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ABSTRACT

Research has shown relationship between personality and job satisfaction in two domains namely core self-theory and genetic theories related to personality. The main question in the current research was to investigate relation of personal characteristics according to Myers-Briggs Type Indicator, emotional intelligence and positive affect with job satisfaction. Statistical population was total personnel, formal or informal persons in the Isfahan Oil Distribution and Refinery Company including 1429 persons who were working in 2009 (1388 s.c.). A simple random sample of 230 personnel was chosen. Myers-Briggs Type Indicator (1960) Job Satisfaction Questionnaire of Judge and Bono (2000) Emotional Intelligence Questionnaire of Human and Health Capabilities Institution (2006), and Positive Affects in Job Questionnaire of Fox and Spector (1999) were used as instruments to measure the variables. Result indicate that extraversion predict job satisfaction (p<0.05). Also affect and emotion play role in job satisfaction.
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INTRODUCTION

The relationship between job satisfaction and different individual and organizational variables as antecedent and consequent variables has been evaluated several times in different studies. For example, cases such as job absenteeism (Farrell and Stamm, 1988; Punnett, Greeneidge, Ramsey, 2007), job quitting (Crampton and Wagner, 1994; Yang, 2010; Lee, Magnini, Kim, 2011), job burnout (Lee and Ashforth, 1996; Reissner et al, 2008; Scalrik and Scalrik, 2009; Senter et al; 2010), psychological and physical health (O’Driscoll and Beehr, 1994), aggressive behavior and theft in workplace (Chen and Spector, 1992) and life satisfaction (Hugick and Leonard,1991; Ramazannian et al, 2010; Shafqat, Hashmi, Hussain Naqvi, 2010; Zhao, Qu, Ghiselli, 2011) can be implied. Therefore have gained importance in organizations. But which features do affective job satisfaction? In the present study, positive affect, emotional intelligence, and personality dimensions were examined to predict job satisfaction.

Job satisfaction is the individual’s negative or positive evaluative judgment about his/her job (Weiss, 2002, p:175). The importance of this concept refers to its main role in job design, leadership and employee’s quitting (Rogelberg, 2007). Three main approaches have been proposed in relation to effective factors on job satisfaction. The proponents of the first approach are some organizational psychologists that pay attention to individual’s moods and tends that have determinant effect on his job attitudes (George, 1992; Judge and Locke, 1993; Staw and Ross, 1985, Watson and Slack, 1993). In the second approach (Davis-Blake and Pfieffer, 1989) the role and effect of individual differences on job attitudes has been denied and the focus is on situational factors. The third approach is a combination of the first two approaches that focuses on both individual and situational factors. (Staw and Cohen-Charash, 2005; Parker, 2007). The present study by the support of the first approach has paid attention to three variables of positive affect (temperament), emotional intelligence and personality for determining job satisfaction. Plenty of studies examined general and facet job satisfaction by positive affect approach (Bowling, Hendricks and Wagner, 2008; Huang, 2009). Job satisfaction like all attitudes involves three components that has been studied in researches (Brief and Roberson, 1989; Weiss, Nicholas, and Daus, 1999). These components are affect (or emotional), cognitive (or evaluative) and behavioral components (Eagly and Chaiken, 1993). Some studies affect aspect (Locke, 1969, 1976; Weiss and Cropanzano, 1996; Oreyzi and Golparvar, 1388) and some paid attention to its cognitive aspect (Smith, Kendall and Halin, 1969) and introduced instruments for its evaluation. Some useful questionnaires such as job descriptive index (JDI) and Minnesota satisfaction questionnaire (MSQ) just evaluate the cognitive aspect of job satisfaction and as a result lack of affective questions in questionnaires leads to ignore some relations. Therefore, Judge and Bono (2000) during the revision of job satisfaction instruments made an instrument that involves all the job satisfaction components and it has been used in the present study.
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Lock (1976) defines job satisfaction as a positive or pleasant affect that derives from job experience or evaluation that each individual have about his job. Individuals with high job satisfaction experience a positive and pleasant affect when think about their job. In other words, they love their jobs. Vis also defines job satisfaction as individual’s positive or negative evaluative judgment about his job (Weiss, 2002).

