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Due to increases in dual-earner couples and single-parent families, work-family conflict (WFC) is a prominent issue among employees, which has prompted empirical examinations of the work-family interface. However, little research has integrated emotional labor (i.e., emotion regulation within the workplace) into the work-family interface. Due to the expectation of employees, of any industry, to effectively manage their emotions, the present study is timely in integrating emotional labor into the work-family interface. In addition to examining the relationships between emotional labor strategies and the forms of WFC, work-family integration and psychological detachment were examined as moderators buffering the negative impacts of emotional labor on WFC. Utilizing a sample of 316 employees, results of the hierarchical moderated regression and relative weights analyses supported the proposed direct positive relationship between surface acting and WFC. Furthermore, work-family integration moderated the relationships between surface acting and behavior-based WFC. Implications and future research are discussed.
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CHAPTER 1
INTRODUCTION

Work and family are the two central domains that compose most individuals’ lives. Therefore, a large area of organizational research has examined work-family conflict, originally defined by Greenhaus and Beutell (1985) as existing when pressures from an individual’s work and family domains interfere with one another. Substantial scholarly research has indicated the negative impact work-family conflict can have on individuals and organizations, including lower family satisfaction, lower organizational commitment, and negative physical and psychological health outcomes (Mesmer-Magnus & Viswesvaran, 2005). Furthermore, researchers have identified several antecedents of work-family conflict, including job demands, workload, and job and organizational characteristics (Eby, Casper, Lockwood, Bordeaux, & Brinkley, 2005). Recently research has examined emotional labor – emotion regulation that occurs within the workplace (Grandey, 2000) – as an additional contributing antecedent (Yanchus, Eby, Lance, & Drollinger, 2010).

Within the emotions literature, scholars generally concur on the importance of emotional labor for employees within the customer service industry because a high degree of emotional control is needed to maintain positive relationships with customers to future ensure business (Brotheridge & Grandey, 2002; Kinman, 2009; Varca, 2009). However, understanding the emotional labor process within all employees, regardless of the industry, has become a new focus in the literature, as all employees are expected to effectively manage their emotions for coworkers, supervisors, and customers alike (Mesmer-Magnus, DeChurch, & Wax, 2012). Thus, the research and practice of effective emotional labor strategies are becoming important beyond
the traditional narrow scope of customer service jobs (e.g., Johnson & Spector, 2007) and broadening to all industries. In line with the growing presence of emotional labor in all industries, the current study contributes to the literature by examining emotional labor within both customer service and noncustomer service-related positions. Therefore, the study’s findings will inform researchers on the use and influence of emotional labor on work-family conflict in industries beyond the customer service industry.

Although emotional labor has become an increasingly important job requirement for employees of various industries, minimal research has integrated emotional labor into the work-family interface (e.g., Yanchus et al., 2010). In particular, much of the research on the emotional labor – work-family conflict relationship has only examined the effects of emotional labor on overall work-family conflict, ignoring the differential relationships that may exist between emotional labor and the different forms of work-family conflict. Only one known study has examined the distinct relationships between emotional labor and the forms of work-family conflict, however this was limited to a sample of nurse aides and child care workers that may not be generalizable to employees within different industries (Seery et al., 2008). A deeper examination of emotional labor – work-family conflict is particularly important, as past research has shown that differential relationships exist between the forms of work-family conflict and various individual outcomes (e.g., Lapierre & Allen, 2003). Thus, the current study will contribute to the literature by providing a finer grained analysis of the emotional labor–work-family conflict relationship that examines the distinct forms of work-family conflict.

Amidst the minimal research on the relationship between emotional labor and work-family conflict, consistent findings have shown surface acting (i.e., an emotional labor strategy that involves the suppression of true emotions and expression of fake emotions, Grandey, 2000)
contributes to greater work-family conflict (e.g., Montgomery, Panagopolou, & Benos, 2005). However, little research has attempted to identify variables that may buffer emotional labor’s negative influences on work-family conflict (e.g., Cheung & Tang, 2009; Yanchus et al., 2010). Thus, the present study is the first to examine work-family integration (i.e., the extent to which individuals segment of separate their work and family roles, Ashforth, Kreiner, & Fugate, 2000) and psychological detachment from work (i.e., “an individual’s sense of being away from the work situation”, Sonnentag, Binnewies, & Mojza, 2008) as moderators of the emotion labor–work-family conflict relationship. Accordingly, one of the aims of this research is to inform scholars and practitioners about the effective management of emotions, resulting in less work-family conflict, as well as strategies (e.g., work-family integration, psychological detachment) for employees to use to decrease emotional labor’s negative impacts on work-family conflict.

Collectively, the purpose of the current study is to examine a) the specific relationships between emotional labor and the three forms of work-family conflict (i.e., time-, strain-, behavior-based) and b) the moderating roles of work-family integration and psychological detachment within these relationships. To begin, the manuscript will explain the concepts of work-family conflict and the impacts of work-family conflict on individuals and organizations within the contemporary workplace. Next, the concept of emotional labor will be described, including its functions and effects within the work environment. Finally, the manuscript will describe the relationships between emotional labor and work-family conflict by specifying hypotheses for these relationships and the moderating hypotheses for work-family integration and psychological detachment from work.
Work-Family Conflict

Day-to-day, sometimes moment-to-moment, individuals are juggling the competing roles of work and family (Rothbard, 2001). Increases in dual-earner families, single-parent families, and individuals caring for elders, have increased the likelihood that both men and women must manage both work and family demands (Byron, 2005). Greenhaus and Beutell (1985) originally described work-family conflict as “a form of interrole conflict in which the role pressures from the work and family domains are mutually incompatible in some respect. That is, participation in the work (family) role is made more difficult by virtue of participation in the family (work) role” (p. 77).

Greenhaus and Beutell (1985) identified three distinct sources of work-family conflict: time-, strain-, and behavior-based conflict. Time-based conflict exists when time pressures or pressure produced from preoccupation with one role makes it hard to complete duties and fulfill expectations of another role. For example, time-based conflict is experienced when an individual attends an evening board meeting and misses his/her child’s soccer game. Strain-based conflict occurs when strain, such as psychological distress or tension, produced in one role impacts performance in the other role. This form may be present when an individual is too stressed and anxious about his/her spouse’s chronic illness to concentrate at work and complete work tasks. Lastly, behavior-based conflict arises when behavior performed in one role is incompatible with behavior in the other role. For example, behavior-based conflict is experienced when a manager directs her husband to complete several chores at home after instructing employees to complete certain tasks earlier that day at work. Conflict is present due to the manager portraying work-desired management behaviors at home, while her family may expect family-desired behaviors such as warmth and nurturance.
Work-family conflict operates in two directions, work-to-family conflict (WFC) and family-to-work conflict (FWC). Netermeyer, Boles, and McMurrian (1996) differentiate between these two directions of conflict and describe WFC as a form of interrole conflict in which the general demands of, time dedicated to, and strain produced by the job interfere with performing family-related duties. Conversely, FWC refers to a form of interrole conflict in which the general demands of, time dedicated to, and strain produced by the family interfere with performing work-related duties. In regard to the current study, only WFC will be examined due to the demands of emotional labor performed at work hindering individuals’ ability to fulfill family responsibilities, thus contributing more to WFC.

Research on the individual and organizational outcomes of work-family provide evidence for its association with job dissatisfaction, job burnout, turnover, absenteeism, lower organizational commitment (Allen, Herst, Bruck, & Sutton, 2000; Anderson, Coffey, & Byerly, 2002), as well as to lower family satisfaction, lower martial satisfaction and negative physical and psychological health outcomes (Allen et al., 2000; Mesmer-Magnus & Viswesvaran, 2005). Beyond these negative individual and organizational outcomes, it is essential to also examine the antecedents of work-family conflict. Established antecedents include job demands, workload, job and organizational characteristics, job stress, family stress, high job involvement, and inflexible work schedules (Eby et al., 2005; Michel, Kotrba, Mitchelson, Clark, & Baltes, 2011). Furthermore, recent research has identified emotional labor as a contributing antecedent to this conflict as well (Yanchus et al., 2010).

**Emotion Regulation and Emotional Labor**

**Emotion regulation.** Prior to discussing emotional labor, it is important to distinguish between the processes of emotion regulation, which originated in the social psychology literature
(Gross, 1998), and emotional labor, which was introduced in the I/O psychology literature (Grandey, 2000). Emotion regulation has been defined by Gross (1998) as “the processes by which individuals influence which emotions they have, when they have them, and how they experience and express these emotions” (p. 275). Gross’s (1998) theory of emotion regulation involves antecedent-focused emotion regulation - the regulation of the precursors of an emotion - and response-focused emotion regulation - the regulation of the emotional expression of the reaction to a situation. Both of these types of emotion regulation involve different emotion regulation strategies. Table 1 presents Gross’s (1998) definitions of the specific antecedent-focused and response-focused emotion regulation strategies, as well as examples of Grandey’s (2000) corresponding emotional labor strategies that apply Gross’s (1998) strategies to those that employees use in the workplace.

In particular, Gross’s (1998) antecedent-focused emotion regulation strategies (i.e., situation selection, situation modification, attention deployment, cognitive change) correspond to Grandey’s (2000) deep acting strategies (i.e., management of feelings and occurs when employees change their internal feelings to experience the emotions required of them), because they involve the modification of internal thoughts and feelings so emotional expressions are received by customers as sincere (Grandey, 2000). Conversely, Gross’s (1998) response-focused emotion regulation strategy (i.e., response modulation) aligns with Grandey’s (2000) surface acting strategy (i.e., management of observable emotions and operates when employees suppress true emotions and express fake emotions), because it involves altering an emotional expression through the suppression of true feelings and the fake expression of appropriate emotions. Overall, employees engage in deep acting techniques when employees regulate emotions by
altering the situation or perceptions of the situation, whereas employees use surface acting techniques when regulating emotions in response to a situation.

