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The goal of the current study was to test and extend Grandey’s (2000) model of emotional labor by investigating the antecedents and outcomes of emotional labor. Specifically, the study presented and tested a model in which display rule perceptions were antecedents to emotional labor (i.e., surface and deep acting), which in turn led to emotional exhaustion, performance, and turnover. In addition, it was proposed that POS would moderate the relationship between display rules and emotional labor such that individuals that perceive they are supported by their organization would be more likely to conform to display rules via surface or deep acting. Furthermore, it was hypothesized that LMX would buffer the negative effects of surface acting on emotional exhaustion.

Path analyses indicated that display rule perceptions to express positive emotions were positively related to deep acting and negatively related to surface acting. Conversely, display rule perceptions to suppress negative emotions were positively related to surface acting and not related to deep acting. In addition, surface acting was positively related to emotional exhaustion. However, contrary to the proposed hypotheses, LMX did not moderate the surface acting-emotional exhaustion relationship. Perceived organizational support was found to moderate several relationships between display rule perceptions and acting strategies, and contributes to the limited work on motivation to comply with display rules. Results also suggested that emotional labor was tied to actual turnover behaviors, such that surface acting was positively related to
turnover intentions, which in turn led to actual turnover behaviors six months later.

Implications, future research, and limitations are discussed.
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Emotional labor, the regulation of feelings and expressions at work (Grandey, 2000; Hochschild, 1983), is a critical aspect of many jobs that require employees to interact with customers, coworkers, and the public. Hochschild’s (1983) study of airline attendants was one of the first studies to document the salience of emotional labor in everyday work roles. Since Hochschild’s (1983) seminal work on the management of human feelings and emotions in the workplace, many researchers have further elaborated on this view and provided theoretical and empirical support showing that emotional labor is a central part of everyday work life for many employees. With the overall expansion of the service economy and increased competition among service providers, managing emotions in the workplace will continue to become increasingly important (MacDonald & Siriani, 1996; Morris & Feldman, 1996; Pulgliesi, 1999).

Interpersonal interactions, such as the emotions employees express to others, can affect important organizational outcomes. For example, Pugh (2001) showed that employees’ displays of positive emotion were directly related to customers’ evaluations of service quality. The expression of emotions has also been linked to customer mood (Luong, 2005), customer willingness to return and pass positive comments to friends about the organization (Tsai, 2001; Tsai & Huang, 2002), and customer overall satisfaction with the organization (Matilla & Enz, 2002).
Correspondingly, Morris and Feldman (1996) argued that the expression of emotion has become “a marketplace commodity” and an important part of the customer service experience. Therefore, many organizations prescribe how emotions should be presented to others through the use of emotional display rules (Diefendorff & Richard, 2003). Emotional display rules are behavioral standards that indicate which emotions are appropriate and how those emotions should be expressed (Ekman, 1973). Thus, emotional display rules clarify which emotions are appropriate in a given job situation and serve as important referent standards that help employees evaluate their own emotions and make adjustments consistent with the organization’s requirements (Diefendorff & Gosserand, 2003; Diefendorff & Richard, 2003; Ekman, 1973). These rules can either be explicitly stated role expectations, or unwritten and implicit rules that can be taught in one’s occupational education, or learned in one’s professional experience or during the organizational socialization process (Diefendorff & Richard, 2003; Rafaeli & Sutton, 1987; Zapf, Vogt, Siefert, Mertini & Isic, 1999). Whether explicit or implicit, employees and supervisors perceive them to be required, in-role aspects of their jobs (Diefendorff, Richard, & Croyle, 2006). Some jobs may require the display of negative (e.g., bill collector) or neutral (e.g., judge) emotions. However, the display rules appropriate for most jobs, and thus the focus of this study, require employees to show displays of positive emotions (such as happiness or cheerfulness) and to hide displays of negative emotions (such as anger or contempt).

Display rule perceptions are important antecedents to emotional labor, which Grandey (2000) argued can be performed with two types of acting. The first type of acting that Grandey (2000) identified is *surface acting*, which involves suppressing one’s
felt emotions and faking the desired emotions. Because surface acting entails modifying emotional displays without changing internal feelings it is also known as “faking in bad faith” (Grandey, 2000; Grandey, 2003). On the other hand, deep acting involves actually changing one’s feelings in order to elicit the appropriate emotional display. Deep acting is also known as “faking in good faith” because it entails changes in internal emotional states and the intent to seem authentic (Grandey, 2000; Grandey, 2003).

Researchers have empirically shown that this distinction may help explain the differential outcomes associated with emotional labor in previous research. Specifically, surface acting has been shown to be related to negative outcomes, such as inauthenticity, lower ratings of affective delivery, depersonalization, emotional exhaustion, dissatisfaction, and burnout (Brotheridge & Lee, 2002; Brotheridge & Grandey, 2002; Gosserand, 2003; Grandey, 2003; Grandey, Fisk, & Steiner, 2005; Grandey, Fisk, Matilla, Jansen, & Sideman, 2005; Totterdell & Holman, 2003). Conversely, deep acting is more likely to lead to positive outcomes, such as authenticity, personal accomplishment, lower likelihood of revealing negative emotions, job satisfaction, and performance (Brotheridge & Lee, 2002; Brotheridge & Grandey, 2002; Grandey, 2000; Grandey, 2003; Grandey et al., 2005; Totterdell & Holman, 2003).

The literature on emotional labor and emotional display rules has garnered increasing attention in recent years (Bono & Vey, 2005). However, it is still a relatively new literature with room for several extensions of the current research to increase our understanding of the emotional labor process. Thus, the purpose of the current study is to develop a theoretically-driven model of the emotional labor process that integrates display rule perceptions, motivation, social buffers, job performance, and withdrawal
behaviors (see Figure 1). Specifically, building on the work of Grandey (2000) and other researchers, I will examine the effects of display rule perceptions to express positive and suppress negative emotions on emotional labor (i.e., surface and deep acting) and emotional exhaustion. In addition, I will investigate two new moderators (i.e., perceived organizational support and leader-member exchange) that may qualify some of the effects proposed in Grandey’s (2000) model of emotional labor. Lastly, I will tie emotional labor to important dependent variables, including overall job performance and actual turnover behavior, neither of which have been studied in previous empirical work. Overall, the purpose of this study is to test and extend Grandey’s (2000) model, which has guided much of emotional labor research, in a structural equation modeling framework.
Figure 1.

Hypothesized Model.
Display Rule Perceptions to Express Positive Emotions Versus Suppress Negative Emotions

As noted previously, display rules are important antecedents to emotional labor (Bono & Vey, 2005; Diefendorff & Gosserand, 2003; Gosserand & Diefendorff, 2005; Grandey, 2003; Rubin, Tardino, Daus, & Munz, 2005). However, it may be important to differentiate between display rule perceptions to express positive emotions versus suppress negative emotions. Some research has shown that display rules to express positive emotions and suppress negative emotions are two distinct constructs (Diefendorff et al., 2006). Some preliminary evidence also suggests that these two forms of display rules may have differential effects on surface and deep acting (Brotheridge & Grandey, 2002; Diefendorff, Croyle, & Gosserand, 2005; Gosserand, 2003). Specifically, some researchers have suggested that display rule perceptions to express positive emotions may be more strongly related to deep than surface acting, and display rule perceptions to suppress negative emotions may be more strongly related to surface than deep acting (Gosserand, 2003).

In addition, the two forms of display rule perceptions may also have differential effects on emotional exhaustion, such that the relationship between display rule perceptions to suppress negative emotions has a positive relationship with emotional exhaustion and perceptions to express positive emotions is unrelated to emotional exhaustion (Brotheridge & Grandey, 2002; Schaubroeck & Jones, 2000). Furthermore, surface acting has been shown to be positively related to emotional exhaustion (Bono & Vey, 2005; Brotheridge & Lee, 2003; Brotheridge & Grandey, 2002; Grandey, 2003; Holman, Chisick, & Totterdell, 2005; Zammuner & Galli, 2005).
Thus, some research suggests that demands to suppress negative emotions are related to emotional exhaustion, and more strongly associated with surface than deep acting. Moreover, surface acting has been shown to be related to emotional exhaustion. However, to my knowledge, no research has empirically investigated the role that surface acting may play in the relationship between display rule perceptions and emotional exhaustion. Therefore, the current study will examine the relationship between display rule perceptions to express positive emotions and suppress negative emotions, surface and deep acting, and emotional exhaustion. In particular, I will explore the differential role that display rule perceptions to express positive emotions and suppress negative emotions may have on surface and deep acting. In addition, I will investigate the possible mediating role of surface acting on the relationship between display rule perceptions and emotional exhaustion.

The Important Role of Motivation

The role of motivation to comply with emotional labor demands has largely been ignored in the emotional labor literature (for an exception, see Gosserand & Diefendorff, 2005). However, recently researchers have begun to note that there is an important motivational component that influences whether employees conform to display rules. Based on the goal-setting literature, Gosserand and Diefendorff (2005) argued and empirically demonstrated that commitment to display rules is an important moderator of the relationship between display rule perceptions and surface and deep acting. In particular, their results showed that individuals more committed to display rules had a stronger relationship between display rule perceptions and surface acting, deep acting, and positive affective delivery than their less committed counterparts. Their results were
the first to show that motivation has a crucial role in the emotional labor process. They concluded that the regulation of emotions or emotional displays requires more than the simple presence of display rules; it also requires that the employee intend to extend effort toward displaying organizationally desired emotions (Gosserand & Diefendorff, 2005).

The current study will generalize from Gosserand and Diefendorff’s (2005) findings by examining whether another motivational construct, perceived organizational support (POS), also affects the relationship between display rule perceptions and surface acting and deep acting. Perceived organizational support is the extent to which employees perceive an organization values the employee’s contributions and cares about his or her well-being (Eisenberger, Huntington, Hutchison, & Sowa, 1986). Based on the norm of reciprocity, which indicates that people tend to feel obligated to help those who have helped them (Gouldner, 1960), this study will examine whether employees high in POS may be more likely to conform to organizational display rules. Specifically, individuals with high POS may perceive more contractual obligations to the organization (Aselage & Eisenberger, 2003) and may be likely to invest more effort in emotional labor in order to reciprocate the good treatment provided by the organization. Thus, once individuals recognize the display rule requirements of the job, those high in POS may be more likely to engage in emotional labor strategies in order to display positive and suppress negative emotions to meet organizationally required displays rules than those with low levels of POS. On the other hand, individuals with low levels of POS may not feel the need to repay the organization by conforming to organizational display rules in order to display positive or suppress negative emotions.
The Buffering Role of Leader-Member Exchange

As stated previously, emotional labor can be performed with either surface or deep acting (Grandey, 2000) and surface acting has been shown to be related to negative outcomes, while deep acting is more likely to lead to neutral or positive outcomes (Brotheridge & Lee, 2002; Brotheridge & Grandey, 2002; Gosserand, 2003; Grandey, 2003; Grandey, Fisk, & Steiner, 2005; Grandey, Fisk, Matilla et al., 2005; Totterdell & Holman, 2003). Thus, researchers have recommended that employees engage in deep acting rather than surface acting (Côté, 2005).

Despite these recommendations, researchers have found that personality traits influence employees’ tendencies to surface act or deep act (Diefendorff et al., 2005). Thus, because some people are predisposed to surface act, it is important to examine contextual variables that may buffer against the negative outcomes associated with surface acting. Social support has been a heavily investigated variable that may possibly buffer employees from work stress (Abraham, 1998; Abraham, 1999; Marin & Garcia-Ramirez, 2005). For example, Holman et al. (2002), showed that supervisor support moderated the relationship between performance monitoring intensity and emotional exhaustion. However, there has been mixed support for this buffering effect (Fenlason & Beehr, 1994; Kaufmann & Beehr, 1986; Kickul & Posig, 2001; Tourigny, Baba, & Lituchy, 2005). Some studies have found no relationship between support and emotional exhaustion, while other studies have even found a reverse buffering effect such that social support strengthened the positive relationship between stressors and strains (Fenlason, 1994; Kaufman & Beehr, 1986, Marin & Garcia-Ramirez, 2005; Tourigny et al., 2005).
Due to some of these inconsistent results in regards to social support and the important effects of emotional labor on organizational and individual outcomes, Bono and Vey (2005) argued that it is critical to gain a better understanding of conditions that moderate the association between emotion management and negative outcomes. Leadership behaviors are one promising area of research that may help alleviate the negative effects associated with emotion management. Levinson (1980) argued that leadership behaviors play a crucial role in the anticipation, alleviation, and amelioration of work stress. In particular, leaders can help subordinates deal with negative emotional reactions to work obstacles (Pirola-Merlo, Hartel, Mann, & Hirst, 2002) and can provide emotional support to followers (Steiner, 1997). Although leadership behaviors may play an important role in the emotional labor process, no published studies have integrated emotional labor with leadership theories. The current study will attempt to fill this gap, by integrating leader-member exchange (LMX) theory and the emotional labor process. Specifically, the current study will examine leader-member exchange (LMX), as a possible buffer (i.e., moderator) of the relationship between surface acting and emotional exhaustion.

Leader-member exchange theory describes the process through which leaders develop different exchange relationships with their followers (Graen & Scandura, 1987). It suggests leaders distinguish between their subordinates based on their perceived levels of employees’ competence, skill, trustworthiness, and willingness to accept responsibility (Dansereau, Graen, & Haga, 1975). Subordinates that are deemed to be high on these qualities compose the leader’s in-group, which receives greater opportunities, autonomy, influence in decision-making, and emotional support. Conversely, subordinates low on
these qualities compose the leader’s out-group, which are treated more formally and receive less support (Dansereau et al., 1975). Researchers have suggested that high quality leader-member exchanges serve as a source of support which can help employees cope with work challenges (Erdogen, Kraimer, & Liden, 2004) and mitigate the stress associated with emotional dissonance (Brotheridge & Lee, 2002).

Empirically, LMX has been shown to be negatively related to perceptions of job stress. Subordinates that compose the in-group are less likely to perceive job stressors because they have greater resources, attention, desirable work assignments than subordinates that compose the out-group (Bernas & Major, 2000; Nelson, Basu, & Purdie, 1998). In addition, Harris and Kacmar (2005) demonstrated that LMX buffers the relationship between perceptions of politics and strain. Correspondingly, supervisors may also serve as a buffer to the negative effects of emotion management, such that subordinates that comprise the in-group will benefit from the additional support and thereby suffer fewer negative effects from surface acting than subordinates in the out-group.

*Emotional Labor and Organizationally-Based Outcomes*

This next section will discuss emotional labor and its influence on organizationally-based outcomes, specifically focusing on global job performance and employee turnover behaviors.

*Job Performance.* Emotions are an integral part of everyday organizational life and can impact job behavior and performance (Ashforth & Humphrey, 1995; Staw, Sutton, & Pelled, 1994). In particular, employee emotional responses and displays can affect work-related behaviors and performance ratings (Arvey, Renz, & Watson, 1998).
For example, Rubin et al. (2005) suggested that performance may suffer when employees spend their resources engaging in emotional labor because they may not have the necessary resources to perform additional job functions. Similarly, Grandey’s (2000) model of emotional labor suggests that job performance would be an important long-term consequence associated with surface and deep acting.

Because emotional labor consumes the available resources to perform other job duties (Rubin et al., 1995), it may affect many different dimensions of job performance. However, previous empirical studies that have examined the relationship between emotional labor and job performance have focused solely on very narrow aspects of performance, such as ratings of emotional displays, customer service performance ratings, affective delivery, and evaluations of the service encounter (Beal, Trougakos, Weiss, & Green, 2006; Diefendorff & Richard, 2003; Gosserand, 2003; Gosserand & Diefendorff, 2005; Luong, 2005; Mattila & Enz, 2002; Pugh, 2001). In contrast, the measure of performance that will be used in this study measures a broader conceptualization of performance. For example, in addition to measuring “quality customer service”, the performance measure also assesses dimensions such as “knowledge and compliance with bank procedures” and “promoting teamwork within the organization”. Therefore, this will be the first study to examine the effects of emotional labor on a more comprehensive range of performance dimensions.

**Turnover.** Many researchers have suggested that emotional labor is related to withdrawal behaviors such as turnover (Brotheridge & Lee, 2002; Grandey, 2000; Rubin et al., 2005). Accordingly, many studies have shown that emotional labor is related to turnover intentions (Abraham, 1999; Babukus, Craven, Johnson, & Moncrief (1999);
Cote & Morgan, 2003; Cropanzano, Rupp, & Bryne, 2003; Grandey, Tam, & Brauburger, 2002; Zerbe, 2000). However, job attitudes, such as turnover intentions, do not always predict actual behaviors (Ajzen & Fishbein, 1977; Ajzen & Madden, 1986). Thus, it is important to examine the relationship between emotional labor and actual turnover. However, to my knowledge, no previous research has empirically examined this relationship. Therefore, the current study will examine the relationship between emotional labor and actual turnover behaviors measured six months later.

*Integrated, Theoretically-Driven Model*

The last purpose of this paper is to integrate empirical and theoretical knowledge to develop a broad model linking perceptions of display rules and emotional labor to employee and organizational outcomes. Most research in the area of emotional labor has developed in a piecemeal fashion. Empirical studies have generally focused on the bi-variate relationships that exist between display rule perceptions, emotional labor, and outcomes of interest. In addition, most of these studies have examined display rule perceptions and emotional labor in relation to a narrow range of outcomes without integrating previous findings. Thus, the present study integrates and expands upon many of these previously established relationships into a unifying model that is tested within a structural equation model (SEM) framework to explain the outcomes associated with perceptions of differential display rules and emotional labor. The use of SEM allows for the simultaneous estimation of multiple variable relationships and the ability to integrate bi-variate relationships found in previous studies to assess the extent to which they function together in a unified model (Kline, 2005). Therefore, SEM will allow for a more comprehensive examination of the emotional labor process.
Moreover, the integrative model developed in this study fits within the stress-strain framework (Brotheridge & Lee, 2002; Cartwright & Cooper, 1997; Cropanzano, Weiss, & Elias, 2004; Hochschild, 1983). Specifically, this framework states that stressors (sources of stress) lead to the experience of stress, which in turn leads to strains (outcomes of stress). Hochschild’s (1983) conceptualization of emotional labor emphasizes that acting can be a stressor for the employee that can lead to a variety of negative outcomes. Moreover, Cropanzano et al.’s (2004) review of the emotional labor literature suggested that surface acting in particular should be stressful, whereas deep acting could be beneficial, or at least not as detrimental to the employee. Thus, the pattern of relationships discussed previously fits within this framework by tying surface acting (stressor) to emotional exhaustion (stress; see Grandey, 2000), which in turn leads to reduced job performance and increased turnover (strains). Further, because deep acting is not expected to act as a stressor, consistent with Cropanazano et al. (2004), it is expected to improve performance without causing emotional exhaustion.

Summary

In sum, the purpose of the present investigation is to further expand on the current emotional labor literature in at least five ways. First, I will examine the relationships between display rule perceptions, emotional labor, and emotional exhaustion. In particular, I will focus on the differential relationships that display rule perceptions to express positive emotions versus suppress negative emotions have on surface and deep acting, as well as the mediating role of surface acting in the display rule perceptions-emotional exhaustion relationship. Second, I will integrate a motivational component in my model by examining the influence of POS on the relationship between display rule
perceptions and emotional labor. Third, I will attempt to increase our understanding of variables that may buffer employees from the negative effects of surface acting by including LMX as a possible moderating variable. Fourth, I will expand on the outcomes examined in most emotional labor studies by including a global measure of job performance and actual turnover behavior as dependent variables. Lastly, I will integrate past research into a more comprehensive model, which will be tested within a SEM framework in order to integrate and further our understanding of the antecedents and consequences of emotional labor.

With these purposes in mind, the current study will use an archival dataset to test a model of emotional labor (see Figure 1). The dataset consists of online surveys completed by bank tellers in early 2006, as well as teller job performance for each survey respondent provided by the tellers’ supervisors. In addition, the dataset also contains organizational records of turnover information collected six months after the initial teller survey.
CHAPTER II
LITERATURE REVIEW

The focus of the present study is to extend the emotional labor research by integrating empirical and theoretical knowledge on the antecedents and consequences of emotional labor by developing a broad model of emotional labor. In addition, the model will incorporate motivational and social elements to expand our understanding of the emotional labor process. The following sections will discuss the importance of emotional labor in today’s economy, provide an overview of the different conceptualizations of emotional labor, and present the definition that will be utilized in the current study. Following this discussion of foundational material, the proposed model of emotional labor (Figure 2) is presented. This model includes display rule perceptions as antecedents to, and emotional exhaustion as an outcome of, emotional labor. The proposed model also incorporates motivational and social elements by including perceived organizational support (POS) and leader-member exchange (LMX), respectively, as potential moderators. In addition, the proposed model considers job performance and turnover as direct and indirect organizationally based outcomes of emotional labor. Each pathway is discussed in detail and relevant theoretical and empirical research is presented to support the proposed pathways.
Hypotheses not included in Figure 1:
H2a: Display rule perceptions to express positive emotions will be more strongly related to deep acting than surface acting.
H2b: Display rule perceptions to suppress negative emotions will be more strongly related to surface acting than deep acting.
H4a: The relationship between display rule perceptions to express positive emotions and emotional exhaustion will be mediated by surface acting.
H4b: The relationship between display rule perceptions to suppress negative emotions and emotional exhaustion will be mediated by surface acting.
H9: Emotional exhaustion will partially mediate the relationship between surface acting and job performance.
H10: Surface acting will be positively related to turnover.
H12: Emotional exhaustion will mediate the relationship between surface acting and turnover.

Figure 2.
Full Hypothesized Model.
Importance of Emotional Labor

Until recently, research has overlooked the role of emotions in organizational life. Traditionally, emotionality was thought of as the absence of rationality, which led to the perception of emotions as a barrier to effective organizational functioning (Ashforth & Humphrey, 1995). However, during the past 25 years, organizational researchers have recognized the importance of emotions and the everyday role they have in influencing organizational behavior (Lord & Kanfer, 2002). Ashforth and Humphrey (1995) argued that emotionality and rationality are intertwined and emotions are often functional for the organization. For example, they used the literature on transformational leadership to illustrate the relevance of emotion to motivation, leadership, and group dynamics; they suggested that transformational leaders deemphasize rationality and emphasize symbols, membership in the collective, and organizational values in order to make use of emotions to pursue organizational goals (Ashforth & Humphrey, 1995). Other related areas that have garnered recent attention include emotional intelligence, emotion regulation, workplace violence and aggression, and emotions in teams (George, 2002; Glomb, Steel, & Arvey, 2002; Grandey, 2000; Van Rooy & Viswesvaran, 2004).

The importance of emotions has become even more prevalent with the expansion of the service economy. Oftentimes the products provided by service employees are intangible and the perceived quality of the service is related to the interpersonal interactions between the employee and the customer (Morris & Feldman, 1996; Wolcott-Burnam, 2004). In her study of office-based employees in the United Kingdom, Mann (1999) found there were at least moderate levels of emotional labor in about two-thirds of all corporate communications, and there were no differences between frontline and non-
frontline employees. Thus, an important aspect of the work performed by many employees concerns the emotions that are presented to others (Wichroski, 1994). Emotions involved in employee-customer interactions have been shown to influence customer evaluations of service quality, likelihood to return, and overall assessment of the organization (Luong, 2005; Matila & Enz, 2002; Pugh, 2001; Tsai, 2001). Therefore, organizations increasingly desire to exert control over the emotions employees present to others (Hochschild, 1983). Hochschild (1983) referred to employees’ attempts to manage emotions as prescribed by a work role as emotional labor.

Since Hochschild’s (1983) original study on the effects of emotional labor on airline attendants, many researchers have further elaborated on the management of emotions in the workplace. Although research on emotional labor has flourished in recent years, not all researchers have agreed on the definition of emotional labor.

Defining Emotional Labor

Generally, researchers agree that emotional labor assumes emotions are managed at work; however, differences in definitions and operationalizations of the construct have led to some confusion (Bono & Vey, 2005). In order to support the current study’s conceptualization of emotional labor, I will review the four main ways that past literature has defined the construct.

As stated previously, Hochschild (1983) was the first to coin the term emotional labor. She described emotional labor as “the management of feelings to create a publicly observable facial and body display” (Hochschild, 1983, p.7) which is sold for a wage. Hochschild’s conceptualization of emotional labor drew heavily from the dramaturgical perspective. This perspective states that the workplace serves as a stage where employees
are the actors performing for the customers (or the audience). Thus, employees’ performance involves managing impressions, including managing emotions, in order to achieve organizational goals (Grandey, 2000). Hochschild argued actors could manage their emotions through either surface acting or deep acting. Surface acting involves modifying and controlling emotional expressions and deep acting involves consciously managing feelings, rather than simply manipulating the expression of emotion, in order to express the desired emotion (Hochschild, 1983). Both surface and deep acting require effort, and Hochschild (1983) argued and empirically demonstrated that emotional labor was related to negative outcomes such as job stress, burnout, headaches, and absenteeism.

Although Hochschild (1983) focused on the internal management of emotions (i.e., surface acting and deep acting), she operationalized emotional labor using characteristics of the job. Specifically, employees were classified as having high emotional labor if (1) the job involved voice or facial contact with the public, (2) the employee was expected to induce an emotional state in another person, and (3) the employer exerts some control over the employees’ emotional activities. Using these criteria, Hochschild (1983) categorized jobs as either having or not having emotional labor requirements. She proposed a list of 44 jobs involving emotional labor, including airline attendants, nurses, and waiters. While Hochschild’s work is critical to the development and understanding of emotional labor, the dichotomous operationalization of the construct assumes that all jobs within a category have the same emotional demands and ignores individual and organizational variables that may influence the degree of emotional labor experienced (Gosserand, 2003). For example, using Hochschild’s dichotomous operationalization of emotional labor, Wharton (1993) showed that contrary
to Hochschild’s propositions, performance of emotional labor did not have uniformly negative effects for employees. Specifically, employees categorized as having high emotional labor jobs did not report higher levels of emotional exhaustion.

