

M25 – Managerial Leadership and Emotional Intelligence

Emotional Intelligence as a Tool for Effective Managerial Leadership

Option 1 – Written Assignment Report

Submitted in partial fulfilment of the requirements for
M25 – Managerial Leadership and Emotional Intelligence

Table of Contents

Abstract	3
1. Introduction	3
2. Literature Review	4
2.1 Defining Emotional Intelligence	4
2.2 Emotional Intelligence and Leadership Effectiveness	5
2.3 Emotionally Intelligent Communication and Trust	6
2.4 Emotional Intelligence and Employee Motivation	7
3. Methodology	8
4. Findings	8
4.1 The Five Components of EI in Practice	8
4.2 Real-World Organisational Examples	9
5. Discussion	11
6. Conclusion	13
References	14
Appendices	16

Abstract

One of the most essential qualities in contemporary managerial leadership is emotional intelligence (EI). The use of EI as a strategic tool to enhance leadership effectiveness in contemporary businesses is explored in this research. The report is based on key theoretical foundations including Goleman's five-component model (1995, 1998) and examines self-awareness, self-regulation, motivation, empathy and social skills as interrelated dimensions of effective leadership practice. The research synthesises peer-reviewed evidence to demonstrate how managers with emotional intelligence increase communication, develop trust and maintain employee motivation. Theoretical ideas stated are given empirical grounding by real-world illustrations include Microsoft under Satya Nadella, Google's Project Oxygen and Johnson & Johnson's Values-Based Leadership initiative. The analysis is based on a qualitative, interpretive methodology based on secondary sources. The findings reveal a strong, positive association between management EI and outcomes such as employee engagement, organisational commitment and team performance. The debate critically

evaluates constraints and context variables and the conclusion recommends systematic EI development as a basic leadership investment.

1. Introduction

In the 21st century, leadership effectiveness is not just about cognitive aptitude, technical skill, or strategic acumen. Increasingly, scholarly research reveals that how managers perceive, comprehend and regulate emotions, both their own and of others, substantially impacts organisational outcomes. This relational, affective side of leadership is encapsulated in the construct of emotional intelligence (EI), a concept that has received sustained interest from academics and practitioners since its theoretical popularisation by Salovey and Mayer (1990) and subsequent diffusion into management discourse through the work of Daniel Goleman (1995).

There are many ways in which EI is relevant to managerial practice. Managers with high emotional intelligence typically demonstrate better interpersonal communication, a greater ability to resolve conflict, stronger mentoring behaviour and a better capacity to inspire and sustain staff enthusiasm (Côté, 2014; Harms & Credé, 2010). In a business climate marked by workforce diversity, rapid change and escalating psychological demands on employees, these qualities are not peripheral pleasures but core necessities for organisational success.

In this report we address the key question: How does emotional intelligence contribute to management leadership? This report seeks to answer this question by: (1) defining EI and discussing its main components; (2) reviewing the theoretical and empirical literature linking EI to leadership effectiveness; (3) discussing how emotionally intelligent managers promote communication, trust, and motivation; and (4) supporting these claims with real-world examples. The research ends with a synthesis of significant insights and recommendations for organisations looking to harness EI as a developmental tool.

The report is limited to managerial and organisational leadership situations. It does not attempt to discuss EI in therapeutic, educational or wider social domains. The analysis draws on a variety of quality secondary sources and well-established corporate case studies via a critical interpretive lens.

2. Review of Literature

2.1. Emotional Intelligence Definition

Salovey and Mayer (1990, p. 189) formally defined emotional intelligence 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." In their initial ability model, EI was seen as a set of hierarchically arranged cognitive capacities: perceiving emotions accurately,

using emotions to facilitate thought, understanding emotional meanings, and managing emotions in oneself and others (Mayer & Salovey, 1997).

However, it was Goleman's (1995) famous and extensively read description which established EI into the organisational and managerial awareness. In his next essay for the Harvard Business Review, "What Makes a Leader?" (1998), Goleman reduced EI to five basic qualities that are particularly relevant to leadership: self-awareness, self-regulation, motivation, empathy, and social skills. Some academics have challenged the model for combining personality qualities with cognitive ability (Locke, 2005), yet the model has been tremendously influential in the management literature and forms the main theoretical lens of this report.

