Netanyahu, the Prime Minister of Israel, held the premiership for the longest period in the history of the Jewish nation. He considered as a very strong and influential leader. Leadership has manifestations of EI. The study aims to construct new knowledge about how Israeli citizens perceive the EI of Netanyahu. Questionnaire were sent to 414 Israeli participants who own first academic degree or above. Results show that the Israeli citizens perceived Bibi’s EI as high, with average of 5.08 out of 7. It was assumed that in order to achieve his goals, Netanyahu uses also dark side of EI. This study demonstrated that EI could be used with positive-oriented and can also use with negative-oriented.
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**Introduction**

Benjamin Netanyahu (Bibi), the Prime Minister of Israel, held the premiership for the fourth time and for the longest period in the history of the Jewish nation. Bibi is considered a very strong and very influential leader not only in Israel but around the world. He was ranked by the Forbes, as one of the world’s 25 most powerful leaders (Haaretz, November 4th, 15). Friends and foes know him as no stranger to controversy (Pfeffer, 2018). He is the object, however, of numerous criminal accusation. His legacy is mixed, and he is also credited with bringing Israel to a place where it is viewed as a powerful country by any standard and a good place in which to live (David, 2017).

Although Israel is a small state that has been facing existential threats from its neighbors since its establishment, during Bibi’s time as prime minister, Israel is a very strong country from many points of view. Israel has built a mighty military machine that has successfully overcome many military threats and deterred nuclear options. Israel has a strong economy and was admitted to the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD) in 2010 and which brings together the most 33 developed countries that are committed to democracy and market economies.

Israel is also an attractive site for overseas investors particularly in the high-tech sector. Despite the long- simmering social rift, the Ashkenazi-Sefhardic cleavage, and religious-secular divide, Israel is a strong and mostly unified society. It has a highest ratio of university degrees to the population in the world, produces more scientific papers per capita than any other nation by a large margin, and the highest rate per capita of patents filed (Inbar, April 18, 2018).

Netanyahu does have many admirers, but most of them are Sephardic, right-wing people, religious and people from the periphery that support him with a blind eye and no matter what he does, they will still support him and
vote for him. The other side, comprised of Ashkenazi educated left-wingers, hate him and would do anything in order to get rid of him (Hecht, 2017). Although commentators argue that even if his career would soon end and he would not be elected again to premiership in Israel, his influence would endure (Pfeffer, 2018). He is considered a very bright, organized, strong, and powerful leader (Ball, 1996) but there is no research that investigated how the Emotional Intelligence (EI) of Netanyahu is perceived by Israeli citizens.

EI is widely used in organizational leadership and graduate schools with an increase in published research supporting its benefits (Boyatzis, 2018). EI has varied definitions. Salovey & Mayer define it as the “ability to perceive and express emotion, assimilate emotions in thought, understand and reason with emotion, and regulate emotion in self and others, for the mutual benefit of self and others” (Salovey & Mayer, 1990). EI can matters more than IQ (Goleman, 1995). Leaders, managers, politicians and CEO's excel, not just through cognitive skills and smarts, but also by emotionally connecting with others. The EI construct was brought to the forefront of public attention because the emotional task of the leader is primal, in two senses: it is the original and the most important. Great leadership works through the emotions (Goleman, Boyatzis & McKee, 2004).

However, there is no research that has explored the perceived EI (or lack thereof) of Netanyahu, and it is important to investigate it mostly because of his controversial personality in that some know him as very successful, influential and high achieving leader and others view him as a failure. This study aims to investigate how Israeli citizens perceive the EI of Netanyahu. Understanding his perceived EI will help leaders understand what enables him to be perceived as a success and/or failure.

**Conceptual Framework**

Benjamin Netanyahu, Bibi, was born in Tel Aviv to secular Jewish parents (Remnik, 2013) in 1949. His family lived in the United States (US) in 1956 - 1958 and in 1963 - 1967 in a suburb of Philadelphia, where he graduated from high school. In 1967, he returned to Israel to serve in the Israel Defense Forces (IDF). Specifically, he served for five years in an elite unit, Sayeret Matckal, and took part in cross-border assaults including the rescue of the hijacked Sabena Flight 571 in May 1972 in which he was injured (Melman, 2010).

In late 1972, Netanyahu returned to US to study and graduated from the MIT Sloan School of Management in 1976. His studies for a doctorate in political science (Hartley, Lea & Cossali, 2004) was cut short because of the death of his older brother Jonatan Netanyahu that was killed in Operation Entebbe while fighting to rescue more than 100 hostages hijacked by terrorists. After working for Boston Consulting Group between 1976 - 1978, he returned to Israel to run the Jonatan Netanyahu Anti-Terror Institute between 1978 – 1980 and between 1980 - 1982 he was a marketing director for Rim Industries in Jerusalem (Warshaw, 2009). Netanyahu has been married three times. His
first wife was Miriam Weizmann and they have one daughter, Noa. His second wife, Fleur Cates, converted to Judaism for him and his third wife is Sara Ben-Artzi with whom they have two sons, Yair and Avner. (Kalman, 2013).

