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While previous research has posited that organizational display rules and employee affect are important predictors of emotional labor, the mechanism underlying these is unclear. The current study offers the concept of emotional discrepancy as a variable that may help explain how display rules and affect give rise to emotional labor. Emotional discrepancies are created when employees’ affect is discrepant from the organizational display rule, thereby motivating them to engage in emotional labor to reduce the discrepancy.

A laboratory simulation was conducted whereby participants acted as either a bill collector or campus tour guide. The results revealed that emotional discrepancy significantly predicted emotional labor and dispositional affect and display rules interacted to predict emotional discrepancies. Lastly, the results indicated that emotional discrepancy mediated the relationship between display rules and emotional labor, pointing to the importance of including this construct in future emotional labor models. Implications and future directions are discussed.
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CHAPTER I. INTRODUCTION TO EMOTIONAL LABOR

Background

The study of emotions in organizations has become increasingly important in recent years due to the rise in the number of jobs that require their employees to interact in emotionally-laden encounters (i.e. customer service, healthcare and counseling occupations). Such encounters often mandate that an employee display certain emotions and suppress others (Hochschild, 1983; Ashforth & Humphrey, 1995). For example, bill collectors are expected to be angry and irritated (Rafaeli & Sutton, 1987), nurses are supposed to show caring and empathy (Zerbe, 2000), and customer service workers are expected to maintain ‘service with a smile’ (Hochschild, 1983; Pugh, 2001). When people regulate or manage their emotions in exchange for a wage, they are said to be undertaking ‘emotional labor’ (Hochschild, 1983). Emotional labor is an area that has been witnessing increased research attention over the past twenty years.


Though past research has offered a few different conceptualizations of the emotional labor construct (for examples, see Ashforth & Humphrey, 1995; Glomb & Tews, 2004; Hochschild, 1983; Morris & Feldman, 1996), Grandey’s (2000) theoretical model is one of the most integrative and widely-accepted frameworks. A distinguishing factor of Grandey’s (2000) conceptualization that renders it one of the most comprehensive models of emotional labor is the fact that it clearly separates situational antecedents, felt emotions, and behavioral responses that occur in the emotional labor process. According to Grandey (2000), emotional labor is a motivated act in which one attempts to regulate emotion and produce an appropriate emotional display. It occurs in response to situational factors and felt emotions. An important situational factor that influences emotional labor is the set of expectations that organizations have regarding
how the employees should interact with customers. Many jobs require their employees to interact in emotionally-laden encounters for certain amounts of time and emotional intensity (Morris & Feldman, 1996). These requirements are dictated by the display rules of the organization, which are norms or formal rules governing the emotional displays that are expected from an employee at work (Ashforth & Humphrey, 1993). Display rules often require an employee to express certain facial expressions (i.e. smiling), vocal tone (i.e. cheerful), and overall demeanor appropriate for the job (Fineman, 2003). Training and performance appraisal materials may directly request and enforce these display rules (Grandey, 2000). Note that when researchers measure organizational display rules, they often measure display rule perceptions in order to measure how well the employee understands the norm or rule to display emotion (i.e. Diefendorff & Richard, 2003). Because employees will strive to meet the display expectations that they perceive to be required of them, it’s important to gauge perceptions instead of the objective environment.

Along with display rules, an employee’s felt emotions are also posited to be important predictor of emotional labor. Felt emotions can occur naturally (i.e. an employee who is dispositionally high in negative affect), or they can be triggered by emotional events in the workplace. The felt emotions that an employee experiences can make it easier or harder for an employee to meet organizational display rules (Grandey, 2000), and thus would prompt more or less emotional labor. For example, a customer service worker may experience a negative felt emotion after being blamed by a hostile customer for a product malfunction, making it more difficult for the employee to maintain ‘service with a smile’ (Grandey, 2000).

When faced with a felt emotion that is discrepant with organizational expectations, an employee must undertake emotional labor to regulate the emotion and produce the appropriate
display. Hochschild (1985) posits that this emotional labor consists of both surface acting (effort directed towards producing the appropriate emotional display) or deep acting (effort directed towards producing the appropriate internal felt emotion, which would in turn lead to the appropriate emotional display). Thus, emotional labor is a motivated action prompted by situational factors (such as display rules) and felt emotions.

Though Grandey’s (2000) framework is useful for understanding and organizing the emotional labor process, it fails to posit the mechanism by which display rules and felt emotions motivate emotional labor. Because of the potential negative outcomes that emotional labor has been known to cause (e.g. burnout, stress, health problems; Adelmann, 1995; Brotheridge & Lee, 1998; Zapf, Seifert, Schmutte, Mertini & Holz, 2001; Gross & Levenson, 2001), it is important to explore and understand how this behavior occurs. The current study looks to fill this gap in the literature by extending Grandey’s (2000) conceptualization of the antecedents of emotional labor. This study will specify and test a particular mechanism (emotional discrepancy) that may help explain how display rules and felt emotions give rise to emotional labor.
CHAPTER II. EMOTIONAL DISCREPANCIES

Emotional Discrepancies and Control Theory

The current study introduces the concept of emotional discrepancy, which is created when an individual’s felt emotions conflict with he or she perceives to be the required emotions, that is, his or her perception of organizational display rules. Because an emotional discrepancy arises from a mismatch between perceived organizational expectations and felt emotions, it is a purely affective state (Rubin, Tardino, Daus & Munz, 2005).

Control theory offers a useful framework within which to understand how an emotional discrepancy may be considered an antecedent of emotional labor and how it works to motivate such behavior. Control theory centers around a self-regulating feedback loop, which contains four parts: a standard, an input function, a comparator, and an output function. First, in order for self-regulation to occur, there must be a goal or standard that an individual is working to achieve (Carver & Scheier, 1998). The input function then perceives and assesses an individual’s current behavior or state. A comparator mechanism is used to compare the information received by the input function with the goal to see if a discrepancy is present. If an individual’s current behavior is aligned with his or her goal, then no discrepancy exists and thus, there will be no motivation to change current behavior. However, if a discrepancy is detected, the output function is activated to bring current behavior more into line with the goal. This new behavior is then again sensed and assessed by the input function and compared with the standard, thus creating a feedback system (Carver & Scheier, 1998). At the top of the following page is a figure depicting the basic tenets of control theory.
Applying control theory to emotional labor helps one understand why emotional discrepancy is a likely mechanism by which display rules and felt emotions come to influence emotional labor. In an organization that requires emotional expressions as a part of the job, display rules can be viewed as the goal or standard, because these communicate the emotional display that the employee is expected to produce and adherence to such rules is often rewarded in organizations (Rubin et al. 2005). Thus, an employee has the goal of producing the emotional expression required by the organizational display rules (Diefendorff & Gosserand, 2003). In order to achieve this goal, the employee will assess his or her current felt emotions (analogous to the input function), and determine whether or not they align with the goal (by means of the comparator mechanism). If the employee’s felt emotions are not aligned with the display rule, a discrepancy will exist (known in the present study as an emotional discrepancy). In response to this discrepancy, the employee’s output function will become activated, and the employee will
be motivated to take action to reduce this discrepancy. Emotional labor is a way in which employees can self-regulate in an attempt to reduce this discrepancy and bring their actions in line with their goal (Diefendorff & Gosserand, 2003). Below is a diagram of control theory applied to emotional labor.

Figure 2

*Control Theory Applied to Emotional Labor*

---

**Emotional Labor Strategies**

When employees feel emotions that are not in line with the emotions that they are required to display, there are two emotional labor strategies that they will be motivated to use to manage their emotions and meet the display rule requirements. The first is accomplished when an employee fakes an emotion that is appropriate for the situation. This is generally referred to as “surface acting” or “response-focused regulation” (Hochschild, 1983; Grandey, 2000). It is called “response-focused” because an individual regulates his or her *response* to a felt emotion (i.e. their display), but does not try to change the emotion itself (Gross, 1998). Thus, in surface
acting, employees only manage the visible aspects of emotions that appear on the ‘surface’ to bring them in line with organizational display rules. The second strategy for reducing an emotional discrepancy and bringing felt emotions in line with required emotions is through “deep acting” or “antecedent-focused regulation.” Deep acting occurs when employees strive to actually modify the emotion they are experiencing in order to display the appropriate emotion (Hochschild, 1983; Grandey, 2000). Deep acting requires an employee to actively invoke thoughts, images, and memories to induce a certain emotion (Ashforth & Humphrey, 1993). Thus, this strategy is “antecedent-focused” because it attempts to change the felt emotion before displaying the appropriate emotion (Gross, 1998).