Positive affect is an active energy high concentration and enjoyable employment (Watson and Clark, 1994, P: 402). Studies have shown that positive affect has correlation with job satisfaction (Judge and Ilies, 2004; Moë, Pazzaglia, Ronconi, 2010) and positive affect in comparison with negative affect has stronger correlation with job satisfaction (Connolly and Viswesvaran, 2000; Moë, Pazzaglia, Ronconi, 2010; Arizi and Golparvar, 1388). Job satisfaction is independently affected by affect experiences (temperament and emotions) and cognition. The effect of temperament on job satisfaction implies the role of affection in satisfaction (Gerhart, 2005; Spector, 2005; Staw and Cohen-Charash, 2005; Dormann, and Zapf, 2001; Staw and Ross, 1985). Plenty of studies have reported high stability in job satisfaction even after changing job (Dormann and Zapf, 2001; Staw and Ross, 1985). For researchers this stability implies that job satisfaction is based on personality moods that among them two dimensions of temperament affect that are positive and negative affect have been studied by researchers (Brief, Butler and Roberson, 1995; Weiss and Crapanzano, 1996; Judge and Larsen, 2001). Positive affect is associated with concepts such as self-confidence and extraversion and negative affect with neurosis (Clark, Watson, Minka, 1994; Judge, Locke, Durham and Kluger, 1998). Moreover, the results of the meta-analysis done by Thoresen, Kaplan, Barsky, Warren, and de Chernont (2003) revealed that there was a positive correlation between job satisfaction and negative affect (r = -0.34) and positive affect (r=0.34). The results of meta-analysis by Thoresen, Kaplan, Barsky and Warren (2008) on 63 studies in this area showed that positive affect and not negative one is strongly correlated with the scale of affective job satisfaction. Staw et al. perceived that the individual’s affect in his childhood can predict his job satisfaction in adulthood. In addition, they found that individual’s job satisfaction in different times and jobs is relatively stable (Staw and Ross, 1985). For instance, individuals who are most of the time in positive affect mood ignoring the workplace have been reported to have more job satisfaction and on the other hand individuals who are in negative affect mood ignoring their workplace express more negative attitudes toward their job (Baron and Baron, 2005). Accordingly, the first hypothesis of this study proposed as: 

H1: positive affect is able to predict the job satisfaction variable.

Another individual variable that affects job satisfaction is emotional intelligence (Chiva and Algere 2008). According to Goleman’s definition (2001, P: 14), emotional intelligence in most levels points out the individual’s ability to diagnose and adjust emotions in himself and others. Mayer and Salovey (1997) define emotional intelligence as the ability to perceive exactly, evaluation and expressing emotions, ability to access the feelings that facilitate reflection and the ability to recognize emotions and adjust them for intellectual growth. Emotional intelligence can be considered as a concept that coordinates between individual and environment (Chiva and Alegre, 2008).

Many people have access to methods and appropriate instruments for working pleasantly; however, they experience job dissatisfaction, job burnout and anxiety that lead to behavioral consequences such as job absenteeism and quitting or mental disorder (Kinman and Jones, 2008, Vilanueva and Djurkovic, 2009). Emotional intelligence can affect individual’s success in organizations (Goleman, 2001). According to a survey and observations in working environments, emotional intelligence increases the function and benefits (Thilam and Kerby, 2002).

Individuals with higher emotional intelligence are happier and more successful in their relations. Also those people have balance between affects and intellect, are aware of their feelings, have compassion and sympathy toward others and have high self-esteem. Low emotional intelligence may cause general dissatisfaction and its consequences would be feelings such as loneliness, fear, disappointment, guiltiness, immorality, futility, depreseed, instability, disinterested, discouragement, necessity and obligation, anger, dependence, sacrificed and defeat. On the other hand, high emotional intelligence leads to individual’s general satisfaction that appears as having high motivation, kindness, intimacy, getting the attentions, loyalty to commitment, being relaxed, awareness, balance, freedom, independence, satisfaction, being successful in relationship establishments and favorably (Hin, 1386).

