Perceived Manager’s Emotional Intelligence and Happiness at Work: The Mediating Role of Job Satisfaction and Affective Organizational Commitment

Malek Bakheet ELAYAN¹, Abdulmajeed Saad ALBALAWI², Haifa Mohammed SHALAN³, Ali H. AL-HOORIE⁴, Mohamed Dawood SHAMOUT⁵

¹ Institute of Public Administration, Riyadh, Saudi Arabia, elayanm@ipa.edu.sa
² Tabuk University, Tabuk, Saudi Arabia, abdulmajeed_balwi@ut.edu.sa
³ Shaqra University, Riyadh, Saudi Arabia, hshalan@su.edu.sa
⁴ Royal Commission for Jubail and Yanbu, Jubail, Saudi Arabia, hoorie_a@rcjy.edu.sa
⁵ Department of Management, College of Business Administration, University of Sharjah, Sharjah, United Arab Emirates, mshamout@sharjah.ac.ae

Background: Happiness at work is an important factor in employee satisfaction, productivity and retention. This study aimed to investigate the relationship between perceived manager’s emotional intelligence and happiness at work, and whether job satisfaction and affective organizational commitment mediate this relationship.

Method: A questionnaire was distributed online to a random sample of 350 schoolteachers in Saudi public schools teaching different majors.

Results: Structural equation modelling results showed that satisfaction and affective organizational commitment fully mediated the relationship between perceived manager’s emotional intelligence and happiness at work.

Conclusion: Our results support the hypothesis that perceived manager’s emotional intelligence influences employee happiness through its influence on increasing or decreasing job satisfaction and affective organizational commitment. These findings therefore provide insight into employee’s wellbeing and potentially how to promote it.
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1 Introduction

Emotional intelligence (EI) has recently developed as both a social and a managerial skill. The concept is defined as the capacity to read and understand others in social contexts, detect their emotional response, as well as the capacity to regulate one’s own emotions (Melita Prati et al., 2003, p. 21). While the EI concept itself is not particularly new, the use of the term in the workplace context has gained traction more recently, and there is ongoing research on the topic of EI and employee behavior in different cultures and parts of the world. Managers who are the most effective are skillful in managing emotions and exhibit leadership empathy. Thus, in a given organization, EI may be a vital aspect of effective leadership, critically contributing to successful team performance (Mérida-
López et al., 2019).

Moreover, recent work examining employees’ job satisfaction (JS) has shown that EI represents a core factor promoting JS (e.g., Ghahramani et al., 2019). In education, JS has become a critical issue due to the unique role that the sector plays in nurturing and guiding future generations. Indeed, some decades ago, Johnson and Holdaway (1994) acknowledged the importance of researching the issue of JS in the education sector context due to the critical role of teachers in society. It has also been noted that the relationship between principals and teachers influences JS, and thus the relation between managerial and teaching staff requires an in-depth investigation. Employees with an increased scope of JS and potential to achieve creativity are a critical asset to the teaching profession. Moreover, JS is a core aspect impacting the creativity and improved performance of teachers. Hence, the presence of JS is vital for the overall efficacy of educational institutions (Bozeman & Gaughan, 2011).

Furthermore, research examining the employee–organization relationship has found evidence to support the presence of what is known as affective organizational commitment (AOC) and have demonstrated that AOC is integral to an employee’s attitudes (e.g., Scott-Ladd et al., 2006). Furthermore, Yucel and Bektas (2012) have shown that AOC has a positive correlation with JS while Nikolaou and Tsaousis (2002) have found that EI predicts AOC. Similarly, Carmeli (2003) reported the existence of a significant relationship between EI and positive work attitudes, behavior, and outcomes. Leaders possessing high EI can be considered emotional managers, and such managers can increase the presence of a positive affective tone in the workplace (Pescosolido, 2002). In light of the above, this paper hypothesizes that managers who possess higher EI (hereinafter referred to as ‘EI managers’) are more likely to increase the level of AOC in their employees. These constructs are linked to happiness at work (HAW), which is primarily considered to be related to JS, AOC, and typical mood at work (Cooper-Hakim & Viswesvaran, 2005; Sasanpour et al., 2012). Hence, this paper aims to shed light on the mechanism through which perceived manager EI may influence HAW of employees, particularly examining the extent to which this association is influenced by JS and AOC.