Though they are two different strategies for reducing emotional discrepancies, both surface acting and deep acting involve the active regulation of emotions and emotional displays, and thus require effort, control and the use of personal resources to achieve (Kruml & Geddes, 2000a, b; Grandey & Brauburger, 2002; Morris & Feldman, 1996). In fact, recent research suggests that regulating emotion depletes a finite pool of resources available for acts of volition (Muraven, Tice & Baumeister, 1998). From this perspective, the self has limited resources, and the supply is diminished each time the pool of resources is drawn upon. For example, studies on emotion regulation have found that suppressing emotion decreases subsequent performance on a cognitive task, presumably because the effort spent to regulate emotion drains resources that were needed for successful performance on the task (Baumeister, Bratslavsky, Muraven & Tice, 1998). Additional studies have shown that emotion regulation activates sympathetic nervous system activity, which subsequently interferes with cognitive capacity (Richards & Gross, 1999). The behaviors undertaken to regulate emotion is considered the “labor” of emotional labor (Rubin, et al, 2005; Grandey, 2000). Thus, the larger the emotional discrepancy individuals
experience, the more resources they will use and effort they will have to exert to bring their feelings and/or displays in line with organizational requirements and reduce the discrepancy. The effort and resources used to regulate one’s emotions have been found to have many negative consequences. For example, the average correlation between emotional labor and physical complaints is .36 (Bono & Vey, 2005) and it has also been associated with burnout and stress (Brotheridge & Grandey, 2002; Zapf, Seifert, Schmule, Mertini & Holz, 2001).

Emotional labor, particularly surface acting, is also thought to create emotional dissonance, an uncomfortable psychological state that arises when there is a conflict between felt emotions and displayed emotions (Kruml & Geddes, 2000a, b). Note that the construct of emotional dissonance is theoretically similar to the present study’s idea of emotional discrepancy. Both arise from a conflict involving felt emotions; however, emotional dissonance occurs after emotional labor has taken place and is a conflict between felt emotions and actual displays, whereas emotional discrepancy occurs before emotional labor and represents a conflict between felt emotions and organizationally-required emotional displays. Thus, the timing of the conflict distinguishes these two constructs and makes one an antecedent of emotional labor, and the other an outcome.

Emotional Discrepancy as an Antecedent of Emotional Labor

In certain instances, a person’s felt emotions may be consistent with organizational expectations, known as ‘emotional harmony’ (Rafaeli & Sutton, 1987). Some researchers have argued that individuals experiencing emotional harmony will still engage in emotional labor (e.g. Glomb & Tews, 2004), yet the current study proposes that what prompts the regulation of emotions is the discrepancy between felt emotions and the organizationally-required emotions. If a person’s felt emotions in a given moment are consistent with organizational expectations
(yielding no discrepancy), there will be no motivation to self-regulate towards the display rule goal in that moment. Control theory suggests that we are motivated to change our behavior only when there is a conflict between our current state or behavior, and the behavior necessary to achieve our goal (Carver & Scheier, 1998). Thus, viewed from this perspective, an employee experiencing emotional harmony would not be motivated to engage in emotional labor, because he or she is already on track to meet the display rule standard. In fact, previous literature has suggested that no considerable amount of control or presentational effort is required when the emotion that the employee is expected to display matches the emotion actually felt (Leary & Kowalski, 1990). As Morris and Feldman (1996) pointed out, “It should require little emotional ‘labor’ to sell products one genuinely believes in” (pg. 992). In fact, it has been argued that emotion work in this case is done in ‘automatic mode’ and thus is done effortlessly and is not actually ‘work’ (Frese & Zapf, 1994; Hacker, 1998). For example, a nurse feeling sympathy at the sight of an injured child has no need to ‘act’ to display this sentiment (Zapf, 2002). Thus, if an employee does not perceive the required emotional demands to be as emotionally taxing (because he or she is already feeling the required emotions), then there will be no need for the employee to engage in emotional labor.

Note that based on the preceding discussion of limited resources we should be able to measure whether or not individuals engaged in emotional labor not only by self-report, but also by assessing their performance on a cognitive task done after the emotional labor simulation, such as solving anagrams. This task has been used in previous research to illustrate how, when individuals engage in emotional labor, their resource pools are depleted and they have fewer resources available to use for the cognitive anagram task (Muraven, Tice & Baumeister, 1998). Thus, those who experience emotional harmony (i.e. those who do not experience an emotional
discrepancy) should A.) Not report engaging in emotional labor and consequently, B.) Not expend much effort and resources to regulate emotions, and therefore have better performance on the anagram task done after the emotional labor simulation than those who did engage in emotional labor. The current study uses both measures of emotional labor, distinguishing it from the majority of emotional labor studies that rely solely on self-report measures.

**H1a:** Emotional discrepancy will be positively related to reported emotional labor.

**H1b:** Emotional discrepancy will be negatively related to performance on an anagram task done after the emotional labor simulation.
CHAPTER III. DISPLAY RULES AND AFFECT IN EMOTIONAL LABOR

Affective Dispositions and Display Rules: Default Emotional ‘Input’

As previously mentioned, display rules are organizationally-determined norms or standards of behavior indicating which emotions are appropriate to display on the job (Zapf, 2002; Hochschild, 1983). Display rules emphasize the publicly observable side of emotions rather than actual feelings, and are often necessary for effective job performance (Diefendorff & Richard, 2003). While numerous jobs have the rule that positive emotions should be displayed (i.e. in customer service jobs), other jobs involving emotion work may require an individual to display negative emotions, such as irritation (e.g. bill collector; Rafaeli & Sutton, 1987). In control theory terms, display rules are the ‘standard’ that employees self-regulate towards (Diefendorff & Gosserand, 2003).

Individual differences are relevant to the understanding of what contributes to emotional discrepancies. Because an emotional discrepancy is subjective, individuals given identical goals (i.e. the same display rules), may experience emotional discrepancies of varying degrees (and thus engage in different amounts of emotional labor). Grandey’s (2000) emotional labor framework suggests that felt emotions can be influenced by emotional events in the workplace (as was shown in the previously-discussed example of a service employee who becomes angry after a customer blames him on a product malfunction). However, in the absence of such emotional events that prompt acute emotions, an employees’ felt emotions are likely to be a product of dispositional influences; that is, the emotion that an individual feels on average or in general. Recall that control theory suggests that individuals use an input function to assess their current state and compare it with the standard. In the case of an employee in a job with emotional display requirements, the default input (felt emotions) can best be represented by an
individual’s affective disposition, because that is what the employee ‘brings with them’ to the job.

Lazarus (1993) has defined affectivity as a general tendency to react to objects (e.g., jobs or people) in an emotionally consistent way (e.g., to be happy or sad). Two such affective traits that can serve as input and influence an employee’s felt emotions are positive and negative affectivity (PA and NA). Affective traits are theoretically relevant to the study of emotional discrepancies and emotional labor because affectivity consists of mood and emotional temperament (Watson, 2000). In fact, studies have shown that self-reported levels of affect have corresponded directly to different emotions (for example, negative affectivity corresponds with anger) (Izard, 1972; McNair, Lorr & Droppleman, 1971; Watson & Clark, 1992, 1994). Thus, it is important to explore how PA and NA might impact the emotional experience of discrepancy.

PA and NA have been found to have strong dispositional bases (Watson, 2000). A large body of evidence demonstrates that affectivity is stable over time, suggesting that PA and NA have personality trait-like stability (e.g. Diener & Larsen, 1984; Watson, Clark & Tellegen, 1988). Furthermore, affect research has shown that PA and NA are consistent across situations (Deiner & Larsen, 1984; Watson, 2000). For example, individuals who are unhappy and dissatisfied at work should also report more conflict and strain in their interpersonal lives.

Research on affectivity has shown that individuals high in PA tend to perceive things more positively. They tend to be sociable, energetic, experience happier moods and view the world in more positive terms. On the other hand, NA encompasses trait anxiety, low self-esteem, and depression. Those individuals that are high in NA tend to view the world in negative terms, leading to self-recrimination, distress, and dissatisfaction (Hogan, 1991; Watson & Clark, 1984; Watson, 2000). Note that although the names positive and negative affect
suggest that these are opposites, they actually represent two distinctive dimensions of affectivity (Watson, Clark & Tellegen, 1988; cf. Russell & Carroll, 1999).

PA and NA could moderate the relationship between display rules and emotional discrepancies by influencing felt emotions (i.e. by acting as ‘default input’). Emotional discrepancies depend on the mismatch between display rule perceptions and felt emotions; thus, the more an individual feels emotions in line with what is required of them, the less discrepancy he or she will experience. Because individuals high in PA tend to naturally feel positive emotions (Watson, 2000), it is likely that when faced with organizational demands to display positive emotions, they will experience little emotional discrepancy. However, those low in PA should experience a larger discrepancy because they likely will not be naturally feeling the emotions required to meet that display rule; that is, their default ‘input’ will likely be discrepant from the display rule standard to display positive emotions).

