Int. Journal of Business Science and Applied Management, Volume 18, Issue 1, 2023

The Effect of Leader's Emotional Intelligence and Role-Breadth Self-Efficacy on Proactive Behaviour at Work

Praise Choeni
Optentia Research Focus Area, North-West University
Vanderbijlpark 1900, South Africa
Email: ppchoeni@gmail.com

Sunday Samson Babalola*
Department of Management, Walter Sisulu University
Butterworth, 4960, South Africa
Tel: +27474016211
Email: sbabalola@wsu.ac.za

Chiyem Lucky Nwanzu
Department of Psychology, Delta State University
Abraka, Nigeria
Email: nwanzulc@delsu.edu.ng

Abstract
The literature makes it clear that there is a need for proactivity among employees for the effective functioning of an organisation. This study aimed to determine the effect of a leader's emotional intelligence (LEI) and role-breadth self-efficacy (RBSE) on proactive behaviour at work (PBW). The sample comprises 204 employees of selected customs clearing companies in Zimbabwe. A cross-sectional design was adopted, and a self-administered questionnaire compiled from standardised scales on the substantial variables was used for data collection. Data analysis showed that LEI and RBSE independently and jointly predict PBW, and the relationships are of practical value, as indicated by the large effect sizes. However, compared to RBSE, LEI has a stronger relationship with PBW. The conclusions are that LEI and RBSE are of value for PBW. Therefore, it is recommended that, in enhancing PBW, the two factors should be considered in an organisation's work design, recruitment, selection, and training and development programmes.

Keywords: leaders' emotional intelligence, role-breadth self-efficacy, proactive behaviour at work

1. INTRODUCTION

Knowledge of the factors that promote or hinder proactive practises is essential for the survival of organisations. Today's employees face many job demands and increased work pressures, yet they are expected to be effective and efficient (Davidescu et al., 2020; Griffin et al., 2007). Employees need to develop strategies to undertake rapid changes, learn to think ahead and act to achieve the anticipated results and keep up with rapid changes from the global market forces organisations (Turner, 2017). For example, due to recent technology, employees may need to be equipped with additional skills to remain at the forefront of their industry (Osborne & Hammoud, 2017), as the dynamic nature of the workplace requires the willingness and ability of employees to act and make decisions proactively (Ellis, 2012). This may imply that much work is to be done, but fewer people do it.

Proactive behaviour at work (PBW) refers to employees' anticipatory actions to improve work circumstances and avoid uncertainties (Grant & Ashford, 2008). Parker and Collins (2010) emphasised that PBW aims to bring about change within the organisation by improving work methods and initiating innovative ideas, expressing concerns, and taking immediate action to prevent the reoccurrence of problematic situations. Although much-documented evidence indicates the importance of PBW, promoting the behaviour is still underexplored (Hong et al., 2016). It is worth further investigating the best possible ways to promote PBW.

It can be assumed that a leader's emotional intelligence (LEI) is crucial to enhancing PBW. Emotionally intelligent leaders often help employees develop various ways of working without barriers to positive work outcomes (Parker et al., 2010). LEI refers to leaders' ability to recognise and control their emotions and those of others (Mayer et al., 2008). Emotional intelligence enables leaders to work with their employees effectively (Coetzee & Schreuder, 2013). People who can control and understand their emotions are believed to be emotionally intelligent (Shapiro, 2008). Van Rooy and Viswesvaran (2004) suggest that LEI can significantly enhance employee PBW. Similarly, Whitehurst (2015) agreed that LEI is essential in cultivating and imparting a compelling vision that enables employees to be passionate and proactive.

Role-breadth self-efficacy (RBSE) is also a motivating concept in promoting PBW (Cheah et al., 2019). RBSE encompasses a person's perception of their ability to execute specific tasks and behaviours, focusing on integrative and interpersonal roles. In simple terms, RBSE is how people feel confident enough to perform broader and more proactive roles, even those that extend beyond traditionally prescribed technical requirements (Parker, 1998). Therefore, it is vital to determine how an individual's confidence in their ability relates to PBW. Additionally, more studies are needed as the extent to which LEI and RBSE influence PWB is unknown.

PBW has gained substantial research interest for two fundamental reasons. First, several studies have linked PBW with effective organisational functioning. For example, there is a relationship between proactive and innovative work behaviour (Nurjaman et al., 2019) and career success (Ling et al., 2017). Second, PBW can be developed (Jia et al., 2020; Nguyen et al., 2020). To maximise the benefits of PBW, complete knowledge of its predictors is necessary. Andersson (2015) emphasised the need for continuous identification of the antecedents and consequences of PBW. This study will help to understand the conditions that cultivate employee proactivity. It will help organisations stimulate and encourage proactive work behaviour. Moreover, individual employees are bound to benefit by understanding how embracing proactive behaviour will foster employees' ability to control their work and initiate action towards the desired results. The study will also help organisations develop strategies that promote proactive behaviour among employees.

2. REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE AND DEVELOPMENT OF HYPOTHESES

The role of LEI in leadership has received a great deal of discussion and support. Leaders with high emotional intelligence can achieve positive affective states and withstand adverse emotional conditions without negative results (Sistad, 2020). Emotional intelligence involves one's ability to understand one's own and others' emotions (Davies et al., 1998). Accurately assessing and expressing one's emotions provides several advantages in interpersonal relationships, such as self-confidence and easy rapport (Arora, 2017). The interpersonal benefits offered to individuals with high emotion perceptions enable them to perform their duties, among others, effectively. Emotional intelligence is necessary for leaders' effectiveness (Bartz et al., 2018). The influence of LEI on leadership emergence, effectiveness, effective leader outcomes, and transformational leadership has received much empirical confirmation. For example, the study by Liman et al. (2019) indicated that head teachers of secondary schools' self-management and self-awareness significantly and positively affect their performance. Emotional intelligence positively correlates with leadership emergence and transformational and transactional leadership styles (McCullough, 2015). In a review of the literature, Chirania and Dhal (2017) concluded that emotional intelligence has a strong positive correlation with entrepreneurial abilities.

Proactive behaviour is widely approached from three perspectives. One approach examines proactive behaviour from a complementary perspective, categorising proactive behaviour into general and specific proactive behaviour (Crant, 2000). Another approach classifies proactive behaviour into three distinct

categories: proactive organisational behaviour, individual proactive behaviour, and coworker-oriented proactive behaviour (Hashemi et al., 2012). The third approach classifies proactive behaviour as proactive behaviour at work or proactive work behaviour (Parker & Collins, 2010). In this study, proactive behaviour will be examined following the third approach. According to Parker and Collins (2010), PBW is discretionary behaviour that aims to change the internal organisational environment. These authors identified four constructs (taking charge, individual innovation, problem prevention, and voice) that constitute PBW.

