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Emotional Labour Strategies: A Subgroup Analysis

ABSTRACT

Prior research has identified three strategies that employees use to manage Emotional Labour (EL): surface acting, deep acting, and genuine expression. Surface acting is the adjustment of the outward expression of emotion to create the ‘appropriate’ emotional display as determined by the organisation’s display rules. Deep acting is the adjustment of internal emotion in order to display the ‘appropriate’ emotional expression. Using a large sample of nurses, cluster analysis was performed to identify whether employees use different combinations of strategies to manage their EL. Four clusters were obtained which were labelled: amateurs (moderate use of all three strategies), masqueraders (high surface and deep acting), empathists (high deep acting and genuine expression), and realists (high genuine expression). Discriminant analysis was then used to examine the relationship between the four clusters and outcomes. The amateurs and masqueraders experienced emotional exhaustion and depersonalisation, while the empathists and realists tended to be high in job satisfaction, affective commitment and personal accomplishment. These results provide a new perspective on emotional labourers and their preferred strategies. Managerial implications are discussed. Further research is needed to replicate these findings in other occupations.
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EMOTIONAL LABOUR

There is a growing body of evidence suggesting that jobs involving high amounts of Emotional Labour (EL) may have adverse consequences for employees, such as burnout (emotional exhaustion) (Brotheridge & Grandey 2002; Brotheridge & Lee 2002; Brotheridge & Lee 2003; Grandey 1999; Grandey 2003; Totterdell & Holman 2003; Zammuner & Galli 2005) and lowered job satisfaction (Brotheridge & Lee 2002). It is important therefore, for organisations to be proactive in managing employees in jobs with high EL demands, particularly since EL has also been associated with employees’ intentions to leave an organisation (Grandey 1999). To assist them, further research is required into the strategies employees use to manage their emotions in jobs that are high in the frequency and intensity of their interpersonal interactions, and how those strategies are related to adverse outcomes. The purpose of the present research is to explore these issues. Before discussing the present study, a short review of the main conceptualisations of EL will be provided along with a discussion of the strategies used by employees to manage EL. This is followed by details of the present study and finally, the implications for the management of EL and future research directions are discussed.

Emotional Labour Conceptualisations

Hochschild (Hochschild 1983: 7) defined emotional labour as ‘the management of feeling to create a publicly observable facial and bodily display’. According to Hochschild, EL occurs when employees have face-to-face or voice contact with the public, are required to produce a particular emotional state in another such as the customer or client, and these emotional adjustments are monitored by their manager. Despite divergent opinions as to how EL should be conceptualised, there
is general agreement that EL involves the management of emotions in order to conform to implicit or explicit display rules in organisations (Brotheridge & Grandey 2002; Brotheridge & Lee 2002; Diefendorff, Croyle & Gosserand 2005; Glomb & Tews 2004; Grandey 1999; Grandey 2003). Four main conceptualisations of EL can be identified in the literature.

**Emotional job demands**

Within this research stream, EL is seen to occur when there are emotional job demands in employee-customer interactions and EL is defined as ‘the effort, planning, and control needed to express organizationally desired emotion during interpersonal transactions’ (Morris & Feldman 1996a: 987). Emotional labour is measured as the frequency, variety, length and intensity of the emotions required in particular occupations (Mann 1999; Morris & Feldman 1996a). The assumption is that the greater the frequency, variety, length and intensity of emotional display, the greater will be the emotional exhaustion experienced by employees. This conceptualisation provides useful information about customer interactions and the EL requirements of some occupations. This view is also useful for understanding why there is a need to manage emotions (Grandey 1999). However, it provides little information about the internal turmoil employees may experience during customer interactions. Based on an interactionist perspective, this conceptualisation also provides little insight into how employees actually translate the emotional demands into the expression of the desired emotion - that is, the internal processes employees use to manage their emotions.

