Development and Psychometric Examination of Two Tests of Manipulation Skill

Kimberly A. Barchard and Jennifer Skeem
University of Nevada, Las Vegas

Contact Information: Kim Barchard, Department of Psychology, University of Nevada, Las Vegas, 4505 S. Maryland Parkway, P.O. Box 455030, Las Vegas, NV, 89154-5030, USA, barchard@unlv.nevada.edu

Abstract

The ability to manage other people's emotions can be viewed as a part of Emotional Intelligence or as skill at manipulating others, and is discussed in both the literature on Emotional Intelligence and the literature on Psychopathy. Measures of this ability exist in both literatures. However, none of these measures distinguish between the ability to change other people's emotions and the ability to change their behaviors. The purpose of this research was to examine two new measures of these skills. Using a sample of 152 participants, we selected items from a large item pool based upon their correlations with established measures of the ability to manage others' emotions and overall Emotional Intelligence. Then we assessed the reliability and validity of the shortened versions of the tests, by examining their internal consistency, correlating the two tests with each other, and correlating the tests with 16 measures of Emotional Intelligence and Manipulation. Based upon these analyses, we determined that there was little evidence for the discriminant validity of the two shortened tests. Consequently, we combined the two tests into a single 41-item measure of the ability to manage others' emotions and behaviors. Further research is needed to determine if the broader construct definition of this measure results in higher predictive validity coefficients than other maximum-performance tests of this skill.

Introduction

Management of others' emotions can occur deliberately, when one attempts to change how another person feels, or as a side-effect, when one attempts to change how another person behaves. Measures of this skill exist in two separate literatures: the literature on Emotional Intelligence and the literature on Psychopathy. Emotional Intelligence includes the ability to perceive, understand, and manage your own emotions and others' emotions. Although management of others' emotions is acknowledged as an important part of Emotional Intelligence (Goleman, 1995; Mayer & Salovey, 1997; Tett, Wang & Fox, 2003), and measures exist to assess the overall skill of managing others' emotions (Mayer, Salovey & Caruso, 2000a, 2000b; Tett, Wang & Fox, 2003), no existing measures of Emotional Intelligence distinguish between the ability to manage other people's emotions and the ability to manage their behaviors. Management of others' feelings and behaviors can also be referred to as manipulation. Manipulation skill is measured by subscales on self-report psychopathy scales (e.g., Andershed, Kerr, Stattin & Levander, 2002; Lilienfeld & Andrews, 1996), but once again, these scales do not distinguish between changing others' feelings and changing their behaviors.

The purpose of this study was to assist in the development of two new measures of these skills: the Changing People's Behaviors and Changing People's Feelings tests. In the first part of this study, items were selected from initially large items pools and shortened versions of the Changing People's Behaviors and Changing People's Feelings scales were created. In the second part, the reliability and validity of the shortened forms were assessed.

Method

Participants

A total of 152 undergraduate students (104 female) participated in this study in return for course credit. Participants ranged in age from 18 to 48 (mean 22.5, SD 5.7). Most participants identified themselves as White (61%), Asian (15%), Hispanic (10%) or Black (9%). All participants either spoke English as their first language (91%) or had been speaking English for at least 10 years and felt very comfortable reading and writing in English.

Measures

Maximum-Performance Measures

Changing People's Feelings (Barchard & Skeem, 2003a). The original version of the Changing People's Feelings test consisted of 8 scenarios depicting the relationship between two people. For each scenario, one of the people could respond in five different ways. The respondent was asked to assess the effectiveness of that response, in changing the second person's feelings in a specified manner. Effectiveness ratings were made on a scale of 1 to 5, where 1 indicated that the response was "Very effective" and 5 indicated that the response was "Very ineffective".

Changing People's Behaviors (Barchard & Skeem, 2003b). The original version of the Changing People's Behaviors test consisted of 11 scenarios depicting the relationship between two people. For each scenario, one of the people could respond in five different ways. The respondent was asked to assess the effectiveness of each response in getting the second person to act in a specified manner.

Mayer-Salovey-Caruso Emotional Intelligence Test (MSCEIT; Mayer, Caruso, & Salovey, 2000a, 2000b). The MSCEIT is a maximum-performance test of Emotional Intelligence. It contains eight subscales that are grouped into four branches: Perception, Facilitation, Understanding, and Management. The total score on the MSCEIT is calculated by combining all four branches.

General Intelligence. Participants were asked to provide four indicators of General Intelligence: their Verbal and Math SAT scores, their ACT scores, and their overall GPA. A composite measure of General Intelligence was formed by 1) calculating the average SAT score, 2) calculating the z-scores for average SAT scores, for ACT scores, and for GPA, and 3) calculating the mean of these three z-scores for each participant. Participants were then categorized into higher intelligence and lower intelligence, using a median split. The lower intelligence group was therefore lower in intelligence than the higher intelligence group, but cannot be understood to be low in intelligence compared to the general population: This is only low compared to college students.

