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This study investigated the relationship between trait emotional intelligence and burnout among managers and non-managers in the humanitarian sector in Lebanon. We explored trait emotional intelligence as it relates to burnout while controlling for status (managerial and non-managerial) and working from home. The study's results suggest a significant inverse relationship between the average score of trait emotional intelligence and burnout as total score. That is the higher the trait emotional intelligence score reported, the lower is the burnout score. Further analysis suggested that there is a significant relationship between trait emotional intelligence as a total score as well as the subscales burnout. This aligns with the studies on positive psychology and linkages between well-being and positive emotions. While controlling for employment status, results indicated that employment status (manager and non-manager) did not affect emotional exhaustion, which was unexpected. Finally, those working from home had higher levels of burnout than those who did not.
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INTRODUCTION

While numerous research articles have been published examining the antecedents of turnover, few have examined the consequences of turnover (Holtom, Mitchell, Lee, & Eberly, 2008). This research reveals that high levels of employee turnover can have negative effects on business-unit performance. The COVID-19 pandemic had a domino effect on the world’s economy as poverty and inequality soared while livelihoods deteriorated (Golden, 2020). As a result of this inequality, along with subsequent crises facing the world, the pressure on the humanitarian field increased (United Nations News, Economic Development, 2020) as it became more challenging to meet the exponentially increasing needs of the communities (Driss, 2020; Poole et al., 2020). In the case of Lebanon, on top of the COVID-19 pandemic, the country had been facing unprecedented economic and social crises (World Bank, 2022). This situation was followed by the explosion of Beirut on August 4th, 2020 (Human Rights Watch, World Report 2021, “Lebanon events
Various sectors had to adapt differently – some were burdened more than ever; others were facing a different challenge. Consequently, it was bound by various constructs, be it occupational, emotional and, social, among others. With many life changes occurring concurrently followed by the increase in occupational burdens two constructs prevail: Emotional Intelligence and Burnout rate.

Due to contextual changes, 2020 has been characterized with an increase in burnout rates standing at 72% post-pandemic compared to 42% pre-pandemic on a global level (Lesser A.L., Limeade Institute, 2020). Thus, it negatively impacts job performance, whether on managerial or non-managerial levels. However, there is a dearth in research on burnout in Lebanon. From an organizational perspective, if emotional intelligence impact employees’ performance, motivation, and job satisfaction positively, then it is worth examining how emotional intelligence and in particular trait emotional intelligence can affect burnout rates among managers and non-managers (Lopez & Extremera, 2017; Lee, J. J., & Ok, C., 2012; Zeidner, Matthews, & Roberts, 2012). This study was subject to the current contextual changes to better understand the reasons and justifications for the current increase in burnout rates (Lesser A.L., 2020; Vlachou et al., 2016; Njoroge & Yazdanifard, 2014; Malik, 2013; Brackett et al., 2011; Zampetakis & Moustakis, 2011, Bratton et al., 2011, Davis, 2011). Therefore, this study aimed to explore the effect of trait emotional intelligence on the total burnout rate among managers and non-managers in the humanitarian field in Lebanon. The study explored the relationship between trait emotional intelligence to burnout, whilst controlling for status (managerial and non-managerial) and working from home.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Theoretical Foundation

Positive psychology was inspired from the humanistic movement that became popular in 1960 (Bar-on, 2010). The movement resulted in a shift from focusing on psychopathology to enhancing human development, which constitutes the basis of positive psychology nowadays. Positive psychology is linked to building strengths in life that contribute to the success of individuals, communities, and societies (Li, C., & XU, J., 2019; Maddux, 2002; Seligman and Csikszentmihalyi, 2000). It flourished with its main topic of well-being as it offered an expanded dimension to the continuity of well-being (Li, C., & XU, J., 2019; Bar-On 2010). According to the Positive Psychology Center, positive psychology is “the scientific study of positive characteristics and strengths that enable individuals to thrive. It is based on the belief that people want to lead meaningful and fulfilling lives, cultivate what is best within themselves, and enhance their experiences of love, work, and play.” (Positive Psychology Center, 2009). Thus, it includes self-regard, self-acceptance, the ability to understand others’ feelings, emotional self-control, and the capacity for interpersonal interaction (Positive Psychology Center, 2009; Gable & Haidt, 2005; Seligman et al., 2005). Moving forward, Seligman (2011) developed the well-being positive psychology-based theory by proposing the five-dimensional PERMA model of well-being: Positive emotions, Engagement, Relationships, Meaning and Accomplishment. As a result, a degree of overlap and link between positive psychology and emotional intelligence was identified.

