



저작자표시-비영리-변경금지 2.0 대한민국

이용자는 아래의 조건을 따르는 경우에 한하여 자유롭게

- 이 저작물을 복제, 배포, 전송, 전시, 공연 및 방송할 수 있습니다.

다음과 같은 조건을 따라야 합니다:



저작자표시. 귀하는 원저작자를 표시하여야 합니다.



비영리. 귀하는 이 저작물을 영리 목적으로 이용할 수 없습니다.



변경금지. 귀하는 이 저작물을 개작, 변형 또는 가공할 수 없습니다.

- 귀하는, 이 저작물의 재이용이나 배포의 경우, 이 저작물에 적용된 이용허락조건을 명확하게 나타내어야 합니다.
- 저작권자로부터 별도의 허가를 받으면 이러한 조건들은 적용되지 않습니다.

저작권법에 따른 이용자의 권리는 위의 내용에 의하여 영향을 받지 않습니다.

이것은 [이용허락규약\(Legal Code\)](#)을 이해하기 쉽게 요약한 것입니다.

[Disclaimer](#)

심리학석사 학위논문

Wearing the 'work' mask :
Antecedents and Consequences of
Emotional Work

감정 근로 유형의 확장:
선행변인, 결과변인과의 관계

2019 년 8 월

서울대학교 대학원
심리학과 조직심리학 전공
송 현 정

Wearing the 'work' mask : Antecedents and Consequences of Emotional Work

지도 교수 김 명 언

이 논문을 심리학석사 학위논문으로 제출함
2019 년 8 월

서울대학교 대학원
심리학과 조직심리학 전공
송 현 정

송현정의 심리학석사 학위논문을 인준함
2019 년 6 월

위 원 장 _____ 최 인 철 _____ (인)

부위원장 _____ 한 소 원 _____ (인)

위 원 _____ 김 명 언 _____ (인)

ABSTRACT

Even though most researches on emotional labor considered two types of acting and emphasized on investigating the relationship between emotional labor acting and consequences, it has been necessary for the researcher to further develop an expanded type of emotional work acting due to mixed findings.

This research expanded and developed five different types of emotional work acting – surface, deep, internalized, deviant, and robotic acting. In order to clearly investigate the distinct five acting types and their relationships with other variables, antecedents and consequences were also measured. Therefore, it was able to demonstrate an expanded range of emotional work. While previous researches mainly focused on emotional work enacted between the customer and the organization members, this research further expands the target of the emotional work acting, which includes both the relationship between customer and organization members and the relationship among organization members.

In study 1, emotional work types were expanded into five different types. Those types were clearly distinguished and it was significant that these five types were not only supported in statistics through factor analysis but also in real life through scenario study.

In order to further investigate the relationship between emotional work types and variables, seven antecedents such as work orientation- job, career, calling, positive/negative affectivity, customer characteristics, and organization culture were measured in study 2. As a result, work orientation – calling perspective predicted internalized acting significantly while negative affect predicts surface and deviant acting significantly. Lastly, organization culture also predicts deep acting and

internalized acting. Therefore, it is suggested in study 2 that in order to bring out the internalized acting from employees who enact the emotional work, the organization must let the employees have the calling orientation and construct the positive organization culture, which will, in fact, increase the workplace performance.

In study 3, in order to further explore the relationship between emotional work types and consequent variables, job satisfaction, eustress, work engagement, job burnout, and emotional dissonance were measured. As a result, internalized acting was positively related to job satisfaction and work engagement but negatively related to job burnout. This study signified that the internalized acting could be a successful predictor of increased workplace performance and thus, internalized acting must be displayed for employees.

This research contributes to the present emotional labor researches in terms of expanding the scope of emotional work type and investigating the relationship of different emotional work types to the variable. In addition to the present research, investigating the underlying mechanism of the emotional work types and their relationships could be suggested in order to further explore and expand the understanding of emotional work.

Keywords: Emotional Labor, Emotional Work, Work Orientation, Organization Culture, Work Engagement

Student Number: 2017-27682

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. INTRODUCTION	1
Conceptual background	4
II. STUDY 1: Expansion of Emotional Work Types.....	11
Research Objective.....	11
Method.....	11
Result	18
Discussion.....	25
III. STUDY 2: Antecedents of Emotional Work	27
Research Objective.....	27
Conceptual Background and Hypotheses	27
Method.....	32
Result	34
Discussion.....	41
IV. STUDY 3: Consequences of Emotional Work.....	43
Research Objective.....	43
Conceptual Background and Hypotheses	43
Method.....	47
Result	50
Discussion.....	57
V. GENERAL DISCUSSION.....	59

Theoretical and practical implication.....	59
Limitation & Future research direction	60
REFERENCES.....	62
APPENDICES.	70
국문 초록	85

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1. Demographic characteristics for the study sample (employee-customer)	13
Table 2. Demographic characteristics for the study sample (employee-coworker).....	14
Table 3. Surface Acting Scenario example for Employee-customer sample	17
Table 4. Surface Acting Scenario example for Employee-coworker sample.....	17
Table 5. Items and factor loadings for Emotional Labor Types (Employee-coworker sample).....	19
Table 6. Items and factor loadings for Emotional Labor Types (Employee-customer sample)	20
Table 7. CFA results for Emotional Labor Types Scale (Employee-customer sample)	21
Table 8. CFA results for Emotional Labor Types Scale (Employee-coworker sample).....	21
Table 9. Descriptive Statistics and Correlations (Employee-Coworker Sample)	22
Table 10. Descriptive Statistics and Correlations (Employee-Customer Sample).....	22
Table 11. Descriptive Statistics and Correlations for Scenario (Employee-Coworker Sample).....	23
Table 12. Descriptive Statistics and Correlations for Scenario (Employee-Customer Sample)	24

Table 13. Means, Standard Deviations, reliabilities, and correlations of variables (Employee-customer sample).....	37
Table 14. Means, Standard Deviations, reliabilities, and correlations of variables (Employee-coworker sample)	38
Table 15. Regression of Emotional labor types on independent variables (Employee-customer sample).....	39
Table 16. Regression of Emotional labor types on independent variables (Employee-coworker sample).....	40
Table 17. Means, Standard Deviations, reliabilities, and correlations of variables (Employee-customer sample).....	51
Table 18. Means, Standard Deviations, reliabilities, and correlations of variables (Employee-coworker sample)	52
Table 19. Multiple regression for emotional work predicting consequences (Employee-customer sample).....	53
Table 20. Multiple regression for emotional work predicting consequences (Employee-coworker sample)	54

INTRODUCTION

“Most of us have jobs that require some handling of other people’s feelings and our own, and in that sense, we are all partly flight attendants.” (Hochschild, 1983: 11)

Emotional work has been grasping great attention since the rapid growth and the expansion of the service industry. Previous researches have investigated the emotional work in the workplace and how it influences the psychological and physical wellbeing of employees. The first introduction of emotional work (or emotional labor) was from Arlie Hochschild (1983) and she explained that flight attendants wear the smiling ‘mask’ during their service and it would be necessary for them to align their felt emotion with the desired emotion. Therefore, she coined the term ‘emotional labor’ and defined it as “the management of feeling to create a publicly observable facial and bodily display” (p. 328). Building on that introduction and definition, previous theories (Asforth & Humphrey, 1993; Diefendorff & Gosserand, 2003) distinguished and considered two types of emotional work – surface and deep acting.

Even though researches focused on investigating those two types of emotional work and how those influence workplace outcomes, still many researches were emphasized in finding the ‘dark’ side of the emotional labor (Humphrey et al., 2015; Grandey et al., in press). Then, some researches started to shed a light on the brighter side of the emotional work and it was found that even more, suggested on the possible different types of emotional work and their beneficial effects. Therefore, it was asked for researchers to investigate the bright side of the emotional labor using the expanded types of emotional work.

Few pieces of research were done in order to investigate the relationship of emotional work with its antecedents and consequences at the same time. Not only comparing how one variable has a positive or negative effect on the emotional work, it has been required to expand beyond one paradigm but to a higher dimension in order to investigate the whole framework of emotional work (Grandey & Gabriel, 2015). In order to achieve that, researches on finding the mechanism – the mediator and moderator- has been suggested. Although many researches were done to link the emotional labor processes with well-being, there must be an expansion in order to uncover the dynamic process of emotional work.

Lastly, expansion on the target of emotional work actors is suggested for further researches. Previous researches only dealt with frontline service providers and measured their emotional labor occurring when dealing with customers. However, usually, organizations have a set of common rule and norm in terms of displayed emotion. This emotional work not only accounts for the service providers, but also for the organization employees who work with their internal customers – coworkers, stakeholders, boss, and etc. Therefore, emotional labor towards the internal customer has been suggested for further exploration.

The current study extends previous literature on emotional work by expanding the types of emotional work into five distinct constructs and finding their relationship with antecedents and consequences. In addition, this study targets the employees who are dealing with customers and coworkers at the workplace.

Study 1 focuses on the expansion of emotional work types. It is hypothesized that there five different emotional work types; surface, deep, internalized, deviant, and robotic. In addition to surface and deep acting, which were widely used emotional work type, I developed three more types in order to expand

the types of emotional labor.

Study 2 focuses on investigating the relationship between emotional work types and antecedents. Antecedent variables were work orientation (job, career, and calling), positive affectivity, customer characteristics, and organization culture. Several hypotheses were designed. First, calling orientation correlates positively with internalized and deep acting while job orientation correlates positively with surface and deviant acting. Second, positive affectivity correlates positively with internalized and deep acting. Third, negative customer characteristic correlates positively with surface and deviant acting. Fourth, positive organization culture correlates (a) positively with internalized and deep acting and (b) negatively with surface and deviant acting.

Study 3 focuses on examining the relationship between five emotional work types and consequences. Hypotheses are the following: Internalized and deep acting correlates positively with (1) job satisfaction, (2) eustress, (3) job engagement, and correlates negatively with (4) job burnout and (5) emotional dissonance.

I. Conceptual Background

Emotional Work

Previous researches have demonstrated and expanded the definition of emotional labor and served as the groundwork for future studies. The term ‘emotional labor or emotional work’ was first coined by Hochschild about 35 years ago and she defined it as “the management of feeling to create a publicly observable facial and bodily display” (Hochschild, 1983). Organizations specify the expressed and implied guideline on how employees are expected to express their emotions appropriately. This is called a display rule. In order to display the appropriate emotion, employees are also expected to manage their feelings and even suppress what they actually feel at the workplace in order to achieve organizational goals and match the display rules. Because this management requires significant efforts and control, emotional labor occurs.

Many researches focused on investigating the conceptual definition of emotional labor first and then, finding the relationship with employees and organization. After Hochschild’s introduction of the term, Ashforth and Humphrey (1993) defined emotional work as “an act of displaying appropriate emotions, with the goal to engage in a form of impression management for the organization”. Morris & Feldman (1996) considered emotional work in terms of the job characteristics – “the effort, planning, and control needed to express organizationally desired emotion during interpersonal transactions”. They considered emotional work as observable behaviors and suggested how it could offer different advantages such as accessing to more emotional experiences. Grandey (2000) defined emotional work “involves

enhancing, faking, or suppressing emotions to modify the emotional expression ... in response to display rules for the organization or job” and related emotional work to negative effects on physical and psychological health (i.e. burnout).

Emotional work has three components: emotional requirements, emotion performance, and emotion regulation (Grandey & Gabriel, 2015). Emotional requirements are emotional display rules that the organization requires for employees. It could be either positive, negative, or even neutral emotion. Emotional performance is the expression that is congruent with the requirement. The facial expression, body language, voice pitch, and tone could be the example. Lastly, emotion regulation is the effort of the employee in “meeting the socioemotional demands of the job” (Grandey & Gabriel, 2015). This emotional regulation is the most important part since depending on the emotion that must be regulated, the types of emotion regulation will be decided; the type of emotion regulation is the key to the type of emotional work acting. (김명언, 2019).

Types of Emotional Work

In light of scholarly work, many researches focused on examining the relationship of each type of emotional work with antecedents and outcomes (Brotheridge & Lee, 2002; Diefendorff, Croyle, & Gosserand, 2005; Grandey, 2003). Mainly two acting types were engaged by employees in order to produce the desired emotional displays – surface acting and deep acting. Assuming that organizations specify display rules, many researches focused on how individuals achieve the appropriate emotional displays (Ashforth & Tomiuk, 2000; Diefendorff et al., 2005; Grandey, 2003). When the individual suppresses, hides, and fakes the felt emotion and paints on the required emotional display, it is called surface acting. When the

individual tries to experience the required emotional display to align with the required emotional display, it is called deep acting. Grandey (2000) argued that emotional labor could be beneficial or harmful in terms of emotional regulation because suppressing the felt emotion and displaying the positive emotion could result in emotional dissonance, leading to the negative effect on the organizational and the individual. However, when the individual changes the internal feelings to conform to the expectation, which could be more genuine displays and results in a beneficial effect on the organization and the individual (Gabriel et al., 2015).

Even though many researches were conducted using two widely-accepted types of emotional work acting, many questions were raised on whether there are only two types of emotional work or more types are needed to be explored and expanded. This claim could be supported by inconsistent empirical findings between two types of emotional work and well-being.

Even though researches argued that there is a link between emotional labor and well-being and performance outcomes, still many questions remained unanswered and showed inconsistent empirical findings (Bono & Vey, 2005; Fisher & Ashkanasy, 2000; Rubin, Staebler Tardino, Daus & Munz, 2005). Concerning deep acting, researches have shown that deep acting is related to high strain (Grandey, 2003; Totterdell & Holman, 2003) while other researches found it to be related to low strain (Brotheridge & Grandey, 2002; Brotheridge & Lee, 2002) or unrelated to strain at all (Beal, Trougakos, Weiss, & Green, 2006). Therefore, empirical findings showed the mixed result of deep acting on whether it is beneficial, harmful, or unrelated to the well-being. Hülshager & Schewe (2011) found from their meta-analysis that deep acting was unrelated to the well-being and showed a positive relationship with the performance. This indicated that emotional labor in deep acting

improves the performance but does not influence well-being. However, this also questions that deep acting changes the internal emotion of the individual into the positive one, which is expected to have a positive consequence for well-being. (Von Gilsa & Zapf, 2013). Thus, it has been difficult to draw a reliable conclusion about the relationship between emotional labor acting and the performance and well-being. This suggested that distinct types of emotional regulation might exist.

There were several other supporting researches on firing the debate. In the book, *The Managed Heart: Commercialization of the Human Feeling* (1983), the author Hochschild states about the ‘passive deep acting’, which “occurs when employees may automatically feel emotions needed for a particular situation”. In this book, Hochschild states ‘active deep acting’ as the case where an employee has to spend the effort to regulate their emotions (Zapf et al., 1999). This supports that even deep acting could be divided into two distinct concepts depending on whether it is passive (automatically feeling the desired emotion) or active (feeling the desired emotion with effort). In addition, other research suggests displaying naturally felt emotions as another type of emotional work and argues that it is distinguished from the surface and deep acting (Diefendorff et al., 2005). Mauss et al. (2007) also suggested that emotion regulation may become automatic and become easier for the performer. Overall, different researches suggest that the measures must be expanded beyond the surface and deep acting.