**Emotional expression**

This conceptualisation of EL focuses on the external behavioural display of emotions (Ashforth 2000; Ashforth & Humphrey 1993; Wharton 1999). EL is defined as ‘the act of displaying appropriate emotions (i.e. conforming to a display rule)’ (Ashforth & Humphrey 1993: 90). These researchers argue that only observable emotion is unbiased and, thus, should be studied in the place of inner feelings that are subjective and difficult to measure accurately. Conceptualising EL in this way provides useful insight into the types of emotions that may be displayed in certain occupations. However, the approach provides little insight into the experienced difference between employees’ felt and expressed emotions or the mechanisms and coping strategies individuals in high EL occupations utilise. Contrary to other researchers, Ashforth and Humphrey (1993) consider that EL is not always effortful arguing that managing EL can become routine in repetitive jobs and hence, employees no longer find it stressful.

**Emotional dissonance**

Several researchers conceptualise EL as emotional dissonance (Abraham 1999; Abraham 2000; Adelmann 1995; Kruml & Geddes 2000; Mann 1999; Morris & Feldman 1996b; Morris & Feldman 1997; Zapf, Vogt, Seifert, Mertini & Isic 1999). Emotional dissonance is defined as ‘the
degree to which employees’ expressed emotions align with their true feelings’ (Kruml & Geddes 2000: 19). Researchers who conceptualise EL in this way provide useful insight into the emotional energy needed to perform EL, linking dissonance with job dissatisfaction and emotional exhaustion (Grandey 2000). These researchers have not, however, investigated employees’ coping strategies when they experience emotional dissonance. There has also been concern about genuine expression as, sometimes employees may not experience emotional dissonance even though they perform jobs typically considered to be high in emotional demands, such as customer service representatives (Ashforth & Humphrey 1993; Morris & Feldman 1996b). It has also been argued that, as emotional dissonance is an internal state, it does not align with the definition of EL and, thus, the two are not the same (Grandey 1999).

Emotion regulation strategies

Most recently, EL has been conceptualised as the internal regulation of emotion through surface acting and deep acting strategies. These researchers (e.g. Brotheridge & Lee 1998; Brotheridge & Lee 2003; Glomb & Tews 2004; Grandey 2000; Hochschild 1983; Zummuner & Galli 2005) define emotional labour as ‘the process of regulating both feelings and expressions for organizational goals’ (Grandey 2000: 97). This approach examines the strategies employees use to regulate emotions during customer interactions and, therefore, provides a link between the need for EL (emotional job demands), the goal of EL (emotional expression or suppression), and the state that may occur when performing EL (emotional dissonance) (Grandey 1999). Conceptualising EL in this way provides insight into employees’ internal processes and the coping mechanisms that occur during interpersonal interactions.

Emotional Labour Strategies: Surface Acting, Deep Acting and Genuine Expression

Hochschild (1983) first introduced the terms, surface and deep acting, in her seminal work ‘The Managed Heart’, when she argued that employees use these two strategies to comply with display rules. Surface acting is the adjustment of outward emotional expression to create a required emotional display as determined by the organisation’s ‘display rules.’ Rafaeli and Sutton (1987) refer to this as ‘faking in bad faith’ as the employee does not attempt to feel the displayed emotion, only to manage their observable expressions and body language. Surface acting also does not mean that the person experiences no emotion, but rather that the expressed emotion differs from the felt emotion. The second strategy that employees may use to comply with display rules is deep acting. Deep acting has been referred to as ‘faking in good faith’ (Rafaeli & Sutton 1987) as it refers to the adjustment of internal feeling in order to express the appropriate and required emotional display (Hochschild equated this with method acting). Deep acting requires an adjustment of inner feelings as well as the outward expression of that emotion. Hochschild (1983) suggested deep acting would have a stronger link to emotional exhaustion than would surface acting as it requires the greater use of emotional resources.
Brotheridge and Lee (1998; 2000) developed the Emotional Labour Scale (ELS) to measure the use of surface and deep acting strategies. They found different links between surface and deep acting and outcome variables, providing evidence of the discriminant validity of these two EL emotion regulation strategies. Several studies have used the ELS to study such antecedents as display rules (Brotheridge & Grandey 2002; Brotheridge & Lee 2002; Diefendorff et al. 2005; Grandey 1999; Grandey 2003), social support from supervisors and co-workers (Brotheridge & Lee 2002; Grandey 1999; Totterdell & Holman 2003), emotional job demands (Brotheridge & Lee 2002; Diefendorff et al. 2005; Grandey 1999; Zammuner & Galli 2005), self-monitoring (Brotheridge & Lee 2002; Diefendorff et al. 2005) and job satisfaction (Grandey 2003). Outcome variables studied include burnout (Brotheridge & Grandey 2002; Brotheridge & Lee 2002; Brotheridge & Lee 2003; Erickson & Ritter 2001; Grandey 1999; Grandey 2003; Zammuner & Galli 2005), turnover intentions (Grandey 1999), customer service performance (Grandey 1999; Grandey 2003), and job satisfaction (Grandey 1999). Burnout has received the most attention and it seems that, contrary to Hochschild’s (1983) expectation, surface actors suffer greater emotional exhaustion (Brotheridge & Grandey 2002; Brotheridge & Lee 2002; Grandey 2000; Totterdell & Holman 2003; Zammuner & Galli 2005).

