Available online at www.sciencedirect.com
SCIENCE DIRECT®
Journal of Vocational Behavior 66 (2005) 339–357
Journal of Vocational Behavior
www.elsevier.com/locate/jvb

The dimensionality and antecedents of emotional labor strategies

James M. Diefendorff,[a,*] Meredith H. Croyle,[a] and Robin H. Gosserand[b]

[a] *Department of Psychology, Louisiana State University, Baton Rouge, LA 70803, USA*
[b] *IBM/Louisiana State University in Shreveport, USA*

Received 13 May 2003
Available online 6 May 2004

Abstract

This investigation had two purposes. The first was to determine whether the display of naturally felt emotions is distinct from surface acting and deep acting as a method of displaying organizationally desired emotions. The second purpose was to examine dispositional and situational antecedents of surface acting, deep acting, and the expression of naturally felt emotions. Results supported a three-dimensional structure separating deep acting, surface acting, and the expression of naturally felt emotions. In addition, the dispositional and situational variables exhibited theoretically consistent and distinct patterns of relationships with the three emotional labor strategies. Overall, the results of this study expand the nomological network of surface acting and deep acting and suggest that the expression of naturally felt emotions is a distinct strategy for displaying emotions at work and should be included in research on emotional labor.

Keywords: Emotional labor; Emotion regulation; Big five personality dimensions

1. Introduction

Hochschild (1983) defined emotional labor as "the management of feeling to create a publicly observable facial and bodily display" for a wage (p. 7). In most theories of emotional labor, organizations specify display rules that serve as standards for the appropriate expression of emotions. Emotional labor entails following these display

* Corresponding author.
E-mail address: jdiefen@lsu.edu (J.M. Diefendorff).

0001-8791/$ - see front matter © 2004 Elsevier Inc. All rights reserved.
doi:10.1016/j.jvb.2004.02.001

rules regardless of how one actually feels. A central focus of emotional labor research is on how individuals achieve the desired emotional displays. Previous theory (e.g., Ashforth & Humphrey, 1993; Diefendorff & Gosserand, 2003) suggests that individuals may simply express what they feel, or when this will not produce the desired display, they may surface act (fake unfelt emotions and/or suppress felt emotions) or deep act (modify felt emotions so that genuine displays follow). Thus, surface acting (SA) and deep acting (DA) may be considered compensatory strategies that individuals use when they cannot spontaneously display the appropriate emotions. Interestingly, research has focused primarily on SA and DA (e.g., Brotheridge & Lee, 2002; Grandey, 2003), while giving little attention to the expression of naturally felt emotions. This focus is surprising given that the display of naturally felt emotions at work may be fairly common and should not be associated with the negative effects often attributed to emotional labor, such as emotional dissonance and burnout. Further, individuals who display their felt emotions likely will appear sincere, a quality associated with good customer service (Ashforth & Humphrey, 1993).

The first purpose of this investigation was to determine whether the display of naturally felt emotions can be empirically distinguished from SA and DA as a method of displaying organizationally desired emotions. The second purpose of this paper was to examine dispositional and situational antecedents of SA, DA, and the expression of naturally felt emotions. The following sections describe emotional labor strategies and then discuss the antecedent variables and their hypothesized relationships with emotional labor strategies.

2. Emotional labor strategies

Most emotional labor conceptualizations suggest that to display appropriate emotions at work, individuals sometimes must hide or fake felt emotions (SA) or try to experience the desired emotion (DA). Because many occupations have the general expectation that positive emotions should be displayed, DA typically involves trying to experience positive emotions so that positive displays naturally follow. In contrast, SA usually involves faking positive emotions and sometimes suppressing negative felt emotions, so that positive displays will follow. SA has been described as "acting in bad faith" and DA has been described as "acting in good faith" as the former involves going through the motions and the latter involves trying to experience the emotions (Grandey, 2003).

Ashforth and Humphrey (1993) argued that focusing on only SA and DA ignores the possibility that employees can spontaneously experience and display appropriate emotions. Indeed SA and DA may be considered compensatory strategies that help individuals express emotions that do not come naturally. Ashforth and Humphrey (1993) considered the expression of naturally felt emotions to constitute emotional labor in that individuals still may have to put forth conscious effort to ensure that their displays coincide with the organization's expectations. However, no published research has examined the display of naturally felt emotions as an emotional labor strategy. Therefore, the first purpose of this study was to measure the strategy of

displaying of naturally felt emotions and empirically distinguish it from SA and DA. In the process of examining these emotional labor strategies, the present study also attempted to improve existing measures of SA and DA by modifying previously used scales (Grandey, 2003; Kruml & Geddes, 2000) and adding new items.

3. Individual difference antecedents of emotional labor strategies

Several recent studies have tested the relationships of individual difference variables with SA and DA (Brotheridge & Grandey, 2002; Brotheridge & Lee, 2002, 2003). The present investigation extended this research by examining the big five personality dimensions, emotional expressivity, and self-monitoring. In conceptualizing how individual differences might affect emotional labor strategy use, this study categorized individual difference variables into two groups: those influencing the *need* to actively regulate one's emotional displays, and those impacting the *willingness* to regulate one's emotional displays. Hypotheses are developed for each individual difference variable, except openness to experience, which is examined in this study for exploratory purposes.

