The emotional intelligence’s effect on job satisfaction of bank salespeople
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A B S T R A C T
This research tested the effect of emotional intelligence (EI) on job satisfaction (JS), with positive affect (PA) and negative affect (NA) as mediators and organizational learning capability (OLC) as a moderator. Respondents of this research are 132 salespeople of banks in Banyumas Regency, Central Java Indonesia. They completed 59 items on distributed questionnaires. Results using structural equation modeling indicated that positive effect of EI on JS was not significant; instead, the effect was significantly mediated by PA. Furthermore, EI had significant positive effect on PA and PA had significant positive effect on JS as well. Those results confirm expectation derived from Affective Events Theory regarding the role of work affectivity as an interface between personality and work attitudes. Meanwhile, EI had insignificant negative effect on NA and NA also had insignificant negative effect on JS; therefore, NA was not a significant mediator of EI’s effect on JS. Different from expectations, OLC was not a significant moderator of the effect itself.

1. INTRODUCTION
Some experts believe that emotional intelligence is a predictor of job satisfaction. Carmeli (2003) stated that people with high emotional intelligence are able to maintain their positive moods and feelings, so they can maintain their satisfaction and well-being as well. They tend to be more reactive to mood stimulation but also show better emotional recovery, than people who have low emotional intelligence (Berrocal & Extremera 2006). They are associated with lower depression, stress, ruminative thoughts (including negative, intrusive and uncontrollable thoughts), and neuroticism or mood liability (Salovey et al. 1995). Therefore, they can cope with things and events that can lower their job satisfaction.

Moreover, a number of empirical studies shows link between emotional intelligence and job satisfaction (Wong & Law 2002; Carmeli 2003, Carmeli et al. 2007; Kafetios & Zampetakis 2008; and Jordan & Troth 2011). However, researches who examined correlation between both constructs
indicates inconsistent results. Some other inquiries suggested insignificant correlation between emotional intelligence and job satisfaction (Lopes et al. 2006 and Chiva & Alegre 2007). The inconsistency of research results might have been caused by existence of other variables that could strengthen or weaken relationship between emotional intelligence and job satisfaction. It is possible that the relationship is not a direct one; instead, there are some possible mediators between both variables. Kafetios & Zampetakis (2008) found affect as mediator for EI-JS relationship, while positive affect played role as a stronger mediator than negative affect. Another research by Chiva & Alegre (2007) showed a significant mediatory role of organizational learning capability in the relationship between emotional intelligence and job satisfaction.

Despite the growing number of emotional intelligence inquiries, in order to test the variables, salespeople at banks were chosen as the respondents of this research. Review article of Walker et al. (1977) in industrial selling stated that because of the characteristic of their job, salespeople are sensitive to role inaccuracy, ambiguity and conflict. Salespeople need to develop high-touch interaction with their customers, so they need emotional ability to communicate with their customers well, manage their moods, and express their empathy. Their tasks are relatively more unstructured and unsystematic than back officers, customer services, and tellers at the banks. Therefore, they need self-time management and creativity to solve their problems and face challenges at work. It is also necessary for them to motivate themselves coping with their job stresses, marketing targets, and competitions. Those needs require capabilities which are based on emotional intelligence. Furthermore, marketing is a job that is flexible, dynamic, and sensitive to environmental changes. Hence, salespeople need openness to information and communication, support to creativity and tolerance to risk taking from the organization. Therefore, organizational learning capability is a right concept to be applied in the marketing jobs. Those reasons are the background in choosing salespeople as the respondents of this research.

The aim of this study is to understand in what condition (organizationally and individually) that emotional intelligence can be a predictor of job satisfaction. Therefore, this research examined roles of affect and organizational learning capability in the effect itself. Moreover, conclusions and implications of this research are included at the end of this article.

2. THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK AND HYPOTHESIS

Emotional Intelligence and Job satisfaction

People with high emotional intelligence have a capability to regulate their emotion (Salovey & Meyer 1990). Hence, they are able to maintain their satisfaction and wellbeing (Carmeli 2003). Those statements were supported by some research results. Research by Wong & Law (2002) of middle-level Hong Kong government administrator found that emotional intelligence of subordinates had significant effect on their job satisfaction. Carmeli (2003) found that emotional intelligence of senior managers in Israeli government was positively related to their job satisfaction. A study by Carmeli et al. (2007) of employees of various organizations showed that employees who have higher emotional intelligence reported higher level of psychological wellbeing (life satisfaction, self-acceptance, and self-esteem) than other employees who reported low level of emotional intelligence. Moreover, an inquiry by Jordan & Troth (2011) on employees of a private Australian pathology companies found that followers’ emotional intelligence was linked to their job satisfaction.

On the contrary, two other researches found insignificant correlation between emotional intelligence and job satisfaction, such as a study by Lopes et al. (2006) that found insignificant negative correlation between total scores of emotional intelligence and self-rated job satisfaction and a research by Chiva & Alegre (2007) indicates insignificant direct effect of emotional intelligence on job satisfaction.

Given the inconsistency of research results, the following hypothesis was set forth:

H1 : Emotional intelligence has a positive effect on job satisfaction.

Emotional Intelligence and Affect at Work

Affective Events Theory (Weiss & Cropanzano 1996) suggests that personal disposition (e.g. personality, trait emotional intelligence and trait affect) can influence one’s affective states which are caused by experienced events at the workplace. On the other hand, people are relatively motivated to maintain their positive affect and repair their negative affect by recalling their positive memories (e.g. happy moments and inspiring stories) about themselves or others (Salovey & Meyer 1990 and Ciarrochi et al. 2000). Similarly, few research results suggest that people’s emotional intelligence influences their affect at work. Research results by Kafetios & Zampetakis (2008) show that emotional intelligence had a higher effect on positive affect than negative
affect. Moreover, experimental researches by Ciarrochi et al. (2000) and Schutte et al. (2002) resulted that persons who have high emotional intelligence could maintain their positive mood, but emotional intelligence did not play role in reducing negative mood.

Based on the Affective Events Theory, the following hypothesis was formulated:

H2: (a) Emotional intelligence has a positive effect on positive affect; (b) Emotional intelligence has a negative effect on negative affect.

Affective at Work and Job Satisfaction
Affective Events Theory (Weiss & Cropanzano 1996) explained that affective experience at the workplace can influence judgments about job satisfaction. In fact, there are various research results about the correlation between affect/mood and job satisfaction. Kafetios & Zampetakis (2008) found that both positive and negative affect influenced job satisfaction, but the negative affect’s effect was much weaker than the positive affect’s. A study by Ilies & Judge (2002) proved that across individual (cross-sectional method of their research using average of time series data per individual) and within individual (longitudinal method of research using time series data) positive and negative affect influenced job satisfaction significantly, but across individual negative affect had insignificant correlation with JS. Research results by Judge & Ilies (2004) indicated that, between individually, positive and negative affect at work were significant predictors of job satisfaction, and within individually, the positive and negative affect also significantly predicted job satisfaction concurrently. An inquiry by Scott & Judge (2006) suggests that across individual and between individual joviality (positive affect), attentiveness (positive affect), and hostility (negative affect) had significant positive effect on job satisfaction, however, fatigue (negative affect) did not have significant effect on participant’s job satisfaction. Moreover, Judge et al. (2006) found that positive affect and hostility was significant predictors of job satisfaction, but they found that the effect of negative affect on job satisfaction was insignificant.

Grounded on Affective Events Theory, the following hypothesis was proposed:

H3: (a) Positive affect has a positive effect on job satisfaction; (b) Negative affect has a negative effect on job satisfaction.

The Mediator Role of Affect at Work
To solve the research gap about emotional and job satisfaction relationship, present research engages affect at work as mediators, including positive and negative affect. That concept is supported by Affective Events Theory (Weiss & Cropanzano 1996), the theory suggests that people personal dispositions can influence their affective reactions, then the affective reactions can influence their attitudes, including job satisfaction. Kafetios & Zampetakis (2008) found that both positive and negative affect have significant mediatory roles in the effect of emotional intelligence on job satisfaction.