A complementary mixed model has been suggested by Bar-On (1997), in which EI includes intrapersonal and interpersonal abilities, adaptation, stress management, and general mood. Bar-On's model, although differing from Goleman's in a number of aspects, also underlines the importance of emotional and social functioning as factors influencing effective conduct in complicated contexts. Both theories agree on the perspective of EI as a competency that can be learned and developed; a view that has considerable consequences for managerial training and organisational development (Boyatzis, 2009).

The 5 components of Goleman's approach deserve some elaboration in the context of managerial practice:

Self-awareness is the ability to understand one's own feelings, strengths, weaknesses, values and how one's actions affects others. Self-aware managers understand how their emotions influence their decision-making and relationships with others and are receptive to feedback and willing to act on it (George, 2000). It is this metacognitive capacity that is thought to be the foundation of EI, from which the other competencies develop.

Self-regulation is the ability to control disruptive impulses and emotions, to think before acting, and to behave with integrity and trustworthiness in conditions of stress. Managers with high self-regulation are consistent, transparent and less reactive, which creates a psychological safety in teams (Edmondson, 1999).

Here, motivation is an internal desire to achieve more than external benefits - a passion for one's work that is beyond position, salary or recognition. The motivated managers are resilient, optimistic and orientated towards the future, which is contagious for the staff around them (Deci & Ryan, 2000).

Of the five components, empathy is likely the most socially relevant. Empathy is the capacity to comprehend and share the emotional experiences of others. Empathic managers are sensitive to the needs, viewpoints, and worries of their teams and use this sensitivity to influence their interactions and decisions (Goleman, 1998). Empathy is not to be mistaken with compassion. It is a cognitive-affective capacity, not a license for sentimentality.

Social skills are the set of competencies that allow you to manage relationships – influencing, communicating, resolving conflict, developing networks and leading change. Managers high in social competence are excellent at steering people in desired directions through captivating communication and connection building (Goleman, 1998).

2.2 Emotional Intelligence and Effective Leadership

EI and leadership effectiveness have been the subject of much empirical attention. Some of the best evidence is from meta-analytic evaluations. A large meta-analysis by Joseph and Newman (2010) indicated that EI (especially ability-based EI) was positively connected to job performance, with this relationship being mediated by emotional labour demands. More directly relevant to leadership, Harms and Credé (2010) conducted a thorough meta-analysis of the relationship between EI and leadership outcomes and found moderate, statistically significant positive correlations, even when controlling for personality and general cognitive ability.

The theoretical link with EI is especially productive in transformational leadership theory. Bass (1985) defined transformational leaders as those that motivate followers to transcend their own self-interest for the good of the group and to be innovative and considerate of the individual needs of team members. Each of these activities maps well to EI competencies: inspiring motivation maps to Goleman's motivation dimension, intellectual stimulation maps to self-awareness and social awareness, and individualised consideration is based on empathy. In this vein, George (2000) contended that EI is "the key to effective leadership," allowing leaders to inspire vision, comprehend the needs of followers, and create the emotional atmosphere where discretionary effort grows.

On the contrary, low EI in managers has been related with undesirable consequences such as abusive supervision, followers' emotional weariness, higher levels of voluntary turnover, and weaker organisational commitment (Ashforth & Humphrey, 1995; Côté, 2014). Managers who are not self-regulating can create psychologically hazardous settings in which employees are hesitant to speak out, take risks, or admit mistakes—conditions that are hostile to learning and creativity (Edmondson, 1999).

In theory, the contrast between leader EI and follower EI is important. According to research by Glasø and Einarsen (2006), the EI of the leader has a more significant impact on the emotional climate of the team than the collective EI of team members. Leaders establish the affective tone; their emotional expressions provide social information that followers use to make sense of organisational events and adjust their own behavioural responses. This leader–follower emotional contagion (Hatfield, Cacioppo, & Rapson, 1993) underlines the disproportionate organisational influence of managerial EI.

