The
British
Psychological
Society

www.wileyonlinelibrary.com

Short research note

Development and validation of the Interpersonal Emotion Management Scale

Laura M. Little[1]*, Don Kluemper[2], Debra L. Nelson[3]
and Janaki Gooty[4]

[1]Terry College of Business, University of Georgia, Athens, USA
[2]Northern Illinois University, DeKalb, USA
[3]William S. Spears School of Business, Oklahoma State University, Stillwater, USA
[4]Belk College of Business, University of North Carolina, Charlotte, USA

Interpersonal Emotion Management (IEM) strategies represent behaviours targeted at managing negative emotions in others. This paper describes the development and validation of the four-dimensional IEM strategies scale. Four studies were conducted to assess the psychometric properties of the scale, including content, discriminant, and criterion validity. Results provided strong support for the four-dimensional measure of IEM strategies, distinct from conceptually related constructs, and predictive of subordinates' trust in their supervisor.

Emotion regulation is the manipulation in self *or other* of emotional antecedents or components of the emotional response (Gross & Levenson, 1993); however, the vast majority of empirical studies investigating emotion regulation have focused on managing one's own undesired negative emotions (e.g., Gross, 1998). One's *ability* to manage others' emotions has been investigated (e.g., Mayer, Salovey, & Caruso, 2004; Tett, Fox, & Wang, 2005). Additionally, a few studies have outlined various other-directed emotion management strategies used in specific work contexts (e.g., reciprocal coping strategies in law firms, Lively, 2000; humour in medical interactions, Francis, Monahan, & Berger, 1999; paralegals managing superiors' emotions, Pierce, 1995; customer behaviour impacting cashier emotion, Rafaeli & Sutton, 1990), but no overarching theoretical framework or measure to investigate behavioural strategies aimed at other-directed emotion management has existed until the recent emergence of two frameworks: Williams' (2007) interpersonal emotion management (IEM) framework and Niven, Totterdell, & Holman (2009, 2011) emotion regulation of others and self (EROS).

Building on Gross's (1998) work on emotion regulation of self, Williams (2007) presented a theoretical framework including IEM strategies or specific behavioural

Correspondence should be addressed to Laura M. Little, 408 Brooks Hall, University of Georgia, Athens, GA 30602, USA (e-mail: lmlittle@terry.uga.edu).

strategies used to manage the negative emotions of others. Based on the idea that individuals manage others' emotions at work with the same tactics used to manage their own undesired emotions (Francis, 1997; Lively, 2000; Thoits, 1996), Williams positioned four of Gross' (1998) strategies as behavioural strategies used to help manage perceived threats felt by others. These four strategies are (1) *situation modification* (SM: removing or altering a problem to reduce the emotional impact), (2) *attentional deployment* (AD: directing the target's attention to something more pleasant, (3) *cognitive change* (CC: reappraising a situation as more positive, and (4) *modulating the emotional response* (MER: suppressing emotional *responses*). These strategies are aimed at addressing others' negative emotions (or impending negative emotions) by reducing negative emotions as well as increasing positive emotions in others.

Building on intrinsic affect regulation (Parkinson & Totterdell, 1999) and extrinsic affect regulation (Niven *et al*., 2009), Niven, Totterdell, Stride, and Holman (2011) presented the EROS framework and measure which consists of two broad categories of behaviour (affect-improving and affect-worsening) used intrinsically (on oneself) and extrinsically (on a target). Extrinsic affect improving behaviours include spending time with targets, listening to targets' problems, and giving targets helpful advice. Extrinsic affect worsening behaviours include telling targets their shortcomings and acting annoyed towards them.

In this paper, we develop a measure based on the Williams' (2007) conceptualization to address key issues in the regulation of others' emotions. First, considerable empirical support exists for Gross' fine-grained framework and speaks to the importance of assessing the relative effectiveness of specific strategies (Diefendorff, Richard, & Yang, 2008; Gross & John, 2003). Second, whereas identifying emotion regulation as affect improving and affect worsening implies a single factor model of affect, empirical evidence suggests separate positive and negative factors (Watson & Clark, 1992). Finally, because positive and negative emotions are produced by different neurological processes (Damasio, 1995), different strategies are likely to exist for managing positive, neutral, and negative emotions. For example, an agent may want to 'improve' the affect of angry targets and neutral targets; however, the strategies used would likely vary. Listening to targets' problems and giving advice, for example, don't seem to apply to the latter. Because a more fine-grained approach that specifies the type of emotions being managed could provide a great deal of insight into the most appropriate ways to manage others' emotions, we utilize the Williams' (2007) conceptualization.

