

## Characteristics Of A Spiritual Leader

### Introduction

1. Few subjects are more important to the Lord's church than leadership.
2. Hell will be very populated with souls of men and women who have not been effective leaders at home, in life, and in the church.
3. We need to examine characteristics of a spiritual leader under two general headings: in the church and in the home.

### I. Fearless

- A. The word "afraid" is found 193 times in 189 KJV verses.
  1. God told Israel to not be afraid 8 times in Deuteronomy and Joshua, books of conquest.
  2. Jesus tells His followers not be afraid 9 times in Matthew through Acts.
- B. "Anger is the primary sign of fear" (Dr. Philip Holder, <http://www.wingchuncenter.com/Articles/art01.htm>).
  1. The Pharisees' hatred of Jesus is well documented (Mark 3:6). Luke 22:2 tells that their violent hatred of Jesus was based on fear.
  2. A lot of the anger in the church (and toward the church) is based on fear.
- C. Fear is paralyzing. It keeps us from doing what God wants us to do.
  1. Many people are afraid to be baptized, so they never are. Many congregations are afraid to practice church discipline, so they do nothing.
  2. The paralyzing effects of fear kept God's people from entering the Promised Land (Numbers 13:21-14:39).

### II. Willing To Be Different

- A. God intends for His people to be a peculiar people "zealous of good works" (Titus 2:14) reflecting praise to Him Who called us "out of darkness into his marvelous light" (1 Peter 2:9).
- B. God's church will have to look different!
- C. Christian homes will have to look different!
  1. Homes are more fractured than ever—multiple marriages and divorces contribute to this (see Matthew 19:1-9).
  2. Homes are being hijacked by homosexual and feminist agendas.
  3. A good question to ask is, "How much Bible is in your home?"
    - a. Ephesians 5:20-32
    - b. 1 Peter 3:1-7
    - c. Psalm 101:3

### III. Boldness

- A. Boldness should be the calling-card of the Lord's true people (Acts 4:13).
- B. Boldness is more impressive than being wishy-washy. **Surprising Insights from the Unchurched** by Thom Rainer reveals the following:

1. The majority of the unchurched interviewed stated a desire to hear more complex and doctrinal sermons. They were looking for the truth and did not want to hear watered down, psycho-babble.
2. Only 11% stated worship style/music was a factor.
- C. Being a good leader means sometimes having to say, “Here is the way things are going to be.”
  1. Paul did this.
    - a. He appears to have had a regular plan upon entering cities (Acts 17:1, 2).
    - b. Consider Paul’s bold dealings of the situation in Acts 16:37.
  2. Good leaders know where they’re going, and they have some ideas about how to get there.

#### IV. Compassion

- A. The Bible regularly declares that Jesus had compassion toward people (Matthew 9:36; 14:14; Mark 1:4; 6:34).
  1. “Compassion” translates a word meaning, “to have the bowels yearn (figuratively) feel sympathy, to pity” (Strong’s).
  2. This compassion must be more than just a feeling (James 2:14-24).
- B. People are generally compassionate, but they are compassionate toward things instead of people (consider John 4:6-11).
- C. Jesus describes Christian compassion as active (Luke 10:30-37).

#### V. Empathy

- A. Empathy is said to be the ability to walk in another’s shoes.
  1. “Leaders who are high on both (a) comprehending others’ feelings, and on (b) re-experiencing others’ feelings in a shared emotional bond, are more likely to be true transformational and authentic leaders” (Ronald H. Humphrey, Department of Management, School of Business, Virginia Commonwealth University, <http://gli.unl.edu/conference/documents/paper10072.doc>).
  2. “Leaders who are high on (a) comprehending others’ feelings, but low on (b) re-experiencing others’ feelings in a shared emotional bond, are more likely to be pseudo-transformational and inauthentic leaders” (ibid).
- B. Jesus declares that what we do to His church (His followers) we do to Him (Matthew 25:32-45).
- C. Perhaps the reason why people are not good leaders in the home and church is that they do not care how their decisions effect others.

1. Hear (Romans 10:17)	2. Believe (Mark 16:16)
3. Repent (Acts 17:30)	4. Confess (Matthew 10:32, 33)
5. Be baptized (Acts 2:38)	6. Live faithfully (Revelation 2:10)

# Scripture Sheet

## Be not afraid

**Deu 1:17** Ye shall **not** respect persons in judgment; *but* ye shall hear the small as well as the great; ye shall **not be afraid** of the face of man; for the judgment *is* God's: and the cause that is too hard for you, bring *it* unto me, and I will hear it.

**Deu 1:29** Then I said unto you, Dread **not**, neither **be afraid** of them.

**Deu 7:18** Thou shalt **not be afraid** of them: *but* shalt well remember what the LORD thy God did unto Pharaoh, and unto all Egypt;

**Deu 18:22** When a prophet speaketh in the name of the LORD, if the thing follow **not**, nor come to pass, that *is* the thing which the LORD hath **not** spoken, *but* the prophet hath spoken it presumptuously: thou shalt **not be afraid** of him.

**Deu 20:1** When thou goest out to battle against thine enemies, and seest horses, and chariots, *and* a people more than thou, **be not afraid** of them: for the LORD thy God *is* with thee, which brought thee up out of the land of Egypt.

**Deu 31:6** **Be** strong and of a good courage, fear **not**, nor **be afraid** of them: for the LORD thy God, he *it is* that doth go with thee; he will **not** fail thee, nor forsake thee.

**Jos 1:9** Have **not** I commanded thee? **Be** strong and of a good courage; **be not afraid**, neither **be** thou dismayed: for the LORD thy God *is* with thee whithersoever thou goest.

**Jos 11:6** And the LORD said unto Joshua, **Be not afraid** because of them: for tomorrow about this time will I deliver them up all slain before Israel: thou shalt hamstring their horses, and burn their chariots with fire.

-

**Mat 14:27** But straightway Jesus spake unto them, saying, **Be of good cheer; it is I; be not afraid.**

**Mat 17:7** And Jesus came and touched them, and said, **Arise, and be not afraid.**

**Mat 28:10** Then said Jesus unto them, **Be not afraid: go tell my brethren that they go into Galilee, and there shall they see me.**

**Mar 5:36** As soon as Jesus heard the word that was spoken, he saith unto the ruler of the synagogue, **Be not afraid, only believe.**

**Mar 5:36** As soon as Jesus heard the word that was spoken, he saith unto the ruler of the synagogue, **Be not afraid, only believe.**

**Luk 12:4** **And I say unto you my friends, Be not afraid of them that kill the body, and after that have no more that they can do.**

**Joh 6:20** But he saith unto them, **It is I; be not afraid.**

**Joh 14:27** **Peace I leave with you, my peace I give unto you: not as the world giveth, give I unto you. Let not your heart be troubled, neither let it be afraid.**

**Act 18:9** Then spake the Lord to Paul in the night by a vision, **Be not afraid, but speak, and hold not thy peace:**

## Peculiar People

**Exo 19:5** Now therefore, if ye will obey my voice indeed, and keep my covenant, then ye shall be a **peculiar** treasure unto me above all people: for all the earth *is* mine:

**Deu 14:2** For thou *art* a holy people unto the LORD thy God, and the LORD hath chosen thee to be a **peculiar** people unto himself, above all the nations that *are* upon the earth.