Taking charge occurs when employees seek to improve work performance, including work structures, practises, and routines, which involves voluntary, constructive, and change-oriented efforts to bring about positive and functional change (Morrison & Phelps, 1999). Taking charge can be equated to extra-role behaviour because it is voluntary. However, it is distinct from other forms of behaviour in that it is naturally change-oriented and aims at improvement. Problem prevention is self-directed and anticipatory action to prevent the reoccurrence of work problems (Frese & Fay, 2001). Individual innovation is focused on perceiving new and growing opportunities and producing and executing new ideas. It also involves novelty, differentiating it from voice, and taking charge (Parker & Collins, 2010). Voice occurs when employees engage in constructive expression to improve the work environment's standard procedures (Parker & Collins, 2010). Promotive behaviour, like constructive challenges, tends to improve rather than merely criticise (LePine & Van Dyne, 2001).

Studies have identified various forms of relationship between LEI and proactivity. For example, team LEI influenced the relationship between team empowerment and proactivity (Erkutlu & Chafra, 2012). Gupta and Bajaj (2017) presented a conceptual framework linking LEI with employee creativity and theoretically established the moderating role of the psychological climate in the relationship. The supervisor's emotional intelligence (self–awareness, self–management, and social awareness) significantly affected subordinates' daily performance (Callahan, 2016). LEI significantly impacts team innovation performance, partially mediated by leader-member exchange and team psychological safety (Wang et al., 2019). LEI moderates the relationship between job characteristics and organisational citizenship behaviour (OCB) (Asadullah et al., 2020). Managers' emotional intelligence significantly affected the OCB dimensions of altruism, courtesy, conscientiousness, and civic virtue (Ölçer et al., 2014). Group LEI improves group performance by improving group-level cohesion, and at the individual level, group LEI positively affects person-group fit (Zhang et al., 2020). Therefore, it is hypothesised that:

H1. Leaders' emotional intelligence positively predicts proactive behaviour at work.

2.1. Role Breadth Self-Efficacy and Proactive Work Behaviour

RBSE is a unique, intentional, focused, and lasting phenomenon. There is a common understanding that an individual's level of RBSE is based on one's ability to mobilise competence (Srikanth & Jomon, 2015). The reason is that individuals should have confidence in their ability to achieve goals. Self-doubters usually suffer setbacks and give up, while self-confident people will likely keep at it and succeed (Tsai et al., 2011).

Several studies highlight the importance of RBSE in improving employee PBW because employees are confident to be proactive and overcome obstacles (Hwang et al., 2015; Martin et al., 2013). According to (Parker et al., 2010), the belief that one can be effective at work is relevant in proactive behaviour because such behaviour involves a high potential psychological risk to the individual. For example, proactive employees may have to deal with resistant and inconvincible others. Therefore, RBSE gives employees the confidence to adapt to proactivity outcomes. Axtell (2000) argued that RBSE is one of the most crucial determinants of employees' tendency to develop ideas to improve things.

A study by López-Domínguez et al. (2013) revealed that employees with high RBSE perceive their job roles more broadly and actively and perform a broader range of tasks than employees with lower RBSE. Kim et al. (2015) also posited that proactivity at work is associated with many uncalculated risks. Therefore, employees must believe they can bring positive organisational change against all obstacles. Employees with high RBSE are known to see opportunities in their environment and perceive an increased probability of success through proactive behaviour (Wu & Parker, 2017). Furthermore, Strauss et al. (2009) argued that employees should be confident in their ability to engage in proactive behaviour because proactivity involves questioning the status quo. Hence, it requires a person with a strong level of RBSE to perform such a question. RBSE is considered a proximal predictor of PBW. Typically, employees with a high sense of RBSE develop strategic skills when faced with challenges requiring proactive action (Griffin et al., 2007). According to Griffin et al. (2010), people high in RBSE believe that acting proactively will succeed. Thus, they are motivated to engage in proactive behaviour. Although people with low-role RBSE are less sure of their ability to perform tasks outside their prescribed roles successfully, they perceive proactive behaviours as riskier.

The existing research reports that RBSE strongly predicts behaviours, such as change-oriented OCB and PBW (López-Domínguez et al., 2013; Parker et al., 2006). Hwang et al. (2015) and Sonnentag and Spychala (2012) found a link between RBSE and PBW. Den Hartog and Belschak (2012) also found that individuals with high RBSE are more likely to display proactive behaviour than those with low RBSE. Employees requiring

higher levels of job control and high time pressure experienced higher levels of RBSE, showing more proactive behaviour (Sonnentag & Spychala, 2012). RBSE strongly predicted individual, team, and organisational proactivity (Griffin et al., 2007). Ohly and Fritz (2007) emphasised that RBSE is crucial in improving proactivity. RBSE had a positive effect on (1) pro-organisational proactive behaviour among those with a higher collective self-concept, (2) pro-supervisor proactive behaviour among those with a higher relational self-concept, and (3) pro-self-proactive behaviour among those with a higher individual self-concept (Hwang et al., 2015). RBSE predicts PBW and mediates the relationship between a proactive personality and PBW (Yuspahruddin et al., 2021). RBSE mediates the relationship between humble leadership and PBW (Li, 2021), supportive supervision and job crafting (Han, 2020), job control, and proactive behaviour (Sonnentag & Spychala, 2012). RBSE and the employees taking charge are significantly correlated, and the willingness to take risks partially mediates the relationship (Lou, 2020). Role breadth self-efficacy moderates the link between mutual support and sustainable job performance (Cheah et al., 2019).

H2: Role breadth self-efficacy predicts PBW.

LEI and RBSE are specific forms of emotional intelligence and self-efficacy, respectively. Studies have identified various forms of relationship between generic emotional intelligence and generic self-efficacy. For example, emotional intelligence, directly and indirectly, affects self-efficacy (Sun & Lyu, 2022). Self-efficacy mediated the association between emotional intelligence and job satisfaction (Sökmen & Sarikay, 2022), team cohesion (Black et al., 2019) and creativity (Qahir et al., 2022). Given this nomological network of emotional intelligence and self-efficacy, it is argued that since LEI and RBSE independently impact PWB positively, they will also jointly impact PWB positively. Therefore, it is hypothesised that:

H3: Leaders' emotional intelligence and role breadth self-efficacy jointly predict PBW

An overview of the existing literature reviewed a lack of studies on the relative contribution and influence of situational factors and personality traits on employee behaviour, including PBW. Several studies that examined personality and emotion never investigated the relative impact of the two classes of variables on behaviour (Cooper, 2018). However, the few studies that have contributed to addressing the gap have published insightful findings. For instance, Hasan and Eldous (2020) reported that the situation is more influential than a person's personality in predicting aggressive behaviour. Therefore, it is hypothesised that:

H4: Leaders' emotional intelligence and role breadth self-efficacy differ in their contribution to PBW.

