INTRODUCTION TO SPECIAL TOPIC FORUM

INTEGRATING EMOTIONS AND AFFECT IN THEORIES OF MANAGEMENT

NEAL M. ASHKANASY
The University of Queensland

RONALD H. HUMPHREY
Lancaster University

QUY NGUYEN HUY
INSEAD

Scholars have studied emotions and affect in organizational settings for over twenty years, providing numerous insights into how organizations and the people who work in them behave. With such a rich accumulation of knowledge, the time seemed right to call for today's scholars of management to propose new and exciting theory. The eight articles in this special topic forum address topics that cross multiple levels of analysis and include a range of different theories, explicating how anger and fear can spark productivity, how employees respond to abusive supervision over time, how leader-member exchanges are shaped by affective events, the social functions of emotional complexity for leaders, team entrepreneurial passion, the effects of institutional beliefs on emotional displays, the nexus of affective climate and organizational effectiveness, and the role of gratitude in organizations. In this introduction we briefly summarize the main points from each article and discuss new research directions arising from the articles. To spur even deeper research into this important and still unfolding field of discovery, and stimulated by the articles in this special topic forum, we conclude with additional thoughts and ideas on the role of emotions and affect in organizations.

Organizations are intrinsically human entities. As such, the processes that drive human thought and behavior also drive organizations. Understanding organizations therefore requires understanding the processes that guide human behavior and decision making. These processes, in turn, emanate from the human brain, which is the source of two related but nonetheless differentiable phenomena: cognition and affect.

These statements are axiomatic, yet, until recently, organizational scholars tended to favor explanations of organizational behavior and decision making that assume the human brain reacts in predictable and programmatic ways to environmental contingencies and stimuli. Just twenty years ago, for example, Ashforth and Humphrey (1995) commented that scholars until that time seemed to have neglected the role of "everyday emotions" in studies of organizations. The mid 1990s appears to have been the turning point, however. Weiss and Cropanzano (1996) published "Affective Events Theory: A Theoretical Discussion of the Structure,

Causes and Consequences of Affective Experiences at Work," in which they proposed that behavior in organizations is intrinsically driven by members' emotional reactions to events in their environment. Goleman (1995) published his best-selling *Emotional Intelligence: Why It Can Matter More Than IQ*, which served to popularize the notion that emotions play a central role in human behavior in general, and he followed up in 1998 with a book (*Working with Emotional Intelligence*) applying his ideas specifically to organizations. The year 1997 saw the establishment of the Listserv EMONET, which serves as an international forum for scholars working in the field, and this was followed shortly thereafter by the first International Conference on Emotions and Worklife (see http://www.emotionsnet.org). This period also saw publication of a raft of journal special issues on the topic (e.g., see Ashkanasy, 2004; Fisher & Ashkanasy, 2000; Fox & Spector, 2002; Humphrey, 2002).

In the early 2000s researchers continued to emphasize the centrality of affect and emotion in

organizational research. In this regard, Ashkanasy (2003a) proposed a multilevel framework of emotion in organizations that encompassed emotions as a within-person and between-persons variable—as well as recognized interpersonal-, group-, and organization-wide levels of analysis—and Elfenbein (2007: 318) later published a "process framework" that focused on emotion as an essentially interpersonal phenomenon and connected across different levels of analysis. In a more recent and comprehensive state-of-the art review, Ashkanasy and Humphrey concluded that "this is a growing and vibrant field of research, with untapped potential" (2011a: 220).

Indeed, empirical research on emotions and affect at work continues to flourish. For instance, a Google Scholar search revealed that some 260,000 articles have used the terms *emotional labor* (also spelled "emotional labour") or *emotional intelligence*, with more than 50,000 of these published since 2012. Emotional labor has been studied extensively among service workers, and recent research suggests that leaders and subordinates also use emotional labor in their interactions with each other, while emotional intelligence has been studied across a diverse range of organizational settings and variables. Clearly, just these two lines of inquiry have the potential for incorporation into our core theories of management. Moreover, recent theories of emotions are being applied in new ways to a wide variety of management topics, some of which had previously given little attention to affect. For example, emotions are now being studied with regard to topics like strategy (Ashton-James & Ashkanasy, 2008; Hodgkinson & Healey, 2011; Huy, 2011), entrepreneurship (Cardon, Wincent, Singh, & Drnovsek, 2009; Shepherd, Wiklund, & Haynie, 2009), and organizational change (Huy, 1999, 2002; Seo et al., 2012). As Cardon, Foo, Shepherd, and Wiklund stated in their introduction to the special issue "The Heart of Entrepreneurship," in *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice,* "Entrepreneurial emotion is a hot topic" (2012: 1). At the other end of the spectrum, breakthrough studies are documenting the neurological basis of affect and leadership (e.g., see Waldman, Balthazard, & Peterson, 2011).

In view of this "untapped potential," identified by Ashkanasy and Humphrey (2011a), it seemed that this was an opportune time for us to call for organizational scholars to submit their ideas for further theoretical development in this field. The manuscripts we received cross multiple levels of analysis, ranging from micro (within temporal variability, between persons) to meso (interpersonal relationships and teams) and then to macro (organization wide). In the following discussion we introduce each of the articles in this special topic forum (STF), ordering them according to level of analysis, from micro to macro.

THE ARTICLES

In the first of the articles included in this STF, Lebel (2017) develops what he refers to as "a contingent model of how the emotional regulation of anger and fear sparks proactivity." Situated at micro to meso levels of analysis (within person, between persons, interpersonal), Lebel's arguments constitute a significant departure from the more traditional view of negative emotion as a source of nonoptimal outcomes in organizational settings, especially when it comes to productivity. This is in contrast to the literature that has sprung up around ideas of "positive organizational studies" (Cameron, Dutton, Quinn, & Wrzesniewski, 2003) and "positive organizational behavior" (Luthans, 2002). In particular, positive affect is usually linked to creativity, as encapsulated in Fredrickson's (2001) "broaden and build" theory. More recent research (e.g., To, Fisher, & Ashkanasy, 2015; To, Fisher, Ashkanasy, & Rowe, 2012), however, has revealed that negative emotions can also play a positive role in promoting creativity and productivity. What has been missing to date, however, has been a cogent theoretical framework that will enable us to understand the processes underlying this seemingly paradoxical situation.

This is exactly what Lebel sets out to do in his article. Focusing specifically on the discrete negative emotions of anger and fear, Lebel seeks to address the issue through the lens of proactive behavior theory (Parker, Bindl, & Strauss, 2010), with a view to identifying the conditions under which anger and fear prompt proactive behavior. In a deceptively simple model, the author explains how anger (via self-efficacy) and fear (via protective effort) can lead to productive behavior under particular personal and environmental circumstances, especially when the individual possesses emotional regulation knowledge. The model, which incorporates four propositions, is compelling in its simplicity and is sure to contribute to our understanding of how and when

negative emotions can contribute to productive behavior, with implications for both research and practice.

