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Abstract
While scholars know a great deal about the importance of a leader’s emotional intelligence in organizational context, there is much to be learned about the factors how a leader’s emotional intelligence influences employee performance and work engagement on individual level. This exploratory study integrated COR theory, and hypothesized that a leader’s emotional intelligence set off a chain reaction of subsequent (social and personal) employee resources: an employee’s perceived service climate and an employee’s psychological capital. Non-managerial service employees of a global professional services organization in the Netherlands (\(N = 197\)) rated the emotional intelligence of their own leader as well as their perceived service climate, psychological capital, job performance and work engagement. The results supported a full three-path mediation model: a leader’s emotional intelligence was related to perceived service climate, which in turn was related to psychological capital, which ultimately influenced work engagement. Besides, a partially mediating effect is found between a leader’s EI and job performance, through service climate and psychological capital. In this study job performance and work engagement are shown to be two dependent variables. Practical implications of the findings for (professional) services firms are discussed, together with limitations and ideas for further research.
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1 Introduction
A growing body of studies shows that job resources are related to employee performance (Siu, Cheung, & Lui, 2014; Zhong, Wayne, & Liden, 2016). Resources can be described as psychological states or things that people value (Halbesleben, Neveu, Paustian-Underdahl, & Westman, 2014). Job resources refer to the organizational aspects of a job that are functional in achieving work goals, stimulating personal growth, learning and development (Halbesleben et al., 2014; Hobfoll, 1989). Bakker and Schaufeli (2008) have suggested that job resources, such as leadership and organizational climate (e.g., service climate), are antecedents of a motivational process. Therefore, the presence of available job resources stimulates employees’ personal development and increases their motivation (Salanova, Agut, & Peiró, 2005), and thus consequently employee job performance (Brouer, Gallagher, & Badawy, 2016) and work engagement (Bakker & Schaufeli, 2008). How employees use available job resources is important to understand in order to utilize available job resources more effectively.

The present study invokes the Conservation of Resources (COR) theory and examines how a leader’s Emotional Intelligence (EI) may boost non-managerial employee job attitudes and their performance (Halbesleben et al., 2014). According to the COR theory, employees who obtain a resource are more likely to gain or use other resources in the future (Hobfoll, 1989). Job resources for the employees are, among others, a leader’s EI, perceived service climate and psychological capital. Whereby, EI of the leader and service climate are external resources, psychological capital is a personal resource. This study reveals how individual service employees with high levels of job performance and work engagement respond to available job resources such as, a leader’s EI, service climate, and psychological capital, sequentially. The broaden-and-build perspective supports the linkages in this “chain” between a leader’s EI and the way it is reflected in employees’
job performance and work engagement (Fredrickson, 2001). Therefore, in the present cross-sectional study we view a leader’s EI as the key resource (Halbesleben et al., 2014) that generates subsequent job resources which employees can use to achieve high levels of job performance.

In the past, extensive research focused on the contribution of factors that related to employee work engagement and, in turn, ultimately were translated into job performance (Randall, Cropanzano, Bormann, & Birjulin, 1999; Zhong et al., 2016). In our study, job performance is the focal dependent variable along with one more dependent variable: work engagement. Even though previous research has argued that job performance yields positive relationships with other job attitudes, such as work engagement (Newman & Harrison, 2008), Parker and Griffin (2011) suggested that work engagement does not always translate into job performance. Given these results, we examine several forms of job resources, not only in the light of job performance, but also in a somewhat different aspect: by examining work engagement. Thus, we test a model with indirect links between a leader’s EI and two dependent variables, job performance and work engagement. Figure 1 contains an overview of the theoretical model.

Our study contributes in the following ways. First, the subject of EI in relation to service climate may be important in the service sector as well as in other job sectors where employees interact significantly with customers: as shown in a meta-analysis conducted by Joseph and Newman (2010). Joseph and Newman (2010) showed in their research that for jobs with a high degree of emotional sensitivity and social interactions, an emotionally intelligent leader is an important contributor to employee job performance. Our study test the model in a global professional services firm. In the tested subsidiary of this professional services firm, employees work in the same organizational setting with a shared vision, policy and working mentality. Therefore, another contribution of this study is that we limit the chance of variations in an
employees’ use of resources that might be explained by other factors than the ones examined herein. Second, the indirect mechanism how a leader’s EI influenced employee job performance and work engagement, as well as the impact of other job resources on this relationship, has not yet gained sufficient attention in research conducted prior. In particular EI in relation to psychological capital has not gained sufficient attention as this is a relatively new, yet already quite validated, concept in the organizational literature (e.g., Widianto & Wilderom, 2016). In the present study, we test how a leader’s EI might induce positive feelings in individual employees which in turn may boost employees’ work engagement and job performance as well. Thus, we examine the question of how a leader’s EI is linked towards employee job outcomes at the individual level. Third, few studies report on the effect of a leader’s EI on service climate. Our study examines the link between a leader’s EI and service climate through the lens of the employees (Awwad & Ali, 2012). Lastly, the impact of service climate on an individuals’ job attitude, referred to as work engagement, warrants further research attention (Jiang, 2016) and is examined here (Well & Conditions, 2016).

Based on the above mentioned reasoning, the following research question has been developed: To what extent does a leader’s emotional intelligence influence the employees work engagement and job performance as well? And to what extent is this relationship mediated through the employees’ perceived service climate and psychological capital?

The structure of this thesis paper is as follows: in the theory section we will present several hypotheses after theorizing on the links between the key variables. This will be followed by the methods and results section. We will end by discussing our results, along with the managerial implications, and we will provide future research suggestions and explain the limitations of the design of this empirical field study.
2 Theory and Hypotheses

2.1 Leaders’ Emotional Intelligence and Employee Job Performance/Work Engagement

In the past decade, the study of emotions in a business-related context has become a key topic of interest amongst organizational behavioral researchers. A meta-analysis by Harter, Schmidt, and Hayes (2002) established the effect of leaders’ emotions on job outcomes. More specifically, evidence is accumulating that a leader’s EI is successfully associated with successfully living in the world and particular in the work environment (Goleman, 1995). Wang, Oh, Courtright, and Colbert (2011) and Wilderom, Hur, Wiersma, Van den Berg, and Lee (2015) emphasized this whilst studying a leader’s EI extensively as a predictor of job outcomes.

