Despite years of denial, management scholars are now recognizing that emotions and affect comprise an inescapable component of organizational life (Barsade and Gibson, 2007). The Free Dictionary defines emotion as ‘A mental state that arises spontaneously rather than through conscious effort and is often accompanied by physiological changes.’ If it is indeed the case that emotions ‘arise spontaneously’, then this clearly will have major ramifications for the way people behave in general, and in their working life in particular. In this chapter we discuss the implications of the pervasiveness of emotion in organizations from the point of view of learning and education, with an emphasis on the role of emotions and emotional intelligence training in leadership programs. To accomplish this, we first define emotions, and then we review the recent literature on emotions as it pertains to organizational settings. In particular, the controversial notion of emotional intelligence has attained wide prominence, especially in the practitioner literature (e.g., Goleman, 1998), so we deal with this topic in some depth in this chapter, including a definition of emotional intelligence, discussion of the ongoing controversy, and elucidation of the role of emotion intelligence in the context of leadership. We then discuss issues surrounding emotional intelligence teaching, and specifically discuss how emotional skills may assist in the development of organizational leadership skills. We conclude with a discussion of the implications of emotions and emotional intelligence for management learning and education, and discuss some directions for the future development of this field.

THE RISE AND RISE OF EMOTION IN ORGANIZATIONS AS A FIELD OF STUDY

Over the past two decades, there has been an almost exponential increase in research interest and productivity in the field of emotion in organizations. This upsurge began in the 1980s with sociological studies of emotional labor (Hochschild, 1983), and renewed research into mood and affect by social psychologists (e.g., see Alice Isen and colleagues’ work on positive effect, e.g., Isen and Means, 1983). Other seminal studies from the 1980s (with an organizational focus) included Van Maanen and Kunda’s (1989) ethnographic studies of culture and emotion, and Rafaeli and Sutton’s (1987, 1989) studies of emotional labor. Sutton and Rafaeli (1988) was particularly noteworthy. This study of emotional labor in service encounters was the recipient of the Academy of Management Journal’s 1989 Best Paper Award.

By the close of the twentieth century, the volume of literature addressing emotion in organizational settings stepped up even further, including special issues of journals (e.g., Ashkanasy, 2004; Fisher and Ashkanasy, 2000; Fox, 2002; Humphrey, 2002a; Weiss, 2001, 2002); edited books (e.g., Ashkanasy et al., 2000a; Ashkanasy et al., 2002; Fineman, 2000; Härtel et al., 2005; Lord et al., 2002; Payne and Cooper, 2001), and Brief and Weiss's chapter in the 2002 *Annual Review of Psychology*. The annual book series, *Research on Emotion in Organizations*, first published in 2005, is now up to its third volume. Indeed, by 2003, Barsade et al. (2003) had declared that the study of organizational behavior was in the midst of an 'affective revolution'. Finally, from an educational point of view, recognition of the study of emotions in organizations as a legitimate field in itself came with the inclusion of a standalone chapter on ‘Emotions and Moods’ in the best-selling OB textbook (Robbins and Judge, 2007).

And even as we write this chapter, the prevalence of research into emotion in organizations continues to develop. This is reflected in established conferences such as the Emonet-sponsored biannual ‘International Conference on Emotions and Worklife’, conference tracks on the topic (e.g., annual conference of the European Academy of Management or EURAM), and a plethora of papers on emotion in organizations presented at major international conferences including the annual meetings of the Academy of Management (http://www.aamonline.org) and the Society for Industrial and Organizational Psychology (http://siop.org). For organizational behavior scholars, the message is clearly that emotions, affect and moods now constitute central concepts in our understanding of behavior at work.

**DEFINING AFFECT, EMOTIONS AND MOODS**

Surprisingly, scholars seem to have great difficulty in deciding how to define emotion. We prefer to take the view that emotions are derived from human neurobiology. For example, and consistent with the online definition we gave in the introductory paragraph to this chapter, Fischer et al. (1990) define emotion as a ‘discrete, innate, functional, biosocial action and expression system’ (p. 84). Ashkanasy et al. (2000b) separate emotion into internal and external manifestations. In this model, internal manifestations of emotion constitute the subjective feelings of emotions that individuals experience as a result of an emotion-eliciting stimulus. This feeling is, in turn, processed cognitively, resulting in the conscious expression of emotion. At the same time, however, emotions are also experienced as a sub-conscious level (see Damasio, 1994; Le Doux, 1996) resulting in external manifestations of emotion such as respiration rate, facial expression, and posture. In this latter respect, humans constantly struggle to regulate their emotions (see Gross et al., 2006).

It is also important to differentiate moods from emotion. While both are classified under the rubric of affect, emotions are discrete responses to particular objects or occurrences and are generally of a relatively short duration (Frijda, 1986). Moods, on the other hand, tend to be relatively long-lasting, and are not generally object-focused. Still, moods are important, insofar as they infuse cognitive thinking processes (Forgas, 1995) and thus deeply influence an individual's judgment processes.

**UNDERSTANDING EMOTIONS IN THE WORKPLACE: A 5-LEVEL MODEL**

In order to present a fuller understanding of the pervasiveness of emotion in organizations, Ashkanasy (2003a) devised a five-level model. The five levels are (see also Figure 9.1):

1. Neuropsychological and cognitive correlates of emotion at the within-person level of analysis.
Level 1 of the model is based essentially on the neurobiology of emotion (see Ashkanasy, 2003b), which is still in the process of being understood (e.g., see Frijda et al., 2006). Neurobiologists, such as Antonio Damasio (1994) and Joseph Le Doux (1996), continue to unravel the essential relationships between emotion and every aspect of human behavior and intellect. From the organizational perspective, this is reflected in Weiss and Cropanzano’s (1996) Affective Events Theory, which holds that organizational environments generate ‘affective events’ also known as ‘hassles’ and ‘uplifts’, which engender positive or negative emotional reactions in organizational members. 4 These emotional reactions in turn engender both direct (‘impulsive’) and indirect behavioral reactions (positive or negative). These indirect behaviors (e.g., intention to turnover, intentional poor productivity) are the result of attitudes (e.g., job satisfaction, commitment) that derive from the members’ emotional reactions.

