

Marin Paunov

**On the Mediating Role of Individual Differences
on the Consequences of Emotional Dissonance
in Organizations**

Sofia consulting, Sofia, 2010

On the Mediating Role of Individual Differences on the Consequences of Emotional Dissonance in Organizations

First edition

© Marin Alexandrov Paunov, author, 2010

Scientific Reviewers:

Prof. Margarita Atanassova

Prof. Blagoy Kolev

Prof. Kiril Spassov

Publisher: Sofia consulting

Sofia, 2010

ISBN 978-954-2909-04-0

Keywords: emotional dissonance, emotional labor, job performance, individual differences

Abstract

This study reports the results of two research surveys, conducted in big administrative entities and covering 158 and 233 employees respectively. It confirms some of the most important organizational consequences of emotional labor, showing that – generally – high levels of perceived emotional dissonance affect negatively job performance, commitment and satisfaction. It also proves that individual differences play an important role as pre-requisites of emotional labor, thus mediating the effect of emotional dissonance on levels of job performance, job satisfaction and intention to quit. Researchers' interest by now has been focused almost entirely on “the big five” model. The results in these cases are often quite surprising, contradictory and far from encouraging. Here an alternative (more conservative) approach to measuring individual differences is used and the results show, for example, that performance of employees belonging to the “Thinking” type in Jung’s typology, and scoring high on “Power” Schwarz’s value dimension, is less affected by emotional dissonance than performance of their “Feeling” and “Low-power” colleagues. Emotional dissonance may cause different levels of emotional labor in different personalities and eventually may have different impact on their motivation and job performance.

1. Conceptual background

Back in the early 80-ies the American sociologist Arlie Russell Hochschild, professor at Berkeley, California, introduced the term *emotional labor* as a core element of a more general concept, which has later become one of the promising fields in the contemporary studies of human emotions in organizational context. In her seminal book “The Managed Heart” she deals with the fact that in many professions (e.g. flight attendants who initially drew the author’s attention) employees have to face and cope with the difference between felt and expressed emotions. This observation led Hochschild to her definition of emotional labor: “*the management of feeling to create a publicly observable facial and bodily display for a wage*”. (Hochschild, A.,1983, p.17)

The conflict between emotions or the discrepancy between felt and expressed emotions were not entirely new topics, but here the emotional dissonance was viewed upon as caused by the demands of the job, from the standpoint of what Hochschild described as “commercialization of feelings”. In the realities of many professions there are activities (customer services, for example), which suppose facing of trust and enthusiasm on behalf of the jobholder, while in others (e.g. tax collectors) the employee meets with distrust and even hatred. For the sake of the effective fulfillment of their duties, the employees have to manage different emotions and the mismatch between felt emotion and the requirements of the job, the organizationally desirable manifestation of emotion on the workplace, results in emotional dissonance.

Emotional dissonance is somewhat similar to cognitive dissonance, the latter being an uncomfortable feeling caused by holding two contradictory ideas simultaneously, at least as far as the element of feeling uncomfortably is concerned, because the lack of congruence between felt and expressed emotions might lead to guilt, anger, frustration, or embarrassment. When experiencing such discomfort, one seeks to neutralize or balance the discrepancy. For Hochschild, there are two possible approaches for achieving this: “surface acting” and “deep acting”. Surface acting is more or less behavioral response and the “actor” is not going beyond the ambition to simply demonstrate signs of unfeared emotions for the “public” to observe and interpret. I believe in this case we may comfortably use the theatrical concept of “Brecht acting”. The “deep acting”, on the other hand, focuses on the deeply felt feelings and implies attempts for internalization of the required, organizationally desirable, emotion. In this approach (we may call it “Stanislavski acting”), with the help of the imagination, one creates or invokes thoughts, reflections and memories in one’s mental world by the help of which the desired emotion is induced.