Surface Acting

Surface Acting is one of the widely accepted types of emotion regulation. In order to appropriately express desired emotion at the workplace, employees hide, fake, or suppress the felt emotion. It is usually defined as a response-focused form

of emotion regulation since it is about covering the emotion that is already felt. The emotional experience and emotion expression remain incongruent when engaged in surface acting (Grandey, 2000; Gross, 1998; Totterdell & Holman, 2003).

Deep Acting

In order to appropriately express the desired emotion at the workplace, employees try to modify their thought, feeling, interpretation about the situation, thus resulting in emotional change (Grandey & Melloy, 2017). While considered as beneficial in the previous researches, deep acting, however, shows the mixed result to some variables like work strain. Deep actors usually reappraise the situation, consider the perspective of others, and change the frame of the situation (김명인, 2019). This comes from the idea of the active deep acting – actively changing the internal feeling in order to align with the display rule.

Internalized Acting

Internalized acting comes from the idea of passive deep acting – automatically modifying the emotion to align with the display rule. This type of acting is a more genuine expression of the actor. There were previous researches suggesting on the internalized acting. Zammuner & Galli (2005b) suggested that when genuine emotions are aligned with requirements for emotive displays, then the employee is free to act in a manner that is consistent with their natural desires and it is resulted into enhanced feelings of personal accomplishment and decreased emotional exhaustion. (Mermer-Magnus et al., 2012; Näring, Briët, & Brouwers, 2006). This type of actor naturally feels the emotion that matches the display rule of the organization and genuinely expresses it. Therefore, this actor does not feel any

negative consequences resulted from faking the emotion. It could be also interpreted as the most ideal emotional work type. In the research of 김명언 et al. (2014), internalized acting is shown to have a significant negative relationship with psychological exhaustion ($r = -.47$) and R-square value of 4% (김명언, 2019).

Deviant Acting

Deviant acting is the acting that expresses the employee's genuine emotion even though it is not desired in the organization (Rafaeli & Sutton, 1987). In this case, instead of a displayed rule of organization, a private display rule is more activated and thus for the actor, it is not necessarily to follow the display rule of the organization when it conflicts with the private display rule (김명언, 2019). Therefore, this might result in the negative consequence for both the organization and for the individual.

Robotic Acting

Robotic acting is the acting that expresses the desired emotion of the organization automatically on the outside, but do not really feel anything inside the actor. Because it is difficult for the robotic actor to handle the situation that the felt emotion and expressed emotion is incongruent, the robotic actor usually just do not respond emotionally but rather 'show' the desired mask. It could be explained as a type of automatic emotional regulation (Beal et al., 2006).

The life of emotional workers is constituted of various types of emotional work acting (공혜선 & 김효선, 2014). Not only different researches suggest that the measures must be expanded but also these types could be found in the real-life

because there are more than two types of dealing with the congruent or incongruent expressed emotion to felt emotion. Therefore, the following is the first hypothesis for the study.

Hypothesis 1. Emotional work type is expanded to five distinct components: surface, deep, internalized, deviant, and robotic acting.

Targets of Emotional Work

Previously, lots of researches focused on finding the emotional work of service providers enacted on customers. However, as the emotional work has been expanded in terms of the conceptual framework, emotional work of employees on their coworkers has received much attention because there are interpersonal interaction going on both for individuals who are internal and external to the organization

Mesmer-Magnus et al. (2012) found that although individual difference variables do not get affected, employee health and work satisfaction do show the difference when emotional labor is directed either toward individuals external to the organization (e.g. customer) compared toward individuals internal to the organization (e.g. coworker). Therefore, it is important to measure the extent to which the employees show emotional work to both customers and coworkers. Therefore, in this study, the target of emotional work is considered towards individuals internal and external to the organization.

STUDY 1. Expansion of Emotional Work Types

I. Research Objective

Previous researches have investigated there are two general types of displaying organizationally desired emotions – surface and deep acting. However, many researches have only focused on investigating primarily on surface and deep acting, but pay little attention to expanding different emotional work types.

This study is designed to empirically determine three additional emotional work types (internalized, deviant, and robotic acting) in addition to surface and deep acting. Therefore, this study hypothesized that there are five distinct emotional types as a method of displaying organizationally desired emotions: surface, deep, internalized, deviant, and robotic acting. For empirical verification, three methods were used. First, through scenario result and compared means, it was supported that the three additional emotional work types exist. Through exploratory factor analysis and confirmatory factor analysis, the 5-factor model was also supported and clearly distinguished five types of emotional work.

II. Method

Sample and Procedure

Participants were current employees from various service occupations dealing with the customer and co-workers in South Korea. They were from different

occupations such as insurance company employees, airport customer service agents, and healthcare center nurses.

For the study, we collected the data twice. At Phase 1, participants were asked with items on different emotional labor types, scenario questions, and antecedents. After three weeks, at phase 2, the same participants were asked with items asking about the consequence of emotional labor. Each time participants fill in the survey, they were asked to write down the code number and thus for the researcher to be able to match the number from Phase 1 to the number from Phase 2. This method was designed in order to minimize the common method bias.

Every participant was approached by the researcher and was asked to join the study. They were able to choose either an online or paper survey. For emotional work acting types, all items were randomly mixed among five types in order to minimize any possible bias. Items are in Appendix A and Appendix B.

For scenario questions, five different situations reflecting each emotional work types were presented and a question asking the frequency of performing emotional work was followed. Five scenario questions were also presented in a random order as shown in Appendix C.

After the completion of the survey, research assistants majored in organizational psychology and the author of the research cross-checked and eliminated abnormal responses and missing data, which did not match the Time 1 and Time 2 code number. I initially gained 160 employees who deal with customers and 175 employees who work with coworkers. However, through screening, 139 and 148 employees were retained for customer sample and coworker sample respectively. Since a recommended item-to-response ratios range from 1:4 (Rummel, 1970) to 1:10 (Schwab, 1980), the sample size was sufficient to conduct the research.

Since the study tried to separately see the emotional work performance of employees dealing with the customers (hereafter, employee-customer or customer sample) and the emotional work of employees dealing with the co-workers (hereafter, employee-coworker or coworker sample), demographical characteristics are separately calculated and shown in Table 1 and 2.

Measure: emotional work items

Every measurement that is used in this study are used with a 6-point Likert scale (6=“ Strongly Agree”; 1= “Strongly Disagree). A set of items used for the survey is listed in Appendix A and B.

Table 1
Demographic characteristics for the study sample (employee-customer)

Variable	Distinction	N	Percentage (%)
Sex	Male	49	35.3
	Female	90	64.7
Age	20s	34	24.5
	30s	35	25.2
	40s	40	28.8
	50s	30	21.5
Industry	Airline Company	31	22.3
	Health Care Center	48	34.5
	Insurance Company	60	43.2
Job Tenure	Less than 3 years	54	38.8
	3 – 5 years	26	18.7
	More than 5 years	59	42.5
Total		139	100

Table 2
Demographic characteristics for the study sample (employee-coworker)

Variable	Distinction	N	Percentage (%)
Sex	Male	48	32.4
	Female	100	67.6
Age	20s	38	25.7
	30s	39	26.4
	40s	44	29.7
	50s	27	18.2
Industry	Airline Company	29	19.6
	Health Care Center	63	42.6
	Insurance Company	56	37.8
Job Tenure	Less than 3 years	58	38.8
	3 – 5 years	35	18.7
	More than 5 years	55	42.5
Total		148	100

Surface Acting. The initial surface acting scale consisted of six items that were adapted from Diefendorff, Croyle, & Gosserand’s (2005) Surface Acting scale and were translated and modified for the present investigation. Depending on the target of the survey, whether it is for employees dealing with coworker or customer, the label for the target has been changed accordingly while keeping the context same. As an example, one item states “I fake the emotions I show when dealing with customers” for employees dealing with the customer. The same item is used for employees dealing with the coworker except that the word ‘customer’ is modified into ‘coworker’. After exploratory and confirmatory factor analysis, two items were eliminated and the reliability was $\alpha = .83$ for coworker and customer sample.

Deep Acting. The initial deep acting scale consisted of five items: four items were adapted from Diefendorff, Croyle, & Gosserand’s (2005) Deep Acting scale and one item was developed for the present study. Items were translated and modified

for the present investigation. Depending on the target of the deep acting, whether it is coworker or customer, the label for the target has been modified. As an example, one item states “I try to actually experience the emotions that I must show to customers (or coworkers)”. The internal consistency reliability for five items was $\alpha = .90$ for coworker and customer sample.

Internalized Acting. The initial internalized acting scale consisted of six items: one item was based on Kruml & Geddes (2000) and five items are developed for the investigation by the research project team. Depending on the target of the internalized acting, whether it is coworker or customer, the label for the target has been modified. As an example, one item states “The emotions that I need to display toward customers (or coworkers) are what I spontaneously feel”. After exploratory and confirmatory factor analysis, three items were eliminated and the reliability was $\alpha = .87$ for coworker sample and for customer sample.

Deviant Acting. The initial deviant acting scale consisted of five items that are developed for the investigation by the research project team. Depending on the target of the deviant acting, whether it is coworker or customer, the label has been modified to match the desired target. As an example, one item states “Even though my organization does not want me to express the emotions I feel genuinely, I do when I am in anger”. After exploratory and confirmatory factor analysis, every item was retained and the reliability was $\alpha = .86$ for coworker sample and $\alpha = .87$ for customer sample.

Robotic Acting. The initial robotic acting scale consisted of five items, which are developed for the investigation by the research project team. Depending on the target of the robotic acting, whether it is coworker or customer, the label for the target

has been modified. As an example, one item states “It is clever to have neither negative nor positive emotion towards customers (or coworkers), so I try to feel nothing towards them”. After exploratory and confirmatory factor analysis, four items were removed and the reliability was $\alpha = .78$ for coworker sample and $\alpha = .81$ for customer sample.

Control Variable. Sex, Age, industry, and job tenure were used for control variables.

Measure: scenario items

A scenario method was used in order to make sure that five emotional work types do exist in real-life circumstances. There were five scenarios reflecting five emotional types. Even though there were two conditions (dealing with coworker condition and dealing with customer condition), most participants who were dealing with both coworkers and customers at the workplace answered ten scenarios in total. In order to minimize the bias, every scenario was randomly presented. A sample scenario for surface acting is shown in Table 3 and Table 4 and the full version of the scenario is presented in Appendix B. Scenario was a bit different in terms of the details like settings (i.e. face-to-face situation for healthcare center and airport service desk) since it had to reflect the situation each respondent was involved in. Two different scenarios for each emotional work type was presented for employee dealing with customer and coworker sample.

Table 3

Surface Acting Scenario example for Employee-customer sample

For Healthcare center employees (service-providers)

A 원장님의 진료를 받으러 온 환자가 대기 시간이 길어지면서 내게 다가와 짜증을 내며 말했다.

환자: (화난 표정으로 언성을 높이며) “어떻게 된거죠? 얼마나 더 기다려야 하나요?”

속으로는 기분이 좋지 않았지만 겉으로는 안 그런척, 미소를 띄우며 부드럽게 대답했다.
나 (간호사): “죄송합니다. 조금만 더 기다려주시기 바랍니다.”

For Airline company employees (service-providers)

탑승 수속을 기다리는 고객이 대기 시간이 길어지면서 내게 다가와 짜증을 내며 말했다.
고객: (화난 표정으로 언성을 높이며) “어떻게 된거죠? 얼마나 더 기다려야 하나요?”

속으로는 기분이 좋지 않았지만 겉으로는 안 그런척, 미소를 띄우며 부드럽게 대답했다.
나 (직원): “죄송합니다. 조금만 더 기다려주시기 바랍니다.”

For insurance company employees (service-providers)

업무 처리를 기다리는 고객이 대기 시간이 길어지면서 짜증을 내며 말했다.

고객: (화난 목소리로 언성을 높이며) “어떻게 된거죠? 얼마나 더 기다려야 하나요?”

속으로는 기분이 좋지 않았지만 겉으로는 안 그런척, 미소를 띄우며 부드럽게 대답했다.
나 (직원): “죄송합니다. 조금만 더 기다려주시기 바랍니다.”

Table 4

Surface Acting Scenario example for Employee-coworker sample

For Healthcare center employees (service-providers)

<상황>

A 부서에서 직원 C에게 서류를 전달하며, 타 부서 직원 B에게 전달해 달라고 부탁했다. 그러나, 환자에 대한 검사 결과 서류가 누락된 것을 발견한 직원 B가 내게 다가와 짜증을 내며 말했다.

직원 B: (화난 표정으로 언성을 높이며) “어떻게 된 거죠? 검사 결과 서류가 왜 없는거예요? 이런 것은 미리 좀 체크하고 전달해줘야 하는거 아니예요?”

속으로는 기분이 좋지 않았지만 겉으로는 안 그런 척, 미소를 띄우며 부드럽게 대답했다.

직원 C: “A 부서에서 전달해주시는 과정 중에 서류가 누락된 것 같으니, 제가 확인해보고 연락 드리겠습니다. 죄송합니다.”

For Airline company employees (service-providers)

<상황>

A 부서에서 직원 C에게 서류를 전달하며, 타 부서 직원 B에게 전달해 달라고 부탁했다. 그러나, 중요한 회의 자료가 누락된 것을 발견한 직원 B가 내게 다가와 짜증을 내며 말했다.

직원 B: (화난 표정으로 언성을 높이며) “어떻게 된 거죠? 회의 자료가 왜 없는거예요? 이런 것은 미리 좀 체크하고 전달해줘야 하는거 아니예요?”

속으로는 기분이 좋지 않았지만 겉으로는 안 그런 척, 미소를 띄우며 부드럽게 대답했다.

직원 C: “A 부서에서 전달해주시는 과정 중에 서류가 누락된 것 같으니, 제가 확인해보고 연락 드리겠습니다. 죄송합니다.”

For insurance company employees (service-providers)

<상황>

A 부서에서 직원 C에게 서류를 전달하며, 타 부서 직원 B에게 전달해 달라고 부탁했다. 그러나, 중요한 업무 보고서가 누락된 것을 발견한 직원 B가 내게 다가와 짜증을 내며 말했다.

직원 B: (화난 표정으로 언성을 높이며) “어떻게 된 거죠? 업무 보고서가 왜 없는거예요? 이런 것은 미리 좀 체크하고 전달해줘야 하는거 아니에요?”

속으로는 기분이 좋지 않았지만 겉으로는 안 그런 척, 미소를 띄우며 부드럽게 대답했다.

직원 C: “A 부서에서 전달해주시는 과정 중에 서류가 누락된 것 같으니, 제가 확인해보고 연락 드리겠습니다. 죄송합니다.”

After the situation is presented, a simple question was asked, “How frequently do you experience this kind of situation that is mentioned above?” with a 5-point Likert scale (5 = “always (every day)”; 4 = “usually (3-4 times a week)”; 3 = “often (once a week)”; 2 = “sometimes (once-twice a month)”; 1 = “Never”). This question was asked in order to find whether the performance of five emotional work could be found in real life.

III. Results

Factor analysis

Our hypothesis states that there are five types of emotional labor acting: surface, deep, internalized, deviant, and robotic acting. Because any previous theoretical or empirical research has been done on five dimensions of emotional labor acting, it was necessary to first test the reliability and to verify the hypothesized factor structure. Therefore, an exploratory factor analysis (EFA) and a confirmatory factor

analysis (CFA) were conducted using Mplus 7.0 for both employee-customer and employee-coworker sample.