**Deu 26:18** And the LORD hath avouched thee this day to be his **peculiar** people, as he hath promised thee, and that *thou* shouldest keep all his commandments;

**Psa 135:4** For the LORD hath chosen Jacob unto himself, *and* Israel for his **peculiar** treasure.

**Tit 2:14** Who gave himself for us, that he might redeem us from all iniquity, and purify unto himself a **peculiar** people, zealous of good works.

**1Pe 2:9** But ye *are* a chosen generation, a royal priesthood, a holy nation, a **peculiar** people; that ye should show forth the praises of him who hath called you out of darkness into his marvelous light:

**Mat 9:36** But when he saw the multitudes, he was **moved with compassion** on them, because they fainted, and were scattered abroad, as sheep having no shepherd.

**Mat 14:14** And Jesus went forth, and saw a great multitude, and was **moved with compassion** toward them, and he healed their sick.

**Mar 1:41** And Jesus, **moved with compassion**, put forth *his* hand, and touched him, and saith unto him, **I will; be thou clean.**

**Mar 6:34** And Jesus, when he came out, saw much people, and was **moved with compassion** toward them, because they were as sheep not having a shepherd: and he began to teach them many things.

**Jam 2:14** What *doth it* profit, my brethren, though a man say he hath faith, and have not works? can faith save him?

**Jam 2:15** If a brother or sister be naked, and destitute of daily food,

**Jam 2:16** And one of you say unto them, Depart in peace, be *ye* warmed and filled; notwithstanding ye give them not those things which are needful to the body; what *doth it* profit?

**Jam 2:17** Even so faith, if it hath not works, is dead, being alone.

**Jam 2:18** Yea, a man may say, Thou hast faith, and I have works: show me thy faith without thy works, and I will show thee my faith by my works.

**Jam 2:19** Thou believest that there is one God; thou doest well: the devils also believe, and tremble.

**Jam 2:20** But wilt thou know, O vain man, that faith without works is dead?

**Jam 2:21** Was not Abraham our father justified by works, when he had offered Isaac his son upon the altar?

**Jam 2:22** Seest thou how faith wrought with his works, and by works was faith made perfect?

**Jam 2:23** And the Scripture was fulfilled which saith, Abraham believed God, and it was imputed unto him for righteousness: and he was called the Friend of God.

**Jam 2:24** Ye see then how that by works a man is justified, and not by faith only.

**Jon 4:1** But it displeased Jonah exceedingly, and he was very angry.

**Jon 4:2** And he prayed unto the LORD, and said, I pray thee, O LORD, *was* not this my saying, when I was yet in my country? Therefore I fled before unto Tarshish: for I knew that thou *art* a gracious God, and merciful, slow to anger, and of great kindness, and repentest thee of the evil.

**Jon 4:3** Therefore now, O LORD, take, I beseech thee, my life from me; for *it is* better for me to die than to live.

**Jon 4:4** Then said the LORD, Doest thou well to be angry?

**Jon 4:5** So Jonah went out of the city, and sat on the east side of the city, and there made him a booth, and sat under it in the shadow, till he might see what would become of the city.

**Jon 4:6** And the LORD God prepared a gourd, and made *it* to come up over Jonah, that it might be a shadow over his head, to deliver him from his grief. So Jonah was exceeding glad of the gourd.

Jon 4:7 But God prepared a worm when the morning rose the next day, and it smote the gourd that it withered.

Jon 4:8 And it came to pass, when the sun did arise, that God prepared a vehement east wind; and the sun beat upon the head of Jonah, that he fainted, and wished in himself to die, and said, *It is* better for me to die than to live.

Jon 4:9 And God said to Jonah, Doest thou well to be angry for the gourd? And he said, I do well to be angry, *even* unto death.

Jon 4:10 Then said the LORD, Thou hast had pity on the gourd, for the which thou hast not labored, neither madest it grow; which came up in a night, and perished in a night:

Jon 4:11 And should not I spare Nineveh, that great city, wherein are more than sixscore thousand persons that cannot discern between their right hand and their left hand; and *also* much cattle?

Luk 10:30 And Jesus answering said, **A certain man went down from Jerusalem to Jericho, and fell among thieves, which stripped him of his raiment, and wounded him, and departed, leaving him half dead.**

Luk 10:31 **And by chance there came down a certain priest that way: and when he saw him, he passed by on the other side.**

Luk 10:32 **And likewise a Levite, when he was at the place, came and looked on him, and passed by on the other side.**

Luk 10:33 **But a certain Samaritan, as he journeyed, came where he was: and when he saw him, he had compassion on him,**

Luk 10:34 **And went to him, and bound up his wounds, pouring in oil and wine, and set him on his own beast, and brought him to an inn, and took care of him.**

Luk 10:35 **And on the morrow when he departed, he took out two pence, and gave them to the host, and said unto him, Take care of him; and whatsoever thou spendest more, when I come again, I will repay thee.**

Luk 10:36 **Which now of these three, thinkest thou, was neighbor unto him that fell among the thieves?**

Luk 10:37 **And he said, He that showed mercy on him. Then said Jesus unto him, Go, and do thou likewise.**

Mat 25:32 **And before him shall be gathered all nations: and he shall separate them one from another, as a shepherd divideth his sheep from the goats:**

Mat 25:33 **And he shall set the sheep on his right hand, but the goats on the left.**

Mat 25:34 **Then shall the King say unto them on his right hand, Come, ye blessed of my Father, inherit the kingdom prepared for you from the foundation of the world:**

Mat 25:35 **For I was hungry, and ye gave me meat: I was thirsty, and ye gave me drink: I was a stranger, and ye took me in:**

Mat 25:36 **Naked, and ye clothed me: I was sick, and ye visited me: I was in prison, and ye came unto me.**

Mat 25:37 **Then shall the righteous answer him, saying, Lord, when saw we thee hungry, and fed thee? or thirsty, and gave thee drink?**

Mat 25:38 **When saw we thee a stranger, and took thee in? or naked, and clothed thee?**

Mat 25:39 **Or when saw we thee sick, or in prison, and came unto thee?**

Mat 25:40 **And the King shall answer and say unto them, Verily I say unto you, Inasmuch as ye have done it unto one of the least of these my brethren, ye have done it unto me.**

Mat 25:41 **Then shall he say also unto them on the left hand, Depart from me, ye cursed, into everlasting fire, prepared for the devil and his angels:**

Mat 25:42 For I was hungry, and ye gave me no meat: I was thirsty, and ye gave me no drink:

Mat 25:43 I was a stranger, and ye took me not in: naked, and ye clothed me not: sick, and in prison, and ye visited me not.