Trait Emotional Intelligence

Emotional intelligence (EI) is the ability to understand, acknowledge, and manage one’s feelings. Those of the other, allowing them to build on each other’s common goals in a constructive and transparent environment and establishing positive relationships (Goleman, 1995). In organizational studies, EI is a predictor of several organizational outcomes, such as job performance, job satisfaction, organizational ownership, and organizational commitment (Gong Z. et al., 2019; Khalid et al., 2018; Bahrani, 2017; Rexhepi et al., 2017; Alferaih, 2015; Baloch et al., 2014; Seo et al., 2012; Brackett et al., 2011). Specifically, EI has been linked positively with supervisors to subordinates strategies of handling conflict, positive work attitudes, work outcomes, altruistic behaviors, cooperation, commitment, and creativity (Aziz et al., 2020; Kim & Park, 2020; Jain & Duggal, 2018; Ahmad et al., 2017; Bahrani, 2017; Carmeli, 2003; Rahim et al., 2002; Cherniss, 2001). Moreover, 90% of the difference between excellent performance leaders and other average leaders is attributed to EI skills (Walter et al., 2011). Trait Emotional Intelligence (TEI) was one of
several models that were developed to elaborate more on the concept of EI (Petrides & Furnham, 2001). TEI (or emotional self-efficacy) refers to a collection of behavioral characteristics and self-perceptions concerning one’s ability to recognize, process, and utilize emotion-laden information (Petrides, Frederickson, & Furnham, 2004). The model includes four different subscales: Well-Being (WB), Self-Control (SC), Emotionality (EMO) and Sociability (SO) (Trait EI – TEIQue Test, K.V. Petrides 2010; Petrides, K. V., Furnham, A., & Mavroveli, S., 2007; Petrides, 2001). WB refers to feelings across time based around achievements, self-regard, and expectations (Trait EI - TEIQue Test, K.V. Petrides 2010). Self-Control (SC) refers to regulating and having control over emotions, impulses, and stress (Trait EI - TEIQue Test, K.V. Petrides 2010). Emotionality (EMO) refers to the ability to perceive, express, and connect with emotions in self and others, which can be used in creating successful interpersonal relationships (Trait EI - TEIQue Test, K.V. Petrides 2010). Sociability (SO) refers to being socially assertive and aware, managing others’ emotions, and effective communication and participating in social situations (Trait EI - TEIQue Test, K.V. Petrides 2010). TEI stands out from other models of EI because it is rooted in the personality domain rather than cognitive and social domains included in other models. Additionally, the different aspects of TEI relate to the constructs of happiness, optimism, adaptability, and well-being associated with positive psychology (Li, C., & XU, J., 2019; Wachtel, 2016). Therefore, TEI takes center stage in organizational strategy since organizations nowadays are encouraging employees and managers to improve performance and efficiency. It is a relevant skill in organizations with continuously changing behaviors and motivations, especially COVID-19 (Melinda, 2021). On the other hand, to improve performance, adapt to changes or achieve organizational goals, some employees and/or managers overwhelm and overwork themselves. In other words, they put themselves at the risk of “Burnout”.

**Burnout**

“Burn-out is an expectational mediated, job-related, dysphoric and dysfunctional state in an individual without major psychopathology who has (1) functioned for a time at adequate performance and effectual levels in the same job situation and who (2) will not recover to previous levels without outside help or environmental rearrangement” (Brill, 1984). Burnout is characterized by three dimensions: Emotional Exhaustion (EE), Depersonalization (DP) and personal accomplishment (PA) (World Health Organization, 2019). EE refers to feelings of energy depletion or exhaustion. DP refers to increased mental distance from one’s job, or feelings of negativism or cynicism related to one’s job. PA refers to reduced professional efficacy (PA).

Burnout likelihood augments feelings and practices of depersonalization, inefficiency and negative aspects increase concurrently. In general, highly demanding jobs or pejorative work environments may deplete employees’ physiological and psychological aspects, leading to burnout (Xanthopoulou, D. et al., 2007). Furthermore, when managers fail to support employees and working environments are too challenging and demanding, employees become stressed, their motivation may decline. Hence, they would feel dissatisfied, depressed, and burnt-out (Lee, J. J., & Ok, C., 2012). This situation was exacerbated when the COVID-19 pandemic began, switching to remote working and leading to a work-life imbalance as offices shifted home, thus, augmenting the likelihood of burnout (Kniffin et al., 2021; Bapuji et al., 2020; Hayes et al., 2020; Ayyala et al., 2020; Wilke et al., 2020).

Among professional sectors most prone to burnout are humanitarian workers (NGOs) (Jachens et al., 2018; Eriksson et al., 2013; Connorton, Perry, Hemenway, & Miller, 2011). The humanitarian sector is defined as organized entities or voluntary groups that are functionally independent of, and do not represent, a government or state normally devoted to humanitarian, policy reform and human rights causes (Relief Web Glossary of Humanitarian Terms, 2008). Examples consist of Non-Governmental Organization (NGOs,) International NGOs, UN agencies, Development Agencies, and the European Union. These entities share a mandate to aid, support and protect vulnerable and marginalized people in some of the world’s most challenging political, social, economic, and technological environments. Subsequently, the nature of humanitarian work is associated with the pressures and challenges that may result in chronic stress and burnout (Ager et al., 2012; Eriksson et al., 2013).
Relationship Between Trait Emotional Intelligence and Burnout

Examining the above, it is critical to highlight that there exists a correlation between TEI and burnout rates. Having trait emotional intelligence skills have increasingly been considered as a helpful way to enhance stress resilience, mental health and was directly linked to positive psychology (Wachtel, 2016; Kong et al., 2013; Augusto et al., 2010; Mikolajczak et al., 2007; Brackett & Katulak, 2006; Liu et al., 2003). Meaning, that the higher you score on trait emotional intelligence the lower your risk of burnout. Employees with high emotional intelligence have better self-perception of social ability and more successful interpersonal relationships with less interpersonal aggression and problems (Siegling et al., 2014; Kong et al., 2013; Augusto et al., 2010; Mayer et al., 2008). These skills help employees relate and understand their colleagues and customers, making them less prone to burnout from interpersonal relationships (Li et al., 2019; Mayer et al., 2008).