Salovey and Mayer (1990, p. 189) defined EI as: “the sub-set of social intelligence that involves the ability to monitor one’s own and others’ feelings and emotions, to discriminate among them and to use this information to guide one’s thinking and actions”. They conceptualized EI as a model which includes the perception, assimilation, understanding and management of emotions (Mayer & Salovey, 1997). Emotionally intelligent individuals use their ability to: appraise verbal, nonverbal and express emotions; perceive, understand and regulate emotions in the self and others;
design emotional knowledge to promote intellectual and emotional growth; and to generate emotions to assist problem solving (Wong & Law, 2002). For example, emotionally intelligent individuals are seen as being more empathetic, trustful and charismatic (Mayer, Roberts, & Barsade, 2008). More specifically and as mentioned before, a leader’s ability to control and handle their emotions is important in an organizational setting (Jordan & Troth, 2002; Kerr, Garvin, Heaton, & Boyle, 2006).

There is meta-analytic evidence of how a leader’s EI, seen as a job resource, might affect the level of an employee performance (Joseph & Newman, 2010; Miao, Humphrey, & Qian, 2016). First, Acha, Hargiss, and Howard (2013) suggest that high emotionally intelligent leaders stimulate a motivational work environment in which employees are influenced through a leader’s positive emotions. Those leaders have the ability to easily shift from negative to positive moods, and therefore give more suitable responses to employees’ emotions (Ölcer, Florescu, & Nastase, 2014). This suggests that emotionally intelligent leaders take on the role of “mood managers” to influence their employees’ emotions and to let them experience more positive and less negative feelings (Miao et al., 2016). Thereby, these leaders have the social skills to enhance belonging, unity and social connection among employees, which are sources of meaningfulness at work (Lips-Wiersma & Morris, 2009). In other words, emotionally intelligent leaders tend to affect an employee’s sense of meaningfulness (Thory, 2016).

Second, George (2000) discovered that leaders who understand their own emotions are more likely to establish and maintain higher-quality relationships with their employees. Emotionally intelligent leaders do this by treating their employees with approval, respect and affection (Jacobs, 1970). Those leaders have superior emotion-appraisal skills and therefore facilitate employees behaviors that are favorable for the organization, and ultimately facilitate higher job performance.
Third, emotionally intelligent leaders behave in ways that create work environments conducive to high employee performance. They do this by accurately perceiving employees’ emotions in order to direct employees towards meeting their performance objectives (Vidyarthi, Anand, & Liden, 2014) and conveying a message of authenticity along the way, through their high level of honesty (Dasborough & Ashkanasy, 2002). Controversially, leaders who score low on self-awareness of their own and other emotions tend to impede employee performance through poorer exchange and mistaken allocation of social support. Lastly, Whiteoak and Manning (2012) support the finding that a leader’s EI appears as an important management competency. Whiteoak and Manning (2012) argued that employees may benefit from the EI of their leaders because those leaders create relationships that enhance trust in their employees. Also through their high level of openness, high emotionally intelligent leaders convey a message of authenticity (Dasborough & Ashkanasy, 2002), which fosters job satisfaction and ultimately influences job performance (Schleicher, Hansen, & Fox, 2011).

Next to job performance, work engagement is the other dependent variable in this study. Work engagement has been extensively studied in the past, both empirically and meta-analytically (Crawford, Lepine, & Rich, 2010; Harter et al., 2002). Schaufeli, Salanova, Gon Alez-ro, and Bakker (2002, p. 74) define work engagement as “a positive, fulfilling, work-related state of mind that is characterized by vigor, dedication and absorption”. Vigor refers to having high levels of energy, mental resilience in one’s work as well as being willing to invest effort and persistence. Dedication refers to enthusiasm, inspiration, pride and challenge. Lastly, absorption refers to having full concentration and being engrossed in one’s work (Salanova & Schaufeli, 2008). Engaged employees go beyond the basic job requirements and responsibilities to get the job done.
They show a strong level of commitment to the organization and are more motivated and optimistic about their work goals (Macey & Schneider, 2008).

Fredrickson's (2001) broaden-and-build perspective supports the linkages in the chain between a leader’s EI as a key job resource and the manner in which it ultimately gets reflected in job performance and work engagement. This broaden-and-build theory states that employees’ positive emotions, in this case arising from a leader’s EI, enable broader behavior amongst their employees (e.g., job performance and work engagement) and builds social and personal resources. In other words, an emotionally intelligent leader not only generates higher levels of extra effort amongst employees to perform well, but is also likely to induce work engagement amongst his or her employees (Mahon, Taylor, & Boyatzis, 2014). Employees feel engaged because they converge emotionally with their work. This can be seen as an emotional process. Since emotionally intelligent leaders express more positive emotions, they have capacities to manage this process effectively. Another explanation of why an emotionally intelligent leader can arouse work engagement amongst their employees is that of Druskat and Wolff (2001). Druskat and Wolff (2001) showed that high emotionally intelligent leaders show interpersonal understanding and caring behaviors, next to their ability of proactive problem solving. Furthermore, as said before, these leaders are likely to imbue employees with job meaningfulness (Thory, 2016), which stimulates employees to attain higher engagement in their work (Fairlie, 2011). Another argument is that emotionally intelligent leaders might foster work engagement through providing their current employees with work-related challenges, given that those challenges are communicated in an effective, creative and supportive way towards their team members. Employees should therefore be more motivated to fulfill these challenges, because these challenges are perceived as positive by current employees (Crawford et al., 2010). Furthermore, effects of high emotionally intelligent
leaders on employee work engagement were demonstrated in an empirical study amongst police officers (Brunetto, Teo, Shacklock, & Farr-Wharton, 2012). This study showed evidence that emotionally intelligent leaders influenced their employees’ engagement. Moreover, May, Gilson, and Harter (2004) showed that employee engagement is influenced by the support and resources available at work. These resources include supervision and management practices. Moreover, a recent study of Mahon et al. (2014) found that a leader’s EI has an amplifying role for a shared vision between leaders and employees. In other words, a high emotionally intelligent leader will strengthen the ties between an organization’s vision and that of an employee. This ultimately foster the employees’ degree of supportiveness by the organization and their level of engagement.

We can assume that working with an emotionally intelligent leader seems equivalent to having access to a job resource when needed. Thus, EI might constitute as a positive employee job resource (Liu & Liu, 2013; Wilderom et al., 2015). This is in line with the COR theory, in which individuals strive to maintain valuable resources, and were stress emerges when they do not have access to those resources. An emotionally intelligent leader not only generates employee job performance but also in the work engagement among employees. The above mentioned findings reinforce the notion that leadership is a process of social influence through which a leader affects employees’ perceptions, feelings, and behavior (Zampetakis & Moustakis, 2011). Therefore, the hypothesis emerged:

Hypothesis 1a) A leader’s EI is positively related to employee job performance.