Sensations Test Version 2 (Barchard & Skeem, 2003c). The Sensations Test Version 2 consists of 5 emotions and 11 physical sensations. For each emotion-sensation pair, respondents are asked to indicate the frequency with which the emotion is associated with the sensation. A 6-point frequency scale is used, with 1 indicating the sensation is never associated with that emotion, and a 6 indicating it is always associated with that emotion. Of the 55 emotion-sensation pairs, 19 are scored.

Self-Report Measures

Style in the Perception of Affect Scale (SIPOAS; Bernet, 1996). The SIPOAS is a 93-item ipsative measure of personal preferences for each of three styles of emotion perception. The first subscale, Based on Body, "reflects an effortless, integrated awareness of the fine nuances of body feelings that precede or accompany the awareness of emotion" (p. 4), and Bernet argues that it is closely related to Emotional Intelligence. Emphasis on Evaluation "reflects a style in which great effort is made to understand what is happening to oneself, often from the viewpoint of an outside observer, or in terms of imagined ideals or expectations" (p. 4). Looking to Logic "interposes logic between feelings and response, to control or avoid potential discomfort or ambiguity of emotions" (p. 4). Each item is forced-choice with three response options, but not all items contribute to each of the three scales.

Toronto Alexithymia Scale – 20 (TAS-20; Bagby, Parker, & Taylor, 1994; Bagby, Taylor, & Parker, 1994). The TAS-20 is a 20-item self-report measure of alexithymia. Alexithymia is a clinical condition associated with an inability to describe emotional experiences, and is often conceptualized as the opposite of Emotional Intelligence. The TAS-20 has three subscales: Difficulty Identifying Feelings, Difficulty Describing Feelings, and Externally-Oriented Thinking. Each item is answered using a five-point Likert-type scale. For each subscale, high scores indicate a low level of Emotional Intelligence.

Trait Meta-Mood Scale (TMMS; Salovey, Mayer, Goldman, Turvey, & Palfai, 1995). The TMMS assesses "people's tendency to attend to their moods and emotions, [to] discriminate clearly among them, and [to] regulate them" (Salovey et al., 1995, p. 128.) It contains 30 five-point Likert-type items falling on three scales: Attention, Clarity, and Repair.

The Youth Psychopathic traits Inventory (YPI; Andershed, Kerr, Stattin, & Levander, 2002). The YPI consists of 10 subscales of psychopathy, including a Manipulation subscale that was used in this study. The Manipulation subscale consists of 5 items that were written in an indirect manner to prevent response biases from influencing scores.

Psychopathic Personality Inventory (PPI; Lilienfeld & Andrews, 1996). The PPI is a self-report measure of psychopathy with eight subscales. One of these scales, Machiavellian Egocentricity, has 30 items (7 reverse-coded) and was administered in this study.

Statistical Analysis

Scores on the 40 items on the Changing People's Feelings Test and the 55 items on the Changing People's Behaviors test were correlated with scores on the MSCEIT Managing Emotions subscale and total scores on the MSCEIT. Items with significant correlations (either positive or negative) with both the MSCEIT scores were interpreted as useful item-level measures of this aspect of Emotional Intelligence. These analyses were then repeated for the higher-intelligence and lower-intelligence groups, to ensure that the items were useful with a wide variety of participants. Scenarios with the maximum number of useful items were selected for inclusion on Version 2 of these two tests, and for each scenario the best three or four items were selected.

To assess the reliability and validity of the Version 2 tests, three statistical analyses were conducted. First, the internal consistencies of the Version 2 tests were examined and item analyses were conducted to determine if any items were detracting from internal consistency. Second, convergent validity was assessed by correlated these two tests with each other. Third, to assess construct validity, total scores on the two Version 2 tests were correlated with 9 self-report measures of Emotional Intelligence (the subscales of the SIPOAS, TMMS, and TAS-20 scales) and 5 maximum-performance measures of Emotional Intelligence (the total scores and four branch scores of the MSCEIT), as well as two self-report measures of manipulation (YPI Manipulation Subscale and the PPI Machiavellianism Egocentricity Subscale).

Procedures

Participants completed the above-mentioned measures in two one-hour sessions scheduled one week apart. All measures were administered on the computer under the supervision of a trained research assistant.

Results

Development of Version 2 Tests

Of the eight scenarios on the original Changing People's Feelings test, five contained at least three or four items where responses to the items were correlated (either positively or negatively) with Emotional Intelligence. See Table 1 for the item-level correlations for all subjects. (Correlations for the higher-intelligence and lower-intelligence groups are available from the first author upon request.) Version 2 of the test was constructed using five scenarios and the most promising items from each (see the Appendix).

Of the 11 scenarios on the original Changing People's Behaviors Test, six contained at least three or four items where responses to the items correlated with Emotional Intelligence. See Table 2 for the item-level correlations for all subjects. (Correlations for the higher intelligence and lower-intelligence groups are available from the first author upon request.) Version 2 of this test was constructed using the most promising items from each of these six scenarios (see the Appendix).