2.3 Trust and Emotionally Intelligent Communication

Communication is the foremost medium of managerial EI in the organisational life. Emotionally intelligent communication is described by active listening, nondisruptive response, situational awareness, and the ability to communicate in a manner that is consistent with the emotional states of the message recipient (Riggio & Reichard, 2008). These activities are regularly linked to greater levels of perceived leader-member exchange quality, a relationship variable highly connected with employee happiness, performance, and citizenship behaviour (Gerstner & Day, 1997).

Trust is both the cause and the effect of emotionally competent communication. According to the tripartite model of Mayer, Davis, and Schoorman (1995), the primary determinants of

trustworthiness are ability, compassion, and integrity. Managers who are self-aware and self-regulating show consistency and integrity; managers who show empathy show benevolence; and managers who use social skills well show interpersonal competence. These EI abilities together build a strong foundation for follower trust.

This assertion is supported empirically by the meta-analysis of Dirks and Ferrin (2002), who showed leader trustworthiness to be one of the strongest predictors of a variety of follower outcomes including work satisfaction, commitment, and citizenship behaviour. Brunetto et al (2012) expanded this finding explicitly to the healthcare industry, indicating that nurse managers' EI strongly influenced subordinates' levels of trust in management, which in turn predicted job satisfaction and retention intentions.

It is worth emphasising that EI-based communication also plays a vital role in dealing with tough talks – performance criticism, organisational change announcements, disciplinary procedures – which have high affective stakes. In these high-stakes circumstances, managers who can moderate their own anxiety, attend empathically to follower concerns, and communicate with clarity and compassion are better able to preserve relationship trust even while delivering disagreeable messages (Boyatzis & McKee, 2005).

2.4 Emotional Intelligence and Motivation of Employees

Several mechanisms mediate the association between managerial EI and employee motivation. According to self-determination theory (Deci & Ryan, 2000), emotionally competent managers are more likely to fulfil the three main psychological needs—autonomy, competence, and relatedness—that form the basis of intrinsic motivation. They support the need for relatedness by demonstrating empathy and attunement to individual employee circumstances, for competence by offering suitably calibrated feedback and developmental opportunities, and for autonomy by consulting employees, seeking input, and honouring individual agency.

Finally, special attention needs to be paid to the role of emotional contagion in motivation. Goleman, Boyatzis and McKee (2002) invented the term "primal leadership" to characterise the leader's role in establishing the emotional tone of an organisation in general. They maintained, based on neurological studies, that the affect of a leader was physically contagious, transmitted through limbic system resonance and shaping the mood states of followers. Leaders who sustain positive, energetic, and optimistic emotional registers tend to induce matching states in their teams, increasing motivation, inventiveness, and tenacity. On the other hand, chronic negative affect: irritation, anxiety, disdain, leads leaders to dampen such consequences.

Research by Sy, Tram and O'Hara (2006) provides empirical support for this mechanism. They found that management EI was positively associated to employee job satisfaction and performance, and that this impact was partly mediated by the emotional contagion of positive group affect in their study of food service workers. Wong and Law (2002) also demonstrated that both leader EI and follower EI predicted work satisfaction and organisational commitment in a Chinese managerial sample.

Another way of achieving this is by recognition and gratitude. Managers with emotional intelligence can be better at seeing and giving proper acknowledgement to the contributions

of each employee, triggering the inner motivational power of recognition instead of relying entirely on outside rewards. This capacity for individualised, contextually sensitive acknowledgement is in line with transformational leadership's focus on individualised consideration (Bass & Riggio, 2006).

3. Methods

This report employs a qualitative, interpretive approach based on the systematic review of secondary sources. Instead of creating primary data, the analysis draws together peer-reviewed academic articles, authoritative textbooks, meta-analytic studies and documented organisational case studies, to build a theoretically coherent and empirically grounded account of EI's role in managerial leadership.

The selection of sources favoured: (a) theoretical rigour, prioritising peer-reviewed journal articles and seminal texts in the EI and leadership literatures; (b) empirical grounding, paying special attention to meta-analytic reviews and longitudinal studies; and (c) real-world relevance, including credible corporate case studies from sources such as Harvard Business Review, McKinsey Quarterly and documented organisational programmes. Incorporating both fundamental and more contemporary studies (1985–2024) ensures that the analysis reflects both the intellectual background and the current state of the field.