First, exploratory factor analysis was performed for both 139 employees dealing with customers and 148 employees dealing with coworkers. It was conducted to determine the factor structure of 27 items. Oblique direct Quartimin rotation was used in the analysis and the factor loadings for 27 items generally supported the hypothesized five dimensions of emotional labor.

However, in order to refine items, items with low loading values were removed and the final 19 items were retained for both employee-coworker and employee-customer sample (See Table 5 and 6).

Table 5
Items and factor loadings for Emotional Labor Types (Employee-coworker sample)

Dimensions	Items	Factor Loadings				
		1	2	3	4	5
Surface Acting	Surface 1	.75				
	Surface 2	.64				
	Surface 4	.74				
	Surface 6	.61				
Deep Acting	Deep 1		.81			
	Deep 2		.94			
	Deep 3		.84			
	Deep 4		.76			
	Deep 5		.69			
Internalized Acting	Internalized 1			.68		
	Internalized 2			.73		
	Internalized 3			.80		
Deviant Acting	Deviant 1				.66	
	Deviant 2				.82	
	Deviant 3				.87	
	Deviant 4				.74	
	Deviant 5				.65	
Robotic Acting	Robotic 2					.72
	Robotic 3					.91

Note. N=148; See Appendix A for items

Extraction method: Maximum Likelihood
 Rotation Method: Oblique rotation (Direct Quartimin)

Table 6
Items and factor loadings for Emotional Labor Types (Employee-customer sample)

Dimensions	Items	Factor Loadings				
		1	2	3	4	5
Surface Acting	Surface 1	.74				
	Surface 2	.67				
	Surface 4	.81				
	Surface 6	.56				
Deep Acting	Deep 1		.78			
	Deep 2		.92			
	Deep 3		.80			
	Deep 4		.73			
	Deep 5		.63			
Internalized Acting	Internalized 1			.68		
	Internalized 2			.75		
	Internalized 3			.81		
Deviant Acting	Deviant 1				.68	
	Deviant 2				.81	
	Deviant 3				.85	
	Deviant 4				.66	
	Deviant 5				.67	
Robotic Acting	Robotic 2					1.00
	Robotic 3					.61

Note. N=139; See Appendix A for items
 Extraction method: Maximum Likelihood
 Rotation Method: Oblique rotation (Direct Quartimin)

In addition, confirmatory factor analysis was conducted to validate the five-factor structure separating surface, deep, internalized, deviant, and robotic acting. Indicators for model fit were examined with CFI (Comparative Fit Index), TLI (Tucker Lewis Index), RMSEA (Root Mean Square Error of Approximation), SRMR (Standardized Root Mean Square Residual), and χ^2 Goodness of Fit. With the criteria to assess the model fit (RMSEA < .06; TLI and CFI > .90; SRMR < .10), the five-factor model showed overall good model fits for both employee-customer

sample and employee-coworker sample. (See Table 5 and 6). In addition, in order to compare the model, the alternative 2-factor model was also assessed and clearly, the five-factor model separating five emotional labor types was preferable, which confirms the hypothesized model.

Table 7
CFA results for Emotional Labor Types Scale (Employee-customer sample)

Model	N	CFI	TLI	RMSEA	SRMR	Chi-square	df	P value
5-factor	139	.94	.92	.04	.07	231.68	142	0.00
2-factor	139	.44	.38	.00	.18	921.15	152	0.00

Table 8
CFA results for Emotional Labor Types Scale (Employee-coworker sample)

Model	N	CFI	TLI	RMSEA	SRMR	Chi-square	df	P value
5-factor	148	.92	.91	.02	.07	244.056	142	0.00
2-factor	148	.40	.33	.00	.18	945.31	152	0.00

Note. CFI = comparative fit index; and NNFI (also referred to as TLI) non-normed fit index; RMSEA = root mean square error of approximation; SRMR = standardized root-means-square residual

As a result, an exploratory factor analyses and a confirmatory factor analysis supported the hypothesized 6-factor structure of emotional labor. Therefore, for further testing, the composites for sub-dimension of emotional labor acting types, which are surface, deep, internalized, deviant, and robotic acting, were averaged and used for analysis.

Descriptive Statistics and Correlations

As illustrated in Table 9 and 10, means, standard deviations, and correlations for five different emotional labor types are presented. It was shown that

every mean value for the averaged dimension was over 3.0 out of 6.0 for both samples. Even though surface acting and deep acting showed the overall high value, which is over 4.0, our hypothesized internalized, deviant, and robotic acting also showed relatively high value. That is, five emotional work types including not only surface and deep acting but also internalized, deviant, and robotic acting exist as well.

It was also interesting to find the pattern in the correlations. Internalized acting is shown to have a strong positive relationship with deep acting and generally, robotic acting is shown to have a significant positive relationship with surface and deviant acting.

Table 9
Descriptive Statistics and Correlations (Employee-Coworker Sample)

	N	Mean	SD	1	2	3	4	5
1. Surface Acting	148	4.12	.86	1				
2. Deep Acting	148	4.12	.86	.14	1			
3. Internalized Acting	148	3.90	1.07	-.09	.45**	1		
4. Deviant Acting	148	3.05	.97	.02	.14	.23**	1	
5. Robotic Acting	148	3.31	1.11	.23**	-.01	.12	.28**	1

Note. ** $P < .01$; * $P < .05$ (two-tailed)

Table 10
Descriptive Statistics and Correlations (Employee-Customer Sample)

	N	Mean	SD	1	2	3	4	5
1. Surface Acting	139	4.36	.81	1				
2. Deep Acting	139	4.14	.93	.18*	1			
3. Internalized Acting	139	3.78	1.06	-.05	.53**	1		
4. Deviant Acting	139	3.95	1.00	-.06	.09	.23**	1	
5. Robotic Acting	139	3.33	1.17	.27**	.07	.14	.30**	1

Note. ** $P < .01$; * $P < .05$ (two-tailed)

Scenario

As illustrated in Table 11 and 12, means, standard deviations, and correlations for five different emotional labor scenarios are presented. It was shown that every mean value for the averaged dimension was over 2.0 out of 5.0 for both samples. Since value that is higher than 2.0 out of 5.0 means that employees at least experience some extent of the emotional type, this also shows the evidence that five different emotional types might exist.

For employee-coworker sample, surface acting and internalized acting showed a relatively high value while for employee-customer sample, internalized and robotic acting showed a relatively high value. This shows that when dealing with a coworker, employees use internalized and surface acting more often. However, when dealing with the customer, employees use internalized and robotic acting. It is interesting how both employees use internalized acting more often while whether dealing with customer or coworker.

Table 11
Descriptive Statistics and Correlations for Scenario (Employee-Coworker Sample)

	N	Mean	SD	1	2	3	4	5
1. Surface Acting	148	3.05	1.18	1				
2. Deep Acting	148	2.97	1.14	.74**	1			
3. Internalized Acting	148	3.01	1.20	.72**	.77**	1		
4. Deviant Acting	148	2.78	1.25	.52**	.66**	.66**	1	
5. Robotic Acting	148	2.85	1.11	.58**	.59**	.59**	.56**	1

Note. ** $P < .01$; * $P < .05$ (two-tailed)

1 = "Never"

2 = "sometimes (once-twice a month)"

3 = "often (once a week)"

4 = "usually (3-4 times a week)"

5 = "always (everyday)"

Table 12
Descriptive Statistics and Correlations for Scenario (Employee-Customer Sample)

	N	Mean	SD	1	2	3	4	5
1. Surface Acting	139	2.96	.92	1				
2. Deep Acting	139	2.88	1.01	.38*	1			
3. Internalized Acting	139	3.04	.89	.11	.42**	1		
4. Deviant Acting	139	2.89	1.54	-.01	.04	.05	1	
5. Robotic Acting	139	3.32	.99	.35**	.22**	.13	.20*	1

Note. ** $P < .01$; * $P < .05$ (two-tailed)

1 = "Never"

2 = "sometimes (once-twice a month)"

3 = "often (once a week)"

4 = "usually (3-4 times a week)"

5 = "always (everyday)"

IV. Discussion

To summarize the results from study 1, five types of emotional labor acting were investigated including surface, deep, internalized, deviant, and robotic acting (hypothesis 1). In both samples of employees dealing with coworkers and customers, five hypothesized acting was separately distinguished through exploratory factor analysis and confirmatory factor analysis. Through exploratory factor analysis, it was shown that there are five distinct constructs of the emotional work types and through confirmatory factor analysis, it was again confirmed that 5-factor model is ideal compared to the alternative model with 2 factors. These findings are important because they argue that there are only two types of emotional work acting.

Descriptive statistics and correlation for each emotional work type also showed the existence by having the means of over 2.5 generally for both samples. For scenario studies, it was also examined that different emotional work types are overall experienced in the daily life of employees in the service industry. Taken together, the current study verified the expanded construct of emotional work acting.

Much more will be further analyzed in investigating the relationship between emotional work type and employee well-being. But, it could be expected that these five types will possibly explain the mixed results of emotional labor on outcome variable such as job satisfaction.

Not only this study expands the construct of emotional work acting and lights the possible explanation for contradictory result, but this study is also significant that it includes both employee samples dealing with customers and coworkers. Only a few literatures examined employee samples dealing with

customer and coworkers at the same time, and thus, it is significant to show that the expanded work emotional types are applicable for both samples.

In order for further investigation, study 2 and study 3 will continue its exploration on finding the antecedents and consequences of emotional work.

STUDY 2. Antecedents of Emotional Work

I. Research Objective

Study 1 has investigated there are five types of displaying organizationally desired emotions – surface, deep, internalized, robotic, and deviant acting. However, not only the research stops at expanding the emotional acting type, but it further expands analysis by examining the antecedents such as work orientation, positive and negative affectivity, customer characteristics, and organization culture. Hypotheses are developed for each variable.

II. Conceptual Background and Hypotheses

Through empirical researches on measuring the antecedents of emotional work have been done in the past, there are several focal antecedents that predict the emotional labor (Grandey & Gabriel, 2015). Since most jobs tend to expect positive and prosocial interactions (Diefendorff et al., 2006), personal traits, motives, abilities, organization context that are congruent with positive emotional requirements predict emotional work. (Dahling & Johnson, 2013). Therefore, person-job congruence (i.e., the person that matches the emotional requirements), emotion-goal congruence (emotions/events that match the emotional requirements), organization-job congruence (organization/job that matches the emotional requirements), and social congruence (social/cultural context that matches the emotional requirements) were four perspectives that explain the predicting antecedents of emotional work

(Grandey & Gabriel, 2015; 김명연, 2019). In this study, I used work orientation and affectivity as the personal trait that explains person-job congruence, customer characteristic as emotion-goal congruence, and organizational culture as social congruence.

Work Orientation – Job, Calling, and Career

Work orientation is the perception of the individual towards their work. This idea was approached from the idea that individuals differ in their experience of the work they do (Wrzesniewski et al., 1997). Bellah et al. (1985) argue there are three distinct relations people can have to their work: job, careers, and callings (Schwartz, 1986; Wrzesniewski et al., 1997). People who have job orientation are only interested in material benefits from the work and do not get (or even try to get) rewarded or motivated from other resources. People who have career orientation have a deeper personal investment in their work; they not only are interested in monetary gain but also through advancement within the organizational structure, which brings power and social standing. Calling orientation finds their work inseparable from their life. They are fulfilled by doing the work. The job-career-calling distinction is not necessarily limited to a certain occupation, but rather applied to many fields and industries.

Even though there wasn't any exact research on finding the relationship between emotional labor and work orientation, there were some researches on finding the relationship between emotional labor acting and motivation. Truta (2014) found in the research that deep acting has the strongest correlations with intrinsic motivation. Even though we cannot say that job, career, and calling orientation exactly fall into the dimensions of intrinsic and extrinsic motivation, Wrzesniewski

et al. stated that they presume that intrinsic motivation is most associated with callings while extrinsic motivation is somewhat closer to extrinsic motivation (1997). Since calling orientation is about people who believe their work is contributing to making the world a better place and focus on their inner motivation deeply, I presume that it is possible to relate the calling orientation into deep acting and even more, internalized acting. Therefore, H2-1 is the following:

Hypothesis 2-1. Calling orientation correlates positively with internalized and deep acting while job orientation correlates positively with surface and deviant acting.

Positive and Negative Affectivity

Affectivity is defined as a tendency to experience a particular mood (positive or negative) or to react with certain emotions (Lazarus, 1993). Positive affectivity describes how an individual reacts positively to environmental stimuli (Cropanzano et al., 1993). Even though some researches considered positive and negative affectivity as two separate constructs, they were also suggested to be one construct that concerns the amount of happiness an individual experiences over time (Judge, 1992; Morris & Feldman, 1996).

Individuals who are higher in trait positive affectivity tend to engage in prosocial behaviors of deep acting and showing genuine displays to others (Diefendorff et al., 2005; Kammeyer-Mueller et al., 2013; Grandey & Gabriel, 2015). In contrast, people with negative affectivity, moody and cynical characteristics tend to show surface acting more likely (Kammeyer-Mueller et al., 2013). Therefore, in this study, positive and negative affectivity may have significant influences on types of emotional work. Individuals who experience positive emotions are expected to

experience a more genuine display of their felt emotions in the organization because their felt emotions are more likely to match the required emotion of the organization. Thus, it will lead them to display deep acting and internalized acting more. Therefore, H2-2 is the following:

Hypothesis 2-2. Positive affectivity correlates positively with internalized and deep acting while negative affectivity correlates positively with surface and deviant acting.

Customer characteristics

Interaction with hostile, rude, and tough customers typically evoke a discrepancy between one's felt emotion and emotional requirement (Grandey & Gabriel, 2015). Many previous studies have examined that employees who experience injustice or mistreatment from customers are more likely to display surface acting but not deep acting (Grandey et al., 2004; Rupp et al., 2008; Silter et al., 2010). Experiments also showed the same result that direct or indirect (observed) exposure to a hostile customer leads to negative emotions and more surface and deep acting in order to reduce the discrepancy (Goldberg & Grandey, 2007; Rupp & Spencer, 2006; Spencer & Rupp, 2009). Therefore, interaction with hostile, tough customers and experience of mistreatment from them might result in negative feelings and lead employees to show surface and deviant acting because they want to minimize the discrepancy. This does not only lead to surface emotional acting towards customers but also toward coworkers that they interact. Therefore, H2-3 is as follows:

Hypothesis 2-3. Negative customer characteristic correlates positively with surface

and deviant acting.

Organization Culture

In the past decade, many researches have shown that culture influences employees satisfaction, burnout, teamwork, and absenteeism. Emotions impacts on how people perform, achieve, and engage. Organization culture, especially positive culture has been considered as the predictor of organizational success because specific organization culture influences how employees believe, feel and react. Positive organization culture with serving, the compassionate spirit among coworkers allow employees practice the genuine service to internal and external customers of the organization and even minimize the negative effects of emotional work (Curtis & Upchurch, 2008). In organizations where employees care and serve each other, they could feel social support among employees and are able to better handle the stressful situation and conflicts. Because employees feel more positive and supportive emotions in the positive organizational culture, they are able to show their genuine reactions and have less discrepancy when they have to show positive emotions to their customers and coworkers. Therefore, H2-4 is suggested.

Hypothesis 2-4. A positive organization culture correlates (a) positively with internalized and deep acting and (b) negatively with surface and deviant acting.

III. Method

Sample and Procedure

In this study, participants were the employees who participated in study 1. Data for both employees dealing with customers (N=139) and coworkers (N=148) was examined. Demographic information for the samples is listed in Table 1 and 2.

