Studies of Emotion in Organizational Behavior at the Present Time
Muralidhar K

Indian Institute Of Management–Bangalore (IIM–Bangalore)

Abstract

Research on emotion in organizational behavior has become a significant subject in the last 15 years after being overlooked for most of the previous century. This shift in perspective is part of an emotional revolution in the organization sciences. This article provides a comprehensive overview of the state of the art in the study of emotions in the workplace, categorizing studies into five broad categories: individual, interpersonal, dyadic, leadership/team, and organizational. Affective events theory, state and trait affect and mood, emotional intelligence, emotional labor, emotional contagion, emotions and leadership, and fostering a positive emotional atmosphere are just some of the specifics we get into. Finally, we provide several directions for follow-up study.

Research on the role of emotions in OB was largely neglected for most of the post-World War II era (Brief & Weiss, 2002). For instance, Barsade, Brief, and Spataro (2003) observed that "the normal science of affect as job satisfaction" (p. 3) has absorbed the study of emotions in the workplace. The introduction of the concept of emotional labor in Hochschild's 1983 book The Managed Heart and subsequent research by Rafaeli and Sutton (Rafaeli & Sutton, 1987, 1989; Sutton & Rafaeli, 1988) in the 1980s started to alter this perception. The 1990s saw a rise in interest because to significant publications such as those written by Pekrun and Frese (1992) and Ashforth and Humphrey (1995). However, Affective Events Theory (AET; Weiss & Cropanzano, 1996) provided the primary motivation for the study of affect and emotions in workplace contexts from an OB perspective. Employees' attitudes and actions are influenced by their emotional reactions to certain "affective events" in the workplace, as proposed by Weiss and Cropanzano in their thesis. In the decade that followed, research on the role of emotions in the workplace flourished (for a review, see Ashkanasy & Ashton-James, 2005), and by the turn of the millennium, what Barsade et al. (2003) called "the affective revolution in organizational behavior" (p. 3) was well under way. Present-day manifestations of this fascination include the yearly book series Research on Emotion in Organizations (see http://www.emotionsnet.org) and the biennial International Conference on Emotions and Worklife.Despite this development, the discipline has often been fragmented, with researchers pursuing several areas of study (such as emotional intelligence, emotional labor, affective events theory, etc.) without making any real effort at integration. Ashkanasy (2003a) created a five-tiered emotional intelligence model for businesses to fill this gap. This serves as the basis for the structure of our analysis.

The Multi-Level Model of Emotionin Organizations

Ashkanasy (2003a) identified five levels of analysis in emo- tions research as applied to organizations: (a) within person,
(b) between persons (individual differences), (c) interpersonal interactions, (d) group, and (e) organization-wide (Figure 1). In a follow-up piece, Ashkanasy (2003b) noted that the model wasintegrated across the five levels through a common thread basedon the neurobiology of emotion.

Level 1. At this level of analysis, the focus is on momentarytemporal variations in within-person emotion as experienced byindividual organizational members. Weiss and Cropanzano (1996) argued specifically in AET that individuals at work experience "affective events" as daily hassles and uplifts that then determine immediate behavioral outcomes, as well as theirattitudes that influence their longer term outcomes.[1]

Level 2. This level focuses on individual differences and attitudes (between-person effects), for example, emotional intelligence (Mayer & Salovey, 1997), organizational commit- ment (Meyer & Allen, 1997), and trait affectivity (Watson & Tellegen, 1985). Job satisfaction as a between-person attitudinalvariable (Fisher, 2000) is also addressed at this level.

Level 3. This level includes emotional labor (Hochschild, 1983), discussed earlier in this review, as well as the gamutof emotional communication, including voice and facial recognition of emotion (Ekman, 1999). Also included at this level is Elfenbein's (2007) "Integrated Interpersonal Process Framework" (p. 318).

Level 4. The focus here moves to teams and team leadership,including group affective tone (George, 1990) and

emotional contagion (Hatfield, Cacioppa, & Rapson, 1992). For example, Kelly and Barsade (2001) found that contagion in work teams has consequences for team affective tone (mood) and performance.

Level 5. The top level in the model deals with the organization as a whole. In this respect, Ashkanasy quotes De Rivera's (1992) definition of emotional climate as "an objective group phenomenon that can be palpably sensed— as when one enters a party or a city and feels an attitude of gaiety or depression, openness or fear" (p. 197).

Level 1: Within-Person Emotional Variation

As we noted earlier, Level 1 is best understood in terms of affective events theory (AET; Weiss & Cropanzano, 1996). Moreover, and as Ashton-James and Ashkanasy (2005) point out, AET highlights the differential effects of positive and negative mood. Isen (1987) and Fredrickson (2001), for instance, argue that (mild) positive affect increases creativity and cognitive flexibility. More recently, Isen (2002) noted that positive mood affects self-related, task-irrelevant cognitions leading to increased attention to task demands (see also Rank & Frese, 2008). A corollary of this is that positive mood should enhance creativity and cognitive flexibility on tasks such as product design and innovation. Using experience sampling methodology (Larson & Csikszentmihalyi, 1983), Amabile, Barsade, Mueller, and Staw (2005) demonstrated this empirically in a field setting.216 Emotion Review Vol. 3 No. 2 On the other hand, there is evidence to suggest that employ-ees experiencing negative affect can be more effective than their positive affect colleagues in certain situations. Staw and Barsade (1993) and George (1990) refer to this as the "sadder- but-wiser" hypothesis. In this respect also, Forgas (1995) demonstrated that negative affect can lead to more vigilant monitoring of environmental events, and less susceptibility to persuasion (Forgas & East, 2003) and bias (Forgas & George, 2001).

