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This paper aims to identify and investigate the relationship between emotional intelligence (EI) and the effectiveness of global leaders. Practical experiences emphasize that effective global leadership is essential for rapidly changing multinationals and emotional intelligence has been identified by a large number of researchers as a major driver of effective leadership. Although academic evidences are increasing, the gap on the connection between emotional intelligence and leadership still maintains. The exploration of extensive researches has revealed a powerful link between emotional intelligence and leadership performance. Directions of future research of EI of global leaders may refer to the investigation of job satisfaction, organizational engagement or followers’ motivation.

INTRODUCTION

The new realities of the business arena ask for culturally attuned and emotionally sensitive global leaders who can react to the challenges of the particular foreign environments of various countries and complex interpersonal work situations. Scholarly works and practical experiences show that two emerging concepts are essentially relevant to the development of efficient global leaders: emotional and cultural intelligences.

A modern perspective of cognitive intelligence emerged from psychology has gained popularity within the area of leadership science. Termed emotional intelligence, it attempts to link emotional abilities to leadership effectiveness (Salevey & Mayer, 1990; Cavallo & Brienza, 2004; Ozcelik et al., 2008; Momeni, 2009). Emotional intelligence abilities are referred to as the capacity to reason “about emotions and the ability to use emotions and emotional knowledge to enhance thought” (Mayer et al., 2008, p. 511).

Compared to the traditional approach of intelligence as calibrated by the IQ, cultural and emotional intelligences facilitate the understanding of cross-cultural leadership and shed light on the potential redesign of the leadership programs in multinational companies. Alon and Higgins (2005) argued that emotional intelligence (EQ), analytical intelligence (IQ) and leadership behaviors are moderated by cultural intelligence (CI) in the achievement of worldwide success.

The past few decades have been marked by extensive debates of both academic and practitioners on the topic of a leader’s emotional intelligence relative to leadership and organizational effectiveness (Chopra & Kanji, 2010; Adams, 2013). Daniel Goleman, the foremost contributor to the field of emotional intelligence and leadership underlined that leaders with a high EI level are crucial to organizational success. They have the ability to seize employees’ feelings related to their work environment, solve the issues that arise, manage their own emotions to gain the staff confidence and understand the political and social agreements within a company (Goleman, 1998, 2001). The literature also notes a successful global leader ability to increase the performance of the organization by establishing a particular work climate.
Reuven Bar-On is another prominent scholar researching the emotional intelligence constructs and the creator of the emotional quotient term. From a slightly different perspective, Bar-On refers to the emotional intelligence as to the concern of understanding oneself and others, adapting to and coping with immediate surroundings to achieve success when dealing with environmental requirements (Bar-On, 1997). No matter of the discrepancies between definitions of emotional intelligence, what is clear is that EI is distinct of what is known as standard intelligence, or IQ.

Emotional intelligence quotient is defined as an array of skills that prove one’s ability to identify and understand own behaviors, moods and impulses and conduct him to best respond to the requirements of a certain context (Kasapi & Mikiotis, 2014). McGarvey (1997) defines EI as the talent to relate with people and grasp their emotions, a quality vital for the management of employees, attraction of customers and investors. Rich academic evidences document that across all job types, the EI is the most powerful predictor of success.

Stys and Brown (2004) highlighted the existence of three main models of emotional intelligence. The model of Salovey and Mayer (1997) defines EI as a pure cognitive ability. A second model by Bar-On (1997) considers EI as form of mixed intelligence, driven by cognitive skills and personality aspects, influencing the general well-being. The third model established by Goleman (1998) also suggests that EI is a mixed intelligence that involves cognitive ability and personality features. However, compared to Bar-On model, Goleman construction indicates how cognitive and personality aspects lead to work environment success.

The emotional intelligence model of Salovey and Meyer (1997) is calibrated using the Mayer-Salovey-Caruso Emotional Intelligence Test (MSCEIT), a performance indicator that requires the participant finish tasks associated with EI. Both Bar-On and Goleman models apply self-report measures of emotional intelligence. Bar-On model uses the Emotion Quotient Inventory (EQ-i), and Goleman’s construct is captured based on the Emotional Competency Inventory (ECI), the Emotional Intelligence Appraisal (EIA), and the Work Profile Questionnaire – Emotional Intelligence Version (WPQei) (Stys and Brown, 2004).

