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Abstract: The aim of this paper is to analyze the impact of autonomy at work and organizations’ support for their employees on employee well-being and, ultimately, their commitment to their work, and how employees’ emotional intelligence mediates between these constructs. We distributed a 5-point Likert scale questionnaire among professionals from different companies in the IT consultancy sector in Spain. The data collected were analyzed using the PLS-SEM (partial least squares structural equation modeling) technique in the SmartPLS software. The analysis of the data collected shows that there is indeed a positive relationship between job autonomy and the organizational support received by workers and their well-being, as well as between the well-being of workers and their commitment to work. Likewise, the mediation effect of emotional intelligence between job autonomy and organizational support and the well-being of workers is also evident. We can conclude that improving the autonomy and support given by organizations to their employees would have a beneficial effect on the well-being and work engagement of employees.
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1. Introduction

One of the most important factors in making a difference in the business environment in current working conditions is to have committed, productive, and highly motivated employees who are willing to do their best for the company (Aydogdu and Asikgil 2011). The success and long-term survival of any organization depends on its ability to maximize the commitment of its key employees. To a large extent, aspects such as customer satisfaction, company performance, or the labor climate depend on the organization’s ability to retain and motivate the best employees (Das and Baruah 2013).

Different aspects such as work–life balance (Abeykoon and Perera 2019), stress (Lu 1999), or lack of compensation (Jonge et al. 2000) are capable of influencing employee well-being and have an impact on their professional performance and degree of organizational commitment. Being aware of these aspects and understanding how they are able to influence employees is key if we want to keep staff motivated and get the best out of them. While encouraging well-being and commitment to work is important in any company, it is especially important in a sector as competitive and dynamic as the IT consultancy sector; in addition to high turnover rates of over 30% according to the Spanish Association of Consultancy Firms (Asociación Española de empresas de consultoría 2018), this sector requires a high level of qualifications and work experience, which are often difficult to achieve.

Previous studies have focused on the relationship between organizational support and workers’ well-being (Panaccio and Vandenberghe 2009), professional autonomy and
employee well-being (Van Mierlo et al. 2007), or the impact of emotional intelligence on employee well-being (Bar-On 2005). Although different papers have been found that analyze the impact of these aspects separately in different ways, there are no studies that analyze how emotional intelligence mediates between perceived organizational support and team autonomy and employees’ well-being in the Spanish IT consulting industry and how the emotional intelligence of employees directly impacts their well-being. This paper aims to fill the existing gap in the literature and increase the current knowledge on how job autonomy and organizational support are related to employee well-being and work engagement within the IT consultancy sector in Spain. In addition, it aims to determine how emotional intelligence mediates between these aspects and analyze how companies should approach these aspects in order to improve the well-being and work engagement of professionals in this sector in Spain.

For this paper, the following research questions have been raised:

• Research question 1: How does perceived organizational support and team autonomy impact the employees’ well-being?
• Research question 2: How does the employees’ well-being impact their work engagement?
• Research question 3: How does the employees’ emotional intelligence impact their well-being?
• Research question 4: What is the impact of the mediation of emotional intelligence between perceived organizational support and work autonomy and employees’ well-being?

It is important to note that this study was conducted during the COVID-19 pandemic, which has had a major impact on both workers’ and companies’ concern for well-being at work in sectors in which, historically, concern for this aspect was secondary (Agius 2020; Godderis and Luyten 2020). It is also worth noting the importance of IT consultancy work during the COVID-19 crisis (Jeffery et al. 2020; Kaminski 2020; Ye 2020), which has led to increased workload and pressure on workers in the sector.

The remaining of this paper is structured as follows. In Section 2, the literature reviews are described, where mainly, we will address other paper about similar topics that can be found in literature. In Section 3, the followed research methodology and processes carried to perform our study will be shown. The results will be detailed in Section 4, and finally, Sections 5 and 6 will include the discussion and the conclusions of this study, respectively.

2. Literature Review

2.1. Autonomy at Work, Organizational Support, and Employee Well-Being

Previous studies have analyzed the relationship between autonomy at work, organizational support, and employee well-being (Gunsel and Açıkgoz 2013; Brough and Frame 2004; Timms et al. 2015), focusing on different activities.