Hypothesis 1b) A leader’s EI is positively related to employee work engagement.
2.2 Service Climate as a Mediator between Leaders’ Emotional Intelligence and Psychological Capital

Next to the direct effect of a leader’s EI on employee work engagement and job performance, a leader’s EI is also seen as an antecedent which promotes employee job outcomes through indirect mechanisms (Shrestha & Baniya, 2016). In this study, we focus on service climate and psychological capital as indirect mechanisms. Below, we explore the link between a leader’s EI and perceived service climate. After that, we expand on the assumption that social external resources such as a leader’s EI with service climate fuels personal resources such as psychological capital (Hobfoll, 1989).

Service climate refers to the shared sense that people who work for an organization have. This includes policies, procedures, and rewarded employee behaviors, which all emphasize service excellence (Schneider, White, & Paul, 1998). Research suggests that a service climate is a proven resource for achieving favorable employee outcomes and customer experiences (Auh, Bowen, Aysuna, & Menguc, 2016; Bowen & Schneider, 2014). Thus, next to a leader’s EI, service climate has been considered as a critical link between the internal management and organizational performance. A strong service climate is necessary to guide the attitudes and behaviors of employees in the service process (Schneider, Salvaggio, & Subirats, 2002). Therefore, in this study both service climate and a leader’s level of EI are perceived as social external resources. In a positive service climate, employees feel a level of team spirit and work with a positive attitude to deliver service quality to their clients (Bowen & Schneider, 2014). Next to their daily tasks, employees who perceive their service climate as positive will engage in extra-role behaviors to promote customer satisfaction, leading to better business results (Schneider, Ehrhart, Mayer, Saltz, & Niles-Jolly, 2005). Nowadays, in an environment that manifests a high pressure of competition,
service climate may play an important role for a firm to stay ahead of their competitors. Therefore, organizations must understand how leaders induce a team atmosphere in which employees will perceive a positive service climate. In turn, such climate ultimately induces employee efforts to deliver customer’s service quality (Kuenzi & Schminke, 2009).

Leaders create success not only by themselves: they also need others to achieve success in their work. This is the reason why we examine indirect mechanisms through which emotionally intelligent leaders achieve positive job outcomes. We assume that emotionally intelligent leaders are effective in shaping better service climates in several ways. This assumption is supported by the following arguments. Emotionally intelligent leaders create closer relationships among employees and their leaders: through their ability of positive emotional display. Closer relationships induce more openness in communication between leaders and followers. In turn, this creates mutual sharing and reduces variation in group members’ perceptions (Zohar & Tenne-Gazit, 2008) which is a characteristic of service climate. Another argument of why emotionally intelligent leaders are effective in shaping a service climate is that of Hong, Liao, Hu, and Jiang (2013). They studied the role of a leader as an antecedent of service climate and found that effective leaders, and especially the ones who are perceived as emotionally intelligent (Palmer, Walls, Burgess, & Stough, 2001), generate task-oriented, people-oriented, and ethical actions. Those actions assist leaders to set service excellence as high performance goals; stimulate employees to achieve those goals; and provide feedback to reinforce positive employee behaviors (Liao & Chuang, 2007). Moreover, past leadership studies have shown that a leader’s positive attitude and belief in the situation is essential to fuel an employees’ energy (Avolio & Gardner, 2005) and trust (Norman, Avolio, & Luthans, 2010). This is in line with a study of Avey, Avolio, and Luthans (2011). Avey et al. (2011) have shown that leaders evoke “emotional contagion” by their
employees. This is because a leader’s positive mood spills over to the positive mood of followers. Thus, in the process of promoting a positive service climate, leaders could inspire their employees with emotional contagion. This process can be productive when employees feel connected and identified with the group (Wilderom et al., 2015). Another argument is based on the outcomes of the research of Walumbwa, Peterson, Avolio, and Hartnell (2010). Walumbwa et al., (2010) linked servant leadership directly with shaping a positive service climate. Since servant leadership is characterized by highly emotional intelligent leaders (Du Plessis, Wakelin, & Nel, 2015), servant leaders emphasize the needs and development of others, primarily that of their employees. By doing this, such leaders show their ability to understand employees’ emotions and having insight into why employees act the way they do. These leader capabilities are characteristics of EI and are needed in order to achieve developments in their employees (Barbuto, Gottfredson, & Searle, 2014). Lastly, in the process of encouraging and enhancing a positive service climate, an emotionally intelligent leader offers the employees more than just emotional inspiration through “social identification with the group” (Bono & Judge, 2003, p. 555). They offer, in addition, also cognitive inspiration for an employee’s work. Leaders do this by shaping employees’ perceptions and behaviors. “Employees look to leaders for signals about what is normal and acceptable behavior in our work organization” (Dutton & Heaphy, 2003, p. 161). In other words, leaders also shape group norms, beliefs and standards that contribute to desired service excellence (Carmeli & Waldman, 2010).

Thus, we assume that emotionally intelligent leaders are able to set norms that are accepted by employees because those leaders try to identify with their employees through their charisma, supportiveness and interpersonal skills (Hong et al., 2013). Based on COR theory’s premises, emotionally intelligent leaders act as a human resource which can generate other social resources.
such as service climate. In organizational settings, a leader’s EI and service climate are both perceived as social resources. (Hobfoll, 1989). Both social types of job resources are assumed to affect employees’ personal resource “psychological capital” (Barbier, Hansez, Chmiel, & Demerouti, 2012). Next to a leader’s EI, an employee’s perceptions of service climate can thus be seen as another resource-on-the-job. This paper will now elaborate next on the consequences of service climate; it explores in which manner a perceived service climate fuels psychological capital of employees.