Hochschild believes that generally emotional labor has negative consequences and in this regard she formulates three scenarios with different implications for the organization and the individual. When the identification of the employee with the emotional requirements of the job has been taking place for a long period, the consequences may be burnout, stress and de-personification. If the employee tends to distinguish well enough between himself as a feeling person, and the job with its requirements, the result may be less burnout, but more ideas about being “phony” or false because of either over-manifestation of a faked feeling, or simply poor actor’s performance. The third scenario implies self-alienation of the person from his own feelings and from the organizational “scene”, which is harmful for the individual commitment, job satisfaction and morale.

One of the points, for which Hochschild has been criticized, is the lack of adequate techniques for measuring emotional labor, instead of which she proposes a list of professions, which imply “considerable amount” of such.

Hochschild’s concept is further developed by Ashforth and Humphrey, who tend to focus more on behaviors, rather than on their underlying emotions. (Ashforth, B.E. & Humphrey, R.H., 1993, pp.88-116). This behavioral bias is based on the idea, that observable behavior has a direct impact on customers and that the employee could just comply with the requirements for expression of emotions without having to manage them. The authors stress on the importance of “rules of expression” as a function of organizational and job-related norms, determining what emotional expressions are due in a given work situation. Apparently, what is really felt by the employee is to some extent underestimated here. In fact, the explanation these two authors provide for emotional labor is that it is simply a factual expression of appropriate emotions. Thus, to what we called “Brecht acting” and “Stanislavki acting”, Ashforth and Humphrey add the display of actually experienced emotion, which is hardly an emotional dissonance. And again in addition to and unlike Hochschild, Humphrey and Ashforth believe that emotional labor can have both negative and positive consequences. For instance, if the emotion displayed by the “actor” is perceived by the “audience” as sincere, the compliance with the “rules of expression” is associated with success in job performance. Further to the negative consequences Hochschild is talking about, the authors add the case when unrealistic expectations are provoked in the customer.

Developing further Ashforth and Humphrey’s concept, Morris and Feldman conclude that the emotional labor is “*an effort, planning and control needed to express organizationally preferred emotions during interpersonal interactions*” (Morris, J. A. & Feldman, D. C. ,1996, p.987). The authors examine emotional labor as a multi-layer phenomenon and prefer to interpret it from the point of view of the emotions’ social function. They disapprove of

“frequency” as the only measure of intensity used by authors before them or the “weight” of emotional labor and three other measures: attention paid to rules of expression; diversity and emotional dissonance.

The generalized explanatory scheme by Morris and Feldman includes their idea about the prerequisites and consequences of emotional labor. (Morris, J. A. & Feldman, D. C. , 1997, pp 257-275). For the authors, major prerequisites are: explicitness of rules of expression (here, in their later publications, the authors no longer describe it as an element, but as a prerequisite for emotional labor); routine character of the task (mainly in terms of its repetitiveness); job position autonomy; relative strength of the role receiver (focal person in the context of the “role episode” scheme). The consequences of the emotional labor in this concept are: emotional exhaustion (burnout), job satisfaction (position), and role internalization.

As it was mentioned earlier, Morris and Feldman are not particularly engaged in surface and deep acting since they believe that the focus should be on the appropriate expression behaviour as this is what organisations are interested in. How do employees deal with their own emotions in order to produce the organizationally desired emotional expression remains in the peripheral part of these authors’ interests.

Alicia Grandey proposes a further way of interpreting emotional labor by modifying the beliefs expressed by Hochschild, Ashforth, Humphrey, Morris and Feldman. (Grandey, A. A., 2000, pp 95-100) According to her the notion emotional labor includes the regulation not only of emotional expression, but also the feelings themselves which corresponds to a certain degree with Hoshchild’s ideas. An interesting element of Grandey’s contribution is directing attention towards emotional events as a conceptual prerequisite for emotional labor. Within its conceptual framework she incorporates elements from contributions of the authors before her: from Hoshchild – the two types of acting, from Ashforth and Humphrey – the rules of

expression as a situational prerequisite for emotional labor, from Morris and Feldman – the frequency, the continuity and the diversity as such prerequisites.

