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Abstract
The study intended to examine leaders’ emotional intelligence, emotional work climate and job satisfaction among several teams of higher educational institutes. A few studies have examined the effects of these variables but seldom studies existed which examined the level of these variables. The aim of this study was to find out the difference between the true mean and the comparison value. Questionnaire survey of 30 team leaders and 120 team members was conducted. The paper applied one sample t-test using the SPSS 20 software to test the hypothesis. The study found out that there is a slight difference between the true mean and the comparison value. Although the difference is statistically significant but not large enough to be practically significant. Therefore, the subjects recruited were treated as normal.
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1. Introduction
Job satisfaction has been a topic of immense discussion and exploration and it has been one of the major variables that is getting searched in workplace psychology. Many researchers have declared Job satisfaction as the key of organizational success (Lyubomirsky, King & Diener, 2005; Fredrickson, 2016; Dar, Akmal & Naseem 2011; Liu, Liu, 2013). As of now, organizations are focusing on team work and teams, so it has been a challenge for the organization to harness high performance work teams and high satisfaction. The effectiveness of a team should not only be measured by efficiency but the team members should also have high fulfillment and individual development in teams (Liu et al., 2013). Job satisfaction of a team member is an essential factor of team efficiency and has an impact on the team. Parikshit, Kaur and Jain (2014) proposes that job satisfaction and emotional intelligence are correlated.
Emotional intelligence is a burning issue in the field of management “plan and action” since 1990 as Salovey and Mayer, were the pioneers in formally coining this term. Theoretically, emotional intelligence is an amalgamation of the capability of understanding and controlling personal and others’ emotions. Indeed, emotional intelligence is omnipresent and has been declared as a significant factor for banks (Emelia, 2014), organizations (Kaura, 2011), employees (Deeter-Schmelz et al., 2013), managers (Carmelli, 2003) and leaders (Goleman, 1998).

Leaders’ emotional intelligence helps leadership outcomes, and emotional intelligence could enhance leaders’ competence of tackling problems and grabbing the opportunities that are being faced by the leaders’ as well as the organization. Leader’s behavior can enhance the employee attitude and behavior (Ishaque, Tufail, & Farooq, 2017). Hundreds and thousands of researches indicate the magnitude of Leader’s Emotional Intelligence. For instance, Goleman (1998) points out that leaders with a high level of emotional intelligence have a successful career. Emotional intelligence is the main ingredient in leadership (George, 2000). Leadership style in one of the key factor that influence job satisfactions among subordinates and team members, hence, leader’s emotional intelligence can be a contestant that has an impact of job satisfaction and team emotional work climate (Saleem, 2014). Organizational behavior has found the significance of emotions and is now diverting its attention to the role of emotions in the field. Researchers are now emphasizing to understanding the processes and outcomes of collective emotion and individual emotions. Team emotional work climate is flattering a new area for study regarding team effectiveness. Emotion is a particularly important concept for teams. Team emotional climate is the perceptions of emotions and emotional exchanges that typify a workgroup and such perceptions are considered to have important consequences for group members (Elfenbein & Shirako, 2006). Looking at the very first perspective, the effectiveness and happiness of team member are issues of concern for the organization, and secondly looking from an emotional point of view, leaders’ emotional intelligence, emotional work climate and job satisfaction has its roots deep in the theoretical contribution in the field of leadership and has enhanced the significance of group emotional climate. The sector chosen for this study are higher educational institutes so team leader can be addressed as Academic Leader and team members refer to lecturers.

1.1 Research Questions

- What is the level of Academic leaders’ emotional intelligence?
- What is the mean value of emotional work climate?
- What is the level of job satisfaction?

1.2 Research Objectives

- To investigate the level of Academic Leaders’ emotional intelligence.
- To examine the level of job satisfaction.
- To expose the team’s emotional climate.
Hypotheses:
1. Academic Leaders’ Emotional Intelligence
   \[ H_0: \mu \neq 3 \]
   \[ H_1: \mu = 3 \]
2. Emotional Work climate
   \[ H_0: \mu \neq 3 \]
   \[ H_1: \mu = 3 \]
3. Team members’ Job Satisfaction
   \[ H_0: \mu \neq 3 \]
   \[ H_1: \mu = 3 \]

2. Literature Review
2.1 Background of Study
A number of research articles and reviews has discussed academic Leaders’ emotional intelligence, team emotional climate and job satisfaction. Many different organizations have been studied in context with these variables. They are studied either separately or in
combinations, however HEIs have been taken into less consideration regarding these constructs.

