Leadership and Emotional Intelligence have been the focus of organizational development for centuries but it has become a hot topic in recent years. This study explores the relationship between Emotional Intelligence and leadership culture. Understanding of Emotional Intelligence can lead to increased cohesion in the organization, better decision-making in the management team and the empowerment of employees. Emotional Intelligence makes a contribution to overall performance and organizational effectiveness.
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Introduction to the Problem

Leadership has been the focus of organizational development for centuries. During the last 30 years the subject of leadership theory has been studied more extensively than any other aspect of human behavior but researchers still seem to know little about what characteristics define effective leadership (Dulewicz & Young, 2005). Feelings, moods, and emotions play a central role in the leadership process. If leaders are high in basic IQ but have no emotional competence, they are not going to be able to articulate and relate to subordinates as effectively. Emotional competence is particularly central to leadership, a role whose essence is getting others to do their jobs more successfully in accordance with the vision and mission of the organization.

Talked about loosely for decades under a variety of names from ‘character and personality,’ to ‘soft skills and competence’, there is at last a more precise understanding of these human talents, a new name for them: Emotional Intelligence. Emotional Intelligence is a controversial topic among business leaders today due to lack of understanding of the concept and its importance to organizational cohesiveness. Emotional Intelligence or (EI) is a concept that is a work in progress among Psychology professionals as well. There are a lot of arguments about the definition of EI, arguments that regard both terminology and construct. EI combines the fields of emotions and intelligence by viewing emotions as useful sources of information that help a person to make sense of and navigate their social environment. Self awareness, managing emotions, self motivation, empathy for others, and relationship building are the five
common elements in the most popular definitions of EI. Psychology professionals have been testing EI for years without calling it that (Salovey & Grewal, 2005).

The first published attempt toward a definition was made by Salovey and Mayer in 1990 who defined EI as “the ability to monitor one's own and others' feelings and emotions, to discriminate among them and to use this information to guide one's thinking and actions” (Salovey & Grewal, 2005). Despite this early definition, there has been confusion regarding the exact meaning of this construct. The definitions are so varied, and the field is growing so rapidly, that researchers are constantly amending even their own definitions of the concept.

EI is a fairly recent concept only formally existing for about fifteen years. There have been many studies developing the actual theory and competency models but no research has been completed to directly relate emotional intelligence to healthy company culture and positive employee morale. This researcher will be exploring the theory of emotional intelligence in an attempt to establish a link between EI and organizational holism.

Team cohesiveness and decision-making are additional facets of the observation that were analyzed. Teaming in the work environment can take on many different connotations. Some teams in the workplace contain individuals striving toward the same goal with selfish motivations. Other teams want to meet their objective as a group, sharing in the successes as well as the failures, while striving not as individuals but as a cohesive entity. “Mistakes will be made, goals will not be met, attitudes will flare, but the team will survive” (Stemberg, 1999). The more team members work together collaboratively and think together as a socially interested group, they will bring
cohesiveness to the team. In a cohesive team, leadership skills are applied to each individual, and their ideas are heard and implemented. Communication and innovation by the group makes the team more efficient. One of the most important factors to team cohesiveness is the bonding relationship between the team members and the coach. There is an emotional connectedness that makes the team more successful as a whole. The researcher of this study believed that team cohesiveness was lacking in the organization observed. This research sought to highlight the need of team cohesiveness and decision-making power that, if not present, would hinder the organization in achieving operational excellence. The absence of a unified team has led to many seemingly unrelated issues such as gossip, absenteeism, fearful culture, poor time management skills, and accountability problems. The organization studied needed to be taught how to utilize the tools they already possessed within themselves in order to create an optimal company culture and boost employee morale through cohesive teaming and decision-making.

