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Abstract
How power works through the handling of emotion of others is analysed by a case example from a study on emotions in organisational change. This case is a starting point for the theoretical argument that power analysis can benefit from analysing how emotions are engendered as part of power processes, and not merely repressed or controlled. The analysis elaborates and applies the analytical possibilities of the notion of other emotion management, which seems particularly relevant in understanding organisational change, as change increases the amount of emotion work/coping compared to routine situations. I analyse from a perspective on emotion that emphasises productive and performative dimensions of emotional life, and this emotional kind of power is distinguished from management of meaning (legitimacy, discourse). Hereby, the paper aims at contributing to a development of power theory and analysis, which has been too cognitively biased.
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Introduction
How power works through more or less silent ways of managing emotion of others is the issue of this paper. The aim is to analyse some aspects of how power works by applying the notion of other emotion management (Thoits, 1996; Francis, 1994; Erickson, 1997) to a case study on emotion in organisational change. I argue in favour for an emotion perspective on power. Primarily I give theoretical grounds for balancing power theory with an emotion perspective, but empirical grounds for an increasing salience of power operating through emotions are also briefly suggested.

The main argument goes like this. Power works through mobilising and directing emotions based on the power-exercising agent’s relating to the other's emotions (other emotion management). The analysed case shows how the manager's display of empathy is part of dealing with an employee that expresses severe frustration. The manager's way of acknowledging emotional expression in a formal staff meeting is seen as part of confirming a practice of segmentation of emotional expression. I introduce the notion of segmentation of emotional expression in order to emphasise that emotion is expressed accordingly to different rules of distribution such as a distinction between colleague and ‘a trusted colleague’. Segmentation can be seen as an alternative to the private/public distinction, which misleads us to think that emotions are repressed in work contexts and merely expressed in the private sphere.

The first section describes an unusually emotional staff meeting and focuses on how managerial action handles emotion of the employees. This case description (situational focus) is both a way of introducing the case organisation and a starting point for the argument in favour of an emotion perspective on organisational and managerial power developed in the second section. This second section firstly locates the endeavour of the paper in the context of power theory and suggests reasons why emotional dimensions of power gain significance. Other emotion management is then explored as a condition and form of power and linked to the analysis of the case example. The concluding section suggests that the case organisation may be seen as incarnating future organisational practices that acknowledge emotion more fully, and it sums up how the paper contributes to a development of power theory and analysis.

Case story: Emotion in organisational interaction
The meeting took place when the department had been working on establishing itself for about 2½ months. At that time the workload was still increasing and members still thought that they did not have sufficient working capacity. Normally the meetings took about 1-2 hours and the agenda of the meetings was generated as the manager put forward items to be discussed, and he asked the employees about other items to be added. The atmosphere seemed generally relaxed, and it was not unusual that the 10-12 employees (consultants and mainly administrative employees) joked during the meeting. Sometimes they even joked with their novel manager who had a non-authoritarian style.

The unusual staff meeting
The meeting was an ordinary staff meeting dealing with the status and development of a few particular tasks such as advertising, launching a campaign, and more importantly, the issue of a new distribution of tasks among the employees. “Great, existential items” the manager said jokingly.

The manager started out by telling the group that he had made a suggestion to a new distribution of tasks without any dramatic or major changes. And that probably there was not enough time to change the distribution very much right now. He suggested that they could discuss the new distribution later at their departmental seminar in May, when they could think things through more creatively if necessary. The present suggestion was a provisional distribution of tasks.

He presented his suggestion and asked if there were any questions or comments. Only one (consultant) employee commented by telling that he was very satisfied with the new distribution, as it meant that some administrative burdens were lifted off his shoulders. The manager looked around the room - nobody else had any comments besides a few clearing questions from two employees. The manager rounded off by saying: “Okay, then we’ll work according to the new task distribution”.

Then one of the experienced administrative employees rose and explained that if she had had a short fuse lately and she had been sharp towards colleagues or clients, then it was probably due to the workload. When she (A) felt as stressed as she did her patience with other people diminished, she explained. She also asked the manager which of the consultants were supposed to help when, and what tasks precisely the consultants were supposed to take care of. When the manager had answered these questions, another employee took over.