Harms and Credé (2010) suggest that EI can be approached as either a trait or an ability. In the first case, emotional intelligence is an innate factor that enables and promotes wellbeing. In the second case, EI is important to comprehend and manage emotions, as well as understand and integrate them into cognitions. Debates about the positioning of emotional intelligence has led Mikolajczak et al. (2009) to build a tripartite model of emotional intelligence introducing three levels of EI: knowledge (what individuals know about emotions and the management of emotion-laden situations), abilities (what one can do), and traits (what people actually do).

The literature includes large scientific investigations that measure the impact of emotional intelligence on life quality, occupational success or stress resistance (inter alia, Nelis et al., 2009). However, until recently, EI was treated mainly as concept applying to leadership and performance, with only limited touch on the larger area of organizational behavior. Scholarly works that focus on relating the emotional intelligence to social interactions are scarce. Few studies have strongly indicated EI as a catalyst of these processes and resulting outcomes (Douglas et al., 2004).

Extensive researches (George, 2000; Caruso et al., 2002; Palmer & Gignac, 2012) show that while technical knowledge is a major determinant of successful leadership, social skills and emotional abilities have been linked to managerial effectiveness. As stated by Nazarova (2004), emotional intelligence is the critical element of leadership. Nowack (2006) argued that successful managers and leaders reveal higher emotional abilities than those lacking emotional competencies.

**LITERATURE REVIEW**

It is widely acknowledged that successful global leadership requires multiple intelligences. For instance, Riggio et al. (2002) provided strongly documented evidences that global leaders’ skill have to go beyond a high IQ. The authors posit that intelligence is a multidimensional concept manifested in several forms and that multiple types of intelligences are needed for a highly performing leader. Based on
extensive research of the literature, Alon and Higgins (2005) highlighted three forms of intelligence that represent the core of global leadership and hence, of development of global leaders, as presented below:

1. Rational and logic-based verbal and quantitative intelligence, familiar to most individuals and calibrated by classical IQ test;
2. Emotional intelligence, that gained popularity and become a prominent driver of success in the past decade, measured by EQ tests;
3. The most recently added form of intelligence, cultural intelligence, captured by innovative CQ tools.

The literature that investigates leadership abilities has also been connected to emotional intelligence (Bar-On, 2006). Extensive researches (inter alia, Kouzes & Posner, 2007; Anand & UdayaSuriyan, 2010) explore the link between leadership practices and managers EI document a positive correlation between the two notions. Based on Bass and Avolio (1997) transformational/transactional leader construct, Parker and Sorenson (2008) identified a positive relationship between EI and leadership. While these connections do not essentially link EI of a manager with the engagement levels of subordinates, a conclusion can be formulated on the existence of a potential relationship. Theoretical and empirical evidences outline indicate a positive connection between EI and transformational leadership (Brown & Moshavi, 2005). Thor and Johnson (2011) emphasized that both leadership constructs comprise factors that may affect the engagement degree of subordinates, and in the presence of a link between EI and successful leadership, one may also identify a relationship between a manager EI and the followers level of engagement.

The scholarly works have developed a large number of theories that outline which features define the most effective leader. The academic research studies two distinct types of managers: transformational and transactional (Mandell & Pherwani, 2003). Transformational leaders raise interest among subordinates, create a different working environment, increase the visibility of the company goals, offers assistance in order to improve the performance of the organization employee and motivate staff to put the best interest of the company over their own interests. Alternatively, transactional leaders reward or discipline subordinates in accordance to their performance. As described by Bass and Avolio (1994), transactional leaders focus on work guidelines, task accomplishment and employee positive outcomes. Given the similarities that exist between the features of transformational leaders and emotional intelligence (empathy, inter and intrapersonal skills, self-awareness), large academic evidences document a clear relationship between the concepts (inter alia, George, 2000; Daus & Ashkanasy, 2005).

Based on the research of 62 independent studies with 7,145 subjects, Harms and Crede (2010) investigated the assumption that emotional intelligence has a positive impact on transformational leadership. The authors used five different indicators of EI, with the first three including the MSCEIT (Mayer et al., 2003), the Emotional Intelligence Scale (Wong & Law, 2002), and EQ-i (Bar-On, 2006). The most popular measures of transformational leadership applied in the work of Harms and Crede (2010) used were the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (Bass & Avolio, 1995) and the Leadership Practices Inventory (Kouzes & Posner, 2007). The independent works underlying the analysis included a mixture of both self-rated (most common) emotional intelligence and leadership competencies and subordinate or peer rated skills. The findings revealed a significant gap in the comparison between the self and others rated EI and leadership characteristics.