3.1. Personality variables associated with the need to manage emotional displays

Grandey (2000) suggested that individual differences in felt affect and emotional expressivity may impact whether individuals need to engage in active emotion regulation. Research has shown that negative affectivity is positively related to SA, positive affectivity is negatively related to SA, and neither affectivity variable is related to DA (e.g., Brotheridge & Grandey, 2002; Brotheridge & Lee, 2003). These findings suggest that how individuals typically feel relates to whether they fake emotions at work, but not to whether they directly modify their feelings. Consistent with past work (e.g., Diefendorff & Richard, 2003; George, 1996; Watson, 2000), the present study operationalized positive affectivity with extraversion and negative affectivity with neuroticism. Because individuals high in extraversion experience positive emotions more often, they may have less of a need to surface act and be more likely to display their naturally felt emotions than individuals low in extraversion. In contrast, people high in neuroticism tend to experience negative emotions more often and may be more likely to surface act and less likely to express naturally felt emotions than individuals low in neuroticism. Finally, DA was not expected to relate to extraversion or neuroticism.

Hypothesis 1. Extraversion correlates (a) negatively with SA and (b) positively with the expression of naturally felt emotions.

Hypothesis 2. Neuroticism correlates (a) positively with SA and (b) negatively with the expression of naturally felt emotions.

Emotional expressivity is a stable trait characterizing the extent to which people outwardly display emotion, regardless of whether it is positive or negative (Kring, Smith, & Neale, 1994). Simply put, people high in emotional expressivity tend to

express more emotions than people low in emotional expressivity. Grandey (2002) found that positive emotional expressivity was negatively correlated with SA, but uncorrelated with DA. It was anticipated that people low in expressiveness may have to fake the appropriate expression to meet expectations, whereas individuals high in expressiveness may have little need to surface act. Because emotional expressivity relates to emotional expressions, it was not expected to relate to DA, which focuses on modifying feelings rather than displays. However, we expected that individuals high in expressiveness would display their naturally felt emotions.

Hypothesis 3. Emotional expressivity correlates (a) negatively with SA and (b) positively with the expression of naturally felt emotions.

3.2. Personality variables associated with the willingness to manage emotional displays

Individuals also may differ in the extent to which they are *willing* to display organizationally desired emotions. Conscientiousness, agreeableness, and self-monitoring were used to operationalize the dispositional willingness to conform to display expectations. Conscientiousness reflects the extent to which a person is careful, thorough, and responsible. It was expected that a individuals high in conscientiousness would be more likely to conform to emotional display rules. Based on the idea that DA is "acting in good faith" and SA is "acting in bad faith" (e.g., Grandey, 2002), it was anticipated that conscientious individuals would follow emotional display rules by working to be genuine in their expressions (DA and expressing naturally felt emotions), rather than just going through the motions, as is done with SA.

Hypothesis 4. Conscientiousness correlates (a) positively with DA and (b) the expression of naturally felt emotions and (c) negatively with SA.

Agreeableness reflects stable individual differences in the need to develop and maintain positive relationships through social behavior. (Tobin, Graziano, Vanman, & Tassinary, 2000) found that when faced with negative situations, individuals high in agreeableness expected to experience stronger emotions and exert more effort to regulate emotions than individuals low in agreeableness. These results suggest that agreeable individuals may put more effort into emotion regulation so that they will have positive social interactions. Further, realizing the potential negative effects of insincere emotional displays, agreeable individuals may try to display genuine emotions by DA or by displaying naturally felt emotions, rather than SA.

Hypothesis 5. Agreeableness correlates (a) positively with DA and (b) the expression of naturally felt emotions and (c) negatively with SA.

Self-monitoring is defined as the self-observation and self-control of expressive behaviors according to what is appropriate for a specific situation (Snyder, 1974). High self-monitors adapt their behavior to fit role expectations while low self-monitors behave as they feel regardless of role expectations (Kilduff & Day, 1994). In two

separate studies, Brotheridge and Lee (2002, 2003) found that self-monitoring was positively related to SA and unrelated to DA. Indeed, Brotheridge and Lee (2002) stated that "…high self-monitors are more able to simulate emotional expression without actually feeling these emotions" (p. 61), suggesting that SA may be their emotional labor strategy of choice. In contrast, low self-monitors do not adapt their behaviors to situations, suggesting that they may be more likely to express how they feel.

Hypothesis 6. Self-monitoring correlates (a) positively with SA, and (b) negatively with the expression of naturally felt emotions.

4. Job-based antecedents of emotional labor strategies

4.1. Emotional display rules

Emotional display rules are the standards for the appropriate expression of emotions on the job (Ekman, 1973). Thus, the presence of display rules increases the likelihood that employees will need to actively regulate their emotional displays. In customer service jobs, display rules aim to have individuals display positive emotions. Some researchers have used unidimensional measures of emotional display rules, whereas others have distinguished between positive display rules (perceived norms for expressing positive emotions) and negative display rules (perceived norms for suppressing negative emotions). Using a unidimensional display rule measure, Grandey (2003) found that display rules were positively related to DA and unrelated to SA. Using a similar measure, both Grandey (2002) and Brotheridge and Lee (2003) found that display rules were positively correlated with DA and SA. In a study separating positive and negative display rules, Brotheridge and Grandey (2002) found that both types of display rules were positively correlated with SA and DA. Although there is good reason to expect that display rules will predict the use of SA and DA, it is unclear whether they will relate to the display of naturally felt emotions.

Hypothesis 7. Positive display rules correlate positively with (a) DA and (b) SA.

Hypothesis 8. Negative display rules correlate positively with (a) DA and (b) SA.

4.2. Interaction characteristics

Frequency, duration, and routineness of interpersonal interactions were examined as antecedents of emotional labor strategies. Frequency refers to how often employees interact with customers. Morris and Feldman (1996) argued that when jobs require frequent contact with others, individuals will have a greater need to regulate their emotional displays. Confirming this idea, Brotheridge and Lee (2003) and Brotheridge and Grandey (2002) found that frequency of interactions was positively correlated with both SA and DA. In addition, frequent interactions might make it less likely that individuals will display naturally felt emotions.