Political Career

In 1982, Netanyahu was appointed as Deputy Chief of Mission at the Israeli Embassy in Washington D.C. and in 1984, he was appointed the Israeli ambassador to UN (Benjamin Netanyahu archive, 2012). In 1988, he joined the Likud party and became the head of the Likud party in 1993. After the assassination of Yitzhak Rabin in 1995, Bibi won the election and became the youngest and the first Prime Minister (PM) who had been born in Israel. Netanyahu's victory over Shimon Peres surprised many, mainly because shortly before the elections on March 3 and 4th 1996, Palestinians carried out two suicide bombings, killing 32 Israelis. Unlike Shimon Peres, Netanyahu did not trust Yasser Arafat, the head of the Palestinian Liberation Organization (PLO) and conditioned any progress in the peace process with the PLO on fulfilling its obligations to fight terrorism. At the election of 1999, Netanyahu was defeated by Ehud Barak and he moved to the private sector and returned to politics in 2000.

On 2003 during uncertain economic times in Israel, PM Ariel Sharon, appointed Netanyahu as Finance Minister and commentators accredited him as having achieved an “economic miracle” (Scott, 2015). He liberalized the markets, capped the budget deficit at 1%, reduced individual tax rate from 64% to 44% and the corporate tax rate from 36% to 18%. He privatized state assets worth billions of dollars, including banks, oil refineries, the El Al national airline, Zim Integrated Shipping Services and the ports in Haifa and Ashdod (Coren, 2014). Commercial banks were forced to spin off their long-term savings, increase competition, and the currency exchange laws were liberalized. He ended welfare dependency by requiring people to apply for jobs or training. The retirement age was raised and unemployment declined while economic growth soared, the debt-to-GDP ratio dropped to one of the lowest in the world, and foreign investment reached a record high (Asa-El, 2014). Netanyahu resigned from government in 2005, over disagreements regarding the Gaza disengagement plan (Hoffman, 2005). Netanyahu won his second premiership between 2009 - 2013, the third premiership between, 2013 - 2015, (Baum, Zrahiyia & Coren, 2013) and the fourth premiership, 2015 - 2019, (Ynet, 2015) and in the elections on April 2019, he won the election for the 21 Knesset but was not able to build a coalition, missing one mandate (Sanger, 2017).

Israel Palestinian Conflict

In general, PM Netanyahu emphasized a policy of "three no(s)”: no withdrawal from the Golan Heights, no discussion of the division of Jerusalem, no negotiations with the Palestinians under any preconditions (Akram, 2011).
He opposed the commitments made by previous Israeli governments and the PLO under the Oslo accords that were signed in Washington, D.C., in 1993 and Oslo II, that was signed in Taba, Egypt, on 1995 (Remnik, 2013); both were aimed at achieving peace between Israel and the Palestinians. In his Bar-Ilan speech from June 14th 2009, Bibi expressed his willingness to accept a Palestinians state alongside Israel (Leigh, 2009). He indicated, however, that any negotiations with the Palestinians, would be under a few conditions: (a) The Palestinians recognize Israel as the homeland of the Jewish people; (b) The Palestinian State would be demilitarized; (c) Jerusalem would remain the united capital of Israel; (d) Palestinians would give up demand for a right of return; (e) Security settlements; (f) A "natural growth" in the existing Jewish settlements in the West Bank (Efune, 2014). A July 2009 survey by Ha'aretz found that most Israelis supported the Netanyahu government, giving him a personal approval rating of 49% (Friedman, 2009). Another study that was done by The Israeli Democracy Institute found overall support for Netanyahu's solution reached 63% among Jewish Israelis. However, since than support has fallen dramatically. In August 2018 th support has fallen to 47% (Cubbison, 2018).

The reaction from the international community for the Bar Ilan Speech was mixed (Yamany & Gongzheng, 2009). The Palestinians, the Hamas, the Islamic Jihad the Arab League, (Whatley, 2009) Egypt (Mark, 2009) Syria, Lebanese, Jordan and Iran rejected the conditions. The Czech Republic praised it while Sweden saw it as a small step forward. Russia saw it as a sign of readiness for dialogue, but did not accepted the conditions and France praised it but called on ceasing the settlements in the West Bank. President Barak Obama stated that solution must ensure both Israel's security and the Palestinians' aspirations for a state (Yamany & Gongzheng, 2009).

In April 2014 and again in June, Netanyahu expressed his deep concerns when Hamas and the Palestinian formed a unity government. He was severely critical of the decision of the US and European governments to work with the Palestinian coalition (Leas, 2015). He blamed Hamas for kidnapping and murdering three Israeli teenagers in June 2014 (Haaretz, 2014) and in a round of television shows in the US, he described Hamas as "genocidal terrorists" (Cohen & Scheer, 2016). As to Iran, since 2007, Netanyahu opposed the Iranian regime, asserting that they were seeking to obtain a nuclear weapon and once it has them will then start a world war (Byers & Hider, 2009). Since he first became a PM of Israel in 2009, he described Iran as the greatest threat that Israel has ever faced (Bergman, 2016).

