in Appendix VI. As a result, non-parametric tests (Spearmans Rank Order Correlation and Mann Whitney U) were conducted. The sample consisted of 222 employed people over the age of 18. With a mean age of 39 years old. 38.3% of participants were male ($n = 85$), and 61.7% were female ($n = 137$).
Table 1

Table for descriptive statistics – continuous variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>M [95% CI]</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Range</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>39.59 [37.81-41.37]</td>
<td>13.46</td>
<td>18-73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotional Intelligence</td>
<td>146.06 [143.13-149]</td>
<td>22.18</td>
<td>69-184</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>138.55</td>
<td>27.45</td>
<td>69-184</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>150.73</td>
<td>16.65</td>
<td>103-184</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Satisfaction</td>
<td>74.88 [72.85-76.9]</td>
<td>15.31</td>
<td>31-100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>72.02</td>
<td>18.54</td>
<td>31-100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>76.66</td>
<td>12.67</td>
<td>34-98</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Inferential Statistics

The relationship between emotional intelligence and job satisfaction was investigated using a Spearman’s Rank Order Correlation. There was a moderate, positive correlation between the two variables ($r_s = .45$, $N = 222$, $p < .001$). Results indicate that higher levels of emotional intelligence are associated with higher levels of job satisfaction.

A Mann Whitney U Test was conducted to compare levels of emotional intelligence and job satisfaction between males and females. There was no significant difference in the job satisfaction levels of males ($Md = 76$, $n = 85$) and females ($Md = 78$, $n = 137$), $U = 5255$, $z = -1.22$, $p = .223$. There was a significant difference in the emotional intelligence levels of males ($Md = 145$) and females ($Md = 52$), $U = 4440$, $z = -2.98$, $p = .003$.

A Moderation Analysis was conducted to test whether gender moderated the relationship between emotional intelligence and job satisfaction: gender was a significant moderator. $R^2 = 75.44$, $F(3,218) = 41.73$, $p = .0155$. The relationship between emotional
intelligence and job satisfaction is larger for males ($r = .580, p < .001$) than females ($r = .359 p < .001$).

**Figure 1**

*Scatter plot of emotional intelligence and job satisfaction scores of females and males*
Discussion

The current study aimed to provide a greater understanding into the relationship between emotional intelligence and job satisfaction. The study examined the differences reported between males and females on outcomes of emotional intelligence and job satisfaction. The moderation effect of gender was also examined.

Findings indicated a moderate positive correlation between emotional intelligence and job satisfaction, meaning emotional intelligence is directly associated with job satisfaction. It is apparent, from the indicated relationship that the higher the emotional intelligence of an individual, the higher their job satisfaction will be. Therefore the null hypothesis was rejected and research hypothesis 1 was accepted, “there will be a relationship between emotional intelligence and job satisfaction”. This finding of higher emotional intelligence correlating with job satisfaction is consistent with prior studies (Wong & Law, 2002; Sy, Tram, & O’Hara, 2006), the findings imply that employees with high emotional intelligence are more adept at perceiving and facilitating emotions.

The capacity to understand their own emotions may indicate that emotionally intelligent employees are to a greater extent, conscious of the factors that influence their personal experiences of positive and negative emotions (Carmeli, 2003). Therefore, an awareness of matters that stimulate certain emotions and comprehending the outcomes of their emotions, facilitates employees with high emotional intelligence to carry out the necessary actions that will lead to higher levels of job satisfaction (Suleman et al. 2020). For instance, employees with high emotional intelligence in comparison to employees with low emotional intelligence, are more proficient at dealing with acute stress and chronic stress (Singh & Sharma, 2012). This sense of awareness gives them the opportunity to examine the causes of their stress, allowing them to develop coping strategies and methods of managing...
their emotional reactions to the stressors. The higher one’s emotional intelligence is the more skilled one is at coping with stress (Ramesar, Koortzen & Oosthuizen, 2009).

The current study examined the differences reported between males and females on outcomes of emotional intelligence and job satisfaction. The results indicated while, there was a minute difference in job satisfaction levels of males and females, while females were slightly more satisfied, there was no statistically significant difference. This indicates that gender does not contribute, nor does it contravene job satisfaction. This result lead to a similar conclusion, as previous literature (Chaplain, 1995; Crossman & Harris, 2006; Miao & Bian, 2017), who observed no significant difference between male and female employee levels of job satisfaction. Job satisfaction, describes the degree of fulfilment employees get about their jobs. If the individual’s abilities and interests and their level of desired engagement are in coordination with their current job they are more than likely to be satisfied within their role. Conceivably, the differing job expectations and values with regards to job satisfaction may be the basis for minor differences in job satisfaction between men and women (Mora & Ferrer-i-Carbonell, 2009).