2.1.1 Emotional Intelligence
Salovey and Mayer (1990) presented the term “emotional intelligence” in their work which associates affects intelligence, emotion, and cognition. Emotional intelligence speaks to an arrangement of dis positional traits for checking one's own particular and others' sentiments, convictions, and interior states with a specific end goal to give valuable data to control one's and others' reasoning and activity (Barbuto Jr., Gottfredson, Searle, 2014). From the last one score year emotional intelligence has been researched widely (Salovey & Mayer, 1990; Libbrecht, Beuckelaer, Lievens, & Rockstuhl, 2012). Then majority of this exhilarating effort used emotional intelligence to predict many behaviors, like encompassed constructive work attitudes, humane performance (Shockley, Singla, 2011), approaches towards organizational change (Trivellas, Gerogiannis, & Svarna, 2013), cognitive-based performance (O’Boyle Jr., Humphrey, Pollack, & Story, 2011), transformational leadership (Fisk & Friesen, 2012), critical thinking temperament (Niu, Behar-Horenstein & Garvan, 2013), and greater quality of interpersonal associations (Qualter, Gardner, Pope, Hutchinson, & Whiteley, 2012).

The popularity alongside with argument of the concept of emotional intelligence advances a lot of consideration from both researchers and practitioners, prompting the production of various subjective and quantitative review articles and books e.g. (Goleman, 1995; Martins, Ramalho, & Morin, 2010; Mayer & Salovey, 1997; O'Boyle et al., 2011). EI has been turned out to be a noteworthy indicator of essential results, for example, mental and physical wellbeing (Johnson, Batey, & Holdsworth, 2009; Martins et al., 2010; Schutte et al., 2007). Research has likewise shown that characteristic EI has a hereditary premise, which again substantiates the presence of EI as an imperative and independent trait (Perera, & DiGiacomo, 2013).

2.1.2 Team emotional climate
Team emotional climate is another aspect of workplace psychology which has been researched since organizations diverted their focus on teams. Emotional climate is a concept is an idea that evaluates the “atmosphere” of a group, being a little gathering, a classroom, an association, a topographical region. Emotional climates indicate the emotional relationships linked among members of a community and describe the quality of the environment within a particular context (Rivera, 1992). A team is also characterized by its own (1) route and (2) mutual attitude and (3) shared accountability (Moura, Dominguez & Varajão, 2014). Team emotional climate affects the productivity and outcomes of teams and individuals (Liu & Liu, 2013). High levels of emotional intelligence create advanced levels of spirits of responsibility, sociability and support, that consequently affects the members’ and the leaders’ decision making, commitment and efficiency (Maamari & Majdalani, 2017). Mood management might be the most critical element of team leadership (Ashkanasy & Humphrey, 2011a). If this is the case, then leaders’ emotional intelligence may well be the key factor determining team effectiveness and efficiency.

2.1.3 Job Satisfaction
Job satisfaction is a fundamental factor of organizational environment and a significant part in management-employee affiliation. It is the constructive enthusiastic express that
happens when a man's employment appears to satisfy imperative occupation esteem provided; these qualities match with one's needs. Job satisfaction can be presumed as employees’ total behavior and attitude regarding their toil and work environment (Liu & Liu, 2013). The human relations movement of organizational management laid the foundation for the belief, which happy and satisfied employees work harder than those who are not (Miller & Belmont, 2012). When employees get appreciation from their coworkers, such employees need less attention regarding job satisfaction services to increase job satisfaction (Boren & Johnson, 2013). Job satisfaction and motivation are correlated (Viswanathan & Devi, 2015), positive relation with job behavior (Li, Liang, & Crant, 2010), performance (Hamid & Yahya, 2011; Nielsen, Bachrach, Sundstrom, & Halfhill, 2012), Organizational Justice (Andrews & Michael 2014). The above-mentioned variable (EI, EWC and JS) have been studied separately as well as in combination, but in HEIs, EI has been treated only with job performance and other outcomes, they have not taken in consideration EWC or any other mediating or moderator variables. The author is interested to see the results of these variables in HEIs, because academic staff of the HEIs are very essential to the progress of any country. Awang, Hanim and Mohammed (2010) claims that academic staff perform several important functions, including research activities to report a prevalent problem or to grab opportunities in the society, preparation of students who will finally handle the matters of different sectors of the economy including hospitals, schools, court, banks, engineering, politics etc.

3. Methodology
The research was conducted with positivistic approach and therefore relay upon quantitative methods (Habib & Kamran, 2014).

3.1. Population
As the study perceives to explore the combination of theoretical framework in higher educational institutes of Peshawar, so the population comprised of the Academic leaders and lecturers which numbered more than 400 (Habib & Kamran, 2014) which roughly consisted of 40 teams/departments. Data was collected from the Academic leaders (Dean/HOD/Coordinators) and the lecturers.

3.2. Sample and Sampling Techniques
Departments of Management Sciences and Computer Sciences of private sector higher educational institutes of Peshawar were taken as a sample. Non-probability sampling technique was adopted and within non-probability, convenience sampling for the collection of data. 40 teams/departments were chosen, each team comprised of minimum 5 members and maximum of 20. 30 (150) questionnaires were distributed to (60%) of the population and among them 105 were returned. Out of 105, 90 were completely filled and were used for analysis purpose, such a high response rate is high in Asian context (see, Tufail, Shahzad, Gul & Khan, 2017).