To sum it up, a negative relationship exists between EI and burnout in all their dimensions. However, there seems to be little or no research examining how TEI can affect burnout rates of both managers and non-managers in the humanitarian sector in Lebanon in light of the COVID-19 pandemic. Studying the previously mentioned relationship within the current contextual change from COVID-19 and increasing stress on both the humanitarian sector can result with increasing and insightful answers, which in turn leads to a better understanding of reasons and mitigation for spikes in burnout rate. Thus, this study aimed to analyze the relationship between TEI and burnout rates among managers and non-managers in the humanitarian sector in Lebanon.

FIGURE 1
CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK
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Figure 1 depicts the relationship that this study was based on. Our main research question was:

Research Question: Does TEI affect burnout as a total score among both managers and non-managers in the humanitarian field in Lebanon whilst controlling for the effects of status and working from home experience?
Specifically, what subscales of TEI have the largest impact on burnout as total score? What subscales of TEI have the largest impact on the various subscales of burnout? Thus, testing the following major hypothesis for managers and non-managers:

**H1:** There is an inverse relationship between TEI and burnout as total score. The higher the TEI score, the lower is the burnout score.

**H2:** There is an inverse relationship between TEI and Emotional Exhaustion (EE) dimension of Burnout. The higher the TEI score, the lower is EE.

**H3:** There is an inverse relationship between TEI and Depersonalization (DP) dimension of Burnout. The higher the TEI score, the lower is DP.

**H4:** There is a direct relationship between TEI and Personal Accomplishment (PA) dimension of Burnout. The higher the TEI score, the higher is PA.

**METHOD**

**Sample and Procedure**

The population of interest in this study were workers (managers and non-managers) in the humanitarian sector in Lebanon who were currently employed or have been employed since March 31st, 2020, or earlier - coinciding before the COVID-19 pandemic lockdown. According to literature, the humanitarian field constitutes a challenging work environment linked with pressure on different levels, exacerbating burnout among employees (Ager et al., 2012; Eriksson et al., 2013). With the current situation in Lebanon, humanitarian workers are facing increasing stress. Thus, examining the situation would result with insightful answers and solutions for burnout in the field. According to Bartlett (2001), it is recommended to collect 5 responses per statement in the questionnaire; hence, based on the number of statements measuring the independent (30 statements) and dependent variables (22 statements) we aimed to reach 255 responses as a final sample size using the stratified random sampling technique (Ajay S. & Micah B., 2014).

To collect the data, we used pre-existing scales to measure TEI and Burnout through Likert scale survey questions developed on Survey Monkey. When piloting the survey, we modified some wordings for the respondents to better understand the statements, the average duration of the survey was reduced to 9 minutes and demographic information were put towards the end of the survey to ensure that participants would complete the survey and to avoid response fatigue bias. To ensure respondent anonymity, the survey was shared through a unique usage link in both English and Arabic, via email directly sent to the human resource department of the targeted entity, which was then shared with the different participants.

**Measures**

To measure TEI, we used the Trait Emotional Intelligence Questionnaire - TEIQue SF - (K.V. Petrides, 2009; Petrides and Furnham, 2001) consisting of a set of 30 statements of which 8 statements measuring EMO of which 5 were reverse coded, 6 statements measuring SO of which 3 were reverse coded, 6 statements measuring SC of which 3 were reverse coded, 6 statements measuring WB of which 2 were reverse coded and 4 statements measuring EI in general of which 2 were reverse coded. Respondents stated their level of agreement on a Likert scale from 1 to 7 such that Completely Disagree (1) to Completely Agree (7). The TEIQue test measures TEI thoroughly and has been cited in more than 2,000 academic studies, with wide-ranging evidence supporting its reliability and validity (Andrei et al., 2016). Although there exists a long and a short version of the TEIQue, in this research we used the shorter version as it has a better completion rate than the longer one (Bowling et al., 2020; Dr. Berdie, 1973), and has proved to be significantly reliable, valid and accurate (Pérez-Díaz, P. A., et al., 2021; Andrei et al., 2016; K.V. Petrides 2009; Petrides and Furnham, 2003). For language sensitivity and ensuring that respondents were comfortable with the language, we used the Arabic version from the TEIque website, this version was
developed by Maria-Jose Sanchez-Ruiz (2017) (Lebanese American University) and has been previously used in EI studies.

To measure burnout, we used the Burnout Maslach Inventory (MBI HSS) questionnaire consisting of 22 statements asking for how frequently the respondent experiences the statement, according to the following six-point Likert-scale ranging from 0 to 6: Never, a few times a year, once a month, a few times a month, once a week, a few times a week and every day. The questionnaire covered all three dimensions of Burnout: Emotional Exhaustion (EE), Depersonalization (DP), and Personal Accomplishment (PA). Of the 22 statements: 9 cover EE, 5 cover DP and 8 cover PA. There is discrepancy in how to calculate burnout. In some cases, burnout was calculated as a total score (Doulougeri et al., 2016; Chironetal, 2010; Golembiewski & Munzenrider, 1981) while the scale developers Maslach and Jackson (1986) advise not to use an overall scoring for burnout instead scoring singular scores for each dimension according to the below cut-off scores in table 1. We will discuss both scenarios. For the MBI HSS, we used S. Nasrawi & F. Ben Zerwal (2017) version and went for a professional translator to adjust the statements. This instrument was used because of its validity and reliability, $\alpha = 0.80$ in literature (Wheeler et al., 2011; Schepman and Zarate, 2008; Schaufeli & Enzmann, 1998; Maslach et al., 1997).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TABLE 1</th>
<th>BURNOUT MASLACH INVENTORY (MBI HSS) SCORING REFERENCE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Level</td>
<td>EE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>27+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>17-26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>0-16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

To test the hypotheses, first, we used simple linear regression to regress TEI and burnout total scores for managers and non-managers, respectively. Similarly, we conducted simple linear regression to test the effect of WB, SC, EMO and SO on EE, DP, and PA respectively. Then we ran multiple linear regression to examine the relationship of all subscales of the independent variable TEI on all the dimensions of the dependent variable burnout, to see which subscale had the largest magnitude. Third, to compare the scores of TEI and burnout across work from home and status (managerial or non-managerial) and burnout dimensions we conducted the independent t-test. We concluded with conducting a two-way ANOVA test to measure differences within subscales of TEI and subscales for burnout for managers and non-managers, and from working from.