At the beginning of the new millennium, almost alongside Grandey, Kruml and Geddes (Kruml, S. M. & Geddes, D., 2000, pp 8-49) published their research, based on the idea that emotional labor consists of two factors: emotional tension and emotional dissonance. Drawing on the understanding that the dissonance factor affects the degree at which employees display emotions which are in symphony with the felt ones, the authors find out that the high value of this factor will lead to more surface acting, while the low one – passive deep acting or “authentic” display of emotions. The high values of emotional tension as a factor, on the contrary, can be seen as a prerequisite for and gauge of the active deep acting.

Unlike most of the above mentioned authors, the Canadian researcher Celeste Brotheridge believes that the emotional labor does not necessarily include emotional dissonance by reminding us the situation in which employees who sincerely feel the required for display emotions, do not register emotional dissonance and do not experience emotional labor. This – she justly points out – is not an obstacle to the *manifestation* of dissonance through surface acting on the part of these employees (Brotheridge, C. M., 2003). Among the most significant Brotheridge’s contributions is the development and validation of a tool to measure emotional labor.

Nevertheless, the research field of emotional dissonance and emotional labor remains relatively underdeveloped and the authors who are interested in these areas are far from expressing methodological and theoretical accord. The focus is on internal states (emotional states and moods), psychological processes (surface and deep acting), external expression of emotions, the rules of expression of the organizational context, personal differences as a factor which brings about emotional labor, the consequences of dissonance and the labor in

organizational and personal plan etc. (Glomb and Tews provide useful classification in this field: Glomb, T.M. & Tews, M. J. ,2004, pp 1-23)

It seems that from a pragmatic point of view the following considerations are of greatest significance. The need for control over the emotional expression through behaviour, language, facial expression is the essence of human civilization mechanism. This is especially evident organizationally where both the common institutional and personal interest require compliance with the desirability of one emotional state or another. The experienced feelings and moods, however, are observable to a different degree and can coincide with the desired (rules of expression and adequacy). Attention should be drawn to the fact that there is a considerable difference between emotional tension and emotional labor. Tension represents the intensity of the experiences in general. Labor is related to the conscientious impact on the experienced and/or expressed. Thus the understanding of emotional tension as a phenomenon, prerequisites and consequences should consider the following options, circumstances and scenarios:

1. It is possible that the experienced moods match the rules of expression. In this case emotional tension exists in various degrees related to the job requirements and the individual characteristics. Emotional labor might be observed in cases when the desired expression intensity differs from the actual experience.
2. It is also possible that what is experienced does not coincide with the rules of expression, i.e. emotional dissonance exists. This presupposes the following two alternatives:
3. Suppressing the expression of what is felt in those cases when it is inadequate. Passive (without action) emotional labor is observed.

4. Displaying feelings and moods which differ from the experienced ones. The emotional labor is active and is expressed in two types of action: surface (only related to the means of expression) and deep (autosuggestion or “learning” the “correct” moods and feelings).
5. Difference should be expected in emotional tension in terms of positive/negative character of the experienced, suppressed and acted emotional states.
6. Feelings and moods (resultant) are generated both when the emotional labor itself achieves success or results in failure and when the need for such labor is realized. The direction and the intensity of these resultant emotions will depend on the motivational orientation and the individual characteristics of the person.
7. As a whole, the emotional tension is a function of two groups of variables: related to the personality (individual characteristics, motivation, values, artistic qualities) and the environment (intensity, continuity and frequency of the emotional dissonance and the strictness of the rules of expression).
8. In these two – organizational and personal – spheres lie the consequences of emotional tension. It is not necessary for them to be negative – they can vary from satisfaction on one pole to burnout and demotivation on the other and actually, this will depend on the type of feelings and moods we are talking about, the structure of the personality, the type and intensity of the emotional labor, the value and motivational orientation of the employee and others.

2. Major findings of previous research

A review of the more influential empirical studies of emotional dissonance and emotional labor could start with Morris and Feldman (Morris, J. A. & Feldman, D. C., 1997, pp 257-275), who reveal a significant positive relation between emotional dissonance and emotional exhaustion. An interesting point in this study is the authors' attempt to find a relationship between emotional exhaustion on the one hand and the frequency and continuity of the emotional labor on the other. However, they do not succeed in doing this. The explanation presented within the framework of the authors' theoretical model points out that the emotional dissonance represents an independent component of the emotional labor and has its own individual consequences. It seems much more convincing to reconsider the model itself and in particular the logical connection between dissonance and labor.

