

DOI: 10.16538/j.cnki.fem.2018.02.007

## 领导者情感的研究述评

冯镜铭, 刘善仕

(华南理工大学工商管理学院, 广东广州 510640)

**摘要:** 领导丛林盘根错节, 需要回归领导影响力的本质——领导有效性, 而有效性的高低在一定程度上依赖于领导者对情感的运用。本文详细梳理了西方有关领导者情感的研究, 通过介绍领导者情感的内涵、发展历程、作用模型以及其对领导者本身和下属的影响效应, 让国内研究者对其有比较全面的认识, 同时也发现目前西方研究所存在的空白之处: (1) 领导者消极情感在什么情境下有消极作用? 然后什么情境下有积极作用? (2) 领导者情感的影响因素有哪些方面? (3) 领导者情感临场感的实证研究非常少。本文有助于丰富领导领域的情感视角, 以吸引更多研究者关注领导者情感在领导者—下属交换中所发挥的作用。

**关键词:** 情感; 情绪; 心境; 领导者; 下属

**中图分类号:** F270 **文献标识码:** A **文章编号:** 1001-4950(2018)02-0093-12

### 一、引言

根据Lord等(2017)的归纳整理, 真正意义上的领导研究至今已接近70年, 始于Stogdill和Shartle(1948)的呼吁——领导研究应该从关注领导问题和领导者个性转向“参与目标导向群体活动的个体之间的互动过程”。传统的领导理论主要关注认知视角(Van Knippenberg和Van Kleef, 2016), 产生了领导特质理论(Ghiselli, 1971)、权变理论(Fiedler, 1967)和领导下属交换理论(Settoon等, 1996)等重要理论, 以及魅力型领导(House, 1977)、变革型领导(Bass, 1985)、授权型领导(Raub和Robert, 2010)、伦理型领导(Brown和Treviño, 2006)、谦卑型领导(Owens和Hekman, 2012)和破坏型领导(Krasikova等, 2013)等一系列领导类型, 从而形成了领导理论丛林。尽管领导理论丛林盘根错节, 并且有越来越多的分支, 但研究者已达成共识: 领导影响力的本质是领导有效性(Van Knippenberg和Van Kleef, 2016)。领导有效性指领导者为了集体目标(例如, 团队或组织目标、使命或愿景)而成功地动员和激励下属的程度(Yukl和Van Fleet,

收稿日期: 2017-05-08

基金项目: 国家自然科学基金项目(71472067); 广东省自然科学基金项目(2016A030310296); 教育部人文社科研究项目(17YJC630172)

作者简介: 冯镜铭(1988—), 男, 华南理工大学工商管理学院博士研究生(通讯作者);

刘善仕(1966—), 男, 华南理工大学工商管理学院教授。

1992; Van Knippenberg, 2012)。大量研究指出,领导者魅力和领导有效性有一部分源自于领导者对情感的运用(Bono和Ilies, 2006; Damen等, 2008; Erez等, 2008; Johnson, 2008; Barnes等, 2016; Van Knippenberg和Van Kleef, 2016)。虽然领导者魅力并不等同于领导有效性(Van Knippenberg和Van Kleef, 2016),但两者关系密切且常常伴随出现(House等, 1991; Awamleh和Gardner, 1999)。因为领导者魅力也能对一些与领导有效性挂钩的指标产生积极影响,例如领导者绩效(Lowe等, 1996)、领导者连任(Jacquart和Antonakis, 2015)、组织有效性(Wowak等, 2016),以及一系列下属产出(例如,工作绩效、工作满意度和帮助行为)(Den Hartog等, 2007; Lester等, 2002)。因此,尽管现有的大量领导类型都基于认知视角来产生,但若以领导有效性为目标,则可以将所有领导类型的情感表达方式统一划分为两类:领导者积极情感表现(positive leader affective displays)和领导者消极情感表现(passive leader affective displays)。基于以上认识,本文不再拘泥于盘根错节的领导丛林,而是聚焦于每个领导者为实现其有效性所必须要表现的情感——在某种意义上,领导者情感可以视为领导丛林的共性。

没下属则无领导(Damen等, 2008; Van Knippenberg和Van Kleef, 2016),因此对领导者情感的研究应该立足于领导者和下属的互动过程。虽然领导者情感的研究在中国尚属起步阶段,但在西方已经较为成熟。首先,对于领导者情感的表达行为,根据情感互动双方(领导者和下属)的感受角度,研究者分别提出了领导者情感表现(leader affective displays)和领导者情感临场感(leader affective presence)这两个不同的概念。前者的焦点主体在于领导者,是领导者对自身情感状态的展现或表达,由领导者自己定义;面对领导者所表现出来的情感,不同个体有不同感受,而单个下属所感受(被引发)的情感体验就是领导者情感在下属心中的呈现(领导者情感临场感),由下属来定义。然后,对于领导者情感在领导者—下属交换中所发挥的作用,研究者最初关注的是情感中的情绪状态,最为常用的研究模型是情绪劳动模型和EASI模型。情绪劳动模型即“用情绪劳动来领导(leading with emotional labor)”(Humphrey, 2005, 2006; Humphrey等, 2008),指管理者或领导者运用情绪劳动和情绪表达来影响下属或追随者的心境、情绪、动机和绩效。随后, Van Kleef等(2010)提出了EASI(emotion as social information)模型,将情绪(emotions)对他人的作用机制分为传染和信号两条路径。近几年,在Humphrey等(2008)和Van Kleef等(2004)的研究基础上,研究者用情感(affect)来替代这两个模型中的情绪(emotions),并运用这两个模型产出了大量研究成果(Barnes等, 2016; Van Knippenberg和Van Kleef, 2016; Liu等, 2017)。