**H2: PA will moderate the relationship between positive display rules and emotional discrepancy such that the relationship between positive display rules and emotional discrepancy will be stronger for those lower in PA.**

Similar reasoning applies to those high in NA. Because individuals high in NA tend to experience more negative emotions, it is likely that when faced with display rules requiring the expression of negative emotions (i.e. as in the job of a bill collector), they will not experience much emotional discrepancy because it is likely that their feelings will naturally align with those expected for the job. However, if an individual low in NA is in a job that requires the display of negative emotions, that individual should experience more emotional discrepancy because it is likely that his or her felt emotions will not be consistent with those required.
**H3: NA will moderate the relationship between negative display rules and emotional discrepancy such that the relationship between negative display rules and emotional discrepancy will be stronger for those lower in NA.**

**Emotional Discrepancy as a Mediating Variable**

Past studies have explored display rules and display rule perceptions as predictors of emotional labor (Grandey, 2003; Diefendorff & Richard, 2003). Previous researchers have tested the assumption that the more that employees perceive that the organization expects them to display certain emotions, the more likely they will be to engage in emotional labor to produce those displays. For example, Hochschild (1983) found that explicit display rules for flight attendants predicted their emotional labor. Similarly, in a study of 152 working adults in a variety of occupations, Diefendorff and Richard (2003) concluded that employee perceptions of display rules to express positive emotions was related to emotional labor. However, these and other studies have failed to test how display rule perceptions predict emotional labor. The present study’s construct of emotional discrepancy can provide the theoretical link that helps explain how display rule perceptions influence emotional labor.

Recall that an emotional discrepancy is created by a mismatch between felt emotions and perceived organizationally-required emotions, and that emotional discrepancies are posited to elicit emotional labor. This suggests that the extent to which display rule perceptions predict emotional labor is dependent on the extent to which display rule perceptions are in conflict with an individual’s felt emotions (that is, how large of an emotional discrepancy exists). Thus, given identical displays rules, we should see varying degrees of emotional labor due to the fact that some people will not find the rules as emotionally taxing (because their emotions naturally align with what is required), and others will have to put forth substantially more emotional labor effort.
in order to bring their displays in line with organizational requirements. Because an emotional discrepancy is impacted by display rule perceptions (as previously discussed), and discrepancies are posited to be necessary precursors to emotional labor, it follows that display rules may predict emotional labor through emotional discrepancies. Though this idea has been suggested before in previous literature (Rubin et al., 2005), the current study is the first to operationalize and test emotional discrepancy as a mediating variable in the display rule-emotional labor relationship.

H4: Emotional discrepancy will mediate the relationship between display rule perceptions and emotional labor.

Summary and Framework of Proposed Study

The current study tests and elaborates on a part of Grandey’s (2000) model by proposing that a conflict between display rule perceptions and felt emotions (termed emotional discrepancy) gives rise to emotional labor. Specifically, display rule perceptions are posited to interact with affective dispositional traits to create an emotional discrepancy, which then prompts emotional labor (in the form of surface and deep acting) to reduce this discrepancy and meet the display rule. This yields two specific models: 1.) one that predicts that positive display rule perceptions will interact with PA to create an emotional discrepancy and 2.) one that predicts that negative display rule perceptions will interact with NA to create an emotional discrepancy. On the following page are visual depictions of current study’s proposed model.
Figure 3

*Model of Emotional Discrepancy for Positive Display Rules*

Positive organizational display rule perceptions → Emotional discrepancy → Emotional labor behaviors (surface/deep acting)

PA

Figure 4

*Model of Emotional Discrepancy for Negative Display Rules*

Negative organizational display rule perceptions → Emotional discrepancy → Emotional labor behaviors (surface/deep acting)

NA
CHAPTER IV. METHOD

Participants

Participants were 155 male and female undergraduate psychology students at a mid-sized university in the Midwest who received course credit for their participation. Forty (25.8%) of the participants were male and 115 (74.2%) were female. Consistent with the demographics of the university, a majority of the participants were White (76.8%), and of the remaining participants, 13.5% were Black, 3.9% were Hispanic, 1.3% were Asian and 4.5% identified themselves as either ‘mixed’ or ‘other’ race. The average age of the participants was 19.4 years, which is consistent with the average age of the students who take the general psychology course from which the sample was recruited. Fifty participants (32.3%) had no previous service experience, 35 (22.6%) had less than one year, 49 had between 1-3 years, and 13.6% had over 3 years of previous service experience.

Procedures

The present study employed an experimental method involving an emotional labor simulation. There were two display rule conditions – one in which the participants were asked to display positive emotions (specifically, happiness and enthusiasm; N=77), and one in which the participants were asked to display negative emotions (specifically, irritation and hostility; N=78). In the positive display rule condition, subjects participated in a role-play in which they acted as a university recruiter whose job was to recruit a top-notch student. In the negative display rule condition, subjects participated in a role-play in which they acted as a landlord whose job was to collect rent from delinquent student tenants. Each role-play was designed to simulate jobs where the display rules mandated the expression of the relevant emotions (i.e. enthusiasm for service workers, Totterdell & Holman, 2003, and irritation for bill collectors, Sutton, 1991).
Before arriving at the experimental session, the participants were sent a link to an online survey assessing their demographics and affective disposition (PA and NA). Each participant was assigned an ID number to fill in on the survey and this number was used to identify all data collected during the experimental session, allowing the author to match the survey data with the experimental data. When a participant arrived at the session, a research assistant (hereby referred to as ‘the experimenter’) randomly assigned him or her to either the positive or negative display rule condition via a coin toss. The experimenter then explained to the participant that he or she would be participating in a role-play and that he or she was expected to portray the assigned role as realistically as possible. The participant was given a written description of what to do in the role-play (see Appendices A and B for the role-play instructions). Furthermore, all of the participants were informed that they would be interacting with actual people and that it was important to stay in character. Note that the person with whom the participant interacted (hereafter referred to as ‘the target’) was a research assistant affiliated with the study, but the participant was not explicitly told this. Rather, they were simply told that they would be interacting with a ‘real person.’

In both display rule conditions, participants were told that “the emotion expressed in your role-play is just as important the content.” In order to ensure compliance with the experiment, the participants were watched by the experimenter during their interaction through a two-way mirror and they were evaluated on how well they expressed the emotions that their job required of them. The participants were told that if they did not display the appropriate emotions, they would have to repeat the simulation. Note that in the actual experiment, none of the participants actually were asked to repeat the simulation.
After being informed of what is required of them for the simulation, the participants read the role-play instructions and were given 10 minutes to prepare their speech and practice it with the experimenter. The experimenter pretended to be the other person in the role-play (either the delinquent student tenant or the potential student being recruited) and the participant did a run-through of their role-play with the experimenter. Throughout this process, the experimenter answered any questions that the participant had and emphasized the importance of expressing the required emotions.

After the participants completed the practice session and understood what was expected of them, they completed an emotional discrepancy measure to gauge how much their felt emotions conflicted with what they perceived to be the organizationally-required emotions. Furthermore, they completed a measure assessing perceived display rules. After completing these measures, the participant began the role-play. Because emotional labor is an interpersonal phenomenon (Hochschild, 1983), the participants interacted with a target who was a research assistant to the study. The target was trained to respond to the participant in such a way as to elicit more ‘emotion work’ from the participant. For example, in the negative display rule condition, the participant was harsh, irritated and angry when demanding rent money from the tenant. The target in response acted distressed and asked for kindness and understanding from the bill collector, thus challenging the bill collector to be even more irritated and angry. In the positive display rule condition, the target acted unimpressed and grumpy with the participant, thus challenging the recruiter to be even more enthusiastic and happy. The targets were trained by the author to use the appropriate facial expressions, body language, and gestures in the role-play, and each target practiced several role-plays under the supervision of the author before they worked with participants. To measure how well the target displayed the emotions appropriate to
the role-play condition, the experimenter observed the interaction through a two-way mirror and rated the target’s performance. The target was rated using a 3-item measure designed for each condition for the purposes of this study (see Appendices C and D for the items that were used to rate the target in the positive and negative conditions, respectively). One-hundred percent of the target’s ratings in the study were favorable responses (either a score of ‘4’ or ‘5’ on each item), indicating that the target performed well in the role-play.

Upon completion of the role-play, the participants filled out a survey assessing how much emotional labor they engaged in during the role-play. After completing the survey, the participants worked on an anagram task that required them to unscramble sets of letters to comprise English words, a task similar to that used by Baumeister, et al (1998). They were given five minutes to complete as many anagrams as they could. Additionally, while the participant was working on the anagram task, the target and the experimenter who observed the interaction through a two-way mirror rated how well they thought the participant did in meeting the display rule.

**Measures**

**Emotional Discrepancy**

Emotional discrepancy was measured using seven items from the Richard, Bourgeois and Diefendorff (2005) emotional dissonance scale, which improved upon the original Kruml and Geddes’ (2000b) emotional dissonance scale. Recall that emotional dissonance and emotional discrepancy are very similar constructs theoretically in that they both refer to a conflict involving felt emotions and emotional displays. However, an important difference is timing: emotional dissonance refers to a conflict between felt emotions and actual displays and emotional discrepancy refers to a conflict between felt emotions and anticipated displays (displays that an
employee perceives they are required to show). Thus, the seven-item Richard et al. scale was an appropriate scale to measure emotional discrepancy, with the items slightly reworded to reflect the difference in timing and context (for example, “The emotions I showed at work match what I truly feel” became “The emotions I’m expected to show in this simulation match what I truly feel.”). The responses were scored on a five-point Likert-type scale ranging from “Strongly agree” to “Strongly disagree.” The scale demonstrated high reliability ($\alpha=.94$). See Appendix E for the emotional discrepancy measure.