Measure

Participants responded to scales of work orientation (job, career, and calling orientation), positive and negative affectivity, customer characteristics, and organization culture. Every measurement was used with a 6-point Likert scale (6= "Strongly Agree"; 1= "Strongly Disagree). A set of items used for the survey is listed in Appendix D.

Work Orientation. The work orientation scale was adapted from the questionnaires used in Wrzesniewski, McCauley, Rozin, & Schwartz (1997). It is titled as "University of Pennsylvania Work-Life Questionnaire", which included behaviors and feelings related to work. The job orientation scale included four items. As an example, one item states "I view my job as just a necessity of life, much like breathing or sleeping". The coefficient alpha of the items was .69 for employee-coworker sample and .68 for the employee-customer sample.

The career orientation scale consisted of five items. As an example, one item states "I view my work primarily as a stepping stone to other jobs". The coefficient alpha of the items was .82 for employee-coworker sample and .86 for the employee-customer sample.

The calling orientation scale consisted of three items. As an example, one item states “I find my work rewarding”. The coefficient alpha of the items was .79 for employee-coworker sample and .85 for the employee-customer sample.

Positive and Negative Affectivity. Positive and Negative Affect Scale (PANAS; Watson et al., 1988) was used to measure both positive and negative forms of affect. 10 adjectives with five reflecting positive (e.g., exciting) and five reflecting negative (e.g., upset) affects were presented. Participants were asked to rate the extent to which they have experienced the emotion. The reliability for positive and negative state affect was $\alpha = .87$ and $\alpha = .88$ respectively for employee-coworker sample. The reliability for positive and negative state affect was $\alpha = .92$ and $\alpha = .90$ respectively for the employee-customer sample.

Customer Characteristics. The customer characteristics scale consisted of six items that were written for the investigation by the project team consisted of the professor and the researcher. This scale asked about the characteristics of customers that employees deal with. Each item was a statement asking about whether the customer is particularly tough or angry compared to other customers. As an example, one item states “Our customers cannot stand even a small complaint”. After screening, only four items were retained and the reliability was $\alpha = .90$ for coworker sample and customer sample.

Organization Culture. The initial organization culture scale consisted of five items, which were written for the investigation by the project team consisted of the professor and the researcher. This scale asked about the organization culture that employees are involved in. Each item was a statement asking about the caring and compassionate culture of the organization. As an example, one item states “Our

organization believes it is important for employees to show empathy and kindness to our customers”. Participants rated each item using a 6-point Likert scale (6= “Strongly Agree”; 1= “Strongly Disagree). After screening, all items were retained and the reliability was $\alpha = .90$ for coworker sample and $\alpha = .92$ for customer sample.

Control Variable. Sex, Age, industry, and job tenure were used for control variables.

IV. Results

Means, standard deviations, reliabilities, and correlations for variables are presented in Table 13 and 14. All measures showed acceptable internal reliabilities ranging from .68 to .92. As expected, correlations between five emotional labor variables and some independent variables were significant. Comparing the correlation results in both samples, I was able to find some expected results. First, work orientation – job showed a significant positive correlation with surface acting and robotic acting. Work orientation – calling, positive affectivity, and organization culture all showed a significant positive correlation with deep and internalized acting. Negative affectivity both showed a positive correlation with surface and deviant acting, but not in robotic acting. Work orientation – calling showed a significant positive correlation with deviant acting and showed a mild significant positive correlation with deep and internalized acting. For both employee-customer samples, customer characteristics showed a significant, positive relationship with deep acting.

In order to test the hypotheses, multiple regression analysis was conducted. As shown in Table 15 and 16, the standardized regression coefficients, also known as

the beta coefficient, were compared in order to find the significant predictors for each emotional labor type. For both coworker and customer sample, each emotional labor type was regressed on seven antecedent variables.

For employee-customer sample, the antecedent variables explained a significant amount of variance in surface ($R^2 = 0.21, p < 0.001$), deep ($R^2 = 0.22, p < 0.001$), internalized ($R^2 = 0.38, p < 0.001$), deviant ($R^2 = 0.18, p < 0.001$), and robotic acting ($R^2 = 0.10, p < 0.05$).

From employee-customer sample, work orientation – career was significant predictor of surface acting (0.82, $p < 0.001$), robotic acting (2.29, $p < 0.05$), and deviant acting (2.95, $p < 0.01$). Work orientation – calling was significant predictor of deep acting (2.42, $p < 0.05$) and internalized acting (5.07, $p < 0.001$). Negative affectivity was predictor of deviant acting (2.61, $p < 0.01$) and surface acting (3.11, $p < 0.01$). Work orientation – job was a predictor of robotic acting (2.53, $p < 0.05$).

From employee-coworker sample, work orientation – career was a significant predictor of deviant acting (2.06, $p < 0.05$). Work orientation – calling was a significant predictor of internalized acting (3.56, $p < 0.01$). Negative affectivity was predictor of deviant acting (2.02, $p < 0.05$) and surface acting (1.92, $p < 0.05$). Work orientation – job was a predictor of robotic acting (2.53, $p < 0.05$). Organization culture was a predictor of deep acting (3.04, $p < 0.05$) and internalized acting (2.18, $p < 0.05$).

In sum, Hypotheses 2-1 was partially supported. Both samples showed that work orientation-calling is the significant predictor of internalized acting. Hypotheses 2-2 was also partially supported that negative affectivity is the significant predictor of surface and deviant acting for both samples. Hypotheses 2-3 was not supported. Hypotheses 2-4 was partially supported for employee-coworker

sample because organization culture was a significant predictor of deep acting and internalized acting.

Table 13
*Means, Standard Deviations, reliabilities, and correlations of variables
 (Employee-customer sample)*

	Mean	SD	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12
1. Surface Acting	4.26	0.81	(.78)											
2. Deep Acting	4.14	0.93	.18*	(.92)										
3. Internalized Acting	3.78	1.06	-.05	.53**	(.83)									
4. Deviant Acting	2.95	1.00	-.06	.09	.23**	(.87)								
5. Robotic Acting	3.32	1.17	.27**	.07	.14	.30**	(.81)							
6. WO – Job	4.24	0.89	.34**	.04	-.12	.13	.23**	(.68)						
7. WO – Career	3.37	1.12	.06	.17*	.22*	.32**	.19*	-.02	(.86)					
8. WO – Calling	3.78	1.10	-.09	.40**	.59**	.20*	.01	-.16	.39**	(.85)				
9. Positive Affectivity	3.58	1.02	-.17*	.33**	.44**	.06	-.04	-.08	.26**	.60**	(.92)			
10. Negative Affectivity	3.32	1.04	.34**	.05	.05	.26**	.11	.16	.07	-.04	-.27**	(.90)		
11. Customer characteristic	3.69	1.29	.02	.25**	.22*	.10	.04	.00	.23**	.26**	.31**	-.01	(.90)	
12. Organization culture	4.04	0.99	-.09	.29**	.31**	.02	-.06	-.21*	.21*	.44**	.43**	-.16	.21*	(.92)

Note. Reliabilities are on the diagonal.

* $p < .05$ ** $p < .01$ *** $p < .001$

Table 14
*Means, Standard Deviations, reliabilities, and correlations of variables
 (Employee-coworker sample)*

	Mean	SD	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12
1. Surface Acting	4.12	0.86	(.78)											
2. Deep Acting	4.12	0.86	.14	(.90)										
3. Internalized Acting	3.90	1.07	-.09	.45**	(.83)									
4. Deviant Acting	3.05	0.97	.02	.14	.23**	(.86)								
5. Robotic Acting	3.31	1.11	.23**	-.01	.11	.28**	(.78)							
6. WO – Job	4.26	0.87	.22**	.04	-.12	.14	.15	(.69)						
7. WO – Career	3.42	1.07	.06	.18*	.18*	.25**	.16	.06	(.82)					
8. WO – Calling	3.83	1.04	.01	.25**	.43**	.17*	.08	-.16	.40**	(.79)				
9. Positive Affectivity	3.57	0.95	-.11	.23**	.28**	.02	.06	-.16*	.26**	.48**	(.87)			
10. Negative Affectivity	3.40	1.04	.24**	.07	.09	.23**	.07	.24**	.09	.05	-.21*	(.88)		
11. Customer characteristic	3.69	1.25	.06	.18*	.06	.10	-.03	.05	.16	.13	.22**	.07	(.90)	
12. Organization culture	4.11	0.91	-.09	.33**	.29**	.07	-.03	-.12	.11	.28**	.37**	-.07	.20*	(.90)

Note. Reliabilities are on the diagonal.

* $p < .05$ ** $p < .01$ *** $p < .001$

Table 15
Regression of Emotional labor types on independent variables (Employee-customer sample)

Independent Variables	Dependent Variables									
	Surface Acting		Deep Acting		Internalized Acting		Deviant Acting		Robotic Acting	
	β	t	β	t	β	t	β	t	β	t
Work Orientation – Job	.27	3.62	.11	1.32	-.06	-.64	.13	1.36	.29	2.53*
Work Orientation – Career	.05	.82***	-.02	-.22	-.04	-.56	.23	2.95**	.22	2.29*
Work Orientation – Calling	-.02	-.30	.22	2.42*	.46	5.07***	.13	1.30	.01	.10
Positive Affectivity	-.09	-1.02	.11	1.16	.17	1.74	-.01	-1.13	-.07	-.52
Negative Affectivity	.20	3.11**	.08	1.14	.13	1.73	.21	2.61**	.04	.39
Customer characteristic	.02	.42	.09	1.42	.04	.61	.02	.25	.02	.23
Organization culture	.05	.60	.13	1.49	.04	.46	-.04	-.39	-.05	-.40
Total R^2	.209		.216		.381		.184		.100	
F	4.93***		5.15***		11.52***		4.22***		2.09*	

Note. * $p < .05$ ** $p < .01$ *** $p < .001$

Table 16
Regression of Emotional labor types on independent variables (Employee-coworker sample)

Independent Variables	Dependent Variables									
	Surface Acting		Deep Acting		Internalized Acting		Deviant Acting		Robotic Acting	
	β	<i>t</i>	β	<i>t</i>	β	<i>t</i>	β	<i>t</i>	β	<i>t</i>
Work Orientation – Job	.16	1.94	.08	.93	-.07	-.75	.11	1.22	.19	1.74
Work Orientation – Career	.02	.33	.05	.66	.01	.12	.17	2.06*	.13	1.39
Work Orientation – Calling	.06	.68	.10	1.28	.34	3.56**	.10	1.11	.04	.37
Positive Affectivity	-.07	-.78	.06	.68	.09	.83	-.06	-.55	.08	.69
Negative Affectivity	.14	1.92*	.06	.80	.12	1.49	.16	2.02*	.04	.41
Customer characteristic	.04	.66	.06	1.04	-.03	-.47	.03	.52	-.06	-.80
Organization culture	-.06	-.77	.24	3.04*	.21	2.18*	.05	.58	-.05	-.49
Total R^2	.097		.163		.232		.123		.055	
<i>F</i>	2.14*		3.90**		6.03***		2.81**		1.17	

Note. * $p < .05$ ** $p < .01$ *** $p < .001$

V. Discussion

Study 2 was conducted in order to further expand what was investigated in Study 1. Study 2 measured the antecedents of emotional work types and argued which antecedent is related to different emotional work types. There were seven specific antecedents such as work orientation (job orientation, career orientation, and calling orientation), affectivity (positive and negative affectivity), customer characteristics, and organization culture. Through correlation and regression, the following results with respect to the hypotheses were found.

First, as expected, work orientation-calling is the significant predictor of internalized acting. It is interesting to point out that only internalized acting is predicted by calling orientation, not including the deep acting. This might show that genuine expression of internal feeling might be the key to explaining the relationship between internalized acting and calling orientation. Even though it was not hypothesized, it was noteworthy to point out that work orientation-career was also found to be the predictor of deviant acting for both samples.

Secondly, it was supported that negative affectivity is the significant predictor of surface and deviant acting for both samples. It was expected from previous theoretical works that individuals with negative affectivity will more likely to show surface and deviant acting. Even though positive affectivity was not resulted as expected, it is noteworthy to find out that negative affectivity does predict surface and deviant acting, which predicts negative individual and organizational outcomes.

Thirdly, it was partially supported that organizational culture was a significant predictor of deep acting and internalized acting. This result was only

shown in the employee-coworker sample. This might explain that the organization culture that is elicited will be most influential in terms of interacting with coworkers and displaying emotional labor towards coworkers. Thus, organization culture influences their deep and internalized acting towards coworkers more directly.

STUDY 3. Consequences of Emotional Work

I. Research Objectives

Study 2 investigated the antecedents of five types of displaying organizationally desired emotions and how each antecedent predicts different types of emotional work types. Study 3 further expands analysis by examining the consequences of emotional work types. Variables are job burnout, eustress, job satisfaction, work engagement, and emotional dissonance. Hypotheses are developed for each variable.

II. Conceptual Background and Hypotheses

Consequences of Emotional Work

Job Satisfaction

Job satisfaction is a measure for evaluating employee well-being at the workplace (Grandey, 2000). Generally, employees with high emotional regulation are less satisfied with their job. Rutter and Fielding (1988) argued that emotion suppression is the source of stress and leads to low job satisfaction. Adelman (1995) also reported that employees with a genuine expression of feelings have more job satisfaction compared to employees with false expression.

However, previous researches have shown a contradictory result in terms of the relationship between emotional labor and job satisfaction. They have argued that the relationship between surface acting and job satisfaction was consistently negative, but the relationship between deep acting and job satisfaction was

inconsistent (Bono & Vey, 2005; Hülshager & Schewe, 2011).

It is possible to predict that the current definition of deep acting might not fully predict the well-being of the employees and thus, it is necessary to expand the existing definition into more detailed constructs. Internalized acting, which is the genuine expression of felt emotion without faking or pretending, will be the factor that predicts job satisfaction.

Therefore, in the study, surface acting is expected to show a negative correlation with job satisfaction while internalized acting correlates positively with job satisfaction.

Hypothesis 3-1. Internalized acting correlates positively with job satisfaction while surface acting correlates negatively with job satisfaction.

Eustress

If individuals perceive a stressor as a threat, they become distressed. However, if an individual perceives a stressor as a challenge, it becomes eustress. If employees engage in reappraisal process and perceive customer and coworker interactions as a challenge, not a threat, this could be a eustress response even though it was an emotional work (Quinones, Carvajal, & Griffiths, 2016). Podsakoff, LePine, and Lepine's (2007) model of eustress argues that challenge stressors generate positive affective states through reappraisal.

A genuine expression of felt emotion could be related to eustress since those actors consider emotional labor as a challenge, not a threat. For deep and internalized actors, expression of their feelings in accordance with the desired emotion is no longer challenging and thus, interaction with customers is no more a threat to them.

Therefore, the hypothesis for the eustress is as following.

Hypothesis 3-2. Internalized and deep acting correlates positively with eustress.

Work Engagement

Work engagement has been defined as a “positive, fulfilling, work-related state of mind that is characterized by vigor, dedication, and absorption” (Schaufeli et al., 2002). Many previous researches were done on investigating the work-related outcome such as low absenteeism, low turnover, high organizational commitment, job satisfaction, and performance (Bechtoldt et al., 2011). In addition, empathy is predicted for engaged workers in the service interaction. Engaged workers, therefore, are considered as authentic, understanding, and motivated for their high performance.