As opposed to Hochschild (1983), Ashforth and Humphrey (1993) defined emotional labor using a more behavioral approach. They suggested that emotional labor is “the act of displaying the appropriate emotion” (i.e., conforming with a display rule) (Ashforth & Humphrey, 1993, p. 90). Thus, they focused on observable behavior rather than internal feelings or emotional states, thereby separating the experience of emotion from the expression of emotion. Ashforth and Humphrey (1993) argued that focusing on behavior is more appropriate than focusing on the presumed emotions underlying behavior because it is the actual display or behavior that is observed by customers. Further, employees may be able to conform to display rules without managing actual feelings. Contrary to Hochschild’s (1983) definition of emotional labor, which assumes that surface or deep acting must be performed in order to comply with display rules, Ashforth and Humphrey (1993) argued that an employee may naturally have feelings consistent with display rules, thus requiring no effort to garner the required emotional display. Therefore, they suggested that in addition to surface acting and deep acting, genuine experience and expression of emotion is another form of emotional labor in that the employee is conforming to organizationally required emotions (Ashforth & Humphrey, 1993; Diefendorff et al., 2005).

Morris and Feldman (1996) provided a third conceptualization of the construct in which they defined emotional labor as “the effort, planning, and control needed to express organizationally desired emotion during interpersonal transactions” (Morris &
Feldman, 1996, p. 987). They proposed that emotional labor consisted of four dimensions: frequency of appropriate emotional display, attentiveness to required display rules, variety of emotions to be displayed, and emotional dissonance. Frequency of appropriate emotional displays describes the frequency of interactions between service providers and customers. The authors argued it is the most examined component of emotional labor, and the more often appropriate emotional displays are required, the greater the demand for regulating emotions (Morris & Feldman, 1996). The second dimension, attentiveness to required display rules, consists of both the duration and intensity of emotional displays. Emotional displays that require longer duration and involve intense emotions require more effort, and thereby more emotional labor (Morris & Feldman, 1996). Their third major dimension of emotional labor is the variety of emotional displays required to be expressed. The authors suggested that the greater the variety of displays that need to be expressed on the job, the greater the level of emotional labor. The last dimension is emotional dissonance, which is the conflict between genuinely felt emotions and emotional displays required by the job. They suggested that greater levels of emotional dissonance resulted in more labor-intensive situations (Morris & Feldman, 1996). Overall, Morris and Feldman’s (1996) model of emotional labor takes into account the work situation (i.e., number of interactions and length, intensity, and variety of emotions required) rather than defining emotional labor in a dichotomous nature. Their model also represents emotional labor as an internal state of tension (i.e., dissonance).

However, Grandey (2000) criticized Morris and Feldman’s (1996) four dimensions of emotional labor arguing that the first three dimensions provide a circular
argument for why the dimensions are components of emotional labor. In addition, she critiques the emotional dissonance dimension by suggesting that dissonance is a state of being rather than an effortful process as suggested by the authors’ original definition of emotional labor. Therefore, Grandey (2000) proposed that the dimensions do not adequately define emotional labor.

Instead, Grandey (2000) proposed a fourth definition of emotional labor based on her review and integration of previous conceptualizations of the construct. She recognized two themes common to most definitions of emotional labor: 1) individuals are able to regulate their emotions at work and 2) surface and deep acting are often acknowledged as methods for performing emotional labor. Therefore, she defined emotional labor as “the process of regulating both feelings and expressions for the organizational goals” (Grandey, 2000, p. 97). Specifically, she suggested that emotional labor should be thought of as surface acting (managing the expression of emotions) and deep acting (managing actual emotions).

She argued that defining emotional labor as surface acting and deep acting is beneficial for three reasons. First, surface acting and deep acting are not intrinsically positive or negative which allows emotional labor to have both negative and positive outcomes. Second, if differences exist between the outcomes of surface acting and deep acting, training can be utilized to teach more effective emotional labor. Lastly, surface acting and deep acting can be tied to Gross’ (1998) established model of emotional regulation (Grandey, 2000).

According to Gross (1998), emotion regulation is the process of influencing which emotions you have, when you have them, and how you experience and express
these emotions. Gross’ (1998) model proposed that emotion regulation can occur at two points in time. Regulating the precursors of emotions through strategies such as attention deployment and cognitive change is called antecedent-focused regulation. Conversely, response-focused regulation involves modifying the physiological signs or expression of emotions (Gross, 1998). Grandey (2000) argued that antecedent-focused regulation and response-focused regulation correspond to deep acting and surface acting, respectively. Specifically, deep acting requires that employees regulate the precursors of emotion (i.e., antecedent-focused regulation) and surface acting requires that employees regulate their emotional responses (i.e., response-focused regulation) (Totterdell & Holman, 2003). In a time-sampling study, Totterdell and Holman (2003) showed that antecedent-focused regulation was linked to deep acting and response-focused regulation was linked to surface acting. Based on these results, consistent with Grandey’s (2000) definition of emotional labor, they suggested that emotion regulation is a good basis for understanding emotional labor (Totterdell & Holman, 2003).

Current Study’s Conceptualization of Emotional Labor. A review of the literature shows that emotional labor has been conceptualized as an internal emotional state (Hochschild, 1983; Morris & Feldman, 1996), displays of emotion (Ashforth & Humphrey, 1993), situational factors related to the job (Morrison & Feldman, 1996), and behaviors, such as surface acting and deep acting (Grandey, 2000; Hochschild, 1983). The behavioral definition of emotional labor (i.e., surface acting and deep acting) provides conceptual clarity by separating emotional labor from emotional states and situational demands (Wolcott-Burnam, 2004). In addition, it is grounded in an established theory of emotion regulation (Grandey, 2000). Therefore, consistent with Grandey
(2000), the present study will define emotional labor as the process of regulating feelings and expressions at work to meet organizational goals (i.e., comply with organizational display rules), and use surface acting and deep acting to operationalize the construct.

Proposed Model

As noted previously, the emotional labor literature is open to several extensions. The proposed model (Figure 2) extends the current literature by examining the relationships between display rule perceptions to express positive emotions and suppress negative emotions, surface acting, and deep acting in a unified model of emotional labor that is tested within a SEM framework. In addition, this study will investigate motivational and social components that may affect the emotional labor process. Lastly, I will tie the emotional labor process to overall job performance and actual turnover behaviors, neither of which of been previously investigated in prior research. Extraversion, neuroticism, and organizational tenure will be included as control variables.

To provide a conceptual overview of the pathways shown in the model, I will begin by discussing the links between display rule perceptions and surface and deep acting. Next, I will investigate the relationship between surface and deep acting, and emotional exhaustion. Following this section, I will incorporate a motivational component to the model by examining the potential moderating role of POS on the relationship between display rule perceptions and emotional labor. Next, I will include a social component to the model by investigating LMX as a possible buffer that may attenuate the relationship between emotional labor and emotional exhaustion. Lastly, I will review the literature tying emotional labor to important organizational outcomes, such as job performance and turnover.
Display Rules and Emotional Labor

Emotional display rules are standards that clarify the appropriate emotions that should be expressed in a given job situation (Rafaeli & Sutton, 1987). Importantly, Diefendorff et al. (2006) found that abiding by emotional display rules is considered an in-role aspect of the job by both supervisors and subordinates. Although display rules are often perceived by workers to be an expected part of their jobs, most organizations do not have formal policies regarding appropriate emotional displays (Diefendorff et al., 2006). Employees may therefore acquire their display rule beliefs from various sources, including job descriptions, leader behaviors and perceptions of display rules, organizational norms, socialization, or training materials (Diefendorff et al., 2006; Diefendorff & Richard, 2003; Rafaeli & Sutton, 1989; Wilk & Moynihan, 2005). In addition, Diefendorff and Richard (2003) also found that perceptions of display rules may be influenced by personality traits (i.e., extraversion and neuroticism).

Whereas jobs may vary on how display rule beliefs are developed, most jobs prescribe similar integrative emotional display rules. Integrative emotional display rules promote positive interactions by focusing on expressing positive emotions and hiding negative emotions (Ashforth & Humphrey, 1995; Wharton & Erickson, 1993). Although display rules for some jobs may require differentiating emotional displays (i.e., displaying negative emotions) or emotional masking (i.e., hiding both positive and negative emotions), most jobs require that employees express positive emotions and suppress negative emotions (Cropanzano et al., 2004). Because supervisors and subordinates both perceive compliance with display rules to be an in-role aspect of the job (Diefendorff et al., 2006), subordinates may feel compelled to abide by these
integrative display rules by actively regulating their emotions. Therefore, the current study will focus specifically on emotional labor elicited by employees’ perceived demands to express positive emotions and perceived demands to suppress negative emotions.

Emotional display rules are the most frequently investigated predictor of emotional labor (Bono & Vey, 2005). For example, Diefendorff and Gosserand (2003) applied control theory to the emotional labor process and argued that display rules play a critical role in understanding emotional regulation. They suggested that emotional display rules represent subgoals that employees strive to attain in order to meet the higher-level performance goal. Thus, when individuals detect a discrepancy between their perceived emotional displays and display rules, they will initiate behavioral changes. Specifically, these behavioral changes involve manipulating emotional displays through emotional regulation strategies (i.e., surface and deep acting) in order to align emotional displays with display rules. In a similar vein, Rubin et al. (2005) theorized that the presence of display rules may lead to emotional dissonance (a mismatch between emotions and local norms regarding appropriate displays of emotions), resulting in motivated acts, such as surface and deep acting.

Some empirical evidence also indicates that display rule perceptions are related to surface and deep acting. For example, Gosserand and Diefendorff (2005) hypothesized that integrative emotional display rule perceptions would be positively related to surface and deep acting. Their results supported the expected positive relationship between display rule perceptions and surface acting; however, the relationship between display rule perceptions and deep acting was non-significant. Similarly, Grandey (2003)
predicted that awareness of emotional display rules would relate positively to surface and deep acting. Her results found the opposite relationship from those of Gosserand and Diefendorff (2005), such that awareness of display rules positively related to deep acting, but was not significantly related to surface acting.

Brotheridge and Lee (2002) tested a conservation of resources model of emotional labor in which they also investigated the relationship between display rules and emotional labor. They argued that employees are presented with display rules which regulate the frequency, intensity, and variety of emotions they should convey to others. These display rules lead to employees’ attempts to abide to their role demands via emotional labor. Their results indicated that emotional display rules were directly related to the perceived emotional role characteristics of the job, and directly and indirectly related to both surface and deep acting.

Furthermore, in the first published meta-analysis of emotional labor, Bono and Vey (2005) found that organizational display rules were positively associated with an overall emotional labor category, which for their purposes, included surface acting, deep acting, emotional dissonance, and emotional performance. However, in more than 10% of the studies, they found a negative relationship between organizational display rules and emotional labor. Nonetheless, when they separated emotional labor to specifically examine the various emotional labor operationalizations, they found positive relationships and credibility intervals that did not include zero between display rule perceptions, and surface and deep acting. Therefore, they concluded that employees who perceive display rules are more likely to engage in emotional regulation (i.e., surface and
Based on these conclusions, the following hypotheses are proposed:

H1a: Display rule perceptions to express positive emotions will be positively related to emotional labor (i.e., surface acting and deep acting).

H1b: Display rule perceptions to suppress negative emotions will be positively related to emotional labor (i.e., surface acting and deep acting).

The Effects of Display Rule Perceptions to Express Positive Versus Suppress Negative Emotions on Emotional Labor

Although display rules have been shown to be important antecedents of emotional labor, it may be important to distinguish between display rule perceptions to express positive emotions versus suppress negative emotions. Using principal component analysis, Diefendorff et al. (2006) provided empirical support suggesting that display rules to express positive emotions and those to suppress negative emotions make-up two different dimensions of display rules. Many researchers have also made this distinction when investigating display rules (e.g., Brotheridge & Grandey, 2002; Diefendorff & Richard, 2003; Montgomery, Panagopolou, de Wildt, & Meenks, 2006; Schaubroeck & Jones, 2000; Simpson & Stroh, 2004).

Furthermore, research has found the relationship between display rule perceptions to express positive emotions and emotional labor may differ from the relationship between display rule perceptions to suppress negative emotions and emotional labor. Specifically, some research indicates that subordinates who perceive a demand to express positive emotions are more likely to engage in deep acting, while subordinates who perceive a demand to suppress negative emotions are more likely to engage in surface
acting (Brotheridge & Grandey, 2002; Diefendorff et al., 2005; Gosserand, 2003; Wolcott-Burnam, 2005). For example, Brotheridge and Grandey (2002) differentiated between perceptions of display rules to express positive emotions and display rules to suppress negative emotions and found they were differentially related to surface and deep acting. Their results showed that perceptions of display rule demands to express positive emotions were more strongly related to deep acting \((r = .36)\) than surface acting \((r = .21)\) and perceptions of display rule demands to suppress negative emotions were more strongly to surface acting \((r = .39)\) than deep acting \((r = .25)\). Similarly, Diefendorff et al. (2005) found that positive (expressive) display rules correlated positively with deep acting and were unrelated to surface acting. On the other hand, negative (suppressive) display rules correlated positively with surface acting and were unrelated to deep acting. Although these results were not as originally hypothesized, Diefendorff et al. (2005) suggested this effect may have occurred because when employees perceive display rule requirements to express positive emotions, they try to experience the positive emotional state via deep acting. Conversely, when employees perceive display rule requirements to suppress negative emotions they are more likely to fake the necessary emotions via surface acting.

In her dissertation, Gosserand (2003) hypothesized that whether employees surface or deep act may depend on whether they perceive display rule demands to express positive emotions versus demands to suppress negative emotions. She rationalized this effect occurs because deep acting often involves genuinely feeling the desired positive emotions via thinking positive thoughts or cognitive reappraisal. Thus, deep acting is more consistent with display rule demands for expressing positive emotions than
suppressing negative emotions. On the other hand, surface acting often implies hiding genuine negative feelings, which is more consistent with display rule demands to suppress (or hide) negative emotions than demands to express positive emotions. Her dissertation results partially supported this view. Specifically, she found display rule demands for hiding negative emotions were more strongly related to surface acting than deep acting. However, unexpectedly, she found no differences in the relationship between display rule demands to express positive emotions and surface acting, and the relationship between display rule demands to express positive emotions and deep acting (Gosserand, 2003).

Thus, although I expect that perceived demands to express positive emotions and perceived demands to suppress negative emotions will both be related to surface and deep acting (H1a and H1b), based on recent research (Brotheridge & Grandey, 2002; Diefendorff et al., 2005; Gosserand, 2003) I expect that these relationships will differ in magnitude. Specifically, I hypothesize that:

H2a: Display rule perceptions to express positive emotions will be more strongly related to deep acting than surface acting.

H2b: Display rule perceptions to suppress negative emotions will be more strongly related to surface acting than deep acting.

Surface Acting, Deep Acting, and Emotional Exhaustion

Hochschild’s (1983) original work on emotional labor suggested that emotional labor results in negative outcomes, such as emotional dissonance, job stress, burnout, physical symptoms (e.g., headaches), and absenteeism. Grandey (2000) supported this view by arguing that emotional demands increase employee burnout because of the
physiological demands associated with emotion regulation. Because burnout has been shown to be an important outcome of emotional labor, the current study will include one component of burnout (i.e., emotional exhaustion) as a proximal outcome of emotional labor.

Maslach (1982) originally defined burnout as the stress that results from “social interactions between helpers and their recipients” (Maslach, 1982, p. 3). Burnout is often found among employees in service industries when they become overly emotionally involved in interactions with customers, thereby depleting their emotional resources (Grandey, 2000; Jackson, Schwab, & Schuler, 1986). Burnout is composed of three distinct components: (1) emotional exhaustion, characterized by depleted emotional resources and feeling exhausted due to one’s work; (2) depersonalization, resulting in detachment from coworkers, customers, and the organization; and (3) reduced personal accomplishment, which involves negative evaluations of oneself (Maslach & Jackson, 1986; Wright & Cropanzano, 1998).

The current study will focus exclusively on emotional exhaustion because most researchers agree that it represents the core meaning of burnout (Brotheridge & Grandey, 2002; Shirom, 1989; Wright & Bonnet, 1997; Wright & Cropanzano, 1998). Shirom (1989) has gone as far as to argue that emotional exhaustion is the only dimension of burnout that demonstrates discriminant validity. Empirical evidence also suggests that emotional exhaustion is the first stage of the burnout process, such that it is the precursor to depersonalization and feelings of reduced personal accomplishment (Cordes & Dougherty, 1993). Therefore, emotional exhaustion may represent an important point for interventions directed at reducing burnout (Gaines & Jermier, 1983). In addition, Gaines
and Jermier (1983) suggested that emotional exhaustion, because of its similarities to chronic fatigue states, is the dimension of burnout that is most applicable to a broad range of occupations. Thus, consistent with this body of research, this study will only measure emotional exhaustion because it is the likely key component of burnout most relevant to emotional labor research.

Grandey (2003) argued that surface and deep acting may result in emotional exhaustion because of the resources required to effortfully act in order to conform with emotional display rules. As expected, her results revealed a positive association between surface acting and emotional exhaustion. However, contrary to her expectations, deep acting was unrelated to emotional exhaustion. Post-hoc, she suggested that the lack of relationship between deep acting and emotional exhaustion may have occurred because, although deep acting requires effort, it also results in payoffs, such as reduced emotional dissonance and positive reactions from customers (Grandey, 2003). These results suggest that the relationship between emotional labor and emotional exhaustion may depend on how employees manage their emotions.

Brotheridge and Grandey (2002) made a similar argument suggesting that surface acting, or modifying emotional expressions, results in showing emotions that are discrepant from your true feelings yielding emotional dissonance. The internal tension and physiological effort associated with this emotional dissonance produces emotional exhaustion (Morris & Feldman, 1996; Morris & Feldman, 1997). On the other hand, deep acting, or modifying internal feelings to produce displays that are more authentically positive (Grandey, Fisk, Matilla, et al., 2005) diminishes the tension associated with emotional dissonance. Thus, they suggested, deep acting would not be associated with
emotional dissonance. Consistent with their rationale, surface acting was positively correlated with emotional exhaustion and regression results revealed a marginal relationship as well. In addition, as expected, correlation and regression results showed no relationship between deep acting and emotional exhaustion.

Brotheridge and Lee (2003) also found differential relationships between surface and deep acting, and emotional exhaustion. Consistent with previous arguments, their results revealed positive correlations between surface acting and emotional exhaustion and no association between deep acting and emotional exhaustion. To further support this perspective, Bono and Vey (2005) found emotional exhaustion was positively correlated with an overall measure of emotional labor. However, when examining surface and deep acting as different dimensions of emotional labor, they found a moderate correlation between surface acting and emotional exhaustion ($r = .36$) and a small correlation between deep acting and emotional exhaustion ($r = .14$). Since previous research has theorized and empirically demonstrated a null relationship between deep acting and emotional exhaustion, the current study will not predict an association between these two variable. However, consistent with previous research, the following hypothesis is proposed:

H3: Surface acting will be positively related to emotional exhaustion.

Display Rules to Express Positive Versus Suppress Negative Emotions, Emotional Labor, and Emotional Exhaustion

As noted previously, distinguishing between display rule perceptions to express positive and suppress negative emotions is important. Not only may they differentially relate to surface and deep acting (see Hypotheses 2a and 2b), but some research has also
shown they may have different effects on individual and organizational outcomes. For example, Diefendorff and Richard (2003) found that employees’ perceived demands to express positive emotions were positively related to both coworker ratings of emotional displays and job satisfaction. However, perceived demands to suppress negative emotions were unrelated to coworker ratings of emotional displays and were negatively related to job satisfaction. Their findings suggest that display rules do not have uniformly negative effects on employees; instead, the outcomes associated with perceived display rule demands may vary depending on whether display rules reflect expression or suppression demands (Diefendorff & Richard, 2003).

Another important outcome of display rule perceptions is emotional exhaustion, as indicated by Brotheridge and Grandey’s (2002) study on emotional labor and burnout. Although they hypothesized that perceived display rules to express positive and suppress negative emotions would relate positively to burnout, their findings did not support this simplistic view. Their regression results showed no relationship between display rule perceptions to express positive or suppress negative emotions and emotional exhaustion after accounting for control variables (sex, negative affectivity, and occupational group) and interpersonal work demands (frequency of interpersonal behaviors, variety of emotional expressions, intensity of emotional expression, duration of interpersonal interactions). However, bi-variate correlations revealed differential effects of the two forms of display rule perceptions on emotional exhaustion. Specifically, they found a positive relationship between display rule perceptions to hide negative emotions and emotional exhaustion and no relationship between display rule perceptions to express positive emotions and emotional exhaustion.
However, further research has demonstrated different relationships between display rule perceptions and emotional exhaustion. For example, Schaubroeck and Jones (2000) also promoted the distinction between perceptions of display rules to express positive emotions and suppress negative emotions. Based on the facial feedback hypothesis (Soussignan, 2002; Tourangeau & Ellsworth, 1979), they argued that requirements to express positive emotions should be negatively associated with physical symptoms (i.e., somatic complaints). In addition, because suppression demands are linked to lower immune levels they hypothesized that requirements to suppress negative emotions would be positively associated with physical symptoms. However, contrary to their expectations, their regression results revealed a positive relationship between perceptions of display rule demands to express positive emotions and physical symptoms. Also, they did not find the expected relationship between display rule demands to suppress negative emotions and physical symptoms. Although their regression results did not support their hypotheses, the bi-variate correlations revealed a stronger positive relationship between display rule perceptions to suppress negative emotions and physical symptoms ($r = .43$) than between display rule perceptions to express positive emotions and physical symptoms ($r = .28$).

Montgomery et al.’s (2006) study provided some additional results that further blur the relationship between display rule perceptions and emotional exhaustion. In their study of emotional labor and work-family interference, they found both perceived demands to express positive and suppress negative emotions had a positive relationship with emotional exhaustion. Thus, although most researchers agree that display rule perceptions to suppress negative emotions should positively relate to emotional
exhaustion (Brotheridge & Grandey, 2002; Schaubroeck & Jones, 2000; Montgomery et al., 2006), the relationship between display rule perceptions to express positive emotions and emotional exhaustion is equivocal. Specifically, Brotheridge and Grandey (2002) hypothesized a positive relationship between display rule perceptions to express positive emotions and emotional exhaustion; however, their results showed no relationship existed. On the other hand, Schaubroeck and Jones (2000) suggested that requirements to express positive emotions should be negatively related to physical symptoms. Contrary to expectations, they found a positive relationship between these variables. Finally, Montgomery et al. (2006) found perceived demands to express positive emotions was positively related to emotional exhaustion.

The relationship between display rule perceptions to express positive emotions and emotional exhaustion may be better explained by including surface acting as a potential mediator. As mentioned previously, one concern with the existing literature is that it focuses predominantly on bivariate relationships. Therefore, previous studies investigating the relationships between display rules and emotional exhaustion may have misspecified these relationships because an important intermediary variable (i.e., surface acting) was omitted.

Although the relationship between display rules, emotional labor, and outcomes such as emotional exhaustion have been discussed in previous research (Grandey, 2003; Bono & Vey, 2005), to my knowledge, no previous research has empirically examined this relationship. However, Grandey’s (2000) theoretical model suggests that interaction expectations, including display rules, lead to emotional labor, which then affects long-term consequences, such as burnout. Consistent with Grandey’s (2000) theory, I therefore
expect that display rule perceptions should only impact emotional exhaustion via emotional labor (i.e., acting). However, as stated previously, only surface acting is expected to mediate this relationship because deep acting is unrelated to emotional exhaustion (Brotheridge & Grandey, 2002; Brotheridge & Lee, 2003; Grandey, 2003).

Some empirical, bivariate research supports the existence of this mediated relationship. For example, as discussed previously, perceptions of display rules to express positive emotions and suppress negative emotions are related to surface acting (Bono & Vey, 2005; Brotheridge & Lee, 2002; Diefendorff et al., 2005; Gosserand & Diefendorff, 2005; Grandey, 2003). Further, some research has found that surface acting is related to emotional exhaustion (Bono & Vey, 2005; Brotheridge & Grandey, 2002; Brotheridge & Lee, 2003; Grandey, 2003). Thus, bivariate empirical research provides some support for Grandey’s (2000) model, although no existing research has tested the complete mediated relationship.

Thus, to explain the inconsistent results regarding the relationship between emotional display rules and emotional exhaustion, I will examine the possible mediating role of surface acting and hypothesize the following:

H4a: The relationship between display rule perceptions to express positive emotions and emotional exhaustion will be mediated by surface acting.

H4b: The relationship between display rule perceptions to suppress negative emotions and emotional exhaustion will be mediated by surface acting.
The Importance of Motivation and the Moderating Role of Perceived Organizational Support

Although past research has shown emotional display rules are important antecedents to emotional labor and appropriate emotional displays (Bono & Vey, 2005; Brotheridge & Lee, 2002; Grandey, 2003), most of this research has ignored the role of motivation. Most emotional labor research assumes that the simple presence of display rules results in employee efforts to conform to these display rules (Gosserand & Diefendorff, 2005). For example, Grandey (2003) hypothesized awareness of display rules positively relates to surface and deep acting, assuming that the mere awareness of display rules results in motivation to conform to them. However, recent work by Diefendorff and Gosserand (Diefendorff & Gosserand, 2003; Gosserand & Diefendorff, 2005) argued that motivation plays a crucial role in whether employees decide to abide by organizational display rules.