Internal Consistency Item Analysis of the Version 2 Tests

The internal consistency of the 18-item Changing People's Feelings Test Version 2 was .51. This is lower than would ideally be desired, but may be sufficient for research purposes. An item-analysis was conducted to determine if any particular items were decreasing the internal consistency of this test (see Table 3.) Two items from Scenario 1, one item from Scenario 4, and two items from Scenario 7 slightly decreased the internal consistency of this test.

The internal consistency of the 23-item Changing People's Behaviors Test Version 2 was .61. Although slightly low, this is an adequate level of internal consistency for research purposes. An item analysis was then conducted to determine if any particular items were decreasing the internal consistency of this test (see Table 4). Two items from Scenario 1, one item from Scenario 5, and one item from Scenario 9 slightly decreased the internal consistency of this test.

Convergent Validity and Combining the Two Version 2 Tests

Next, the correlation between total scores on the Changing People's Feelings Version 2 and Changing People's Behaviors Version 2 were calculated. The correlation was .80 ($p < .001$). This correlation is particularly high, and is even higher than the internal consistencies of the individual measures. Therefore, the items from the two measures were combined into a single 41-item measure. The internal consistency of this combined measure, Changing People's Feelings and Behaviors, was .74. An item analysis was then conducted to determine if any particular items were decreasing the internal consistency of this combined test (see Table 5). Although many of the same items resulted in very small decreases in coefficient alpha, none of these items decreased the internal consistency of the combined test by more than .01.

Construct Validity of the Version 2 Tests

The validity of the Changing People's Feelings Version 2 Test, the Changing People's Behaviors Version 2 Test, and the combined Changing People's Feelings and Behaviors Version 2 Test was assessed by correlating total scores on these three tests with nine self-report measures of Emotional Intelligence, five maximum-performance measures of Emotional Intelligence, and two self-report measures of Machiavellianism Egocentricity and Manipulation (see Table 6.)

As expected, the three Version 2 tests had negative correlations with all three of the subscales from the Toronto Alexithymia scale. The correlations of these measures provide convergent validity evidence for both the TAS-20 and these new measures.

The correlations between the Version 2 measures and the TMMS were not as expected. Although the Attention and Clarity subscales had significant positive correlations with the combined Version 2 scale, the Repair subscale did not. It should be noted that the six items on the TMMS Repair subscale appear to measure both optimism and the tendency to attempt to regulate one's own emotions, rather than focusing directly on skill at emotion management.

Finally, there were no significant correlations between the Version 2 scales and the SIPOAS subscales. Given that the SIPOAS is a new instrument with no known validity evidence, this finding is somewhat difficult to interpret. Perusal of the remaining validity evidence for the Version 2 measures, however, suggests that the lack of validity may be on the side of the SIPOAS.

Turning to the maximum-performance measures of Emotional Intelligence, the Version 2 measures correlated with each of the four MSCEIT branch scores and with total scores on the MSCEIT (see Table 6). The highest correlations were with the Managing Emotions Branch, as would be predicted. The reader must keep in mind, however, that these correlations almost certainly over-estimate the degree of relationship between the Version 2 measures and the MSCEIT, because MSCEIT scores were used in the item selection process.

Scores on the Version 2 measures were next correlated with the YPI Manipulation Subscale and the PPI Machiavellianism Egocentricity Subscale (see Table 6). All three Version 2 measures had significant negative correlations with the YPI Manipulation Subscale and the PPI Machiavellianism Egocentricity Subscale. These correlations are surprising, given that the Changing People's Feelings and Changing People's Behaviors tests might be thought of as measures of manipulation skill. If that were the case, then positive correlations would be expected with measures of manipulativeness. Instead, it may be that the ability to skillfully manage others' emotions requires empathy, and empathic individuals are less likely to manipulate others for their own benefit. Further research on the relationship between manipulativeness and skill at managing others' emotions and behaviors is needed.

The relationships between the combined Changing People's Feelings and Behaviors Test and the various measures of Emotional Intelligence and manipulation were very similar to the correlations obtained for the two separate Version 2 tests. Combining this result with the extremely high convergent validity correlation between the Changing People's Feelings Version 2 and the Changing People's Behaviors Version 2, we concluded that there does not appear to be any utility in maintaining two separate tests, and hereafter the two tests shall be combined into a single 41-item form.

Conclusions

The purpose of this paper was to assist in the development of two new measures of Emotional Intelligence, the Changing People's Feelings and Changing People's Behaviors tests. By correlating items on these tests with an established measure of Emotional Intelligence, 41 items were selected for inclusion on the second versions of these tests. Subsequent analyses revealed that these two tests are not empirically discriminable, and so they were combined into a single test with 41 items. This test, Changing People's Feelings and Behaviors Version 2, has evidence of moderate internal consistency and construct validity. However, additional validity evidence using a new sample is needed, and further research on the relationship between this ability and the tendency to manipulate others is required.

Part of the impetus for the creation of this new test was to distinguish between the ability to manage others' emotions and the ability to manage others' behaviors. This research suggests that these may not be separate skills at all. On the other hand, adequate sampling of the construct domain may require that both aspects of this skill be included. Further research is therefore needed to determine if this test is a better predictor of behavior than other existing measures of the ability to manage others' emotions, such as the MSCEIT (Mayer, Caruso, & Salovey, 2000b) Managing Emotions scale.