## 2 Literature Review and Hypothesis Development

### 2.1 Emotional Intelligence and Happiness at work

Happiness is a domain wellbeing and life quality, and in the organizational context, it can result in employees holding a positive view toward their organization. HAW can be described as favorable mood and emotion, well-being, and a good attitude, resulting in efficiency and embracing organizational objectives. The issue of HAW has been attracting an increasing amount of attention in psychology (Cooper-Hakim & Viswesvaran, 2005), which may in part be due to the growing emphasis on ensuring mental wellbeing of individuals and the increasing pressures of globalization both economically and socially. According to Mirkhan et al. (2014), happiness can be defined generally as the experience of high-frequent positivity and low frequent negativity. It has also been shown that happy people perform better than their unhappy counterparts. Hence, HAW is of great value to an organization (Diener, 2000; McKee, 2017) because it can help to ensure organizational success. In this regard, Zietsma et al. (2019) have argued that emotions should be central to organizational theory because they are essential to any organization. Indeed, emotions are considered a linchpin of the interaction process between management and employees (Lewa & Lewa, 2020). A core factor leading to employees’ happiness is solid and supportive leadership (Zietsma et al., 2019). Wang et al. (2011) have suggested that networking is essential to transmitting happiness, organizational values, and moral and cultural norms. Furthermore, Naseem (2018) argued that employees who demonstrate an increased scope of EI experience and suffer from less stress with a higher likelihood of contentment and satisfaction.

Adopting Mayer and Salovey’s (1997) definition, EI is the ability to recognize and regulate one’s emotions. This assists in thought processes, understanding them, embracing emotional knowledge, and reflecting on emotional regulation to promote emotional and intellectual growth. This definition arose after extensive research on and revision to EI after it was first coined by Salovey and Mayer (1990). Since then, an EI model consisting of four branches or skills has been extracted from this definition: (1) the ability to accurately recognize emotions within oneself and as well as in others, (2) then using these emotions to aid one in thinking processes, (3) interpreting these emotions, and (4) manipulating them to accomplish goal(s). Each of these branches comprises different levels of the use of EI, ranging from simple to more complex uses. This model highlights the differences in the performance of each individual based on each branch separately; thus, one’s behavioral patterns depend on their mastery of the four EI skills, which can influence one’s quality of life (Salovey & Grewal, 2005).

In the organizational context, EI is an embedded set of domains that work to enrich the interactions between managers and employees in positive ways. This can be through the regulation and expression of emotions and taking an empathetic approach to the expression of emotion (George, 2000). A manager possessing high EI can elicit positive emotions in employees because they can empathize (George, 2000). Moreover, Law et al. (2004)
showed a positive relationship of EI with life satisfaction. Recognition of emotional factors and the ability to manage them effectively helps an individual to process emotions. A person possessing high EI can recognize and regulate emotions effectively, thus facilitating a high level of performance. This also results in such individuals generally experiencing greater satisfaction in life (e.g., Wong & Law, 2002). In a similar vein, an investigation by Mérida-López et al. (2019) revealed that skilled employees in terms of emotional regulation evidence higher JS and HAW levels.

Generally, past research has focused on the concept of emotional regulation and capacity of staff and its impact on their happiness. In contrast, in this study, we examined the extent to which teachers’ perception of manager EI influences teacher HAW. Hence, the following hypothesis was formulated:

**H1: Perceived manager emotional intelligence is positively related to happiness at work for teachers.**

### 2.2 Emotional Intelligence, Job Satisfaction, and Affective Organizational Commitment

JS can be defined as the gratifying state of emotion experienced by an employee and is brought about by pleasant work circumstances and experiences (Liu et al., 2016). It can also be interpreted as an individual’s stance on their employment, the social and physical environment, and the remuneration packages on offer (Yousef, 2017).