In the workplace, moreover, because tasks typically entail substantive processing, they are likely to be influenced by what Forgas (1995) has termed "affect infusion" (see Forgas & George, 2001, for organizational applications). Empirical evi- dence of this can be found in a study by Mittal and Ross (1998), where they found that decision-makers are more willing to take risks in the presence of uncertainty when in a positive rather than a negative mood. As such, in the assessment of risk, managers in a positive mood will be more likely to identify opportunities than threats, and consequently are likely to be more optimistic in their situation appraisals and to take more risks (Ashkanasy & Ashton-James, 2007). In particular, and although risk-taking in many organizational situations might be inappropriate and dysfunctional, managers are often required to take risks in conditions of uncertainty in order to harness mar- ket opportunities, for example, launching a new product or increasing the price of an existing product. More recent research by Au, Chan, Wang, and Vertinsky (2003), Kuvaas and Kaufmann (2004), and Amabile et al. (2005) confirms that positive mood results in managers being more optimistic and confident in their business decisions.

Empirical findings for AET. AET is a theory relating to momentary variations of emotions and mood in individuals at work. As such, the appropriate empirical procedures involve measures in real time of affect and consequential variables (Fisher, 2008). Early empirical studies (e.g., Weiss, Nicholas, & Daus, 1999) utilized diary methods, but the approach almost universally employed nowadays is the experience sampling method (ESM; Larson & Csikszentmihalyi, 1983), also known as "ecological momentary assessment" (Beal & Weiss, 2003, p. 440; see also Weiss & Beal, 2005).

Importantly, empirical research based on AET and using experience sampling has been invariably supportive. Moreover, this research has also served to answer some of the enduring questions in the OB literature concerning affect and job satis- faction. For example, Weiss et al. (1999) found in their diary study that affect and job satisfaction were differentiable in that job satisfaction was shown to comprise a mixture of affective and cognitive attitudes to the job. Using a more sophisticated ESM based on the use of programmable wristwatches, Fisher (2000, 2002) found that affect was unrelated to job satisfaction if attitudinal factors are controlled for. Fisher (2002) also reported that affect was related to affective commitment, help- ing behavior, and role conflict when job satisfaction is accounted for. Ilies and Judge (2002; see also Judge & Ilies, 2004) and Fuller et al. (2003), in ESM studies using personal digital assistant (PDA) devices, reaffirmed that job satisfaction and affect at work are related but separate constructs. Finally, Fisher and Noble (2004), in an extension of Fisher's (2000, 2002) earlier ESM studies using programmable watches, found that affect and job satisfaction and performance were strongly related within person (correlations in the .70 range). Thus the within- person relationship is considerably stronger than the between- person job satisfaction–job performance relationship, which has been estimated at .30 in a meta-analysis by Judge, Thoresen, Bono, and Patton (2001).

More recent studies have moved away from job satisfac- tion to study the effects of affect on emotional labor and counterproductive behaviors though the lens of AET. Beal, Trougakos, Weiss, and Green (2006), for example, found in a PDA-ESM study of emotional labor that negative affect was negatively associated with maintenance of the requisite dis- play rules, especially for employees who engage in surface acting. Dalal, Lam, Weiss, Welch, and Hulin (2009), in an ESM study where they examined within-person effects of affect on citizenship and counterproductive behaviors, also found unequivocal support for AET. Finally, Rodell and Judge (2009) reported

in a sophisticated ESM study combining AET and stress theory (Lazarus & Folkman, 1984) that anxiety and anger had direct and indirect effects on counterproductive behaviors, and that the relationship was stronger for more neurotic employees.

In summary, studies using experience sampling methodshave consistently supported AET (see Weiss & Beal, 2005, for a more extensive review). In addition, the theory has also been supported in non-ESM studies of call-center operators (e.g., Wegge, van Dick, Fisher, West, & Dawson, 2006).

Level 2: Between-Person Emotional Variation

At this level, individual differences determine the frequency, intensity, and duration of the experience of positive and nega- tive moods and emotions. We examine the two most researchedaspects of between-person differences in organizational behavior: trait affect and emotional intelligence.

Trait affect. Weiss and Cropanzano (1996) noted that trait affect (Watson & Tellegen, 1985) is a personality variable relat-ing to an individual's general emotional tendencies. In an organizational context, Staw and Barsade (1993) reported that positive and negative trait affect was a useful predictor oforganizational performance. Similarly, Judge (1993; Judge & Ilies, 2004; Judge & Larsen, 2001) found that positive trait affect predicted individual overall job satisfaction. Negative trait affect, on the other hand, has been shown to mediate the effect of (self-reported job) stressors on stress symptoms (Brief, Burke, George, Robinson, & Webster, 1988; Schaubroeck, Ganster & Fox, 1992). More recently, Barsky and Kaplan (2007) reported that negative affect is associated with perceptions of injustice.