无论哪一种领导风格,在对下属进行影响时都离不开情感的运用,领导者情感的研究对领导理论丛林的统一和组织管理实践有重要意义。目前国内学者对情感(affect)的研究比较少,大多数研究都集中在情绪(emotion)之上。其中,有不少研究将情感、情绪和心境(mood)三个概念混用。例如,有不少中国研究者在叙述领导者情绪表达与下属合作行为的关系时,大量引用了情感和心境方面文献的观点,却笼统地全部以“情绪”一词表示。鉴于此,本文的第一个目标在于梳理并厘清与情感相关的概念,有助于让情感领域的研究更加规范和一致。然后,通过展现领导者情感的作用模型和研究进展,让国内研究者更加关注领导者情感在领导者—下属交换中所发挥的作用,这是本文的第二个目标。

总的来说,下文由四个部分组成:第二部分,介绍情感和领导者情感的内涵,并简要回顾其发展历程;第三部分,详细介绍领导者情感在领导者和下属互动过程中的理论模型,展现其影响路径;第四部分,在第三部分的基础上,整理并分类领导者情感的影响效应;最后一部分,提出研究结论和未来展望。

## 二、领导者情感的发展与相关概念

### (一)情感的内涵与发展历程

作为大量情感现象的统称,情感(affect)具有状态(state)和特质(trait)两种形式(Brief和Weiss, 2002; Elfenbein, 2007; Frijda, 1986; Weiss和Cropanzano, 1996)。情感状态可以划分为情绪(emotions)和心境(moods)(Van Knippenberg和Van Kleef, 2016)。情绪是一种不连续的感觉状态,虽然带有相对清晰的缘由、起点和终点,但通常只会持续一段比较短暂的时间(Frijda, 1986; Lazarus, 1991)。相对而言,心境状态的强度更低且更加松散,能够持续更长的时间,而且没必要具备清晰的缘由——实际上,心境会在个体没有意识到的时候悄然无声地发挥作用(Forgas, 1995; Russell和Barrett, 1999)。心境通常归结为两种类型——积极心境和消极心境(即觉得好和觉得坏),但情绪则可以细分为很多不同的积极和消极情绪状态(例如,开心、自豪和热情等积极情绪,以及愤怒、恐惧、恶心和伤心等消极情绪)(Van Knippenberg和Van Kleef, 2016)。若情感为特质,那么积极情感指偏向于积极情感状态的性格倾向(dispositional tendency),而消极情感则指偏向于消极情感状态的性格倾向(Lazarus, 1991; Watson和Clark, 1984)。在某种程度上,积极情感性情和消极情感性情可以分别被视为积极情感状态和消极情感状态的代理(Van Knippenberg和Van Kleef, 2016)。情感状态与情感特质有着不同的效果(George, 1991),而两者之间很可能存在相互作用(Van Knippenberg等, 2010)。

情感为我们感知到的社会世界增添色彩(Damen等, 2008),关于情感影响机理的研究经历了从个体内部到人际互动的发展过程。虽然情绪和心境的研究在心理学上由来已久,但在过去相当长的一段时间里,研究者只关注情感如何影响个体自身——影响诸如回忆、想象、专注、判断和计划等认知过程,从而引导个体的想法和行为(Damasio, 1994; Forgas, 1995; Forgas和Bower, 1987; Frijda, 1986; LeDoux, 1996; Schwarz和Clore, 1983; Zajonc, 1980; Williams等, 1997)。近年来,研究者开始重视情感在人际互动中所扮演的角色,并意识到情感的影响不只针对个体内部,还能影响他人(Hatfield等, 1994; Keltner和Haidt, 1999; Eisenkraft和Elfenbein, 2010; Van Knippenberg和Van Kleef, 2016; Madrid等, 2016)。具体而言,人们会利用自己和别人的情感表现(affective displays)作为人际互动过程中的一种信息投入,以让双方互动能够成功开展(Damasio, 1994; Forgas, 2001; Frijda, 1986; Keltner和Haidt, 1999; Oatley和Jenkins, 1996)。例如,情感表现可以提供关于个体的感觉、意愿和关系取向的重要信息(Scherer, 1986; Fridlund, 1992; Knutson, 1996),从而影响人际互动。

### (二)领导者情感及其表达行为

作为组织内最典型的人际互动之一,领导者和下属的互动也离不开情感。在一个团队里面,领导者是其他团队成员情感体验的实质来源(Sy等, 2005),因为领导者占据着突出而有权力的位置,从而在团队成员的认知、情感和行为过程中扮演着核心角色(Anderson等, 2003; Kozlowski等, 1996; Magee和Galinsky, 2008)。因此,在领导者与下属互动的过程中,领导者的情感直接影响领导行为的有效性。早期的研究通常只关注领导者情绪(leader emotion)(Humphrey等, 2008; Fisk和Friesen, 2012)或领导者心境(leader mood)(George, 1995; Sy等, 2005; Shemla和Kearney, 2012)。直到后来研究者了解情绪和心境均为情感(affect)的一部分后(Van Knippenberg和Van Kleef, 2016),这一系列零散的研究开始统一在领导者情感的研究范畴里。由于已有研究大多都关注情感状态,因此本文对领导者情感定义为:领导者的一种相对短暂(相对于情感特质)的感觉状态,包括情绪和心境。对于领导者情感的表达行为,根据情感互动双方(领导者和下属)的感受角度,可以区分为两个变量:领导者情感表现和领导者情感临场感。