Overall, Gross’s (1998) theory of emotion regulation refers to the ways in which individuals control their emotional expressions to align with informal emotional display rules of any social situation, while emotional labor refers to the ways in which employees regulate their emotions at work to align with the organization’s emotional display rules. These rules refer to the expectations for employees’ emotional expressions at work, which may be stated formally or informally by the organization. Furthermore, many organizations’ display rules focus on employees’ emotional expressions shown to the public, such as customer service employees who are encouraged to smile while interacting with customers. As a result, emotional expressions displayed in congruence with organizational display rules result in more effective workplace interactions (Grandey, 2000). Altogether, Gross’s (1998) emotion regulation theory is a guiding framework for Grandey’s (2000) model of emotional labor, which applies the emotion regulation processes to organizational settings.

**Emotional labor definitions and perspectives.** Emotional labor was originally identified and described by Hochschild (1983) as “the management of feeling to create a publicly observable facial and bodily display” (p. 7) and involves the enhancing, faking, or suppressing of emotions to modify one’s emotional expression in response and compliance with organizational emotional display rules (Grandey, 2000). In addition to Hochschild’s (1983) perspective on emotional labor, Ashforth and Humphrey (1993) and Morris and Feldman (1996) also defined emotional labor with slightly differing perspectives, as shown in Table 2. Collectively, each of these perspectives stems from the belief that emotional labor processes enable employees to regulate their emotional expressions at work to achieve organizational goals, such as successful
interactions with customers. However, Table 2 highlights the differences among these definitions and perspectives, including whether the emotional labor process is considered effortful and the outcomes of emotional labor.

In particular, Hochschild (1983) originally conceptualized emotional labor as a performance between the employee and customer, in which the customer is the audience and employee plays the actor. The performance involves employees managing their emotional expressions using various “expressive devices” to meet organizational goals. An employee’s performance could be destroyed if unacceptable emotions are expressed during an interaction with a customer, such as anger instead of friendliness. Additionally, Hochschild (1983) emphasized that employees manage their emotions in two ways: surface and deep acting. Specifically, surface acting involves the suppression of true emotions and expression of fake emotions, while deep acting involves the modification of emotions to those emotions that are required.

While the main emphasis of Hochschild’s (1983) perspective of emotional labor is that the management of emotions is effortful, due to organizations having the power to control employees’ emotions by creating and enforcing organizational emotional display rules for employees to abide by, Ashforth and Humphrey (1993) propose the automaticity of emotional labor processes. Thus, Ashforth and Humphrey (1993) focus on the automatic nature of emotional labor benefiting performance when employees display sincere emotion expressions to customers. In contrast to performance outcomes, both Hochschild’s (1983) and Morris and Feldman’s (1996) perspectives focuses on emotional labor’s negative influence employees’ health and well-being outcomes. Even though each of these perspectives slightly differs in their conceptualizations of emotional labor, altogether they similarly highlight employees’ abilities to
regulate their emotional expressions to meet organizational display rules and achieve organizational goals. Due to the current study’s focus on emotional labor’s impact on work-to-family conflict, which may be conceptualized as a well-being outcome, we will focus on Hochschild’s (1983) and Morris and Feldman’s (1996) perspectives for theoretical support for the emotional labor-work-family conflict relationship.
## Table 1.

**Emotion Regulation and Emotional Labor Strategies**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Strategy</th>
<th>Emotion Regulation</th>
<th>Emotional Labor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Situation Selection</strong> Approaching or avoiding particular people, places, or objects based on self-knowledge of the situations’ features and emotional meaning</td>
<td>Employees’ selection of their jobs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Situation Modification</strong> Actively modifying the situation to change its emotional impact</td>
<td>Employees’ modification of the situation, such as choosing not to interact with a particular customer, such as a restaurant server leaving the dining room when a customer enters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Antecedent-</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Attention Deployment</strong> a) Distraction, in which attention shifts to non-emotional parts of the situation, b) concentration, in which attention is focused on emotional parts of the situation, or c) rumination, in which attention is focused on emotions and their consequences</td>
<td>An aspiring singer working as a restaurant server may continually hum music while working, because focusing on an enjoyable activity helps her maintain a positive mood while interacting with customers (Grandey, 2000)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Focused/Deep Acting</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Cognitive Change</strong> Altering cognitive perceptions of the situation so its emotional impact is reduced</td>
<td>Flight attendants who were trained to cognitively change their perceptions of rude passengers and perceive them as children so they would not become angry with rude passengers’ behaviors (Hochschild, 1983)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Response Modification</strong> Directly influencing physiological, experiential, or behavioral responding, examples include exercise, biofeedback, or relaxation techniques to decrease negative emotions</td>
<td>An employee may suppress his/her true feelings of being angry with a rude customer by instead smiling and being polite towards the customer (Grandey, 2000)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 2

**Emotional Labor Perspectives**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Perspective</th>
<th>Definition</th>
<th>Effort Requirement</th>
<th>Outcomes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hochschild (1983)</td>
<td>“The management of feeling to create a publicly observable facial and bodily display” (p. 7) and involves the enhancing, faking, or suppressing of emotions to modify one’s emotional expression in response and compliance with organizational emotional display rules. Involves surface and deep acting.</td>
<td>Both surface and deep acting require effort</td>
<td>Related to job burnout and job stress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ashforth and Humphrey (1993)</td>
<td>The process of displaying appropriate emotions that align with the organization’s display rules through the alteration of observable behaviors and emotional displays.</td>
<td>Does not always require effort, therefore it can become an effortless and automatic process for employees</td>
<td>Positively related to employee performance, as long as customers perceive employees’ emotional expressions to be sincere during employee-customer interactions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morris and Feldman (1996)</td>
<td>“The effort, planning, and control needed to express organizationally desired emotion during interpersonal transactions” (p.987). Consisting of four dimensions: a) frequency of employees’ interactions with customers, b) attentiveness (i.e., intensity of emotions and length of interactions), c) variety of emotions required by employees, and d) emotional dissonance (i.e., discrepancy between true feelings felt by employees and their expressed emotions)</td>
<td>Described as an employee’s state of being, rather than an effortful process</td>
<td>Related to job dissatisfaction and emotional exhaustion</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Antecedents of emotional labor. In addition to examining employees’ use of emotional labor techniques, research has examined the antecedents and consequences of these techniques. Grandey’s (2000) model of emotional labor describes the situational cues that precede the emotional labor process, the individual and organizational outcomes of emotional labor, and the individual and organizational factors that influence this process. To begin, employees may be cued to engage in emotional labor techniques from their expectations for customer interactions and/or emotional events occurring in the workplace. Customer interaction expectations may differ for employees based on the job. Specifically, these expectations include the frequency of employees’ interactions with customers, the duration of customer interactions, and the variety of emotional expressions utilized during customer interactions. Employees’ customer interaction expectations arise from and are controlled by the organization’s emotional display rules, which employees perceive differently depending on the extent to which they believe certain emotional expressions are part of the job. For example, if a car salesperson believes friendliness towards customers is a top job characteristic and is expected by the organization, he/she may be more likely to engage in emotional labor to meet those expectations. Therefore, the more employees perceive that the organization expects certain emotional expressions, the more they will manage their emotions through emotional labor (Grandey, 2000).

Workplace emotional events are also proposed to increase or decrease employees’ engagement in emotional labor (Grandey, 2000). Specifically, emotional labor may increase when a negative emotional event occurs that causes an employee’s emotions to be discrepant from the organization’s display rules. For example, an organization may expect their employees to interact with customers by being friendly and positive. However, if an employee finds out that a family member is terminally ill, then that employee may have to engage in more emotional
labor to maintain an appropriate positive mood while working. But if another employee finds out she is receiving a raise, which creates a positive emotion, then less emotional labor may be needed, because it helps the employee meet the organization’s display rule of maintaining a positive mood with customers. Thus, emotional events within the workplace and organizational emotional display rules both contribute to employees’ engagement in emotional labor (Grandey, 2000).

**Outcomes of emotional labor.**

*Individual outcomes.* Even though several research studies have examined the antecedents of emotional labor, the individual and organizational outcomes of emotional labor have comprised much of the emotional labor research. In accordance with Hochschild’s (1983) beliefs, Grandey (2000) proposed burnout and job satisfaction as its individual well-being outcomes and customer service performance and withdrawal behaviors as organizational well-being outcomes. Burnout is a stress response to chronic emotional and interpersonal stressors on the job characterized by emotional exhaustion, cynicism (depersonalization), and reduced personal accomplishment (Maslach, Schaufeli, & Leiter, 2001). Several studies have examined the relationship between emotional labor and burnout with results indicating that employees’ continual emotion regulation leads to emotional exhaustion (Brotheridge & Lee, 2002; Morris & Feldman, 1997). Furthermore, Grandey (2000) proposed that continual emotional labor can lead to employees detaching themselves from their customers by depersonalizing, as a ways of coping with their emotional exhaustion.

In support of this proposition, Hülsheger and Schewe’s (2011) recent meta-analysis found surface acting to have a strong positive relationship with emotional exhaustion, depersonalization, psychological strain, and psychosomatic health complaints, whereas deep
acting only had a small positive relationship with psychosomatic health complaints. These results indicate that both surface and deep acting are related to negative individual well-being outcomes; however surface acting is related to many more negative outcomes. Hülsheger and Schewe (2011) posit that surface acting is more detrimental to employees’ well-being because it depletes employees’ mental resources through the suppression of negative emotions and expression fake emotions. As a result, negative emotions persist and mental resources are not readily recovered, leading to emotional exhaustion and other negative outcomes. Conversely, deep acting is believed to be less detrimental to employees because it modifies employees’ internal emotions and turns a negative emotion into a positive emotion. Therefore employees experience positive emotions that can increase current positive affect and build up long-term mental resources and coping mechanisms (Hülsheger & Schewe, 2011).