Furthermore, there were studies finding the relationship between surface/deep acting and work engagement. Results show that surface acting was negatively related to work engagement while deep acting showed positive relationship towards work engagement when emotion recognition is high (Bechtoldt et al., 2011).

Therefore, it is possible to infer that internalized and deep acting might correlate positively with work engagement because engaged workers are authentic and they aware of their emotion.

Hypothesis 3-3. Internalized and deep acting correlates positively with work engagement.

Job Burnout

Burnout is a measure for evaluating employee stress at the workplace (Grandey, 2000). When an employee becomes emotionally exhausted in terms of interactions with customers and coworkers, they feel burnout. Signs of burnout are emotional exhaustion, depersonalization, and reduced personal accomplishment (Cordes & Dougherty, 1993; Maslach, 1982). Brotheridge & Lee (1998) argued that the surface acting is more likely related to emotional exhaustion, and thus leading to job burnout. Moreover, Pogrebin & Poole (1995) found that when police officers are expected to suppress their reactions to tragic events, this results in less empathy and connection. Emotional suppression might lead to emotional detachment, and this might show that robotic acting might be positively correlated to job burnout since robotic acting is about feeling detached from customers.

Hypothesis 3-4. Internalized and deep acting correlates negatively with job burnout while surface acting correlated positively to job burnout.

Emotional Dissonance

Emotional Dissonance has been considered as a moderator in the relationship between emotional labor and employee burnout and job dissatisfaction (Diefendorff et al., 2006; Mesmer-Magnus et al., 2012). Emotional dissonance is fatal when acted behaviors violate self-identity perceptions (Ashforth & Humphrey, 1993). However, employees who fully identify themselves with work-role and have internalized the organizational goal are less likely to experience. Pugh et al. (2011) showed that surface actor who especially value authenticity was found to have the emotional dissonance more often. It could be expected that if emotional actors do

not have incongruence between felt emotion and displayed emotion, they are expected to feel less emotional dissonance because they express or try to display what they felt. Therefore, it is possible to infer that internalized and deep acting are more likely negatively related to emotional dissonance.

Hypothesis 3-5. Internalized and deep acting correlates negatively with emotional dissonance.

III. Method

Sample and Procedure

In this study, participants were the employees who participated in study 1 and 2. Since the data for study 1 and 2 collected first, the data for study 3 were collected 3 weeks after the first survey in order to minimize the possible bias. Samples were both employees dealing with customers (N=139) and coworkers (N=148). Demographic information for the sample is listed in Table 1 and 2.

Measure

Participants responded to scales of job satisfaction, eustress, work engagement, job burnout, and emotional dissonance. Every measurement was used with a 6-point Likert scale (6= "Strongly Agree"; 1= "Strongly Disagree). A set of items used for the survey is listed in Appendix E.

Job Satisfaction. The job satisfaction scale was adapted from the questionnaires used in Judge & Klinger (2008) and translated. This scale included four items. As an

example, one item states “I feel fairly satisfied with my present job”. The coefficient alpha of the questionnaire was .83 for employee-coworker sample and .85 for the employee-customer sample.

Eustress. Eustress Scale was adapted from the questionnaires used in O’Sullivan (2011). Since the eustress scale used in this research was aimed to measure the eustress in the school setting, I modified it in order for each item to meet with organization setting. In addition, the initial item asked about the frequency of feeling the eustress. However, for this study, each item was changed to a statement so participants are able to indicate to what extent they agree with it. As an example, one item states “I feel motivated by my stress”. The coefficient alpha of the items was $\alpha = .80$ for employee-coworker sample and .81 for the employee-customer sample.

Work Engagement. The customer characteristics scale consisted of five items that were adapted from the Utrecht Work Engagement Scale (Schaufeli & Bakker, 2003). A sample item states “I am enthusiastic about my job”. The reliability for work engagement item was $\alpha = .89$ for coworker sample and $\alpha = .90$ for customer sample.

Job Burnout. This scale was adapted from Maslach et al.’s MBI-GS (1996). For the study, five items were used. A sample item indicates “I feel tired when I get up in the morning and have to face another day on the job”. The reliability for job burnout item was $\alpha = .84$ for coworker sample and $\alpha = .86$ for customer sample.

Emotional Dissonance. The emotional dissonance scale consisted of five items, which were written for the investigation by the project team consisted of the professor and the researcher. This scale asked about the emotional conflict that

employees experience in the workplace. As an example, one item states “I show certain feelings to customers that do not correspond to the feelings at that moment”. Participants rated each item using a 6-point Likert scale (6=“ Strongly Agree”; 1= “Strongly Disagree). After screening, all items were retained and the reliability was $\alpha = .60$ for coworker sample and $\alpha = .63$ for customer sample.

Control Variable. Sex, Age, industry, and job tenure were used for control variables.

IV. Results

Means, standard deviations, reliabilities, and correlations for variables are presented in Table 17 and 18. All measures showed acceptable internal reliabilities ranging from .60 to .92. As expected, correlations between five emotional labor variables and some variables expecting consequences were significant. Comparing the correlation results in both samples, I was able to find some expected results. First, job satisfaction showed a significant positive correlation with deep and internalized acting and showed a significant negative correlation with surface acting. Eustress showed somewhat interesting result; it was positively correlated to not only deep and internalized acting but also robotic and deviant acting. Job engagement showed a significant positive correlation with deep and internalized acting. Job Burnout showed a positive correlation with surface and robotic acting in both samples and also showed a significant negative correlation with internalized acting only in the employee-customer sample. Emotional dissonance showed a significant negative correlation with internalized acting only in the employee-customer sample.

In order to test the hypotheses, multiple regression analysis was conducted. As shown in Table 19 and 20, the standardized regression coefficients, also known as the beta coefficient, were compared in order to find the significant predictors for each emotional labor type. For both coworker and customer sample, each emotional labor type was regressed on five consequence variables.

Table 17
*Means, Standard Deviations, reliabilities, and correlations of variables
 (Employee-customer sample)*

	Mean	SD	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
1. Surface Acting	4.26	0.81	(.78)									
2. Deep Acting	4.14	0.93	.18*	(.92)								
3. Internalized Acting	3.78	1.06	-.05	.53**	(.83)							
4. Deviant Acting	2.95	1.00	-.06	.09	.23**	(.87)						
5. Robotic Acting	3.32	1.17	.27**	.07	.14	.30**	(.81)					
6. Job Satisfaction	3.75	.99	-.21*	.38**	.48**	0.00	-0.06	(.85)				
7. Eustress	3.55	.79	-.01	.31**	.50**	.27**	.28**	.48**	(.81)			
8. Work Engagement	3.90	.97	-.13	.35**	.48**	.09	-.08	.84**	.51**	(.90)		
9. Job Burnout	3.91	.94	.44**	.04	-.16	.10	.28**	-.49**	-.20*	-.38**	(.86)	
10. Emotional Dissonance	3.93	.83	-.05	-.12	-.19*	.08	.03	-.13	-.03	-.12	.06	(.63)

Table 18
*Means, Standard Deviations, reliabilities, and correlations of variables
 (Employee-coworker sample)*

	Mean	SD	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
1. Surface Acting	4.12	0.86	(.78)									
2. Deep Acting	4.12	0.86	.14	(.90)								
3. Internalized Acting	3.90	1.07	-.09	.45**	(.83)							
4. Deviant Acting	3.05	0.97	.02	.14	.23**	(.86)						
5. Robotic Acting	3.31	1.11	.23**	-.01	.11	.28**	(.78)					
6. Job Satisfaction	3.82	0.95	-.23**	.23**	.41**	-.03	0.00	(.83)				
7. Eustress	3.55	0.77	.11	.20*	.36**	.20*	.25**	.41**	(.80)			
8. Work Engagement	4.00	0.88	-.10	.24**	.36**	.07	-.06	.79**	.45**	(.89)		
9. Job Burnout	3.90	0.90	.42**	.01	-.21*	.09	.18*	-.47**	-.16	-.27**	(.84)	
10. Emotional Dissonance	3.92	0.80	.04	-.03	-.11	.08	.06	-.10	-.01	-.09	.06	(.60)

Table 19

Multiple regression for emotional work predicting consequences (Employee-customer sample)

Independent Variables	Dependent Variables									
	Job Satisfaction		Eustress		Work Engagement		Job Burnout		Emotional Dissonance	
	β	<i>t</i>	β	<i>t</i>	β	<i>t</i>	β	<i>t</i>	β	<i>t</i>
Surface Acting	-.28	-2.92**	-.05	-.60	-.13	-1.34	.43	4.56***	-.06	-.67
Deep Acting	.25	2.72**	.07	.90	.18	1.89	.07	.75	-.01	-.12
Internalized Acting	.35	4.22***	.30	4.55***	.36	4.35***	-.20	-2.40*	-.17	-2.08*
Deviant Acting	-.11	-1.40	.09	1.44	.02	.20	.11	1.39	.09	1.20
Robotic Acting	-.03	-.42	.14	2.51*	-.10	-1.51	.14	2.04*	.03	.44
Total R^2	.317		.313		.274		.257		.054	
<i>F</i>	12.35***		12.10***		10.02***		9.18***		1.53	

Note. * $p < .05$ ** $p < .01$ *** $p < .001$

Table 20

Multiple regression for emotional work predicting consequences (Employee-coworker sample)

Independent Variables	Dependent Variables									
	Job Satisfaction		Eustress		Work Engagement		Job Burnout		Emotional Dissonance	
	β	t	β	t	β	t	β	t	β	t
Surface Acting	-.24	-2.80**	.08	.16	-.07	-.79	.39	4.72***	.01	.12
Deep Acting	.13	1.33	.04	.44	.10	1.12	.05	.53	.03	.28
Internalized Acting	.32	4.16***	.23	3.50**	.26	3.54***	-.20	-2.69**	-.12	-1.59
Deviant Acting	-.13	-1.75	.06	.98	.00	.03	.09	1.29	.08	1.13
Robotic Acting	.05	.67	.12	2.02*	-.06	-.92	.08	1.20	.04	.54
Total R^2	.225		.082		.151		.231		.029	
F	8.25***		2.55*		5.05***		8.52***		.83	

Note. * $p < .05$ ** $p < .01$ *** $p < .001$

For employee-customer sample, the measures explained a significant amount of the variance in job satisfaction ($R^2 = 0.32, p < 0.001$), eustress ($R^2 = 0.31, p < 0.001$), work engagement ($R^2 = 0.27, p < 0.001$), and job burnout ($R^2 = 0.26, p < 0.001$). For employee-coworker sample, the measures explained a significant amount of the variance in job satisfaction ($R^2 = 0.23, p < 0.001$), eustress ($R^2 = 0.08, p < 0.001$), work engagement ($R^2 = 0.15, p < 0.001$), and job burnout ($R^2 = 0.23, p < 0.001$).

For employee-customer sample, surface acting predicted job burnout (4.56, $p < 0.001$) and job satisfaction (-2.92, $p < 0.01$). Deep acting predicted job satisfaction (2.72, $p < 0.01$). Internalized acting predicted job satisfaction (4.22, $p < 0.001$), eustress (4.55, $p < 0.001$), work engagement (4.35, $p < 0.001$), job burnout (-2.40, $p < 0.05$), and emotional dissonance (-2.08, $p < 0.05$). Robotic acting also predicted eustress (2.51, $p < 0.05$) and job burnout (2.04, $p < 0.05$).

Surface acting predicted job burnout (4.75, $p < 0.001$) and job satisfaction (-2.80, $p < 0.01$) in employee-coworker sample. Internalized acting predicted job satisfaction (4.16, $p < 0.001$), eustress (3.50, $p < 0.01$), work engagement (3.54, $p < 0.001$), and job burnout (-2.69, $p < 0.01$). Robotic acting also predicted eustress (2.02, $p < 0.05$). Therefore, some of expectations were supported.

In sum, Hypotheses 3-1 was fully supported in both samples. Both samples showed that internalized acting was positively predicting job satisfaction while the surface acting was negatively predicting job satisfaction. Hypotheses 3-2 was partially supported that only internalized acting predicted eustress and it was additionally found that robotic acting predicted eustress. Hypotheses 3-3 was also partially supported that only internalized acting predicted work engagement. Hypotheses 3-4 was partially supported. Internalized acting positively correlated to

job burnout while surface acting negatively correlated to job burnout in both samples. For, employee-coworker sample, robotic acting was also negatively correlated to job burnout. Hypotheses 3-5 was only partially supported in the employee-customer sample; Internalized acting correlates negatively with emotional dissonance.

V. Discussion

Study 3 was conducted in order to further expand what was investigated in Study 1 and Study 2. Study 3 measured the consequences of emotional work types and argued which type of emotional work is related to each consequence variable. There were five consequence variables such as job satisfaction, eustress, job burnout, work engagement, and emotional dissonance. Through correlation and regression, the following results with respect to the hypotheses were found.

First, as expected, internalized acting was positively predicting job satisfaction while the surface acting was negatively predicting job satisfaction. This might show that genuine expression feeling that matches the required emotion is satisfactory to many employees who are consistently in emotional interaction. However, employees who have to ‘wear on’ their emotions must be in opposite since they have suppressed what they feel and experience.

Secondly, it was supported that only internalized acting predicts eustress. As argued in previous theoretical works, a genuine expression of felt emotion could be related to eustress because individuals with internalized acting might have no difficulties in reappraising the emotion because they just express what they felt. Therefore, emotional interaction with customers or coworkers is considered as a challenge, not a distressing threat.

Thirdly, it was partially supported that only internalized acting predicts work engagement. Bechtoldt et al. (2011) argued in their research that engaged workers are considered as authentic. If authenticity is the key characteristics of engaged workers, internalized acting should be related to work engagement because

internalized actors show their authentic expression that matches that display rule of the organization.

Fourth, surface acting positively correlated to job burnout while internalized acting negatively correlated to job burnout in both samples. As expected, internalized actors are less likely to experience job burnout while surface actors are more likely to experience job burnout. Because job burnout is composed of depersonalization, robotic acting was expected to show a significant result on job burnout. But, faking emotion must be much fatal in terms of predicting job burnout.

Fifth, internalized acting correlates negatively with emotional dissonance. This was also expected from previous researches. Internalized acting must be the emotional work type that matches between felt emotion and expressed emotion. However, this result was only shown in the employee-customer sample.

General Discussion

I. Theoretical and Practical Implication

First, this research tried to expand the type of emotional work into five categories, surface, deep, internalized, deviant, and robotic acting. Previous researches mainly focused on two types of emotional work – surface and deep acting. However, this research suggested three additional types of emotional work acting and empirically investigated through scenario study and survey. Items for internalized, deviant, and robotic acting were adopted, modified, or newly designed and through exploratory factor analysis and confirmatory factor analysis, they were distinctively separated into the five-factor model.

Second, this research tried to expand the target of emotional work acting. Many researchers investigated mainly on frontline service providers who deal with customers. However, every organization is making an interpersonal relationship with not only customers but also with coworkers and stakeholders. Every organization has its own display rules and thus, emotional work (Humphrey et al., 2015). Even though some researches tried to target the internal customers of the organization, only a few researches were done to target and measure the emotional work of the employees who deal with customers and coworkers at the same time.

Third, our sample not only includes service providers from one occupation, but they are from various occupation. Since the service industries have gone through massive growth and change, there are different kinds of occupations who provide different services to specific targets. Our sample employees work at the health care center, airline service, and insurance company dealing with both customers and

coworkers.

