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Abstract

The study focused on the meditational role of job satisfaction and job performance between EI and job commitment. A sample of 200 bank employees was collected from different banks in the Lahore district, age ranging from 30 to 59 year. Scale of Emotional Intelligence (Batool & Khalid, 2011), Organizational Commitment Questionnaire (Mowday, Steers & Poter, 1979), Job Satisfaction Survey (Spector, 1997) and Role Base Performance Scale (Welbroune, Johnson & Erez, 1998) were employed to collect the data. Baron and Kenny’s guideline (1986) was followed to run the mediational analysis. Results revealed that job satisfaction and job performance fully mediated the relationship between EI and job commitment. Implications of the study are also discussed.
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Emotional Intelligence (EI) works as an inseparable unit working crosswise over commonly cognitive and emotional system (Sternberg, 2000). EI skill enables individuals to effectively deal with difficult situations and it becomes easier for them to manage stress. The EI enables people to know themselves in a better way and recognize the emotions and feelings of other people to become more efficient in communication and social and workplace relationships (Van Jaarsveld, 2003). In understanding and estimating individual performance at work, EI is a factor that is potentially useful (Bhalla & Nauriyal, 2004). People with higher EI have higher self-reliance and do well in their jobs, use effective leadership styles and have greater impact on their staff to motivate them and are healthier individuals (Cooper & Sawaf, 1997). Literature illustrates that EI brings responsibility and dedication, commitment and trust between personnel in the organization, which help to yield higher output and competence among workers (Cooper & Sawaf, 1997). Martinez (1997) argued that 20% success of employees’ work performance depends upon IQ and 80% on EI.

Job commitment is a key element in human plan of action administration (Bargh, McKenna, & Fitzsimons, 2002). Literature illustrates that EI has exceptionally significant impact on job commitment (Velmurugan & Zafar, 2010). Emotionally intelligent employees show sympathy toward the organizations by illustrating their obligations with responsibility and keep their emotional state high even in the discriminating times (Ashkanasy, Ascough, Ashkanasy & Daus, 2005; Velmurugan & Zafar, 2010). Abraham (2000) supports the role of EI in individual’s capacity to support others, and in appreciating more commitment with their specific organization.

Job commitment may be influenced by other job related consequences like, overall turnover, job role, job effort, Job satisfaction, earnings and employee’s performance or vice versa (Cooper-Hakim & Viswesvaran, 2005; Herscovitch, 2000). There are also well-built evidences that EI is a fundamental indicator of work performance and Job satisfaction (Kafetsios & Zampetakis, 2008). It is
normally believed that workers with higher EI will have greater job satisfaction. This could be due to the fact that workers with higher EI are capable of developing ways of coping to overcome the likely effects which may arise out of stress; while, those with lower EI would not be in a position to overcome the stress situation. High EI supports to arrive at job satisfaction (Hassankhooei, 2006; Mehdi, Habib, Salah, Nahid, & Gashtaseb, 2012). Similarly, enhancing the EI of employees enhances personal job performance and overall productivity of an organization as well (Gardner, 2003). Various emotional intelligence aspects for example, accomplishment drive, developing others, adaptability, impact and self-assurance distinguished famous top performers from average ones (McClelland, 1998). High level of EI results in better performance whereas, low EI level results in second rate performance in stressful work conditions (Lyons & Schneider, 2005), and performance can be tested and upgraded through certain extents of EI (Côté & Miners, 2006; Quoidbach & Hansenne, 2009).

Literature unveils triangular relationships among emotional intelligence, job commitment, job satisfaction, and job performance. On the one hand the EI appears as a predictor of job commitment, job satisfaction, and job performance. Alternatively and unsurprisingly job satisfaction and job performance have been taken as salient positive correlates of organizational commitment. A large portion of the writings on job satisfaction and job commitment depicts that employees show stronger commitment to their work, if they are satisfied with their work. (Malik, Nawab, Naeem, & Danish, 2010; Yang & Chang, 2007). Likewise, Benkhoff (1997) studied the link between employees’ job commitment and performance in terms of sales targets met and change in profits in the branch network of a bank, and found that employees’ job commitment is significantly related with the financial success of the bank branches. There is profound evidence on positive relationship between job commitment and job performance (Chen, Silverthrone & Hung, 2006; Khan, Ziauddin, Jam, & Ramay, 2010). Chugtave and Zafer (2006) conducted a study among university
teachers in Pakistan. The Findings indicated that highly committed teachers outperformed as compared to uncommitted teachers. Lee and Olshfski (2002) studied job commitment of firefighters in New York, and concluded that job performance is significantly related to the job commitment of the employees.