Netanyahu has close ties with US president Donald Trump (Maev, 2012), with Republican Senator Mitt Romney (Bernstein, 2011), with former US Vice President, a Democrat, Joe Biden (White House, 2010) and was a friend of Trump's father (Sherman, 2016). His relationship with previous president of US, Barak Obama, was problematic. They reportedly did not like and did not trust each other. Obama's administration wanted to stop the settlements in the West Bank and Netanyahu accused Obama of "acting contrary to American values" (The Jerusalem Post, 2014) and blamed him as failing to protect Israel.
against the UN. Because of Netanyahu’s accusations Secretary of State John Kerry phoned Netanyahu to clarify that his blames are disgraceful, unacceptable and do not reflect the position of the US. (Keinon, 2014).

Netanyahu has been described as very bright, organized, strong, and powerful leader (Ball, 1996). Another study describes Netanyahu as seeing himself as more qualified than others and as very gifted politician. He loves the good life that his position and his power have offered him. He has been described as using manipulation in order to promote his goals, mostly to insure his political survival. He is very suspicious and perceives himself as a victim, as if all the political world is always against him. He has problems in making important decisions about basic questions regarding the Israeli-Palestinian conflict. His ambitions to keep his premiership comes from the will to stay in power no matter what. He is very fluent speaker with a great ability to bestow his message (Kimchi, Yehoshua & Uliel, 2017).

Since January 2017, Netanyahu has been investigated by Israeli police in four cases and is also considered suspicious in three cases. Netanyahu was suspected of bribery, among other things. His former chief of staff, Ari Harow, had signed a deal with prosecutors to become state’s witness and testify against him. In case 4000, Netanyahu intervened with regulators to help the Bezeq group, which was controlled by Shaul Elovitch. In exchange, Elovitch, a friend of Netanyahu’s, allegedly ordered Bezeq’s Walla news site to provide favorable coverage of the PM and his wife Sara (Ziv, 2018).

What is Emotional Intelligence?

Emotional Intelligence (EI) is widely used in organizations and graduate schools with an increase in published research supporting it (Boyatzis, 2018). EI has varied definitions. Salovey & Mayer observe EI as the ability to “perceive and express emotion, assimilate emotion thought, understand and reason with emotion, and regulate emotion in self and others, for the mutual benefit of self and others” (Salovey & Mayer, 1990).

According to Golelman, Boyatzis and McKee, (2004) EI is also evident in leadership competencies of primal leaders that excel in the art of relationships. They defined leadership in interpersonal terms and argue that the best focal point to look at it is through a set of social skills, which can organize in four general clusters and 18 sub-scales: The first general competence is Self-Awareness which consists of three sub-scales: (a) Emotional self-awareness - Leaders high in emotional self-awareness are attuned to their inner signals, recognizing how their feelings affect them and their job performance. They are attuned to their guiding values and can often intuit the best course of action, seeing the big picture in a complex situation. Emotionally self-aware leaders can be candid and authentic, able to speak openly about their emotions or with conviction about their guiding vision. (b) Leaders with high self-awareness typically know their limitations and strengths, and exhibit a sense of humor about themselves. They exhibit a gracefulness in learning where they need to improve and welcome constructive criticism and feedback. Accurate self -
assessment lets a leader know when to ask for help and where to focus in cultivating new leadership strength. (C) Self-confidence - Knowing their abilities with accuracy allows leaders to play to their strengths. Self-confident leaders can welcome a difficult assignment. Such leaders often have a sense of presence, a self-assurance that lets them stand out in a group.

The second general cluster is Self-Management with six sub-competences:
(a) Self-control - Leaders with emotional self-control find ways to manage their disturbing emotions and impulses and even to channel them in useful ways. A hallmark of self-control is the leader who stays calm and clear-headed under high stress during a crisis and remains unflappable even when confronted by a trying situation. (b) Transparency - Leaders who are transparent live their values. Transparency, an authentic openness to others about one's feelings, beliefs, and actions, allows integrity. Such leaders openly admit mistakes or faults, and confront unethical behavior in others rather than turn a blind eye. (c) Adaptability - Leaders who are adaptable can juggle multiple demands without losing their focus or energy and are comfortable with the inevitable ambiguities of organizational life. Such leaders can be flexible in adapting to new challenges, nimble in adjusting to fluid change, and limber in their thinking in the face of new data or realities. (d) Achievement - Leaders with strength in achievement have high personal standards that drive them to constantly seek performance improvements - for both themselves and those they lead. They are pragmatic, setting measurable but challenging goals, and are able to calculate risk so that their goals are worthy but attainable. A hallmark of achievement is in continually learning - and teaching ways to do better. (e) Initiative - Leaders who have a sense of efficacy - that they have what it takes to control their own destiny - excel in initiative. They seize opportunities - or create them - rather than simply waiting. Such a leader does not hesitate to cut through red tape or even bend the rules, when necessary to create better possibilities for the future. (f) Optimism - A leader who is optimistic can roll with the punches, seeing an opportunity rather than a threat. Such leaders see others positively, expecting the best of them and their "glass half full."