Complementing a leader’s emotional intelligence that enhances performance, employee engagement has also been a central topic in organizational science as a determinant of success at the workplace (Robinson et al., 2004; Harter et al., 2009).

As leadership is a dynamic exhaustible reality, success highly depends on the followers and situational context (Marques, 2006). The essential characteristic of a performing leader is given by his skills in successfully analyzing cases and formulating the optimal response at a given time. George (2000) highlighted the critical role of emotions in the leadership process. In addition, Marques (2006) documented that the ability to control emotional impulses, understand and manage them greatly supports successful relationship development and the solving of conflicts.
Intrapersonal and interpersonal abilities associated with emotional intelligence are a skill set most commonly cited by scholarly works (inter alia, Dulewicz & Higgs, 2003; Rosete & Ciarrochi, 2005; Downey et al., 2006). The literature offers extensive empirical evidence on the positive effect of EI on leadership effectiveness (Goleman, 1995, 1998; Wong & Law, 2002; Coetzez & Schaap, 2004; Leban & Zulaf, 2004; Srivastava & Bharamaanaikar, 2004; Kerr et al, 2006). However, there are also studies that indicate the absence of any statistical significance between the two concepts (Schulte, 2002; Weinberger, 2003; Barchard, 2003; Brown, 2005; Barbuto & Burbach, 2006; Brown et al., 2006).

Other scientific arguments suggest that an immediate supervisor is a determinant of employee work engagement, from the perspective of emotional and rational commitment to the company (Corporate Leadership Council, 2004; Harter et al., 2010; Palmer & Gignac, 2012). As documented by leadership development analyses, EI abilities hold a larger share of behavioral skills in the context of successful leaders compared to technical competencies (Goleman, 1995; Leban & Zulaf, 2004). Cavallo (2004) findings revealed that the more successful performing managers possessed the highest intelligence scores. There is a consensus that traditional indicators of IQ alone do not have the predicative power to estimate how well will managers perform in their careers (Goleman, 1998; Austin, 2010).

Emotional intelligence impact on management performance is one of the main discussion points in the current leadership debates. As indicated by Goleman (1997) important leadership skills highly depend on the on the competencies to understand and control emotions at workplace; hence the ability accompanied with EI will influence the capability to lead people. In addition, since the managers’ emotions influence their employees’ behavior, the EI is treated as one of the major factors to distinguish between successful and unsuccessful managers (Bagshow, 2000; Dulewicz and Higgs, 2000). Schutte et al. (1998) suggested that EI of managers is powerful connected with a modern corporate culture including greater optimism, less depression and lower impulsivity levels in the working environment. George (2000) study showed that emotional intelligence fostered by managers would lead to increased employee motivation, cooperation, financial results and productivity. Given that, the EI cannot be delineated from the notion of leadership, which explains the rationale for considering this link in any organization.

Emotionally intelligent individuals perform a successful leadership (Zeidner, 2001). As suggested by Lunenburg (2011), multiple intelligences construct and EI gained impressive consideration at present times, mainly by means of leadership capability. Goleman et al. (2002) argued that excellent leaders moving their organization ahead reveal high emotional intelligence. EI supports mangers efforts to orientate their employee in a successful and resourceful manner by enhancing their competitive edge. Singh (2009) conclusions show that increased emotional intelligence facilitates problem solving in any circumstance, encourages and stimulates employees.

Under the current working environment, relationship construct proves especially important and significant. Presently, employees are particularly attracted to a leader’s ability to understand, cooperate and create powerful connections that enhance their performance. Law et al. (2004) demonstrated that highly skilled people in using emotions to improve their outcomes would be capable to help others develop their skills and express emotions in order to build something constructive. Jordan et al. (2002) stressed that emotionally intelligent individuals possess valuable skills to create cohesive and performing teams in a more efficient manner compare to less emotionally intelligent people. EI-leaders have the ability to optimally solve any issue arising at a certain moment, and adjust their style in order to obtain the finest outcomes from every employee of the company.