Conceptualization of the study

Emotional intelligence not only appeared to significantly predict job commitment (e.g., Gardner, 2003; Velmurgan & Zafar, 2010), it also has remarkable impact on job performance (O’Boyle, Humphrey, Pollack, Hawver, & Story, 2010) and job satisfaction (Kafetsios & Zampetakis, 2008; Sy et al., 2006) as well. Gardner (2003) was the first who found that job satisfaction significantly mediated between the relationship of EI and job commitment. Since, Job performance and Job satisfaction are joined as: “delightful worker’s output is higher” (Robbins, 1999). This stance on the relationships between job satisfaction and job performance and Gardner’s work have provided us with new channel to hypothesize the mediational model assessing the mediating role of job satisfaction and job performance in the relationship between emotional intelligence and job commitment. To the best of our knowledge, no work has been initiated to study the mediating role of job satisfaction and job performance in the relationship between emotional intelligence and job commitment simultaneously.

Research Design

This is a correlational study and cross-sectional research design was employed for the purpose of examining the relationship among emotional intelligence, job satisfaction, job performance and job commitment.
Research Question

Do job satisfaction and job performance mediate the relationship between emotional intelligence and job commitment?

Hypotheses

H_1: There would be a significant positive relationship between emotional intelligence and job satisfaction.
H_2: There would be a significant positive relationship between emotional intelligence and job performance.
H_3: There would be a significant positive relationship between emotional intelligence and job commitment.
H_4: There would be a significant positive relationship between job satisfaction and job commitment.
H_5: There would be a significant positive relationship between job performance and job commitment.
H_6: Job satisfaction and job performance will mediate the relationship between emotional intelligence and job commitment.

The first five hypotheses were constructed to execute the requirements of mediational analysis (Baron & Kenny, 1986).

Method

Sample

A sample of 200 bank employees (e.g., operational manager, customer service representative, chief teller, universal teller, relationship officer, and personal banker) were recruited from different banks in Lahore district (male = 140 and Female = 60). The age range of the participants was from 30 and 59 years (Mean_{age} = 39.28, SD = 6.82). Purposive sampling strategy was used to recruit the participants of study. The minimum level of education of the participants was graduation, and maximum education was MPhil (see Table 1). Bank
employees with at least one year experience to ensure their acculturation with the bank employment were included in the study.

**Instruments**

*Organizational Commitment Questionnaire (OCQ: Mowday, Steers, & Porter, 1979)*

This instrument was administered to measure the job commitment of the employees. For the measurement of job commitment, OCQ is the most commonly and widely deployed instrument. It includes 15 items which are helpful in measuring the identification level of employees with the company or organization they work for. The instrument provides a 5-point Likert type format. The response options for the questionnaire range from 1= *strongly disagree* (SD) to 5= *strongly agree* (SA). Higher scores portray stronger commitment to the organization. This instrument has high convergent and predictive validity and reliability (Barge & Schlueter, 1988). The Cronbach’s alpha of the scale for this study is .75.

*Job Satisfaction Survey (Spector, 1997)*

This survey was used for the purpose of measuring job satisfaction among employees. It consists of 36 items including 9 component scales which are used for the purpose of assessing the varying employee attitudes which they hold in relevance to different aspects of their jobs: promotion, salary, supervision, procedure for operations, contingency rewards, work nature, communicating with other employees, co-workers and fringe benefits. Each of these components is assessed and evaluated using four items. The total score is determined from the summation of scores on all items. The response range is from strongly disagree to strongly agree. It is imperative that half items for this scale should be scored in a reverse order (2,4,6,9,10,12,14,16,18,19,21,.23,24,26,29,31,32,34 and 36).
The scale shows promising validity and reliability (Spector, 1997). The computed Cronbach’s alpha value for this scale is .82.

*Role-based Performance Scale (Welbroune, Johnson & Erez, 1998)*

It measures the role based performance. It has twenty items with 5 subscales: job, career, innovation, team and organization (each sub scale has 4 items), and gives five point rating scale which ranges from 1 to 5. *Needs much improvements* = 1, *need some improvements* = 2, *satisfactory* = 3, *good* = 4, *excellent* = 5. The Authors of the scale reported high internal consistency: job scale (.75), innovator (.90), career (.90), team (.87) and organization (.84) and promising validity. Computed alpha value of the scale for this study is .88.