As well as supporting previous research, the current study makes a contribution to the literature on emotional intelligence through the findings of a significant difference observed in the emotional intelligence levels of males and females, with females reporting higher emotional intelligence than males. This indicates that employees who possess empathy, self-awareness, self-management, motivation proficient interpersonal skills, i.e. emotional intelligence are more prevalent within this demographic. Research hypothesis 2: “There will be differences between males and females in levels of emotional intelligence and jobs satisfaction ” is accepted in terms of emotional intelligence as there are significant differences between males and females in levels of emotional intelligence, but rejected in terms of job satisfaction as there was no significant difference between males and females.
The present study explored whether gender moderates the relation between emotional intelligence and job satisfaction, therefore a moderation analysis was conducted. Results revealed gender as a significant moderator. The presence of this statistically significant moderating variable augments the correlation between emotional intelligence and job satisfaction. The relationship between emotional intelligence and job satisfaction is larger for males than females. Although males had lower emotional intelligence, their emotional intelligence was more strongly correlated with job satisfaction than females, who had greater emotional intelligence.

Other studies have observed gender operating as a moderator the relationship between job satisfaction and emotional intelligence. Findings from the limited amount of empirical studies which examine the moderating role of gender in the relationship between emotional intelligence and job satisfaction are contentious. According to Petrides and Furnham (2006) and Salim, Nasir, Arip and Mustafa (2012), gender does not act as a moderator between emotional intelligence and job satisfaction, whereas Psilopanagioti, Anagnostopoulos and Mourtou (2012) and Mohammad, Akhtar, Ur Rahman, and Haleem (2018), suggest the opposite, that gender does moderates the relationship between emotional intelligence and job satisfaction.

**Practical Implications**

The current study has produced findings which have important theoretical and practical implications. The current study further demonstrates the imperative role which emotional intelligence plays in the outcome of job satisfaction. Emotional intelligence has been a buzzword used by companies worldwide, the growing attention towards emotional intelligence originates from a slow-but-steady acknowledgment that the individuals who occupy workspaces are, in fact, emotive individuals. Companies and their human resources departments, benefit from emotional intelligence regarding decision making when hiring
potential employees (Cuéllar-Molina, García-Cabrera, & Déniz-Déniz, 2019). Research on employment recruitment shows that 59% of recruiters reported they would not hire a candidate with a high IQ and low EI (CareerBuilder Government Solutions, 2011).

Employers can also use emotional intelligence as part of their assessment of which employees should be promoted and or have leadership potential. With 75% of employers reported they are more likely offer a promotion an employee with high emotional intelligence (CareerBuilder Government Solutions, 2011). These findings generate issues of inequality, with those with low emotional intelligence seemingly disadvantaged in the job market. The current study provides an opportunity to redress this inequality by improving emotional intelligence.

Those with high emotional intelligence are proficient at motivating themselves. According to Goleman (1995), individuals with high emotional intelligence, possess self-regulation and exhibit a higher degree of self-motivation which subsequently decreases procrastination, improves one’s self-confidence, and facilitates concentration which are necessary in order to accomplish long-term goals.

With the process of globalization and the increasing of number multinational corporations, emotional intelligence, particularly social awareness is imperatively necessary when dealing with teams and personnel in cross-cultural and global context, on matters such as the complexity of interactions of emotions and the way in which they are communicated (Alon & Higgins, 2005; Umamaheswararao, Lalatendu, & Pattnaik, 2016).

Undeniably, emotional intelligence has a vital and practical role to play within the workplace. To embrace the nuanced nature of human emotion in the workplace will have pragmatic benefits, such as improved collaboration among colleagues and as a result the more people who are satisfied with their jobs the more amiable the workplace becomes (Kreamer, 2011). Employees who have lower emotional intelligence and are dissatisfied
within their job, are less likely to be productive, engage in office culture and are more likely
to showcase increased rates of absenteeism and increased rates of turnover (Iverson & Deery,
2001), with several companies experiencing absenteeism at rates of 12 % (Bydawell, 2000).
Therefore, keeping employees satisfied within their roles should be an employer’s primary
concern as employees are companies greatest assets (Gabčanová, 2011).