Based on expectancy theory (Vroom, 1964), Diefendorff and Gosserand (2003) suggested that the value, or valence, of displaying the organizationally desired emotion and the expectancy of successfully displaying the desired emotion influence whether individuals adopt organizational display rules. Specifically, they argued that the valence and expectancy judgments are combined multiplicatively to determine the motivational force for displaying the required emotions. The motivational force will be high when both the valence and expectancy judgments are high; in this case, employees are likely to adopt the organizational display rule. However, when either the valence or expectancy is low, the motivational force will be low, leading to a lower likelihood of adopting the organizational display rule. Although not related to the workplace, in their study of
children and display rules, Reissland and Harris (1991) made a similar argument suggesting that conforming to display rules require the motivation and ability to control one’s behavior in order to express the appropriate emotions.

Consistent with Diefendorff and Gosserand’s (2003) ideas, Gosserand and Diefendorff (2005) reasoned that some employees may recognize organizational display rules and choose not to follow them. For example, Morris and Feldman (1997) did not find a relationship between the explicitness of organizational display and frequency of emotional labor. Thus, the mere presence of display rules does not always lead to compliance with them.

To further the understanding of the relationship between display rule perceptions and emotional labor, Gosserand and Diefendorff (2005) introduced the idea of commitment to display rules. Commitment to display rules is “a person’s intention to extend effort toward displaying organizationally desired emotions, persist in displaying these emotions over time, and not abandon the display rules under difficult conditions” (Gosserand & Diefendorff, 2005, p. 1257). They argued that the relationship between display rule perceptions and surface and deep acting shown in past research (Bono & Vey, 2005; Brotheridge & Lee, 2002; Grandey, 2003) may have been attenuated because individuals’ levels of commitment to display rules were not included. Based on the goal-setting literature, they suggested that display rule commitment should moderate the relationship between display rule perceptions and surface and deep acting. Specifically, they hypothesized that the relationships should be strong and positive when display rule commitment was high and there should be little or no relationship when display rule commitment was low. Consistent with their expectations, they found individuals more
committed to display rules had a stronger relationship between display rule perceptions and surface acting, deep acting, and positive affective delivery than their less committed counterparts (Gosserand & Diefendorff, 2005). Their results were the first to empirically demonstrate the important role of motivation in the emotional labor process.

The current study will extend the limited research incorporating the role of motivation in the emotional labor process by examining perceived organizational support (POS) as a potential moderator between display rule perceptions and deep acting. Perceived organizational support is the extent to which employees believe the organization values their contributions and cares about their well-being (Eisenberger, Huntington, Hutchinson, & Sowa, 1986). More than 70 empirical studies have focused on POS and found it to be related to a number of important individual and organizational outcomes, including affective commitment, job satisfaction, positive mood (Rhoades & Eisenberger, 2002).

Perceived organizational support is generally conceptualized in social exchange theory terms, specifically focusing on the norm of reciprocity (Cropanzano & Mitchell, 2005). The norm of reciprocity argues that individuals are obligated to reciprocate favorable treatment received by others (Gouldner, 1960). Thus, applying the norm of reciprocity to the employee-employer relationship suggests that individuals with high levels of POS should feel obligated to care about the organization’s welfare and help the organization reach its goals (Rhodes & Eisenberger, 2002). In other words, employees with high levels of POS may attempt to repay the organization for a high level of support by investing more work effort in order to contribute to organizational effectiveness (Eisenberber, Armeli, Rexwinkel, Lynch, & Rhoades, 2001). Because the emotions
employees express can affect customers’ evaluations of the organization (Luong, 2005; Matilla & Enz, 2002; Pugh, 2001; Tsai, 2001; Tsai & Huan, 2002), employees high in POS may strive to increase, or improve, their displays of organizationally desired emotions.

Thus, POS is relevant to work motivation in that it is predictive of employees’ willingness to reciprocate by engaging in, and increasing effort, on desirable work task (Eisenberger et al., 2001; Sptizmuller, Glenn, Barr, Rogelberg, & Daniel, 2006) such as conforming to emotional display rules. However, to my knowledge, no published studies have investigated the role of POS as a motivator in relation to emotional labor. However, in her dissertation, Gosserand (2003) examined POS as an antecedent to both surface and deep acting, arguing that employees high on POS should feel more obligated to their organization. Consequently, they should put more effort into regulating their emotions (i.e., surface and deep acting) to meet display rules than employees low on POS. Contrary to her expectations, POS did not have a positive relationship with either surface or deep acting.

Nonetheless, POS may still play an important role in the emotional labor process. POS may not have a direct effect on surface and deep acting (Gosserand, 2003); however, it may have a more complex relationship with emotional labor. Specifically, similar to the effects of commitment to display rules (Gosserand & Diefendorff, 2005), POS may affect the relationship between display rule perceptions and emotional labor. Based on the norm of reciprocity, employees with high levels of POS, as opposed to their low POS counterparts, may be more likely to conform to display rules in order to help the organization meet its goals. Accordingly, POS may strengthen the relationship between
display rule perceptions and deep acting. As stated previously, deep acting, or “faking in good faith,” involves changing one’s feelings in order to elicit the appropriate emotional display and leads to more authentic displays (Grandey, 2000; Grandey, 2003; Hochschild, 1983). Thus, once aware of display rules, high POS employees may be more likely to abide by display rules and put in additional effort to internally manage their feelings (deep acting) in order to create authentic displays (Grandey, Fisk, Matilla, et al., 2005).

Specifically, I hypothesize that:

H5a: POS will moderate the relationship between display rule perceptions to express positive emotions and deep acting. Specifically, the positive relationship between display rule perceptions to express positive emotions and deep acting will be stronger for employees high in POS as compared to employees low in POS.

H5b: POS will moderate the relationship between display rule perceptions to suppress negative emotions and deep acting. Specifically, the positive relationship between display rule perceptions to suppress negative emotions and deep acting will be stronger for employees high in POS compared to employees low in POS.

The effects of POS on the relationship between display rule perceptions and surface acting is not as clear. POS could potentially interact with display rule perceptions to have two different effects on surface acting. First, POS may strengthen the relationship between display rules and surface acting. In particular, parallel to the effects on deep acting, employees with high POS could engage in more surface acting because they have a greater desire to conform to organizational display rules. Second, employees with high POS may engage in less surface acting because they see it as “faking in bad faith.” In
other words, employees may perceive that high levels of surface acting only involves conforming to the minimum job requirements by changing one’s emotional displays without changing internal feelings resulting in less authentic displays (Grandey, 2000; Grandey, 2003; Hochschild, 1983).

However, in some instances, employees may be unable to engage in deep acting strategies (e.g., lack of time or ability), and surface acting, although not the ideal response, may be the most adaptive response. Thus, although surface acting results in less authentic displays of emotions, it may be the only available strategy to conform to organizational display rules and meet the job requirements (Kruml & Geddes, 2000). Consequently, employees high in POS, who are operating under the norm of reciprocity, may be more likely to engage in surface acting when they perceive display rule demands than their low POS counterparts. Therefore, it is hypothesized that:

H5c: POS will moderate the relationship between display rule perceptions to express positive emotions and surface acting. Specifically, the positive relationship between display rule perceptions to express positive emotions and surface acting will be stronger for employees high in POS as compared to employees low in POS.

H5d: POS will moderate the relationship between display rule perceptions to suppress negative emotions and surface acting. Specifically, the positive relationship between display rule perceptions to suppress negative emotions and surface acting will be stronger for employees high in POS compared to employees low in POS.
Social Support, Leadership, and the Moderating Role of Leader-Member Exchange

As noted previously, employees can perform emotional labor to conform to organizational display rules by either surface or deep acting. Surface acting is related to negative outcomes, such as inauthentic displays of emotions, lower ratings of affective delivery, depersonalization, dissatisfaction, and emotional exhaustion (Brotheridge & Lee, 2002; Brotheridge & Grandey, 2002; Grandey, 2003; Grandy, Fisk, & Steiner, 2005; Grandy, Fisk, Matilla, et al., 2005; Totterdell & Holman, 2003). Conversely, deep acting is related to positive or neutral outcomes, including feelings of authenticity and personal accomplishment, lower likelihood of revealing inappropriate negative emotions, job satisfaction, and performance (Brotheridge & Lee, 2002; Brotheridge & Grandey, 2002; Grandey, 2003; Grandey, Fisk, & Steiner, 2005; Grandey, Fisk, Matilla, et al., 2005; Totterdell & Holman, 2003). Because of these differential outcomes, deep acting has been recommended over surface acting as the more desirable form of emotional labor (Cote, 2005; Grandey, 2003; Grandey, Fisk, Matilla, et al., 2005; Grandey, Dickter, & Sin, 2004; Zammuner & Galli, 2005).

However, some research has demonstrated that personality traits influence employees’ likelihood of surface or deep acting (Diefendorff et al., 2005). Diefendorff et al. (2005) argued that individuals high in extraversion and low in neuroticism tend to experience fewer negative emotions, and therefore have less of a need to surface act than their low extraversion and high neuroticism counterparts. Their results were consistent with their expectations, such that extraversion correlated negatively, and neuroticism correlated positively, with surface acting. In addition, they suggested that individuals high in conscientiousness and agreeableness would be more likely to conform to
organizational display rules by acting in good faith (deep acting) than acting in bad faith (surface acting). Partial support was found for their hypotheses. Specifically, individuals high in conscientiousness were less likely to surface act and individuals high in agreeableness were more likely to deep act and less likely to surface act. Overall, their results showed that personality variables accounted for almost three times the variance in surface acting than the situational variables investigated (i.e., positive and negative display rules; frequency, duration, and routineness of interpersonal interactions) (Diefendorff et al., 2005).

In addition, Kruml and Geddes (2001) suggested that the more attached employees are to customers, the less likely they will have to hide their true feelings (i.e., surface act) and the more likely they are to attempt to truly feel the emotions they should express (i.e., deep act). Consistent with these arguments, their results suggested that employees with stronger attachments to their customers were less likely to experience emotional dissonance as a result of surface acting and more likely to report engaging in deep acting. Because shorter encounters result in less customer attachment (Morris & Feldman, 1996), Kruml and Geddes (2001) argued that in shorter encounters, employees may not have adequate time to engage in deep acting. Therefore, in short encounters with customers, surface acting may be the only available strategy.

Because some employees may be predisposed to surface act rather than deep act (Diefendorff et al., 2005), and some situations may only allow for surface acting (Kruml & Geddes, 2001), it is important to examine the contextual variables that may mitigate the negative outcomes that are associated with high levels of surface acting over time. Accordingly, Morris and Feldman (1996) called for researchers to examine potential
moderators of the relationship between emotional labor and psychological well-being. Thus, the current study will investigate how the relationship between surface acting and emotional exhaustion may be reduced.

When employees surface act, they are only changing their outward displays of emotions, which is associated with emotional dissonance (Grandey, 2003; Kruml & Geddes, 2000; Kruml & Geddes, 2001). Emotional dissonance is a stressful state that occurs when employees’ expressed emotions do not coincide with their true, internal feelings and has been associated with decreased mental and physical well-being (Abraham, 1998; Kruml & Geddes, 2000; Morris & Feldman, 1996; Morris & Feldman, 1997; Tschan, Rochat, & Zapf, 2005; Zerbe, 2000). Morris and Feldman (1996) suggested that employees with supportive relationships may be able to rely on others to help them cope with conflicts between organizationally-desired, expressed emotions and internally felt emotions, thereby reducing psychological distress.

Accordingly, past research has shown that social resources can play an important role in protecting employees from work stress (Bernas & Major, 2000; Fenlason & Beehr, 1994; Giebels & Janssen, 2005; Harris & Kacmar, 2005; Kaufmann & Beehr, 1986; Kickul & Posig, 2001; Marin & Garcia-Ramirez, 2005; Morris & Feldman, 1996; Sand & Miyazaki, 2000; Tourigny et al., 2005). Brotheridge and Lee (2002) argued that when unrewarding interpersonal interactions drain emotional resources, employees may replenish their resources through their social support network. Consistent with these arguments, social support has been shown to have a main effect on emotional exhaustion, such that higher levels of social support lead to lower levels of emotional exhaustion (Brotheridge & Lee, 2002; Houckes, Janssen, de Jonge, & Bakker, 2003; Janssen,
Peeters, de Jonge, & Tummers, 2004; Marin & Garcia-Ramirez, 2005; Zapf, Siefert, Schmutte, Mertini, & Holz, 2001).

Furthermore, there is also evidence that social support plays a buffering role in the relationship between stress and emotional exhaustion (Marin & Garcia-Ramirez, 2005; Morris & Feldman, 1996; Holman et al., 2002). To explain this buffering effect, Morris and Feldman (1996) proposed that employees with supportive relationships can rely on others to help them deal with the emotional dissonance that develops from surface acting, thereby resulting in less psychological distress. In addition, Holman et al. (2002) showed that supervisor support buffered employees from the relationship between performance monitoring intensity and emotional exhaustion.

However, there has been some mixed support for the buffering effect of social support. Specifically, some studies have found no relationship between social support and emotional exhaustion, while other studies have found a reverse buffering effect (Fenlason & Beehr, 1994; Kaufman & Beehr, 1986; Kickul & Posig, 2001; Tourigny et al., 2005). For example, Kickul and Posig (2001) found that supervisory emotional support strengthened the positive relationship between stressors (i.e., time pressure and role conflict) and emotional exhaustion.

The mixed results regarding social resources, combined with the negative effects that surface acting can have on individual and organizational outcomes, led Bono and Vey (2005) to call for additional research on conditions that may moderate the relationship between emotion management and negative outcomes. Levinson (1980) suggested that leadership behaviors have an important role in employees’ anticipation
and mitigation of work stress. Thus, leadership behaviors may be one promising area of research that can diminish the negative outcomes associated with emotional labor.

The management of emotions, including one’s own and those of others, is a critical component of effective leadership (Ashforth & Humphrey, 1995; Ashkanasy & Tse, 2000; Goleman, 1998). Leaders can help subordinates manage cognitive appraisals and emotional reactions to obstacles and frustrating events and help subordinates deal with complex social problems (Mumford, Zaccaro, Harding, Jacobs, & Fleishman, 2000; Pirola-Merlo et al., 2002), such as emotion management. In addition, high quality relationships between leaders and followers may result in increased trust and increased expectations of emotional support (Steiner, 1997).

Thus, emotional labor research indicates that social support may be important for mitigating some of the negative effects associated with emotional labor, and leadership research suggests that leaders can provide emotional social support. However, no published studies have integrated these two streams of research and empirically investigated the relationship between emotional labor and leadership. The current study will attempt to fill this gap, by integrating leader-member exchange (LMX) theory and the emotional labor process.

Leader-member exchange theory adopts a relationship-based approach to leadership, specifically focusing on the dyadic relationship between a leader and a subordinate (Graen & Uhl-Bien, 1995). Leader-member exchange theory posits that leaders develop differential relationships or exchanges with their followers rather than treating all subordinates similarly (Graen & Scandura, 1987; Gerstner & Day, 1997). Subordinates that are perceived by their leaders as competent, skilled, and willing to
accept responsibility develop high quality LMX relationships and comprise the leader’s in-group (Dansereau et al., 1975). High LMX relationships are characterized by mutual trust, respect, liking, and reciprocal influence. In addition, subordinates with high LMX relationships receive greater opportunities, autonomy, and emotional support (Dansereau et al., 1975). On the other hand, subordinates with low quality LMX relationships (the out-group) receive more formal treatment and less support from their leaders (Dansereau et al., 1975).

The key principle of LMX theory is that the individualized relationship between a leader and a subordinate has important implications for organizational outcomes (Liden, Wayne, & Stilwell, 1993). Research indicates that LMX is related to a variety of outcomes, including performance ratings, job satisfaction, organizational commitment, role clarity, and turnover intentions (Gerstner & Day, 1997; Kacmar, Witt, Zivnuska, & Gully, 2003; Schriesheim, Castro, & Cogliser, 1999). In addition, researchers have suggested that high quality LMX relationships can operate as a source of support (Ashkanasy & Tse, 2000). Specifically, Erdogan et al. (2004) argued that LMX is an important source of support that can help employees cope with work challenges. Their findings indicated that high levels of LMX could buffer employees from work stress and help them adjust to the work environment (Erdogen et al., 2004).

Furthermore, Harris and Kacmar (2005) demonstrated that LMX plays an important role in the relationship between perceptions of politics and strain. They argued that, by providing high levels of trust, rewards, and continuous emotional support, supervisors can buffer the negative effects of politics on work strain. Consistent with their arguments, they found that relationship exchange quality moderated the relationship
between perceptions of politics and strain. Specifically, employees with higher quality LMX relationships had a weaker positive relationship between perceptions of politics and strains than employees with lower quality LMX relationships (Harris & Kacmar, 2005). Correspondingly, high quality LMX relationships may buffer the negative effects of emotion management. In particular, subordinates with high-quality LMX relationships may benefit from the additional support, especially the continuous emotional support, thereby mitigating the emotional exhaustion that is associated with surface acting. Therefore, it is hypothesized that:

H6: LMX will moderate the relationship between surface acting and emotional exhaustion. Specifically, the positive relationship between surface acting and emotional exhaustion will be weaker for employees high in LMX compared to employees low in LMX.

**Organizationally-Based Outcomes of Emotional Labor**

Past research has suggested that emotional labor should be related to organizationally-based outcomes such as job performance and withdrawal behaviors (Grandey, 2000; Rubin et al, 2005), therefore the current study will empirically investigate the role of surface and deep acting on global job performance and actual turnover behaviors.

**Job Performance.** Emotions are an integral part of everyday organizational life and can impact job behavior and performance (Ashforth & Humphrey, 1995; Staw et al., 1994). Employee emotional responses and displays can influence work-related behaviors as well as supervisor and customer perceptions of job performance (Arvey et al., 1998). For example, Rubin et al. (2005) suggested that performance may suffer when employees
spend their resources engaging in emotional labor because they may not have the necessary resources to perform additional job functions. Therefore, emotional labor may affect a wide variety of performance dimensions because it consumes resources that are no longer available for performing other required job tasks.

However, to my knowledge, previous studies that have investigated the relationships between emotional labor and job performance have focused solely on very narrow aspects of performance, such as ratings of emotional displays, customer service performance ratings, and evaluations of the service encounter (Diefendorff & Richard, 2003; Gosserand, 2003; Gosserand & Diefendorff, 2005; Luong, 2005; Mattila & Enz, 2002; Pugh, 2001). The most frequent outcome of interest in previous emotional labor research is affective delivery, the extent to which employees maintain the expressive displays that are required by the organization (Beal et al., 2006). In contrast, the measure of performance used in this study measures a broader conceptualization of performance. In addition to measuring customer service quality, other job functions, such as knowledge and compliance with bank procedures and promoting teamwork, will be incorporated into a global measure of job performance. Therefore, this will be the first study to tie emotional labor to a comprehensive range of performance dimensions.

Surface Acting, Deep Acting, and Job Performance. Generally, research has assumed that happy, smiling employees lead to better performance (Bono & Vey, 2005); however, more recent research by Grandey and colleagues (Grandey, Fisk, Matilla, et al., 2005) suggested that customers can recognize when employees are just pasting on a smile (surface acting) and these inauthentic displays can lead to negative outcomes. Specifically, Grandey, Fisk, Matilla, et al. (2005) argued that surface acting results in
insincere expressions and customers may view these false smiles as manipulative. Consistent with this rationale, they found surface acting led to lower customer evaluations of friendliness and satisfaction. On the other hand, deep acting led to displays that were perceived by customers as more authentic, resulting in increased customer ratings of friendliness and satisfaction (Grandey, Fisk, Matilla, et al., 2005). Similarly, Grandey (2003) found that surface acting was negatively related to coworker ratings of affective delivery (sincerity, enthusiasm, warmth, friendliness, and courtesy of the focal employee during service encounters). Conversely, deep acting was positively related to coworker ratings of affective delivery.

In addition, Diefendorff and Gosserand (2003) proposed that the size of the discrepancy between emotional display rules and actual emotional displays are negatively related to job performance. Employees that regulate their emotions through surface acting may be more likely to reveal their negative moods or reactions to coworkers and customers (Grandey, 2003). Deep acting may have the reverse effect, such that when deep acting employees actually try to feel what is expected, their negative moods and reactions are less likely to leak out (Grandey, 2003). Thus, surface acting may not only result in inauthentic displays, it may also lead to a discrepancy between organizationally desired emotional display rules and employee displayed emotions. Either the inauthenticity of emotional displays or the discrepancy between organizationally desired emotional displays and actual displays may lead to lower ratings of job performance. On the other hand, deep acting may result in authentic displays of organizationally desired emotions, thereby increasing ratings of job performance. Therefore, it is hypothesized that:
H7a: Surface acting will be negatively related to job performance.

H7b: Deep acting will be positively related to job performance.

*Emotional Exhaustion and Job Performance.* Emotional exhaustion has also been linked to decreased job performance (Babakus et al., 1999; Cropanzano et al., 2003; Singh et al., 1994; Wright & Bonett, 1997; Wright & Cropanzano, 1998). Emotionally exhausted employees have reduced resources and energy available, thereby leading to diminished efforts at work (Singh et al., 1994). In addition, based on conservation of resources (COR) theory, Wright and Cropanzano (1998) argued that emotionally exhausted employees would use avoidance or withdrawal coping mechanisms, including reduced job performance, to help restore or minimize their lost resources. Thus, they hypothesized, and their findings confirmed, that emotional exhaustion was negatively associated with job performance. Similarly, Wright and Bonnet (1997) suggested that intense emotional arousal associated with emotional exhaustion would interfere with effective job performance. Consistent with their suggestions, they found that feelings of emotional exhaustion were negatively related to supervisor ratings of work performance measured three years later. Thus, in accordance with previous research, I hypothesize that:

H8: Emotional exhaustion will be negatively related to job performance.

Consistent with previous research, surface acting and emotional exhaustion are hypothesized to negatively relate to job performance (see Hypothesis 7a and 8). In addition, as noted previously (see Hypothesis 3), surface acting has been shown to relate positively to emotional exhaustion. However, to my knowledge, no previous research has investigated emotional exhaustion as a potential mediator of the surface acting-job
performance link. Surface acting may *directly* affect job performance because it leads to inauthentic displays of emotion (Grandey, Fisk, Matilla, et al., 2005) and a larger gap between organizationally desired emotional displays and actual displays of emotions (Diefendorff & Gosserand, 2003; Grandey, 2003). In addition, surface acting may *indirectly* affect job performance through emotional exhaustion. Specifically, surface acting may increase levels of emotional exhaustion due to the internal tension and physiological effort associated with emotional dissonance (Morris & Feldman, 1996). Furthermore, emotional exhaustion may lead to lowered job performance because emotionally exhausted employees have reduced resources to perform effectively on the job (Singh et al., 1994). Thus, the current study hypothesizes that:

H9: Emotional exhaustion will partially mediate the relationship between surface acting and job performance.

*Turnover.* Many researchers have suggested that emotional labor is related to withdrawal behaviors, such as turnover (Abraham, 1999; Brotheridge & Lee, 2002; Grandey, 2000; Rubin et al., 2005; Zerbe, 2000). For example, Brotheridge and Lee (2002) suggested that employees that lack the resources to perform emotional labor required by the job will be more likely to seek turnover in order to stop further drain in emotional resources. Similarly, Grandey (2000) argued that emotion management leads to increased physiological arousal which may eventually impact withdrawal behaviors such as turnover.

However, most studies that have investigated emotional labor and turnover have focused on turnover intentions rather than actual turnover. For example, Zerbe (2000) empirically demonstrated that emotional dissonance and turnover intentions were
moderately correlated ($r = .35$). In addition, Cote and Morgan (2002) found that the suppression of unpleasant emotions was positively related to turnover intentions, and this relationship was mediated by job satisfaction. Because job attitudes, such as turnover intentions, do not always predict actual behavior (Ajzen & Fishbein, 1977; Ajzen & Madden, 1986), it is important to examine the relationship between emotional labor and actual turnover behaviors. However, to my knowledge, no previous research has empirically investigated the relationship between emotion management and actual turnover. Thus, the current study will extend this limited research by integrating actual turnover behavior into a model of emotional labor.

Research has suggested a positive relationship between emotional exhaustion and turnover, such that employees that are emotionally exhausted are likely to withdraw from work (Babakus et al., 1999; Cropanzano et al., 2003; Lee & Ashforth, 1996; Singh et al., 1994; Wright & Cropanzano, 1998). Consistent with this suggestion, Cropanzano et al. (2003) found that emotional exhaustion had a strong positive relationship with turnover intentions. Furthermore, in a meta-analytic review, Lee and Ashforth (1996) found a .44 correlation between emotional exhaustion and turnover intentions. However, few studies have demonstrated a relationship between emotional exhaustion and actual turnover behavior. One exception is the work of Wright and Cropanzano (1998); they argued that emotionally exhausted employees are likely to use withdrawal coping mechanisms. Based on this argument, they hypothesized and empirically demonstrated that emotional exhaustion predicted actual turnover behavior measured one year later (Wright & Cropanzano, 1998).
Therefore, past research has shown that emotional labor (i.e., surface acting) is related to emotional exhaustion (Brotheridge & Lee, 2003; Brotheridge & Grandey, 2002; Grandey, 2003). In addition, Wright and Cropanzano (1998) demonstrated a positive relationship between emotional exhaustion and turnover. However, no research has integrated this literature and examined the relationship between emotional labor, emotional exhaustion, and turnover in one theoretically-driven model. Therefore, the current study extends previous literature by incorporating actual turnover behavior into a model of emotional labor that is tested within a SEM framework.