The third general competence is Social-Awareness with three sub-competencies:
(a) Empathy - Leaders with empathy are able to attune to a wide range of emotional signals. Letting them sense the felt, but unspoken, emotions in a person or group. Such leaders listen attentively and can grasp the other person's perspective. Empathy makes a leader able to get along well with people of diverse backgrounds or from other cultures. (b) Organizational awareness - A leader with a keen social awareness can be politically astute, able to detect crucial social networks and read key power relationships. Such leaders can understand the political forces at work in an organization, as well as the guiding values and unspoken rules that operate among people there. (c) Service - Leaders high in the service competence foster an emotional climate so that people directly in touch with the customer or client will keep the relationship on the right track. Such leaders monitor customer or client
satisfaction carefully to ensure they are getting what they need. They also make themselves available as needed.

The fourth cluster is Relationship-Management that contains five sub competencies: (a) Inspiration - Leaders who inspire both create resonance and move people with a compelling vision or shared mission. Such leaders embody what they ask of others, and are able to articulate a shared mission in a way that inspires other to follow. They offer a sense of common purpose beyond the day-to-day tasks, making work exciting. (b) Influence - Indicators of a leader's powers of influence range from finding just the right appeal for a given listener to knowing how to build by in from key people and a network of support for an initiative. Leaders adept in influence are persuasive and engaging when they address a group. (C) Developing others - Leaders who are adept at cultivating people's abilities show a genuine interest in those they are helping along, understanding their goals, strengths, and weaknesses. Such leaders can give timely and constructive feedback and are natural mentors or coaches. (D) Change catalyst - Leaders who can catalyze change are able to recognize the need for the change, challenge the status quo, and champion the new order. They can be strong advocates for the change even in the face of opposition, making the argument for it compellingly. They also find practical ways to overcome barriers to change. (e) Conflict Management - Leaders who manage conflicts best are able to draw out all parties, understand the differing perspectives, and then find a common ideal that everyone can endorse. They surface the conflict, acknowledge the feelings, view of all sides, and then redirect the energy toward a shared ideal. (f) Teamwork and Collaboration - Leaders who are able team players generate an atmosphere of friendly collegiality and are themselves models of respect helpfulness and cooperation. They draw others into active enthusiastic commitment to the collective effort and build spirit and identity. They spend time forging and cementing close relationships beyond mere work obligations.

Gross (1988) and Wong & Law definitions of EI are match. They argue that before people can regulate their emotions, they should have a good understanding of these emotions (Self Emotional Appraisal - SEA). Since many of our emotional responses are stimulated by the emotions of other individuals, our understanding of our own emotions is related to our ability to understand the emotions of other’s (Other’s Emotional Appraisal, OEA). Just after understanding our own and other’s emotions, we can modulate how to experience these emotions and how to regulate them (Regulation of Emotions, ROE) as well as how to express them (Use of Emotions – UOE). Therefore, according to the definitions of EI and emotional regulation, a person with high EI should be more able to modulate his response tendencies and have more effective emotion regulation processes (Gross, 1988b; Wong & Law, 2002).

The authors decided to use this definition for the research.

All the emotional competencies involve some degree of skill in the realm of feelings and cognitive elements, emotions and cognition combined (Goleman et al., 2004). Emotions play a critical role in developing and maintaining social relationships (Ashkanasy, 2003). While intellectual
intelligence is the pre-eminent predictor for individual work performance, group performance is more a function of emotional than intellectual intelligence (Ashkanazy & Dause, 2005) According to Goleman: "EI counts more than IQ or expertise for determining who excels at any job" (Goleman, 2006, p. 13). "Outstanding leaders' emotional competencies make up 85% to 100% of the competences crucial for success (Goleman, 1995). Understanding emotions can make people more satisfied and happier and happy people tend to function better in life than less happy people. They are more productive, more socially engaged, tend to be more enhancing and enabling than those low in subjective well-being. Positive emotions can lead to positive cognitions, which, in turn contribute to positive emotions as well (Huppert, 2009).

Hypothesis 1: The Israeli citizens who support Bibi would perceive his EI above average and his opponent will perceive his EI as law.

Dark side of EI

Although there are many positive sides of EI, there are also studies exploring the dark sides of the EI (Furnham & Rosen, 2016). For example: Individuals can use their EI to fabricate favorable impressions of themselves, to advance their self-interest and welfare at the expense of others (Kilduff, Chiaburu & Menges, 2010). Emotionally intelligent individuals with dark sides, are prone to utilize their EI to influence strategically important targets, to disguise and or display certain emotions to maximize personal gain to shape others’ emotions via misattribution and to strategically control emotion-laden information (Miao, Humphery, Qian & Pollack, 2019). Research also shown link between EI and Dark Triad traits such as taking advantage of others by manipulating their emotions and prone to engage in callous exploitation (Nagler, Reiter, Furtner, & Rauthmann, 2014). EI can also associate with antisocial impulsive features, managing others’ emotions to achieve personal goals, ingratiating supervisors by reporting successes and hiding failures and mortifying others to maximize personal gain (Fix & Fix, 2015).