References

Andershed, H., Kerr, M., Stattin, H., & Levander, S. (2002). Psychopathic traits in non-referred youths: A new assessment tool. In E. Blauuw & L. Sheridan (Eds.), *Psychopaths: Current International Perspectives* (pp. 131-158). The Hague: Elsevier.

Barchard, K.A. & Skeem, J. (2003a). Changing People's Feelings, Version 1. *Unpublished psychological test.* Available from Kim Barchard, Department of Psychology, University of Nevada, Las Vegas, 4505 S. Maryland Parkway, P.O. Box 455030, Las Vegas, NV, 89154-5030, USA, barchard@unlv.nevada.edu

Barchard, K.A. & Skeem, J. (2003b). Changing People's Behaviors, Version 1. *Unpublished psychological test.* Available from Kim Barchard, Department of Psychology, University of Nevada, Las Vegas, 4505 S. Maryland Parkway, P.O. Box 455030, Las Vegas, NV, 89154-5030, USA, barchard@unlv.nevada.edu

Barchard, K.A. & Skeem, J. (2003c). *Measuring the Ability to Identify One's Own Emotions: The Development of the Sensations Test.* Poster presented at the Western Psychological Association Annual Convention, 2004, Pheonix, Arizona.

Bagby, R. M., Parker, J. D. A., & Taylor, G. J. (1994). The twenty-item Toronto Alexithymia Scale. I. Item selection and cross-validation of the factor structure. *Journal of Psychosomatic Research, 38*, 23-32.

Bagby, R. M., Taylor, G. J., & Parker, J. D. A. (1994). The twenty-item Toronto Alexithymia Scale. II. Convergent, discriminant, and concurrent validity. *Journal of Psychosomatic Research, 38,* 33-40.

Bernet, M. (1996, August). *Emotional intelligence: Components and correlates*. Paper presented at the 104th Convention of the American Psychological Association, Toronto, Canada.

Lilienfeld, S.O. & Andrews, B.P. (1996). Development and preliminary validation of a self-report measure of psychopathic personality traits in noncriminal populations. *Journal of Personality Assessment*, 66, 488-524.

Mayer, J.D., Caruso, D.R., & Salovey, P. (2000a). Emotional intelligence meets traditional standards for an intelligence. *Intelligence*, 27, 267-298.

Mayer, J.D., Caruso, D.R., & Salovey, P. (2000b). Instruction manual for the MSCEIT, Mayer, Salovey-Caruso emotional intelligence test, research version 1.1 Toronto, ON: Multi-health Systems.

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

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 D. M. Wegner & J. W. Pennebaker (Eds.), *Emotion, disclosure, and health* (pp. 125-154). Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.

Tett, R., Wang, A., & Fox, K. (2003). *Emotional Intelligence as a Multidimensional Personality Construct: Development and Validation of a Self-Report Measure.* Manuscript in preparation. Available from Robert Tett, Department of Psychology, 308 Lorton Hall, University of Tulsa, 600 S. College, Tulsa, OK 74104.

Table 1

Correlations Between Changing People's Feelings Items and MSCEIT Managing Emotions and MSCEIT Total Scores

Scenario	Item	Managing	Total MSCEIT
Scenario 1	Response 1	.07	-.10
Confidence at Work	Response 2+	.37**	.24**
	Response 3+	.32**	.23**
	Response 4+	-.38**	-.38**
	Response 5+	-.31**	-.32**
Scenario 2	Response 1	-.04	-.01
Remodel	Response 2	.00	.03
	Response 3	.11	.12
	Response 4	-.16*	-.16*
	Response 5	.05	.10
Scenario 3	Response 1	.07	-.03
Cancellation	Response 2	.08	-.05
	Response 3	-.07	-.08
	Response 4	.02	.02
	Response 5	.26**	.24**
Scenario 4	Response 1	.10	.08
Lawyer Fees	Response 2+	-.27**	-.33**
	Response 3+	-.27**	-.23**
	Response 4+	.39**	.36**
	Response 5	-.06	-.06
Scenario 5	Response 1	-.11	-.13
Flattered	Response 2	-.09	-.12
	Response 3	-.11	-.13
	Response 4	-.05	-.08
	Response 5	.12	.08
Scenario 6	Response 1+	-.38**	-.39**
Cheer up Friend	Response 2+	-.36**	-.36**
	Response 3+	-.41**	-.42**
	Response 4+	-.33**	-.27**
	Response 5	-.30**	-.18*
Scenario 7	Response 1	-.14	-.24**
In Love	Response 2+	-.47**	-.41**
	Response 3+	.25**	.21**
	Response 4+	.28**	.31**
	Response 5+	.40**	.39**
Scenario 8	Response 1+	-.43**	-.44**
Boxer	Response 2+	-.14	-.15
	Response 3	-.10	-.11
	Response 4+	.25**	.17*
	Response 5+	-.07	-.09

* *p* < .05. ** *p* < .01.
+ Item was retained on Version 2.