Job satisfaction, defined as the extent to which employees evaluate their job in a positive or negative way (Weiss, 2000), has also been supported as an outcome of emotional labor. Grandey’s (2000) emotional labor model proposes two opposing views on emotional labor’s impact on job satisfaction. One view suggests that employees’ requirement to be friendly and positive towards customers can lead employees to enjoy the job more (i.e., increased job satisfaction), whereas the opposing view suggests that emotional labor restricts personal expressions and makes the job unpleasant (i.e., decreased job satisfaction). As with these differing views, research on the relationship between emotional labor and job satisfaction have been contradictory. Hülsheger and Schewe (2011) found surface acting was negatively related to job satisfaction, while Adelmann (1995) found deep acting to be positively related to job satisfaction. However, according to Hochschild’s (1983) perspective, deep acting should also be
negatively related to job satisfaction, because managing emotions in any way is unpleasant for individuals.

*Organizational outcomes.* Customer service performance and withdrawal behaviors were proposed as the two main organizational outcomes of emotional labor (Grandey, 2000). Specifically, employees’ management of emotions impacts organizational performance, because expressing appropriate emotions during customer interactions can lead to customer loyalty and repeat business. However, Grandey (2000) calls attention to surface and deep acting’s differing relationships with different types of performance. In particular, surface acting may be perceived by customers as “inauthentic” and as a result may negatively impact customer service. Furthermore, it depletes employees’ mental resources, which may decrease overall task performance. In contrast, deep acting is posited to enhance task and customer service performance because it involves “authentic” emotional expressions, which can lead to positive employee-customer interactions. Empirical support for Grandey’s (2000) propositions have been inconsistent, however recent research has found surface acting to be negatively related to task performance, emotional performance, and customer satisfaction, while deep acting is positively related to emotional performance and customer satisfaction (Hülsheger & Schewe, 2011).

In addition to performance, emotional labor is believed to be related to employee withdrawal behaviors. These behaviors include employees leaving the work floor during their shifts, absenteeism, and turnover. They result from employees experiencing emotional exhaustion, due to continually regulating emotions, and provide employees with ways to cope with their emotions. However, withdrawal behaviors, such as leaving the work floor, are not desirable for customer service jobs, because employees become unavailable to customers. As a
result of these behaviors, the organization’s performance may be negatively impacted and employees may ultimately decide to leave the organization for a different job (Grandey, 2000).

**Individual and organizational influences on emotional labor.** Within Grandey’s (2000) emotional labor model, gender, emotional expressivity, emotional intelligence, self-monitoring, and affectivity are proposed as individual influences, while job autonomy and supervisor and coworker support are proposed as organizational influences on emotional labor. Each of these individual and organizational factors are proposed to influence emotional labor and its individual and organizational effects. For example, individuals high in self-monitoring (i.e., the extent that people monitor their self-presentations and control their expressive behaviors) tend to be more aware of other individuals’ emotional cues in social situations and will modify their emotional expressions to fit the situation (Snyder, 1974). As a result, high self-monitors should be more likely to follow organizational displays rules in jobs where emotional labor is required (Grandey, 2000). The present study will examine other individual factors that influence the relationship between emotional labor and work-family conflict.

**Emotional Labor and the Work-Family Interface**

Due to the surmounting findings that emotional labor, particularly surface acting, negatively impacts individuals and organizations, recent research has examined the role of emotional labor within the work-family interface. This includes emotional labor’s influence on work-family conflict, work-family facilitation, burnout, job satisfaction and life satisfaction (Seery, Corrigall, & Harpel, 2008; Yanchus et al., 2010). Initial empirical support for the relationship between emotional labor and work-family conflict found surface acting to be an antecedent of work-family conflict among health care professionals (Montgomery, Panagopolou, & Benos, 2005). Further research by Montgomery, Panagopolou, deWilt, and Meenks (2006)
found work-family conflict partially mediated the relationship between hiding negative emotions and emotional exhaustion and the relationship between surface acting and psychosomatic complaints.

Further research by Seery et al. (2008) examined emotional labor’s influences on both work-family conflict and facilitation (i.e., “a form of synergy in which resources associated with one role enhance or make easier participation in the other role”, Voydanoff, 2004, p. 399). Their findings revealed surface acting was positively related to time-, strain-, and behavior-based WFC and time- and behavior-based FWC and negatively related to work-to-family facilitation. Additionally, deep acting was not related to work-family conflict or facilitation, providing further support for surface acting’s greater negative impact on work-family conflict, in comparison to deep acting.

Further research by Yanchus et al. (2010), examined the influences of emotional labor strategies at work and home on both work and family outcomes. Specifically, the frequency and variety of emotional interactions influenced surface and deep acting that occurred at work and in the family. Surface acting at work and in the family were positively related to WFC through increased negative affective responses to work and family, while deep acting at work was linked to greater work-to-family enrichment (i.e., the extent to which experiences in one role improve the quality of life in the other role; Greenhaus & Powell, 2006, p. 73) through increased positive affective responses to work. Surface acting at work and in the family was also related to decreased positive affective responses to work and family. Their results further indicated that WFC was negatively related to life satisfaction, while FWC was negatively related to job satisfaction and positively related to burnout. Overall, Yanchus et al.’s (2000) results provide evidence for the existence and impact of emotional labor within both the work and family
domains, with differential impacts existing for surface and deep acting on work and family outcomes.

Altogether, these previously discussed findings support emotional labor’s role as an important antecedent of work-family conflict. In particular, these results indicated surface acting has stronger relationships with negative individual and organizational outcomes than deep acting. Recent research has proposed possible moderators of this relationship, due to the significant impact of emotional labor on work-family conflict. However, research has been limited by only proposing gender, affectivity, emotional expressivity, extraversion, supervisor support, and coworker support as moderators of the relationships between emotional labor and individual and organizational outcomes (Chi, Grandey, Diamond, & Krimmel, 2011; Grandey, 2000), which neglects the relationship between emotional labor and work-family conflict.

**Moderators of the emotional labor–work-family conflict relationship.** One of the only studied moderators of this relationship is emotional intelligence (Yanchus et al., 2010). Emotional intelligence refers to “the capacity to process emotional information relevant to the recognition, construction, and regulation of emotion in oneself and others” (Mayer & Salovey, 1995, p. 197). Specifically, Yanchus et al. (2010) assessed perceived emotional intelligence as an individual’s ability to repair his/her mood, due to its similarity to emotion regulation and ability to work with deep acting to moderate an individual’s affective responses to work and family. Accordingly, these results found emotional intelligence only moderated the relationship between deep acting at work and negative affective responses at work; its role within surface acting was not examined. As a result, individuals high on emotional intelligence experienced less negative affective responses when deep acting than those low on emotional intelligence. On the contrary, Johnson and Spector (2007) found that emotional intelligence was not a significant
moderator of the relationships between emotional labor (i.e., surface and deep acting) and outcomes including emotional exhaustion, affective well-being, and job satisfaction. Within this research, emotional intelligence was assessed as an individual’s ability to identify and regulate emotions in the self and others. These inconsistent findings on emotional intelligence as a moderator of emotional labor relationships may be due to these study’s different conceptualizations and operationalizations of emotional intelligence. Yanchus et al. (2010) assessed emotional intelligence as trait mood repair, while Johnson and Spector (2007) assessed it as an individual’s ability to effectively identify and regulate emotions.

While the effects of emotional labor strategies on individual and organizational outcomes have been widely demonstrated, the direct influences of emotional labor strategies on work-family conflict and moderators of these relationships are less clear. Therefore the present study provides greater clarity on the impact of emotional labor strategies on WFC by examining work-family integration and psychological detachment as moderators of these relationships. The results from this research will give insights to both employees and organizations on the effective use of work-family integration and psychological detachment in reducing the negative impact of emotional labor strategies on WFC.
CHAPTER 2
PRESENT STUDY AND HYPOTHESES

Emotional Labor and Work-Family Conflict

As previously discussed, emotional labor has been proposed as an antecedent of work-family conflict (Seery et al., 2008; Yanchus et al., 2010). Within this relationship, one key theoretical mechanism linking emotional labor experiences at work to conflict experienced at home is the work-family spillover effect, which is a process that involves work and family effects creating similarities between the domains (Edwards & Rothbard, 2000). Two types of spillover exist, one in which spillover creates similarity between a construct in the work domain and a separate construct in the family domain (e.g., positive association between job and family satisfaction) and another type that describes spillover as experiences transferred intact between domains (e.g., work fatigue experienced at home; Edwards & Rothbard, 2000). For the current study, the latter type of spillover will be the focus because it explains how work experiences may influence family experiences, which aligns with emotional labor’s impact at work on WFC experienced at home.

Spillover can occur at affective, value, skill, and behavioral levels (Edwards & Rothbard, 2000). The present study focuses on affective and behavioral spillover to link emotional labor experiences at work to WFC experiences at home. Affective spillover refers to work-related moods or feelings entering the family domain, or family-related moods transferring to the work domain. Ilies, Wilson, and Wagner (2009) found that for individuals with highly integrated work and family roles, daily job satisfaction (dissatisfaction) positively related to positive (negative) affect at home. Applying these findings to the present study, moods and feelings produced by
engaging in emotional labor strategies at work can continue to influence individuals while they are at home. As a result, to the extent that individuals employing surface acting strategies experience strain and negative affect, this may transfer to their family domain, contributing to WFC. Similarly, behavioral spillover refers to behaviors in one domain that may directly influence behaviors in the other domain (Edwards & Rothbard, 2000). Therefore, the behaviors associated with emotional labor strategies may also be transferred to and employed at home, such that employees may surface or deep act with individuals at home. Consequently, these behaviors may continue to drain personal resources, due to their effortful nature, and may also be incompatible with expected behaviors for the family domain, thus contributing to WFC.