This employee (B) looked troubled and she flushed when she began stating her opinion, that the situation was “inhuman” and that she very well knew that she had said that before. But now she had to say it again: “There are too few administrative resources in the department”. She had received 5 complaints from customers that morning, asking why their cases were not finished yet. She explained to the manager that she was saying this on behalf of the group - she had talked with others about this.

In the group this lead to a discussion about the fact that people had generally received help from other colleagues. And the woman (B) who had articulated her frustration answered to this by saying a “thank you” directed to her colleagues who had helped her. The manager took part in the conversation at this point, stating that he did not think that people should feel that they had to say "thank you". "It ought to be a natural thing that people help each other".

The conversation then focussed on how heavy the work was administratively. It had improved things a little that a student assistant had been employed. After this the employee who had described the whole situation as inhuman, asked if it was only she who felt those problems and saw the departmental situation as unbearable. One colleague answered “no” to this question and stated briefly that he and two other colleagues agreed on what she was saying.

The manager then asked the employee (B) who felt the situation unbearable (“inhuman situation”), if she had any suggestions as to how they could do things differently. She answered that maybe they could make a co-operation team and in that way think more creatively. In connection to this answer she told the group that she was not particularly good at structuring and carrying out administrative
work. But she also did express the view that the manager was probably right, when he said they had better reflect more on that issue in relation to a mentioned coming departmental seminar.

Commenting on the idea about teams, the manager made the point that even if they created a team out of the departmental members, then everybody would still have to do some administrative work, as this had also been a condition right from the beginning. (The manager had the idea of mixing administrative and consultative tasks more than practised before). He also stated that he did not think that people (colleagues) would say no when they were asked for help. To this the employee explained that lack of time was a problem. It was not the lack of good will. It was difficult to ask for help when everybody else was buried in work, too.

Sitting with folded arms the manager answered that several of the employees had experienced that more resources had been put into the department. The employee (B) then said that she was sad and felt that the manager was misunderstanding her. She knew very well that everybody was pressed hard. The manager suggested that she should come to his office to talk, if she needed more help.

And he asked the others if they had suggestions concerning an improvement of the situation in the department. No one had. “We will have to think about it”, the manager said, and repeated the idea about having a seminar in May. As a recapitulation of the meeting he restated that the new distribution of tasks was provisional.

Then the employee (B) suggested that they had better carry on with the agenda of the meeting, and here she for the second time tried to pull back her initial statement, as she again indicated that maybe it was just her who found the situation too much (“inhuman”).

The employee (B) who had brought a bunch of letters with her and was putting them into envelopes while expressing her view - that the situation was “inhuman” - commented upon this herself, as she assured the group that her bringing in work was not meant as a provocation. She only did it because she was so busy, she explained.

The colleagues and the manager had, of course, noticed this activity, but seemed not to be disturbed or provoked by it. The manager made no comment concerning the envelopes. He took the situation in an easy manner, although he seemed a bit influenced by the extraordinary action (The manager later told me that he had been a bit surprised by the employee’s statement about the departmental situation). And one of the colleagues only had a suggestion as to how the letters could be more efficiently packed.

While expressing her point of view she (B) told about how hard it was to return to a lot of complaints from customers after having been on holiday. But her way of speaking was not agitated or speedy. It seemed difficult for her to say what she did, but she managed to do it in a calm and controlled way.

Later in the meeting the manager said that it was also completely amazing how much work they had done - 3 times as much as they had been expected to, and for this he wanted to thank his employees.

**Handling intense emotion**
The expression and handling of emotion is a complex issue and the following analysis reflects merely a few aspects of how emotion is handled.