Background of the study

The origins of EI can be traced back to Charles Darwin’s early work on the importance of emotional expression for survival and adaptation. In the 1900's, even though traditional definitions of human intelligence emphasized cognitive aspects, such as memory and problem-solving, several influential researchers in the intelligence field of study had begun to recognize the importance of the non-cognitive aspects of intelligence (Rijamampianina, 2005). For instance, as early as 1920, E. L. Thorndike at Columbia University used the term social intelligence to describe the skill of understanding and managing other people (Carmeli & Josman, 2006). Similarly, in 1940 David Wechsler described the influence of non-intellective factors on intelligent behavior, arguing that
our models of intelligence could not be complete until we can describe what these non-intellective factors are. In 1975, Howard Gardner's *Frames of Mind: The Theory of Multiple Intelligences* introduced the idea of Multiple Intelligences which included both *Interpersonal intelligence* (the capacity to understand the intentions, motivations and desires of other people) and *Intrapersonal intelligence* (the capacity to understand oneself, to appreciate one's feelings, fears and motivations). In Gardner's view, traditional types of intelligence, such as IQ, fail to fully explain cognitive abilities. Even though the names given to the concept of EI varied, there was a common belief that traditional definitions of intelligence were lacking in the ability to fully explain performance outcomes (Carmeli & Josman, 2006).

The term "emotional intelligence" has appeared in many scholarly journals throughout the century. It first emerged in Leuner around 1966, followed by Greenspan who invented the EI model in 1989. Salovey and Mayer, & in turn Goleman matured the concept in 1990 and 1995 respectively. The first use of the term "Emotional Intelligence" as a theory was in Wayne Payne's 1985 doctoral thesis, *A study of emotion: Developing emotional intelligence*. As a result of the growing acknowledgement of business professionals for the importance and relevance of emotions to work outcomes, research on the topic of EI continued to gain momentum, but it wasn’t until the publication of Daniel Goleman's best seller *Emotional Intelligence: Why It Can Matter More Than IQ* that the term became widely popularized. A 1995 Time magazine article by Nancy Gibbs highlighted Goleman's book sparking a string of mainstream media interest in EI. After the concept was highlighted on a national stage, articles on EI began to appear with increasing frequency across a wide range of academic and popular outlets.
Definition of EI

According to Rodney Hall in the article, “It's in the EQ,” there are many different definitions of EI that have been identified throughout the course of creating this concept. Some of the most common definitions are:

- Our ability to manage and regulate our emotions in a healthy and balanced manner to achieve personal and business goals
- The capacity for recognizing our own feelings and those of others, for motivating ourselves, and for managing emotions in ourselves and in our interpersonal relationships
- The ability to restrain negative feelings such as anger and self-doubt and instead focus on positive ones such as confidence and congeniality
- The ability to recognize what works and what doesn’t work within a company, and/or what is required to achieve results as part of a team
- An individual’s fit with the social, political, and management culture of an organization
- The ability to monitor one's own and others' feelings and emotions, to discriminate among them, and to use this information to guide one's thinking and actions

The later definition coined by Salovey and Mayer will be the definition utilized for this research as it is the most recent and widely used definition by notable scholars.

These conceptualizations and multiple definitions of EI can be divided into two general categories: ability models in which EI is defined as a set of cognitive abilities in emotional functioning, and mixed-trait ability models that incorporate a wide range of
personality characteristics and their traits. Ability models conceptualize EI as a form of intelligence that involves emotion, but EI defined as an ability compromises a number of skills including: emotional perception and expression, emotional facilitation of thinking, emotional understanding, and emotional regulation. At the center of EI are the propositions that emotion can make thinking more intelligent and that one can think intelligently about emotions. EI is thought to have similarities to other types of intelligence in the fact that it should reflect a type of ability or aptitude, be related to other abilities, and develop with age and experience (Goldenberg, Matheson & Mantler, 2006).

Statement of the problem

EI has been used as a blanket term that encompasses elements such as “soft skills” and “people skills” and a general ability to cope with life’s many struggles and demands. Attraction to this construct stems from the popular view that some individuals of seemingly average intelligence do well in life, while others struggle with life challenges despite possessing an above average IQ. Therefore, the underlying theme of EI is that classical intelligence is not necessarily a good predictor of life success, and that other attributes may be better determinants of success in and out of the business environment (Goldberg, Matheson, & Mantler, 2006).

Employees and managers alike who are high in EI are expected to attain a higher level of achievement in both the workplace and their personal lives as well as contributing significantly to the performance of their organization. This is why EI has become such an important concept in the business world today. Managers and employees who understand their “role” within the organization and contribute to team learning
ensure a higher profitability than organizations who do not recognize the importance of this theory. “In their quest for competitive advantages, organizations have teamed up with researchers and consultants to initiate various programs for developing an emotional intelligent workforce (Carmeli & Josman, 2006).” Companies are starting to use EI assessments to integrate the concept into their training and evaluation practices in order to examine the role of EI in individual and organizational success.