Genuine expression, which occurs when the employee’s genuine emotion matches the ‘required’ emotional display, has been suggested as a third strategy to manage emotional job demands (Ashforth & Humphrey 1993; Grandey 1999). Ashforth and Humphrey (1993) observed that the problem with Hochschild’s (1983) definition of EL is that it does not allow for instances when an employee spontaneously and genuinely expresses the desired emotion. For example, ‘A nurse who feels sympathy at the sight of an injured child has no need to “act”’ (Ashforth & Humphrey 1993: 94). When an employee is expressing genuine emotions they do not experience emotional dissonance, and hence, the emotion may be displayed with little or no effort and they may not suffer from the negative outcomes typically attributed to jobs high in EL. Grandey (1999) found that genuine expression was negatively related to emotional exhaustion in a sample of administrative assistants; and that it was positively related to job satisfaction and personal accomplishment. Närting, Briët and Brouwers (2006), Brotheridge and Lee (2002), and Zammuner and Galli (2005) have also found a positive relationship between genuine expression and personal accomplishment. Customer satisfaction is also enhanced in service encounters when employees’ smiles are authentic (known as a ‘Duchenne smile’) (Grandey 1999; Grandey, Fisk, Mattila, Jansen & Sideman 2005). Similarly, in a study of business-to-business service relationships Kiely (2005) found that a genuine desire to get to know the other party encouraged the genuine expression of emotions resulting in personal satisfaction for both parties. Grandey (1999) concluded that more research is needed into how genuine expression fits into the EL framework, and how to encourage employees to genuinely express their emotions.

The three EL strategies are considered to be independent of one another, and hence, an employee may engage in all three strategies (surface, deep and genuine) in a given day (Grandey 1999). However, little information is known about the characteristics of employees who favour a
particular strategy or whether there are distinct groups of people who prefer a particular strategy or combination of EL strategies. That is, are surface actors different to deep actors or to those people who genuinely express their felt emotions?

THE PRESENT STUDY

The present study was undertaken to see if there are sub-groups of emotional labourers in a workforce who use different strategies and to see whether members of these groups have different backgrounds. Information on people’s EL strategies and individual outcomes (i.e. job satisfaction, organisational commitment, and burnout) was obtained from enrolled and registered nurses and nurse managers who had daily interactions with patients in a large, private sector hospital. Nursing ranked fifth highest of 560 occupations in terms of EL demands, making this a particularly useful sample (Glomb, Kammeyer-Mueller & Rotundo 2004). Eleven hundred surveys were distributed and 332 completed surveys were returned, providing a response rate of 29 percent. Sixty percent of the respondents were enrolled nurses and most were well-educated part-time employees. There was a spread of age groups, although most respondents were aged between 35 and 54 years.

Surface acting and deep acting strategies were measured using the 12-item EL Scale (Brotheridge & Lee 1998; Brotheridge & Lee 2003), while three items suggested by Grandey (1999) were included to measure genuine expression. All of the items were measured on a five-point scale that ranged from “never” (1) to “always” (5). Warr, Cook and Wall’s (1979) 15-item scale, which included extrinsic and intrinsic aspects, was used to measure job satisfaction on a seven-point scale that ranged from “extremely dissatisfied” (1) to “extremely satisfied” (7). Allen and Meyer’s (1990) scale was used to measure affective and continuance commitment on a seven-point scale that ranged from “strongly disagree” (1) to “strongly agree” (7). Three burnout aspects (emotional exhaustion, depersonalisation and personal accomplishment) were measured using Maslach and Jackson’s (1981) 22-item scale on a seven-point scale that ranged from “never occurs” (0) to “occurs every day” (6). Background information including nurse type (enrolled, registered, clinical, manager), age, highest education level attained, hours worked per week, employment type (fulltime, part-time, casual), years worked for the organisation, and years worked as a nurse was also collected.

