UNIVERSITY OF OKLAHOMA

GRADUATE COLLEGE

EXAMINING THE COMPLEXITIES OF EMOTION REGULATION IN THE WORKPLACE: THE DEVELOPMENT AND VALIDATION OF THE WORKPLACE EMOTION REGULATION PREFERENCE INVENTORY

A DISSERTATION

SUBMITTED TO THE GRADUATE FACULTY

in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the

Degree of

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

By

JOSHUA L. DAVIS
Norman, Oklahoma
2009

Downloaded from SHAREOK. Persistent Handle URL: https://hdl.handle.net/11244/319262

EXAMINING THE COMPLEXITIES OF EMOTION REGULATION IN THE WORKPLACE: THE DEVELOPMENT AND VALIDATION OF THE WORKPLACE EMOTION REGULATION PREFERENCE INVENTORY

A DISSERTATION APPROVED FOR THE
DEPARTMENT OF PSYCHOLOGY

BY

_____
Dr. Shane Connelly

_____
Dr. Michael Buckley

_____
Dr. Lori Anderson Snyder

_____
Dr. Calvin Stoltenberg

_____
Dr. Robert Terry

© Copyright by JOSHUA L. DAVIS 2009
All Rights Reserved.

Acknowledgements

First, I extend my gratitude to my advisor Dr. Shane Connelly. I would not have reached my goals without her knowledge and guidance. I have grown and developed both personally and professionally throughout my graduate training, directly due to her mentorship.

To my committee members Drs., Michael Buckley, Lori Anderson Snyder, Calvin Stoltenberg, and Robert Terry thank you for being a part of my graduate training. Each of you uniquely and substantially contributed to my education, knowledge, and goals. To the entire psychology faculty of OU, and specifically Dr. Michael Mumford, I have valued your knowledge, advice, and guidance.

I also would like to thank my colleagues and friends Amanda Angie, Ethan Waples, Vykinta Kligte, and Greg Ruark for their contributions to this project, for their mentorship, and their friendship as well. I would also like to thank Lauren Blackwell, Erica Hauk, and Chase Thiel for there for their substantial contributions on this project.

I extend my sincere gratitude to my family and friends who have whole-heartily supported my endeavors. In particular, I would like to acknowledge my parents Dr. Daniel Davis and LeAnn Davis, and my grandparents Bill and Jane Davis for their support. Their love and pride for me provided the inspiration to not only set, but also achieve my goals.

Finally, words cannot express my gratitude for my loving wife Prutha. I could not have been successful without the love, patience, and understanding from her. Thank you for your sacrifices, dedication, and support for me throughout this experience.

Table of Contents

Acknowledgements iv
Table of Tables vii
Abstract viii
Introduction 1
Affective Events 2
Emotion Regulation 4
Individual Well-Being Consequences of Emotion Regulation 9
Job satisfaction. 9
Life Satisfaction. 14
Customer Service Performance 19
Individual Differences in Regulation Strategy Tendencies 24
Method 25
Participants 25
WERPI Development 26
Reference Measures 32
Emotion regulation and study control measures. 32
Convergent validation and discriminant validation measures. 33
Consequences of Emotion Regulation 36
Analyses Overview 38
Results 39
Reliability 39
Descriptive Statistics 40
WERPI Intra-scale Correlations 41
Reference Measure Correlations 41
Regulation Strategies and Job Satisfaction 46
WERPI Regulation Strategies and Life Satisfaction 49
WERPI Regulation Strategies and Customer Service Performance 51
Cluster Analysis 57
Emotion regulation strategy profiles. 58

Demographic information analyses 60
Cluster Profile differences in Well-being 60
Cluster Profile differences in Customer Service Performance 61
Discussion 62
Reference Measure Relationships 64
Consequences of Emotion Regulation 65
Job satisfaction. 65
Life satisfaction. 67
Customer service. 67
Preferences in emotion regulation. 69
Limitations 72
Future Directions 74
References 77
Appendix A 105
Appendix B 106
Appendix C 107
Appendix D 109
Appendix E 110
Appendix F 111
Appendix G 112
Appendix H 115
Appendix I 116

Table of Tables

Table 1. Sample Population Demographic Information 94
Table 2. Percent Emotion Regulation Response Strategies Endorsed in Negative Events 95
Table 3. WERPI Intra-scale Correlations 96
Table 4. Correlations between WERPI Scales and Reference Measures 97
Table 5. Correlation between WERPI Scales and Outcome Measures 100
Table 6. Summarized Regression Results on Well-being Outcome Measures 101
Table 7. Summarized Regression Results on Customer Service Performance 102
Table 8. Group Means on Emotion Regulation Strategy by Cluster 103
Table 9. Cluster Emotion Regulation Strategy Profiles 104

Abstract

The purpose of this study is to examine how several categories of emotion regulation strategies are related to satisfaction and performance outcomes. A measure of workplace emotion regulation was developed and validated with respect to a battery of reference measures, as well as life satisfaction, job satisfaction, and performance on a series of customer service scenarios. Overall, the results of this study showed that different categories of regulation strategies such as situation modification, situation selection, attention deployment, cognitive change, and response modulation show different relationships with job satisfaction, life satisfaction, and simulated customer service performance. Furthermore, cluster analysis indicated clear sets of preferences in emotion regulation. The four groups identified in this analysis showed significantly different means on the outcomes of interest, suggesting that individual differences in regulation preferences may be important to consider. Test development procedures as well as theoretical and practical implications of findings are discussed.

Examining the Complexities of Emotion Regulation in the Workplace: The Development and Initial Validation of the Workplace Emotion Regulation Preference Inventory (WERPI)

Introduction

Emotions are considered vital to both individual and organizational performance, in addition to employee well-being (Grandey & Brauburger, 2002). Consequently, emotions are routinely incorporated into numerous areas of organizational research including decision-making, interpersonal behaviors, creativity, problem solving, negotiation, citizenship withdraw behaviors, job attitudes and job satisfaction (Brief & Weiss, 2002; Straw & Barsade, 1993). Emotions are also considered a significant factor in the perceptions of customer service quality, and employee customer service performance (Barger & Grandey, 2006; Rafaeli & Sutton, 1989; Pugh, 2001).

The complexities of both the causes and consequences of emotions in the workplace, lead individuals to experience a wide range of emotions at work, caused by a number of unique affective events. Because individuals do not experience and respond to affective events and to emotions in the same way (Muchinsky, 2000), researchers have begun to recognize the importance of studying emotion regulation mechanisms to understand how individuals manage the emotional events at work (e.g. Bono, Foldes, Vinson, & Muros, 2007; Callahan, 2000; Côté & Morgan, 2002; Grandey, 2000; Grandey, Fisk, & Steiner (in press); Morris & Feldman, 1997; Zammuner & Gali, 2005). Theories of emotion regulation provides potential

frameworks to systematically study how people deal with emotions triggered by affective events and consequences associated with various regulation strategies.

The general need for emotion regulation in the workplace is rarely questioned. Nevertheless, there exists a need to understand the complex nature of emotion regulation in the context of the work environment, including the influences of both the individual's emotion regulation tendencies and the nature of affective events. Thus, the purpose of this study is to provide insight into the relationships of categories of emotion regulation strategies in the workplace to satisfaction and performance outcomes, while providing initial validation evidence for a new measure of emotion regulation in the workplace. Specifically, this study investigates how particular categories of emotion regulation strategies (e.g. cognitive change, situation selection) relate to an individual's overall well-being, job satisfaction, and customer service performance, with respect to overall quality, approach style, and communication effectiveness.

Affective Events

Affective Events Theory (AET) (Weiss & Cropanzano, 1996) provides a useful rationale and a framework for linking workplace features and events to employee emotional reactions and behavior. The essential components to this theory amount to the simultaneous influence of features of the work environment, unique work events, and affective dispositions, all working together to lead to an affective state. It is the experience of the affective state that results in either affective driven behaviors, or the formation of work attitudes, which then in turn lead to judgment driven behaviors.

Affective job events are incidents that stimulate the appraisal and emotional reaction to a transitory or ongoing job related agent, object or event (Basch & Fisher, 2000). They are happenings in the work environment that members consider important or relevant to the organizational environment and their role, which elicit an emotional reaction. Distinct events can elicit unique emotions (Izard, 1991) with immediate consequences, however the cumulative effects of felt emotions may lead to general outcomes, such as job satisfaction, organizational commitment, and intention to quit (Fisher, 1998).

Empirical research regarding the nature of affective events has emerged in both qualitative (e.g. Basch & Fisher, 2000; Grandey, Tam, & Brauburger, 2002) and quantitative studies (e.g. Miner, Glomb, & Hulin, 2005). However, to date there seems to be no widely accepted extensive categorization of emotion eliciting job events. For that reason, in the current study, a broader more basic framework of *task events* and *interpersonal events* was evoked. This categorization of events emerged from a number of sources regarding affective events, including AET and emotional labor studies, where triggers of emotional events were described (e.g. Basch & Fisher, 2000; Diefendorff, Richard & Yang, 2008; Weiss & Cropanzano, 1996). Task-based affective events reflect affective events where the emotion yields from a specific job related task, (i.e. unit of work, or activity that is needed to produce some result). For example, having to use a frustrating, error ridden computer program, or having to meet an urgent deadline for a client report. Interpersonally-based events concern affective events where the emotion is generated from a social interaction, such as a situation involving a

difficult co-worker, or boss. For example, when a coworker does not complete their responsibilities for a project one may feel angry or frustrated.

This is important to consider because the type of affective event may give rise to individuals responding differently in how they handle their emotions. Additionally, the effects of how one handles emotions within these contexts may have unique consequences. The effects of emotion regulation processes may be considered situationally optimal depending upon the individual's goals and the aspects of the surrounding environment, as evidenced by the coping literature (Folkman, Lazarus, Gruen, & DeLongis, 1986). Therefore, in the current study, the context of the work event will be accounted for using the aforementioned categorization of task and interpersonal job events. We expect that there will be differences in how individuals regulate their emotions in different types of affective events, as well as differences on the effectiveness of the strategies in different affective events.

Emotion Regulation

A number of different approaches exist to investigate how individuals control or utilize emotions in the workplace (e.g. emotional intelligence, emotional labor, emotional competence, emotion management). Emotion regulation provides one general framework to address how individuals manage emotional events. Emotion regulation is generally defined as the "process by which individuals influence which emotions they have, when they have them, and how they experience and express these emotions" (Gross, 1998).

Having emerged from a number of research streams; such as defense mechanisms (e.g. Freud, 1926), stress and coping (Lazarus, 1966), and a number of

various emotion theories (e.g. Frijda, 1986) emotion regulation is consequently explained by a number of different models and theories (e.g. Larsen, Diener, & Lucas, 2002; Lazarus, 1984; 1991; Levenson, 1994; Walden & Smith, 1997; Wegner, 1994), residing in a variety of subfields in psychology. All of these perspectives generally suggest that the emotion regulation process encompasses the entire duration of the emotion, from the appraisal of the emotionally evocative event, to the expression of the emotion and the related outcomes. In these models, a number of conscious, unconscious, physical, cognitive, and behavioral processes are involved in the experience of emotion, and at any point the type, intensity, or the manifestation of the emotion may be altered by an emotion regulation strategy.

One of the most widely utilized and well-researched model of emotion regulation is Gross's (1998) model. Gross's model is utilized as the guiding framework in this study for examining the complexities of emotion regulation in the workplace, and as well as for test development. Gross's model is appropriate for our purposes for its process orientation, its empirical founding, as well as its capacity to fit within other relevant frameworks.

In Gross's (1998) model, emotion regulation strategies are organized into a conceptual framework whereby various strategies influence the emotion generative process at specific points, increasing, decreasing, or altering felt emotions. At the broadest conceptualization, this model groups regulation strategies into antecedent and response strategies. Antecedent focused emotion regulation strategies occur before emotion appraisals give rise to responses, whereas response focused strategies occur after the emotional response has been manifested (Gross & Munoz, 1995). Gross's

model suggests a series of recursive sequential processes, where at any given point during the emotion generation process; one, or none of the strategies may be elicited. However, he notes that none of these strategies is characteristically optimal in all situations.

Within the antecedent and response strategy dichotomy, five categories of regulation strategies comprise Gross's (1998) model including, situation selection, situation modification, attention deployment, cognitive change, and response modulation. The first of these, *situation selection*, involves approaching or avoiding certain people, places, or objects in order to regulate emotions. Situation selection requires a degree of perspective taking, where an understanding of the likely features of a situation and forecasting the likely emotional response is necessary (Gross & Thompson, 2007). Effective use of the situation selection regulation strategy also requires the evaluation of the short-term costs of emotional regulation versus the longer-term costs, of selecting in or out of a situation. Consider the example of a shy person who was recently hired into an organization. In the short term, they can avoid the Friday after work happy hours attended by their new workgroup. However, the long-term costs of repeatedly avoiding this after work social get together may eventually result in this individual being socially isolated from the workgroup.

Alternatively, one can *modify the situation*, by directly manipulating aspects of the situation to alter the emotional impact. This is similar to problem-focused coping, since it involves a strong problem-solving component. In situation modification, steps are taken to directly modify the external physical environment, in order to modify felt

emotions. For example, while at work on a frustrating task, asking a co-worker for help on the task would be an example of situation modification.

Individuals may also regulate their emotions without directly effecting their environment. *Attention deployment* involves selectively directing one's attention within a situation to influence their emotions. The two main aspects of this strategy are distraction and concentration. Distraction focuses attention on different aspects of the situation that evoke a different emotion, or moving attention away from the situation altogether by invoking inconsistent thoughts or memories. An example of this would be to evoke a past memory of excitement or enjoyment when feeling depressed; or thinking "happy thoughts" when filled with anger. Concentration can involve drawing attention to the non-emotional features of the situation.

Individuals can also change the way they think about a situation, through processes categorized as *cognitive change* in Gross's (1998) model. Many of these strategies are either related to or similar to many of the classical defense mechanisms (e.g. denial, isolation, and intellectualization). Another cognitive change strategy, cognitive reframing or reappraisal, includes the changing of one's perspective or the meaning of an event. For example, cognitive reappraisal occurs when one thinks about how another person would feel or think about the situation. The common cliché of "putting yourself in another person's shoes" demonstrates this strategy well.

Additionally, several methods exist for regulating emotion after the emotion has been elicited. These response-focused strategies, categorized as *response modulation*, involve physiological, experiential, or behavioral responses that alter the experience or display of emotion. Regulating expressive emotion behavior (i.e. suppression) is the

most common form of emotion regulation (Gross, 1998). The often-repeated adage of "grin and bear it" reflects this principle. Suppression entails an individual hiding their emotional expression. Individuals may also fake their emotions, by displaying an emotion they do not feel. Studies have shown that initiating emotion expressive behavior can slightly increase the feeling of that emotion (Izard, 1990; Matsumoto, 1989). Other examples of response modulation include the use of relaxation techniques, such as deep breathing, or even the use of drugs or alcohol. Response modulation also includes physical exercise, if it is used as a way to relieve negative emotional states.

Emotion regulation response strategies are commonly employed in organizations, through either formal (e.g. emotional labor; Hoschild, 1983) or informal rules or norms that organizations place on the display of emotions. Emotional labor concerns the discrepancy between what emotions are experienced by employees, and the required display of emotions in the work context. In other words, the organization may place informal or formal rules on the proper display of emotions (Hoschild, 1983), thus preventing the employee from displaying their actual felt emotions. After extended or repeated periods of emotional labor, negative consequences such as stress or burnout may result from this discrepancy of what the employee is feeling versus what they are displaying.

Much of the organizational research examining the causes and consequences of emotion regulation in the workplace takes place under the realm of emotional labor. A number of researchers have integrated emotion regulation strategies into process models of emotional labor (e.g. Diefendorff & Gosserand, 2003; Grandey, 2000;

Totterdell & Holman, 2003). These models utilize emotion regulation as a guiding theory for understanding the mechanisms of emotional labor (Grandey, 2000).

For example, *surface acting* as conceptualized in emotional labor is similar to response modulation in emotion regulation as it involves employees regulating their emotional expressions, by either suppressing or faking emotions. Furthermore, in emotional labor *deep acting* occurs when the individual's perception of the situation is modified. This could occur by an individual focusing only on positive thoughts or memories, which are categorized as attention deployment in Gross's (1998) model of emotion regulation; or by reappraising the situation, a form of cognitive change in Gross's model of emotion regulation. In general, emotional labor is generally focused on the long-term effects of these two broad categories of techniques (surface vs. deep acting), and the environmental conditions that could alleviate the ill effects. Consequently, although related, emotion regulation may best be thought of as a process occurring in emotional labor.

Individual Well-Being Consequences of Emotion Regulation

Job satisfaction.

Emotion regulation has a significant influence on determining an individual's well-being at work (Gross, 1999; Guion, 1995). Organizational life provides a unique set of constraints and contextual variables to influence emotion regulation processes. Laboratory and field research in emotional labor has consistently shown that employees often use expression modulation through surface acting (e.g. suppression) (Grandey, 2003).

However, these response strategies contribute to higher levels of job stress, which would typically result in lower job satisfaction and higher levels of burnout and emotional exhaustion (Beal, Trougakos, Weiss, & Green, 2006; Brotheridge & Lee, 2002; Grandey, 2003; Gross & John, 2003; Morris & Feldman, 1996; Rutter & Fielding, 1988; Zammuner & Galli, 2005). Expanding on this notion, Côté & Morgan (2002) found that suppression of negative emotions lead to a decrease in job satisfaction while the upgrade of positive emotions led to an increase in job satisfaction. Research has also suggests that trait emotion regulation (identified as a dimension of EI) relates to higher job satisfaction (Kafetsios & Zampetakis, 2008). Therefore, one consequence of emotion regulation that is particularly useful in identifying work related outcomes of emotion regulation at work would be job satisfaction.

Consequently, this study will expand upon these findings to address the relationship between the various categories of emotion regulation strategies (situation selection, situation modification, attention deployment, cognitive change, and response modulation) and job satisfaction. While other studies have investigated the relationship between emotion regulation and job satisfaction, we will utilize a more comprehensive framework, expanding and contextualizing the types of strategies (i.e. beyond reappraisal and suppression). We will contextualize these strategies to investigate how the attributes of the situation may influence a strategy's effectiveness. Using the characteristics inherent to the type of job event we make several assertions about how the situation may or may not make an emotion regulation strategy effective.

We predict that for interpersonally-based situations, situation modification, attention deployment, and cognitive change will relate to higher job satisfaction. When an individual engages in situation modification, they directly address the problem at hand. In interpersonally-based situations, individuals are likely to have a higher degree of control or autonomy over the circumstances. The autonomy permitted by these types of situations, is likely to lead to more successful resolution efforts, thereby decreasing the negative affective environment; and in turn, resulting in higher levels of job satisfaction.

Attention deployment strategies in interpersonally-based events are also expected to be positively related to job satisfaction. For example, by simply ignoring the emotional focal point and focusing on the goals of the interaction is likely an appropriate and useful attention deployment strategy in an interpersonal work event. This attention diversion, away from an emotional view, may enable a person to better identify causes underlying the other person's emotions and/or actions so that the event can be resolved more quickly, as evidenced by Repetti (1993) assertion that removal from a social interaction allows for the arousal state to have a chance to return to baseline levels.

We also suggest that cognitive change will correlate positively with job satisfaction in interpersonally-based situations. Cognitive change is characterized by a change in perspective, and may require less cognitive effort in interpersonally-based affective events than in task-based affective events. Putting oneself in "another person's shoes" or looking at the problem from another vantage point can change one's cognitions and emotions/experience in a way that is less negative.