Mat 25:44 Then shall they also answer him, saying, Lord, when saw we thee hungry, or athirst, or a stranger, or naked, or sick, or in prison, and did not minister unto thee?

Mat 25:45 Then shall he answer them, saying, Verily I say unto you, Inasmuch as ye did *it* not to one of the least of these, ye did *it* not to me.

## **Illustrations**

-Compassion

### **Strange Fruit**

*Woman's Day* magazine told of a strange happening on the campus of Green Acres Elementary School near Santa Cruz, California. One year a tree on that campus began to bear strange fruit, mostly sandwiches, but sometimes a cookie, a cupcake, an apple or an orange.

It came into being through the efforts of two teachers, Sophie Farrar and Sandra Enz, who were upset at the quantities of uneaten sandwiches discarded by the children. They suggested that the unwrapped sandwiches be placed under what the children began to call the free-food tree, for students who had come without a lunch or who had lost or forgotten their lunches. The idea was very popular among the children. Some youngsters asked their mothers to pack an extra sandwich so they would have one to put under the free-food tree.

### **Burdened for the Lost**

The St. Bernard dogs in the Alps who seek out travelers lost in a storm take their mission very seriously. One of these dogs returned late one afternoon, wearied from fighting his way through the drifts. He went to his kennel, lay down in a corner, and acted thoroughly despondent, despite the efforts of his master to encourage him. Was he sick? Well, no—not in body, but in heart. He had failed to find anyone to help and had come back ashamed. It is such sorrow of heart, resulting in outbursts of tears on behalf of others, that should characterize the Christian.

-Empathy

### **More Than Sympathy**

Queen Victoria was a close friend of Principal and Mrs. Tullock, of St. Andrews. Prince Albert died and Victoria was left alone. Just at the same time, Principal Tullock died and Mrs. Tullock was left alone. Quite unexpectedly, Queen Victoria came to call on Mrs. Tullock when she was resting on a couch in her room. The Queen stepped forward. "My dear," she said, "don't rise. I am not coming to you today as a queen to a subject, but as one woman to another who has lost her husband." She put herself in her friend's place. That is what God did for us. That is what we should do for others.



---

## **FEAR... YOUR WORST ENEMY**

By  
Philip Holder, Ph.D.  
Grandmaster: North American Wing Chun Association  
Copyright by Philip Holder

### **THE SOURCE OF FEAR**

Fear is defined in Webster's dictionary as, "an unpleasant, sometimes strong emotion caused by an anticipation or awareness of danger" or "anxious concern". That may be true but from my experience in my therapy practice I would modify that slightly. I think it more accurate to say that fear is an unpleasant, sometimes strong emotion caused by the anticipation of "loss". It may be a loss of health (disease or damage to the body) or it may be loss of face (damage to the ego, pride, or image). It stands to reason then, that fear increases with an increased attachment to the physical world. It increases as well with a dependence on the approval of others. Fear is also more pervasive when there is a lack of faith that we have greater significance in the universe than what we own, or how others perceive us.

### **SIGNS OF FEAR**

Fear is shown in many ways. Some show fear by withdrawing or by cowering (if you never take a chance there is no risk of loss). The most profound examples of fear are anger and hate.

Some people think that hate is the opposite of love. I disagree. Indifference is the opposite of love. Hate and love are often closely knit. Someone who can deeply affect your life can bring you loss therefore hate and love are often intertwined.

Anger is the primary sign of fear. Those who act out their insecurities as anger are the most fearful of all people. Often those who act "macho" or "bad" are perceived as brave. Look past the façade. Those who act with anger are deeply immersed in fear. When two kids get in a fight, it is fear that spurs them on. It may be fear of looking like a chicken to friends, or losing their girlfriend (or boyfriend), or it may be fear of physical harm. It is rare that fights occur over reasonable issues. Fear is the catalyst that fuels anger.

### **THE EFFECTS OF FEAR**

There are two areas to consider when contemplating the effects of fear on your life. The first is the physical short term effect and the second is in how fear effects your life in general.

Fear is more than a simply a mental state. It effects both the physiology of the body and the chemical balance of the brain as well. When people are afraid it generates stress. Extreme stress can manifest itself physically in a number of ways. In extreme cases it can cause tunnel vision, loss of color perception (color blindness), it can cause a distortion of both time and of depth perception.

Want a good example of this... Often when someone is involved in a serious auto accident they will describe these effects. They may say, "It was like everything was in slow motion", or, "Everything was in black and white". What they are describing is the effect of stress generated by fear. Fear (and the stress generated by it) will raise blood pressure. It will also deplete the immune system. Fear causes errors in judgment and prevents

us from taking the most reasonable course of action.

The long-term effect of fear can be more devastating than the short term. We are all what we practice to be. If you practice baseball every day you will become a good baseball player. If you practice carpentry every day you will become a good carpenter. If you practice being happy every day, you will become happy. If you practice fear (anger) every day, you will become a fearful and angry person. People often train themselves to perpetuate these negative behaviors. There are times when this behavior has been practiced for so long that the person is unaware that they have a problem with fear and anger. It becomes their practiced behavior for dealing with any challenge.

## **CASTING OUT FEAR**

To cast out fear one must first get past the ego. More fear has been created as a result of perceived or anticipated loss of face (ego) than was ever created out of anticipation of loss of physical well being. A great deal of this fear is a result of people's inability to prioritize. I always suggest that when someone feels himself or herself getting angry that they ask "is this situation really going to have any effect on the overall outcome of my life". In most cases, the answer is no. Place your attention on what is truly valuable. Look at the bigger picture. In this life we own nothing and no one belongs to us. I don't know who first said it but I truly believe in the old saying, "let go of everything and what remains is what is truly yours". When you are angry, stop and ask yourself what you are afraid of. Only by being honest with yourself about what is causing anger can you take back control of your life from fear and anger.

When I see the mindless things that we adults often argue over, I wonder who the kids really are. Winning a meaningless and petty battle or point can cause you to lose the war. Remember... "Never argue with an idiot. People watching can't tell who is the idiot". In an argument or confrontation people often lose sight of what the original disagreement was even about. Fear of losing (or being outdone) takes total precedent over the importance or lack of importance of the original issue. People argue about whose religion is best, what martial arts style is best, who's the toughest guy or the cutest woman. These arguments are all rooted in fear. Those who are condescending to others, or boastful, exhibit a state of perpetual fear. Someone who is truly centered, confident, and focused has no need for boasting or for petty squabbles. They are too busy doing things that are positive and constructive. The next time that you hear a person degrade or belittle another person, or criticize another martial arts style or instructor, or say destructive things about a colleague, know that it is the person doing the criticizing who is full of fear and insecurity. Anger is born out of fear. Fear is born out of a sense of inadequacy and/or the anticipation of loss. Fearful people are those who take themselves and the material things of the world far too seriously. Life is to be enjoyed by raising ourselves up to meet our personal potential. It has nothing to do with anyone else.