Level 2 deals with between-person variables, or individual differences. From an emotions perspective, the most pertinent of these are state or trait positive and negative affect (Watson and Tellegen, 1985) and emotional intelligence (Mayer and Salovey, 1997). Positive and negative state/trait affect describe an individual’s penchant to be in a positive or negative affective state, either as a personality-type trait (trait affect) or as a short-lived contingent state (state affect). The affect construct is usually described using a circumplex based on axes of positive and negative affect, although Russell and Carroll (1999) argue that a more accurate representation is based on dimensions of positive–negative valence and strong–weak activation. 5 (We discuss emotional intelligence in more detail in the next section of this chapter.)

Level 3 deals with the interpersonal or social exchange level of analysis, focusing in particular on emotional recognition in the human face. Citing Ekman’s work in general (e.g., Ekman, 1999), and a study by Frank et al. (1993) in particular, Ashkanasy (2003a) argues that people make a key distinction between feigned and real smiles that, in workplace settings, can be important. For instance, in a study involving conflicting facial and verbal communication in performance appraisal feedback, Newcombe and Ashkanasy (2002) found that perception of facial expression counted more than verbal feedback, with the strongest (negative) response elicited when positive verbal feedback was combined with a negative facial expression. More recently, Althoff and Ashkanasy (2004) found that female observers more accurately decoded facial expressions in a boardroom scenario and that this effect was mediated by emotional intelligence.

Level 4 captures emotional processes at the group-level of analysis, including leadership (especially leader-member exchange or LMX, see Graen and Uhl-Bien, 1995) and emotional contagion (Hatfield et al., 1992). Moreover, recent research into emotional contagion processes in work teams has shown that:

- team emotion is promulgated through emotional contagion (Barsade, 2002);
- team leaders communicate emotional states to their followers (Sy et al., 2005);
- leader-member exchange relationships impact on team-member exchange relationships (TMX, Seers,
Finally, Level 5 refers to the role of emotion at the organizational level, reflecting what De Rivera (1992) has termed ‘emotional climate’. Ashkanasy and Nicholson (2003) have also studied the phenomenon of ‘climate of fear’, and demonstrated that climate was distinguishable from organizational culture in the organizations they studied, in that climate varied by site within organizations, while culture varied across organizations, but not within each organization. In addition, climate in this study was a measure of affective reactions, while the measures of culture related more to organizational artifacts and values. More recently, Kimberley and Härtel (2007) described the role played by organizational-level emotions in facilitating a climate of trust.

In summary of Ashkanasy’s (2003a) 5-level model, it is clear that emotions play a key role as a determinant of human attitudes and behaviors at every level of organizational functioning. Ashkanasy (2003b) points out further that this level of embeddedness is explained in terms of the fact that emotion is a fundamental neurobiological property of human beings. Every thought humans have and every behavior they execute is affected in some way by emotional substrates. Muraven and Baumeister (2000) argue further that emotional regulation is in itself effortful, resulting in physical depletion similar to physical exertion. If this is so, then teaching students about emotion and its role in organizations would seem to be imperative in management education.

Of the variables discussed within the 5-level model, the one that has attracted most attention in both the popular and academic literature is emotional intelligence. In this respect, emotional intelligence has been characterized by Ashkanasy and Daus (2002: 81) as follows:

1. Emotional intelligence is distinct from, but positively related to, other intelligences.
2. Emotional intelligence is an individual difference, where some people are more endowed, and others are less so.
3. Emotional intelligence develops over a person’s life span and can be enhanced through training.
4. Emotional intelligence involves, at least in part, a person’s abilities to effectively identify and to perceive emotion (in self and others), as well as possession of the skills to understand and to manage those emotions successfully.

We discuss this variable in more detail in the next section.
Stream 1. Emotional intelligence in this stream conforms to the definition given by Mayer and Salovey (1997) and is measured using the ‘abilities’ test developed by the authors in conjunction with consultant David Caruso (Mayer et al., 2002), known as the MSCEIT (Mayer, Salovey, Caruso Emotional Intelligence Test). Mayer and Salovey defined emotional intelligence as comprising four ‘branches’: (1) ability to perceive emotion, both in self and in others; (2) ability to assimilate emotion into the cognitive processes underlying thought; (3) ability to understand emotion and its consequences; and (4) ability to manage and thereby to regulate emotion, again in self and others. The MSCEIT comprises a series of eight test scales (two for each branch) that purport to be measures of emotional intelligence ability, in much the same way that an IQ test measures intellectual mental abilities. The ‘right’ answers to the test items are either based on a set of consensus norms (N = 5000), or scores obtained from a panel of 80 ‘experts’ who were in fact members of the selective Society for Research on Emotions (see http://www.isre.org). Of course, whether these answers are ‘right’ in reality remains a bone of contention (e.g., see Davies et al., 1998), but emerging evidence (e.g., see Daus and Ashkanasy, 2005) seems to support the validity and reliability of the MSCEIT in organizational applications.

Stream 2. Emotional intelligence in Stream 2 purports to conform to the Mayer and Salovey (1997) four-branch definition, but is measured using self-report questionnaires (e.g., Brackett et al., 2006; Jordan et al., 2002; Schutte et al., 1998; Wong and Law, 2002) or, more rarely, using peer-reports (e.g., Jordan and Ashkanasy, 2006). Of course, the major point of contention with this approach is that self-reports of emotional intelligence are inherently suspect (see Mayer, 2004 for discussion of this issue). Nonetheless, results using self-report (Stream 2) measures in organizational settings have been impressive (e.g., see Jordan and Troth, 2004; Law et al., 2004; Offermann et al., 2006).