Psychological capital refers to the construct that has been defined as “an individual’s positive psychological state of development characterized by: (1) having confidence (efficacy) to take on and put in the necessary effort to succeed at challenging tasks; (2) making a positive attribution (optimism) about succeeding now and in the future; (3) persevering toward goals and, when necessary, redirecting paths to goals (hope) in order to succeed; and (4) when beset by problems and adversity, sustaining and bouncing back and even beyond (resilience) to attain success” (Luthans, Youssef, Avolio, 2007, p. 3). The four components have received support to be indicators of one underlying construct, which accounts for higher positive effects than each individual component does on their own. Thus, the four dimensions load onto one core factor, which we term psychological capital (Luthans et al., 2007). It results in a common synergistic capacity of internal resources. The key distinction between psychological capital and other positive core constructs, like positive affectivity, self-evaluations, and the Big Five personality traits, is that psychological capital is conceptualized to be state-like and open to development. This means that psychological capital differs from the more fixed, trait-like constructs. The manner in which service climate may boost psychological capital, will now be explored.
Recent literature suggests that a positive service climate increases an employee’s psychological capital (Shahnawaz & Hassan, 2009). As said before, a positive service climate is characterized by an optimistic and cohesive work environment where the employee is being appreciated and supported. Within a service climate, organizational values and norms are shaped. Consequently, this positive service climate is reinforced as employees begin to adopt the organization’s values and internalize them as their own. Thus, by creating a positive service climate in which the organization serves its clients, employees feel more confident, hopeful and optimistic about their work, thereby increasing their psychological capital. In other words, once an employee is aware of this atmosphere, his or her hope, optimism, self-efficacy and resilience is likely to increase (Qadeer & Jaffery, 2014). Moreover, the organizational literature suggests that a positive service climate creates an atmosphere that directs employee attention towards attaining high performance standards (Liao & Chuang, 2007). Those standards are especially adopted by employees with high psychological capital. Because those employees require a continuous stream of information exchange about expected and rewardable work behavior (Schneider et al., 2005), their service climate is likely to promote a cooperative work environment. Such a work environment bolsters confidence amongst all service employees. This is because they receive feedback and constructive hints from their colleagues. In contrast, in situations where the service climate is negative, employees are less likely to attain high performance standards because the work environment provides ambiguous cues. Unclear or negative expectations about the service delivery may reduce employees’ confidence and, consequently, effort (Walumbwa et al., 2010). Thus we hypothesized:

Hypothesis 2: Service climate mediates the relationship between a leader’s EI and psychological capital.
2.3 Psychological Capital as a Mediator between Service Climate and Job Performance/Work Engagement

A second indirect mechanism between a leader’s EI and work engagement and job performance might be psychological capital. Since the relationship between psychological capital and employee attitudes is studied both empirically as well as meta-analytically (Avey et al., 2011; Gibbs & Cooper, 2011), we assume that psychological capital is an important mediator in the relationship between employee perceptions of a positive service climate and employee work outcomes. In the next paragraph we elaborate further on this assumption.

Kersting (2003) stated that employee psychological capital is developed through a pattern of investments of resources, such as their leaders’ roles and perceived positive climate. Those resources stimulate employees’ positive psychological states in the present as well as an increasing likelihood of future benefit. Hence, (components of) psychological capital may contribute to desirable work attitudes (Larson & Luthans, 2006; Luthans et al., 2007; Youssef & Luthans, 2007).

An explanation as to why psychological capital could mediate the relationship between service climate and both job performance and work engagement can be found in a case study conducted by Thompson, Lemmon, and Walter (2015). They found that leadership and organizational service culture could improve work engagement through employees’ psychological capital, showing that the inclusion of employee ideas and voice in the value- and goal-setting of an organization culture is critical to developing hope, efficacy, resilience and optimism. In more detail, they stated that “a culture of resiliency and efficacy improved employees’ focus and engagement in their work” (Thompson et al., 2015, p. 192). Therefore, we stipulate that perceptions of such a climate will encourage employees to be more engaged and meet customer service expectations. In a similar vein, Martin and Marsh (2006) showed that resilience is recognized as a significant factor in the successful adaptation and/or moving forward when one finds oneself in uncertain and
challenging circumstances. This suggests that resilience strengthens an employee’s ability to engage in current and future job tasks. Furthermore, a recent empirical field study carried out by Jung and Yoon (2015), showed that self-efficacy of employees positively affected job engagement, by having confidence of absorption in the tasks and performing a task with vigor and energy (see also, Luthans et al., 2007). Next to this, an employee’s psychological availability for higher levels of work engagement is improved by optimism, while hope boosts a positive job-resource spiral with an effect on work engagement (Kahn, 1990). Thus, psychological capital can enhance employees’ positive appraisals of their circumstances and increase their perceived probability of success, based on their motivation, effort and assertiveness. This ultimately would lead to higher job performance (Luthans et al., 2007). This relationship is in line with the study of Siu et al., (2014) who examined the mediating role of psychological capital between organizational identification and job satisfaction among Chinese police officers. They implicated that those police officers who identified with their organization, defined themselves as members of the organization and were viewed more likely to have positive attitudes toward their organization. When they perceived the service climate as positive, they identified themselves as a full member of their organization. Hence, we expect that a high level of service climate can fuel a high level of psychological capital in employees, because those employees will then have a positive motivational state. When employees demonstrate high levels of psychological capital they do elevate their job performance and work engagement and, as a result, decisively affect the level of service provided to customers (Chow et al., 2006). In COR terms, the acquisition of three resources, i.e., a leader’s EI, perceived service climate (social job resources) and psychological capital (personal job resource), enables individual employees to perform well and be engaged in their work. Thus, we formulated the following hypothesis:
**Hypothesis 3a:** Psychological capital mediates the relationship between perceived service climate and job performance.

**Hypothesis 3b:** Psychological capital mediates the relationship between perceived service climate and work engagement.

**Figure 2: Overview of the hypotheses and the three-path mediational model of the study**

The straight arrows represent hypothesized relationships. The curved arrows represent relationships that have been controlled for during their testing.
3 Methods

3.1 Participants and procedures

Participants in this cross-sectional study were employees from a global professional services firm located in Amsterdam, with a total of 1576 employees (all employee-ranks included). The organization has four different services lines: Assurance (594 employees), Advisory (489 employees), Tax (339 employees) and Transaction Services (154 employees). Each line consists of specialized subservice departments that serve clients. In our study we distinguished between leaders and employees in the following manner: leaders are the supervisors who directly manage the work-floor employees on specific client projects in their day-to-day activities. These leaders offer feedback and set values as well as norms within their teams. Unlike those who are managing within this organization, referred to as ‘(senior) staff’, most respondents are all ranked as work-floor employees.

The survey was pre-tested on 10 employees in one specific department whereby the face and content validity of the survey scales was examined. The participants of this pre-test were not included in the main sample. The main survey was distributed to 670 (senior) staff and 197 completed surveys were returned. This is a response rate of 34%. The respondents worked in the 4 different above mentioned service lines. While 39.6% of the respondents worked in the Advisory service line, 30.5% were employed in the Assurance line, 21.8% of the respondents worked as Tax (senior) staff, and 8.1% in the Transaction service line. The mean age of the employee respondents was 28 years (SD = 5.5); they had an average job tenure of 3.6 years (SD=4.8) and the gender of the main sample entailed 44.2% percent females.