It has been argued that JS is an important factor in attracting and retaining staff. Individuals with high levels of JS are healthier both physically and psychologically and are likely to be more productive and effective in their working life (Tandung, 2016).

However, the JS of employees is also influenced by their managers. By its very nature, leadership in organizations affects the feelings, perceptions, and behaviors of staff through their social influence (Pirola-Merlo et al., 2002). It can therefore be said that an employee’s feelings about their employer and workplace are influenced by the ability of a leader to perceive, understand, and manage emotions—an ability also known as leader EI (George, 2000). Furthermore, it has been argued that the most critical factor in being a good leader is the quality of leadership and staff interaction with an effective communication capacity, through for example listening, providing feedback, coaching, and information-sharing—all of which are key to building positive relationships (Robbins & Digby, 2003). Similarly, the evidence available highlight the critical link of the scope of EI and team JS as well as trust in others (Mishra et al., 2019). However, despite a substantial amount of research on leader EI, there is limited research evaluating the explicit impact of leader EI on employee satisfaction (Zeidner et al., 2004). Hence, the hypothesis developed was

**H2: Perceived manager emotional intelligence is positively related to job satisfaction for teachers.**

With regard to the level of commitment that employees have toward their organization, research has shown that commitment to an organization is core in employees’ attitudinal responses (Scott-Ladd et al., 2006). Commitment to an organization is identified as a psychological phenomenon characterizing staff relations with the organization, impacting decisions to become, and continue to be, a member of such an entity (Meyer & Allen, 1991). In a similar vein, Jang and Kandampully (2018) have argued that the intention for current employees to remain in their current positions or move on is determined by their commitment.

Meyer and Allen (1991, 1997) have also claimed that commitment at the organizational level is multifaceted and comprises three different aspects. The first component is affective commitment, which involves taking an active role, identifying with, and being emotionally linked to an organization. The second aspect is known as continuance commitment (Sonker, 2019). This is when employees, through strategic calculations, weigh up the economic benefits of holding onto their position in the company against leaving for greener pastures. Among other factors, it is expected that they will choose the former if it is more financially lucrative. The third is normative commitment, which refers to the perceived obligation that employees should stay for long in their organization (Meyer & Allen, 1991). Most theorists have come to view AOC as stemming from emotional attachment to an organization and as being most closely aligned with happiness because happiness is in part dependent on a person’s emotional link to their potential employer (Meyer & Allen, 1991).

Based on reviews of the AOC literature, Albalawi et al. (2019) and Rath and Rastogi (2009) proposed that it might be possible to predict organizational outcomes (e.g., job performance, turnover, absenteeism, and workplace behavior) based on the level of AOC. In this regard, Yucel and Bektas (2012) showed that AOC has a positive correlation with JS, and Allen and Meyer (1993) found that, although there is a notable increase in AOC with employee age, there is a closer relationship between increases in continuance commitment and organizational and positional incumbency.

Furthermore, studies that have analyzed the behaviors of managers have shown that manager EI is a crucial attribute in AOC because it significantly affects management processes, behaviors, and outcomes (Schutte et al., 2002; Vakola et al., 2004; Buitendach & De Witte, 2005). In addition, Nikolaou and Tsousis (2002) found that EI predicts AOC, while Carmeli (2003) found a significant relationship between EI and AOC but not continuance commitment.