3. METHODOLOGY

3.1. Design and Participants

The research design was cross-sectional since data were collected from the sample at one point, and data were obtained using questionnaires. Questionnaires were appropriate because they are less expensive, easy to administer and enable data collection from a large pool of participants quickly and efficiently (Bless et al., 2013). In terms of method, this study is quantitative, as a standardised questionnaire adapted from previous studies was the only data collection technique (Ijigu et al., 2023). The quantitative approach is appropriate, as it is beneficial when examining relationships and describing and determining cause-and-effect interactions between variables (Zaman et al., 2021).

The target population was 600 employees working in customs clearing agent companies at the Beitbridge border post in the Matabeleland South Province of Zimbabwe. The present study used multisampling techniques to select the sample. The first step involved using a purposive sampling method to select the clearing agent companies. The second step involved using simple random sampling to select respondents from participating companies. Before administering the questionnaire, ethical approval and permission to conduct the investigation were obtained from the Venda University Research and Ethics Office, after permission was obtained from the Human Resources Department of each participating company for its employees to participate in the study.

Consequently, informed consent was obtained from the participants. Participants received the questionnaires distributed at their workplaces and were asked to submit the completed questionnaires to their supervisors. The supervisors subsequently handed the completed questionnaires to the research team. Three hundred questionnaires were distributed to the participants of the clearing agent companies, and 235 were returned in two weeks. This gives a response rate of 78%. However, after sorting through the questionnaires, some were not completed adequately. Therefore, 204 (68 %) were used for data analysis. This return rate is satisfactory, as it exceeded survey response rate levels and trends in organisational research (Mellahi & Harris, 2016). The sample size is adequate, as it met the maximum sample-to-item ratio of 5-1 and the sample-to-variable ratio of 20-to-1 requirements (Memon et al., 2020; Tsang et al., 2017).

The participants consist of 116 (56.9%) males, 88 (43.1%) females, 82 (40.2%) senior employees, 79 (38.7%) junior employees, and 43 (21.1%) management staff. Seventy-six (13.2%) hold a diploma, 29 (14.2%)

a degree, 27 (13.2%) an ordinary level, 27 (23, 2%) certificate, 29 (14.2%) honours, 25 (12.3%) advanced level, and 1 (1.5%) master's degree certificates. Educational qualifications indicate that the participants in this study are sufficiently literate, which justified the adoption of the self-report measure in data collection (Nwanzu & Babalola, 2020). One hundred and fifty-eight (77.5%) were permanent, 24 (11.8%) interns, 18 (8.8) temporary, and 4 (1.9%) contract employees. The mean age of the participants was 30.4 years (*SD*, 7.62; 38 years). All employee categories were represented in the sample. The analysis was carried out at the individual level.

3.2. Measures

3.2.1. Leaders' Emotional Intelligence Measure

The Wong and Law (2002) leaders' emotional intelligence scale was used. This is a 16-item measure, and the responses to each item were rated using a 7-point Likert scale ranging from 1 = strongly disagree, 2 = disagree, 3 = somewhat disagree, 4 = neutral, 5 = somewhat 6 = agree to 7 = strongly agree. A sample item on the scale "has a good sense of why they have certain feelings most of the time." The reliability of this scale was considered acceptable, with an α of 0.95 in one study (Boerrigter, 2017). For the present study, Cronbach's α of 0.86 was observed.

3.2.2. Measurement of Proactive Behaviour at Work

The measure adopted for proactive behaviour at work was a combination of items on three standardised scales. These scales are Frese et al.'s (1997) 7-item scale on personal initiative, a 6-item scale on voice behaviour developed by Van Dyne and LePine (1998), and Morrison and Phelps's (1999) 10-item scale on taking charge behaviour. This combination was adjudged to represent the existing PBW models adequately. Each item on the scale is rated using a 5-step scale ranging from 1 (absolutely false) to 5 (absolutely true. Some items included in this instrument are "I am particularly good at realising ideas." "I often try to correct a faulty procedure or practise," and "I get involved with issues affecting my company's quality of life." The three scales with good psychometric properties are well adopted in the literature (e.g., Deng et al., 2020; Nsereko et al., 2018). For the present study, the measure had an α of 0.78, adjudged adequate for internal consistency reliability and the convergent aspect of construct validity (Field, 2018).

3.2.3. Role-Breadth Self-Efficacy Measure

Parker's (1998) RBSE scale was adopted. This is a five-point Likert scale with seven items and a response option ranging from 1 = strongly disagree, 2 = disagree, 3 = neither agree nor disagree, 4 = agree, and 5 = strongly agree. Some items included in this instrument are: "I would feel confident to represent my work area in meetings with senior management" and "I would feel confident writing a proposal to spend money in my work area." Previous studies reported that Cronbach's alpha for the scale ranges between α = 0.73 and α = 0.96 (Axtell & Parker, 2003; Yuspahruddin et al., 2021). In the present study, an α of 0.86 was observed.

3.3. Statistical Tool

Regression analysis was then adopted as a statistical tool to test the hypotheses. Regression analysis is a parametric test; therefore, assumptions associated with its use were considered in the design of this study. For example, the Likert scaling format used to collect data met the requirement to collect data at the interval level. The data collected for this study were independent of each other, which met the independent response requirement (Nwanzu & Babalola, 2019). Scatter plots produced with IBM-SPSS on the data showed the linearity of the relationship between each pair of variables. The Shapiro-Wilk statistics were significant at 0.12, indicating a normal distribution. The Durbin-Watson test statistics of 1.93 and 1.97 were acceptable in autocorrelation (Field, 2018).

3.4. Control Variables

In the data analysis, sociodemographic factors of age and gender were included as control variables. These sociodemographic variables were treated as control variables; theories and empirical studies have linked them to this study's independent and dependent variables. For instance, social role theory (Eagly, 1987) accounts for gender differences. Socioemotional selectivity theory (Khetjenkarn & Agmapisarn, 2020) acknowledged age differences in social behaviour. Empirically, gender and age influence employee perceptions of voice (Korkmaz, 2020; Sağlam et al., 2019).

3.4.1. Common Method Variance

Data for this study were collected with self-report measures. Since self-report measures have the potential for common method variance (CMV), some design controls widely recommended in the literature were implemented. CMV refers to systematic variance shared between study observed variables attributable to the measurement method adopted rather than the constructs the variables represent (Cooper et al., 2020). The design

control adopted includes having the items in the dependent variable first on the questionnaire before the items in the independent variables, presenting the substantial variable of the study in different response options, ensuring the anonymity *and* confidentiality of the respondents, and making the questionnaire and the items clear, brief, and easy to comprehend (Liman et al., 2019; Nwanzu. & Babalola, 2020; Rodríguez-Ardura & Meseguer-Artola, 2020).