Hypothesis 2: The Israeli citizens would perceive that Netanyahu knows highly how to use and regulate his emotions in order to achieve his goals.
Ethodology

Description of the Sample

Four hundred fourteen (N=414) Israeli legal citizens participated in the study, 275 women (67.2%) and 134 men (32.8%). All the participants are currently living in Israel and eligible to vote for the Israeli government. All of them have earned one or more academic degrees. Additional information about participants in table 1.

Table 1: Participants Matrix

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participants</th>
<th>Total (N = 414)</th>
<th>Percentage 100%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Men</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>32.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woman</td>
<td>275</td>
<td>67.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22–30</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>13.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31–40</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>29.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41–50</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51–60</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>17.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60 and Above</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>13.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Education:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BA, B.Ed</td>
<td>224</td>
<td>59.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MA, M.Ed</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>32.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PhD, Ed.D</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>7.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religion:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jewish</td>
<td>366</td>
<td>79.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muslim</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>7.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christian</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2: Participants Political Belonging

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Likud</th>
<th>Kachol Lavan</th>
<th>Avoda</th>
<th>Haya min Chadash</th>
<th>Chdash Taal</th>
<th>Balad Rama</th>
<th>Yah adut Haya ra</th>
<th>Shas</th>
<th>Mflagit Haya min</th>
<th>Isra el Betemu</th>
<th>Kul anu</th>
<th>Mer etz</th>
<th>Ges her</th>
<th>Zeh ut</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>97</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24.4%</td>
<td>34.2%</td>
<td>6.8%</td>
<td>4.5%</td>
<td>2.3%</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
<td>5.8%</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Research Tools

We used a structured questionnaire that was developed by Wong & Law (2002). The questionnaire was validated to measure EI of incumbents and contains 16 items, which divided to four clusters. The response format was a 7-point Likert-type scale, with an open-ended question for the participants to write additional information that she or he thinks that is important to know about Netanyahu. The questionnaire was translated from English to Hebrew and from Hebrew to English and to Hebrew again by one of the authors. In the
introduction of the questionnaire, the authors explained the meaning of the term EI. The authors also included basic demographic data including gender, age, academic education, religion, and political belonging. In addition, they further questioned as to how they perceive the EI of Benjamin Netanyahu.

Reliability estimates of Alfa Cronbach for the four dimensions of EI according to Wong and Law: Self-emotion appraisal (SEA) .89, Other emotion appraisal (OEA) .89, Use of emotion (UOE) .76, and Regulation of emotion .85. According to our examination, the Alpha Cronbach reliability is .94.7. The Factor Analysis test of the four clusters as divided by Wong and Law, confirmed by us. Reliability estimates of Alfa Cronbach for the four dimensions of EI according us: Self-emotion appraisal (SEA) .92, Other emotion appraisal (OEA) .93, Use of emotion (UOE) .89, and Regulation of emotion .93

Questionnaire was distributed either by email or online, using a Google doc format. It was sent to people who have a BA degree and above such as to students who participated in a Masters degree program in educational leadership and to faculty members in three colleges and in a big university in central Israel. It was also sent to nurses and physicians in two big hospitals one in south Israel and one in the center of Israel.

Statistical Analysis

The purpose of the study was to construct new knowledge about how Israeli citizens perceived EI of their PM in his fifth term, over 10 years in power. The authors converted the information that collected through google forms to SPSS software, then we calculated the following data: the reliability and the descriptive data about demographic information. In order to check the perception of the Israeli citizens about the EI of their PM, we used descriptive statistics to calculate the means and standard deviations for each question and for each cluster separately. We also used the T-Test, Person Correlation, to check the correlation among the variables.

Results

The purpose of the study was to construct new knowledge about how Israeli citizens perceived EI of their PM Binyamin Netanyahu. From the descriptive data, we learn that the Israeli citizens perceived the mean the four clusters that consists the EI of Bibi as 5.08% out of 7. Which means, the Israeli citizens perceived Bibi’s EI as high and above average. The highest grade that was given to Bibi among the four clusters was on cluster number three, UOE, with scores of 6.02% out of 7. On the second-place ranked cluster number one, SEA, with grade of 5.24%. On the third place, ranked cluster number four, ROE, with grade of 4.98% and on the fourth place ranked cluster number two, OEA, with grade of 4.10%. Table number three demonstrates the Mean and SD of the four clusters of Bibi’s EI as described by the participants.
Table 3. Mean and SD of the four clusters of Bibi’s EI, as described by participants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Four Cluster of EI</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Self-emotional appraisal</td>
<td>5.24</td>
<td>1.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others’ emotional appraisal</td>
<td>4.10</td>
<td>1.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use of emotions</td>
<td>6.02</td>
<td>1.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regulation of emotion</td>
<td>4.98</td>
<td>1.55</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Graph Number 1: The mean of Netanyahu’s EI as perceived by participants

Gender Differences as Perceived Netanyahu’s EI by Participants

The T test for independent samples was used in order to find if there were differences in the perceptions between men and women. Significance differences were found between man and women as on cluster number 1, SEA, t(171) = -2.017, p<.05 and cluster number 3, ROE, t(172) = -2.526, p<.05. That means, women rated Netanyahu in cluster 1 and 3 significantly higher than rated him. Table number four demonstrates the mean of genders differences, SD, T test and DF.