Overall, research has suggested that emotional labor should be related to turnover (Abraham, 1999; Brotheridge & Lee, 2002; Grandey, 2000; Rubin et al., 2005). However, the rationale for the relationship between emotional labor and withdrawal behaviors provided by most researchers seems to suggest that emotional labor does not have a direct relationship with turnover. Rather, emotional labor leads to a drain in emotional resources (Brotheridge & Lee, 2002) and physiological arousal (Grandey, 2000) that is consistent with feelings of emotional exhaustion. Thus, emotional labor should result in turnover via emotional exhaustion. As mentioned previously, only surface acting is associated with emotional exhaustion; consequently, emotional exhaustion should only mediate the relationship between surface acting and turnover. Accordingly, I hypothesize that:

H10: Surface acting will be positively related to turnover.

H11: Emotional exhaustion will be positively related to turnover.

H12: Emotional exhaustion will mediate the relationship between surface acting and turnover.
Summary

This chapter tests and extends Grandey’s (2000) model of the emotional labor process. Specifically, the proposed model (see Figure 2) includes antecedents to, and individual (i.e., emotional exhaustion) and organizational outcomes (i.e., job performance and turnover) of, surface and deep acting. In addition, the proposed model incorporates motivational (i.e., POS) and social components (i.e., LMX) that may affect the emotional labor process and qualify the effects originally proposed by Grandey (2000). To test this model, a specific series of hypotheses have been proposed. In the following chapter, a detailed presentation of the methods by which this model will be tested is outlined.
CHAPTER III

METHOD

Overview and Sample

The current study used an archival dataset to test the proposed model of emotional labor (see Figure 2). The dataset consisted of an online survey completed by tellers at a Midwestern bank in the United States in early 2006 as part of a larger organizational study. One month before the start of data collection, all tellers in the bank were sent a letter describing the purpose of the study and directions for accessing the online survey. As an incentive to take part in the study, all participants were entered into a raffle to win one of ten $50 gift cards issued by the bank.

Bank tellers are a prime sample for a study on emotional labor because they are frontline service providers requiring high levels of control over their emotions. For example, tellers’ work activities include communicating with supervisors, peers, and subordinates, establishing and maintaining interpersonal relationships, and performing for or working directly with the public, and they are often called upon to display warmth and confidence (Zerbe, 2000). In addition, the O*NET indicates that teller work styles require being sensitive to others’ needs and feelings, being pleasant with others on the job, displaying a good-natured, cooperative attitude, and being personally connected with others on the job. These requirements suggest that bank tellers are an excellent sample for investigating emotional labor.
The dataset contained self-reported information by 263 tellers on display rule perceptions to express positive emotions, display rule perceptions to suppress negative emotions, surface acting, deep acting, emotional exhaustion, POS, and LMX. Tellers were given the option of whether to provide their names on their surveys. Overall, 227 of the 263 tellers who completed the online survey provided their names. The dataset also included a measure of teller performance for each completed survey provided by the tellers’ supervisors. The dataset also contained demographic information (i.e., age and tenure) provided by the organization and organizational records of turnover information collected six months after the initial teller survey. However, the job performance, demographics, and turnover information were only available for the 227 participants that self-identified on the online survey. In addition, performance ratings were missing for an additional 22, and turnover information was missing for 9 participants, that self-identified on the survey.

The average age of participants was 38 years old. Women made up 95% of the sample. Approximately 92.7% of the sample was Caucasian, 4.6% were African American, and the remaining 2.8% classified themselves as Asian American, Hispanic/Latino, or American Indian/Alaskan Native. Average job tenure was approximately 4 years.

Interviews were also conducted with nine bank tellers after the survey data was collected to discuss their emotional labor demands and strategies. The purpose of these interviews was to further explore, in a qualitative sense, the specific display rules, emotions, and challenges that tellers experience in the workplace.
Measures

Unless otherwise noted, all variables were self-report and assessed with a 5-point Likert-type response scale with anchors ranging from 1=Strongly Disagree to 5=Strongly Agree. Table 1 provides a list of constructs, scales, and sources of data for all measures used in the present study. In addition, items for all measures are included in Appendix A.

Display Rule Perceptions to Express Positive Emotions. Display rule perceptions to express positive emotions were measured using Diefendorff et al.'s (2005) four-item scale which assesses the extent to which employees perceive there is a norm for expressing positive emotions (α = .73). This scale was developed by modifying three items from Brotheridge and Grandey’s (2002) measure of requirements to display positive emotions and Schaubroeck and Jones’ (2000) measure of demands for positive efference. Sample items include “This organization would say that part of the product to customers is friendly, cheerful service” and “My organization expects me to try to act excited and enthusiastic in my interactions with customers.”

Display Rule Perceptions to Suppress Negative Emotions. Diefendorff et al.’s (2005) three item scale was used to assess the extent to which employees perceive a norm for suppressing negative emotions (α = .75). This scale was developed by modifying one item from Brotheridge and Grandey’s (2002) measure of requirements to hide negative emotions and Schaubroeck and Jones’ (2000) suppression of negative efference scale. Sample items include “This organization expects me to try to pretend that I am not upset or distressed” and “I am expected to suppress my bad moods or negative reactions to customers.”
**Surface Acting.** Surface acting was measured with Diefendorff et al.’s (2005) seven item scale which assessed the extent to which employees report they fake unfelt emotions and/or suppress felt emotions. This scale consists of five items adapted from Grandey’s (2003) surface acting scale and two items adapted from Kruml and Geddes’ (2000) emotive dissonance scale. Coefficient alpha values for this scale have ranged from .91-.92 (Diefendorff et al., 2005). Sample items include “I put on an act in order to deal with customers in an appropriate way” and “I fake a good mood when interacting with customers.”

**Deep Acting.** Diefendorff et al.’s (2005) four item deep acting scale was used to measure the extent to which employees report they modify their felt emotions so that genuine displays follow. The items for this scale were adapted from Grandey’s (2003) deep acting scale and Kruml and Geddes’ (2000) scale of emotive effort. This scale has a reported reliability of .82 (Diefendorff et al., 2005). Sample items include “I work at developing the feelings inside of me that I need to show to customers” and “I work hard to feel the emotions that I need to show to customers.”

**Emotional Exhaustion.** An adaptation of Wharton’s (1993) six item emotional exhaustion scale was used to assess employees’ feeling of being “used up” at the end of the workday (α = .87). Sample items include “I feel emotionally drained from my work” and “I feel burned out from my work.”

**Perceived Organizational Support.** Eisenberger et al.’s (1986) shortened nine-item perceived organizational support (POS) scale was used to measure employees’ perceptions about the extent to which an organization values their contributions and cares about their well-being. Previous research has demonstrated reliability estimates ranging
from .74 to .95 (Fields, 2002). Sample items include “The organization strongly considers my goals and values” and “Help is available from the organization when I have a problem.”

**Leader-Member Exchange.** Consistent with the recommendations of Gerstner and Day (1997), Scandura and Graen’s (1984) LMX-VII, was used to measure leader-member exchange (LMX). The LMX-VII is the most commonly used measure for operationalizing LMX and meta-analysis confirm that the measure is the most robust and psychometrically sound LMX instrument (Bernas & Major, 2000; Gerstner & Day, 1997). According to Gerstner and Day’s (1997) meta-analysis, the LMX-VII showed a reliability of .89 across 28 samples. Sample items include “My immediate supervisor recognizes by potential” and “My working relationship with my immediate supervisor is effective.”

**Turnover Intentions.** Although turnover intentions were not included as part of the hypothesized model, it is discussed here because it is included in this study in an alternative model presented later. An adaptation of Hom, Griffeth, and Sellaro’s (1984) 3-item turnover intentions scale was used to measure employees’ intention to leave the organization in the next 12 months. Sample items include “I intend to leave the organization in the next 12 months” and “It is likely that I will leave the organization in the next 12 months.” This scale has a reported reliability of .95 - .97 (Mitchell, Holtom, Lee, Salynski, & Erez, 2001)

**Job Performance.** The organization was conducting performance appraisals concurrently with this study. Supervisors rated each employee across six dimensions: provides quality customer service, makes referrals for sales opportunities, maintains and
balances teller window, knows and complies with all bank and regulatory policies and procedures, exhibits professional image and proactive approach to self-development, and promotes and maintains team work within the branch and with customers. Supervisors rated each dimension on a 5-point Likert-type response scale with anchors ranging from 1=unsatisfactory performance to 5=excellent performance.

In addition, each dimension was weighted based on what the organization deemed to be most important dimension of teller performance. Specifically, the dimensions “provides quality customer service,” “makes referrals for sales opportunities,” “maintains and balance teller window,” “promotes and maintains team work within branch and with customers” were all weighted a three. The dimensions “knows and complies with all bank and regulatory policies and procedures” and “exhibits a professional image and proactive approach to self development” were weighted a two. Therefore, an average performance score across all weighted dimensions was calculated for each participant, and this single score was used to assess job performance in this study. Unfortunately, the dataset used for this study only includes the global performance score, and individual dimensions of job performance cannot be analyzed separately.

**Turnover.** Turnover was assessed using organizational records six months after the online study. Turnover will be operationalized as a dichotomous variable indicating whether or not the participant is still employed by the organization.

**Extraversion.** Two items from Gosling, Rentfrow, and Swann’s (2003) Ten-Item Personality Inventory (TIPI) was used to assess extraversion. The items asked participants to rate the extent to which they saw themselves as “extraverted, enthusiastic” and “reserved, quiet.” This scale has a reported reliability of .68 (Gosling et al., 2003).
Neuroticism. Two items from Gosling et al.’s (2003) TIPI was used to assess neuroticism ($\alpha = .73$). The items asked participants to rate the extent to which they saw themselves as “anxious, easily upset” and “calm, emotionally stable.”

Statistical Analysis Strategy

In order to investigate emotional labor process, structural equation modeling (SEM) was employed using Mplus v. 3.12 (Muthén & Muthén, 1998-2005). A path analysis was performed in order to estimate the relationships among the observed variables and test all the proposed hypotheses, including moderator hypotheses (Kline, 2005). For these analyses, maximum likelihood (ML) estimation was used. In addition, consistent with the recommendations of Aiken and West (1991), display rules perceptions to express positive emotions, display rule perceptions to suppress negative emotions, POS, and LMX were centered to reduce multicollinearity.

There are a variety of model fit indices described in the SEM literature. The most basic fit statistic is the model chi-square, which tests the null hypothesis that the model is correct. In other words, the model has perfect fit in the population. However, relying solely on the model chi-square fit statistic has several problems, including that it may be unrealistic to expect a model to have perfect population fit and that it is highly influenced by sample size (Kline, 2005). Therefore, model fit was also evaluated using absolute and incremental fit indices. Specifically, the standardized root mean square residual (SRMR) and comparative fit index (CFI) were used to assess model fit. The analysis utilized Hu and Bentler’s (1999) two-index presentation strategy, which recommend the following cutoff values when assessing model fit: SRMR of .09 or below and CFI greater than .95.
All hypotheses, except Hypotheses 2a and 2b, were evaluated by examining individual path coefficients. Hypothesis 2a proposed that display rule perceptions to express positive emotions will be more strongly related to deep acting than surface acting. In order to test this hypothesis, the path from display rule perceptions to express positive emotions to surface acting was constrained to be equal to the path from display rule perceptions to express positive emotions to deep acting. This model was then compared to the model where the paths were allowed to be freely estimated. A chi-square difference test was used to assess the change in model fit. If a significant decrease in model fit occurred when the two paths were constrained to be equal, then Hypothesis 2a will be supported. A similar analytical strategy was used to test Hypothesis 2b, which predicted that display rule perceptions to suppress negative emotions will be more strongly related to surface acting than deep acting.
## Table 1

Constructs, Sources, Measures, and Scale Authors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Construct</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Authors of Measure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Display Rule Perceptions to Express Positive Emotions</td>
<td>Subordinate</td>
<td>Positive Display Rule Perceptions Scale</td>
<td>Diefendorff et al. (2005)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Display Rule Perceptions to Suppress Negative Emotions</td>
<td>Subordinate</td>
<td>Negative Display Rule Perceptions Scale</td>
<td>Diefendorff et al. (2005)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surface Acting</td>
<td>Subordinate</td>
<td>Surface Acting Scale</td>
<td>Diefendorff et al. (2005)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deep Acting</td>
<td>Subordinate</td>
<td>Deep Acting Scale</td>
<td>Diefendorff et al. (2005)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotional Exhaustion</td>
<td>Subordinate</td>
<td>Emotional Exhaustion Scale</td>
<td>Wharton (1993)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived Organizational Support</td>
<td>Subordinate</td>
<td>Shortened Perceived Organizational Support Scale</td>
<td>Eisenberger et al. (1986)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leader-Member Exchange</td>
<td>Subordinate</td>
<td>LMX-VII</td>
<td>Scandura &amp; Graen (1984)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turnover Intentions</td>
<td>Subordinate</td>
<td>Turnover Intentions</td>
<td>Hom et al., (1984)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Performance</td>
<td>Supervisor</td>
<td>Developed Specifically for the Organization</td>
<td>Developed Specifically for the Organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turnover</td>
<td>Organizational Records</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extraversion</td>
<td>Subordinate</td>
<td>Ten-Item Personality Inventory</td>
<td>Gosling et al. (2003)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neuroticism</td>
<td>Subordinate</td>
<td>Ten-Item Personality Inventory</td>
<td>Gosling et al. (2003)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational Tenure</td>
<td>Organizational Records</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>Organizational Records</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CHAPTER IV

RESULTS

The present section summarizes the results of the current study. This section begins with a discussion of an initial exploratory factor analysis, the treatment of missing data, and presentation of descriptive statistics and correlations. Next, the hypothesized model is presented along with modifications that were made to arrive at a final well-fitting model. Hypotheses 1 through 12 are discussed in relation to this final model. Following the discussion of hypothesis testing, the results of exploratory analyses where alternative models were investigated will be discussed. Lastly, a final section will review the results of the nine teller interviews.

Exploratory Factor Analysis

Exploratory factor analysis (EFA) was used to investigate the factor structure of the variables. Specifically, based on the suggestions of Fabrigar, Wenener, MacCallum, & Strhan (1999), I used principal axis factoring with an oblique (promax) rotation. Both the Kaiser criterion (Kaiser, 1960) and scree test (Kachigan, 1991) indicated that nine factors exist. However, some authors have criticized these tests as being arbitrary and subjective (Fabrigar et al., 1999; Velicer, Eaton, & Fava, 2000). Therefore, following the recommendations of Lautenschlager (1989) and O’Connor (2000), I conducted a parallel analysis to confirm the factor structure. The results confirmed the existence of a nine-factor structure (see Table 2). As shown in Table 3, all but one item loaded on its existing
scale with a factor loading above .30 (Tabachnick & Fiddel, 2001) with no cross loadings on any other scales. One item from the display rule perceptions to suppress negative emotions scale had a factor loading of .28. However, this item was not dropped from further analyses because it did not have any strong cross loadings, and if dropped, only two items would remain to make up the display rule perceptions to suppress negative emotions scale.

Table 2
Parallel Analysis Results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Raw Data Eigenvalue</th>
<th>Mean Random Eigenvalue</th>
<th>95% Random Eigenvalue</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12.49</td>
<td>1.09</td>
<td>1.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.76</td>
<td>.98</td>
<td>1.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.29</td>
<td>.90</td>
<td>.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.92</td>
<td>.84</td>
<td>.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>.78</td>
<td>.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.44</td>
<td>.73</td>
<td>.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.01</td>
<td>.67</td>
<td>.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.86</td>
<td>.63</td>
<td>.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.70</td>
<td>.58</td>
<td>.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.44</td>
<td>.53</td>
<td>.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part of my job is to make the customer feel good</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>-.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My workplace does not expect me to express positive emotions to</td>
<td>-.14</td>
<td>-.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>customers as part of my job</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This organization would say that part of the product to customers is</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>friendly, cheerful service</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My organization expects me to try to act excited and enthusiastic in</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>my interactions with customers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am expected to suppress my bad moods or negative reactions to</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>customers.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This organization expects me to try to pretend that I am not upset</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>or distressed.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am expected to try to pretend I am not angry or feeling contempt</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>-.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>while on the job.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I put on an act in order to deal with customers in an appropriate</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>way.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I fake a good mood when interacting with customers.</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I put on a “show” or “performance” when interacting with customers.</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I just pretend to have the emotions I need to display for my job.</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I put on a “mask” in order to display the emotions I need for the</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>job.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I show feelings to customers that are different from what I feel</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>inside.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I fake the emotions I show when dealing with customers.</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I try to actually experience the emotions that I must show to</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>-.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>customers.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I make an effort to actually feel the emotions that I need to display</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>-.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>toward others.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I work hard to feel the emotions that I need to show to customers.</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I work at developing the feelings inside of me that I need to show</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>to customers.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel emotionally drained from my work.</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel used up at the end of the work day.</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>-.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I dread getting up in the morning and having to face another day on</td>
<td>-.16</td>
<td>.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the job.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel burned out from my work.</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel frustrated by my job.</td>
<td>-.18</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel I’m working too hard on my job.</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The organization strongly considers my goals and values.</td>
<td>.84</td>
<td>-.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Help is available from the organization when I have a problem.</td>
<td>.75</td>
<td>-.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The organization really cares about my well-being.</td>
<td>.88</td>
<td>.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The organization is willing to extend itself in order to help me</td>
<td>.79</td>
<td>-.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>perform my job to the best of my ability.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Even if I did the best job possible, the organization would fail to</td>
<td>.68</td>
<td>-.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>notice.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The organization cares about my general satisfaction at work.</td>
<td>.81</td>
<td>.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The organization shows very little concern for me.</td>
<td>.72</td>
<td>-.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The organization cares about my opinions.</td>
<td>.91</td>
<td>.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The organization takes pride in my accomplishments at work.</td>
<td>.73</td>
<td>-.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I usually know where I stand with my immediate supervisor.</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My immediate supervisor recognizes my potential.</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>-.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My immediate supervisor understands my problems and needs.</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>-.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My working relationship with my immediate supervisor is effective.</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I can count on my immediate supervisor to “bail me out”, even at his</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>or her own expense, when I really need it.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My immediate supervisor has enough confidence in me that s/he</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>would defend and justify my decisions if I was not present to do so.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regardless of how much power my immediate supervisor has built</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>into his/her position, my supervisor would be personally inclined to</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>use his/her power to help me solve problems in my work.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I see myself as extraverted</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>-.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I see myself as reserved</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I see myself as anxious, easily upset</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>-.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I see myself as calm, emotionally stable</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.06</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Conventional methods for handling missing data, such as pairwise deletion, listwise deletion, and mean imputation, generally produce biased estimates of parameters and/or standard errors (Allison, 2003). In addition, they assume that data are missing completely at random (MCAR) (i.e., randomly distributed across all observations) (Allison, 2003). Because of these disadvantages, the current study used a full information maximum likelihood estimation (FIML) procedure. This missing data technique assumes that “missing values on a variable $X$ are conditionally dependent on other observed variables in the data, and incorporating vectors of partially complete data in the individual-level likelihood functions implies probable values for the missing data during the parameter estimation process” (Enders, 2001). This technique is considerably less restrictive than techniques that assume data are MCAR; it assumes that the missing data are missing at random (MAR). In other words, it assumes that the pattern of missingness can depend on another observed variable but not on the value of the missing observation itself (Enders & Bandalos, 2001; Newman, 2003). Even when data do not meet this assumption, this method produces less biased estimates than conventional approaches (Schafer & Graham, 2002; Sinharay, Stern, & Russell, 2001). In addition, the FIML approach allows for the full use of all existing observations, thereby maximizing the data available, and does not require the imputation of values for individual responses (Elicker, Levy, & Hall, 2006). Due to these advantages, researchers have suggested that FIML is much preferred over conventional methods for dealing with missing data for most SEM applications (Allison, 2003; Little & Rubin, 2002; Raykov, 2007).
Descriptive Statistics and Correlations

Table 4 presents mean values, standard deviations, bi-variate correlations, and internal consistency reliabilities (on the diagonals) for the observed scale score variables. Most scales exhibited acceptable reliabilities (Nunnally, 1978). However, the display rule perceptions to express positive emotions ($\alpha = .74$) and suppress negative emotions ($\alpha = .69$) had reliabilities lower than generally desired. These low reliabilities may be due to restriction of range that results in attenuated inter-item correlations. Therefore, the internal consistency reliabilities may be the lower bounds of the scale and reduce the path coefficients found in the current study, resulting in a more conservative estimate of the relationships.

In addition, neuroticism exhibited a lower reliability ($\alpha = .57$) than typically recommended. Due to constraints imposed by the organization regarding survey length, the two items corresponding to neuroticism from the Ten-Item Personality Inventory (TIPI) were used to measure the construct. Because internal consistency reliabilities are a direct function of the number of items and their intercorrelations (Spector, 1992), the TIPI results in lower reliabilities than is typical of longer scales. Nevertheless, Gosling et al. (2003) suggested that the TIPI emphasizes content validity and shows similar patterns of external correlates as the 44-item Big-Five Instrument (BFI). Thus, it is an appropriate scale to use when brief measures are needed and personality is not the primary topic of interest (Gosling et al., 2003), as was the case in this study. Although low reliabilities may lead to problems for testing hypotheses and estimating effect sizes (John & Benet-Martinez, 2000), neuroticism is solely used as a control variable, thus the low reliability associated with this scale should not significantly affect the results.
Table 4

Means, Standard Deviations, Correlations, and Reliabilities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>11</th>
<th>12</th>
<th>13</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>PosRule</td>
<td>.74</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>NegRule</td>
<td>.34*</td>
<td>.69</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Surface</td>
<td>-.22*</td>
<td>.21*</td>
<td>.96</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Deep</td>
<td>.21*</td>
<td>.16*</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.89</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Exhaust</td>
<td>-.30*</td>
<td>.13*</td>
<td>.56*</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>.92</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>POS</td>
<td>.19*</td>
<td>-.17*</td>
<td>-.34*</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>-.64*</td>
<td>.94</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>LMX</td>
<td>.23*</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>-.20*</td>
<td>.14*</td>
<td>-.37*</td>
<td>.43*</td>
<td>.95</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>Extra</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>-.22*</td>
<td>.13*</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.74</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>Neuro</td>
<td>-.17*</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>.16*</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>.32*</td>
<td>-.26*</td>
<td>-.21*</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>.57</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>Tenure</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>-.00</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>Perf</td>
<td>.17*</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>-.18*</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>-.20*</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.19*</td>
<td>.20*</td>
<td>-.14*</td>
<td>.26*</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>TO</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>.14*</td>
<td>-.13</td>
<td>-.11</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>-.21*</td>
<td>-.43*</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>TOInt</td>
<td>-.14*</td>
<td>.13*</td>
<td>.36*</td>
<td>-.15*</td>
<td>.49*</td>
<td>-.43*</td>
<td>-.28*</td>
<td>-.12</td>
<td>.21*</td>
<td>-.14*</td>
<td>-.17*</td>
<td>.40*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mean 4.44 4.03 2.44 3.56 3.65 3.24 3.69 3.55 2.30 4.16 3.32 -- 2.10
SD  .51  .83  .97  .86  .91  .81  .90  .90  .69  5.64  .54 -- 1.14

Note. PosRule = display rule perceptions to express positive emotions; NegRule = display rule perceptions to suppress negative emotions; Surface = surface acting; Deep = deep acting; Exhaust = emotional exhaustion; POS = perceived organizational support; LMX = leader-member exchange; Extra = extraversion; Neuro = neuroticism; Perf = performance; TO = turnover; TOInt = turnover intentions. Reliabilities are on the diagonal.

*p < .05

Hypothesized Model

The hypothesized model was tested with path analysis, using maximum likelihood estimation, performed in Mplus v. 3.12 (Muthén & Muthén, 1998-2005). Tenure, extraversion, and neuroticism were included as control variables on all the endogenous
variables in the model. The paths between the control variables and endogenous variables are not included in the figures below in order to keep the figures clearer. However, Table 5 shows the relationships between the three control variables and the endogenous variables for the Modified Hypothesized Model discussed below. Furthermore, although not shown in the figures, all exogenous variables were allowed to covary. The intercorrelations among the exogenous variables for the final model (Modified Hypothesized Model, Figure 4) are shown in Table 6.

Figure 3 presents the Hypothesized Model with standardized path estimates. The hypothesized model did not fit the data well ($\chi^2 = 112.71$, df = 24, CFI = .77, SRMR = .04). Modification indices indicated that fit might be improved if a direct link between perceived organizational support (POS) and emotional exhaustion was added. Because this modification made conceptual sense (i.e., employees that perceive high levels of support from their organization should feel less emotionally exhausted) and past empirical research has shown a negative relationship between POS and emotional exhaustion (Armstrong-Stassen, 2004), it was included in a Modified Hypothesized Model (see Figure 4). This modified model fit significantly better than the original hypothesized model ($\Delta \chi^2(1) = 71.80$, p < .05). In addition, the fit indices for this model met Hu and Bentler’s (1999) two-index presentation strategy indicating a good model fit ($\chi^2 = 40.91$, df = 23, CFI = .95, SRMR = .03). Therefore, this Modified Hypothesized Model was used to test the proposed hypotheses.
Table 5

Path Coefficient ($\beta$) Between Control Variables and Endogenous Variables for Modified Hypothesized Model

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Extraversion</th>
<th>Neuroticism</th>
<th>Tenure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Surface acting</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>-.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deep Acting</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.13*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotional Exhaustion</td>
<td>-.11*</td>
<td>.11*</td>
<td>-.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Performance</td>
<td>.17*</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>.26*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turnover</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>-.20*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* $p < .05$

Table 6

Intercorrelations Among Exogenous Variables for Modified Hypothesized Model

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>.34*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>.18*</td>
<td>-.17*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>-.14*</td>
<td>-.15*</td>
<td>.19*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>-.14</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.36*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>.23*</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.43*</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.13*</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.24*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>.12*</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>.13*</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>-.17*</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>-.26*</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>-.21*</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. PosRule = display rule perceptions to express positive emotions; NegRule = display rule perceptions to suppress negative emotions; POS = perceived organizational support; POS x PosRule = interaction term of perceived organizational support and display rule perceptions to express positive emotions; POS x display rule perceptions to suppress negative emotions; LMX = leader-member exchange; LMX x surf = interaction term of leader-member exchange and surface acting; extra = extraversion, neuro = neuroticism.