Given the theory and the research result, the following hypothesis was set forth:

H4: (a) The effect of emotional intelligence on job satisfaction is mediated by positive affect; (b) The effect of emotional intelligence on job satisfaction is mediated by negative affect.

The Regulative Role of Organizational Learning Capability
Research by Chiva & Alegre (2007) found that the effects of EI on were mediated by organizational learning capability. Chiva & Alegre (2007) had a notion that people with high emotional intelligence have social capability that can make them able to express and communicate their ideas, and build good relationship. Emotional intelligence also provide social skill that is needed in team works and adaptability to environmental changes. Therefore, they believe that emotional intelligence of their respondents (157 non-managerial workers in ceramic tiles companies) could support organizational learning capability. But, present research has placed organizational learning capability as a moderator instead of mediator, because the statement that considered emotional intelligence as a predictor of organizational learning capability (Chiva & Alegre 2007) is not consistent with the idea of organizational learning from Fiol & Lyles (1985) who explained that building organizational learning is not as simple as combining each individuals learning at organizations. They also asserted that organizations build and maintain their learning system through organizational histories and norms over time.

Given that the concept of organizational learning by Fiol & Lyles (1985), the following hypothesis is set forth:

H5: The relationship between emotional intelligence and job satisfaction is moderated by organizational learning capability.

3. RESEARCH METHOD
Population and Sampling Technique
Population of this research is 302 Staff marketing at banks in Banyumas Regency (Central Java, Indone-
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Samples were taken from main branch offices of the banks. The questionnaires were distributed by my relatives and friends who work at the banks, without sending any institutional letter to get permission from the authorities of involved banks. Banks in Banyumas are relatively closed organization and barely sharing their information with outsiders, so it was really difficult and time-consuming to get the data by completing administrative requirement. Unfortunately, the informal approach to the respondents made simple random sampling was too difficult to reach and therefore I used convenient sampling which was the most possible method to apply.

Research Respondents Description
From 200 distributed questionnaires, 137 questionnaires were collected (response rate 68.5%), and there were 132 usable questionnaire. The samples included 82 males (62.1%) and 50 females (37.9%). Most of the respondents are aged between 21-30 years (72.7%), holding bachelor degree (77.3%), impermanent (contract and outsourcing) employees (53%), working as salespeople less than 5 years (72%), and working at their present workplace less than 5 years (82.6%).

Definition
Job Satisfaction (JS)
According to Kalleberg (1977), JS refers to employees whole affective orientation about their work role. Warr, et al. (1979) defined JS as one’s satisfaction level with either extrinsic or intrinsic job characteristic. Luthans (2005, pp. 212) considered JS as the result of employees perception about how their work can deliver things that they believe its importance. Whereas Robbins & Judge (2007, pp. 99) described JS as positive feelings about one’s job which is a result of evaluation from its (job) characteristic.

Affect
Affect is a common term which includes various feelings that is experienced by someone (Robbins & Judge 2007, pp. 308). Affect comprises emotion and mood. Emotion is intense feelings about something or someone (Robbins & Judge 2007, pp. 308). Whereas, mood is feelings that is relatively less intense than emotion and oftentimes (not always), it emerge without any contextual stimulation (Robbins & Judge 2007, pp. 308).

Researches about affect at work have began since 1930’s (Brief & Weiss 2002), nevertheless, Robbins & Judge (2007, pp. 310) asserted that affect, mood, and emotion terminology is still confusing and overlapping. In short, emotion is wider and more general than mood, and if emotions (e.g. happiness, anger, gratefulness, guilty feeling, etc.) are divided into positive and negative categories, it is referred to mood (Watson et al. 1988 and Robbins & Judge 2007). Here are some explanations about affect dimensions:

a. Positive Affect (PA)
PA is one of mood aspects consists of specific emotion with positive characteristic. High-PA is the state of happiness, excitement, sobriety, and full concentration. Whereas, low-PA is characterized by boredom, laziness, tiredness, and sadness (Robbins & Judge 2007, pp. 316 and Watson, et al. 1988)
b. Negative Affect (NA)
NA is a mood aspect includes specific emotion with negative characteristic that relate to depressed and unhappy feeling. High-NA is the state of nervousness, stress, restlessness, anger, disgust, fear and guilt. Whereas, low-PA is characterized by relaxation, sobriety, and calm (Robbins & Judge 2007, pp. 316 and Watson, et al. 1988)

Organizational Learning Capability (OLC)
The idea of organizational learning emerged at 1980’s (Fiol & Lyles 1985). Chiva et al. (2007) summarized the organizational learning (OL) definitions as learning process of an organization. Furthermore, Theriou et al. (2004) described learning organization (LO) as an organization that adopt particular strategies, mechanisms, and practices determined to encourage its members to learn endlessly, in order that they can adapt to business environment that always change.