The interpretive approach acknowledges that no single methodology can provide definitive causal evidence of the impact of EI within complex organisational systems, but rather the report aims to build a coherent, well-evidenced argument by triangulating theoretical perspectives, empirical findings and real-world examples. We discuss the limitations of this strategy, including the difficulty to control for confounding variables in case-study evidence and the possibility for publication bias in the meta-analytic literature, in the Discussion section.

4. Findings

4.1 The Five Elements of EI in Management Practice

The literature converges into a consistent picture, in which each of Goleman's five EI components contributes uniquely to managerial performance and their combined presence is a potent leadership asset.

Self awareness and management effectiveness Research by Tasha Eurich (2018) synthesising data from over 5,000 participants indicated that only 10-15% of people are actually self aware despite 95% thinking themselves to be so. Managers with calibrated self-awareness are more responsive to developmental feedback, more adept at managing their emotional reactions under pressure, and more capable of truthful communication—all of which have downstream consequences on follower trust and engagement. Atwater and Yammarino (1992) discovered that managers whose self-assessments were consistent with followers' assessments (high self-awareness) were regarded substantially more effective as leaders than managers whose self-assessments were not consistent with followers' assessments.

Self-regulation and organisational climate: The relationship between self-regulation and psychological safety is widely documented. Edmondson's (1999) landmark research on team psychological safety showed that the main factor in whether teams establish psychologically safe climates is manager behaviour, i.e. whether managers respond to mistakes by blaming and punishing or being curious and supportive. Learning is possible when managers are self-regulating, able to suspend reactive responses and engage constructively with failure, so creating the circumstances for creativity and candid communication.

Motivation and performance culture Managers' intrinsic motivation is infectious to their teams. Pink's (2009) research on the limits of extrinsic reward systems in cognitively challenging work is consistent with the EI literature's focus on the motivational impact of leaders who model passion, purpose, and tenacity. Managers who display true passion for their profession tend to be better at maintaining the motivation of their teams during setbacks and hardship than managers who are viewed as simply going through the motions.

Empathy and retention: Workforce retention is one of the most commercially relevant outcomes related to managerial empathy. According to a landmark Businessolver (2023) Workplace Empathy Report, 92% of employees said they would be more inclined to stay with an empathetic company. Empathy predicted greater ratings of employee net promoter measures, suggesting its commercial as well as relational worth. Managers that genuinely care about the wellness, career objectives and personal situations of their direct reports create strong reciprocal commitment.

Social skills and change management Managing organisational change is one of the most difficult tests of a manager's social skill repertoire. Research on change management has repeatedly identified poor communication and lack of attention to the emotional responses of those affected by change as key reasons for the failure of change initiatives (Kotter, 1996). High social skill managers make better change leaders because they can create coalitions, work through objections by discussion rather than dictate, and keep people motivated through uncertainty.

4.2 Examples of Real-World Organisations

There are a number of significant organisational situations that demonstrate the practical effectiveness of EI in management leadership:

Microsoft Under Satya Nadella: Perhaps the most often recognised modern example of transformational leadership based in EI is the tenure of Satya Nadella as CEO of Microsoft, which began in 2014. Nadella inherited an organisation defined by a tight stack-ranking performance culture, interdepartmental competitiveness and a waning reputation for creativity. His answer was specifically and intentionally founded in cultural and emotional development. In his 2017 biography, *Hit Refresh*, Nadella traced much of his leadership philosophy to lessons in empathy he learned raising a child with cerebral palsy. He systematically demolished the stack-ranking structure, replacing it with a growth mindset culture (drawing on the work of Carol Dweck), and promoted cross-divisional collaboration based on psychological safety. Under his leadership, Microsoft's market capitalisation rose from around \$300 billion to over \$3 trillion, a trajectory that coincided with, and arguably

was enabled by, a tangible improvement in employee engagement and organisational culture (Nadella, 2017; Hess & Ludwig, 2017).