Emotional intelligence. Mayer and Salovey (1997) definedemotional intelligence (EI) in terms of four basic abilities:
(a) ability to perceive emotions in self and others; (b) ability toAshkanasy & Humphrey *Emotions in Organizational Behavior* 217
assimilate the information in cognitive functioning; (c) ability to understand the role of emotions; and (d) ability to use and to manage emotions in decision-making. Although subject to con-troversy (Ashkanasy & Daus, 2005; Daus & Ashkanasy, 2005; Jordan, Ashkanasy, & Ascough, 2007; Jordan, Ashkanasy, & Daus, 2008; Locke, 2005), the idea that individuals differ in theway they process emotional information is really very straight-forward. After *The New York Times* journalist Daniel Goleman (1995) wrote his popular book on the subject, however, the structure and importance of the underlying constructs havebecome muddied in the eyes of many commentators (e.g., see Locke, 2005). In this respect, Ashkanasy and Daus (2005) notedthat EI researchers tend to adopt one of three approaches to emotional intelligence, corresponding to three "streams:" (a) *Stream 1* research is based on the ability model of emotional intelligence, and uses an ability measure (the MSCEIT; Mayer,Salovey, & Caruso, 2002); *Stream 2* research is based on the same (Mayer & Salovey, 1997) definition, but uses self- or peer-report measures; and *Stream 3* research uses other definitions ofthe construct, measured using self or peer reports. Ashkanasy and Daus (2005) endorse the Stream 1 and 2 approaches, but advise against use of the Stream 3 models on the basis that theytypically overlap with measures of personality.[2]

Emotional intelligence and job performance. The question remains as to whether the data support a relationship between emotional intelligence and performance. In this respect, two recent meta-analyses are germane. Joseph and Newman (2010) found that self-report ability measures and self-report mixed models of emotional intelligence had incremental validity over and above cognitive ability and the Big Five personality meas- ures when predicting job performance. In addition, they found that performance-based (or objective) measures of emotional intelligence, self-report ability measures, and self-report mixed models all had incremental validity over and above cognitive intelligence and personality when predicting performance in jobs that required emotional labor.

In a subsequent, more comprehensive meta-analysis O'Boyle,Humphrey, Pollack, Hawver, and Story (in press) found that Stream 2 and Stream 3 EI measures (Ashkanasy & Daus, 2005)had incremental validity (5.2% and 6.8%, respectively) when predicting job performance over and above the effects of cognitiveintelligence and Big Five personality measures. Stream 1 meas-ures, on the other hand, did not significantly increase the variance.Using a new technique (dominance analysis) to analyze the rela-tive contribution of variables, O'Boyle et al. (in press) reportedthat Stream 1 emotional intelligence was the third most importantpredictor behind cognitive intelligence and conscientiousness, andexplained 6.4% of R^2; Stream 2 emotional intelligence was the second best predictor (behind cognitive intelligence) and explained13.6% of R^2; and Stream 3 emotional intelligence explained 13.2% of R^2 and was also the second best predictor.

Level 3: Interpersonal Emotions

At this level of the model, we address the display and commu- nication of emotion in dyadic encounters. Indeed, emotion plays a key role in communication. Ekman (1972), for example, dem-onstrated that many emotional expressions are universally rec- ognized across cultures, thus demonstrating their importance tocommunication. Although some emotional expressions are uni-versally recognized, Elfenbein and Ambady (2003) found that people are more accurate at recognizing emotions expressed bymembers of their own cultural group. Cultural groups may havetheir own emotional "dialect" (Elfenbein, Beaupré, Lévesque, & Hess, 2007). Elfenbein (2007) has developed a model called the "integrated interpersonal process framework for emotion in organizations." This model diagrams the interplay between con- sciously controlled elements of emotional expressions with the automatic components of emotions.

As indicated earlier in the section on emotional intelligence,people differ in their ability to recognize emotions and nonver- bal expressions. Nowicki and Duke (2001) developed the diag- nostic analysis of nonverbal accuracy (DANVA) to assess thesedifferences. Researchers who have used the DANVA have found that the ability to recognize nonverbal displays is impor- tant to transformational leadership (Rubin, Munz, & Bommer, 2005) and to effective supervision (Byron, 2007). As foreshad- owed earlier in this article, however, the literature on emotions in organizations has traditionally focused on emotional labor. We deal with this in detail in the following section.

Emotional labor. As we noted earlier, Hochschild (1983) was the first to study emotional labor. She argued that many organizations require service employees to display emotions to customers or clients as part of their job duties. For example, waiters and waitresses, airline attendants, hotel desk clerks, and many other service employees are expected to provide "servicewith a smile" and thus to display positive emotions to customers(Pugh, 2001). Employees perform emotional labor when they express emotions to customers and clients as part of their job duties. In particular, Hochschild (1983) described two types of emotional labor. The first is *surface acting*, which consists of outward displays of emotion that do not match what the actor isreally feeling. For example, a waiter who is feeling tired, frus- trated, and even angry may smile at a customer nonetheless in order to receive a good tip and to comply with the restaurant's policies. The second approach is *deep acting*, where employeestry to experience the emotions they are supposed to display. In turn, their induced emotions would then alter their outward emotions to comply with the display rules.