Highly emotionally intelligent people stand out as successful leaders because of their predisposition to a more transformational leadership style (Zafra et al., 2008). EI exceeds the cognitive ability in solving issues and establishing the leader entrepreneur, board of director/executive (Chopra & Kanji, 2010). Emotionally intelligent leaders, who understand their feelings, differentiate and treat successfully with the moods of others, always succeed (Badea and Pana, 2010). An emotional intelligent manager is sensible to emotional consciousness, self-esteem, impressionability, improvement, innovation, risk-taking, service direction, communication, building of relationships and mutual flexibility (Kulkarni et al., 2009).
According to Ruderman et al. (2001), highly emotionally intelligent leaders are successful leaders; they hold the necessary skills of EI and control of their competencies associated with leadership performance that drives improved results. Dijk and Freedman (2007) highlight that excellence managers reveal leadership abilities for the reason that leadership features are expressed in measures of emotional intelligence. There is a plethora of papers that document a substantial impact of leaders’ emotional intelligence on the performance of employees and companies (George, 200; Ruderman et al., 2001; Bradberry & Greaves, 2003; Caruso, & Salovey, 2004; Voole et al., 2004; Lopes et al., 2004; Killian, 2011; Brackett et al., 2011).

Carmeli (2003) findings showed that leaders’ emotional intelligence is a catalyst of positive work attitudes, altruistic behavior and improved outcomes. Rahim and Malik (2010) described that improved emotional intelligence influences the intellectual capital, a major factor driving competitive advantages.

Managers possessing superior EI always create a powerful relationship with their subordinates by building a supportive and helpful working place which leads to not only enlarged employee performance, but also to company success (Affandi and Raza, 2013). Hence, leaders’ ability to improve commitment by creating appropriate circumstances that drives employee perception of significant work (Christian et al., 2011).

According to Jang (2009) work schedule flexibility, working environment support, managerial assistance and work-life balance represent underlying exogenous factors. This can happen only in the context of emotionally intelligent leaders. Work environment characteristics and well-being are positively connected with each other (Sicking et al., 2010). The factors that are substantially linked with wellbeing include increased control of work methods and techniques, limited observation intensity and motivating team leader (Holder, 2002). Leaders possessing extensive emotional intelligence facilitate the creation of better working conditions and offer autonomy to employees, improving the overall quality of the working environment.

Casey and Grzywacz (2008) described how managers that implement flexible working provisions and other guidelines increasing flexibility within the company help improve the health, performance and motivation from employees. The skills of highly emotionally intelligent leaders are crucial for the creation of an encouraging environment that facilitates constructive empowerment schemes driving subjective wellbeing (Akerjordet & Severinsson, 2008).

Managers that explore the potential of emotional intelligence constantly and equally connect with improved performance of their subordinates (Kafetsios et al., 2011). Rego et al. (2007) highlighted that emotionally intelligent leaders encourage the creativity of the employees of the organization.

According to Feather (2009), efforts to enlarge and boost EI are crucial for leadership success, as managers drive employees to perform their jobs more efficiently and increase work motivation. Iordanoglu (2007) describes the positive impact of emotional intelligence on leadership roles in terms of performance valuation, motivation, assistance, development and improvement. Hence, managers can raise the level of emotional intelligence within their organizations by accentuate EI competencies not only in support and mentoring initiatives, but also in their selection and promotion programs (Berman & West, 2008).

Goleman et al. (2002) study provided strong evidences that linked EI to the performance of managers within the US and found that the essential leadership abilities were connected to emotional intelligence. In addition, the authors suggested that as much as 79% of the success of leaders in the US was driven by superior EI competencies. A large number of analyses showed that the level of leaders EI influences they conduct, driving success more or less.

In a similar way, organizational cultural intelligence is critical, at least for the US companies, when managers move into or work with new organizations. Alon and Higgins (2005) stressed that many times, the absence of CI leads to individual and corporate failures.

As presented by McKay (2007), leaders may apply more effective methods and techniques in order to change their negative spirit and created alternative solutions to a complex array of potential issues. It is not too difficult to build scenarios of managers well served by the experience of a plethora of moods and feelings. In addition, scenarios can also be constructed around a leader’s effectiveness that may by
hindered by the painful experience of certain emotions. Jones and George (1998) stressed that managers who manifest anger frequently may encounter hardships in establishing good connection with followers that may engender their confidence.