The concept of autonomy at work refers to the ability of the practitioner(s) to make their own decisions relating to the project they are working on and to carry out the work in the way they see fit without external interference (Gerwin and Moffat 1997; Sethi 2000). Autonomy is one of the most important aspects of work flexibility (Lee and Xia 2007), and is of great importance when adapting to possible changes in the business environment. This is why team autonomy is often considered a key characteristic of work teams (Langfred 2000; Leach et al. 2005; Van Mierlo et al. 2006).

Several studies indicate that increased work autonomy is important for promoting both work effectiveness and employee well-being (Goodman et al. 1988; Sundstrom et al. 1990; Guzzo and Dickson 1996; Sonnentag 1996; Langfred 2000). Autonomy at work has been listed as a predictor of individual well-being in the workplace (Karasek 1998; Kompier 2003), while autonomy in the performance of individual professional tasks was found to be key to the psychological well-being of employees. Team autonomy was also found to contribute to individual work independence, which also contributes to the well-being of employees (Van Mierlo et al. 2007).
The concept of organizational support is closely related to employees’ perceptions or beliefs about the level at which the organization values their work and contribution to the company and cares for their well-being and professional development (Eisenberger et al. 1986). Perceived organizational support has a positive influence on employees in inducing them to care for their company and help to achieve its objectives (Rhoades and Eisenberger 2002). This obliges management to strive to build a healthy work environment, where aspects such as organizational support become relevant, since they can contribute to the well-being of individuals (Berthelsen et al. 2008). Previous studies (Behson 2005; Timms et al. 2015) indicate that providing a supportive environment in the company has an impact on increasing employee satisfaction, reducing their stress levels, and therefore, improving their well-being.

This relationship has been previously studied in different sectors, such as flight crews or computer technicians (Guzzo and Dickson 1996), government organizations (Langfred 2000), sales and engineering (Sundstrom et al. 1990), post and manufacturing (Eisenberger et al. 1986), dental clinics (Berthelsen et al. 2008), or the IT sector (Hussain and Asif 2012). We believe that the implementation of adequate organizational support policies and job autonomy will have a positive impact on the well-being of workers in the IT consultancy sector in Spain.

Hypothesis 1 (H1). There is a positive relationship between team autonomy and perceived organizational support and employee well-being.

2.2. The Mediation Role of Emotional Intelligence

The concept of emotional intelligence has become a common topic of research in recent years in areas such as strategic management, organizational behavior, and human resources (Sala 2005). The first definition of the term emotional intelligence is attributed to Mayer and Salovey (1995), who defined this construct as the ability to perceive emotions, integrate them to facilitate thinking, understand them, and be able to regulate them to promote personal growth. Emotional intelligence involves the ability to control and use feelings and emotions, both our own and others’, to guide our thinking and actions (Huy 1999).

Emotional intelligence is composed of a set of skills for perceiving and regulating emotions, both in oneself and in others, and being able to use these emotions to facilitate and improve one’s own and others’ performance (Mayer et al. 2000; Coté and Miners 2006).

Previous studies on emotional intelligence indicate that it is important for professional performance (García-Prieto et al. 2007), helping to maintain appropriate relationships between team members, and contributing to improved communication and information exchange and decision making, thus improving team performance (Jordan and Troth 2004). Different studies have associated emotional intelligence with well-being (Huang et al. 2018; Salovey et al. 1999; Bar-On 2005), some of which consider emotional intelligence as a predictor of well-being (Lin et al. 2016; Koydemir and Schütz 2012; Gallagher and Vella-Brodrick 2008; Austin et al. 2005; Bar-On 2005; Ciarrochi and Scott 2006) and others consider that emotional intelligence will have a significantly positive effect on well-being (Huang et al. 2018; Di Fabio and Kenny 2016; Sánchez-Álvarez et al. 2016; Vergara et al. 2015; Zeidner and Olnick-Shemesh 2010).

Previous studies have examined the mediation between different human resource and organizational policies (Gungel and Açikgöz 2013; Yamazaki and Petchdee 2015) and the mediation or moderation effect of emotional intelligence between different aspect and well-being (Zhang et al. 2020; Nauman et al. 2019; Chen et al. 2016; Kang and Ba 2015; Li and Zheng 2014; Schutte and Malouff 2011). This paper analyzes the mediation effect of workers’ emotional intelligence between job team autonomy and the organizational support received by workers and their well-being, a relationship not studied so far in the IT industry in Spain. In this paper, we want to demonstrate how emotional intelligence, in addition to having a direct positive relationship with employee well-being, also has
a partial mediating relationship between job autonomy and the organizational support perceived by employees and their well-being.