Hypothesis 9. Frequency of interactions correlates positively with (a) SA and (b) DA, and (c) negatively with the expression of naturally felt emotions.

Routineness is the extent to which customer interactions are repetitive and scripted. The most effective response for routine interactions may be to simply go through the motions of fulfilling the script by faking the prescribed emotions. Indeed, when interactions are routine, customers may prefer "impersonal" but cordial interactions (e.g., Sutton & Rafaeli, 1988). Together, this circumstance creates little incentive to deep act. However, for nonroutine interactions, natural emotional displays may be more likely and DA may be the emotion regulation technique of choice.

Hypothesis 10. Routineness of interactions correlates (a) positively with SA and negatively with (b) DA and (c) the expression of naturally felt emotions.

Duration refers to how long typical customer interactions last. Morris and Feldman (1996) proposed that long interactions increase the likelihood that individuals will need to actively regulate their emotional displays. In addition, long interactions may increase the chances that interactions will become more personal and that naturally felt emotions will be displayed. Brotheridge and Lee (2003) and Brotheridge and Grandey (2002) found that duration was positively related to DA and unrelated to SA. DA may be the strategy of choice during long interactions when more effort is needed to regulate emotions and maintaining an act (i.e., SA) becomes more difficult.

Hypothesis 11. Duration of interactions correlates (a) negatively with SA and positively with (b) DA and the (c) the expression of naturally felt emotions.

5. Method

5.1. Participants and procedure

The focal sample consisted of 297 employed undergraduate students at a large Southeastern university who worked in jobs considered to be high in "people work" (e.g., sales, service, healthcare, childcare, and clerical). Twenty-seven individuals were dropped from the analyses because they worked less than 10 h per week, resulting in a final sample size of 270. The mean age for the final sample was 20.4 years, and 76% were female. Employees had an average organizational tenure of 1.5 years and worked 22 h per week (67% of individuals worked 20 h or more per week). All participants attended a one-hour session to complete the study questionnaires and received extra course credit for participating in the study. A second sample of 179 individuals working in "people work" jobs responded to the SA, DA, and the expression of naturally felt emotions scales to cross-validate the final factor solution obtained in the focal sample. These individuals had an average age of 27.7 years, and 78% were female.

5.2. Measures

5.2.1. Surface acting

The initial SA scale consisted of nine items: five items were adapted from Grandey's (2003) SA scale, two items were adapted from Kruml and Geddes' (2000) emotive dissonance scale, and two items were developed for the present investigation. Emotive dissonance is the extent to which a person's feelings are different from his or her displays and was described by Kruml and Geddes as being conceptually similar to SA. Participants rated each item using a 5-point Likert scale (5 = "Strongly Agree"; 1 = "Strongly Disagree"). Confirmatory factor analysis (CFA) resulted in the removal of the two newly written items. The internal consistency reliability for the seven items was $\alpha = .91$ in the primary sample and $\alpha = .92$ in the cross-validation sample. The final set of items is listed in Appendix A.

5.2.2. Deep acting

The initial scale included three items adapted from Grandey's (2003) DA scale and four items adapted from Kruml and Geddes' (2000) emotive effort scale. Emotive effort is the effort involved in displaying appropriate emotions and was described by Kruml and Geddes as being similar to DA. Participants rated each item using a 5-point Likert scale (5 = "Strongly Agree"; 1 = "Strongly Disagree"). CFA resulted in the removal of three Kruml and Geddes items. The internal consistency reliability for the remaining four items was $\alpha = .82$ in the primary sample and $\alpha = .85$ in the cross-validation sample (see items in Appendix A).

5.2.3. Expression of naturally felt emotions

This scale consisted of three items (two written for this investigation and one adapted from Kruml & Geddes (2000)). Participants rated each item using a 5-point Likert scale (5 = "Strongly Agree"; 1 = "Strongly Disagree"). All items were retained based on CFA results. The scale reliability was $\alpha = .75$ in the primary sample and $\alpha = .83$ in the cross-validation sample. These items are listed in Appendix A.

5.2.4. The big five personality dimensions

Saucier's (1994) measure of the big five personality factors was used in this study. This scale consists of 40 adjectives assessing the big five traits (eight items for each dimension; scale reliabilities ranged from .76 to .86). All responses were made on a 5-point Likert scale (5 = "Strongly Agree"; 1 = "Strongly Disagree").

5.2.5. Self-monitoring

Self-monitoring was assessed with 18 items of the Self-Monitoring Scale (Snyder, 1974) recommended by Snyder and Gangestad (1986). Individuals responded to each item on a 5-point Likert scale indicating the extent to which it was true of their behavior (1 = "Not at all true"; 5 = "Very true"). Two items were removed because they had item-total correlations near zero, and a scale score was calculated based on the remaining 16 items. The internal consistency reliability for this scale was $\alpha = .70$.

5.2.6. Emotional expressivity

The 17-item Emotional Expressivity Scale developed by Kring et al. (1994) was used in this study. Individuals responded to each item on a 5-point Likert scale indicating how often it was true of their behavior (1 = "Never true"; 5 = "Always true"). The internal consistency reliability for this scale was $\alpha = .92$.

5.2.7. Perceived display rule demands

Positive display rules was operationalized by modifying three items from Brotheridge and Grandey (2002) and one item from Schaubroeck and Jones (2000). Negative display rules was operationalized by modifying one item from Brotheridge and Grandey (2002) and two items from Schaubroeck and Jones (2000). Participants rated each item using a 5-point Likert scale (5 = "Strongly Agree"; 1 = "Strongly Disagree"). The reliabilities for the positive and negative display rule scales were $\alpha = .73$ and $\alpha = .75$, respectively. The items on these scales are listed in Appendix B.