Table 2

Correlations Between Changing People's Behaviors Items and MSCEIT Managing Emotions and MSCEIT Total Scores

Scenario	Item	Managing	Total MSCEIT
Scenario 1	Response 1+	.46**	.42**
Speeding	Response 2	.24**	.22**
	Response 3+	-.34**	-.29**
	Response 4+	.51**	.43**
	Response 5+	.39**	.31**
Scenario 2	Response 1	-.17*	-.18*
CD	Response 2	.11	.11
	Response 3	-.02	-.01
	Response 4	.09	.02
	Response 5	-.12	-.14
Scenario 3	Response 1+	-.19*	-.20*
Evaluations	Response 2+	-.28**	-.23**
	Response 3	.19*	.08
	Response 4+	-.25**	-.22**
	Response 5+	-.45**	-.41**
Scenario 4	Response 1+	-.26**	-.16
Raise Money	Response 2	-.17*	-.13
	Response 3+	-.33**	-.36**
	Response 4+	.27**	.32**
	Response 5+	.27**	.26**
Scenario 5	Response 1	.29**	.30**
Jealous	Response 2+	.45**	.44**
	Response 3+	-.34**	-.30**
	Response 4+	-.46**	-.41**
	Response 5+	.43**	.43**
Scenario 6	Response 1	-.16	-.20*
Pain Killers	Response 2	.06	.06
	Response 3	-.20*	-.20*
	Response 4	.02	-.04
	Response 5	-.28**	-.25**
Scenario 7	Response 1+	.07	.10
Babysitting	Response 2+	-.52**	-.45**
	Response 3+	.25**	.23**
	Response 4	.10	.12
	Response 5+	-.23**	-.17*

* *p* < .05. ** *p* < .01.
+ Item was retained on Version 2.

6

Table 2 *con't*

Scenario	Item	Managing	Total MSCEIT
Scenario 8	Response 1	-.09	-.15
Movie	Response 2+	.23**	.20*
	Response 3+	.07	.01
	Response 4	-.35**	-.32**
	Response 5+	.12	.14
Scenario 9	Response 1	.14	.11
Dog	Response 2	-.19*	-.23**
	Response 3	-.21*	-.20*
	Response 4	.02	.05
	Response 5	.48**	.44**
Scenario 10	Response 1	-.17*	-.15
Pay Back Loan	Response 2	.07	.16*
	Response 3	-.33**	-.30**
	Response 4	.07	.13
	Response 5	.13	.14
Scenario 11	Response 1	-.09	-.04
Garage	Response 2	-.03	-.02
	Response 3	-.08	-.05
	Response 4	-.32**	-.22**
	Response 5	-.40**	-.42**

$* p < .05. ** p < .01.$
+ Item was retained on Version 2.

Table 3
Item Analysis for Changing People's Feelings Version 2

Scenario	Item	Corrected Item-Total Correlation	Alpha if Item Deleted
Scenario 1	Response 2	-.05	**.54**
Confidence at Work	Response 3	-.10	**.55**
	Response 4	.46	.44
	Response 5	.14	.50
Scenario 4	Response 2	.30	.46
Lawyer Fees	Response 3	.16	.49
	Response 4	-.18	**.56**
Scenario 6	Response 1	.36	.46
Cheer up Friend	Response 2	.25	.47
	Response 3	.27	.47
	Response 4	.36	.46
Scenario 7	Response 2	.28	.47
In Love	Response 3	.14	.50
	Response 4	.01	**.52**
	Response 5	-.07	**.54**
Scenario 8	Response 1	.33	.46
Boxer	Response 2	.36	.45
	Response 4	.14	.50

Note. Coefficient Alpha for the 18-item test was .51.

Table 4

Item Analysis for Changing People's Behaviors Version 2

Scenario	Item	Corrected Item-Total Correlation	Alpha if Item Deleted
Scenario 1	Response 1	-.05	**.63**
Speeding	Response 3	.23	.60
	Response 4	-.05	**.63**
	Response 5	.15	.61
Scenario 3	Response 1	.37	.58
Evaluations	Response 2	.14	.61
	Response 4	.29	.59
	Response 5	.30	.59
Scenario 4	Response 1	.27	.59
Raise Money	Response 3	.18	.60
	Response 4	.26	.59
	Response 5	.29	.59
Scenario 5	Response 2	-.07	**.63**
Jealous	Response 3	.17	.60
	Response 4	.17	.60
	Response 5	.09	.61
Scenario 7	Response 1	.28	.59
Babysitting	Response 2	.28	.59
	Response 3	.16	.61
	Response 5	.37	.58
Scenario 9	Response 2	.42	.57
Dog	Response 3	.31	.59
	Response 5	.06	**.62**

Note. Coefficient Alpha for the 23-item test was .61.