3.4.2. Ethical Considerations

The study was conducted among clearing agent employees at the Beitbridge border, Zimbabwe, and ethical issues were considered. The purpose of the study was made clear to the participants. For example, participants were informed that their participation was voluntary and that they could withdraw from the research should they wish to do so. In ensuring anonymity and confidentiality, participants' names or any form of identification were not requested or obtained. Participants were also assured that there would be no harm in participating in the study.

4. RESULTS

4.1. Reliability and Validity

The reliability of the internal consistency of the measures was tested with Cronbach's alpha. The coefficients obtained are presented in Table 1. Alpha statistics within $\alpha = 0.75$ and $\alpha = 0.86$ are considered satisfactory (Wagner & Skowronski, 2019). The scales adopted in the present study have a high acceptance and usage in the literature, indicating face and content validity (Karimi et al., 2020; Mirjana et al., 2018). The Cronbach's alpha statistics obtained in this study also supported the convergent validity of the measures (Field, 2018). The moderate Pearson r obtained on LEI and PBW and RBSE and PBW also supported the convergent validity of the measures. Table 1 also shows zero-order correlations in study variables. The zero-order correlation revealed a significant positive relationship between the variables. The most vital degree of relationship was between RBSE and PBW. The weakest relationship was between gender and LEI. The modest zero-order correlation between the predictors and the criterion variables indicates the absence of multicollinearity in the model.

Table 1: Mean, SD, Coefficient Alpha, and Zero-Order Correlations of The Study Variables

		$\bar{x}$	SD	α	No. of items	1	2	3	4
1	Gender					1			
2	Age					-0.24**	1		
3	LEI	89.13	14.67	0.86	16	-0.001	0.09	1	
4	RBSE	42.07	4.75	0.86	10	-0.02	0.15*	0.42**	1
5	PBW	28.67	3.22	0.78	23	-0.12	0.19**	0.33**	0.44**

*Note: ** < 0.001; * < 0.05*

Table 2 shows a simple regression analysis predicting PBW from LEI. Statistics show that LEI significantly predicted PBW ($\beta = 0.33$, 95% CI [0.04 - 0.10], $t = 5.08$, $p < 0.001$). Therefore, Hypothesis 1 was supported. The observed *B* value indicates that a one-unit increase in LEI brings a 0.07-unit increase in PBW. R^2 also indicates that LEI accounts for about a 12% variance in PBW, and R^2 of 0.12 indicates a significant effect. Analysis of variance test (ANOVA), $F (1; 199) = 25.87$, $p < 0.001$, indicates that the regression was statistically significant, which means that PBW can be predicted from LEI (good model). The slight difference between R^2 (0.12) and adjusted R^2 (0.11), which is 0.01, indicates good cross-validation; this model can be applied to other samples from the same population.

Table 2 also shows a simple regression analysis that predicts PBW from RBSE. Statistics show that RBSE significantly predicted PBW ($\beta = 0.45$, 95% CI [0.22 - 0.38], $t = 5.08$, $p < 0.001$). Therefore, Hypothesis 2 was supported. Analysis of the variance test (ANOVA), $F (1; 202) = 50.60$, $p < 0.001$, indicates that the regression was statistically significant, which means that PBW can be predicted from LEI (good model). The observed B value indicates that a one-unit increase in LEI brings a 0.30-unit increase in PBW. R^2 also indicates that LEI accounts for about 0.19% variance in PWB, and R^2 of 0.20 indicates a significant effect. The slight difference between R^2 (0.20) and adjusted R^2 (0.19, which is 0.01) indicates good cross-validation; this model can be applied to other samples from the same population.

Table 2: Simple Regression of LEI and RBSE in PBW

Model	B	SE	β	P	R^2	Adj R^2	Dublin Watson
Constant	21.96{19.33, 24.59}	1.33		0.001			
LEI	0.07 {0.04, 0.10}	0.01	0.33	0.001	0.12	0.11	1.93
Constant	15.88{12.13, 19.45}	1.80		0.001			
RBSE	0.30{.22, 0.38}	0.04	0.45	0.001	0.19	0.19	1.97

Criterion variable: PWB = proactive behaviour at work

Table 3 shows the variances of LEI and RBSE separately and jointly explained in PBW. The variable entered on the first block is LEI. For this block, R = 48, $p < 0.001$ indicates support for hypothesis 3. The R^2 for this block was 0.12, meaning LEI explains a 12% variance in PBW. The statistical significance of the *f*-ratio of 25.87 for this block or model is $p < 0.001$. This value is below the critical value of 0.05. The regression equation explained a significant proportion of PBW variance at this first stage. The variable entered on the second block is RBSE. Adjusted R^2 for this block or model is 0.21, meaning LEI and RBSE explain a 21% variance in PBW. The statistical significance of the f-ratio for this block is $p < 0.001$. This value is lower than the critical value of $p < 0.05$. The first and second steps of the regression equation explain a significant proportion of the PBW variance. The R statistics for the first and second blocks indicate that the correlation between LEI and PWB was 0.48, while RBSE and PWB were 0.15 (48-33). These statistics indicate that, compared to RBSE, LEI has a stronger relationship with PBW, supporting Hypothesis 4.

Table 3: Hierarchical Multiple Regression on the Contribution of LEI and RBSE to PBW

					Change Statistics					
Model	R	R^2	Adj R^2	SE	R^2 Change	F Change	df1	df2	Sig F Chang	Durbin Watson
1	0.33	0.12	0.11	3.06	0.12	25.87	1	199	0.001	
2	0.48	0.23	0.21	2.87	0.11	28.67	1	199	0.001	1.90

5. DISCUSSION

This study determined the effect of LEI and RBSE on PWB among employees from customs clearing companies in Zimbabwe. The study tested four hypotheses generated from the empirical and theoretical literature. Hypothesis 1 proposed that LEI positively affects PBW, and the collected data confirmed the model, which is in line with studies by Erkutlu and Chafra (2012), Gupta and Bajaj (2017), and Wang et al. (2019). Several plausible explanations for this pattern of observation abound in the literature. For instance, leaders with superior emotional appraisal skills can treat their employees with approval and respect, facilitating employee behaviours that benefit them and the organisation (Moss et al., 2006). Leaders with high emotional perceptions impart specific understanding and control in their workplace relationships, motivating employees to cherish their leader and display desirable outcomes (Wong & Law, 2002). Leaders with high emotional intelligence can realise their employees' needs; such leaders are likely to possess supportive behaviours that enhance proactivity (Rahim & Malik, 2010). Since emotional intelligence consciously and subconsciously enables the evaluation and adjustment of emotions, leaders with high emotional intelligence are likely to succeed in evoking positive behaviours among their employees (Zineldin & Hytter, 2012).