In addition to work-family conflict arising from certain moods, emotions, and behaviors spilling over from work to home domains, work-family conflict can result from a lack of personal resources to cope with the work and family demands. According to self-regulation theory (Baumeister, 1998) individuals’ executive functions are responsible for their behavior. Self-regulatory behaviors include controlled processing, active choice, initiating behavior, and overriding responses (Baumeister, Bratslavzky, Muraven, & Tice, 1998). Drawing from self-regulation theory, the ego depletion model (Baumeister et al., 1998) posits that any self-regulatory behavior draws on a limited supply of personal resources (e.g., attention, energy). Therefore, ego depletion refers to the expenditure of self-regulatory resources (Baumeister et al., 1998) and when resources are depleted, subsequent behaviors and functioning are impaired. In line with the ego depletion model (Baumeister et al., 1998), resources can be lost due to work and family demands and the effort given to meet those demands, which results in stress (Brotheridge & Lee, 2002). This loss of resources is known as resource drain and is defined as, “the transfer of finite personal resources, such as time, attention, and energy, from one domain to
another” (Edward & Rothbard, 2000, p. 181). When resources are lost and not readily recovered, individuals experience stress and may fail to balance their competing demands of work and family roles. Thus, resource drain can lead to a negative relationship between work and family resources, due to the resources used in one domain that are then unavailable for use in the other domain.

Several different types of work and family demands can cause a loss of resources, including emotional labor strategies used by employees. Due to the effortful nature of emotional regulatory processes, both surface and deep acting contribute to resource drain (Hochschild, 1983), which aligns with the ego depletion model (Baumeister, Bratslavzky, Muraven, & Tice, 1998). Specifically, the ego depletion model posits that intentional self-control and regulatory processes are effortful and deplete mental resources. During surface acting, employees must constantly monitor their felt and desired emotions, to ensure they are effectively suppressing their felt emotions and expressing the expected fake emotions. Through this regulatory process, large amounts of effort are expended and many resources are drained, without the opportunity to be recovered. In a similar, yet distinct way, deep acting also requires effort as felt emotions are altered to meet the expected emotion for the situation. In particular, reappraisal processes that employees engage in during deep acting diminish personal resources, however deep acting provides an opportunity for resources to be recovered when negative emotions are converted to positive emotions. Thus, surface and deep acting both drain resources, just to different degrees. Furthermore, surface acting requires more resources when it is used compared to deep acting, because increased effort is required to suppress emotions than to reappraise emotions (Goldberg & Grandey, 2007).
Several empirical findings consistently indicate that surface acting is positively related to work-family conflict (Montgomery et al., 2005, Seery, et al., 2008; Yanchus et al., 2010). These previous findings indicate that surface acting may lead to higher levels of work-family conflict than deep acting because it requires more effort, drains more resources, and does not allow for resources to be recovered. Therefore, as individuals engage in more surface acting strategies than deep acting strategies at work, they will have fewer resources available to them to deal with family demands, contributing to increased conflict between work and family domains. Overall, I hypothesize the following:

\[ H1 \) Surface acting at work will be positively related to: a) time-based; b) strain-based; and c) behavior-based work-to-family conflict.\)

Similar to surface acting, deep acting drains resources in order to alter emotions. However, the extent to which resources are drained and subsequently recovered is more complex for deep acting. In particular, some scholars have noted that deep acting may involve both resource-draining and resource-gaining processes (e.g., Martínez-Iñigo, Totterdell, Alcover, & Holman, 2007). While the attentional deployment, emotion appraisal, and emotion modification processes involved in deep acting require effort and deplete personal resources, the promotion of self-authenticity, creation of positive interactions with customers, and transformation of negative to positive emotions can restore personal resources (Martínez-Iñigo et al., 2007). Therefore these opposing processes may equalize each other and not provide a net loss or gain in resources. This may explain why some studies find no significant relationship between deep acting and work-family conflict (e.g., Montgomery et al., 2006; Seery et al., 2008). However, other evidence points to a positive relationship between deep acting and work-family conflict (Karim & Weisz,
Thus, the exact resource draining or gaining processes involved within deep acting and subsequent outcomes remains unclear.

Although inconsistent findings exist for the relationship between deep acting and work-family conflict, the present paper draws from the theoretical framework and support provided by the ego depletion model, (Baumeister et al., 1998), which suggests that regulatory processes involved in deep acting are effortful and deplete personal resources. In line with this theorizing, meta-analytic results indicate deep acting is positively related to emotional exhaustion and psychosomatic complaints (Hülsheger & Schewe, 2011). However, it is important to address the present study’s focus on the resource-draining nature of deep acting, rather than resource-gaining nature. In particular, past scholars have suggested that deep acting restores resources when individuals experience positive interactions with customers and transform emotions from negative to positive (Hülsheger & Schewe, 2011). While this is certainly plausible, the present study does not examine deep acting solely within customer service interactions or the specific transformation of a negative emotion to a positive emotion. Rather, the present study examines deep acting among all employee interactions, which may not elicit the same positive experience as customer interactions. Furthermore, this study examines the general modification of emotions, including negative to positive or positive to negative, therefore resources may not be gained in all instances (e.g., when positive emotions are turned to negative emotions).

Due to the focus on the general modification of emotions among all employee interactions, I expect that the resource-draining nature of deep acting will be a prominent process in the present study, rather than the resource-gaining process. From this theorizing, deep acting is an effortful process that drains personal resources that are needed for the fulfillment of work and family demands. Consequently, as individuals engage in more deep acting strategies at work,
they will have fewer resources available to fulfill family demands, resulting in greater WFC.

Therefore, I hypothesize the following.

_H2) Deep acting at work will be positively related to: a) time-based; b) strain-based; and c) behavior-based work-to-family conflict._

As previously discussed, both surface and deep acting drain personal resources through the suppression of true emotions and the expression of fake emotions or the modification of emotions. However, the resource-draining nature of these emotional labor strategies differs, with surface acting draining more resources through the substantial expenditure of effort in suppressing true emotions and expressing fake emotions, while deep acting expends less effort in reappraising and modifying emotions (Hülsheger & Schewe, 2011). Because surface acting drains more resources compared to deep acting, this will leave individuals with fewer resources to fulfill family responsibilities, contributing to greater WFC, compared with deep acting. Accordingly, I hypothesize the following:

_H3) Surface acting at work will have a stronger positive relationship with: a) time-based; b) strain-based; and c) behavior-based work-to-family conflict than deep acting at work._

**Moderating Relationships**

Beyond examining the direct influences that surface and deep acting may have on WFC, the present contributes to the literature by examining moderating variables that may buffer the negative impacts of emotional labor on WFC. Prior research has only identified emotional intelligence as a moderator of this relationship (Yanchus et al., 2010). However, it is imperative to further examine how employees may avoid emotional labor’s negative impact on WFC, given that emotional labor is important for all employees (Mesmer-Magnus et al., 2012) and that WFC
contributes to negative individual and organizational outcomes (Mesmer-Magnus & Viswesvaran, 2005). The present study is the first study to examine work-family integration and psychological detachment from work as moderators of the relationship between emotional labor and all forms of WFC (i.e., time-, strain-, and behavior-based).

**Work-family integration.** Work-family integration refers to the extent to which individuals segment or blend their work and family roles, including the influence of work experiences while at home and vice versa (Ashforth et al., 2000). Individuals manage the integration of their work and family roles by managing the borders or boundaries that surround these separate roles. Clark’s (2000) work-family border theory posits that individuals’ work and family domains are separate, but also interconnected and therefore influence each other. Along similar lines, Ashforth et al.’s (2000) boundary theory describes physical, temporal, emotional, cognitive, and/or relational limits that define domains as separate from one another. Both of these theories describe ways in which individuals integrate or segment their different roles; however work-family border theory comes from work-family literature, while work-family boundary theory comes from a cognitive theory of classification. For simplicity, the present study will refer to the borders or boundaries only as boundaries.

Altogether, these theories posit that individuals create boundaries between their work and family domains, to achieve balance between the two. These boundaries take three main forms, physical (e.g., walls of a workplace or home), temporal (e.g., set work hours), and psychological (e.g., work-related thoughts while at work; Clark, 2000). Additionally, the boundaries between work and family domains may differ in their permeability and flexibility. Permeability is the degree to which elements from one domain may enter into another domain, such as an individual who is physically located in one role’s domain, but psychologically and/or behaviorally involved
in another role. An example of an individual with a highly permeable work role boundary is an individual who is able to accept personal phone calls while at work and effectively complete work tasks. Conversely, flexibility is the extent to which a boundary may contract or expand, depending on the demands of one domain or the other. For example, an individual who works in any location he/she chooses (e.g., at home or at work), has a very flexible physical work boundary.

In addition to differing on the permeability and flexibility of their work and family domains, individuals also differ on their segmentation or integration of these domains. Segmentation and integration occur through the “thickness” (segmentation) or “thinness” (integration) of the boundaries around the roles and domains, and individuals alter the thickness or thinness according to their boundary style or preference. Individuals who prefer to segment or separate their work and family roles have thick boundaries surrounding these domains. As a result, these individuals do not allow their work role experiences to influence their family role experiences and vice versa. On the contrary, individuals who prefer to integrate their work and family roles have thin boundaries surrounding these domains. Therefore, work role experiences are allowed to influence family role experiences and vice versa (Ashforth et al., 2000).