**Positive and Negative Affectivity**

PA and NA were measured with the Positive and Negative Affect Schedule (PANAS; Watson, Clark & Tellegen, 1988). The PANAS is widely used to measure trait affective disposition. Participants were asked to rate the extent to which they generally feel certain emotions, including ten positive (i.e. excited, enthusiastic) and ten negative (i.e. upset, irritable). PA and NA were rated on a five-point Likert-type scale ranging from “Not at all” to “Extremely” and had high reliability in the present study’s sample ($\alpha=.89$ for both the PA and NA subscales). See Appendix F for the PANAS measure.

**Display Rule Perceptions**

Positive display rule perceptions were measured using a modified version of Diefendorff, Croyle and Gosserand’s (2005) measure of perceived display rule demands. The scale consisted of six items—four from Diefendorff et al.’s scale that were slightly modified to correspond to a tour guide’s job, and two that were created by the author for the purposes of this study. For example, the item “My organization expects me to try and act excited and enthusiastic in my interactions with the customer” from the Diefendorff et al. scale was modified to become “I’m expected in the simulation to try to act excited and enthusiastic in my interactions with the
The participants rated the extent to which they agreed with statements regarding the display expectations in the simulation on a five-point, Likert-type scale ranging from “Strongly agree” to “Strongly disagree.” These items demonstrated high reliability ($\alpha = .91$). Negative display rule demands were measured using the same six items used to measure positive display rules, except modified to reflect negative display rules for the rent collector occupation. The participants rated the extent to which they agreed with statements regarding the display expectations in the simulation on a five-point, Likert-type scale ranging from “Strongly agree” to “Strongly disagree.” These items also had a high reliability ($\alpha = .90$). See Appendices G and H for copies of the positive display rule and negative display rule measures, respectively.

**Emotional Labor**

Emotional labor was first assessed using traditional self-report measures. Participants filled out a survey assessing surface acting, deep acting (which have traditionally been used to measure emotion regulation), as well as reverse-coded items reflecting emotional harmony (expressing naturally-occurring emotions). The scale contained 14 Likert-type items asking the participant to rate the extent to which they agreed with emotional labor items on a 5-point scale ranging from “Strongly agree” to “Strongly disagree.” The measure that was used was developed by Diefendorff, Cryole and Gosserand (2005). The Diefendorff, et al (2005) measure consists of several items from the Brotheridge and Lee (1998) Emotional Labor Scale and Kruml and Geddes (2000b) Emotive Effort Scale. The emotional labor scale had demonstrated high reliability in the present study’s sample ($\alpha = .91$). See Appendix I for a copy of the emotional labor scale items.

Additionally, emotional labor was measured indirectly using performance on an anagram task completed after the emotional labor simulation. Previous research has suggested that
emotional labor will expend effort and draw resources from a limited pool (Baumeister et al, 1998) that can affect performance on a subsequent, unrelated task. Thus, the current study measured emotional labor implicitly by assessing performance on an anagram task as used by Baumeister, et al (1998). The task required the participants to unscramble sets of letters to form English words. Anagrams were chosen as a measure of performance because they minimize differences in experience or knowledge with no gender difference in performance (Bourne, Ekstrand and Dominowski, 1971; Mendelsohn, Griswold and Anderson, 1966). The anagrams were thirty five-letter words taken from an anagram list created by Tesselt and Maynzer (1966) with an average solving time of between 15-30 seconds each. Sample words included YAPTR (party) and NUFYN (funny). Performance was measured based on the number of words correctly formed in four minutes. The fewer words an individual unscrambled, the more emotional labor was assumed to have taken place. Refer to Appendix J for a copy of the anagram task.

**Emotional Display Effectiveness**

To ensure that the participant was complying with the experiment, a measure was created for the purposes of the study to tap the extent to which the participant displayed the appropriate emotions in each condition. Both the experimenter, who observed the interaction through a two-way mirror, and the target, rated the participant on this dimension in order to establish inter-rater reliability. The raters indicated the extent to which they agreed with six items on a five-point Likert-type scale ranging from “Strongly disagree” (1) to “Strongly agree” (5). The scale had demonstrated high reliability with both the experimenter and target ($\alpha = .93$ and .95, respectively). Please refer to Appendices K and L for the emotional display effectiveness items in the positive and negative display rule conditions, respectively.
Control variables

Because research has suggested that females traditionally engage in emotional labor naturally more than men (Hochschild, 1983; Simpson & Stroh, 2004), gender information for each participant was collected. Furthermore, previous researchers have suggested that role internalization, which occurs when an individuals does a job for so long that they begin to identify with the job or job values, may decrease the amount of emotional labor that individual engages in over time (Rubin, et al, 2005). To ensure that previously job experience did not affect emotional discrepancies or emotional labor, number of years’ experience working in the service industry was noted. Other demographic information, such as age and race, was also collected to ensure that those factors did not influence the relationships
CHAPTER V. RESULTS

Descriptive Statistics and Bivariate Correlations

All data were analyzed using the data analytic program SPSS. Means, standard deviations and intercorrelations of all major study and control variables are shown in Table 1 on the following page. Of special interest is the finding that emotional discrepancy was strongly correlated to reported emotional labor \((r = .785, p < .001)\), suggesting that as participants experienced more discrepancy, they also reported in engaging in more emotional labor. Also notable is the fact that age and previous service experience did not significantly correlate with any of the major study variables. Furthermore, there were no differences in scores between genders or racial groups (see Tables 2 and 3 on page 27). As such, these control variables were not included in further analyses.

Preliminary Analyses

Preliminary analyses were conducted on the emotional display effectiveness variable to indicate the extent to which the participants took the experiment seriously and displayed the appropriate emotions. Inter-rater agreement on the ratings of the participants’ effectiveness was established by calculating Pearson’s \(r\) coefficient. The coefficient of agreement between these two variable was \(r = .77 (p = .000)\), indicating that raters had high agreement of the participants’ display effectiveness. As such, both ratings were averaged to obtain a single rating of effectiveness for each participant. Of the 155 participants, 130 (84%) obtained a rating of 3 or higher on the effectiveness scale, indicating that the participants took the experiment seriously and displayed the appropriate emotions in the simulation.
Table 1

*Means, Standard Deviations, Intercorrelations, and Coefficient Alpha Reliabilities for Major Study Variables*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</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>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Positive Affect</td>
<td>3.37</td>
<td>.79</td>
<td>α=.89</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Negative Affect</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>.76</td>
<td>.034</td>
<td>α=.89</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Positive DR</td>
<td>4.53</td>
<td>.70</td>
<td>.119</td>
<td>-.043</td>
<td>α=.91</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Negative DR</td>
<td>4.22</td>
<td>.89</td>
<td>.053</td>
<td>-.206</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>α=.90</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Emotional Discrepancy</td>
<td>3.57</td>
<td>1.12</td>
<td>-.169</td>
<td>-.264**</td>
<td>-.056</td>
<td>.108</td>
<td>α=.94</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Emotional Labor</td>
<td>3.43</td>
<td>.85</td>
<td>-.019</td>
<td>-.275**</td>
<td>.032</td>
<td>.232*</td>
<td>.785**</td>
<td>α=.91</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Age</td>
<td>19.41</td>
<td>2.97</td>
<td>.038</td>
<td>-.038</td>
<td>.060</td>
<td>.038</td>
<td>-.029</td>
<td>-.049</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Previous Service Experience</td>
<td>2.28</td>
<td>1.08</td>
<td>.008</td>
<td>-.070</td>
<td>.104</td>
<td>-.006</td>
<td>.084</td>
<td>.145</td>
<td>.303**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: N=155  * p < .05  ** p < .01*
Table 2

*T-test for Gender Differences in Major Study Variables*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>t-statistic</th>
<th>Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Positive Affect</td>
<td>.83</td>
<td>.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative Affect</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td>.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive Display Rule Perceptions</td>
<td>-1.25</td>
<td>.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative Display Rule Perceptions</td>
<td>-.64</td>
<td>.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotional Discrepancy</td>
<td>-1.07</td>
<td>.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotional Labor</td>
<td>-1.83</td>
<td>.07</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3

*ANOVA Test for Racial Group Differences for Major Study Variables*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>F-statistic</th>
<th>Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Positive Affect</td>
<td>.66</td>
<td>.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative Affect</td>
<td>1.57</td>
<td>.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive Display Rule Perceptions</td>
<td>.58</td>
<td>.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative Display Rule Perceptions</td>
<td>1.55</td>
<td>.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotional Discrepancy</td>
<td>.32</td>
<td>.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotional Labor</td>
<td>.48</td>
<td>.80</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Hypothesis Testing

**Hypothesis 1**

Multiple regression was used to test Hypothesis 1a and 1b. For Hypothesis 1a, emotional discrepancy was entered in the regression equation as a main effect with self-reported emotional labor as the dependent variable. The results indicated that emotional discrepancy strongly predicts reported emotional labor ($\beta = .592, p = .000$). Furthermore, emotional discrepancy explained 61.7% of the variance in reported emotional labor, supporting Hypothesis 1a. Hypothesis 1b also tested emotional discrepancy as a predictor of emotional labor, but used scores on an anagram task as a different measure of emotional labor. Because the anagram task was a cognitive task, a measure of cognitive ability (ACT scores) was controlled for. Thus, to test this hypothesis, ACT score was entered in the first step of the regression equation, and emotional discrepancy was entered second in the regression equation as a predictor of the number of words the participant correctly unscrambled on the anagram task. The analysis revealed no support for this hypothesis ($\beta = -.199, p > .05, R^2 = .001$).