OLC is one of methods to measure OL besides measurements from its outputs, processes, and sources (Chiva et al. 2006). Chiva et al. (2006) defined OLC as organization and management characteristics in facilitating OL process, or in supporting organization to learn. Likewise, Goh & Ryan (2002) stated that OLC is certain mechanisms, managerial practices, procedures, and organizational structures that encourage and facilitate learning in the organization.

Emotional Intelligence (EI)
Salovey & Mayer (1990) defined EI as a capability to monitor self and others feelings and emotions, to distinguish them and use the emotion-related information as the basis to think and behave. Furthermore, they also explain that EI is an ability to use information that related to emotion
accurately and efficiently, it also includes ability to recognize, assess, regulate and use the emotional information to solve life problems. According to Matthews et al. (2002), EI is a competence to identify, express, understand, and regulate emotion in mind, and also regulate self and others positive and negative emotion. Meanwhile, Goleman (1995, pp. xiii) asserted that EI includes self-control, spirit and perseverance, and self-motivation. Those capabilities draw a distinction between EI and IQ (Intelligence Quotient). Furthermore, Goleman (2001) had a notion about emotional competence as an EI-based capability that can be learned, so it could improve one’s performance at the workplace.

Measurement
Questionnaires were translated into Indonesian. To make sure that the questionnaires were usable and understandable, few modifications were made and a pilot study was run to examine validity and reliability of the questionnaires before they were distributed to the respondents.

Job Satisfaction
This research used job satisfaction 16-items measurement that was fostered by Warr, et al. (1979). Each question consists of seven point Likert-type scale (1 = very dissatisfied, 7 = very satisfied). A pilot test was done and the result suggested to drop 3 items from JS questionnaire. Then, convergent and discriminant validity was calculated to assess construct validity by using Confirmatory Factor Analysis (CFA). The CFA’s result showed good convergent validity ($\lambda > 0.5, AVE = 0.710, CR = 0.970$) and discriminant validity ($\sqrt{AVE}$ score [0.840] was greater than correlation coefficient between JS construct and other constructs) as well.

Affect
This research used 20-items PANAS (PA and NA Schedule) by Watson, et al. (1988). The instrument was used to measure respondent’s mood states. Each question consists of five point Likert-type scale (1 = very slightly or not at all, 5 = extremely). The pilot test result showed that 3 out of the 20-items had insignificant validity, so those 3 items could not be used in this research. Furthermore, result of the CFA indicated a good convergent validity of PA ($\lambda > 0.5, AVE = 0.630, CR = 0.960$) and NA ($\lambda > 0.5, AVE = 0.630, CR = 0.940$). $\sqrt{AVE}$ score (PA = 0.825 and NA = 0.795) were greater than correlation coefficients between affective states (PA and NA) construct and other constructs, indicating good discriminant validity.

Organizational Learning Capability
OLC was measured by 14-items measurement by Chiva et al. (2006). Each question consists of seven point Likert-type scale (1 = total disagreement, 7 = total agreement). After the whole questionnaires were translated into Indonesian, the OLC measurements were modified into 18-items measurement, in order to make it simpler and easier to understand without changing its meaning. The pilot test’s result suggested to set 2 items aside, so there were left 16 usable items. Afterwards, the CFA’s result indicated that the construct had good convergent validity ($\lambda > 0.5, AVE = 0.710, CR = 0.970$) and discriminant validity ($\sqrt{AVE}$ score [0.840] was greater than correlation coefficient between OLC construct and other constructs) as well.