**Hypothesis 2 (H2).** There is a mediating relationship of emotional intelligence between team autonomy and perceived organizational support and employee well-being.

**Hypothesis 3 (H3).** There is a relationship between employees’ emotional intelligence and their well-being.

### 2.3. Workers’ Well-Being and Commitment to Work

Interest in the study of organizational and work commitment emerged in the 1960s (Cohen 2003). As time went by, new approaches to commitment appeared that were not so centered on organizational aspects, but were more focused on the job and the work group (Randall and Cote 1991; Morrow 1993).

The concept of work engagement can be defined as a state of well-being, of an affective or motivational nature, related to work and characterized by high vigor, motivation, and dedication (Bakker et al. 2008); it can also be seen as the opposite of burnout, with most studies agreeing that engaged employees tend to have high levels of energy and a strong identification with their work activity (Bakker et al. 2008). Several studies have found a significant relationship between work engagement and well-being or personal fulfilment (Schaufeli et al. 2006; Kanste 2011; Shimazu et al. 2015) as well as with job satisfaction and a decrease in employees’ intention to change (Schaufeli and Bakker 2003).

Although this relationship has been previously studied in articles in sectors such as social work, health, teaching, policing, or management jobs in countries such as Australia, Belgium, Canada, Finland, France, Germany, the Netherlands, Norway, South Africa, Spain, Denmark, Sweden, or Japan (Schaufeli et al. 2006; Kanste 2011; Shimazu et al. 2015), we will focus on analyzing the magnitude of this relationship in the field of IT industry in Spain, a sector in which we have not found studies of this nature.

**Hypothesis 4 (H4).** There is a positive relationship between workers’ well-being and their work engagement.

Figure 1 shows the research model.
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### 3. Materials and Methods

In order to carry out this study, we used a questionnaire composed of 32 pre-questions with a 5-point Likert scale ranging from ‘totally disagree’ to ‘totally agree’. The questionnaire was distributed electronically among 1000 professionals from the main Spanish companies in the IT consultancy sector during November 2020. We obtained 458 responses, of which we were finally left with 281 correctly completed questionnaires.
companies in the IT consultancy sector during November 2020. We obtained a total of 458 responses, of which we were finally left with 281 correctly completed questionnaires.

The questions used in this study were validated in previous studies (Holton 1996; Eisenberger et al. 1997; Wong and Law 2002; Lee and Xia 2007; Radic et al. 2020) and adapted to the particularities of our study. Of the 32 questions in the questionnaire, 5 correspond to the socio-demographic characteristics of the respondents, and the other 27 are grouped into 7 constructs and used for statistical analysis: team autonomy and organizational support (Holton 1996; Eisenberger et al. 1997; Lee and Xia 2007), regulation of emotion (Wong and Law 2002), self-emotion appraisal (Wong and Law 2002), others’ emotion appraisal (Wong and Law 2002), use of emotion (Wong and Law 2002), well-being (Radic et al. 2020), and work engagement (Radic et al. 2020).

The research questionnaire is available in the Table A1, Appendix A.

For the data analysis, a quantitative model was used due to the nature of the research questions and for the goal to generate greater understanding of the relations of the analyzed variables (Edmondson and McManus 2007), which was validated by using the PLS-SEM (partial least squares structural equation modeling) method in the SmartPLS 3 software (Sarstedt et al. 2017) as well as the IBM SPSS tool, which was used for the analysis of the socio-demographic data.

Structural equation modeling (SEM), including PLS-SEM, is a second-generation technique used for multivariate data analysis. It is able to provide a high level of reliability to investigations due to its statistical efficiency, largely achieved through the use of specialized software, such as SmartPLS, VisualPLS, or the various packages available for R. This software allows the simultaneous examination of the relationships between several variables, both dependent and independent, and is widely used in research in different fields such as the social sciences (Haenlein and Kaplan 2004). There has been a significant increase in the use of SEM in recent years and it is increasingly used in a wide variety of disciplines, including strategic management (Shook et al. 2003).

Statistically, SEM methods are an evolution of linear modeling procedures and are used to assess whether the analyzed model is consistent with the collected data in order to validate the theory (Lei and Wu 2007). Although the most commonly used approach in SEM is CB_SEM, increasingly more researchers are using partial least squares (PLS-SEM) to analyze structural equation models (Hair et al. 2012). SEM is a multivariate analytical method used to estimate complex relationships between several variables, even when these relationships are not directly observable (Williams et al. 2009) and is valid for use in both confirmatory and exploratory research (Hair et al. 2014).