The survey was designed with a web-based tool called GEMA. This tool was customized and fitted with the in-house style of the firm. This specific style is relevant for the creation of awareness...
amongst the employees to fill in the questionnaire. All the survey items were in English. Once the pre-test was completed, the survey was distributed by e-mail and included an introductory letter from the author as well as a personal endorsement from the firm’s leader who is ultimately responsible for this research. The reason behind this personal endorsement is that the (senior) staff know their firm’s leader and this ultimately results in more willingness amongst the employees to fill in the questionnaire. Participation was voluntary, and responses were kept confidential. Two reminders were sent in the following month. All survey questions items can be found in the Appendix 1.

3.2 Measures

3.2.1 Emotional intelligence
Employees rated the emotional intelligence of their immediate leader with the 16-item Emotional Intelligence Scale (Wong & Law, 2002). The WLEIS measures Self-Emotional Appraisal (SEA), Others’ Emotional Appraisal (OEA), Regulation of Emotion (ROE), and Use of Emotion (UOE). The immediate leader herein is the one who manages the day to day employee’s project activities. In other words, this leader is the employee’s project manager.

WLEIS is a self-rating scale meaning that the scale focuses on the self-evaluation of one’s own emotional intelligence. In this study the statements were rephrased to no longer be self-rating. A native English speaker has double-checked the rephrasing. The employees were asked to what extent they agreed with the statements about their own leader’s emotional intelligence (e.g., “My manager is a good observer of others’ emotions” and “My manager has a good understanding of his/her own emotions”). The WLEIS has demonstrated convergent and discriminated validity. Furthermore, items were measured on 7-point scales, ranging from 1 (completely disagree) to 7 (completely agree). The Cronbach’s alpha was .95.
3.2.2 Service climate
Employees were asked to rate their perceived service climate with the 9-item scale from Mayer, Ehrhart, and Schneider (2009). A sample item from the 9-item scale was; “How do you rate the atmosphere in your team for promoting superior quality work and service?” Employees were asked to respond on a rating scale that ranged from 1 (poor) to 7 (excellent). The Cronbach’s alpha was .88.

3.2.3 Psychological capital
Employees rated their psychological capital with a short version of the questionnaire developed by Luthans et al. (2007). This version consists of twelve items and four dimensions: efficacy, hope, resilience, and optimism. Employees were asked to what extent they agreed with each statement. A sample item is “I always look on the bright side of things regarding my job”. The items of this scale ranged from 1 (completely disagree) to 7 (completely agree). The Cronbach’s alpha was .82.

3.2.4 Work engagement
Employees’ work engagement was measured with a shortened version of the Utrecht Work Engagement Scale (Schaufeli, Bakker, & Salanova, 2006). It consisted of nine items. Employees gave their opinions about statements that focused on how engaged they are with their work (e.g. “At work, I am bursting with energy”). The items were measured on a 7-point Likert scale ranging from 1 (completely disagree) to 7 (completely agree). The Cronbach’s alpha was .90.

3.2.5 Job performance
The employees filled out a short, five item version of the job performance scale of Williams and Anderson (1991). A sample item is “I complete assigned duties adequately”. The responses were again given on the seven-point Likert scales, ranging from 1 (completely disagree) to 7 (completely agree). The Cronbach’s alpha was .80.
3.2.6 Control variables
Recent research shows that psychological capital may differ among demographic characteristics: such as gender (Bernstein & Volpe, 2016) and age (Lu, Liu, Sui, & Wang, 2015). Additionally, job tenure was used as control variables. The reasoning is that employees with higher job tenure may have more experience in their job and thus perform better (Steffens, Shemla, Wegge, & Diestel, 2014).

3.3 Analysis
For testing mediation effects we used Baron and Kenny’s (1986) procedures. A mediation effect is present when (a) the relationship between the independent variable and the dependent variable is significant; (b) the relationship between the independent variable and the mediator is significant; and (c) the relationship between the mediator and the dependent variables is significant while holding the independent variable constant. In addition, the entire three-path mediation model was tested, with the method described by Taylor, MacKinnon, and Tein (2007). Two mediators (M1 + M2) intervene in the link between an independent variable and a dependent variable (X and Y). A three-path mediation appears when: (a) relationship between X and M1 is significant, (b) relationship between M1 and M2 is significant while controlling for X, (c) relationship between M2 and Y is significant while controlling for X and M1. The relationship between the variables is presented in a theoretical figure 1.

Although most of the scales in this study have been validated in previous studies, we conducted a confirmatory factor analysis with AMOS 23 to verify the fit of the hypothesized model. We used the maximum-likelihood estimation procedures. Results showed that the proposed model fit the data reasonably well because we conducted regression analysis in SPSS for testing the proposed hypotheses. The following results indicated a marginal model fit and supported the
discriminant validity of the key measures in this study: $\chi^2 = 1.74$, df = 1625, p < .001; CFI = .90; RMSEA = .06; SRMR = .59 (Hu & Bentler, 1999).

In order to minimize common-method bias, we examined whether a single factor, based on a factor analysis with all items, would explain less than fifty percent of the variance (Harman, 1976). If a single factor emerges and will account for the majority of the variance among the measures then we can assume that a substantial amount of common method variance is present. This was not the case in our research. This method of addressing the common method variance is one of the most widely used techniques in behavioral research (Podsakoff et al., 2003). For example, Widianto and Wilderom (2016) also used this technique in their longitudinal study.

4 Results

Table 1 reports the means, standard deviations, internal consistency, and correlations of all variables. The internal consistencies were high, ranging from .80 and .95. With these results we can assume that the questionnaires of EI, service climate, psychological capital, work engagement and job performance are reliable measurements in the work setting where this research was conducted.

A Pearson bivariate correlation analysis is executed in order to test which variables show a significant (2-tailed) correlation. The results in table 1 show significant correlations between the dependent and independent variables. Although the variables were highly correlated, the variance inflation factor (VIF) scores were lower than 2.14. Thus we can assume that there is no evidence of multicollinearity between the variables. The correlation between a leader’s EI and employee work engagement was significant ($r = .45$, p<.01) also the correlation between a leader’s EI and employee job performance was significant ($r = .40$, p<.01). In addition, a leader’s EI was
significantly related to service climate ($r = .42$, $p<.01$) and significantly related to psychological capital ($r = .42$, $p<.01$). Moreover, service climate was significantly related towards psychological capital ($r = .42$, $p<.01$) and, in turn, psychological capital was strongly related to work engagement ($r = .64$, $p<.01$) as well as to job performance ($r = .56$, $p<.01$). All the correlations were positive.