Stream 3. Models of emotional intelligence in this stream are differentiated from the model used in Streams 1 and 2, based on the Mayer and Salovey (1997) definition. The Stream 3 models are often referred to as ‘mixed models’ of emotional intelligence, insofar as they tend to introduce aspects of personality into the construct. Some well-known examples include the EQi (Bar-On, 1997), the Emotional Competency Index (ECI; Sala, 2002), the Emotional Intelligence Questionnaire (EIQ: Dulewicz et al., 2003) and the Swinburne University Emotional Intelligence Test (SUEIT: Palmer and Stough, 2001). Consistent with Ashkanasy and Daus (2005), we do not regard any of the Stream 3 models as valid representations of emotional intelligence. All include elements of personality and other individual difference constructs, and most depart radically from Mayer and Salovey’s (1997) conceptualization. While these measures may be handy consulting tools, we fail to see how a particular defined construct can be represented by other (at best) remotely related constructs.

In summary, and consistent with Jordan et al. (2006), we regard only the Stream 1 and 2 approaches (which are based on the Mayer and Salovey, 1997, four-branch representation of emotional intelligence) as valid representations of emotional intelligence. Thus, as we note in the following sections of this chapter, claims for any results based on Stream 3 measures are going to be of doubtful authenticity. Moreover, we do not recommend that the Stream 3 models be taught, except in a comparative context with the more valid Mayer and Salovey (1997) model of emotional intelligence represented in Streams 1 and 2.

Next, we discuss the role of emotions and emotional intelligence in leadership. We outline the empirical research exploring the emotional aspects of leadership in organizations, and explain how emotional intelligence has been examined as a predictor of leadership effectiveness.

**EMOTIONS IN LEADERSHIP**

*Historical perspectives on emotions in leadership*
Early empirical work on the field of leadership implicitly touched on emotional aspects of leadership behaviors, yet there was no explicit mention of follower emotions evoked by leaders. The Ohio State Leadership studies and the Michigan Leadership studies of the 1950s highlighted task-oriented behaviors versus relations-oriented behaviors (Yukl, 2005). These relations-oriented behaviors are socio-emotional in nature; however, there was no reference to the emotions of followers in these studies. With regards to follower outcomes, satisfaction and productivity were the key outcome variables of interest during this early stage.

Similar to management research in general, most leadership research traditionally emphasized cognitive processes, with emotions as a basis for influence only coming to the spotlight since emotions came to prominence in research in the late 1980s (as we noted earlier in this chapter; see also Yukl, 2005). The recent advances in our understanding and appreciation of emotion in workplace settings that we noted earlier have shifted the focus from purely behavioral and cognitive processes to emotions, a perspective that has been neglected to date by most scholars of leadership (e.g., see Ashforth and Humphrey, 1995; Ashkanasy and Tse, 2000; George, 2000). This shift has been long overdue because, as Humphrey (2002b) has emphasized, leadership is intrinsically an emotional process, whereby leaders recognize and evoke employees’ emotional states, seeking to manage employees’ emotional states.

In an early general discussion of emotion in the workplace, Ashforth and Humphrey (1995) explained that leaders need to be able to evoke follower emotion, in order to achieve their task of creating and maintaining a system of shared meanings. Ashforth and Humphrey also discuss the idea of ‘symbolic management’, noting that this ‘is largely dependent upon the evocation of emotion’ (p. 111). They also suggest that, when employees are emotionally charged by a call from their leaders, they are less likely to view the call as being an attempt by the leader to be manipulative.

Early work identifying emotional consequences of leadership was related only to charisma (see George, 2000 for a discussion); however, since employee behavior and productivity are directly affected by their emotional states (Ashkanasy, Härtel and Daus, 2002), it is now considered imperative to consider follower emotional responses to organizational leaders. At a basic level, since leadership involves interpersonal relationships in the workplace, the relationship between a leader and his or her follower is inherently emotional in nature (Dasborough, 2006). As George (2000) argues, leadership is a particularly emotion-laden process, with emotions entwined with the social influence process.

**Emotions in leadership development**

Day (2000) has reviewed the concept of leadership development as a distinct field, distinguishing between intrapersonal characteristics of individual leaders and the interpersonal processes of leadership as a relational process. Day identified McCauley, Moxley, and van Velsorto (1998) as the originators of this concept, and defined leadership development as ‘expanding the collective capacity of organizational members to engage effectively in leadership roles and processes’ (p. 582). Importantly, he specifically listed emotional self-awareness and self-regulation as critical skills for leadership development. This idea was subsequently fleshed out by Caruso and Wolfe (2004), who based a leadership development model on the four-branch Mayer and Salovey (1997) model of emotional intelligence abilities, and suggested how training can be used to enhance these abilities to improve leadership effectiveness.

**Empirical contributions: leadership as a source of affective events**

With a focus now on emotional aspects of leadership, empirical studies are being conducted to explore the types of emotional responses followers have to their leaders. As we noted earlier in this chapter, many of these studies are based on affective events theory (AET: Weiss and Cropanzano, 1996). According to this theory, leaders are sources of affective events in the workplace (Brief and Weiss, 2002), bringing about both positive and negative emotional responses in followers during their interactions with them in the workplace. In the context of leadership, for example, when leaders recognize employee efforts, they can induce employee self-
pride, as well as enthusiasm for the job (see Basch and Fisher, 2000; Dasborough, 2006; Grandey et al., 2002). Leaders can also evoke strong negative emotions, for example when mishandling employee discipline (Ball et al., 1992). In this section, we outline findings from a range of empirical studies demonstrating the emotional side of leadership.

In more recent applications of AET in leadership research, Gaddis et al. (2004) and Newcombe and Ashkanasy (2002) examined leaders’ negative feedback as an affective event. The authors of both studies reported that subordinates’ attitudes and performance were influenced by the nature of the failure feedback and the emotional response of the subordinate to the feedback. Thus, in terms of AET, leader behavior can be seen as an affective event in the workplace producing positive and negative emotions in employees.