Highly emotionally intelligent leaders have superior abilities to help their subordinates maintain positive moods while interacting with customers and performing emotional tasks (O’Boyle et al., 2010). The study of Goleman (1998) indicated that excellent leaders have 15% IQ and technical abilities, and 85% emotional intelligence. Various researchers (Bliss, 2005; Besterfield et al. (2003) have investigated the strength of this relationship through the features of leaders. Based on the characteristics that managers share, they are considered to be individuals with vision that struggle to change the current paradigm, from different perspectives than that of their subordinates. They are referred to as “quality leaders” as they strive to improve the overall quality in the company, starting with their own traits.

While the concept of “quality leadership” is based on the personality of managers, “emotional intelligence” construct relies on the fact that leaders have no other option than bring their mood and attitudes to the workplace (Kasapi & Mihiotis, 2014). Hence, the implications for their subordinates are not only related to the job features, but also to the ethical and behavioral competencies that leaders possess. This essentially means that both the dimensions of emotional intelligence and the characteristics of excellent managers blend in a manner that would finally lead to the improvement of relationships between leaders and their followers (Kasapi and Mihiotis, 2014).

Robbins and Judge (2012) indicated empathy as a core aspect of emotional intelligence. Empathetic managers understand better other needs, listen to their subordinates and seize the reactions of others. In addition, Champy (2003) emphasized that the caring part of empathy, is what inspires employee to stay with the leader when faced with difficulties.

Schwalbe (2001) stressed that beyond the importance of basic leadership skills, having highly performing leaders within an organization is one of the crucial factors in managing human resources, particularly in the context of team-basis projects.

The research of Bar-On and Orme (2003) of one of the UK major restaurant groups presented solid arguments that emotionally intelligent managers drive superior effectiveness. Their performance exceeded the results of others in terms of improved guest satisfaction, decreased turnover and 34% greater profit growth (Bar-On and Orme, 2003).

Freedman and Everett (2004) study is a reminder for managers that their success begins and ends with their inner resources: leaders who do not develop self-awareness risk fall into an emotionally dangerous routine that threatens their overall potential. The reluctance to explore their own competencies not only weakens leaders’ motivation, but also can severely affect their ability to inspire subordinates.

A study of Dulewicz and Higgs (2000) demonstrated that EI exceeds the importance of intellect and other management competencies. In addition, to raise the value of EI in leadership, the same authors (2003) identified superior emotional intelligence levels among managers that increased with the leadership scales within an organization.

Deeter-Schmelz et al. (2008) described the potential of EI to change an efficient sales manager into an excellent leader. The ability of emotionally intelligent individuals to turn all positive emotions into performance and to reverse the impact of negative emotions transforming them into challenging objectives could unlock huge opportunities for any company (Law et al., 2004). Dulewicz and Higgs (2000) emphasized that managers with a balance mix of IQ and emotional intelligence perform a superior leadership compared to those that not.

CONTROVERSY

The literature also includes studies that question the existence of a significant impact of EI on leadership effectiveness (Buford, 2001; Collins, 2001; Schulte, 2002; Weinberger, 2003; Brown et al., 2006). For instance, the findings of Antonakis (2004) and Goleman (1998) point out to the claims that emotional intelligence are twice as important as IQ or technical skills for leadership success as the major thesis against emotional intelligence. Moreover, according to Mayer and Caruso (2002), although EQ is
an important leadership asset, it co-exists with other capabilities and weaknesses. In addition, Weinberger (2009) indicated the absence of any relationship between a manager’s emotional intelligence and leadership style or the leaders’ perceived effectiveness.

Given that the construct of emotional intelligence is still at an early stage, the criticism of some researchers should not come as a surprise. The most popular themes that emerged from the critics of emotional intelligence refer to the notion’s arguable resemblances to personality features, the absence of a clearly-shaped measurement system, its inability to accomplish psychometric requirements, large claims on performance enhancement, and the cunning to replicate emotional intelligence relative to certain assessment instruments (Conte, 2005; Landy, 2005; Locke, 2005; Day & Carroll, 2008). For illustrative purposes, a recent study of Day and Carroll (2008) described how by faking EI, some indicators create a false reality that an individual is highly emotionally intelligent when motivated to behave so.