Additionally, in line with the previous research suggesting that response modulation does not address the root of the dissatisfaction, and involves denying ones true feelings, we predict that response modulation in interpersonally-based events will be negatively related to job satisfaction. When an individual is involved in an interpersonally-based affective event, and uses response modulation, he/she is trying to hide or mask the emotion(s) actually being experienced rather than trying to do something to change the emotion, which creates stress (Brotheridge & Lee, 2002). In addition, it is possible that others will notice the insincerity in one's responses and not receive them well. This type of situation may eventually result in a negative work environment, marked by frustration and conflict, ultimately decreasing job satisfaction.

We also predict that situation selection in interpersonally-based affective events will be negatively related to job satisfaction. We make this prediction based on the assumption that if an individual chooses situation selection, they are not making an effort to change their thoughts or feelings about the potentially negative interpersonal interaction. In fact, they may even ruminate or hypothesize about how bad the interaction would have been had they decided to interact, further reinforcing negative emotions. We expect this would be related to lower job satisfaction.

Hypothesis 1a: For interpersonally-based affective events, situation modification, attention deployment and cognitive change will be positively related to job satisfaction.

Hypotheses 1b: For interpersonally-based affective events, situation selection and response modulation will be negatively related to job satisfaction.

With respect to task-based affective events, emotion regulation strategies may show a somewhat different pattern of relationships with job satisfaction. Affective events triggered by technical or task aspects of one's job may entail greater cognitive load than interpersonally-based affective events. Task-based events are likely to require cognitive processing of potential errors or problems from a technical standpoint as well as dealing with the stress and negative emotions accompanying the event. In these kinds of situations, regulation strategies requiring more cognitive processing, such as cognitive change, may divert one's focus from the task, drawing resources away from task completion and resulting in less effective performance. Thus, cognitive change strategies for task-based affective events are expected to be negatively correlated with job satisfaction.

Similarly, situation selection, or avoidance of task situations where negative affective events may occur, essentially means a person is not fulfilling certain job responsibilities. Regulating emotion through modifying the situation may not be a viable alternative in terms of how it might affect task performance and job satisfaction. This may be particularly true for less complex jobs enabling little discretion and autonomy. Attempting to modify the situation by altering the task may result in greater task error, or, violation of company rules, norms, or procedures. Consequently, these types of emotion regulation strategies could spiral into feelings of low professional efficacy and withdrawal, and thus are expected to correlate negatively with job satisfaction.

Attention deployment strategies may also help to lessen the focus on negative emotions, enabling greater concentration on the current task and allowing for more

cognitive resources for resolving the task-based problem. However, certain types of attention deployment such as distraction may hurt task performance because it takes focus away from the situation at hand. Thus, as an overall category it is difficult to know how attention deployment will ultimately relate to job satisfaction in task-based affective events.

Alternatively, response modulation in task-based affective events is expected to be positively related to job satisfaction. Because these affective events do not involve interpersonal interaction, there is less concern about negative social perceptions in response to the display of insincere or faked emotions, or attempts to engage relaxation strategies. Thus, the effect of these strategies on performance is likely to be less negative than in interpersonally-based affective events. In fact, relaxation strategies applied in a task-based affective event may clear one's mind and relieve negative feelings, potentially contributing to better performance and satisfaction. Therefore, we offer the following hypotheses:

Hypotheses 2a: For task-based affective events, cognitive change, situation selection, and situation modification will be negatively related to job satisfaction.

Hypotheses 2b: For task-based affective events, response modulation will be positively related to job satisfaction.

Life Satisfaction.

While a majority of the research on emotion regulation in the workplace, focuses on normal, healthy individuals, research suggests that a relationship exists between the different emotion regulation strategies and an individual's level of overall

life satisfaction. This may be important given tremendous increase in interest on work - life balance (Beauregard & Henry, 2009). Previous research in this area has indicated that the habitual use of reappraisal is generally associated with positive outcomes, while suppression has been related to negative outcomes (e.g. Gross & John, 2003). It is suggested that individuals who habitually reappraise are fundamentally changing their negative emotions early on, preventing the full experience and expression of those emotions. Therefore, the long-term effects of harboring negative emotions are substantially reduced because they are changing what emotions are experienced from negative to more neutral or positive.

The rational provided for Gross & John's (2003) study seems plausible and more relevant for interpersonally-based situations, where cognitive change strategies are relatively effortless, and might have more positive long term consequences. In line with previous research, we propose that cognitive change in interpersonally-based situations will have a positive relationship with life satisfaction.

Expanding on previous research, we additionally propose that situation modification in interpersonally-based job events will increase life satisfaction. Consistent with the predictions on job satisfaction, individuals who actively pursue positive changes in their environment (in the case of regulating negative emotions) through routine use of situation modification will be equipped to alter the interpersonal causes of their dissatisfaction at work, greater job satisfaction in turn will decrease work to life spillover effects and life satisfaction should be better.

Following our previous logic in the relationship between job satisfaction and attention deployment, we offer the proposition that attention deployment in

interpersonal events will also increase life satisfaction. Attention deployment is a relatively effortless strategy, and when executed in a suitable situation, may result in beneficial outcomes. Due to the ease in employing attention deployment in interpersonally-based situations, we suggest that it is an appropriate strategy in interactional situations. Overtime, the beneficial outcomes from successful and appropriate use of attention deployment could contribute to higher life satisfaction.

The assertion that response modulation strategies over time may lead to negative life satisfaction has been empirically justified (Beal, Trougakos, Weiss & Green, 2006; Brotheridge & Lee, 2002; Grandey, 2003; Grandey, 2004, Gross & John, 2003; Côté & Morgan, 2000; Morris & Feldman, 1996; Rutter and Fielding, 1988; Zammuner & Galli, 2005). However, we further contextualize this relationship and suggest that this may not be the case for negative workplace task-based events. In task-based situations, where the interpersonal element is either not fundamental or altogether absent, response modulation may be effective at reducing negative emotions. We suggest that this will be the case in regards to response modulation, and propose that response modulation in task-based events will relate positively to life satisfaction.

We additionally predict that situation selection will be negatively related to life satisfaction. Simply avoiding negative emotional stimuli should have detrimental effects on life satisfaction. The absence of taking any actions to change either the aspects of the situation, or the feelings or cognitions about the situation, should not result in a change in one's negative feelings about the environment. Over time, negative affect has been shown to be negatively related to life satisfaction (Kuppens,

Realo, & Diener, 2008). Therefore, when exposed to negative life events, life satisfaction would decrease when situation selection is routinely used.

Situation modification may also be counterproductive in task-based events. If the situation modification is not successful, or a considerable amount of effort is required, this strategy employed in task-based events may lead to frustration, or other negative emotions. Negative task-based work situations, by their nature, may not be easily resolved, otherwise they would not be experiencing the intense negative emotion. Therefore, we suggest that routine use of situation modification in task-based events may be negatively related to life satisfaction.

Attention deployment in task-based situations may also not be considered an optimal strategy. Attention deployment utilized in task-based situations would consist of diverting attention away from the current task, therefore potentially resulting in negative task consequences. Overtime, effects of the negative task consequences could have adverse effects on general well-being.

The positive effect of cognitive change might not be germane to all situations, notably in task-based events in the workplace setting. We propose that cognitive change will evidence a negative relationship to life satisfaction in task-based situations. We make this departure from interpersonally-based events because in task-based events, cognitive resources are critical. In task-based situations, cognitive change would entail changing how they are fundamentally approaching the task. Unfortunately, these cognitive strategies draw substantial cognitive resources, thus depleting valuable cognitive resources necessary for task performance (Richards & Gross, 1999). From this depletion of resources, one could presume a consequential

performance decrement on the task. Due to the unsuccessful task performance or task problem resolution, a variety of negative affective states could result. For example, cognitive fatigue, frustration, or lowered sense of self-efficacy could set in. These negative feelings overtime could eventually lead to a spillover effect, resulting in decreased life satisfaction.

Gross and John (2003) revealed that individuals who habitually suppressed emotions (response modulation) also had lower self-esteem, were more depressed, and less optimistic; therefore in general having lower life satisfaction. From these results, it was suggested that individuals who habitually rely on suppression still harbor the emotion internally for a period of time, and then only artificially change the external display. We utilize this rationale for the bases of our suggestion that response modulation will be negatively related to life satisfaction in interpersonally-based events. Furthermore, negative feelings may result from ineffective strategy use, linger, and eventually accumulate possibly resulting in an eventual spillover effect into general well-being. Experimental evidence has supported the claim that negative emotional experiences influence satisfaction judgments (Schwartz & Clore, 1983), ultimately overtime forming judgments about life satisfaction (Kuppens, Realo, & Diener, 2008). This leads to the second set of Hypotheses for the study.

Hypothesis 3a: In interpersonally-based events, situation modification, attention deployment, and cognitive change will be positively related to life satisfaction.

Hypothesis 3b: In task-based events, response modulation will be positively related to life satisfaction.

Hypothesis 4a: In interpersonally-based events, situation selection and response modulation will be negatively related to life satisfaction.

Hypothesis 4b: In task-based events, situation modification, situation selection, attention deployment, and cognitive change will be negatively related to life satisfaction.

Customer Service Performance

Emotion regulation also has a significant influence on an individual's performance at work (Gross, 1999; Guion, 1995). Emotion regulation processes are important to contextual performance, especially considering the role that organizational norms and culture play in partially scripting out accepted methods of emotional display and responses (Weick, 1995). This is especially relevant regarding areas where the quality of interpersonal interaction is instrumental (Lopes, Salovey, Côté, Beers, & Petty, 2005), which would include customer service roles. This is particularly evident through the assertions made by Hochschild (1983) who described through the process of emotional labor, display rules; or formal polices that script expected emotions for employees (Sutton & Rafaeli, 1988).

Display rules are a critical component to the role of those that interact with the public, such as in customer service positions. For example, the well-known catch phrase of "service with a smile" is an example of a display rule, where employees are generally expected to express emotions that indicate friendliness and sympathy (Parasuraman, 1995). Display rules are positively related to organizational performance. The display of friendliness and enthusiastic positive emotions by

customer service agents predicts customer service satisfaction and service quality ratings (Barger & Grandey, 2006).

While many jobs in the customer service sector may have specific requirements that employees only show positive emotions to customers, many actions by the customers or coworkers typically result in the employee experiencing negative emotions. Service employees often experience hostile customers (Dorman & Zapf, 2004). For instance, consider the example of the customer service representative who is facing an irate customer that is shouting personal insults at them for problems they actually encountered with *another* employee. The employee has to remain calm and perhaps even empathetic toward the customer in order to perform their job duties. As the emotional labor research has pointed out, the exposure to these types of situations, over time may lead to aversive side effects, such as emotional fatigue or job burnout.

Cumulatively, this research demonstrates that emotion regulation remains a critical component to the customer service interaction. How customer service agents respond to emotional events and manage their emotions is an integral aspect of their contextual job performance, as well as their well-being. Emotion regulation is also pertinent to task performance in customer service. Some research even suggests that the task-based components of customer service are more important determinants to customer service satisfaction than friendliness (Grandey, Fisk, Mattila, Jaansen & Sideman, 2005).

In the present study, questions establishing the relationship between the various emotion regulation strategies and customer service performance will be examined. This will expand on past research, by examining a comprehensive model of emotion

regulation (i.e. situation selection, situation modification, attention deployment, cognitive change, and response modulation). The customer service environment poses some unique aspects that potentially influence the effectiveness of certain regulation strategies. For example, in customer service, task performance contains an inseparable interpersonal element. This attribute should uniquely influence the effectiveness of a particular regulation strategy. Consequently, due to these high levels of interpersonal characteristics in task events, we do not expect substantial differences between the effectiveness of the regulation strategies based on the type of job event.

We first propose that situation modification in a customer service environment will lead to positive customer service performance outcomes. We support this proposition by the notion that what is fundamentally essential to the customer interaction is ultimately the outcome of the business transaction. In essence, if one has a problem with their product or service, they want it fixed. Therefore, for task-based and interpersonally-based job events, situation modification should be positively related to customer service performance.

Attention deployment may be another effective strategy to use in a customer service situation. As previously mentioned, attention deployment is rather effortless, and can be effective at reducing negative emotions. Furthermore, because the customer service interaction is rather short-lived, any ill effects of long-term consequences of this strategy are lessoned. We hypothesize that attention deployment will be effective in terms of customer service performance for both task-based and interpersonally-based events.

We propose that the use of cognitive change in task-based and interpersonally-based job events will be positively related to higher levels of customer service performance. Deep acting in emotional labor (similar to cognitive change) has been reported as being more effective in actually changing mood in customer service agents (Totterdell & Parkinson, 1999), and has been related to higher coworker ratings and customer satisfaction (Grandey, 2003). The negative effects resulting from cognitive change, while resource intensive, may be short lived in less complex, social customer service situations. After the cognitive change has taken effect, resources may be freed up that would still be in use under other strategies, such as suppression (Goldberg & Grandey, 2007). Consequently, cognitive change seems to be an important factor in customer service, especially for contextual performance.

The customer service tasks are generally not cognitively challenging, and therefore because of the high level of social interaction involved, we believe that cognitive change should have positive effects on customer service task performance. For example, Tracy and Tracy (1998) described how emergency call takers engage in perspective taking (a form of cognitive change) to increase feelings of empathy, thereby increasing the quality of the interactions between the customer and the representative. As a result of the previous studies, we propose that cognitive change will be positively related to customer service in both task-based and interpersonally-based job events.

Situation selection, by its nature of avoiding negative emotionally eliciting situations, would result in the customer service agent avoiding resolving the situation, thereby reducing the quality of the customer service interaction. Therefore, in both

task-based and interpersonally-based events, we predict that situation selection will have negative effects on customer service.

Previous research indicates that response modulation is a commonly employed regulation strategy; ironically, however the literature indicates that it is not an effective strategy to utilize. This is typically framed in terms of the employee consequences of repeated use, as in the emotional labor research. We further expand on this notion, and suggest that response modulation is not effective from a performance perspective as well, due to both the transparency of the strategy in an interpersonal setting, as well as the notion that the employee still harbors the negative emotion.

Laboratory studies have indicated that suppression of emotions inhibits information retention (Gross, 1998). The explanation is that individuals have a limited source of personal resources, such as cognitive resources, attention, and mental energy (Beal, Weis, Barros, & McDermid, 2005). Regulating emotions decreases cognitive and motivational resources (Baumeister, Bratslavsky, Muraven, & Tice, 1998; Muraven & Baumeister, 2000; Richards & Gross, 1999). Emotion regulation takes away from this central pool of resources, because certain strategies require substantial energy and resources, which in turn delete resources needed for current or subsequent performance (Baumeister et al., 1998; Beal, Weis, et al., 2005; Muraven & Baumeister, 2000; Richards & Gross, 1999). Richards and Gross (2000) found that suppression resulted in worse memory recall than reappraisal, but memory recall was best when there was no regulation at all. Therefore, it would be expected that customer service agents might suffer increased difficulty in retaining information from angry customers when applying a less optimal regulation strategy like suppression. We expect that

response modulation will therefore be negatively related to customer service in both task-based and interpersonally-based events. This leads us to our final set of hypotheses regarding emotion regulation strategies and various outcome variables.

Hypothesis 5a: For interpersonally-based affective events, situation modification, attention deployment, and cognitive change will be positively related to customer service performance.

Hypothesis 5b: For task-based affective events, situation modification, attention deployment and cognitive change will be positively related to customer service performance.

Hypothesis 6a: For interpersonally-based affective events, situation selection and response modulation will be negatively related to customer service performance.

Hypothesis 6b: For task-based affective events, situation selection, and response modulation will be negatively related to customer service performance.

Individual Differences in Regulation Strategy Tendencies

Much of the work done by researchers in emotion regulation (e.g. Gross & John, 2003) submit the notion that individuals routinely utilize certain emotion regulation strategies. It is suggested that through an individual's life experiences, individuals adapt habitual patterns of emotion regulation. This research has primarily focused on the habitual use of reappraisal and suppression. Therefore, this study will expand upon these findings, and take steps to address whether stable individual differences exist in the habitual use of the five general categories of emotion regulation

strategies in the workplace. Since this study also has an exploratory component, additional research questions will be addressed concerning the feasibility of indentifying types of individuals that routinely utilize certain emotion regulation strategies in the context of the workplace.

Research Question 1: Can individuals be identified with distinct emotion regulation patterns within interpersonally-based and task-based job events?

Research Question 2: If so, do these groups of individuals show differences on various outcomes such as job satisfaction, life satisfaction, and customer service performance?

Method

Participants

Four hundred and thirteen undergraduates (75 % female and 25% male; 310 female, 103 male) enrolled in various psychology courses participated in this online study for partial fulfillment of a course requirement. Ages ranged from 17 to 64 (M = 19.97, SD = 5.24) and a variety of academic majors and ethnicities were represented in the sample, with a majority reporting Caucasian (77.4%). All participants were required to have at least two years of previous employment history. Forty percent of the sample was currently employed at the time of participation, while 60% was not currently employed, but had been in the recent past (within 2 years). Table 1 includes demographic details of the sample population. It should be noted that while the sample could be described as a convenience sample, participant attributes were similar to those important to emotion regulation. For example, emotion regulation and similar constructs (e.g. emotional labor) are seen as important to entry-level jobs, jobs within

the service industry, and jobs with a high degree of customer contact. These entry level and service-based jobs are often filled with a younger workforce, or individuals with somewhat limited work history; much like the sample utilized in the current investigation. Furthermore, a majority of the sample (95%) reported employment in the retail, hospitality, or health and human services industries; industries often categorized as having a high degree of emotional labor.

WERPI Development

To address the current study's hypothesis a new measure of workplace emotion regulation was developed by the researchers, the "Workplace Emotion Regulation Profile Inventory" (WERPI). The WERPI was developed to reflect generalizable emotion eliciting workplace events that people might encounter in their day-to-day work, common to a number of industries and occupations, regardless of job level. These workplace events were developed from an affective job events taxonomy created by the researchers. To ensure representativeness of the taxonomy, a comprehensive literature review from a number of emotion related topics were conducted including: emotion regulation, emotional labor, emotional intelligence, and emotions in the workplace. This review led to the identification of several emotion evoking job events, which were then subsumed under the two basic job event categories (interpersonally-based affective events vs. task-based affective events). Several common negative workplace emotions (e.g. anger, embarrassment, guilt, anxiety, pessimism, and powerlessness), were also identified in the literature review, and were aggregated up to global negative affect. It was determined that negative emotions are more relevant to examine in the study of regulation, as the most frequent goal of emotion regulation in

everyday life is down regulating negative emotions (John & Gross, 2007). This by no means discounts the importance of other forms of regulation (e.g. upgrading negative emotions, upgrading positive emotions, downgrading positive emotions), in fact future research involving such instances is encouraged. See Appendix A for the job events taxonomy, and Appendix B for definitions of the targeted emotions included.

Following the development of the affective job event taxonomy, a panel of five graduate level Industrial/Organizational student researchers familiar with emotion regulation and workplace emotions were familiarized with the developed affective job event taxonomy, along with the item development procedures outlined by the lead researchers. This panel developed short scenarios (3 to 5 sentences) of negative workplace events based on the developed job event taxonomy, which served as the question stems for the test items. Each member developed their scenarios independently and met over the course of several weeks to review the scenarios for content, clarity, and grammatical issues. Following the development of these scenarios, the same panel developed item responses for the scenario.

For each scenario, five responses were developed, each representing one of the categories of regulation strategies according to Gross's (1998) model (i.e. situation selection, situation modification, cognitive change, attention deployment, and response modulation). In development of responses, efforts were taken to remain consistent across responses with respect to the goal of the regulation stemming from the scenario (i.e. down grading negative emotions). Therefore, the strategy of rumination was not included in the WERPI responses as a strategy of attention deployment.

Procedures for item response development mimicked scenario development, with independent development followed by group review. In total, 84 negative emotion-eliciting scenarios were developed: with approximately an even distribution of items covering task-based event (n=36) or interpersonally-based event (n=48). Appendix C includes sample items along with their respective categories. After item development, an independent review by three Industrial/Organizational Psychology graduate students was conducted to review the scenarios and responses for accurate job event and regulation classification, grammatical errors, readability, excessive social desirability and realism.