Dasborough (2006) has since empirically demonstrated a whole range of emotional responses of employees to specific organizational leader behaviors. In her qualitative study, she viewed leaders as sources of both positive and negative affective events for followers. Dasborough found that, when it came to recalling emotional incidents, employees remembered more negative incidents than positive incidents, and they recalled them more intensely and in more detail than positive incidents.

When leaders express their own emotions, this too can be a source of affective events for followers (e.g., see Newcombe and Ashkanasy, 2002). Leaders need to be able to manage their own emotions. Prati et al. (2003) discuss how a lack of emotional control by a leader can be perceived by followers as a weakness, and this may be related to leader ineffectiveness. Leaders should aim to be in control over their emotions, especially negative emotions, which might transfer from themselves to their followers via emotional contagion. In this respect, several studies have empirically demonstrated emotional contagion from leaders to followers (Bono et al., 2007; Cherulnik et al., 2001; Lewis, 2000; Sy et al., 2005).

Leaders also need awareness of the emotional content in the messages they are delivering, and to manage their emotional expressions when delivering the message. Newcombe and Ashkanasy (2002) found that positive messages and message-congruent leader affect results in more positive member ratings of the leader. They found that, if message content and leader affect are incongruent, then the leader's expression may appear manipulative, resulting in perceptions of lower quality LMX.

When leaders express negative emotions, the result is a reduction in follower liking for the leader, and more negative evaluations of the leader (Gaddis et al., 2004; Glomb and Hulin, 1997; Lewis, 2000). These effects depend on the specific type of emotion being expressed and the gender of the leader expressing them. For example, female leaders will receive higher ratings than male leaders in the case of expressing sadness; while male leaders will receive higher ratings than female leaders in the case of expressing anger (Lewis, 2000). Lewis explains this in terms of the gender norms that exist, and follower expectations around these norms.

These empirical studies have examined follower emotional responses to leadership. Next, we focus in on the most emotional leadership theory, the theory of transformational leadership.

**Empirical contributions: transformational leadership and emotion**

There are numerous theories of leadership in organizations (see Bass, 1990). Transformational leadership theory has been one of the most widely studied theories, and has been consistently argued as being the most effective type of leadership (see Bass and Riggio, 2005, for an up-to-date review). In comparison to transactional leaders, transformational leadership involves heightened emotions in followers, and the nature of influence is more emotion-based. Antonakis (2004) argues that transformational leaders generate affective links with their followers, and that this is a result of the leaders’ vision and moral convictions, combined with their courage and confidence.

Transformational and charismatic leaders have a positive emotional impact on their followers and their success
as leaders is determined by managing their follower's emotions (Ashkanasy and Tse, 2000). Leaders rated high on charisma and transformational leadership behaviors by their followers are often associated with followers reporting higher levels of positive emotions (Bass and Riggio, 2005). The energetic positive emotions experienced by followers, such as excitement and enthusiasm, may be the reason why they rate the leaders as being effective (Bono and Ilies, 2006; Damen et al., 2008).

Empirical demonstrations of transformational leadership also provide support for these arguments. McColl-Kennedy and Anderson (2002) found that sales representatives (who worked under a transformational leader) had higher sales and this was explained by the representatives’ felt optimism and frustration. Further support for the association between transformational leadership and positive emotions was provided by Dasborough (2006). In her field sample of employees, Dasborough found that, to evoke positive emotional responses, leaders displayed behaviors associated with transformational leadership (individualized consideration, inspirational motivation, intellectual stimulation, and charisma or idealized influence: Bass and Riggio, 2005). Specifically, Dasborough (2006) found that the following leader behaviors had positive emotional consequences: ‘awareness and respect’ (individualized consideration), ‘empowerment’ (intellectual stimulation), ‘motivation and inspiration’ (inspirational motivation), ‘reward and recognition’ (individual consideration).

De Cremer (2006) examined the effect of procedural justice and transformational leadership style on followers’ emotions. He found that procedural justice and transformational leadership style interacted to influence followers’ self-esteem and emotions, such that the positive relationships between procedural justice and emotions were more pronounced when the leadership style was high in transformational behavior. Given these and earlier findings, we conclude that the evidence supports the idea that transformational leaders have an emotional impact on their followers.

**Emotional intelligence and leadership**

Given the affective nature of leadership, attention has turned to emotional abilities of leaders as a means of improving leadership effectiveness. Early leadership studies have shown that the emotional maturity of leaders is associated with their effectiveness (Bass, 1990). In more recent times, a range of emotional abilities have been explored. Of these, and despite the concerns we noted earlier in this chapter, emotional intelligence has received considerable attention by leadership researchers. This is in contrast to other emotion-related variables such as emotion recognition (Newcombe and Ashkanasy, 2002; Rubin et al., 2005) and empathy (Kellett et al., 2006), which have not been as popular as the broader construct of emotional intelligence.

The underlying assumption of those who view emotional intelligence as important in leadership is that the skills required for leaders to be effective depend in part on the ability of leaders to understand and manage emotions (Cooper and Sawaf, 1997). Goleman et al. (2002) explain that effectively dealing with emotions may contribute to how a leader can effectively motivate employees, and to deal with their needs in the workplace. As Kellett et al. (2006) state, the ability of leaders to display emotions can influence how followers perceive them. In turn, this can influence their relationships with followers over the long term (see Dasborough and Ashkanasy, 2002).

George (2000) was the first to provide a detailed discussion of the central role of emotions and emotional intelligence in the leadership process. She based her arguments on the ability model of emotional intelligence (Mayer and Salovey, 1997). George made a substantial contribution to the literature, by being the first to propose how emotional intelligence specifically contributes to effective leadership. In particular, George explained how emotional skills contribute to the development of collective goals and objectives; instilling in others an appreciation of the importance of work activities; generating and maintaining enthusiasm, confidence, optimism, cooperation, and trust; encouraging flexibility in decision making and change; and establishing and maintaining a meaningful identity for an organization.