Hypothesis 2 proposed that RBSE positively affects PBW, and the data confirmed the model. Some related studies in the existing literature also reported similar observations (Hwang et al., 2015; Li, 2021; Sonnentag & Spychala, 2012; Yuspahruddin et al., 2021). Several factors explained the positive effect of RBSE on PBW. RBSE indicates confidence, which therefore assists employees in promoting being proactive and overcoming obstacles (Hwang et al., 2015; Parker et al., 2010). RBSE gives employees the confidence they need to adapt to proactivity outcomes. Employees with high RBSE are known to see opportunities in their environment and perceive an increased probability of success through proactive behaviour (Wu & Parker, 2017). Individuals with high RBSE believe that proactive behaviour will result in successful outcomes and are motivated to engage in proactive behaviour. On the contrary, individuals with low-role RBSE are less sure of their ability to take on

tasks outside their prescribed roles successfully, and they perceive proactive behaviours as carrying more risk (Griffin et al., 2010).

Hypothesis 3 proposed that LEI and RBSE would have a combined positive effect on PBW, and data analysis confirmed the model. Therefore, Hypothesis 3 was supported. This finding is related to Singh and Pathardikar's (2011) observation that personality traits and emotional intelligence jointly predict leadership effectiveness and the study by Estrada et al. (2016) that found personality variables and emotional intelligence significantly impact problem-solving styles. These findings indicated that when these factors are combined, they are favourably predisposed to PBW, thus likely resulting in a positive outcome.

Mathematically, the addition of two positives makes another positive. Hypothesis 4 proposed that LEI and RBSE will differ in their contribution to PBW. This hypothesis was supported. The difference was in favour of LEI**,** and this is because leadership in the organisation essentially controls the expression of personal characteristics (including personality) and the behaviour of the employees. In addition to the positive significant predictive relationship of LEI and RBSE on PBW, the observed effect sizes are large, indicating that the effect is essential and of practical value.

5.1. Theoretical Contribution

This study has contributed to the LEI, RBSE and PBW literature. When examining LEI and RBSE as predictors of PBW in a single study, this study has expanded the literature on the relationship between the three variables. This study supported social role theory (Eagly, 1987) and socio-emotional selectivity theory (Khetjenkarn & Agmapisarn, 2020) with the positive effect of LEI and RBSE on PBW when age and gender were controlled. The present study has the potential to contribute to theory and practise.

5.2. Limitations and Recommendations for Future Research

Since the self-report measure adopted in the present study is mainly associated with weaknesses such as social desirability bias, it is recommended that further studies collect data with interviews to obtain enough subjective feedback from participants. This study was carried out in one occupation, which limits implications for generalising the results. Therefore, it is recommended that further studies be carried out with other occupational groups and larger companies to determine whether LEI and RBSE on PBW would remain the same in different sectors and occupational groups. Furthermore, this study used a cross-sectional design with a weak potential for cause-effect interpretation. Therefore, it is recommended that future studies embark on a longitudinal study to determine whether the influence of LEI on PBW remains stable over time. Finally, this study was limited to examining the direct effects of LEI and RBSE on PBW. As expected, intervening factors are possible with the relationship between organisational behaviour variables. Therefore, it is recommended to examine plausible mediators and moderators. Some researchers (e.g., Gupta & Bajaj, 2017) have suggested the psychological climate as a mediating variable in LEI and innovative work behaviour.

5.3. Practical Implications

This study made observations that have practical value for organisational practises. First, LEI and RBSE independently and jointly impact PWB in an organisationally desirable direction. Second, although LEI and RBSE independently contribute positively to the employee expression of PBW, the former contributes more. A practical lesson from these findings and related others is that organisations need emotionally intelligent leaders with the characteristics that evoke PBW among employees. Providing organisations with emotionally intelligent leaders is achievable through recruitment, selection, and training processes. Some studies (e.g., Gilar-Corbi et al., 2018; Idowu & Adegboyega, 2020; Kotsou et al., 2019) have confirmed the efficacy of various methods and programmes. Another practical implication is the need for organisations to have high RBSE employees. High RBSE symbolises task confidence, and PBW results from felt task confidence in the employee. Again, organisations could have high RBSE through work design, recruitment, selection, and training processes. The efficacy of these practises been noted in the literature. For example, a longitudinal investigation revealed that as a member of an active improvement group, increased task control, breadth of training, improved quality of communication, and job enrichment were related to increased RBSE (Axtell & Parker, 2003; Parker, 1998).

5.4. Conclusions

The focus of this study was the influence of leaders' emotional intelligence and role breadth self-efficacy on proactive work behaviour. The stepwise multiple regression analysis results indicated that LE and RBSE contributed to proactive work behaviour. However, RBSE contributed the most. This clearly shows that an organisation with emotionally intelligent leaders and high RBSE employees is bound to produce proactive employees at work and thus enhance individual and organisational success.

REFERENCES

Andersson, K. (2015). *Proactivity at work.* Örebro University.

Arora, B. (2017). Importance of emotional intelligence in the workplace. *International Journal of Engineering and Applied Sciences*, *4*(1), 43- 45.

Asadullah, M., Azam, K., Mehnaz, R., & Hussain, M. (2020). Moderating role of leaders' emotional intelligence in job characteristics and employees' organisational citizenship behaviour relationship: Evidence from construction sector of Pakistan. *Journal of Business and Tourism*, *6*(1), 19-30.

Axtell, C. M., & Parker, S. K. (2003). Promoting role breadth self-efficacy through involvement, work redesign, and training. *Human Relations*, *56*(1), 113-131. https://doi.org/10.1177/0018726703056001452

Axtell, R. (2000). *Why agents? on the varied motivations for agent computing in the social sciences.* Brookings Institution Working Paper, Issue. C. o. S. a. E. Dynamics.

Bartz, D., Greenwood, S., Hall, L., & Rice, P. (2018). Emotional intelligence: A necessity to leaders' effectiveness. *International Journal of Management, Business, and Administration*, *21*, 1-12.

Black, J., Kim, K., Rhee, S., Wang, K., & Sakchutchawan, S. (2019). Self-efficacy and emotional intelligence: Influencing team cohesion to enhance team performance. *Team Performance Management*, 25(1/2), 100-119. https://doi.org/10.1108/TPM-01-2018-0005.

Bless, C., Higson-Smith, C., & Kagee, A. (2013). *Fundamentals of social research methods: An African perspective* (5th ed.). Juta and Company Ltd.

Boerrigter, C. (2017). *What makes employees highly engaged and performing? Leader's emotional intelligence, service climate, and psychological capital.*The University of Twente.

Callahan, H. (2016). *Emotional intelligence: A leader's impact on productivity in a distribution environment.* Brandman University.

Cheah, S., Li, S., & Ho, Y.-P. (2019). Mutual support, role breadth self-efficacy, and sustainable job performance of workers in young firms. *Sustainability*, *11*(12), 3333. https://doi.org/10.3390/su11123333

Chirania, V., & Dhal, S. K. (2017). A study of the relationship between emotional intelligence and leadership abilities: Literature review. *International Journal of Business Management and Leadership*, *8*(1), 23-31.