Similarly, an argument has been presented that leaders with higher EI can be considered emotional managers and
can thus promote a positive affective tone in the workplace (Pescosolido, 2002). Both D’Innocenzo et al. (2016) and Yousef (2017) identified JS as a critical determinant for AOC among incumbent employees. A significant percentage of available research delve into the role of employee EI in employees’ levels of engagement (Carmeli, 2003; Akhtar et al., 2017). There is a lack of research focusing on the relationship between leader or manager EI and AOC among teachers. Hence, this study hypothesizes that managers who possess EI are more likely to have a potential for increasing the level of AOC in employees, postulating that

H3: Perceived manager emotional intelligence is positively related to affective organizational commitment for teachers.

2.3 Job Satisfaction, Affective Organizational Commitment, and Happiness at Work

Research on HAW suggests positive attitude and experience is linked to a high level of achievement among both employees and organizations. For example, it has been shown that JS and AOC have a negative relationship with turnover intention and absenteeism and with depression, anxiety, and burnout, and these factors are all linked to physical health outcomes (see Griffeth et al. 2000; Meyer et al., 2002). On the other hand, it has been argued that AOC can be viewed as the willingness of employees to make a more significant effort on behalf of their organization as well as the strong inclination to stay in their positions and to embrace the goals and values of their organization (Porter et al., 1974).

Undoubtedly, the construct most frequently associated with HAW is JS, used as either an independent or dependent variable in the context of organizational research (Brahmana et al., 2021). According to Clugston (2000), JS has a positive influence on normative commitment, so it follows that JS may also have a similar impact on AOC. Research has been conducted to investigate these constructs’ relationships, effects, or consequences on HAW, and such studies have shown that AOC is correlated with JS (Cooper-Hakim & Viswesvaran, 2005; Wang et al., 2021). Other studies have highlighted the existence of a significant positive relationship between AOC and favorable employee attributes, including JS and high performance (Meyer & Allen, 1991). Therefore, the following two hypotheses were formulated to consider these key constructs:

H4: Job satisfaction is positively related to happiness at work for teachers.

H5: Affective organizational commitment is positively related to happiness at work for teachers.

2.4 The Mediating Role of Job Satisfaction and Affective Organizational Commitment in the Relationship Between Emotional Intelligence and Happiness at Work

Akar (2018) evaluated teachers’ perceptions of school leadership and its link to school culture and their satisfaction and commitment levels. Akar (2018) found that school principals can establish unique environments within their workplaces, and it is through the differentiation of such environments that teacher commitment and satisfaction is fostered or hindered.

A somewhat surprising result was revealed by a study that focused on the difference between temporary and permanent staff regarding JS and commitment. It was shown that temporary employees have higher levels of JS and commitment to their organization despite not having a permanent position (Saridakis et al., 2020). Güleryüz et al. (2008) studied the relationships among EI, JS, and AOC and found that JS is a mediator between EI and AOC. These results were supported by Field and Buitendach (2011), who found AOC correlated positively with work engagement and HAW. Similarly, HAW and work engagement predict AOC among employees in tertiary education (Field & Buitendach, 2011). According to Spector (1997), JS is associated strongly with AOC because it has to do with an individual’s attitude towards their work. The finding reported by Spector (1997) aligns with earlier research conducted by Meyer et al. (1993), who reported similar results. More recently, Ayala (2018) also demonstrated the correlation of EI and AOC.

Although many studies have been conducted on JS and AOC and their relationship with EI, very few have examined the relationship between EI and HAW, especially in determining whether JS and AOC both act as mediators in the EI–HAW relationship. Therefore, this study contributes to enriching the literature review in this field by considering this issue. Accordingly, the following two hypotheses were developed:

H6: Job satisfaction mediates the relationship between perceived manager emotional intelligence and happiness at work for teachers.

H7: Affective organizational commitment mediates the relationship between perceived manager emotional intelligence and happiness at work for teachers.

Figure 1 depicts the hypothesized research model informed by the hypothesis presented above. The model underlies the anticipation of a causal link of EI (as an independent variable) and the HAW (dependent variable) where JS and AOC act as mediating variables.
3 Method

3.1 Participants

A total of 350 Saudi schoolteachers completed the questionnaire. Since the teachers’ information is available in the Ministry of Education database, the teachers were contacted and requested to participate in the research. A follow-up email was also sent to the participants reminding them about participation in the study.