4.1 Test of hypotheses

Table 2 shows the results of the regression analyses for the proposed hypotheses. To test the hypotheses, we controlled for the employees’ age, gender and job tenure. Hypotheses 1, stating that a leader’s EI is positively related to both employee work engagement and employee job performance, found support and therefore hypotheses 1a and 1b were accepted. There was a positive significant relationship between a leader’s EI and employee work engagement ($\beta = .46$, $p<.001$) and job performance ($\beta = .39$, $p<.001$).

Hypothesis 2, proposing that service climate mediates the relationship between leaders’ EI and psychological capital, was not fully supported. A leader’s EI was significantly related to service climate ($\beta = .42$, $p<.001$). In turn, service climate was significantly related to psychological capital when controlling for a leader’s EI ($\beta = .29$, $p<.001$). Moreover, the positive relation between a
leader’s EI and psychological capital decreased somewhat, but remained significant (β = .31, p< .001), when service climate was added to the model. Also there is still a significant relationship between a leader’s EI and psychological capital when the mediator, service climate, is added to the analysis. This indicates a partially mediating effect. In other words, service climate partially mediates the relationship between a leader’s EI and psychological capital.

Hypothesis 3a, which stated that the relationship between service climate and employee work engagement would be mediated by psychological capital, was also not fully supported. The results showed that service climate was significantly related to psychological capital (β = .43, p< .001) and that the relationship between service climate and work engagement remains significant, when adding psychological capital as a mediator (β = .42, p< .001). This means that service climate partially mediates the relationship between a leader’s EI and employee work engagement.

Support was found for hypothesis 3b, which stated that the relationship between service climate and employee job performance would be mediated by psychological capital. Service climate significantly predicted psychological capital (β = .43, p< .001), fulfilling the first mediation condition. In turn, psychological capital significantly predicted job performance (β = .56, p< .001) while holding service climate constant. In this case there is a fully mediation effect because the independent variable, service climate, will have no significant relationship with the dependent variable, job performance (β = .02, n.s.), when the mediator, psychological capital, is added to the analysis. Furthermore, we found a zero-order correlation between work engagement and job performance (r = .47, p<.01: see Table 1): although the path coefficient from work engagement to job performance was not significant (β = .15, n.s.).

The fully three-path mediation model is only supported for the relationship between a leader’s EI and work engagement, because when adding M1 (service climate) and M2
(psychological capital), the indirect link between EI and work engagement is not significant anymore ($\beta = .10$, n.s.: see Table 2, Model 4). Besides, the results show a partially three-path mediating effect for the relationship between a leader’s EI and employee job performance. The relationship between a leader’s EI and job performance decreased somewhat, but remained significant ($\beta = .18$, $p< .001$) when service climate and psychological capital was added to the model (Table 2, Model 4). Also there is still a significant relationship between a leader’s EI and job performance when the mediators ($\beta = .17$, $p< .05$), service climate and psychological capital, are added to the analysis. This indicates a partially mediating effect.
Table 2:
Results of Regression Analysis that Tested the Hypothesized Mediation Effects.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Service Climate</th>
<th>Psychological capital</th>
<th>Work engagement</th>
<th>Job performance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Model 1</td>
<td>Model 2</td>
<td>Model 3</td>
<td>Model 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a Leader's EI</td>
<td>.42**</td>
<td>.42**</td>
<td>.30**</td>
<td>.46**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service climate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.29**</td>
<td>.43**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychological capital</td>
<td></td>
<td>.64**</td>
<td>.46**</td>
<td>.43**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work engagement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employee age</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employee gender</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>-.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employee job tenure</td>
<td>-.003</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>-.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$R^2$</td>
<td>.62***</td>
<td>.18**</td>
<td>.25**</td>
<td>.18**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There was no evidence of multicollinearity; none of the variance inflation factors (VIFs) was > 2.14

**$p<.001$, *$p<.05$**
Figure 3: The Standardized Path Coefficients of the Linkages between the Key Variables.
5 Discussion

5.1 Discussion of the findings
This study finds a significant association between emotionally intelligent leaders and employees’ job performance and work engagement. Also, the results show some significant indirect relationships between a leader’s EI on both employee job performance and work engagement as well. More specific, there is a fully mediating effect between a leader’s EI and work engagement, and there is a partially mediating effect between a leader’s EI and job performance. This indicates that a leader’s EI has both a significant indirect and direct effect on job performance. Hence, our analysis only supported a full three-path mediational model between a leader’s EI and work engagement. There is a partial three-path mediational model between a leader’s EI and job performance.

These findings offer not only evidence that a leader’s EI is indirectly related to individual employee outcomes, such as job performance and work engagement; it also contributes to how two intervening variables play a role as they are likely to be “chained”. Such results empirically support the notion of the COR theory (Halbesleben et al., 2014). Herein, a leader’s EI can be seen as a “key” resource: one that facilitates the use of other human resources at work. This supports the idea of a valuable “resource caravan”, which means that the resources studied here are “chained” one after another (Halbesleben et al., 2014, p. 1338). Thus, an emotionally intelligent leader can lift the perceived service climate amongst employees to be more positive and thereby bolsters employee psychological capital and in turn employee job performance and work engagement.

Another interesting point is that the chain effects uncovered by this study may relate to the self-determination theory (Kovjanic, Schuh, Jonas, Quaquebeke, & Van Dick, 2012; Ryan & Deci, 2000), which can be regarded as a validated framework of psychological needs: (a) the needs for
autonomy, (b) relatedness, and (c) competence. The resources studied by this research satisfy those basic employee needs: (a) an emotionally intelligent leader satisfies the need to be autonomous through his or her excellent interpersonal skills, such as charisma, empathy and positivity, (b) perceived service climate, shaped by an emotionally intelligent leader, enhances an employee’s relatedness with other colleagues and shows willingness on their job, and (c) an employee’s psychological capital bolsters his or her need to feel competent. Furthermore, our results support the finding of Deci, Connell, and Ryan (1989) that leaders are seen as the most important factor in satisfying employee needs, because a leader’s EI is a “key” resource (Halbesleben et al., 2014). These outcomes open up possible future combinations with the self-determination theory.