Table 4: Gender’s Differences between man and women in cluster 1 and 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cluster</th>
<th>MAN</th>
<th>WOMAN</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>DF</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cluster 1</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>4.75</td>
<td>5.30</td>
<td>-2.017*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>1.75</td>
<td>1.39</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cluster 3</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>4.64</td>
<td>5.31</td>
<td>-2.526*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>DS</td>
<td>1.91</td>
<td>1.38</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p<.05**p<.01

Age Differences in Perception of Netanyahu’s EI
In order to check if there were age differences as to the perception of Netanyahu’s EI, we used a one-way ANOVA test. In the analysis we found significant differences in the perception of Netanyahu’s EI: In cluster number one, SEA, F(4,402)=2.84, p<.05 and in cluster number three, ROE, F(4,403)=6.51, p<.01. In Scheffe analysis was found a significant different between cluster one, SEA and cluster number three ROE. ROE, was found significantly higher. Group age of 25 – 36, rated Netanyahu significantly lower, compare the other age groups. See table number five.

**Table 5: Age differences between cluster SEA and ROE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AGE GROUP</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>MEAN</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>DF</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cluster1, SEA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2.837**</td>
<td>(4,402)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>4.75</td>
<td>1.75</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>5.30</td>
<td>1.39</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>5.53</td>
<td>1.23</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>5.19</td>
<td>1.64</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>5.07</td>
<td>1.46</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cluster2, ROE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6.515**</td>
<td>(4,403)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>5.31</td>
<td>1.87</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>1.14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>6.31</td>
<td>.99</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>6.07</td>
<td>1.15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>6.17</td>
<td>.99</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p<.05**p<.01

**Political inclination: Differences between Left and Right**

In order to check possible differences of the political affiliation and perception of Netanyahu’s EI, we used a one-way ANOVA test. In the analysis we found significant differences between the parties. In all the four clusters, it was found that the political right significantly rated Netanyahu higher in EI compared to the political left. See Table six.

**Table 6: Political inclination: Comparison between left and right**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cluster</th>
<th>MEAN</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>DF</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cluster 1, SEA</td>
<td>Tendency to right</td>
<td>5.76</td>
<td>1.16</td>
<td>53.502***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tendency to left</td>
<td>4.75</td>
<td>1.54</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cluster 2, OEA</td>
<td>Tendency to right</td>
<td>5.07</td>
<td>1.428</td>
<td>164.728***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tendency to left</td>
<td>3.13</td>
<td>1.57</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Academic Educational differences of Netanyahu’s EI

In order to check if there were differences in the academic education belonging as to the EI of Netanyahu, we used one-way ANOVA test. In the analysis was not found different among those who own first, second or third academic degree.

Additional results were given as open-ended question. People were asked to write their opinions of Netanyahu. 63 participants out of the 414 wrote their opinions about him. 7 people wrote a mixed opinions, 26 people wrote negative opinions about Netanyahu and 30 people wrote a positive opinion about him. Among the negative opinions were statements such as: Questionnaire number 3: “He is A liar who ignored injured people in the battle field. His personal interest is above all for those who are loyal to him, mostly the Druse people”; Questionnaire number 8: He is corrupted and discasting”; Questionnaire number 9: “He is competitive, narcissistic, only serves the rich people, and is manipulative.”

Among the positive opinions were statements such as: Questionnaire number 6: “The best prime-minister in the history of the Jewish nation”; Questionnaire number 14: “Excellent prime-minister even though I’m not among the people who voted for him.”Questionnaire number 52: Netanyahu is a very sophisticated politician. He is educated, intelligent; his IQ is very high. He is a genius who has high speech qualifications and brought the country to beautiful and impressive achievements. It is not surprising that he was elected for the fifth time. He has charisma.”

Discussion

The purpose of the study was to construct new knowledge about how Israeli citizens perceive the EI or the social intelligence of their PM Netanyahu. From the descriptive data, we have learned that the Israeli citizens have been perceiving the mean of the four clusters that construct the EI of Bibi as 5.06% out of 7. That means, the Israeli citizens perceived Bibi’s EI as high and above average. Not only the mean of the four clusters was high, but also that mean that was given to each cluster, has been rated above average. The highest grade that was given to Bibi among the four clusters was on cluster number three, UOE, with scores of 6.02% out of 7. The cluster that was rated on the second place was cluster number one, SEA, with grade of 5.24%. On the third place, rated cluster number four, ROE, with grade of 4.98% and on the fourth and the lowest place rated cluster number two, OEA, with 4.10%.
Table number 3 displays the mean and SD of the four clusters of Bibi’s EI, which shows that his EI is high. Bibi knows to apprise his emotions and have good understanding of these emotions (SEA). He knows how to use his emotions, experience them, modulate them and regulate them (ROE). As well as a charismatic speaker (Fisher-Ilan, 2015) he knows how to express his emotions (UOE), the best and the highest part of his EI. These emotions reinforced by Boal and Hooijberg (2000), as behavioral complexities that articulate a core element of leader effectiveness, since leaders need to play different roles at different times and need to have the ability to select the right roles for the situation. EI or social intelligence is the underlying ability that governs the behavioral complexity of leaders, and viewed in the leadership literature as a core variable that affects leader effectiveness. People with high levels of EI as perceived Netanyahu, can make Use of Emotion Regulation mechanism effectively and promote emotional and intellectual growth (Wang & Law, 2002, p. 247).