Google's Project Oxygen In 2009, Google started Project Oxygen, a data-driven examination into what distinguished its greatest performing managers from the others. The findings, later published and widely discussed (Garvin, 2013), indicated that the best Google managers were defined not so much by technical expertise as by interpersonal and emotional competencies: a good coach, who empowers and does not micromanage, is concerned about the success and well-being of their employees, is results-oriented but also a good communicator and possesses key soft skills such as empathy and the ability to listen. The findings were paradoxical at a company that had historically valued technical talent, and prompted a comprehensive overhaul of Google's management training courses to foreground EI competencies. Google then broadened its enquiry with Project Aristotle (2016), which revealed that psychological safety, itself a consequence of empathic and self-regulated managerial behaviour, was the single most powerful predictor of team effectiveness across hundreds of Google teams.

Johnson & Johnson's Leadership Development Programme Johnson & Johnson has long been acknowledged as a pioneer in the integration of EI into leadership development. The company's Values-Based Leadership programme specifically includes EI evaluation and training, based on 360-degree feedback methods in line with Goleman's competency paradigm. Boyatzis and McKee (2005) quote internal study where J&J managers, who had undergone EI development programmes, demonstrated considerable progress in abilities such as emotional self-awareness, coaching and mentoring and influence. These changes were associated with better team performance measures and higher scores for employee satisfaction. The programme's durability – it has been a fixture of J&J's leadership development for more than two decades – indicates an enduring institutional belief in EI's usefulness to the company.

The Ritz-Carlton Hotel Company Service excellence organisations provide a particularly insightful perspective on EI in management. The Ritz-Carlton's famed customer service philosophy, summed up in its Gold Standards, is based not simply on obedience to procedures but on the emotional sensitivity of its employees—a trait that must be first exemplified and nurtured by managers. The company's daily line-up is an example of EI in a purposeful, institutionalised form, with managers spending a few minutes at the start of each shift talking with their personnel about the emotional climate. Empirical evidence from studies on service organisations is consistent in demonstrating that the emotions displayed by employees are heavily affected by the emotions that managers display (Grandey, 2000), therefore making managerial EI a proximate determinant of customer experience outcomes.

5. Discussion

The research covered in the preceding sections leads to a convincing conclusion: emotional intelligence is not simply a desired add-on to traditional managerial competencies but a core ingredient of effective leadership in complex, people-intensive companies. This result is reinforced by the convergence of theoretical frameworks, meta-analytic evidence and real-world situations across sectors and regions. However, critical inspection is required in some areas.

First, the measurement of EI remains controversial. The field is separated into ability-based models (Mayer & Salovey, 1997), mixed models (Goleman, 1998; Bar-On, 1997), and trait-based models (Petrides & Furnham, 2001). These models use distinct assessment instruments—MSCEIT for ability EI, ECI-360 for Goleman’s competency model, EQ-i for Bar-On’s model, TEIQue for trait EI—and they do not correlate fully with each other. Mixed and trait-based EI models are little more than a repackaging of proven personality factors (especially agreeableness, conscientiousness and neuroticism from the Big Five) according to critics like Locke (2005) and Landy (2005). This criticism is valid and warns against the naïve embrace of EI as a panacea, but does not invalidate the vast empirical evidence that EI-related competences predict leadership outcomes; it just complicates the theoretical explanation of why they do so.

Second, in many research the causal direction of the relationship between EI and leadership is uncertain. Cross-sectional survey designs, which dominate the literature, cannot prove whether EI causes successful leadership or whether the experience of effective leadership enhances EI. The strongest causal evidence is from longitudinal research and evaluations of training interventions. Boyatzis (2009) reviewed competency-based leadership development programmes which included extended EI coaching and found persistent increases in self-awareness and relationship management competencies which were sustained over multi-year follow-up periods. However, the evidence base for EI training treatments is smaller and less methodologically robust than the broader correlational literature, and this gap suggests a focus for future research.