As a kind of ‘critical incident’ the case can shed light on the borders of the ordinary meeting, as the borders are provoked by the unusual action of the employee (B). The manager and the colleagues accepted/tolerated her strong articulation of frustration. There was tolerance even though one of the employees thought, that is was a misunderstanding to bring some of one’s work into the meeting. Another colleague had seen it as a sign of powerlessness and not as a sign of provocation. But the point is that no one expressed his or her possible judgement on this unusual activity. Moreover, the case shows how the extra-ordinary character of the meeting was normalised, as the participants did not treat it as something unusual - they did not take any further notice of it - and in that sense the odd, sensitive, provocative character of the situation was downplayed.

This meeting was rather emotional given the expression 'this situation is inhuman'. But also because the employee (B), who claimed to be speaking on behalf of the group did an unusual and therefore 'dangerous' thing by bringing in her work. She did risk loosing face - the manager or others could have disapproved of or resented her expression of frustration. This extraordinary action indicated that the situation had a particular weight. The meeting was emotional in the sense that a strong feeling of what could be called frustration was articulated by (B). Compared to how the increasing workload and the pressure of work (stress) had been discussed in earlier meetings, it was also a more direct expression of dissatisfaction and frustration, as the 'strong' expression 'inhuman' indicated. Something important was at stake for the employee.

The meeting was emotional, but not to such a degree that emotions got out of control. The 'frustrated' employee expressed her views and emotions in a controlled way. While expressing distress and frustration she remained calm, self-reflective, considerate, rather than agitated and uncontrolled. Also the other employee’s (A) personal account of her - in her own eyes - too impatient and harsh personal behaviour. This was accounted for in terms of the emotional experience of stress was given in a very calm manner. It was something she had prepared to say, and her message was given in a concise way.

The employee who expressed her frustration and claimed to do this on behalf of the whole group did not receive much support from her colleagues. Only one colleague supported her in a brief comment. Consequently, the description of the situation as inhuman very much fell back on her shoulders. Twice did she express defensive retreats such as “well, maybe it is only me who is having a problem”. Finally the manager said that if she had a problem, she could come and talk to him in his office. This managerial handling of the articulation of frustration is significant in terms of understanding managerial power in action. By making the 'helpful' suggestion - come to my office if you need help - the manager suggested a 'privatising' of this frustration and the communication about it: frustration is to be talked about in relationship with the manager. In this way the manager made the group proceed to other items of the meeting. And the focus was moved away from the issue of frustration. The managerial action towards the expression of frustration can be seen as an attempt to avoid spreading of feelings of frustration to the whole group.

Summing up, the meeting situation shows how managerial power operates in terms of being attentive to the frustration of the employee, as the manager listened and did not oppose her expression of emotion and her unusual activity. He showed understanding (displayed empathy) as he invited her to come to his office to talk about the situation. They had talked together in that way
several times before and he was still willing to talk together again. Acting in this manner he directed emotional expression toward the expected and common practice of talking about difficult issues primarily in the personal (‘private’) and confidential context of the manager and the individual employee. The emotion expression in the meeting was accepted/tolerated and directed and hereby he made it possible to carry on with the meeting. This case demonstrates that when it gets emotional in a meeting setting then it is not necessarily getting emotional in the sense of people loosing self-control. The unusual, tense meeting situation was managed in a way that acknowledged emotional expression and confirmed the common practice of dealing with difficult, emotional issues in ‘confidential’ company of either the manager or trusted colleagues.

Emotion and power

Cool power theory?

Intuitively power may be felt as an emotional phenomenon as we use emotions to move other people and many emotions are about power, persuasion, manipulation, and intimidation. The existence of emotions is a political force influencing us, not a neutral social or psychological fact (Solomon, 1999:59). In spite of this (too) obvious insight has the theory of (organisational) power only to a rather limited degree theorised how emotions work in the service of power. In organisational studies this neglect of researching emotion in power has been explained as a result of reducing authority to legitimacy in terms of culture or ideology. A reduction that seems particularly inappropriate considering contemporary forms of authority, that have little to do with rules, orders and instructions (Albrow, 1994).