We decided to use the PLS-SEM method because it has fewer restrictions regarding sample size, residual distributions, and data normality (Roy 2008; Gefen and Straub 2005; Chin et al. 2003; Cassel et al. 1999), in addition to being a powerful multivariate analysis technique suitable for evaluating the causal relationships between the different variables involved and with a high predictive value (Hair et al. 2019a; Sharma et al. 2019). This method is currently considered the most advanced among variance-based systems for structural equation modeling and is applied in a wide range of disciplines and provides high reliability and predictive strength (Fornell and Bookstein 1982; Urbach and Ahlemann 2010).

On the other hand, PLS facilitates the possibility of simultaneously generating and studying both formative and reflective measurement models, which constitutes an important advantage over covariance-based SEM modeling tools (Reinartz et al. 2009; Chin 1998), in addition to a high statistical power for the analysis of complex models such as those used in this paper.

Why the IT Industry in Spain?

According to the data compiled by the Spanish Association of Consultancy Firms (2020) in its 2019 report, the IT consultancy sector obtained revenues of 14,517 million euros in 2019, 3225 million of which came from abroad; this is an increase of 5.9% compared to 2018, when revenues stood at 13,714 million euros. In the field of employment, the
sector experienced an 8.9% increase in its workforce compared to the previous year, thus exceeding 202,000 workers, and was also a national benchmark for youth employment. It is important to highlight that more than 66% of the workers in this sector have university-level qualifications, a much higher percentage than the national average, with 74% of the graduates having specializations in STEM areas (science, technology, engineering, and mathematics). This sector, therefore, has great importance for both the economy and national employment, which is why it is necessary to determine which aspects are likely to enhance the well-being and commitment of workers, and thus, improve their professional performance.

4. Results

Our working model was empirically analyzed through the use of the PLS-SEM technique, as it is the most suitable for this type of study due to its high predictive capacity (Hair et al. 2019b; Sharma et al. 2019). This method is currently considered the most evolved among variance-based systems for SEM and is applied in a wide range of disciplines. The analysis was conducted using a two-step approach: evaluation of the measurement model and evaluation of the structural model.

Regarding the socio-demographic characteristics of the participant sample, the largest group of the professionals surveyed (32.74%) are between 30 and 39 years old, with the second-largest group being 40 to 49 years old (28.83%), while 22.06% of the professionals are aged 18 to 29 years old, 16.01% are aged 50 to 59 years old, and only 0.36% are more than 60 years old. In terms of gender, there are more men than women (58.01% compared to 41.99%, respectively). Regarding the level of education, 75.08% are educated up to university studies, 32.74% have post-graduate studies, and 22.78% have secondary studies, while only 2.14% have only primary studies. We can also observe that the vast majority of those surveyed, 87.19%, have a permanent contract, compared to 12.81% who have a temporary contract. In terms of length of service in their current company, the majority of those surveyed (54.09%) have been at their current company for less than 5 years, 19.93% have been in their current company for between 5 and 10 years, 11.74% for between 11 and 15 years, and only 14.23% for more than 15 years, which confirms our premise of the high turnover in the sector, as can be seen in Table 1.

Table 1. Demographic variables.

| Age       |          |          |
|-----------|----------|----------|
| 18–29     | 22.06%   |          |
| 30–39     | 32.74%   |          |
| 40–49     | 28.83%   |          |
| 50–59     | 16.01%   |          |
| More than 60 | 0.36%   |          |

| Gender   |          |          |
|----------|----------|----------|
| Men      | 58.01%   |          |
| Women    | 41.99%   |          |

| Education level |          |          |
|-----------------|----------|----------|
| Primary studies | 2.14%    |          |
| Secondary studies| 22.78%   |          |
| University studies | 42.34%  |          |
| Post-graduate studies | 32.74% |          |

| Terms of employment |          |
|---------------------|----------|
| Permanent contract  | 87.19%   |
| Temporary contract  | 12.81%   |

| Time of current company |          |
|-------------------------|----------|
| Less than 5 years       | 54.09%   |
| Between 5 and 10 years  | 19.93%   |
| Between 11 and 15 years | 11.74%   |
| More than 15 years      | 14.23%   |
4.1. Measurement Model

The PLS-SEM method using the SmartPLS software was selected due to the complexity of the model to be analyzed and the reliability and predictive power of this method (Fornell and Bookstein 1982; Urbach and Ahlemann 2010). The model was evaluated by validating different factors of the model; thus, we can observe that the significance level of the model is 95%.