Fourth, our sample tried to find the expanded model of the emotional work through investigating the antecedents, consequences, and even moderator and mediator. Through a concrete model, the organization is able to confirm the mechanism of emotional work and prevent the negative effect of emotional work acting and even prepare what to do in order to minimize the effect through buffering moderator and mediator. In opposite, the organization is also able to enhance the positive consequence of emotional work through buffering moderator even if the surface or deviant acting is performed.

Lastly, this study suggests the bright side of emotional work. Emotional work, which is often labeled as emotional labor, was mostly investigated in order to support the negative effects on emotional work. However, for certain variables under certain conditions, positive effects are also available. Emotional labor implies how emotion regulation takes the effort and is 'laborious', but for today's organization, emotional labor exists everywhere and it could be transformed as 'work' since it is part of the duty for employees to work on.

II. Limitations and Future Research Direction

Even though five types of emotional work has been demonstrated, further researches could be done on investigating the interaction; for example, emotional dissonance as a mediator and psychological resource as moderator. Through investigating the moderator and mediator, we can suggest that there could be positive effect through moderator that buffers the effect, even in the condition of the surface and deviant acting that might not be beneficial to both organization and individual.

Another suggestion is that each sample could be designated with emotional type and analyzed in order to find the relationship with the antecedents and consequences. Five types of emotional work acting could be also compared to each other when each sample is designated each other. There might be emotional work actors who use not only one type of emotional work but also spontaneously use a combination of two or three types of emotional work. Further researches could be done in order to find the relationship among them.

REFERENCES

- 공혜원, 김효선 (2014). 감정조절전략이 조직시민행동에 미치는 차별적 효과: 직무소진의 매개효과를 중심으로, *조직과 인사관리연구*, 38(3), 1-31.
- 공혜원, 김효선 (2014). 직장 내 정서 경험에 따른 감정보동 프로세스 모델 구축에 관한 연구: 근거이론을 중심으로, *Korea Business Review (KBR)*, 18(4), 325-356.
- 김명언 (2019). 일과 감정의 두 연결고리, *지식의 지평*, 26, 1-18.
- 김명언, 이유리, 황주련, 윤여진. (2014). 감정근로 측정모형의 확장. *한국심리학회 학술대회 자료집*, 2014(1), 233-233.
- 박춘신, 장재운 (2017). 정서노동 유형과 웰빙 및 객관적 수행: 표면 및 내면행위의 잠재 프로파일 분석, *한국심리학회지: 산업 및 조직*, 30(3), 393-413.
- Adelman, P. K. (1995). Emotional labor as a potential source of job stress. In S. L. Sauter & L. R. Murphy (Eds.), *Organizational risk factors for job stress* (pp. 371-381). Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.
- Ashforth, B. E., & Humphrey, R. H. (1993). Emotional Labor in Service Roles: The Influence of Identity, *Academy of Management Journal*, 18(1), 88-115.
- Ashforth, B. E., & Tomiuk, M. A. (2000). Emotional Labor and Authenticity: Views from service agents, In S. Fineman (Ed.), *Emotion in*

Organizations, 2, 184-203. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

- Arvey, R. D., Renz, G. L., & Watson, T. W. (1998). Emotionality and job performance: Implications for personnel selection. *Research in Personnel and Human Resources Management*, 16, 103-147.
- Beal, D. J., Trougakos, J. P., Weiss, H. M., & Green, S. G. (2006). Episodic processes in emotional labor: Perceptions of affective delivery and regulation strategies. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 91, 1053-1063.
- Bechtoldt, Myriam & Rohrmann, Sonja & De Pater, Irene & Beersma, Bianca. (2011). The Primacy of Perceiving: Emotion Recognition Buffers Negative Effects of Emotional Labor. *The Journal of applied psychology*. 96. 1087-94
- Beellah, R. N., Madsen, R., Sullivan, W. M., Swidler, A., & Tipton, S. M. (1985). *Habits of the heart*. New York: Harper & Row.
- Blau, G., Fertig, J., Tatum, D. S., Connaughton, S., Park, D. S., & Marshall, C. (2010). Further Scale Refinement for Emotional Labor: Exploring distinctions between types of surface versus deep acting using a difficult client referent. *Career Development International*, 15(2), 188-216.
- Bono, J. E., & Vey, M. A. (2005). Toward Understanding Emotional Management at Work: A Quantitative review of emotional labor research. In C. E. Hartel, W. J. Zerbe, & N. M. Ashkanasy (Eds.). *Emotions in organizational behavior* (212-233). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum Publishers.
- 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. (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, CA.
- 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.
- Côté, S. (2005). A Social Interaction Model of the Effects of Emotional Regulation on Work Strain. *Academy of Management Review, 30*, 509-530.
- Cordes, C. L., & Dougherty, T. W. (1993). A review and integration of research on job burnout. *Academy of Management Review, 18*(4), 621-656.
- Cropanzano, R.; James, K.; Konovsky, M.A. (1993). Dispositional affectivity as a predictor of work attitudes and job performance. *Journal of Organizational Behavior, 14*, 595–606.
- Dahling, J. J., & Johnson, H. M. (2013). Motivation, fit, confidence, and skills: how do individual differences influence emotional labor? See Grandey et al. 2013c, pp. 57-78.
- Dieffendorff, J. M. Croyle, M. H., & Gosserand, R. H. (2005). The Dimensionality and Antecedents of Emotional Labor Strategies. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 66*, 339-357.
- Fisher, C. D., & Ashkanasy, N. M. (2000). The emerging role of emotions in work life: An introduction. *Journal of Organizational Behavior, 21*, 123-129.
- Goldberg, L., & Grandey, A. A. (2007). Display rules versus display autonomy: emotion regulation, emotional exhaustion, and task performance in a call center simulation. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology, 12*(3) 301-318.

- Gabriel A. S., Daniels, M. A., Diefendorff, J. M., & Greguras, G. J. J. (2015). Emotional Labor Actors: A latent profile analysis of emotional labor strategies. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 100*, 863-879.
- Grandey, A. A. (2000). Emotion Regulation in the Workplace: A New Way to Conceptualize Emotional Labor. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology, 5(1)*, 95-110.
- Grandey, A. A. (2003). When “The show must go on”: Surface acting and deep acting as determinants of emotional exhaustion and peer-rated service delivery. *Academy of Management Journal, 46(1)*, 86-96.
- Grandey, A. A., & Gabriel, A. S. (2015). Emotional Labor at a Crossroads: Where Do We Go from Here?. *Annual Review of Organizational Psychology and Organizational Behavior, 2*, 323-349.
- Grandey, A. A., & Melloy, R. C. (2017). The State of the Heart: Emotional Labor as Emotion Regulation Reviewed and Revised. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology, 22(3)*, 407-422.
- Grandey, A. A., Rupp, D. E., & Brice, W. N. (in press). Emotional labor threatens decent work: A proposal to eradicate emotional display rules. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*.
- Gross, J. J. (1998). The emerging field of emotion regulation: An integrative review. *Review of General Psychology, 2*, 271-299.
- Henderson, A. (2001). Emotional labor and nursing: an under-appreciated aspect of caring work. *Nursing Inquiry, 8(2)*, 130-138.
- Hochschild, A. R. (1983). *The managed heart: Commercialization of human feeling*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.
- Hülshager, U. R., & Schewe, A. F. (2011). On the Costs and Benefits of Emotional

- Labor: A Meta-Analysis of Three Decades of Research. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, 16(3), 361-389.
- Humphrey, R. H., Ashforth, B. E., & Diefendorff, J. M. (2015). The Bright Side of Emotional Labor. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 36, 749-769.
- Judge, T. A. (1992). The dispositional perspective in human resource research. In G. R. Ferris & K. M. Rowland (Eds.), *Research in personnel and human resource management*, 10, 31-72.
- Judge, T. A., & Klinger, R. (2008). Job satisfaction: Subjective well-being at work. *The science of subjective well-being*, 393-413.
- Kammeyer-Mueller, J. D., Rubenstein, A. L., Long D. M., Odio, M. A., Buckman, B.R., et al. (2013). A meta-analytic structural model of dispositional affectivity and emotional labor. *Personnel Psychology*, 66, 47-90.
- Kruml, S. M., & Geddes, D. (2000). Exploring the dimensions of emotional labor: The heart of Hochschild's work. *Management Communication Quarterly*, 14, 8-49.
- Lazarus, R. S. (1993). From psychological stress to the emotions: A history of changing outlooks. In L. W. Porter & M. R. Rosenzweig (Eds.), *Annual review of psychology*, 44, 1-21.
- Mauss, I. B., Bunge, S. A., & Gross, J. J. (2007). Automatic emotion regulation. *Social and Personality Psychology Compass*, 1, 146-167.
- Mesmer-Magnus, J. R., DeChurch, L. A., & Wax, A. (2012). Moving emotional labor beyond surface and deep acting: A discordance-congruence perspective. *Organizational Psychology Review*, 2(1), 6-53.
- Morris, J. A., & Feldman, D. C. (1996). The dimensions, antecedents, and consequences of emotional labor. *Academy of Management Review*, 21(4),

986-1010.

Näring, G., Briët, M., & Brouwers, A. (2006). Beyond demand-control: Emotional labour and symptoms of burnout in teachers. *Work & Stress*, 20(4), 303-315.

O'Sullivan, G. (2011). The Relationship Between Hope, Eustress, Self-Efficacy, and Life Satisfaction Among Undergraduates. *Social Indicators Research*, 101(1), 155-172

Quinones, C., Carvajal, R., & Griffiths, M. (2016). Eustress/distress model of emotion regulation. *International Journal of Stress Management*.

Rubin R. S., Staebler Tardino, V. M., Daus, C. S., & Munz, D. C. (2005). A reconceptualization of the emotional labor construct: "On the development of an integrated theory of perceived emotional dissonance and emotional labor. In C. E. J. Hartel, W. J. Zerbe, & N. M. Ashkanasy (Eds.). *Emotions in organizational behavior* (189-211). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.

Rummel, R. J. (1970). *Applied Factor Analysis*. Evanston, IL: Northwestern University Press.

Rupp, D. E., McCance, A. S., Spencer, S., & Sonntag, K. (2008). (In)Justice and emotional labor: the role of perspective taking and anger. *Journal of Management*, 34(5), 903-924.

Rupp, D. E., & Spencer, S. (2006). When customers lash out: the effects of customer interactional injustice on emotional labor and the mediating role of discrete emotions. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 91 (4), 971-978.

Rutter, D. R., & Fielding, P. J. (1988). Sources of occupational stress: An examination of British prison officers. *Work and Stress*, 2(4), 291-299.

- Schaufeli, W. B., & Bakker, A. B. (2003). Utrecht work engagement scale: Preliminary manual. *Utrecht: Occupational Health Psychology Unit, Utrecht University.*
- Schaufeli, W. B., Salanova, M., Gonzalez-Roma, V., & Bakker, A. B. "The measurement of engagement and burnout: a two sample confirmatory factor analytic approach", *Journal of Happiness Studies*, 3, 71-92.
- Schwab, D. P. (1980). Construct validity in organization behavior. In B. M. Staw & L. L. Cummings (Eds.), *Research in organizational behavior* (Vol. 2, pp. 3-43) Greenwich, CT: JAI Press.
- Schwartz, B. (1986). *The Battle for Human Nature: Science, Morality, and Modern Life*. New York: Norton.
- Sliter, M., Jex, S., Wolford, K., McInnerney, J. (2010). How rude! Emotional labor as a mediator between customer incivility and employee outcomes. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 42(2), 314-322.
- Spencer, S., & Rupp, D. E. (2009). Angry, guilty and conflicted: Injustice toward coworkers heightens emotional labor through cognitive and emotional mechanisms. *Journal of Applied Psychology*. 94(2), 429-444.
- Totterdell, P., & Holman, D. (2003). Emotion Regulation in Customer Service Roles: Testing a model of emotional labor, *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, 8, 55-73.
- Von Gilsa, L. & Zapf, D. (2013). Motives for Emotion Regulation in Service Work, in: P. L. Perrewé, C. C. Rosen, & J. R.B. Halbesleben (ed.), *The Role of Emotion and Emotion Regulation in Job Stress and Well Being (Research in Occupational Stress and Well-being, Volume 11, pp. 133-161)*. Emerald Group Publishing Limited.

- Watson, D., Clark, L. A., & Tellegen, A. (1988). Development and validation of brief measures of positive and negative affect: the PANAS scales. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 54, 1063-1070.
- Wrzesniewski, A., McCauley, C., Rozin, P., & Schwartz, B. (1997). Jobs, Careers, and Callings: People's Relations to Their Work, *Journal of Research in Personality*, 31, 21-33.
- Xanthopoulou, D., Bakker, A. B., Oerlemans W. G. M., & Koszucka, M. (2018). Need for recovery after emotional labor: Differential effects of daily deep and surface acting. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 39, 481-494.
- Zammuner, V. L., Galli, C. (2005b). Wellbeing: Causes and consequences of emotion regulation in work settings. *International Review of Psychiatry*, 17 (5), 1-10.
- Zapf, D., Vogt, C., Seifert, C. Mertini, H., & Isic, A. (1999). Emotion Work as a Source of Stress: The Concept and Development of an Instrument. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology*, 8(3), 371-400.