Research Questions

This research consists of a multi-case study to determine the importance of EI in the business structure, what EI techniques are being utilized, and if this concept is influential to a healthy company culture and positive employee morale. The research questions defined are as follows:

1. What are the main emotional intelligence models and how do they measure levels of emotional competencies?
2. What are emotional intelligence assessments and what arguments attempt to disprove the validity of these assessments?
3. How are emotional intelligence assessments utilized in business units to increase task performance and profitability?
4. How does emotional intelligence directly impact company culture and employee satisfaction?

EI Models

Salovey and Mayer's interpretation of EI attempts to define EI within the confines of the standard criteria for a new intelligence. Their initial definition of EI was defined as: "The ability to perceive emotion, integrate emotion to facilitate thought, understand
emotions, and to regulate emotions to promote personal growth" but after extensive
research and the creation of the ability based model, the definition was revised to “The
ability to monitor one's own and others' feelings and emotions, to discriminate among
them and to use this information to guide one's thinking and actions.”

The ability based model views emotions as useful sources of information that help
people to begin to make sense of and navigate their social environment. This model
implies that individuals differ in their god-given ability to process information of an
emotional nature and in their ability to relate emotional processing to a wider cognition.
This ability is seen to manifest itself in certain adaptive behaviors (Petrides, Perez-
Gonzales, & Furnham, 2007). According to Peter Salovey and Daisy Grewal, the model
proposes that EI includes 4 types of abilities:

1. **Perceiving emotions** - the ability to detect and decipher emotions in faces,
pictures, voices, and cultural artifacts; including the ability to identify one’s own
emotions. Perceiving emotions represents a basic aspect of emotional intelligence,
as it makes all other processing of emotional information possible.

2. **Using emotions** - the ability to harness emotions to facilitate various cognitive
activities, such as thinking and problem solving. The emotionally intelligent
person can capitalize fully upon his or her changing moods in order to best fit the
task at hand.

3. **Understanding emotions** - the ability to comprehend emotion language and to
appreciate complicated relationships among emotions. For example,
understanding emotions encompasses the ability to be sensitive to slight variations
between emotions, and the ability to recognize and describe how emotions evolve over time.

4. Managing emotions - the ability to regulate emotions in both ourselves and in others. Therefore, the emotionally intelligent person can harness emotions, even negative ones, and manage them to achieve intended goals.

The EI model introduced by Daniel Goleman focuses on EI as a wide array of competencies and skills that improve managerial performance, and are measured by group and self-assessments. In *Working with Emotional Intelligence* (1998), Goleman explored the function of EI on the job, and claims that EI is the strongest predictor of success in the workplace, with more recent confirmation of these findings on a worldwide sample seen in Bradberry and Greaves, "The Emotional Intelligence Quick Book".

Goleman's model outlines four main EI constructs:

1. Self-awareness - the ability to read one's emotions and recognize their impact while using gut feelings to guide decisions.

2. Self-management - involves controlling one's emotions and impulses and adapting to changing circumstances.

3. Social awareness - the ability to sense, understand, and react to other's emotions while comprehending social networks.

4. Relationship management - the ability to inspire, influence, and develop others while managing conflict.

Goleman includes a set of emotional competencies within each construct of EI.

Emotional competencies are not innate talents, but rather learned capabilities that must be worked on and developed to achieve outstanding performance initiatives. Goleman
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predicts that individuals are born with a general emotional intelligence that determines their potential for learning emotional competencies in the future (Salovey & Grewal 2005).

Psychologist Reuven Bar-On developed one of the first measures of EI that used the term "Emotional Quotient". He defines emotional intelligence as being concerned with effectively understanding oneself and others, relating well to people, and adapting to and coping with the immediate surroundings to be more successful in dealing with environmental demands personally and professionally. Bar-On proposes that EI develops over time and that it can be improved through training, programming, and therapy. Bar-On also hypothesizes that those individuals with higher than average Emotional Quotients or E.Q.’s are in general more successful in meeting environmental demands and pressures. He also notes that a deficiency in EI can mean a lack of success and the existence of emotional problems. Problems in coping with one’s environment are thought, by Bar-On, to be especially common among those individuals lacking in the subscales of reality testing, problem solving, stress tolerance, and impulse control. In general, Bar-On considers emotional intelligence and cognitive intelligence to contribute equally to a person’s general intelligence, which then offers an indication of that person’s potential to succeed in life (Carmeli & Josman, 2006).