Brotheridge and Lee (2003) subsequently developed widely used emotional labor scales based on Morris and Feldman's (1996) theory that emotional labor can be conceptualized in terms of its frequency, intensity, variety, and duration, along with surface acting and deep acting. The frequency of customer inter- actions may be of particular interest, although many factors maydetermine how the frequency of interaction influences employees' psychological reactions (Grandey & Diamond, 2010; Humphrey,Nahrgang, & Morgeson, 2007). Call centers are another area in which employees must perform high frequencies of emotional labor (Jenkins, Delbridge, & Roberts, 2010).

Ashforth and Humphrey (1993) reasoned, on the other hand,that genuine and naturally felt emotions may also comply with218 Emotion Review Vol. 3 No. 2display rules and thus could be considered a third form of emotional labor. Hairdressers, for example, may enjoy talking to their long-term customers and thus their naturally felt emo- tions may frequently comply with organizational display rules. Scholars are now giving considerable attention to this formof emotional labor. Glomb and Tews (2004) found that genuineemotional displays are distinct from the other two forms of emotional labor. They developed the Discrete Emotions EmotionalLabor Scale (DEELS). This scale, as its name implies, focuses on discrete emotions and includes positive emotions such as happiness, liking, and enthusiasm, as well as negative emotionssuch as sadness, irritation, and anger. In addition, the scale assesses the suppression of emotional displays as well as the displays of the emotions.

Other research has demonstrated that surface acting, deep acting, and genuine emotional displays are separate forms of emotional labor. Diefendorff and Gosserand (2003) argued thatindividuals normally express their genuine emotions, and only when this fails to achieve the results they desire do they engagein surface acting or deep acting. Diefendorff, Croyle, and Gosserand (2005) developed items to measure the expression ofnaturally felt emotions, and they found that their items factoredappropriately. In addition, in both their primary sample and theircross-validation sample, they found that individuals reported expressing naturally felt emotions more often than they used either surface acting or deep acting. Dahling and Perez (2010) found that older, more experienced workers were more likely touse deep acting and to express naturally felt emotions, and thusless likely to use surface acting.

Hochschild (1983) also argued that performing emotional labor can have harmful effects on service providers. In particu- lar, displaying emotions that you do not actually feel can pro- duce dissonance and feelings of inauthenticity. Van Dijk and Kirk-Brown (2006), for example, found that people only suf- fered negative outcomes when emotional labor created feelingsof dissonance. When people identified with their role-related emotional displays then they did not experience emotional exhaustion. Bono and Vey (2007), in a qualitative and

quantita-tive review, found that surface acting in particular leads to burnout and other psychological problems. In another meta- analysis, Judge, Woolf, and Hurst (2009) found that surface acting was associated with negative mood, emotional exhaus- tion, and decreased job satisfaction. Deep acting, however, had no effect on job satisfaction, although it was associated with somewhat lower positive affect. In addition, they found that extroverts were able to perform emotional labor with fewer negative psychological consequences.

Finally, we note that researchers have generally found that deep acting is more effective than surface acting in terms of performance and customers' reactions. For example, Groth, Hennig-Thurau, and Walsh (2009) found that customers respond better to deep acting, although this varies with customers' ability to detect the service providers' use of deep versus sur- face acting. Likewise, Grandey (2003) found that deep acting resulted in customers perceiving the service providers as being warmer and friendlier. Hennig-Thurau, Groth, Paul, and Gremler (2006) also found that authentic emotional displays lead to better customer reactions.

Level 4: Leadership and Teams

There have been two dominant streams of research in leadership and teams. The first has focused on the role of leaders as mood managers. The second is the nexus of emotional intelligence and leadership. We deal with each of these topics in turn.

Leaders as mood managers. Scholars have long argued that leaders have an important influence over the moods and feelings of their followers. George (2000) theorized that leaders high on emotional intelligence are better at creating a sense of enthu- siasm among their group members. Humphrey (2002) argued in particular that managing the moods of group members is a major, not a minor, leadership function. Managers and leaders may influence the moods of their followers and teammates in different ways. Pescosolido (2002) found in two qualitative studies that emergent leaders had a better understanding of how to respond to various emotionally arousing workplace events, and influenced others by role-modeling the correct emotional response. He also argued that emergent leaders created shared emotional experiences that bonded group members together.

Pirola-Merlo, Härtel, Mann, and Hirst (2002) argued that the workplace is full of frustrating, mood-dampening events, and that transformational leaders help subordinates overcome the mood-damaging effects of these events. In their empirical study of research and development teams, they found that leaders could boost performance by lifting followers' moods. McColl-Kennedy and Anderson (2002) also examined nega- tive, frustrating events at work, and found that managers high on transformational leadership were able to instill feelings of optimism, thereby increasing performance and goal achieve- ment. Since these groundbreaking studies on leaders as mood managers, scholars have continued to find that leaders exert much of their influence by influencing the moods of their followers (e.g., Tsai, Chen, & Cheng, 2009).