领导者情感表现(leader affective displays)是领导者所感受到的自身情感的表达行为。在广义上,领导者情感表现被理解为个体情感状态的观察指标,包括面部表情,个人演讲的音调、音量和语速等方面,身体动作和姿势,以及关于自身情感状态的口头表达(Van Knippenberg和Van Kleef,2016)。在这种意义上,领导者情感表现包括积极情感表现和消极情感表现两种。积极情感表现传递出一种安全、开放或关心他人的意愿;相反,消极情感表现则传递出一种威胁、固执或与他人保持距离的意愿(Forgas,1995;Forgas和George,2001)。狭义上的领导者情感表现只关注积极方面,特指口头和非口头的积极情绪表达,例如展现微笑或运用温和的语气来交谈(Barnes等,2016)。值得注意的是,一些行为方式虽然能够导致某种情感属性,但并不能代表该情感本身,则不属于领导者情感表现的范畴(例如,领导者讲述一个被顾客拒绝业务的消息,这会导致失望的情感,但讲述负面消息这一行为并不等同于失望的情感表现;再如,一个正在唱歌的领导者可以被认为是开心的,但唱歌行为并不等同于开心的情感表现)(Van Knippenberg和Van Kleef,2016)。领导者情感表现一般采用领导者自评的形式来测量,让其评价自己在某一个时期(现在,过去几天,过去几个星期,或者总体来说的感受)的情感表现。最流行的测量工具是Watson等(1988)编制的PANAS量表,包括10个积极情感题项和10个消极情感题项。

领导者情感临场感(affective presence)是下属所感受到的领导者的情感表达行为,即领导者情感表现在下属心中的呈现。Van Knippenberg和Van Kleef(2016)指出,情感表现存在灰色地带——一个人看到情感表现,但另一个人未必能看到。于是,从个体自身感受的角度,研究者提出了情感临场感的概念,指个体在与他人互动时始终被对方引起的愉快情感激发(积极情感临场感)和不愉快情感激发(消极情感临场感)(Eisenkraft和Elfenbein,2010)。换言之,下属被领导者引起的积极和消极情感临场感就是领导者情感临场感。领导者情感临场感的概念比较抽象,理解时需要关注以下三个方面。首先,情感临场感是一个人际特质变量,因为它是由互动双方中体验情感的一方来定义,而不是表达情感的一方(Madrid等,2016)。然后,情感临场感不同于情感传染(即情感从一个人传递到互动的另一个人),因为不同下属对领导者的情感临场感都不一样(Madrid等,2016),而情感传染传递的是相同的情感体验。最后,与领导者情感表现不同,领导者情感临场感是下属被领导者引起的总体(或通常)感受,而不能限定于某个时期(Eisenkraft和Elfenbein,2010)。因此,虽然领导者情感临场感的测量量表与领导者情感表现相似(也是采用PANAS量表),但需要由下属进行评价,并指出“在与团队领导者互动时,他/她(指领导者)通常会让你感到……”。

### 三、领导者情感的作用模型

一系列隐性的和显性的情感联结过程理论可用于解释情感的作用机理,包括移情、互动同步、受控的人际情感调控,以及印象管理过程(Kelly和Barsade,2001;Niven等,2009),这些理论只对某些特定情境有效,难以单独解释更为复杂的情感互动过程。对于领导和下属之间的情感互动,研究者们主要使用两个模型:情绪劳动模型和EASI模型。情绪劳动模型(emotional labor model)(Humphrey,2005,2006;Humphrey等,2008)关注的是情感互动过程中的领导者一方,认为领导者对情感的扮演方式会影响情感表达的效果。情绪劳动指为了表达一个特定的情绪所做的努力、计划和控制(Morris和Feldman,1996)。情绪劳动运用两种策略来调控情感表现:(a)表层扮演(surface acting),指抑制个人的真实情绪并假装成自己期望的情绪;(b)深层扮演(deep acting),指修改个人感受以表现出适当的情绪(Grandey,2000)。表层扮演对情绪的修改并没有改变潜在的情绪体验,而深层扮演则修改了情绪本身以迎合期望的情绪表现(Grandey,

2003)。正如Humphrey等(2008)所举的例子,领导者通常需要表现得自信,哪怕领导者当时对下属充满怀疑和担忧(表层扮演);当然,领导者也可以尝试运用深层扮演来支撑他们的自信心,并设法去感受他们想要扮演的情绪。在实际应用中,研究者通常用更宽泛的“情感”来代替“情绪”,并指出领导者通过情绪劳动来表现其积极情感,以让下属得出高领导者魅力的归因(Erez等,2008;Barnes等,2016)。情绪劳动模型在领导者和下属互动中十分重要,因为情感扮演(即情绪劳动)是领导者的任务之一,即使他们不一定真的感受到这些情感(Humphrey等,2008)。

第二个重要模型是EASI(emotion as social information)模型(Van Kleef等,2010),它关注的是情感在互动双方之间的传递过程,认为领导者情感通过传染过程(contagion process)和信号过程(signaling process)两条截然不同的路径来影响他人。个体会无意识和不由自主地“捕获”他人的情感,这个过程指的就是情感传染;在传染过程中,领导者情感会隐性地唤起下属的情感,进而影响下属的态度和行为(Hatfield等,1994)。当观察到领导者的情感表现后,下属会被唤起类似的情感(Elfenbein,2014)。通过对身体方面的情感表现(面部表情、身体姿势等)的无意识模仿,情感表现会对观察者生成一种类似的情感状态(Hatfield等,1994;Strack等,1988),然后影响观察者的判断、态度和行为(Forgas,1995)。在信号过程中,下属会在认知上评估领导者情感,随后表现出相应的态度和行为(Van Kleef等,2009)。情感会向互动对象传递有价值的信息,包括情感发出者当时的感受、社交意愿和关于这段关系的期望(Ames和Johar,2009;Van Kleef等,2004)。通过观察一个人的情感状态,可以让我们知道其如何对事物(互动对象、情境等)进行评价和反应;换言之,领导者情感被下属从认知上解读后,会影响下属的态度和行为(Van Knippenberg和Van Kleef,2016)。在研究领导者如何通过情感表现来提高下属心目中的领导有效性时,Van Knippenberg和Van Kleef(2016)提出了一个相似的模型,指出领导者情感表现至少通过两条路径来对下属产生影响:情感路径和认知路径;其中,情感路径即情感传染,而认知路径则是信息的认知解读(信号过程)。