Table 5

Item Analysis for Combined Changing People's Feelings and Behaviors Version 2

Scenario	Item	Corrected Item-Total Correlation	Alpha if Item Deleted
Changing People's Feelings			
Scenario 1	Response 2	.07	**.75**
Confidence at Work	Response 3	.04	**.75**
	Response 4	.44	.73
	Response 5	.21	.74
Scenario 4	Response 2	.21	.74
Lawyer Fees	Response 3	.22	.74
	Response 4	.01	**.75**
Scenario 6	Response 1	.33	.73
Cheer up Friend	Response 2	.18	.74
	Response 3	.21	.74
	Response 4	.36	.73
Scenario 7	Response 2	.27	.74
In Love	Response 3	.19	.74
	Response 4	.17	.74
	Response 5	.09	.74
Scenario 8	Response 1	.32	.73
Boxer	Response 2	.35	.73
	Response 4	.30	.73
Changing People's Behaviors			
Scenario 1	Response 1	-.07	**.75**
Speeding	Response 3	.28	.73
	Response 4	-.08	**.75**
	Response 5	.13	.74
Scenario 3	Response 1	.43	.73
Evaluations	Response 2	.20	.74
	Response 4	.34	.73
	Response 5	.44	.73
Scenario 4	Response 1	.33	.73
Raise Money	Response 3	.31	.73
	Response 4	.22	.74
	Response 5	.27	.73
Scenario 5	Response 2	-.11	**.75**
Jealous	Response 3	.27	.74
	Response 4	.25	.74
	Response 5	.07	.74
Scenario 7	Response 1	.30	.73
Babysitting	Response 2	.38	.73
	Response 3	.12	.74
	Response 5	.42	.73
Scenario 9	Response 2	.42	.73
Dog	Response 3	.33	.73
	Response 5	.01	**.75**

Note. The internal consistency of the 41-item test was .74.

Table 6

Correlations of Changing People's Feelings and Changing People's Behaviors Version 2 and Combined Measure with Other Emotional Intelligence and Manipulation Measures

	CPF	CPB	CPFB
Self-Report Emotional Intelligence Measures			
TAS20 Difficulty Identifying Feelings	-.21**	-.23**	-.23**
TAS20 Difficulty Describing Feelings	-.25**	-.20*	-.23**
TAS20 Externally Oriented Thinking	-.33**	-.28**	-.32**
TMMS Repair	.05	.07	.06
TMMS Attention	.20**	.14	.18*
TMMS Clarity	.15	.18*	.17*
SIPOAS Looking to logic	-.17	-.07	-.12
SIPOAS Based on Body	.11	.08	.10
SIPOAS Emphasizing Evaluation	.10	.06	.08
Maximum-Performance Emotional Intelligence Measures			
MSCEIT Perceiving	.37**	.38**	.39**
MSCEIT Facilitation	.27**	.32**	.31**
MSCEIT Understanding	.43**	.43**	.46**
MSCEIT Managing	.61**	.64**	.66**
MSCEIT Total	.56**	.59**	.61**
Self-Report Manipulation Measures			
YPI Manipulation	-.21**	-.25**	-.24**
PPI Machiavellianism	-.27**	-.32**	-.32**

CPF = Changing People's Feelings; CPB = Changing People's Behaviors; CPFB = Changing People's Feelings and Behaviors.
* $p < .05$. ** $p < .01$.

Appendix

Changing People's Feelings
Version 2, April 20, 2003

A number of situations are presented below. For each situation, your goal is to make a person feel a certain way. You will be provided with three or four possible responses to each situation. Your task is to judge the effectiveness of each response in making that person feel that way.

Use the following response scale:

Very INeffective	Somewhat INeffective	Neutral	Somewhat Effective	Very Effective
1	2	3	4	5

Scenario 1
Last week, Maria had drinks with her friend from work, Raoul. Maria confided that she was having trouble with one of their coworkers. Maria just found out that this coworker knows that Maria is upset with her, and Maria is sure that Raoul must have told someone in the office what she said over drinks. How effective would Maria be in making Raoul feel guilty and remorseful if she chose to respond in the following ways?

Response 1	Maria sulks until Raoul asks what is wrong. She says, "nothing" and gives him the cold shoulder to convey that she knows what he has done.	1 2 3 4 5
Response 2	Maria tells her office mates what Raoul said about the coworker over drinks. She figures that once he knows how it feels to have his trust violated, he'll feel guilty about what he has done.	1 2 3 4 5
Response 3	Maria quietly approaches Raoul. She describes how close she feels to Raoul and notes that she doesn't confide in just anyone. She tearfully explains how hurt she feels about Raoul's having told someone about their private conversation.	1 2 3 4 5
Response 4	Maria talks to Raoul about the confidences and secrets that she has kept for him over the years, even when it was difficult to do so. She notes how important trust is to her and talks about how long it takes her to "open up" to someone.	1 2 3 4 5

Scenario 2
Steven is talking to his lawyer. His lawyer says that he has to pay him before the end of the month, or else he's not going to work for him anymore. How effective would Steven be in making his lawyer feel sorry for him if he responded in the following ways?