Generally, little has been done in terms of integrating power theory with emotion theory (Gibson & Schroeder, 2001; Cohen, 1998; Flam, 2000). There have been exceptions to this trend of ‘rationalising’ the understanding of power. Most commonly theorists have focussed on power over emotion provided by the influence of social structures (e.g. Kemper, 1978; Barbalet, 1998; Gibson, 1997) or culture (e.g. Hochschild, 1983; Maanen & Kunda, 1989). Or power over emotions in terms of various techniques of ‘normalising’ emotions (Ashforth & Humphrey, 1995; Ashforth & Kreiner, 2001). More rarely have theorists thought about the emotionality of power and how power function through mobilising and demobilising emotions. Though, a few significant contributions can be mentioned to situate my endeavour in a theoretical context. Sennett (1980) has developed a theory of how power operates through emotion with his notion of how autonomous managers induce shame feelings in the subordinate employees in modern organisations. More recent has Clark (1997) developed a comprehensive theory of how emotion display work as social forces in micro-political action in more or less omni-present micro-hierarchies. Layder (1997) has more generally stressed the analytical importance of focussing on the subjective aspects of power because these dimensions tend to be neglected in social theory and radical constructionist thinking (Layder, 1997; see also Crespi, 1992; Craib, 1998).

Much theory of power presupposes that inferiors just react to instances of power, instead of seeing how people actively act in relation to specific actions of power – for instance by circulating other attitudes than the official ones (Alvesson, 1996). This point is crucial, but it is also crucial to go further and ask how people are energised or de-energised by actions of power. One need not be satisfied with e.g. showing, that some times official identities are opposed by other identities or values. It is pertinent to find out how power move people by engaging them emotionally which is not necessarily related to identity, securing compliance through the threat of sanctions or imposition of more abstract world-views. Not all emotions are bound to identity and interactional power need
not always secure common understanding, discourse or compliance. Management of emotions through for instance how managers relate to their employees by way of chatting, joking and popping by can engender trust between manager and employee. Such behaviour involving more than discourse is very crucial considering how much emotion exchange and emotion work interact on a unnoticed level (Clark, 1997; Barbalet, 1996; Layder, 1997).

**Power emotionalised**

Emotional dimensions of power exercising become more central in situations of organisational change, because changes lead to conflicts and erosion of employees’ 'status shields' which involves more emotion management and coping to be done compared to routine-related situations (Freund, 1998). But emotional dimensions of power also become more central as a consequence of societal developments towards “soft capitalism” consisting of emotion celebrating organisations (Thrift, 1997) and towards “personalisation of work-life” (Sørhaug, 1996). Another significant development in terms of making emotional relating more part of power exciting seems to be that social status no longer automatically translate into power in micro-situational situations. Randall Collins advances the thesis that the social power of categorical identities erodes. Consequently, one can not assume that high position in the social stratification pattern automatically translates into (deference) power in everyday interactions (Collins, 2000). Collins' critique of the common notion of the powerful micro-effects of macro-social social stratification is useful in understanding the context of the interactions between managers and employees in the case organisation. Here, people did not communicate as 'manager' and 'subordinate' and the general atmosphere seemed 'equalised' and non-hierarchical.

Collins suggests that “…whether organisational members will be increasingly free of constraints or subject to covert manipulation: these are matters still to be worked out by investing the actual dimensions of micro-situational power” (Collins, 2000:35). The task is to understand how micro situations are stratified by other conditions than macro-social stratification. But the alternative between either freedom from constraints or covert manipulation seems too sharp. At least, I suggest that if deference-power (based on macro-social stratification) is decreasing then the ongoing display and exchange of emotions may become more salient in the ongoing negotiation and establishing of micro-hierarchies. This development is part of the background for understanding Clark’s claim that more than ever emotions are key micro-political instruments (Clark, 1997). And such power of energising or de-energising others through engaging people emotionally is not necessarily best understood in terms of the dichotomy between freedom of constraints and covert manipulation. It is a kind of productive power based on relating to others emotions as a basis of influencing them. And such engaging power needs not be covert manipulation or freedom of constraint as the notion of other emotion management explains in the following sections.