According to a study in the University of Suin Bern, Gardner and Stogh (2003) found that emotional intelligence is a beneficial predictor for job satisfaction and organizational commitment. In a research with the aim to study emotional intelligence and job satisfaction and trust in the employees of the University of California, Dong and Howard (2006) concluded that emotional intelligence and job satisfaction are correlated. Hosseinian, Monavar yazdi, Zahraie and Fatehi- Ashtiani (2008) found that correlation between job satisfaction and emotional intelligence is significant. In a research with the aim to study the effects of emotional intelligence and its dimensions on job satisfaction and nurses’ organizational commitment, Guleryaz, Guney, Miski, Aydin, and Asan (2008) found that emotional intelligence is correlated with job satisfaction and organizational commitment. The results of the Ozturk and Deniz’s research (2008) implied the significant correlation between emotional intelligence and job satisfaction. Lordanglou (2008) in a research studied the evaluation of relationships between emotional intelligence,
effectiveness of management and commitment and job satisfaction in education and found that emotional intelligence has a positive effect on teachers’ commitment, satisfaction and effectiveness.

Othman and Anugerah (2009) studied the relationship between commitment and job satisfaction and the mediating role of commitment in relation to emotional intelligence and job success. They concluded that individuals with high emotional intelligence have more commitments towards their job and commitment can predict job satisfaction. Moreover, they found that commitment is the relationship mediation between emotional intelligence and job satisfaction. In another research, Sener, Demirel and Sarlak (2009) studied 80 employees of a hospital and found the positive correlation between general emotional intelligence and general job satisfaction. Generally speaking, few applied researches have studied the relationship between emotional intelligence and job satisfaction. It might be an attitude that has devoted most researches in the area of organizational behavior to itself (Chiva and Alegre, 2008). Accordingly, the second hypothesis is as follows:

H₂: emotional intelligence is able to predict the job satisfaction variable.

Another variable that studied in this research as predictor variable was personality dimensions according to Yung approach. Among the questionnaires available for evaluating the personality, MBTI personality questionnaire was applied in many organizational situations that was based on Yung approach towards personality and was made by Myers-Brigs in 1930s for evaluating Yung’s ideas about individuals’ differences. Myers and Brigs later added “Judging- perceiving” dimension to three dimensions of Yung’s bipolar personality (Nelson and Quick, 2006). In Myers-Brigs Type indicator, four two-categorical scales along with two possibilities for each scale are extroversion-introversion, sensing-intuitive, thinking-feeling and judging-perceiving (Nelson, Quick, 2006).

People behave in different ways based on their personality aspects and have special expectations, unique abilities and behavioral skills and different needs and based on their personality model have special needs, expectations, motivations and goals. Organizations based on goals, responsibilities and current activities satisfy needs and special expectations. Thus, a different job environment is appropriate for each personality type (Nelson and Quick, 2006). Accordingly, the third hypothesis of this research is:

H₃: MBTI personality dimensions are able to predict job satisfaction variable.

A number of researchers studied the effect of personality on job satisfaction. Nevlarug and McOlive (1992) studied the relationship between job congruence and personality and job satisfaction. Results showed significant positive correlation between job satisfaction and job congruence and personality. Bhatewara (2005) in a research entitled “the relationship between personality features and job satisfaction among employees of Indian companies” found that there is a negative correlation between job satisfaction and personality feature of neurosis. Also there is a positive correlation between job satisfaction and other personality dimensions such as extraversion, agreement, open to experience and sense of duty. Mehra and Mishra (1999) have reported that job stress has negative correlation with job satisfaction and personality features affect the relationship between job satisfaction and job stress.

Hull (2004) studied the relationship between personality types and job satisfaction among 101 professional university counselors by MBTI questionnaire and job satisfaction Questionnaire (Job Descriptive Index or JDI) and found a positive correlation between job satisfaction and extraversion. Generally, ESTP personality type has higher job satisfaction and INTP type have lower job satisfaction in comparison with other personality types.

Mohammadi (1387) in a research named “cross-cultural relationship of Iran and India in relation to personality features and its relationship with teachers’ job satisfaction” that was done on two samples of 224 individuals in Iran and 223 individuals in India by NEO personality scale and the scale of JDI job satisfaction found that there was a significant positive correlation between extravert personality features and job satisfaction dimensions (colleague satisfaction, salary satisfaction, promotion satisfaction, management satisfaction) and general job satisfaction among Iranian and Indian teachers.

METHODOLOGY

The population of the study was all male and female employees (formal and informal) of refinery and distribution of oil Products Company (1259 individuals) in 1388 and the sample of the study was 230 employees of this company that were chosen based on simple random sampling. Sampling framework of the employees list was based on comprehensive system of humanities force and each employee’s sampling unit was defined in levels lower than diploma in population. The data was calculated based on comprehensive system of National Refinery and Distribution Company’s humanities force and statistics units were chosen by random selection. Data analysis was done by SPSS 16.00.