The second of the articles in this STF is also situated at micro to meso levels of analysis. Authors Oh and Farh (2017) present an emotional process theory of how subordinates appraise, experience, and respond to abusive supervision over time. As the title of this article suggests, the authors tie in cognitive processes—namely, appraisals and attributions—to emotional processes. Although often treated as separate, emotions and cognitions are intricately and inseparably linked (Lazarus & Folkman, 1984). Furthermore, Oh and Farh examine the role of situational constraints on appraisals and emotional processes and, ultimately, on the resulting reactions to abuse. In terms of appraisals, the authors classify them as either primary or secondary. Primary appraisals are influenced by the novelty of the abuse and by goal congruency. Novelty influences attributions about whether the behavior is abusive or not, depending on behavioral norms and the context. Goal congruence is influenced by the person's ego sensitivity and by whether subordinates' friends are also subject to abuse. Secondary appraisal dimensions consist of blame, certainty, and coping potential. The authors assign a key role to emotional regulation ability when explaining individual coping potential.

Because their article deals with abusive supervision, Oh and Farh (2017) focus on three discrete negative emotions that can result: fear, anger, and sadness. According to their model, fear is associated with what that they call an "emotivational goal" to escape harm, anger with the goal to remove harm, and sadness with the acceptance of loss. These different emotions trigger distinct behavioral responses. One of the major contributions of the article is that its authors specify seven different types of behavior responses according to the types of emotions and the behavioral pathway. For anger and sadness, these behavioral pathways are categorized into three types: dominant, constrained, and regulated. For sadness, there is no action tendency other than withdrawal and disengagement. Thus, this article greatly expands our understanding of how people respond to abusive supervision.

Attention in the third of the articles in this STF turns to the mesolevel issue of leadership and focuses on the means by which leader-member exchanges (LMXs) are shaped by affective events (at the micro level). Authors Cropanzano, Dasborough, and Weiss (2017) develop a model of the three stages of LMX relationship development (role taking, role making, role routinization) using affective events theory (AET; Weiss & Cropanzano, 1996). Thus, in the role-taking stage, leaders signal their willingness to engage in a high-quality LMX with individual followers. Their display of emotions is a key signaling device, and emotional contagion and affective empathy also have a powerful effect on the quality of leader-member relationships. Although many models focus on how leaders' emotional displays influence followers, the authors of this article explicate how both followers and leaders are influenced by affective events and by each other's emotional expressions. As a result, leaders and followers may become "affectively entrained," in that their emotions fluctuate together. Moreover, because emotions are such a key part of any relationship, this common rhythm holds potential to improve the quality of the leader-member relationships. The authors realize that entrainment is not a simple process, and they model different patterns of entrainment and discuss the implications of each pattern.

Cropanzano and his colleagues (2017) are especially insightful insofar as they analyze the effects of affective entrainment at the group level. LMX theory posits that leaders have unique relationships with individual members of their team. Moreover, the theory holds that some of these relationships develop into high-quality relationships marked by mutual liking and respect, perhaps even by close friendship. In contrast, other relationships are low quality and devoid of real interpersonal affection, so managers use formal rules and rewards to motivate their followers. As a result, the LMX relationships become differentiated according to levels of liking and shared leader-follower emotions. Stemming from these ideas, the authors develop a series of testable propositions examining how this relative LMX affects specific emotions. Followers who perceive that others have higher-quality relationships with the leader may feel anger, disgust, and contempt toward the leader, especially if they feel that their relative status is unjust. In contrast, followers who perceive that they are in the leader's good graces and enjoy a positive relative standing vis-à-vis their teammates may experience positive emotions like gratitude. The

authors conclude by discussing how these emotions either improve or degrade the quality of the LMX relationships over time.

Also on the topic of leadership within a multi-level framework, Rothman and Melwani (2017), in the fourth article of this STF, focus on the social functions of emotional complexity for leaders. These authors challenge the commonly held assumption that emotional complexity—defined as the simultaneous or sequential experience of at least two different emotional states during the same emotional episode—represents a leadership weakness (i.e., conveying leader indecisiveness and fostering cognitive rigidity). They argue that emotional complexity represents a more developed reaction to complex change events (that often exhibit contradicting demands by various stakeholder groups) than emotional simplicity, such as just feeling "positive" or "negative." Emotional complexity could help enhance leadership of change.

Drawing on functional theory of emotion, Rothman and Melwani (2017) argue that emotional complexity should facilitate the level of intrapersonal cognitive flexibility that allows a balanced consideration of multiple divergent perspectives, thus enhancing creative adaptation during a change process. In interpersonal interactions, leaders' expressions of emotional complexity should also stimulate creative thinking in followers because it conveys leaders' role modeling and support for followers' openness and flexibility, thus fostering honest dialogue and learning from mistakes during a change process. The authors also point to important contingency conditions such that leaders who are high in neuroticism and low in openness to experience will be less likely to become cognitively flexible. Moreover, followers who share the same vantage point with their leaders, and who perceive their leaders as dealing with competing demands, will be more likely to judge their leaders as cognitively flexible.

Beyond bringing a fresh emotion-based perspective to the change literature, the theory proposed by Rothman and Melwani (2017) should also bring an enriched perspective to the leadership literature, which has often focused on leaders' relatively stable *trait* in terms of leader flexibility and adaptability. Rather, Rothman and Melwani propose that state emotions act as dynamic enablers of flexibility and show how these states could change from one situation to the next.

Moving on from leadership, the fifth article in this STF spans meso to macro levels of analysis and deals with the issue of emotions in entrepreneurship. Indeed, perhaps no topic in management evokes more emotions than the passion of entrepreneurship. As Cardon et al. (2009) pointed out, entrepreneurs are by nature passionate about what they do. But entrepreneurs seldom operate alone. They need to assemble a team of entrepreneurial peers who can push their ideas through to realization. In this STF, authors Cardon, Post, and Forster (2017) seek to address this issue by building on the earlier individual-level theory and extending it to the team level of analysis. They do this through a concept they call "team entrepreneurial passion." According to Cardon and colleagues, this represents "the level of shared intense positive feelings for a collective and central team identity for new venture teams" (2017: 283).

As with all team-level constructs, team entrepreneurial passion presents a set of unique challenges, not the least of which is to model the team processes that underlie the development of this phenomenon. In particular, the question arises as to how a group of entrepreneurs can combine their own entrepreneurial passions in a cohesive fashion such that the team (rather than a group of individuals) develops a sense of purpose. This is a nontrivial question, involving issues of shared affect, affective diversity, and the development of a shared collective identity. To deal with this, Cardon et al. (2017) develop a dynamic cyclical model of individual and entrepreneurial passion accompanied by a set of nine specific propositions linking between and across the two levels of analysis. The resulting model provides a clear way forward for researchers seeking to explain this important yet complex process.

Also crossing meso to macro levels of analysis, Jarvis (2017), in the sixth STF article, deals with the effect of feigning emotions on institutional logics. As such, Jarvis's article represents one of the rare works linking micro emotional behavior to institutional theory, showing how institutional beliefs have the potential to shape emotional display behaviors and how these behaviors, in turn, could contribute to maintaining or changing the institutions in which they are embedded. Challenging the often taken-for-granted assumption that authentic emotional displays are normatively desirable, Jarvis theorizes as to how feigning behaviors—or emotional displays that differ in valence or intensity from physiological experience—

represent strategic behaviors that could be adaptive in regard to satisfying institutionalized norms.