#### 四、领导者情感的影响效应

##### (一)对领导者的影响

领导者如何表达情感会影响下属对领导者魅力和领导有效性的感知。例如,领导者若在演讲时展现笑容(积极情感表现),会让下属觉得其更有魅力(Awamleh和Gardner,1999)。实际上,领导者情感源于魅力—变革型领导(charismatic-transformational leadership)的研究。这类研究认为,魅力—变革型领导在很多方面都与积极的情感表现有关(Damen等,2008;Van Knippenberg和Van Kleef,2016)。很多证据显示,领导者积极情感与领导者魅力关系密切。例如,有研究者进行了一个实验,先让领导者表现不同程度的积极情感,然后让观察者评价其魅力,实验结果发现,领导者表现出的积极情感程度越高,就越让人觉得有魅力(Damen等,2008)。Johnson(2008)通过实证研究,也发现领导者的积极情感表现(相对于消极情感表现)会让下属觉得其更有领导魅力。此外,还有很多实证研究也支持领导者积极情感与领导者魅力的积极相关关系(Bono和Ilies,2006;Erez等,2008;Barnes等,2016)。

魅力—变革型领导曾一度被描述为最有效的领导风格,而其领导有效性源于领导者对情感的运用(Ashkanasy和Tse,2000;Awamleh和Gardner,1999;Bass,1998;Cherulnik等,2001;Conger和Kanungo,1998)。Gaddis等(2004)的实证结果发现,当领导者表现出积极情感时(相对于表现出消极情感),会获得高水平的领导有效性。而当领导者在沟通时若表现出消极情感时(相对于中性情感),其领导会被视为低效(Lewis,2000)。Van Knippenberg和Van Kleef(2016)

认为,通过情感传染和认知诠释两条路径,领导者情感表现会影响下属对其领导有效性的评价。在情绪智力的角度,很多研究表明领导者的情绪智力对领导有效性有显著促进作用(Palmer等,2001;Rosete和Ciarrochi,2005;Kerr等,2006;)。虽然情绪智力并不等同于情感,但情绪智力从情感特质方面支持了领导者情感与领导有效性的积极关系。实际上,若下属觉得领导者有魅力,也在一定程度上体现魅力型领导的有效性。类似地,有研究者发现,那些怀有高水平积极情感的领导者在下属心目中更具变革性(Rubin等,2005),即变革型领导的有效性更高。

## (二)对下属的影响

当下属无意识地接收或有意识地诠释领导者所表现的情感时,下属的态度或行为就会受到影响(Van Kleef等,2009)。对于领导者情感对下属的影响机制,研究者通常运用EASI模型(Van Kleef等,2010),即领导者情感通过传染过程和信号过程两条截然不同的路径来影响下属的情感、态度和行为(更多EASI模型的介绍请看前文的叙述)。

1. 下属情感。在传染过程中,领导者情感能够传染给下属,并让下属产生类似的情感体验(Van Knippenberg和Van Kleef,2016)。当一个管理者做出破坏性的批评时,下属心里会产生愤怒和紧张的情感状态,很可能导致下属采取无效的方式去处理手头上的工作问题(Baron,1988;Heldmann,1988;Weisinger,1989)。相反,当领导者表现出积极情感时,下属往往也会产生积极的情感体验,大量实证研究也支持这一观点(Kelly和Barsade,2001;Johnson,2008;Damen等,2008;Liu等,2017)。实际上,领导者情感不仅可以传染给个人,也可以传染给整个团队。例如,Sy等(2005)发现,当领导者带有积极心境(属于情感状态的其中一个方面)(相对于消极心境),团队成员会更容易形成类似的团队情调(group affective tone)。类似地,Chi等(2011)的研究结果也表明领导者积极心境能够促使团队积极情调的形成。

2. 下属态度。在信号过程中,领导者情感蕴含了领导者当时的感受、社交意愿和关于双方关系的期望等有价值的信息(Ames和Johar,2009;Van Kleef等,2004)。作为回应,下属基于这些信息进行诠释并做出判断(Filipowicz等,2011;Miron-Spektor等,2011;Van Kleef等,2009),形成相应的态度。例如,有研究者发现领导者情感能够提升下属的心理安全感(Liu等,2017),即在与领导者的互动过程中,下属能够毫无顾忌地表达自己的观点(Kish-Gephart等,2009;Liang等,2012)。

3. 下属行为及工作产出。个体的情感表现会对他人的行为产生积极或消极的强化效果(Klennert等,1983)。有证据表明,某人的开心情感表现会鼓励他人继续当前行为,而其愤怒情感表现则会迫使他人做出行为调整(Cacioppo和Gardner,1999;Fischer和Roseman,2007)。在领导的情境中,George和Bettenhausen(1990)在调查销售团队时发现,领导者的积极心境能够促进员工的亲社会行为,并降低员工的离职率。再如,George(1995)的研究结果表明,领导者的积极情感表现能够显著促进团队成员在顾客服务方面的绩效。Koning和Van Kleef(2015)发现促进下属积极行为的不一定就是领导者的积极情感表现,而是取决于领导者是否在合适的时候表达合适的情感,若领导者根据下属的付出和绩效做出合适的情感表现(开心或愤怒)时,下属会更加愿意做出组织公民行为(例如加班)。此外,领导者的积极情感表现还有助于鼓励下属做出更多的建言行为(Detert和Burriss,2007;Liu等,2017)。例如,Liu等(2017)对中国IT企业的中层管理者及其直接下属进行抽样配对调查,研究结果显示领导者所表现的积极情感与下属的建言行为显著正相关。