*Scale of Emotional Intelligence (SEI: Batool & Khalid, 2011)*

It contains 56 items with ten well defined factors. SEI measures self-regard, assertiveness, interpersonal skills, emotional self-awareness, empathy, flexibility, impulse control, problem-solving, optimism and stress tolerance. This instrument uses a 4 point Likert format with 1 = *never true*, 2 = *true sometimes*, 3 = *more often true* and 4 as *always true*. Higher scores indicate high EI and lower scores show low EI. The authors have reported promising validity and reliability. The computed alpha value of the scale for this scale is .88.

*Procedure*

Sample of the study was approached at their work places and were briefed about the purpose of the study. Scale of Emotional Intelligence, Organizational Commitment Questionnaire, and Job Satisfaction Survey were distributed among bank employees after obtaining permission from their branch managers, and Role Base Performance Scale was completed by branch managers. Written consent was taken from the participants. They were assured that...
their provided information would be kept confidential. Many of the participants returned the set of questionnaires on the same day and some took a couple of days. Questionnaires were given to a large sample to counter the problem of failure of participants to return the questionnaire. Out of 280 questionnaires, 200 were returned. Data were analyzed using SPSS version 21.

**Ethical Considerations**

After the approval of research project by the departmental Board of Studies, data were collected from June 2014 to October 2014. Keeping in view the ethical consideration of the research, written permission was obtained from the authors whose scales were used in the research. Permission from the branch managers of the banks was also sought prior to data collection.

**Results**

**Table 1**  
*Demographic Information of the Sample (N = 200)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age groups in years</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-44</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>71%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45-59</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>70.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>30.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qualification</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BA/BSc</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>36.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MA/MSc</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>62.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MS/MPhil</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marital Status</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>56%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Hierarchical Regression

In order to control the demographic variables in the prediction of job commitment via emotional intelligence directly and indirectly through the mediation of job satisfaction and job performance in two separate models, we ran two separate hierarchical regression analyses.

Table 2

*Hierarchical Regression to Predict Job Commitment by Demographic Variables, Emotional Intelligence, and Job satisfaction (N =200).*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>SE</th>
<th>β</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Gender</td>
<td>3.58</td>
<td>1.87</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>1.92</td>
<td>.563</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qualification</td>
<td>-.67</td>
<td>1.36</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>.49</td>
<td>.624</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marital Status</td>
<td>-.56</td>
<td>1.67</td>
<td>1.02</td>
<td>.33</td>
<td>.735</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Gender</td>
<td>3.66</td>
<td>1.82</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>2.01</td>
<td>.057</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qualification</td>
<td>-.21</td>
<td>1.33</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>.875</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marital Status</td>
<td>-.22</td>
<td>1.63</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.889</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotional intelligence</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.22*</td>
<td>3.16*</td>
<td>.004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Gender</td>
<td>3.29</td>
<td>1.75</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>1.88</td>
<td>.066</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qualification</td>
<td>-.85</td>
<td>1.29</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>-.66</td>
<td>.505</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marital Status</td>
<td>.452</td>
<td>1.57</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.28</td>
<td>.776</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotional intelligence</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.65</td>
<td>.517</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job satisfaction</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.33*</td>
<td>4.29*</td>
<td>.002</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: *p < .01

$R^2 = .02, .07, .15$

Table 2 illustrates that demographic variables (viz., gender, marital status, and qualification of the participants) did not significantly predict their job commitment ($R^2 = .02$), and the model is not fit ($F= 1.41, p= .238$). However, emotional intelligence (EI) significantly predicted job commitment as 7% variance in job commitment is accounted for by EI, and model is fit ($F 3 = 3.62, p = .007$). When the mediator (job satisfaction) entered in the next step in the model, it not only increased $R^2 = .15$ and model is improved ($F= 6.85, p= .000$), it also decreased the value of beta from ($β = .22, p=.004$)
to (β = .05 , p= .517), which supports the subsequent mediational analysis as well (Baron & Kenny, 1986).

**Table 3**  
*Hierarchical Regression to Predict Job Commitment by Demographic Variables, Emotional Intelligence, and Job Performance (N =200).*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>b</th>
<th>SE</th>
<th>β</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sig</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Gender</td>
<td>3.58</td>
<td>1.86</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>1.92</td>
<td>.063</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qualification</td>
<td>-.67</td>
<td>1.36</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>-.49</td>
<td>.625</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marital Status</td>
<td>-.56</td>
<td>1.67</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>-.33</td>
<td>.735</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Gender</td>
<td>3.66</td>
<td>1.82</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>2.01</td>
<td>.056</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qualification</td>
<td>-.22</td>
<td>1.33</td>
<td>-.011</td>
<td>-.16</td>
<td>.867</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marital Status</td>
<td>-.22</td>
<td>1.63</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>-.13</td>
<td>.889</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotional intelligence</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.22*</td>
<td>3.16*</td>
<td>.002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Gender</td>
<td>3.17</td>
<td>1.64</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>1.92</td>
<td>.056</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qualification</td>
<td>-1.89</td>
<td>1.23</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>-1.53</td>
<td>.126</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marital Status</td>
<td>-1.17</td>
<td>1.47</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>-.11</td>
<td>.908</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotional intelligence</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.92</td>
<td>.355</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job performance</td>
<td>.38</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.45**</td>
<td>6.76**</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: *p<.01, **p<.001