RESULTS

The data was screened prior to analysis and three outliers removed. As there were very little missing data and these were randomly scattered in the data, the EM (expectation-maximisation) method was used to substitute values for the missing data. The composite subscales were calculated and the scales were generally normally distributed. Descriptive statistics including means, standard deviations, alpha reliabilities and correlations were calculated for each of the scales. As can be seen in Table 1, respondents reported moderate levels of job satisfaction, below average levels of continuance and affective commitment, and moderate amounts of emotional exhaustion. Respondents also
reportedly felt some personal accomplishment as a result of working with their patients. The standard deviations were around one, indicating reasonable variation in the data set. Cronbach’s alpha was above 0.70 for all of the scales except continuance commitment, suggesting the scale’s had good internal reliability.

| Table 1: Means, Standard Deviations, Correlations and Alpha Reliabilities* |
|----------------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
|                      | Mean | SD   | 1    | 2    | 3    | 4    | 5    | 6    | 7    |
| 1 Extrinsic Job Satisfaction | 4.67 | 0.94 (0.81) |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |
| 2 Intrinsic Job Satisfaction | 4.67 | 1.06 0.75 ** (0.87) |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |
| 3 Continuance Commitment | 3.67 | 1.04 -0.03 0.01 (0.65) |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |
| 4 Affective Commitment | 3.98 | 1.16 0.54 ** 0.54 ** 0.207 ** (0.82) |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |
| 5 Emotional Exhaustion | 2.58 | 1.27 -0.55 ** -0.39 ** 0.13 * -0.32 ** (0.93) |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |
| 6 Depersonalisation | 1.33 | 1.13 -0.42 ** -0.35 ** 0.04 -0.28 ** 0.55 ** (0.83) |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |
| 7 Personal Accomplishment | 3.98 | 0.83 0.30 ** 0.43 ** 0.02 0.38 ** -0.21 ** -0.39 ** (0.84) |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |

Note: Alpha reliabilities in brackets. *p<0.05. ** p<0.01. SD= standard deviation.

After this initial assessment, the data were analysed in two stages. A cluster analysis was undertaken to see whether there were meaningful sub-groups in the sample, after which discriminant analysis was used to understand the nature of the obtained clusters. The three EL strategy scales (deep acting, surface acting and genuine expression) were used to group the respondents. Howard and Harris’s (1966) k-means clustering procedure was used in this case as it has been found useful in a variety of management and marketing contexts (Clark-Murphy & Soutar 2005; Ross 2007; Soutar & McNeil 1995; Soutar & Sweeney 2003; Soutar & Williams 1985). The number of possible clusters was varied from two to eight and point biserial correlations were calculated to determine the appropriate number of clusters (Milligan & Mahajan 1980). The point biserial correlations ranged from 0.44 (for two clusters) to 0.48 (for four clusters). Consequently, the four-cluster solution was used in the subsequent analysis. The numbers of respondents in each cluster were similar, as can also be seen in Table 2, which also shows the means and standard deviations for each cluster. The standard deviations, which are shown in parentheses, suggest the groups have very similar views, while the means suggest there are real differences between the clusters. Cluster One seems to be about average on all three EL strategies and was consequently termed the ‘Amateurs’. Cluster Two primarily used deep acting and genuine expression to manage their EL and was termed the ‘Empathists’. Cluster Three used a combination of surface and deep acting strategies and was termed the ‘Masqueraders’. Cluster Four mainly used genuine expression and was, consequently, termed the ‘Realists’.
Table 2: Means and Standard Deviations for Each Cluster