Third, the heterogeneity of environment and culture hampers the application of EI-based leadership models universally. Hofstede (2001) has researched national cultural dimensions and suggested that cultures vary in the extent to which they value emotional expression, empathy and participative management. The emphasis on visible empathy and emotional transparency typical of high-EI management styles may be more easily embraced in individualistic, low-power-distance cultures (e.g., Northern Europe and North America) than in collectivist, high-power-distance contexts (e.g., parts of East Asia), where more indirect communication and hierarchical deference are normatively anticipated. Thus, organisations that operate in diverse cultural contexts should be careful in using EI frameworks universally and pay close attention to cultural adaptation.

Fourth, the risk of the instrumentalisation of EI needs the ethical attention. When organisations train managers to use empathy and social skill primarily as instruments of increasing employee productivity – what Hochschild (1983) called “emotional labour” – there is a risk of inauthenticity that, if perceived by employees, may undermine the very trust that EI-based leadership seeks to build. Genuine EI is distinguished from performed EI by its motivational basis: Authentic empathy arises from genuine concern for others and not from a deliberate desire to elicit performance-facilitating affect. Leadership development programmes that focus solely on behavioural technique without developing underlying values and dispositions risk creating managers who are superficially skilled but essentially inauthentic – something that followers tend to notice and find more disturbing than overt emotional roughness.

These caveats aside, the practical ramifications are evident. Organisations that invest in systematic EI development (via rigorous multi-source feedback, coaching, reflective practice and organised developmental experiences) are likely to develop more successful managers

and achieve better organisational outcomes. The examples of Microsoft, Google and Johnson & Johnson are instructive not just in what they did but in how they did it: by weaving EI into the fabric of leadership culture, selection criteria, performance assessment and training, these organisations built self-reinforcing developmental ecosystems rather than relying on isolated interventions.

The ramifications for individual managers are evident too. Self-awareness is the most accessible entry point for EI growth, and it is universally accessible – honest 360-degree feedback, reflective journals, coaching/therapy, mindfulness practice, have all been demonstrated to improve self-awareness over time (Goleman et al., 2002). Self-regulation can be developed by the deliberate practice of behavioural pause techniques, which is the discipline of creating a reflective gap between emotional input and behavioural reaction. Empathy can be cultivated by perspective-taking exercises, training in active listening, and conscious focus on the non-verbal and para-verbal cues of others. These are not esoteric abilities, but talents that may be developed via conscious, continuous effort.

6. Conclusion

In this research, we have investigated emotional intelligence as a strategic instrument for efficient management leadership. The report has demonstrated that EI is a crucial and multifaceted driver of leadership effectiveness, starting with Goleman's original five-component model: self-awareness, self-regulation, motivation, empathy, and social skills, and grounding the analysis in a rich body of theoretical and empirical literature.

The analysis has shown that self-awareness enables authentic, consistent leadership behaviour, self-regulation creates climates of psychological safety and trust, intrinsic motivation generates a contagious organisational energy, empathy sustains employee motivation, wellbeing, and retention, and social skills facilitate communication, change management, and collaboration. These competences together prepare managers to deal with the emotional and relational challenges of contemporary organisational life with the sensitivity and intentionality that technical skills alone cannot provide.

Microsoft, Google, Johnson & Johnson and the Ritz-Carlton show that EI-based leadership is not a theoretical ambition but a practically viable and financially consequential strategy. " These businesses have entrenched EI ideas into their management cultures with measurable effects in employee engagement, innovation and organisational performance.

The limits of the EI notion, including as measurement heterogeneity, causal ambiguity, cultural variability, and the risk of instrumental inauthenticity, have been addressed in critical reflection and thus placed in a balanced evaluative framework. These issues provide a counterpoint to naïve or mechanistic uses of EI frameworks while reaffirming the underlying validity of EI as a crucial leadership competency.

In conclusion, the data is compelling that emotionally intelligent managers are more effective managers. The implications for organisations are clear: invest in EI development as a core component of leadership strategy, embed it into selection, assessment and training processes, and develop the organisational conditions – starting with psychologically safe, empathically led teams – in which EI can flourish. The message to individual managers is just as clear: the

pathway to leadership success lies as much in emotional depth as it does in intellectual brilliance.