Table 3 illustrates that demographic variables (viz., gender, marital status, and qualification of the participants) did not significantly predict their job commitment (R² = .02), and the model is not fit (F= 1.41, p= .239). However, emotional intelligence (EI) significantly predicted job commitment as 7% variance in job commitment is accounted for by EI, (F 3 = 3.62, p = .007). When the mediator (job performance) entered in the next step in the model, it not only increased R² = .24 and model is improved (F= 12.71, p= 000), it also decreased the value of β from (β = .22, p=.002) to (β = .06 , p=.335), which support the subsequent mediational analysis as well (Baron & Kenny, 1986).
Table 4
Inter-correlations among Variables (N= 200)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Age</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. EI</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-.33**</td>
<td>.50**</td>
<td>.22*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. JS</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>.46**</td>
<td>.47**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. JP</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>.36**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. JC</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: *p<.05, **p< .01.

Table 4 shows inter-correlations between continuous variables (age, emotional intelligence (EI), job satisfaction (JS), job performance (JP) and job commitment (JC)). Results indicate that age does not significantly correlate with any other variable in the study. However, emotional intelligence, job performance, job satisfaction and job commitment are significantly correlated (r ranged from .22 to .50; p<.05, p < .01, p<.001), which support the Baron and Kenney’s proposed pattern of relationships as a prerequisite for mediational analysis.

Mediational Analysis

![Diagram](image-url)
The comparison of parts (A, B, C) of Figure 1 shows that the direct linear relationship between independent variable (EI: emotional intelligence) and the dependent variable (JC: job commitment) not only decreased, but became insignificant on entering the mediators (JP: job performance, and JS: job satisfaction), which again supports the mediational analysis (Baron & Kenny, 1986). Figure 1 shows that without mediators, the EI significantly predicts JC (b = .22, p < .01, total effect). However, in presence of the mediators (job satisfaction and job performance) predictive relationship between EI to JC (b = .00, p = .98) becomes non-significant (direct effect).

Figure 2
Emotional Intelligence and Job Commitment: . . .

Standardized mediation model showing full mediation of JS (job satisfaction) and JP (job performance) in the relationship between EI (emotional intelligence) as predictor, and JC (job commitment) as an outcome variable.

Results indicate that EI to JS (b = .50, p < .001), EI to JP (b = .33, p < .001), JS to JC (b = .19, p < .01) and JP to JC (b = .39, p < .001) are significant paths (indirect effects).

Furthermore to test the significance of indirect effect of job satisfaction and performance between emotional intelligence and job commitment, parametric bootstrapping has been used. In bootstrapping, Monte Carlo method by using 95% bias-corrected confidence intervals have been examined. Results signify a significant full mediation of job satisfaction and job performance in relationship between EI and Job commitment.

Table 5

*Standardized Direct and Indirect Effect* (N = 200)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mediation path</th>
<th>Mediator</th>
<th>Indirect effect</th>
<th>Direct effect</th>
<th>95% CI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>LL</td>
<td>UL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EI → JC</td>
<td>Job satisfaction</td>
<td>+ .23</td>
<td>.00**</td>
<td>.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Job performance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EI → JC</td>
<td>Job satisfaction</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>.05**</td>
<td>.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EI → JC</td>
<td>Job performance</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>.07**</td>
<td>.09</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* Bootstrap sample size = 2000.

All indirect effects are significant at .01 level. All direct effects are *ns = non-significant.* Table 5 shows different mediation paths between emotional intelligence (EI) and job commitment (JC). It appears that job satisfaction and job performance fully mediate the relationship between emotional intelligence and job commitment.
Discussion

The present research was conducted to examine the mediating role of job satisfaction and job performance in the relationship between EI and job commitment.

The hypotheses, which were constructed as a prerequisite to run mediational analysis, were supported in our study (see Table 4). Significant positive relationship between EI and job satisfaction coincides with the previous work (e.g., Gardner, 2003; Monfared; Kafetsios & Zampetakis, 2008; Mehdi, Habib, Salah, Nahid, Gashtaseb, 2012).