As the current study has shown emotionally intelligent employees have higher job
satisfaction. Yukl, and Mahsue (2010), state in order for emotional intelligence to be
effective and for employees to experience job satisfaction, employers must look
introspectively, and monitor and classify their own emotions, using this information to guide
their judgment and actions (Salovey & Mayer, 1990). In advance, of attempting to cultivate
and improve others well-being, and self-perception.

Encouragingly for employees and their job satisfaction levels, and in order to equate
the disparity that exists on the job market between employees with high emotional
intelligence and those with low emotional intelligently. Emotional intelligence is a skill that
can be and should be learned (Cunico et al., 2012; Gilar-Corbí, Pozo-Rico, Sánchez &
Castejón, 2018). Research has showcased support for the validity of teaching emotional
intelligence, by means of social and emotional learning (SEL) programs. Employing SEL
programs in has been found to increase emotional intelligence of participants (Reuben,
Sapienza, & Zingales, 2009). In order to elevate job satisfaction levels amongst employees
‘The Optimal Process for Developing Emotional Intelligence in Organizations’ should be
implemented in workplaces (Cherniss, Goleman, Emmerling, Cowan, & Adler, 1998). There
are four phases each one incorporates a different aspect of emotional intelligence. The
employees must assess the needs of the company and their own personal strengths and
limitations. Within companies, scepticism will be encountered about the significance of
emotional intelligence. Therefore, it is important to have quantifiable results. Goldstein
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(1993), discusses the dubiety of some executive directors until they were presented with results showing financial advisors who were able to manage the emotional facets of work and clientele, exceeded their sale targets. Emotional intelligence training programs became available and encouraged thereafter.

While employers and managers with a high emotional intelligence can assist workplace teams to cooperate more efficiently, however, employees can also acquire emotional intelligence own their own. Research conducted by Druskat and Wolff (2001), found that the most efficient work teams had highly emotionally intelligent members, they also state that all groups can develop emotional intelligence. By means of, fostering emotional awareness and regulation to become standard practices across all levels of interaction. Those who possess high emotional intelligence in turn are better satisfied within their job.

Limitations and Future Research

The current study responds to the appeal to provide a greater understanding into the relationship between emotional intelligence and job satisfaction. This study examined the differences reported between males and females on outcomes of emotional intelligence and job satisfaction. This study employed scales which have shown good validliady and reliability and are well established in many research settings. Item response theory (IRT) model has revealed itself as a good fit for the Trait Emotional Intelligence Questionnaire- Short Form (TEIQue-SF)( Petrides, 2009). The Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire Short Form (MSQ-SF) (Weiss, Dawis, & England, 1967), was implemented to measure job satisfaction has a high reliability estimate and correlational analysis’s of validity are significant (Dolbier, Webster, McCalister, Mallon, & Steinhardt, 2005). The research conducted into these questionnaires corroborate the psychometric properties of the TEIQUE-SF as an emotional intelligence measure and the MSQ-SF as job satisfaction measure.
Regarding future research, additional studies on the moderators of the emotional intelligence and job satisfaction would offer useful information by identifying circumstances that produce beneficial outcomes. Additionally, researchers can investigate the additional variables and add them onto a regression model such as years of work experience or marital status, in order to ascertain the way in which the variables effect job satisfaction when controlling the model via these factors while emotional intelligence is present as an independent variable.

A Moderation Analysis was conducted to test whether gender moderated the relationship between emotional intelligence and job satisfaction. Gender was found to be a significant moderator. The relationship between emotional intelligence and job satisfaction is larger for males, therefore the practical implication is more effective with females. Thus, further research should be conducted to develop another approach that will be effective for male emotional intelligence and job satisfaction. As discussed previously emotional intelligence can be learned, therefore future research should be conducted in order to establish emotional intelligence training that is targeted towards male employees. Moreover, more research should be done to find what specific factors produce higher levels of emotional intelligence and job satisfaction in females.

A fruitful endeavour for possible factor analytical research, would be to examine the effect of emotional intelligence and job satisfaction on the outcome of job performance. Job performance factors could include task and non-task specific behaviours, level of effort, communication and personal discipline (Campbell, 1990). As a result of the similarities between job satisfaction and performance pertaining to a person’s emotional traits.

Since this study does not stipulate the specific job types, the research design may need to be developed further regarding cross functionality or include factors such as job type and
or level of experience and level of education, and their reported job satisfaction and its relationship with emotional intelligence.