If you cultivate a sense of your spiritual worth, if you understand that there are greater things in this world than what we have or what others perceive us to be, then there is no reason to fear. When fear vanishes, so does anger. When anger is gone, your thoughts become clear. When your thoughts are clear, you function at your best.

Only lazy people attempt to make themselves look better by degrading others. You can practice being brave by being kind. You can practice courage by being tolerant of the beliefs of others. Accept that there is more than one way to accomplish any goal. What is the right way for one may not be the right way for others. Those who think that theirs is the only way, or that they know all of the answers have condemned themselves to ignorance. When you keep an open mind your potential for growth is unlimited. When you are free from fear, you can experience each moment to the fullest. This focused and centered state of mind will help you to excel in anything you undertake. Only by letting go of fear and casting out anger can one truly experience the joys of life.

***Surprising Insights from the Unchurched and Proven Ways to Reach Them by Thom S. Rainer, 2001, 281pgs, HBDJ, Zondervan publishing.***

Mr. Rainer interviewed individuals who became professed Christians. These people were not those who had claimed a previous faith. There have been other studies which looked at why individuals claimed certain memberships, but this study was to find out why the 'unchurched' decided to claim membership.

Some of the findings are interesting.

- 90% said that the preaching was a factor for their choosing the church they were attending.
- 88% mentioned doctrines as a factor.
- 49% stated friendliness of members.
- Only 11% stated worship style/music was a factor. (It would seem that only those who are looking for a change of where to worship think this is important. Perhaps those who are so driven to be more 'contemporary' should take note of this fact—Mark McWhorter).
- 91% stated that the beliefs of the church were important in their decision to come to that church. It was found that the unchurched were not turned off by the name of a church. 81% stated that the name of the church did not influence their decision. (Therefore, the current trend to change the title from church of Christ to community church makes no difference to those who do not attend worship presently. It is not true that the name will drive the unchurched away--Mark McWhorter).
- 53% stated that someone from the church shared with them how to become a Christian.
- 35% stated that no one from the church they were attending had done so as an initial reason for them to attend.
- While the preacher was important in the choice of where to attend, the majority stated that it was not important for the preacher to be a dynamic and charismatic leader. They did like a good speaker but it was not the reason for the choice to attend.
- The majority of the unchurched interviewed stated a desire to hear more complex and doctrinal sermons. They were looking for the truth and did not want to hear watered down, psycho-babble.
- The most stated factor related to preachers that was voiced by the unchurched in the study was preaching that teaches. The second most stated was preaching that applied to their life. Third was the authenticity of the preacher. Fourth was the conviction of the preacher. Fifth was personal contact by the preacher.
- Friendliness or facilities was stated as a concern by 90%. While the facilities were not one of the most important items, an unclean and unkept facility did turn off interest. A common misperception by church members is that they are friendly, when in fact the unchurched noted that they were not. The unchurched are exploring friendliness: 68% stated that they attend Sunday school. 17% stated being part of other small groups.

These stats are more than for those who transferred church membership

- Items mentioned as important for the previously unchurched to stay where they were included: doctrine clarified, high expectations by the church of them, an entry point class, small group studies such as Sunday school, clarity of purpose, and involvement in some work of the church.
- 83% of those previously unchurched who remained active for five years stated active attendance in Bible Class.
- Of those who only attended worship services, only 16% stayed active after five years. (In association with this, in 1999 only 19% of adult Americans attended Sunday school.)
- The majority of the previously unchurched were looking for absolutes.

# *On Empathy*

By: [Dr. Sam Vaknin](#)

The [Encyclopaedia Britannica \(1999 edition\)](#) defines empathy as:

*"The ability to imagine oneself in another's place and understand the other's feelings, desires, ideas, and actions. It is a term coined in the early 20th century, equivalent to the German Einfühlung and modelled on "sympathy." The term is used with special (but not exclusive) reference to aesthetic experience. The most obvious example, perhaps, is that of the actor or singer who genuinely feels the part he is performing. With other works of art, a spectator may, by a kind of introjection, feel himself involved in what he observes or contemplates. The use of empathy is an important part of the counselling technique developed by the American psychologist Carl Rogers."*

Empathy is predicated upon and must, therefore, incorporate the following elements:

- a. Imagination which is dependent on the ability to imagine;
- b. The existence of an accessible Self (self-awareness or self-consciousness);
- c. The existence of an available other (other-awareness, recognizing the outside world);
- d. The existence of accessible feelings, desires, ideas and representations of actions or their outcomes both in the empathizing Self ("Empathor") and in the Other, the object of empathy ("Empathee");
- e. The availability of an aesthetic frame of reference;
- f. The availability of a moral frame of reference.

While (a) is presumed to be universally available to all agents (though in varying degrees) - the existence of the other components of empathy should not be taken for granted.

Conditions (b) and (c), for instance, are not satisfied by people who suffer from personality disorders, such as the [Narcissistic Personality Disorder](#). Condition (d) is not met in autistic people (e.g., those who suffer from the Asperger syndrome). Condition (e) is so totally dependent on the specifics of the culture, period and society in which it exists - that it is rather meaningless and ambiguous as a yardstick. Condition (f) suffer from both afflictions: it is both culture-dependent AND is not satisfied in many people (such as those who

suffer from the Antisocial Personality Disorder and who are devoid of any conscience or moral sense).

Thus, the very existence of empathy should be questioned. It is often confused with inter-subjectivity. The latter is defined thus by *"The Oxford Companion to Philosophy, 1995"*:

*"This term refers to the status of being somehow accessible to at least two (usually all, in principle) minds or 'subjectivities'. It thus implies that there is some sort of communication between those minds; which in turn implies that each communicating minds aware not only of the existence of the other but also of its intention to convey information to the other. The idea, for theorists, is that if subjective processes can be brought into agreement, then perhaps that is as good as the (unattainable?) status of being objective - completely independent of subjectivity. The question facing such theorists is whether intersubjectivity is definable without presupposing an objective environment in which communication takes place (the 'wiring' from subject A to subject B). At a less fundamental level, however, the need for intersubjective verification of scientific hypotheses has been long recognized". (page 414).*

On the face of it, the difference between intersubjectivity and empathy is double:

- a. Intersubjectivity requires an EXPLICIT, communicated agreement between at least two subjects.
- b. It involves EXTERNAL things (so called "objective" entities).

These "differences" are artificial. This how empathy is defined in "Psychology - An Introduction (Ninth Edition) by Charles G. Morris, Prentice Hall, 1996":

*"Closely related to the ability to read other people's emotions is empathy - the arousal of an emotion in an observer that is a vicarious response to the other person's situation... Empathy depends not only on one's ability to identify someone else's emotions but also on one's capacity to put oneself in the other person's place and to experience an appropriate emotional response. Just as sensitivity to non-verbal cues increases with age, so does empathy: The cognitive and perceptual abilities required for empathy develop only as a child matures... (page 442)*

*In empathy training, for example, each member of the couple is taught to share inner feelings and to listen to and understand the partner's feelings before responding to them. The empathy technique focuses the couple's attention on feelings and requires that they spend more time listening and less time in rebuttal." (page 576).*

Thus empathy does require the communication of feelings AND an agreement on the appropriate outcome of the communicated emotions (=affective

agreement). In the absence of such agreement, we are faced with [inappropriate affect](#) (laughing at a funeral, for instance).