3.2 Instruments

Four questionnaire scales were used in the present study. Manager Perceived Emotional Intelligence was adapted from the Others–Emotions Appraisal scale (Law et al., 2004) to reflect the extent to which the participating teachers perceived their managers to evidence emotional intelligence (e.g., “My manager is a reasonable observer of others’ emotions”). Job Satisfaction was measured with four items adapted from Spector (1997). An example item was “I am satisfied with the procedures at work.” Affective organization commitment as operationalized with a four-item scale from Ziauddin et al. (2010). An example item was “I feel a strong sense of belonging to my organization.” Finally, happiness at work was operationalized with a 4-item scale adapted from Parker and Hyett (2011). An example item was “I feel happy about my job.” All items were anchored with a 5-point Likert scale with a higher score representing higher levels of the respective construct. The reliabilities of these scales are presented in the Results section. The common method bias was avoided by increasing the physical separation of the items in the questionnaire to ensure that the respondents had time to synthesize the potential answers with minimal bias. All items are available in the Appendix.

3.3 Procedure

The researchers distributed a questionnaire online to teachers at Saudi public schools using a random sampling method. Using this method, the researchers made sure that all the members of the sampling frame had an equal opportunity to participate in this study equally. The process was a probability-based sampling technique with the capacity to provide representative results that can be generalized to the broad population of focus. A total of 500 teachers were contacted via email with an exact number of questionnaires distributed. A total of 368 questionnaires were received, and 350 were valid for analysis. Data were collected in 2019.

3.4 Data Analysis

The analysis commenced by analyzing the measurement model to establish the psychometric features of the four scales used in the current study. We first submitted the questionnaire items to parallel analysis to ascertain the unidimensionality of the scales. Using Mplus 7 we conducted a confirmatory factor analysis using diagonally weighted least squares (WLSMV) estimation to account for ordinal data. We computed construct reliability, average variance extracted, and inter-construct correlation to examine convergent and discriminant validity. We also tested fit against standard model indices, including CFI (> .950), TLI (> .950), and RMSEA (< .08).
The structural model was subsequently investigated. We tested the hypothesized model (Figure 1), and no data-driven modifications were made apart from correlating the error covariances of specific items (see chapter Results for details). Mediation analysis was performed to estimate the indirect effect for each of 10,000 bootstrapped samples. Support for full mediation is found when the direct effect drops to non-significance after mediators are added to the model (Baron & Kenny, 1986).

4 Results

Of the 350 respondents participating in this study, 15% were younger than 30 years old, 42% between 31–40, 35% between 41–50, and 7% over 50. They had a range of educational qualifications, including diplomas (11%), BA (78%), MA (10%), and PhD (1%). The majority were teaching at elementary school (45%), while the rest were

Table 1: Reliability and validity of the constructs in the measurement model and their inter-construct correlations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>CR</th>
<th>AVE</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Perceived Manager EI</td>
<td>.86</td>
<td>.62</td>
<td>.79</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Job Satisfaction</td>
<td>.86</td>
<td>.61</td>
<td>.64</td>
<td>.78</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Affective Organizational Commitment</td>
<td>.88</td>
<td>.65</td>
<td>.48</td>
<td>.60</td>
<td>.81</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Happiness at Work</td>
<td>.91</td>
<td>.71</td>
<td>.58</td>
<td>.75</td>
<td>.75</td>
<td>.84</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Values in the diagonal are the square roots of their respective AVE. AVE = average variance extracted. CR = construct reliability. EI = Emotional Intelligence.