**Hypothesis 2**

Hypothesis 2 posited that positive display rule perceptions would positively predict emotional discrepancy only for those lower in PA, and thus moderated regression was used to test this hypothesis. When testing for the presence of an interaction, the first step is to center the independent variables. This makes the results more interpretable and reduces multicollinearity among the predictors (Aiken & West, 1991). Thus, the variable means for PA and positive display rule perceptions were subtracted from each PA and positive display rule score to center the variable. Then, an interaction term was created by multiplying each PA score by the positive display rule perceptions score. To test the hypothesis, the main effects (PA and positive display
rule perceptions) were entered in the first step of the equation, and then the interaction term was entered in the second step. Emotional discrepancy was entered as the dependent variable.

The results of the Hypothesis 2 tests indicated a significant main effect for PA ($\beta = -.486$, $p = .000$), indicating that participants high in PA were less likely to experience emotional discrepancy. There was no significant main effect for positive display rule perceptions ($\beta = .002$, $p > .05$). Overall, Step 1 of the regression equation accounted for 23.6% ($p = .000$) of the variance in emotional discrepancy. The results also indicated a significant interaction term ($\beta = -.227$, $p = .04$), with the interaction of PA and positive display rule perceptions accounting for an additional 4.3% of the variance in emotional discrepancy. A graph of the interaction was created in order to determine whether or not the interaction occurred in the hypothesized direction (see Figure 5). Examination of the form of the interaction reveals that Hypothesis 2 is indeed supported: The graph indicates a positive relationship between positive display rule perceptions and emotional discrepancy for those low in PA, but not for those high in PA. Please see Figure 5 on the top of the following page for the graph of the interaction and refer to Table 4 on page 31 for the complete moderation analysis.
Figure 5

*Graph of Interaction between PA and Positive Display Rule Perceptions in Predicting Emotional Discrepancy*
Table 4

*Moderation Analysis for Hypothesis 2*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Emotional Discrepancy</th>
<th>Independent Variable</th>
<th>Step 1</th>
<th>Step 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Positive Affect (PA)</td>
<td>-.486**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Positive Display Rule Perceptions (PDR)</td>
<td>.002</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PA x PDR</td>
<td></td>
<td>-.227*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$\Delta R^2$</td>
<td>.236**</td>
<td>.043*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$R^2$</td>
<td>.236**</td>
<td>.279*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Adjusted $R^2$</td>
<td>.215**</td>
<td>.249*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: N = 77. Standardized coefficients are reported.  *p < .05  **p < .01*
Hypothesis 3

Hypothesis 3 was tested next. Hypothesis 3 stated that negative display rule perceptions would positively predict emotional discrepancy only for those low in NA, and, like Hypothesis 2, moderated regression was used. First, the independent variables were centered by subtracting the variable means for NA and negative display rule perceptions from each NA and negative display rule score to center the variable. Then each NA score was multiplied by the negative display rule score to create an interaction term. To test the hypothesis, the main effects (NA and negative display rule perceptions) were entered in the first step of the equation, and then the interaction term was entered in the second step. Emotional discrepancy was entered as the dependent variable. The regression analysis revealed a significant main effect for NA ($\beta = -.685$, $p = .000$), indicating that participants high in NA were less likely to experience emotional discrepancy in the negative display rule (bill collector) condition. No significant main was found for negative display rule perceptions ($\beta = -.033$, $p > .05$). Overall, Step 1 of the regression equation accounted for 46.1% ($p = .000$) of the variance in emotional discrepancy. The second step of the regression equation (the interaction term) was also found to be a significant predictor of emotional discrepancy ($\beta = -.346$, $p = .000$), and it added 11.2% ($p = .000$) of incremental variance to the model. A graph of the interaction was created in order to determine whether or not the interaction occurred in the hypothesized direction (see Figure 6). Inspection of the form of the interaction suggests that Hypothesis 3 is supported: The graph reveals a positive relationship between negative display rule perceptions and emotional discrepancy for those low in NA, but not for those high in NA. Please see Figure 6 on the following page for a graph of the interaction and refer to Table 6 on the page 34 in for the complete moderation analysis.
Figure 6

Graph of Interaction between PA and Positive Display Rule Perceptions in Predicting Emotional Discrepancy
Table 5

*Moderation Analysis for Hypothesis 3*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Emotional Discrepancy</th>
<th>Independent Variable</th>
<th>Step 1</th>
<th>Step 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Negative Affect (NA)</td>
<td>-.685**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Negative Display Rule Perceptions (NDR)</td>
<td>-.033</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NA x NDR</td>
<td></td>
<td>-.346**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Δ$R^2$</td>
<td>.461**</td>
<td>.112*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$R^2$</td>
<td>.461**</td>
<td>.573*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjusted $R^2$</td>
<td>.447**</td>
<td>.555*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: N = 78. Standardized coefficients are reported. * p < .05  ** p< .01*
**Hypothesis 4**

Hypothesis 4 posited that emotional discrepancy would mediate the relationship between display rule perceptions and emotional labor. Because PA and NA have been shown to interact with display rule perceptions to impact emotional discrepancy (Hypothesis 2 and 3), and because there are two different display rule conditions (positive and negative), it was necessary to conduct two separate mediated moderation models to test this hypothesis. The first mediation tested whether the emotional discrepancy mediated the relationship between the interaction of PA and positive display rule perceptions and emotional labor (see below Figure 7 for a visual depiction of this mediation):

Figure 7

*Proposed Mediation in Positive Condition*

The mediated moderation procedure was done in accordance with the regression procedure developed by Baron and Kenny (1986; 2006). According to this method, the magnitude of mediation is determined by the reduction of the effect of the predictor on the outcome once the mediator variable is added to the model. Four steps need to be fulfilled in order to establish mediated moderation. First, one must show that the initial variable is correlated with the outcome variable (i.e. that there is an effect that may be mediated). Because this is a moderated mediation, the initial variable is the interaction term, with the main effects being treated as covariates. Thus, to test Step 1 of the mediation procedure, a regression analysis
was performed with PA and positive display rule perceptions entered first in the equation and the interaction term entered second in the equation. Emotional labor was the dependent variable. The results revealed that the interaction term significantly predicted emotional labor ($\beta = -.358$, $p = .003$), thus satisfying Step 1 of the mediation procedure.

In Step 2, one must demonstrate that the initial variable is related to the mediator. Thus, to test this step, PA and positive display rule perceptions were first entered into the regression equation and the interaction term was entered second. Emotional discrepancy was the dependent variable. The interaction term was found to be a significant predictor of emotional discrepancy ($\beta = -.227$, $p = .04$), thus fulfilling Step 2 of the mediation procedure. In Step 3, one must show that the mediator affects the outcome variable while controlling for the effects of the initial variable. Thus, to test Step 3, the covariates and the interaction term were entered first and second in the regression equation as controls. Emotional discrepancy was entered last. Emotional labor was the dependent variable. The results indicated that emotional discrepancy predicted emotional labor, even when controlling for the effects of the interaction term ($\beta = .780$, $p = .000$), thus meeting the criteria for Step 3.

For the final step in the mediation procedure, to establish full mediation, one must demonstrate that the effect of the initial variable on the outcome variable becomes zero once the mediator is controlled for. To test this step, emotional discrepancy was entered in the first step of the regression equation, with the interaction term and its covariates entered in the second and third steps. Emotional labor was the dependent variable. The results indicated that the interaction term still significantly predicted emotional labor ($\beta = -.181$, $p = .026$). However, the beta coefficient was reduced in magnitude from Steps 1 to 4 (from -.358 to -.181), suggesting
partial mediation. Please refer to Table 7 on the following page for the complete mediation analysis.

Steps 1-4 were repeated to test the second mediated moderation model for the negative display rule condition (see Figure 8 below).