5.2.8. Frequency, duration, and routineness of interactions

Two items each were developed to assess the frequency and duration of interactions. Task routineness was measured with three items adapted from a scale by Withey, Daft, and Cooper (1983) to fit the customer service context. The internal consistency reliability for these scale ranged from $\alpha = .74$ to $\alpha = .82$. Participants rated each item using a 5-point Likert scale (5 = "Strongly Agree"; 1 = "Strongly Disagree"). These items are listed in Appendix B.

6. Results

6.1. Confirmatory factor analysis of scale items

Confirmatory factor analysis in LISREL 8.3 (Jöreskog & Sörbom, 1993) was used to investigate the factor structure and item performance of the three emotional labor strategy scales. Several nested models representing various combinations of the scales were tested in the primary sample, with the final model being cross-validated in a second sample. A three-factor model (Model A) separating DA, SA, and the expression of naturally felt emotions was compared to three two-factor models (Models B, C, and D) and a one-factor model (Model E). Model B combined SA and DA into one scale and kept the expression of naturally felt emotions separate, based on the idea that there might be a single "emotion regulation strategy" construct that is distinct from expressing naturally felt emotions. Model C combined SA and the expression of naturally felt emotions based on the idea that these two constructs might represent opposite ends of a "fake-natural display" continuum. Model D combined the expression of naturally felt emotions with DA to examine whether these items may load onto a common "express genuine emotions" dimension because both are "good faith" methods of displaying emotions. Model E had all items load onto a single "managing emotional displays" factor.

For each CFA model, individual items were allowed to load on only one factor and the latent variables were allowed to freely correlate. Several indicators of model

fit were examined, including (a) the χ^2 Goodness of Fit statistic, (b) the Tucker Lewis Index (TLI), (c) the root mean square error of approximation (RMSEA), (d) the standardized root mean square residual (SRMR) and (e) the Comparative Fit Index (CFI). The lower bound of good fit for the TLI and the CFI is considered to be .90. For the RMSEA and the SRMR, the upper bounds for good fit are considered to be .08 and .10, respectively (Vandenberg & Lance, 2000). Further, because the models were nested, their fit could be directly compared using the χ^2 difference test.

The initial set of analyses revealed that none of the models fit the data especially well (see Table 1). Because all of the models had poor fit, comparison of models was not conducted. Instead, the source of the misfit was investigated. Five items (two SA and three DA items) were removed from the scales for having low factor loadings and/or high secondary factor loadings. Modification indices revealed that a large increase in model fit could be achieved by allowing the residual error terms of two of the DA items to freely correlate. Both items ended with the phrase "…that I need to show to customers," suggesting the presence of a common secondary influence and that allowing the error terms to freely correlate made sense.

Models A–E were re-estimated with the removal of the five items and a freely estimated correlation between the uniquenesses of the two DA items. This set of analyses yielded substantially better fit than the first set of analyses (see the middle portion of Table 1). However, Model A was the only model to achieve good fit ($\chi^2 = 151.81$, $df = 73$, $p < .05$; RMSEA = .064; SRMR = .041; TLI = .95; CFI = .96). Further, this model fit significantly better than every other model, based on the χ^2 difference test: Model A versus Model B ($\Delta\chi^2(2) = 361.29$, $p < .001$); Model A versus Model C

Table 1
Summary of fit statistics

Model	χ^2	*df*	RMSEA	SRMR	TLI	CFI
Primary Sample, Set 1: 19 items						
A. 3 Factor	702.83*	149	.130	.130	.74	.77
B. 2 Factor (SA & DA combine)	1234.56*	151	.200	.180	.50	.56
C. 2 Factor (SA & Natural combine)	856.15*	151	.140	.140	.68	.71
D. 2 Factor (DA & Natural combine)	972.79*	151	.160	.170	.62	.67
E. 1 Factor	1370.98*	152	.210	.180	.44	.50
Primary Sample, Set 2: 14 items and 1 set of correlated uniquenesses						
A. 3 Factor	151.81*	73	.064	.041	.95	.96
B. 2 Factor (SA & DA combine)	513.10*	75	.140	.130	.72	.77
C. 2 Factor (SA & Natural combine)	309.86*	75	.110	.081	.85	.88
D. 2 Factor (DA & Natural combine)	406.76*	75	.140	.140	.79	.83
E. 1 Factor	648.30*	76	.170	.140	.64	.70
Cross-validation Sample: 14 items and 1 set of correlated uniquenesses						
A. 3 Factor	133.46*	73	.066	.063	.97	.98

Note. RMSEA, root mean square error of approximation; SRMR, standardized root mean squared residual; TLI, Tucker–Lewis index; CFI , comparative fit index.

* Significant at $p < .05$.

($\Delta\chi^2(2) = 158.05$, $p < .001$); Model A versus Model D ($\Delta\chi^2(2) = 254.95$, $p < .001$); and Model A versus Model E ($\Delta\chi^2(3) = 496.49$, $p < .001$). Thus, Model A with three separate dimensions was retained as the final model.

The final model from the primary sample (Model A with 14 items and one set of correlated error terms) was cross-validated on a second sample of 179 individuals. The fit for this model was quite good ($\chi^2 = 133.46$, $df = 73$, $p < .05$; RMSEA $= .066$; SRMR $= .063$; TLI $= .97$; CFI $= .98$), providing evidence that the factor structure could be replicated in a separate sample and was not a result of capitalizing on sample-specific variance.