Moreover, the current study was conducted using self-report measures to determine job satisfaction and emotional intelligence levels. As a result, the effects of a social desirability bias may have occurred. Participants may have responded either consciously or unconsciously by over-reporting desirable behaviour and characteristics or under-reporting undesirable behaviour and characteristics. A limitation of this study is the lower number of male participants compared to female participants. There were more female participants than male, as the current sample consisted of 137 females and 85 males, this could affect the study by way of gender bias. Which could lead to a slightly unequal variance.

Conclusion

The present study expands upon previous research pertaining to the relationship between emotional intelligence and job satisfaction. The study also examined the differences reported between males and females on outcomes of emotional intelligence and job satisfaction. The moderating effect of gender was also examined. The current study contributes to earlier and is consistent with previous literature which has found high emotional intelligence is associated with high job satisfaction. The findings regarding gender observed gender was a significant moderator in the relationship between emotional intelligence and job satisfaction. Females have higher emotional intelligence than males, there was a slight difference in job satisfaction levels of males and females but no significant statistical difference. Regardless, future studies should continue to explore this relationship and assess the factors which contribute to females having higher levels of emotional intelligence than males. Future studies may benefit from taking job performance into account when assessing the relationship between emotional intelligence and jobs satisfaction.
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Appendices

**Appendix I**

**Participant Information Sheet**

You are being invited to take part in a research study investigating the relationship between emotional intelligence and job satisfaction. This study aims to ascertain if high emotional intelligence is associated with higher levels of job satisfaction and the gender differences between levels emotional intelligence and job satisfaction. Before deciding whether to take part, please take the time to read this document, which explains why the research is being
done and what it would involve for you. If you have any questions about the information provided, please do not hesitate to contact me using the details at the end of this sheet.

This study is being conducted by Georgina Coyle, a final year undergraduate student in BA (Hons) Psychology at National College of Ireland. As part of our degree we must carry out an independent research project.

The study is supervised by Dr. Matthew Hudson. Taking part in this research involves completing a questionnaire that should take about 10-15 minutes to complete. This can be completed in your own time. The questionnaire contains two sections in total. The first section will assess Emotional Intelligence. The Trait Emotional Intelligence Questionnaire Short Form (TEIQue–SF) will be provided. The second section will assess Job Satisfaction. The Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire Short Form (MSQ-SF) will be provided.

In order to participate in this study, you must be over 18 years of age and currently employed.

Participation in this study is voluntary, you are not required to participate and your if you choose not to it will have no consequences for you. Not all of the questions are compulsory to answer, hence if you find a question too distressing you are not obligated to answer. If you decide to withdraw from the study you can do so while you are answering the survey by simply leaving the Google Form, but due to anonymisation of data you cannot withdraw on completion of the survey. There are no direct advantages for you for taking part in this research. However, the information gathered will contribute to the field of organisational psychology.

The questionnaire is anonymous, it is not possible to identify a participant based on their responses to the questionnaire. All data collected for the study will be treated in the strictest confidence.
The results of this study will be presented in my final dissertation, which will be submitted to National College of Ireland. An electronic version will be openly available at the National College of Ireland’s Institutional Repository (http://trap.ncirl.ie/).

If you want to find out more information or have concerns regarding the study, please do not hesitate the researcher or the project supervisor. Researcher - Georgina Coyle. Email: gcquestionnaire20@gmail.com. Supervisor – Dr. Matthew Hudson. Email: matthew.hudson@ncirl.ie

Appendix II

Consent Form

In agreeing to participate in this research I understand the following:

This research is being conducted by Georgina Coyle an undergraduate BA (Hons) Psychology student National College of Ireland.

The method proposed for this research project has been approved in principle by the Departmental Ethics Committee, which means that the Committee does not have concerns about the procedure itself as detailed by the student. It is, however, the above-named student’s responsibility to adhere to ethical guidelines in their dealings with participants and the collection and handling of data.

If I have any concerns about participation, I understand that I may refuse to participate or withdraw at any stage.
I have been informed as to the general nature of the study and agree voluntarily to participate. There are no known expected discomforts or risks associated with participation. All data from the study will be treated confidentially. The data from all participants will be compiled, analysed, and submitted in a report to the Psychology Department in the School of Business. No participant’s data will be identified by name at any stage of the data analysis or in the final report. At the conclusion of my participation, any questions or concerns I have will be fully addressed. I may withdraw from this study at any time and may withdraw my data at the conclusion of my participation if I still have concerns.