Although there are many supporters of the link between emotional intelligence and leadership, there remain some harsh critics. Antonakis (2004), for example, claims that people have been ‘hoodwinked’ in regard to the
claims made about the necessity of emotional intelligence for leadership and organizational performance. To clarify our position on this matter, we argue that, while emotional intelligence abilities may not be an absolute necessity, these abilities do assist with the social aspects of leadership which involve emotions. As reported earlier, leadership is an emotional process involving social interaction and influence. Hence, emotional intelligence abilities may be of use to individuals wishing to manage these emotional aspects of the workplace. We acknowledge nonetheless that there may be some circumstances in which these skills may not be as useful, as for example, in the case of an external leader with little social interaction with followers.

**Empirical support for emotionally intelligent leaders**

Specifically, George (2000) explained that when it comes to the development of collective goals and objectives, the affective state of the leader may influence the content of their vision. Positive emotions have been shown in a range of empirical studies to enhance creativity (see Isen and Baron, 1991). Hence, leaders may use their emotional intelligence to boost positive emotions and moods in order to assist with developing their innovative vision for the organization. Further, George argues that emotionally intelligent leaders who can manage the emotions of their employees can garner positive employee emotions such as enthusiasm and confidence. These positive emotions may then be used to establish commitment to the vision, and help to develop a collective identity (see also Ashkanasy and Ashton-James, 2007).

The majority of the early empirical work on emotional intelligence and leadership, however, has been based on the Stream 3 (mixed) models of emotional intelligence, and was conducted by management consultants. Some of these studies have made unsubstantiated claims about the connection between emotional intelligence and effective leadership. For example, Goleman et al. (2002) concluded astonishingly that emotional intelligence may contribute 80 to 90 percent of the competencies that distinguish outstanding from average leaders. Despite this and other claims by some consulting groups, there still remains a dearth of scholarly empirical evidence to support this statement (see Antonakis, 2004).

Sosik and Megerian (1999) explain that emotional intelligence has recently gained popularity as a potential underlying attribute of effective leadership. Along with this popularity, scholarly research has begun to emerge examining the connection between emotional intelligence and leadership. There are strong arguments for the connection between the abilities based model of emotional intelligence (Stream 1) and leadership ability, especially in the case of the more ‘emotional’ transformational leadership style. Daus and Ashkanasy (2005) outline these arguments, and state that this is an exciting area of research in organizational behavior. They report scholarly empirical studies that demonstrate the association between transformational leadership and the abilities based model of emotional intelligence; however, these are mostly conference papers and unpublished manuscripts. Initial empirical evidence does provide some support for the role of emotional intelligence abilities in promoting transformational leadership behaviors, and hopefully with time, more empirical studies will make their way into peer-reviewed journals. Next, we outline some of the published work in this field.

In a Stream 3 study by Palmer et al. (2000), preliminary evidence was found for the relationship between EI and effective leadership. Based on their work, they suggest that the ability to monitor and manage emotions within oneself and others may be an underlying competency of transformational leadership. Despite their promising findings, they call for caution, as do Moss et al. (2006) who also conducted field studies on emotional intelligence and leadership behaviors. They found mixed support for the role of emotional intelligence, and conclude that emotional intelligence may enhance the ability of managers to adapt their leadership style appropriately, but only in some contexts.

Wong and Law (2002) argue that supervisors with high emotional intelligence and maturity are more likely to be psychologically supportive of their followers, because such supervisors are more sensitive to feelings and emotions, both of themselves and their followers. Their (Stream 2) field study provides some preliminary support for researchers who have proposed the importance of leader emotional intelligence. Specifically, they
found that the emotional intelligence of leaders is positively related to the job satisfaction and extra-role behavior of followers. While this is a promising finding, they did not find support for the hypothesized connection between leader emotional intelligence and follower performance, arguably the most important outcome indicative of leadership effectiveness. Hence, similar to Palmer et al. (2000), and Moss et al. (2006), caution is again called for.

Within team contexts, the results of empirical studies on emotional intelligence and leadership have been more positive, specifically in regard to leader emergence. Leadership emergence is considered to have a logical tie with emotional intelligence, and this has even been stated by critics of the emotional intelligence construct, such as Frank Landy (see Daus and Ashkanasy, 2005). Emotional intelligence has been examined as a predicator of emergent team leadership by Pescosolido (2002); Wolff et al. (2002); Pirola-Merlo et al. (2002); and Dasborough et al. (2007). All of these scholars provide justification for the relevance of emotional skills for the emergence of team leaders. Here, the focus is on leader emergence, and not leader effectiveness (as indicated by follower performance or satisfaction for example), and it is within a team context.

Kellett et al. (2006) also examined emotional abilities and effective leadership within a team context, using a Stream 2 approach to emotional intelligence and peer ratings of leadership behaviors. In their study, they found support for the importance of emotional skills, especially empathy, in the development of follower perceptions of task and relations oriented leadership. Given their findings, and earlier supportive findings for the role of emotional intelligence in team leadership, it seems that the prevalence of face-to-face interactions with leaders and followers in teams may result in a stronger need for emotional skills within teams.

Outside of the team context, there have also been some promising developments. Rosete and Ciarrochi (2005) examined leadership and emotional intelligence in a small field study. Their research was based on the ability based model of EI (Stream 1) using the MSCEIT measure of EI. They found that higher emotional intelligence was associated with higher leadership effectiveness. Building on from this work, and also using the ability based model (Stream 1), Kerr and colleagues (2006) examined the association of emotional intelligence and leadership effectiveness (as measured by subordinates). Their results are also promising, with support for emotional intelligence being a predictor of leadership effectiveness. Further, they found that the branches of emotional intelligence had different levels of predictive power. The ability to perceive emotions and to use emotions were the strongest predictors of leadership effectiveness. This study and the one by Rosete and Ciarrochi before it paved the way forward in learning more about emotional intelligence and leadership. Utilizing an ability-based measure of emotional intelligence (Stream 1) and subordinate ratings of leadership effectiveness overcome many of the problems associated with other types of measures. The measures used in previous studies do raise questions over the validity of the results.