Instruments

In the present study following instruments were used for data collection:
Data were collected via Judge’s and Bono’s job satisfaction questionnaire, Fax’s and Spector’s job related positive affect questionnaire, Myers-Briggs type indicator and humanity and hygienic capabilities institute that will be described respectively.

1. **Judge and Bono’s job satisfaction questionnaire (2000):** This scale has five questions and answering was based on five-degree-Likert scale. Number one was given for completely agree and number 5 for completely disagree. Questions number 3 and 5 were coded in reverse.

2. **Fax’s and Spector’s job-related positive affect questionnaire (1999):** In comparison with other questionnaires measuring affect (see Watson et al, 1988) this questionnaire has this advantage that sentences have been designed in a way that measure affect in the workplace. Subjects of the study for responding to job-related affect scale use five-degree Likert scale and select Never to Almost always. This scale includes 15 questions and does not have a reverse option. The reliability of the research instrument via split-half was equal to 0.77 and via Alpha Cronbach was 0.93 (Farahani and Oreyzi, 1384).

3. **Emotional Intelligence Scale of Humanity and Hygienic Capabilities Institute (2006):** This instrument includes 12 questions and each individual should answer based on his or her moods similarities to the context of question and check one of the options. Ranking of this questionnaire was number 1 for completely disagree and number 5 for completely agree.

4. **Myers Briggs Type Indicator (MBIT):** Myers Briggs Type Indicator includes two M and G forms which in the current study the shortened version of M form translated by Yaghoobi Beglar (2008) in Allame Tabatabaie University and assessed in case of reliability and validity was used. The primary M form is composed of 93 questions which was decreased to 54 questions after psychometric investigation according to new measurement theory (IRT) whereof 33 were statements and interrogatives as well as two-option questions and 21 other items in separate two-word form and the questions of this invoice are multiple choice “must” items. Myers Briggs Type Indicator answer sheet is one page of 54 boxes and it includes two options of A and B. At the upper part of the answer sheet is the instruction and the information of the samples and below it there are some spaces specified to register the scores of every scale and a place for registering the personality type code of the samples. In Myers Briggs Type Indicator four major aspects include: 1. Introversion-Extroversion or E-I 2. Sensing-Intuition or S-N 3. Thinking-Feeling or T-F and 4. Judgment-Perception or J-P. The last reliability of the scales after omitting some questions which didn’t have fitness were, in order, increased to 0.72, 0.74, 0.77, 0.76 (Yaghoobi Beglar, 2009).

### RESULTS

#### Table 1: mean, standard deviation and reliability, Separated by Sub-scales

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>variables</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>reliability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Job satisfaction</td>
<td>230</td>
<td>16.86</td>
<td>4.10</td>
<td>0.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotional intelligence</td>
<td>230</td>
<td>47.10</td>
<td>12.27</td>
<td>0.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive affect</td>
<td>230</td>
<td>44.55</td>
<td>6.44</td>
<td>0.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>extraversion</td>
<td>230</td>
<td>31.15</td>
<td>6.73</td>
<td>0.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>introversion</td>
<td>230</td>
<td>2.67</td>
<td>1.39</td>
<td>0.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sensing</td>
<td>230</td>
<td>2.65</td>
<td>1.72</td>
<td>0.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>intuition</td>
<td>230</td>
<td>3.27</td>
<td>1.20</td>
<td>0.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>thinking</td>
<td>230</td>
<td>1.83</td>
<td>1.36</td>
<td>0.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>feeling</td>
<td>230</td>
<td>5.35</td>
<td>1.57</td>
<td>0.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>judging</td>
<td>230</td>
<td>3.15</td>
<td>2.70</td>
<td>0.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>perceiving</td>
<td>230</td>
<td>3.27</td>
<td>1.02</td>
<td>0.60</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Table 2: Intra-correlation Coefficient between research variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>variable</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>11</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.31**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.69**</td>
<td>0.201**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.251*</td>
<td>0.182*</td>
<td>0.171*</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>-0.23*</td>
<td>-0.178*</td>
<td>-0.206*</td>
<td>-0.358**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.102</td>
<td>0.106</td>
<td>0.023</td>
<td>-0.087</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>-0.001</td>
<td>0.017</td>
<td>0.040</td>
<td>0.157*</td>
<td>0.083</td>
<td>0.196**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>0.019</td>
<td>0.013</td>
<td>0.016</td>
<td>-0.103</td>
<td>-0.093</td>
<td>-0.089</td>
<td>-0.254**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>-0.056</td>
<td>0.011</td>
<td>-0.044</td>
<td>0.087</td>
<td>0.077</td>
<td>0.254**</td>
<td>0.207**</td>
<td>-0.670**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>0.051</td>
<td>0.221*</td>
<td>0.046</td>
<td>-0.013</td>
<td>-0.034</td>
<td>0.002</td>
<td>-0.013*</td>
<td>0.401**</td>
<td>0.407**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>-0.135</td>
<td>-0.126</td>
<td>-0.116</td>
<td>0.014</td>
<td>0.186**</td>
<td>0.056</td>
<td>0.175**</td>
<td>-0.236**</td>
<td>0.303**</td>
<td>-0.533**</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < 0.05. **p < 0.01. N=230.