Next, these scenarios were then judged by an expert sample, consisting of 20 professionals employed in a number of organizations, as well as Doctoral Candidates in Industrial/Organizational Psychology. Half of these experts (n=10) rated the scenarios on the emotions being elicited, and the intensity of emotion (ICC = .82), to capture any trends in more socially desirable kinds of responses. The other half (n = 10) of these experts rated the responses by indicating which response they believe would be the most effective for the situation (ICC = .83). Slight differences were found between strategies on the effectiveness of the responses, most notably between situation selection and situation modification. Situation selection was rated as least effective while situation modification was rated most effective, in terms of effectiveness of resolving the situation. It should be noted that this rating is different from a rating of the degree that a strategy would be successful at reducing negative emotions. Differences between the other strategies were negligible. The results from these analyses are presented in Appendix D.

Test Description. The instructions for the WERPI have the test taker assume they are the primary actor in the scenario. The test taker is then presented with a workplace event in each of the scenarios (approximately 3 to 5 sentences). Each scenario then concludes with the prompt "what reaction would you most likely have to this situation?" followed by a presentation of the response options. Each of the response options corresponds with one of the targeted emotion regulation strategies (i.e. situation selection, situation modification, attention deployment, cognitive change, response modulation). These response options were no more than two sentences long. For examples of test items, please refer to Appendix C.

Test Administration. This test was administered online, by a large commercial web-survey vendor. For the WERPI administration, questions were presented one at a time, after clicking on a response, participants progressed by clicking on a "next" button. The average time to take the WERPI was 58 minutes. Post-Questionnaire analyses indicated that testing environments and the website administration did not substantially affect the participants' perceptions of performance. See Appendix E for detailed post-questionnaire analyses.

Test Scoring. The measurement approach to emotions and emotion regulation can take a number of different forms. To categorize a measurement approach, how the questions are phrased, along with the item format should be considered. The psychometric measurement of emotions and emotion regulation often takes a direct, overt approach to measurement, commonly through retrospective self-reports, asking how often they perform regulation strategies (e.g. Emotion Regulation Questionnaire). However, underlying assumptions to this method may not be consistently met

(Bachorowski & Braaten, 1994; King & Emmons, 1990; Swinkels & Guiliano, 1995; Salovey, Mayer, Goldman, Turvey, & Palfai, 1995). Participants' retrospective reports may be biased by memory, or other features of the situation. Furthermore, a number of emotion-related individual differences have been articulated suggesting that people vary in terms of their ability to accurately identify and use emotional information (Lane & Schwartz, 1987; Mayer & Salovey, 1997; Gohm & Clore, 2000, 2002). Finally, overt measures may be prone to socially desirable responding if used in organizational or other contexts where particular affective dispositions may be more valued than other responses.

Therefore, to avert many of these limitations (e.g. transparency of test constructs, assumption of self-awareness, social desirability) the WERPI was developed with a fundamentally different approach to measurement; an indirect, performance based approach was used. Instead of having respondents' retrospectively self-report particular behaviors, the WERPI prompts individuals to pick a response they would most likely engage in. This method of assessment comes with some limitations and criticism, which will be extensively discussed in the study limitations.

Overall scores for each regulation strategy were created by aggregating the number of times each strategy was picked by the individual. Second, emotion regulation strategy scores were created for task-based and interpersonally-based affective events by aggregating the number of times each strategy was picked within each type of event. For example, if an individual chose situation modification in 25 out of the 54 task-based situations they would receive a score of 46.30 for situation modification in task-based events.

General Procedures

Participants were recruited from the psychology department's online subject research pool website. On this website for recruitment purposes, a brief summary stated that the study was an online survey of workplace behaviors. Potential study recruits were informed of the total time to take the online study, and that the study was broken up into six parts that did not have to be taken all at once. Participants were informed that the study would consist of a 1-hour section (for the WERPI), followed by five 20-minute sections for the reference and criterion measures. Finally, the recruitment website contained instructions to contact the researcher to obtain a unique survey link and participation identification number. Upon recruitment, the subjects were informed that the study would include a series of surveys on workplace behaviors and individual characteristics. Efforts were taken to randomize the presentation of study materials, with the exception of the WERPI, which was always administered first. Participants were given 2 weeks to complete the study in its entirety from the time of sign up.

Upon entering the website, participants read and digitally signed the informational statement, which confirmed their acceptance to participate in the study. Following the WERPI, participants completed the post-questionnaire, followed by a number of reference measures, performance measures, and demographic information, described in the following sections. Finally, a debriefing statement informing them of

the nature of the study and researchers contact information concluded their participation.

Reference Measures

The reference measures administered in effort to provide validation evidence for the WERPI fell into two general categories: a) reference measures providing convergent and discriminant validation evidence for construct validation of the emotion regulation responses b) criterion related reference measures. In addition, a number of individual difference measures it seemed necessary to include as social desirability and verbal intelligence as controls.

Emotion regulation and study control measures.

Social Desirability: The Crowne & Marlowe measure of Social Desirability Scale (Crowne & Marlowe, 1960) was administered to indicate high levels of impression management. Participants responded to 33 items true-false items. Reliability reached acceptable levels at $\alpha = .74$.

Verbal Intelligence: The Employee Aptitude Survey (EAS) (Ruch & Ruch, 1980) was used to assess verbal intelligence. Furthermore, since performance measures were utilized which could have a problem-solving component, the additional cognitive control variables seemed a necessary precaution. In addition, verbal intelligence should also provide discriminant evidence of the constructs being measured in the WERPI. The EAS is a verbal reasoning measure that provides an assessment of intelligence based on analogical reasoning questions. The EAS verbal reasoning test yields retest reliabilities in the .80s while evidencing adequate criterion-related validity as a

predictor of job performance (Ivancevich, 1976; Ruch & Ruch, 1980; Tenopyr, 1969). Reliability exceeded acceptable levels with α = .82.

Convergent validation and discriminant validation measures.

Evidence bearing on the construct validity of the WERPI was examined through the investigation of the relationship of the WERPI with several reference measures. A number of studies have demonstrated relationships between emotion regulation and related constructs (e.g. coping, emotional intelligence) with a number of related psychological constructs (e.g. personality). The following measures will provide an examination of the convergent and discriminant validity evidence for the WERPI.

Coping: The COPE (Carver, Scheier, & Weintraub, 1989) is one of the most commonly used coping measure, containing 13 short scales measuring different coping styles, 7 of which were utilized in the present efforts (Active Coping α = .74, Planning α = .64, Positive Reframing α = .74, Humor α = .83, Substance Use α = .94, Venting α = .71, Behavioral Disengagement α = .75). Reliability showed acceptable levels in all of the subscales utilized, with an average scale reliability estimate of α = .76.

Emotional Intelligence: The Wong and Law Emotional Intelligence Scale (WLEIS; Wong, Law, 2002), defines emotional intelligence as consisting of a set of abilities that a person uses to understand, regulate, and make use of his or her emotions. The WLEIS is composed of 16 items, measuring four dimensions. 1) Appraisal of self-emotions (α = .83): describes an ability to understand his or her deep emotions and express them naturally. Individuals high in this ability sense and

acknowledge emotions better than most other people. 2) Appraisal of others emotions (α = .83): describes an ability to perceive and understand the emotions of others. Individuals high in this are sensitive to emotions in others and are able to predict the emotional responses of others. 3) Regulation of emotion (α = .86): refers to an individual's ability to regulate their emotions enabling a rapid recovery from psychological stress. A person high on this ability can control their emotions easily. 4) Use of emotion to facilitate performance (α = .80): refers to the ability of a person to make use of their emotions by directing their emotions towards constructive activities and personal performance. A person who is high in this has the ability to continuously encourage themselves to do better, and direct their emotions in positive and productive directions.

Emotion Regulation: The Emotion Regulation Questionnaire (ERQ; Gross & John, 2003) measures individual differences in the habitual use of reappraisal and suppression. ERQ is a well-established measure of habitual suppression (4 items; α = .74) and reappraisal (6 items; α =.77) which ask participants to rate their ability to cognitively reappraise. An example item for reappraisal is "I control my emotions by changing the way I think about the situation I'm in, and for suppression "I control my emotions by not expressing them". The correlations between reappraisal and suppression scales are zero (John & Gross, 2007).

Trait Affect: Trait affect was measured using the 20-item Positive and Negative Affect Schedule (PANAS: Watson, Clark, & Tellegen, 1988) administered in the "general" format. This measure consists of 10 positive and 10 negative adjectives rated on a 5-point Likert scale. Positive affect (PA) reflects the extent to which an individual

feels enthusiastic, active, and alert. Negative Affect (NA) is defined as distress, expressed in terms of anger, contempt, disgust, guilt, and fear (Watson & Clark, 1984). Prior research has demonstrated that people with high trait NA tend to experience more intense negative emotions and focus on negative aspects of situations than people who are high on trait PA (George, 1995). Cronbach's alpha demonstrated acceptable levels of internal consistency on trait PA ($\alpha = .87$), and trait NA ($\alpha = .88$).

Self-Monitoring: Self-monitoring of expressive behaviors was measured by the Self-Monitoring Scale (SM; Snyder, 1974). Self-monitoring is defined as the extent to which individuals monitor their self-presentation, expressive behavior, and non-verbal affective display. Individuals who are high on self-monitoring are good at learning what is socially appropriate in new situations, have good self-control of their emotional expressions, and utilize these abilities to create the impressions they want others to perceive them as (Snyder, 1974). In this measure, participants responded to 25 true-false items ($\alpha = .69$).

Personality: The "Big Five" inventory (BFI; John, Donahue, & Kentle, 1991) was given to assess personality traits. The BFI consists of 44 items, on a 5-point Likert scale, measuring Consciousness ($\alpha = .81$) Extroversion ($\alpha = .85$), Openness ($\alpha = .77$), Neuroticism ($\alpha = .69$), and Agreeableness ($\alpha = .76$). Conscientiousness describes socially prescribed impulse control that facilitates task and goal directed behaviors (e.g. following norms and rules, planning, organizing) (John & Gross, 2007). Extraversion is contrasted with introversion and implies an energetic approach toward social and material world, including traits such as sociability, activity, assertiveness, and positive emotionality (John & Srivastava, 1999). Neuroticism contrasts emotional stability and

even- temperedness with negative emotionality (e.g. anxiety, nervousness, sadness). Openness to Experience compared to closed mindedness describes breadth, depth, originality, and complexity in an individual's mental and experienced life. Agreeableness refers to social features, contrasting a pro-social (e.g. altruism, tender mindedness, trust and modesty) and command orientation e.g. antagonism, mistrust, selfishness).

Consequences of Emotion Regulation

Job Satisfaction: The Job Descriptive Index (JDI; Balzer et al., 1997) was utilized to measure job satisfaction. For this study only select dimensions of overall job satisfaction ($\alpha = .92$), satisfaction with work in general (work that is performed on the job) ($\alpha = .84$), satisfaction with supervisor ($\alpha = .87$), and satisfaction with superiors ($\alpha = .86$) was utilized. For the regression analysis these factors were combined ($\alpha = .87$), which was supported by a factor analysis. Instructions prompted participants to answer in regards to their current job or most recent job (study participants had to be currently employed, or recently employed within the past 2 years to participate).

Life Satisfaction: Life Satisfaction was measured by the Life Satisfaction Index Z (LSIZ; Wood, Wylie, & Sheafor, 1969). This scale was developed to measure an individual's own evaluation of life satisfaction, independent of level of activity or social participation. Participants responded to 20 true-false items ($\alpha = .78$).

Customer Service Performance: Previous research indicates that emotion regulation strategies are often related to customer service performance (Grandey, 2000). Therefore, to assess the relation of the various emotion regulation strategies to predict customer service performance and to discriminate patterns of performance

differences between individuals, low-fidelity simulations were used to provide assessments of customer service performance. Within the domain of customer service performance, problem solving and customer service communication activities were assessed through a series of four open-ended, ill-defined customer service scenarios.

The researchers developed the customer service task, where participants took on the role of a customer service representative, and handled a customer service related problem. Each of these customer service scenarios put the participant in a client-facing situation, where strong negative emotions were evoked. Please refer to Appendix F for an example of one of the scenarios. In total, four scenarios were developed and utilized.

To evaluate the customer service performance task, the responses were evaluated on problem solving quality; comprised of dimensions of completeness, effectiveness and originality (i.e. novelty, and uniqueness), as well as the degree of positive communication tactics with the customer. This included dimensions of positive rapport (i.e. tact, courtesy, friendliness) communicating empathy and willingness to assist. Integrative customer service approach style was also evaluated, which consisted of the degree that the participant integrated both demands by the customer as well as business objectives in their approach. Appendix G includes definitions of each of these dimensions, along with benchmark rating scales.

For each of these four scenarios, a variation on Hennessey and Amabile's (1988) consensual rating technique was applied. Initially, three graduate students were asked to read the written responses obtained for each of the performance tasks, along with a list of considerations that should be taken into account in making quality and

communication evaluations. A set of five examples was selected that reflected high, medium, and low levels of quality and originality, and were used as benchmarks for the rating scales. Three I/O psychology Doctoral students blind to the study's purpose completed a 2-hour training session to serve as judges for the customer service scenarios. The benchmarks scales were used by these judges with respect to customer service problem solving quality, and communication dimensions to rate on a 5-point Likert scales. Each scenario for all participants was rated by all three judges. Inter-rater agreement coefficients were relatively high, customer service problem solving quality (ICC =.81), integrative approach style (ICC =.73), and positive communication tactics (ICC =.82). Please refer to Appendix H for a full overview of scale inter-rater reliability as well as inter-scenario reliability.

Analyses Overview

The first phase of the analysis identified an appropriate scoring approach for the newly developed WERPI measure. The analysis undertaken for this phase will be described in several distinct steps. First, reliability estimates for the different possible scoring approaches were obtained using Cronbach's Coefficient Alpha (Cronbach, 1951) as an estimation of internal consistency. Following the reliability estimation, analyses of basic descriptive statistics, and *t*-tests were conducted utilizing the different scoring approaches (i.e. job event type). After identifying a stable scoring mechanism, the newly developed WERPI was compared to several reference measures, to provide evidence on both convergent and discriminant validity. General correlation patterns between the WERPI constructs and related reference measures were examined.

To examine the Hypothesis 1a and 1b, 2a and 2b regarding the relationship of the various regulation strategies with well-being indicators (job/life satisfaction), and hypothesis 3a and 3b concerning customer service performance, bivariate correlations and hierarchal regressions between the WERPI and the outcome constructs were examined.

To address Research Question 1, steps were taken to determine if there were distinguishable patterns of individual differences in emotion regulation exhibited by participants. To accomplish this, a cluster analysis using the Ward and Hook (1963) method was conducted. Following the group profile analyses, a comparison of group profiles on these outcome measures was conducted using a series of ANOVAs/MANOVAs and follow up post hoc tests.

Results

Reliability

The first analysis was to examine the reliability of the newly developed WERPI. Cronbach's Coefficient Alpha was used to assess the internal consistency of these five strategies, with in the negative job event types (interpersonal/task). Results yielded acceptable levels of reliability for research purposes (Nunnally, 1978), bearing in mind the initial development phase of this measure. Task-based Situation Selection ($\alpha = .60$) resulted in the lowest observed alpha level, while generally considered appropriate for research purposes, further test refinement should be pursued. In general, questions concerning negative task-based job events [Task-Based Situation Selection ($\alpha = .60$), Task-Based Situation Modification ($\alpha = .77$), Task-Based Attention Deployment ($\alpha = .66$), Task-Based Cognitive Reappraisal ($\alpha = .69$), and Task-Based

Response Modulation (α = .69)] resulted in lower observed internal consistency, than those concerning interpersonally-based job event situations [Interpersonally-Based Situation Selection (α = .81), Interpersonally-Based Situation Modification (α = .65), Interpersonally-Based Attention Deployment (α = .72), Interpersonally-Based Cognitive Reappraisal (α = .76), Interpersonally-Based Response Modulation (α = .77)].

Descriptive Statistics

The next set of analyses begins with examining the frequency of use for the different emotion regulation strategies between negative task-based and negative interpersonally-based job events. Therefore, the first column in Table 2 displays the average percent of times each of the regulation strategies was endorsed, regardless of job event type. The second and third columns in Table 2 represent averages of the percent of the emotion regulation strategies were endorsed in negative task-based and negative interpersonally-based job event categories respectively. A series of one-sample *t*-tests indicated that between task-based and interpersonally-based negative job events there are substantial differences in the utilization of emotion regulation strategy. More specifically, in negative task-based job event situations; attention deployment (*M%* = 20.06, *SD* = 6.87) was used significantly more than in interpersonally-based job event situations (*M%* = 19.43, *SD* = 6.38), $p < .05$. In negative task-based job event situations, cognitive change (*M%* = 20.57, *SD* = 7.72) was used significantly more than in interpersonally-based job event situations (*M* %= 19.18, *SD* = 7.38), $p < .001$. Finally, in interpersonally-based job event situations, response modulation (*M%* = 21.91, *SD* = 7.10) was used significantly more than in task-based job event situations

(*M* %= 19.42, *SD* = 7.56), *p* <.001. These analysis in part, justify maintaining these two categories of emotionally evocative job events separate, when investigating emotionally evocative job events.

WERPI Intra-scale Correlations

Before reviewing the convergent and discriminant validity evidence for the WERPI, we examined the inter-scale correlations presented in Table 3. In reviewing this table, note that all of the WERPI scales are negatively correlated, due to the forced choice format of the items. Furthermore, correlations between interpersonally-based and task-based job events for the same regulation strategy are only moderately correlated. These correlations offer some additional support to the notion for keeping these separate in further analyses. Along the diagonal of Table 3, the WERPI's internal consistency reliabilities are also presented.

Reference Measure Correlations

Turning to Table 4, correlations of the WERPI with all of the reference measures utilized are presented. In general, it is noteworthy to acknowledge the subtle differences in correlation patterns between negative task and negative interpersonal scores on the WERPI. Notably, these are primarily differences of degree and not direction. This again partly justifies the WERPI interpersonal/task categories of job events.

When inspecting the relationships between the WERPI and the reference measure several prominent correlations appear. We will first examine the WERPI's relationship with the Big Five Personality Inventory (John, Donahue, & Kentle, 1991). Neuroticism demonstrated a positive relationship to situation selection on the WERPI

(negative task r = .09; negative interpersonal r = .15). This may be due in part to individuals who are high on neuroticism might not be able to cope with many negative emotionally evocative situations, choosing instead to avoid interpersonally uncomfortable situations. This explanation falls in line with Gross & John (1998) assertion that people high in neuroticism are less likely to change their emotions and report emotions as being difficult to control. Agreeableness on the Big Five resulted in a negative relationship (negative task r = -.19; negative interpersonal r = -.17) with situation selection on the WERPI. Therefore, those that habitually select out of situations are also less agreeable to others. Conscientiousness also produced a negative relationship to situation selection (negative task r = -.16; negative interpersonal r = -.15). Openness was positively related to cognitive change (r = .11) and negatively related to response modulation only for negative task–based events (r = -.10) on the WERPI. The relationship between cognitive change and openness suggests frequent utilization of cognitive change in workplace task-based situations is related to being open to wide range of ideas and experiences.

In general, these results of the WERPI's relationship to the Big Five personality traits indicate that individuals who habitually utilized situation selection on the WERPI, also tended to be more emotionally unstable, less agreeable, less goal oriented, and less rule following. Those who frequently engaged in cognitive change were open to more ideas, as opposed to those who utilized response modulation. While providing insight into how the various regulation strategies relate to personality variables, these findings also add some additional evidence to the WERPI's construct validity evidence.