To improve the empirical research on emotional intelligence and leadership, we support the call by Antonakis (2004) for researchers to request target leaders to complete measures of cognitive ability, personality, and emotional intelligence, and followers/peers/bosses to assess the leadership of the target leader. This would enable the testing of emotional intelligence discriminant validity, incremental validity, and construct validity, and would avoid social desirability bias. It would ensure that the association between leadership and emotional intelligence is not merely an artifact of a single respondent assessing independent and dependent items on a single survey. While Antonakis (2004) predicts that the ‘EI boat’ will ‘suffer a calamity of titanic proportions’, we argue that when measured according to Stream 1 (the ability based test of EI), emotional intelligence is indeed a useful and valid predictor of leadership and is a tool that can be utilized to aid in the education of future organizational leaders.

In the final section of this chapter, we turn to the issue of educating about emotions and emotional intelligence. We outline the concerns and the suggestions by scholars in the field. We also explain the current methods being utilized to assist in developing individual’s emotional abilities, such as emotional literacy. We then report findings from a study of teaching about emotional intelligence within the context of leadership education.
TEACHING ABOUT EMOTIONS AND EMOTIONAL INTELLIGENCE

Teaching emotions

Although emotional capacities may be partly influenced by genetic factors and early development, many scholars argue that there is room for further development (e.g., see Lopes et al., 2006; Moriarty and Buckley, 2003). Lopes and his colleagues (2006) maintain further that learning to manage emotions and relationships with others is a lifelong process. In this case, Dunlop (1984) suggests that such education provides individuals with a selection of tools to assist with dealing with their own and others’ emotions. As we have earlier argued (e.g., see Forgas, 1995), emotions and moods have a pervasive influence on all mental activity, so the availability of tools for better managing emotions has implications also for cognitive functioning and behavior. Consequently, understanding of our own and others’ emotions and their effects, or what Denzin (1984) refers to as ‘emotional ways of knowing’, deserve our attention.

In the specific instance of the workplace, Thomson (1998) has made the case that learning about emotion contributes to what he calls ‘emotional capital’, and that this in turn, creates the basis for business success. Thomson (1998) suggests further that, by encouraging learning about emotion, the organization becomes more human ‘in the most amazing and positive way’ (p. 22). Thus, training in emotional skills may enhance work performance. Lopes et al. (2006) have shown that emotion training for leaders is likely to be most effective if it induces leaders to pay more attention to the feelings and concerns of others, and thereby enhances their understanding of others’ motives and behavior. Steiner and Perry (1999) believe that everyone has something to learn about their emotions, and consequently managers can enhance their effectiveness in the workplace through acknowledging and managing feelings. Therefore, managers should strive to acquire a degree of emotional literacy in order to be effective in their roles as organizational leaders (Fineman, 1997).

As an example of a typical teaching syllabus, leading emotions researcher Anat Rafaeli includes an ‘Emotions in Organizations’ syllabus available on her website. The syllabus provides a broad coverage of the field, including an introduction to the fundamentals of positive and negative emotions, and models of emotion. Other topics include monitoring and control of emotions in organizations, emotional labor, the effects (outcomes) of emotions, emotion and culture and emotional intelligence. Rafaeli asks her students to read published studies of emotion in organizational contexts, covering both employee and customer emotional responses and emotional abilities. The studies cover a wide range of research approaches in the field of emotions, including surveys, experiments, observations, event analysis and qualitative analysis.

Another leading emotions researcher, Quy Hui, has developed a program for teaching emotions to senior managers as a component of INSEAD Management School’s ‘Challenge of Leadership’ Executive Education Program. Hui uses detailed case examples to demonstrate how top managers’ understanding and empathetic management of emotion can be the key to organizational success and failure. In particular, by using realistic case studies, students are encouraged to think about how the concepts are going to apply to their own organizational problems and issues.

Thus, and as Ashkanasy and Daus (2002) argue, teaching about emotions in an organizational context may be seen as integral to leadership development. Still, while some pioneers in emotions scholarship are making progress, and there is a growing volume of research demonstrating the effects of emotions within the organization (Ashkanasy, 2003b), there is still little to show exactly how emotional abilities can be developed and what impact that development then has on the organization (e.g., see Wong et al., 2007).

Teaching emotional intelligence

Ashkanasy and Daus (2002) assert that training programs involving emotional intelligence are the key to the development of emotional capacities in organizations. Indeed, there is a virtual plethora of consultants and training organizations offering emotional intelligence training programs (see http://www.emotionaliq.org/EI-
Workshops.htm, for example). Clarke (2006) has pointed out, however, that the evidence demonstrating the actual impact of training in emotional intelligence on performance related outcomes is rare. Still, it is hard to ignore the volume of literature claiming that emotional intelligence is beneficial to leaders, and as such, training programs focused on enhancing leaders’ emotional intelligence should be pursued (for example see Bagshaw, 2000; Dulewicz and Higgs, 1999; Langley, 2000; Rozell et al., 2002; Sy and Côté, 2004; Welch, 2003).

Kunnanatt (2004) claims that the goal of emotional intelligence training is to facilitate individuals in developing self-knowledge about who they are and where they stand in the world of emotions, in order to guide them smoothly towards interpersonal success. He believes that a carefully drafted emotional intelligence training program changes both the inside aspects and the outside relationships of participants, and cultivates a host of virtues and attributes, including better attitudes, clearer perceptions, and productive affiliations.