In both samples, all of the items had primary factor loadings greater than .43 and negligible cross-loadings (see Appendix A for primary factor loadings). As described in the method section, the scale internal consistency reliabilities were acceptable in both samples. The correlations between the three scale scores revealed that SA was negatively or nonsignificantly correlated with DA ($r = -.17$, $p < .05$ in the primary sample; $r = -.04$, $p > .05$ in the cross-validation sample) and negatively correlated with the expression of naturally felt emotions ($r = -.48$, $p < .05$ in the primary sample; $r = -.61$, $p < .05$ in the cross-validation sample). DA was positively correlated with the expression of naturally felt emotions ($r = .27$, $p < .05$ in the primary sample; $r = .26$, $p < .05$ in the cross-validation sample).

Additional findings of interest are that participants reported displaying naturally felt emotions to a higher degree than DA ($t(269) = 5.76$, $p < .001$ in the primary sample; $t(178) = 7.07$, $p < .001$ in the cross-validation sample) and SA ($t(269) = 10.01$, $p < .001$ in the primary sample; $t(178) = 8.43$, $p < .001$ in the cross-validation sample). These findings suggest that individuals may display their naturally felt emotions on the job more often than change how they feel through DA or fake their emotions through SA. This may not be surprising given that SA and DA may be compensatory strategies that occur in response to difficult situations or negative affective states. However, the results suggest that SA and DA may be the exception rather than the rule and that displaying naturally felt emotions plays a more prominent role in emotional expressions at work than past emotional labor research would suggest.

6.2. Relationship of emotional labor strategies with dispositional and situational variables

Means, standard deviations, and correlations for study variables are presented in Table 2. Because of the large sample size (and high power for detecting significant results) and the possible upward biasing effect of percept–percept inflation on the correlations, the relationships of the dispositional and situational variables with the emotional labor strategy variables also were examined in simultaneous regression analyses. These regression analyses provided tests of the unique relationship of each predictor with the dependent variables, controlling for the effects of all of the other predictors (see Table 3). Supplemental hierarchical regression analyses aimed at revealing the incremental variance accounted for by the group of dispositional variables versus the group of situational variables are reported in the text.

Table 2
Means, standard deviations, reliabilities, and correlations of variables

	Mean	*SD*	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15
1. Emotional expressivity	3.26	.71	(.92)														
2. Extraversion	3.52	.81	.39**	(.84)													
3. Neuroticism	3.30	.71	.01	−.26**	(.77)												
4. Openness	3.76	.59	.09	.21*	−.06	(.69)											
5. Conscientiousness	3.85	.69	.15*	.16*	−.24**	.16*	(.80)										
6. Agreeableness	4.10	.63	.27**	.21*	−.33**	.30**	.32**	(.81)									
7. Self-monitoring	2.99	.53	.03	.41***	−.09	.26***	−.07	−.04	(.70)								
8. Positive display rules	4.41	.72	.13*	.04	−.10	.18*	.15*	.16*	−.05	(.73)							
9. Negative display rules	3.99	.93	.05	−.03	.13*	.08	.08	.04	.08	.39**	(.75)						
10. Frequency	4.23	1.01	.22**	.21*	.06	.19*	.21*	.22**	.07	.28**	.23**	(.72)					
11. Duration	2.82	1.09	.10	.06	−.11	.03	.03	.16*	.03	−.03	−.07	−.04	(.82)				
12. Routineness	3.86	.88	.11	.05	.21**	.04	.06	.01	.05	.10	.22**	.30**	−.23**	(.79)			
13. Surface acting	2.70	.80	−.14*	−.20*	.40**	−.00	−.28**	−.31**	.15*	−.01	.29**	−.05	−.14*	.19*	(.91)		
14. Deep acting	3.17	.86	.16*	.15*	−17*	.11	.13*	.27**	.01	.17*	.00	.08	.23**	−.15*	−.17*	(.82)	
15. Naturally felt emotions	3.50	.73	.16*	.28**	−.24**	.10	.16*	.30**	.04	.09	−.13*	.18*	.17**	−.08	−.48**	.27**	(.75)

Note. Reliabilities are on the diagonal.
* $p < .05$.
** $p < .01$.
*** $p < .001$.

Table 3
Regression of emotional labor strategies on dispositional and situational variables

Independent variables	Dependent variables					
	Surface acting		Deep acting		Expression of naturally felt emotions	
	β	t	β	t	β	t
Dispositional variables						
Emotional expressivity	−.04	−.68	.06	.87	<.01	.04
Extraversion	−.13	−2.00*	.06	.85	.18	2.58*
Neuroticism	.24	4.02*	−.02	−.35	−.08	−1.17
Openness	.06	1.07	.01	.17	−.03	−.40
Conscientiousness	−.16	−2.93*	.03	.42	.03	.54
Agreeableness	−.14	−2.20*	.16	2.32*	.18	2.65*
Self-monitoring	.17	2.86*	<−.01	−.02	−.02	−.24
Situational variables						
Positive display rules	−.02	−.34	.15	2.24*	.07	1.13
Negative display rules	.25	4.34*	−.03	−.43	−.16	−2.54*
Frequency	−.07	−1.26	.03	.43	.14	2.25*
Duration	−.05	−.91	.17	2.75*	.10	1.77
Routineness	.10	1.82	−.14	−2.16*	−.07	−1.05
Total R^2	.343		.156		.202	

* $p < .05$.