Coding: 1= job satisfaction 2= emotional intelligence 3= positive affect 4= extraversion 5= introversion 6= sensing 7= intuition 8= thinking 9= feeling 10= judging 11= perceiving
Mean, Standard Deviation, Minimum and Maximum of each variables of the study have been shown in Table 1. As it is illustrated, positive affect is highly scattered and Judging dimension has the least scatterings. Based on the results of Table 2, the factor of job satisfaction is in significant correlation with positive affect and emotional intelligence. Also job satisfaction shows significant correlation with extraversion, introversion and perception from MBTI questionnaire; however, no significant correlation has been shown with other dimensions of this questionnaire.

In Table 3 the results of step by step regression have been shown to predict job satisfaction based on positive affect, emotional intelligence and MBTI personality. According to Table 3 positive affect predict 0.48 job satisfaction variance. This value is increased to 0.512 by adding emotional intelligence and to 0.523 by adding extraversion.

Values of P shows that the effect of positive affect and emotional intelligence is significant (p<0.05) and all the variables are effective in estimating individual’s job satisfaction. The value of β shows that by adding one unit to the variables of positive affect, emotional intelligence and extraversion, job satisfaction is increased by 0.641, 0.164, and 0.111 respectively. As it is seen based on positive β it can be concluded that the effect of positive affect and emotional intelligence is direct on job satisfaction. Therefore, the first and second hypotheses are confirmed and the third hypothesis is confirmed in a way that the extraversion dimension among Myers-Briggs type indicator dimensions is the predictor of job satisfaction and has positive correlation with job satisfaction.

It is worth mentioning that in the given test for evaluating the models to be significant, all three models were significant at P≤0.05.

**Conclusion**

Interests of researchers and managers of organizations in understanding the functional features of employees has been led to ample of studies regarding effective factors on employees’ job satisfaction and it is increasing day by day. However, there is no general consensus about this factor. According to the results of the study, the first hypothesis that was based on the ability to predict individual’s job satisfaction referring to their positive affect was confirmed. This result is in parallel with the studies done by Staw and Ross (1985), Weiss, Nicholas and Daus (1991), Weiss, Nicholas and Daus (1999), Connolly and Viswesvaran (2000), Tresen, Kaplan, Bareski, Varen (2003), Judge and Ilies (2004), Tresen, Kaplan, Bareski, Varen (2008), Moë, Pazzaglia, Ronconi (2010).

Temperament hypothesis (Isen and Patrik, 1983) is referred to in order to keep this relationship. This hypothesis states that individuals in a positive affective state tend to keep their positive affects and avoid negative affects. Researchers by putting individuals in pleasant situations such as finding money in pay phone (Isen and Levin, 1972) and thinking about positive events (Isen et al, 1985) found that when happiness of positive temperament is stimulated by an event this pleasant state is continued until 20 minutes. Since people enjoy having good feeling they try to continue their pleasant state more than 20 minutes. Therefore they expand their positive temperament in different ways. As a result an individual with positive temperament perceive his job with satisfaction and think it as positive (Isen, 1987). Individuals with higher positive affect in comparison with individuals with lower positive affect express more positive states and dynamic emotions, have positive viewpoint about themselves and concentrate on positive aspects of situation (Moyle, 1995; Watson, Clark and Tellgen, 1988). Positive affect is considered as an important source for interpreting the situation and cause individuals with positive affect in comparison with those with negative affect to have feelings, understanding, and more measured actions in their personal and social relationships (Hough et al, 1990; Lyubomirsky, King and Diener, 2005).