The internal consistency of the model was assessed through Cronbach’s alpha together with determining the composite reliability of the constructs to be analyzed. The convergent validity of the model was assessed through the indicator reliability and the average variance extracted (AVE), while the discriminant validity of the model was assessed via the Fornell–Larcker criterion. Cross-loadings between the indicators and latent variables were also assessed. Finally, to validate the internal consistency of the model, we checked that all the variables reached an adequate Cronbach’s alpha value (Hair et al. 2013), as can be seen in Table 2.

Table 2. Factor loadings, means, standard deviations, reliabilities, and average variance extracted.

| Construct                                  | Item                | Mean  | SD    | Factor Loading | Cronbach’s Alpha | CR   | AVE  |
|--------------------------------------------|---------------------|-------|-------|----------------|------------------|------|------|
| Team autonomy/Organizational Support       | B10(SQ001)          | 3.534 | 1.183 | 0.774         |                   |      |      |
|                                            | B10(SQ002)          | 3.342 | 1.221 | 0.801         |                   |      |      |
|                                            | B10(SQ003)          | 3.548 | 1.221 | 0.766         |                   |      |      |
|                                            | C10(SQ001)          | 3.228 | 1.338 | 0.827         |                   |      |      |
|                                            | C10(SQ002)          | 3.039 | 1.294 | 0.867         |                   |      |      |
|                                            | C10(SQ003)          | 3.036 | 1.322 | 0.866         |                   |      |      |
|                                            | G10(SQ001)          | 3.164 | 1.196 | 0.631         |                   |      |      |
|                                            | G10(SQ002)          | 3.463 | 1.105 | 0.696         |                   |      |      |
| Self-emotion appraisal                     | D10(SQ001)          | 4.128 | 0.869 | 0.826         |                   |      |      |
|                                            | D10(SQ002)          | 4.096 | 0.899 | 0.922         |                   |      |      |
|                                            | D10(SQ003)          | 4.089 | 0.939 | 0.886         |                   |      |      |
|                                            | D10(SQ004)          | 4.096 | 0.953 | 0.709         |                   |      |      |
| Others’ emotion appraisal                 | D11(SQ001)          | 3.637 | 0.864 | 0.831         |                   |      |      |
|                                            | D11(SQ002)          | 3.940 | 0.914 | 0.876         |                   |      |      |
|                                            | D11(SQ003)          | 4.057 | 0.893 | 0.714         |                   |      |      |
|                                            | D11(SQ004)          | 3.786 | 0.818 | 0.864         |                   |      |      |
| Use of emotion                             | D12(SQ001)          | 4.050 | 0.805 | 0.758         |                   |      |      |
|                                            | D12(SQ002)          | 3.911 | 0.920 | 0.790         |                   |      |      |
|                                            | D12(SQ003)          | 4.046 | 0.957 | 0.870         |                   |      |      |
|                                            | D12(SQ004)          | 4.181 | 0.801 | 0.849         |                   |      |      |
| Regulation of emotion                      | D13(SQ001)          | 3.822 | 0.947 | 0.868         |                   |      |      |
|                                            | D13(SQ002)          | 3.808 | 0.906 | 0.927         |                   |      |      |
|                                            | D13(SQ003)          | 3.452 | 1.072 | 0.837         |                   |      |      |
|                                            | D13(SQ004)          | 3.758 | 0.898 | 0.922         |                   |      |      |
| Well-being                                 | G11(SQ001)          | 4.082 | 0.791 | 0.821         |                   |      |      |
|                                            | G11(SQ002)          | 3.801 | 0.904 | 0.764         |                   |      |      |
|                                            | G11(SQ003)          | 3.833 | 0.835 | 0.740         |                   |      |      |
|                                            | G11(SQ004)          | 3.263 | 1.008 | 0.720         |                   |      |      |
|                                            | G11(SQ005)          | 3.712 | 1.003 | 0.783         |                   |      |      |
| Work engagement                            | I10(SQ001)          | 3.633 | 0.905 | 0.909         |                   |      |      |
|                                            | I10(SQ002)          | 3.833 | 0.936 | 0.916         |                   |      |      |
|                                            | I10(SQ003)          | 3.890 | 1.034 | 0.840         |                   |      |      |

It was verified that the composite reliability (CR) values are adequate, reaching values ranging from 0.890 to 0.938 (Nunnally and Bernstein 1994), as can be seen in Table 2. Convergent validity, which is validated through average variance extracted (AVE), indicates that a set of variables represents a single construct (Henseler et al. 2009). This
value must be equal to or greater than 0.50; as can be seen in Table 2, this value is met for the model evaluated.