References

- Ashforth, B. E., & Humphrey, R. H. (1995). Emotion in the workplace: A reappraisal. *Human Relations*, 48(2), 97–125. <https://doi.org/10.1177/001872679504800201>
- Atwater, L. E., & Yammarino, F. J. (1992). Does self–other agreement on leadership perceptions moderate the validity of leadership and performance predictions? *Personnel Psychology*, 45(1), 141–164.
- Bar-On, R. (1997). The emotional intelligence inventory (EQ-i): Technical manual. Multi-Health Systems.
- Bass, B. M. (1985). *Leadership and performance beyond expectations*. Free Press.
- Bass, B. M., & Riggio, R. E. (2006). *Transformational leadership* (2nd ed.). Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Boyatzis, R. E. (2009). Competencies as a behavioural approach to emotional intelligence. *Journal of Management Development*, 28(9), 749–770. <https://doi.org/10.1108/02621710910987647>
- Boyatzis, R. E., & McKee, A. (2005). *Resonant leadership: Renewing yourself and connecting with others through mindfulness, hope, and compassion*. Harvard Business School Press.
- Brunetto, Y., Teo, S. T. T., Shacklock, K., & Farr-Wharton, R. (2012). Emotional intelligence, job satisfaction, wellbeing and engagement: Explaining organisational commitment and turnover intentions in policing. *Human Resource Management Journal*, 22(4), 428–441.
- Businessolver. (2023). State of workplace empathy report. <https://www.businessolver.com/resources/state-of-workplace-empathy>
- Côté, S. (2014). Emotional intelligence in organizations. *Annual Review of Organizational Psychology and Organizational Behavior*, 1(1), 459–488. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-orgpsych-031413-091233>
- Deci, E. L., & Ryan, R. M. (2000). The "what" and "why" of goal pursuits: Human needs and the self-determination of behaviour. *Psychological Inquiry*, 11(4), 227–268.
- Dirks, K. T., & Ferrin, D. L. (2002). Trust in leadership: Meta-analytic findings and implications for research and practice. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 87(4), 611–628. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.87.4.611>
- Edmondson, A. C. (1999). Psychological safety and learning behavior in work teams. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 44(2), 350–383.
- Eurich, T. (2018). What self-awareness really is (and how to cultivate it). *Harvard Business Review*. <https://hbr.org/2018/01/what-self-awareness-really-is-and-how-to-cultivate-it>
- Garvin, D. A. (2013). How Google sold its engineers on management. *Harvard Business Review*, 91(12), 74–82.
- George, J. M. (2000). Emotions and leadership: The role of emotional intelligence. *Human Relations*, 53(8), 1027–1055.
- Gerstner, C. R., & Day, D. V. (1997). Meta-analytic review of leader–member exchange theory: Correlates and construct issues. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 82(6), 827–844.
- Glasø, L., & Einarsen, S. (2006). Experienced affects in leader–subordinate relationships. *Scandinavian Journal of Management*, 22(1), 49–73.