MSCEIT co-developer David Caruso has put together a suite of emotional intelligence training courses (see Caruso and Salovey, 2004). Topics include: MSCEIT overview, emotional blueprint, emotionally intelligent feedback, the emotionally intelligent manager, emotional intelligence and change, and emotional intelligence and teams. As one would expect, Caruso's training courses are built around the Mayer and Salovey (1997) four-branch model of emotional intelligence, and involve administration of the MSCEIT (Stream 1). Caruso teaches course participants about each of the four branches of emotional intelligence, and then uses exercises as a means to develop skills in each of the four areas. Finally, Caruso has participants apply their learning to case study scenarios as well as cases from their own experience.

Murray et al. (2006) have also developed training programs based on the Mayer-Salovey four-branch model. Their program consists of a two-day interactive workshop format that includes specific activities that address each of the four branches, including training in perception of emotional ‘micro-expressions’ (Ekman, 1999); introduction to emotional contagion and ‘organizational stories’ (Van Buskirk and McGrath, 1992); teaching understanding of emotions through knowledge of emotional transitions (Mayer et al., 2001); and skills training related to emotion management (Caruso and Salovey, 2004). In a series of experimental studies in a large organization, Murray and her colleagues (2006) demonstrated that the training had positive results on team performance.

Cherniss and Adler (2000) outline a number of similar programs', which they called ‘model programs’. These programs consisted of two prevailing techniques for teaching emotional intelligence. The first is a workshop format, similar to the Murray et al. (2006) format described above, and conducted over varying timeframes of one- or two-day block seminars, to a series of sessions over a more extended period of time (e.g., once a week for six weeks). In these group training models, trainers employ a variety of methods such as lectures, group discussions, and role play exercises to facilitate emotional intelligence training.

The other popular format is one-on-one coaching sessions where the emotional intelligence trainer meets with a manager for personal development training. The executive coaching model described by Cherniss and Adler (2000) is an example of this technique. In this program, participants go through an initial one- or two-day diagnostic assessment and feedback session, followed by a coaching phase that involves usually one day of training per month for approximately six months.

Despite all the encouraging progress outlined above, we note that many of the studies reporting positive findings that training can have an impact in developing emotional intelligence are in fact based on the Stream 3 (mixed) models of emotional intelligence (Ashkanasy and Daus, 2005) and not on the Stream 1/2 (ability) approach. Many of these studies seem to provide impressive results (e.g., see also Hein, 2004) perhaps because, as we noted earlier, these authors are often consultants with access to large samples. However, these Stream 3 studies lack the scientific validity and credibility to be published in high quality journals. Clarke (2006) argues further that training based on the Stream 3 models of emotional intelligence run the risk of undermining the potential benefits that might be gained from training or development programs based on the more valid
ability model.

In light of this argument, Wong et al. (2007) tested the abilities based concept of emotional intelligence in order to shed some light on if an individual can develop abilities in emotional management and regulation. These authors claim that the key to discovering whether emotional intelligence can be effectively trained is found in the definition of the emotional intelligence construct. They argued that, if emotional intelligence is accepted as a set of abilities as presented by Mayer and Salovey (1997), then there is a possibility that emotional intelligence may be developed or enhanced by training programs. Based on a Stream 2 approach (i.e., using the Wong and Law, 2002, self-report instrument) these authors asked whether nurture or nature constructs are more important in development of emotional intelligence capabilities. By investigating the impact a full-time parent has on the development of their child, Wong et al. (2007) provided evidence that parental nurturing did indeed enhance emotional intelligence. They concluded that, because emotional intelligence is determined in essence from numerous exogenous sources, including family and social environment, there remains considerable scope for development of alternative whole-of-life models of emotional intelligence training. In other words, rather than viewing emotional intelligence as something that can be developed in a specific training program, it may be more useful to regard it as a set of skills/competencies that develop over an individual's lifetime (see also Mayer et al., 2001).

**Teaching emotional literacy rather than 'intelligence' per se**

A further issue that needs to be addressed is whether it makes sense at all to speak of teaching 'intelligence' per se. Mayer and Dobb (2000), for example, argue that, with a few exceptions, it probably does not. These authors point out that *intelligence* refers to a *capacity* to learn. It means that there are differences among people in emotional processing. Emotional intelligence relies on knowledge of emotional processes and information-processing skills (e.g., see Lopes et al., 2006). The problem here, as Clarke (2006) has observed, is that emotional intelligence is more than likely derived from genetic inheritance and home nurturance (see also Wong et al., 2007), and therefore may not be a skill or competency that can necessarily be developed through education.

Emotional literacy, on the other hand, is the constellation of understandings, skills, and strategies that a person can develop and nurture from infancy throughout an entire lifetime (Bocchino, 1999). Thus, emotional intelligence becomes the capacity to which an individual can develop emotional literacy. Therefore, the higher an individual's emotional intelligence, the more able s/he is to process emotional information accurately and efficiently and to increase emotional literacy. Therefore, although training in emotional skills is beneficial to leaders in general, such training would be more effective and enhanced in those high in emotional intelligence. This line of argument is also consistent with authors such as Perkins (1995) who argue that intelligence can be developed though expansion of inherent intelligence capacities.

**Teaching emotional awareness and emotional intelligence to develop leaders**

While there is a myriad of emotional intelligence training programs for organizational leaders advertised by consultants, there is little published scholarly research on the impact of teaching about emotional intelligence on leadership. Ashkanasy and Dasborough (2003) conducted an empirical study to assess the impact of such training in a classroom setting focused on leadership. Ashkanasy and Dasborough measured emotional intelligence of student participants using both an ability-based test (Stream 1) and self-report (Stream 2) measures of emotional intelligence. They found that teaching about emotions and emotional intelligence in the leadership class had an impact on subsequent team performance. Similar to the field studies on emotional intelligence and leadership emergence in teams discussed earlier in this chapter, Ashkanasy and Dasborough's findings in regards to teaching about the role of emotional intelligence and leadership, again suggests that this is more important in social settings such as workplace teams.
IMPLICATIONS, FUTURE RESEARCH DIRECTIONS AND CONCLUSION

It is clear from the foregoing discussion that, despite all the hyperbole we read in popular literature, we still have a long way to go before we can conclude that emotional intelligence training is truly effective. As we have argued, intelligence is a capacity for performance, and is derived from a person's genetic background and home nurturance. On the other hand, there is no reason that an individual cannot be trained to use his or her intelligence, even defined as a capacity, more effectively. The studies that we have reviewed in this chapter give hope that emotional skills can be developed, and there are encouraging signs that these skills lead to better performance outcomes for individuals and teams. Moreover, based on Ashkanasy's (2003a) five-level model, this also has the potential to lead to improved organizational performance.