Jarvis (2017) thus unpacks the dichotomous notion of authentic versus inauthentic emotional display and theorizes about the function of three types of emotional display or feigning: display that is aligned with actual physiological experience, feigning emotional display that exhibits the same valence but could differ in intensity, and feigning with displaying emotion that has the opposite valence of physiological experience. He then discusses various ways in which these types of emotional displays could help maintain social order or motivate change, providing illustrative evidence drawn from such diverse contexts as customer service, work identity, and social movement. In so doing, he integrates eclectic insights from the literature on institutional logics, emotion regulation, emotional labor, emotional contagion, organizational change, organizational culture, and leadership. He then uses these insights to formulate revelatory, nonintuitive predictions about how various types of emotional feigning behaviors—varying in valence, intensity, or duration—could contribute to the maintenance of various institutional logics and blending and, at the same time, could support the contestation of the same logics.

In sum, we expect this essay to open fresh pathways for research linking emotion-related behaviors to macrolevel society and institutions, and to investigate various contextual conditions and underpinning mechanisms linking these microemotional behaviors to institution-level factors and outcomes. In addition, this work could serve as one of the rare exemplars for scholars to produce more works that link micro emotion to macro factors in insightful ways.

In the seventh of the articles in this STF, Parke and Seo (2017) develop a macrolevel theory around the role of affect climate in organizational effectiveness. The concept of affect climate has been with us since its introduction by sociologist Joseph de Rivera (1992). Our understanding of the psychological nature of the construct, however, continues to be elusive. Parke and Seo endeavor to build on previous work in this field (Ashkanasy & Härtel, 2014; Ostroff, Kinicki, & Muhammad, 2013; Schneider, Ehrhart, & Macey, 2013) in order to outline a comprehensive model of the antecedents and effects of affect climate in organizations. In their model, company practices, leaders, and routines combine to contribute to the development of an affect climate that affects employees' expression and experience of emotion. This effect, in turn, flows on to affect employees' mood state and, ultimately, their accomplishment of functional goals. Parke and Seo identify six particular affect climate types and explain how these types "differentially" impact "four strategic outcomes of organizational units: relationship, productivity, creativity, and reliability performance" (2017: 334). This is the first time, to our knowledge, that a comprehensive explanatory model of affect climate and its effects has been proposed. The model is rife with research possibilities, especially given the importance of affect climate as a driver of employee behavior and, ultimately, organizational success outcomes.

Finally, in the eighth article in the STF, Fehr, Fulmer, Awtrey, and Miller (2017) address a novel topic: the role of gratitude in organizations. The model is once again multilevel, crossing micro to macro levels of analysis. Based on the work of Emmons and McCullough (2004), Fehr and his associates define gratitude as "a feeling of appreciation in response to an experience that is beneficial to, but not attributable to, the self" (2017: 363). They note in particular that while gratitude is generally seen as important to human relationships, the concept has rarely been studied with regard to organizational behavior. Fehr et al. rectify this situation at multiple levels. Thus, they examine episodic gratitude (occurring at the event level), persistent gratitude (occurring at the individual level), and collective gratitude (occurring at the organizational level). Most research has focused on gratitude at the episodic or event level, which occurs when people interpret help or other beneficial behaviors from others in a way that promotes feelings of gratitude. The interpretation of events plays an important role, because not everyone is willing to recognize the beneficial help received from others.

Fehr and his coauthors define persistent gratitude as "a stable tendency to feel grateful within a particular context" (2017: 363). They conceptualize persistent gratitude not as a trait but as a schema, or mental representation. Individuals with abusive managers and workplaces develop negative schemas about the workplace that do not support the development of gratitude. In contrast, employees in positive workplaces with helpful and friendly leaders and coworkers develop schemas

that support persistent feelings of gratitude. Their focus on schemas creates a logical tie-in to their emphasis on context.

The emphasis on context, in turn, allows the development of a wide range of theoretically based strategies for creating organizational cultures that support collective gratitude. Fehr et al. define collective gratitude as "persistent gratitude that is shared by the members of an organization" (2017: 364). They argue that this collective gratitude is an emergent process that results from shared interactions. Because of gratitude's importance, they argue that the amount of collective gratitude in an organization becomes a key aspect of its culture. They then go on to describe a range of HR practices that can facilitate the development of collective gratitude, and they discuss as well events that could disrupt the growth of collective empathy. Finally, the authors illustrate the considerable benefits that developing collective gratitude offers both individuals and organizations.

FUTURE RESEARCH DIRECTIONS

Taken together, the eight articles in this STF suggest twelve exciting directions for future research, which we list in Table 1 and discuss below. We acknowledge that these might appear to represent a disparate collection of ideas, but, like all the articles in this STF, they are nonetheless

TABLE 1
Seventeen Future Research Directions

Ideas that derive directly from the articles in this STF
- The importance of context
- Individual differences and gender
- Complexity
- Dynamic effects
- Mixed emotions and emotional composition
- Multiple levels of analysis
- New methods
- Positive versus negative emotions
- Climate strength and type
- Linking microlevel affect and emotions to macrolevel phenomena
- Group-focused emotions and social identity
- Collective emotions

Additional ideas inspired by the articles in this STF
- Emotion-based organizational routines
- Organizational structures
- Emotion management actions
- Emotional labor
- Emotional intelligence

integrated through a common theme—that emotions derive from the basic biological processes that underlie all human behavior and cognition (Ashkanasy, 2003b).

Context (Social, National, Industry)

Rothman and Melwani (2017) state an expectation that their model on leader emotional complexity could be extended to future research at the individual, dyadic, group, organizational, and cultural levels. They make the very reasonable suggestion that power differences may influence the effects of leader emotional complexity, and they reason that high power differences may reduce leader emotional complexity. When endowed with high levels of power, leaders may focus more on themselves than on others and feel less of a need for emotional complexity. Power differences are one of the key cross-cultural differences according to the GLOBE study (House et al., 2004). In this regard, organizations differ considerably in the extent to which they concentrate power in leaders or empower subordinates and teams. Likewise, tolerance for ambiguity or uncertainty is also a major cultural dimension, and this has direct implications for Rothman and Melwani's model. A wide variety of other emotion-related variables may also be influenced by organizational and national differences, so the potential for research on these differences is considerable.

Individual Differences (Including Gender)

Individual differences are one of the most frequently studied topics in the social sciences, yet more can be done to understand how individual differences may shape the way people respond to affective events. For example, Lebel (2017) speculates that there might be differences in how men and women respond to fearful events. The author asks whether one gender is more likely to seek affiliation and support while the other seeks retaliation. In the same way, it is likely that a wide variety of individual-difference variables determine how people respond to various emotional events in organizations. Introverts' responses may be different from extroverts' responses to most affective events. Likewise, emotional stability, openness to experience, agreeableness, and conscientiousness may all determine to some extent how people respond not only to fearful

events but to the other emotional events portrayed in this special issue.

Complexity (Including Reciprocal and Recursive Effects)

It is often easiest and most straightforward to model unidirectional effects; this is definitely true from a statistical perspective, but also from a theoretical perspective. Yet, as Cropanzano et al. (2017) note, AET holds that events and emotions operate in a reciprocal manner. The authors acknowledge that their own article focuses on explicating the one-way paths, but they urge others to explore the complexity of emotional interactions. Likewise, most models of emotional contagion assume that the same emotion communicated by the sender is also the emotion that is experienced by the receiver. Yet emotional displays may elicit a complementary emotion rather than the same emotion. For example, although fear is contagious, it is also possible that an observer who witnesses a scared person may respond with compassion rather than fear. Even displays of gratitude may evoke complex responses that vary between people, ranging from mutual gratitude to pride or even to self-deprecation.