Even though individuals control the segmentation or integration of their work and family roles, there are costs and benefits for each of these boundary preferences. One cost of segmentation is that role transitions between domains may be difficult, such as an individual at work experiencing family demands and having trouble disconnecting from family and transitioning back to the work role. However, an obvious benefit of segmentation is the reduction of integration between work and family roles. For example, a highly segmented individual at work may be less distracted by family thoughts and demands, and therefore may be more
productive at work. Conversely, integration of work and family domains can be beneficial because it eases the transitions between domains. Therefore, individuals can easily transfer from work to family roles without difficulty, such as a woman who leaves work to pick up her children from school and easily transitions to her role as a mother. However this integration between work and family domains can also be costly, because highly integrated individuals may take work home to finish or they may take time for personal issues while at work. As a result, conflict at work and/or home may arise from work and family duties interfering which each other (Ashforth et al., 2000).

In addition to possessing an overall preference for either segmentation or integration of their work and family domains, individuals may have different boundary preferences for each domain (Ashforth et al., 2000; Kossek, Ruderman, Braddy, & Hannum, 2012). For instance, an individual may prefer to integrate work-to-family roles (e.g., takes work home to complete), but may prefer to segment family-to-work roles (e.g., will not take personal calls at work) and vice versa. To carry out these boundary preferences, individuals take actions to enforce these boundaries and to achieve congruence between their preferences and actions. Kreiner, Hollensbe, and Sheep (2009) identified several types of boundary actions or tactics individuals utilize to achieve boundary congruence including behavioral, temporal, physical, and temporal tactics. In addition to these individual tactics, organizations provide policies and resources (e.g., onsite childcare and flextime) to employees so they may maintain their boundary preferences. As a result, individuals experienced greater job satisfaction and organizational commitment and less time-based and strain-based WFC (Chen, Powell, & Greenhaus, 2009; Rothbard, Phillips, & Dumas, 2005).
Altogether, individuals’ work-family segmentation and integration preferences influence work and individual outcomes in positive and negative ways. These preferences may influence the relationship between emotional labor and WFC. Individuals with highly integrated work and family roles may be more strongly influenced by work experiences while at home than those with more segmented work and family roles. As a result, individuals with highly integrated work and family roles may experience greater WFC from emotional labor strategies performed at work than individuals with more segmented work and family roles. Individuals with highly integrated work and family roles who also perform surface and/or deep acting at work, will be more likely to take their work experiences home (e.g., strain). Drawing from resource drain theory (Edward & Rothbard, 2000), in which individuals’ personal resources are depleted in one domain and are not readily recovered for use in another domain, emotional labor strategies (i.e., surface and deep acting) performed at work drain individuals’ personal resources that are needed to fulfill family duties. Without sufficient resources, individuals will experience greater WFC. However, individuals with more segmented work and family roles who also engage in surface and/or deep acting at work may be less likely to experience WFC than high integrators because they are less likely to allow their work experiences (e.g., surface and/or deep acting experiences) to influence them at home. Therefore, I hypothesize:

**H4)** The relationship between surface acting at work and: a) time-based; b) strain-based; and c) behavior-based work-to-family conflict will be moderated by work-family integration, such that the positive relationship between surface acting and the different types of work-to-family conflict will be stronger for individuals with high work-family integration.
The relationship between deep acting at work and: a) time-based; b) strain-based; and c) behavior-based work-to-family conflict will be moderated by work-family integration, such that the positive relationship between deep acting and the different types of work-to-family conflict will be stronger for individuals with high work-family integration.

Psychological detachment. Psychological detachment from work refers to individuals being physically (e.g., not checking work-related emails) and mentally (e.g., temporarily choosing to forget about a work task to complete) away from the workplace (Sonnentag & Bayer, 2005). Sonnentag & Fritz (2007) conceptualized psychological detachment as a recovery experience because it allows individuals to mentally disengage from negative work experiences and job stressors that may cause negative affect. When individuals fail to psychological detachment from work, work-related thoughts and stressors will continue to occupy their minds and recovery cannot occur. As a result, stressors from work persist and increased negative activation and fatigue arise (Sonnentag et al., 2008). However, when individuals do psychologically detach from work, recovery of resources occurs that further results in fewer psychological and physiological strain symptoms (Fritz & Sonnentag, 2006).

Sonnentag (2012) highlights four benefits individuals experience when psychologically detaching from work. The first benefit is that employees who psychologically detach from work report higher levels of psychological well-being, including less emotional exhaustion and psychological strain, than employees who do not detach while at home. Secondly, individuals who psychologically detach during off-hours on a daily basis experience more positive affective states than individuals who fail to detach day after day. An additional benefit highlights one example of psychological detachment serving as buffer for negative outcomes. Specifically,
Sonnentag (2012) provides the example of detachment buffering the negative association between workplace bullying and psychological strain (e.g., poor sleep). The final benefit of psychological detachment is its positive relationship with task performance and proactive work behaviors. These benefits underscore the effectiveness psychological detachment for employees, because it has the ability to reduce negative affect and psychological strain, while also increasing positive affective states and task performance.

Recent research has examined the role of psychological detachment within work-family conflict using the theoretical framework of the effort-recovery model (Meijman & Mulder, 1998). This model posits that recovery is needed to stabilize an individual’s system when work tasks that require effort and drain resources are completed. If recovery is not achieved, the individual experiences negative workload effects, such as fatigue. This suggests that when employees engage in surface acting at work, which requires effort and drains resources, recovery is needed to avoid experiencing its negative effects, such as work-family conflict. In line with this model, Moreno-Jiménez, Mayo, Sanz-Vergel, Geurts, Rodríguez-Muñoz, and Garrosa (2009) found psychological detachment from work moderated the relationship between WFC and psychological strain and the relationship between FWC and life satisfaction.

The effort-recovery model and previous findings both suggest that when individuals engage in surface and/or deep acting at work, resources are drained. For surface acting, resources are drained and not readily recovered due to the effort required in the suppression of emotions, while resources are also drained during the reappraisal process of deep acting but there is an opportunity for recovery when negative emotions are changed to positive emotions (Hülsheger & Schewe, 2011). However, even with deep acting’s opportunity to recover resources, substantial recovery may not occur, as evidenced by previous research that has found deep acting to be
related to increased emotional exhaustion and greater psychosomatic complaints (Hülsheger & Schewe, 2011). Collectively, when individuals engage in surface and/or deep acting at work and psychologically detach from work while at home, they will be less likely to experience WFC because the detachment will help recover their lost resources, so they can deal with their family demands. Therefore, I hypothesize the following:

*H6* The relationship between surface acting at work and: a) time-based; b) strain-based; and c) behavior-based work-to-family conflict will be moderated by psychological detachment from work, such that the positive relationship between surface acting and the different types of work-to-family conflict will be stronger for individuals who engage in less psychological detachment while at home.

*H7* The relationship between deep acting at work and a) time-based; b) strain-based; and c) behavior-based work-to-family conflict will be moderated by psychological detachment from work, such that the positive relationship between deep acting and the different types of work-to-family conflict will be stronger for individuals who engage in less psychological detachment while at home.
Figure 1. Proposed conceptual model
CHAPTER 3

METHOD

Participants and Procedure

Data were collected from 316 U.S. full-time employees (i.e., worked 35 hours or more per week) recruited from Amazon’s Mechanical Turk (Mturk). To participate, individuals accepted the Human Intelligence Task (HIT) via Amazon’s Mturk and received a link to the screening survey and survey one via Qualtrics, an online survey program. Individuals meeting the eligibility criteria (i.e., full-time status; U.S. residence) from the screening survey then completed survey one, which contained measures of emotional labor and demographic information (N = 556). To separate the measurement of the predictor variables from the outcome variables, participants who completed survey one were emailed a link to survey two, two weeks following the completion of survey one with one reminder email one week later. In survey two, participants completed measures of work-family integration, work-family conflict, and psychological detachment. Participants received $0.50 for their participation in survey one and an additional $0.50 for participation in survey two. Three hundred-twenty two participants completed survey two, yielding a response rate of 58%. After eliminating four cases of duplicate responses from participants and two cases in which participants failed both of the two random response check items, the final sample was 316.

Participant’s average age was 35.4 (SD = 10.3); 61% were women, and a majority of the sample were married or in an exclusive relationship (75%) and parents (52%). Most of the participants were Caucasian (76%), followed by African-American (7%), Asian (7%), Hispanic (5%), and other (5%). On average, participants worked 42.8 (SD = 7.0) hours per week. An
examination participants job titles and descriptions revealed that the sample held a variety of jobs dealing with, for example, accounting, administration or management, healthcare, education, customer service, software and technology, finance, and human services.

Measures

**Emotional labor.** Emotional labor was measured using Brotheridge and Lee’s (2003) Emotional Labor Scale. Items were measured on a scale ranging from 1 = never to 5 = always, with higher scores corresponding to greater emotional labor. Participants’ surface acting at work was measured with three items (e.g., “Pretend to have emotions that I don’t really feel”), while participants’ deep acting at work was measured with three items (e.g., “Try to actually experience the emotions that I must show”). The internal consistencies for the subscales were .83 for surface acting and .91 for deep acting. All scales can be found in Appendix A.

**Work-to-family conflict.** Participants’ WFC was assessed using Carlson, Kacmar, and Williams’s (2000) Work-Family Conflict Scale. Items were measured on a scale ranging from 1 = strongly disagree to 5 = strongly agree, with higher scores reflecting more WFC. This scale assesses time-based (e.g., “My work keeps me from my family activities more than I would like”), strain-based (e.g., “I am often so emotionally drained when I get home from work that it prevents me from contributing to my family”), and behavior-based (e.g., “The behaviors I perform that make me effective at work do not help me to be a better parent and spouse”) WFC. Internal consistencies for the time-based, strain-based, and behavior-based subscales were .88, .90, and .82, respectively.