The WERPI did not correlate positively with social desirability as measured by Crowne and Marlowe's (1960) Social Desirability Scale. In fact, only one significant negative correlation, between situation selection in interpersonally-based situations (r = -.14) was observed. This suggests that responses generally reflected something more than socially desirable responding. The indirect approach to assessing emotion regulation in this study appears to have helped alleviating social desirability influences.

Self-monitoring (Snyder, 1974) was positively related to response modulation on the WERPI (negative task r = .12; negative interpersonal r = .16). Additionally, cognitive change in task-based events on the WERPI was negatively related to self-monitoring (r = -.12). These results support the notion that individuals who utilize response modulation are consciously aware of their emotional displays, and often seek to control them. Furthermore, those high on cognitive change more often seek to change how they feel, rather than how their emotion is displayed.

Examining the relationships between the PANAS (Watson, Clark & Tellegen, 1988), a measure of positive and negative trait affectivity, and the WERPI, we see very few significant correlations. The single significant correlation observed was situation selection demonstrating a negative relationship with positive affect in negative task events (r = -.13). This result is somewhat different from Gross and John's (2003) finding that reappraisal was positively related to positive affect, and suppression was positively related to negative affect. However, there are two potential explanations for this difference. First, the cognitive change and response modulation scales included strategies other than reappraisal and suppression. Second, implicit measures generally

show smaller correlations with self-report measures of the same or related constructs (James, 1998; James & Mazerolle, 2001; Mumford et al, 2000).

Next, we will examine the relationships of the WERPI with the Emotion Regulation Questionnaire (ERQ; John & Gross, 2003). Cognitive reappraisal and expression suppression are two well-studied emotion regulation strategies identified by Gross & John (2003) as exhibiting habitual individual differences. Furthermore, these strategies are represented by two categories of emotion regulation strategies in the WERPI. Cognitive reappraisal is defined as changing the meaning of a situation, and is a strategy subsumed under the cognitive change scales on the WERPI. The suppression of emotional expressions involves inhibiting emotion expression, and is classified under the category of response modulation on the WERPI.

Situation selection in negative task-based events on the WERPI was negatively related to expressive suppression on the ERQ (r = -.14). Therefore, those that routinely engage in situation selection in negative task-based events are less likely to suppress their negative emotions. Reappraisal was strongly negatively related to situation modification (negative task r = -.25; negative interpersonal r = -.17). It appears from this study that those who routinely engage in situation modification do not use reappraisal often. Attention deployment in interpersonally-based events was positively related to reappraisal, possibly due to the fact that these are both cognitive regulation strategies.

Results from the investigation of the relationships observed between the WERPI and emotional intelligence, as defined by Wong & Law (2003), consisted of four dimensions; self-emotions, others emotions, use of emotions, and regulation of

emotions. It was found that situation selection in negative task-based job events (self-emotions r = -.11, others emotions r = -.14, use of emotions r = -.17, and regulation of emotions r =-.12) produced more statistically significant correlations than situation selection in negative interpersonally-based job events (self-emotions r = -.19, use of emotions r = -.15). Taken together, frequent use of situation selection appears to be generally related to lower levels of emotional intelligence, supporting the notion that without the resources to handle an emotional evocative situation, individuals may opt out of a situation. The construct of *use of emotions* on the emotional intelligence scale was also positively related to situation modification (negative task r = .11, negative interpersonal r = .12). Second, the emotional intelligence construct of others emotions was positively related to situation modification (negative task r = .14). In general, frequent use of situation modification was related to higher levels of emotional intelligence, while situation selection was related to low levels of emotional intelligence. The findings add some additional support to the WERPI's construct validity evidence.

The last reference measure utilized in the current study was the COPE (Carver, Scheier, & Weintraub, 1989), which describes different coping mechanisms. Seven scales from the COPE were utilized specifically, seen as most relevant to emotion regulation. This is one of the first known studies to comprehensively evaluate the relationship between these two constructs; however many of the findings are consistent with the predictions made by Gross and John (2007). Situation modification in both task-based and interpersonally-based job events was positively related to active coping (negative task r = .16; negative interpersonal r = .11), which would be expected

because active coping and situation modification are both active problem solving styles of coping. Situation selection in both task-based and interpersonally-based job events was positively related to behavioral disengagement (negative task r = .20; negative interpersonal r = .22), which once more, would be expected. Active coping was negatively related to situation selection on the WERPI, for negative task events (r = -.15). Furthermore, active coping was negatively related to response modulation for negative task-based job events on the WERPI (r = -.13). This indicates that those who engage in manipulating their outward emotional expressions in negative task-based work events are less likely to cope actively with their negative emotions. Surprisingly, venting on the COPE scale was positively related (r = .16) with situation modification in negative task-based job events. The use of humor as a coping mechanism was negatively related to situation modification in negative interpersonally-based job events (r = -.11) while positively related to response modulation (r = .16) in negative interpersonally-based job events. The relationship between humor and response modulation appears to support the idea that those who focus on their outward display of emotion in negative interpersonally-based job events are more inclined to also utilize humor (laughing) as a coping mechanism, and less inclined to modify the situation. Behavioral disengagement on the COPE was negatively related to situation modification (Negative Task r = -.12; negative interpersonal r = -.12).

Regulation Strategies and Job Satisfaction

Correlations between the WERPI regulation strategies with coworker, supervisor, job in general, and work satisfaction as measured by the JDI (Balzer et al., 1997) are presented in Table 5. Additionally, a composite scale of overall job

satisfaction was developed by averaging across all the job satisfaction facets. Hypothesis 1a predicted that for interpersonally-based affective events, situation modification, attention deployment and cognitive change would be positively related to job satisfaction. Hypothesis 2b asserted that in task-based events, response modulation would be positively related to job satisfaction. From these zero-order correlations, it does not appear that any of these strategies significantly relate to job satisfaction. A small but meaningful correlation was found between response modulation in task-based events and job satisfaction, notably with supervisor satisfaction (r = .12) and overall job satisfaction (r = .11.

Hypothesis 1b predicted that for interpersonally-based affective events, situation selection and response modulation would be negatively related to job satisfaction. This was partially supported with situation selection demonstrating negative relationships with coworker satisfaction (r = -.13), supervisor satisfaction (r = -.14), and overall job satisfaction (r = -.12). Furthermore, hypothesis 2a suggested that for task-based affective events, situation modification, situation selection, and cognitive change would all be negatively related to job satisfaction. Our observations provided partial support for this hypothesis, with situation selection yielding significant negative relationships with all job satisfaction facets, coworker satisfaction (r = -.10), supervisor satisfaction (r = -.15), job in general satisfaction (r = -.13), work satisfaction (r = -.11), and overall job satisfaction (r = -.15).

To expand on these findings, a hierarchal linear regression was used to determine the impact of the various emotion regulation strategies on job satisfaction. First, to simplify the process, a factor analysis was conducted on the JDI dimensions

(coworker satisfaction, supervisor satisfaction, job in general satisfaction, and work satisfaction). Results indicated that it was appropriate to combine these factors into one factor: overall job satisfaction. Additionally, to avoid singularity with the independent variables (i.e. WERPI strategies), regressions were ran grouping the independent variables by the proposed direction of the relationship.

Hierarchal multiple regression was used to assess hypotheses 1a & 2b examining the relationship between emotion regulation strategy and job satisfaction. In the first block, social desirability (β = .16), gender (β = .16), EI "use of emotions" (β =.20) were included as controls. After step 1, with the covariates included, R^2 =.13, F (3, 331) = 15.80, p < .001. In block 2, the WERPI emotion regulation strategies of interpersonal situation modification (β = .05), interpersonal attention deployment (β = .11), interpersonal cognitive change (β =.09), and task response modulation (β = .14) were added. After step 2 with the WERPI emotion regulation added to the prediction of overall job satisfaction, R^2= .15, adjusted R^2= .13, F (7, 327) = 8.37, p < .001. Table 6 presents the results from this regression analysis in the upper first column. Results from this analysis indicated that routine use of response modulation in task-based events, and attention deployment in interpersonally-based events leads to an increase in overall job satisfaction. These results provide additional partial support for Hypotheses 1a & 1b.

To examine Hypotheses 1b and 2a using hierarchical regression, social desirability (β = .18), gender (β = .15), EI "Use of Emotions" (β = .18) were included in step 1 as controls. After step 1, with the covariates included, R^2 =.13, F (3, 331) = 15.80, p < .001. In block 2, the WERPI emotion regulation strategies of interpersonal

situation selection (β = -.06), interpersonal response modulation (β = -.10), task situation modification (β = -.12), task situation selection (β = -.19), task attention deployment (β = -.17), and task cognitive change (β = -.20) were added. After step 2 with the WERPI emotion regulation strategies added to the prediction of overall job satisfaction, R^2=.16, adjusted R^2= .14, F (9, 325) = 6.81, p < .001. Table 6 presents the results from this regression analysis in the lower half of the first column.

Results provided partial support for hypothesis 1a, and supported 2b. Attention deployment in interpersonally-based situations and response modulation in task-based events were positively related to job satisfaction. Results did not support hypothesis 1b. However, results provided partial support for hypothesis 2a, indicating that routine use of situation selection in task-based events and cognitive change in task-based events decrease overall job satisfaction.

WERPI Regulation Strategies and Life Satisfaction

To investigate hypothesis 3a which predicted that in interpersonally-based events, situation modification, attention deployment, and cognitive change would be positively related to life satisfaction, and hypothesis 3b that proposed in task-based events, response modulation would be positively related to life satisfaction, we examined the bivariate correlations between the WERPI regulation strategies and life satisfaction. Results indicated that none of these strategies significantly positively related to life satisfaction.

To complement these zero-order correlations we ran hierarchal multiple regression on life satisfaction to assess hypotheses 3a & b. In a similar manner to previous analysis, to avoid singularity with the independent variables (i.e. WERPI

strategies), regressions were ran grouping the independent variables by the proposed direction of the relationship. In the first block, positive affect (β = .35), negative affect (β = -.25), reappraisal (β = -.15), extroversion (β = .17), conscientiousness (β = .10), and openness (β = -.15) were included as controls. After step 1, with the covariates included, R^2 =.34, F (6, 326) = 28.24, p < .001. In block 2, the WERPI emotion regulation strategies of interpersonal situation modification (β = .05), interpersonal attention deployment (β = .13), interpersonal cognitive change (β = -.01), and task response modulation (β = .08) were included. After step 2 with the WERPI emotion regulation strategies added to the prediction of life satisfaction, R^2= .36, adjusted R^2= .34, F (10, 322) = 18.31, p < .001. Table 6 presents the results from this regression analysis in the upper half of the second column.

Results from this analysis provided partial support for hypotheses 3a, indicating that routine use of attention deployment in interpersonally-based work events increases life satisfaction. This indicates that such strategies as diverting your attention from the emotion, by focusing on a task when experiencing negative emotions from interpersonal work situations is beneficial.

Hypothesis 4a predicted that in interpersonally-based events, situation selection and response modulation would be negatively related to life satisfaction. While hypothesis 4b proposed that for task-based events; situation modification, situation selection, attention deployment, and cognitive change would all be negatively related to life satisfaction. To assess our hypotheses, we first examined the bivariate correlations between the aforementioned WERPI regulation strategies and life

satisfaction. Results indicated that only situation selection was negatively related to life satisfaction in task (r = -.15) and interpersonal events (r = -.13).

To complement these zero-order correlations we ran a hierarchal multiple regression on life satisfaction to assess hypotheses 4a & b. In a similar manner to previous analysis, to avoid singularity with the independent variables (i.e. WERPI strategies), regressions were ran grouping the independent variables by the proposed direction of the relationship. In the first block, positive affect (β = .34), negative affect (β = -.25), reappraisal (β = -.13), extroversion (β = .16), conscientiousness (β = .09), and openness (β = -.16) were included as controls. After step 1, with the covariates included, R^2 =.34, F (6, 326) = 28.24, p < .001. In block 2, the WERPI emotion regulation strategies of interpersonal situation selection (β = -.04), interpersonal response modulation (β = -.05), task situation modification (β =-.06), task situation selection (β =-.11), task attention deployment (β = -.04), and task cognitive change (β = -.14) were included. After step 2 with the WERPI emotion regulation strategies added to the prediction of life satisfaction, R^2= .36, Adjusted R^2= .33, F (12, 320) = 14.84, p < .001. Table 6 presents the results from this regression analysis in the lower half of the second column.

Results from this analysis did not lend support to hypothesis 4a, however did provide partial support for hypotheses 4b. Results indicated that routine use of cognitive change in task-based work events decreases life satisfaction.

WERPI Regulation Strategies and Customer Service Performance

To assess the relationship between emotion regulation strategies and customer service performance addressed in Hypothesis 5a, 5b, 6a, and 6b participants responded

to a series of customer service scenarios, where they responded as if they were customer service agents. We used trained judges to rate participant responses in the simulated customer service interactions on scales of "quality of customer service problem solving" (quality), "integrative approach to customer service" (integrative approach), and the "presence of positive communication tactics" (positive communication).

In Hypothesis 5a, we asserted that in interpersonally-based events, situation modification, attention deployment and cognitive change would be positively related to customer service performance. Results demonstrated that in interpersonally-based events, situation modification was significantly positively related to most of the customer performance indicators, quality (r =.13), integrative approach (r =.14), with a positive but not statistically significant relationship with positive communication. Attention deployment in interpersonally-based events was significantly positively related to positive communication (r =.11), and data trended in the positive direction with quality and integrative approach. Cognitive change did not produce any significant positive relationship with any of the customer service performance indicators.

Hypothesis 5b suggested that in task-based events, situation modification, attention deployment, and cognitive change would be positively related to customer service performance. Situation modification in task-based events was not related to any of the customer service performance indicators. Attention deployment in task-based events was positively related to positive communication (r =.12). Cognitive change in

task-based events related positively to all customer service performance indicators; quality (r =.11), integrative approach (r =.16), and positive communication (r =.13).

Hypothesis 6a predicted that for interpersonally-based events, situation selection and response modulation would be negatively related to customer service performance. Situation selection in interpersonally-based events did relate negatively to all of the customer service performance indicators, quality (r = -.16), integrative approach (r = -.15), and communication (r = -.18). Response modulation in interpersonally-based events also produced negative relationships with all the customer service indicators, quality (r = -.11), integrative approach (r = -.12), and positive communication (r = -.11).

Hypothesis 6b proposed that for task-based events, situation selection and response modulation would be negatively related to customer service performance. Situation selection in task-based events did relate negatively to all of the customer service performance indicators, quality (r = -.10), integrative approach (r = -.12), and positive communication (r = -.13). Additionally, response modulation in task-based events also produced negative relationships with all the customer service indicators, quality (r = -.13), integrative approach (r =-.20), and positive communication (r = -.12).

To complement the zero order correlations, several hierarchal linear regressions were run on quality, integrative approach and positive communication for the various emotion regulation strategies to assess. In a similar manner to previous analysis, to avoid singularity with the independent variables (i.e. WERPI strategies), regressions were ran grouping the independent variables by the proposed direction of the

relationship, for each of the customer service performance indicators. To assess what may increase customer service quality, in the first block, verbal intelligence (β = .11), age (β =.10), and reappraisal (β = -.14) were included as controls. After step 1, with the covariates included, R^2 =.06, F (3, 330) = 6.60, p < .01. In block 2, the WERPI emotion regulation strategies of interpersonal situation modification (β = .18), interpersonal attention deployment (β = .13), interpersonal cognitive change (β = -.01), task situation modification (β = .02), task attention deployment (β = .12), and task cognitive change (β = .16) were included. After step 2 with the WERPI emotion regulation strategies added to the prediction of quality of customer service problem solving, R^2= .12, Adjusted R^2= .09, F (9, 327) = 4.78, p < .01. Table 7 presents the results from this regression analysis in the upper half of the first column.

To assess what emotion regulation strategies may lead to an increase in the use of an integrative customer service approach, a separate hierarchal linear regression was used. In the first block, agreeableness (β = .14), age (β =.15), and reappraisal (β = -.12) were included as controls. After step 1, with the covariates included, R^2 =.09, F (3, 371) =11.83, p < .01. In block 2, the WERPI emotion regulation strategies of interpersonal situation modification (β = .14), interpersonal attention deployment (β = .11), interpersonal cognitive change (β =-.05), task situation modification (β =.10), task attention deployment (β = .10), and task cognitive change (β = .24) were included. After step 2 with the WERPI emotion regulation strategies added to the prediction of quality of integrative customer service approach, R^2= .16, adjusted R^2= .14, F (9, 365) = 7.56, p < .01. Table 7 presents the results from this regression analysis in the upper half of the second column.

To assess which emotion regulation strategies may lead to an increase of positive communication tactics, a hierarchal linear regression was used. In the first block, extroversion (β = .11), and conscientiousness (β =.12) were included as controls. After step 1, with the covariates included, R^2 =.04, F (2, 396) =8.97, p < .01. In block 2, the WERPI emotion regulation strategies of interpersonal situation modification (β = .16), interpersonal attention deployment (β = .15), interpersonal cognitive change (β =.01), task situation modification (β = .03), task attention deployment (β = .12), and task cognitive change (β = .17) were included. After step 2 with the WERPI emotion regulation strategies added to the prediction of positive communication, R^2= .11, adjusted R^2= .09, F (8, 390) = 5.79, p < .01. Table 7 presents the results from this regression analysis in the upper half of the third column.

To assess what may decrease customer service quality, a hierarchal linear regression was utilized, in the first block, verbal intelligence (β = .10), age (β = .11), and reappraisal (β = -.12) were included as controls. After step 1, with the covariates included, R^2 =.06, F (3, 333) = 6.59, p < .01. In block 2, the WERPI emotion regulation strategies of interpersonal situation selection (β = -.09), interpersonal response modulation (β = -.09), task situation selection (β =-.12), and task response modulation (β = -.08) were included. After step 2 with the WERPI emotion regulation strategies added to the prediction of quality of customer service problem solving, R^2= .10, adjusted R^2= .08, F (7, 329) = 5.12, p < .01. Table 7 presents the results from this regression analysis in the bottom half of the first column.

Using hierarchal linear regression to assess the relationship between the emotion regulation strategies and a decrease in integrative customer service approach,

in the first block, agreeableness (β = .16), age (β =.15), and reappraisal (β = -.10) were included as controls. After step 1, with the covariates included, R^2 =.09, F (3, 371) =11.83, p < .01. In block 2, the WERPI emotion regulation strategies of interpersonal situation selection (β = -.09), interpersonal response modulation (β = -.17), task situation selection (β = -.06), and task response modulation (β = -.05) were included. After step 2 with the WERPI emotion regulation strategies added to the prediction of quality of integrative customer service approach, R^2= .14, adjusted R^2= .12, F (7, 367) = 8.27, p < .01. Table 7 presents the results from this regression analysis in the bottom half of the second column.

A final hierarchal linear regression was used to assess the relationship between the emotion regulation strategies and a decrease in positive communication tactics. In the first block, extroversion (β = -.09), and conscientiousness (β = .13) were included as controls. After step 1, with the covariates included, R^2 =.04, F (2, 396) =8.97, p < .01. In block 2, the WERPI emotion regulation strategies of interpersonal situation selection (β = -.12), interpersonal response modulation (β = - .08), task situation selection (β = -.12), and task response modulation (β = -.08) were included. After step 2 with the WERPI emotion regulation strategies added to the prediction of positive communication, R^2= .09, Adjusted R^2= .07, F (6, 392) = 6.33, p < .01. Table 7 presents the results from this regression analysis in the bottom half of the third column.

In summary, with regard to customer service performance, these findings offered partial support for hypothesis 5a, with attention deployment and situation modification in interpersonally-based work event situations leading to higher customer service performance. Partial support was found for hypothesis 5b, with attention

deployment in task-based events being positively related to customer service performance. Hypotheses 6a and 6b were both supported with situation selection and response modulation being negatively related to customer service performance in both types of job events.