Petrides proposed a conceptual distinction between the ability based model and a trait based model of EI. Trait EI (or ‘trait emotional self-efficacy’) refers to "a constellation of behavioral dispositions and self-perceptions concerning one’s ability to recognize, process, and utilize emotion-laden information". This definition of EI encompasses behavioral dispositions and self perceived abilities and is measured by self
report, as opposed to the ability based model which refers to actual abilities as they express themselves in performance based measures. Trait EI should be investigated within a personality framework (Petrides, Perez-Gonzales, & Furnham, 2007).

The trait EI model is general, and encompasses the Goleman and Bar-On models discussed above. There are many critics of the ability-based model and the Mayer-Salovey-Caruso Emotional Intelligence Test (MSCEIT) which is used to measure EI, arguing that they are based on "psychometrically meaningless" scoring procedures. The conceptualization of EI as a personality trait leads to a construct that lies outside the realm of human cognitive abilities. This is an important distinction in as much as it bears directly on the core assessments of the construct and the theories and hypotheses that are formulated about EI. The trait EI model is among the most prominent in the scientific literature (Petrides, Perez-Gonzales, & Furnham, 2007).

EI models are only as good as their assessments or measures. One of the primary purposes in proposing a model of EI is to provide framework for scholars exploring individual differences in the processing of emotionally relevant information. Assessments and measures of EI help to make the theory reality by applying performance indicators to the various models of EI.

EI Measures and Assessments

Different models of EI have led to the development of various instruments for the assessment and implementation of EI. While some of these measures may overlap, most researchers agree that they employ slightly different constructs. The current measure of Mayer and Salovey’s model of EI, the Mayer-Salovey-Caruso Emotional Intelligence Test (MSCEIT) is based on a series of emotion-based problem-solving items. The
MSCEIT is a forty minute assessment that may be completed in person or online. By testing a person’s abilities on each of the four branches of EI (perceiving, using, understanding, and managing) it generates scores for all of the branches as well as a total score. Consistent with the model's notion of EI as a type of intelligence, the test is modeled off of ability-based IQ tests. Central to the four-branch model is the idea that EI requires a special attunement to social norms (Salovey & Grewal, 2005). Therefore, the MSCEIT is scored in a consensus fashion, with higher scores indicating higher overlap between an individual’s answers and those provided by a worldwide sample of respondents. The MSCEIT can also be expert-scored, so that the amount of overlap is calculated between an individual’s answers and those provided by a group of twenty-one emotion researchers.

Creating an assessment tool that successfully tests a construct as broad as EI is challenging, but it appears that the MSCEIT is an appropriate starting point. Scores on the four branches correlate perfectly with one another, and the branch and overall scores are reliable. The MSCEIT tests emotional abilities rather than personality traits, but it also does not correlate with the scales that measure a person’s likelihood to respond in socially desirable ways (Salovey & Grewal, 2005). Some downfalls to this assessment tool are that the MSCEIT is promoted as an ability test, but the MSCEIT is most unlike standard IQ tests in that its items do not have objectively correct responses. Among other problems, the consensus scoring criterion means that it is impossible to create items (questions) that only a minority of respondents can solve, because by definition, responses are deemed emotionally 'intelligent' only if the majority of the sample has endorsed them. This and other similar problems have led cognitive ability experts to
question the definition of EI as a genuine intelligence (Cherniss, Extein, Goleman, & Weissberg, 2006).

The Bar-On Emotion Quotient Inventory (EQ-I), is a self-report measure of EI and it was developed as a measure of emotionally and socially competent behavior that provides an estimate of one's emotional and social intelligence. The EQ-I is not meant to measure personality traits or cognitive capacity, but rather the mental ability to be successful in dealing with environmental demands and pressures. One hundred and thirty three items are used to obtain a Total EQ (Total Emotion Quotient) and to produce five composite scale scores, corresponding to the five main components of the Bar-On model. “It is claimed that the BarOn EQ-I is an appropriate measure of EI in the areas of: clinical, educational, forensic, medical, corporate, human resources and research settings” (Wakeman, 2007). The only limitation of this model is that it claims to measure some kind of ability through self-report items which is open to interpretation.