Emotional Intelligence
16-items of self report WLEIS (Wong Law EI Scale) by Wong & Law (2002) was used in this research. Each question consists of seven point Likert-type scale (1 = strongly disagree, 7 = strongly agree). The measurement was also modified into 17-items, in purpose to make it easier to be understood by the respondents. Afterward, a pilot test resulted that 4 items needed to be dropped, so there were left 12 usable items. Furthermore, the CFA’s result showed good convergent validity ($\lambda > 0.5, AVE = 0.630, CR = 0.960$) and discriminant validity ($\sqrt{AVE}$ score [0.791] was greater than correlation coefficient between OLC construct and other constructs) of the measurement.

Data Analysis Technique
This research used AMOS 16.0 in analyzing the model. Models with large amount of indicators (as this research) are theoretically good, because they are able to explain measurement errors better. However, such models become too complex because they involve so many free parameters. A large amount of free parameters make the numbers of parameters which have to be estimated become so large as well. Hence, the model evaluation and specification become so complex (Ghozali 2008). If a model is too complex, the fit model will be really difficult to reach (Hair et al. 2010). Therefore, to simplify the model of this research, I used composite indicator (Figure 1). I referred to Ghozali (2008) who explained systematic steps to built composite indicators.
4. DATA ANALYSIS AND DISCUSSION

Assessment of Measurement Model

The prior model of this inquiry (table 1) did not indicate good fit to the data: $\chi^2 (df = 5, N = 132) = 20.748, p = 0.001, RMSEA = 0.155, GFI = 0.955, AGFI = 0.813, CMIN/DF = 4.150, TLI = 0.673, CFI = 0.891$. Besides, modification indices suggested to draw a causal line from OLC to PA to improve goodness of fit of the model. OLC’s effect on PA is supported by Affective Events Theory (Weiss & Cropanzano 1996) which asserted that working environment features could emerge events that resulted in causing employee’s affective experiences at the workplace.

Based on the modification indices and the Affective Events Theory, the former model of this research was modified (Figure 1). Table 1 shows that the modification revealed a good fit to the data: $\chi^2 (df = 5, N = 132) = 7.373, p = 0.117, RMSEA = 0.080, GFI = 0.982, AGFI = 0.906, CMIN/DF = 1.843, TLI = 0.912, CFI = 0.977$. Therefore, the recent model of this research was used to test the hypothesis.

Assessment of Structural Equation Modeling

Tabel 2 displays insignificant effect of EI on JS ($0.018, C.R. = 0.224, P = 0.823$), so hypothesis 1 was rejected. Meanwhile, EI had a significant positive effect on PA ($0.301, C.R. > 2, P < 0.001$) and insignificant negative effect on NA ($-0.086, C.R. = -0.922, P = 0.345$), so those result supported hypothesis 2 (a) but rejected hypothesis 2 (b). Table 2 also shows that there were significant PA effect on JS ($0.487, C.R. > 2, P < 0.001$) and insignificant NA effect on JS ($-0.108, C.R. = -1.567, P = 0.117$), supporting hypothesis 3 (a) but rejecting hypothesis 3 (b).

In line with the significance of EI’s effect on PA and PA’s effect on JS were significant, direct effect of EI on JS ($0.018$) was much lower than its indirect effect ($0.156$). A Sobel test was conducted and it indicates that the indirect effect is significant (Sobel test statistic = $2.975$, S.E. = $0.049$, $P < 0.01$). Therefore, it was not a direct effect, but was mediated by PA, confirming hypothesis 4 (a). Nevertheless, EI’s effect on NA and NA’s effect on JS were not significant, so NA was not a significant mediator for the effect itself and the result did not support hypothesis 4 (b). The regulative role of OLC in EI’s effect on JS can be seen from the effect of interaction (between EI and OLC) variable on JS in Table 2. In fact, that effect was proven insignificant ($0.074, C.R. = 1.131, P = 0.258$), so OLC did not mediate EI’s effect on JS and hypothesis 5 was not supported. Meanwhile, the modification of this research model result a significant effect of OLC on PA ($0.329, C.R. > 2, P < 0.001$).