One of the main ways in which leaders influence the moods of their followers and teammates is by emotional contagion. Emotional contagion occurs when emotions spread from one person to another, often when people mimic each others' emo- tional expressions, body language, and vocal tone (Hatfield, Cacioppa, & Rapson, 1992). Goleman, Boyatzis, and McKee (2002), in their book on primal leadership, argued that one of the main ways in which emotional leadership works is by creat-ing emotional contagion. Primal leaders first act to create emo- tional synchronization, or resonance, in which both leaders and followers are moving in step emotionally. The leaders then use their emotional connection to move with followers to produc- tive emotional states. Barsade (2002) demonstrated how emo- tions are easily transmitted among work group members. Sy, Côté, and Saavedra (2005) found that when leaders were in a positive mood, individual group members also experienced more positive moods and were more likely to cooperate with each other. More recently Dasborough, Ashkanasy, Tee, and Tse (2009) argued that emotional contagion can also affect the leaders, leading to an "emotional spiral" (Hareli & Rafaeli, 2008).

Finally, Humphrey et al. (Humphrey, 2008; Humphrey, Pollack, & Hawver, 2008) theorized that, to take control of emotional-contagion processes, leaders need to use emotional labor and regulation tactics to control their own emotional reactions and feelings. After taking control of their own feel- ings, they should then be able to use emotional labor tactics (such as deep acting or genuine emotional expression) to dis- play the appropriate emotions for the situation; the leaders' expressed emotions would then spread to their followers through emotional contagion.

Emotional intelligence and leadership. Considerable rese- arch has been done in the last decade on emotional intelligence/competencies and leadership. For example, Walter, Cole, and Humphrey (in press) found in a review of studies conducted since 1999 that all six studies of the link between emotional intelligence and leadership emergence were supportive; that 13 of 16 studies of the role of emotional intelligence in facilitating effective leadership behaviors found at least partial support; and that 13 of 15 studies of emotional intelligence and leadership effectiveness either fully or partially supported a relationship.

The research on emotional intelligence has been conducted using measures from all three streams (Ashkanasy

& Daus, 2005) of emotional intelligence research. In Stream 1 research, Côté, Lopez, Salovey, and Miners (2010) found that MSCEIT scores predicted peer-rated leadership emergence when control-ling for cognitive ability and personality; Leban and Zulauf (2004) reported that MSCEIT scores were correlated with project managers' leadership behaviors; and Rosete and Ciarrochi(2005) found that managers' MSCEIT scores were related to their performance when assessed by their own superiors.

In Stream 2 research, results have been similar. For example,Kellett, Humphrey, and Sleeth (2006) examined leadership emer-gence in a student assessment center using a new measure of interactive empathy, plus two measures from the Workgroup Emotional Intelligence Profile (WEIP) (Jordan, Ashkanasy, Härtel, & Hooper, 2002) on the ability to express own emotionsand the ability to read others' emotions. Kellett et al. (2006) foundthat interactive empathy was the best predictor of leadership emergence (even better than cognitive intelligence) and that it partially mediated the effects of the other two emotional intelli-gence variables. Stream 2 emotional intelligence/competency measures are also related to effective leadership behaviors. Self-ratings of emotional intelligence have been found to be correlatedwith charismatic leadership as rated by observers (Middleton, 2005) and by subordinates (Groves, 2005). With regard to leader-ship effectiveness, Sy, Tram, and O'Hara (2006) found that man-agers' emotional intelligence correlated with subordinates' job satisfaction and subordinates' performance ratings.

Stream 3 measures have also predicted leadership emer-gence, behaviors, and effectiveness. For example, Kellett, Humphrey, and Sleeth (2002) found that the Emotional Competence Inventory (ECI) measure of empathy successfully predicted leadership emergence even when controlling for college-grade-point average and complex task performance. Ina similar vein, Wolff, Pescosolido, and Druskat (2002) found that the ECI measure of empathy influenced various behavioralstrategies, which in turn led to leadership emergence. In terms of leadership behaviors, Barling, Slater, and Kelloway (2000) found that managers' EQ-i® scores were positively associated with subordinates' ratings of the managers on transformational leadership. Stream 3 measures have also predicted leadership effectiveness. For example, Young and Dulewicz (2007) found that officers' emotional self-awareness was positively related totheir performance ratings.