There are many self-report measures of EI pertaining to the EQI of an individual. Some of these measures include: the Swinburne University Emotional Intelligence Test (SUEIT), the Six Seconds Emotional Intelligence Assessment (SEI) and the Schutte Self-Report Emotional Intelligence Test (SSEIT). These questionnaires are a quick way to evaluate emotional competencies, and are fairly easy to use (Wakeman 2007). From the perspective of the trait EI model, none of these tests assess intelligence, abilities, or skills (as their authors often claim), but rather are limited measures of trait emotional self-efficacy (Petrides, Furnham, & Mavroveli, 2007). The Trait Emotional Intelligence Questionnaire (TEIQue) is an open-access measure that was specifically designed to
measure the construct of EI comprehensively and is currently available in fifteen languages.

The TEIQue provides an assessment for the Petrides and colleagues' model that conceptualizes EI in terms of personality. The test encompasses fifteen subscales organized under four factors: Well-Being, Self-Control, Emotionality, and Sociability. The psychometric properties of the TEIQue were investigated in a recent study on a French-Speaking Population, where it was reported that TEIQue scores were globally normally distributed and reliable. The researchers also found TEIQue scores were unrelated to nonverbal reasoning, which they interpreted as support for the personality trait view of EI (as opposed to a form of intelligence). As expected, TEIQue scores were positively related to some personality dimensions like optimism, agreeableness, openness and conscientiousness as well as inversely related to others such as neuroticism (Petrides, Furnham, & Mavroveli, 2007).

Measurement tools based on Goleman’s model of emotional intelligence include the Emotional Competency Inventory (ECI) and the Emotional Intelligence Appraisal (EIA), which can be taken as a self-report or 360-degree assessment. These are some of the standards on EI assessment models but they continue to evolve with continued research. There are also new assessments, such as the Emotional Intelligence Questionnaire, that build on prior research and existing instruments in order to tailor assessments for specific needs in the personal or corporate environment.

Criticism of the theoretical foundation of EI

“Emotional intelligence (EI) has been embraced by many practitioners and academicians without clear empirical support for the construct” (Antonakis, 2007). One
of the arguments against the theoretical soundness of the concept suggests that the constant changing and broadening of its definition- which has come to encompass many unrelated elements - had rendered it an unintelligible concept. According to E.I. Locke, there are many holes in the construct of EI which make it hard to prove in theory. According to Locke, "What is the common or integrating element in a concept that includes: introspection about emotions, Emotional expression, non-verbal communication with others, empathy, self-regulation, planning, creative thinking and the direction of attention? There is none."

Other critics mention that without some stabilization of the concepts and the measurement instruments of EI, meta-analyses of the concept are difficult to implement, and the theory coherence is likely to be adversely impacted by this instability (Antonakis, 2007). Goleman's early work has been criticized for assuming that EI is a type of intelligence. Eysenck (2000) writes that Goleman's description of EI contains unsubstantiated assumptions about intelligence in general, and that it even runs contrary to what researchers have come to expect when studying types of intelligence:

"Goleman exemplifies more clearly than most the fundamental absurdity of the tendency to class almost any type of behaviour as an 'intelligence'... If these five 'abilities' define 'emotional intelligence', we would expect some evidence that they are highly correlated; Goleman admits that they might be quite uncorrelated, and in any case if we cannot measure them, how do we know they are related? So the whole theory is built on quicksand; there is no sound scientific basis".
Similarly, Locke (2005) claims that the concept of EI in itself is a misinterpretation of the intelligence construct, and he offers an alternative interpretation: it is not another form or type of intelligence, but intelligence (the ability to grasp abstractions) applied to a particular life domain: emotions. He suggests the concept should be re-labeled and referred to as a skill rather than a theory.

Other researchers have raised concerns with the extent to which self-report EI measures correlate with established personality dimensions and moods. Generally, self-report EI measures and personality measures have been said to converge, because they both propose to measure traits, and because they are both measured in the self-report form. They can easily be skewed by mood changes (Antonakis, 2007). One criticism of the works of Mayer and Salovey suggests that the EI, as measured by the MSCEIT, may only be measuring conformity. This argument is rooted in the MSCEIT's use of consensus-based assessment, and in the fact that scores on the MSCEIT are negatively distributed (meaning that its scores differentiate between people with low EI better than people with high EI). Further criticism suggests that unlike tests of cognitive ability, the MSCEIT tests knowledge of emotions but not necessarily the ability to perform tasks that are related to the knowledge that is assessed. The main argument is that even though someone knows how he should behave in an emotionally laden situation, it doesn’t necessarily follow what could actually carry out in the reported behavior (Antonakis, 2007).