6.2.1. Dispositional variables

Sixteen of 21 bivariate correlations between the dispositional variables and the emotional labor variables were significant (see Table 2; only the correlations of openness to experience with the three emotional labor variables and the correlations of self-monitoring with DA and the expression of naturally felt emotions were nonsignificant). In testing hypotheses, we relied primarily on the simultaneous regression analyses reported in Table 3. For the dispositional variables thought to impact the *need* to regulate one's emotions (emotional expressivity, extraversion, and neuroticism), three significant predictors emerged: extraversion and neuroticism were significant predictors of SA ($\beta = -.13$, $p < .05$ and $\beta = .24$, $p < .05$, respectively), supporting H1a and H2a. In addition, extraversion was a significant predictor of the expression of naturally felt emotions ($\beta = .18, p < .05$), supporting H1b. Emotional expressivity did not predict any emotional labor strategies, failing to support H3a and H3b. Further, neuroticism did not predict the expression of naturally felt emotions, providing no support for H2b. Finally, none of these personality variables predicted DA.

All three of the dispositional variables thought to impact the *willingness* to regulate one's emotions were significant predictors of SA [conscientiousness ($\beta = -.16$, $p < .05$), agreeableness ($\beta = -.14$, $p < .05$), and self-monitoring ($\beta = .17$, $p < .05$)], supporting H4c, H5c, and H6a. In addition, agreeableness was a significant predictor of DA ($\beta = .16$, $p < .05$) and the expression of naturally felt emotions ($\beta = .18$, $p < .05$), supporting H5a and H5b. Conscientiousness was not a significant predictor of DA or the

expression of naturally felt emotions, failing to support H4a and H4b. Self-monitoring did not predict the expression of naturally felt emotions, failing to support H6b. Finally, openness to experience was not related to the emotional labor variables.

Supplemental regression analyses were conducted with the situational variables entered at Step 1 and the dispositional variables entered at Step 2. Results revealed that the dispositional variables accounted for 20.1% of the unique variance in SA, 4.9% of the unique variance in DA, and 9.5% of the unique variance in the expression of naturally felt emotions.

6.2.2. Situational variables

Nine of 15 bivariate correlations between the situational variables and the emotional labor variables were significant (see Table 2). As with the hypotheses for the dispositional variables, simultaneous regression analyses were relied upon to examine the unique predictive ability of each of the situational variables. Positive display rules was a significant predictor of DA ($\beta = .15$, $p < .05$), supporting H7a. However, the nonsignificant relationship between positive display rules and SA resulted in no support for H7b. Negative display rules was a significant positive predictor of SA ($\beta = .25$, $p < .05$), supporting H8b. However, the nonsignificant relationship between negative display rules and DA failed to support H8a. Although not hypothesized, negative display rules was a significant predictor of the expression of naturally felt emotions ($\beta = -.16$, $p < .05$).

For the interaction characteristics, frequency was not predictive of SA or DA; however, it did predict the expression of naturally felt emotions, but in the opposite direction of what was expected ($\beta = .14$, $p < .05$). Thus, H9a, H9b, and H9c were not supported. Routineness ($\beta = -.14$, $p < .05$) and duration ($\beta = .17$, $p < .05$) were significant predictors of DA, supporting H10b and H11b. SA was not uniquely predicted by any of the interaction characteristic variables, failing to support H9a, H10a, and H11a. Further, H10c and H11c were not supported, as the expression of naturally felt emotions was not predicted by routineness or duration. Supplemental hierarchal regression analyses controlling for the dispositional variables revealed that the situational variables accounted for 7.5% of the unique variance in SA, 6.6% of the unique variance in DA, and 4.9% of the unique variance in the expression of naturally felt emotions.

7. Discussion

Confirmatory factor analysis supported a three-factor structure in two separate samples, suggesting that DA, SA, and the expression of naturally felt emotions are distinct constructs. These findings are important because they argue against the ideas that expressing naturally felt emotions is just a proxy for low levels of SA, or that it is redundant with DA because both involve expressing felt emotions. In addition, supplemental analyses revealed that displaying naturally felt emotions was used by individuals more often than either DA or SA, suggesting that it plays a prominent role in displaying emotions at work. Thus, consistent with the ideas of Ashforth and Humphrey (1993) and Diefendorff and Gosserand (2003), this study showed that there

may be value in exploring the display of naturally felt emotions as an emotional labor strategy.

7.1. The role of dispositional variables in predicting emotional labor strategies

Overall, the dispositional variables were most predictive of SA, with significant unique effects for extraversion, neuroticism and all three of the "willingness to" variables (i.e., agreeableness, conscientiousness, and self-monitoring). The results for extraversion suggest that individuals who feel positive emotions more often tend to fake the desired emotions less than individuals who experience fewer positive emotions. The results for neuroticism suggest that individuals who generally experience negative emotions may "need" to feign positive emotions to meet role expectations. In addition, the "willingness to" variables showed a strong pattern of relationships with SA. The negative relationship for conscientiousness suggests that individuals who are less dependable are more likely to fake emotions at work. Further, the agreeableness finding suggests that individuals who value positive interactions with others are less likely to engage in SA. Thus, being low on either of these attributes is associated with going through the motions and "acting in bad faith" when interacting with others. Also, consistent with the findings of Brotheridge and Lee (2002, 2003), self-monitoring was a significant positive predictor of SA, confirming the idea that individuals who focus on managing impressions are more likely to manipulate their displays. Overall, the findings for SA imply that it is associated with less positive personal attributes. However, SA should not be considered all bad; indeed, it may be better than displaying felt emotions when a person is having a bad day. Further, when unexpected situations create strong negative emotions in employees, SA may be the only option for displaying the desired emotion.

The display of naturally felt emotions was uniquely predicted by extraversion and agreeableness. Thus, individuals who were predisposed to experience positive emotions and those who tend to emphasize having positive interactions tended to display spontaneously felt emotions at work. Clearly, individuals high in extraversion have an advantage in displaying positive emotions as they experience these emotions naturally more often. Agreeable individuals also may be more equipped to naturally display positive emotions, given the premium they place on maintaining positive relationships and avoiding being perceived as insincere.