Level 5: The Organizational Level

Level 5 of the model takes a whole-of-organization perspectivewhere, as Ashkanasy and Daus (2002) point out, the aim should be for a "healthy emotional climate," where the positive emo- tions need to be created and then sustained across the whole organization (see also Ashkanasy, Härtel, & Daus, 2002; Härtel& Ashkanasy, 2010). Ashkanasy and Ashton-James (2005) note, however, that "Level 5 is qualitatively different from the other levels of the model" (p. 221). This is because Level 5 encompasses interactions at the five lower levels (see Figure 1),so that organizational policies and values are interpreted in the context of the processes at the lower levels, including the basic neurobiological mechanisms discussed at Level 1. In effect, organizational managers at Level 5 need to be able to understand that employees' attitudes and behavior are driven to a large extent by an accumulation of affective events (Level 1);that employees need to be skilled in emotional perception,assimilation, understanding, and management (Level 2); that they need to display appropriate emotional expressions in their dealings with coworkers and clients/customers (Level 3); and that, in group situations and leadership roles, understanding theprocesses of perception and transmission of emotions are the keys to engendering high-quality leader–member relationships and high-performing teams (Level 4). At the organization-wideor macro view, on the other hand, the situation is much more complex and intervening (or meso-level) processes come into play (see Uhl-Bien & Marion, 2009). For example, Dasborough et al. (2009) describe a meso-level model where a leader's behavior to subordinates (Level 4) is reflected in team-memberrelationships (Level 3) that in turn reflect on the leader's per- formance via emotional-contagion processes, leading to an organizational management response to the leader (Level 5). Also, Momeni (2009) found that managers' emotional intelli- gence (Level 2) had a direct effect on climate (Level 5). Froma broader perspective, however, this complexity becomes sub- sumed under two topics: emotional climate and organizational policies regarding display rules. We deal with each of these topics in the following sections.

Emotional climate. De Rivera (1992; see also Yurtsever &de Rivera, 2010) introduced and defined the concept of emo- tional climate as "an objective group phenomenon that can be palpably sensed—as when one enters a party or a city and feelsan attitude of gaiety or depression, openness or fear" (p. 197). As such, emotional climate is a subset of the broader concept oforganizational climate (see Ashkanasy, Wilderom, & Peterson, 2000, 2010; Schneider, Ehrhart, & Macey, 2010). Emotional climate, however, focuses specifically on the collective mood of organizational members toward their jobs, their colleagues, the organization, and management. As a climate, the construct is distinct from organizational culture because it is less stable thanculture, and does not relate to members' beliefs, values, and deeply embedded assumptions (see Ashkanasy et al., 2000; Schein, 2004), although Schein notes that the assumptions uponwhich an organization's organizational culture derive also fromdeeply felt feelings.

In a study of the "climate of fear," Ashkanasy and Nicholson(2003) examined culture and climate in two Australian restau- rant chains and found that, while culture varied across theorganizations, climate varied across the restaurants within the organizations, but not across the organizations. They concludedthat this finding relates to the essential difference between cli- mate (a team-level phenomenon) and culture (an organizational-level phenomenon). As such, the classification of emotional climate at Level 5 in the multi-level model of emotion in organizations may be debatable.

Emotional display rules. An organization's culture becomesrelevant in consideration of organizational policies governing employees' emotional displays or emotional labor (e.g., see Beyer & Niño, 2001; Fineman, 2000; Hochschild, 1983; Rafaeli & Sutton, 1987, 1989; van Maanen & Kunda, 1989). Diefendorff et al. (e.g., Diefendorff & Greguras, 2009; Gosserand& Diefendorff, 2005), in particular, have studied the interac- tion of organizational display rules and person and contextual variables.

Finally, we note that several authors (e.g., Ashkanasy & Daus, 2002; Cooper & Williams, 1994; Härtel & Ashkanasy, 2010; Vacharkulksemsuk, Sekerka, & Frederickson, 2010) haveemphasized the need for emotional climate/culture to be posi- tive and 'healthy.' Cooper and Williams (1994), for example, emphasize that healthy organizations give equal priority to the maintenance of both employee well-being and positive organi- zational outcomes. Importantly, the healthy organization should seek to keep negative emotional events that affect employees toa minimum, and not engage in unreasonable demands for emo- tional labor. In this respect, Härtel, Hsu, and Boyle (2002) and Kelly and Barsade (2001) highlight the fact that organizational-level policies often are the key to determining group and personal emotional outcomes.

Discussion and Conclusions

In this review, we have provided an overview of current research on emotion in organizational behavior, based on the Ashkanasy (2003a) five-level model of emotion in organiza- tions (Figure 1). We have demonstrated that research is ongoing at all levels of the model, with particular focus on affective events theory, emotional intelligence/competency, mood effects,and emotional labor. Although neglected for many years in the OB literature, it is clear from the various reviews of this field (e.g., Ashforth & Humphrey, 1995; Ashkanasy et al., 2002; Brief & Weiss, 2002; Elfenbein, 2007) that this is a growing andvibrant field of research, with untapped potential and "a bright future" (Ashkanasy & Ashton-James, 2005, p. 221).

As to the future, Gooty, Gavin, and Ashkanasy (2009) have noted three areas in particular that need to be addressed. These are (a) definitional inconsistency, especially between the terms affect, emotion, and mood; (b) a tendency to focus on dimen- sions of positive and negative affect, rather than study the dif- ferential effects of discrete emotions; (c) a need for more research at Level 1 (within person), rather than studies that aggregate variables across time; and (d) the need to take more account of context in studies of emotion in organizations. In addition to these issues, Ashkanasy (2009) commented that OBresearch in general is going to be characterized by more multi- level research, especially based on longitudinal methods such asESM. Moreover, the availability of SMS-based ESM methods (e.g., see Forgasz & Leder, 2006) makes this methodologymuch easier and cheaper to use than in the past. Finally, we notethat this field has been and will continue to be strongly influ- enced by recent advances in studies of neurobiology (see Ashton-James & Ashkanasy, 2005, for a review of this field andits application to AET).