Moreover, we recognize the importance of managing negative emotions specifically. Negative emotions occur more frequently and last longer than positive emotions in workplace settings (Dasborough, 2006). Negative emotions are related to negative consequences in the individual experiencing them (Brief & Weiss, 2002); they also lead to distress, absenteeism, and turnover in others (Frost, 2003). Effective management of others' negative emotions in the workplace may be essential in contexts such as customer/client relationships, organizational change, performance feedback, teamwork, and leader–follower relationships.

As shown in Table 1, IEM strategies are specific and distinct from one another, and yet are classified as either antecedent- or response-focused strategies. The antecedent-focused strategies, SM, AD, and CC, involve changing emotions by impacting the cause while the response-focused strategy, MER, involves suppression (Williams, 2007). In IEM, MER manifests as suppression because it, by definition, is impacted by others. Biological modulations (e.g., exercise), are not typically relevant in this other-directed context.

Table 1. IEM strategies, definitions, and examples

Strategy	Definition	Example
Situation modification	Modifying or changing the situation by removing some or all of the emotion provoking elements (Gross, 1998).	A vice president of a large financial institution dealing with anger and frustration felt by clerical workers worked behind the scenes to secure a transfer of one of the clerical workers reporting to a difficult individual (Frost & Robinson, 1999).
Attentional deployment	Selecting which aspects of the situation to focus on by distracting attention away from the elements of a situation that are harmful to goals, concerns, or well-being, or by moving away from the situation entirely (Gross, 1998).	An agent may use humour (acting silly, to make the target laugh) or other means (offering to buy the target a drink) as ways of distracting targets to improve their emotions (Niven *et al.*, 2009).
Cognitive change	Selecting which of many possible meanings will be attached to the situation, reappraising or reinterpreting the situation as having less potential for harm to goals, concerns, and well-being (Gross, 1998).	A supervisor who plays the front man for an abusive CEO. When subordinates get angry with a CEO and vent to this supervisor, he points out that the CEO wants what was best for the organization, reappraising the CEO's demands and intimidation techniques (Frost & Robinson, 1999).
Modulating the emotional response	Suppressing emotional *responses* by directly influencing physiological, experiential, or behavioural responding (Gross, 1998).	To calm down an employee when upset, a supervisor may say something like 'relax' or 'it's not that big of a deal' or 'calm down'.

Although Gross (1998) and others conceptualize emotion regulation exclusively as a general tendency or style, we position IEM strategies similar to other organizationally relevant constructs (e.g., regulatory focus, Johnson, Shull, & Wallace, 2011) that can be measured at different levels such as event-specific, person-specific, and general style. In developing this scale, we investigate IEM as a general tendency because according to a study assessing the consistency of strategies across multiple events using behavioural ratings (average ICC = .50, Little, Kluemper, Nelson, & Ward, 2010), IEM strategies are somewhat stable within agents.

Study hypotheses

Trust has been positioned as a primary outcome of IEM strategies (Williams, 2007). Subordinates' trust in their supervisor, defined as willingness to make themselves vulnerable to their supervisor (Mayer, Davis, & Schoorman, 1995), is particularly important in the workplace because it affects a variety of outcomes including performance (Dirks & Ferrin, 2001). To assess criterion validity of the IEM strategies scale, we investigate the impact of supervisors' use of IEM strategies on their subordinates' trust. Supervisors

who reduce subordinates' negative emotions will increase positive cognitive appraisals and engender perceptions that their behaviour is goal-conducive to the subordinate. In particular, supervisor behaviours aimed at changing subordinate emotions (i.e., antecedent-focused strategies) signal to subordinates that the supervisor cares about the subordinates' well-being and the stressors in their workplace (House, 1981; Lively, 2000). These behaviours will increase subordinate trust in their supervisor.