Signed: _______________________
Participant _______________________
Researcher __________________ Date ______________________

Appendix III

MSQ-SF
Ask yourself: How satisfied am I with this aspect of my job?
5 = Extremely Satisfied, 4 = Very Satisfied, 3 = Satisfied, 2 = Somewhat Satisfied and 1 = Not Satisfied.
1. Being able to keep busy all the time.
2. The chance to work alone on the job.
3. The chance to do different things from time to time.
4. The chance to be “somebody” in the community.
5. The way my boss handles his/her workers.
6. The competence of my supervisor in making decisions.
7. Being able to do things that don’t go against my conscience.
Appendix IV

TEIQue–SF

Please answer each statement below by selecting the number that best reflects your degree of agreement or disagreement with that statement. There are seven possible responses to each statement ranging from ‘Completely Disagree’ (number 1) to ‘Completely Agree’ (number 7).

Completely Agree 1........2........3........4........5........6........7 Completely Disagree

1. Expressing my emotions with words is not a problem for me.
2. I often find it difficult to see things from another person’s viewpoint.
3. On the whole, I’m a highly motivated person.
4. I usually find it difficult to regulate my emotions.
5. I generally don’t find life enjoyable.
6. I can deal effectively with people.
7. I tend to change my mind frequently.
8. Many times, I can’t figure out what emotion I'm feeling.
9. I feel that I have a number of good qualities.
10. I often find it difficult to stand up for my rights.
11. I’m usually able to influence the way other people feel.
12. On the whole, I have a gloomy perspective on most things.
13. Those close to me often complain that I don’t treat them right.
14. I often find it difficult to adjust my life according to the circumstances.
15. On the whole, I’m able to deal with stress.
16. I often find it difficult to show my affection to those close to me.
17. I’m normally able to “get into someone’s shoes” and experience their emotions.
18. I normally find it difficult to keep myself motivated.
19. I’m usually able to find ways to control my emotions when I want to.
20. On the whole, I’m pleased with my life.
21. I would describe myself as a good negotiator.
22. I tend to get involved in things I later wish I could get out of.
23. I often pause and think about my feelings.
24. I believe I’m full of personal strengths.
25. I tend to “back down” even if I know I’m right.
26. I don’t seem to have any power at all over other people’s feelings.
27. I generally believe that things will work out fine in my life.
28. I find it difficult to bond well even with those close to me.
29. Generally, I’m able to adapt to new environments.
30. Others admire me for being relaxed.

Appendix V

Debriefing Form

I would like to take this opportunity to offer my sincere thanks for participating as a research participant in this study concerning emotional intelligence and job satisfaction.

If you know of any friends, family or acquaintances that are eligible to participate in this please feel free to share the link.
All data from the study is anonymous and will be treated confidentially. The data from participants will be compiled, analysed, and submitted in a report to the Psychology Department in NCI.
If you have any questions regarding this study, please do not hesitate to contact the researcher, Georgina Coyle at gcquestionnaire20@gmail.com or the academic supervisor, Dr. Matthew Hudson at matthew.hudson@ncirl.ie.
Thank you again for your participation.