Cluster Analysis

To address Research Question 1, the Ward and Hook (1963) procedure was used to identify patterns of individual differences in emotion regulation. The Ward Hook procedure is an iterative, hierarchical clustering procedure. This process took each study participants profile scores on the different emotion regulation strategies (i.e. the subscales of the WERPI, utilizing the frequency that the strategy was endorsed) and treated them as their own type. Next, the two most similar types were then combined. This process was repeated until all individuals had been grouped into distinct groups. The number of groups to be retained was determined by identifying the point at which further combination of groups resulted in a sharp increase in within group heterogeneity. Examination of the plot of incremental within-group variation indicated that a four-cluster solution should be retained. This solution appeared to provide the smallest possible number of relatively homogenous clusters.

After the number of clusters was identified, mean profiles for each group were obtained and used as seed points for a non-hierarchical *k*-means analysis. This serves as a control for drift in early assignment into groups, as well as providing the final assignment of individuals for groups to be used in subsequent analyses.

The follow up *k*-means analysis resulted in four relatively evenly populated clusters (Cluster 1: n=108, Cluster 2: n=111, Cluster 3: n=85, Cluster 4: n=109).

A discriminant function analysis was then conducted in which the group assignment (Cluster) served as the criterion, and negative task/interpersonal scores (frequencies of regulation strategies) on the WERPI served as the predictors. This was conducted to confirm the group structures. In the discriminant function analysis, it was found that 94% of the participants were assigned to the same cluster to which they were assigned in the *k*-means analysis. Therefore, the four-cluster solution appears to provide a stable description of the emotion regulation strategy tendencies or profiles.

After the set of clusters was identified, the next set of analyses was intended to provide basic descriptive data concerning the four types or clusters that appeared. Here, the nature of each cluster type was assessed by examining differences in the emotion regulation profiles, in excess of half of the pooled within-groups standard deviations. This procedure was undertaken in lieu of traditional statistical significance testing because clustering intentionally induces wide variation in cluster cell size and different levels of within-group variation across clusters (Mumford et al. 2000; Owens & Schoenfeldt, 1979). These group profile differences were then used to label and describe the nature of the group clusters, which will be described in the following section.

Emotion regulation strategy profiles.

For each of the four types identified in the cluster analysis, Table 8 presents the average percent of times an emotion strategy was elicited in the various negative emotion situations (i.e. task and interpersonal). To identify distinguishable patterns in

the emotion regulation strategies elicited, mean differences in excess of half of the pooled within-group standard deviation from the sample means were utilized as indicators of characteristically high or low for a given strategy.

Members of the first group can be characterized as frequently eliciting situation modification in both task-based and interpersonally-based job events: while eliciting response modulation in task-based situations and attention deployment in interpersonally-based situations less frequently. This pattern of emotion regulation led us to label this type *Situation Modifiers*. Individuals in this group based on their observed scores; tended to regulate their emotions by trying to manipulate the situation to lessen the emotional impact. In other words, they seek to solve the problem, by taking direct action on the source of the emotion.

The second type to emerge in this analysis was characteristically high on cognitive change in both task-based and interpersonally-based work situations. Compared to other groups, members of this group tended to elicit response modulation less frequently in task-based situations, and a low level of situation selection in interpersonally-based work events. Therefore, this group was labeled *Cognitive Changers*. Based on their behavioral tendencies identified in this test, these individuals when faced with an emotionally evocative situation in an organizational context will tend to regulate the emotion by changing their perspective of the situation. Cognitive change can be enacted by a variety of methods. For example, individuals in this cluster on the WERPI in interpersonally-based situations often looked at the situation through another's perspective to lessen their own experienced negative emotion.

A third group was distinguished by eliciting situation selection more frequently in both task-based and interpersonally-based work situations than the other individuals. This group was accordingly labeled the *Situation Selectors*. These individuals use emotional forecasting to predict the emotional state, and then either by approaching or avoiding certain people, places, or objects to regulate their own emotions. For example, when faced with the prospect of a negative emotionally evocative situation at work, these individuals often tended to physically either avoid the situation, or defer the situation to another coworker.

A final fourth group was identified as evoking response strategies habitually more than other groups. Consequently, we labeled this group R*esponse Modulators*. This category of strategies involves a variety of physiological, experimental, or behavioral responses that alter the experience or display of emotions, after the emotion has already been felt. For example, these individuals may often suppress their outward expression of the emotion, when feeling an emotion that they consider inappropriate to display for the context of the situation.

Demographic information analyses.

Demographic information, such as gender, employment industry, and race was collected for potential influence on emotion regulation strategy use. Appendix I includes available demographic information, presented by cluster. This table demonstrates that the clusters had relatively similar demographic profiles, thus providing evidence for a lack of substantial demographic influences on group membership.

Cluster Profile differences in Well-being

To address potential group differences in job satisfaction posed in research question 1, an ANCOVA was performed between cluster types on job satisfaction, with emotional intelligence (use of emotions dimension), and social desirability included as a covariates. After adjustment by covariates, cluster types varied significantly on job satisfaction with an overall main effect (F (5, 336) = 7.31, p<.001, η^2_p=.10). However, no significant differences on job satisfaction were found between group types after controlling for covariates. Therefore, it appears that differences in preference patterns in emotion regulation do not result in differences in job satisfaction.

To examine potential difference in life satisfaction, an ANCOVA was performed between the emerged cluster types on life satisfaction, with positive and negative affect, and reappraisal from the ERQ included as a covariates. After adjustment by covariates, cluster types varied significantly on life satisfaction with an overall main effect (F (6, 328) = 22.14, p<.001, η^2_p=.29). However, no significant differences were found between clusters on life satisfaction after controlling for covariates. Therefore, differences in preference patterns of emotion regulation may not result in differences in life satisfaction.

Cluster Profile differences in Customer Service Performance

To examine differences in customer service performance, a MANCOVA using Wilk's λ was performed between cluster types, with age included as a covariate. This analysis showed a significant main effect (F (3, 384) = 192.28, p <.001, η^2_p=.60). Follow up univariate analyses showed that there were significant differences between clusters in relation to all of the customer service performance metrics; use of integrative problem solving style (F (4, 386) = 7.48, p<.001, η^2_p= .07), quality of

customer service problem solving (F (4, 386) = 4.30, p <.01, η^2_p= .04), and use of positive customer service communication tactics (F (4, 386) = 3.70, p <.01, η^2_p= .04).

Post-hoc analysis showed that Cluster 2: *Cognitive Changers* had higher levels of integrative problem solving style (M = 2.31, SE = .06) than Cluster 4: *Response Modulators* (M = 2.06, SE = .06), p <.05. As well, Cluster 4: *Response Modulators* had lower levels of quality of customer service problem solving (M =2.36 SE =.05) than Cluster 2: *Cognitive Changers* (M =2.61, SE =.05), p < .01, and Cluster 4: *Response Modulators* evidenced lower levels of positive customer service communication tactics (M =2.48, SE =.05) than Cluster 2: *Cognitive Changers* (M =2.72, SE = .05), p <.01. However, no significant differences were found on positive customer service communication tactics between Cluster 4: *Response Modulators* (M =2.48, SE = .05) and Cluster 1: *Situation Modifiers* (M =2.58, SE = .05).

Cluster 2: *Cognitive Changers* had significantly higher levels of positive customer service communication tactics (M = 2.72, SE = .05), than Cluster 3: *Situation Selectors* (M = 2.49, SE = .06), p <. 05. However the differences were not significant in quality of customer service problem solving, between Cluster 2: *Cognitive Change* (M =2.61, SE = .05) and Cluster 3: *Situation Selectors* (M =2.44, SE = .06). In general, Cluster 3: *Situation Selectors*, had poor customer service performance, while Cluster 2: *Cognitive Changers* had higher levels of customer service performance.

Discussion

The purpose of this study was to determine the unique effects of specific emotion regulation strategies in different types of affective events on a number of well-being and performance outcomes. To address this goal, a new measure of workplace

emotion regulation (WERPI) was developed and validated. This in part answers the call by Diefendorff, Richard, & Yang (2008) who suggested the next step in research on workplace emotion regulation should be to develop a multi-faceted measure of emotion regulation taking into account the circumstances of strategy use and the various outcomes. Overall, the results of this study demonstrated that specific regulation strategies for interpersonally-based versus task-based based affective events have unique effects on a variety of outcomes.

Before briefly discussing the study's findings, it should be noted that this study was contingent on the development of a reliable and valid measure of workplace emotion regulation. Close attention was paid to developing theoretically sound response options reflecting the various emotion regulation strategies as well as providing task-based and interpersonally-based items covering a variety of affective events that have been described in previous literature.

This study provided some compelling insight into how people regulate their emotions in response to different affective contexts. This study utilized the broad conceptualization of *task-based* or *interpersonally-based* job events to demonstrate how the features of the emotionally eliciting event may shape preferences for, and effectiveness of particular regulation strategies. First, in general, situation modification was utilized most frequently across both task-based and interpersonally-based events. Response modulation was utilized more frequently in interpersonally-based versus task-based based events, whereas cognitive change was used more frequently in task-based versus interpersonally-based events. Situation selection was utilized the least in both task-based and interpersonally-based events. These findings are consistent with

previous research indicating that problem-focused approaches (similar to situation modification) are viewed as adaptive and more effective, than emotion focused (similar to attention deployment, cognitive change, response modulation) (Billings & Moos, 1984).

These finding were echoed by the subject matter expert ratings of effective responses to these scenarios. However, we must bear in mind that while situation selection was the least effective and least utilized strategy across job events, certain types of individuals utilize this strategy frequently. This study's findings coincide with Diefendorff, Richard & Yang's (2008) survey data, reporting that employees reported using approach regulation (i.e. situation modification) much more than avoidant strategies (i.e. situation selection). Furthermore, the use of situation selection had significant implications for well-being and performance outcomes.

Reference Measure Relationships

In summary, many of the relationships between the WERPI and reference measures bolstered well for the construct validity of the test. Results from the zero-order correlations between the WERPI and reference measures indicated a mix of moderate to low correlations, with task-based and interpersonally-based events producing some meaningful differences in the magnitude of relationships. In general, these correlations, along with the moderate correlations of emotion regulation strategies across task-based and interpersonally-based events indicate that emotion regulation in task-based affective events is different from emotion regulation in interpersonally-based events. Furthermore, the relationships observed can be

reasonably explained, and further support the measures construct validity, bearing in mind the limitations of the measurement format.

This test took an indirect approach to measurement, in which individuals responded to situations, whereas all the reference measures were direct measures; in other words, the respondents self-reported particular behaviors. This fundamental difference likely creates attenuation in correlations, as noted in previous research such as in Mumford et al's (2000) research on direct and indirect measures of values, as well as James (1998), and James & Mazerolle, (2001) measure of personality. Therefore, interpretation of the WERPI's construct validation efforts taken in this study, should consider that the correlations were likely attenuated due to the indirect/direct measure discrepancy.

Consequences of Emotion Regulation

Job satisfaction.

A number of important findings stem from this study regarding the relationships between regulation strategies and job satisfaction. The distinction between interpersonal and task related job events provided some very interesting contradictions. Situation selection in task-based events was negatively related satisfaction, while situation selection in interpersonally-based events had no relationship with job satisfaction. It is possible that when people employ situation selection for task-based events, removal from the situation leads to negative effects on performance which could decrease job satisfaction (Judge, Thoresen, Bono,& Patton, 2001).

Attention deployment had a positive relationship with job satisfaction in interpersonally-based events, and a negative relationship with task-based events. In social situations, diverting attention by focusing on the goals of the interaction, rather than the emotional focus point, allows an individual to better identify causes underlying the other person's emotions and/or actions so that the event can be quickly resolved. However, in task-based situations, use of this strategy might involve diversion of attention away from what is relevant for task performance. Decreased task performance could then lead to negative affective states, and ultimately lower job satisfaction.

Cognitive change strategies did not produce a significant relationship with job satisfaction in interpersonally-based events, however in task-based events a negative relationship was found. This could relate to the inherent complexity and lack of autonomy involved in many workplace tasks. Cognitive change requires cognitive processing, which can in turn remove available resources from task completion and result in less performance. Frustration or other negative emotions might set in from the less effective performance, resulting in lower job satisfaction over time.

Response modulation evidenced a negative relationship with job satisfaction in interpersonally-based events, and a positive relationship in task-based events. These findings support the notion that response modulation might not be appropriate for a number of reasons (Aldelmann, 1995; Gross & John, 2003), including possible negative social consequences. Response strategies such as suppression and faking have been consistently related to higher levels of stress, and lower job satisfaction (Adelmann, 1995; Brotheridge & Lee, 2002; Côté & Morgan, 2000; Grandey, 2003,

Parkinson, 1991). However, in task-based situations, suppression and faking might be more appropriate because there is less concern for how others will perceive these kinds of behaviors. Therefore, in task-based situations, response strategies, such as relaxation, suppression, and faking appeared to be successful in contributing to job satisfaction.

Life satisfaction.

In the current investigation, few of the regulation strategies demonstrated relationships to life satisfaction. This finding diverges from Gross & John's (2003) observation that reappraisal was linked to higher life satisfaction, while suppression was related to lower life satisfaction. This may have been limited due to the workplace context of the WERPI. However, attention deployment in interpersonally-based situations was positively related to life satisfaction. This is consistent with the current study's job satisfaction findings, and the notion that attention deployment is appropriate to employ in interpersonally-based situations. Cognitive change in task-based events also evidenced similar negative relationships with life and job satisfaction. This is consistent with the notion that the complexity of task situations may hamper the effectiveness of this strategy.

Customer service.

The relationship between the regulation strategies and customer service performance were relatively consistent across the three performance indicators. Situation modification in interpersonally-based events was positively related to customer service. This may come to no surprise, given the large social and problem-

solving component to customer service. However, just as important is the lack of a relationship of situation modification with respect to task-based events. Modifying the situation when task-based affective events occur appears to do little to affect performance. As expected, situation selection produced negative relationships with customer service, in task-based affective events, but did not show any significant relationship in interpersonally-based events.

Attention deployment was positively related to customer service performance, in both interpersonally-based and task-based events. This is an important finding, for a couple of reasons. First, it points to the nature of the outcome, which is inherently social in nature; therefore, consistent with this study's other findings, where attention deployment was effective in interpersonally-based situations. Second, it is widely reported that suppression is the most common strategy for customer service agents to employ (Grandey, 2003). However, this study suggests that attention deployment may be more valuable in reducing the negative consequences of negative emotionally evocative events.

Furthermore, cognitive change is commonly reported as being effective for customer service (Grandey, 2003). However, cognitive change may be difficult to perform in some situations because of the cognitive resources it requires, as well as situational time constraints. In the current study, cognitive change in task-based situations was found to be beneficial for customer service. This may be explained by the assumption that customer service situations are not very complex, and highly social situations. It would then be reasonable to conclude that cognitive change would actually serve well under those circumstances. Furthermore, if cognitive change is

successful, then a positive customer experience from both perspectives might result (Bitner, Booms, & Tetreault, 1990). However, as noted in previous research (e.g. Kanfer & Ackerman, 1989), and the current study, repeated use of cognitive change can have negative well being consequences, such as lowered job and life satisfaction. Therefore, further study is needed, to further explore cognitive change as a useful strategy for customer service agents, and to fully grasp the unintended long-term consequences.

Finally, response modulation did not evidence significant positive or negative relationships to customer service, in either interpersonal or task events. This finding suggests that while many customer service agents utilize this strategy frequently, it may not be beneficial, for the employee's well-being (Beal, Trougakos, Weiss & Green, 2006; Brotheridge & Lee, 2002; Grandey, 2003; Grandey, 2004, Gross & John, 2003; Côté & Morgan, 2000; Morris & Feldman, 1996; Rutter and Fielding, 1988; Zammuner & Galli, 2005).

In summary, in interpersonally-based events, it appears that the use of situation modification and attention deployment is related to higher levels of customer service. In task-based events, attention deployment and cognitive change may be successful. However, cognitive change comes with associated costs, therefore, use of this strategy with respect to customer service warrants precaution, and further study.

Preferences in emotion regulation.

The study also explored the idea that different emotion regulation preference patterns exist, and, that these patterns may be differentially related to key outcomes.

This study extends previous research on emotion regulation individual differences by grouping individuals based on their frequency of strategy use across the five regulation categories in Gross's (1998) model. A cluster analyses identified four groups of individuals with similar emotion regulation tendencies, stable across job contexts (task or interpersonal job events). Individuals in these groups tended to habitually regulate their emotions in four distinct ways, each corresponding to specific categories of emotion regulation in Gross's model of emotion regulation.

Individuals who were classified as *Situation Modifiers*, when faced with a negative work event, tended to regulate their emotions by problem solving, or by directly manipulating the situation, while not utilizing response modulation or attention deployment frequently. The second group *Cognitive Changers*, more frequently sought alternative perspectives on the job event, rather than using response modulation or situation selection. Next, the *Situation Selectors* often avoided negative emotional situations, while rarely employing cognitive change. Finally, the individuals who were labeled *Response Modulators* regularly focused on their outward display of emotions, typically by hiding or changing their emotional expressions, and not utilizing situation modification as frequently as others. It should be noted that one of Gross's categories of emotion regulation; attention deployment, was not identified as a distinct cluster. Furthermore, those in the *Cognitive Change* group also frequently elicited attention deployment strategies. This observation could be explained by the fact that both attention deployment and cognitive change are both cognitively oriented emotion regulation strategies.

Results indicated that the clusters did not differ substantially in the well-being measures. Neither life satisfaction nor job satisfaction differed significantly among the four groups, after accounting for other influential variables. This suggests that while the groups of individuals have different patterns of emotion regulation, and the emotion regulation strategies related differently to these variables, individuals do not vary on life and job satisfaction because of their regulation preferences.

However, a different picture emerged for customer service outcomes, with the profile types exhibiting rather distinct performance levels. Individuals who used cognitive change (Cluster 2), performed consistently better on all three customer service indicators (problem solving quality, positive communication tactics, and integrative approach). Cluster 4, the *Response Modulators,* also did consistently worse in customer service performance, across the customer service performance indicators. Cluster 3, the *Situation Selectors,* displayed less positive communication tactics than cognitive changers, and consistently performed low on customer service.

Taken together, the present investigation demonstrated that the WERPI did demonstrate a decent level of construct validity evidence. Furthermore, regulation strategies differ in their effectiveness on a number of different well-being and performance indicators. Situation modification in interpersonally-based situations lead to higher levels of customer service. Attention deployment in interpersonally-based situations had positive effects across all outcome variables. Cognitive change in task-based events was good for performance, but demonstrated negative consequences in terms of job and life satisfaction, in line with cognitive resource allocation theories (e.g. Kanfer & Ackerman, 1989). Response modulation in task-based events was

positively related to job satisfaction, but negatively related in interpersonally-based events. Finally, situation selection generally evidenced negative consequences, as well as demonstrating strong relationships with many negative personality traits, which subsequently accounted for large portions of variance when examining performance and outcome variables.

Lastly, this study identified four distinct patterns of individuals that have unique emotion regulation preference patterns in the workplace. Additionally, customer service performance differences between these groups were identified. Those who routinely engaged in response modulation or situation selection tended to perform worse on the customer service tasks, while those who utilized cognitive change performed better.

Results from this study are important for a number of reasons. First, it provides a measure of emotion regulation specific to the workplace. Second, it demonstrates that regulation strategies vary in their effectiveness on different outcome metrics. Third, it fills a substantial gap in the emotion regulation research, identifying that effective regulation strategy use may in part be dependent on the context that it occurs. Finally, it demonstrates that individuals have unique preference patterns for emotion regulation strategies, which appears to have performance implications.