Coetzee, M., & Schreuder, D. (2013). Career anchors and emotional intelligence as predictors of human resource staff graduateness skills and employability attributes. *South African Journal of Labour Relations*, *37*(2), 97-117.

Cooper, B., Eva, N., Fazlelahi, F. Z., Newman, A., Lee, A., & Obschonka, M. (2020). Common method variance in vocational behaviour research: Reviewing the state of the literature. *Journal of Vocational Behaviour*, *121*, 103472. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jvb.2020.103472

Cooper, J. N. (2018). *The influence of emotional intelligence and personality traits on the effective leadership* University of Texas at Tyle. http://hdl.handle.net/10950/1165

Crant, J. M. (2000). Proactive behaviour in organisations. *Journal of Management*, *26*(3), 435-462. https://doi.org/10.1177/014920630002600304

Davidescu, A. A., Apostu, S.-A., Paul, A., & Casuneanu, I. (2020). Work flexibility, job satisfaction, and job performance among Romanian employees: Implications for sustainable human resource management. *Sustainability*, *12*(15), 6086. https://doi.org/10.3390/su12156086

Davies, M., Stankov, L., & Roberts, R. D. (1998). Emotional intelligence: in search of an elusive construct. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *75*(4), 989–1015. https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.75.4.989

Den Hartog, D. N., & Belschak, F. D. (2012). When does transformational leadership enhance employee proactive behaviour? The role of autonomy and role breadth self-efficacy. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *97*(1), 194-202. https://doi.org/10.1037/a0024903

Deng, C., Liao, S., Liu, Z., Zhang, Y., & Bao, Y. (2020). Informal status and taking charge: The different roles of OBSE, P-J fit, and P-S fit. *Frontiers in Psychology*, *11*(1994). https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2020.01994

Eagly, A. (1987). *Sex differences in social behaviour: A social-role interpretation*. Lawrence Earlbaum Associates.

Ellis, A. M. (2012). *The role of psychological resources in the relationship between work stressors and proactive behaviour* Portland State University].

Erkutlu, H., & Chafra, J. (2012). The impact of team empowerment on proactivity. *Journal of Health Organisation and Management*, *26*(5), 560-577. https://doi.org/10.1108/14777261211256918

Estrada, C. R., Enriquez, D. I. D. L. T., & Madrazo, S. A. D. (2016). The influence of personality and emotional intelligence on the negotiation style of Mexican business undergraduate students. *Repositorio de la Red Internacional de Investigadores en Competitividad*, *10*, 1573-1592.

Field, A. (2018). *Discovering statistics using IBM SPSS statistics* (5th ed.). Sage.

Frese, M., & Fay, D. (2001). 4. Personal initiative: An active performance concept for work in the 21st century. *Research in Organisational Behaviour*, *23*, 133-187. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0191-3085(01)23005-6

Frese, M., Fay, D., Hilburger, T., Leng, K., & Tag, A. (1997). The concept of personal initiative: Operationalisation, reliability, and validity in two German samples. *Journal of Occupational and Organisational Psychology*, *70*(2), 139-161. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.2044-8325.1997.tb00639.x

Gilar-Corbi, R., Pozo-Rico, T., Pertegal-Felices, M. L., & Sanchez, B. (2018). Emotional intelligence training intervention among trainee teachers: A quasi-experimental study. *Psicologia: Reflexão e Crítica*, *31*(1). https://doi.org/10.1186/s41155-018-0112-1

Grant, A. M., & Ashford, S. J. (2008). The dynamics of proactivity at work. *Research in Organisational Behaviour*, *28*, 3-34. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.riob.2008.04.002

Griffin, M. A., Neal, A., & Parker, S. K. (2007). A new model of work role performance: Positive behaviour in uncertain and interdependent contexts. *Academy of Management Journal*, *50*(2), 327-347. https://doi.org/10.5465/amj.2007.24634438

Griffin, M. A., Parker, S. K., & Mason, C. M. (2010). Leader vision and the development of adaptive and proactive performance: A longitudinal study. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *95*(1), 174–182. https://doi.org/10.1037/a0017263

Gupta, R., & Bajaj, B. (2017). The relationship between leader's emotional intelligence and employee creativity: A conceptual framework of mechanism. *Procedia Computer Science*, *122*, 471-477. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.procs.2017.11.395

Han, S. (2020). Mediation effects of calling and role breadth self-efficacy on the relationship between supportive supervision and job crafting of nurses in general hospitals. *Journal of Korean Academy of Nursing Administration*, *26*(3), 251-261. https://doi.org/10.11111/jkana.2020.26.3.251

Hasan, Y., & Eldous, H. (2020). The role of personality traits and situational factors as determinants of aggression. *The Open Psychology Journal*, *13*(1), 282-288. https://doi.org/10.2174/1874350102013010282

Hashemi, S. M. K., Nadi, H. K., Hosseini, S. M., & Rezvanfar, A. (2012). Agricultural personnel's proactive behaviour: Effects of self-efficacy perceptions and perceived organisational support. *International Business and Management*, *4*(1), 83-91. https://doi.org/10.3968/j.ibm.1923842820120401.2170

Hong, Y., Liao, H., Raub, S., & Han, J. H. (2016). What it takes to get proactive: An integrative multilevel model of the antecedents of personal initiative. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *101*(5), 687–701. https://doi.org/10.1037/apl0000064

Hwang, P.-C., Han, M.-C., & Chiu, S.-F. (2015). Role breadth self-efficacy and foci of proactive behaviour: Moderating role of collective, relational, and individual self-concept. *The Journal of Psychology*, *149*(8), 846-865. https://doi.org/10.1080/00223980.2014.985284

Idowu, A. O., & Adegboyega, L. O. (2020). Assessing and Enhancing Emotional Intelligence among Nigerian Librarians. *Mimbar Pendidikan: Jurnal Indonesia untuk Kajian Pendidikan*, *5*(2), 101-116. https://doi.org/10.2121/mp.v5i2.1352.g1171

Ijigu, A. W., Alemu, A. E., & Kuhil, A. M. (2023). High-performance work system and employee work performance: A moderated mediation model of ambidextrous leadership and employee ambidexterity. *International Journal of Business Science and Applied Management*, 18(1), 47-62.

Jia, J., Yan, J., Jahanshahi, A. A., Lin, W., & Bhattacharjee, A. (2020). What makes employees more proactive? Roles of job embeddedness, the perceived strength of the HRM system, and empowering leadership. *Asia Pacific Journal of Human Resources*, *58*(1), 107-127. https://doi.org/10.1111/1744-7941.12249

Karimi, R., Zawawi, D., Aziz, Y. A., & Krauss, S. E. (2020). The antecedent and consequence of emotional labour among frontline employees in Malaysian hotels. *International Journal of Academic Research in Business and Social Sciences*, *10*(16), 317-331. http://dx.doi.org/10.6007/IJARBSS/v10-i16/8315

Khetjenkarn, S., & Agmapisarn, C. (2020). The effects of emotional labour on the outcomes of the job and the organisation: Do the differences in age and the manager's emotional intelligence have any impact in the hotel business? *European Journal of Tourism Research*, *25*, 2504.