Appendix VI

Histogram for Age
Histogram for Emotional Intelligence

Histogram for Job Satisfaction
Appendix VII

Proof of SPSS Data and Output File
## Variable View of Data Set

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Width</th>
<th>Decimals</th>
<th>Label</th>
<th>Values</th>
<th>Missing</th>
<th>Columns</th>
<th>Align</th>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Role</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>Numeric</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>None</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Right</td>
<td>Nominal</td>
<td>Input</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Age</td>
<td>Numeric</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>None</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Right</td>
<td>Scale</td>
<td>Input</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>EQ1</td>
<td>Numeric</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Expressing my...</td>
<td>1, Complete None</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Right</td>
<td>Scale</td>
<td>Input</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>EQ2</td>
<td>Numeric</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>I often find it d...</td>
<td>1, Complete None</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Right</td>
<td>Scale</td>
<td>Input</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>EQ3</td>
<td>Numeric</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>On the whole, I...</td>
<td>1, Complete None</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Right</td>
<td>Scale</td>
<td>Input</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>EQ4</td>
<td>Numeric</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>I usually find it...</td>
<td>1, Complete None</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Right</td>
<td>Scale</td>
<td>Input</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>EQ5</td>
<td>Numeric</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>I generally don't...</td>
<td>1, Complete None</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Right</td>
<td>Scale</td>
<td>Input</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>EQ6</td>
<td>Numeric</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>I can deal effe...</td>
<td>1, Complete None</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Right</td>
<td>Scale</td>
<td>Input</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>EQ7</td>
<td>Numeric</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>I tend to chang...</td>
<td>1, Complete None</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Right</td>
<td>Scale</td>
<td>Input</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>EQ8</td>
<td>Numeric</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Many times, I...</td>
<td>1, Complete None</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Right</td>
<td>Scale</td>
<td>Input</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>EQ9</td>
<td>Numeric</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>I feel that I hav...</td>
<td>1, Complete None</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Right</td>
<td>Scale</td>
<td>Input</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>EQ10</td>
<td>Numeric</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>I often find it d...</td>
<td>1, Complete None</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Right</td>
<td>Scale</td>
<td>Input</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>EQ11</td>
<td>Numeric</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>I'm usually abl...</td>
<td>1, Complete None</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Right</td>
<td>Scale</td>
<td>Input</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>EQ12</td>
<td>Numeric</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>On the whole, I...</td>
<td>1, Complete None</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Right</td>
<td>Scale</td>
<td>Input</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>EQ13</td>
<td>Numeric</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Those close to...</td>
<td>1, Complete None</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Right</td>
<td>Scale</td>
<td>Input</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>EQ14</td>
<td>Numeric</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>I often find it d...</td>
<td>1, Complete None</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Right</td>
<td>Scale</td>
<td>Input</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>EQ15</td>
<td>Numeric</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>On the whole, I...</td>
<td>1, Complete None</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Right</td>
<td>Scale</td>
<td>Input</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>EQ16</td>
<td>Numeric</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>I often find it d...</td>
<td>1, Complete None</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Right</td>
<td>Scale</td>
<td>Input</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>EQ17</td>
<td>Numeric</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>I'm normally abl...</td>
<td>1, Complete None</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Right</td>
<td>Scale</td>
<td>Input</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>EQ18</td>
<td>Numeric</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>I normally find...</td>
<td>1, Complete None</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Right</td>
<td>Scale</td>
<td>Input</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>EQ19</td>
<td>Numeric</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>I'm usually abl...</td>
<td>1, Complete None</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Right</td>
<td>Scale</td>
<td>Input</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
NPar Tests

Mann–Whitney Test

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ranks</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean Rank</th>
<th>Sum of Ranks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>EL_Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>121.59</td>
<td>16657.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>95.24</td>
<td>8095.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>222</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>JS_Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>115.64</td>
<td>15842.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>104.83</td>
<td>8910.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>222</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Test Statistics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>EL_Total</th>
<th>JS_Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mann–Whitney U</td>
<td>4440.500</td>
<td>5255.500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilcoxon W</td>
<td>8095.500</td>
<td>8910.500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Z</td>
<td>-2.972</td>
<td>-1.219</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.003</td>
<td>.223</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Grouping Variable: Gender

Moderation Analysis

OUTCOME VARIABLE: JS_Total

Model Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>R</th>
<th>R-sq</th>
<th>MSE</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>df1</th>
<th>df2</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>.6038</td>
<td>.3646</td>
<td>151.1103</td>
<td>41.7023</td>
<td>3.0000</td>
<td>218.0000</td>
<td>.0000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Model

constant | coeff | se | t    | p    | LLCI | ULCI |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>75.4440</td>
<td>.8565</td>
<td>88.0027</td>
<td>.0000</td>
<td>73.7559</td>
<td>77.1321</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EL_Total</td>
<td>.3613</td>
<td>.6433</td>
<td>8.3410</td>
<td>.0000</td>
<td>.2759</td>
<td>.4466</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>.3220</td>
<td>1.7614</td>
<td>.1828</td>
<td>.8551</td>
<td>-3.1496</td>
<td>3.7937</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Int_1</td>
<td>.1950</td>
<td>.0800</td>
<td>2.4386</td>
<td>.0155</td>
<td>.0374</td>
<td>.3526</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Product terms key:
Int_1 : EI_Total x Gender

Test(s) of highest order unconditional interaction(s):
R2-chng F df1 df2 p
X*W .0173 5.9469 1.0000 218.0000 .0155

Focal predict: EI_Total (X)
Mod var: Gender (W)

Conditional effects of the focal predictor at values of the moderator(s):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Effect</th>
<th>se</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>p</th>
<th>LLCI</th>
<th>ULCI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-.3829</td>
<td>.2866</td>
<td>.0633</td>
<td>4.5277</td>
<td>.0000</td>
<td>.1618</td>
<td>.4114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.6171</td>
<td>.4816</td>
<td>.0489</td>
<td>9.8567</td>
<td>.0000</td>
<td>.3853</td>
<td>.5779</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>