- Goleman, D. (1995). *Emotional intelligence: Why it can matter more than IQ*. Bantam Books.
- Goleman, D. (1998). What makes a leader? *Harvard Business Review*, 76(6), 93–102.
- Goleman, D., Boyatzis, R., & McKee, A. (2002). *Primal leadership: Realizing the power of emotional intelligence*. Harvard Business School Press.
- Grandey, A. A. (2000). Emotional regulation in the workplace: A new way to conceptualize emotional labor. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, 5(1), 95–110.
- Harms, P. D., & Credé, M. (2010). Emotional intelligence and transformational and transactional leadership: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Leadership & Organizational Studies*, 17(1), 5–17.
- Hatfield, E., Cacioppo, J. T., & Rapson, R. L. (1993). Emotional contagion. *Current Directions in Psychological Science*, 2(3), 96–99.
- Hess, E. D., & Ludwig, K. (2017). *Humility is the new smart: Rethinking human excellence in the smart machine age*. Berrett-Koehler.
- Hochschild, A. R. (1983). *The managed heart: Commercialization of human feeling*. University of California Press.
- Hofstede, G. (2001). *Culture's consequences: Comparing values, behaviours, institutions, and organizations across nations* (2nd ed.). Sage.
- Joseph, D. L., & Newman, D. A. (2010). Emotional intelligence: An integrative meta-analysis and cascading model. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 95(1), 54–78.
- Kotter, J. P. (1996). *Leading change*. Harvard Business School Press.
- Landy, F. J. (2005). Some historical and scientific issues related to research on emotional intelligence. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 26(4), 411–424.
- Locke, E. A. (2005). Why emotional intelligence is an invalid concept. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 26(4), 425–431.
- Mayer, J. D., & Salovey, P. (1997). What is emotional intelligence? In P. Salovey & D. J. Sluyter (Eds.), *Emotional development and emotional intelligence: Educational implications* (pp. 3–31). Basic Books.
- Mayer, R. C., Davis, J. H., & Schoorman, F. D. (1995). An integrative model of organisational trust. *Academy of Management Review*, 20(3), 709–734.
- Nadella, S. (2017). *Hit refresh: The quest to rediscover Microsoft's soul and imagine a better future for everyone*. HarperCollins.
- Petrides, K. V., & Furnham, A. (2001). Trait emotional intelligence: Psychometric investigation with reference to established trait taxonomies. *European Journal of Personality*, 15(6), 425–448.
- Pink, D. H. (2009). *Drive: The surprising truth about what motivates us*. Riverhead Books.
- Riggio, R. E., & Reichard, R. J. (2008). The emotional and social intelligences of effective leadership. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 23(2), 169–185.
- Salovey, P., & Mayer, J. D. (1990). Emotional intelligence. *Imagination, Cognition and Personality*, 9(3), 185–211.
- Sy, T., Tram, S., & O'Hara, L. A. (2006). Relation of employee and manager emotional intelligence to job satisfaction and performance. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 68(3), 461–473.
- Wong, C. S., & Law, K. S. (2002). The effects of leader and follower emotional intelligence on performance and attitude: An exploratory study. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 13(3), 243–274.

Appendices

Appendix A: Goleman's Five Components of Emotional Intelligence

The table below summarises the five components of emotional intelligence as conceptualised by Goleman (1998) and their primary managerial applications.

Component	Definition	Managerial Application
Self-Awareness	Recognising one's emotions and their effects	Authentic feedback, consistent behaviour
Self-Regulation	Managing disruptive impulses and emotions	Psychological safety, trustworthiness
Motivation	Intrinsic drive to achieve beyond external rewards	Role-modelling resilience and purpose
Empathy	Understanding others' emotional experiences	Retention, wellbeing, inclusive decisions
Social Skills	Managing relationships and networks	Change management, conflict resolution

Appendix B: Summary of Key Research Findings on EI and Leadership

The following presents a brief synthesis of major empirical findings referenced in this report:

- Harms & Credé (2010): Meta-analysis of 62 studies found moderate positive correlations between EI and transformational leadership ($r = .59$) and leadership effectiveness generally.
- Joseph & Newman (2010): Meta-analysis confirmed positive EI–job performance relationship, moderated by emotional labour demands; effect largest in high-interaction managerial roles.
- Dirks & Ferrin (2002): Leader trustworthiness—strongly linked to EI competencies—was among the most potent predictors of follower satisfaction, commitment, and citizenship behaviour.
- Sy et al. (2006): Manager EI positively predicted employee job satisfaction and performance in food service workers, partly through emotional contagion mechanisms.
- Google Project Aristotle (2016): Psychological safety—a product of empathic, self-regulated management—was the single strongest predictor of team effectiveness across 180+ Google teams.

Appendix C: Recommended EI Development Frameworks for Organisations

- 360-Degree EI Feedback: Instruments such as the Emotional and Social Competency Inventory (ESCI) provide multi-source assessment of EI competencies, creating a foundation for targeted development planning.
- Mindfulness-Based Leadership Training: Programmes such as Search Inside Yourself (developed at Google) integrate mindfulness practice with EI competency development, with documented improvements in self-awareness and self-regulation.
- Executive Coaching: Individualised EI coaching by qualified professionals has been shown to produce durable improvements in EI competencies, particularly

for managers who have received 360-degree feedback revealing significant blind spots.

Reflective Practice Programmes: Structured opportunities for reflective journaling, peer coaching, and facilitated case-based learning support the integration of EI concepts into everyday manageria