Data Analysis

The survey was sent out in an email to 31 NGOs, INGOs and Networks of NGOs of which 17 agree to participate in this survey. 278 responses were collected from 17 participating NGOs/INGOs in both Arabic (79 respondents) and English (199 respondents) over 3 weeks. The data was cleaned from incomplete responses to ensure a more accurate and reliable analysis. After cleaning, the total number of responses stood at 239 respondents (85.9% of the data collected) of which 133 respondents were non-managers and 106 were managers.

Finally, outliers in variables were explored. Outliers were identified in 8 different variables. Eight outliers corresponded to the same individual. The difference between the mean value and 5% trim mean varied between 0.1 and 0.17. When the outliers were removed, few reliability changes occurred. As such we decided to keep the data as is (Mourao-Miranda et al., 2011, Zijlstra et al., 2011).

Most of the respondents were females 142 (59.4%) and 97 (40.6%) were males. 77 (32.22%) of the respondents were females in non-managerial positions and 56 (23.43%) were males in non-managerial positions. 65 (27.19%) of the respondents were female managers and 41 (17.15%) were male managers. Respondents in 133 (55.64%) in non-managerial positions surpassed those in managerial positions 106 (44.35%). 67 (28%) respondents were between 18 and 25 years old, with the majority being non-managers. 75 respondents (31.4%) are between 26 and 30 years old with the majority being non-managers while 73
(30.5%) are between 31 and 40 years old of which 49 are managers, thus leaving 24 (11.1%) of the respondents over the age of 41 of which 16 are managers. During the past period, 45 (18.8%) respondents have never worked from home, 31 (13%) worked from home for less than a month, 88 (36.8%) worked home between 1 and 6 months, 33 (13.8%) worked from home between 7 and 12 months, and 42 respondents (17.57%) worked from home for more than a year. Furthermore, 157 (65.69%) respondents worked from the office of which 54 were managers and 103 are non-managers, 68 (28.45%) respondents worked hybrid of which 47 are managers and 21 are non-managers and only 14 (5.86%) respondents work from home of which 9 are non-managers.

The average TEI score for 239 respondents was 4.59 over 7.
- SC: 4.37
- EMO: 4.68
- WB: 4.87
- SO: 4.49

The average burnout subscale scores were:
- EE: 19.88 over 54
- DP: 7.08 over 30
- PA: 33.50 over 48

Table 2 represents the reliability of our scales:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale/Subscale</th>
<th>Cronbach’s Alpha</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Burnout as a total score</td>
<td>.879</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EE</td>
<td>.864</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DP</td>
<td>.740</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PA</td>
<td>.801</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TEI</td>
<td>.867</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EMO</td>
<td>.573</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SC</td>
<td>.531</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SO</td>
<td>.644</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WB</td>
<td>.704</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For a scale to be reliable, its α should be larger than .61 (Taber, K.S., 2018). Referring to the table 2, Burnout and its subscales EE, DP and PA are reliable with respective scores of .879 (22 items), .864 (9 items), .740 (5 items) and .801 (8 items) which aligns with previous reliability results of the scale (Doberty, A.S. et al., 2021, Gomez Garcia et al., 2019). As for the TEI scale and subscales, TEI, SO and WB are reliable with respective scores of .867 (30 items), .644 (6 items) and .704 (6 items). On the other hand, EMO and SC are unreliable with respective scores of .573 (8 items) and .531 (6 items). Only few studies (Feher et al. 2019; Siegling et al. 2015) reported results on reliability and validity on both levels the overall scale and the subscale. Compared to previous studies, EMO and SC have a lower alpha value than SO, WB and TEI yet they remain reliable (Zampetakis, 2011).