Dynamic Effects

For reasons of convenience, most researchers in the social science area tend to examine static effects. Interpersonal behavior is inevitably complex and interactive, however, so the behavior of one person determines the response of other interactional partners. In this regard, Oh and Farh (2017) model how victims' appraisal processes determine their behavioral response to abusive supervision. Yet these authors also note (in their discussion of future research) that dynamic, interactive appraisals need to be explored. For example, how do abusive supervisors respond to subordinates' anger, fear, or sadness?

Mixed Emotions and Emotional Composition

In terms of studying discrete emotions, and again out of convenience, most researchers in general prefer to examine simple basic and/or self-conscious emotions, such as joy, happiness, fear, anger, pride, and shame. But many emotional experiences in life are complex and involve multiple emotions that are in conflict with each other to some degree. In this regard, Rothman and Melwani (2017) explain how leader emotional complexity can help leaders guide their followers through change efforts. In fact, most organizational change involves a mix of positive and negative outcomes, and leaders need to display a range of complex emotions to empathize with the mixed emotions experienced by their followers. Rothman and Melwani's article provides an excellent example to other researchers about how to model emotional complexity in the workplace.

Multiple Levels of Analysis

In addition to studies of individuals, there are a substantial number of studies looking at dyadic interactions, such as between coworkers, romantic partners, service agents and customers, leaders and followers, abusers and victims, and so forth (e.g., see Ashkanasy & Humphrey, 2011a,b). The insightful articles in this STF show, however, that individually experienced emotions such as gratitude take place in larger organizational contexts. The authors of these articles take a multilevel approach that links the development of experienced emotions to different levels of the organization (e.g., Fehr et al., 2017). Nonetheless, much more could and should be done in this regard, since research at multiple levels is sorely lacking and, thus, presents a tremendous opportunity (Ashkanasy & Humphrey, 2011a,b; Ashkanasy & Jordan, 2008). For example, Cardon et al. (2017) suggest that future research would do well to examine how team entrepreneurial passion influences individual health and well-being, studying both positive and negative consequences.

New Methods (Measurement, Experimental, Physiological, Ethnographic)

In many ordinary social interactions, people often feign or hide their emotions (as Jarvis, 2017, demonstrates in his insightful article). This makes studying emotions in the workplace difficult, especially because people do not always honestly report their emotions. Perhaps even worse, as Jarvis points out, is that people may not even be aware of their true emotions or that they are

feigning their emotional displays. This dilemma is not unique to research on feigning, since a wide variety of emotions may be hidden, including anger, shame, and even joy. Fortunately, Jarvis outlines several research methods that can help us appreciate the true picture. In particular, most studies in the social sciences tend to use self-report scales, and Jarvis has some useful ideas about how to craft these scales. Experimental methods can also be useful to try to determine if subjects become accurately aware of how the experimental conditions might have affected their emotions. Physiological measurements (e.g., heartbeat, blood pressure, sweating, measures of facial movements, etc.) can also provide measures of emotional responses independent of self-reports. Moreover, and as we noted earlier in this introduction, emotions are complex, and many emotional episodes of interest to scholars (e.g., responses to crisis situations, job loss, or incidents of bullying) cannot ethically be created in the lab. The complex and intense emotions that arise in these situations might therefore only be amenable to study via ethnography or autoethnography.

A further point is that many of the articles in this STF take a multilevel approach to studying emotions, and this presents a range of issues and opportunities for scholars. In this regard, and as we already noted, emotions are typically studied at the individual level—for example, gratitude is usually thought of as an individual emotion. Yet, as Fehr et al. (2017) observe, we need to develop measures of collective gratitude in order to study this emotion at multiple levels. Likewise, we need scales for a wide range of other emotions that can be applied to multiple levels of the organization, as well as to occupational, industry, and societal levels. Fehr and his team suggest that longitudinal methods are particularly useful when examining the emergence of emotions at group and organizational levels.

Positive versus Negative Emotions

In general, research has shown that positive emotions are most useful at work most of the time (Judge & Kammeyer-Muellar, 2008). Nonetheless, we have evolved all of our emotions, even ones such as anger, fear, and shame, because they help us survive under the right circumstances. Knowing the right emotion to portray in a particular circumstance is not always easy, for scholars or for actors, in the heat of the moment. People may

even have trouble portraying positive emotions, such as gratitude, at the right time and to the right degree. Fortunately, the articles in this STF specify some of the contingencies that stipulate when each of these emotions might be most useful. It is not enough simply to know whether an emotion is positive or negative in affective tone. This is because, as Oh and Farh (2017) demonstrate, anger, fear, and sadness are distinct emotional responses to abusive supervision and are therefore likely to motivate different behavioral reactions.

Also, as we noted earlier, emotions are complex, and the interactions among events and emotions and their consequences are even more complex. A good example of this can be found in Lebel's (2017) article. Lebel models the complex ways ostensibly negative emotions like fear can spark positive proactive behavior. Although he focuses on anger and fear, Lebel recommends that future researchers also examine the way positive emotions can stimulate proactive behavior. Overall, it would seem to be clear there is considerable room to examine the interplay between positive and negative emotions and the contingencies that determine when each emotion is most adaptive.

Climate Strength and Type

As Parke and Seo (2017) convincingly argue, affect climate is a crucial aspect of overall organizational climate. These authors lay out a set of key propositions but also observe that there are still many unanswered questions that deserve investigation. Does climate strength change the relationships modeled in their article? How about subclimates? Most organizations are likely to have subclimates or miniclimates. Do their assumptions hold true for subclimates? How does industry affect climate or national affect climate influence the relationships in their model? Clearly, there is room for considerable research on moderators and mediators.

Linking Microlevel Affect and Emotions to Macrolevel Phenomena

Half of the articles in this STF focus on describing interactions between macrolevel and microlevel emotion-related phenomena. The authors of these articles do so by theorizing how macro factors—for example, institution-, organization-, and group-level mechanisms—

might influence and be influenced by patterns of individuals' and teams' emotion-related behaviors. Cardon et al. (2017)'s article on team entrepreneurial passion, for example, introduces a rich variety of group-based mechanisms, including similarity attraction, shared group identity, group diversity and variance, and bottom-up emergence of collective processes.

Moving to the organizational level, Parke and Seo (2017) propose a model of the antecedents and effects of an organization's affect climate, which influence how employees experience and express their emotions, and this, in turn, impacts various units' outcomes. Antecedents of affect climate include such mechanisms as company practices and leaders' actions. This work represents an extension of prior research suggesting how emotion-related organizational routines (called "emotional capability") could facilitate radical change (e.g., Huy, 1999, 2002). It thus shows how these mechanisms underlie the relationships between diverse types of collective emotions in the context of organizational continuity and evolutionary change.