> *Hypotheses 1–3*: SM (1), AD (2), and CC (3) will positively relate to subordinates' trust in their supervisor.

Because MER involves behaviours aimed at suppressing subordinate's emotions, we do not anticipate the advantages outlined above. Instead, subordinates will interpret the use of MER as lack of concern for their well-being. Studies have shown that students whose parents discouraged the expression of emotion when they were feeling sad, angry, or fearful had higher rates of psychological distress (Garside & Klimes-Dougan, 2002). Distress and negative emotions produced by the use of MER will result in less subordinate trust in the supervisor.

> *Hypothesis 4:* MER will negatively relate to subordinates' trust in their supervisor.

In the sections that follow, we present three studies that adhere to established scale development procedures and support the content and discriminant validity of IEM strategies. Next, we describe a fourth study in which we tested our hypotheses using supervisor and subordinate dyads.

STUDY 1: CONTENT VALIDITY

To represent the four proposed IEM strategies, we developed 32 scale items using theoretical definitions and assessments of related measures (e.g., self-regulation). Content validity was assessed using Hinkin and Tracey's (1999) analysis of variance technique. This technique eliminates subjective judgment for item retention and allows for small samples, providing more conservative means of distinguishing practical significance from statistical significance (Runkel & McGrath, 1972).

Method

Fifty-two undergraduate honours business students (28 males) at a Southeastern US university indicated the extent to which items represented construct definitions. We chose this particular sample because college students are thought to have sufficient intellectual ability to rate the correspondence between items and definitions of theoretical constructs and they typically lack pertinent biases (Hinkin & Tracey, 1999).

Results

Duncan's multiple range tests were used to detect significant differences between the items and the four construct definitions at the $p < .001$ level. The content validity analysis suggested the removal of six items from the scale, resulting in 26 items for further analyses.

STUDY 2: CONFIRMATORY FACTOR ANALYSIS

Method

The 26 items remaining after the content validity study were administered to 290 business students at a different US university in the South. The participants, 140 of which were female, averaged 21.6 years of age and worked, on average, 24 hr per week. Participants were asked to respond to scale items on a 7-point Likert scale.

Results

The results of the confirmatory factor analysis (CFA) supported the overall factor structure; however, we removed four items with significant cross-loadings leaving 22 items (five for AD and CC; six for SM and MER). For SM and MER, we selected five high-loading items, resulting in a 20-item scale with acceptable fit (Marsh, Hua, & Wen, 2004; $\chi^2 = 372$, $df = 164$, CFI $= .91$, RMSEA $= .06$, SRMR $= .06$) shown with factor loadings from studies 2–4 in Table 2.

STUDY 3: DISCRIMANT VALIDITY

We also assessed discriminant validity to distinguish the IEM strategies scale from the six closely related constructs: perspective taking, empathic concern, emotion regulation of self reappraisal and suppression, and self-reported and ability-based emotional intelligence. Below, we present the related constructs and explain their inclusion in this study by outlining the conceptual reasons that they are similar, yet distinct as well as their expected relationship with the IEM strategies.

Perspective taking and empathic concern

Perspective taking is an intrapsychic process of imagining another's thoughts, motives, or feelings from that person's point of view and empathic concern is emotional reactivity to others' points of view (Davis, 1996; Mead, 1934). These mechanisms allow individuals to have forethought, understand the meaning a situation has for another, and feel for others (Mead, 1934). Williams (2007) theorizes that being able to understand the meaning a situation has for another should increase the use of antecedent-focused strategies. This understanding should also reduce the use of response-focused strategies. However, these constructs should still be distinct as they reside in a different domain than IEM strategies (intrapsychic vs. behavioural).

Emotion regulation of self

As mentioned above, IEM strategies were derived from emotion regulation of self strategies (Gross, 1998) because it is thought that individuals manage others' emotions at work using the same tactics that they use to manage their own emotions (Francis, 1997; Lively, 2000; Thoits, 1996; Williams, 2007). Thus, the antecedent-focused strategy of reappraisal should be positively related to antecedent-focused IEM strategies (SM, AD, CC) while the response-focused strategy (suppression) should be positively related to the response-focused IEM strategy (MER); however, these strategies should also be distinct given the different referent (self vs. other).