RESULTS

Overall, out of 19 hypotheses testes, 15 were supported with significant results (table 3 and 4).
### TABLE 3
RESULTS OF REGRESSION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Research Question</th>
<th>Hypothesis</th>
<th>Result</th>
<th>Significance p=</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>What is the effect of TEI on burnout as a total score among both managers and non-managers in the humanitarian field whilst controlling for the effects of status and work from home experience?</td>
<td>H1 There is an inverse relationship between average score of TEI and burnout as total score. The higher the TEI score, the lower is the burnout score</td>
<td>Supported</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>H2: There is an inverse relationship between average score of TEI and EE</td>
<td>Supported</td>
<td>0.009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>H2.A: There is an inverse relationship between WB and EE</td>
<td>Supported</td>
<td>0.004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>H2.B: There is an inverse relationship between SC and EE</td>
<td>Supported</td>
<td>0.020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>H2.C: There is an inverse relationship between EMO and EE</td>
<td>Not Supported</td>
<td>0.587</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>H2.D: There is an inverse relationship between SO and EE</td>
<td>Not Supported</td>
<td>0.193</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>H2.E: There is an inverse relationship between all TEI four subscales and EE</td>
<td>Supported</td>
<td>0.019</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### TABLE 4
**RESULTS OF REGRESSION CONTINUED**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Research Question</th>
<th>Hypothesis</th>
<th>Result</th>
<th>Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>What is the effect of TEI’s subscales on DP?</td>
<td>H3: There is an inverse relationship between average score of TEI and DP</td>
<td>Supported</td>
<td>0.005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>H3.A: There is an inverse relationship between WB and DP</td>
<td>Supported</td>
<td>0.019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>H3.B: There is an inverse relationship between SC and DP</td>
<td>Supported</td>
<td>0.042</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>H3.C: There is an inverse relationship between EMO and DP</td>
<td>Supported</td>
<td>0.012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>H3.D: There is an inverse relationship between SO and DP</td>
<td>Not Supported</td>
<td>0.436</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>H3.E: There is an inverse relationship between all TEI four subscales and DP</td>
<td>Supported</td>
<td>0.030</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What is the effect of TEI’s subscales on PA?</td>
<td>H4: There is a direct relationship between average score of TEI and PA</td>
<td>Supported</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>H4.A: There is a direct relationship between WB and PA</td>
<td>Supported</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>H4.B: There is a direct relationship between SC and PA</td>
<td>Supported</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>H4.C: There is a direct relationship between EMO and PA</td>
<td>Not Supported</td>
<td>0.507</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>H4.D: There is a direct relationship between SO and PA</td>
<td>Supported</td>
<td>0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>H4.E: There is a direct relationship between all TEI four subscales and PA</td>
<td>Supported</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The regression showed a significant inverse relationship between the average score of TEI and burnout as a total score with a significance of \( p = .000 \). \( r = .262 \) and \( r^2 = .069 \) (all p-values reported in the study are two-tailed). Such that:

\[
BO = 70.347 - 6.259 \times (TEI)
\]
For hypothesis 2, the results indicate a significant inverse relationship between the average score of TEI and EE with a significance of \( p = .009, r = .169 \) and \( r^2 = .028 \).

Such that:

\[
EE = 30.331 - 2.274\, (EI) \quad (2)
\]

While analyzing the subscales of TEI, there was a significant inverse relationship between average score of WB, SC, EMO and EE while SO was not a significant predictor of EE. However, it is worth noting that since the scale reliability for SC and EMO was low, we did not consider this result in the discussion and were dropped from further analysis of single subscales.

Such that:

\[
EE = 27.948 - 1.656\, (WB) \quad (3)
\]

\[
EE = 27.073 - 1.648\, (SC) \quad (4)
\]

Multiple regression showed a significant inverse relationship between the average score of all TEI four subscales and EE with a significance of \( p = .019 \), with only WB being the significant variable in predicting WB. \( R = .221 \) and \( R^2 = .049 \). Such that:

\[
EE = 27.258 + .226\, (SO) - .300\, (SC) + 1.310\, (EMO) - .741\, (WB) \quad (5)
\]

For hypothesis 3, the results indicate a significant inverse relationship between the average score TEI and DP with a significance of \( p = .005, r = .181 \) and \( r^2 = .033 \). Such that:

\[
DP = 13.099 - 1.310\, (TEI) \quad (6)
\]

While analyzing the subscales of TEI, there was a significant inverse relationship between WB and DP while SO was not a significant predictor of DP.

Such that:

\[
DP = 10.636 - .730\, (WB) \quad (7)
\]

Multiple regression showed a significant inverse relationship between the average score of all TEI four subscales and DP with a significance of \( p = .03 \), \( R = .211 \) and R-squared = .044. Such that:

\[
DP = 12.391 + .790\, (SO) - .522\, (SC) - .893\, (EMO) - .521\, (WB) \quad (8)
\]

For hypothesis 4, the results indicate a significant direct relationship between the average score of TEI and PA with a significance of \( p = .000, r = .273 \) and \( r^2 = .075 \). Such that:

\[
PA = 21.083 + 2.675\, (TEI) \quad (9)
\]

While analyzing the subscales of TEI, there was a significant direct relationship between WB and SO with PA.

Such that:

\[
PA = 23.198 + 2.089\, (WB) \quad (10)
\]

\[
PA = 26.573 + 1.515\, (SO) \quad (11)
\]
Multiple regression showed a significant inverse relationship between the average score of all TEI four subscales and PA with a significance of $p = .000$, $r = .392$ and $r^2 = .154$. Such that:

$$PA = 24.421 + .784 (SO) + 1.130 (SC) - 2.223 (EMO) + 2.191 (WB)$$

Finally, the independent t-test with the burnout, TEI and their respective subscales variables was performed to explore the difference between females and males, managerial and non-managerial positions. Females showed a significantly ($p=0.042$) higher TEI score (4.68) than males (4.47). They as well showed a significantly ($p=0.003$) higher WB score (5.05) than males (4.6). However, no significant difference was observed between males and females on any other TEI subscale nor in burnout or its subscales. Managers showed significantly ($p=0.029$) higher PA scores (34.59) than non-managers (32.40). However, no significant difference was observed between managers and non-managers on any other burnout subscales. Moreover, managers show significantly ($p=0.001$) higher TEI scores (4.77) than non-managers (4.45). They also showed significantly ($p=0.001$) higher WB score (5.15) than non-managers (4.65), significantly higher ($p=0.003$) SC score (4.57) than non-managers (4.20). Lastly, they also show significantly ($p=0.001$) higher SO score (4.68) than non-managers (4.33). However, no significant difference was observed between managers and non-managers on EMO subscale.

While running ANOVA to check for differences between groups and within groups (working from home, hybrid and office), the results indicated no significant difference within groups (working from home, hybrid and office). However, groups significantly differed among the following variables: EI, WB, EMO, Burnout, and DP. The significance ranges between $p=.004$ and $p=.034$.