Likewise, Fehr et al.'s (2017) multilevel model of gratitude draws on such mechanisms as shared interactions and emergent processes that characterize an organizational culture. These authors' focus on how HR practices facilitate the development of collective gratitude to garner organizational benefits shows how a healthy affective culture can be built. This work again shows how organization-level theorizing—through the mechanisms of emotion-based HR practices and routines—can shape the affective dimension of organizational culture.

Moving to the institutional level, Jarvis (2017) describes how institution-level beliefs shape feigned emotional displays. Jarvis shows how interactions among various mechanisms—including individual-level emotion regulation and (feigned) emotional display behaviors, group-level socialization, and institution-level logics (i.e., the patterns of cultural symbols and practices, values, and beliefs by which people organize and provide meaning to their daily activity)—can be employed to explain how people can maintain or change an institutional order.

Nonetheless, there is still insufficient research that theorizes how individual-level or group-level emotions influence and are influenced by organization-level and institution-level outcomes. For example, only a handful of field studies have shown how unexpected group-level emotions from the lower level of the organization

might influence the entire governance of the organization—and even cause decline in organizational performance (e.g., see Huy, 2011; Huy, Corley, & Kraatz, 2014; Vuori & Huy, 2016). Although Huy and his colleagues have studied the linkages between microemotions and macroorganizational effects in the context of strategic change, these micro-to-macro linkages might also apply to other themes of interest to organization and strategy scholars. Illustrative themes might include social movements, changes in institutional logics, mergers and acquisitions, strategic alliances, or bottom-up organizational innovation.

One frequent cause of failed theorizing attempts relates to oversimplification of the organizational context. Organization scholars generally construe an organization as a coalition of diverse groups with diverse preferences and interests (Cyert & March 2013/1963), yet in many theorizing attempts researchers construe organizations as simple psychological reflections of an individual. This implies that findings from research in psychology can be mechanically applied to an organization, treating the organization, in effect, as a single person, and reviewers typically do not accept such an oversimplification. This is a well-known issue in theorizing, called the "aggregation problem" (Powell, Lovallo, & Fox, 2011).

Instead, micro-macro scaling mechanisms should start from a more nuanced understanding of the organization as a plurality of diverse groups (and individuals) and study how interactions among these groups (including affect-based interactions) influence the quality of intergroup and group-organization interactions. Researchers might also study how the aggregation of diverse groups' interactions influences organization-level outcomes, and vice versa. In this regard, beyond the mechanisms proposed by the articles in this STF, Huy (2012) and Vuori and Huy (2016) propose emotion-based scaling mechanisms that could help foster future research into the micro-macro links. Illustrative mechanisms include group focus emotions that are linked to social identity, collective emotions, emotion-based routines, and organizational structures.

Group-Focused Emotions and Social Identity

In appraisal theories of emotion (Ellsworth & Scherer, 2003; Smith & Ellsworth, 1985), scholars view emotions as arising when a person appraises an event as harming or helping her or his important

personal goals or well-being. But people can also experience strong emotions when events do not directly affect themselves and those who are personally close to them. They can experience what scholars call group-focused or group-level emotions when, for example, they are joyful when their sports team wins (Smith, Seger, & Mackie, 2007). In this regard, scholars have shown that group-focused emotions predict collective behavior more strongly than do other individual emotions. Group-focused emotions could also be linked to social identity (Huy, 2011). In this case, organization members who identify strongly with their group (or firm) can be expected to experience emotions that are similar to those of others in the organization when faced with events that impact their collective's identity or welfare.

Collective Emotions

Two of the articles in this STF (Cardon et al., 2017; Fehr et al., 2017) address collective emotions, which represent the composition of various shared emotions of a group's members (Barsade & Gibson, 1998) and have been shown to influence a variety of group outcomes (van Zomeren, Spears, & Fischer, 2004). Collective emotions do not just reflect an emotionally homogeneous group but can also consist of sizable proportions of different shared emotions—for example, 70 percent of members experience negative emotions while the other 30 percent experience positive emotions. Since a strategic change is unlikely to affect all work units in the same organization in the same way, the composition of collective emotions might be heterogeneous in large organizations inhabited by groups with distinctive roles, values, and interests (Sanchez-Burks & Huy, 2009).

SOME ADDITIONAL THOUGHTS AND FUTURE RESEARCH DIRECTIONS

In addition to the foregoing directions for future research, which emerge directly from the articles published in this STF, we list in Table 1 five additional topics that, although not explicitly addressed in the articles, are inspired by them. We discuss these topics next.

Emotion-Based Organizational Routines

Individual emotions can become collective and organizational through the enactment of what is called organizational emotional capability, which refers to the organizational ability to recognize, monitor, discriminate, and attend to emotions of employees at both the individual and the collective levels (Huy, 1999, 2005). This ability is built into the organization's routines, which reflect the collective knowledge and skills to manage the emotions of its members—when needed to realize organizational outcomes.

In the context of strategic change, Huy (1999, 2005) described various emotion management routines (also called emotional dynamics) that constitute an organization's emotional capability, such as emotional experiencing, reconciliation, and encouragement, and that express or elicit specific positive emotions during strategic change, such as empathy, sympathy, and hope, to foster various change processes. Although alluded to in the STF articles, the extent to which these emotional dynamics are relevant to interfirm emotion management and their associated boundary conditions in other interfirm contexts has not received enough empirical investigation and more nuanced theorizing.

Organizational Structures

Also alluded to, but not directly addressed in the articles, are differences in emotional experiences among organizational groups that might arise because of the influence of their varied positions in the organizational structure. If groups specialize in different tasks and focus on different matters, they likely perceive things differently and regard some matters as more important than others. Differing emotions among groups could arise because of the structural distribution of attention (Ocasio, 1997). To illustrate, strategic change that evokes threats to some managers' status and power within the structure of the organization can trigger strong emotions (Vuori & Huy, 2016). The organizational hierarchy grants unequal formal status to various organization members and groups through titles and responsibilities. This status determines, in part, an individual's "power" (i.e., the extent of the individual's control over resources that other members value; see Pfeffer, 1981). Organization members who value status and power likely compete with one another to obtain or maintain their status and may feel strong emotions if they perceive related threats. Low-status employees likely fear higher-status individuals (Menges & Kilduff, 2015).

Emotion Management Actions

Several of the STF articles touch upon issues of emotion management (e.g., Jarvis, 2017; Lebel, 2017; Oh & Farh, 2017), but only tangentially. Nonetheless, a good deal of literature has focused on this topic, especially in the form of individual leader interpersonal emotion management (e.g., Humphrey, Pollack, & Hawver, 2008; Kaplan, Cortina, Ruark, LaPort, & Nicolaides, 2014). Much less attention has been devoted to examining how emotion management actions influence organization-level outcomes (e.g., organizational continuity and change, which we elaborate on below) or are embedded in organization-level constructs (such as organizational routines). Within this topic, we identify two particular lines of potential future research: (1) organization-level paradoxes involving affect, such as emotional balancing continuity and change, and (2) emotion-related organizational routines.

Organization-level paradoxes involving affect. Huy's (2002, 2005) research illustrates the usefulness of investigating organization-level paradoxes involving affect (Smith & Lewis, 2011). Huy (2002), for instance, has drawn attention to the importance of managing emotions related to both organizational continuity and change, rather than focusing on change alone. Emotional balancing is necessary because too much and too rapid change risks generating chaos, while too little and too slow change risks creating inertia. Emotional balancing at the organizational level involves some organizational groups displaying high emotional commitment to pursue change projects, with other groups attending to the emotions of change recipients in order to maintain operational continuity (as a type of organizational paradox). Researchers in the future would do well to investigate emotion-related processes and mechanisms involved in organizations pursuing various tensions, such as efficiency versus innovation, short- versus long-term benefits, and economic versus social welfare.