Table 2: Standardized and unstandardized factor loadings, standard errors, and z ratios of the measurement model

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Path</th>
<th>β</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>SE(β)</th>
<th>z</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Perceived Manager Emotional Intelligence →</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EI1</td>
<td>.83</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>0.022</td>
<td>37.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EI2</td>
<td>.88</td>
<td>1.06</td>
<td>0.015</td>
<td>57.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EI3</td>
<td>.84</td>
<td>1.01</td>
<td>0.019</td>
<td>43.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EI4</td>
<td>.92</td>
<td>1.11</td>
<td>0.013</td>
<td>70.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Satisfaction →</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JS1</td>
<td>.85</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>0.025</td>
<td>33.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JS2</td>
<td>.88</td>
<td>1.04</td>
<td>0.022</td>
<td>39.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JS3</td>
<td>.67</td>
<td>0.79</td>
<td>0.036</td>
<td>18.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JS4</td>
<td>.72</td>
<td>0.85</td>
<td>0.030</td>
<td>23.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affective Organizational Commitment →</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AOC1</td>
<td>.58</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>0.040</td>
<td>14.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AOC2</td>
<td>.71</td>
<td>1.22</td>
<td>0.030</td>
<td>24.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AOC3</td>
<td>.94</td>
<td>1.60</td>
<td>0.012</td>
<td>77.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AOC4</td>
<td>.94</td>
<td>1.62</td>
<td>0.012</td>
<td>78.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Happiness at Work →</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HAW1</td>
<td>.88</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>0.019</td>
<td>46.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HAW2</td>
<td>.85</td>
<td>0.97</td>
<td>0.018</td>
<td>46.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HAW3</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>0.023</td>
<td>34.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HAW4</td>
<td>.85</td>
<td>0.96</td>
<td>0.018</td>
<td>47.99</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. All coefficients are significant at the .001 level.
Table 3: Standardized and unstandardized coefficients, standard errors, and z ratios for the structural model

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Path</th>
<th>β</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>SE(β)</th>
<th>z</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Perceived Manager EI</td>
<td>JS</td>
<td>.41</td>
<td>.65</td>
<td>.050</td>
<td>8.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>HAW</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.054</td>
<td>1.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>AOC</td>
<td>.46</td>
<td>.34</td>
<td>.046</td>
<td>9.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JS</td>
<td>HAW</td>
<td>.64</td>
<td>.43</td>
<td>.042</td>
<td>15.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AOC</td>
<td>HAW</td>
<td>.48</td>
<td>.69</td>
<td>.042</td>
<td>11.62</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. EI = Emotional Intelligence. JS = Job Satisfaction. HAW = Happiness at Work. AOC = Affective Organizational Commitment.

Table 4: Standardized direct, indirect, and total effects on Happiness at Work

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Direct</th>
<th>Indirect</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Perceived Manager EI</td>
<td>.10†</td>
<td>.26 (mediated by Job Satisfaction)</td>
<td>.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.22 (mediated by AOC)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Satisfaction</td>
<td>.41</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AOC</td>
<td>.46</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>.46</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Indirect effects were computed for each of 10,000 bootstrapped samples. Significance was tested based on the 95% confidence interval. All coefficients significant at the .001 level unless otherwise indicated. EI = Emotional Intelligence. AOC = Affective Organizational Commitment. † p = .174

Figure 2: The basic structural model

Note. $\chi^2$(16) = 22.177, p = .138, CFI = .999, TLI = .999, RMSEA = .033, 90% CI [.000, .064], p = .790. For all coefficients, p ≤ .001 unless otherwise indicated. EI = Emotional Intelligence. ** p < .01
teaching at the intermediate (16%) and secondary (39%) school levels. Most had also been teaching for over 15 years (41%), while the remaining reported a teaching experience of less than 5 years (17%), 6–10 years (27%), or 11–15 years (14%).

As shown in Table 1, the reliability and average variance extracted values for each of the four scales in this study were satisfactory. All scales showed adequate reliability (over .70), and the average variance extracted values were more than .50, indicating acceptable convergent validity. The square root of each scale’s average variance extracted value (presented in the diagonal in Table 1) was also larger than its inter-construct correlations, suggesting acceptable discriminant validity.