* $p < .05$. 
Figure 3.

Hypothesized Model Results.

Note: * $p < .05$. In addition to the paths shown, a direct path from POS to deep acting ($\beta = .08$) and surface acting ($\beta = -.23*$), and from LMX to emotional exhaustion ($\beta = -.19*$) were included.
Figure 4.

Modified Hypothesized Model.

Note: * p < .05. In addition to the paths shown, a direct path from POS to deep acting ($\beta = .08$) and surface acting ($\beta = -.23^*$), and from LMX to emotional exhaustion ($\beta = -.04$) were included.
Hypotheses 1a, 1b, 2a and 2b. The first four hypotheses focused on the relationship between display rule perceptions and emotional labor (i.e., surface and deep acting). Hypothesis 1a and 1b proposed that display rule perceptions to express positive emotions and suppress negative emotions, respectively, would be positively related to emotional labor. Inspection of the path coefficients in Figure 4 indicates partial support for Hypothesis 1a. Specifically, as hypothesized, display rule perceptions to express positive emotions were uniquely positively related to deep acting ($\beta = .19, p < .05$). However, contrary to expectations, the relationship between display rule perceptions to express positive emotions and surface acting was negative ($\beta = -.27, p < .05$). Hypothesis 1b, which proposed that display rule perceptions to suppress negative emotions would be positively related to surface and deep acting was also partially supported. In support of Hypothesis 1b, display rule perceptions to suppress negative emotions were uniquely positively related to surface acting ($\beta = .30, p < .05$). On the other hand, contrary to Hypothesis 1b, display rule perceptions to suppress negative emotions did not have a significant effect on deep acting ($\beta = .09, p > .05$).

Hypothesis 2a proposed that display rule perceptions to express positive emotions would be more strongly related to deep acting than surface acting. As can be seen in Figure 4, the path coefficient between display rule perceptions to express positive emotions and deep acting ($\beta = .19$) was weaker in magnitude than the path coefficient to surface acting ($\beta = -.27$). Thus, Hypothesis 2a was not supported. Hypothesis 2b predicted that display rule perceptions to suppress negative emotions would be more strongly related to surface acting than deep acting. A comparison of the path coefficients provides initial support for Hypothesis 2b. In particular, the path from display rule
perceptions to suppress negative emotions to surface acting ($\beta = .30$) is higher in magnitude than the path from negative display rule perceptions to suppress negative emotions and deep acting ($\beta = .09$). In addition, equality constraints were imposed on these two paths to test the significance of the difference between these coefficients. In support of Hypothesis 2b, the model constraining these two paths to be equivalent resulted in significantly worse fit than the unconstrained model which allowed the paths to be freely estimated ($\Delta \chi^2 = 6.92, p < .05$).

**Hypotheses 3, 4a, and 4b.** Hypotheses 3 and 4 focused on the role of surface acting in linking display rule perceptions and emotional exhaustion. Hypothesis 3 proposed that surface acting would be positively related to emotional exhaustion. In support of Hypothesis 3, as shown in Figure 4, surface acting had a strong, positive effect on emotional exhaustion ($\beta = .34, p < .05$) over and above the effects of extraversion, neuroticism, tenure, display rule perceptions, POS, and LMX.

Hypothesis 4a proposed that the relationship between display rule perceptions to express positive emotions and emotional exhaustion would be mediated by surface acting. Results showed a significant indirect effect of display rule perceptions to express positive emotions on emotional exhaustion through surface acting ($ab = -.09, p < .05$). However, the indirect effect was not in the expected direction. Specifically, display rule perceptions to express positive emotions had a negative relationship with surface acting, and surface acting had a positive relationship with emotional exhaustion. In addition, perceptions to express positive emotions still had a direct effect on emotional exhaustion ($\beta = -.12, p < .05$), indicating that surface acting only partially mediated this relationship. Similarly, Hypothesis 4b predicted that the relationship between display rule perceptions
to suppress negative emotions and emotional exhaustion would also be mediated by surface acting. Consistent with expectations, a significant indirect effect of display rule perceptions to suppress negative emotions on emotional exhaustion through surface acting was found ($\alpha\beta = .10, p < .05$). Furthermore, although there was a significant bivariate relationship between display rule perceptions to suppress negative emotions and emotional exhaustion ($r = .13, p < .05$), there was no direct effect once deep acting was included as a mediator ($\beta = .03, p > .05$). The significant indirect effect and the lack of a direct effect provide evidence that surface acting fully mediates the relationship between display rule perceptions to suppress negative emotions and emotional exhaustion.

Hypotheses 5a, 5b, 5c, and 5d. Hypotheses 5a, 5b, 5c, and 5d were associated with the effect of perceived organizational support (POS) on the relationship between display rule perceptions and emotional labor. It was predicted that POS would moderate the relationship between display rule perceptions and deep acting. Specifically, it was expected that the positive relationships between display rule perceptions to express positive (Hypothesis 5a) and suppress negative emotions (Hypothesis 5b), and deep acting would be stronger for employees high in POS as compared to their low POS counterparts. Contrary to Hypothesis 5a, POS did not moderate the relationship between display rule perceptions to express positive emotions and deep acting. However, as expected, POS did moderate the relationship between display rule perceptions to suppress negative emotions and deep acting ($\beta = .17, p < .05$). Figure 5 shows the nature of this interaction. In support of Hypothesis 5b, the positive relationship between display rule perceptions to suppress negative emotions and deep acting was stronger for employees high in POS than employees low in POS.
Hypothesis 5c proposed that POS would moderate the relationship between display rule perceptions to express positive emotions and surface acting. In particular, it was expected that the positive relationship between display rule perceptions to express positive emotions and surface acting would be stronger for employees high in POS than employees low in POS. Although this interaction effect was significant ($\beta = .14$, $p < .05$), the nature of this interaction was not as hypothesized (see Figure 6). Contrary to expectations, there was a stronger negative relationship between perceptions of demands to display positive emotions and surface acting for employees low in POS than employee high in POS. Similarly, Hypothesis 5d suggested that POS would moderate the relationship between display rule perceptions to suppress negative emotions and surface acting, such that the positive relationship would be stronger for employees high in POS than their low POS counterparts. POS did moderate this interaction ($\beta = -.20$, $p < .05$); however, the interaction effect was not in the hypothesized direction (see Figure 7). Specifically, the positive relationship between perceptions of display rules to suppress negative emotions and surface acting was stronger for employee low in POS than employees high in POS.
Figure 5.

The Interactive Effect of Perceptions of Display Rules to Suppress Negative Emotions and POS on Deep Acting.

Figure 6.

The Interactive Effect of Perceptions of Display Rules to Express Positive Emotions and POS on Surface Acting.
Hypothesis 6. Hypothesis 6 focused on the effect of leader-member exchange (LMX) on the relationship between surface acting and emotional exhaustion. In particular, it was proposed that LMX would moderate the surface acting-emotional exhaustion relationship, such that the positive relationship between surface acting and emotional exhaustion would be weaker for employees high in LMX than employees low in LMX. This interaction effect was not significant. Therefore, Hypothesis 6 was not supported.

Hypotheses 7a, 7b, 8, and 9. Hypotheses 7a, 7b, 8, and 9 pertain to the relationships between surface acting, deep acting, emotional exhaustion, and job performance. It was hypothesized that surface acting would be negatively...
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7a), and deep acting would be positively (Hypothesis 7b), related to job performance. In addition, Hypothesis 8 proposed that emotional exhaustion would be negatively related to job performance. Surface acting, deep acting, and emotional exhaustion were not uniquely related to job performance. Therefore, Hypotheses 7a, 7b, and 8 were not supported. Hypothesis 9 proposed that emotional exhaustion would partially mediate the relationship between surface acting and job performance. However, because emotional exhaustion was not related to job performance (see Hypothesis 8), this mediation hypothesis was also not supported.

**Hypotheses 10, 11, 12.** Hypotheses 10, 11, and 12, focused on the relationship between surface acting, emotional exhaustion, and turnover. Hypothesis 10 and 11 proposed that surface acting and emotional exhaustion, respectively, would be positively related to turnover. Contrary to Hypotheses 10 and 11, neither surface acting nor emotional exhaustion was related to turnover over and above the control variables and job performance. It was also hypothesized that emotional exhaustion would mediate the relationship between surface acting and turnover (Hypothesis 12). However, this indirect effect was not significant, indicating that emotional exhaustion does not mediate the surface acting-turnover relationship. Table 7 presents a summary of the results pertaining to each hypothesis in this study.
Table 7

Summary of Research Hypotheses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hypothesis</th>
<th>Support</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Hypothesis 1a:</strong> Display rule perceptions to express positive emotions will be positively related to emotional labor (i.e., surface acting and deep acting).</td>
<td>Partial Support - Display rules perceptions to express positive emotions positively related to deep acting and negatively related to surface acting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Hypothesis 1b:</strong> Display rule perceptions to suppress negative emotions will be positively related to emotional labor (i.e., surface acting and deep acting).</td>
<td>Partial Support - Display rule perceptions to suppress negative emotions positively related to surface acting and not related to deep acting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Hypothesis 2a:</strong> Display rule perceptions to express positive emotions will be more strongly related to deep acting than surface acting.</td>
<td>Not Supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Hypothesis 2b:</strong> Display rule perceptions to suppress negative emotions will be more strongly related to surface acting than deep acting.</td>
<td>Full Support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Hypothesis 3:</strong> Surface acting is positively related to emotional exhaustion.</td>
<td>Full Support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Hypothesis 4a:</strong> The relationship between display rule perceptions to express positive emotions and emotional exhaustion will be mediated by surface acting.</td>
<td>Partial Supported - Mediation was supported, however not in expected direction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Hypothesis 4b:</strong> The relationship between display rule perceptions to suppress negative emotions and emotional exhaustion will be mediated by surface acting.</td>
<td>Full Support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Hypothesis 5a:</strong> POS will moderate the relationship between display rule perceptions to express positive emotions and deep acting. Specifically, the positive relationship between display rule perceptions to express positive emotions and deep acting will be stronger for employees high in POS as compared to employees low in POS.</td>
<td>Not Supported</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 7

Summary of Research Hypotheses (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hypothesis</th>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Support</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Hypothesis 5b</strong>:</td>
<td>POS will moderate the relationship between display rule perceptions to suppress negative emotions and deep acting. Specifically, the positive relationship between display rule perceptions to suppress negative emotions and deep acting will be stronger for employees high in POS compared to employees low in POS.</td>
<td>Full Support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Hypothesis 5c</strong>:</td>
<td>POS will moderate the relationship between display rule perceptions to express positive emotions and surface acting. Specifically, the positive relationship between display rule perceptions to express positive emotions and surface acting will be stronger for employees high in POS as compared to employees low in POS.</td>
<td>Moderation Supported - Not in hypothesized direction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Hypothesis 5d</strong>:</td>
<td>POS will moderate the relationship between display rule perceptions to suppress negative emotions and surface acting. Specifically, the positive relationship between display rule perceptions to suppress negative emotions and surface acting will be stronger for employees high in POS compared to employees low in POS.</td>
<td>Moderation Supported - Not in hypothesized direction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Hypothesis 6</strong>:</td>
<td>LMX will moderate the relationship between surface acting and emotional exhaustion. Specifically, the positive relationship between surface acting and emotional exhaustion will be weaker for employees high in LMX compared to employees low in LMX.</td>
<td>Not Supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Hypothesis 7a</strong>:</td>
<td>Surface acting will be negatively related to job performance.</td>
<td>Not Supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Hypothesis 7b</strong>:</td>
<td>Deep acting will be positively related to job performance.</td>
<td>Not Supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Hypothesis 8</strong>:</td>
<td>Emotional exhaustion will be negatively related to job performance.</td>
<td>Not Supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Hypothesis 9</strong>:</td>
<td>Emotional exhaustion will partially mediate the relationship between surface acting and job performance.</td>
<td>Not Supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Hypothesis 10</strong>:</td>
<td>Surface acting will be positively related to turnover.</td>
<td>Not Supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Hypothesis 11</strong>:</td>
<td>Emotional exhaustion will be positively related to turnover.</td>
<td>Not Supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Hypothesis 12</strong>:</td>
<td>Emotional exhaustion will mediate the relationship between surface acting and turnover.</td>
<td>Not Supported</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. POS = perceived organizational support, LMX = leader-member exchange.*
Alternative Models

In this section, an alternative model that includes turnover intentions is examined to provide additional insight into the emotional labor-turnover relationship. Specifically, past research suggests intention to turnover is an important direct antecedent to turnover behaviors (Allen & Griffith, 2001; Allen, Shore, & Griffeth, 2003). Accordingly, turnover intentions is included in this alternative model as a direct antecedent of turnover. In addition, previous studies also suggest that emotional exhaustion and emotion management (e.g., surface acting) both lead to turnover intentions (Cote & Morgan, 2002; Cropanzano et al., 2003; Zerbe, 2000). Therefore, this Alternative Model 1 also includes additional paths from surface acting and emotional exhaustion to turnover intentions. Figure 8 presents the exploratory, alternative model.

Alternative Model 1 did not fit the data well ($\chi^2 = 134.21$, df = 33, CFI = .80, SRMR = .05). Consistent with the hypothesized model, modification indices indicated that fit might be improved if a direct link between POS and emotional exhaustion was added. In addition, modification indices suggested the addition of a direct path between POS and turnover intentions. Because the addition of these two paths also made theoretical sense (i.e., employees high in POS should feel less emotionally exhausted and be less likely to intend to turnover), they were included in a second alternative model (Alternative Model 2). Figure 9 presents Alternative Model 2. This model met Hu and Bentler’s (1999) stringent criteria for a well fitting model ($\chi^2 = 53.85$, df = 31, CFI = .95, SRMR = .03) and resulted in a significantly better model fit than the Alternative Model 1 ($\Delta \chi^2 (2) = 80.36, p < .05$). Although extraversion, neuroticism, and tenure were included as control variables on all focal analyses, to keep the figures clearer, the pathways are not
included in Figures 8 and 9. However, Table 8 shows the relationship between the three control variables and the endogenous variables for Alternative Model 2. Furthermore, although not shown in the figures, all exogenous variables were allowed to covary. The intercorrelations among the exogenous variables for Alternative Model 2 are shown in Table 9.

As can be seen in Figure 9, the relationships between display rule perceptions to express positive emotions, display rule perceptions to suppress negative emotions, POS, LMX, surface acting, emotional exhaustion, and job performance were similar to those found in the Modified Hypothesized Model (see Figure 4). Thus, this section will focus on the relationships between surface acting, emotional exhaustion, turnover intentions, and turnover.

Similar to the Modified Hypothesized Model, surface acting and emotional exhaustion were not directly related to turnover. However, both surface acting ($\beta = .13, p < .05$) and emotional exhaustion ($\beta = .25, p < .05$) were significantly related to turnover intentions controlling for extraversion, neuroticism, tenure, and POS. In addition, emotional exhaustion partially mediated the relationship between surface acting and turnover intentions ($\alpha\beta = .08, p < .05$).
Figure 8.

**Alternative Model 1.**

Note: p < .05. In addition to the paths shown, a direct path from POS to deep acting (β = .08) and surface acting (β = -.22*), and from LMX to emotional exhaustion (β = -.19*) were included.
Figure 9.

Alternative Model 2.

Note: p < .05. In addition to the paths shown, a direct path from POS to deep acting (β = .08) and surface acting (β = -.23*), and from LMX to emotional exhaustion (β = -.04*) were included.
Table 8

Path Coefficient ($\beta$) Between Control Variables and Endogenous Variables for Alternative Model 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Extraversion</th>
<th>Neuroticism</th>
<th>Tenure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Surface acting</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>-.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deep Acting</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.13*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotional Exhaustion</td>
<td>-.11*</td>
<td>.12*</td>
<td>-.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Performance</td>
<td>.17*</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>.25*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turnover</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>-.13*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* $p < .05$

Table 9

Intercorrelations Among Exogenous Variables for Alternative Model 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. PosRule</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. NegRule</td>
<td>.34*</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. POS</td>
<td>.18*</td>
<td>-.17*</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. POS x PosRule</td>
<td>-.14*</td>
<td>-.15*</td>
<td>.19*</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. POS x NegRule</td>
<td>.14*</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.36*</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. LMX</td>
<td>.23*</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.43*</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. LMX x Surf</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.13*</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.24*</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Extra</td>
<td>.12*</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>.13*</td>
<td>.15*</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Neuro</td>
<td>-.17*</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>-.26*</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>-.21*</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Tenure</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* PosRule = display rule perceptions to express positive emotions; NegRule = display rule perceptions to suppress negative emotions; POS = perceived organizational support; POS x PosRule = interaction term of perceived organizational support and display rule perceptions to express positive emotions; POS x NegRule = interaction term perceived organizational support and display rule perceptions to suppress negative emotions; LMX = leader-member exchange; LMX x Surf = interaction term of leader-member exchange and surface acting; Extra = extraversion, Neuro = neuroticism.

* $p < .05$.
Consistent with previous research, turnover intentions was uniquely related to actual turnover behaviors ($\beta = .41, p < .05$). Furthermore, emotional exhaustion had a significant bivariate correlation with turnover ($r = .14, p < .05$). However, as indicated previously, emotional exhaustion did not have a direct effect on turnover after including turnover intentions in the full path model, suggesting that turnover intentions fully mediated the relationship between emotional exhaustion and turnover ($a\beta = .10, p < .05$). The role of turnover intentions in the surface acting-turnover relationship is equivocal. Surface acting was not significantly correlated with turnover ($r = .10, p > .05$); therefore, Baron and Kenny’s (1986) first step of testing for mediation was not met. However, path analysis results revealed that the indirect effect of surface acting on turnover through turnover intentions was significant ($a\beta = .09, p < .05$). Therefore, it appears surface acting and emotional exhaustion may both be related to turnover through turnover intentions.

*Teller Interview Results*

Transcripts of the nine teller interviews can be found in Appendix B. Major themes of these interviews are discussed below, where they are organized in terms of emotional experiences at work, emotion management at work, and consequences of emotional labor.

*Emotional experiences at work.* Overall, there seems to be a general trend of feeling and displaying positive emotions on the job. Specifically, of the nine tellers, seven reported feeling happiness on the job and one reported feeling joy. In addition, four tellers said they display happiness, cheerfulness, and smile on the job. Other emotions experienced to a lesser extent on the job were frustration and anger. In particular, five
individuals said they were experienced frustration and one reported feeling angry. When asked what emotions the organization expects them to display on the job, eight reported that they were expected to be happy and smile and one teller said they could not display anger or frustration. Therefore, it seems as if most individuals experienced, displayed, and felt they were expected to display happiness on the job.

Emotion management at work. Consistent with the idea that the organization expects tellers to display happiness, and most tellers generally felt and displayed happiness, eight tellers reported that displaying the required emotions on the job was either easy or easy on most days. However, when tellers did have to manage their emotions because of a conflict between their felt emotions and the organizationally desired emotions, they reported using a variety of strategies. Four tellers stated that they talk with either a manager or coworker, two reported stepping away from the situation, one said they try not to take the situation too seriously, and one said they do not dwell on the situation. In addition, seven tellers agreed that displaying emotions that you do not internally feel (i.e., surface acting) was acceptable. For example, the teller from interview three stated “I don’t think it is a bad thing to fake it for a while to get through your job.” In addition, in interview 7 a teller said “I don’t think it is a bad thing, but it is not necessarily the best thing to do all the time. Sometimes you just have to grin and bear it and go about your business.”

Consequences of emotional labor. Although the quantitative results discussed previously did not find a relationship between emotional labor and job performance, all nine tellers interviewed felt that the emotions they displayed on the job or felt on the job influence their performance ratings. For example, the teller from interview 5 stated “We
have to be happy and smile to the customers. It’s part of our teller performance.”

Similarly, in interview 6 the teller said “I think you manager definitely monitors what
you are doing; definitely watches how you interact with customers.” In addition, most
tellers felt that the process of managing emotions on the job left them feeling emotionally
exhausted. Specifically seven of the nine tellers reported that they felt emotionally
exhausted if spent the day managing their emotions on the job.
CHAPTER V
DISCUSSION

During the past three decades, organizational researchers have increasingly recognized the importance of emotions and the pivotal role they play in organizational behavior (Lord & Kanfer, 2002). In particular, managing emotions in the workplace has become ever more important with the expansion of the service economy (MacDonald & Siriani, 1996; Morris & Feldman, 1996; Pulgliesi, 1999). For example, in her study, Mann (1999) found that 92% of all communications involved some form of emotional expression. She also showed that emotions are likely to be faked in approximately 20% of all communications and suppressed in approximately 25% of all communications. In addition, employees’ displays of emotions have been directly linked to customers’ evaluations of customer service, customer mood, customer willingness to return to the organization, and overall satisfaction with the organization (Luong, 2005; Matilla & Enz, 2002; Pugh, 2001; Tsai, 2002).

This study contributes to the literature on emotional labor in several ways. Specifically, based on the work of Grandey (2000) and other researchers, a more comprehensive model of emotional labor was developed to simultaneously investigate the relationships between display rule perceptions, surface and deep acting, and emotional exhaustion. Previously, these relationships have been examined in a piecemeal fashion, whereas the current study assessed these relationships in a unified model. Another unique
contribution of this study was an examination of the roles of POS and LMX as moderators of the emotional labor process. In particular, the role of motivation in the emotional labor process was investigated by including POS as a moderator between display rule perceptions and surface and deep acting. LMX was included as a potential buffer from the negative effects of surface acting on emotional exhaustion. Lastly, this study was the first to examine the relationships of emotional labor with global job performance ratings and both turnover intentions and actual turnover behaviors. The following sections present a discussion of this study’s finding, implications for practice, directions for future research, and limitations of the study.

Display Rule Perceptions and Emotional Labor

Past research suggests that perceptions of display rule demands for expressing positive emotions and those for suppressing negative emotions are positively related to surface and deep acting (Bono & Vey, 2005; Brotheridge & Lee, 2002; Diefendorff & Gosserand, 2003; Rubin et al., 2005). Consistent with past research, Hypotheses 1a and 1b proposed that both types of display rule demands would be positively related to surface and deep acting. As expected in Hypothesis 1a, display rule perceptions to express positive emotions were positively related to deep acting. This finding suggests that employees who perceive that their organization has display rules requiring them to express positive emotions are likely to engage in deep acting. However, contrary to expectations, display rule perceptions to express positive emotions were negatively related to surface acting. This finding suggests that employees who perceive display rules requiring them to express positive emotions are less likely to engage in surface acting.
It is noteworthy that this study is the first to find a negative relationship between display rule perceptions to express positive emotions and surface acting. Two points are worth noting in regards to this finding. First, many of the past studies that have looked at this relationship have drawn upon mixed samples of “people workers,” such as sales, healthcare, and clerical employees across a variety of organizations (e.g., Brotheridge & Grandey, 2002; Diefendorff et al., 2005; Gosserand, 2003). In contrast, this study drew upon employees from a single occupation within a single organization. Researchers have recently become increasingly aware of the variable expectations for emotional labor that exist between occupations and organizations (Bolton, 2005). It may be the case that the discrepant negative relationship between display rule perceptions to express positive emotions and surface acting observed in this study may be due to some characteristic of the sample of bank tellers. For example, many banks provide similar services and products; therefore, the quality of the service interaction, including the emotions expressed, may be even more important in this industry. Consequently, surface acting, or faking in bad faith, may be an especially undesirable emotional labor strategy for bank tellers. This study suggests that the nature of the relationships between display rule perceptions and emotional labor strategies may vary based on organizational or occupational differences. Such differences could be the focus of future research efforts. Bolton (2005) provides some useful theoretical insights in this regard.

Second, as discussed in greater detail below, these findings may be partially influenced by the nature of the measure used to capture surface acting. The results of the qualitative interviews indicated that tellers from this organization felt that (a) the emotions they express or feel are integrated into their performance ratings, and (b) they
are closely observed by supervisors. Importantly, the surface acting measure used in this study frames surface acting in terms of negative behaviors, such as “being fake” or “pretending” to show prescribed emotions. Therefore, tellers from this organization who perceived display rules to express positive emotions may have reported engaging in less surface acting because this surface acting measure framed this strategy in a way that was likely to detract from performance ratings.

Consistent with expectations and past research (Bono & Vey, 2005; Brotheridge & Grandey, 2005; Diefendorff et al., 2005; Gosserand, 2005), Hypothesis 1b found that perceptions of display rules to suppress negative emotions were positively related to surface acting. However, perceptions of display rules to suppress negative emotions were not significantly related to deep acting. Although there was a significant bivariate correlation, the path between perceptions of display rules to suppress negative emotions and deep acting in the final path model was not significant. These results indicate that perceptions of display rules to suppress negative emotions do not explain any unique variance in deep acting after accounting for perceptions of display rules to express positive emotions and the control variables (i.e., extraversion, neuroticism, and tenure).