Moreover, empathy does relate to external objects and is provoked by them. There is no empathy in the absence of an empathee. Granted, intersubjectivity is intuitively applied to the inanimate while empathy is applied to the living (animals, humans, even plants). But this is a difference in human preferences - not in definition.

Empathy can, thus, be re-defined as a form of intersubjectivity which involves living things as "objects" to which the communicated intersubjective agreement relates. It is wrong to limit empathy to the communication of emotion. It is the intersubjective, concomitant experience of BEING. The empathor empathizes not only with the empathee's emotions but also with his physical state and other parameters of existence (pain, hunger, thirst, suffocation, sexual pleasure etc.).

This leads to the important (and perhaps intractable) psychophysical question.

Intersubjectivity relates to external objects but the subjects communicate and reach an agreement regarding the way THEY have been affected by the objects.

Empathy relates to external objects (the Others) but the subjects communicate and reach an agreement regarding the way THEY would have felt had they BEEN the object.

This is no minor difference, if it, indeed, exists. But does it really exist?

What is it that we feel in empathy? Is it OUR emotions/sensations merely provoked by an external trigger (classic intersubjectivity) or is it a TRANSFER of the object's feelings/sensations to us?

Such a transfer being physically impossible (as far as we know) - we are forced to adopt the former model. Empathy is the set of reactions - emotional and cognitive - to triggering by an external object (the other). It is the equivalent of resonance in the physical sciences. But we have NO WAY to ascertain the "wavelength" of such resonance is identical in both subjects. In other words, we have no way to verify that the feelings or sensation invoked in the two (or more) subjects are one and the same. What I call "sadness" may not be what you call "sadness". Colours have unique, uniform, independently measurable properties (like energy). Still, no one can prove that what I see as "red" is what another calls "red" (as is the case with Daltonists). If this is true where

"objective", measurable, phenomena are concerned - it is infinitely true in the case of emotions or feelings.

We are, therefore, forced to refine our definition:

Empathy is a form of intersubjectivity which involves living things as "objects" to which the communicated intersubjective agreement relates. It is the intersubjective, concomitant experience of BEING. The empathor empathizes not only with the empathee's emotions but also with his physical state and other parameters of existence (pain, hunger, thirst, suffocation, sexual pleasure etc.).

### ***BUT***

The meaning attributed to the words used by the parties to the intersubjective agreement known as empathy is totally dependent upon each party. The same words are used, the same denotates - but it cannot be proven that the same connotates, the same experiences, emotions and sensations are being discussed or communicated.

Language (and, by extension, art and culture) serve to introduce us to other points of view ("what is it like to be someone else" to paraphrase Thomas Nagle). By providing a bridge between the subjective (inner experience) and the objective (words, images, sounds) -language facilitates social exchange and interaction. It is a dictionary which translates one's subjective private language to the coin of the public medium. Knowledge and language are, thus, the ultimate social glue, though both are based on approximations and guesses (see George Steiner's "After Babel").

But, whereas the intersubjective agreement regarding measurements and observations concerning external objects IS verifiable or falsifiable using INDEPENDENT tools (e.g., lab experiments) - the intersubjective agreement which concerns itself with the emotions, sensations and experiences of subjects as communicated by them IS NOT verifiable or falsifiable using INDEPENDENT tools. The interpretation of this second kind of agreement is dependent upon introspection and an assumption that identical words used by different subjects still possess identical meaning. This assumption is not falsifiable (or verifiable). It is neither true nor false. It is a probabilistic statement with no probabilities attached. It is, in short, a meaningless statement. As a result, empathy itself is meaningless.

In human-speak, if you say that you are said and I empathize with you it means that we have an agreement. I regard you as my object. You communicate to me

a property of yours ("sadness"). This triggers in me a recollection of "what is sadness" or "what is to be sad". I say that I know what you mean, I have been sad before, I know what it is like to be sad. I empathize with you. We agree about being sad. We have an intersubjective agreement.

Alas, such an agreement is meaningless. We cannot (yet) measure sadness, quantify it, crystallize it, access it in any way from the outside. We are totally and absolutely reliant on your introspection and my introspection. There is no way anyone can prove that my "sadness" is even remotely similar to your sadness. I may be feeling or experiencing something that you might find hilarious and not sad at all. Still, I call it "sadness" and I empathize with you.

This would not have been that grave if empathy hadn't been the cornerstone of morality.

**[The Encyclopaedia Britannica, 1999 Edition:](#)**

*"Empathy and other forms of social awareness are important in the development of a moral sense. Morality embraces a person's beliefs about the appropriateness or goodness of what he does, thinks, or feels... Childhood is ... the time at which moral standards begin to develop in a process that often extends well into adulthood. The American psychologist Lawrence Kohlberg hypothesized that people's development of moral standards passes through stages that can be grouped into three moral levels...*

*At the third level, that of postconventional moral reasoning, the adult bases his moral standards on principles that he himself has evaluated and that he accepts as inherently valid, regardless of society's opinion. He is aware of the arbitrary, subjective nature of social standards and rules, which he regards as relative rather than absolute in authority.*

*Thus the bases for justifying moral standards pass from avoidance of punishment to avoidance of adult disapproval and rejection to avoidance of internal guilt and self-recrimination. The person's moral reasoning also moves toward increasingly greater social scope (i.e., including more people and institutions) and greater abstraction (i.e., from reasoning about physical events such as pain or pleasure to reasoning about values, rights, and implicit contracts)."*

But, if moral reasoning is based on introspection and empathy - it is, indeed, dangerously relative and not objective in any known sense of the word. Empathy is a unique agreement on the emotional and experiential content of two or more introspective processes in two or more subjective. Such an agreement can never have any meaning, even as far as the parties to it are concerned. They can never be sure that they are discussing the same emotions or experiences. There is no way to compare, measure, observe, falsify or verify

(prove) that the "same" emotion is experienced identically by the parties to the empathy agreement. Empathy is meaningless and introspection involves a private language despite what Wittgenstein had to say. Morality is thus reduced to a set of meaningless private languages.