For differences between groups, in terms of TEI average score, we noticed that there is a significant difference between those who work from the office and those who work hybrid. Those who work hybrid scored significantly higher than those who work from the office ($p=.011$) by a difference of 0.291 points. For WB, we can notice a significant difference between those who work from the office and those who work hybrid. Those who work hybrid scored significantly higher than those who work from the office ($p=.007$) by a difference of 0.463 points. However, there was no significance in TEI or WB between those working from the office and those working from home.

For Burnout, we noticed that there is a significant difference between those who work from home and those who work from the office. Those who work from the office significantly scored a lower burnout score than those who work from home ($p=.014$) by 12.887 points. Moreover, we noticed that there is significant difference between those who work from home and those who work hybrid. Those who work hybrid significantly scored a lower burnout score than those who work from home ($p=.010$) by a difference of 14.145 points. For EE, we noted that there is a significant difference between those who work from home and those who work from the office. Those who work from the office significantly scored a lower burnout score than those who work from home ($p=.20$) by a difference of 6.865 points. Moreover, we observed a significant difference between those who work from home and those who work hybrid. Those who work hybrid significantly scored a lower Burnout score than those who work from home ($p=.032$) by a difference of 6.668 points. For DP, we noticed a significant difference between those who work from home and those who work from Hybrid. Those who work hybrid significantly scored a lower burnout score than those who work from home ($p=.007$) by a difference of 4.426 points. Moreover, we observed a significant difference between those who work from the office and those who work hybrid. Those who work hybrid significantly scored a lower Burnout score than those who work from the office ($p=.020$) by a difference of 1.898 points. However, there was no significant difference between those working from the office those working from home and those working hybrid for PA.

**DISCUSSION**

Most respondents were youth/young adults, which can be linked to the relatively young population segment in Lebanon with 44% of the population characterized as youth (Government of Lebanon and UN, 2019). About the work duration, the majority of respondents have been working for less than 3 years at the
same organization, this can be attributed to three main factors: the humanitarian sector in Lebanon has been growing in the past 3 years due to the different crises thus reflecting an increase in job opportunities in the sector specifically coupled with an increase in unemployment rate in the country (ILO, 2022), the humanitarian sector is a project based, hence a large turnover as most project last between 1 to 3 years (Daleel Madani, 2021) and lastly, due to the demanding nature of the sector and high risk of burnout, employees tend to switch organizations (Wood et al., 2020; Jachens et al., 2018; Eriksson et al., 2013; Connorton, Perry, Hemenway, & Miller, 2011) and take gap years to compensate. Looking at the work-from-home duration, the largest percentage of working from home duration was for less than a month. These percentages align with the lockdown measures and nature of the humanitarian sector. In the first month of the pandemic, lockdowns were enforced on all sectors, yet since organizations work in humanitarian and emergency responses, they were given priority to continue their operations (UNOCHA, April 2020). Lastly, managers worked home longer than non-managers and continue to work from home or hybrid. This can be attributed to the nature of tasks, where managers have a larger volume of desk work than non-managerial positions with more field visits.

The results of the hypothesis testing suggest a significant inverse relationship between average score of TEI and burnout as total score. The higher the TEI score, the lower is the burnout score. The significance and reliability of burnout as a total score supports findings by Dolougeri et al. (2016), Chironetal (2010), and Golembiewski & Munzenrider (1981), that burnout can be calculated a total score. Yet it contradicts findings by Maslach and Jackson (1986), suggesting that burnout can only be calculated through its three dimensions. Hence, it is worth conducting more research and further look into calculating burnout as a total score rather than separate scales thus feeding into the ongoing debates. Moreover, the findings support and aligns with research by Gong et al., 2019; Vlachou et al., 2016; Platsidou, 2010; Mayer et al., 2008; and Chan, 2006 who also found that EI is a crucial factor in mitigating burnout. They also support findings by Naharire (2018), showing that in the humanitarian sector specifically there exists a negative correlation between EI and burnout.

There is a significant relationship between TEI and BO subscales as well as all four subscales of TEI (SC, SO, WB and EMO) and the different burnout subscales (EE, DP and PA). This suggests that there is an inverse relationship between average score of TEI and all four subscales of TEI (SC, SO, WB and EMO) and EE and DP, respectively, and a direct relationship between average score of TEI and all four subscales of TEI (SC, SO, WB and EMO) and PA. The higher the average TEI score, the lower the EE and DP score and the higher the PA score. These findings support the results of the first hypothesis, as well as align with research by Gong et al. (2019), Mayer et al. (2008) suggesting that higher TEI negatively affects burnout. The results are expected since emotionally intelligent people would have higher perceptions of social support from managers and colleagues, thereby diminishing the consequences of burnout (Mérida-López and Natalio, 2017). Adding on, controlling, and managing one’s emotions results in better interactions with surroundings and a better environment (Brackett et al., 2010), which might decrease burnout (Njoroge & Yazdanifard, 2014; Malik, 2013).