Figure 8

*Proposed Mediation in Negative Condition*

![Diagram](image)

To test Step 1, NA and negative display rule perceptions (the covariates) were entered first in the regression equation and the interaction term was entered in the second. Emotional labor was the dependent variable. The results revealed that the interaction term significantly predicted emotional labor ($\beta = -.279, p = .002$), thus satisfying Step 1 of the mediation procedure. To test Step 2, NA and negative display rule perceptions were first entered into the regression equation and the interaction term was entered second. Emotional discrepancy was the dependent variable. The interaction term was found to be a significant predictor of emotional discrepancy ($\beta = -.346, p = .000$), thus fulfilling Step 2 of the mediation procedure. For Step 3, the covariates and the interaction term were entered first and second in the regression equation as controls. Emotional discrepancy was entered last. Emotional labor was the dependent variable. The results indicated that emotional discrepancy predicted emotional labor, even when controlling for the effects of the interaction term ($\beta = .568, p = .000$), thus meeting the criteria for Step 3.
### Table 6

*Meditation Analysis for Positive Condition*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mediation Regression Steps</th>
<th>Mediation Analysis Step 1: Initial $\rightarrow$ Outcome</th>
<th>Mediation Analysis Step 2: Initial $\rightarrow$ Mediator</th>
<th>Mediation Analysis Step 3: Mediator $\rightarrow$ Outcome/Initial</th>
<th>Mediation Analysis Step 4: Initial $\rightarrow$ Outcome/Mediator</th>
<th>Mediation Outcome</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Control Variables</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive Affect</td>
<td>-.380**</td>
<td>-.537**</td>
<td>.039</td>
<td>.101</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pos DR Perceptions</td>
<td>.198</td>
<td>.084</td>
<td>.132</td>
<td>.066</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Initial Predictor Variable</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pos DR Perceptions $x$ Positive Affect</td>
<td>-.358**</td>
<td>-.227*</td>
<td>-.181*</td>
<td>-.181*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mediator</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotional Discrepancy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.780**</td>
<td>.825**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Outcome</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotional Labor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$R^2$</td>
<td>.197**</td>
<td>.279*</td>
<td>.636**</td>
<td>.636*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: N = 77  ** p < .05  * p < .05*
To test the final step in the mediation procedure, emotional discrepancy was entered in the first step of the regression equation, with the covariates and the interaction term entered in the second and third steps. Emotional labor was the dependent variable. The results indicated that once discrepancy was controlled for, the relationship between the interaction term and emotional labor became non-significant ($\beta = -0.083, p = 0.331$). This is consistent with Baron and Kenny’s (1986, 2006) criteria for full mediated moderation. Please refer to Table 8 on the following page for the complete mediation analysis in the negative display rule condition. Taking both mediation analyses together, Hypothesis 4 was mostly supported – the positive display rule model showed partial mediated moderation, while the negative display rule model indicated full mediated moderation.
Table 7
*Mediation Analysis for Negative Condition*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mediation Regression Steps</th>
<th>Mediation Analysis</th>
<th>Mediation Analysis</th>
<th>Mediation Analysis</th>
<th>Mediation Analysis</th>
<th>Mediation Outcome</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Step 1: Initial → Outcome</td>
<td>Step 2: Initial → Mediator</td>
<td>Step 3: Mediator → Outcome/Initial</td>
<td>Step 4: Initial → Outcome/Mediator</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Control Variables</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative Affect</td>
<td>-.594**</td>
<td>-.674**</td>
<td>-.212*</td>
<td>-.180</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neg DR Perceptions</td>
<td>.183</td>
<td>.060</td>
<td>.149</td>
<td>.128</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Initial Predictor Variable</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neg DR Perceptions x Negative Affect</td>
<td>-.279**</td>
<td>-.346**</td>
<td>-.083</td>
<td>-.083</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mediator</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotional Discrepancy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.568**</td>
<td>.568**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Outcome</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotional Labor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$R^2$</td>
<td>.475*</td>
<td>.573**</td>
<td>.612**</td>
<td>.612**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: N=78  ** p < .01  * p < .05*
CHAPTER VI. DISCUSSION

The purpose of the current study was to add to the current emotional labor literature by testing a mechanism by which employees might be motivated to engage in emotional labor. While past research has posited that display rules and affective states can influence emotional labor (Grandey, 2000), no known research has explored how these antecedents might interact to impact the emotional labor process. Diefendorff and Gosserand (2003) offered control theory (Carver & Scheier, 1998) as a possible theoretical framework within which to understand emotional labor, and so the current study extends and tests this work by positing and testing emotional discrepancy as a possible mechanism that helps motivate emotional labor.

Overall, the data overwhelmingly supported emotional discrepancy as an important part of the emotional labor process. Emotional discrepancy and emotional labor were highly correlated ($r = .785$), and regression analysis revealed that emotional discrepancy strongly predicts emotional labor ($\beta = .592, p = .000$). This lends support to the idea that individuals may engage in emotional labor because they experience a conflict between what the emotions they are currently feeling and those that they are expected to display. The conflict acts as motivation for the employee to engage in emotional labor strategies to reduce the conflict.

It is important to note there that the current study measured emotional labor in two different ways: self-reported emotional labor and also as performance on an anagram task. Anagram tasks have been used in previous research to demonstrate how, when individuals engage in emotional labor, their resource pools are depleted and they have fewer resources available to use for cognitive tasks (Muraven, Tice & Baumeister, 1998). Emotional discrepancy was found to be a strong predictor of emotional labor only as measured by self-report and was not related to performance on an anagram task ($\beta = -.199, p > .05$). There are a couple of
explanations for this finding. First, it is possible that the participants did not engage in emotional labor long enough to drain resources that would noticeably impair performance on an anagram task. The participants in the current study engaged in the role-plays for between three and five minutes; in other studies measuring resource depletion, participants engaged in emotional labor for up to 18 minutes (e.g. Muraven, Tice & Baumeister, 1998). Thus, perhaps it takes some time for resources to be depleted and the participants did not engage in emotional labor for a long enough time. Alternatively, it is possible that perhaps cognitive ability is such a strong predictor of performance on this particular cognitive task (in fact, the correlation between ACT scores and performance on the task was .504), that it outweighs any effect drained resources may have. In any case, it is unclear from the results of the present study if drained resources are an accurate reflection of the emotional labor an employee engages in, and thus further research is needed in this area.

The present study also looked at how display rule perceptions and affective dispositions interact to impact emotional discrepancy (which in turn impacts emotional labor). Display rule perceptions are an employee’s perception of what emotions they are expected to display on the job (Grandey, 2000). The current literature offers that display rules are an important antecedent of emotional labor (e.g. Grandey, 2000), but does not explain how. Thus, the present study hypothesized that a conflict between the emotions that one is currently feeling (likely influenced by their general affective disposition) and their expectations for what they need to display (their display rule perceptions) would lead to emotional discrepancy. And indeed, the data provide support for this assertion. In the positive display rule condition, both a main effect for PA ($\beta = -.486, p = .000$) and a significant interaction between PA and positive display rule perceptions ($\beta = -.227, p = .04$), were found for emotional discrepancy. The negative beta weight in the main
effect indicates that the higher participants were in PA, the less likely that they were to report experiencing a discrepancy. Although not specifically hypothesized, this main effect makes sense because these individuals were in a simulation where they were expected to display positive emotions. Thus, those higher in PA didn’t experience as much of a conflict (or discrepancy) because they were already naturally feeling the emotions that they needed to display (due to their high positive affect). Furthermore, examination of the graph of the interaction points to the importance of both display rule perceptions and affective disposition in predicting emotional discrepancy. Positive display rule perceptions were positively related to emotional discrepancy only for those low in PA. Thus, if an employee is low in PA, the more they are aware that they must display positive emotions, the more discrepancy they will experience.

Similar results were obtained for the negative display rule condition. The data yielded a main effect for NA on discrepancy ($\beta = -.685, p = .000$), which again, makes sense because in a simulation where the participants had to display negative emotions, the higher the participant was in NA, the less discrepancy they experienced because they were likely already naturally feeling the emotions required for the simulation. Like the positive display rule condition, there was also a significant interaction of NA and negative display rule perceptions on emotional discrepancy ($\beta = -.346, p = .000$), such that negative display rule perceptions predicted emotional discrepancy only for those low in NA. It is interesting to note that while the moderated model was supported for both the positive and negative conditions, the effects were stronger in the negative display rule condition (i.e. $\beta = -.227$ in the positive condition and -.346 in the negative condition). This may be due to the fact that more people reported themselves as being higher in PA than NA (mean score for positive affect was 3.4 vs. 2.0 for negative affect). Thus, more
participants may have experienced a discrepancy in the negative display rule condition due to the fact that they were, on average, naturally lower in NA, thus yielding a stronger effect.

Perhaps the most interesting finding was the fact that the mediated moderated model was fully supported in the negative display rule condition and partially supported in the positive display rule condition, lending support to the idea that emotional discrepancy helps explain the relationship between display rules and emotional labor. This is a very important addition to the literature, as previous researchers have tested the assumption that the more that employees perceive display rules, the more they will engage in emotional labor to meet those display rules but they have not explained how this relationship comes to be or under what conditions it might hold. The results of this study indicate that it is not simply the display rules that automatically lead an employee to engage in emotional labor. Rather, it is whether or not an employee perceives a display rule and whether or not that rule conflicts with their current affective state that contributes to emotional labor.