Discriminant validity is used to determine to what extent a construct differs from others and is measured mainly through the Fornell–Larcker criterion, which considers the amount of variance that a construct captures from its indicators (AVE): this must be greater than the variance that the construct shares with other constructs (Barclay et al. 1995). Table 3 shows how the observed values for our model meet this condition.

Table 3. Discriminant validity—Fornell–Larcker criterion.

| Others' emotion appraisal | Regulation of emotion | Self-Emotion Appraisal | Team Autonomy/Organizational Support | Use of Emotion | Well-Being | Work Engagement |
|---------------------------|-----------------------|------------------------|--------------------------------------|----------------|------------|-----------------|
| 0.824                     |                       |                        |                                      |                |            |                 |
| 0.359                     | 0.889                 |                        |                                      |                |            |                 |
| 0.349                     | 0.418                 | 0.840                 |                                      |                |            |                 |
| 0.219                     | 0.274                 | 0.196                 | 0.782                                |                |            |                 |
| 0.338                     | 0.380                 | 0.388                 | 0.156                                | 0.818          |            |                 |
| 0.377                     | 0.492                 | 0.454                 | 0.365                                | 0.503          | 0.766      |                 |
| 0.306                     | 0.370                 | 0.371                 | 0.493                                | 0.379          | 0.637      | 0.889          |

Table 2 also shows the loading factors of the different variables together with their mean values and standard deviation. The loading factors of all the variables have acceptable values, which serves to confirm the validity of our model.

4.2. Structural Model

The structural equation model used in this study is shown in Figure 2. This model is used to simultaneously evaluate the relationships between the different constructs in the model.

Figure 2. Structural equation model.
For the proposed model, a second-order construct was created using the hierarchical component method. Based on this analysis, we can see how autonomy and organizational support at work have a direct positive influence on employee well-being (0.196) and how employee well-being has a positive influence on employee work engagement (0.637). We also observe that emotional intelligence has a direct positive influence on employee well-being (0.573).

4.3. Mediation Analysis

We refer to the existence of mediation when a variable, Emotional Intelligence in our model, is able to enhance or reduce the influence of a preceding variable, Team Autonomy and Organizational Support in our model, on a dependent variable or construct, Well-being in our model, in such a way that the magnitude of the relationship between the two is modified (Mathieu and Taylor 2006).

Although mediation can be of different types, when we consider only the impact on the magnitude of the previous relationship between X and Y, two types of mediating effect can be distinguished: total mediation, when the initial relationship between X and Y is no longer significant, and partial mediation, when the initial relationship between X and Y is reduced but remains significant (Baron and Kenny 1986). When the inclusion of the mediating variable reduces the strength of the relationship between the independent variable and the dependent variable, but it is still significant, this is partial mediation (Henseler et al. 2009); partial mediation is considered to be complementary when the direction of the two variables points in the same direction (Sarstedt et al. 2017). In this case, the inclusion of the variable emotional intelligence between the variables autonomy and support at work and well-being reduced the strength of the direct relationship between these two variables from 0.366 to 0.196 (Figures 2 and 3), while maintaining the same direction.

![Figure 3. Structural equation model without mediation.](image-url)

To calculate the magnitude of the indirect effect, we must consider the value of the variance accounted for (VAF) (Hair et al. 2014), which is used to determine the magnitude of the total indirect effect. In our model, a calculated VAF of 0.462 was obtained; therefore, we found partial mediation with a magnitude of 0.462.

To evaluate and validate the mediation model, we used the bootstrapping method (Hayes et al. 2011), which is a non-parametric procedure used for the analysis of mediation, both simple and multiple; it is valid for small sample sizes and is, therefore, suitable for the PLS-SEM method (Hair et al. 2014). Aspects assessed for both direct and indirect effects include the magnitude of these effects, their confidence interval, t-value, and significance based on the p-value (Sarstedt et al. 2017). These values can be seen in Table 4.