The results show a significant inverse relationship between WB and EE and SC and EE. The magnitude of the effect of WB on EE is larger than the magnitude of the effect of SC on EE, and when running all four subscales jointly, WB is the only variable that has a significant effect on EE. This would suggest that it is important to enhance WB and SC to decrease EE, which is not unexpected as Xanthopoulou, D. et al., 2007, Demerouti et al., 2001 highlighted that WB would reduce the impact of high job demand and the respective physiological and psychological consequences (EE and DP). Moreover, this aligns with the studies on Positive Psychology and linkages between WB and positive emotions (Li, C., & XU, J., 2019). On another hand, self-control (SC) can mitigate feelings of EE (Bolton et al., 2011). However, when combining all four subscales of EI, SC does not have a significant effect on EE, which suggested the need to better explore this relationship and affecting factors. Interestingly, EE was not affected by employment status (manager and non-manager), which was unexpected as it contradicts Bolton et al., 2011 stating that managers are in a better position to understand EE. These results can be attributed to the fact that EE is a subjective measure, hence despite facing different stress and situations both managers and non-managers experience EE. This can be linked to the case of Lebanon, a country passing through unprecedented crises, thus constituting a...
external factor that can be explored in future research. Adding on, since results indicate that working from home is associated with higher burnout, EE and DP rates, this can be attributed to the fact that managers worked from home for a longer duration and continue to do so in certain cases. For example, among those who never worked from home 15.56% are managers while 84.44% are non-managers, and among those who worked from home for more than 12 months 61.9% are managers and 38.10% are non-managers.

A significant inverse relationship exists between WB and DP, SC and DP, and EMO and DP. This suggests that better WB, SC and EMO lead to less DP which is not unexpected as since WB would reduce the impact of high job demand and the respective physiological and psychological consequences (EE and DP) (Xanthopoulou, D. et al., 2007, Demerouti et al., 2001). On EMO, high TEI leads to better self-perception of social ability and more successful interpersonal relationships with less interpersonal aggression and problems (Mayer et al., 2008), which leads employees to relate and understand their colleagues and customers thereby making them less prone to burnout from interpersonal relationships (DP) (Gong et al., 2019; Mayer et al., 2008). On SC, high levels of self-control and tolerating stress in difficult situations helps in maintaining personal relationships and demonstrating social responsibility (DP) (Hersing, 2017). The magnitude of the effect of EMO on DP is larger than the magnitude of the effect both WB and SC. This difference in magnitude is expected whereas EMO is defined as the ability to perceive, express, and connect with emotions in self and others, which can be used in creating successful interpersonal relationships (K.V. Petrides, 2009; Mayer et al, 2008; Petrides, 2001) and DP is defined as the increased mental distance from one’s job, or feelings of negativism or cynicism related to one’s job (Maslach, C., & Jackson, S. E. 1986) – which is the opposite of EMO. Results showed that there is also a significant negative relationship between all TEI four subscales (SO, SC, WB and EMO) and DP, which is expected since DP is counterintuitive for humans (Radek Ptacek et al., 2013). Even though the model was significant, yet the results did not indicate a significant relation between the four different variables and DP, which was unexpected and can be attributed to a third external factor since the study did not include control variables nor other scores.

A significant direct relationship exists between WB and PA, SC and PA, and SO and PA. This would suggest that having a higher score of WB, SC, and SO leads to higher scores of PA. These results support previous findings by Behbahani (2011) in which EI contributed to understanding and forecasting professional accomplishments (PA), thus limiting the feelings of dissatisfaction. Moreover, this can be directly linked with positive psychology and its objective to building individuals strengths and sense of development (Li, C., & XU, J., 2019). Moreover, Cheung and Tang, 2009, shed light that emotional discrepancy (EE and SC) result with emotional discomfort (WB) and stress which consequently leads to burnout and specifically job dissatisfaction (PA). The results show that SO only had a significant relationship with PA, which suggests that being socially assertive and aware, managing other’s emotions and effectiveness in communication and participation in social situations along with human connections can lead to higher PA as suggested by Gong et al., 2019; K.V. Petrides, 2009; Mayer et al., 2008; Petrides, 2001. The magnitude of the effect of WB on PA is larger than the effect of SO and SC on PA. This suggests that being in a healthy physical and emotional status on a personal level can positively affect feelings of PA. Specifically, managers tend to have higher PA scores compared to non-managers, which can be attributed to having a higher position, salary, and influence. Moreover, these findings are also in line with literature reporting managers having higher EI scores compared to non-managers, in particular they have higher WB, SC and SO scores (Aziz et al., 2020; Gong Z. et al., 2019; Jain & Duggal, 2018; Khalid et al., 2018; Bahrani, 2017; Rexehpi et al., 2017; Alferaih, 2015; Fiori, 2015; Baloch et al., 2014; McCleskey, 2014; Seo et al., 2012; Brackett et al., 2011, Waler et al., 2011, Quoidbach and Hansenne, 2009; Steve, 2004; Janovics and Christiansen, 2001; Bachman et al., 2000; Bar-On, 1997). This suggests that EI, WB, SC and SO contribute to managers’ higher PA scores and that the latter score is not only affected by positions, salary, and influence. Hence, it would be interesting to further explore the nature of the relationship between TEI, WB, SC, and SO, for potential causality. However, when looking at all TEI four subscales and their effect on PA, WB loses its significance, and the effect of EMO on PA becomes significant and, indicating an indirect relationship between EMO and PA. This suggests that having a stronger ability to perceive, express and connect with emotions in self and others can decrease feelings of
PA, which can be attributed to the fact that emotions are contagious (Desautels, 2016; Desautels, 2014; Cherniss, 2001) – be it negative or positive. Thus, if surrounded by a demanding environment (Wood et al., 2020; Jachens et al., 2018; Eriksson et al., 2013; Connorton, Perry, Hemenway, & Miller, 2011) filled with stress, negative emotions and feelings of un-accomplishment, having a high level of EMO can affect negatively PA.