Emotion-related organizational routines. Beyond interpersonal leader emotion management actions, emotion management can also be performed thanks to embedded organizational action routines that attend to recipient employees' emotions caused by major change (e.g., Huy, 1999). In future research on micro-macro linkages, scholars would thus do well to explore the various types of organization-level paradoxes and emotion management actions that are relevant for diverse organizational and institutional contexts, and how this organization-level emotional capability could be developed. Affective differences in contexts could matter for organizational performance (e.g., Huy, 2002; Vuori & Huy, 2016). For example, organizations that tend not to value emotional sensitivity, such as some financial trading companies, may have less emotional resilience and adaptive capacity during disruptive change than organizations that value it more, such as human care organizations (Barsade & O'Neill, 2014).

Emotional Labor

As we noted earlier, while emotional labor has been a major topic of research ever since publication of Hochschild's (1983) seminal book, the last few years have seen an impressive amount of work on the topic (as documented by Grandey, Diefendorff, & Rupp, 2013). Emotional labor takes place whenever people modify their emotional displays in order to meet organizational display rules that specify the emotions they should be expressing. For example, restaurants and retail establishments often urge their employees to provide "service with a smile." Although (as we noted earlier) the articles in this STF brush on issues related to emotion management, none of them address this topic directly. Nonetheless, and despite the considerable amount of work that has been done on this topic, there are still major avenues of research that need exploring.

In particular, the "bright side" of emotional labor offers fruitful prospects. The predominant views of emotional labor stem from Hochschild's (1983) perspective that performing emotional labor can be stressful and can lead to feelings of inauthenticity. This leads to an investigation of emotional labor in companies and in occupations known to have high levels of employee dissatisfaction, as well as a focus on negative outcomes, such as stress and burnout. As a result, the positive aspects of emotional labor have largely been overlooked and underinvestigated.

Humphrey, Ashforth, and Diefendorff (2015) argue, in this regard, that the concentrated focus on the undesirable aspects of emotional labor has caused researchers to overlook the many positive aspects of it. In their review of existing research, these researchers concluded that the deleterious effects of emotional labor occurred primarily when people used the wrong form of emotional

labor—surface acting—instead of the more beneficial forms—deep acting and natural, spontaneous, and genuine emotions (Ashforth & Humphrey, 1993). Humphrey et al. (2015) further maintain that the use of surface acting is often caused by poor person-job fit and that emotional labor is beneficial for those with good job fit, especially extroverts and people with high emotional stability, high emotional intelligence, and high positive trait affect. Thus, similar to the approach adopted by Lebel (2017), we argue that instead of searching for negative effects in companies known for mistreating their employees, future research should examine exemplary workers in companies known for providing outstanding customer service and for having high employee job satisfaction.

There has also been some very exciting research extending emotional labor beyond the service context. Researchers have been applying emotional labor concepts to leadership and to interactions among coworkers (Ashkanasy & Humphrey, 2011b; Fisk & Friesen, 2012; Gardner, Fischer, & Hunt, 2009; Humphrey et al., 2008; Iszatt-White, 2009, 2013). Emotional labor may be particularly relevant to leadership because "leaders use emotional labor to regulate their own emotions and to manage the moods, job attitudes, and performance of their followers" (Humphrey, 2012: 740). Leaders and subordinates may use surface acting, deep acting, or genuine emotions when interacting with each other, and the choice of emotional labor strategy may have a profound effect on the quality of their relationships. The potential for research in this area is enormous.

Emotional Intelligence

Finally, we note that emotional intelligence, which is an individual-difference variable and continues to be one of the most researched topics in the area of emotions and management, is not addressed directly in any of the STF articles. Nonetheless, emotion-related individual differences still underpin much of the work on emotion in organizational settings, especially at the more micro levels of analysis (e.g., see Cropanzano et al., 2017; Lebel, 2017; Oh & Farh, 2017). In this regard, Ashkanasy and Daus (2005) brought clarity to this booming field by categorizing the different streams of emotional intelligence research into ability measures, self-reports based on the Mayer-Salovey (1997) model, and mixed competency models of emotional intelligence. Irrespective of which stream,

all measures of emotional intelligence deal with the individual's ability to regulate and perceive emotions, both with regard to self and others, and, as such, are implied in most theories of emotion.

Despite ongoing controversy (Antonakis, Ashkanasy, & Dasborough 2009), emotional intelligence measures have shown a wide range of utility across the spectrum of work-related outcomes. In this regard, results of meta-analyses show that that emotional intelligence is positively related to physical, mental, and psychosomatic health (Martins, Ramalho, & Morin, 2010; Schutte, Malouff, Thorsteinsson, Bhullar, & Rooke, 2007). More relevant to work settings, Walter, Cole, and Humphrey (2011) reviewed the literature and concluded that there is evidence that emotional intelligence is positively related to leadership emergence and effectiveness. These results are reinforced by the results of recent meta-analytic findings (Miao, Humphrey, & Qian, 2016, in press; O'Boyle, Humphrey, Pollack, Hawver, & Story, 2011) showing that emotional intelligence predicts job performance, organizational commitment, turnover intentions, and job satisfaction (controlling for Big Five personality and cognitive ability).

Given these important findings, future research clearly needs to continue, particularly to understand how emotional intelligence relates to multiple levels of analysis, on boundary conditions, on training and development, and on many other issues. Given the considerable incremental validity that emotional intelligence measures have shown across a wide domain of work-related behaviors, it should now be expected that researchers routinely include measures of emotional intelligence in their studies. Thus, we argue that although emotional intelligence was not addressed in the articles included in this STF, it remains an important topic that can benefit from deeper and more rigorous research.

CONCLUSION

The study of emotions and affect in organizational settings has come a long way in the last two decades, beginning with the seminal call for action by Ashforth and Humphrey (1995). Nonetheless, while we scholars of emotion and affect in organizations no longer need to introduce our articles by bemoaning the lack of research in this regard (e.g., see Fisher & Ashkanasy, 2000), the

research outlined in this STF tells us that there remains tremendous scope to further our understanding in this field. Especially exciting are the emerging fields identified in this issue (see Table 1). Multilevel issues and new methods are also opening up new avenues for research and theory. Moreover, and as we noted earlier, there still remains much additional room for development in such established fields as emotional labor and emotional intelligence. Our hope is that this STF will stimulate further development in this field, and we eagerly look forward to seeing what comes next.

REFERENCES

Antonakis, J., Ashkanasy, N. M., & Dasborough, M. T. 2009. Does leadership need emotional intelligence? *Leadership Quarterly,* 20: 247–261.

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. *Research in Multi-Level Issues,* 2: 9–54.

Ashkanasy, N. M. 2003b. Emotions at multiple levels: An integration. *Research in Multi-Level Issues,* 2: 71–81.

Ashkanasy, N. M. 2004. Emotion and performance. *Human Performance,* 17: 137–144.