3.3. Data collection tool(s)
Data collection tool(s) was adopted from the studies conducted by several studies. TEIQue v1.50 was used as data collection tool for measuring the emotional intelligence adapted from Petrides & Furnham (2003) comprising of 15 items having validity of 0.71 and reliability 0.76. Emotional work climate tool was adapted from Liu, Härtel & Sun (2014) having 16 items but was modified as the CFA test showed the main dimension having 4 items was then adapted bearing the reliability value of .80. Job satisfaction
questionnaire was adapted from Cook, Hepworth, Wall (1981)” coefficient of alpha ranged from 0.67 to 0.71. These inventories were adapted because of their high test and reliability validity. Answers for items were obtained on 5-point Likert scale where 1 was Very True and 5 was for Very Untrue.

3.4. Statistical techniques
One sample t-test (2-tailed) was used to find the results of hypotheses. Each hypothesis was tested one by one and only one assumption of one sample t-test i.e. “the dependent variable must be continuous (ratio/interval)” was violated.

4. Findings and Analysis

One-Sample Statistics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
<th>Std. Error Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Leaders' Emotional Intelligence</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>2.1733</td>
<td>.51894</td>
<td>.09475</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotional Work Climate</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>3.6583</td>
<td>.87451</td>
<td>.11290</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Satisfaction</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>2.4500</td>
<td>.65904</td>
<td>.08508</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Mean “Leaders’ Emotional Intelligence” score (2.17 ± .51) is lesser than the population average Emotional Intelligence score of 3.00
- Mean “Emotional Work Climate” score (3.65 ± 0.87) is higher than the population average Emotional Work Climate score of 3.00
- Mean “Job Satisfaction” score (2.45 ± 0.65) is lower than the population average Job Satisfaction score of 3.00

One-Sample Test

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>t</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Sig. (2-tailed)</th>
<th>Mean Difference</th>
<th>95% Confidence Interval of the Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Leaders' Emotional Intelligence</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>-.82667</td>
<td>-1.0204 to -.6329</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotional Work Climate</td>
<td>5.831</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.65833</td>
<td>.4324 to .8842</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Satisfaction</td>
<td>6.464</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>-.55000</td>
<td>-.7202 to -.3798</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- One sample t-test was used to find out whether leaders’ emotional intelligence in the conscripted subjects was different to normal, defined as leaders’ emotional intelligence score of 3.00. Leaders’ emotional intelligence scores were normally distributed and there were no outliers data by the examination of boxplot. Mean leaders’ emotional intelligence score (2.17 ± .51) was found out to be lesser than the standard score of 3.00, a statistically significant difference of 0.49 (95% CI, 1.02 to 0.63), t(29) = -8.725, p = .000
- One sample t-test was used to find out whether Emotional Work Climate in the recruited subjects was different to standard, defined as Emotional Work Climate
score of 3.00. Emotional Work Climate scores were normally distributed and there were no outliers data by the examination of boxplot. Mean Emotional Work Climate score (3.65 ± 0.87) was higher than the normal score of 3.00, a statistically significant difference of 0.13 (95% CI, 0.43 to 0.88), t(59) = 5.831, p = .000

- One sample t-test was used to find out whether Job Satisfaction in the recruited subjects was diverse to standard, defined as Job Satisfaction score of 3.00. Job Satisfaction scores were normally distributed and there were no outliers data by the examination of boxplot. Mean Job Satisfaction score (2.45 ± 0.65) is lower than the normal score of 3.00, a statistically significant difference of 0.35 (95% CI, 0.72 to 0.37), t(59) = 5.831, p = .000

5. Conclusion(s)
- In the case of leaders’ emotional intelligence, a statistically significant difference between the means was found and, therefore we can reject the alternative hypothesis and accept the null hypothesis where mean ≠ 3.
- A statistically significant difference between means of Emotional work climate was found, in this scenario, therefore we can reject the null hypothesis and accept the alternative hypothesis.
- As far as Job Satisfaction is concerned, a statistically significant difference between the means was found and, therefore we can reject the alternative hypothesis and accept the null hypothesis where mean ≠ 3.

A statistically significant difference of 0.49 (95% CI, 1.02 to 0.63) has been found between the leaders’ emotional intelligence in the conscripted subjects vs. the standard leaders’ emotional intelligence score, it does not certainly mean that the difference found, is adequate to be put into practicality. Undeniably, the researcher admits that the difference is statistically significant, but the difference is not huge enough to be implemented into practicality, therefore, the subjects can be declared as normal.

A statistically significant difference of 0.13 (95% CI, 0.43 to 0.88) has been found between the Emotional work climate in the conscripted subjects vs. the standard Emotional Work Climate score, it does not certainly mean that the difference found, is adequate to be put into practicality. Undeniably, the researcher admits that the difference is statistically significant, but the difference is not huge enough to be implemented into practicality, therefore, the subjects can be declared as normal.

A statistically significant difference of 0.35 (95% CI, 0.72 to 0.37) has been found between the Job satisfaction in the conscripted subjects vs. the standard Job Satisfaction score, it does not certainly mean that the difference found, is adequate to be put into practicality. Undeniably, the researcher admits that the difference is statistically significant, but the difference is not huge enough to be implemented into practicality, therefore, the subjects can be declared as normal.
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