In this paper I assume that managerial power becomes emotionalised as employees expect managers not ‘to tell me’, but ‘to show me’, and decisions are being delegated to employees. Such an emotionalising of power does not entail that usual forms of power are replaced. It simply adds to these forms. How, then, can this emotional aspect of power be understood I will explore through the notion of other emotion management.

**Managing emotion**

The notion of emotion management or work refers to the fact that emotion is not just a matter of automatic emotional response, but is co-constructed through our attempts to feel and express emotions that are appropriate in connection with specific situations. The notion is a key notion of Hochschild's general theory of the social interactional character of emotions (Hochschild, 1983).
Having and feeling emotions is an experience constituted in relating to socially defined and distributed 'feeling rules', suggesting what to feel and how to display emotions in particular situations. The emotion work is directed towards bringing emotion in line with the feeling norms of the situation.

Hochschild's pioneering study and succeeding studies have focussed on how the individual employee handles the task of realising certain expectations concerning how to present and produce a certain kind of emotionality ('emotional labour') such as presenting a smiling and engaged service-oriented personality. Hochschild describes different techniques of self-management of emotion. Techniques used by employees in order to change, alter, modify, repress, dissolve and create certain emotions in order to cope with demands, expectations and tensions of various work situations. Organisational emotion research has been particularly preoccupied with the relationships between job tasks and self-management processes.

The Hochschildian approach has been criticised for working on the basis of an 'emotional package metaphor' (Waldron, 1994) leading to a one-sided focus on processes of repressing, controlling or manipulating. Waldron calls for a research on the performance and communication of emotion in order to see how emotion creates something by being communicated. From such a perspective one can e.g. study how expression of emotion can be part of maintaining power relations when superiors creates positive feelings praising the subordinate employee in the company of others. The power as other emotion management approach I explore in this paper is one way of stressing a performance approach to the study of emotion in organisation. Hochschild’s own work also emphasises the creating dimension of emotion work/management and Waldron's critique therefore does not hit her as hard. But Waldron's call for also investigating the productive dimension of emotion work is crucial, and emotion management in this paper therefore refers to both processes of limiting and creating emotions or moods.

Other emotion management

Other emotion management is about influencing the emotions of other individuals. Research shows that the way leaders manage emotional tensions among group members plays a great role for the social success of the group (Thoits: 1996:86). But other emotion management is a fairly new construct as strategies for managing emotions in other people have rarely been an explicit focus of sociological investigation (Thoits, 1996:86).

Other emotion management is based on ‘empathic role-taking emotions (Shott, 1979). Such a kind of emotion arises from attending to and identifying with other individuals seeking to understand and/or experience the world from his or her emotional standpoint. Empathic role-taking emotions most often occur in the interactional presence of others and may not merely be about feeling sympathy or pity. Basically empathic emotions are about one’s ability to understand and share the emotions that others are experiencing. Empathic emotion involves more than taking the view of an other and then reflect attention back onto one’s experienced self-reflexive role-taking emotions such as guilt, shame, pride and embarrassment. These self-reflexive emotions are crucial in motivating emotional self-management and other normative behaviour (Goffman, 1956).

Other emotion management is not just about producing and reproducing meaningful identities but also about creating organisational structures and cultures. When therapists or managers get others to manage or ‘work on’ their emotions in a specific way, they are also reproducing a certain ideology (see e.g. Cameron, 2000). This because we understand ideology qua emotional experiences that
help us make sense of the world (Erickson, 1997:14). Ideology is (also) about group identification, rituals and symbolic resources. Seeing for example therapy as an ideology makes it possible to pursue the notion of interpersonal emotion management as an ideologically driven occurrence. That is, as a process driven by more than just the situation and its personalities. The point is to understand other emotion management as a broader phenomenon produced also by ideological forces. Managerial power/action is linked to ideology and a more general 'politics of emotional expression' (Campbell, 1997) that shapes emotional life in organisations.