References

Amabile, T. M., Barsade, S. G., Mueller, J. S., & Staw, B. M. (2005). Affect and creativity at work. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, *50*, 367–403.

Ashforth, B. E., & Humphrey, R. H. (1993). Emotional labor in service roles: The influence of identity. *Academy of Management Review*, *18*, 88–115.

Ashforth, B. E., & Humphrey, R. H. (1995). Emotion in the workplace:A reappraisal. *Human Relations*, *48*, 97–125.

Ashkanasy, N. M. (2003a). Emotions in organizations: A multilevel perspective. In F. Dansereau and F. J. Yammarino (Eds.), *Research in multi-level issues* (Vol. 2, pp. 9–54). Oxford, UK: Elsevier/JAI Press.

Ashkanasy, N. M. (2003b). Emotions at multiple levels: An integration. In
F. Dansereau and F. J. Yammarino (Eds.), *Research in multi-level issues*
(Vol. 2, pp. 71–81). Oxford, UK: Elsevier/JAI Press.

Ashkanasy, N. M. (2009). After thirty years: What does the future hold?
Journal of Organizational Behavior, *30*, 15–20.

Ashkanasy, N. M., & Ashton-James, C. E. (2005). Emotion in organiza- tions: A neglected topic in I/O Psychology, but with a bright future. In
G. P. Hodgkinson & J. K. Ford (Eds.), *International review of industrial and organizational psychology* (Vol. 20, pp. 221–268). Chichester, UK: Wiley.

Ashkanasy, N. M., & Ashton-James, C. E. (2007). Positive emotion in orga-nizations: A multi-level framework. In C. L. Cooper & D. Nelson (Eds.), *Positive organizational behavior* (pp. 57–73). Chichester, UK: John Wiley and Sons. Ashkanasy & Humphrey *Emotions in Organizational Behavior* 221 Ashkanasy, N. M., & Daus, S. D. (2002). Emotion in the workplace: The new challenge for managers. *Academy of Management Executive*, *16*, 76–86.

Ashkanasy, N. M., & Daus, C. S. (2005). Rumors of the death of emotional intelligence in organizational behavior are vastly exaggerated. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, *26*, 441–452.

Ashkanasy, N. M., Härtel, C. E. J., & Daus, C. S. (2002). Diversity and emotion: The new frontiers in organizational behavior research. *Journal of Management*, *28*, 307–338.

Ashkanasy, N. M., & Humphrey, R. H. (in press). A multi-level view of leadership and emotions: Leading with emotional labor. In A. Bryman,
D. Collinson, K. Grint, B. Jackson & M. Uhl-Bien (Eds.), *Sage hand- book of leadership* (pp. 363–377). London, UK: Sage Publications.

Ashkanasy, N. M., & Nicholson, G. J. (2003). Climate of fear in organiza- tional settings: Construct definition, measurement, and a test of theory. *Australian Journal of Psychology*, *55*, 24–29.

Ashkanasy, N. M., Wilderom, C. P. M., & Peterson, M. F. (2000). Introduction. In. N. M. Ashkanasy, C. Wilderom, & M. Peterson (Eds.), *Handbook of organizational culture and climate* (pp. 1–18). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Ashkanasy, N. M., Wilderom, C. P. M., & Peterson, M. F. (2010). Introduction to the handbook of culture and climate, second edition. In
N. M. Ashkanasy, C. E. P. Wilderom, & M. F. Peterson (Eds.), *The handbook of culture and climate* (2nd ed., pp. 3–10). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Ashton-James, C. E., & Ashkanasy, N. M. (2005). What lies beneath? A deconstructive analysis of affective events theory. In N. M. Ashkanasy,
W. J. Zerbe & C. E. J. Härtel (Eds.), *Research on emotion in organizations*
(Vol. 1, pp. 23–50). Oxford, UK: Elsevier/JAI Press.

Au, K., Chan, F., Wang, D., & Vertinsky, I. (2003). Mood in foreign exchange trading: Cognitive processes and performance. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, *91*, 322–338.

Barling, J., Slater, F., & Kelloway, E. K. (2000). Transformational leader- ship and emotional intelligence: An exploratory study. *Leadership & Organization Development Journal*, *21*, 157–161.
Barsade, S. G. (2002). The ripple effect: Emotional contagion and its influ-ence on group behavior. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, *47*, 644–675. Barsade, S. G., Brief, A. P., & Spataro, S. E. (2003). The affective revolution in organizational behavior: The emergence of a paradigm. In
J. Greenberg (Ed.), *Organizational behavior: The state of the science*
(pp. 3–52). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Barsky, A., & Kaplan, S. A. (2007). If you feel bad, it's unfair: A quantita- tive synthesis of affect and organizational justice perceptions. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *92*, 286–295.