The [Encyclopaedia Britannica](#):

*"... Others have argued that because even rather young children are capable of showing empathy with the pain of others, the inhibition of aggressive behaviour arises from this moral affect rather than from the mere anticipation of punishment. Some scientists have found that children differ in their individual capacity for empathy, and, therefore, some children are more sensitive to moral prohibitions than others.*

*Young children's growing awareness of their own emotional states, characteristics, and abilities leads to empathy--i.e., the ability to appreciate the feelings and perspectives of others. Empathy and other forms of social awareness are in turn important in the development of a moral sense... Another important aspect of children's emotional development is the formation of their self-concept, or identity--i.e., their sense of who they are and what their relation to other people is.*

*According to Lipps's concept of empathy, a person appreciates another person's reaction by a projection of the self into the other. In his *Ästhetik*, 2 vol. (1903-06; 'Aesthetics'), he made all appreciation of art dependent upon a similar self-projection into the object."*

This may well be the key. Empathy has little to do with the other person (the empathee). It is simply the result of conditioning and socialization. In other words, when we hurt someone - we don't experience his pain. We experience OUR pain. Hurting somebody - hurts US. The reaction of pain is provoked in US by OUR own actions. We have been taught a learned response of feeling pain when we inflict it upon another. But we have also been taught to feel responsible for our fellow beings (guilt). So, we experience pain whenever another person claims to experience it as well. We feel guilty.

In sum:

To use the example of pain, we experience it in tandem with another person because we feel guilty or somehow responsible for his condition. A learned reaction is activated and we experience (our kind of) pain as well. We communicate it to the other person and an agreement of empathy is struck between us.

We attribute feelings, sensations and experiences to the object of our actions. It is the psychological defence mechanism of projection. Unable to conceive of

inflicting pain upon ourselves - we displace the source. It is the other's pain that we are feeling, we keep telling ourselves, not our own.

The [\*Encyclopaedia Britannica\*](#):

*"Perhaps the most important aspect of children's emotional development is a growing awareness of their own emotional states and the ability to discern and interpret the emotions of others. The last half of the second year is a time when children start becoming aware of their own emotional states, characteristics, abilities, and potential for action; this phenomenon is called self-awareness... (coupled with strong narcissistic behaviours and traits - SV)..."*

*This growing awareness of and ability to recall one's own emotional states leads to empathy, or the ability to appreciate the feelings and perceptions of others. Young children's dawning awareness of their own potential for action inspires them to try to direct (or otherwise affect) the behaviour of others...*

*...With age, children acquire the ability to understand the perspective, or point of view, of other people, a development that is closely linked with the empathic sharing of others' emotions...*

*One major factor underlying these changes is the child's increasing cognitive sophistication. For example, in order to feel the emotion of guilt, a child must appreciate the fact that he could have inhibited a particular action of his that violated a moral standard. The awareness that one can impose a restraint on one's own behaviour requires a certain level of cognitive maturation, and, therefore, the emotion of guilt cannot appear until that competence is attained."*

That empathy is a **REACTION** to external stimuli that is fully contained within the empathor and then projected onto the empathee - is clearly demonstrated by "inborn empathy". It is the ability to exhibit empathy and altruistic behaviour in response to facial expressions. Newborns react this way to their mother's facial expression of sadness or distress.

This serves to prove that empathy has very little to do with the feelings, experiences or sensations of the other (the empathee). Surely, the infant has no idea what it is like to feel sad and definitely not what it is like for his mother to feel sad. In this case, it is a complex reflexive reaction. Later on, empathy is still rather reflexive, the result of conditioning.

The [\*Encyclopaedia Britannica\*](#) quotes fascinating research which dramatically proves the object-independent nature of empathy. Empathy is an internal reaction, an internal process, triggered by external cue provided by animate objects. It is communicated to the empathee-other by the empathor but the

communication and the resulting agreement ("I know how you feel therefore we agree on how you feel") is rendered meaningless by the absence of a monovalent, unambiguous dictionary.

*"An extensive series of studies indicated that positive emotion feelings enhance empathy and altruism. It was shown by the American psychologist Alice M. Isen that relatively small favours or bits of good luck (like finding money in a coin telephone or getting an unexpected gift) induced positive emotion in people and that such emotion regularly increased the subjects' inclination to sympathize or provide help.*

*Several studies have demonstrated that positive emotion facilitates creative problem solving. One of these studies showed that positive emotion enabled subjects to name more uses for common objects. Another showed that positive emotion enhanced creative problem solving by enabling subjects to see relations among objects (and other people - SV) that would otherwise go unnoticed. A number of studies have demonstrated the beneficial effects of positive emotion on thinking, memory, and action in pre-school and older children."*

If empathy increases with positive emotion (a result of good luck, for instance) - then it has little to do with its objects and a lot to do with the person in whom it is provoked.

***ADDENDUM - Interview granted to the National Post, Toronto, Canada, July 2003***

***Q. How important is empathy to proper psychological functioning?***

A. Empathy is more important socially than it is psychologically. The absence of empathy - for instance in the [Narcissistic](#) and Antisocial personality disorders - predisposes people to exploit and abuse others. Empathy is the bedrock of our sense of morality. Arguably, aggressive behavior is as inhibited by empathy at least as much as it is by anticipated punishment.

But the existence of empathy in a person is also a sign of self-awareness, a healthy identity, a well-regulated sense of self-worth, and self-love (in the positive sense). Its absence denotes emotional and cognitive immaturity, an inability to love, to truly relate to others, to respect their boundaries and accept their needs, feelings, hopes, fears, choices, and preferences as autonomous entities.

***Q. How is empathy developed?***

A. It may be innate. Even toddlers seem to empathize with the pain - or happiness - of others (such as their caregivers). Empathy increases as the child forms a self-concept (identity). The more aware the infant is of his or her emotional states, the more he explores his limitations and capabilities - the more prone he is to projecting this new found knowledge unto others. By attributing to people around him his new gained insights about himself, the child develop a moral sense and inhibits his anti-social impulses. The development of empathy is, therefore, a part of the process of socialization.

But, as the American psychologist Carl Rogers taught us, empathy is also learned and inculcated. We are coached to feel guilt and pain when we inflict suffering on another person. Empathy is an attempt to avoid our own self-imposed agony by projecting it onto another.

***Q. Is there an increasing dearth of empathy in society today? Why do you think so?***

A. The social institutions that reified, propagated and administered empathy have imploded. The nuclear family, the closely-knit extended clan, the village, the neighborhood, the Church- have all unraveled. Society is atomized and anomic. The resulting alienation fostered a wave of antisocial behavior, both criminal and "legitimate". The survival value of empathy is on the decline. It is far wiser to be cunning, to cut corners, to deceive, and to abuse - than to be empathic. Empathy has largely dropped from the contemporary curriculum of socialization.

In a desperate attempt to cope with these inexorable processes, behaviors predicated on a lack of empathy have been pathologized and "medicalized". The sad truth is that narcissistic or antisocial conduct is both normative and rational. No amount of "diagnosis", "treatment", and medication can hide or reverse this fact. Ours is a cultural malaise which permeates every single cell and strand of the social fabric.

***Q. Is there any empirical evidence we can point to of a decline in empathy?***

Empathy cannot be measured directly - but only through proxies such as criminality, terrorism, charity, violence, antisocial behavior, related mental health disorders, or abuse.