These findings for display rule perceptions to suppress negative emotions are similar to those found by Diefendorff et al. (2005). Specifically, they also found that negative display rules correlated positively with surface acting and were unrelated to deep acting. Although not originally hypothesized by Diefendorff et al. (2005) or by the current study, Diefendorff et al. (2005) suggested this effect may have occurred because when employees perceive display rule requirements to suppress negative emotions they
are more likely to fake the necessary emotions via surface acting, rather than actually try to experience the positive emotional state via deep acting.

To expand upon their ideas, this relationship between display rule perceptions to suppress negative emotions and deep acting is consistent with work by Carver and Scheier (1998) on avoidance goals. Display rules to suppress negative emotions are consistent with avoidance goals because they state the emotions that employees are not supposed to display. However, these display rules do not provide direction to indicate which emotions should be displayed instead. If employees are only aware of what they should not show (i.e., negative emotions), then they would not reliably engage in deep acting because they are unaware of the emotions that they should feel. In contrast, surface acting involves hiding or avoiding an undesired emotional display, which may be the most natural response to a perceived need to suppress a negative emotional display in the presence of a requirement to hide negative emotions. Given that Diefendorff et al. (2005) and Gosserand (2003) both found a similar, unexpected non-significant relationship between display rule perceptions to suppress negative emotions and deep acting, future research needs to examine this relationship in greater detail, perhaps by integrating work on approach and avoidance goals.

Consistent with the reasoning of Diefendorff et al. (2005), Hypothesis 2b predicted that the relationship between display rule perceptions to suppress negative emotions would be more strongly related to surface than deep acting. Results supported this prediction; as indicated previously, there was a significant positive relationship between display rule perceptions to suppress negative emotions and surface acting, and no relationship with deep acting.
Similarly, Hypothesis 2a predicted that display rule perceptions to express positive emotions would have a stronger positive relationship with deep acting than surface acting. Conforming to display rules to express positive emotions is more consistent with deep acting, which involves genuinely feeling the desired positive emotions via thinking positive thoughts or cognitive reappraisals, than with surface acting, which often implies hiding negative feelings (Diefendorff et al., 2005; Gosserand, 2003). However, as noted previously, rather than having a weaker positive relationship with surface acting, perceptions of display rules to express positive emotions were actually negatively related to surface acting. On the other hand, perceptions of display rules to express positive emotions were positively related to deep acting.

Together, the results of Hypotheses 2a and 2b suggest that perceptions of display rules to express positive emotions are more closely tied to deep acting and perceptions of display rules to suppress negative emotions are more consistent with surface acting. In other words, when employees perceive that the organization expects them to express positive emotions they are more likely to conform to these expectations by using deep acting strategies, such as cognitive reappraisals or attention deployment, rather than surface acting (i.e., faking the desired positive emotions). On the other hand, when employees perceive expectations to suppress their negative emotions, they are more likely to engage in surface acting rather than deep acting.

*Emotional Labor and Emotional Exhaustion*

Past research has suggested that performing emotional labor can be emotionally exhausting (Brotheridge and Grandey, 2002; Grandey, 2000; Hochschild, 1983). Specifically, Brotheridge and Grandey (2002) argued that surface acting results in
emotional dissonance. The internal tension and physiological arousal associated with emotional dissonance produces feelings of emotional exhaustion (Morris & Feldman, 1996; Morris & Feldman, 1997). Based on this past research, Hypothesis 3 predicted and found that surface acting was positively related to emotional exhaustion. This finding is consistent with the pattern of relationships discussed by Cropanzano et al. (2004) in their discussion of emotional labor and well-being. Specifically, they noted that surface acting consistently functioned as a stressor in previous research, leading to detrimental outcomes for the individual and the organization, such as alienation, reduced job involvement, and reduced role identification. Support for Hypothesis 3 fits within this broader stress-strain framework noted by previous researchers (Brotheridge & Lee, 2002; Cartwright & Cooper, 1997; Grandey, 2000; Hochschild, 1983).

Hypotheses 4a and 4b sought to further build on this finding by examining surface acting as a mediator of the relationship between display rule perceptions and emotional exhaustion. Past research has found mixed results for the relationship between display rule perceptions to express positive emotions and emotional exhaustion. For example, Brotheridge and Grandey (2002) found no relationship between these constructs, whereas Schaubroeck and Jones (2000) found an unexpected positive relationship. The relationship between display rule perceptions to suppress negative emotions and emotional exhaustion has been more consistent in past research, with most studies finding a positive relationship (e.g., Brotheridge & Grandey, 2002; Montgomery et al., 2006).

Hypotheses 4a looked at the relationships between display rule perceptions to express positive emotions, surface acting, and emotional exhaustion. Partial support was found as surface acting partially mediated the relationship between display rule
perceptions to express positive emotions and emotional exhaustion, but the relationship was not in the expected direction.

These unexpected findings fit within a broader pattern that indicates that display rule perceptions to express positive emotions are highly desirable. An examination of Table 4 indicates that employees that perceive positive display rules are less likely to surface act and more likely to deep act, less likely to feel exhausted, more likely to report high POS and LMX, are less neurotic, and are more likely to have higher performance ratings and lower turnover intentions. These findings suggest the influence of a broader personality characteristic that may be influencing display rule perceptions, and subsequently acting strategies and individual and organizational outcomes. Although little research has examined the antecedents of display rule perceptions, Diefendorff and Richard (2003) did find that personality influenced these perceptions. This issue is addressed in greater detail below as a necessary topic of future research by considering the role of regulatory focus in emotional labor research.

As proposed in Hypothesis 4b, the relationship between display rule perceptions to suppress negative emotions and emotional exhaustion was mediated by surface acting. Thus, perceiving demands to suppress negative emotions was associated with more surface acting, which in turn was linked to greater emotional exhaustion. Although several studies have looked at the bivariate relationships between display rule perceptions to suppress negative emotions and exhaustion, and between surface acting and exhaustion, the current study is the first to demonstrate a mediated relationship between these three variables.
Support for the mediated relationship in Hypothesis 4b contributes to the literature on emotional labor and exhaustion by clarifying the mechanism through which perceived display demands lead to exhaustion. Past research has suggested that perceived display rules to suppress negative emotions should be directly related to exhaustion (e.g., Brotheridge & Grandey, 2002; Montgomery et al., 2006; Schaubroeck & Jones, 2000), but the current study suggests that it is the actual emotional labor that occurs as a response to perceiving display rules that contributes to exhaustion. This finding is important because it is the first to show support for Grandey’s (2000) theoretical model, which argues that display rules affect long-term consequences through emotional labor.

Motivation to Conform to Display Rules

Recent research has started to stress that the effect of perceiving display rules on actual emotional labor is influenced by the extent to which the employee is committed to those display rules (Diefendorff & Gosserand, 2003; Gosserand & Diefendorff, 2005). For example, Gosserand and Diefendorff (2005) examined commitment to display rules, arguing that this commitment generated a motivational force that strengthened the relationship between display rule perceptions and emotional labor. Consistent with this emphasis on the role of motivation in the emotional labor process, the current study built on the norm of reciprocity (Cropanzano & Mitchell, 2005) to examine POS as a moderator of the relationships between display rule perceptions and emotional labor (Hypotheses 5a-5d). Specifically, POS was expected to strengthen each relationship as employees high in POS would be expected to be more motivated to engage in emotional labor in reciprocation when they perceive display rule demands.
Mixed support was found for these hypotheses. Hypotheses 5a and 5b examined POS as a moderator between display rule perceptions and deep acting. No support was found for Hypothesis 5a, which stated that high POS would strengthen the relationship between display rule perceptions to express positive emotions and deep acting. This may have occurred because employees that engage in deep acting in response to display rule perceptions to express positive emotions, do so regardless of their levels of POS. In other words, these employees conform to emotional display rules to express positive emotions via deep acting although they do not feel pressure to repay the organization for valuing them and caring about their well-being. Consistent with this idea, there was a positive main effect of display rule perceptions to express positive emotions on deep acting.

Full support was found for Hypothesis 5b, which indicated that employees high in POS would have a stronger relationship between display rule perceptions to suppress negative emotions and deep acting than employees low in POS. This result suggests that employees that feel their organization values their contributions and cares about their well-being will be more likely to engage in deep acting in order to conform to organizational display rules to hide their negative emotions. It is worth noting that there was no main effect of display rule perceptions to suppress negative emotions on deep acting; rather, individuals were only likely to deep act in the presence of such suppression requirements when they believed they were supported by their organization.

The role of POS as a moderator between display rule perceptions and surface acting was examined in Hypotheses 5c and 5d. Partial support was found for both hypotheses; a significant interaction effect occurred, but in both cases the relationship was not as expected. Figure 6 illustrates the relationship proposed in Hypothesis 5c.
Whereas the hypothesis expected that high POS would result in a stronger positive relationship between display rule perceptions to express positive and surface acting, the reverse actually occurred. In particular, there was a stronger negative relationship between display rule perceptions to express positive emotions and surface acting for individuals low in POS. This effect may have occurred because employees high in POS are unlikely to engage in surface acting in response to display rule demands to express positive emotions because they perceive this strategy as “acting in bad faith” (Grandey, 2002).

On the other hand, employees low in POS may be more likely to surface act when they do not feel the external pressure to display positive emotions. However, when they feel external pressure to display positive emotions because of display rules to express positive emotions, they are less likely to fake the required positive emotions (i.e., surface act). As mentioned previously, this effect may have occurred because tellers believe that the quality of their emotional displays are related to their performance ratings, and “faking” the necessary emotions, as stated in the surface acting scale, may be perceived negatively. Therefore, these employees may be less likely to report engaging in surface acting when they perceive high levels of display rules to express positive emotions.

A similar effect was found for the role of POS on the relationship between display rule perceptions to suppress negative emotions and surface acting (Hypothesis 5d). As shown in Figure 7, the positive relationship between display rule perceptions to suppress negative emotions and surface acting was weaker for those with high POS. This unexpected finding could have occurred for several reasons. First, as noted previously, surface acting has been characterized as “acting in bad faith” (Grandey, 2000). If
employees perceive surface acting to be a less-favored means of conforming to display rules, the norm of reciprocity would suggest that employees with high POS would be less likely to engage in surface acting when confronted with display rule perceptions to suppress negative emotions.

Another potential cause for these unexpected findings involves the nature of the surface acting scale. Although employees may not explicitly consider surface acting to be undesirable, the language of the Diefendorff et al. (2005) scale, as well as all other current surface acting scales, presents this strategy in an unfavorable light. For example, as shown in Appendix A, most of the items refer to being “fake” or “pretending” or “putting on an act,” which might encourage employees high in POS to indicate lower levels of utilizing this strategy when they perceive display rule demands as compared to their low POS counterparts. Thus, future research may develop a new surface acting scale that does not use language with negative connotations that may encourage respondents to feel more comfortable reporting the use of this strategy.

Furthermore, another potential reason for this unexpected finding may be because employees high in POS feel valued and cared for by their organization, thus they may not feel as many negative emotions as employees low in POS. Therefore, when confronted with display rules to suppress negative emotions, they may not have to engage in as much surface acting in order to conform to these expectations. In other words, high POS employees may be able to meet these display rule expectations by using other strategies, such as displaying their naturally felt emotions or deep acting.

Overall, the results of Hypothesis 5c and 5d seem to indicate that employees high in POS engage in less surface acting, regardless of display rule perceptions. Employees
that are low in POS and that perceive display rules to express positive emotions are less likely to surface act. Conversely, employees that are low in POS and that perceive display rules to suppress negative emotions are more likely to surface act. Thus, it appears as if display rule perceptions only have strong effects on surface acting for individuals low in POS.

Although mixed results were found for Hypotheses 5a-5d, this study did extend Gosserand and Diefendorff’s (2005) work on the role of motivation in emotional labor. Further, no published studies to date have examined POS in the context of emotional labor, which is a relevant construct due to its emphasis on reciprocating with the organization and conforming to its rules.

The Buffering Role of LMX

Hypothesis 6 introduced LMX, another moderator of the emotional labor process. Specifically, it was expected that the positive relationship between surface acting and emotional exhaustion would be weaker for employees high in LMX compared to employees low in LMX. This moderation was proposed based on research indicating that social resources are important for protecting employees from exhaustion (e.g., Holman et al., 2002; Morris & Feldman, 1996) and that leaders in particular can help employees effectively manage their emotions (Levinson, 1980; Mumford et al., 2000; Pirola-Merlo et al., 2002).

However, no support was found for this hypothesis, despite a clear theoretical basis for expecting a significant moderation effect. Interestingly, the importance of leadership was mentioned in several qualitative interviews with tellers, as shown in Appendix B. For example, the teller from Interview 2 stated, “…I feel comfortable
talking to my manager so they can give me advice on how to make it a better day or forget about it. Having a manager that has an open door policy is really great.” In addition, when asked if she felt exhausted due to managing emotions, the teller from Interview 3 replied, “definitely, sometimes I feel like I am a bartender…when the day is over, you can talk about it with a manager…” Lastly, the teller from Interview 8 spoke directly to the role of leaders in relieving exhaustion when she noted that:

“I think it would be good that managers take someone into their office and say, ‘I’ve seen you are having a bad day, is there something wrong?’ Talking about it always helps because it releases that tension that you have. This branch is very busy, so it’s not like we can have counseling sessions, but it would be good sometimes to release it.”

Thus, although Hypothesis 6 was unsupported, leadership behaviors seem potentially important in helping employees manage emotional labor, and this is the first study to examine the role of LMX in the emotional labor process. The interview statements suggest that leaders who help buffer employees against exhaustion are those who are accessible, supportive, and considerate. These characteristics suggest that other leader-related constructs, such as the extent to which the supervisor establishes a supportive feedback environment (Steelman, Levy, & Snell, 2004), may serve as moderators of the relationship between surface acting and emotional exhaustion. This is an important avenue for future research because of the strong, positive relationship observed between surface acting and emotional exhaustion, especially considering research that indicates that some employees are predisposed to surface act due to their
personality or work situations (Diefendorff et al., 2005; Kruml & Geddes, 2001; Morris & Feldman, 1996).

However, it may also be possible that supervisors cannot buffer employees from some of the negative effects associated with emotional regulation. Although not published at the time this study was conducted, Bono, Foldes, Vinson, and Muros (in press) showed that the association between emotional regulation and stress is strong and lasts for more than two hours. In addition, they found that supervisor support, in the form of transformational leadership (Bass & Avolio, 1993), was not able to protect employees from the emotional regulation-stress relationship. They argued that this buffering effect may not occur because managers are unable to protect employees from the stress of emotion regulation because it has a physiological basis. They suggested rather than buffering employees from the negative effects after it has occurred, supervisors may be able to reduce the need for emotional regulation itself. This suggestion is consistent with points raised in the leadership literature, such as those presented by Pirola-Merlo et al., (2002), who noted that transformational leaders can proactively minimize the impact of negative events and manage the emotional effects of obstacles on their teams. Thus, future research should investigate whether having high LMX or transformational leadership results in less need for employees to regulate their emotions.

*Emotional Labor and Job Performance*

Past research that has examined the influence of emotional labor on performance have traditionally examined narrow criteria, such as ratings of emotional displays, customer service ratings, evaluations of the service transaction, and affective delivery (Diefendorff & Richard, 2003; Gosserand & Diefendorff, 2005; Luong, 2005; Mattila &
Enz, 2002; Pugh, 2001). In contrast, emotional labor was expected to relate to global job performance in the current study because emotional labor consumes resources that are subsequently unavailable for other job tasks (Rubin et al., 2005; Schmeichel & Baumeister, 2004).

Hypotheses 7a stated that surface acting would be negatively related to performance, and Hypothesis 7b stated that deep acting would be positively related to performance. Neither hypothesis was supported. Hypothesis 8 proposed that emotional exhaustion would relate negatively to job performance, but it was not supported either. Hypothesis 9, which posed a mediated relationship of surface acting to exhaustion to performance, could therefore not be tested because the constituent relationships were not supported.

This disappointing pattern of results around job performance could have occurred for several reasons. One likely explanation could be low variability in performance ratings. As shown in Table 2, the mean of job performance ratings was 3.32 with a standard deviation of only 0.54. In addition, the lowest rating received by any participant was 2.25, and 50% of the sample had performance ratings between 2.89 and 3.65 on a five-point scale. This pattern of ratings is consistent with central tendency error (Hoyt, 2000), which occurs when supervisors tend to use only the midpoint of the scale when rating employees. Central tendency error results in range restriction and difficulty discriminating between effective and ineffective employees. Thus, the lack of variability in performance ratings may have made it difficult to find relationships between the emotional labor variables and job performance.
Related to the non-significant relationships between surface and deep acting and job performance, another potential issue may have been the broadness of the criteria bandwidth. Past research has distinguished between variables with a broad bandwidth, such as global measures of job performance (Ashton, Jackson, Paunonen, Helmes, & Rothstein, 1995) and those with a narrow bandwidth that measure precise constructs, such as deep or surface acting. Research indicates that attempting to predict broad bandwidth outcomes, such as performance, is difficult with narrow bandwidth predictors (Ones & Viswesvaran, 1996) because the criterion is composed of many aspects. Surface and deep acting may have been related to a component of the global performance measure used in this study, but this relationship may have been obscured by the other dimensions captured in this measure. In other words, if the current study was able to differentiate between the different dimensions of job performance, surface and deep acting may have been related to narrower, specific aspects of job performance. For example, surface and deep acting may be related to the “provides quality customer service” dimension which involved behaviors such as greets customers with eye contact and smile, uses positive non-verbals, and provides friendly customer service. However, it was not possible to access data at this level of analysis.

Lastly, a potential explanation for the lack of relationship between emotional exhaustion and job performance may be due to subgroups that may exist within the respondent sample. Some employees could have experienced decreased performance because their job demands emotionally exhausted them to such an extent that they were unable to adequately perform other duties. On the other hand, some employees may have felt emotionally exhausted as a consequence of adequately meeting their job duties. Thus,
both groups may be equally exhausted, but the first would receive lower performance ratings, and the second would receive higher performance ratings, thereby canceling out the effect of emotional exhaustion on job performance. Based on conservation of resources theory, Wright and Cropanzano (1998) suggested that emotional exhaustion results in decreased job performance. However, they also acknowledged that decreased job performance could also lead to emotional exhaustion, such that an employee who receives continual negative feedback regarding his performance may be more likely to feel emotionally exhausted than an employee who receives positive feedback (Wright & Cropanzano, 1998). Thus, it may be likely that exhaustion and performance influence each other via a feedback loop, such that increased performance increases exhaustion, which then may lower subsequent performance. However, because it is difficult to infer causality from cross-sectional data (i.e., emotional exhaustion and job performance ratings were collected at the same time) (Bobko & Stone-Romero, 1998), future research is needed to further address this issue.

*Emotional Labor and Turnover*

Hypotheses 10-12 examined actual turnover as an outcome of surface acting and emotional exhaustion. No support was found for Hypotheses 10 or 11, which stated that surface acting and emotional exhaustion would be positively related to turnover behavior, respectively. Therefore, Hypothesis 12, which proposed that emotional exhaustion would mediate the relationship between surface acting and turnover, could not be tested.

In the interest of further exploring these relationships, an alternative model, shown in Figure 9, was developed. This model includes turnover intentions as an antecedent of turnover behavior. Paths were modeled from surface acting and emotional
exhaustion to turnover intentions, and from turnover intentions to turnover behavior. The results of this model were far more encouraging. Surface acting and emotional exhaustion were both positively related to turnover intent. Emotional exhaustion partially mediated the relationship between surface acting and turnover intentions. Most importantly, turnover intent fully mediated the relationships between emotional exhaustion and turnover, and there was some initial evidence that it also mediated the relationship between surface acting and turnover.

Thus, these findings suggest that emotional labor (i.e., surface acting) may be related to actual turnover, but that this relationship is mediated by turnover intent. These results are consistent with Mobley, Griffeth, Hand, and Mehlino’s (1979) model of the employee turnover process which suggests that the immediate precursor of turnover behaviors are turnover intentions. Similarly, in their expansion of Hom and Griffeth’s (1991) turnover model, Hom and Kincki (2001) showed that withdrawal cognitions, such as turnover intentions, were a direct antecedent of turnover behaviors.

The findings of the current study are important because they represent the first empirical test of the relationship between emotional labor and actual turnover behavior. The results are especially compelling because turnover intentions was a self-report variable, whereas actual turnover data were collected from organizational records six months later. Moreover, the nature of the data prohibited the separation of voluntary and involuntary instances of turnover. Given that emotional exhaustion and turnover intentions may be more strongly related to voluntary turnover than involuntary turnover, this finding suggests that an even stronger relationship may be evident if turnover data could be categorized in this fashion.
Implications

The results of the current study have several implications for organizations, including motivating employees to meet organizational display rules, reducing turnover, and incorporating emotional labor into the formal performance appraisal process.

Motivation to Conform to Display Rule. These findings have a number of important implications for theory and practice. First, results of the present study extend on the work of Gosserand and Diefendorff (2005) and highlight the important role of motivation in emotional labor. Organizations cannot assume that employees will conform to display rules just because they perceive that they exist. Employees that perceive their organization cares about them and values their contributions are more likely to engage in deep acting in order to conform with display rule perceptions. In addition, employees may be less likely to conform to display rules using undesirable strategies (i.e., surface acting) when they feel valued by the organization. Thus, if organizations want their employees to use deep acting strategies to express authentic, desired emotions, rather than surface acting strategies that result in inauthentic, fake displays, they should attempt to build high levels of POS in their employees. Research indicates that POS can be facilitated by allowing participation in decision-making, providing growth opportunities, making sure reward allocations are fair (Allen, Shore, & Griffeth, 2003), and reducing perceptions of organizational politics (Hochwarter, Kacmar, Perrewe, & Johnson, 2002).

Reducing Turnover. As noted previously, this study is the first to tie emotional labor to turnover behaviors. Turnover costs range from 93%-200% of a departing employee’s annual salary (Griffith & Hom, 2001), which is an especially relevant figure given the high turnover rates in customer service industries. The results of this study
therefore imply that organizations can reduce losses by discouraging surface acting, which would in turn lower emotional exhaustion and turnover intentions, as well as actual turnover behaviors.

Importantly, these results also suggest that targeted interventions may be possible to reduce turnover. The a priori model indicated that surface acting and emotional exhaustion did not directly influence turnover behavior; significant relationships were only obtained with turnover intentions as a mediator. This finding implies that surface acting gradually wears down employees, resulting in a longer period of thinking about turnover before ultimately quitting (Hom & Kinicki, 2001). This mode of turnover stands in sharp contrast to immediate turnover decisions without turnover cognitions, such as those proposed in some of the pathways of Lee, Mitchell, Wise, and Fireman’s (1996) unfolding model of turnover. Organizations therefore may have time to react to the mounting consequences of surface acting and emotional exhaustion before employees choose to quit.

One preemptive strategy for organizations may be to consider emotional labor tendencies during selection and recruitment processes. Diefendorff et al. (2005) found that extraversion, neuroticism, conscientiousness, agreeableness, and self-monitoring all influenced employees’ tendencies to utilize surface acting. Because these ingrained traits can make it difficult for employees to adapt new emotional regulation strategies, Diefendorff et al. (2005) suggested that selecting employees on the basis of these characteristics may be more effective than trying to subsequently redesign jobs to accommodate them.
One of the more cost-effective methods for discouraging applicants prone to surface act might be to provide realistic job previews (RJPs). RJPs operate on the self-selection hypothesis (Bretz & Judge, 1998; Rynes, Bretz, & Gerhart, 1991), which states that applicants seek the best fit between their characteristics and the known conditions of potential jobs. Previous research has shown that RJPs are effective for reducing turnover (Hom, Griffeth, Palich, & Bracker, 1998), which suggests that including information about emotional labor demands in RJPs could discourage those employees who are likely to have difficulty with displaying the appropriate emotions with effective strategies.

Several organizational interventions could also be utilized to train current employees to perform emotional labor in less exhausting ways. Some researchers have noted that organizational display rules are typically unwritten and implicit (e.g., Diefendorff & Richard, 2003), which suggests that they may be open to interpretation. Thus, one simple intervention may be to make organizational display rules to express positive emotions more explicit, and to provide specific means that employees can conform to those rules through deep acting. As noted previously, perceiving demands to express positive emotions was tied to a number of beneficial outcomes in this study. Therefore, organizations may want to encourage this perception instead of display rule perceptions to suppress negative emotions, which were tied to multiple, undesirable outcomes, such as greater exhaustion, lower POS, and higher turnover intent. Employees could be encouraged to perceive display rules to express positive emotions by introducing emotional labor information into new employee training, formal socialization, or role modeling processes (Diefendorff et al., 2006; Diefendorff & Richard, 2003; Grandey et al., 2005; Rafaeli & Sutton, 1989; Wilk & Moynihan, 2005).
Emotional labor training could also target specific strategies, such as those identified by Parkinson and Totterdell (Parkinson & Totterdell, 1999; Totterdell & Parkinson, 1999). Their studies have examined the ways that employees in service occupations regulate their moods during interactions. They designate two broad classes of strategies, namely engagement strategies that direct attention or effort towards current mood and challenges, such as reappraisal or social support; and diversion strategies that direct attention or effort away from the current situation, such as avoidance. They found that participants instructed to use engagement strategies reported more positive moods and a better ability to withstand emotional demands, which suggests that instructing employees to use specific emotional labor strategies may have some promise.