Limitations

Before addressing the implications of this study, a number of limitations to this study should be borne in mind. One important limitation to this study concerns the WERPI's item format. In essence, the multiple-choice format of the WERPI carries some of the same limitations as an ipsative measure. From a substantive validity

argument, respondents may not be going through the psychological test taking processes in a similar manner, and this process might not accurately represent real world psychological processes. In taking the WERPI, the respondent views all the available options, and then is forced to choose one, whereas in a real-world situation, they may not have the luxury or resources to evaluate available options, or may engage in multiple regulation strategies sequentially or simultaneously. To address these issues, further research of the test format is needed.

Concerning psychometric properties, forced choice measures induce negative correlations among the scales within the sets of task and interpersonal event items. Thus, multivariate statistics may be inappropriate for use with the WERPI (Meade, 2004). However, a forced choice item format does show preferences in emotion regulation strategies quite well, which was of high interest in this study.

This test was also limited in scope, by only examining the downgrading of negative emotions. This was done purposely, for the sake of simplicity, given the exploratory nature of this study. However, it is likely important to understand the nature of the circumstances when it may be beneficial to increase negative emotions, for example in managing others' behaviors (e.g. bill collectors, managers, etc). Furthermore, increasing or decreasing positive emotions was not examined in this study, which also likely provides valuable information.

Another limitation was the use of low-fidelity simulations as performance measures, which, in many ways serves only as a proxy to actual performance data. However, for the purposes of this initial investigation, low-fidelity simulations were appropriate, for a number of reasons beyond the associated costs. Extensive steps were

taken in scenario development, to tap into appropriate dimensions, and assure construct validity. Furthermore, research has shown that low-fidelity simulations are predictive of job performance (Motowidlo, Hanson, & Crafts, 1997) as well as training performance (Fine & Dover, 2005).

Concerning the relationship to life and job satisfaction a number of external influences and circumstances not identified could have influenced the observed relationships that may have not been included in our efforts. For example, job satisfaction could have been influenced by a number of job or task characteristics. Life satisfaction could have been influenced by unique life history events or experiences, level of support network (family/friends), or even economic status.

The current study only examined two possible ways to group affective events, given the complexity of affective work event, research on additional affective event contexts is warranted. Likewise, there are additional emotion regulation strategies that could shed light on individual preferences and how these relate to outcomes at work and outside of work.

The findings from this study have a number of implications for future research on measuring emotion regulation, and emotion regulation in the workplace. First, we were able to find reliable patterns of regulation strategies as formulated by Gross (1998). Moreover, this study demonstrates the worthiness of expanding the focus of emotion regulation measurement beyond reappraisal and suppression, as notable significant differences were found between relationships with relevant constructs, as well as well-being and performance based outcomes.

Future Directions

Several additional steps should be taken in test development and refinement. For example, investigation into different scoring approaches, such as Likert scaling would substantially increase the test's psychometric properties allowing for additional types of statistical evaluation. Additionally, it may be beneficial to measure specific emotion regulation strategies that go beyond the category level of classification that was employed in this study, reflecting Diefendorff, Richard, & Yang's (2008) conclusions. It may be that differential relationships between specific strategies and outcomes within a category exist. This study is viewed as an initial step providing the framework for future research in this area to pursue.

Beyond future test refinement, results from this study suggest that future research in emotion regulation in the workplace should also consider the various categories of strategies, as well as the number of different antecedents and consequences of the strategies. Continued inclusion of the context by which the regulation strategy is evoked should be pursued. Models could eventually expand beyond the interpersonal/task distinction utilized in the current study, either by identifying additional types of situations, or alternatively deriving situational characteristics that are paramount in determining appropriate use. Expansion into discrete emotions, investigating anger, frustration, pessimism, etc. could also provide an intriguing future research endeavor. It may be that certain discrete emotions are dealt with distinctively with unique outcomes. Finally, results suggest that a more in depth expansion of individual differences in emotion regulation would be a worthwhile research endeavor.

Consequently, while bearing from no direct results in this particular study, future research endeavors might consider the investigation of the degree of impact that display rules have on employees' use of emotion regulation strategies in organizations. For example, when there is incongruence between the natural tendencies of an individual and what the role demands, does this exaggerate the ill effects for a strategy for well being and satisfaction, how does it impact task performance? Therefore, one suggestion for future research would be to manipulate display rules in customer service simulations.

Additionally, this study seems to add some support to the notion that employees should be trained to effectively regulate their emotions, for a number of different objectives. For example, effective emotion regulation strategies could be seamlessly added to customer service training, as tips for proving good service. Results from this study suggest that cognitive change and attention deployment should be useful, as well as avoiding situation selection and response modulation when involved in a customer service environment. Finally, beyond customer service, results suggest that emotion regulation strategies could also be included in various employee assistance-training initiatives, given its contribution to job and life satisfaction.

In conclusion, this study offers insight into the complexities and intricacies of emotion regulation. Results suggest that different strategies in specific environments have unique effects on employee performance, and well-being. While more research is needed, this study provides a suggested framework and measurement approach for this work to continue.

References

Adelmann, P. K. (1995). Emotional labor as a potential source of job stress. In S. L. Sauter & L(. R. Murphy (Eds.), *Organizational risk factors for job stress*: 371-381. Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.

Arvey, R. W., Renz, G. L., Watson, T. W., & Ferris, G. R. (1998). Emotionality and job performance: Implications for personnel selection. In *Research in personnel and human resources management, Vol. 16.* (pp. 103-147). US: Elsevier Science/JAI Press.

Ashforth, B. E., & Humphrey, R. H. (1995). Emotion in the workplace: A reappraisal. *Human Relations, 48*(2), 97-125.

Ashforth, B. E., & Kreiner, G. E. (2002). Normalizing emotion in organizations: Making the extraordinary seem ordinary. *Human Resource Management Review, 12*(2), 215-235.

Bachorowski, J., & Braaten, E.B. (1994). Emotional intensity: Measurement and theoretical implications. *Personality and Individual Differences,* 17,(2) 191-1999.

Balzer, W. K., Kihm, J. A., Smith, P. C., Irwin, J. L., Bachiochi, P. D., Robie, C., Sinar, E. F., & Parra, L. F. (1997). *Users' manual for the Job Descriptive Index (JDI; 1997 Revision) and the Job In General scales*. Bowling Green, OH: Bowling Green State University.

Barsade, S. G., Brief, A. P., Spataro, S. E., & Greenberg, J. (2003). The affective revolution in organizational behavior: The emergence of a paradigm. In

Organizational behavior: The state of the science (2nd ed.). (pp. 3-52). Mahwah, NJ, US: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates Publishers.

Barger, P., & Grandey, A. (2006). "Service with a smile" and encounter satisfaction: Emotional contagion and appraisal mechanisms *Academy of Management Journal*. 49(6), 1229–1238.

Barrick, M. R., & Mount, M. K. (1991). The Big Five personality dimensions and job performance: A meta-analysis. *Personnel Psychology, 44*(1) 1-26.

Basch, J. & Fisher, C. D. (2000). Affective events-emotions matrix: A classification of job related events and emotions experienced in the workplace. In, N. Ashkanasy, W. Zerbe, & C. Hartel (Eds.) Emotions in the Workplace: Research, Theory and Practice (pp. 36-48). Westport, CT: Quorum Books.

Baumeister, R., Bratslavsky, E., Muraven, M., & Tice, D. (1998). Ego depletion: Is the active self a limited resource? *Journal of personality and Social Psychology*, 74, 1252-1265.

Beal, D. J., Trougakos, J. P., Weiss, H. M., & Green, S. G. (2006). Episodic Processes in Emotional Labor: Perceptions of Affective Delivery and Regulation Strategies. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *91*(5), 1053-1065.

Beal, D.J, Weiss, H.M, Barros, E., & McDermid, S.M (2005). An episodic process model of affective influences on performance. *Journal of Applied Psychology*. 90, 1054-1068.

Beauregard, T.A., & Henry, L.C. (2009). Making the link between work life balance practices and organizational performance. *Human Resource Management Review*, 19 (1) 9-22.

Billings, A., & Moos, R. (1984). Comparison of children of depressed and nondepressed parents: Moos Family Environment Scale. Annotated Bibliography Abstracts.

Bitner, M.J., Booms, B.H. & Tetreault, M.S. (1990). The service encounter: Diagnosing favorable and unfavorable incidents. *Journal of Marketing*, 54, 71-84.

Bono, J.E., Foldes, H.J., Vinson, G., Muros, J. P. (2007). Workplace emotions: the role of supervision and leadership. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 92(5) 1357-1367.

Brief, A. P., & Weiss, H. M. (2002). Organizational behavior: Affect in the workplace. *Annual Review of Psychology, 53(*1) 279-307.

Brotheridge, C.M., & Lee, R.T. (2002). Development and validation of the Emotional Labour Scale. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, 76 (3) 365-379.

Callahan, J. (2000). Emotion management and organizational functions: A case study of patterns in a non-for profit organization. *Human Resource Development Quarterly*, 11(3) 245-267.

Carver, C. S., Scheier, M. F., & Weintraub, J. K. (1989). Assessing coping strategies: A theoretically based approach. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 56*(2) 267-283.

Côté, S. (2005). Reconciling the feelings as information and hedonic contingency models of how mood influences systematic information processing. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 35, 1656-1679.

Côté, S., & Morgan, L. (2002). A longitudinal analysis of the association between emotion regulation, job satisfaction, and intentions to quit. *Journal of Organizational Behavior, 23*, 947-962.

Cronbach, L. J. (1951). Coefficient alpha and the internal structure of tests. *Psychometrika, 16(3),* 297-334.

Cropanzano, R., Howes, J. C., Grandey, A. A., & Toth, P. (1997). The relationship of organizational politics and support to work behaviors, attitudes, and stress. *Journal of Organizational Behavior, 18*(2), 159-180.

Cropanzano, R., Weiss, H. M., Suckow, K. J., Grandey, A. A., Ashkanasy, N. M., Hartel, C. E., et al. (2000). Doing justice to workplace emotion. In *Emotions in the workplace: Research, theory, and practice.* (pp. 49-62). Westport, CT, US: Quorum Books/Greenwood Publishing Group.

Cropanzano, R., Rupp, D. E., & Byrne, Z. S. (2003). The relationship of emotional exhaustion to job performance ratings and organizational citizenship behavior. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 88(1*) 160-169.

Crowne, D.P., & Marlowe, D. (1960). A new scale of social desirability independent of psychopathology. Journal of Consulting Psychology, 24, 349-354.

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(3) 498-508.

Diefendorff, J. M., & Gosserand, R.H. (2003). Understanding the emotional labor process: A control theory perspective. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 24 (8) 945-959.

Diefendorff. J.M, & Richard, E.M. (2003). Antecedents and consequences of emotional display rule perceptions. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 88*, 284-294.

Dorman, C., & Zapf, D. (2004). Customer-related social stressors and burnout. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, 9, 61-82.

Fine, S., & Dover, S. (2005). Validity study: Cognitive ability, personality, and low fidelity simulation measures in predicting training performance among customer service representatives. *Applied H.R.M. Research,* 10 (1) 103-106.

Fisher, C. D. (1998). Effects of external and internal interruptions on boredom at work: Two studies. *Journal of Organizational Behavior, 19*(5), 503-522.

Fisher, C. D. (2002). Antecedents and consequences of real-time affective reactions at work. *Motivation and Emotion, 26*(1) 3-30.

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

Fisher, C. D., & Noble, C. S. (2004). A Within-Person Examination of Correlates of Performance and Emotions While Working. *Human Performance, 17(*2),145-168.

Freud, S. (1926). *Inhibitions, symptoms, and anxieties*. Standard Edition, vol. 20, pp. 75-174.

Frijda, N. H. (1986). The Emotions. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Folkman, S., Lazarus, R. S., Gruen, R. J., & DeLongis, A. (1986) Appraisal, coping, health status, and psychological symptoms. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 50, 571–579.

Fox, S., Spector, P. E., & Miles, D. (2001). Counterproductive work behavior (CWB) in response to job stressors and organizational justice: Some mediator and moderator tests for autonomy and emotions. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 59*, 291-309.

Gasper, K., & Clore, G. L. (2000). Do you have to pay attention to your feelings to be influenced by them? Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 26, 698-711.

Gasper, K., & Clore, G. L. (2002). Attending to the big picture: Mood and global versus local processing of visual information. *Psychological Science, 13*(1), 34-40.

George, J.M. (1995). Leader positive mood and group performance: The case of customer service. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 25(*9), 778-794.

George, J. M., & Bettenhausen, K. (1990). Understanding prosocial behavior, sales performance, and turnover: A group-level analysis in a service context. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 75*(6), 698-709.

George, J. M., Brief, A. P., Staw, B. M., & Cummings, L. L. (1996). Motivational agendas in the workplace: The effects of feelings on focus of attention and work motivation. In *Research in organizational behavior: An annual series of analytical essays and critical reviews, Vol. 18.* (pp. 75-109). US: Elsevier Science/JAI Press.

Gohm, C. L., & Clore, G. L. (2002). Four latent traits of emotional experience and their involvement in well-being, coping, and attributional style. *Cognition and Emotion*, 16, 495-518.

Gohm, C. L., & Clore, G. L. (2000). Individual differences in emotional experience: Mapping available scales to processes. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 26, 679-697.

Goldberg, L. S., & Grandey, A. A. (2007). Display rules versus display autonomy: Emotion regulation, emotional exhaustion, and task performance in a call center simulation. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology, 12*(3), 301-318.

Goleman, D. P. (1995). *Emotional Intelligence: Why It Can Matter More Than IQ for Character, Health and Lifelong Achievement*. Bantam Books, New York.

Grandey, A. A. (2000). Emotional regulation in the workplace: A new way to conceptualize emotional labor. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology, 5*(1), 95-110.

Grandey, A. A. (2003). When 'the show must go on': Surface acting and deep acting as determinants of emotional exhaustion and peer-rated service delivery. *Academy of Management Journal, 46*(1), 86-96.

Grandy, A., Fisk, G., Mattila, A., Jansen, K. J. & Sideman, L. (2005). Is service with a smile enough? Authenticity of positive displays during service encounters. *Organizational Behavior & Human Decision Processes,* 96, 38-55.

Grandey, A. A., Tam, A. P., & Brauburger, A. L. (2002). Affective states and traits in the workplace: Diary and survey data from young workers. *Motivation and Emotion, 26(*1), 31-55.

Grandey, A., Fisk, G., & Steiner, D. (in press). Must "Service with a Smile" Be Stressful? The Moderating Role of Personal Control for U.S. and French Employees. *Journal of Applied Psychology*.

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

Gross, J.J. (1999). Emotion regulation: Past, present, future. *Cognition and Emotion*, 13, 551-573.

Gross, J. J., & John, O. P. (2003). Individual differences in two emotion regulation processes: Implications for affect, relationships, and well-being. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 85*(2), 348-362.

Gross, J. J., & Munoz, R. F. (1995). Emotion regulation and mental health. *Clinical Psychology: Science and Practice, 2*(2), 151-164.

Gross, J. J., Thompson, R. A., & Gross, J. J. (2007). Emotion Regulation: Conceptual Foundations. In *Handbook of emotion regulation.* (pp. 3-24). New York, NY, US: Guilford Press.

Guion, R. M. (1995). Commentary on values and standards in performance assessment. *Educational Measurement: Issues and Practice, 14(4*), 25-27.

Hennessey, B. A., & Amabile T. M. (1988). The conditions of creativity. In: R. J. Sternberg, Editor, *The nature of creativity: Contemporary psychological perspectives*, Cambridge Univ. Press, New York. 11–38.

Hochschild, A. R. (1983). The Managed Heart: Commodification of Human Feeling. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Ivancevich, J. M. (1979). Predicting job performance by use of ability tests and studying job satisfaction as a moderating variable. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 9(1), 87-97.

Ivancevich, J.M. (1990) Effects of goal setting on performance and job satisfaction. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 61*, 605-612.

Izard, C. E. (2007). Basic emotions, natural kinds, emotion schemas, and a new paradigm. *Perspectives on Psychological Science, 2*(3), 260-280.

Izard, C. (1990). Facial expressions and the regulation of emotions. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 58*, 487-498.

Izard, C.E. (1991). *The psychology of emotions.* New York: Plenum Press.

Izard, C. E., Safran, J. D., & Greenberg, L. S. (1991). Perspectives on emotions in psychotherapy. In *Emotion, psychotherapy, and change.* (pp. 280-289). New York, NY, US: Guilford Press.

James, R.J., & Mazerolle, M.D. (2001). *Personality in Work Organizations*. Thousand Oaks, California: Sage Publications, Inc.

James, L.R. (1998). Measurement of personality via conditional reasoning. *Organizational Research Methods*, 1(2), 131-163.

John, O. P., & Gross, J. J. (2004). Healthy and unhealthy emotion regulation: Personality processes, individual differences, and life span development. *Journal of Personality, 72*(6), 1301-1333.

John, O. P., Gross, J. J., & Gross, J. J. (2007). Individual Differences in Emotion Regulation. In *Handbook of emotion regulation.* (pp. 351-372). New York, NY, US: Guilford Press.

John, O. P., Donahue, E. M., & Kentle, R. L. (1991). *The "Big Five" inventory-Version 4a and 54*. Berkeley: University of California, Berkeley, Institute of Personality and Social Research.

John, O. P., Srivastava, S., Pervin, L. A., & John, O. P. (1999). The Big Five Trait taxonomy: History, measurement, and theoretical perspectives. In *Handbook of personality: Theory and research (2nd ed.).* (pp. 102-138). New York, NY, US: Guilford Press.

Judge, T.A., Thoresen, C.J., Bono, J.E., Patton, G.K. (2001). The job satisfaction-job performance relationship: A qualitative and quantitative review. *Psychological Bulletin,* 127(3), 376-407.

Kafetsios, K., & Zampetakis, L.A. (2008). Emotional intelligence and job satisfaction: Testing the mediatory role of positive and negative affect at work. *Personality and Individual Differences,* 44, 712-722.

Kanfer, R. & Ackerman, P. L. (1989). Motivation and cognitive abilities: an integrative/aptitude-treatment interaction approach to skill acquisition. Journal *of Applied Psychology*, 74, 657-690.

King, L. A., & Emmons, R. A. (1990). Conflict over emotional expression: Psychological and physical correlates. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 58, 864-877.

Kuppens, P., Realo, A. & Diener, E. (2008). The role of positive and negative emotions in life satisfaction judgment across nations. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 95*(1), 66-75.

Lane, R. D., & Schwartz, G. E. (1987). Levels of emotional awareness: a cognitive-developmental theory and its application to psychopathology. *American Journal of Psychiatry,* 144, 133–143.

Larsen, R. J. (1984) Theory and measurement of affect intensity as an individual difference characteristic. Dissertation Abstracts International, 5, 2297 B (University Microfilms No. 84-22112).

Larsen, R. J. (2000). Toward a science of mood regulation. Psychological Inquiry, 11, 129-141.

Larsen, R. J., Diener, E., & Lucas, R, E. (2002). Emotion: Models, measures, and individual differences. In R. G. Lord, R. J. Klimoski, & R. Kanfer (Eds.), *Emotions in the workplace*. pp. 64-106. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Law, K. S., Wong, C.-S., & Song, L. J. (2004). The Construct and Criterion Validity of Emotional Intelligence and Its Potential Utility for Management Studies. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 89(*3), 483-496.

Lazarus, R. S. (1966). *Psychological stress and the coping process*. New York, NY, US: McGraw-Hill.

Lazarus, R. S. (1984). Puzzles in the study of daily hassles. *Journal of Behavioral Medicine, 7*(4), 375-389.

Lazarus, R. S. (1991). Psychological stress in the workplace. *Journal of Social Behavior & Personality, 6*(7), 1-13.

Levenson, R. W. (1994). Human emotion: A functional view. In P. Ekman & R. Davidson (Eds.), *The nature of emotion: Fundamental Questions.* 123-126 New York: Oxford University Press.

Lopes, P. N., Salovey, P., Côté, S. P., Beers, M., & Petty, R. E. (2004). Emotion Regulation Abilities and the Quality of Social Interaction. *Emotion, 5*(1), 113-118.