Discussion

EI has become one of important human resources competencies in organizations. It also theoretically
related to individual and company performance and employees job satisfaction. However, research results showed that not all of high EI people seem to be satisfied with their jobs. Therefore, OLC and affect is considered in examining EI’s effect on JS in present research.

This research found insignificant EI’s effect on JS. The result is similar with some other research results such as Lopes et al. (2006) and Chiva & Alegré (2007) and yet contrary to research results by Wong & Law (2002), Carmeli (2003), and Kafetios & Zampetakis (2008). The contradiction of research results indicates that not all high EI people is satisfied with their jobs, some them may get satisfaction from their jobs while others are not.

Results of present research indicate that emotionally intelligence salespeople tend to maintain their PA, instead of repairing their NA. The result is in line with research results by Ciarrochi et al. (2000) and Schutte et al. (2002). Maybe, high-EI respondents are not strongly motivated to engage in mood repair, because avoiding the negative thoughts when in a bad mood condition may allow them to reduce their bad moods, but it can also prevent them from focusing on what caused the negative moods (Ciarrochi et al. 2000). Likewise, Kafetios & Zampetakis (2008) found that EI had much higher effect on PA than NA (the effect of EI on both affective states is significant). They had an argument that PA is a better predictor of work outcomes, so person with high-EI is linked better with efforts to maintain their PA, because PA is a source of human strength and it also influence human cognitions, emotions and actions that promote the building of personal and social capability (Salovey & Meyer 1990 and Kafetios & Zampetakis 2008).

The insignificant EI’s effect on NA in this research might be caused by other things such as job pressures and stresses. Each salespeople have their own monthly, 3-month, 6-month and even annual targets that also include consequences in case they can not achieve their targets. Based on my inter-view with some of the respondents, their targets of fund-rising and lending range from Rp 180,000,000,- to Rp 1,000,000,000,- per month. Meanwhile, the consequences will be stiffer for impermanent salespeople (53% from the total respondents are contracted and outsourced employee), the banks may not extend their contract anymore, or even end the contract and discharge them. Salespeople also face rivalry and competition, either with their colleagues or with salespeople of other banks. Therefore, job pressures and stress might weaken the effect of EI on NA.

Furthermore, this research result shows that PA had a significant positive effect on JS. On the contrary, NA had an insignificant negative effect on JS. The results are similar with research results by Kafetios & Zampetakis (2008) who found that both PA and NA had effects on JS, but the NA’s effect was much weaker (-0.19) than the PA’s effect (0.56), Ilies & Judge (2002) who found that across individual NA had insignificant correlation with JS, and Judge et al. (2006) who found that the effect of NA on JS was insignificant. This can be caused by one of the weaknesses of cross-sectional research method that do not have capability to examine mood change, whereas the state of moods is often changing over time.

PA had significant positive effect on JS, while NA did not have significant negative effect on JS, it suggests that the effect of respondent’s PA on their judgments about JS was much stronger than their NA. On the other words, PA is the dominant affect that is involved in respondent’s judgment of job satisfaction, instead of NA. It may be reasoned by three things, first, mood management/mood regulation capability. The capability makes someone who is in a bad mood is able avoid recalling bad memories and tends to remember good things in order to cope with the bad mood (mood repair). Hence, bad mood may not affect respondents JS judgment, because their mood regulation capability makes them not to involve their negative emotion
in evaluating their JS (Weiss and Cropanzano 1996), as arespondent said: “If we think that our job is hard and difficult, so it will be felt too hard and difficult as well. So, it’s better to see from the good side, because targets and competitions are always existing.” The second thing that could be the reason is respondent’s trait. Respondent’s positive attitude about their jobs could have been caused by their trait, such as personality and affective trait (trait PA and NA), because some people are easy to feel happy, optimist and energetic, while others are not. Therefore, respondent’s trait may influence their affective judgment about their JS. Finally, marketing incentive payment could also influence respondent’s affect that involved in making judgment about their JS. Some of the respondents said that their income is bigger than other employees at the same level but in different division (e.g. tellers, cashiers, customer services, and back-officers), because they also receive marketing incentives. The incentives could also have impact on respondents affect and JS, so it might have been the reason why PA has much bigger effect on their judgment of JS than NA.