Table 2. IEM strategies scale and factor loadings from studies 2–4

	Study 2				Study 3				Study 4			
	FI	F2	F3	F4	FI	F2	F3	F4	FI	F2	F3	F4
Situation modification												
I modify the elements of the situation that are having an undesired impact on others.	.70				.61				.59			
I work out plans to remove the negative aspects of situations.	.52				.47				.82			
I remove the negative aspects of the situation that are negatively impacting others.	.53				.66				.84			
I change the situation to alter its emotional impact.	.90				.77				.79			
I take actions to get rid of the problems others are having.	.75				.67				.69			
Attentional deployment												
When a situation is disturbing others, I focus their attention away from the troubling aspect of the problem.		.67				.64				.82		
I refocus the conversation towards aspects of the situation that others should find more appealing.		.70				.60				.76		
I distract others' attention from the aspect of the problem causing their undesired emotions.		.71				.70				.66		
When a situation is unpleasant to others, I refocus them by discussing positive issues.		.64				.66				.78		
When I think a situation will cause an undesirable emotion in others, I distract them from focusing on the negative aspects of that situation.		.70				.80				.70		
Cognitive change												
When I want others to feel more positive emotions (such as joy or amusement), I put their problems into perspective.			.60				.80				.50	
I try to influence the emotions of others by changing how they think about the situation they are in.			.77				.55				.59	

Table 2. (*Continued*)

	Study 2				Study 3				Study 4			
	F1	F2	F3	F4	F1	F2	F3	F4	F1	F2	F3	F4
When I want others to feel less negative emotion (such as sadness or anger), I change the meaning they are attaching to a situation.			.78				.65				.93	
When I want others to feel more positive emotion (such as joy or amusement), I change the meaning they are attaching to the situation.			.73				.68				.92	
When I want others to feel less negative emotion (such as sadness or anger), I put their problems into perspective.			.32				.75				.63	
Modifying the emotional response												
When others are experiencing undesirable emotions, I tell them not to express them.				.64				.65				.90
I encourage others to keep their emotions to themselves.				.37				.31				.96
When others with whom I am interacting are 'venting' about a problem, I get them to stop.				.36				.50				.82
When others are experiencing undesirable emotions, I suggest strategies for them to suppress these emotions.				.79				.83				.64
I encourage others not to express their emotions.				.43				.44				.93

Note. Study 2 $N = 379$; Study 3 $N = 196$; Study 4 $N = 118$.
INSTRUCTIONS: This survey addresses your behaviour directed at others. Specifically, we are interested in your behaviour when you think a situation may cause another individual to feel a negative emotion or when another is experiencing negative emotions. During these types of situations, how do YOU behave towards others at work? Please indicate the degree of agreement or disagreement with the following statements using the scale provided. (Respondents were asked to indicate their agreement from 1 'strongly disagree' to 7 indicating 'strongly agree'.)

Emotional intelligence

Emotional intelligence (EI) is defined as a broad ability to perceive, facilitate, understand, and manage self and others' emotions (Mayer *et al.*, 2004). EI represents one's resources or one's innate ability (Mayer, Salovey, Caruso, & Sitarenios, 2001). IEM strategies consist of specific behavioural strategies aimed at managing others' undesired, negative

emotions. Like perspective taking and empathic concern, EI should be positively related to the antecedent-focused strategies and negatively related to the response-focused strategy. However, IEM strategies are differentiated from EI in the same way that emotion regulation of self is differentiated from EI: there is a clear distinction between construct domains (ability vs. behaviour).

Method

Participants were 196 job incumbents who attended classes at a Southern US university. The participants, of which 93 were female, averaged 21.9 years of age, were currently employed in a diverse sample of organizations, and worked a minimum of 20 hr per week ($M = 27$ hr, range 20–60).