In the present study, a significant positive correlation between EI and job performance designates that work performance relies on personal and interpersonal assets (Seibert, Kraimer, & Liden, 2001). Work performance is enhanced by EI, empowering individuals to control their feelings in order to adapt effectively to nervousness, accomplish well under stress, and direct to organizational change. Different researchers have likewise discovered positive connection between emotional intelligence and job performance (Côté & Miners, 2006; Lyons & Schneider; 2005; Quoidbach & Hansenne, 2009).

The reason for a significant positive correlation between EI and job commitment appeared in our study might be that the social connection inside the organization supports job commitment and obligation of the staff. Emotional intelligence strongly correlates with individual’s capacity to get support with others; and thus they appear to appreciate more commitment with their specific organization (Abraham, 2000; Gardner, 2003). This finding is consistent with the previous literature (Ashkanasy et al., 2005; Carmeli, 2003; Humphreys, Brunsen, & Davis, 2005; Nikolaou & Tsanousis, 2002; Perryer & Jordan, 2005; Sharma, 2005; Velmurgan & Zafar, 2010).

Significant positive relationships between job satisfaction and job commitment, and job performance and job commitment appeared in our study are in line with (e.g., Benkhoff, 1997; Chen, 917
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Silverthrone & Hung, 2006; Clerke, 2006; Chugtai & Zafer, 2006; Lee & Olshefski, 2002).

Finally results of mediational analysis supported our hypothesized model as job satisfaction and job performance fully mediated the relationship between emotional intelligence and job commitment (see Figure 2). For the mediational role of job satisfaction we find support from (Guleryüz, Guney, Ayşen & Asan, 2008). However, job performance as a mediator in the relationship between emotional intelligence and job commitment finds no direct support from the extant literature. However, O’Boyle et al. (2010) suggested the predictive strength of emotional intelligence in job performance and Widyaningrum (2012) has proposed that job performance significantly predicted job commitment. The results suggest a provocative idea that management concerns the possibility that a new form of intelligence pertaining to emotions is indirectly related to commitment of organization members. Some workers in an organization work efficiently because they have high EI (Côté & Miners, 2006). A large portion of the writings on job satisfaction and job commitment of employees illustrates that employee show stronger commitment to their work, if they are satisfied with their work (Malik, et al., 2010). Employees who have high EI could be more skillful in the regulation of their emotions and are more satisfied and have greater command over work related skills, which make them more efficient and they manipulate work outcomes positively (Sy, Tram, & O’Hara, 2006).

 Nonetheless, empirical work on the various dimensions of EI and emotion regulation at work is still limited (Kafetsios & Zampetakis, 2008). In the light of the results of present study we recommend EI training among the organizational employees, so that they become satisfied with their job/work and perform better, which may lead to boost-up their commitment with the work and organization. Committed employees are less likely to quit and offer their best knowledge, expertise, skill and effort for the interests of an organization and the well-being of their colleagues (Meyer & Allen, 1997; Golden, Veiga, & Dino, 2008; Yang & Chang, 2008; Alniacik, Cigerim, Akcin, & Bayram, 2011; Yucel & Bektas, 2012).
Limitations and Recommendations

The study provides useful insight regarding the role of EI in job satisfaction and job performance and the resultant job commitment. However, there are some limitations:

- The data were collected from only Lahore District. So, there is a need to collect data from different areas of Pakistan to enhance the generalizability of the results.
- The sample size was not larger enough because limited number of banks allowed to approach due their work load. Therefore, study can be replicated with a larger sample size.
- No comparison group was taken in the study. So it is recommended to conduct the future study comparing people in different fields/organizations.
- Study may also be extended by adding qualitative study to explore the experience of people working in Pakistani context, regarding their job commitment.

Implications of the Study

The findings could provide strategic plan to human resource managers and organizational/industrial professionals in a sense that if they are encouraged to promote emotional intelligence, they could increase job satisfaction and job performance, and it will positively affect job commitment. It could also facilitate the recruitment process, as most organizations want to retain their employees and expect lower turnover rate. In the initial process of the selection, employees’ EI could be examined to predict their future job satisfaction and their job performance that will determine their job commitment.

Conclusion

The previous literature on EI suggests that there might be an indirect relationship between EI and job commitment. However, the current study provided the additional understanding regarding relationship between EI and job commitment. It is concluded that EI does not directly affect job commitment; instead the EI determines job satisfaction and job performance, which leads to lower or higher job commitment.
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