Emphatic emotions become especially central because other emotion management based on the evocation of emphatic emotions becomes central in terms of social control and functioning as an effective self (Erickson, 1997:13). Contemporary organisations can be described as therapeutic in so far as people in their work life are involved in activities directed towards developing their personality in order to improve capacities for communication or their sense of confidence. Human resource management is about leading and governing employees through working on their selves (Rose, 1989). In a therapeutic society people work on their emotions in order to be or become authentic or the kind of person they would like to be. People are reliant on (self-management) experts such as therapists and counsellors who assist them in such endeavours through the techniques of interpersonal emotion management. Emotion management is thus a 'normative' (Erickson) or formative endeavour. People handle or manage emotions in order to construct and present themselves and not just for the sake of self-control. Seeing emotion management as a formative process implies taking a critical step back from the prevalent cultural orientation ('impulsive orientation') that sees emotion management as primarily a manipulative activity, since it is assumed that only the 'unmanaged' emotion is authentic or natural (Erickson, 1997).

Erickson describes the basis for exercising other emotion management, namely having the ability to understand and share the emotions which others experience. She mentions humour and therapy as examples of specific forms of other emotion management. But she does not go into exploring specific examples of how interpersonal management shapes emotional experience of others in a specific direction. Thoits reckons that attempts to elicit and/or play upon other people’s feelings probably occur during labour negotiations, divorce settlements, jury trials, faculty meetings, and other encounters marked by conflict or attempts to persuade. And she emphasises that we need more description and analysis of the techniques used to evoke or change people’s emotions in various settings (Thoits, 1996:106). Thoits makes useful points, but does not go very far in extending her analysis of the techniques of therapeutic encounter groups to the more conventional social life. But I agree with Thoits’ general theoretical points concerning the sociological significance of other emotion management. Consequently, my contribution aims at analysing other forms of other emotion management and applying the theoretical perspective to a more ordinary or conventional social setting compared to the encounter groups. I assume that emotion managing of others is an integral part of conflict situations and situations marked by attempts of persuasion but also of social life more generally. Organisational change implies a lot of different situations of conflict between interests and aspirations and it also means attempts of persuasion of others - e.g. management trying to convince the employees of the advantages of the proposed change. In the case organisation managers were engaged in persuading employees that they were able to succeed in establishing a new successful department and that it would be fun, exciting and challenging.

Other emotion management as power

Having emphatic skills is related to the possibility of exercising power, because feeling/understanding what others feel put you in a better position to shape or manage the emotional
experiences of these others (Erickson, 1997:13-14). Consequently, empathic skills have sociological significance since managing others’ emotions is a central element in building social solidarity, stimulating social change and identity change, and solidifying power. Erickson extends this point by Thoits by suggesting that management of others' emotions is directly related to processes of socialisation and social control. Other emotion management is central in understanding relationships between emotions and social control, or socialisation (Erickson, 1997). Consequently, social research should not merely look at self-management techniques but turn to investigation of how actors manage the emotions of others (Erickson, 1997:12; Lively, 2000; Clark, 1997). Such a shift of focus can lead to new lines of inquiry concerning the relationship between emotions and social control (Erickson, 1997:13).

Emotion management of others services power, as it tunes people in to certain emotions and thereby predisposes them to act in certain directions (Barbalet, 1998). Other emotion management is both a condition of power and can be a means of power in terms of various strategies of other emotion management such as humour, provocation or comforting (Francis, 1994; Thoits, 1996). Power is exercised through relating actively to employees in order to influence how they feel. Other emotion management is a way of grasping how power works through emotion and not merely qua suppression of emotion. Such an approach emphasises an understanding of power as mobilising or de-mobilising of ‘emotional energy’ (Randall Collins) or what can also be called social energy. Handling and shaping such energy is not independent from the issue of management of meaning and it will often be part of meanings and symbols (Ashforth & Humphrey, 1995). But management of emotion must also be understood as something distinct as it can operate beyond the level of meaning. It can be an operating of power that is not first and foremost to be understood in terms of meaning. The “up-keying” or “down-keying” of emotional energy (Downing, 1997) by the manager or employees is not a phenomenon of meaning, although it can naturally be given meaning through interpretations. When the manager - as the analysis above shows - directs emotional expression towards the context of the manager and the individual employee this is not a situation of power through repression of emotion. It is power operating in terms of constructing and confirming an established practice of dealing with difficult emotions in contexts of either the manager alone or in company with trusted colleagues.