Kim, D.-H., Wang, C., Ahn, H. S., & Bong, M. (2015). English language learners' self-efficacy profiles and relationship with self-regulated learning strategies. *Learning and Individual Differences*, *38*, 136-142. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.lindif.2015.01.016

Korkmaz, İ. H. (2020). Innovative behaviour patterns of employees in terms of demographic characteristics, professional experiences, and educational status: An investigation on the Turkish banking sector. *OPUS Uluslararası Toplum Araştırmaları Dergisi -International Journal of Society Researches*, 1-1. https://doi.org/10.26466/opus.642734

Kotsou, I., Mikolajczak, M., Heeren, A., Grégoire, J., & Leys, C. (2019). Improving emotional intelligence: A systematic review of existing work and future challenges. *Emotion Review*, *11*(2), 151-165. https://doi.org/10.1177/1754073917735902

LePine, J. A., & Van Dyne, L. (2001). Voice and cooperative behaviour as contrasting forms of contextual performance: Evidence of differential relationships with Big five personality characteristics and cognitive ability. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *86*(2), 326. https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.86.2.326

Li, D. (2021). Linking humble leadership and proactive behaviours of frontline service employees in the hospitality industry: The influences of role-breath self-efficacy. 6th International Conference on Social Sciences and Economic Development (ICSSED 2021),

Liman, J. A., Yonla, M. N., Ochola, O., Sortu, M. S., Longdi, D. J., & Bakut, C. J. (2019). The role of emotional intelligence among principals of secondary schools: A case of Plateau State Nigeria. *European Journal of Business and Innovation Research*, *7*(5), 26-41.

Ling, N.-P., Bandar, N. F. A., Halim, F. A., & Muda, A. L. (2017). Proactive behaviour as a mediator in the relationship between quality of work-life and career success. *International Journal of Business and Society*, *18*(S4), 701-709.

López-Domínguez, M., Enache, M., Sallan, J. M., & Simo, P. (2013). Transformational leadership as an antecedent of change-oriented organisational citizenship behaviour. *Journal of Business Research*, *66*(10), 2147-2152. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusres.2013.02.041

Lou, H. (2020). The effect of role breadth self-efficacy on the employee taking charge: The mediating role of willingness to take risks. *World Scientific Research Journal*, *6*(3), 166-172. https://doi.org/10.6911/WSRJ.202003_6(3).0021

Martin, S. L., Liao, H., & Campbell, E. M. (2013). Directive versus empowering leadership: A field experiment comparing impacts on task proficiency and proactivity. *Academy of Management Journal, 56*(5), 1372-1395. https://doi.org/10.5465/amj.2011.0113

Mayer, J. D., Salovey, P., & Caruso, D. R. (2008). Emotional intelligence: New ability or eclectic traits? *American Psychologist*, *63*(6), 503–517. https://doi.org/10.1037/0003-066X.63.6.503

McCullough, G. E. (2015). *The influence of emotional intelligence on leadership emergence and leadership styles.* Western Kentucky University. http://digitalcommons.wku.edu/stu_hon_theses/549

Mellahi, K., & Harris, L. C. (2016). Response rates in business and management research: An overview of current practice and suggestions for future direction. *British Journal of Management*, *27*(2), 426-437. https://doi.org/10.1111/1467-8551.12154

Memon, M. A., Ting, H., Cheah, J.-H., Thurasamy, R., Chuah, F., & Cham, T. H. (2020). Sample size for survey research: Review and recommendations. *Journal of Applied Structural Equation Modeling*, *4*(2), i-xx.

Mirjana, P. B., Ana, A., & Marjana, M.-S. (2018). Examining determinants of entrepreneurial intentions in Slovenia: Applying the theory of planned behaviour and an innovative cognitive style. *Economic research-Ekonomska istraživanja*, *31*(1), 1453-1471. https://doi.org/10.1080/1331677x.2018.1478321

Morrison, E. W., & Phelps, C. C. (1999). Taking charge at work: Extrarole efforts to initiate workplace change. *Academy of Management Journal*, *42*(4), 403-419. https://doi.org/10.5465/257011

Moss, S., Ritossa, D., & Ngu, S. (2006). The effect of follower regulatory focus and extraversion on leadership behaviour: The role of emotional intelligence. *Journal of Individual Differences*, *27*(2), 93-107. https://doi.org/10.1027/1614-0001.27.2.93

Nguyen, H. S., Laufer, D., & Jayne, K. (2020). The effectiveness of guilt and shame appeals on health communications: The moderating role of self-construal and personal cultural orientation. *Australasian Marketing Journal*, *28*(4), 310-324. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ausmj.2020.08.002

Nsereko, I., Balunywa, W., Munene, J., Orobia, L., & Muhammed, N. (2018). Personal initiative: Its power in social entrepreneurial venture creation. *Cogent Business and Management*, *5*(1), 1443686. https://doi.org/10.1080/23311975.2018.1443686

Nurjaman, K., Sandi Marta, M., Eliyana, A., Kurniasari, D., & Kurniasari, D. (2019). Proactive work behaviour and innovative work behaviour: Moderating effect of job characteristics. *Humanities and Social Sciences Reviews*, *7*(6), 373-379. https://doi.org/10.18510/hssr.2019.7663

Nwanzu, C. L., & Babalola, S. S. (2019). Psychological capital, task autonomy and innovative work behaviour among public organisation employees. *International Journal of Work Organisation and Emotion*, *10*(4), 322-338. https://doi.org/10.1504/IJWOE.2019.106892.

Nwanzu, C. L., & Babalola, S. S. (2020). Examining the moderating role of workload in the relationship between emotional intelligence and caring behaviour in healthcare organisations. *International Journal of Business Science and Applied Management*, 15(1), 17-29.

Ohly, S., & Fritz, C. (2007). Challenging the status quo: What motivates proactive behaviour? *Journal of Occupational and Organisational Psychology*, *80*(4), 623-629. https://doi.org/10.1348/096317907x180360

Ölçer, F., Florescu, M. S., & Nãstase, M. (2014). The effects of transformational leadership and emotional intelligence of managers on organisational citizenship behaviours of employees. *Revista De Management Comparat International/Review of International Comparative Management*, *15*(4), 385-401.