Consistent with this idea, some of the responses from the qualitative interviews with tellers suggest some specific techniques consistent with deep acting that may be used to help manage emotions. For example, when asked about certain strategies used to control or manage emotions, the teller from Interview 2 replied, “Just try to forget about the bad stuff. Try to get it in and out, don’t harp on it or think about it too much. Because if you do, then it is going to start to show.” This technique constitutes attention redeployment, which is a form of antecedent-focused emotional regulation, or deep acting (Grandey, 2000; Gross, 1998). Another example, from the teller in Interview 4, was to “…just laugh it off and walk away. Maybe go walk it off, get a pop or something, and just come back.” This technique is a form of situation selection, which is another component of antecedent-focused emotional regulation (Gross, 1998). Tellers can also use techniques like cognitive change, such as the example given by the teller in Interview 6: “I just always try to put myself in their [the customer’s] shoes. If this happened to me,
I might be upset as well.” Thus, employees may be able to help develop or recommend a number of effective techniques for managing emotional labor demands that are consistent with deep acting. Based on this discussion, it seems as if a new measure of deep acting that specifically assesses these specific strategies is needed. This will be discussed in further detail in the future research section below.

*Performance Criteria.* A final implication of this study involves the relationship between emotional labor and job performance. Recent research has identified that both employees and supervisors perceive conforming with emotional display rules to be an in-role aspect of task performance (Diefendorff et al., 2006). Consistent with this finding, tellers from the qualitative interviews repeatedly emphasized that they felt that emotional labor was an important part of their performance. When asked if they thought that the emotions they displayed or felt on the job influenced their performance scores, almost all of the interviewees said yes. The teller from Interview 2 replied, “Oh yeah. Because if you show your bad emotions or that you are stressed, the customers are going to see it and then you are going to lose points and it will affect your performance score.” Similarly, the teller from Interview 5 noted, “We have to be happy and smile to the customers. It’s part of our teller performance. That is how they taught us.” The teller from Interview 6 contributed that, “…I think your manager definitely monitors what you are doing; definitely watches how you interact with customers.”

Despite this recent research and these anecdotal examples, the current study did not find a relationship between emotional labor and job performance. This discrepant finding may suggest that emotional labor does not receive enough formal attention from organizations, especially in the context of performance appraisal systems. As Diefendorff
et al. (2006) suggested, including emotional display behaviors in performance appraisals ensures that employees would receive feedback regarding their performance on those behaviors. Moreover, formally acknowledging and rewarding appropriate displays could increase commitment to emotional display rules, which would further improve conformity to perceived display rules (Gosserand & Diefendorff, 2005).

**Future Research Directions**

The results of this study suggest a number of interesting future research directions. An important question that has largely been neglected in the literature concerns the antecedents of display rule perceptions (Diefendorff & Richard, 2003). As noted previously, the current study found that display rule perceptions to express positive emotions were associated with entirely positive personal and organizational outcomes. This finding suggests the effect of an underlying individual difference that may be influencing both these perceptions and the subsequent outcomes. Diefendorff and Richard (2003) found that extraversion was positively related to display rule perceptions to express positive, but this remains the only study to examine intra-individual antecedents of display rule perceptions. Future research may want to examine the role of other individual differences, such as regulatory focus (Higgins, 1987), on display rule perceptions. For example, individuals with a promotion orientation focus on achievement and approach-related cognitions, may be more prone to perceive display rules to express positive emotions. In contrast, individuals with a prevention orientation focus on avoidance-related cognitions, may be more prone to perceive display rules to suppress negative emotions (Brockner & Higgins, 2001).
As discussed previously, the item wording of some of the scales used in this study may have distorted the results. Specifically, the Diefendorff et al. (2005) surface acting scale uses language with negative connotations, such as “faking,” that may discourage respondents from indicating that they use this strategy. Consistent with the recommendations of Spector (1992), a new scale is needed that can assess the construct without evoking defensiveness or suggesting socially desirable responses from the respondent. Therefore, it may be necessary for future research to develop a new surface acting scale that is able to tap suppressing one’s felt emotions and faking the desired emotions, without inducing the negative associations that may occur with using the word “faking.” In the existing scale, item #6 seems to capture this idea (“I show feelings to customers that are different from what I feel inside”).

Similarly, future research may also want to develop a new deep acting scale. The Diefendorff et al. (2005) deep acting scale used in this study generally assesses the effort that individuals use to feel the desired emotions. For example, a sample items reads, “I work hard to feel the emotions that I need to show to customers.” However, as noted previously, deep acting involves the use of a variety of different strategies, such as attention deployment and cognitive reappraisal, which are not assessed with the current measure. Therefore, a new measure should tap the different strategies that individuals actually use when engaging in deep acting. For example, a sample item for cognitive reappraisal could be “When I am upset with someone, I think about the situation from his/her perspective.”

Future research may also want to further investigate the moderating role of POS on the relationship between display rule perceptions, and surface and deep acting.
Although mixed results were found in the current study, POS seems to play an important role in employees’ motivation to conform to emotional display rules. One potential area of investigation may involve developing a new surface acting scale that does not involve the negative connotations associated with the current scales (as suggested above) and examining if the relationships found in the current study change. For example, if surface acting could be measured in a more positive light, the relationships hypothesized in the current study may be found. Specifically, employees high in POS may have a stronger relationship between display rule perceptions and surface acting than employees low in POS. In addition, future research may want to investigate other variables, such as affective commitment, that may motivate employees to conform to emotional display rules.

Another interesting direction for future research in organizations such as this one involves the potential for multi-level analyses. Because display rules are oftentimes implicit (Diefendorff & Richard, 2003), different units of the organization may develop shared perceptions of the display rules that are unique to their group. These perceptions may be driven by such factors as local leaders and norms, job demands, and team interactions. If display rule perceptions are influenced by group-level variables, then different units of the organization may engage in different emotional labor strategies. For example, a branch that has a strong, shared perception of display rules to suppress negative emotions may have employees that engage in surface acting to a much greater extent than a branch with a shared perception of display rules to express positive emotions. Consequently, if emotional labor is related to turnover as the current study
suggested, these group-level effects could result in differential turnover rates between branches or units.

The influence of leaders on emotional labor processes remains a pertinent question despite the current study’s attempt to examine LMX as a moderator of the relationship between surface acting and exhaustion. Based on the qualitative interview comments presented above, it seems that respondents do feel that leaders play a role in helping them manage their emotions. However, the LMX construct may not capture the characteristics of a leader who is best able to buffer employees against affective events (Pirola-Merlo et al., 2002). As noted previously, a supervisor who sets a supportive feedback environment (Steelman et al., 2004) may also help buffer against exhaustion by being accessible and providing feedback about emotional labor strategies. In addition, future research may also want to investigate whether supportive leaders can reduce the need for emotional labor in general (Bono et al., in press). In particular, employees that feel supported by their supervisors (e.g., high LMX, high transformational leadership) may have less need to regulate their emotions because they naturally feel emotions that are consistent with those desired by the organization. Future research should examine these and other leadership-related constructs in the context of emotional labor.

A last potential area for future research involves the study of emotions at a more detailed level of analysis. The current study conceptualized display rules in terms of perceptions of display rules to express positive emotions and perceptions of display rules to suppress negative emotions. However, these findings could be enhanced by drawing on an emerging body of research that examines discrete emotions, like happiness or anger, rather than generalized positive or negative emotions (e.g., Matsumoto, Yoo, Hirayama,
& Petrova, 2005; Tiedens, 2001). For example, several responses given by participants in the interviews referenced discrete emotions that they experienced or had to manage. For example, the teller from Interview 2 reported feeling happy, upset, and angry when asked about emotions experienced on the job. Diefendorff and Greguras (2006) pointed out that not all positive emotions are desirable and not all negative emotions are undesirable. For example, extreme enthusiasm may be inappropriate in some contexts, and showing shame can smooth over a transaction with an angry customer (Cote, 2005). Future research should examine perceived display rules about specific discrete emotions, and subsequently how these display rules influence acting strategies and outcomes for the self and the organization.

Limitations

Despite its strengths and many significant findings, this study does have several limitations. First, the sample did not possess much demographic variability. Specifically, the sample was 95% female and 92.7% Caucasian, which limits the extent to which the findings can be generalized to other contexts. Additional research is needed to replicate these findings on a more diverse sample, including more men and ethnic minorities. This is particularly important given research indicating cross-cultural differences in emotional regulation strategies (e.g., Matsumoto et al., 2005).

Second, 36 out of 263 survey respondents chose not to provide their names on the survey. Therefore, performance and turnover information were not available from these individuals. It may be possible that these individuals differ from the respondents that provided their names on the surveys. For example, they may have not included their names because they do not trust the organization to the same extent as those that felt
comfortable identifying themselves on the survey. Although ANOVA results revealed these two groups differed on perceptions of display rules to express positive emotions, LMX, POS, and emotional exhaustion, the effect sizes were small ($\eta^2 = .023 - .032$). However, future research may want to replicate this study with a new field sample.

A third limitation concerns the performance criterion used by this study. First, as previously noted, low variability was observed in responses. This lack of variance makes it difficult to detect effects and to draw conclusions about the relationship between emotional labor and job performance. Moreover, the performance criterion was a global measure. The performance appraisal system in place at the organization does measure several specific facets of performance. However, these were aggregated together in organizational records, which made it impossible to assess the influence of emotional labor on more precise aspects of performance. Consistent with research that recommends matching narrow bandwidth predictors and criteria (Ashton et al., 1995), more interesting findings regarding performance could have been found if the performance could be disaggregated.

Although the findings regarding turnover were compelling, an important limitation of this study was that voluntary and involuntary turnover could not be separated. Research indicates that voluntary and involuntary turnover have different antecedents and consequences for the organization (Abelson, 1987; Hollenbeck & Williams, 1986; Shaw, Delery, Jenkins, & Gupta, 1998). The effects of emotional labor and emotional exhaustion on each type of turnover need to be further examined.

A limitation of the current study, as well as the emotional labor literature in general, is that actual emotions are not included in the study. As Cropanzano et al. (2004)
noted, a limitation of much of the emotional labor literature is that the confounding effect of emotion is not controlled for when assessing the effects of emotional labor or outcomes. Thus, it is difficult to determine whether the observed effects are consequences of emotional labor or actual felt emotions.

An additional limitation of the current study and most emotional labor research is the use of a between-subjects design (for an exception, see Bono et al, in press). The emotions that employees experience and the strategies they use to regulate these emotions may change on a day-to-day or momentary basis. Therefore, future research should use an experience sampling methodology to focus on within-person covariations in emotions and emotional labor strategies.

A final limitation concerns the reliability of some of the scales. Due to demands concerning survey length, a two-item scale was used to measure neuroticism. The ultimate reliability of this scale was $\alpha = .57$, which falls below the cutoff recommended by Nunnally (1978). However, this variable was used only as a control on other analyses, and its low reliability was unlikely to have had a disruptive effect on the results. In addition, the display rule perceptions scales also had lower internal consistency reliabilities that typically desired. However, as mentioned previously, this may have been due to range restriction of these two scales. Therefore, the coefficient alphas found in the current study may be the lower bounds of the scale. Correspondingly, the path coefficients found in the current study may be conservative estimates of the true relationships. Nevertheless, future researchers may want to replicate these findings with a more reliable measure of neuroticism and display rule perceptions.
Conclusion

The objective of this study was to test and extend Grandey’s (2000) model of emotional labor by examining a unified model of emotional labor that included display rule perceptions, emotional labor strategies, emotional exhaustion, and organizational outcomes, like performance and turnover. These findings contribute to the literature by combining the results of many piecemeal studies into a larger model tested within an SEM framework. In addition, this study expanded upon past research by including two moderators that have not been considered in the emotional labor literature. Perceived organizational support was found to moderate several relationships between display rule perceptions and acting strategies, and contributes to the growing literature on conformity to display rules. Leader-member exchange was examined as a potential buffer between surface acting and emotional exhaustion; although this hypothesis was not supported, at the time it was conducted, this study was the first to theorize why leadership should be important in emotional labor contexts. Moreover, this study is the first to have tied emotional labor to an objective measure of actual turnover behaviors, demonstrating an important consequence of surface acting. Overall, one of the most interesting findings was the extended pathway from display rule perceptions to suppress negative emotions to turnover behaviors. Specifically, display rule perceptions to suppress negative emotions led to increases in surface acting, which then resulted in increased levels of emotional exhaustion. Furthermore, emotional exhaustion led to increased turnover intentions, which caused actual turnover behavior six months later. These findings suggest that employees who perceive that their organization expects them to suppress their negative emotions will experience negative ripple effects that eventually lead to turnover. In
summary, the current study extends our knowledge of emotional labor by reaffirming and clarifying past research, examining new moderators and outcomes of the emotional labor process, and suggesting further directions for future research.
CHAPTER VI

SUMMARY

Emotional labor is the regulation of feelings and expressions at work (Grandey, 2000). Hochcshild (1983) was one of the first to introduce this idea and portray the important role that emotional labor plays in everyday work life. Research on emotional labor has increased in popularity (Bono & Vey, 2005); however, it is still a relatively new area with room for several extensions.

Accordingly, based on the work of Grandey (2000) and other researchers, a model of emotional labor (see Figure 2) was developed to further investigate the antecedents and outcomes of emotional labor. Specifically, the current study focused on the effects of display rule perceptions to express positive emotions and suppress negative emotions on emotional labor (i.e., surface and deep acting). This study also examined the relationship between emotional labor and job performance and turnover. Furthermore, this study investigated a motivational (i.e., POS) and social (i.e., LMX) component that may affect the emotional labor process.

An archival dataset consisting of observations from 263 bank tellers was used to test this model. The dataset contained self-report information on display rule perceptions, surface and deep acting, emotional exhaustion, POS, and LMX. The dataset also included supervisor reports of job performance and organizational records of turnover collected six
months after the initial survey data was collected. Furthermore, qualitative interviews were conducted with nine tellers to further explore the emotional labor requirements and strategies, as well as the outcomes associated with emotional labor.

Results partially supported the hypothesized model. In particular, display rule perceptions to express positive emotions were positively related to deep acting and negatively related to surface acting. On the other hand, display rule perceptions to suppress negative emotions were positively related to surface acting and not related to deep acting. Consistent with the suggestions of Diefendorff et al. (2005) and Gosserand (2003), these results suggest that display rule perceptions to express positive emotions are more closely tied to deep acting, and display rule perceptions to suppress negative emotions are more consistent with surface acting.

Surface acting was also found to be positively related to emotional exhaustion. However, unexpectedly, LMX did not moderate this relationship. As suggested by past research (Levinson, 1980; Mumford et al., 2000; Pirola-Merlo et al., 2002) and the qualitative interviews in the current study, leadership behaviors may be important in helping employees deal with their emotions and reduce emotional exhaustion. Although the current study did not find that LMX reduced the emotional exhaustion associated with surface acting, future research may want to investigate other leader-related constructs that may buffer employees from the negative effects associated with surface acting.

Limited support was also found for the moderating role of POS on the relationship between display rule perceptions and surface and deep acting. These results suggest that the mere presence of display rules do not necessarily lead to employee compliance with these rules. Because they feel valued and cared for by their organization,
employees high in POS may be more likely to engage in effective strategies (i.e., deep acting) in order to conform to organizational display rules. Organizations that want to increase compliance to organizational display rules need to take into account how they treat their employees and consider ways to increase POS.

Lastly, emotional labor was tied to turnover behaviors. Specifically, surface acting led to increases in turnover intentions, which then led to actual turnover behaviors six months later. This finding is especially important because it was the first to empirically tie emotional labor to actual turnover behaviors. Performing emotional labor (i.e., surface acting) can lead to long-term detrimental effects for the organization. Therefore, organizations may want to design interventions in order to teach employees to conform to organizational display rules using other strategies, such as deep acting.

In summary, this study tested and extended Grandey’s (2000) model of emotional labor by examining a unified model of emotional labor that included display rule perceptions, emotional labor strategies, emotional exhaustion, and organizational outcomes, like performance and turnover. In addition, this study expanded upon past research by including two moderators that have not been considered in the emotional labor literature. The results show the important role POS plays in the emotional labor process, and contributes to the limited literature on motivation to conform to display rules. LMX was examined as a potential buffer between surface acting and emotional exhaustion. Although this effect was not supported, at the time this study was conducted, it was the first to integrate leadership and emotional labor research. Overall, the results of this study serve to increase our understanding of the antecedents and consequences of emotional labor, as well as potential moderators of the emotional labor process.
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APPENDICES
APPENDIX A

MEASURES

Positive Display Rule Perceptions (Diefendorff et al., 2005)
1. Part of my job is to make the customer feel good.
2. My workplace does not expect me to express positive emotions to customers as part of my job.
3. This organization would say that part of the product to customers is friendly, cheerful service.
4. My organization expects me to try to act excited and enthusiastic in my interactions with customers.

Negative Display Rule Perceptions (Diefendorff et al., 2005)
1. I am expected to suppress my bad moods or negative reactions to customers.
2. This organization expects me to try to pretend that I am not upset or distressed.
3. I am expected to try to pretend I am not angry or feeling contempt while on the job.

Surface Acting (Diefendorff et al., 2005)
1. I put on an act in order to deal with customers in an appropriate way.
2. I fake a good mood when interacting with customers.
3. I put on a “show” or “performance” when interacting with customers.
4. I just pretend to have the emotions I need to display for my job.
5. I put on a “mask” in order to display the emotions I need for the job.
6. I show feelings to customers that are different from what I feel inside.
7. I fake the emotions I show when dealing with customers.

Deep Acting (Diefendorff et al., 2005)
1. I try to actually experience the emotions that I must show to customers.
2. I make an effort to actually feel the emotions that I need to display toward others.
3. I work hard to feel the emotions that I need to show to customers.
4. I work at developing the feelings inside of me that I need to show to customers.

Emotional Exhaustion (Wharton, 1993)
1. I feel emotionally drained from my work.
2. I feel used up at the end of the work day.
3. I dread getting up in the morning and having to face another day on the job.
4. I feel burned out from my work.
5. I feel frustrated by my job.
6. I feel I’m working too hard on my job.

**Perceived Organizational Support (Eisenberger et al., 1986)**
1. The organization strongly considers my goals and values.
2. Help is available from the organization when I have a problem.
3. The organization really cares about my well-being.
4. The organization is willing to extend itself in order to help me perform my job to the best of my ability.
5. Even if I did the best job possible, the organization would fail to notice.
6. The organization cares about my general satisfaction at work.
7. The organization shows very little concern for me.
8. The organization cares about my opinions.
9. The organization takes pride in my accomplishments at work.

**Leader-Member Exchange (Scandura & Graen, 1984)**
1. I usually know where I stand with my immediate supervisor.
2. My immediate supervisor recognizes my potential.
3. My immediate supervisor understands my problems and needs.
4. My working relationship with my immediate supervisor is effective.
5. I can count on my immediate supervisor to “bail me out”, even at his or her own expense, when I really need it.
6. My immediate supervisor has enough confidence in me that s/he would defend and justify my decisions if I was not present to do so.
7. Regardless of how much power my immediate supervisor has built into his/her position, my supervisor would be personally inclined to use his/her power to help me solve problems in my work.

**Extraversion (Gosling et al., 2003)**
1. I see myself as extraverted, enthusiastic.
2. I see myself as reserved, quiet.

**Neuroticism (Gosling et al., 2003)**
1. I see myself as anxious, easily upset.
2. I see myself as calm, emotionally stable.

**Turnover Intentions (Hom et al., 1994)**
1. I intend to leave the organization in the next 12 months.
2. I feel strongly about leaving the organization within the next 12 months.
3. It is likely that I will leave the organization in the next 12 months.
Interview 1

**Interviewer:** What emotions do you experience on the job?

**Teller:** Work ethic is come to work and it’s work. Home is home, work is work. Wouldn’t say there is a lot of emotions involved with it.

**Interviewer:** What types of emotions do you actually display on the job?

**Teller:** Good. Happy.

**Interviewer:** Are there certain emotions that you think that [organization] expects you to display on the job?

**Teller:** Smile. Be happy. Proactive.

**Interviewer:** Do you find it is difficult sometimes for you to display the emotions that they expect?

**Teller:** Yeah. But I was always told when you have difficult people, think of it as it was your parent standing in front of you. How would you treat your parents if they were standing in front of you? I have taken that to heart. If it was my mother/father standing in front of me, I wouldn’t treat them like that.

**Interviewer:** What types of challenges/situations are there where you have difficulty with displaying those appropriate emotions?

**Teller:** Certain people that are difficult. Certain customers that are difficult. You only have the three emotions at the most.

**Interviewer:** So we have been talking about emotional displays, do you think there are any expectations from [organization] about the emotions you actually feel on the job?

**Teller:** No, I don’t think so.
**Interviewer:** Do you think that the emotions that you display on the job or those that you feel on the job, influence your performance score?

**Teller:** I think if it is a good attitude, yeah.

**Interviewer:** What if you are expected to smile but you don’t?

**Teller:** Yeah, the customers aren’t going to feel welcome, so I think that is all part of our performance score too. To make the customer feel welcome.

**Interviewer:** Let’s say you had a difficult day with lots of difficult customers, and felt like you had to manage your emotions during the day, do you feel exhausted by the end of that day?

**Teller:** Yeah. You just want to go home and go to bed.

**Interviewer:** So let’s say that you are smiling, but you don’t really feel that emotion, you are just pretending because that is part of your job. Do you think that is a bad thing?

**Teller:** No, because like I said, it is part of the job. It is something that is expected of you.

**Interviewer:** Do you have any suggestions on how employees could go about managing their emotions better?

**Teller:** No, I don’t think so. Like I said, I was taught, always leave (emotions) them at the door. This is your job.

**Interview 2**

**Interviewer:** What emotions do you experience on the job?

**Teller:** Most of the time happy.

**Interviewer:** That is the one that you experience most of the time, do you have other emotions that you experience on occasion?

**Teller:** It varies. But sometimes it can be a little stressful.

**Interviewer:** Do you ever find yourself upset on the job, or angry at a customer?

**Teller:** From time to time, but usually by the next customer it is gone.

**Interviewer:** Are there certain situations that make you feel happy on the job or angry sometimes?
Teller: The people I work with. They keep it pretty light. And my customers, I know all my customers, and usually they are very easy.

Interviewer: Are these the emotions that you also display on the job?

Teller: Yes.

Interviewer: Let’s say you have a rude customer and you are upset with them, do you feel like you display that emotion to the customer?

Teller: Not really. Usually I just smile. The nicer you are, their emotions go down.

Interviewer: So if they come in and are angry, and you are nice to them, then they will come back and be nice to you?

Teller: Right.

Interviewer: So those are the emotions that you feel or display, what do you think it is that [organization] expects you to display on the job?

Teller: Smile. Be ready for customers. Treat every customer like you would want to be treated.

Interviewer: How easy or difficult is it for you to meet those expectations?

Teller: Pretty easy for me.

Interviewer: Are there any type of encounters or challenges that you come across that make it more difficult to meet those expectations?

Teller: Not really. Projects and stuff. I like challenges.

Interviewer: We have been talking about what you display on the job, do you think that there are any expectations that [organization] expects you to feel on the job, rather than just what you display?

Teller: I think they want me to display a comfortable environment, because your customer can feel what you are feeling. They would probably want you to feel professional, have a good environment.

Interviewer: Let’s say that you are angry, and a customer comes in, but you still smile. Do you think that [organization] would think that it is okay?

Teller: Yeah. They don’t want you to show that you are having a bad day. Treat all the customers the same. Not robotic, but keep a good atmosphere at all times.
**Interviewer:** What type of events occur on the job that make you actually have to manage your emotions?

**Teller:** Sometimes on Fridays when it gets hectic in here and the phone is ringing. You kind of have to keep that smile, even though you are feeling stressed.

**Interviewer:** Are there certain strategies that you use to control or manage your emotions?

**Teller:** Just try to forget about the bad stuff. Try to get it in and out, don’t harp on it or think about it too much. Because if you do that, then it is going to start to show.

**Interviewer:** Do you think that the emotions that you display on the job or those that you feel on the job influence your performance score?

**Teller:** Oh yeah. Because if they show your bad emotions or that you are stressed, the customers are going to see it and then you are going to lose points and it will affect your performance score.

**Interviewer:** So, do you think that in the positive way, you smile a lot and show positive emotions, that it would positively influence your performance scores?

**Teller:** Yeah.

**Interviewer:** Let’s say that you have a certain day where customer after customer is a difficult customer, do you feel exhausted at the end of the day having to manage your emotions?

**Teller:** Oh yeah. Sometimes I come home and it’s like I just want to veg.

**Interviewer:** You said sometimes that you display emotions that you aren’t always feeling, do you think that is a bad thing?

**Teller:** Not necessarily. You don’t want your customers to feel that you are having a bad day because it can rub off on them. You know, you kind of want your customers to feel comfortable, and not feel what you are feeling. You kind of have to put on that smile your face in front of your customers. If you have having a bad day, you can go out in the hallway until you feel better.

**Interviewer:** So you don’t think that you have to make yourself feel happy, as long as you display that you are happy, you think the customer will be fine?

**Teller:** Yeah, right.
Interviewer: Do you have any suggestions on how employees can better manage their emotion?

Teller: Here, I feel comfortable talking to my manager so they can give me advice on how to make it a better day or forget about it. Have a manager that has an open door policy is really great.

Interview 3

Interviewer: What emotions do you experience on the job?

Teller: Basically, you experience a lot. Anger, frustration, happiness. Just being able to identify with the regular customers and talk to them about their personal life and how things are going for them.

Interviewer: You mentioned a couple of specific emotions, like anger, frustration, happiness. Are there specific situations that bring these emotions about?