The case study also shows how managerial action/power works through contributing to a creation of emotional energy (spirits) through emphasising departmental narratives that could engender optimism. Narratives that can be characterised by phrases such as: ‘soon things will get better because now we must have seen the top of the increasing work load’, ‘we are doing a very good job’, and ‘we do our best’ (Downing, 1997; Hardy et al., 1998). The employees came to trust their new manager and dedicated themselves heavily to the establishing of the new department. Influential in the creating of this trust and dedication was importantly the fact that the manager expressed sympathy, understanding and gratitude towards the employees during the change process. He also offered comfort for some of the employees who were disappointed with being placed in this particular new department by telling them, that soon they would get tasks that they would see as more exciting in terms of their personal aspirations.

In much power theory it is assumed that exercising power requires self-control of emotions (Greene, 1998) or even lack of emotion (Gibson & Schroeder, 2001). But this need not always be true as the managers seemed to get a lot of their authority through their capability of relating to employees, that is, through their attentiveness, care and display of sympathy. Display of emotion makes emotion a social force that influences the ways others relate to you (Clark, 1997).
Power is also about bodily engaging forms of communication and interacting. Following Freund (1998) it is suggested that other emotion management also work through embodied emotions. Our embodied emotions - e.g. the way we show interest or lack of interest through bodily posture - work to engage and disengage others and this often functions in more or less unnoticed ways (Freund, 1998). This point is crucial to stress the importance of also analysing space and bodily movement (body language) when seeking to understand how power operates. Engaging and disengaging others can be attained in a more or less verbal sense, where the management activity is not in the focus of attention (Goleman, 1998).

Concentrating on the managing - engaging or disengaging - of interpersonal relationships therefore seems to produce insights into power exercising in contemporary 'emotionalised' organisation that may analytically be precluded in discursive approaches that focus is on construction of world views, meaning and identity (e.g. Carter & Jackson, 2000; Alvesson, 1996). In this case of the manager's directing of emotional expression of frustration into his office this was not a situation of securing a common understanding/discourse between the employees and the manager. The situation remained conflictual in terms of meanings or interpretations but not in terms of securing the 'privatising' or 'personalising' pattern of organisational interaction in the department.

I will end this section on a cautious note. The notion other emotion management does not imply a simple and easy control of others' emotions. Maybe interpersonal emotion management signals better the interactive and therefore inherently complex character of the processes of emotion management. Basically, it is an empirical question to decide when and how one part influences another and how strongly. But if it is done effectively, it is still an interactive achievement and not a top-down kind of manipulation.

Conclusion
Other emotion management is about shaping and confirming emotion and about directing emotional expression as the paper shows. The directing of emotional expression towards a 'personalised' relationship between manager and employee has been demonstrated as one kind of other emotion management. And the managerial style and care have been analysed as being crucial in engendering trust and high spirits in the difficult process of change and as being part of the common segmenting practice of confidential, emotional communication between managers and individual employees.

Through this analysis I hope to have shown the potential of applying of notion of power in terms of other emotion management as different from power as management of meaning (legitimacy, discourse). Such a focussing on power from a perspective on emotion that stresses productive and performative dimensions of emotional life can contribute to a development of power theory and analysis, which has been too cognitively biased. Moreover, the paper contributes to a description of a specific event of organisational change, which needs to be studied from other points of view than from that of organisational psychology (Anderson & King, 1995). Exploring the sociological notion of other emotion management as a form of power the paper contributes to moving beyond prevailing “under-socialised models/theories of organisational change”, that conceive of organisational change too instrumental and ‘rationalistic’ (Collins, 1998).