Empathy was measured with the empathic concern and perspective taking sub-scales from Davis's (1980) Interpersonal Reactivity Index. Empathic concern consists of seven items including 'I often have tender, concerned feelings for people less fortunate than me'. Perspective taking consists of seven items including 'I try to look at everybody's side of a disagreement before I make a decision'. Emotion regulation of self (reappraisal and suppression) was measured using Gross and John's (2003) scale. Reappraisal consists of six items including 'I control my emotions by changing the way I think about the situation I'm in'. Suppression consists of four items including 'I keep my emotions to myself'.

Ability-based emotional intelligence was assessed with the 30-item Situational Test of Emotion Management (STEM) developed by MacCann and Roberts (2008). A sample item reads: 'Lee's workmate fails to deliver an important piece of information on time causing Lee to fall behind schedule also. What action would be the most effective for Lee?' The four behavioural alternatives offered with the question are: '(a) Work harder to compensate (0)'; '(b) Get angry with the workmate (0)'; '(c) Explain the urgency of the situation to the workmate (1)'; and '(d) Never rely on that workmate again (0)'. The numbers in the parentheses represent the proportion of experts who selected the option.

Self-reported emotional intelligence was measured using Brackett, Rivers, Shiffman, Lerner, and Salovey's (2006) 19-item scale. It assesses the following facets of EI: perceiving emotions in self and others, using emotions to facilitate thought, understanding emotions, and managing emotions in self and others. Participants responded to questions such as 'By looking at people's facial expressions, I recognize the emotions they are experiencing'.

Results

CFA results for the four IEM strategies demonstrated acceptable fit with satisfactory composite reliabilities and average variance extracted estimates (Fornell & Larker, 1981). A series of chi-square differences tests were conducted including the IEM strategies and each related construct. Each successive model (including the IEM strategies and one other construct, shown in Table 3) demonstrated good fit and discriminant validity from the related constructs. Chi-square difference tests investigating four factor models in which each related construct was loaded on each IEM strategy were supportive of the discriminant validity of the IEM strategies scale.[1] Factor loadings can be found in Table 2 and descriptive statistics and bivariate correlations can be found in Table 4.

---

[1] *The specific results of the chi square difference tests are available from the first author upon request.*

Table 3. CFA results for discriminant validity study (Study 3)

Model	χ^2	df	CFI	RMSEA	SRMR
4 IEM factors	306*	164	.92	.067	.069
5 factor – 4 IEMs + perspective taking	535*	314	.92	.060	.071
5 factor – 4 IEMs + empathic concern	500*	314	.92	.055	.069
5 factor – 4 IEMs + ERQ reappraisal	507*	289	.91	.062	.073
5 factor – 4 IEMs + ERQ suppression	447*	242	.91	.066	.075
5 factor – 4 IEMs + EI ability	1,557*	1,165	.92	.042	.069
5 factor – 4 IEMs + EI self-report-perceive	425*	242	.92	.062	.072
5 factor – 4 IEMs + EI self-report-use in thought	406*	220	.91	.066	.070
5 factor – 4 IEMs + EI self-report-understand	450*	242	.90	.066	.069
5 factor – 4 IEMs + EI self-report-management	592*	335	.91	.063	.074

Note. $^*p < .001$. $N = 196$; RMSEA, Root mean square error of approximation; SRMR, standardized root-mean-squared residual; CFI, comparative fit index.

As expected, perspective taking, empathic concern, reappraisal and both measures of EI were positively correlated with the antecedent-focused strategies (SM, AD, and CC) and negatively correlated with MER. Suppression was significantly and positively correlated with MER and negatively correlated with SM and AD.

STUDY 4: CRITERION VALIDITY

Method

In order to investigate the criterion validity of the IEM strategies scale, we collected data from supervisor/subordinate dyads ($N = 118$) who were recruited by students at a Northeastern US university using the targeted sampling technique (Watters & Biernacki, 1989). The supervisory participants, 42 of whom were female, averaged 42.68 years of age. The subordinates, 62 of whom were female, averaged 34.10 years old and had an average tenure with the organization of 6.29 years, tenure with the supervisor of 3.86 years, and were employed in a diverse sample of jobs (41% sales, service or maintenance, 13% clerical, 16% technical, 26% administrative, and 22% other). Supervisors completed the IEM strategies scale directed towards their subordinate and subordinates indicated their trust in their supervisor using Mayer and Gavin's (2005) 10-item trust scale.