Teller: The anger and frustration when customers are uncooperative about certain situations, like when you have to place a hold on a check, or when their account is overdrawn and they blame you for it because you didn’t keep track of their checking account. The happiness is just seeing the familiar faces. Like I said, talking to customers about their lives, how they are doing. If something is good with their life, then you can feel good. If something is bad about their life, you can sympathize with them. A lot of people think it is just an act, but once you start to get to know the people, it is more like they are your family.

Interviewer: Overall what emotions do you actually display on the job?

Teller: In front of customers, you always have to smile. That is how we are trained. No matter how you are feeling, even if it is a bad situation, just get through the situation. If you have to, go to someone higher, or someone else who can intervene and try and get away from the situation so you don’t show the customer that you are mad. Like I said, you need to show that you are always happy.

Interviewer: Do you think that happiness and smiling are the only emotions [organization] expects you to display on the job, or are there other emotions?

Teller: They know that you are not always going to be happy. They just want you to be professional in whatever situation comes about. Just because someone is mean, they don’t want you to lash out at the customer. Try to keep your cool and get through the situation.

Interviewer: How easy or difficult is it to meet those expectations?
**Teller:** Most of the time it is pretty easy. You know we deal with so many customers everyday, just because one is mad, you can’t let it ruin your day. Just because I have ten customers that have screamed at me, one person that I know that will come and be like “how are you?” It is nice to be able to get that break.

**Interviewer:** So it is a customer by customer basis?

**Teller:** Yeah, you can’t base your mood…even if you are having a bad time in your personal life, you don’t really display that. Just like any job, you can’t just say my life is horrible.

**Interviewer:** Are there any specific challenges that you encounter when you are trying to meet those expectations?

**Teller:** Irate, unreasonable customers. If they are mad, there is no getting through to them. So you just let them blow off their steam and that is when you can accomplish the results that you want.

**Interviewer:** Do you think that [organization] has any expectations on the emotions that you should actually feel?

**Teller:** They don’t show that they only want you to feel happy. They understand if things aren’t going right. My manager is really understanding if you have a bad customer. She always listens to your side of something. She doesn’t reprimand you just because a customer says you are mean and you have no chance to show your side of it.

**Interviewer:** Let’s say that you are angry or frustrated, but as long as you put a smile on your face to the customer, then it should be okay?

**Teller:** Yeah.

**Interviewer:** Are there any specific ways that you go about managing or controlling your emotions when they conflict with what [organization] wants you to display?

**Teller:** I just…I don’t know…just talk it through with somebody…whether it is another teller or my manager…or I will just leave the situation, and go back once I control myself.

**Interviewer:** Do you think that the emotions that you display on the job or those that you feel on the job influence your performance score?

**Teller:** I guess they can be, but I don’t think one instance is going to hurt the way you are scored. If you are constantly in a bad mood and constantly being rude to customers or fellow employees, then definitely it would affect your score. You can even have one
customer every week that is rude. Just because you are not happy all the time, I don’t think it is going to affect the way you performance score comes out.

**Interviewer:** What if you are smiling, cheerful on the job, do you think it will positively affect your performance scores?

**Teller:** It will, but I just don’t think that…I think they look at the all around situation. They don’t expect you to be happy if somebody is completely cussing you out. They don’t expect you to always be happy. But yeah, it would show a positive score.

**Interviewer:** Do you think that showing the emotions that you don’t really feel is a bad thing? For example, you are really angry inside, but you paste on this smile, do you think that is a negative thing?

**Teller:** I think it could be negative if you don’t ever have a chance to release…if things just build up inside, and you have no chance to release the anger or frustration you are feeling, and you are always smiling, I definitely think that it would be a negative influence on your well-being. I don’t see…there isn’t really a time where you aren’t able to release how you are feeling.

**Interviewer:** If you have to manage your emotions all day, do you feel exhausted?

**Teller:** Definitely, sometimes I feel like I am a bartender. People just lay their problems on you all day long and you are just like “uhhh…”. When the day is over you can talk about it with a manager…or anybody else. Everybody here is very…it’s obviously not like this at all offices, but there is not one person here I couldn’t talk about something. I am a pretty open person. I don’t really hide how I am feeling to fellow employees. Customers is definitely a different story.

**Interviewer:** Going back to when you have a conflict between your true emotions and what you need to display, so you think as long as you smile and be happy towards the customer, it should be okay?

**Teller:** Yeah. I don’t think just because the last customer was a complete jerk, you can’t take it out on the next customer. So, no, I don’t think it is a bad thing to fake it for a while to get through your job. But if I did not feel comfortable talking about it with everybody here, then I would definitely get burnout.

**Interviewer:** Do you have any suggestions on how employees can better manage their emotions?

**Teller:** I don’t dwell on a bad situation. You know, like I said earlier, if a customer is cussing you out because their account is overdrawn, dwell on it as long as what it is worth. That is obviously not worth anything to me because it is not my problem that they
can’t keep track of their checking account, so I’m not going to sit there and dwell on it and let somebody frustrate me and ruin my whole day.

Interview 4

**Interviewer:** What emotions do you experience on the job?

**Teller:** It can be stressful sometimes. Sometimes it’s good, sometimes it’s bad. You have good days and you have bad days.

**Interviewer:** Besides stress, is there anything else? For example, happy, sad, angry?

**Teller:** If you are that type of the person that can let that type of thing get to you, it can. But I’m more laid back, so it is kind of hard to get to me and to get me upset. I can just blow it off.

**Interviewer:** Are there any types of situations where you are working and you get upset?

**Teller:** Sometimes you are just trying to do your job and it may not be what the customer wants you to do. It may just be something else, but you just can’t do it. It just doesn’t click to them that you just can’t do it. They want you to do what they want you to do.

**Interviewer:** What types of emotions do you display on the job?

**Teller:** We are supposed to display happiness. We are supposed to “act the part.”

**Interviewer:** Do you think that is what you do?

**Teller:** I think so. I think I am pretty much myself because I have been here so long. It’s natural.

**Interviewer:** How long have you been here?

**Teller:** I have been working for [organization] for four years.

**Interviewer:** We talked about how [organization] expects you to display certain emotions, e.g., happy, do you feel like it is easy or difficult for you to do that?

**Teller:** Most days it is easy, but there are some days where you may not want to go to work or want to be bothered…if you are under the weather or if you are sick…it is kind of hard to do this kind of work because you always have to have that smile and be nice and be courteous.

**Interviewer:** Are there any specific challenges that you come across when you have to display these certain emotions?
Teller: If you just have that customer that is just not prepared and they are not really sure about what they want you to do, it is kind of frustrating. I mean you are trying to talk to them and they are saying that is not it.

Interviewer: We have been talking about the displays of emotions, do you think that [organization] has any expectations for the emotions that you actually feel?

Teller: I don’t think so. No.

Interviewer: What types of events or situations occur on the job that make you feel like you have to manage your emotions?

Teller: If customers get mad…they say things that are inappropriate that they wouldn’t say to you if you were on the street. You can’t just say what you want to say. You just have to hold it in, and keep your composure and just let it go.

Interviewer: How do you do that? How do you hold it in?

Teller: I just laugh it off and walk or way. Maybe go walk it off, get a pop or something and just come back.

Interviewer: What if you are still dealing with that customer?

Teller: If they are still there…I mean, if they are still there, and it is at that point where you feel like you have done everything you can do and they are still carrying on, you just have to walk away and maybe not even come back and let somebody else wait on them. You just have to.

Interviewer: Do you think that the emotions that you display on the job or those that you feel on the job influence your performance score?

Teller: I think you can be misjudged. For example, I am not a real talkative person and you hear them talk all the time. So compared to them, they are real talkative and outgoing. Whereas me, you may not hear my voice that often, so you can be misjudged that way.

Interviewer: So you aren’t seen as friendly to the customers because you are not as talkative?

Teller: Maybe not friendly, maybe not as confident, maybe not as outgoing.

Interviewer: And that somehow influences your performance ratings?

Teller: Uh-huh, they make little comments sometimes about that. Just misjudgments.
**Interviewer:** Do you think that, let’s say you have had a really tough day with lots of difficult customers, and you have had to manage your emotions that day, is that related to exhaustion?

**Teller:** There are Fridays like that, yes. You are just like, “Oh my god, I am ready to go home. I need a drink. I need to unwind. I’m just so tired.” You just go home and sit down and you can just fall straight to sleep.

**Interviewer:** Do you think that showing the emotions that you don’t internally, so let’s say you are frustrated, but you are expected to smile, do you think that if you just put the smile on your face, even if you don’t really feel it, that it is okay?

**Teller:** Yes, but some people see that as you being real sarcastic.

**Interviewer:** So you think some customers can tell that they are being fake?

**Teller:** They are being fake, yes.

**Interviewer:** And is that a bad thing? If you had two options, showing negative emotions or being fake, which do you think would be worse?

**Teller:** Showing that you are fake.

**Interviewer:** Do you have any suggestions on how employees can better manage their emotions?

**Teller:** Just don’t take it out on anybody else. Don’t let it mess your day up for the rest of the day.

**Interview 5**

**Interviewer:** What emotions do you experience on the job?

**Teller:** Sometime happy, sometime...I’m not angry. Because the customers that get angry, they have a reason behind it. Sometimes, frustration because we can always solve that frustration by explain to the customer and talk to the manager about that. Sometimes the customer is irritated, and you feel sad for that.

**Interviewer:** Are there any situations, you say you feel happy most of the time, on the job that make you feel that way?

**Teller:** I am happy on my job. I like the contact with the customers.

**Interviewer:** What types of emotions do you show the customers or display on the job?
**Teller:** I am happy with the customers. Smiley, happy.

**Interviewer:** What emotions or feeling do you think [organization] expects you to display on the job?

**Teller:** [Organization] wants us to be happy and smiley.

**Interviewer:** How easy or how difficult do you think it is to meet those expectations?

**Teller:** I think it is very easy.

**Interviewer:** What makes it so easy for you? Sometimes, it is more difficult for other people to be happy all the time?

**Teller:** My nature is like that. I am always happy with the customers because I work so many years with the customers. I had my own business, so I learned from that if you are happy, the business would be more successful.

**Interviewer:** Are there any challenges or situations that you come across where it makes it more difficult to meet those expectations?

**Teller:** If it is difficult, in front of the customers, you have to be happy. If you have a problem, you can always talk and solve that problem, instead of showing to the customers.

**Interviewer:** Do you think that the emotions that you display on the job or those that you feel on the job influence your performance score?

**Teller:** Yes.

**Interviewer:** How do you think that happens?

**Teller:** We have to be happy and smile to the customers. It’s part of our teller performance. That is how they taught us.

**Interviewer:** You think your manager is watching to make sure you are doing that as part of your job?

**Teller:** Yeah, as part of the job.

**Interviewer:** When you have to manage your emotions during the day, do you feel exhausted?

**Teller:** No, because it is not on me. It is whatever their anger…maybe they don’t understand…sometimes they have overdrawn, negative accounts, they think they
shouldn’t have that much. So when we explain that, I think customers do understand and it is not coming on me. If we explain that, I think the customers will be happy.

Interviewer: What if you can’t make a customer happy?

Teller: If I can’t, then I talk to my manager.

Interviewer: Let’s say you had a rude customer and you had a hard time dealing with them, and [organization] wants you to be smile and be happy. So you do that even though inside you are feeling mad, do you think that is a bad thing to smile and act happy even though you don’t feel it?

Teller: I don’t think so. If the customer is angry and he is shouting at you, I think we feel bad for him, but actually it is not for us to get mad for that. The customer doesn’t understand…maybe he needs more explanation…it’s not on us. When I go home, I don’t get upset with that.

Interviewer: Do you have any suggestions on how other employees can better manage their emotions?

Teller: If the person is unhappy, the person should talk to the other person or manager.

Interviewer: What emotions do you experience on the job?

Teller: A wide range of things. Could be stress, could be happy. It could be anything. It kind of depends on the customers that come in.

Interviewer Teller: Can you give me an example of situation that would cause you to feel happy on the job?

Teller: Happy. Like, when a customer comes in with a problem and you help them solve it. Say someone loses there debit card, something like that. Just helping them get there money back, just fixing everything.

Interviewer: What about stress?

Teller: Stress. Like when you have multiple projects to do at the same time. Organizing those, just getting everything done in the time that you have.

Interviewer: Do you have any other negative emotions on the job besides stress?

Teller: Frustrated. If there is not enough time to get your work done.
Interviewer: What types of emotions do you actually display on the job?

Teller: Try not to display anything.

Interviewer: So you try to stay neutral.

Teller: Right. Right.

Interviewer: What types of emotions do you think [organization] expects you to display on the job?

Teller: Happiness, willing to be there for customers even if they are in a bad mood. You always want to be friendly and help them out.

Interviewer: How easy or how difficult do you think it is to meet those expectations?

Teller: It’s not difficult. You just need to put yourself in the customers’ shoes.

Interviewer: Are there any situations or challenges that you come across that make it more difficult?

Teller: I don’t think so. Sometimes if, maybe if a customer is rude or something like that, it would just be a little harder to help them. But not really, you just have to remember that they are here to fix their account or figure out what the problem is and I’m here to help them.

Interviewer: Do you think that there are any emotions that [organization] wants you to feel, rather than just display?

Teller: Being happy, enjoying your job.

Interviewer: So do you think they want you to not only put the smile on your face, but they actually want you to be internally feeling it?

Teller: I think so; I think they would care.

Interviewer: What types of events or situations occur on the job require you to manage your emotions?

Teller: Dealing with more than one thing at a time. If you are working on one thing and a customer comes up, just needing the help everybody out and organize everything. Time management skills.

Interviewer: Are there any strategies or things that you do to control your emotions on the job?
**Teller:** You just do. Nothing specific. I just always try to put myself in their shoes. If this happened to me, I might be upset as well. Just know I need to help them out.

**Interviewer:** Do you think the emotions you display on the job, or the ones that you feel, are related to your performance scores?

**Teller:** Sure to some extent they are. If you are happy at work, you definitely want to do a good job. It could be related, definitely. I think your manager definitely monitors what you are doing; definitely watches how you interact with the customers.

**Interviewer:** If you spend the day managing a lot of your emotions, do you go home feeling beat or exhausted?

**Teller:** Sure, probably like any job, you just go home and will be worn out. Like Fridays or paydays.

**Interviewer:** Not just because you are busy, but because of the emotions involved?

**Teller:** Personally, not really. Just kind of the more work, rather than the emotions.

**Interviewer:** Do you have any suggestions on how other emotions may better manage or deal with their emotions?

**Teller:** Well, just put yourself the customers’ shoes. I think that is huge. Do one thing at a time. Everything works out at the end of the day.

**Interviewer:** What emotions do you experience on the job?

**Teller:** For the most part, happy. I try not to let people bother me. There are some customers where you get very frustrated and that tends to linger for a little bit. But for the most part, I just try to stay relaxed and not let them bother them too much.

**Interviewer:** Are there any specific situations that cause you have these feelings? Either happiness or frustration?

**Teller:** When customers come in and they are actually nice. Or when they have things filled out and ready to be waited on. It is frustrating when they want to do five different things and don’t account numbers, and don’t know what they actually want or have the forms all filled out.

**Interviewer:** In general, what types of emotions do you actually display on the job?
**Teller:** I don’t do a very good job of hiding any of my emotions. Generally, whatever kind of mood I am in is what people see. I try not to because I know I should act professional and seem like I’m in a good mood, but it is not always easy to do.

**Interviewer:** So you said “act professional, be in a good mood.” Is there anything else the [organization] expects you to display on the job?

**Teller:** I think they expect you to act professional and in a good mood. And not angry or frustrated. When people do frustrate you, they want you to keep being kind and gentle way of showing them that you aren’t getting frustrated.

**Interviewer:** How easy or how difficult do you think it is to meet those display expectations?

**Teller:** Depends on the day. Most days it is pretty easy. Days when you are tired or having a bad day outside of work, that makes it a little more difficult. If family or home issues aren’t going so well and then you come into work and then you are not in a good mood and you have to pretend like you are.

**Interviewer:** Anything that happens at work make it more difficult?

**Teller:** Sometimes the environment that you are in. If you are not working with people that are encouraging and try to help keep you upbeat, it is hard to come in and act happy when you are not, especially if no one is helping you do that.

**Interviewer:** Do you think that [organization] has any expectations about the emotions that you should actually feel on the job?

**Teller:** I think that they want you to enjoy your job and really feel like what you are doing matters.

**Interviewer:** Lets say you have a bad day, and you are feeling frustrated or angry, and you paste on that smile. Do you think it is okay to have a difference between what you actually feel and what you are showing?

**Teller:** Yeah, because you are doing a professional job and people do expect certain things of you. So even if you are not having the best day ever, you still should try and project that because you are in a professional environment dealing with customers and that does affect everyone around you.

**Interviewer:** So, let’s say you are angry, is it better to fake that you are happy or just be the way you are really feeling?

**Teller:** I’ve done both. There have been days where I just don’t really feel good, and there just isn’t any amount of faking that is going to overcome that. And there are days
where the morning started out rough, but I get over it. So it’s kind of like 50/50. Some
days it is easier to do than others.

**Interviewer:** So do you think faking is a good thing or a bad thing?

**Teller:** I don’t think it is a bad thing, but it is not necessarily the best thing to do all the
time either. Sometimes you just have to grin and bear it and go about your business.

**Interviewer:** Are there any specific types of events that occur on the job that make you
have to manage your emotions more?

**Teller:** Yeah, there are management decisions and things like that, which you don’t agree
with, or don’t like. There is nothing you can do about it though.

**Interviewer:** Are there any specific strategies, or things that you do, so that you can
actually meet those expectations?

**Teller:** I usually try and go somewhere for a minute and take a deep breath and clear my
head. If I have time, call my mom or my friends just to say hi and kind of check out of
the situation for a minute.

**Interviewer:** Do you think that your manager thinks it is okay for you to take a break,
and step out of the line, and call somebody?

**Teller:** If it is not busy. If there is a line out the door, obviously you can’t do that. If there
is nobody here and you just had a customer take up 20 minutes of your time to
accomplish nothing, then, it’s kind of laid back here. So if you have time to step away,
you can. If not, then deal with it.

**Interviewer:** Do you think the emotions you display on the job, or the ones that you feel,
are related to your performance scores?

**Teller:** I haven’t been here long enough to know quite how I’m doing or gauge things,
but yeah, I do. Because if you are not having a good time, or you are not happy about
what you are doing, you tend not to care if you are doing a good job or not. They do
random calls on customers to see how their experience was. And if you have a teller that
was in a bad mood, they will probably bring that up. Granted, if you have a teller that is
in a really good mood, they probably won’t say anything spectacular about you, but bad
news always seems to travel a lot faster.

**Interviewer:** Does managing emotions on the job, lead to you feel exhausted or burnt
out?

**Teller:** Some days, yeah. Usually, just hectic. One thing after another and it never seems
to go the way you want. You know, when you have a rude customer and you spend 45
minutes trying to handle this situation and it doesn’t even turn out positively, and the day just keeps going like that. So at the end of the day you are like “I just want to go home. I don’t want anyone to talk to me.”

**Interviewer:** Do you have any suggestions on how employees can better manage their emotions?

**Teller:** Just try not to let people get to you. That is the basis of most of the emotions at work. Are just the customers that come in that irritate you and do things, so I just think you just have to let it roll off your back and go to the next customer and try not to worry about it.

**Interviewer:** Do you find that pretty simple to do?

**Teller:** Yeah, most of the time. The more you can help them do, the sooner they’re gone, the better it is.

**Interviewer:** What emotions do you experience on the job?

**Teller:** I do experience happiness here. I do like the people that I work with. Also, lots of frustration. It is a rather complicated job as far as making sure you are taking care of the people properly. So I would say happiness, frustration, and sometimes confusion. There is a lot to know, and if you don’t you can make some big mistakes.

**Interviewer:** What would you say is the emotions you experience the most often?

**Teller:** Frustration. For sure.

**Interviewer:** In general, what types of emotions do you display on the job?

**Teller:** Humor, we like to have fun here because it is boring a lot of times. Kindness.

**Interviewer:** What emotions do you think [organization] expects you to display on the job?

**Teller:** Professionalism, first. Concern for each person that we help. Concern for their needs and meeting those needs. I would say that frustration, they wouldn’t want us to display. But it goes with the job. I don’t think that is something to have; it is just each situation is different and sometimes it is very frustrating.

**Interviewer:** So do you think there is an expectation of being happy on the job?
**Teller:** Yes. Yes. Because you have to be happy, plus you have to make sure that you are meeting the bank’s goals. And you have to keep a balance of happiness and concern for others, and that can be difficult.

**Interviewer:** So do you think it is difficult to meet these expectations?

**Teller:** Uh-huh.

**Interviewer:** Can you give me an example of a situation that would make it difficult?

**Teller:** Probably when someone is yelling at you and you understand, but a lot of times it is out of your control. It can be just a general bank rule that we just can’t break. Probably the top one would be that.

**Interviewer:** Do you think that [organization] has any expectations about the emotions that you actually should feel internally?

**Teller:** I think so. I don’t know. The expectations here are high just like any other company. I think it would depend on a person’s personality. Like me, I smile all the time, but that is just my personality. Some people have a hard time with that.

**Interviewer:** So let’s say that there is an employee that there personality is not generally happy and smiley all the time, do you think [organization] would want or expect them to change?

**Teller:** I think so. I would definitely think so. It’s not in the job description to smile, but when we are working with a customer, it is pretty much common sense to smile. It shows that internal emotion.

**Interviewer:** If you are angry, how do you go about managing or controlling your emotions?

**Teller:** I show empathy. Because my goal would be to calm the customer down by showing empathy, therefore it would calm me down.

**Interviewer:** Do you think the emotions you display on the job, or the ones that you feel, are related to your performance scores?

**Teller:** In a way. I would say in a way. Because a lot of our performance score…it depends on what category you are talking about. Like if it were about referrals, that is more like sales, so yeah, that would be important. Or the category of team playing; that would definitely show emotions of being a team player which is usually positive.

**Interviewer:** Does managing the emotions that you either feel or display on the job sometimes lead you to feel exhausted?
Teller: Yes. For sure. There was a time last year where the company downsized employees, and we were left very shorthanded. It was very tiring, emotionally tiring because we were doing the jobs of two or three people.

Interviewer: Do you think that showing emotions you don’t feel internally is okay. For example, you are really angry and frustrated and you know you are expected to be happy and smiling, so you put on a smile, do you think that is a bad thing?

Teller: Yes and no. Yes because whatever is going on with me has nothing to do with the person in front of me so I would say it is not bad to show a smile. I would say to an extent it could be bad for your heart, it could be bad for your brain that you are not able to express freely how you feel. Like if someone in front of you is making you mad, you can’t say “you are being really rude.” You can’t express it because those aren’t portraying professionalism for the bank.

Interviewer: Do you have any suggestions on how employees can better manage their emotions?

Teller: I think it would be good that managers take someone into their office and say “I’ve seen you are having a bad day, is there something wrong.” Talking about it always helps because it releases that tension that you have. This branch is very busy, so it’s not like we can have counseling sessions, but it would be good sometimes to release it.

Interviewer: What emotions do you experience on the job?

Teller: Stress, sometimes joy.

Interviewer: Can you give me some situations that would cause you to feel either stress or joy?

Teller: Stress…umm…on Fridays and Saturdays when we are short-handed and are very busy. If our customers are getting a little anxious about waiting. A lot of our customers are fun, and I enjoy the people that I work with.

Interviewer: Any other emotions?

Teller: No.

Interviewer: In general, what types of emotions do you display on the job?

Teller: Try to stay professional, try to be cheerful and greet everybody. Try not to show when you are upset or too stressed out.
Interviewer: What types of emotions do you think [organization] expects tellers to display on the job?

Teller: To be professional, be happy.

Interviewer: How easy or how difficult is it for you to meet those expectations?

Teller: Easy.

Interviewer: Do you think it is easy for most people?

Teller: I mean not everyone, but most of them.

Interviewer: Is there anything that makes it particularly easy for you to meet those expectations?

Teller: It is just the way we need to be.

Interviewer: Are there any challenges that you encounter that make it more difficult?

Teller: There are times when you are extremely busy, or you are not balancing, or you have an unreasonable customer asking for things that you really can’t do.

Interviewer: Do you think there are any expectations that [organization] has of you to actually feeling specific emotions?

Teller: I guess not.

Interviewer: So it is more what you are actually displaying to the customer than what you are actually feeling?

Teller: I think so.

Interviewer: Are there any specific strategies that you use that help you manage or control your emotions?

Teller: I can’t think of anything that I do. I think that we blow it off between each other.

Interviewer: What if the customer is still there and they are being unreasonable, what do you do?

Teller: A lot of times, I will go ask for a manager to try to help. And you try to make them feel like you are trying to help them, even though you know what they are asking for, probably can’t be done.
**Interviewer:** Do you think the emotions you display on the job, or the ones that you feel, are related to your performance scores?

**Teller:** Probably. Professionalism is part of it, so you have to…even if you are upset about something, you have to put that aside until later.

**Interviewer:** Do you think that managing emotions on the job, leaves you exhausted at the end of the day?

**Teller:** I think because of the stress, sometimes.

**Interviewer:** Do you think that showing an emotion to a customer that you don’t internally feel, is a bad thing? For example, you are angry, but you still smile. Do you think that is a good or bad thing to do?

**Teller:** I think it is a good thing. I think you have to or else you lose customers.

**Interviewer:** So it is okay to fake that emotion sometimes?

**Teller:** Yes.

**Interviewer:** Do you have any suggestions on how employees can better manage their emotions?

**Teller:** Don’t take it too seriously. Remember that most of the time that it is not always directed at us. It is mostly directed at the company or situations that they don’t understand. Just don’t take it personally.
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