## 五、结论和展望

本文通过详细梳理西方领导者情感的相关研究,阐释并辨析了几个情感相关的概念,并介绍了领导者情感的两个作用模型和影响效应,为国内领导者情感的未来研究做出了一定的铺

垫和积累。从西方的研究进展可以看出,西方对领导者情感的研究已经较为成熟,甚至成为领导有效性不可忽视的因素,但目前有以下三个方面的研究仍存在争议或空白:(1)领导者消极情感在什么情境下有消极作用?然后在什么情境下有积极作用?(2)领导者情感的影响因素有哪些方面?(3)领导者情感临场感的实证研究非常少。于是,国内研究者在未来可以就这三个方面继续对领导者情感进行探究:

### (一)领导者消极情感的研究

虽然情感有特质和状态两种表现形式,但近几年的研究都倾向于把领导者情感归属为情感状态。随后,研究者关注领导者的积极情感和消极情感对下属和领导者本身的影响,并取得了大量重要的研究成果(实际上大部分研究只关注领导者积极情感的影响效果,而领导者消极情感的研究只占很小一部分)。这些研究似乎都倾向于一个观点:领导者积极情感会产生积极效果,而消极情感只会产生消极效果。这似乎也 and 人们的日常观念吻合。然而,越来越多证据表明,领导者的积极情感不一定都能导致积极产出,而消极情感不是只有坏结果。例如,Sy等(2005)的研究发现,领导者积极心境会让团队成员更加协调,同时领导者消极心境能使得团队成员更加努力。这说明积极情感和消极情感这种分类太笼统,使得实证结果多样化甚至相互矛盾,并不能取得一致的观点。实际上,一些研究者已经发现这一问题,并在情感分类上做努力。例如,有的研究者把积极情感细分为主动积极情感(active positive affect,例如热情)和被动积极情感(passive positive affect,例如满意),同时消极情感也被细分为主动消极情感(active negative affect,例如愤怒)和被动消极情感(passive negative affect,例如伤心)(Lewis,2000)。虽然愤怒和伤心同为消极情感,但在下属眼中,男性领导者在表现出愤怒情感时的领导有效性显得更高(与表现出伤心情感时相比)(Lewis,2000)。也有研究证明领导者的消极心境能够激励团队成员更加努力(Sy等,2005)。通过这些研究,本文提出以下两个猜测:(1)某些领导者消极情感(例如伤心)也许会更有传染性,更能激励下属的积极态度和行为,正所谓“哀兵必胜”;(2)在某些条件的调节下(例如领导者性别),领导者消极情感也许比积极情感更有效。当然,领导者消极情感的专门研究还处于起步阶段,更多理论和解释有待挖掘。这是十分有趣的研究方向,有助于更加全面地理解领导者情感(包括积极情感和消极情感)的影响效果。

### (二)领导者情感表现的影响因素研究

关于领导者情感表现的前因变量的研究非常稀缺,也许是受到长期以来的情感特质论观点影响,误以为领导者情感是领导者天生的特质,无法改变。实际上,领导者情感表现是领导者情感状态的观察指标(Van Knippenberg和Van Kleef,2016)。在这种意义上,领导者情感应该被理解为情感状态而不是特质,可以被某些因素影响。Barnes等(2016)的研究发现,睡眠剥夺(sleep deprivation)会对领导者的积极情感表现和情绪劳动(包括表层扮演和深层扮演)产生负面影响,进而降低领导者在下属心目中的领导魅力,在这个影响过程中,三个情感变量(领导者积极情感表现、情绪表层扮演和情绪深层扮演)都起到中介作用。由于领导者情感表现在领导者—下属关系和团队工作中扮演着十分重要的角色,因此领导者情感表现的影响因素研究很有价值。可以预见,个人特质、个体生理状态和环境变化等方面的因素都有可能对领导者情感表现产生影响,具体因素还有待研究者在未来继续探索。

### (三)领导者情感临场感的实证研究

哪怕在西方学术界,领导者情感临场感也是一个比较新的变量,相关实证研究还十分稀缺。然而,不可否认的是,与领导者情感表现相比,领导者情感临场感在某些方面更有优势。第一,对领导者情感的测量更加准确。领导者情感表现的传统测量方法是让领导者主观评价自己在一定时期的情感状态,这不可避免地会带有主观性的测量偏差;而领导者情感临场感则是让

团队内的多个下属来评价领导者的情感,然后聚合成团队层面的领导者情感临场感变量,显得更加客观可靠。第二,更适用于领导者—下属关系的研究之中。领导者情感表现所表现的是领导者主观认为的情感,而领导者情感临场感则是下属感知到的领导者“真实”情感,后者更有助于准确地研究领导者情感如何对下属的态度和行为产生影响。因此,领导者情感临场感有着很高的研究价值,特别是在信奉明哲保身的中国,领导者有时候并不会给出自己真正的情感表现。在研究领导者情感临场感的过程中,本文建议采用团队—个人匹配的方式来收集问卷,因为每个人对领导者所表现的情感的感知都有差别,只有当把个体的领导者情感临场感上升到团队层次之后,才能代表该团队领导者的真实情感。