Table 2 presents the confirmatory factor analysis results. All factor loadings were statistically significant, and most were over .70. All standardized residuals were also within ±2.0. The model fit was acceptable, $\chi^2(94) = 213.581$, $p < .001$, CFI = .990, TLI = .987, RMSEA = .060, 90% CI [.050, .071], $p = .055$. For all coefficients, $p < .001$ unless otherwise indicated. EI = emotional intelligence.

** Note. $\chi^2(94) = 213.581$, $p < .001$, CFI = .990, TLI = .987, RMSEA = .060, 90% CI [.050, .071], p = .055$. For all coefficients, $p < .001$ unless otherwise indicated. EI = emotional intelligence.

** $p < .01$

5 Discussion

The findings in this study offer empirical evidence supporting the hypothesized EI role in occupational happiness. A literature search on the issue of EI in leadership revealed limited research on evaluating the influence of leaders’ EI on HAW in educational settings. Therefore, the current study focused on addressing this phenomenon by assessing the implications of EI on the employee HAW and also examined whether JS and AOC mediate the EI–HAW relationship. A major contribution of the present study lies in the fact that it was an empirical examination of the mechanism of the impact of perceived manager EI on employee wellbeing in the workplace. In the following, the main findings of the data analysis are discussed and compared with the results of previous studies.

This study predicted that EI would influence HAW, and this hypothesis was supported. This outcome partially affirms the prior findings of Mérida-López et al. (2019), who found that EI predicted HAW suggesting that employees skilled at emotion regulation strategies report higher HAW. The current study also hypothesized that EI would influence JS and AOC, and as expected this hypothesis was also supported. These findings are tandem with previ-
ous studies (e.g., Wong & Law, 2002; Mishra et al., 2019), which identified EI as a determinant of increasing employee satisfaction, enthusiasm, and loyalty. The obtained findings are also aligned with findings reported by Meyer et al. (1993). They also support the study of Ayala (2018), establishing a positive correlation between EI and AOC. Hence, these findings contribute to understanding how manager EI interacts with JS and AOC among teachers. By examining hypotheses H4 and H5, we found that JS and AOC each play a positive role in HAW, which is also in line with previous results (Meyer & Allen, 1991; Cooper-Hakim & Viswesvaran, 2005).

The current study also hypothesized that there would be a potential association of JS and AOC with EI and HAW because Güleryüz et al. (2008) studied the relationships among EI, JS, and AOC and found that JS is a mediator between EI and AOC. This finding was supported by Field and Buitendach (2011), evidencing the existence of a positive relationship of AOC and HAW. The current paper proposed that JS and AOC mediate the link of EI and HAW. The results affirmed the researchers’ expectation that there would be a mediation effect in the model developed for the education sector in Saudi Arabia. Moreover, the results supported a mediated-effects model, in that the two potential mediating variables JS and AOC, were found to influence the correlation between EI and HAW. The current paper showed that JS and AOC mediate the EI–HAW relationship. Overall, this finding indicates that teachers may exhibit HAW when they perceive that their managers have EI, which positively associated with teachers’ JS and AOC.

### 6 Conclusions, Implications, Limitations and Further Research

#### 6.1 Conclusions

Previous studies have investigated the relationships, effects, or consequences of HAW and have indicated that JS and AOC are correlated with EI (Cooper-Hakim & Viswesvaran, 2005). Through exercising a high level of EI, managers can elicit positive emotions in employees by empathetically responding to and activating employees’ positive emotions and thus help them to achieve HAW (George, 2000).