Results

To, again, confirm the factor structure of the IEM strategies scale, we conducted a CFA. Results supported four dimensions ($\chi^2 = 346$, $df = 164$, CFI $= .92$, RMSEA $= .08$, SRMR $= .09$). Significant decrements in model fit were observed with all combinations of combined factors. Factor loading can be found in Table 2 and descriptive statistics can be found in Table 5. Results of a regression analysis (see Table 6) supported hypotheses 1, 3, and 4 in that SM ($\beta = .19$, $p < .05$) and CC ($\beta = .22$, $p < .05$) positively impacted trust in one's supervisor while MER ($\beta = -.21$, $p < .05$) negatively impacted trust in one's supervisor. Hypothesis 2 was not supported in that AD did not impact trust in one's supervisor ($\beta = -.05$, *ns*).

Table 4. Descriptive statistics and bivariate correlations from discriminant validity tests (Study 3)

Variable	M	SD	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
1 Situation modification	3.77	.50	(.71)									
2 Attentional deployment	3.67	.55	.47*	(.70)								
3 Cognitive change	3.57	.57	.44*	.45*	(.70)							
4 Modulating the emotional response	2.40	.76	−.27*	−.22*	−.12	(.79)						
5 Perspective taking	3.57	.60	.37*	.29*	.37*	−.27*	(.80)					
6 Empathic concern	3.62	.55	.31*	.33*	.24*	−.32*	.45*	(.74)				
7 ERQ Reap	3.53	.57	.31*	.31*	.37*	−.19*	.24*	.17*	(.75)			
8 ERQ Supp	2.73	.73	−.18*	−.18*	−.07	.54*	−.08	−.20*	−.15*	(.69)		
9 EI–Ability	4.31	.45	.35*	.25*	.29*	−.52*	.25*	.31*	.34*	−.33*	(.86)	
10 EI–Self-report	3.49	.39	.46*	.48*	.45*	−.43*	.40*	.30*	.44*	−.31*	.38*	(.76)

Note. $N = 196$, $^* p < .05$; Coefficient alphas are in parentheses.
ERQ Reap, emotion regulation of self (reappraisal); ERQ Supp, emotion regulation of self (suppression); EI–Ability, Ability-based emotional intelligence; EI–Self-report, self-reported emotional intelligence.

Table 5. Descriptive statistics and bivariate correlations from criterion validity tests (Study 4)

	Variable	M	SD	1	2	3	4	5
1	Situation modification	5.05	1.07	(.86)				
2	Attentional deployment	3.67	1.18	.34*	(.86)			
3	Cognitive change	4.56	1.07	.24*	.47*	(.84)		
4	Modulating the emotional response	2.50	1.39	.05	.31*	−.12	(.92)	
5	Trust in one's supervisor	3.58	.59	.22*	.05	.22*	−.20*	(.77)

Note. $N = 118$, *$p < .05$; Coefficient alphas are in parentheses.

Table 6. Regression of IEM strategies on Trust (Study 4)

	Trust		
	β	t-test	R^2
Situation modification	.19	2.16*	
Cognitive change	.22	2.08*	
Attentional deployment	−.05	−.49	
Modulating the emotional response	−.21	−2.23*	
			.13**

Note. $N = 118$; *$p < .05$, **$p < .01$.

GENERAL DISCUSSION

In this paper, we developed a 20-item IEM strategies scale for use in organizational research. Results indicated support for the psychometric properties of the measure. Results of discriminant validity tests provided support for its distinctiveness and an indication as to the nomological network of the IEM strategies. As expected, perspective taking, empathy, and emotional intelligence were positively related to SM, AD, and CC and negatively related to MER. This suggests that individuals who are adept at recognizing and managing emotions use the antecedent-focused strategies more often and suppression less often. The emotion regulation of self strategies (reappraisal, representing antecedent focus strategies, and suppression) correlated with like IEM strategies supporting the notion that individuals manage others' emotions with the same tactics used to manage their own undesired emotions.