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cluster Label</th>
<th>Cluster</th>
<th>Deep Acting</th>
<th>Surface Acting</th>
<th>Genuine Expression</th>
<th>Proportion in the Cluster</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Amateurs</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.70 (0.035)</td>
<td>2.68 (0.035)</td>
<td>3.82 (0.041)</td>
<td>0.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Empathists</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.83 (0.050)</td>
<td>2.35 (0.056)</td>
<td>4.35 (0.043)</td>
<td>0.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Masqueraders</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.48 (0.068)</td>
<td>3.73 (0.062)</td>
<td>3.52 (0.065)</td>
<td>0.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Realists</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.68 (0.056)</td>
<td>1.94 (0.048)</td>
<td>4.20 (0.063)</td>
<td>0.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.91 (0.90)</td>
<td>2.64 (0.75)</td>
<td>3.97 (0.56)</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As was noted earlier, a number of background variables and suggested outcomes collected in the present study and their differences across the four groups were examined. The background variables were examined first, after which the outcome variables were examined. A series of ANOVAs were estimated to see if any of the background information collected (e.g. age, gender and tenure) differed across the four groups. The F statistics in this case varied from 0.03 to 2.55, none of which were significant at the five percent level. Clearly, an employee’s preference for a particular combination of EL strategies is not influenced by their backgrounds in this case. This may be because all of the respondents were nurses employed by the same organisation.

A similar analysis of the outcome variables collected in the study found the F statistics ranged from 3.41 to 24.03, all of which were significant well beyond the five percent level. Consequently, a further multivariate analysis was warranted. As the dependent variable in this case (group membership) was nominal, discriminant analysis was used to examine these differences (Klecka 1988). In this case, two significant discriminant functions were found that, using the I squared statistic (Peterson & Mahajan 1976) as a guide, explained 27% of the group differences, suggesting there were real differences between the groups. The F statistics between the groups (Johnson 1977) ranged from 4.26 to 32.05, which are all significant well beyond the one percent level, supporting this view. The structural correlations between the various background constructs and the estimated discriminant functions can be used to determine the nature of the group differences and, as two functions were retained, the relationships can be shown diagrammatically (Soutar & Clarke 1981). In this case, the structural correlations can be shown as vectors, as can be seen in Figure 1. The direction of the vector shows the nature of the relationship (i.e. whether it is a positive or negative relationship), while the length of the vector shows the strength of that relationship (Johnson 1977). The various clusters can also be placed on this ‘map’ by using their group centroid values (Soutar & Clarke 1981) and these are also shown in Figure 1.
Figure 1: Differences between the EL Groups

Groups that scored high on the first function were likely to feel depersonalised and emotionally exhausted. It seems this function can be interpreted as a burnout dimension. Groups that scored high on the second function were likely to feel satisfied with their jobs, to be affectively committed to their employer and to have a sense of personal accomplishment. It seems the second function can be interpreted as a positive well-being dimension. As can be seen from Figure 1, two groups were located in the negative quadrant (i.e. they were suffering burnout and poor well-being), while two were located in the positive quadrant (i.e. high in well-being and personal accomplishment). The negative groups (groups 1 and 3) were the two groups who were more likely to use surface acting and least likely to use a genuine expression strategy. The positive groups (groups 2 and 4), on the other hand, were more likely to use deep acting and genuine expression strategies. Interestingly, group 2, which had the highest well-being, had the highest deep acting and genuine expression scores.

DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

The present study examined the different strategies that people use to manage their EL: surface acting, deep acting and genuine expression. Four distinct groups were found that were labelled Amateurs, Masqueraders, Empathists and Realists. The employees in the Amateur group reported using all three EL strategies some of the time, but did not show a strong preference for any one of the three strategies. This group was the largest of the four groups (34%). Within the acting tradition, amateurs are considered to be inexperienced or unskilled, which we felt described this group of
average performers. In keeping with this, the Amateur group also experienced a low to moderate degree of emotional exhaustion and depersonalisation. In contrast, the Masqueraders (20% of the sample) were far more likely to use surface and deep acting to manage the emotional demands involved in interacting with their patients, and were far less likely to genuinely express their emotions. Masqueraders seemed an apt label for this group as they were more inclined to manage their EL with a false outward show of emotion or by attempting to exhort the feeling through deep acting (Hochschild 1983). More skilled at disguise than their Amateur counterparts, the Masqueraders also were the group with the highest amount of burnout, presumably as a result of the psychic effort involved in surface and deep acting.