This paper is one of the first attempts to measure the relationship between EI and HAW and explore the mediating role of JS and AOC in that relationship in the educational sector. The findings highlight the importance of considering potential mediating effects when seeking to assess the relationship between EI and HAW because doing so enriches knowledge about the impact of EI on HAW both generally and in the region. The results suggest that the EI of managers has a positive influence on the HAW of teachers in the public education sector in Saudi Arabia. In addition, the results revealed that JS and AOC play a mediating role in the relationship between EI and HAW. Moreover, the findings emphasize the importance of managers managing their emotions and relationships with teachers. Specifically, when teachers perceive that managers have EI, this may lead to higher JS and AOC among teachers, consequently leading to higher HAW among teachers. Hence, managerial leaders in educational settings should do their best to monitor their behaviors and feelings towards teachers to ensure HAW in the teaching profession.

#### 6.2 Policy and Managerial Implications

Although the present study is observational in nature, our results are consistent with theory. We therefore tentatively discuss possible implications of our results. The findings of this paper can be used to support school managers because the results can help managers construct a positive and happy educational environment and assist them in enhancing HAW among teachers, which would then reflect on performance improvement. Moreover, it is clear there exists limited EI research in Eastern cultures, particularly in the Arab culture (Rajendran et al., 2007). Hence, this study, conducted in Saudi Arabia, a non-Western culture, contributes to knowledge on the EI–HAW relationship in this contextual setting.

Accordingly, this paper makes a threefold contribution to this area of research. First, it was conducted in an Arab culture, which could have some unique attributes because, in a sense, it is a culture in which social and traditional norms are unique and strongly enforced. Individuals generally attempt to please others by avoiding what might be deemed offensive. Second, this paper could be considered one of the first studies testing these relationships in the context of both Saudi Arabia and the Middle East. Third, the results of this paper support school managers by suggesting ways to construct a positive and happy educational environment and consequently enhance HAW among teachers. As this would reflect favorably on teacher performance, it may as a result be of benefit to future generations.

#### 6.3 Limitations and Further Research

Regarding the findings discussed above, it is important to consider that the study is characterized by some limitations. To start with, there is potential confounding in JS and AOC. That is, it is inadvisable to rule out the possibility that contextual factors such as work experience, type of employment (temporary or permanent), and organizational structure might have an effect on the results. Second, some of the limitations are related to the data itself, which was de-
rived from a single source (questionnaire), and thus limiting the scope of interpretation. However, it is also essential to recognize that gathering the requisite data to measure EI is inherently challenging. Another feature of the current study is executing it in an Arab culture. Social and traditional norms are strong, and individuals generally attempt to please others and avoid saying what might be considered offensive (Whiteoak et al., 2006). Therefore, the value of the current paper is anchored on its input on appreciating some key factors impacting HAW in non-Western working environments.

Furthermore, the role of principal EI, and the resultant impact on teacher HAW, is one area that needs more research (Schulze & Roberts, 2005). Therefore, given the limitations of the current paper, longitudinal and experimental research designs should be utilized in future studies. Longitudinal designs allow for the direct observation of intra-individual changes over a given period, while experimental designs help disentangle underlying causality. Although this will not necessarily address all limitations, it is undoubtedly shed interesting light to complement existing literature.
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Appendix

Perceived Manager Emotional Intelligence
My manager always knows his/her friends’ emotions from their behavior.
My manager is a good observer of others’ emotions.
My manager is sensitive to the feelings and emotions of others.
My manager has good understanding of the emotions of people around him/her.

Job Satisfaction
My work environment is positive.
I am satisfied with the procedures at work.
I am satisfied with the criteria of incentives and promotion at my job.
I am satisfied with the opportunities for advancement and growth in my organization.

Affective Organizational Commitment
This organization has a great deal of personal meaning for me.
I really feel as if this organization’s problems are my own.
I feel a strong sense of belonging to my organization.
I feel emotionally attached to this organization.

Happiness at Work
I feel happy about my job.
At my job, I feel strong and vigorous.
I am enthusiastic about my job.
I would be very happy to spend the rest of my career with this organization.