In present research, PA was a significant mediator in EI’s effect on JS, while NA did not mediate the effect significantly. The result is similar to research result by Kafetios & Zampetakis (2008) who found that the mediatory role of PA was stronger than NA in EI’s effect on JS. They explained that high EI people tend to be more engaged in maintaining their PA, because PA gives them strength in their mind, feeling and action to build up their personal and social capability.

Finally, this research found that OLC did not moderate the effect of EI on JS. OLC was just a significant predictor of JS. The result confirms Affective Events Theory (Weiss & Cropanzano 1996)that asserted that working environment features have direct effect on JS by cognitive judgment about the working environment itself.

In addition, modification of former model in this research result a significant positive effect of OLC on PA. The modification is supported by Affective Events Theory (Weiss & Cropanzano 1996) which explained that working environment features can cause the emergence of events that may bring on the employee’s affective experiences. It seems that the features in banks which facilitate learning can cause events that are able to increase the PA of their salespeople. The salespeople tend to experience high PA (e.g. happy, excited, inspired, etc.) if they work in a learning organization, instead of working in banks that do not facilitate organizational learning, have stiff procedures and regulations, and restrict either communication or information.

5. CONCLUSION, IMPLICATION, SUGGESTION, AND LIMITATIONS

The result of data analysis shows that EI had insignificant positive effect on JS, it indicates that high EI people are not always satisfied with their job. EI had significant positive influence on PA but it did not have significant negative effect on NA, the result means that high EI respondents seem to maintain their PA but they do not or even can not reduce their NA, maybe because of job pressure and stress that they experience. PA had significant positive effect on JS, but NA did not have significant negative effect on JS, the result shows that high PA can increase respondents JS but high NA can not reduce their JS, it maybe caused by respondents’ traits, mood repair capability and the level market-
ing incentives that they receive. PA was a significant mediator of effect of EI on JS, but NA did not significantly mediate the effect itself. Meanwhile, the regulative role of OLC in the effect was also insignificant. Furthermore, model modification shows that OLC has a significant positive effect on PA. In sum, the results of this research is confirming Affective Events Theory (Weiss & Cropanzano 1996) that suggests that working environment features have direct effect on affective experiences, they has direct and indirect (through affective experiences) influence on JS as well. The theory also asserts that personal dispositions have indirect (through affective experiences) influence on JS.

This research result suggests that managers shall recruit high EI marketing personnel and arrange soft-skill trainings to sharpen their staff’s emotional capability, because EI can improve JS through mood maintenance (PA). The managers also need to facilitate organizational learning, by giving appreciation to their staff’s ideas, knowledge sharing, supporting risk taking in trying new things that have never been done before, encouraging openness to information, good communication, interaction with external environment, and participative decision making, because it’s proven that OLC can increase their salespeople’s PA and JS. Therefore, it is necessary for the managers to provide sources of funds, time, trainings, experience and sharing opportunities to improve their salespeople’s skills and knowledge.

Some weaknesses must be recognized in the present research. First, this research only combined the models from Chiva & Alegre (2007) and Kafetios & Zampetakis (2008), so it will be much better for next research to explore new variables that may mediate or moderate the relationship of EI and JS, such as perceived justice, leadership style, perceived organizational support, job characteristic, organizational culture, stress and others. Research about other consequences of EI at the workplace can be more interesting, like organizational citizenship behavior, commitment, job involvement, etc. Second, the present research is analyzing its variable as a whole “package”, aspects of EI and JS was not separately examined. Therefore, the suggestion for next research is investigating the aspect of those variables in order to improve the result to be more detail and accurate. Third, the questionnaires were completed by single kind of occupation from single industry (banks) to control potential effects of type of occupation and industry, so the result can not be generalized to other occupations and industries. To evaluate the generalization of the result, future research may test my hypotheses in other occupations and industries. Fourth, this is a cross-sectional research, so it will be much better if the future research use longitudinal method of research to improve the generalization. Besides, the duration of affect’s effect on JS is still debatable, so longitudinal method of research is the best way in examining PA and NA. Fifth, present research using convenient sampling to collect data. In order to improve the accurate and generalization, future research shall use simple random sampling technique.
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