Response 1	Steven apologizes to the lawyer. He points out that he doesn't have insurance and has to pay for an expensive surgery that his 2-year old daughter had to have this month. He promises to pay the lawyer as soon as he pays some of his medical bills.	1 2 3 4 5
Response 2	Steven says he needs the little money he has in the bank to pay his rent this month. He explains that he'll get his paycheck at the end of the month, and he will pay the lawyer then.	1 2 3 4 5
Response 3	Steven pretends to faint.	1 2 3 4 5

Very INeffective	Somewhat INeffective	Neutral	Somewhat Effective	Very Effective
1	2	3	4	5

Scenario 3

Mike wants to cheer up his friend Colin because he has experienced a lot of disappointments lately. Last week, Colin even lost a big account at work. How effective would Mike be in making Colin feel happy if he chose to respond in the following ways?

Response 1   Mike invites Colin's friends over to Colin's house for dinner. These   1 2 3 4 5
friends surprise Colin with a nice meal, wine, and good music. They talk
late into the night.

Response 2   Mike invites Colin out for drinks after work. As they are talking   1 2 3 4 5
throughout the evening, Mike compliments Colin and tells him how
much his friendship means to him.

Response 3   Mike surprises Colin with tickets to see his favorite hockey team play an   1 2 3 4 5
important game in the end of a series. They spend the night drinking
beer, eating hot dogs, and rooting for Colin's team.

Response 4   Mike tells Colin that he deserves an entire day of doing exactly what he   1 2 3 4 5
wants to do. He tells Colin to make up a list of things that make him
happy and spends a Saturday with Colin doing everything on his list.

Scenario 4

Curtis and July work in the same building. Curtis is desperately in love with July, but July does not seem to have noticed Curtis. How effective would Curtis be in getting July to feel fond of him, if he chose to respond in the following ways?

Response 1   Curtis begins dropping by July's desk occasionally and asking her what's   1 2 3 4 5
happening in her life. After several conversations, he asks her to lunch.

Response 2   Curtis tells several people at work how much he likes July, hoping that   1 2 3 4 5
she will hear about it and seek him out.

Response 3   Curtis tells July that he's having a dinner at his house for several of his   1 2 3 4 5
coworkers. When she shows up, he says that no one else could come.

Response 4   After a few conversations, Curtis tells July about his troubled love life.   1 2 3 4 5
He implies that he thinks no one will ever love him.

Very INeffective	Somewhat INeffective	Neutral	Somewhat Effective	Very Effective
1	2	3	4	5

Scenario 5

Jameil is a professional boxer who is about to begin the biggest boxing match of his career. His coach has worked with him for years and knows that Jameil is more likely to win matches when he is "pumped up" and angry. How effective would the coach be in making Jameil angry if the chose to respond in the following ways?

Response 1   Coach tells Jameil that his opponent is bragging that Jameil has lost his   1 2 3 4 5
              edge—he says he could knock Jameil out without working up a sweat.

Response 2   Coach leaves Jameil waiting for him for 20 minutes before the match. He   1 2 3 4 5
              knows that Jameil has absolutely no patience for his being late.

Response 3   Coach tells Jameil he doesn't think he's fired up for this match. He tells   1 2 3 4 5
              Jameil he's going to lose if he doesn't find some fire.

Changing People's Behaviors
Version 2, April 20, 2003

A number of situations are presented below. For each situation, your goal is to make a person do something specific. You will be provided with five possible responses to each situation. Your task is to judge the effectiveness of each response in making that person act in the desired way.

Use the following response scale:

Very INeffective	Somewhat INeffective	Neutral	Somewhat Effective	Very Effective
1	2	3	4	5

Scenario 1
A patrol officer pulled Tony over for speeding in a school zone. Tony was driving 18 miles per hour in a 15 mile per hour zone. The officer has dismounted her motorcycle and is pulling out her citation tablet as she walks up to Tony's car. How effective would Tony be in getting out of a speeding ticket if he chose to respond in the following ways?

Response 1	Tony angrily asks the officer why she pulled him over and points out that he was only going 3 miles over the speed limit.	1 2 3 4 5
Response 2	Tony calmly listens to the patrol officer. As he pulls out his license and registration for her, he apologizes for speeding and explains that he didn't see the flashing lights for the school zone.	1 2 3 4 5
Response 3	Tony accuses the officer of setting a trap for motorists to meet her speeding ticket quota. He notes that school has been out for hours and tells the officer that her job is to protect the public, not make meaningless traffic stops. He says that he will take the issue up with a judge if he has to.	1 2 3 4 5
Response 4	Tony compliments the officer on her professionalism. He tells her that her skills could be better spent on chasing real criminals. He says that she shouldn't waste her time on trivial matters like traffic tickets.	1 2 3 4 5

Scenario 2
Joe's boss asked him to write evaluations for ten employees by Friday. Joe is worried that he won't have enough time to write the evaluations because of his regular work responsibilities. Joe's coworker, Lisa, knows the ten employees. How effective would Joe be in getting Lisa to help write the evaluations if he chose to respond in the following ways?