Based on the values obtained for the data analyzed, we can consider as proven the existence of a significant partial and complementary mediation between these variables in our model.
Table 4. Total, direct, and indirect effects.

| Team autonomy and work support → Well-being | Direct Effect | 95% Confidence Interval for Direct Effect | $t$ Value | VAF | f² | Significance ($p < 0.05$) |
|--------------------------------------------|---------------|-----------------------------------------|----------|-----|----|---------------------|
| 0.196                                      | [0.093, 0.286] | 4.000                                   | 0.062    | Si  |    |                     |

| Team autonomy and work support → Emotional Intelligence → Well-being | Indirect Effect | 95% Confidence Interval for Indirect Effect | $t$ Value | Significance ($p < 0.05$) |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------|-------------------------------------------|----------|---------------------|
| 0.168                                                               | [0.099, 0.234]  | 4.905                                     | 0.462    | 0.528 Si            |

5. Discussion

According to the results of the research, we are able to state that independence and support at work have a direct positive influence on the well-being of employees (Hypothesis 1). Well-being has a direct positive impact on employees’ work engagement (Hypothesis 4), while emotional intelligence significantly mediates between team autonomy and organizational support and employee well-being (Hypothesis 2). Finally, we found that emotional intelligence has a positive impact on employee well-being (Hypothesis 3).

These results show how, in the IT consultancy sector in Spain, independence and job support are factors of great importance for employee well-being, a result in line with that observed in previous studies in different professional sectors (Eisenberger et al. 1986; Goodman et al. 1988; Sundstrom et al. 1990; Guzzo and Dickson 1996; Sonnentag 1996; Langfred 2000; Rhoades and Eisenberger 2002; Berthelsen et al. 2008).

This finding is in line with our expectations: workers who have autonomy and feel supported in their professional work will enjoy greater well-being at work. These data also serve to verify Hypothesis 1 of our study: the existence of a relationship between team autonomy and organizational support and employee well-being.

We also observe that well-being has a positive impact on employees’ work engagement, which is also in line with previous studies (Schaufeli et al. 2006; Kanste 2011; Shimazu et al. 2015). These data confirm Hypothesis 4: the existence of a positive relationship between employee well-being and employee work engagement. As in the case of the previous hypothesis, this finding is also to be expected: if workers feel good at work, they will be more committed to their professional activity.

Finally, there is also a positive relationship between emotional intelligence and employee well-being, which is in agreement with previous studies (Salovey et al. 1999; Austin et al. 2005; Bar-On 2005; Ciarrochi and Scott 2006). This finding is in line with our expectations for Hypothesis 3: the existence of a relationship between workers’ emotional intelligence and their well-being.

Although this last aspect was also expected, the inclusion of the mediating effect of emotional intelligence between autonomy and job support and employee well-being proves how this variable positively affects the relationship between the other two variables, which is also in line with previous studies (Gunsel and Açıkçı 2013; Yamazakia and Petchdee 2015) and serves to test our Hypothesis 2: the existence of positive mediation between team autonomy and organizational support and employee well-being.

6. Conclusions, Limitations, and Future Lines of Research

According to the data analyzed in this study, we can confirm that workers who have sufficient autonomy and perceive adequate support at work tend to have a higher degree of well-being and, therefore, greater commitment to their work. We have also seen how emotional intelligence, in addition to having a direct positive effect on the well-being of workers, acts as a mediating variable between autonomy and support at work and the
well-being of employees, increasing the positive effect of this autonomy and support on well-being at work.

Although these aspects have previously been addressed independently in other areas, in this study, we demonstrate how, in the case of IT consultancy in Spain, it is also important to consider autonomy and support at work as a priority in the well-being and, ultimately, work engagement of employees, without losing focus on the importance of emotional intelligence on their well-being.

Based on this study, and considering the high turnover in the sector, which is around 25.6% a year in the information and communication technologies sector (Taudien 2019), and its strategic importance, both from an economic and job creation point of view, both the management of these companies and the different public administrations need to strengthen and encourage autonomy and employment support for workers.

While it is clear that both autonomy and support at work improve the well-being and work engagement of workers, it is important not only to implement and improve policies that impact these aspects, but also to care for and improve the emotional intelligence of workers to the greatest extent possible.