Matsumoto, D. (1989). Cultural influences on the perception of emotion. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, 20, 92–105.

Mayer, J. D. & Salovey, P. (1997). What is emotional intelligence? In P. Salovey & D. Sluyter (Eds). *Emotional Development and Emotional Intelligence: Implications for Educators* (pp. 3-31). New York: Basic Books.

Meade, A.W. (2004). Psychometric problems and issues involved with creating and using ipsative measures for selection. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, 77(44), 531-552.

Miner, A. G., Glomb, T. M., & Hulin, C. (2005). Experience sampling mood and its correlates at work. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology, 78*(2), 171-193.

Morris, J. A., & Feldman, D. C. (1997). Managing emotions in the workplace. *Journal of Managerial Issues*, 9(3), 257 – 274.

Morris, J. A., & Feldman, D. C. (1996). The dimensions, antecedents, and consequences of emotional labor. *Academy of Management Review, 21*(4), 986-1010.

Mount, M. K., Barrick, M. R., & Stewart, G. L. (1998). Five-Factor Model of personality and performance in jobs involving interpersonal interactions. *Human Performance, 11*(2), 145-165.

Motowidlo, S.J., Hanson, M.A., & Crafts, J. L. (1997). Low-fidelity simulations. In Whetzel, D.L., & Wheaton, G.R. (Eds) Applied Measurement Methods in Industrial Psychology. (pp. 241-260) Palo Alto, CA, Davies-Black Publishing.

.

Muchinsky, P. M. (2000). *Psychology applied to work: An introduction to industrial and organizational psychology* (6th ed.). Belmont, CA: Wadsworth/Thomson Learning.

Mumford, M.D., Zaccaro, S.J., Johnson, J.F., Diana, M., Gilbert, J.A., & Threlfall, K.V. (2000). Patterns of leader characteristics: Implications for performance and development. *Leadership Quarterly*, 11(1), 115-133.

Muraven, M., & Baumeister, R. F. (2000). Self-regulation and depletion of limited resources: Does self-control resemble a muscle? *Psychological Bulletin, 126*(2), 247-259.

Nunnally, J. C. (1978). Psychometric theory (2nd ed). New York: McGraw Hill.

Owens, W. A. & Schoenfeldt, L. F. (1979). Toward a classification of persons. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 65,* 569-607.

Parasuraman R, A. (1989). When cashiers meet customers: An analysis of the role of supermarket cashiers. *Academy of Management Journal, 32*(2), 245-273.

Parasuraman, A. (1995). Measuring and monitoring service quality. In Glynn, W.J. and Barnes, J.G. (Eds), *Understanding Services Management*. John Wiley and Sons, Chichester, pp. 143-7

Parkinson, B. (1991). Emotional stylists: Strategies of expressive management among trainee hairdressers. *Cognition and Emotion*, 5,419-434.

Pugh, S.D. (2001). Service with a smile: Emotion contagion in the service encounter. *Academy of Management Journal*, 44(5), 1018-1027.

Rafaeli, A., & Sutton, R. I. 1989. The expression of emotion in organizational life. In L. L. Cummings and B. M. Staw (Eds.), *Research in organizational behavior*, vol. 11: 1-42.

Repetti, R. (1993). Social withdrawal as a short-term coping response to daily stressors. In H.S. Friedman (Ed.), Hostility, coping, and health (pp. 151-165). Washington, DC.; American Psychological Association.

Richards, J.M. & Gross, J.J. (1999). Composure at any cost? The cognitive consequences of emotion suppression. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 25 (8), 1033-1044.

Ruch, F. L, &, Ruch, W. W. (1980). *Employee Attitude Survey*, Los Angeles, Psychological Services.

Rutter, D. R., & Fielding, P. J. (1988). Sources of occupational stress: An examination of British prison officers. *Work and Stress*, 2 (4), 291-299.

Salovey, P. & Mayer, J.D. (1990). Emotional intelligence. *Imagination, Cognition, and Personality*, 9, 185-211.

Salovey, P., Mayer, J. D., Goldman, S. L., Turvey, C., & Palfai, T. P. (1995). Emotional attention, clarity, and repair: Exploring emotional intelligence using the trait meta-mood scale. In J. Pennebaker (Ed.), *Emotion, disclosure, and health*. Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.

Schneider, B., & Bowen, D.E. (1985). Employee and customer perceptions of service in banks: Republication and extension. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 70, 423–433.

Schwarz, N., & Clore, G. L. (1983). Mood, misattribution, and judgments

of well-being: Informative and directive functions of affective states. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 45*, 513–523.

Straw, M. B & Barsade, S. G (1993) Affect and managerial performance: A test of the sadder-but wiser vs. happier-and-smarter hypotheses. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 38, 304-331.

Snyder, M. (1974). Self-Monitoring of expressive behavior. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 30*, 526-537.

Sutton, R. I. (1991). Maintaining norms about expressed emotions: The case of bill collectors. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 36, 245-268.

Sutton, R. I., & Rafaeli, A. (1988). Untangling the relationship between displayed emotions and organizational sales: The case of convenience stores. *Academy of Management Journal*, 31, 461-487.

Swinkels, A., & Giuliano, T. A. (1995). The measurement and conceptualization of mood awareness: Monitoring and labeling one's mood states. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 21, 934-949

Tamir, M., John, O. P., Srivastava, S., & Gross, J. J. (2007). Implicit theories of emotion: Affective and social outcomes across a major life transition. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *92*(4), 731-744.

Tenopyr, M. L. (1969). The comparative validity of selected leadership scales relative to success in production management. *Personnel Psychology, 22*, 77-85.

Tracy, K., & Tracy, S. J. (1998). Rudeness at 911: Reconceptualizing face and face attack. *Human Communication Research*, 25, 225-251.

Totterdell, P. & Holman, D. (2003). Emotion regulation in customer service roles: Testing a model of emotional labor. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, 8, 55-73.

Totterdell, P. A., & Parkinson, B. (1999). Use and effectiveness of self-regulation strategies for improving mood in a group of trainee teachers. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, *4*, 219-232.

Walden, T. & Smith, M. (1997). Emotion regulation. *Motivation and Emotion*, 21, 7-25.

Ward, J. H. & Hook, M. E. (1963). Application of an hierarchical grouping procedure to a problem of grouping profiles. *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, 23, 69–81.

Watson D,, & Clark, L.A. (1984). Negative affectivity: The disposition to experience unpleasant emotional states. *Psychological Bulletin*. 1984;95:465–490

Watson, D., Clark, L.A., & Tellegen, A. (1988). Development and validation of brief measures of positive and negative affect: The PANAS scales. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 54, 1063-1070.

Wegner, D.M. (1994). Ironic processes of mental control. *Psychological Review* (101) 34–52.

Weick, K. E. (1995). *Sensemaking in Organizations*. Sage, Thousand Oaks, CA.

Weiss, H. M., & Cropanzano, R. (1996). Affective Events Theory: A theoretical discussion of the structure, causes and consequences of affective experiences at work. In *Research in organizational behavior: An annual series of analytical essays and critical reviews, Vol. 18.* (pp. 1-74). US: Elsevier Science/JAI Press.

Weiss, H. M., Suckow, K., & Cropanzano, R. (1999). Effects of justice conditions on discrete emotions. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *84*(5), 786-794.

Wong, C. S., & Law, K. (2002). Development of an emotional intelligence instrument and an investigation of its relationship with leader and follower performance and attitudes. *Leadership Quarterly*, 13, 1–32.

Wood, V., Wylie, M.L. & Sheafor, B. (1969). An analysis of a short self-report measure of life satisfaction: Correlation with rater judgments. *Journal of Gerontology*, 24, 565-569.

Zammuner, V.L, & Galli, C. (2005). Wellbeing: causes and consequences of emotion regulation in work settings. *International Review of Psychiatry*, 17, 335-364.

Table 1. *Sample Population Demographic Information*

Demographics		n	%
Gender			
	Male	102	*24.70*
	Female	297	*71.91*
	No disclosure	14	*3.39*
*Industry			
	Hospitality	149	*36.08*
	Retail	154	*37.29*
	Health Services	64	*15.50*
	Management	58	*14.04*
	Financial	21	*5.08*
	Other	187	*45.28*
Major			
	Social Sciences	44	*10.65*
	Business	50	*12.11*
	Health Sciences	125	*30.27*
	Math/Engineering	25	*6.05*
	Other/Undeclared	154	*37.29*
*Race			
	White	303	*73.37*
	Black	19	*4.60*
	American India	33	*7.99*
	Hispanic	15	*3.63*
	Asian	35	*8.47*
	Other/No disclosure	15	*3.61*

Note. * indicates participants could choose all that applied
N = 413

Table 2. *Percent Emotion Regulation Response Strategies Endorsed in Negative Events*

	All Negative Events		Task-Based Job Events		Interpersonally –Based Job Events	
Emotion Regulation Strategy	M %	SD	M%	SD	M%	SD
Situation Modification	27.64	7.21	28.23	8.59	27.55	8.11
Situation Selection	11.86	4.80	11.72	6.20	11.94	5.71
Attention Deployment	20.11	5.40	20.06	6.87	19.43	6.38
Cognitive Change	19.94	6.43	20.57	7.72	19.18	7.38
Response Modulation	20.44	6.20	19.42	7.56	21.91	7.10

Note. N=413

Table 3. *WERPI Intra-scale Correlations*

	Workplace Emotion Regulation Profile Inventory									
	Task-Based					Interpersonally-Based				
WERPI	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
Task-Based										
1. Situation Modification	*(.77)*									
2.Situation Selection	-.14**	*(.60)*								
3. Attention Deployment	-.40**	-.28**	*(.66)*							
4. Cognitive Change	-.32**	-.25**	-.09	*(.69)*						
5. Response Modulation	-.33**	-.15**	-.14**	-.37**	*(.69*)					
Interpersonally-Based										
6. Situation Modification	**.49****	.03	-.15**	-.09	-.35**	*(.81)*				
7. Situation Selection	.01	**.38****	-.16**	-.25**	.08	-.18**	*(.65)*			
8. Attention Deployment	-.23**	-.05	**.29****	.01	.03	-.38**	-.21**	*(.72)*		
9. Cognitive Change	-.23**	-.16**	.08	**.46****	-.16**	-.27**	-.39**	-.08	*(.76)*	
10. Response Modulation	-.12*	-.14**	-.04	-.19**	**.48****	-.38**	-.01	-.22**	-.35**	*(.77)*

Notes: Coefficient Alpha Internal Consistencies reported along diagonal (in parentheses and italicized).
Bold numbers indicate job event correlations between interpersonal/task events in a particular regulation strategy.
** = p <.01. *Note.* N=413

Table 4. *Correlations between WERPI Scales and Reference Measures*

Reference Measure	Workplace Emotion Regulation Profile Inventory									
	Task-Based					Interpersonally-Based				
	Situation Modification	Situation Selection	Attention Deployment	Cognitive Change	Response Modulation	Situation Modification	Situation Selection	Attention Deployment	Cognitive Change	Response Modulation
Big Five										
Agreeableness	-.01	-.19**	.07	.06	.05	.04	-.17**	.08	.00	.02
Extroversion	.04	-.04	.06	.01	-.07	.01	-.09	-.06	.05	.06
Conscientiousness	.06	-.16**	.09*	.03	-.05	.12*	-.15**	.05	-.03	-.04
Neuroticism	.06	.09*	-.05	-.08	-.02	.00	.15*	.01	-.09	-.03
Openness	.06	-.09	.00	.11*	-.10*	.05	-.04	-.05	.07	-.05
Social desirability	-.02	-.08	.04	.07	-.02	-.03	-.14*	.06	.07	.02
Self Monitoring	-.06	.05	-.06	-.12*	.12*	-.06	.07	-.06	-.09	.16*

Notes. * Correlation significant at $p<.05$. ** Correlation significant at $p< .01$
N = 413

Table 4. *Continued*

	Workplace Emotion Regulation Profile Inventory									
	Task-Based					Interpersonally-Based				
Reference Measure	Situation Modification	Situation Selection	Attention Deployment	Cognitive Change	Response Modulation	Situation Modification	Situation Selection	Attention Deployment	Cognitive Change	Response Modulation
PANAS										
Positive Affect	.06	-.13*	.05	.04	-.05	-.06	-.05	.04	.06	.02
Negative Affect	.01	.04	-.03	-.03	.01	-.07	.09	-.04	.04	.00
ERQ										
Suppression	.01	-.14*	.06	.02	.04	-.04	-.10	-.04	.06	.10
Reappraisal	-.25**	.01	.09	.06	.14**	-.17**	.07	.13*	.04	-.01
Emotional Intelligence										
Self emotions	.09	-.11*	.06	.00	-.07	.08	-.19**	.01	.06	.00
Others emotions	.14**	-.14**	-.13**	.10	-.02	.07	-.05	-.07	-.02	.05
Use of emotions	.11*	-.17**	.06	-.02	-.02	.12*	-.15**	.01	-.03	.01
Regulation of emotions	-.09	-.12*	.06	.09	.05	-.10	-.09	.08	.10	.01

Notes. * Correlation significant at $p<.05$. ** Correlation significant at $p< .01$
N = 413

Table 4. *Continued*

	Workplace Emotion Regulation Profile Inventory									
	Task-Based					Interpersonally-Based				
Reference Measure	Situation Modification	Situation Selection	Attention Deployment	Cognitive Change	Response Modulation	Situation Modification	Situation Selection	Attention Deployment	Cognitive Change	Response Modulation
Coping										
Active coping	.16**	-.15**	.03	.05	-.13*	.11*	-.06	-.06	-.01	-.01
Venting	.16**	.04	-.04	-.09	-.09	.02	.07	-.09	-.03	.04
Humor	-.01	-.03	-.05	-.02	.09	-.11*	-.02	-.04	.03	.16**
Behavioral Disengagement	-.12*	.20**	-.05	-.02	.03	-.12*	.22**	.02	.00	-.07
Positive Reframing	.01	-.08	.04	.07	-.05	-.02	-.08	-.07	.08	.06
Planning	.09	-.13*	.01	.07	-.07	.02	-.11*	.03	.05	-.01
Substance	-.03	.12*	-.04	-.02	-.01	-.08	.15**	-.05	.01	.01

Notes. * Correlation significant at $p<.05$. ** Correlation significant at $p< .01$
N= 413

Table 5. *Correlation between WERPI Scales and Outcome Measures*

	Job Satisfaction						Customer Service		
WERPI	Coworker Satisfaction	Supervisor Satisfaction	Job General Satisfaction	Work Satisfaction	Overall Job Satisfaction[a]	Life Satisfaction	Quality	Integrative Approach	Communication
Task-Based									
Situation Modification	.06	.00	.06	.05	.05	.09	.02	.08	-.01
Situation Selection	-.10*	-.15**	-.13**	-.11*	-.15**	-.15**	-.10*	-.12*	-.13**
Attention Deployment	-.05	.03	.02	-.02	.01	.10	.09	.04	.12*
Cognitive Change	.00	-.03	-.06	.00	-.05	-.08	.11*	.16**	.13**
Response Modulation	.06	.12*	.10	.05	.11*	.03	-.13**	-.20**	-.12*
Interpersonally-Based									
Situation Modification	-.01	-.05	-.04	-.03	-.02	.01	.13**	.14**	.10
Situation Selection	-.13*	-.14**	-.09	-.07	-.12*	-.13*	-.16**	-.15**	-.18**
Attention Deployment	.11*	.09	.05	.06	.10	.10	.09	.09	.11*
Cognitive Change	.06	.07	.05	.08	.06	-.02	.01	.00	.04
Response Modulation	-.04	.02	.02	-.05	-.02	.02	-.11*	-.12*	-.11*

Notes. * Correlation significant at $p<.05$. ** Correlation significant at $p< .01$

[a]= Created combined score including all facets in JDI

N = 413

Table 6. *Summarized Regression Results on Well-being Outcome Measures*

Model	Job Satisfaction β	Model	Life Satisfaction β
Interpersonal situation modification	.05	Interpersonal situation modification	.05
Interpersonal attention deployment	.11*	Interpersonal attention deployment	.13**
Interpersonal cognitive change	.09	Interpersonal cognitive change	-.01
Task response modulation	.14*	Task response modulation	.08
Step 1: R = .35		Step 1: R = .59	
R^2=.13		R^2=.34	
Adjusted R^2=.12		Adjusted R^2= .33	
F= (3,331) 15.80**		F= (6, 326) 28.24**	
Step 2: R =.39		Step 2: R = .60	
ΔR^2=.03		ΔR^2= .02	
R^2=.15		R^2= .36	
Adjusted R^2=.13		Adjusted R^2= .34	
ΔF =(4,327) 2.58*		ΔF = (4, 322) 2.59*	
F= (7, 327) 8.37**		F= (10, 322) 18.31**	
Model	Job Satisfaction β	Model	Life Satisfaction β
Interpersonal situation selection	-.06	Interpersonal situation selection	-.04
Interpersonal response modulation	-.10	Interpersonal response modulation	-.05
Task situation modification	-.12	Task situation modification	-.06
Task situation selection	-.19**	Task situation selection	-.11
Task attention deployment	-.17*	Task attention deployment	-.04
Task cognitive change	-.20**	Task cognitive change	-.14*
Step 1: R = .35		Step 1: R = .59	
R^2= .13		R^2=.34	
Adjusted R^2= .12		Adjusted R^2=.33	
F= (3, 331) 15.80		F= (6, 326) 28.24	
Step 2: R = .40		Step 2: R = .60	
ΔR^2= ..03		ΔR^2= .02	
R^2= .16		R^2= .36	
Adjusted R^2= .14		Adjusted R^2=.33	
ΔF = 2.15*		ΔF = (6, 326) 1.30	
F= (9, 325) 6.81**		F= (12, 320) 14.84**	

Notes: * = p < .05. ** = p < .01.

Table 7. *Summarized Regression Results on Customer Service Performance*

Model	Quality β	Model	Integrative Approach β	Model	Positive Comm. β
Interpersonal situation modification	.18**	Interpersonal situation modification	.14*	Interpersonal situation modification	.16**
Interpersonal attention deployment	.13*	Interpersonal attention deployment	.11*	Interpersonal attention deployment	.15**
Interpersonal cognitive change	-.01	Interpersonal cognitive change	-.05	Interpersonal cognitive change	.01
Task situation modification	.02	Task situation modification	.10	Task situation modification	.03
Task attention deployment	.12*	Task attention deployment	.10	Task attention deployment	.12*
Task cognitive change	.16*	Task cognitive change	.24**	Task cognitive change	.17**
Step 1: R =.24		Step 1: R =.30		Step 1: R =.21	
R^2=.06		R^2=.09		R^2=.04	
Adjusted R^2=.05		Adjusted R^2=.08		Adjusted R^2=.04	
F= (3,333) 6.60**		F= (3, 371) 11.83**		F=(2, 396) 8.97**	
Step 2: R =.34		Step 2: R =.40		Step 2: R =.33	
ΔR^2=.06		ΔR^2= .07		ΔR^2=.06	
R^2= .12		R^2=.16		R^2=.11	
Adjusted R^2=.09		Adjusted R^2=.14		Adjusted R^2=.09	
ΔF =(6, 333) 3.71**		ΔF =(6, 365) 5.04**		ΔF =(6, 390) 4.57**	
F= (9, 327) 4.78**		F= (9, 365) 7.56**		F=(8,390) 5.79**	

Model	Quality β	Model	Integrative Approach β	Model	Positive Comm. β
Interpersonal situation selection	-.09	Interpersonal situation selection	-.09	Interpersonal situation selection	-.09
Interpersonal response modulation	-.09	Interpersonal response modulation	-.17**	Interpersonal response modulation	-.08
Task situation selection	-.12*	Task situation selection	-.06	Task situation selection	-.12*
Task response modulation	-.08	Task response modulation	-.05	Task response modulation	-.08
Step 1: R =.24		Step 1: R =.30		Step 1: R =.21	
R^2=.06		R^2=.09		R^2=.04	
Adjusted R^2=.05		Adjusted R^2=.08		Adjusted R^2=.04	
F=(3,333) 6.59 **		F= (3, 371) 11.83**		F= (2, 396) 8.97**	
Step 2: R =.31		Step 2: R =.37		Step 2: R =.30	
ΔR^2=..04		ΔR^2= .05		ΔR^2=.05	
R^2=.10		R^2=.14		R^2=.09	
Adjusted R^2=.08		Adjusted R^2=.12		Adjusted R^2=.07	
ΔF =(4, 329) 3.85**		ΔF = (4, 367) 5.20**		ΔF = (4, 396) 4.84**	
F= (7, 329) 5.12**		F=(7, 367) 8.27**		F= (6, 392) 6.33**	

Notes: * = $p < .05$. ** = $p < .01$.