Practical Implications

The present study shed some light into the process of emotional labor and helps us understand how and why employees are motivated to engage in emotional labor. Knowing that emotional discrepancy is an antecedent of emotional labor has important implications for service organizations. Although not specifically examined in this study, emotional labor has been found in previous research to have many negative consequences for the employee (i.e. burnout, stress, health problems; Gross & Levenson, 2001; Zapf, Seifert, Schmutte, Mertini & Holz, 2001; Brotheridge & Lee, 1998; Adelmann, 1995). Thus, organizations may want to focus on reducing emotional discrepancy in order to lessen the amount of emotional labor their employees engage in. One possible way that this might be achieved is through influencing employee mood on the
job, particularly in service organizations where the expressions of positive emotions are required. If the organization takes steps to try to foster a work environment that induces positive moods, it may reduce discrepancy for those individuals who are not naturally high on positive affect, or those who may have experienced a negative event at work that inspired a negative mood (i.e. getting yelled at by a customer). Research has shown that in the workplace, positive moods may be fostered by promoting a sense of competence, achievement, and meaning in the workplace, providing rewards and recognition, and keeping work group or team size relatively small (George, 1998). Thus, one idea may be for management to specially recognize employees who provide excellent customer service in the face of difficult customers as a way of trying to reduce discrepancy and foster a positive mood. Mood in the workplace environment can also be influenced via emotional contagion if the supervisor displays the mood he or she seeks in his subordinates. Emotional contagion is a phenomenon whereby an individual can ‘catch’ another person’s mood (Hatfield, Cappicco & Rapson, 1994). Thus, managers may be able to set the tone of the work environment by adjusting their own mood. This may be a more practical recommendation for organizations in which positive emotions are required. Inspiring negative moods via contagion or other methods in jobs where negative emotions are required may not be ethical or healthy for the employee (despite its potential to reduce discrepancy for those dispositionally low in negative affect), since these negative moods may carry over to other domains of the employee’s life and have a detrimental impact.

Another practical implication of the present study’s findings is in the realm of training. Since emotional discrepancy has been found to predict emotional labor, organizations may want to focus on educating their employees about the construct of emotional discrepancy and ways to manage it. Perhaps management can develop programs in which they train their employees to
understand that discrepancies may occur on the job, either as a product of dispositional influences or emotional events that happen while at work to inspire conflicting emotions. If employees are educated about the nature of emotional discrepancies and are able to anticipate them, perhaps over time they will come to see them as an expected part of their job and thus will be less affected by them. Alternatively, when educating employees about emotional discrepancies, organizations can provide training for ways in which to effectively manage discrepancies when they occur. While a detailed discussion of such a training program is beyond the scope of this manuscript, one idea may be for management to provide opportunities for an employee to discuss any conflicting emotions they may experience on the job. This could be accomplished by encouraging employees to informally share their emotional experiences with one another, or the organization could even set up times for ‘emotional breaks’ throughout the work day where employees could have an opportunity to discuss their discrepancies with management or other employees. Giving employees the chance to discuss or ‘vent’ any conflicting emotions may help to diffuse discrepancies. Overall, the important implication that organizations should take away from the present research is that conflicting emotions are at the root of emotional labor – so any training program that helps employees deal with conflicting emotions will ultimately aid in lessening the amount of emotional labor that their employees engage in. In fact, the development of training along this vein is one area where future research opportunities are plentiful.

Limitations

Although the present study contributed valuable information to the current literature, it is not without its limitations. First, as is the case with any laboratory experiment, generalizability of the results is an issue because of the lack of realism that occurs in a lab setting. The present
study used a student sample and thus did not measure actual employee behavior and feelings. However, other researchers have argued for the external validity of laboratory experiments (Anderson, Lindsay, & Bushman, 1999), particularly when a realistic scenario for the participants is used (such as the one that was created in the present study). Also, it may be possible that the effects found in this study hold only for the jobs that were simulated (tour guides and bill collectors).

Another potential limitation in the present study is the fact that the relationship between emotional discrepancy and emotional labor could be inflated due to common method bias. These variables were both self-report and collected at the same point in time. However, affective disposition (PA and NA) information was collected at a different point in time (in an online survey taken at least 24 hours before the experiment), which is a strength of the present study’s method.

Since emotional discrepancy is a new construct introduced for the first time in this study, its measurement has not been established. Although it makes theoretical sense to adapt an existing emotional dissonance scale and change the wording to reflect the difference in timing to create the emotional discrepancy scale, one may still question how reliable and valid this measure is. It is possible that emotional dissonance and emotional discrepancy are two independent, unrelated constructs, and thus it may not be appropriate to use similar items to measure them.

Future Directions

There are many fruitful avenues for future research in this area, as the role of emotional discrepancy in the emotional labor process is still relatively unknown. One area that needs immediate research attention is the measurement of this construct. As previously mentioned,
there has been no construct validation research done on this variable. Now that there is preliminary evidence suggesting that emotional discrepancy is a powerful predictor of emotional labor, it is important that future researchers begin to develop and validate scales to measure this construct. The adapted emotional dissonance scale was used as a measure of emotional discrepancy in the present study, and though its use was theory-based, there still is a need to validate this instrument or perhaps develop new items that may further tap into this important construct. Furthermore, since emotional discrepancy was measured with a self-report method and was highly correlated with self-report emotional labor, it is important that further research explore the relationship between emotional discrepancy with emotional labor as measured using non self-report methods. By measuring emotional labor with non self-report methods, future research can further establish emotional discrepancy as an important predictor of emotional labor without questioning the confound of common method bias.

Research is also needed to explore additional individual differences that may interact with display rule perceptions to influence emotional discrepancy. Though the present study identified PA and NA as two important dispositional traits, there may be many others that are essential in helping us understand how and why emotional discrepancy occurs. For example, emotional intelligence involves the ability to perceive and appraise emotion and the ability to manage emotions in oneself or others (Mayer, Caruso & Salovey, 2000). Thus, it is possible that emotionally intelligent employees are able to perceive display rules more readily and can naturally and effortlessly adjust their mood and emotions to correspond with these rules, thus reducing their experienced discrepancy. It would be interesting for future research to examine whether levels of emotional discrepancy differ among emotionally intelligent vs. non-emotionally intelligent employees.
It would also be interesting to replicate the current study using other service jobs that require the display of positive or negative emotions. As previously mentioned, one limitation of the present study was the use of only two specific jobs in the simulation; thus, replication is needed to explore whether or not the results generalize to other service occupations. Also, it would be interesting to collect information about the link between emotional discrepancies and emotional labor in a field setting to see if these relationships hold outside of the laboratory.

A final avenue for future research might be to consider emotional discrepancy’s direct impact on other organizationally-important outcome variables that have been associated with emotional labor. For example, emotional discrepancy might be useful in predicting job satisfaction, burnout or job commitment (Diefendorff & Gosserand, 2003). Emotional discrepancy might affect these variables through its impact on emotional labor, or there may be a more direct relationship. As such, it is important that future research address these questions.

Thus, it is evident that the current study has only scratched the surface regarding the role of emotional discrepancy in the emotional labor process. It provides a foundation upon which future research can build in order to continue the exploration into the mechanisms underlying emotional labor.
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APPENDIX A

Campus Recruiter Role-Play Instructions

This is a role-play. You are a recruiter at Bowling Green State University, and your job is to help recruit top-notch students to our school. As part of that job, you are required to interact with a potential student and give him/her information about BGSU. Statistics show that when recruiters show enthusiasm and excitement, the students are more likely to attend BGSU. You must prepare 3-5 minutes’ worth of speech to say to the recruit. Below is a sample speech to help get you started. You are encouraged to expand upon this and add anything else that you think will help persuade the student to come to BGSU.

*BGSU offers an outstanding educational experience. BGSU combines the atmosphere of a small college with the opportunities of a major university. It has more than 200 undergraduate majors and programs with high-quality faculty members who care about their students. BGSU also values growth in areas other than academics, offering more than 325 student organizations for you to get involved in. BGSU also have a number of varsity sports, including an excellent football team. Watching the BGSU Falcons play football is a great way to spend a fall afternoon.*

*Stop at this point and ask for questions or comments*

*Additionally, BGSU offers over 400 cultural and special events each month, including concerts, lectures, and social events. BGSU is in walking distance of many excellent bars and restaurants, and the town itself is close to major cities such as Toledo, Detroit and Ann Arbor. All residence halls offer large, modern rooms with computer labs and internet connection in each room. BGSU is basically an excellent choice for a well-rounded academic and personal growth experience.*

Remember, it is crucial that you show nothing but excitement and enthusiasm the whole time you are speaking with the recruit. *The emotions given in your speech are just as important as the content of your speech!!* In order to make sure that you are communicating excitement and enthusiasm, your boss will be watching the interaction through a two-way mirror. If you do not express enough enthusiasm and excitement, you will have to return here to practice, and then do the interaction over again. Remember, no matter what the potential student says, it is your job to be enthusiastic and excited and convince them that BGSU is a great place to go to school!