Osborne, S., & Hammoud, M. S. (2017). Effective employee engagement in the workplace. *International Journal of Applied Management and Technology*, *16*(1), 50–67. https://doi.org/10.5590/IJAMT.2017.16.1.04

Parker, S. K. (1998). Enhancing role breadth self-efficacy: The roles of job enrichment and other organisational interventions. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *83*(6), 835. https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.83.6.835

Parker, S. K., & Collins, C. G. (2010). Taking stock: Integrating and differentiating multiple proactive behaviours. *Journal of Management*, *36*(3), 633-662. https://doi.org/10.1177/0149206308321554

Parker, S. K., Bindl, U. K., & Strauss, K. (2010). Making things happen: A model of proactive motivation. *Journal of Management*, *36*(4), 827-856. https://doi.org/10.1177/0149206310363732

Parker, S. K., Williams, H. M., & Turner, N. (2006). Modelling the antecedents of proactive behaviour at work. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *91*(3), 636–652. https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.91.3.636

Qahir, A., Karim, J., & Kakar, A. S. (2022). The mediating role of self-efficacy between emotional intelligence and employees' creativity. *Pakistan Social Sciences Review*, 6(2), 209-220. http://doi.org/10.35484/pssr.2022(6-II)19.

Rahim, S. H., & Malik, M. I. (2010). Emotional intelligence and organisational performance: A case study of banking sector in Pakistan. *International Journal of Business and Management*, *5*(10). https://doi.org/10.5539/ijbm.v5n10p191

Rodríguez-Ardura, I., & Meseguer-Artola, A. (2020). How to prevent, detect and control common-method variance in electronic commerce research. *Journal of Theoretical and Applied Electronic Commerce Research*, *15*(2), i-v. https://doi.org/10.4067/S0718-18762020000200101

Sağlam, M., Ülgen, B., & Mohammadi Bazargani, S. (2019). The research on the voice and silence behaviours of Iranian and Turkish employees according to their demographic characteristics. *Ege Akademik Bakis (Ege Academic Review)*, *19*(2), 205-220. https://doi.org/10.21121/eab.511920

Shapiro, D. L. (2008). Revisiting the link between leaders' emotional intelligence and transformational leadership: The moderating role of emotional intensity. Academy of Management Proceedings,

Singh, A. P., & Pathardikar, A. D. (2011). Effect of personality traits and emotional intelligence on leadership effectiveness. *Management Convergence*, *1*(1), 33-41.

Sistad, L. (2020). Emotional intelligence and leadership: Which impact does emotional intelligence have on leadership? In (pp. 1-25): Faculty of Human Sciences, Universität Regensburg.

Sökmen, Y., & Sarikaya, İ. (2022). The mediating role of self-efficacy between emotional intelligence and job satisfaction of primary school teachers. *European Review of Applied Psychology*, *72*(4), 100779. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.erap.2022.100779.

Sonnentag, S., & Spychala, A. (2012). Job control and job stressors as predictors of proactive work behaviour: Is role breadth self-efficacy the link? *Human Performance*, *25*(5), 412-431. https://doi.org/10.1080/08959285.2012.721830

Srikanth, P. B., & Jomon, M. G. (2015). Role breadth and role performance: An empirical investigation. *Management and Labour Studies*, *40*(3-4), 284-301. https://doi.org/10.1177/0258042x16634509

Strauss, K., Griffin, M. A., & Rafferty, A. E. (2009). Proactivity directed toward the team and organisation: The role of leadership, commitment, and role-breadth self-efficacy. *British Journal of Management*, *20*(3), 279-291. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-8551.2008.00590.x

Sun, G., & Lyu, B. (2022). Relationship between emotional intelligence and self-efficacy among college students: The mediating role of coping styles. *Discover Psychology*, 2(1), 42. https://doi.org/10.1007/s44202-022-00055-1.

Tsai, M.-T., Tsai, C.-L., & Wang, Y.-C. (2011). A study on the relationship between leadership style, emotional intelligence, self-efficacy, and organisational commitment: A case study of the Banking Industry in Taiwan. *African Journal of Business Management*, *5*(13), 5319-5329. https://doi.org/10.5897/AJBM10.932

Tsang, S., Royse, C. F., & Terkawi, A. S. (2017). Guidelines for developing, translating, and validating a questionnaire in perioperative and pain medicine. *Saudi Journal of Anaesthesia*, *11*(Suppl 1), S80. https://doi.org/10.4103/sja.SJA_203_17

Turner, F. J. (2017). *Social work treatment: Interlocking theoretical approaches*. Oxford University Press.

Van Dyne, L., & LePine, J. A. (1998). Helping and voice extra-role behaviours: Evidence of construct and predictive validity. *Academy of Management Journal*, *41*(1), 108-119. https://doi.org/10.5465/256902

Van Rooy, D. L., & Viswesvaran, C. (2004). Emotional intelligence: A meta-analytic investigation of predictive validity and nomological net. *Journal of Vocational Behaviour*, *65*(1), 71-95. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0001-8791(03)00076-9

Wagner, M. F., & Skowronski, J. J. (2019). Reliability and validity of measurement in the social and behavioural sciences. In J. E. Edlund & A. L. Nichols (Eds.), *Advanced research methods for the social and behavioural sciences* (pp. 21-37). Cambridge University Press

Wang, S., Wu, M., & Pan, W. (2019). The effects and mechanism of leader's emotional intelligence on team innovation performance. 5th International Conference on Social Science and Higher Education (ICSSHE 2019).

Whitehurst, J. (2015). *The open organisation: Igniting passion and performance*. Harvard Business Review Press.

Wong, C.-S., & Law, K. S. (2002). The effects of leader and follower emotional intelligence on performance and attitude. *The Leadership Quarterly*, *13*(3), 243-274. https://doi.org/10.1016/s1048-9843(02)00099-1

Wu, C.-H., & Parker, S. K. (2017). The role of leader support in facilitating proactive work behaviour. *Journal of Management*, *43*(4), 1025-1049. https://doi.org/10.1177/0149206314544745

Yuspahruddin, A., Abbas, H., Pahala, I., Eliyana, A., Arief, Z., & Gougui, A. (2021). Proactive personality and proactive work behaviour: Mediating role of role breadth self-efficacy in State Detention Center (RUTAN). *Systematic Reviews in Pharmacy*, *12*(1), 1053-1059.

Zaman, U., Nawaz, S., Shafique, O., & Rafique, S. (2021). Making of rebel talent through workplace ostracism: A moderated-mediation model involving emotional intelligence, organisational conflict, and knowledge sharing behaviour. *Cogent Business and Management*, *8*(1), 1941586. https://doi.org/10.1080/23311975.2021.1941586

Zhang, Y., Zhang, L., Zhu, J., Liu, C.-H., Yang, M., & Liu, G. (2020). Group leader emotional intelligence and group performance: A multilevel perspective. *Asian Business and Management*. https://doi.org/10.1057/s41291-020-00123-1

Zineldin, M., & Hytter, A. (2012). Leaders' negative emotions and leadership styles influencing subordinates' well-being. *The International Journal of Human Resource Management*, *23*(4), 748-758. https://doi.org/10.1080/09585192.2011.606114