The political inclination: Between left and right:

In order to examine how the political inclination of the participants possibly connected to how they evaluated Netanyahu’s EI, we used one-way ANOVA test. Significant differences were found between the political inclination and perception of EI. In the mean of all the four clusters, it was found that people from the right block rated Netanyahu significantly higher than the left block voters. However, the left wingers also perceived him with high EI since the mean of the EI was high, 5.06% out of 7 (See Table six). Although it was expected that Bibi who leads a historic right-wing political party would be evaluated with high EI only by the right wing voters, he was perceived with high EI also by the left voters. Which means that our first hypothesis was confirmed partially, since we hypothesised that the left voters will perceive him with low EI.

However, it is interesting to examine who are the majority of right-wing voters, where are they from and why they vote for Netanyahu. The majority of people who vote for Netanyahu are lifelong Likud voters, Sephardic people, Jews of Middle Eastern decent, or Jews who immigrated to Israel from north Africa such as Morocco, Tunis, Libya etc. The Sephardic people, or Sphardim, who also known as Mizrahim, (Rider, March 11, 2015), are disproportionately poorer than Israel’s Ashkenazi Jews with roots in Europe and descendant of the founding elite of the State of Israel. Most of the Sphardim are from lower-income areas and from the periphery of Israel. They can also be found in Jerusalem’s Mahaney-Yehuda market, Haifa marketplace, and other low-income areas.

Most of the Sphardim migrated to Israel in the fifties after years of yearning to come to the homeland of their ancestors and after long journeys. They come to fulfill the Jewish dream, to build a Jewish country and crushed to the left political leaders from Mapai, the Labor Zionist governments who deprived them by sanding them to Ma’abara, a kind of poor villages in places
that no one wants to live, with bad education and no access to jobs. Despite the abundant heritage and beautiful culture of the Spharadim, the Labor Zionist of Mapai despised their culture and heritage, and looked at it as primitive or barbarian behavior. They treated them disrespectfully and when Netanyahu took the election, they saw him as their own salvation. But, he also ignores them (Fisher-Ilan, March 10, 2015) letting them feel like “strangers in their own land” (Hochschild, 2019, p. 12). Despite it, they still vote for him and the question is why.

The Likud’s liberal capitalists approach opened a path for many Mizrahim through the nepotist economy set up by the Labour Zionists. While the Labour party tends to frown on any mention of the Ashkenazi-Mizrahi divide, the Likud emphasized individual opportunity, rather than collective rights, and never bothered with affirmative action or systemic reforms. It made it easier for an ambitious individual to overcome discrimination but did not do enough to prevent the discrimination. The Mizrahim are still deprived, underrepresented in upper-middle class professions and in academia (Reider, March 11, 2015). So again, why despite the fact that Bibi is ruling the government more than ten years do they still vote for him?

It is interesting to compare Likud voters in Israel to Republican voters in the USA. Hochschild (2016) described the Republicans voters who immigrated to the USA in the nineteenth to fulfil the “American Dream” (p. 209), settled in the south, feeling culturally marginalized and part of the demographic declined, besieged minority (p. 221), in the lowest of social ladder (p. 222). As the Republicans the Likud voters, migrated to their Homeland, to fulfil the Jewish Dream of building a Jewish country for the Jewish nation in Israel. They were settled in the Ma’abara and in the Peripheries of Israel, discriminated by getting bad education, being far behind in economy, education and in the lower level of the society (Reider, 2015). The common denominator between Bibi and Trump is that their speeches evoking national pride and personal uplift, inspiring an emotional transformation. Like the Republicans, the Likud voters yearn to feel pride but instead have felt shame (p. 225). Netanyahu, a charismatic speaker like Trump, shifted despair to hope, depression to elation and shame to pride promises them prosperity (Fisher-Ilan, 2015). Like Trump (Hochschild, 2016, p. 226) he promises them to be lifted up from bitterness, despair and depression, promising them secure and safe. These speeches are not impressing the younger voters of group of 25 – 36, whose rated Netanyahu significance differences from older groups. They rated Netanyahu in cluster SEA and on cluster ROE, significantly lower than all older groups. This group-age did not born yet in the period of Mapai, the Labour Zionists who created the deprived reality of the Mizrahim and they did not remember their suffer and were not part of these bad reality who cause a lot of suffer to the Mizrahim. We assume that this is the reason of why they rated Netanyahu lower than the older voters.