You will have 10 minutes to practice your interaction with the experimenter. Please feel free to ask any questions at this time.
APPENDIX B

Rent Collector Role-Play Instructions

This is a role-play. You are a bill collector in at Bowling Green, OH, and your job is to collect money from delinquent student tenants who have not paid their rent in several months. As part of that job, you are required to go to the homes of delinquent tenants and let them know that they have 3 days to pay their back rent, or else they will be evicted. Organizations like when bill collectors show irritation and hostility, because delinquent tenants may be more likely to pay their back rent. You must prepare 3-5 minutes’ worth of speech to say to the tenant. Below is a sample of what you might say to the tenant to help you get started. You are encouraged to expand this and add anything else that you think will help persuade the tenant to pay their rent.

My name is ___________ and I am here on behalf of the Bowling Green Realty, Inc. Our agency has informed me that you are currently three months behind on rent, which totals over $1000. The agency will give you 3 days to pay its back rent, or it will be forced to take action. If you do not pay your debts, the agency will evict you and you will lose your security deposit. Your name will also be reported to the credit bureau, which will tarnish your credit report and you will have trouble getting loans in the future. Remember, you only have THREE DAYS.

*Stop at this point and ask for questions or comments*

The agency has been very patient and cooperative up until this point, but you have been delinquent for so long, that the agency is not going to be nice any longer. I don’t care if you don’t have the money. You will have to find some way to scrape it up by borrowing from a friend or maybe selling some of your possessions. We have waited long enough for our money, and we won’t wait anymore. I expect to see the money in three days, or else there will be consequences.

Remember, it is crucial that you show nothing but irritation and hostility the whole time you are speaking with the tenant. The emotions you express while talking to the tenant are just as important as what you say!! In order to make sure that you are communicating irritation and anger, your boss will be watching the interaction through a two-way mirror. If you do not express anger, irritation and hostility, you will have to return here to practice, and then do the interaction over again. Remember, no matter what the tenant says, or what excuses they make, it is your job to be stern, harsh, angry and convince them to pay their rent within the next 3 days.

You will have 10 minutes to practice your interaction with the experimenter. Please feel free to ask any questions at this time.
APPENDIX C

*Target Rating Scale in Positive Condition*

Please rate the extent to which you agree with these statements. Use the following scale to record your answers:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>Slightly disagree</td>
<td>Neither agree nor disagree</td>
<td>Slightly agree</td>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. The actor appeared unimpressed and unenthusiastic when the participant was talking

   ____

2. The actor looked bored

   ____

3. The actor’s facial expressions, body language, tone of voice, etc. indicated that she was uninterested.

   ____
APPENDIX D

Target Rating Scale in Negative Condition

Please rate the extent to which you agree with these statements. Use the following scale to record your answers:

1. Strongly disagree
2. Slightly disagree
3. Neither agree nor disagree
4. Slightly agree
5. Strongly agree

1. The actor appeared sad and scared when the participant was talking _____

2. The actor looked almost as if they could cry _____

3. The actor’s facial expressions, body language, tone of voice, etc. indicated that she was upset. _____
APPENDIX E

Emotional Discrepancy Measure

Please rate the extent to which you agree with these statements. Use the following scale to record your answers:


1. There is a difference between what I “feel” right now and what I’m expected to “show” in the simulation. ________

2. I’m expected to show the same feelings in the simulation that I’m currently feeling inside. ________

3. The emotions I’m expected to show in this simulation match what I truly feel. ________

4. It is ok for me to show my true emotions in the simulation. ________

5. The feelings I am supposed to show in the simulation are consistent with what I usually feel. ________

6. The feelings that I’m expected to show at in the simulation are the same as what I feel on the inside. ________

7. When I am in the simulation, the way I feel on the inside now is going to be the emotion I show. ________
This scale consists of a number of words that describe different feelings and emotions. Read each item and then mark the appropriate answer in the space next to that word. Indicate to what extent you generally feel this way, that is, on average. Use the following scale to record your answers.

1 very slightly or not at all  2 a little  3 moderately  4 quite a bit  5 extremely

____interested
____distressed
____excited
____upset
____enthusiastic
____irritable
____ashamed
____nervous
____attentive
____active

____strong
____guilty
____scared
____hostile
____proud
____alert
____inspired
____determined
____jittery
____afraid
APPENDIX G

Positive Display Rule Perception Measure

Please rate the extent to which you agree with these statements. Use the following scale to record your answers:

1. Strongly disagree
2. Slightly disagree
3. Neither agree nor disagree
4. Slightly agree
5. Strongly agree

1. Part of this simulation is to make the recruit feel good. _____

2. I’m not expected to express positive emotions to the recruit as part of this simulation. _____

3. Part of this simulation is a friendly, cheerful tour. _____

4. I’m expected in the simulation to try to act excited and enthusiastic in my interactions with the recruit. _____

5. I’m supposed to be extremely cheerful towards the recruit. _____

6. The recruit should think I’m a friendly, enthusiastic campus recruiter. _____
APPENDIX H

Negative Display Rule Perception Measure

Please rate the extent to which you agree with these statements. Use the following scale to record your answers:

1  2  3  4  5
Strongly disagree  Slightly disagree  Neither agree nor disagree  Slightly agree  Strongly agree

1. Part of this simulation is to make the tenant feel bad. ______
2. I am not expected to express negative emotions to the tenant as part of the simulation ______
3. Part of this simulation is hostile, irritable service. ______
4. I’m expected in this simulation to try to act irritable and stern in my interactions with the tenant. ______
5. I’m supposed to be extremely angry with the tenant. ______
6. The tenant should think I’m a mean, very hostile bill collector. ______
APPENDIX I

Emotional Labor Measure

Please rate the extent to which you agree with these statements. Use the following scale to record your answers:

1: Strongly disagree  2: Slightly disagree  3: Neither agree nor disagree  4: Slightly agree  5: Strongly agree

1. I put on an act in order to deal with the tenant/recruit in an appropriate way. _____
2. I faked the appropriate mood when interacting with the tenant/recruit. _____
3. I put on a “show” or “performance” when interacting with tenant/recruit. _____
4. I just pretended to have the emotions I needed to display in the simulation. _____
5. I put on a “mask” in order to display the emotions I needed for the simulation. _____
6. I showed feelings to the tenant/recruit that were different from what I felt inside. _____
7. I faked the emotions I showed when dealing with tenant/recruit. _____
8. I tried to actually experience the emotions that I was expected to show the recruit/tenant. _____
9. I made an effort to actually feel the emotions that I needed to display. _____
10. I worked hard to feel the emotions that I needed to show to tenant/recruit. _____
11. I worked at developing the feelings inside of me that I need to show to the tenant/recruit. _____
12. The emotions I expressed to the recruit/tenant were genuine. _____
13. The emotions I showed the recruit/tenant came naturally. _____
14. The emotions I showed recruit/tenant matched what I spontaneously felt. _____
APPENDIX J

ANAGRAM Task

Instructions: Below you will find a list of 30 five-letter anagrams. You will have five minutes to unscramble as many as you can. There is only one solution for each anagram. Write your answers in the blanks next to the word. Your experimenter will tell you when your time has expired.

ATRYP       _____________                                                   LRUFO       _____________
OEWRP       _____________                                                   AUGDR       _____________
HUOCG      _____________                                                   IPTNA       _____________
RHTIB       _____________                                                    BNLOE      _____________
TAIBH       _____________                                                   ELCSA       _____________
GOFYG       _____________                                                  PATOI       _____________
NUFYN       _____________                                                 RAAML       _____________
MHUNA       _____________                                                LSSUH       _____________
IUMCS       _____________                                                   SJTUO       _____________
OHTYU       _____________                                                  EKRLC       _____________
RBSCU       _____________                                                  GAWNO       _____________
LTIFR       _____________                                                ROING       _____________
UODNP       _____________                                                  AEUVL       _____________
EOKRP       _____________                                                  DPAOT       _____________
CATHB       _____________                                                   IUFR       _____________
APPENDIX K

Emotional Display Effectiveness Measure (positive condition)

Please rate the extent to which you agree with these statements. Use the following scale to record your answers:


1. The participant was a cheerful, enthusiastic campus recruiter _____

2. The participant did a good job at displaying the emotions that were appropriate for the campus recruiter job _____

3. The participant’s facial expressions, tone of voice and body language displayed cheerfulness, friendliness and enthusiasm. ______

4. The emotions expressed in the participant’s role-play were effective ______

5. The participant displayed warmth and friendliness towards the recruit ______

6. Overall, the participant was an effective campus recruiter. ______
APPENDIX L

Emotional Display Effectiveness Measure (negative condition)

Please rate the extent to which you agree with these statements. Use the following scale to record your answers:


1. The participant was a harsh, irritable bill collector _____

2. The participant did a good job at displaying the emotions that were appropriate for the bill collector job _____

3. The participant’s facial expressions, tone of voice and body language displayed sternness, irritability and harshness ______

4. The emotions expressed in the participant’s role-play were effective ______

5. The participant displayed coldness and irritability towards the tenant ______

6. Overall, the participant was an effective bill collector ______