The results of study 4 reveal that when supervisors alter the problem that is causing a negative emotional response (SM) or reappraise the problem causing the negative emotional response (CC), subordinates are more willing to make themselves vulnerable to them. Distracting the subordinate did not have the same impact, perhaps because AD does not provide enough cognitive information to alter one's perception of supervisory trust. If employees are unaware their supervisor is distracting them, this may be a successful strategy; however, if subordinates are aware, they may believe their feelings are not important to their supervisor. MER reduced the subordinate's trust in the supervisor. This strategy may send signals to subordinates that their supervisor does not care about their feelings, which reduces subordinates' willingness to trust the supervisor.

Study 4 also supported the use of IEM strategies in leader–follower relationships, but the IEM strategies scale could also be used to examine how employees manage coworkers', leaders', and customers' negative emotions at work. Others' negative

emotions are related to many organizationally relevant outcomes, and understanding how employees can successfully manage these emotions should be studied further. The relationship between IEM strategies and EI should also be investigated further. Understanding how EI impacts outcomes through IEM strategies could help explain many unanswered questions. Research should examine how the deployment of the IEM strategies affects the agent. Do attempts at managing others' emotions draw upon the agent's energy resources? Or, on the other hand, does the perceived prosocial impact of IEM strategies decrease the likelihood of burnout (Grant & Sonnentag, 2010)?

IEM strategies, like emotion regulation of self strategies, are focused on the management of undesired negative emotions. Future studies could investigate the regulation of undesired positive emotions. Additionally, consistent with emotion regulation of self, the IEM strategies scale measures a general tendency; however, future research should test the viability of using a modified IEM strategies scale at the person-specific level as well as the event-specific level. Studying these strategies at the event level could result in more specific information as to how these behaviours impact targets' emotions and emotional reactions directly.

In conclusion, despite a clear acknowledgement in the literature regarding both self and other emotion regulation, the focus has been almost exclusively on the self. To help fill this gap, we developed a psychometrically sound and theoretically grounded measure of IEM strategies that differentially relates to related constructs and predicts organizationally relevant criteria. Future research should continue to investigate the utility and effectiveness of these four strategies.

Acknowledgement

References

Brackett, M., Rivers, S., Shiffman, S., Lerner, N., & Salovey, P. (2006). Relating emotional abilities to social functioning: A comparison of self-report and performance measures of emotional intelligence. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 91*, 780.

Brief, A. P., & Weiss, H. M. (2002). Organizational behavior: Affect in the workplace. *Annual Review of Psychology, 53*, 279–308.

Damasio, A. R. (1995). *Descartes Error: Emotions, reason, and the human brain*. New York, NY: Penguin Putnam.

Dasborough, M. (2006). Cognitive asymmetry in employee emotional reactions to leadership behaviors. *Leadership Quarterly, 17*, 163–178.

Davis, M. (1980). A multidimensional approach to individual differences in empathy. *JSAS Catalog of Selected Documents in Psychology, 10*, 85.

Davis, M. (1996). *Empathy: A social psychological approach*. Boulder, CO: Westview Press.

Diefendorff, J. M., Richard, E. M., & Yang, J. (2008). Linking emotion regulation strategies to affective events and negative emotions at work. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 73*, 498–508.

Dirks, K., & Ferrin, D. (2001). The role of trust in organizational settings. *Organization Science, 12*, 450–467.

Fornell, C., & Larker, D. F. (1981). Evaluating structural equation models with unobservable variables and measurement error. *Journal of Marketing Research, 28*, 39–50.

Francis, L. E. (1997). Ideology and interpersonal emotion management: Redefining identity in two support groups. *Social Psychology Quarterly, 60*, 153–171.

Frost, P. J. (2003). *Toxic emotions at work*. Boston: Harvard Business School Press.

Frost, P., & Robinson, S. (1999). The toxic handler: Organizational hero and casualty. *Harvard Business Review, 77*, 96–106.

Garside, R., & Klimes-Dougan, B. (2002). Socialization of discrete negative emotions: Gender differences and links with psychological distress. *Sex Roles, 47*, 115–128.

Grant, A. M., & Sonnentag, S. (2010). Doing good buffers against feeling bad: Prosocial impact compensates for negative task and self-evaluations. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes, 111*, 13–22.