Deep acting was uniquely predicted by agreeableness, suggesting that individuals who tend to value having positive interpersonal interactions were more likely to actively try to experience emotions so that genuine emotional displays followed. Surprisingly, no other individual difference variables uniquely predicted DA, suggesting that dispositional factors may have a less prominent role in influencing whether people "act in good faith." However, many of the bivariate relationships between DA and the dispositional variables were significant, but the effects were reduced to non-significant levels in the simultaneous regression analyses.

Agreeableness was the only dispositional variable uniquely related to all three emotional labor strategies, suggesting that individuals' orientation toward having positive interactions with others predicted how they manage their emotional displays

at work. The consistency of these findings is noteworthy and suggests that agreeableness may be important for emotional labor. Surprisingly, emotional expressivity was not uniquely related to any of the emotional labor strategy variables, suggesting that the natural expressiveness of individuals does not impact how they go about displaying organizationally desired emotions. Alternatively, the lack of significant findings might stem from the use of a unidimensional measure of expressivity. Future research on emotional labor might benefit from taking a multi-dimensional approach to assessing emotional expressivity (see Gross & John, 1995). Finally, with the exception of openness to experience, all of the big five variables had significant unique relationships with at least one of the emotional labor strategy variables. The lack of findings for openness to experience is not surprising given its weak theoretical links to emotional labor.

7.2. The role of situational variables in predicting emotional labor strategies

Positive display rules was a positive predictor of DA, but not SA, and negative display rules was a positive predictor of SA, but not DA. This pattern of findings suggests that when individuals perceive requirements to display positive emotions at work, they focus more on trying to experience a positive emotional state (DA), and when individuals perceive requirements to hide negative emotions, they are more likely to fake necessary emotions (SA). These findings indicate that organizational norms regarding emotional expression can influence whether individuals "act in good faith" or "act in bad faith." It might be that telling individuals what to express (i.e., positive display rules) clarifies expectations and results in more "good faith" attempts at managing their emotional displays. In contrast, telling employees what not to express (i.e., negative display rules) results in individuals going through the motions and faking the desired emotions. Although unexpected, negative display rules was negatively related to expressing naturally felt emotions, indicating that having expectations to hide negative emotions at work was associated with less expression of naturally felt emotions.

The findings for the interaction characteristics were less clear cut. Routineness and duration were significant unique predictors of DA, suggesting that having long interactions or less routine interactions resulted in more attempts to actually experience the desired emotion. No interaction characteristics were uniquely related to SA, suggesting that the nature of typical customer encounters did not impact whether people faked emotions. Frequency of interactions was positively related to the expression of naturally felt emotions, counter to expectations.

7.3. Implications for understanding the emotional labor strategies

The fact that dispositional variables accounted for nearly three times the variance in SA than did situational variables suggests that "acting in bad faith" has more to do with the person than the features of the job. It also suggests that when attempting to reduce the amount of SA, selection may be preferred over job redesign efforts. However, it also could be that the measures of situational factors in the present study

did not capture aspects of the job that influence SA. For example, SA might primarily occur in response to negative affective events, which could be measured by having individuals rate the frequency of hassles or rude customers at work. The display rules and interaction characteristics assessed in the present study did not distinguish between positive and negative events (although negative display rules may tap this indirectly).

Dispositional variables also were much stronger predictors of displaying naturally felt emotions than were situational variables, accounting for nearly twice the variance. This finding suggests that emotional display norms and the nature of work interactions have less of an impact on whether individuals display naturally felt emotions than their felt affect (extraversion) and orientation toward interpersonal interactions (agreeableness). In contrast, situational variables predicted DA more strongly than did person variables, suggesting that job-based factors play a stronger role in influencing whether individuals actively try to experience the desired emotion.

7.4. Limitations and future research

One limitation of this study is that all variables were assessed from the same source, increasing the possibility that percept–percept inflation may have affected the correlations. However, relying primarily on the simultaneous regression analyses in testing hypotheses should have neutralized some of the percept–percept inflation by removing the shared variance among the predictors and testing the significance of each variable's unique relationships with the emotional labor variables. Even with this conservative analytic approach, many significant and theoretically consistent relationships were detected. Future research should incorporate multiple data sources (e.g., supervisors, customers) to reduce the possible influence of percept–percept inflation. Also, future research might assess and control for social desirability when testing the relationships of emotional labor strategies with other variables. A second limitation of this study is that it used an employed student sample. Although all individuals had "people work" jobs, student populations may differ from non-student populations. However, given that young, part-time employees are common in many service-based jobs, it is likely that the sample in this investigation is representative of an important segment of the workforce.

Appendix A

Emotional labor strategy items

Scales and items	Primary sample factor loading	Cross-validation sample factor loadings
Surface acting		
1. I put on an act in order to deal with customers in an appropriate way.[a]	.80	.82
2. I fake a good mood when interacting with customers.[a]	.79	.74

Appendix A (*continued*)

Scales and items	Primary sample factor loading	Cross-validation sample factor loadings
3. I put on a "show" or "performance" when interacting with customers.[a]	.72	.69
4. I just pretend to have the emotions I need to display for my job.[a]	.79	.85
5. I put on a "mask" in order to display the emotions I need for the job.[a]	.81	.81
6. I show feelings to customers that are different from what I feel inside.[b]	.63	.77
7. I fake the emotions I show when dealing with customers.[b]	.81	.85
Deep acting		
8. I try to actually experience the emotions that I must show to customers.[a]	.80	.69
9. I make an effort to actually feel the emotions that I need to display toward others.[a]	.95	.91
10. I work hard to feel the emotions that I need to show to customers.[*,a]	.63	.71
11. I work at developing the feelings inside of me that I need to show to customers.[*,b]	.44	.63
Expression of naturally felt emotions		
12. The emotions I express to customers are genuine.	.85	.89
13. The emotions I show customers come naturally.	.78	.73
14. The emotions I show customers match what I spontaneously feel.[b]	.52	.73

[a] Item was adapted from Grandey (2003).