APPENDICES

1. Initial Items used for the study: Types of Emotional Work for employee-coworker sample (N=148)

유형	문항	Mean	SD	α	α if item deleted
Surface Acting	실제로 느끼지 않는 긍정적 감정을 마치 느끼고 있는 것처럼 위장해서 표현한다.	3.86	1.20	0.83	0.80
	고객이나 동료에 대해 실제로 느끼는 부정적 감정을 숨기고 겉으로는 긍정적 감정을 표현한다.	4.29	1.03		0.80
	실제로 느낀 감정을 표현하지 않고 숨기려고 한다.	4.21	1.02		0.82
	내가 가지고 있지 않은 감정을 가지고 있는 것처럼 위장한다.	3.78	1.19		0.77
	내가 표현하는 긍정적 감정은 내가 실제로 느끼는 감정과 다르다.	3.78	1.14		0.80
	속으로 짜증이 날 때에도 겉으로는 안 그런척 한다.	4.54	0.97		0.81
Deep Acting	표현해야 할 긍정적인 감정을 실제로 느끼려고 노력한다.	4.22	1.06	0.90	0.89
	표현해야 할 긍정적인 감정을 실제로 경험하기 위해 노력한다.	4.05	1.08		0.87
	고객이나 동료를 대할 때마다 긍정적 감정을 실제로 느끼기 위해 최선을 다한다	4.14	1.06		0.87
	내가 표현해야 되는 긍정적인 감정을 실제로 느끼기 위해 노력한다.	4.04	0.93		0.87
	표현해야 할 긍정적인 감정을 내 업무의 일환으로 간주하며 실제로 느끼려고 최선을 다한다.	4.18	0.97		0.89
Internalized Acting	평소 직원/환자들에 대해 감사한 마음을 가지고 있어 긍정적인 감정을 표현하는 것이 어렵지 않다.	3.96	1.21	0.87	0.84
	내게 중요한 업무 파트너들 / 월급을 줄 수 있게 해주는 고마운 분들 이기에 직원/고객들에게 진심으로 긍정적인 감정을 가지고 대하는 것은 어렵지 않다.	3.90	1.24		0.85
	직원/고객들은 서로 위해주어야 할 가족 같기에 긍정적인 감정을 표현하기란 어렵지 않다.	3.83	1.27		0.83
	직원들을 대할 때 직장에서 요구되는 감정과 내가 실제로 느끼는 감정은 같다.	3.44	1.12		0.85
	내가 다른 직원/고객들에게 표현하는 긍정적 감정은 내가 평소에 실제로 느끼고 있는 감정과 같다.	3.88	1.12		0.84
	직원/고객들에게 보여줘야 하는 바람직한 감정은 내가 평소에 실제로 가지고 있는 감정이다.	3.93	1.05		0.85

Deviant Acting	직원/고객들의 불손한 태도로 인해 기분 나쁘게 되면 감추지 않고 그대로 표현한다.	2.97	1.19	0.86	0.84
	비록 조직이 원하는 바가 아니지만 화가 나면 감추지 않고 그대로 표현하곤 한다.	2.74	1.18		0.81
	너무 짜증이 나면 참지 못하고 그대로 표현한다.	3.09	1.25		0.81
	상대 직원에 대해 내가 실제로 느낀 감정이 조직에서 표현하길 원하는 감정과 상반되어도 억제하지 못하고 표현한 적이 있다.	3.09	1.15		0.85
	너무 무례한 직원/환자에게는 내가 느낀 감정을 거르지 않고 그대로 표현하고는 한다.	3.34	1.29		0.85
Robotic Acting	직원/고객들에 대해서는 어떤 감정도 가지지 않는 것이 현명하기에 어떠한 감정도 느끼지 않으려고 노력한다.	3.46	1.32	0.72	0.70
	화가 난 직원/고객에게도 아무런 감정도 느끼지 않으며 무감각하게 응대한다.	3.28	1.27		0.63
	짜증을 내는 직원/고객들에게도 별아무런 감정을 느끼지 않고 아무 감정표현 없이 응대한다.	3.35	1.17		0.63
	직원/고객들 대할 때 별다른 감정을 느끼지 않으며 겉으로는 긍정적인 감정표현을 한다.	3.91	1.00		0.67
	직원/고객이 어떻게 말하던 간에 별다른 감정을 느끼지 않으며 습관적으로 친절하게 대한다.	4.04	1.02		0.72
				0.84	

2. Initial Items used for the study: Types of Emotional Work for employee-customer sample (N=139)

유형	문항	Mean	SD	α	α if item deleted
Surface Acting	실제로 느끼지 않는 긍정적 감정을 마치 느끼고 있는 것처럼 위장해서 표현한다.	3.86	1.20	0.83	0.80
	고객이나 동료에 대해 실제로 느끼는 부정적 감정을 숨기고 겉으로는 긍정적 감정을 표현한다.	4.29	1.03		0.80
	실제로 느낀 감정을 표현하지 않고 숨기려고 한다.	4.21	1.02		0.82
	내가 가지고 있지 않은 감정을 가지고 있는 것처럼 위장한다.	3.78	1.19		0.77
	내가 표현하는 긍정적 감정은 내가 실제로 느끼는 감정과 다르다.	3.78	1.14		0.80
	속으로 짜증이 날 때에도 겉으로는 안 그런척 한다.	4.54	0.97		0.81
Deep Acting	표현해야 할 긍정적인 감정을 실제로 느끼려고 노력한다.	4.22	1.06	0.90	0.89
	표현해야 할 긍정적인 감정을 실제로 경험하기 위해 노력한다.	4.05	1.08		0.87
	고객이나 동료를 대할 때마다 긍정적 감정을 실제로 느끼기 위해 최선을 다한다	4.14	1.06		0.87
	내가 표현해야 되는 긍정적인 감정을 실제로 느끼기 위해 노력한다.	4.04	0.93		0.87
	표현해야 할 긍정적인 감정을 내 업무의 일환으로 간주하며 실제로 느끼려고 최선을 다한다.	4.18	0.97		0.89
Internalized Acting	평소 직원/환자들에 대해 감사한 마음을 가지고 있어 긍정적인 감정을 표현하는 것이 어렵지 않다.	3.96	1.21	0.87	0.84
	내게 중요한 업무 파트너들 / 월급을 줄 수 있게 해주는 고마운 분들 이기에 직원/고객들에게 진심으로 긍정적인 감정을 가지고 대하는 것은 어렵지 않다.	3.90	1.24		0.85
	직원/고객들은 서로 위해주어야 할 가족 같기에 긍정적인 감정을 표현하기란 어렵지 않다.	3.83	1.27		0.83
	직원들을 대할 때 직장에서 요구되는 감정과 내가 실제로 느끼는 감정은 같다.	3.44	1.12		0.85
	내가 다른 직원/고객들에게 표현하는 긍정적 감정은 내가 평소에 실제로 느끼고 있는 감정과 같다.	3.88	1.12		0.84
	직원/고객들에게 보여줘야 하는 바람직한 감정은 내가 평소에 실제로 가지고 있는 감정이다.	3.93	1.05		0.85

Deviant Acting	직원/고객들의 불손한 태도로 인해 기분 나쁘게 되면 감추지 않고 그대로 표현한다.	2.91	1.23	.87	0.86
	비록 조직이 원하는 바가 아니지만 화가 나면 감추지 않고 그대로 표현하곤 한다.	2.68	1.19		0.82
	너무 짜증이 나면 참지 못하고 그대로 표현한다.	2.95	1.29		0.81
	상대 직원에 대해 내가 실제로 느낀 감정이 조직에서 표현하길 원하는 감정과 상반되어도 억제하지 못하고 표현한 적이 있다.	3.01	1.17		0.85
	너무 무례한 직원/환자에게는 내가 느낀 감정을 거르지 않고 그대로 표현하고는 한다.	3.18	1.31		0.86
Robotic Acting	직원/고객들에 대해서는 어떤 감정도 가지지 않는 것이 현명하기에 어떠한 감정도 느끼지 않으려고 노력한다.	3.55	1.37	.74	.47
	화가 난 직원/고객에게도 아무런 감정도 느끼지 않으며 무감각하게 응대한다.	3.22	1.35		.55
	짜증을 내는 직원/고객들에게도 별아무런 감정을 느끼지 않고 아무 감정표현 없이 응대한다.	3.41	1.20		.23
	직원/고객들 대할 때 별다른 감정을 느끼지 않으며 겉으로는 긍정적인 감정표현을 한다.	4.04	1.07		.35
	직원/고객이 어떻게 말하던 간에 별다른 감정을 느끼지 않으며 습관적으로 친절하게 대한다.	4.09	1.06		.44
				.85	

3. Final Items used for the study: Types of Emotional Work for employee-coworker sample (N=148)

유형	문항	Mean	SD	α	α if item deleted
Surface Acting	실제로 느끼지 않는 긍정적 감정을 마치 느끼고 있는 것처럼 위장해서 표현한다.	3.86	1.20	0.78	0.74
	고객이나 동료에 대해 실제로 느끼는 부정적 감정을 숨기고 겉으로는 긍정적 감정을 표현한다.	4.29	1.03		0.73
	내가 가지고 있지 않은 감정을 가지고 있는 것처럼 위장한다.	3.78	1.19		0.68
	속으로 짜증이 날 때에도 겉으로는 안 그런척 한다.	4.54	0.97		0.77
Deep Acting	표현해야 할 긍정적인 감정을 실제로 느끼려고 노력한다.	4.22	1.06	0.90	0.89
	표현해야 할 긍정적인 감정을 실제로 경험하기 위해 노력한다.	4.05	1.08		0.87
	고객이나 동료를 대할 때마다 긍정적 감정을 실제로 느끼기 위해 최선을 다한다	4.14	1.06		0.87
	내가 표현해야 되는 긍정적인 감정을 실제로 느끼기 위해 노력한다.	4.04	0.92		0.87
	표현해야 할 긍정적인 감정을 내 업무의 일환으로 간주하며 실제로 느끼려고 최선을 다한다.	4.18	0.97		0.89
Internalized Acting	평소 직원/환자들에 대해 감사한 마음을 가지고 있어 긍정적인 감정을 표현하는 것이 어렵지 않다.	3.96	1.21	0.83	0.78
	내게 중요한 업무 파트너들 / 월급을 줄 수 있게 해주는 고마운 분들 이기에 직원/고객들에게 진심으로 긍정적인 감정을 가지고 대하는 것은 어렵지 않다.	3.90	1.24		0.75
	직원/고객들은 서로 위해주어야 할 가족 같기에 긍정적인 감정을 표현하기란 어렵지 않다.	3.83	1.27		0.76
Internalized Acting	직원/고객들의 불손한 태도로 인해 기분 나쁘게 되면 감추지 않고 그대로 표현한다.	2.97	1.19	.86	0.84
	비록 조직이 원하는 바가 아니지만 화가 나면 감추지 않고 그대로 표현하곤 한다.	2.74	1.18		0.81
	너무 짜증이 나면 참지 못하고 그대로 표현한다.	3.09	1.25		0.81
	상대 직원에 대해 내가 실제로 느낀 감정이 조직에서 표현하길 원하는 감정과 상반되어도 억제하지 못하고 표현한 적이 있다.	3.09	1.15		0.85
	너무 무례한 직원/환자에게는 내가 느낀 감정을 거르지 않고 그대로 표현하고는 한다.	3.34	1.29		0.85
Robotic Acting	화가 난 직원/고객에게도 아무런 감정도 느끼지 않으며 무감각하게 응대한다.	3.28	1.27	.78	
	짜증을 내는 직원/고객들에게도 별아무런 감정을 느끼지 않고 아무 감정표현 없이 응대한다.	3.35	1.17		

4. Final Items used for the study: Types of Emotional Work for employee-customer sample (N=139)

유형	문항	Mean	SD	α	α if deleted
Surface Acting	실제로 느끼지 않는 긍정적 감정을 마치 느끼고 있는 것처럼 위장해서 표현한다.	3.86	1.20	0.78	0.72
	고객이나 동료에 대해 실제로 느끼는 부정적 감정을 숨기고 겉으로는 긍정적 감정을 표현한다.	4.29	1.03		0.74
	내가 가지고 있지 않은 감정을 가지고 있는 것처럼 위장한다.	3.78	1.19		0.69
	속으로 짜증이 날 때에도 겉으로는 안그런척 한다.	4.54	0.97		0.74
Deep Acting	표현해야 할 긍정적인 감정을 실제로 느끼려고 노력한다.	4.22	1.06	0.92	0.91
	표현해야 할 긍정적인 감정을 실제로 경험하기 위해 노력한다.	4.05	1.08		0.89
	고객이나 동료를 대할 때마다 긍정적 감정을 실제로 느끼기 위해 최선을 다한다	4.14	1.06		0.90
	내가 표현해야 되는 긍정적인 감정을 실제로 느끼기 위해 노력한다.	4.04	0.92		0.90
	표현해야 할 긍정적인 감정을 내 업무의 일환으로 간주하며 실제로 느끼려고 최선을 다한다.	4.18	0.97		0.92
Internalized Acting	평소 직원/환자들에 대해 감사한 마음을 가지고 있어 긍정적인 감정을 표현하는 것이 어렵지 않다.	3.96	1.21	0.83	0.76
	내게 중요한 업무 파트너들 / 월급을 줄 수 있게 해주는 고마운 분들 이기에 직원/고객들에게 진심으로 긍정적인 감정을 가지고 대하는 것은 어렵지 않다.	3.90	1.24		0.78
	직원/고객들은 서로 위해주어야 할 가족 같기에 긍정적인 감정을 표현하기란 어렵지 않다.	3.83	1.27		0.77
Internalized Acting	직원/고객들의 불손한 태도로 인해 기분 나쁘게 되면 감추지 않고 그대로 표현한다.	2.97	1.19	0.87	0.86
	비록 조직이 원하는 바가 아니지만 화가 나면 감추지 않고 그대로 표현하곤 한다.	2.74	1.18		0.82
	너무 짜증이 나면 참지 못하고 그대로 표현한다.	3.09	1.25		0.81
	상대 직원에 대해 내가 실제로 느낀 감정이 조직에서 표현하길 원하는 감정과 상반되어도 억제하지 못하고 표현한 적이 있다.	3.09	1.15		0.85
	너무 무례한 직원/환자에게는 내가 느낀 감정을 거르지 않고 그대로 표현하고는 한다.	3.34	1.29		0.86
Robotic Acting	화가 난 직원/고객에게도 아무런 감정도 느끼지 않으며 무감각하게 응대한다.	3.28	1.27	.81	
	짜증을 내는 직원/고객들에게도 별아무런 감정을 느끼지 않고 아무 감정표현 없이 응대한다.	3.35	1.17		

5. Scenarios used for the study: a scenario for employee-coworker sample (N=148)

다음은 조직에서 부서간 일어날 수 있는 갈등에 대한 반응유형 다섯 가지에 대한 가상 시나리오입니다. 각 반응 유형별로 귀하가 보이는 빈도를 평정해주시기 바랍니다.

<상황>

A 부서에서 직원 C에게 서류를 전달하며, 타 부서 직원 B에게 전달해 달라고 부탁했다. 그러나, 환자에 대한 검사 결과 서류 (병원조직 대상) / 중요한 회의 자료 (항공사 대상) / 중요한 업무 보고서 (보험회사 대상) 가 누락된 것을 발견한 직원 B가 내게 다가와 짜증을 내며 말했다.

직원 B: (화난 표정으로 언성을 높이며) “어떻게 된 거죠? 검사 결과 서류가 왜 없는 거예요? 이런 것은 미리 좀 체크하고 전달해줘야 하는 거 아니에요?”

1번째 응답 시나리오.

속으로는 기분이 좋지 않았지만 겉으로는 안 그런 척, 미소를 띄우며 부드럽게 대답했다.

직원 C: “A 부서에서 전달해주시는 과정 중에 서류가 누락된 것 같으니, 제가 확인해보고 연락 드리겠습니다. 죄송합니다.”

1. 귀하는 위의 직원 C와 비슷한 응대를 평소에 얼마나 자주 하시는지요?
 - 1) 매일
 - 2) 자주 (일주일에 3-4번)
 - 3) 종종 (일주일에 1번)
 - 4) 가끔 (한달에 1-2번)
 - 5) 전혀 경험하지 않음

2번째 응답 시나리오.

다소 불쾌했지만 직원 B는 현재 여러 업무를 담당하고 있어 정신없이 바쁘기 때문에, 속으로도 미안하게 느끼며 부드럽게 대답했다.

직원 C: “안그래도 다른 업무 때문에 많이 바쁘실텐데, 신경 쓰게 해드려 죄송합니다. A 직원님께 연락해서 빠르게 찾아보고 연락드리겠습니다.”

2. 귀하는 위의 직원 C와 비슷한 응대를 평소에 얼마나 자주 하시는지요?

- 1) 매일
 - 2) 자주 (일주일에 3-4번)
 - 3) 종종 (일주일에 1번)
 - 4) 가끔 (한달에 1-2번)
 - 5) 전혀 경험하지 않음
-

3번째 응답 시나리오.

직원 B는 소중한 업무 파트너이자 가족 같은 직원이고, 예민한 상황에서는 충분히 그럴 수 있는 반응이라고 이해하며 미안하고 돕고 싶은 마음으로 친절하게 대답한다.