**Work-Family integration.** Work-family integration was measured in through Desrochers, Hilton, and Larwood’s (2005) Work-Family Role Integration-Blurring Scale. Participants responded to the items using the following scale, 1 = strongly disagree to 5 =
strongly agree, therefore higher scores were associated with more integrated work and family roles. The scale consists of three items, which assessed participants’ preferences for either integration or segmentation between work and family roles (e.g., “It is often difficult to tell where my work life ends and family life begins”). Internal consistency for this scale was .77.

**Psychological detachment.** Psychological detachment from work was measured using a slightly-modified version of the Recovery Experience Questionnaire (Sonnentag & Fritz, 2007). Participants responded to the items using a scale ranging from 1 = strongly disagree to 5 = strongly agree, with higher scores indicating greater psychological detachment from work. Four items measured participants’ psychological detachment from work during their time away from work (e.g., “While away from work, I forget about work”). Internal consistency for this scale was .92.
CHAPTER 4
DATA ANALYSIS

Descriptive statistics including variable means, standard deviations, intercorrelations and coefficient alphas are reported in Table 3. Hierarchical moderated regression analyses (Cohen, Cohen, West, & Aiken, 2003) were performed in IBM SPSS Statistics software version 21.0. (IBM Corps, 2012). Supplemental relative weights analyses (Johnson, 2000) were performed in R, an open source statistical program (R Core Team, 2014) to test the hypothesized relationships (see Figure 1). At the bivariate level, our results support the use of relative weights analysis for surface and deep acing ($r = .26$), which examines the partitioning of variance for correlated predictor variables. Next, the latent factor structure of work-family integration and psychological detachment is discussed followed by the discussion of the tests of the hypothesized relationships.

Confirmatory Factor Analyses

Due to past research that has indicated a moderate positive relationship between work-family integration and psychological detachment from work (Park, Frtiz, & Jex, 2011), one-factor and two-factor confirmatory factor models were estimated to determine the distinctiveness of these constructs. The confirmatory factor analyses were conducted using LISREL 8.8 software (Jöreskog & Sörbom, 2006). First, a one-factor model was estimated, in which all seven item-level indicators of work-family integration and psychological detachment were set to load onto a general separation of work and family roles factor, which did not provide a good fit to the data ($\chi^2[14] = 277.19$, Root Mean Square Error of Approximation (RMSEA) = 0.25, Comparative Fit Index (CFI) = .84, Non-Normed Fit Index (NNFI) = 0.76, Standardized Root Mean Square Residual (SRMR) = 0.47). Next, a two-factor model was estimated, which specified a work-
family integration factor and psychological detachment factor, which provided a good fit to the data ($\chi^2[13] = 49.46$, RMSEA = 0.10, CFI = .98, NNFI = 0.97, SRMR = 0.04). Upon examining the fit indices according to Hu and Bentler’s (1999) recommendations for well-fitting models (i.e., values of .95 or greater for CFI, .06 or less for RMSEA, and .08 or less for SRMR), the two-factor model provided a better fit to the data than the one-factor model, which is further supported by the 90% confidence intervals for RMSEA not overlapping for the one-factor model [0.22; 0.27] and two-factor model [0.07; 0.12] and the statistically significant difference between the two models $\Delta \chi^2 (1, N = 308) = 227.73, p < .001$. The estimates of the fit indices for each of the models can be found in Table 4. These results provide support for work-family integration and psychological detachment as two distinct constructs.

**Hierarchical Moderated Regression Analyses**

Before conducting the hierarchical moderated regression analyses, the predictor and moderator variables (i.e., surface acting, deep acting, work-family integration, psychological detachment) were mean-centered to minimize the influence of multicollinearity among the interactions and main effects (Aiken & West, 1991). The resulting standardized regression coefficients are presented in Table 5. In the first step, the control variables – work hours and number of children – were entered. These variables were selected as control variables due to their significant associations with the forms of WFC in the present study (see Table 3), as well as past research (see Eby et al., 2005). At step 2, the main effects of the predictor variables, surface and deep acting were entered. Their addition contributed unique variance for time-based WFC ($\Delta R^2 = .06, p < .001$; total adjusted $R^2 = .12, p < .001$), strain-based WFC ($\Delta R^2 = .14, p < .001$; total adjusted $R^2 = .14, p < .001$), and behavior-based WFC ($\Delta R^2 = .08, p < .001$; total adjusted $R^2 = .08, p < .001$). Coefficients for surface acting were significant for all forms of WFC: time-
based (β = .25, p < .001), strain-based (β = .39, p < .001), and behavior-based (β = .27, p < .001).

These results fully support Hypothesis 1, which proposed a positive relationship between surface acting and all forms of WFC. For deep acting, coefficients were significant for only time-based WFC (β = -.13, p < .05) and behavior-based WFC (β = -.15, p < .05), not for strain-based WFC. However, these results were in the opposite direction than was hypothesized; thus, Hypothesis 3 was not supported.

At step 3, the moderator variables, work-family integration and psychological detachment, were entered. Their addition contributed unique variance for time-based WFC (ΔR² = .09, p < .001; total adjusted R² = .21, p < .001), strain-based WFC (ΔR² = .16, p < .001; total adjusted R² = .30, p < .001), and behavior-based WFC (ΔR² = .03, p < .001; total adjusted R² = .11, p < .001). In step 4, the cross-product terms were entered, which included a set of four interactions. The addition of the interactions only contributed unique variance for behavior-based work-family conflict (ΔR² = .01, p < .001; total adjusted R² = .12, p < .001), but not for time-based and strain-based WFC. Thus, all Hypotheses related to time-based and strain-based WFC (i.e., Hypotheses 4a, 4b, 5a, 5b, 6a, 6b, 7a, and 7b) were not supported. The surface acting X work-family integration interaction was significantly related to behavior-based WFC (β = -.16, p < .05). However, the deep acting X work-family integration, surface acting X psychological detachment, and deep acting X psychological detachment interaction terms were not significantly related to behavior-based WFC, thus hypotheses 5c, 6c, and 7c were not supported.

In accordance with Aiken and West (1991), the significant surface acting X work-family integration interaction was graphed to examine the form of the relationship. Figures 2 presents the plot of the interaction term for behavior-based WFC. Figure 2 indicates a positive relationship between surface acting and behavior-based WFC among employees with low work-
family integration; the simple slope was significantly different from zero ($t = 4.62, p < .001$).

However, the slope of the regression line of employees with higher work-family integration was not significantly different from zero ($t = .61, p = .64$). Because the relationship between surface acting and behavior-based WFC was in the opposite direction than hypothesized, indicating that this relationship was stronger for individuals with lower work-family integration than for those with higher work-family integration, Hypothesis 4c was not supported. Next, relative weights analysis was conducted to examine the relationships between surface and deep acting and the forms of WFC.

**Relative Weights Analyses**

Past research has indicated that multiple regression analyses can inappropriately partition predictor variance when predictors are correlated, thus a type of relative importance analysis, relative weight analysis, was used to appropriately partition the variance among the correlated predictors to provide a better assessment of the variance accounted for in the criterion variables (Tonidandel & LeBreton, 2011). In particular, the relative weights analysis created a new set of orthogonal predictor variables through a transformation approach, to address the correlation among the predictor variables. Then, the criterion variables were regressed onto the new orthogonal predictors, which eliminated multicollinearity among the predictors. The resulting standardized regression coefficients were transformed back to the metric of the original predictors, to provide more accurate estimates of the relative importance of each variable in the prediction of the criterion. Relative weights analysis was conducted to supplement the linear regression hypotheses, because it provides a better understanding of the impact of each predictor variable relative to the other predictor variables in the model. Specifically, relative weights analyses were conducted for the two predictor variables (i.e., surface acting and deep acting) and
three criterion variables (i.e., time-based, strain-based, and behavior-based WFC). Table 6 provides the relative weights (i.e., epsilon coefficients), percentage of predicted variance (i.e., percentage of $R^2$), and results of the confidence interval tests of statistical significance for the epsilon coefficients using bootstrapping procedures, as recommended by Tonidandel, LeBreton, and Johnson (2009).

Hypothesis 2 proposed that surface acting would have a stronger positive relationship with all forms of WFC (i.e., time-based, strain-based, and behavior-based) than deep acting. As shown in Table 6, the results of the relative weights analysis indicate that the greatest amount of explained variance in all forms of WFC was attributable to surface acting and the raw relative weights associated with surface acting were also statistically significant, indicated by the 95% confidence intervals excluding zero. Specifically, surface acting accounted for 77% of the variance in time-based WFC, 98% of the variance in strain-based WFC, and 84% of the variance in behavior-based WFC. These proportions of explained variance in the criteria are the rescaled relative weights, which provide also provide the predictor’s relative importance with regard to the criteria (Johnson, 2004). In contrast to surface acting, deep acting explained minimal variance in time-based WFC (23%), strain-based WFC (2%), and behavior-based WFC (16%) and the raw relative weights associated with deep acting were not statistically significant.

Within Table 5, I provided standardized regression coefficients for surface and deep acting to compare the linear regression analysis and relative weight analysis results. This comparison indicates that there is moderate agreement between these results. In particular, surface acting had higher values for both the standardized regression coefficients and raw relative weights for all the forms of WFC, in comparison to deep acting. However, the standardized regression coefficients associated with deep acting for time-based WFC and
behavior-based WFC were statistically significant, while none of the raw relative weights associated with deep acting were significant for any of the forms of WFC. The discrepancies in these results further underline multiple regressions’ capability to produce inappropriate regression coefficients when the predictors are moderately or highly correlated (Tonidandel & LeBreton, 2011). Thus, the use of relative weight analysis is important for the appropriate estimation of multiple predictors that are intercorrelated. Collectively, these results provide support for Hypothesis 2, as surface acting accounted for a greater proportion of the variance in all forms of WFC than deep acting. Furthermore, it is important to note that the relative weights results only indicate the proportion of variance that surface and deep acting account for in the forms of WFC, not the directions of the effects.
Table 3.