The largest part of emotional intelligence criticism has been focused on the Goleman (1998) and Bar-On (2006) models. For example, Landi (2005) explored Goleman’s findings and suggested that his scientific effort has not been peer reviewed and the results returned from the ECI instrument to measure its construct has not been transparently shared with the academic community. The author argued this made the outstanding performance claims Goleman indicated to be generated by improved EI questionable. Conte (2005) perspective is similar; the author highlighted the limited peer evaluation done on ECI and the minimal predictive and discriminant validity arguments provided, concluding that this instrument is of little significance and consideration. Daus and Ashkanasy (2005) went even further and highlighted that Goleman and Bar-On models adversely influenced the establishment of emotional intelligence as a legitimate concept with a high potential for incremental validity.

Matthews et al. (2002) have also criticized the lack of consistency between instruments used to capture emotional intelligence. The comparative analysis of MSCEIT and the EQ-I showed that the amount of overlap ranged from 4% (Bracket & Mayer, 2003) to 13% (Mayer et al., 2000), which essentially means that the two are measuring different constructs.

Although the ability-based model of Mayer and Salovey (1997) has been less exposed to negative attention, it does not lack criticism. To summarize, the study of the literature indicates the absence of a theoretical consensus and clarity relative to the most performing measurement system among EI, leadership success and decision making process.

Although the extensive debate between the supporters and critics of emotional intelligence could be treated as a drawback within the area of research, a counter argument stresses this is a sign of the positive evolution and validity of the concept. The early evidences show a significant potential for further investigation in analyzing the connection between EI and leadership effectiveness, although more improvement of the notions and measurement system may be required to create a stronger case for the correlation between the two.

As the exploration of the subject continues, a construct is likely to appear as the forerunner in the EI area. Early indications point out that the ability-based model has received only limited negative attention from the perspective of trait based factors; moreover, some scholarly works suggested this is the only EI model that should be seriously considered by researchers (Daus & Ashkanasy, 2005).

**EPILOGUE**

More than two decades ago, the concept of emotional intelligence captured the interest of the academic community, business arena and individuals in general. Presently, we note the existence of three models of emotional intelligence, each with its own instruments and measurement system.

The pioneering model of EI was built around cognitive abilities and differentiated through a result of performance-based indicator of EI. The other two are mixed models that focus on both cognitive competencies and personality traits and apply self-report measures.

Researchers indicate that the connection between EI/communication model and leadership/companies decision-making has to be explored in various industries and professions, so that scholarly efforts must be able to provide comparable findings. Studies (inter alia, Rosete & Ciarrochi, 2005; Rigoglioso, 2006;
Kerr et al., 2006) that describe the relation between emotional intelligence and an efficient leader have built a new environment for the implementation of human resources procedure in the selection, improvement and performance management used by companies.

In order to have the best equipment to deal with change, companies need to increase resilience and emotional intelligence (Reid, 2008). A large number of scholarly works recommend the embedding of emotional intelligence tests into the selection process to improve the level of EI. Other specialists suggest the assessment of emotional intelligence of current and potential managers, the inclusion of EI into performance ratings and succession planning (Conrad, 2008). Complemented by traditional recruitment evaluation techniques, EI estimation can be a powerful indicator of the outcomes of the organization employee (Chrusciel, 2006). This can be a valuable procedure to save monetary resources and time in ensuring that the best-equipped individual is selected for the position.

Directions of future research of emotional intelligence of leaders may refer to the investigation of many other related factors such as job satisfaction, organizational engagement or followers’ motivation. The embedding of emotional intelligence constructs into practice has generated only a limited amount of empirical research that leaves open space for new future analysis areas. For instance, these may include the development of a reliable instrumentation, consensus relative to the definition of emotional intelligence, determining if the concept is a unique measure or it quantitative exploration.

The issues related to the best instrument to capture emotional intelligence have generates extensive debates in the academic community. The vast majority of tools are build based on self-reports. The MSCEIT proposed by Mayer et al. (2002) is one of the pioneering attempts to establish a performance-based instrument. However, the literature indicates that additional efforts are needed in order for this instrument to be used to identify critical relationships between variables and further investigate the field of emotional intelligence, leadership and management.

Some academic opinions stress that the very concept of emotional intelligence needs to be explored further. The explanation is that the construct is subject to in-depth analyses in some works and only narrowly in others. A more closely aligned definition is required for clarity purposes and assistance to future the academic arena and business environment. The myriad of definitions is supported by different hypotheses and calibrated in many different ways. The understanding of an author’s perspective implies careful reading. Confusion may also emerge in practice. In the absence of a critical reading and of an understanding of the multiple dimensions of emotional intelligence, practitioners’ efforts are directed to what might be a corporate fad.
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