Nonetheless, and as we noted earlier, we are witnessing an ‘affective revolution’ in organizational behavior and management (Barsade et al., 2003), including the inclusion of chapters on the topic in leading textbooks. A consequence of this is that there will be increasing attention paid to emotions and affect, both in the workplace and in the classroom. We predict therefore that management classes and organizational training programs will see an introduction of the topics of emotions, and emotional intelligence as an individual difference variable, that are worthy of study. Further, such lessons will become invaluable to the study of leadership, especially within the context of teams.

It is still early days in the study of emotion and emotional intelligence, and our knowledge of how to incorporate these constructs in learning and education programs is still developing. As we outlined at the beginning of this chapter, the study of emotion in organizational settings in general and emotional intelligence in particular, does not have a long history, and we are still on a steep learning curve. Recent findings based on fMRI technology, for example, are redefining important aspects of our understanding of the emotional brain (Gazzaniga, 2004). Clearly, there are limitless possibilities in this field.

We believe that the new developments in the field are going to continue to develop our ideas about the nature and effects of emotions, and especially emotional intelligence. As Barsade (2002) outlines, there is still a deeply embedded prejudice against including non-intellectual constructs in our understanding of organizational behavior. Until Simon's (1976) seminal work on bounded rationality, organizations were assumed to be inherently 100 percent rational, with no place for emotion whatsoever. More recently, scholars have begun to recognize that emotion most likely plays a role in decision processes and behavior at every level of organizational functioning, including CEO's strategic decision-making at the very top (Ashkanasy and Ashton-James, 2002; Daniels, 1998).

One impediment to the development of the field, however, continues to be the ongoing animosity towards emotional intelligence, especially in some academic quarters (e.g., see Antonakis, 2004; Landy, 2005; Locke, 2005). As we have pointed out in this chapter (see also Ashkanasy and Daus, 2005), these negative attitudes have arisen largely because of the exaggerated claims made for emotional intelligence, many of which have not stood up in scientific testing (Jordan et al., 2006), and the proliferation of Stream 3 models. Hopefully, however, the message about the scientifically valid abilities model of emotional intelligence, based on the Mayer and Salovey (1997) four-branch model of emotional intelligence, and embodied in the Stream 1 and 2 approaches is getting through, both in scholarship (i.e., through our efforts) and in educational programs such, as those by Caruso and Huy described earlier in this chapter.

At the same time, we do not want to be seen to be dogmatic about this. As our knowledge of emotion increases in the wake of yet-undiscovered advances, reasons to modify or maybe even abandon altogether the Mayer and Salovey model may emerge. As Jordan et al. (2003) have pointed out, the whole concept of emotional intelligence is still in a developmental phase, and is still therefore open to new ideas and change. The important thing here is that such advances need to be based on scientific and empirically tested models, rather than on exaggerated popular claims.
In conclusion, and as we have shown in this chapter, consistent with Ashkanasy's (2003a) 5-level model, emotions have been shown to play a significant role at every level of organizational functioning. In particular, there is a great deal of interest in the connection between emotional intelligence and leadership, and some promising findings are emerging. Moreover, there are some early indications that emotional intelligence training, or more correctly worded, emotional literacy training, can have beneficial effects in leadership programs.

Nonetheless, we still advise caution. At this point in time there is too little empirical evidence for us to be certain about the efficacy of teaching about emotional intelligence in leadership training. Part of the problem lies in the definition and measurement of emotional intelligence, and part of the problem lies in the definition of what exactly is ‘effective leadership’. Still, although we cannot say how or to what extent emotional intelligence contributes to effective leadership, we do know from empirical research that leadership involves emotions, and emotional skills may be beneficial for leaders in the workplace, especially those within team contexts. Hence, leadership training and development programs to enhance leadership effectiveness should still incorporate these emotion based skills, but caution is still necessary before making any concrete claims of regarding emotional intelligence and leadership.
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NOTES


2 See http://www.elsevier.com/wps/find/bookdescription.cws_home/BS_REO/description# description.

3 Based on Amazon.com search, June 14, 2007.

4 Although ‘hassles’ and ‘uplifts’ are often mentioned in reference to AET, Weiss and Cropanzano did not in fact use either term in their 1996 article.

5 Despite all the controversy between Watson and Tellegen and Russell and Carroll (e.g., see Russell and Carroll, 1999; Watson and Tellegen, 1999), the two perspectives can be shown to be functionally identical using simple 45-degree axis rotation.

6 The term ‘emotional intelligence’ was, in fact, introduced by Payne (1985) in his doctoral dissertation, but this work was not developed further. Salovey and Mayer (1990) developed their concept of emotional intelligence independently, and this is generally regarded as the seminal article in the field.

7 We found 173 citations recorded in SSCI; and 269 recorded in Google Scholar™ (as at Dec. 1, 2007).

8 The articles by Locke and Landy and responses by Ashkanasy and Daus were published in a ‘Point-Counterpoint’ issue of the Journal of Organizational Behavior (introduced by Spector, 2005), which followed a debate on this topic at the 2003 annual meeting of the Society for Industrial and Organizational Psychology (see Daus and Ashkanasy, 2003).


10 http://executive.education.insead.edu/challenge%5Fleadership/(visited June 14, 2007).
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