According to Mina Tzemach, one of the national pollsters for the last 42 years in Israel, there is another answer to this question beyond the issue of Ashkenazi-Mizrahi divide and beyond the economic issue. The Likud voters
believe that if the left wing will win the elections, they will harm the security of the country, while the left wing believes that if the right wing will win the elections, the democracy of the country will be harmed. Security was always a fragile issue in Israel because of the animosities that the country surrounded with, and security and fear as said Mina Tzemach are “stronger than thirst or hunger” (Makover-Blikov, 2019). Additionally, the Israeli electorate do not forget the fear of the wave of Palestinian suicide bombings in the first years of the 21st century. According to Friedman, (2019) much of what we see in 2019, and every election since, has been held in its shadow these attacks which killed hundred of Israeli civilians. Edding to these, Bibi embedding in his speeches over and over the fear from the Iranians (Makover-Blikov, 2019). So, the reason that the Mizrahim still vote for Bibi is because of the fear of the security situation in Israel.

It is important to highlight the competencies that associated to people with high EI and confront them with Bibi’s reality. Leaders with high EI allows integrity, admit mistakes and confront unethical behavior (Goleman et al. 2004, p. 254). They listen attentively and keep relationships on the right track (p. 256). They are model of respect, helpfulness and cooperation (p. 256). In reality Bibi did not demonstrates those competencies and we will prove by two examples: Orna Peretz, a political activist in the Likud party and a lifelong Likud voter from one of the north periphery of Israel, Kiryat Shmona, became sick with head cancer. She interrupted Netanyahu when he was speaking about the rights of all citizens to receive adequate medical treatment no matter where they are. “Then why did you take away the emergency room?” she shouted, to which Netanyahu responded: “You’re not interesting. You’re boring us.” Peretz said in interviews that she did not deserve to be treated disrespectfully by the PM (Bollag, 2018). In his answer to Peretz, Netanyahu did not apply any of the competences that highlighted above. Another demonstration of an unexpected behavior to follower was while Ayoob Kara, Druze, a Likud minister, who was blindly committed and loyal to Bibi, supported him along the way and even supported the nation-state law, which abandon the Druze rights and upset much of the Druse population. (The Jerusalem Post, July 4, 2019). Kara announced his resignation as a communication minister after withdrawing his candidacy to serve as the next ambassador to Egypt. According to him: “I was Netanyahu’s shield, for months now I am being deceived using all short of tricks to embarrass me and drive me out. I have a problem with a leader who do not know to protect his people” (Bachner, 2019).

Despite the radical left seems concerned about country’s future, according Ephraim Inbar (April 18, 2018) Israel in age of 71 is successful more than ever from every point of view mainly because of the Likud party and Netanyahu the PM. However, we cannot ignore the participants in our study who wrote severe statements against Netanyahu. We cannot also ignore the fact that Netanyahu has been suspected in crimes, including bribery and intervention with regulators to help the Bezeq group to provide favorable coverage of the Netanyahu and his wife Sara (Ziv, 2018).
Apparently, these accusations against Netanyahu, are not suitable with the characteristics that the research relate to leader with high EI. Studies demonstrate that emotionally intelligent leaders use effective leadership behavior to influence their followers in positive ways (Walter, Cole & Humphrey, 2011) and studies are clear with regards to many positive sides of EI. However, there are also dark sides of the EI (Furnham & Rosen, 2016). For example: Individuals can use their EI to fabricate favorable impressions of themselves, to advance their self-interest and welfare at the expense of others (Kilduff, Chiaburu & Mengers, 2010). Emotionally intelligent individuals with dark sides, are prone to utilize their EI to influence strategically important targets, to display certain emotions to maximize personal gain to shape others’ emotions via misattribution and to strategically control emotion-laden information (Miao, Humphery, Qian & Pollack. 2019). Research also shown link between EI and Dark Triad traits such as taking advantage of others by manipulating their emotions and prone to engage in callous exploitation (Nagler, Reiter, Furtner, & Rauthmann, 2014). EI can also associate with antisocial impulsive features, managing others’ emotions to achieve personal goals, ingratiating supervisors by reporting successes and hiding failures and mortifying others to maximize personal gain (Fix & Fix, 2015). That means that our second hypothesis was confirmed. Netanyahu would do everything to reach his own goals.

In conclusion, Netanyahu’s EI is high according to the perceptions of the Israeli citizens. However, it does not prove that his high EI demonstrates positive sides of the EI. Some scholars have claimed that people high on EI can use their emotionally skills to manipulate others (Miao et al. 2019) in order to achieve their own goals (Kimchi et al. 2017).

Limitation, Meaning and Further Research

Our study provides some preliminary support for researchers who have high EI that know how to utilize dark sides of his EI. However, there is limitation for these statements since the study was done during two period of time that was around the election for the premiership. We started to collect data on February 2019 and on April 2019 were elections and Netanyahu failed to build a coalition. The Knesset was dismissed and next elections supposed to be on September 17, 2019. Because people were eager to win an election, they may not have been able to be objective. Further research is needed to be done in other neutral times and not around elections. We believe that there are both, theoretical and practical implications of this study. Theoretically, we have applied the high EI of Benyamin Netanyahu as perceived by the Israeli citizens. We hypothesized that the perception of Netanyahu’s EI and his ability to use his emotions is high. However, we assume in order to achieve his goals, he uses also his dark side of his EI. Practically, this studies demonstrated that EI could be used with positive-oriented and can also use with negative-oriented.
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