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. 2014. Positive and negative affective climate and culture: The good, the bad, and the ugly. In B. Schneider & K. Barbera (Eds.), *The Oxford handbook of organizational culture and climate:* 136–152. New York: Oxford University Press.

Ashkanasy, N. M., & Humphrey, R. H. 2011a. Current emotion research in organizational behavior. *Emotion Review,* 3: 214–224.

Ashkanasy, N. M., & Humphrey, R. H. 2011b. 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 handbook of leadership:* 363–377. London: Sage.

Ashkanasy, N. M., & Jordan, P. J. 2008. A multilevel view of leadership and emotion. In R. H. Humphrey (Ed.), *Affect and emotion: New directions in management theory and research:* 17–39. Charlotte, NC: Information Age Publishing.

Ashton-James, C. E., & Ashkanasy, N. M. 2008. Affective events theory: A strategic perspective. *Research on Emotion in Organizations,* 4: 1–34.

Barsade, S. G., & Gibson, D. E. 1998. Group emotion: A view from top and bottom. *Research on Managing Groups and Teams,* 1: 81–102.

Barsade, S. G., & O'Neill, O. A. 2014. What's love got to do with it? A longitudinal study of the culture of compassionate love and employee and client outcomes in the long-term care setting. *Administrative Science Quarterly,* 59: 551–598.

Cameron, K. S., Dutton, J. E., Quinn, R. E., & Wrzesniewski, A. 2003. Developing a discipline of positive organizational scholarship. In K. Cameron & J. Dutton (Eds.), *Positive organizational scholarship: Foundations of a new discipline:* 361–370. San Francisco: Berrett-Koehler.

Cardon, M. S., Foo, M., Shepherd, D., & Wiklund, J. 2012. Exploring the heart: Entrepreneurial emotion is a hot topic. *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice,* 36: 1–10.

Cardon, M. S., Post, C., & Forster, W. R. 2017. Team entrepreneurial passion: Its emergence and influence in new venture teams. *Academy of Management Review,* 42: 283–305.

Cardon, M. S., Wincent, J., Singh, J., & Drnovsek, M. 2009. The nature and experience of entrepreneurial passion. *Academy of Management Review,* 34: 511–532.

Cropanzano, R., Dasborough, M. T., & Weiss, H. M. 2017. Affective events and the development of leader-member exchange. *Academy of Management Review,* 42: 233–258.

Cyert, R. M., & March, J. G. 2013. (First published in 1963.) *A behavioral theory of the firm.* Eastford, CT: Martin Fine Books.

de Rivera, J. 1992. Emotional climate: Social structure and emotional dynamics. In K. T. Strongman (Ed.), *International review of studies on emotions,* vol. 2: 197–218. New York: Wiley.

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

Ellsworth, P. C., & Scherer, K. G. 2003. Appraisal processes in emotion. In R. J. Davidson, H. Goldsmith, & K. G. Scherer (Eds.), *Handbook of affective sciences:* 572–595. New York: Oxford University Press.

Emmons, R. A. & McCullough, M. E. (Eds.). 2004. *The psychology of gratitude.* New York: Oxford University Press.

Fehr, R., Fulmer, A., Awtrey, E., & Miller, J. A. 2017. The grateful workplace: A multilevel model of gratitude in organizations. *Academy of Management Review,* 42: 361–381.

Fisher, C. D., & Ashkanasy, N. M. 2000. The emerging role of emotions in working life: An introduction. *Journal of Organizational Behavior,* 21: 123–129.

Fisk, G. M., & Friesen, J. P. 2012. Perceptions of leader emotion regulation and LMX as predictors of followers' job satisfaction and organizational citizenship behaviors. *Leadership Quarterly,* 23: 1–12.

Fox, S., & Spector, P. E. 2002. Emotions in the workplace: The neglected side of organizational life introduction. *Human Resource Management Review,* 12: 167–171.

Fredrickson, B. L. 2001. The role of positive emotions in positive psychology: The broaden-and-build theory of positive emotions. *American Psychologist,* 56: 218–226.

Gardner, W. L., Fischer, D., & Hunt, J. G. 2009. Emotional labor and leadership: A threat to authenticity? *Leadership Quarterly,* 20: 466–482.

Goleman, D. 1995. *Emotional intelligence: Why it can matter more than IQ.* New York: Bantam Books.

Goleman, D. 1998. *Working with emotional intelligence.* New York: Bantam Books.

Grandey, A. A., Diefendorff, J. M., & Rupp, D. E. (Eds.). 2013. *Emotional labor in the 21st century: Diverse perspectives on emotion regulation at work.* New York: Routledge.

Hochschild, A. R. 1983. *The managed heart: Commercialization of human feeling.* Berkeley: University of California Press.

Hodgkinson, G. P., & Healey, M. P. 2011. Psychological foundations of dynamic capabilities: Reflexion and reflection in strategic management. *Strategic Management Journal,* 32: 1500–1516.

House, R. J., Hanges, P. J., Javidan, M., Dorfman, P. W., Gupta, V., & GLOBE Associates. 2004. *Leadership, culture and organizations: The GLOBE study of 62 societies*. Thousand Oaks, CA. *Sage*.

Humphrey, R. H. 2002. The many faces of emotional leadership. *Leadership Quarterly,* 13: 493–504.

Humphrey, R. H. 2012. How do leaders use emotional labor? *Journal of Organizational Behavior,* 33: 740–744.

Humphrey, R. H., Ashforth, B. E., & Diefendorff, J. 2015. The bright side of emotional labor. *Journal of Organizational Behavior,* 36: 749–769.

Humphrey, R. H., Pollack, J. M., & Hawver, T. 2008. Leading with emotional labor. *Journal of Managerial Psychology,* 23: 151–168.

Huy, Q. N. 1999. Emotional capability, emotional intelligence, and radical change. *Academy of Management Review,* 24: 325–345.

Huy, Q. N. 2002. Emotional balancing of organizational continuity and radical change: The contribution of middle managers. *Administrative Science Quarterly,* 47: 31–69.

Huy, Q. N. 2005. An emotion-based view of strategic renewal. In G. Szulanski, J. Porac, & Y. Doz (Eds.), *Strategy process: Advances in strategic management:* 3–37. New York: Elsevier Science.

Huy, Q. N. 2011. How middle managers' group-focus emotions and social identities influence strategy implementation. *Strategic Management Journal,* 32: 1387–1410.

Huy, Q. N. 2012. Emotions and strategic organization: Opportunities for impactful research. *Strategic Organization,* 10: 240–247.

Huy, Q. N., Corley, K., & Kraatz, M. S. 2014. From support to mutiny: Shifting legitimacy judgments and emotional reactions impacting the implementation of radical change. *Academy of Management Journal,* 57: 1650–1680.

Iszatt-White, M. 2009. Leadership as emotional labour: The effortful accomplishment of valuing practices. *Leadership,* 5: 447–467.

Iszatt-White, M. 2013. Leadership as emotional labour: So what's new? In M. Iszatt-White (Ed.), *Leadership as emotional labour:* 14–36. London: Routledge.

Jarvis, L. C. 2017. Feigned versus felt: Feigning behaviors and the dynamics of institutional logics. *Academy of Management Review,* 42: 306–333.