**Variable Means, Standard Deviations, Intercorrelations, and Reliabilities**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Work hours</td>
<td>42.75</td>
<td>6.97</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of children</td>
<td>1.87</td>
<td>1.14</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surface acting</td>
<td>2.99</td>
<td>.85</td>
<td>.002</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.83</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deep acting</td>
<td>2.87</td>
<td>1.03</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>.26**</td>
<td>(.91)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TBWFC</td>
<td>2.86</td>
<td>1.04</td>
<td>.25**</td>
<td>.12**</td>
<td>.21**</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>.88</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SBWFC</td>
<td>2.82</td>
<td>1.06</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.37**</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.52**</td>
<td>.90</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BBWFC</td>
<td>2.77</td>
<td>.94</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.24**</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>.26**</td>
<td>.47**</td>
<td>(.82)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work-family integration</td>
<td>2.40</td>
<td>.91</td>
<td>.26**</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>.36**</td>
<td>.38**</td>
<td>.21**</td>
<td>(.77)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychological detachment</td>
<td>3.54</td>
<td>1.04</td>
<td>-.22**</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>.004</td>
<td>-.27**</td>
<td>-.38**</td>
<td>-.19**</td>
<td>-.49**</td>
<td>(.92)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: N = 308–316. Reliability coefficients appear in parentheses on the diagonal. Number of Children: 0 = no children, 1 = 1 child, 2 = 2 children, 3 = 3 children, 4 = 4 children, 5 = 5 or more children. TBWFC = Time-Based Work-to-Family Conflict. SBWFC = Strain-Based Work-to-Family Conflict. BBWFC = Behavior-Based Work-to-Family Conflict. **p<.01
Table 4.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>$\chi^2$</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>CFI</th>
<th>NNFI</th>
<th>RMSEA</th>
<th>90% C.I. for RMSEA</th>
<th>SRMR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>One-factor model&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>277.19*</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>.84</td>
<td>.76</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>[0.22; 0.27]</td>
<td>.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two-factor model&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>49.46*</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>.98</td>
<td>.97</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>[0.07; 0.12]</td>
<td>.04</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>Note.</sup> CFI = Comparative Fit Index; NNFI = Non-Normed Fit Index; RMSEA = Root Mean Square Error of Approximation; SRMR = Standardized Root Mean Square Residual.

* p < .001

N=308

<sup>a</sup> separation of work and family roles.

<sup>b</sup> work-family integration, psychological detachment.
### Table 5

**Results of Hierarchical Moderated Regression Analyses**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Predictor Variable</th>
<th>Time-Based WFC</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Strain-Based WFC</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Behavior-Based WFC</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Step 1</td>
<td>Step 2</td>
<td>Step 3</td>
<td>Step 4</td>
<td>Step 1</td>
<td>Step 2</td>
<td>Step 3</td>
<td>Step 4</td>
<td>Step 1</td>
<td>Step 2</td>
<td>Step 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 1: Control variables</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work hours</td>
<td>.25***</td>
<td>.24**</td>
<td>.16**</td>
<td>.16**</td>
<td>.10*</td>
<td>.10*</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of children</td>
<td>.09*</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 2: Main effects of predictors</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surface acting</td>
<td>[.25***</td>
<td>.22***</td>
<td>.22***</td>
<td>.39***</td>
<td>.36***</td>
<td>.34***</td>
<td>.27***</td>
<td>.25***</td>
<td>.22***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deep Acting</td>
<td>-.13*</td>
<td>-.12*</td>
<td>-.12*</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>-.15**</td>
<td>-.15**</td>
<td>-.13*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 3: Main effects of moderators</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WFI</td>
<td>.24***</td>
<td>.25***</td>
<td>.25***</td>
<td>.25***</td>
<td>.25***</td>
<td>.13*</td>
<td>.15*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PD</td>
<td>-.11</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>-.23***</td>
<td>-.22***</td>
<td></td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>-.11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 4: Interactions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surface Acting X WFI</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deep Acting X WFI</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surface Acting X PD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deep acting X PD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ΔR²</td>
<td>.06***</td>
<td>.09***</td>
<td>.002</td>
<td>.14***</td>
<td>.16***</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.07***</td>
<td>.03**</td>
<td>.03*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total adjusted R²</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.30</td>
<td>.31</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>12.19***</td>
<td>11.71***</td>
<td>14.19***</td>
<td>8.50***</td>
<td>1.80</td>
<td>13.81***</td>
<td>22.62***</td>
<td>14.46***</td>
<td>2.37</td>
<td>7.34***</td>
<td>7.00***</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. $N = 308$. WFI = Work-Family Integration; PD = Psychological Detachment.

* $p < .05$

** $p < .01$

*** $p < .001$
Figure 2. Interaction of Work-Family Integration Moderator in the Surface Acting – Behavior-based WFC Relationship
Table 6. Results of Relative Weights Analyses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Predictor Variables</th>
<th>Time-Based WFC</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>βj</td>
<td>RW</td>
<td>RW,RS</td>
<td>βj</td>
<td>RW</td>
<td>RW,RS</td>
<td>βj</td>
<td>RW</td>
<td>RW,RS</td>
<td>βj</td>
<td>RW</td>
<td>RW,RS</td>
<td>βj</td>
<td>RW</td>
<td>RW,RS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surface Acting</td>
<td>.25***</td>
<td>0.051*</td>
<td>76.67</td>
<td>0.012</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>.39***</td>
<td>0.145*</td>
<td>97.75</td>
<td>0.071</td>
<td>0.231</td>
<td>.27***</td>
<td>0.064*</td>
<td>84.41</td>
<td>0.019</td>
<td>0.130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deep Acting</td>
<td>-0.13*</td>
<td>0.015</td>
<td>23.33</td>
<td>-0.003</td>
<td>0.061</td>
<td>-0.09</td>
<td>0.003</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>-0.022</td>
<td>0.014</td>
<td>-0.15**</td>
<td>0.012</td>
<td>15.59</td>
<td>-0.005</td>
<td>0.053</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R²</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td></td>
<td>11.71***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>13.81***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.08</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7.34***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N = 308. βj = standardized regression coefficient; RWJ = raw relative weights (epsilons); RW,RS = rescaled relative weight estimates reported as percentage of predicted variance. Significant testing for RWJ is based on 10,000 bootstrap samples.

* p < 0.05
** p < .01
*** p < .001
CHAPTER 5
DISCUSSION

As noted at the outset, the impact of emotional labor on individual and organizational outcomes has been well documented (e.g., Hülsheger & Schewe, 2011). Less attention has been given to emotional labor within the work-family interface. With that in mind, the present study made two primary theoretical contributions. First, by examining the relationships between surface and deep acting and the three forms of WFC within a sample of employees from customer service and non-customer service positions, the present study provides empirical support for both surface and deep acting as antecedents of WFC, regardless of industry. Importantly, the results indicate differential relationships between surface and deep acting and the forms of WFC. Second, by examining work-family integration and psychological detachment as moderators of the relationships between emotional labor strategies and the forms of WFC, the present study is the first to explore the variables that may buffer emotional labor strategies’ negative impact on WFC. Given that the relationships between emotional labor strategies and the forms of WFC remain relatively untested, explaining any significant direct and moderating relationship is critical.

Consistent with the ego depletion model (Baumeister et al., 1998), the present study’s results show a positive relationship between surface acting and all forms of WFC. Thus, as employees engage in more surface acting at work, they also experience greater amounts of WFC. Furthermore, the findings supported surface acting as more detrimental to employees than deep acting, in that surface acting explained greater amounts of variance in all forms of WFC, compared to deep acting. Therefore, in line with past research and theory (Baumeister et al.,
1998; Seery et al., 2008), the results suggest that employees’ engagement in surface acting drained their resources to a greater extent, than deep acting, and inhibited the opportunity to recover the lost resources for use in the family domain, contributing to greater WFC.

In contrast to the established relationship between surface acting and WFC, the present study’s findings are in line with prior research that found mixed support for the relationship between deep acting and WFC (Karim & Weisz, 2011; Montgomery et al., 2006; Seery et al., 2008). Specifically, results from the hierarchical multiple regression analysis indicated a negative relationship between deep acting and time-based and behavior-based WFC, while results from the relative weights analyses indicated nonsignificant relationships between deep acting and the forms of WFC.

Drawing from the ego depletion model (Baumeister et al., 1998), the present study proposed a positive relationship between deep acting and WFC, based on the idea that the cognitive reappraisal process of deep acting requires effort and drains resources, which leads to greater emotional exhaustion and psychosomatic complaints (Hülsheger & Schewe, 2011). However, at the bivariate level, deep acting is not related to time-based ($r = -.09, \text{ns}$), strain-based ($r = .02, \text{ns}$), or behavior-based WFC ($r = -.07, \text{ns}$). The results of the hierarchical moderated regression results reveal negative relationships between deep acting and time-based and behavior-based WFC, which is opposite of the hypothesized positive relationships. Therefore these results suggest that positive outcomes, rather than negative outcomes, may result from employees engaging in deep acting, as evidenced by decreases in time-based and behavior-based WFC. It is unclear why deep acting did not relate to strain-based WFC, however future research should further examine this relationship.
Beyond examining the relationship between surface and deep acting and the three forms of WFC, the present study also examined work-family integration and psychological detachment as moderators that may buffer the negative effects of emotional labor on WFC. In particular, the present study proposed that both surface and deep acting would have the strongest positive impacts on WFC among individuals with highly integrated work and family roles, based on the idea that these individuals would likely take their work experiences (e.g., strain from emotional labor) home with them, while individuals with segmented work and family roles would be less likely to allow work experiences to influence them at home. In contrast to these predictions, the findings indicate a more positive relationship between surface acting and behavior-based WFC for individuals reporting lower levels of work-family integration, but the relationship between surface acting and behavior-based WFC was not significant for individuals reporting higher levels of work-family integration.