Gross, J. J. (1998). The emerging field of emotion management: An integrative review. *Review of General Psychology, 2*, 271–299.

Gross, J. J., & John, O. P. (2003). Individual differences in two emotion management processes: Implications for affect, relationships, and well-being. *Journal of Personality & Social Psychology, 85*, 348–362.

Gross, J. J., & Levenson, R. W. (1993). Emotional suppression: Physiology, self-report, and expressive behavior. *Journal of Personality & Social Psychology, 64*, 970–986.

Hinkin, T. R., & Tracey, J. B. (1999). An analysis of variance approach to content validation. *Organizational Research Methods, 2*, 175.

House, J. (1981). *Work stress and social support*. Reading, MA: Addison Wesley Publishing Company.

Johnson, P. D., Shull, A., & Wallace, J. C. (2011). Regulatory focus as a mediator in goal orientation and performance relationships. *Journal of Organizational Behavior, 32*, 751–766.

Little, L. M., Kluemper, D., Ward, A. J., & Nelson, D. (2010). Managing customer emotions. Presented at the 2010 Academy of Management Meetings, Montreal, Canada.

Lively, K. (2000). Reciprocal emotion management: Working together to maintain stratification in private law firms. *Work and Occupations, 27*, 32.

MacCann, C., & Roberts, R. (2008). New paradigms for assessing emotional intelligence: Theory and data. *Emotion, 8*, 540–551.

Marsh, H. W., Hua, K., & Wen, Z. (2004). In search of golden rules: Comment on hypothesis-testing approaches to setting cutoff values for fit indexes and dangers in overgeneralizing Hu and Bentler's (1999) findings. *Structural Equation Modeling, 11*, 320–341.

Mayer, J. D., Salovey, P., & Caruso, D. R. (2004). Emotional intelligence: Theory, findings, and implications. *Psychological Inquiry, 15*, 197–215.

Mayer, J. D., Salovey, P., Caruso, D. R., & Sitarenios, G. (2001). Emotional intelligence as a standard intelligence. *Emotion, 1*, 232–242.

Mayer, R., Davis, J., & Schoorman, F. (1995). An integration model of organizational trust. *Academy of Management Review, 20*, 709–735.

Mayer, R., & Gavin, M. (2005). Trust in management and performance: Who minds the shop while employees watch the boss? *Academy of Management Journal, 48*, 874–888.

Mead, G. (1934). *Mind, self & society from the standpoint of a social behaviorist*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Niven, K., Totterdell, P., & Holman, D. (2009). A classification of controlled interpersonal affect management strategies. *Emotion, 9*, 498–509.

Niven, K., Totterdell, P., Stride, C., & Holman, D. (2011). Emotion Regulation of Others and Self (EROS): The development and validation of a new individual difference measure. *Current Psychology, 30*, 53–73.

Parkinson, B., & Totterdell, P. (1999). Classifying affect-regulation strategies. *Cognition & Emotion, 13*(3), 277–303.

Pierce, J. (1995). *Gender trials: Emotional lives in contemporary law firms*. Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press.

Rafaeli, A., & Sutton, R. I. (1990). Busy stores and demanding customers: How do they affect the display of positive emotion? *Academy of Management Journal, 13*(3), 623–637.

Runkel, P. J., & McGrath, J. E. (1972). *Research on human behavior*. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.

Tett, R. P., Fox, K. E., & Wang, A. (2005). Development and validation of a self-report measure of emotional intelligence as a multidimensional trait domain. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 31*(7), 859–888.

Thoits, P. A. (1996). Managing the emotions of others. *Symbolic Interaction, 19*, 85–109.

Watson, D., & Clark, L. A. (1992). Affects separable and inseparable: On the hierarchical arrangement of the negative affects. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 62*(3), 489–505.

Watters, J. K., & Biernacki, P. (1989). Targeted sampling: Options for the study of hidden populations. *Social Problems, 36*, 416–430.

Williams, M. (2007). Building genuine trust through interpersonal emotion management: A threat management model of trust and collaboration across boundaries. *Academy of Management Review, 32*, 595–621.