### 主要参考文献

- [1]Ames D R, Johar G V. I'll know what you're like when I see how you feel: How and when affective displays influence behavior-based impressions[J]. *Psychological Science*, 2009, 20(5): 586-593.
- [2]Anderson C, Keltner D, John O P. Emotional convergence between people over time[J]. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 2003, 84(5): 1054-1068.
- [3]Awamleh R, Gardner W L. Perceptions of leader charisma and effectiveness: The effects of vision content, delivery, and organizational performance[J]. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 1999, 10(3): 345-373.
- [4]Barnes C M, Guarana C L, Nauman S, et al. Too tired to inspire or be inspired: Sleep deprivation and charismatic leadership[J]. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 2016, 101(8): 1191-1199.
- [5]Baron R A. Negative effects of destructive criticism: Impact on conflict, self-efficacy, and task performance[J]. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 1988, 73(2): 199-207.
- [6]Bass B M. *Leadership and performance beyond expectations*[M]. New York, NY: Free Press, 1985.
- [7]Bass B M. *Transformational leadership: Industrial, military, and educational impact*[M]. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum, 1998.
- [8]Bono J E, Ilies R. Charisma, positive emotions and mood contagion[J]. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 2006, 17(4): 317-334.
- [9]Brief A P, Weiss H M. Organizational behavior: Affect in the workplace[J]. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 2002, 53: 279-307.
- [10]Brown M E, Treviño L K. Ethical leadership: A review and future directions[J]. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 2006, 17(6): 595-616.
- [11]Cacioppo J T, Gardner W L. Emotion[J]. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 1999, 50: 191-214.
- [12]Cherulnik P D, Donley K A, Wiewel T S R, et al. Charisma is contagious: The effect of leaders' charisma on observers' affect[J]. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 2001, 31(10): 2149-2159.
- [13]Chi N W, Chung Y Y, Tsai W C. How do happy leaders enhance team success? The mediating roles of transformational leadership, group affective tone, and team process[J]. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 2011, 41(6): 1421-1454.
- [14]Conger J A, Kanungo R N. *Charismatic leadership in organizations*[M]. Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE, 1998.
- [15]Damasio A R. *Descartes' error: Emotion, reason and the human brain*[M]. New York: Grosset/Putnam, 1994.
- [16]Damen F, Van Knippenberg D, Van Knippenberg B. Leader affective displays and attributions of charisma: The role of arousal[J]. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 2008, 38(10): 2594-2614.
- [17]Den Hartog D N, De Hoogh A H B, Keegan A E. The interactive effects of belongingness and charisma on helping and compliance[J]. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 2007, 92(4): 1131-1139.
- [18]Detert J R, Burris E R. Leadership behavior and employee voice: Is the door really open?[J]. *Academy of Management Journal*, 2007, 50(4): 869-884.
- [19]Eisenkraft N, Elfenbein H A. The way you make me feel: Evidence for individual differences in affective presence[J]. *Psychological Science*, 2010, 21(4): 505-510.
- [20]Elfenbein H A. Emotion in organizations: A review and theoretical integration[J]. *The Academy of Management Annals*,



- 2007, 1(1): 315–386.
- [21]Erez A, Misangyi V F, Johnson D E, et al. Stirring the hearts of followers: Charismatic leadership as the transferal of affect[J]. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 2008, 93(3): 602–616.
- [22]Fiedler F E. *A theory of leadership effectiveness*[M]. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1967.
- [23]Filipowicz A, Barsade S, Melwani S. Understanding emotional transitions: the interpersonal consequences of changing emotions in negotiations[J]. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 2011, 101(3): 541–556.
- [24]Fischer A H, Roseman I J. Beat them or ban them: The characteristics and social functions of anger and contempt[J]. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 2007, 93(1): 103–115.
- [25]Fisk G M, Friesen J P. Perceptions of leader emotion regulation and LMX as predictors of followers' job satisfaction and organizational citizenship behaviors[J]. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 2012, 23(1): 1–12.
- [26]Forgas J P. Mood and judgment: The affect infusion model(AIM)[J]. *Psychological Bulletin*, 1995, 117(1): 39–66.
- [27]Forgas J P. *Handbook of affect and social cognition*[M]. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum, 2001.
- [28]Forgas J P, Bower G H. Mood effects on person-perception judgments[J]. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 1987, 53(1): 53–60.
- [29]Forgas J P, George J M. Affective influences on judgments and behavior in organizations: An information processing perspective[J]. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 2001, 86(1): 3–34.
- [30]Frijda N H. *The emotions*[M]. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1986.
- [31]Gaddis B, Connelly S, Mumford M D. Failure feedback as an affective event: Influences of leader affect on subordinate attitudes and performance[J]. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 2004, 15(5): 663–686.
- [32]George J M. State or trait: Effects of positive mood on prosocial behaviors at work[J]. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 1991, 76(2): 299–307.
- [33]George J M. Leader positive mood and group performance: The case of customer service[J]. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 1995, 25(9): 778–794.
- [34]George J M, Bettenhausen K. Understanding prosocial behavior, sales performance, and turnover: A group-level analysis in a service context[J]. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 1990, 75(6): 698–709.
- [35]Ghiselli E E. *Exploration in managerial talent*[M]. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1971.
- [36]Grandey A A. Emotional regulation in the workplace: A new way to conceptualize emotional labor[J]. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, 2000, 5(1): 95–110.
- [37]Grandey A A. When “the show must go on”: Surface acting and deep acting as determinants of emotional exhaustion and peer-rated service delivery[J]. *Academy of Management Journal*, 2003, 46(1): 86–96.
- [38]Hatfield E, Cacioppo J T, Rapson R L. *Emotional contagion*[M]. New York, NY: Cambridge University Press, 1994.
- [39]House R J. A 1976 theory of charismatic leadership[A]. Hunt J G, Larsen L L. *Leadership: The cutting edge*[M]. Carbondale, IL: Southern Illinois University Press, 1977: 189–207.
- [40]House R J, Spangler W D, Woycke J. Personality and charisma in the U.S. presidency: A psychological theory of leader effectiveness[J]. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 1991, 36(3): 364–396.
- [41]Humphrey R H, Pollack J M, Hawver T. Leading with emotional labor[J]. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 2008, 23(2): 151–168.
- [42]Jacquart P, Antonakis J. When does charisma matter for top-level leaders? Effect of attributional ambiguity[J]. *Academy of Management Journal*, 2015, 58(4): 1051–1074.
- [43]Johnson S K. I second that emotion: Effects of emotional contagion and affect at work on leader and follower outcomes[J]. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 2008, 19(1): 1–19.
- [44]Kelly J R, Barsade S G. Mood and emotions in small groups and work teams[J]. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 2001, 86(1): 99–130.
- [45]Keltner D, Haidt J. Social functions of emotions at four levels of analysis[J]. *Cognition and Emotion*, 1999, 13(5): 505–521.
- [46]Kerr R, Garvin J, Heaton N, et al. Emotional intelligence and leadership effectiveness[J]. *Leadership & Organization*