Table 8. *Group Means on Emotion Regulation Strategy by Cluster*

	Percent Response Strategies Endorsed by Cluster									
	Cluster 1 Situation Modifiers		Cluster 2 Cognitive Changers		Cluster 3 Situation Selectors		Cluster 4 Response Modulators		Total	
WERPI	*M*	*SD*	*M*	*SD*	*M*	*SD*	*M*	*SD*	*M*	*SD*
Task-Based Events										
Situation Modification	37.65**	5.83	25.03	6.34	24.51	6.70	25.05	7.17	28.23	8.59
Situation Selection	11.86	5.83	9.38	5.04	16.24**	6.34	10.42	5.70	11.72	6.20
Attention Deployment	17.13	5.91	21.30	6.58	22.91	7.31	19.50	6.55	20.06	6.87
Cognitive Reappraisal	17.93	6.59	28.85**	5.76	17.45	5.61	17.20	5.41	20.57	7.72
Response Modulation	15.43*	5.52	15.44*	5.31	18.89	5.81	27.83**	5.37	19.42	7.56
Interpersonally-Based Events										
Situation Modification	36.34**	5.80	26.05	6.72	25.61	5.40	21.87*	5.79	27.55	8.11
Situation Selection	11.79	4.70	8.28*	4.19	15.91**	6.12	12.71	5.36	11.94	5.71
Attention Deployment	16.03*	5.30	20.31	6.55	22.40	5.79	19.59	6.21	19.43	6.38
Cognitive Reappraisal	16.26	6.20	26.16**	6.58	17.45	5.25	16.30	5.89	19.18	7.38
Response Modulation	19.58	5.65	19.20	5.46	18.63	4.07	29.53**	6.11	21.91	7.10

Notes. ** indicate cluster mean 1/2 standard deviation higher than sample mean. *indicates cluster mean 1/2 standard deviation lower than sample mean
Cluster 1 n = 108, Cluster 2 n=111, Cluster 3 n =85, Cluster 4 n =109, N=413

Table 9. *Cluster Emotion Regulation Strategy Profiles*

	Cluster Outcome Scores										
	Cluster 1 Situation Modifiers		Cluster 2 Cognitive Changers		Cluster 3 Situation Selectors		Cluster 4 Response Modulators				
Outcome	*M*	*SE*	*M*	*SE*	*M*	*SE*	*M*	*SE*	*F*	η^2_p	Post Hoc
Life Satisfaction[a]	8.01	*.68*	8.08	*.65*	8.46	*.80*	9.04	*.65*	.51	-	ns
Job Satisfaction[b]	26.10	*2.81*	25.83	*2.77*	23.90	*3.25*	31.68	*2.74*	1.36	-	ns
Customer Service											
Problem Solving Quality[c]	2.53	*.05*	2.61	*.05*	2.44	*.06*	2.36	*.05*	4.32**	.03	2 vs. 4**
Positive Comm.[c]	2.58	*.05*	2.72	*.05*	2.49	*.06*	2.48	*.05*	4.30**	.03	2 vs. 3*, 4**
Integrative[c]	2.28	*.06*	2.31	*.06*	2.08	*.07*	2.06	*.06*	4.62**	.04	2 vs. 4*

Notes: a =means presented controlling for Reappraisal and Positive/Negative affect. b = means presented controlling for Use of emotions and Social Desirability c = controlling for age. ns = non-significant.* = $p < .05$.** = $p < .01$ Cluster 1 n = 108, Cluster 2 n=111, Cluster 3 n =85, Cluster 4 n =109, N=413

Appendix A

Negative Job Events Taxonomy

Negative Task Events

- **Negative General Task**
  - Bad Physical conditions
  - Negative Task characteristics
  - Task Problems
  - Involvement/Assigned in Mundane or undesired tasks
  - Lack of Involvement in Decision Making
  - Lack of Involvement in Planning
  - Lack of Involvement in Problem solving
  - Job incompetence
  - Goal Impeding events
  - Lack of Goal Achievement
  - Task interference
  - personal problems interfered with work
  - Workload
  - Organizational Justice Events
- **Negative Task Performance Feedback**
  - Lack of Receiving Recognition
  - Received a Negative Performance Evaluation
  - Recognized need for Development
  - Self criticism
- **Negative Interpersonal/Interactional**
  - Negative Acts of Colleagues
    - A well-liked coworker left your work unit
    - Problems getting along with a coworker
    - Personal Attack
    - Incivility
      - Disrespect
    - Public Humiliation

      Directly and publicly humiliated.
    - Immoral behavior by others
      - being lazy, dishonest
      - stealing ,cheating
      - taking advantage of others
      - job incompetence by others
      - slowness in completing tasks
  - Acts of Management/leader
    - Problems getting along with supervisor
    - Personal Attack
    - Incivility
  - Interacting with Customers
    - Acts of Customers
      - Personal attack
      - Incivility

Appendix B

Emotion Taxonomy

Negative Emotions

Anger/Frustration—Feeling a person gets when he/she thinks someone or some group has deliberately caused harm, loss, or thinks that a personal objective or goal is hampered by others or by events/circumstances (psychological, physical, reputation, etc.) to him/her or to valued others.

Embarrassment—Feeling a person gets when they accidentally violate societal norms, rules, or expectations.

Guilt—Feeling a person gets when they feel they have 1) done something they should not have done or 2) have not done something they should have done. This feeling leads a person to make amends for what he/she has done. The feeling is specific with respect to the event and does not generalize to all aspects of what a person feels about him or herself.

Anxiety—Feeling of nervousness, concern, and worry that a person has about something bad that might or could happen. The feeling can be linked to something specific that is anticipated, or can be tied to nothing in particular, existing instead as a generalized feeling of worry.

Pessimism—State of feeling that nothing good can or will happen.

Powerlessness—Feeling a person gets that his/her actions have no impact or influence in the surrounding environment. Can be specific to certain situations or can be more generalized feeling.

Appendix C

Sample Questions

Negative Interpersonal Job Events

1. It seems that every time you make a suggestion for a project, the other team members disregard your ideas. You feel like they are not giving your ideas a chance and that there is nothing you can do about it.

Which reaction would you most likely have to this situation?

a. Put your ideas in writing with support for your ideas *(Situation Modification)*

b. Use your ideas for other projects that do not involve this team *(Situation Selection)*

c. Don't worry about it, make your individual projects your priority *(Attention Deployment)*

d. Try to understand their rationale, and modify your ideas to incorporate their ideas (*Cognitive Change)*

e. Focus on not getting visibly upset with them *(Response Modulation)*

2. A coworker has just sent you an email to follow up on a recent meeting. Your reply comments on the stupidity of the remarks made by another person in the meeting. After sending, you notice the person's name was in the distribution list.

Which reaction would you most likely have to this situation?

a. Apologize to the person, saying you were wrong to talk about them like that *(Situation Modification)*

b. Try to recall the email, ask IT if they can help you *(Situation Selection)*

c. Try not to think about it *(Attention Deployment)*

d. Think to yourself that people never read the department emails, so nobody (including the person you were talking about) will notice it (*Cognitive Change)*

e. Laugh at yourself, and send an email apologizing making light hearted remarks *(Response Modulation)*

Negative Task Job Events

1. Your boss handed off a time sensitive project to you and now is unavailable. You have just realized that you don't clearly understand the task. You are very nervous because this project is going to the divisional vice-president.

Which reaction would you most likely have to this situation?

a. Do the best you can, and have a coworker review it *(Situation Modification)*

b. Wait until your boss gets back so you can clarify the project *(Situation Selection)*

c. Focus on other projects until you figure out what to do *(Attention Deployment)*

d. Think about other projects you successfully completed that initially were unclear (*Cognitive Change)*

e. Take a walk to clear your head *(Response Modulation)*

2. You have been assigned a very difficult and challenging task. You have been trying to figure out how to complete the task for some time now without making any progress.

Which reaction would you most likely have to this situation?

a. Ask a coworker for help *(Situation Modification)*

b. See if somebody else can work on it *(Situation Selection)*

c. Plan to work on something different for a while then come back to it *(Attention Deployment)*

d. Think to yourself you will figure it out, you just have to keep at it (*Cognitive Change)*

e. Decide to go to the break room to rest your mind *(Response Modulation)*

Appendix D

Subject Matter Expert ratings on effectiveness of regulation strategy by job event type

Job Event Type	Emotion Regulation Strategy				
	Situation Modification	Situation Selection	Attention Deployment	Cognitive Change	Response Modulation
Negative	3.61	2.67	3.21	3.30	3.05
Interpersonal	3.49	2.67	3.32	3.32	3.32
Task	3.69	2.94	3.24	3.34	3.12

Note. N=10 (SMEs)

Appendix E

Post Questionnaire Summary

	Cronbach's Alpha	Item	*M*	*SD*
Testing Environment	*.67*		3.46*	.83
		Conditions in the testing environment affected my performance (R)	3.47	1.17
		I think taking the test online affected my performance in a negative way (R)	3.90	.911
		I had trouble concentrating during the test (R)	3.02	1.11
Transparency of Test	*.68*		3.20*	.73
		I know what this test was measuring	3.21	1.00
		I could tell what the test was measuring when I was taking it	2.95	.96
		This test measured my control of emotion	3.42	.77
Length of Test Was Appropriate	*.85*		2.58*	.88
		The test was too long (R)	2.42	.90
		The test length was appropriate	2.69	.90
Responded Accurately	*.73*		3.66*	.51
		I answered the questions honestly	4.20	.68
		I had trouble understanding the questions (R)	4.01	.77
		My responses were accurate	4.02	.63
		I had trouble concentrating during the test (R)	3.01	1.11
		If I took this test again, I would most likely score the same	3.70	.812
		If I took this for a job interview, I would answer differently (R)	3.28	1.04
		Most of the time, I just picked an answer without thinking much about it (R)	3.64	1.03
		I answered as quickly as I could (R)	2.81	1.03
Clarity and Ease of Use	*.64*		4.02*	.55
		The instructions were clear and easy to understand	4.37	.69
		The website was easy to use	4.26	.68
		The responses were confusing (R)	2.24	.85
		I think that the responses were easy to understand	3.70	.83

*Note. * Adjusted means reflect reversed score*

Appendix F

Example Customer Service Scenario

Sooner Tire and Auto is an established auto repair company serving a large metro area. They are recognized as one of the most reputable auto repair centers in the area. Its focus is on routine auto maintenance (e.g. tires, tune – ups, small repairs). The company culture is very service oriented, and the work atmosphere is fast paced. You work at the customer service center, where you answer phones, as well as handle customers in person. Your job includes a wide variety of customer service aspects, from selling upgrades, to ordering parts, writing up orders, and overseeing the customers' experience. You typically work 5 hour shifts, a few days a week, mostly on weekends. You are working on a very busy Saturday morning.

A previous customer is waiting on a part to come in that was ordered a few days ago. The customer calls and tells you that they can drop the car off the car today or tomorrow or they are taking their business elsewhere. You check on the status of their order, and are unable to tell when it will arrive. However, you see that it has been a few days, and normally parts arrive within a few days. Therefore, you assume that the part should be in today or tomorrow. You tell them to drop their car off, and you supply them with a rental car to make their experience easier. The company has a policy of providing rental cars for customers free of charge for one day.

Later that day, the parts truck arrives, and the part is not on the delivery. You express concern with the truck driver, who is able to track down the part. The driver states that the part will not show up for another four days! The car is already in pieces, because the mechanics wanted to get a head start, to have a quick turn around.

A few hours later, the phone rings. It is the same customer (mentioned previously) and they are irate at you. "I just wanted to let you know, that on my way to work I accidently went through a toll way without paying. I usually have a pass that pays automatically. This is all your fault. I don't know what to do; I can't afford the 100 dollar ticket." You have to handle this situation.

Question 1. *If you were in this situation, how would you feel?*

Question 2. *What exactly would you do in this situation?*

Question 3. *What would you specifically say to this customer?*

Appendix G

Customer Service Scales and Benchmark

1. **Length of answers –** On average, how much did the participant write per answer

1	2	3	4	5
Short, fragmented 3 or so word answers		Medium – 2/3 sentences per answer		Long- 4/5 sentences per answer or more

2. Emotionality - Level of positive or negative emotions

a. Positive affectivity – Level and intensity of positive emotions expressed. Moderate positive emotions can include (willing, determined, trying to help, understanding, calm). Strong positive emotions (happy, confident, proud)

1	2	3	4	5
No positive emotions displayed		Some positive emotion displayed		2 or more strong positive emotions mentioned
Absence of emotions or all negative		Determined to help		I would be happy and very determine to help

b. Negative affectivity- Level and intensity of negative emotions expressed. Less severe negative emotions could include (confused, tired). Moderately negative emotions could include (annoyed, flustered, upset, distressed, anxious, and frustrated). Severe negative emotions include feelings of personal attack, or strong emotions (pissed, guilty, angry, horrible, hostile, use of curse words)

1	2	3	4	5
No negative emotions displayed	Low levels of less severe negative emotions	Moderate level of negative affectivity displayed. Includes some moderately negative emotions	Occurrence of severe negative emotions or several moderately negative emotions	2 or more severe negative emotions strongly expressed
Absence of emotions or all positive	I would feel confused	I would be upset	I would feel angry I would feel annoyed and upset	I would feel extremely horrible and very pissed off

3. **Integrative Customer Service Approach -**Approach - how the customer service agent approaches the problem; how they frame their approach . Meets needs of both parties. Explains both sides to customer. Tries to integrate company and customer needs

1	2	3	4	5
Does not use integrative tactics to solve problem		Some or partial use of integrative tactics, incorporating company policies with customer needs, may not explicitly state both needs to parties involved		Sole use of integrative tactics, incorporating company policies with customer needs with explanation to customer
		Apologize and suggest the solution of having tech come out with in 5 days. Also tell them that I will talk to tech and see if schedule can be re-arranged and get out there sooner		Explain that traffic violations are not the responsibility of the company, however since there car is in pieces I would make arraignments for them to keep the rental car

4. Solution Quality

a. Solution Quality – Overall quality of the solution; based on your overall assessment

1	2	3	4	5
Low Quality		Average Quality of solution		High Quality, well above average

b. Completeness/thoroughness – How complete the solution was, the degree that things may be left undone

1	2	3	4	5
Does not cover solution in any detail		Addresses problem but solution lacks thoroughness		Very thorough and complete answer
I would work through the solution with the customer		We will do our best to reschedule another technician. We will call you back shortly.		I am sorry that our technician missed you. The next available slot is in 5 days, but we will do our best to reschedule some other customers and service you before then. We will call you back shortly and get this situation taken care of. Sorry for the inconvenience to you.

c. Effectiveness – How effective do you view the solution in resolving the problem

1	2	3	4	5
The solution offered was not effective		The solution handled the problem to some degree, may leave minor things unresolved		The solution was very effective at solving the problem, no future problems are foreseen

d. Solution Originality -Novelty /Uniqueness – Degree that solution was original, and unique from a typical solution to the problem at hand

1	2	3	4	5
No solution was offered		The solution handled the problem in a typical manner		The solution was very original, creative and unique from the way these situations are typically handled
		We will refund your money		We will send you a gift certificate to have your car cleaned because you had to leave it outside

5. Customer Service Communication

e. Positive Rapport With Customer- Degree of courtesy, friendliness, politeness, respect, and manners displayed to customer.

1	2	3	4	5
No positive rapport with customer. Rude to customer		Displayed a fair amount of positive rapport.		Displayed a large amount and degree of courtesy, friendliness, respect to customer
I would tell them to go screw themselves, it is there fault		I'm sorry sir, that is not our policy		Sir, we are doing the best we can, what else can I do to make you happy?

f. Empathy towards customers situation – Degree of empathy, or sympathy displayed to customer. Displays understanding of problem customer is having.

1	2	3	4	5
No empathy displayed to customer.		Displayed a fair amount of empathy		Displayed a large amount and degree of empathy to customer
I would tell them it is there fault and there is nothing I could do		I would apologize for the in inconvenience		I completely understand and am extremely sorry about your situation

g. Willingness to assist – Verbal statements demonstrating a willingness to assist customer

1	2	3	4	5
No willingness to help was displayed to the customer.		Displayed a fair amount of willingness to assess		Displayed a large amount and degree of willingness to assist the customer
I would tell them it is there fault and there is nothing I could do		I would try to resolve the situation		I would tell them I will do my very best to help them out, if I can't I will find somebody that will.

Appendix H

Inter-rater Agreement levels on Customer Service Task

Scale	ICC	Scenario 1-4 Coefficient Alpha
Integrative Approach	**.73**	**.67**
Quality	**.81**	**.71**
Completeness	.69	.74
Effectiveness	.80	.58
Originality	.62	.62
Communication	**.82**	**.69**
Rapport	.81	.73
Empathy	.76	.70
Willingness	.81	.62

Appendix I

Cluster Population Demographic Information

Demographics		Cluster							
		1 (n=108)		2 (n=111)		3 (n=85)		4 (n=109)	
Gender		n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
	Male	20	*18.52*	28	*25.23*	27	*31.76*	27	*24.78*
	Female	84	*77.78*	80	*72.07*	52	*61.18*	81	*74.31*
	No disclosure	4	*3.70*	3	*2.70*	6	*7.06*	1	*.09*
*Industry									
	Hospitality	50	*46.30*	34	*30.63*	27	*31.76*	38	*34.86*
	Retail	36	*33.33*	46	*41.44*	29	*34.12*	43	*39.45*
	Health Services	20	*18.52*	17	*15.32*	7	*8.24*	20	*18.35*
	Management	14	*12.96*	20	*18.02*	9	*10.59*	15	*13.76*
	Financial	3	*2.78*	9	*8.11*	2	*2.35*	7	*6.42*
	Other	57	*52.78*	52	*46.85*	33	*38.82*	45	*41.28*
Major									
	Social Sciences	18	*16.67*	9	*8.10*	7	*8.24*	10	*9.17*
	Business	10	*9.26*	11	*9.90*	16	*18.82*	13	*11.93*
	Health Sciences	27	*25.00*	39	*35.14*	22	*25.88*	37	*33.94*
	Math/Engineering	3	*2.78*	9	*8.11*	6	*7.06*	7	*6.42*
	Other/Undeclared	45	*41.67*	40	*45.05*	28	*33.41*	41	*37.61*
*Race									
	White	81	*75.00*	84	*75.68*	55	*64.71*	83	*76.15*
	Black	4	*3.70*	4	*3.60*	6	*7.06*	5	*4.59*
	American India	10	*9.26*	12	*10.81*	2	*2.35*	9	*8.26*
	Hispanic	3	*2.78*	5	*4.50*	3	*3.53*	4	*3.67*
	Asian	7	*6.48*	7	*6.31*	12	*14.12*	9	*8.26*
	Other/No disclosure	4	*3.71*	4	*3.60*	2	*2.35*	5	*4.59*

Note. * indicates participants could choose all that applied