Judge, T. A., & Kammeyer-Mueller, J. D. 2008. Affect, satisfaction, and performance. In N. M. Ashkanasy & C. L. Cooper (Eds.), *Research companion to emotion in organizations:* 136–151. Cheltenham, UK: Edward Elgar.

Kaplan, S., Cortina, J., Ruark, G., LaPort, K., & Nicolaides, V. 2014. The role of organizational leaders in employee emotion management: A theoretical model. *Leadership Quarterly,* 25: 563–580.

Lazarus, R. S., & Folkman, S. 1984. *Stress, appraisal, and coping.* New York: Springer.

Lebel, R. D. 2017. Moving beyond fight and flight: A contingent model of how the emotional regulation of anger and fear sparks proactivity. *Academy of Management Review,* 42: 190–206.

Luthans, F. 2002. The need for and meaning of positive organizational behavior. *Journal of Organizational Behavior,* 23: 695–706.

Martins, A., Ramalho, N., & Morin, E. 2010. A comprehensive meta-analysis of the relationship between emotional intelligence and health. *Personality and Individual Differences,* 49: 554–564.

Mayer, J. D., & Salovey, P. 1997. What is emotional intelligence? In P. Salovey & D. J. Sluyter (Eds.), *Emotional development and emotional intelligence: Educational implications:* 3–25. New York: Basic Books.

Menges, J., & Kilduff, M. 2015. Group emotions: Cutting the Gordian knots concerning terms, levels of analysis, and processes. *Academy of Management Annals,* 9: 845–928.

Miao, C., Humphrey, R. H., & Qian, S. 2016. Leader emotional intelligence and subordinate job satisfaction: A meta-analysis of main, mediator, and moderator effects. *Personality and Individual Differences,* 102: 13–24.

Miao, C., Humphrey, R. H., & Qian, S. In press. A meta-analysis of emotional intelligence and work attitudes. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*. (Published online before print, doi:10.1111/joop.12167.)

O'Boyle, E. H., Humphrey, R. H., Pollack, J. M., Hawver, T. H., & Story, P. A. 2011. The relation between emotional intelligence and job performance: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Organizational Behavior,* 32: 788–818.

Ocasio, W. 1997. Towards an attention-based view of the firm. *Strategic Management Journal,* 18: 187–206.

Oh, J. K., & Farh, C. I. C. 2017. An emotional process theory of how subordinates appraise, experience, and respond to abusive supervision over time. *Academy of Management Review,* 42: 207–232.

Ostroff, C., Kinicki, A. J., & Muhammad, R. S. 2013. Organizational culture and climate. In I. B. Weiner, N. W. Schmitt, & S. Highhouse (Eds.), *Handbook of psychology. Volume 12: Industrial and organizational psychology* (2nd ed.): 643–676. New York: Wiley.

Parke, M. R., & Seo, M.-G. 2017. The role of affect climate in organizational effectiveness. *Academy of Management Review,* 42: 334–360.

Parker, S. K., Bindl, U. K., & Strauss, K. 2010. Making things happen: A model of proactive motivation. *Journal of Management,* 36: 827–856.

Pfeffer, J. 1981. *Power in organizations.* Marshfield, MA: Pitman.

Powell, T., Lovallo, D., & Fox, C. 2011. Behavioral strategy. *Strategic Management Journal,* 32: 1369–1386.

Rothman, N. B., & Melwani, S. 2017. Feeling mixed, ambivalent, and in flux: The social functions of emotional complexity for leaders. *Academy of Management Review,* 42: 259–282.

Sanchez-Burks, J., & Huy, Q. N. 2009. Emotional aperture and strategic change: The accurate recognition of collective emotions. *Organization Science,* 20: 22–34.

Schneider, B., Ehrhart, M. G., & Macey, W. H. 2013. Organizational climate and culture. *Review of Psychology,* 64: 361–388.

Schutte, N. S., Malouff, J. M., Thorsteinsson, E. B., Bhullar, N., & Rooke, S. E. 2007. A meta-analytic investigation of the relationship between emotional intelligence and health. *Personality and Individual Differences,* 42: 921–933.

Seo, M., Taylor, M. S., Hill, N. S., Zhang, X., Tesluk, P. E., & Lorinkova, N. M. 2012. The role of affect and leadership during organizational change. *Personnel Psychology,* 65: 121–165.

Shepherd, D. A., Wiklund, J., & Haynie, J. M. 2009. Moving forward: Balancing the financial and emotional costs of business failure. *Journal of Business Venturing,* 24: 134–148.

Smith, C. A., & Ellsworth, P. C. 1985. Patterns of cognitive appraisal in emotion. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology,* 48: 813–838.

Smith, E. R., Seger, C. R., & Mackie, D. A. 2007. Can emotions be truly group level? Evidence regarding four conceptual criteria. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology,* 93: 431–446.

Smith, W. K., & Lewis, M. W. 2011. Toward a theory of paradox: A dynamic equilibrium model of organizing. *Academy of Management Review,* 36: 381–403.

To, M. L., Fisher, C. D., & Ashkanasy, N. M. 2015. Unleashing angst: Negative mood, learning goal orientation, psychological empowerment, and creative behaviour. *Human Relations,* 68: 1601–1622.

To, M. L., Fisher, C. D., Ashkanasy, N. M., & Rowe, P. A. 2012. Within-person relationships between mood and creativity. *Journal of Applied Psychology,* 97: 519–612.

van Zomeren, M., Spears, R., & Fischer, A. H. 2004. Put your money where your mouth is! Explaining collective action tendencies through group-based anger and group efficacy. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology,* 87: 649–664.

Vuori, T. O., & Huy, Q. N. 2016. Distributed attention and shared emotions in the innovation process: How Nokia lost the smartphone battle. *Administrative Science Quarterly,* 61: 9–51.

Waldman, D. A., Balthazard, P. A., & Peterson, S. 2011. Social cognitive neuroscience and leadership. *Leadership Quarterly,* 22: 1092–1106.

Walter, F., Cole, M. S., & Humphrey, R. H. 2011. Emotional intelligence: Sine qua non of leadership or folderol? *Academy of Management Perspectives,* 25(1): 45–59.

Weiss, H. M., & Cropanzano, R. 1996. Affective events theory: A theoretical discussion of the structure, causes and consequences of affective experiences at work. *Research in Organizational Behavior,* 18: 1–74.

Neal M. Ashkanasy (n.ashkanasy@uq.edu.au) is professor of management in the UQ Business School, The University of Queensland. He received his Ph.D. from the University of Michigan. He studies emotion in organizations, leadership, culture, and ethical behavior.

Ronald H. Humphrey (r.humphrey@lancaster.ac.uk) is a distinguished professor of leadership at Lancaster University and director of the Centre for Leadership Studies and Practice. He received his Ph.D. from The University of Queensland. He is currently studying how empathic, emotionally intelligent leadership contributes to leadership emergence, leadership performance, follower performance, job satisfaction (for both the leader and follower), and organizational citizenship behavior. He also studies emotional labor, identity theory, and other topics.

Quy Nguyen Huy (quy.huy@insead.edu) is professor of strategic management at INSEAD. He received his Ph.D. from McGill University. His research focuses on the social emotional dimensions of strategic processes, including strategic change, innovation, and entrepreneurship.