- Development Journal, 2006, 27(4): 265–279.
- [47]Kish-Gephart J J, Detert J R, Treviño L K, et al. Silenced by fear: The nature, sources, and consequences of fear at work[J]. Research in Organizational Behavior, 2009, 29: 163–193.
- [48]Klennert M D, Campos J J, Sorce J F, et al. Emotions as behavior regulators: Social referencing in infancy[A]. Plutchink R, Kellerman H. Emotion: Theory, research and experience[M]. New York: Academic Press, 1983: 57–68.
- [49]Knutson B. Facial expressions of emotion influence interpersonal trait inferences[J]. Journal of Nonverbal Behavior, 1996, 20(3): 165–182.
- [50]Koning L F, Van Kleef G A. How leaders' emotional displays shape followers' organizational citizenship behavior[J]. The Leadership Quarterly, 2015, 26(4): 489–501.
- [51]Krasikova D V, Green S G, LeBreton J M. Destructive leadership: A theoretical review, integration, and future research agenda[J]. Journal of Management, 2013, 39(5): 1308–1338.
- [52]Lazarus R S. Emotion and adaptation[M]. New York: Oxford University Press, 1991.
- [53]LeDoux J E. The emotional brain: The mysterious underpinnings of emotional life[M]. New York: Simon & Schuster, 1996.
- [54]Lester S W, Meglino B M, Korsgaard M A. The antecedents and consequences of group potency: A longitudinal investigation of newly formed work groups[J]. Academy of Management Journal, 2002, 45(2): 352–368.
- [55]Lewis K M. When leaders display emotion: How followers respond to negative emotional expression of male and female leaders[J]. Journal of Organizational Behavior, 2000, 21(2): 221–234.
- [56]Liang J, Farh C I C, Farh J L. Psychological antecedents of promotive and prohibitive voice: A two-wave examination [J]. Academy of Management Journal, 2012, 55(1): 71–92.
- [57]Liu W, Song Z L, Li X, et al. Why and when leaders' affective states influence employee upward voice[J]. Academy of Management Journal, 2017, 60(1): 238–263.
- [58]Lord R G, Day D V, Zaccaro S J, et al. Leadership in applied psychology: Three waves of theory and research[J]. Journal of Applied Psychology, 2017, 102(3): 434–451.
- [59]Lowe K B, Kroeck K G, Sivasubramaniam N. Effectiveness correlates of transformational and transactional leadership: A meta-analytic review of the MLQ literature[J]. The Leadership Quarterly, 1996, 7(3): 385–425.
- [60]Madrid H P, Totterdell P, Niven K, et al. Leader affective presence and innovation in teams[J]. Journal of Applied Psychology, 2016, 101(5): 673–686.
- [61]Magee J C, Galinsky A D. 8 social hierarchy: The self - reinforcing nature of power and status[J]. The Academy of Management Annals, 2008, 2(1): 351–398.
- [62]Miron-Spektor E, Efrat-Treister D, Rafaeli A, et al. Others' anger makes people work harder not smarter: The effect of observing anger and sarcasm on creative and analytic thinking[J]. Journal of Applied Psychology, 2011, 96(5): 1065–1075.
- [63]Morris J A, Feldman D C. The dimensions, antecedents, and consequences of emotional labor[J]. The Academy of Management Review, 1996, 21(4): 986–1010.
- [64]Niven K, Totterdell P, Holman D. A classification of controlled interpersonal affect regulation strategies[J]. Emotion, 2009, 9(4): 498–509.
- [65]Oatley K, Jenkins J M. Understanding emotions[M]. Cambridge, MA: Blackwell, 1996.
- [66]Owens B P, Hekman D R. Modeling how to grow: An inductive examination of humble leader behaviors, contingencies, and outcomes[J]. Academy of Management Journal, 2012, 55(4): 787–818.
- [67]Palmer B, Walls M, Burgess Z, et al. Emotional intelligence and effective leadership[J]. Leadership & Organization Development Journal, 2001, 22(1): 5–10.
- [68]Raub S, Robert C. Differential effects of empowering leadership on in-role and extra-role employee behaviors: Exploring the role of psychological empowerment and power values[J]. Human Relations, 2010, 63(11): 1743–1770.
- [69]Rosete D, Ciarrochi J. Emotional intelligence and its relationship to workplace performance outcomes of leadership effectiveness[J]. Leadership & Organization Development Journal, 2005, 26(5): 388–399.
- [70]Rubin R S, Munz D C, Bommer W H. Leading from within: The effects of emotion recognition and personality on