The use of EI assessments in the workplace have continued to increase but the relevance and concepts of EI continue to be criticized. Whenever a new assessment tool is proposed for hiring purposes, the concern arises that it might lead to unfair job
discrimination. The use of EI tests, whose validity has not been established, may lead to arbitrary discrimination practices in the minds of some. There are two sides to every argument so there would have to be criticisms to the relevance of EI but most research done on EI has shown that there is a place for this concept in business units.

*EI related to Company Culture and Employee Satisfaction*

The organization can be generally defined as a system created through consensus. If there is a direct link between individual success and individual emotional intelligence, then it follows that there is a casual link between sustainable corporate success and corporate emotional intelligence. “The real difference between success and failure in a corporation can be very often traced to the question of how well the organization brings out the great energies and talents of its people” (Barrett, 1999). This is a nice idea, but corporate America has not been that successful at creating the type of environment that can tap the full potential of the American workforce. One important way that employees find personal fulfillment at work is when an organization is able to satisfy their physical, emotional, mental, and spiritual needs. Emotional needs are met when there is effective direct communication, empathetic personal relationships, and appreciation for personal contribution (Barett, 1999). EI is directly impacts emotional needs in the workplace by addressing all of these desires. “The Study of Business Performance, Employee Satisfaction, and Leadership,” by the Wilson Learning Corporation found that thirty-nine percent of variability in organizational performance is attributable to the personal satisfaction of employees. The same study found that sixty-nine percent of the variability in personal satisfaction was attributable to the quality of the employees’ relationship with their managers and their managers’ empowerment skills (Barrett, 1999).
The core of emotional intelligence—ability to inspire and motivate others, should be as equally important as intellectual intelligence in running a successful organization. Research indicates that the success of an organization is dependent on how well an organization can tap the potential of its employees, maintain a healthy company culture, and retain highly emotional intelligent managers. Employee potential is tapped when managers operate with emotional intelligence and the values of the organization align with the personal values of employees. In other words, the construct of EI and its competencies are believed to play a dominant role for learning at the individual level to reach an organizational level. Corporate emotional intelligence starts in the boardroom, but it cannot be used to create value for the organization until it is visible in the decisions made daily in the workplace.

Conclusion

There are many EI models such as ability based, Bar-On, and trait with corresponding assessments, most notably the MSCEIT, but research continues to expand and pinpoint the actual definition of EI. Everyone has their own opinion about what the concept of EI entails, but the evidence to its relevance in the business environment is staggering. The components of the major models of EI can be narrowed to two broad dimensions: awareness and management of one’s own emotions and awareness and management of the emotions of others. The first dimension includes self-regulating abilities, while the second focuses on social skills. There have been many arguments against the use and concept of EI but research indicates that intellectual intelligence and emotional intelligence are independent of one another. The independence of cognitive and social/emotional systems can be seen in two formative cases: those patients with
selective brain lesions and those with Aspergers syndrome. Neurological patients with lesions to their prefrontal cortex display normal levels of cognitive function when assessed by IQ tests but typically have impairments in social judgments and decision-making. Patients with Asperger’s syndrome display normal or superior intelligence on IQ measures, but lack social skills and understanding of social norms (Extein, Goleman, & Weissberg, 2006). It is safe to say that patients with brain lesions on the prefrontal lobe and those with Asperger’s syndrome are completely void of emotional intelligence.

Emotional intelligence is sometimes referred to as a skill but most researchers believe it is inborn. With awareness it can always be developed which is why some believe that EI competencies should be taught in school. If EI can be initiated at a younger age, the rate of success will increase as well. The construct of EI contributes to eighty to ninety percent of the competencies that distinguish outstanding leaders from average leaders and sometimes more. By implementing EI into business units, the organization will reap the benefits of satisfied employees and a healthy company culture. EI has an affect on every aspect of the life of the individual utilizing the tools. Emotional intelligence is related to positive outcomes such as pro-social behaviors, parental warmth, and positive family and peer relations. By realizing the importance of EI now, future possibilities of organizations and individuals are endless.
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