Although previous studies have analyzed separately the impact of the aspects studied in this paper, no studies appear to have analyzed the combined impact of these factors in the national IT industry. Therefore, we contend that this study can fill this gap and help organizations to implement appropriate policies to improve the well-being and work engagement of their employees.

On the other hand, there are increasingly more papers in which the impact of corporate social responsibility in association with human resource management and leadership style on different aspects, such as innovation, improvement of intellectual capital, competitiveness, job satisfaction, or performance, are analyzed (Santos-Jaén et al. 2021; Suto and Takehara 2022; Gallardo-Vázquez et al. 2019; Gimeno-Arias et al. 2021; Hajiali et al. 2022).

While this work has succeeded in testing the selected working hypotheses, it is limited only to the impact of autonomy and support at work, and the mediating influence of emotional intelligence on them. From a practical point of view, this study demonstrates that providing workers with sufficient autonomy and improving employee support helps organizations to improve the well-being and work engagement of their employees. Further research will explore the impact of other factors, such as workplace health and safety (Suárez-Albánchez et al. 2021), organizational support (Suárez-Albánchez et al. 2022), organizational commitment, job satisfaction or stress on workers’ well-being, and their intention to leave the company (Parasuraman 1982; Shore and Martin 1989; Liu and Onwuegbuzie 2012; Lu et al. 2016), thus achieving a broader analysis that includes different work factors and helps in gaining a broader understanding of the relationships between them.

This paper is limited only to the IT industry in Spain and was prepared during the COVID-19 pandemic, which may limit its results, as it is focused on a specific sector and was carried out during this unusual period of time.
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Appendix A

Table A1. Research questionnaire.

| Construct                              | Item          | Question                                                                 |
|----------------------------------------|---------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Demographic characteristics            | A1 Age        | At my work, I feel full of energy                                        |
|                                        | A2 Gender     | I am enthusiastic about my job                                            |
|                                        | A3 Level of education | Help is available from my organization when I have a problem              |
|                                        | A4 Number of years participants have worked for the company | My supervisor will meet with me regularly to work on problems               |
|                                        | A5 Terms of employment | I may be having in trying to use this training                            |
| Work engagement                        | I10(SQ001)    | My organization really cares about my well-being                         |
|                                        | I10(SQ002)    | My organization strongly considers my goals and values                    |
|                                        | I10(SQ003)    | My supervisor will meet with me to discuss ways to apply this training on the job |
|                                        | C10(SQ001)    | The project team was allowed to freely choose tools and technologies      |
|                                        | C10(SQ002)    | The project team had control over what they were supposed to accomplish    |
|                                        | C10(SQ003)    | My supervisor will help me set realistic goals for job performance based on my training |
|                                        | G10(SQ001)    | I always know whether or not I am happy                                   |
|                                        | G10(SQ002)    | I always know why I have certain feelings most of the time                |
|                                        | D10(SQ001)    | I have a good sense of why I have certain feelings most of the time       |
|                                        | D10(SQ002)    | I really understand what I feel                                           |
|                                        | D10(SQ003)    | I have good understanding of my own emotions                             |
|                                        | D10(SQ004)    | I always know my friends’ emotions from their behavior                   |
|                                        | D11(SQ001)    | I am a good observer of others’ emotions                                 |
|                                        | D11(SQ002)    | I am sensitive to the feelings and emotions of others                     |
|                                        | D11(SQ003)    | I have good understanding of the emotions of people around me            |
|                                        | D11(SQ004)    | I always set goals for myself and then try my best to achieve them       |
|                                        | D12(SQ001)    | I always tell myself I am a competent person                              |
|                                        | D12(SQ002)    | I am a self-motivated person                                              |
|                                        | D12(SQ003)    | I would always encourage myself to try my best                           |
|                                        | D12(SQ004)    | I am able to control my temper and handle difficulties rationally        |
|                                        | D13(SQ001)    | I am quite capable of controlling my own emotions                        |
|                                        | D13(SQ002)    | I can always calm down quickly when I am very angry                      |
|                                        | D13(SQ003)    | I have good control of my own emotions                                   |
|                                        | D13(SQ004)    | I have felt cheerful and in good spirits                                  |
|                                        | G11(SQ001)    | I have felt calm and relaxed                                             |
|                                        | G11(SQ002)    | I woke up feeling fresh and rested                                       |
|                                        | G11(SQ003)    | My daily life has been filled with things that interest me               |
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