Response 1	Joe takes Lisa to lunch and talks about how hard he has been working lately and how stressed he feels. When Lisa asks how she can help, he asks her to help write the evaluations.	1 2 3 4 5
Response 2	Joe tells Lisa that important employee evaluations are due Friday. He tells Lisa that her input on these evaluations would be invaluable because she is very fair-minded and knows these employees better than anyone else.	1 2 3 4 5
Response 3	Joe tells Lisa that he's never done employee evaluations. He points out that she has had experience doing this and he could really benefit from her expertise if she would be willing to show him "the ropes."	1 2 3 4 5
Response 4	Joe tells Lisa he is worried he won't have time to do the evaluations and asks for her help. He says that he is more than willing to help her in the future whenever she needs it.	1 2 3 4 5

Very INeffective	Somewhat INeffective	Neutral	Somewhat Effective	Very Effective
1	2	3	4	5

Scenario 3
Tina's job is to raise money for the homeless. She is nearing the end of a big fund-raising campaign and is talking with the CEO of a major company. How effective would Tina be in getting the CEO to donate a large sum of money if she chose to respond in the following ways?

Response 1   Tina shows the CEO a portfolio of pictures of homeless women and   1 2 3 4 5
children who have been assaulted and battered on the street. She points
out that his donation could provide shelter for these people.

Response 2   Tina explains to the CEO that his donation could improve the public's   1 2 3 4 5
view of his company. She argues that his company's profits will increase
because people will know that the company is invested in improving
their neighborhood.

Response 3   Tina calls the CEO and gets around to talking about how worried she is   1 2 3 4 5
about losing her job. She notes that her "standby" companies haven't had
as much money to donate during this drive as they've had in the past. She
works into the conversation that she is a single mother with two kids.

Response 4   Tina tells the CEO that it is important that he make a decision about his   1 2 3 4 5
donation within the next two days. She says that another company is
willing to match (dollar for dollar) the amount of the CEO's contribution
to the homeless cause. She tells him that she really hopes he takes
advantage of this opportunity.

Scenario 4
Over the past two years, Anton has become very close to his girlfriend, Jessica. He suspects that Jessica is seeing other people. She stays out late at night with her friends and goes to clubs often. She doesn't tell Anton much about going out. How effective would Anton be in keeping Jessica from leaving him if he chose to respond in the following ways?

Response 1   Anton locks Jessica out of the house and leaves some of her belongings   1 2 3 4 5
outside. He is certain that, once she sees what it is like to be without him,
she will value him more.

Response 2   Anton asks Jessica if they can talk. He tells Jessica that he is worried that   1 2 3 4 5
she doesn't love him anymore. He tells her that she means the world to
him and he will do whatever she would like to make things better. He
says he can't imagine life without her.

Response 3   Anton surprises Jessica with a nice dinner when she comes home from   1 2 3 4 5
work. Over dinner, he tells her how much he loves her and says he's been
concerned that she's been so distant lately. He asks her what is wrong.

Response 4   Anton calls Jessica's closest friend and interrogates her about whether   1 2 3 4 5
Jessica is cheating on him. He tells her friend not to tell Jessica that he
called. He doesn't talk to Jessica about it.

Very INeffective	Somewhat INeffective	Neutral	Somewhat Effective	Very Effective
1	2	3	4	5

Scenario 5

Chris really wants to go out with his wife and friends on Friday night. He would like his sister, Tonya, to babysit his two sons for him, but he knows that Tonya already has plans. How effective will Chris be in getting Tonya to babysit if he chooses to respond in the following ways?

Response 1	Chris invites Tonya to dinner and spends some time talking about how hard it is to take care of a child without any breaks.	1 2 3 4 5
Response 2	Chris tells Tonya that he hasn't gotten together with his wife and friends for a long time. He says that the group is planning to go to a Paul McCartney concert, which is a once in a lifetime opportunity. He asks Tonya to babysit just this once and offers to do her a favor in return.	1 2 3 4 5
Response 3	Chris drops his sons off at Tonya's early on Friday afternoon, knowing that Tonya won't say no once he is ready to go.	1 2 3 4 5
Response 4	Chris tells Tonya how much his sons love her. He gives her one of the drawings they made for her last week. He tells her that the babysitting would mean a lot to his sons and offers to pay for a dinner and movie rental, so Tonya can have fun with the kids.	1 2 3 4 5

Scenario 6

Jason goes to an animal shelter to adopt a dog. He finds a dog that he really likes, but he's not sure if the dog will get along with his cat. Jason wants to take the dog home to try introducing it to his cat, but the shelter staff say that is against the rules. How successful would Jason be in getting the staff to make an exception to the rule, if he chose to respond in each of the following ways?

Response 1	Jason offers to leave his driver's license with the staff so they have proof of his name, phone number, and address and know that he will bring the dog back.	1 2 3 4 5
Response 2	Jason invites one of the shelter staff people to come with him and the dog to Jason's house so they can supervise the visit.	1 2 3 4 5
Response 3	Jason says that if they do not let him try the introduction at home, he'll leave and never come back. The dog will probably never find a home and will have to be put down.	1 2 3 4 5

Note: The recommended scoring of Version 2 of the Changing People's Feelings and Changing People's Behaviors Tests is the reverse of the original scoring. In the original scoring, 1 = Very Effective and 5 = Very Ineffective. In future research, we recommend 1 = Very Ineffective and 5 = Very Effective, as shown here.