- transformational leadership behavior[J]. *Academy of Management Journal*, 2005, 48(5): 845–858.
- [71]Russell J A, Barrett L F. Core affect, prototypical emotional episodes, and other things called emotion: Dissecting the elephant[J]. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 1999, 76(5): 805–819.
- [72]Scherer K R. Vocal affect expression: A review and a model for future research[J]. *Psychological Bulletin*, 1986, 99(2): 143–165.
- [73]Schwarz N, Clore G L. Mood, misattribution, and judgments of well-being: Informative and directive functions of affective states[J]. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 1983, 45(3): 513–523.
- [74]Settoon R P, Bennett N, Liden R C. Social exchange in organizations: Perceived organizational support, leader–member exchange, and employee reciprocity[J]. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 1996, 81(3): 219–227.
- [75]Stogdill R M, Shartle C L. Methods for determining patterns of leadership behavior in relation to organization structure and objectives[J]. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 1948, 32(3): 286–291.
- [76]Strack F, Martin L L, Stepper S. Inhibiting and facilitating conditions of the human smile: A nonobtrusive test of the facial feedback hypothesis[J]. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 1988, 54(5): 768–777.
- [77]Sy T, Côté S, Saavedra R. The contagious leader: Impact of the leader’s mood on the mood of group members, group affective tone, and group processes[J]. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 2005, 90(2): 295–305.
- [78]Van Kleef G A, De Dreu C K W, Manstead A S R. The interpersonal effects of emotions in negotiations: A motivated information processing approach[J]. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 2004, 87(4): 510–528.
- [79]Van Kleef G A, De Dreu C K, Manstead A S R. An interpersonal approach to emotion in social decision making: The emotions as social information model[J]. *Advances in Experimental Social Psychology*, 2010, 42: 45–96.
- [80]Van Kleef G A, Homan A C, Beersma B, et al. Searing sentiment or cold calculation? The effects of leader emotional displays on team performance depend on follower epistemic motivation[J]. *The Academy of Management Journal*, 2009, 52(3): 562–580.
- [81]Van Knippenberg D, Kooij-De Bode H J M, Van Ginkel W P. The interactive effects of mood and trait negative affect in group decision making[J]. *Organization Science*, 2010, 21(3): 731–744.
- [82]Van Knippenberg D, Van Kleef G A. Leadership and affect: Moving the hearts and minds of followers[J]. *The Academy of Management Annals*, 2016, 10(1): 799–840.
- [83]Watson D, Clark L A. Negative affectivity: The disposition to experience aversive emotional states[J]. *Psychological Bulletin*, 1984, 96(3): 465–490.
- [84]Watson D, Clark L A, Tellegen A. Development and validation of brief measures of positive and negative affect: The PANAS scales[J]. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 1988, 54(6): 1063–1070.
- [85]Weisinger H. *The critical edge: How to criticize up and down your organization, and make it pay off*[M]. Boston, MA: Little, Brown, 1989.
- [86]Weiss H M, Cropanzano R. Affective events theory: A theoretical discussion of the structure, causes and consequences of affective experiences at work[J]. *Research in Organizational Behavior*, 1996, 18: 1–74.
- [87]Wowak A J, Mannor M J, Arrfelt M, et al. Earthquake or glacier? How CEO charisma manifests in firm strategy over time[J]. *Strategic Management Journal*, 2016, 37(3): 586–603.
- [88]Zajonc R B. Feeling and thinking: Preferences need no inferences[J]. *American Psychologist*, 1980, 35(2): 151–175.

## A Literature Review of Leader Affect

Feng Jingming, Liu Shanshi

(*School of Business Administration, South China University of Technology, Guangzhou 510640, China*)

**Summary:** The real sense of leadership research has developed for almost 70 years, since Stogdill and Shartle appealed that leadership research should shift from focusing on leadership problems and

leaders' personalities to "a process of interaction between persons who are participating in goal oriented group activities" in 1948. Traditional leadership research mainly focuses on a cognitive perspective, which generates a number of important theories like leader trait theory, contingency theory, and leader-member exchange theory, as well as many kinds of typical leadership like charismatic leadership, transformational leadership, empowering leadership, ethical leadership, humble leadership, and destructive leadership. In other words, the leadership theory jungle has emerged so far. Although the leadership theory jungle is complicated and has more and more branches, researchers have reached a consensus: the essence of leadership is leadership effectiveness. Much evidence has pointed out that leadership effectiveness partly comes from leaders' display of affect. Although most types of leadership are from a cognitive perspective, if focusing on leadership effectiveness and affect displays, all types can be divided into two categories: positive and passive leader affective displays. Therefore, this paper highlights leader affect and its interpersonal effect, rather than one or more typical types of leadership. While the study of leader affect is relatively mature abroad, such study in China is still in the start-up stage. One of the restraining factors is that there is seldom a systematical review of leader affect research, so that the relevant study is difficult to conduct in China. This paper aims at completing such fundamental work by answering these questions: what is leader affect? what does it consist of? what are the research models? what impact does it have on leaders and subordinates respectively?

After collecting and reviewing a large number of literature, this paper arranges three sections to answer these questions: firstly, we introduce the concepts and development of affect and leader affect; secondly, we introduce the research models that explain how leader affect impacts the interaction between leaders and subordinates; lastly, we review the impacts of leader affect on both leaders and subordinates. Although western research developed several years before Chinese research, we find some research gaps after reviewing western literature: (1) there is not much research focusing on leader's passive affect, especially the moderated or contingency variables that lead passive affect to positive impact; (2) what are the factors influencing leader affect? it is fundamental study that is neglected by many researchers; (3) leader affective presence describes leader affect from subordinates' perspective, which may more approach real leader affect, but there are very few empirical studies on this topic. The study of leader affect is very important for organizational practice and unifying the leadership theory jungle, because each kind of leadership cannot exist without affective displays. In China, most researches focus on emotions and pay very little attention to affect. However, affect, emotion, and mood are different concepts. So this paper aims at two goals: first, by clarifying some relevant concepts about affect, we hope to make the field of affect research more normative and coherent; second, by introducing a review of western research on leader affect, we appeal to Chinese researchers for paying more attention to the role of affect in the interaction between leaders and subordinates.

**Key words:** affect; emotion; mood; leader; subordinate

(责任编辑: 墨 茶)