Another remarkable finding in this study is the fact that work engagement did not relate significantly with job performance. Thus, our assumption that a highly engaged employee does not always perform highly at work, finds support in this study. Parker and Griffin (2011) stated that context and individual differences influenced the link between work engagement and job performance. Translated in this study, our sample consists of highly educated employees working in a professional context. Those employees have high degree of work-related independency, which in turn may influence the variation among them about what they find important in their jobs or how they contribute as high performers. In a similar vein, Widianto and Wilderom (2016) found that highly engaged non-managerial health-care employees may still give emphasis on different non-performing elements in their job. This could explain the lack of a significant link between work engagement and job performance (Parker & Griffin, 2011).
5.2 Practical Implications
This research presents more insights on the role of a leader’s EI in relation to their job performance and work engagement. To preserve, as well as to continue to develop high employee job performance along with work engagement, service organizations should appoint or develop leaders who display a high level of EI. Those leaders bolster service employees’ “psychological capital” indirectly, through creating a positive perceived service climate.

This study establishes the importance of managerial support for service delivery in a professional services climate and explain the notion that “the nature and quality of interactions with supervisors may be a key filter in the interpretations that provides the basis for subordinates’ climate perceptions” (Kozlowski & Doherty, 1989 p. 547). Our findings support the idea that leaders need high emotionally intelligence capabilities, next to their technical and traditional managerial skills. Those emotional and social capabilities can be developed through training (Riggio & Lee, 2007), thus organizations must build, promote and facilitate (managerial) training programs. Management training should support managers to deal with the socio-emotional side of their behavior and leadership skills. This includes understanding subordinates’ emotions and providing appropriate support while making an attempt to motivate employees (Dabke, 2016). A practical implication for organizations with a relatively low degree of emotionally intelligent leaders is creating training programs in order to stimulate leader’s emotional sensitivity and understanding.

Thereby, managers in a professional services organization are also dealing with yearly sales targets. The empirical study of Kadic-Maglajlic, Vida, Obadia, and Plank (2016), conducted in different service sectors, highlighted that EI positively affects an individual sales performance through their relational selling behaviors. Thus, next to the interactive effects between emotionally
intelligent leaders and their services employees, we must not forget the managerial sales target. Hence, in the aspect of driving business and winning more market share, EI is also an important resource.

Given the note that beneficial organizational outcomes are really the result of a coordinated effort among leaders and followers (Conger & Pearce, 2003), organizations are likely to benefit if attention is also paid to employees’ EI and their interpersonal skill development. Furthermore, these non-managerial employees could possibly promote to a leader’s position in the future. In similar vein, the findings in this study underlie the importance of attracting and retaining talent with a high level of EI, given that those potentials are the leaders of the future. Organizations can also build assessments in their recruitment programs for testing on EI. Baron (1993) has shown that emotional competence is an important factor in an applicant interview. Also, Kluemper, McLarty, Bishop, and Sen (2015) presented the positive effect of an interviewee’s EI on interview performance, because these applicants are seen as potentially effective employees by their employer (Kluemper et al., 2015), and EI held positive relationships with leadership emergence (Emery, 2012). In other words, hiring and retaining employees with EI, irrespective of their (potential) position, can be the difference between accomplishment and failure for any organization (Allam, 2011). Thus the importance of taking social and emotional competencies into consideration is important not only in the light of today’s leaders, but also for non-managerial employees and talented potentials.

Furthermore, customer satisfaction serves as a factor of competitive advantage among services organizations (Ilieska, 2016). A number of studies show that fostering customer satisfaction can be improved by an organization’s service climate (Mayer et al., 2009), activated by high emotionally intelligent leaders (Hur, van den Berg, & Wilderom, 2011). Thus, our results
give suggestions of how a professional services firm could enhance satisfaction amongst their customers.

Also, our findings should urge service organizations to be aware of their employees’ psychological capital. Empirical evidence on the negative link between psychological capital and job stress is there (Lu et al., 2015). In professional services organization, job stress is a critical issue that needs to be addressed (Srivastava, 2011). The practical implication herein is that psychological capital might be a positive resource for combating job stress. Thus, efforts should be made to develop strategies or mentorship programs to take employees’ psychological capital into consideration. Other studies have designed and tested interventions to enhance the four components of psychological capital (Luthans, Avey, Avolio, Norman, & Combs, 2006; Luthans & Youssef, 2004).

Moreover, the professional services organization in this study conducts every year their own engagement survey. Our results uncover practical steps for their own explored main areas of an employees’ engagement drivers: (a) leadership competence and employees’ confidence in their leaders, (b) challenging work environment, and (c) employees’ feeling of being recognized and motivated to contribute (GPS, 2015). The resources studied here offer practical ways of implication on these three drivers: (a) emotionally intelligent leaders bolster confidence and inspire their employees, together with involving them in the organization’s longer-term vision, (b) a strong climate of service, promoted by their emotionally intelligent leaders (Hur et al., 2011), enhances a challenging work environment, and (c) employees’ feeling of being recognized is “oiled” by the positive emotions of an emotionally intelligent leader (Acha, Hargiss, Howard, 2013). Besides, employees with a high level of psychological capital, infused by a positive service climate, will put more effort to meet high performance standards, than those with a low level of psychological
capital. In turn, they are more likely to carry out their tasks and are motivated to contribute to the performance.

### 5.3 Strengths, Limitations and Future Research

The strength of this study is that the single professional services organization in which we examined the hypothesized model consists of different businesses: Tax, Assurance, Advisory and Transactions. Those different departments drive business in different ways, with their own values, rules and procedures. The organization in this case not only focuses on different businesses but subsequently also on different sectors (e.g., Start-Ups, Fast-Moving-Consumer-Goods sector, and Public Sector). Therefore, a strength of this study is that our sample consists of different businesses departments, and thus it can be said that the findings are generalizable in other sectors. Also, the workforce in organization X is characterized by different nationalities with their own culture and values-and-beliefs orientations (Liao & Chuang, 2007). Thus, our findings are presumably replicable in various other cultures. Moreover, we reduced the common-method bias by using Harman's (1961) single factor technique. Lastly, employees rated the level of EI amongst their leaders. By asking employees’ perception of their leader’s level of EI, we reduced Williams’ (1998) notion that it might be possible that a leader is emotionally intelligent but if their non-managerial employees perceive their leader’s level of EI differently, their influence of EI on employees might well be limited. A leader might believe that they make an effort to listen, to understand, and to take into consideration the experience of others, but if that does not translate into a ‘reality’ for their employees then it is of limited benefit.