직원 C: (항상 그래왔듯이, 동료에 대한 따뜻한 이해심을 가지고)“죄송합니다. A 직원님께서 전달해주시는 과정 중에 누락된 것 같으니 최선을 다해 찾아보도록 하겠습니다. 바쁜 업무중에 여러모로 신경쓰게 해서 죄송합니다. 혹시나 그 외에 도움 것이 있으면 알려주세요.”

3. 귀하는 위의 직원 C와 비슷한 응대를 평소에 얼마나 자주 하시는지요?

- 1) 매일
 - 2) 자주 (일주일에 3-4번)
 - 3) 종종 (일주일에 1번)
 - 4) 가끔 (한달에 1-2번)
 - 5) 전혀 경험하지 않음
-

4번째 응답 시나리오.

직원 C의 잘못도 아닌데, 막무가내식 행동에 짜증이 나서 대답한다.

직원 C: (언짢은 표정으로 짜증을 내며 통명스럽게) “아니 저는 A 직원님 대신 전달해 드린건데... 저는 잘 모르니, A 직원님께 연락해서 확인해보셔야 할 것 같네요.”

4. 귀하는 위의 직원 C와 비슷한 응대를 평소에 얼마나 자주 하시는지요?
- 1) 매일
 - 2) 자주 (일주일에 3-4번)
 - 3) 종종 (일주일에 1번)
 - 4) 가끔 (한달에 1-2번)
 - 5) 전혀 경험하지 않음
-

5번째 응답 시나리오.

평소 다른 직원의 감정적인 반응에도 별 감정을 느끼지 않고 무덤덤하게 대해 왔기에 다음과 같이 대답한다.

직원 C: (아무 감정 없이 습관적으로 해왔듯이, 미소를 띄우며 부드러운 말씨로)
“죄송합니다. 확인해보고 연락드리겠습니다.”

5. 귀하는 위의 직원 C와 비슷한 응대를 평소에 얼마나 자주 하시는지요?
- 1) 매일
 - 2) 자주 (일주일에 3-4번)
 - 3) 종종 (일주일에 1번)
 - 4) 가끔 (한달에 1-2번)
 - 5) 전혀 경험하지 않음
-

6. Scenarios used for the study: scenario for employee-customer sample (N=139)

다음은 조직에서 일어날 수 있는 대기시간 지연에 대한 반응 유형 다섯 가지에 대한 가상 시나리오입니다. 각 가상 반응유형별로 귀하가 보이는 빈도를 평정해 주시기 바랍니다.

<상황>

A원장님의 진료를 받으러 온 환자가 (병원조직 대상) / 탑승 수속을 기다리는 고객이 (항공사 대상) / 업무 처리를 기다리는 고객이 (보험회사 대상) 가 대기 시간이 길어지면서 내게 다가와 짜증을 내며 말했다.

환자: (화난 표정으로 연성을 높이며) “어떻게 된 거죠? 얼마나 더 기다려야 하나요?”

1번째 응답 시나리오.

속으로는 기분이 좋지 않았지만 겉으로는 안 그런 척, 미소를 띄우며 부드럽게 대답했다.

직원: “죄송합니다. 조금만 더 기다려주시기 바랍니다.”

1. 귀하는 위의 직원과 비슷한 응대를 평소에 얼마나 자주 하시는지요?

- 1) 매일
- 2) 자주 (일주일에 3-4번)
- 3) 종종 (일주일에 1번)
- 4) 가끔 (한달에 1-2번)
- 5) 전혀 경험하지 않음

2번째 응답 시나리오.

(병원조직 대상)다소 불쾌했지만 직장인인 고객이 매번 반차를 내고 진료를 오는 것이

(항공사 대상)다소 불쾌했지만 공항에서의 대기가 길어짐이 피곤하고 지친 고객들에게

(보험회사 대상)다소 불쾌했지만 직장인인 고객이 따로 점심시간에 시간을 내어 오는 것이

어렵고 힘들다는 것을 알기에, 속으로도 죄송하게 느끼며 부드럽게 대답했다.

직원: “항상 어렵게 스케줄 조정해서 방문해 주시는데 정말 죄송합니다. 최선을 다해 가능한 빨리 처리될 수 있도록 조치를 취해보도록 하겠습니다.

2. 귀하는 위의 직원과 비슷한 응대를 평소에 얼마나 자주 하시는지요?

- 1) 매일
- 2) 자주 (일주일에 3-4번)
- 3) 종종 (일주일에 1번)
- 4) 가끔 (한달에 1-2번)
- 5) 전혀 경험하지 않음

3번째 응답 시나리오.

(병원조직 대상) 우리 병원에 오시는 환자들은 모두가 딱한 처지에 놓인 분들이기에 너무나 당연한 반응이라고 충분히 이해하며 죄송한 마음으로 친절하게 안내해드린다.

직원: (항상 그래왔듯이, 환자분들에게 가지는 연민의 마음을 가지고 진솔하고 친절하게)

(항공사 대상) 우리 항공사를 이용하시는 고객들은 항공사를 신뢰해서 선택해주셨기 때문에 이러한 항의는 너무나 당연한 반응이라고 충분히 이해하며 죄송한 마음으로 친절하게 안내해드린다.

직원: (항상 그래왔듯이, 고객분들에게 가지는 감사의 마음을 가지고 진솔하고 친절하게)

(보험회사 대상) 우리 회사를 이용하시는 고객들은 회사를 신뢰해서 선택해 주셨기 때문에 빠른 서비스를 요구하시는 항의는 너무나 당연한 반응이라고 충분히 이해하며 죄송한 마음으로 친절하게 안내해드린다.

직원: (항상 그래왔듯이, 고객 분들에게 가지는 감사하고 죄송한 마음을 담아 진솔하고 친절하게)

“너무 기다리게 해드려서 정말 죄송합니다. 최선을 다해 빨리 처리될 수 있도록

여러 가지로 알아보도록 하겠습니다. 귀한 시간을 소모하며 기다리게 해서 거듭 죄송하다는 말씀을 드립니다..”

3. 귀하는 위의 직원과 비슷한 응대를 평소에 얼마나 자주 하시는지요?

- 1) 매일
 - 2) 자주 (일주일에 3-4번)
 - 3) 종종 (일주일에 1번)
 - 4) 가끔 (한달에 1-2번)
 - 5) 전혀 경험하지 않음
-

4번째 응답 시나리오.

직원의 잘못도 아닌데, 막무가내식 행동에 짜증이 나서 대답한다.

직원: (언짱은 표정으로 짜증을 내며 투명스럽게) “내부 상황 등 다양한 사유로 다소 늦어질 수도 있습니다. 저희가 어찌 할 수 있는 일이 아니니 죄송하지만 기다려주기 바랍니다..”

4. 귀하는 위의 직원 C와 비슷한 응대를 평소에 얼마나 자주 하시는지요?

- 1) 매일
 - 2) 자주 (일주일에 3-4번)
 - 3) 종종 (일주일에 1번)
 - 4) 가끔 (한달에 1-2번)
 - 5) 전혀 경험하지 않음
-

5번째 응답 시나리오.

평소 고객의 감정적인 반응에도 별 감정을 느끼지 않고 무덤덤하게 대해왔기에 다음과 같이 대답한다.

직원: (아무 감정 없이 습관적으로 해왔듯이, 미소를 띄우며 부드러운 말씨로)
“기다리게 해드려서 죄송합니다. 조금만 더 기다려주시기 바랍니다.”

5. 귀하는 위의 직원 C와 비슷한 응대를 평소에 얼마나 자주 하시는지요?

- 1) 매일
 - 2) 자주 (일주일에 3-4번)
 - 3) 종종 (일주일에 1번)
 - 4) 가끔 (한달에 1-2번)
 - 5) 전혀 경험하지 않음
-

7. Items used to measure the antecedents

유형	문항
Work Orientation: Job	솔직히 말하자면, 일하는 주중에도 주말을 많이 기다리는 편이다. 퇴근 후에는 담당 업무에 대해 생각하지 않는다. 내가 현재 일하고 있는 것은 단지 필요에 의해서 할 따름이다. 나는 절대로 일을 집에 가지고 가지 않는다.
Work Orientation: Career	나는 앞으로 하고 싶은 일에 대해 경력을 쌓기 위해 현재의 일을 하고 있다. 현재 하고 있는 일은 앞으로 다른 일을 하기 위한 디딤돌로 생각하며 하고 있다. 보다 나은 일을 하기 위한 경력 쌓기로 지금의 일을 하고 있다. 상위 직책으로의 승진은 내가 현재 열심히 일하는 매우 중요한 이유이다. 현재의 맡은 일을 열심히 하고 있는 것은 지금보다 더 높은 직위로 올라가기 위해서 이다.
Work Orientation: Calling	나는 내가 하고 있는 일에서 보람을 느끼고 있다. 내가 하고 있는 일이 세상을 보다 나은 곳으로 만드는데 일조를 할 것이라 생각하며 일하고 있다. 내가 하고 있는 일을 소명감을 느끼며 하고 있다.
Positive Affectivity	행복한 신나는 열정적인 즐거움 대접받는
Negative Affectivity	괴로운 속상한 적대적인 짜증스러운 불안한
Customer Characteristics	다른 조직의 고객들에 비해 우리 고객들은 응대하기가 까다로운 편이다. 대기시간이 길어지면 참지 못하고 짜증을 내는 편이다. 고객들을 대하기 어려운 점은 별로 없다. 고객들은 조그마한 불편에도 참지 못하는 경향이 있다.
Organization Culture	고객을 나의 가족처럼 생각하고 최선을 다해 지원하는 것을 중시한다. 우리 직원들은 고객들의 어려움을 잘 이해하고, 친절하게 대해주는 편이다. 고객들이 아무리 심한 말을 하더라도, 참고 기분 좋게 대해주는 것을 중시한다. 고객이 처한 상황에 공감하고, 친절히 대해주는 것을 중시한다. 우리 직원들은 고객들을 자신의 가족처럼 생각하고 잘 대해주는 편이다.

8. Items used to measure the consequences

유형	문항
Job Satisfaction	<p>나는 내가 지금 맡고 있는 일에 만족한다.</p> <p>내가 맡은 일에 대해 열정을 가지고 일하고 있다.</p> <p>직장에서의 하루가 길게 느껴진다.</p> <p>내가 하고 있는 일이 별 재미가 없다는 생각을 가지곤 한다.</p>
Eustress	<p>스트레스를 주는 예상치 못한 일이 발생해도 잘 대처하는 편이다</p> <p>업무 스트레스가 긍정적인 영향을 주어 어려운 문제를 잘 해결하는 경우가 꽤 있다.</p> <p>적당한 수준의 스트레스가 오히려 동기부여가 되곤 한다.</p> <p>어느 정도는 업무 스트레스를 받을 때에 오히려 일을 더 잘 해내는 편이다.</p> <p>해야 할 일이 많고 쉽지 않아 부담감을 느낄 때 더 좋은 성과를 내는 편이다.</p>
Work Engagement	<p>이 직장에서 일하면서 에너지가 넘쳐나는 느낌을 자주 가진다.</p> <p>나는 맡고 있는 업무를 열정적으로 수행하는 편이다.</p> <p>집중해서 업무를 수행할 때, 행복감을 느낀다.</p> <p>담당하고 있는 업무에 대해 자부심을 가진다.</p> <p>담당 업무를 수행할 때, 시간 가는 줄 모르면서 몰입하여 일한다.</p>
Job Burnout	<p>맡은 일로 인해 기력이 소진되는 것을 느끼곤 한다.</p> <p>일을 마치고 퇴근할 때 체력이 고갈되는 경험을 종종 한다.</p> <p>아침에 일어나 출근해 온종일 일할 생각을 하면 피곤함을 느끼곤 한다.</p> <p>일하는 것이 스트레스 그 자체이다.</p> <p>담당하고 있는 일에 대해 흥미를 점점 잃고 있다.</p>
Emotional Dissonance	<p>실제로 느낀 감정과 표현해야 할 감정이 불일치한 경우가 있다.</p> <p>실제로 느낀 감정과 요구되는 표현 감정은 유사하다.</p> <p>표현해야 하는 감정과 내가 실제로 느끼는 감정은 다르다.</p> <p>내가 실제로 경험한 감정을 숨겨야 한다.</p> <p>내가 실제로 느끼지도 않은 감정을 표현해야 하는 경우가 있다.</p>

국문 초록

기존에 이루어진 많은 연구들이 감정 근로의 두가지 유형에만 집중하여 감정 노동과 변인들의 관계를 규명하는데 노력했으나, 여러 혼재된 결과를 통해 감정 근로를 측정하는데 확장된 유형에 대한 연구의 필요성이 나타났다.

본 연구에서는 감정 근로의 유형을 다섯가지로 확장하고 규명하는데 목적을 가지고, 다섯가지 감정 근로 유형의 선행 변인과 결과 변인 설정 및 규명을 통해 감정 근로에 대한 폭 넓은 시각을 제시하였다. 또한, 이전의 연구들이 외부 고객을 대하는 조직 구성원의 감정 노동에 집중했다면, 이를 넘어 내부 고객 즉, 조직 구성원 간에 일어나는 감정 근로까지 범위를 확장하여 함께 측정하였다.

연구 1에서는 감정 근로 유형이 기존의 표면 행위 (Surface Acting) 와 내면 행위 (Deep Acting) 을 넘어, 내재적 행위 (Internalized Acting), 일탈적 행위 (Deviant Acting), 그리고 Robotic Acting 까지 다섯가지의 유형으로 구분하였고, 다양한 산업에 종사하는 구성원을 대상으로 한 설문을 통해 다섯가지 요인구조로 나누어짐을 볼 수 있었고, 시나리오 연구를 통해 다섯가지 유형이 실증적으로도 구분됨을 발견할 수 있었다.

이를 기반으로 연구 2에서는 다섯가지 감정 근로 유형과 선행 변인으로 설정한 업무 지향성, 긍정/부정적 감정, 고객 특성, 조직 문화와의 관계를 알아보았다. 결과적으로, 소명 측면의 업무 지향성이 내재적 행위와 유효한 관계를 보이며, 부정적인 감정, 표면 행위와 일탈적 행위에 영향을 끼치며, 마지막으로 조직 문화는 부분적으로 내면행위와 내재화 행위에 영향을 끼친다는 것을 발견할 수 있었다. 따라서, 조직 구성원의 내재화된 감정 근로 행위를 이끌어내기 위해서는 조직 측면에서 조직 구성원이 소명을 발견하는데 집중하고, 긍정적인 조직 문화를 구축하는 것이 중요하다는 시사점을 이야기 한다.

연구 3에서는 다섯가지 감정 근로 유형과 결과 변인으로 설정한

직무 만족, 긍정적 스트레스, 직무 몰입과 탈진, 감정적 불일치와의 관계를 알아보았다. 결과적으로, 내재적 행위가 직무 만족과 직무 몰입과 유의미한 정적 관계를 보였고, 직무 탈진과는 유의미한 부적 관계를 보여 내재적 행위를 통해 조직 구성원들이 긍정적인 성과를 도출할 수 있음이 시사되었다.

본 연구는 감정 근로 유형에 대한 확장적인 사고와 접근을 제시했다는 점에서 감정 근로 연구에 기여할 것으로 예상된다. 후속 연구를 통해, 다섯가지 감정 근로 유형과 변인들 사이에 관계 뿐 아니라 내재된 기제를 발견하는 것으로 연구를 확장시킬 수 있을 것이다.

주요어 : 감정 근로, 감정 노동, 업무 지향성, 조직 문화, 업무 몰입

학 번 : 2017-27682