Emotional dimensions of power have been stressed in order to regain a balance in the analysis of power theoretically. Other emotion management has been linked to power as it has been claimed
that important aspects of power are better understood through this link. The managerial action in the
meeting is about power in the form of directing emotional expression rather than suppressing it.
Emotional expressions were not banned in the organisation and there were examples of less
controlled ‘emotional’ expressions taking place in a manager’s office. In this case emotions are not
relegated to the private sphere as Freund (1998) suggests is most common in work life
organisations. The expression of disruptive emotion is rather relegated to the relationship of the
manager and the individual employees or to the relationship of trusted colleagues. Consequently,
the studied organisational practice modifies the notion of professionalism in work life as implying a
lack of emotional expression (Lively, 2000; Gibson & Schroeder, 2001). The studied organisational
departments have partially succeeded in realising their values of ‘openness’ and ‘honesty’. In this
sense the case study sheds light on an organisation that might point to more common future
organisational practices, as this particular organisation seems close to realising the popular
organisational ideals of “openness” and “honesty”.

---

1 The case study (interviews and observation) deals with the handling of emotions in a process of
organisational change in the HR organisation of a large international company. The management
wanted to specialise by re-allocating some of the HR-employees in new departments. The study
focuses on the establishing of two departments (Staffing and internal service/help desk) with about
10-12 people each, and is part of my Ph.D. dissertation, Emotion, power and organisational change
(work title).

2 In the change process also less controlled and in that sense more ‘emotional’ way of outburst of
emotions took place in the manager’s office, where one employee burst into tears because of the
stress.

3 The issue of how emotions are managed is complex, but generally my position is that the
possibility and degree of managing emotion depends on what the specific emotion and circumstance
are. Some emotions are more manageable and malleable than others (Conrad & Witte, 1994;
Perinbanayagam, 1991; Elster, 1999).

4 Being critical in relation to emotion study does not imply seeing emotion as the good thing to be
liberated. Emotion is not an innocent phenomenon but shaped by and implicated in structures of
power and domination (Hearn, 1993). But even though emotion is socially shaped, is our sensing
experiencing developing and creative. Consequently, there is no reason to treat the given ‘social’
definition of an experiential state as e.g. a ‘sad’ state as necessarily the final and most adequate one.
Language and cultural representations are not expressing our feelings in a simple direct one-to-one
relationship. Our emotions can not be reduced to how we talk about them, although the ways we talk and go about them partly define our emotions. There is a dialectical relationship between experience (of emotion) and expression of emotion (Layder 1997, Craib 1998, Barbalet 1998). I agree with Alvesson and Deetz' (2000) agnostic position concerning the relationship between language and experiential reality, which implies that one can not take the conventional critical position of a 'social therapist' researching into issues of power, social construction and subjectivity. Though, following Campbell (1997) I suggest that a critical position can be realised in pointing to the potentiality of developing personal and interpersonal significance of our lives by further exploring of our emotions (Campbell 1997). Acknowledging such a complex notion of the relationship between experience and language Reddy (1997) reformulates a notion of repression based on his distinction between emotion (emotional experience) and 'emotives' (statements defining emotions that are neither 'constantive' nor 'performative'). On the basis of this distinction is 'repression' defined as occurring when 'emotives' intensify particular emotional experiences to a degree where other experiences (possibilities of other feelings) are ruled out:

"Thus, there are good reason to attribute extensive power to the conventional emotives authorized in a given community to shape members' sense of identity and self-awareness, members' manner of confronting contingencies and routine (Reddy, 1997:333)."

After having read a description of the meeting situation almost similar to the presented in this paper the manager objected to one aspect of the description, namely, my mentioning of him sitting with folded arms. One reason to his 'protest' might be that this bodily feature might signal of a kind of reservation towards what is been communicated, which the manager did not like to acknowledge. As an immense amount of bodily features of the meeting interaction could also, in principle, have been included in the descriptive representation we here confront the complex methodological issue of description also being interpretation. That is, one describes a situation from a certain perspective and is motivated by certain interests.
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