Moreover, it is extremely difficult to separate the effects of deterrence from the effects of empathy.

If I don't batter my wife, torture animals, or steal - is it because I am empathetic or because I don't want to go to jail?

Rising litigiousness, zero tolerance, and skyrocketing rates of incarceration - as well as the ageing of the population - have sliced intimate partner violence and other forms of crime across the United States in the last decade. But this benevolent decline had nothing to do with increasing empathy.

The statistics are open to interpretation but it would be safe to say that the last century has been the most violent and least empathetic in human history. Wars and terrorism are on the rise, charity giving on the wane (measured as percentage of national wealth), welfare policies are being abolished, Darwinian models of capitalism are spreading. In the last two decades, mental health disorders were added to the Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of the American Psychiatric Association whose hallmark is the lack of empathy. The violence is reflected in our popular culture: movies, video games, and the media.

Empathy - supposedly a spontaneous reaction to the plight of our fellow humans - is now channeled through self-interested and bloated non-government organizations or multilateral outfits. The vibrant world of private empathy has been replaced by faceless state largesse. Pity, mercy, the elation of giving are tax-deductible. It is a sorry sight.

---

*Copyright Notice*

*This material is copyrighted. Free, unrestricted use is allowed on a non commercial basis.*

*The author's name and a link to this Website must be incorporated in any reproduction of the material for any use and by any means.*

<http://samvak.tripod.com/empathy.html>

## **EMPATHY AND AUTHENTIC LEADERSHIP**

Ronald H. Humphrey

Department of Management, School of Business

Virginia Commonwealth University

1015 Floyd Avenue, P. O. Box 844000

Richmond, Virginia 23284-4000

(804) 828-3173

Fax: (804) 828-1602

rhumph1@vcu.edu

Paper submitted to the UNL Gallup Leadership Institute Summit and is downloadable from <http://gli.unl.edu/conference/documents/paper10072.doc>

## **EMPATHY AND AUTHENTIC LEADERSHIP**

### *Abstract*

This paper argues that empathy is one of the most important variables related to authentic leadership. Whether a leader feels empathy or not is likely to play a large role in whether the leader becomes a pseudo-transformational and inauthentic leader, or a truly authentic leader. The paper discusses different conceptualizations of empathy, and examines appropriate ways to measure empathy.

Research on emotional intelligence and leadership is particularly relevant to the theme of this conference, because the literature on emotions truly stretches from the academic world to the popular business press. Salovey and Mayer (1990) first defined emotional intelligence in an academic journal, yet the term only gained widespread usage with the publication of Goleman's (1995) bestselling book, Emotional Intelligence. Soon after Goleman's book, both academic conferences as well as practitioner seminars began to focus on emotions and leadership. Thus this is a good example of how both academicians and practitioners benefit from working together.

Empathy is a key component of both authentic leadership and emotional intelligence. As defined by the conference call for papers, authentic leaders are those who:

- Know who they are and what they believe in.
- Are transparent and show consistency between their values, ethical reasoning and actions.
- Focus on developing positive psychological states such as confidence, optimism, hope, and resilience within themselves and their associates.
- Are widely known and respected for their integrity.

(UNL Gallup Leadership Institute, 2004)

As I will show throughout this paper, empathy is related to authentic leadership, especially when it comes to developing positive psychological states and in acting

ethically. Indeed, I will argue that it is empathy that strongly influences whether a manager or executive uses power wisely and for the benefit of all, or for selfish and unethical purposes.

Goleman, Boyatzis, and McKee (2002), in Primal Leadership, updated the description of the emotionally intelligent leader. Their book makes frequent references to the importance of empathy, and their depiction of the primal leader has some commonality with the above definition of authentic leadership. For example, they also tout the importance of transparency. They state (2002: 47):

Transparency—an authentic openness to others about one’s feelings, beliefs, and actions—allows integrity, or the sense that a leader can be trusted. At a primal level, integrity hinges on impulse control, keeping us from acting in ways that we might regret. Integrity also means that a leader lives his values. Such leaders strike others as genuine because they are not making a pretense of being other than what they are. Integrity, therefore, boils down to one question: Is what you’re doing in keeping with your own values?

Goleman, Boyatzis, and McKee argue that empathy is “the fundamental competence of social awareness” and “the sine qua non of all social effectiveness in working life” (2002: 50). They define empathy as “Sensing others’ emotions, understanding their perspectives, and taking active interest in their concerns” (2002: 39). They also state that “empathy means taking employee’s feelings into thoughtful

consideration and then making intelligent decisions that work those feelings into the response. And, most crucially, empathy makes resonance possible; lacking empathy, leaders act in ways that create dissonance” (2002:50).

Goleman, Boyatzis, and McKee’s (2002) definition of empathy is similar to that developed by traditional academic scholars. In their groundbreaking article on emotional intelligence, Salovey and Mayer defined empathy as “the ability to comprehend another’s feelings and to re-experience them oneself” (1990: 194-195). However, other definitions separate the ability to perceive other’s feelings from the definition of empathy. For example, Plutchik’s (1987) definition emphasizes the sharing of positive and negative emotions that establishes a bond between individuals. Naturally, in order to share emotions, some perception of each other’s emotions, at least unconsciously, if not consciously, must take place. However, there are some theoretical and methodological reasons why researchers might want to separate the ability to comprehend another’s emotions from the definition of empathy.

From a theoretical basis, it is clear that there are some people who are quite able to perceive other people’s feelings, but in fact have no sympathy for others and do not experience shared emotional bonds. For example, people high on Machiavellianism may be good at perceiving other people’s feelings, and may use their knowledge of others’ emotional states to manipulate them. It is well-known that con men are good at perceiving their victims’ emotional states, needs, and worries, but of course lack the ability to truly sympathize with their victims.

Another example of the disjunction between comprehending emotions and sharing them concerns self-monitoring. People high on self-monitoring should also be

good at detecting other's emotions, but it is likely that not everyone good at detecting others' emotions actually feel an emotional bond with others. For example, Sosik, Avolio, and Jung (2002: 217) found that "Self-monitoring was negatively related to ratings of pro-social impression management and positively related to ratings of self-serving impression management. Pro-social impression management related positively to charismatic leadership, which predicted managerial and unit performance." Their research suggests that reading others' emotions will only be beneficial when it is coupled with an empathic, pro-social motivation.

Perhaps one way around the above problem is to define empathy as occurring only when (a) someone comprehends another's feelings and (b) re-experiences the other person's feelings, or shares the other person's feelings in a way that creates a bond between them. In other words, empathy only occurs when both parts (a) and (b) occur, with recognition that some people may score high on comprehension but low on shared emotional experience. Another possibility is to define empathy only in terms of the shared emotional bond, and to treat the ability to comprehend other's feelings as a separate, although highly correlated, variable. The advantage of this second approach is that it could allow us to develop pure measures of the ability to comprehend another's feelings, and pure measures of the tendency to develop shared emotional bonds. Then we could examine the naturally occurring correlation between these two variables, and see how they relate to third variables as well. This may also make it easier to separate empathy from other measures, such as self-monitoring, that also include some items that tap the ability to read other's feelings and emotional states.