Despite its strengths, the present study has a number of limitations. The first limitation is the common-method bias, because our study consists of one single source. Future studies must rely on multiple sources in order to increase the confidence in the results. A second limitation is that the
outcomes of the dependent variables, job performance and work engagement, are based on subjective data; the perceptions of employees. In order to gain more reliable outcomes, we need to examine this hypothesized model with more objective measurements (e.g. employees’ performance ratings, sales numbers, turn over ratings, or client satisfaction ratings). Third, although we reduced the social-desirability bias of a leader’s EI, this study may still suffer from it. Future research should include more objective measurements or assessments of employee performance/engagement by the perception of their leader. Fourth, our study may suffer from non-response bias because the response rate of the survey was low. An explanation of this low rating could be that the case company has their own yearly engagement survey. The response rate of this survey was 55%, and was distributed two months before our survey. Fifth, this study focused only on psychological capital of the employees, and did not assess the degree of a leader’s psychological capital involved. Accordingly, Walumbwa et al. (2010) stated that a leader’s psychological capital also affects employees’ job performance. Thus, future research should not only concentrate on psychological capital of employees but also on a leader’s psychological capital. Sixth, the survey data was collected at one point in time. Therefore, it is difficult to establish causal relationships among the variables, as well as reverse causality. Thus, longitudinal studies are recommended. This future research option should investigate data from different periods in time, in order to reveal how the mechanisms occur over a longer period of time. Finally, this research concentrates only on emotionally intelligent leaders. Employees who exhibit a high level of EI may be even important as emotionally intelligent leaders. Wu (2011) found that emotionally intelligent employees positively impact their own job performance. Besides, an employee who scores high on EI is more likely to be able to reduce and transform negative impacts of job stress on job performance. Also, next to an emotionally intelligent leader, also colleagues who score high on EI may impact
employees’ perceived service climate. Future research must elaborate further on the linkages between a leader’s EI and levels of EI among their employees. The question on how emotionally intelligent leaders influence not only the service climate and employees’ psychological capital, but also bolster psychological capital and EI among employees, must be analyzed further.

6 Conclusion

Present work highlights the principles of the COR theory on how individual employees utilize resources that are available to them. This study provides empirical support, especially in the field of professional services organizations, that EI is one of the “key” employee resources (Halbesleben et al., 2014). This social “key” job resource, in turn, relates to two other types of employee resources: perceived climate and employees’ psychological capital. This paper answers recent calls within organization-studies to investigate how a leader’s EI is linked towards employee job outcomes at the individual level: through service climate and psychological capital. The findings provide evidence that, given the positive impact of a leader’s EI on professional service employees and subsequently the firm’s clients, professional services organizations are likely to benefit from these leaders by their ability of promoting a strong climate of service among their employees. This climate contributes to their so-called psychological capital and in turn to both high job performance and work engagement, and as a means of enabling employees to ultimately deliver ‘exceptional client services’. However, longitudinal research is recommended, in order to reveal causal relationships of the hypothesized model. All in all, our study provides a fundamental basis for further research on how specific job resources unveil employees’ performance outcomes, based on the COR-theory. Finally our study provides practical implications on how service workers, clients and (professional services) organizations benefit from high emotionally intelligent leaders.
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### 8 Appendixes: Survey Items

#### 8.1 Emotional Intelligence

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Please choose the most appropriate option that reflects your current situation: My supervisor…</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Somewhat disagree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Somewhat agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>… has a good sense of why he or she has certain feelings most of the time</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>… has a good understanding of his/her own emotions</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>… really understands what he or she feels</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>… always knows whether or not he or she is happy</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>… always knows his/her colleagues’ emotions from their behavior</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>… is a good observer of other people’s emotions</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>… is sensitive to the feelings and emotions of others</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>… has a good understanding of the emotions of people around him/her</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>… always sets goals for him- or her-self and then tries their best to achieve these.</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>… always tells him- or her-self that he/she is a competent person</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>… is a self-motivated person</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>… always encourages him- or her-self to try to do their best</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>… is able to control his/her temper and handles problems rationally</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>… is quite capable of controlling his/her own emotions</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>… can always calm down quickly when very angry</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>… has good control of his/her own emotions</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Please choose the most appropriate option that reflects your situation (1 poor/ 7 excellent)</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Excellent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>How do you rate your team’s belief that superior work and service quality are keys to your success?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>How do you rate the atmosphere in your team for promoting superior quality work and service?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>How do you rate the knowledge and skills of employees in your team to deliver superior quality work and service?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>How do you rate the management in your team in leading the effort to achieve superior work and service quality?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>How do you rate the rewards and recognition in your team for superior quality work and service?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>How do you rate the quality of work and the service you receive from other teams on which your sub service line depend?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>How do you rate the facilities and resources in your team for delivering superior quality work and service?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>How do you rate the efforts to measure and track the quality of work and service delivered by your team?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Overall, how do you rate the quality of work and service produced by your team?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 8.3 Psychological capital

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Please choose the most appropriate option that reflects your situation.</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Somewhat disagree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Somewhat agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>I feel confident in representing my work in meetings with management work self-efficacy</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>I feel confident contributing to discussions about the organization’s strategy</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>I feel confident presenting information to a group of colleagues</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>If I should find myself in a difficult situation at work, I could think of many ways to solve this.</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Right now I see myself as being pretty successful at work</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>I can think of many ways to reach my current work goals</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>At this moment, I am meeting the work goals that I have set for myself</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>I can be “on my own,” so to speak, at work if I have to</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>I usually take stressful things at work in stride</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>I can get through difficult times at work because I’ve experienced difficulty before optimism</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>I always look on the bright side of things regarding my job optimism</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>I’m optimistic about my future in this organization.</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 8.4 Job Performance

Please choose the most appropriate option that reflects your current situation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Please choose the most appropriate option that reflects your current situation</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Somewhat disagree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Somewhat agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 I adequately complete assigned duties</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 I fulfil the responsibilities specified in my job description</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 I perform tasks that are expected of myself</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 I meet the formal performance requirements of the job</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 I engage in activities that will directly affect my performance evaluation</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 8.5 Work Engagement

Please choose the most appropriate option that reflects your current situation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Please choose the most appropriate option that reflects your current situation</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Somewhat disagree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Somewhat agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 At my work, I am bursting with energy</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 At my job, I feel strong and vigorous</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 I am enthusiastic about my job</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 My job inspires me</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 When I get up in the morning, I feel like going to work</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 I feel happy when I am working intensely</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 I am proud of the work that I do</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 I am immersed in my work</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 I get carried away when I am working</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>