

## **APPROACH 2: DEBATE-DRIVEN CRITICAL EVALUATION**

*(Explicitly shows complexity and contestation)*

### **Slide 1 – Provocative Opening**

- Quote by Edith Heard
  - Framing question: “Are EI and CQ essential or overstated?”
- 

### **Slide 2 – Competing Views of Leadership**

- Trait vs behavioural vs contingency theories
  - Where EI and CQ fit  
*(Citation: Northouse)*
- 

### **Slide 3 – Traditional Control-Oriented Leadership**

- Autocratic leadership
  - Theory X
  - Fayol’s principles (authority, discipline)
  - Strengths in crisis / weaknesses in diversity
- 

### **Slide 4 – Human-Centred Leadership**

- Democratic leadership
  - Theory Y and Z
  - Psychological safety
  - Alignment with Heard’s quote
- 

### **Slide 5 – Argument FOR EI**

- Leadership effectiveness
- Motivation and trust
- Goleman’s model  
*(Citation)*

---

### **Slide 6 – Argument AGAINST EI**

- Conceptual inflation
- Western bias
- Over-emphasis on emotion  
(*Citation*)

---

### **Slide 7 – Argument FOR CQ**

- Global collaboration
- Leadership adaptability
- Earley & Ang's model

---

### **Slide 8 – Argument AGAINST CQ**

- Risk of cultural reductionism
- Situational unpredictability

---

### **Slide 9 – Leadership Styles in Multicultural Contexts**

- Transformational vs autocratic leadership
- When each might work
- Critical judgement

---

### **Slide 10 – Business Evidence (2 contrasting cases)**

- Google (successful EI/CQ)
- Starbucks (limits of training-only approach)

---

### **Slide 11 – Business Evidence (continued)**

- Microsoft
- Airbnb

---

### **Slide 12 – Strategy Implications**

- Why organisations must combine:

- EI
  - CQ
  - Structural inclusion
- 

### **Slide 13 – Conclusion**

- Balanced judgement
  - EI & CQ as conditional leadership assets
- 

### **Slide 14 – References**