Whether leaders both comprehend others' emotions and share them may play a large role in whether they are authentic or inauthentic leaders. Researchers have long noted the importance that transformational leaders put on displaying empathic, caring emotions to their followers (Bass & Avolio, 1994). Dasborough and Ashkanasy (2002) discuss the differences between true transformational leaders and pseudo-transformational leaders. Those who make changes to benefit the organization as a whole are true transformational leaders, whereas those who seek to make changes only to benefit themselves are pseudo-transformational leaders. Dasborough and Ashkanasy (2002) argue that leaders attempt to display emotions that would influence their subordinates' perceptions of them. Successful pseudo-transformational leaders are able to read their followers' emotions and use this information to manipulate their followers. In contrast, true transformational leaders display their real emotions and establish a shared emotional connection with their followers. They also note that followers high on emotional intelligence are less likely to be fooled by inauthentic emotional displays. Jung and Avolio (2001) also found that followers' trust in the leader mediated the relationship between transformational leadership and followers' performance.

The above lines of reasoning lead to the following propositions:

Proposition 1a: Leaders who are high on both (a) comprehending others' feelings, and on (b) re-experiencing others' feelings in a shared emotional bond, are more likely to be true transformational and authentic leaders.

Proposition 1b: Leaders who are high on (a) comprehending others' feelings, but low on (b) re-experiencing others' feelings in a shared

emotional bond, are more likely to be pseudo-transformational and inauthentic leaders.

Proposition 1c: Pseudo-transformational leaders who are low on comprehending others' feelings are more likely to be perceived by their followers as inauthentic leaders.

A second issue in the definition and measurement of empathy concerns the degree to which empathy items assess positive or negative emotions. The early research on empathy was largely done by psychologists in counseling or social services settings. Thus they were concerned with the ability to establish rapport with clients who were experiencing emotional problems like depression or anxiety. Consequently, many of the scales developed to measure empathy contain items that largely tap the ability to feel sad when exposed to others who are also feeling sad. Although this may help develop a therapeutic bond in a clinical setting, it may not measure the most effective emotional response for leaders in a typical work setting. Leaders who respond affirmatively to questions that ask them if they feel sad when others feel sad are likely to be the leaders who are prone to feeling depressed themselves.

This does not mean that effective leaders fail to realize when their employees are feeling discouraged, upset, and demoralized. As Goleman, Boyatzis, and McKee (2002) argue, effective leaders recognize when their followers are upset and publicly acknowledge frustrating events. Effective leaders seek to get their emotions in synchronization with their followers' emotions, and thus create a sense of "resonance" and shared understanding. This means sharing negative emotions to some extent.

However, once effective leaders have established synchronization and a shared understanding, they seek to move their followers from experiencing negative emotions to feeling more productive emotions. Consequently, effective leaders need to have the capacity to feel positive emotions even when those around them are experiencing feelings of frustration and defeat. Instead of items like, “I feel sad when others feel sad,” a more effective item might be, “When others feel sad, I feel sorry for them, and I want to help them feel better.” Items that measure positive emotions directly are also useful, such as, “I feel happy when my team members feel happy.”

Because the early empathy scales developed by psychologists are loaded heavily with items that tap negative feelings, researchers on leadership need to be careful when picking empathy scales. Generally speaking, the leadership researchers have developed better scales for measuring empathy in a positive way (e.g., the ECI, Boyatzis, Goleman, & Rhee, 2000). This leads to the next propositions:

Proposition 2a: Empathy scales that measure the degree to which people experience the negative emotions of others will be weakly or even negatively related to authentic leadership.

Proposition 2b: Empathy scales that measure the degree to which people share positive emotions, or the degree to which people help each other feel better, will be positively related to authentic leadership.

The above section on positive and negative empathy items is based on the premise that empathy plays a role in the leadership process. There are several studies that suggest

that empathy does play a role both in leadership effectiveness and in leadership emergence. Pescosolido (2002) argued that group members high in empathy will be more likely to emerge as informal leaders of work groups. In a qualitative field study of 20 groups, he found that group members high in empathy were more likely to understand group members' emotional reactions to work events, and then to portray the appropriate emotional response to the event. By recognizing group members' emotional uncertainty and role modeling the appropriate response, empathic leaders in his study were able to increase performance and satisfaction with the group.

Kellett, Humphrey, and Sleeth (2002) used an assessment center design to test the relationship between empathy and leadership emergence in small groups. They found that empathy was one of "two routes to leadership." One route was through the performance of complex tasks, whereas the other was through displays of empathy. Although few studies have directly examined the path from empathy to leadership emergence, the size of their standardized path coefficient (.46) suggests that empathy may be a very important overlooked variable. Thus I will conclude the paper with the following proposal:

Proposition 3: Empathy will be one of the most important predictors of whether an authentic leader will emerge in a group.

## REFERENCES

- Bass, B. M., & Avolio, B. J. 1994. Improving organizational effectiveness through transformational leadership. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Boyatzis, R. E., Goleman, D., & Rhee, K. S. 2000. Clustering competence in emotional intelligence: Insights from the Emotional Competence Inventory. In R. Bar-On & J. D. A. Parker (Eds.), The handbook of emotional intelligence: Theory development, assessment, and application at home, school and in the workplace (pp. 343-361). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Dasborough, M. T., & Ashkanasy, N. M. 2002. Emotion and attribution of intentionality in leader-member relationships. Leadership Quarterly, 13(5), 615-634.
- Goleman, D. 1995. Emotional intelligence. New York: Bantam Books.
- Goleman, D., Boyatzis, R., & McKee, A. 2002. Primal leadership. Harvard Business School Press.
- Jung, D. I., Avolio, B. J. 2001. Opening the black box: An experimental investigation of the mediating effects of trust and value congruence on transformational and transactional leadership. Journal of Organizational Behavior, 21: 949-964.
- Kellett, J. B., Humphrey, R. H., & Sleeth, R. G. 2002. Empathy and complex task performance: Two routes to leadership. The Leadership Quarterly, 13(5), 523-544.
- Pescosolido, A. T. (2002). Emergent leaders as managers of group emotion. Leadership Quarterly, 13(5), 583-599.
- Plutchik, R. (1987). Evolutionary bases of empathy. In N. Eisenberg & J. Strayer (Eds.), Empathy and its development (pp. 38-46). New York: Cambridge University

Press.

Salovey, P., & Mayer, J. D. (1990). Emotional intelligence. Imagination, cognition and personality, 9(3), 185-211.

Sosik, J. J., Avolio, B. J., Jung, D. I. 2002. Beneath the mask: Examining the relationship of self-presentation attributes and impression management to charismatic leadership. Leadership Quarterly, 13: 217-242.