Studies by Gardner and Stog (2003), Dong and Howard (2006), Findler, Windol and Morbarak (2007), Guleryaz, Guney, Miski Aydin, Asan (2008), Kooztork and Deniz (2008), Lordanaglou (2008), Hosseinian, Monavar yazdi, Zahrare and Fatehi- Ashitani (2008), Othman and Anugerah (2009), Sener, Demirel and Sarlak (2009) can be pointed out regarding the relationship between emotional intelligence and job satisfaction which results are in parallel with the results of this research. It can be stated that employees with higher emotional intelligence in comparison with those with lower emotional intelligence are more compatible in evaluation and

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>step</th>
<th>Variable(s)</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>R²</th>
<th>Δ R²</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
<th>F change</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>SE_b</th>
<th>β</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Positive affect</td>
<td>0.693</td>
<td>0.480</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>210.537</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>210.537</td>
<td>0.232</td>
<td>0.016</td>
<td>0.693</td>
<td>14.510</td>
<td>0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Positive affect emotional intelligence</td>
<td>0.715</td>
<td>0.512</td>
<td>0.32</td>
<td>118.938</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>14.694</td>
<td>0.220</td>
<td>0.016</td>
<td>0.656</td>
<td>13.862</td>
<td>0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Positive affect emotional intelligence extraversion</td>
<td>0.723</td>
<td>0.530</td>
<td>0.012</td>
<td>82.739</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>5.562</td>
<td>0.215</td>
<td>0.016</td>
<td>0.641</td>
<td>13.533</td>
<td>0.001</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Based on Research Variables

**Table 3- Multi-coefficient Correlation and Variance Regression Analysis to Predict Job Satisfaction Variable Based on Research Variables**
adjusting their special affects and it causes more job satisfaction. Also emotional intelligence can bring a pleasant work environment and affects employees’ job satisfaction, effective management, and organization improvement. The reason is that high emotional intelligence increases function, strategic understanding, and job satisfaction and as a result orientations play positive role and employees’ problems decrease (Schelechter, 2008). In this regard Baron’s view (2000) can be stated. His view include five areas that two areas state that emotional intelligence includes stress management area (bearing stress and controlling tension, bearing challenges and tensions) and temperament area (stable happiness, optimism, life satisfaction). As a result individuals with higher emotional intelligence interpret the environment events more positive and are more resistant confronting problems and have been reported to have higher job satisfaction in comparison with individuals without this capability.

Weiss and Cropanzano’s affective events theory (1996) considers affect as dynamic during working. This dynamicity causes temperament states create oscillation in congruence with its orientation and context for job satisfaction. These oscillations highly depend on events that individuals confront while working. The theory of job events proposes an assumed relationship between different job affect states (run due to events while working) and short-term and spontaneous behaviors such as organization civil behaviors, job quitting and obstructionism. Generally speaking, if we assume momentary satisfaction in a job as a stimulus factor for behaviors while working it is natural to assume that individual’s affective dynamic states during the work facilitate or debilitate this procedure. In fact when people are asked about their job satisfaction their attitudes are formed on the spot. Therefore, since positive affect highly predicts affect aspect it reflects affective state better than emotional intelligence. Moreover, in this research Judge’s and Bono’s job satisfaction questionnaire (2000) was used that evaluates affective job satisfaction and it increases the affectivity of job satisfaction by positive affect. It is a reason for a relatively high predicted variance value by positive affect.

Regarding the third hypothesis of this research the relationship between extraversion and job satisfaction is compatible with the results of studies by Nevalarug and McOlive (1992), Hull (2004), Bhatewara (2005). Individuals in high levels of extraversion and low levels of introversion have more capacities for understanding and expressing affects and as a result are more capable for being optimistic and think positive. It is worth mentioning that Judge’s and Bono’s questionnaire (2000) evaluate affective job satisfaction and it facilitates the positive relationship between two variables.

Generally as the results of the research revealed individual variables such as positive affect, emotional intelligence and personality features play an important role to predict the employees’ attitude (in this research job satisfaction).
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