The Empathists, who comprised 24% of the sample, reported a greater preference to use deep acting and the genuine expression of their feelings to manage their EL. In deep acting the person modifies their internal processes (thoughts and feelings) to try to actually feel the required emotion and to make their expression more genuine (Grandey, 1999). According to Ashforth and Humphrey (1993: 93) deep acting involves greater psychic effort than surface acting and hence, ‘this form of emotional labor is more consistent with a strong concern for one’s customers’. Hence, we used Empathist to describe this group as we believed they had a strong concern for their patients as they either genuinely felt the emotion, or they tried to do so through the use of deep acting. Interestingly, the Empathists were reportedly more satisfied with their jobs, and committed to the organisation. Consistent with Brotheridge and Grandey (2002) and Brotheridge and Lee’s (2002) findings in relation to deep acting, they also reported greater feelings of personal accomplishment than any of the other groups. Finally, the employees in the fourth group primarily managed their EL through the genuine expression of their emotions, and hence we labelled them the Realists. Employees in this group rarely used surface or deep acting as a strategy (22% of the sample was in this group). The Realists also experienced positive well-being but not nearly to the same degree as the Empathists.

This paper makes a number of important contributions to the EL literature. By taking a person-centred approach to understanding EL, this research provides a possible explanation for why the same emotional job demands can have adverse consequences for some individuals, and not others. The results suggest that employees favour particular combinations of strategies in how they manage EL. For example, the Amateurs and Masqueraders had a stronger preference for surface acting which, consistent with prior research, was associated with emotional exhaustion and depersonalisation. The results from this study also support the assertion that compliance with display rules can occur through the genuine expression of required emotions. The Empathists and Realists had stronger preferences for this strategy, and these groups also reportedly did not experience the negative consequences experienced by the other two groups. The inclusion of genuine expression or authenticity in models of EL (e.g. Grandey 2000; Brotheridge & Lee 2002), may provide a more complete picture of the strategies employees use to manage EL and its relationship with various outcomes.
The practical implications of this study are significant. While previous EL research has emphasised the importance of person-job matching, training to encourage deep acting and the expression of genuine emotion may provide greater benefit. For example, Larson and Yao (2005) have advocated that physicians need to consciously practice their deep acting to help develop their empathic abilities. Grandey (2000) has suggested two approaches, based on emotion regulation theory (Gross 1998), that may be used to develop a person’s ability to deep act: (1) attentional deployment which involves thinking about something that induces the required emotion, also known as ‘method acting’ (Stanislavsky 1965), and (2) cognitive change which involves reappraising the situation to change the emotions that they induce, such as positive self-talk, distraction, or perspective-taking (Totterdell & Holman 2003). Increasing employees’ awareness of the importance of displaying genuine emotions may also be beneficial, as also may be giving employees greater autonomy to manage the emotional demands of their job. Individualised stress management programs are also important, as some employees appear at greater risk of emotional exhaustion than others.

Future research is needed to investigate whether these four groups generalise to other occupations high in EL demands (e.g. customer service), and to examine the relationship between the four groups and other outcomes, such as organisational citizenship behaviours, absenteeism and job performance. It would also be helpful to managers if researchers were to investigate the factors that influence a person’s preference for using surface or deep acting strategies, or genuinely expressing the required emotion. The fact that there were no significant differences in the backgrounds of the employees in each of the four groups suggests that further research is required. Humphrey (2006) has suggested that certain characteristics such as empathy and emotional intelligence may influence whether a person has a preference to use surface or deep acting strategies. The Empathists, may themselves be high in empathy, predisposing them to deep act and express genuine emotion. Certain personality traits, such as emotional expressivity (Grandey 2000), self-monitoring (Brotheridge & Lee 2002; Diefendorff et al. 2005; Grandey 2000) and positive affect (Grandey 2000), have also been suggested as influencing a person’s ability to regulate their emotions. Finally, we concur with Brotheridge and Lee (2002) that longitudinal research is necessary to see whether the combination of strategies employees use to manage their EL are stagnant, or evolve over time (i.e. from surface to deep acting, to genuine expression). For example, is an Amateur always an amateur? Or, do Amateurs learn to become Masqueraders, who in turn develop into Empathists, who eventually evolve into Realists?
REFERENCES


Howard H & Harris RD (1966) A hierarchical grouping routine; IBM 360/65 FORTRAN IV program University of Pennsylvania Computing Centre.