The results show that those working hybrid reported lower burnout, EE, and DP scores than those working from home and reported lower DP scores (only) than those working from the office. These results are not unexpected since switching to remote working due to COVID-19 has led to a work-life imbalance as offices shifted home, thus augmenting the likelihood of burnout with a specific impact on EE and DP (Kniffin et al., 2021; Bapuji et al., 2020; Hayes et al., 2020; Ayyala et al., 2020; Wilke et al., 2020). A notable result is that those working hybrid also reported lower DP scores and higher TEI, WB and EMO scores than those working from the office. Since working hybrid includes both settings, virtual communication and in-person communication, it requires adaptation of one’s behavior to the context. Mainly, perceiving, expressing, understanding, and connecting emotions with others and creating successful interpersonal relationships require different skills and efforts in virtual communication compared to in-person communication. As a result, this can be attributed to having higher EMO and TEI scores. Lastly, working hybrid allows room for self-regard and comfort compared to working from the office, which can be attributed to higher WB scores.

Moreover, since DP is counterintuitive to humans (Radek Ptaček et al., 2013) and working hybrid leads to more contact with people, conversing and yet ensuring a work-life balance (compared to only working from home or the office) since individuals enjoy a certain level of comfort and flexibility, therefore it may be reasonable to post the association found between working hybrid, higher TEI, WB and EMO and lower DP.

While Craig et al., (2009), Brackett et al., (2004), Mandel et al. (2003), and Cavallo et al., (2002) suggest that females have higher TEI and take better care of their WB, Ahmad et al. (2009), Petrides and Furnham (2000) suggest that females have lower TEI. The results of this study show that females are associated with higher levels of TEI and WB scores on average. This suggests that females have higher TEI and higher WB which can be attributed to females having more empathy (Craig et al., 2009; Kemp et al., 2005) and having better positive relations with others (Matud et al., 2019). Since the TEI test is a self-reporting one, it could be that females reported higher levels of TEI and WB as they experience and acknowledged more emotions relative to men. It can also be attributed to the fact that the 65 (27.19%) of the respondents were female managers compared to 41 (17.15%) of the respondents who were male managers - and managers have higher TEI.

Implications for Research, Practice and Recommendations

First, on a research level and building on the significant and reliable results of the total burnout score, the study recommends the exploration of developing a unique scale for total burnout score (Doulougeri et al., 2016; Chiron et al., 2010; Golembiewski & Munzenrider, 1981). The unique scale will provide a holistic understanding of burnout and facilitate quantifying the burnout level. Second, being a female was associated with higher TEI and WB average scores than males; hence, it is recommended to conduct further research to form a reliable opinion and explore any contributing factors to such a result. Further analysis to the multiple regression is recommended, specifically as variables change signs and significance with no collinearity. Hence, a third external factor can be controlled for or studied to identify the reason.

Fourth, on an organizational level, there are high levels of EE and low levels PA in general in the humanitarian sector. Thus, more frequent recognition, appraisals and appreciations are recommended. Non-managers have lower levels of PA, hence the recommendation is to include non-managers in meetings and public relations with donors and partners, sharing events, highlighting program results, establishing human connections and direct contact with success stories. This would elevate their moral and levels of PA. It is also recommended that frequent organizational level team events and retreats take place highlighting both personal and collective accomplishments. This would lift the team moral up and spread a culture of accomplishment. Moreover, with TEI having the largest effect on PA, it is recommended to strengthen TEI.
for the organization’s managers and non-managers (in particular). This can happen through trainings, sharing, reading and discussing books, and role plays (Nelis et al. (2009), Elias et al. 1997).

Fifth, out of all TEI four subscales, WB has the largest effect on both PA and EE. Hence, organizations are recommended to give more weight for WB, by not only organizing team retreats, daily self-check ins and group discussions but also engaging in prosocial activities (Sanchez-Ruiz et al., 2021), allowing time for self-care, integrating sports, art (Verner et al., 2017; Wheatley et al., 2017; Karparvicate et al., 2016)-based activities within the work environment, allowing for extra vacations and individual retreats for staff Nelis et al. (2009). A specific focus to be directed towards male employees with regards to WB and TEI.

It is recommended to integrate EI and burnout questionnaires during the recruitment and performance evaluation processes. These questionnaires will allow for an inclusive understanding of each employee, needs and tailored support. Complementing the above, having a psychologist in each organization within the HR Department is recommended to provide counselling, guidance, and emotional support.

Lastly, in light of the COVID-19 pandemic and the rise of remote working, it is highly recommended to encourage employees to adopt the modality of working hybrid first or from the office second rather than working from home. The former modalities leave room for work-life balance, personal and human connections as well as social engagement thus decreasing risks of burnout and DP and increasing probabilities of higher TEI, WB and EMO.

Limitations of the Study

The situation in Lebanon remains unstable as the country faces unprecedented social, economic, financial, political and health crises. These crises add to the already burdening work in the humanitarian sector. Since emotions are contagious and the country is going through a period of collective stress and tension, the results of the burnout score can be affected and augmented. However, since the humanitarian sector is being paid in US dollars compared to the devalued local currency, this can have an attuning effect on burnout rates. The TEI and burnout tests are self-reporting ones in the majority of the literature, hence a social desirability bias is to be considered, as it is possible that respondents would not respond honestly to questions - unknowingly. Moreover, SC and EMO were unreliable, affecting the reliability of the multiple regression conducted. Lastly, due to time and accessibility constraints, the data collected was solely quantitative one. Hence, for future research, it is recommended to collect qualitative data that can provide a wider and extensive understanding of burnout and TEI scores and status.
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