[b] Item was adapted from Kruml and Geddes (2000).

[*] The error terms for these two items were allowed to freely correlate (primary sample, $r = .29$; cross-validation sample, $r = .32$).

Appendix B

Display rule and interpersonal interaction items

Positive display rule perceptions

1. Part of my job is to make the customer feel good.[a]
2. My workplace does not expect me to express positive emotions to customers as part of my job.[a]
3. This organization would say that part of the product to customers is friendly, cheerful service.[a]
4. My organization expects me to try to act excited and enthusiastic in my interactions with customers.[b]

Negative display rule perceptions

1. I am expected to suppress my bad moods or negative reactions to customers.[a]
2. This organization expects me to try to pretend that I am not upset or distressed.[b]
3. I am expected to try to pretend I am not angry or feeling contempt while on the job.[b]

Appendix B (*continued*)

Frequency of interactions
1. I interact with many different customers on a daily basis.
2. I do not encounter a large number of interactions with customers during my typical work day.

Duration of interactions
1. I spend a lot of time with each customer I interact with.
2. Most of my interactions with customers are short.

Routineness of interactions
1. My work with customers is fairly routine.
2. I perform the same tasks in the same way from day-to-day.
3. I perform repetitive activities in my interactions with customers.

[a] Item was adapted from Brotheridge and Grandey (2002).
[b] Item was adapted from Schaubroeck and Jones (2000).

Note added in proof

After this article was completed, it was called to our attention that several of the items that we adapted from Grandey (2003), as referenced in Sections 5.2.1 and 5.2.2, were originally presented in:

Brotheridge, C. M., & Leo, R. T. (1998). On the dimensionality of emotional labor: Development and validation of an emotional labor scale. Paper presented at the First Conference on Emotions in Organizational Life, San Diego.

Brotheridge, C. M., & Leo, R. T. (2003). Development and validation of the emotional labour scale. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology, 76*, 365–379.

References

Ashforth, B. E., & Humphrey, R. H. (1993). Emotional labor in service roles: The influence of identity. *Academy of Management Review, 18*, 88–115.

Brotheridge, C. M., & Grandey, A. A. (2002). Emotional labor and burnout: Comparing two perspectives of 'people work'. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 60*, 17–39.

Brotheridge, C. M., & Lee, R. T. (2002). Testing a conservation of resources model of the dynamics of emotional labor. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology, 7*, 57–67.

Brotheridge, C. M., & Lee, R. T. (2003). Development and validation of the emotional labour scale. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology, 76*, 365–379.

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

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

Ekman, P. (1973). *Darwin and facial expression: A century of research in review*. New York: Academic Press.

George, J. M. (1996). Trait and state affect. In K. R. Murphy (Ed.), *Individual differences and behavior in organizations* (pp. 145–171). San Francisco: Josey-Bass.

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

Grandey, A. (2002). Emotional regulation as emotional labor: A test of a framework. Symposium presentation for the 17th annual meeting of the Society of Industrial and Organizational Psychology. Toronto, Ontario.

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

Gross, J. J., & John, O. P. (1995). Facets of emotional expressivity: Three self-report factors and their correlates. *Personality and Individual Differences, 19*, 555–568.

Hochschild, A. R. (1983). *The managed heart: Commercialization of human feeling*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Jöreskog, K. G., & Sörbom, D. (1993). *LISREL 8: Structural equation modeling with the SIMPLIS command language*. Hilldale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Kilduff, M., & Day, D. V. (1994). Do chameleons get ahead. The effects of self-monitoring on managerial careers. *Academy of Management Journal, 37*, 1047–1060.

Kring, A. M., Smith, D. A., & Neale, J. M. (1994). Individual differences in dispositional expressiveness: Development and validation of the Emotional Expressivity Scale. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 66*, 934–949.

Kruml, S. M., & Geddes, D. (2000). Exploring the dimensions of emotional labor: The heart of Hochschild's work. *Management Communication Quarterly, 14*, 8–49.

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

Saucier, G. (1994). Mini-markers: A brief version of Goldberg's unipolar Big-Five markers. *Journal of Personality and Assessment, 63*, 506–516.

Schaubroeck, J., & Jones, J. R. (2000). Antecedents of workplace emotional labor dimensions and moderators of their effects on physical symptoms. *Journal of Organizational Behavior, 21*, 163–183.

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

Snyder, M., & Gangestad, S. (1986). On the nature of self-monitoring: Matters of assessment, matters of validity. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 51*, 125–139.

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

Tobin, R. M., Graziano, W. G., Vanman, E. J., & Tassinary, L. G. (2000). Personality, emotional experience, and efforts to control emotions. *Journal of Personalty and Social Psychology, 79*, 656–669.

Vandenberg, R. J., & Lance, C. E. (2000). A review and synthesis of the measurement invariance literature: Suggestions, practices, and recommendations for organizational research. *Organizational Research Methods, 3*, 4–69.

Watson, D. (2000). *Mood and temperament*. New York, NY: Guilford Press.

Withey, M., Daft, R. L., & Cooper, W. H. (1983). Measures of Perrow's work unit technology: An empirical assessment and a new scale. *Academy of Management Journal, 26*, 45–63.