Beal, D. J., Trougakos, J. P., Weiss, H. M., & Green, S. G. (2006). Episodic processes in emotional labor: Perceptions of affective delivery and regulation strategies. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *91*, 1053–1065.

Beal, D. J., & Weiss, H. M. (2003). Methods of ecological momentary assessment in organizational research. *Organizational Research Methods*, *6*, 440–464.

Beyer, J., & Niño, D. (2001). Culture as a source, expression, and rein- forcer of emotions in organizations. In R. L. Payne & C. L. Cooper (Eds.), *Emotions at work: Theory, research, and applications for management* (pp. 173–197). Chichester, UK: Wiley.

Bono, J. E., & Vey, M. A. (2007). Personality and emotional performance: Extraversion, neuroticism, and self-monitoring. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, *12*, 177–192.

Brief, A. P., Burke, M. J., George, J. M., Robinson, B. S., & Webster, J. (1988). Should negative affectivity remain an unmeasured variable in the study of job stress? *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *73*, 193–198.

Brief, A. P., & Weiss, H. M. (2002). Organizational behavior: Affect in the workplace. *Annual Review of Psychology*, *53*, 279–307.

Brotheridge, C. M., & Lee, R. T. (2003). Development and validation of the emotional labour scale. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, *76*, 365–379. Byron, K. (2007). Male and female managers' ability to "read" emotions: Relationships with supervisor's performance ratings and subordinates' satisfaction ratings. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, *80*, 713–733.
Cooper, C. L., & Williams, S. (1994). *Creating healthy work organizations.*
Chichester, UK: Wiley.

Côté, S., Lopez, P. N., Salovey, P., & Miners, C. T. H. (2010). Emotional intelligence and leadership emergence in small groups. *The Leadership Quarterly*, *21*, 496–508.

Dahling, J. J., & Perez, L. A. (2010). Older worker, different actor? Linking age and emotional labor strategies. *Personality and Individual Differences*, *48*, 574–578.

Dalal, R. S., Lam, H., Weiss, H. M., Welch, E. R., & Hulin, C. L. (2009). A within-person approach to work behavior and performance: Concurrent and lagged citizenship-counterproductivity associations, and dynamic relationships with affect and overall job performance. *Academy of Management Journal*, *52*, 1051–1066.

Dasborough, M. T., Ashkanasy, N. M., Tee, E. E. J., & Tse, H. H. M. (2009). What goes around comes around: How meso-level negative emotional contagion can ultimately determine organizational attitudes toward leaders. *The Leadership Quarterly*, *20*, 571–585.

Daus, C. S., & Ashkanasy, N. M. (2005). The case for an ability-based model of emotional intelligence in organizational behavior. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, *26*, 453–466.

De Rivera, J. (1992). Emotional climate: Social structure and emotional dynamics. *International Review of Studies of Emotion*, *2*, 197–218.

Diefendorff, J. M., Croyle, M. H., & Gosserand, R. H. (2005). The dimen- sionality and antecedents of emotional labor strategies. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, *66*, 339–357.

Diefendorff, J. M., & Gosserand, R. H. (2003). Understanding the emotional labor process: A control theory perspective. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, *24*, 945–959.

Diefendorff, J. M., & Greguras, G. J. (2009). Contextualizing emotional display rules: Examining the roles of targets and discrete emotions in shaping display rule perceptions. *Journal of Management*, *35*, 880–898. Ekman, P. (1972). Universals and cultural differences in facial expressions of emotion. In J. Cole (Ed.), *Nebraska symposium on motivation, 1971*

(Vol. 19, pp. 207–282). Lincoln, NE: University of Nebraska Press.

Ekman, P. (1999). Facial expressions. In T. Dalgleish & M. J. Power (Eds.), *Handbook of cognition and emotion* (pp. 301–320). New York, NY: John Wiley and Sons.

Elfenbein, H. A. (2007). Emotion in organizations: A review and theoretical integration. *The Academy of Management Annals*, *1*, 315–386.

Elfenbein, H. A., & Ambady, N. (2003). Universals and cultural differences in recognizing emotions. *Current Directions in Psychological Science*, *12*, 159–164.

Elfenbein, H. A., Beaupré, M. G., Lévesque, M., & Hess, U. (2007). Toward a dialect theory: Cultural differences in the expression and recognition of posed facial expressions. *Emotion*, *7*, 131–146.

Fineman, S. (Ed.). (2000). *Emotion in organizations* (2nd ed.). London, UK: Sage.

Fisher, C. D. (2000). Mood and emotions while working: Missing pieces of job satisfaction? *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, *21*, 185–202.

Fisher, C. D. (2002). Antecedents and consequences of real-time affective reactions at work. *Motivation & Emotion*, *26*, 3–30.

Fisher, C. D. (2008). What if we took within-person performance variability seriously? *Industrial and Organizational Psychology: Perspectives on Science and Practice*, *2*, 185–189.

Fisher, C. D., & Noble, C. S. (2004). A within-person examination of correlates of performance and emotions while working. *Human Performance*, *17*, 145–168.

Forgas, J. P. (1995). Mood and judgment: The affect infusion model (AIM). *Psychological Bulletin*, *117*, 39–66.