Although, these relationships differ from the hypothesized relationships, Ashforth et al.'s (2000) boundary theory offers some theoretical support for a stronger positive relationship between surface acting and behavior-based WFC for individuals with lower work-family integration. In particular, individuals with less integrated work and family roles experience greater difficulty when transitioning from one role to another, such that they may not be able to easily transition from dealing with work demands to fulfilling family demands. The magnitude of the transition from one role to another further impacts performance in the subsequent role, due to substantial transitions requiring greater psychological and physical effort (Ashforth et al., 2000). Therefore, in the context of the present study, individuals with lower work-family integration may have exerted greater effort and depleted more personal resources transitioning from work to family roles, resulting in greater WFC, compared to individuals with higher work-family
integration, whom can more easily transition from role to role. For example, a manager with lower levels of work-family integration may experience greater behavior-based WFC leaving a department meeting to go home and help his children with their homework, because transitioning from the work to family role is difficult. In particular, he may have trouble transitioning to displaying father-oriented behaviors rather than manager-oriented behaviors when helping his children. From these findings, it is also apparent that work-family integration did not moderate the relationships between surface acting and time-based and strain-based WFC, which may be because work-family integration and the ability to transition from the work to family role does not impact the time employees have to fulfill family demands and it may not strain employees above and beyond the strain of surface acting. In line with the prior example, the manager with lower levels of work-family integration may experience difficulty transitioning from the role required at the work meeting to the role of helping his children, however it does not impact the time he has to devote to his family duties and may not strain him more than the surface acting he engaged in at work.

Furthermore, the present study’s results indicate that work-family integration did not moderate the relationships between deep acting and the forms of WFC. As previously noted, mixed findings exist for these relationships, between the multiple regression and relative weights analyses. Although the multiple regression results indicated that deep acting was related to decreased time-based and behavior-based WFC, individuals’ work-family integration may not provide any further substantial benefits of decreasing WFC than deep acting already provided. Which may provide one explanation to work-family integration not moderating the relationships between deep acting and the forms of WFC.
In addition to proposing that individuals’ integration of their work and family roles would influence the relationships between the emotional labor strategies and the forms of WFC, the present study also proposed that individuals’ psychological detachment from work would buffer the negative impact of the emotional labor strategies on WFC. However, contrary to this prediction, psychological detachment did not moderate the relationships between surface or deep acting and the forms of WFC. In line with the ego depletion model (Baumeister et al., 1998) and the effort-recovery model (Meijman & Mulder, 1998), these findings suggest that surface acting may be so detrimental to individuals, through its resource-draining nature, that even the recovery of resources via psychological detachment does not significantly alter the relationships between surface acting and the forms of WFC. Thus, the findings suggest that when individuals detach psychologically from work, they may not recover enough resources to replenish the resources drained during surface acting, leaving individuals with minimal resources to fulfill family responsibilities. Moreover, psychological detachment may not have moderated the deep acting – WFC relationship because detachment does not further decrease WFC above and beyond deep acting.

**Practical Implications**

Collectively, these findings have several practical implications for both employees and organizations. In particular, these results emphasize the importance of managers recognizing the presence and impact of emotional demands (i.e., surface acting) on employees. Therefore, the present study’s results suggest that organizations should offer training programs focusing on effective emotion regulation skills, which should include teaching employees deep acting strategies and educating employees and management teams on the detrimental effects of surface acting on work-family conflict (Grandey, 2003). Organizational programs targeting effective
emotion regulation will not only promote reductions in work-family conflict, but may also increase employees’ perceptions of family organizational support which has been shown to reduce work-family conflict (Allen, 2001). In addition to implementing emotion regulation targeted programs, organizations may find value in programs and policies that focus on employees’ effective management of work and family roles. Offering policies (e.g., flextime, on-site childcare) or training programs (e.g., work-family segmentation and integration strategies) that allow employees to achieve optimal balance between their work and family roles may further reduce employees’ experiences of work-family conflict (Anderson et al., 2002).

**Limitations and Future Research**

As in all research, this study has several limitations. First, all measures within the study were self-report, which provides the opportunity for common method variance. In particular, common method variance may endanger the validity of the inferences that can be draw among the studied variables relationships (Podsakoff, MacKenzie, Lee, & Podsakoff, 2003). However, the differential relationships between surface and deep acting and the forms of WFC and work-family integration moderating the relationship between surface acting and strain-based and behavior-based WFC, provides support for the validity of the study’s relationships. Despite the longitudinal nature of the study, another limitation is that strong causal inferences cannot be drawn from these findings. In particular, work-family integration, psychological detachment, and WFC were assessed simultaneously, which limits the causal inferences that can be drawn regarding the relationships between these variables. However, future research adopting stronger longitudinal designs (e.g., experience sampling methodology) may be able to provide a finer grained examination of the relationships between emotional labor strategies and WFC, as well as draw stronger causal inferences from these relationships.
In the present study deep acting was assessed via a global deep acting measure (Brotheridge & Lee, 2003), which may have lacked the ability to disentangle the various processes involved in deep acting and their subsequent impacts on the forms of WFC. Thus, another limitation of the study is its deep acting measure that may not have adequately assessed the complex relationships between deep acting and the forms of WFC. Instead of employing a global measure of deep acting, future research may benefit from a measure that assesses the unique processes involved in deep acting (e.g., cognitive reappraisal, changes in emotions), as it may provide a better understanding of this construct and its specific relations with different well-being outcomes (e.g., WFC) (Hülsheger & Schewe, 2011).

One final limitation of the present study is the assessment of work-family integration. Within the work-family literature, scholars have identified additional components of individuals’ management of their work and family roles, beyond work-family integration (Bulger, Matthews, Hoffman, 2007; Matthews & Barnes-Farrell, 2010). In particular, flexibility and permeability have been identified as the central components of work-family boundary management (Matthews & Barnes-Farrell, 2010). Permeability is the degree to which individuals allow elements from one domain to enter the other domain (Ashforth, 2000), which aligns closely with the present study’s measure of work-family integration, however the present study did not assess the flexibility component. Flexibility is the degree to which an individual contracts or expands a domain boundary, which can be further conceptualized as an ability to leave one domain for another and as a willingness to integrate or segment domains (Matthews & Barnes-Farrell, 2010). Future research should examine the influence of flexibility-ability and flexibility-willingness on the relationships between emotional labor and the forms of WFC, because the present study was limited to the assessment of work-family integration. This would provide a different assessment
of work-family boundary management through the contraction and expansion of work and family domains, rather than just the transfer of elements from one domain to another, which may impact the relationships between emotional labor strategies and WFC.

Additional recommendations for future research would be to examine the influence of other recovery experiences in the relationships between emotional labor strategies and WFC, beyond the study of psychological detachment. Specifically, past research has linked mastery experiences to greater well-being and life satisfaction while relaxation activities have been linked to decreased health complaints, exhaustion, and sleep problems (Sonnentag & Fritz, 2007). Thus, there may be value in examining the moderating roles of the remaining recovery experiences (i.e., relaxation, mastery experiences, control; Sonnentag & Fritz, 2007) in the relationships between emotional labor strategies and WFC. In particular, these recovery experiences restore resources, similar to psychological detachment, but they restore resources through different mechanisms. For example, relaxation is a process characterized by a state of low activation and increased positive affect (Sonnentag & Fritz), which may have unique impacts on these relationships.

Conclusion

The present study examined the relationships between emotional labor strategies and the forms of WFC and provided support for surface acting contributing to greater WFC, compared to deep acting. Furthermore, the present study identified work-family integration as a moderator in the relationships between surface acting and strain-based and behavior-based WFC, which informs science and practice on the influence that individuals’ management of their work and family roles may have on work and family outcomes. Though the proposed moderation effect of psychological detachment was not supported, future research should examine the influence of the
remaining recovery experiences on the relationships between emotional labor strategies and WFC, to further identify strategies employees may use to buffer the negative effects of surface acting on WFC.
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Appendix A

Emotional Labor Scale (Brotheridge & Lee, 2003)

1. Resist expressing my true feelings.
2. Pretend to have emotions that I don’t really feel.
3. Hide my true feelings about a situation.
4. Make an effort to actually feel the emotions that I need to display towards others.
5. Try to actually experience the emotions that I must show.
6. Really try to feel the emotions I have to show as part of my job.

Work-Family Conflict Scale (Carlson, Kacmar, & Williams, 2000)

Time-Based Work-to-Family Conflict

1. My work keeps me from my family activities more than I would like.
2. The time I must devote to my job keeps me from participating equally in household responsibilities and activities.
3. I have to miss family activities due to the amount of time I must spend on work responsibilities.

Strain-Based Work-to-Family Conflict

1. When I get home from work I am often too frazzled to participate in family activities/responsibilities.
2. I am often so emotionally drained when I get home from work that it prevents me from contributing to my family.
3. Due to all the pressures at work, sometimes when I come home I am too stressed to do the things I enjoy.

Behavior-Based Work-to-Family Conflict

1. The problem-solving behaviors I use in my job are not effective in resolving problems at home.
2. Behavior that is effective and necessary for me at work would be counterproductive at home.
3. The behaviors I perform that make me effective at work do not help me to be a better parent and spouse.
Work-Family Integration (Desrochers, Hilton, & Larwood, 2005)

1. It is often difficult to tell where my work life ends and my family life begins.
2. I tend to integrate my work and family duties when I work at home.
3. In my life, there is a clear boundary between my career and my role as a spouse or family member. (reverse scored)

Psychological Detachment (Sonnentag & Fritz, 2007)

1. While away from work, I forget about work.
2. During time after work, I don’t think about work at all.
3. When not at work, I distance myself from my work.
4. While away from work, I get a break from the demands of work.