Studying the consequences of emotional dissonance Abraham (Abraham, R., 1998, pp 229 - 247) proves its relationship, on the one hand, with job satisfaction and emotional exhaustion, on the other. The research shows the intermediary function of social support for the relation between satisfaction and dissonance, i.e. the negligible impact of emotional dissonance on the employees' satisfaction with the high levels of social support. In another research the same author exploits the relationships between job satisfaction, the commitment to the organization, the emotional dissonance and the behavioural intention to quit (Abraham, R., 1999, pp 441-455).

Brotheridge and Lee became popular with the emotional labor scale which they developed and validated (Brotheridge, C.M., 2003). In the process of validation they find out that emotional exhaustion and depersonalization are significantly correlated with the "surface acting" sub-scale in their questionnaire. The explanation that the authors present involves the idea that the effort to conceal the actual felt emotions or labor to express actual unfelt emotions comprise the main components of emotional labor (unlike "deep acting" where

“empathy” and auto-suggestion result in fewer tension levels). Attention should be paid to the idea about acting and suppressing emotions as key elements of surface acting.

Everything said seems sufficient to conclude that the research carried out so far illustrates the negative impact of emotional dissonance on job satisfaction. This is particularly important since the latter is positively related to the quality of job performance mainly as labor morale (although it cannot be claimed that this is a motivational determinant). Quite a few meta-analyses illustrate the importance of this correlation (with coefficients $r > 0.2$), among which are those by Iaffaldano and Muchinsky (Iaffaldano, M. T. & Muchinsky, P. M., 1985, pp 251-273) and Petty, McGee and Cavender (Petty, M.M., McGee, G. W. & Cavender, J. W. , 1984, pp 712-721), etc. In other meta-analyses Mathieu and Zajac (Mathieu, J. E. & Zajac, D. M., 1990, pp 171-194), and later – Hackett, Bycio and Hausdorf alike (Hackett, R.D., Bycio, P., & Hausdorf, P.A., 1994, pp 15-23) find a positive, though slight connection between company commitment and the quality of performance.

Ultimately, if a correlation between emotional labor, on the one hand, and satisfaction and commitment, on the other, were established, this would imply a relation with the quality of job performance as well through the facilitating function of satisfaction and commitment.

Those emotions which participate in emotional labor and emotional dissonance can differ depending on the requirements in the professional field and the type of relations providing the framework of the desired emotional expressions. A typical research target in this relation are activities such as client service, for example, or the job of the receiver, ticket inspector or the tax inspector. In client service it is considered that there is enough evidence that mainly suppressing negative emotions and the action of the positive ones will contribute to emotional labor, while for the job of receivers – the opposite: the acting of negative ones and suppression of positive emotions. In principle, this statement has its logic, but its

unconditional acceptance and axiomatic character can result in fallacies at least related to the difficult differentiation between positive and negative in certain typically studied emotional states (like anxiety).

An independent topic in these studies is the search for interrelation between the ability to handle emotional labor and the individual differences, i.e. viewing the latter as prerequisites (Brotheridge, C. M., 2003; Kring, A. M., Smith, D. A. & Neale, J. M., 1994; Tews, M. J., & Glomb, T. M., 2003; Vey, M.A. & Bono, J. E., 2003). A major part (recently nearly all) similar studies base the idea of individual differences on the so-called “big five”: openness; conscientiousness, extraversion, agreeableness, neuroticism.

The big five is an entirely statistical construct, a product of factor and cluster analyses, which for the time being remains – to my opinion - theoretically unsubstantiated and ultimately – ungrounded. It presents a brilliant example of the tendency to bring to extremities the modernity of positivism in the humanitarian scientific areas. Anyway, in principle there is a point in considering individual differences as a predisposition to the frequency and the intensity of the experienced emotional labor since the core of the emotional dissonance concept is the incongruity between felt and displayed emotions, and the individual characteristics could enhance or lower this incongruity (for example, people can differ from one another in terms of their aptitude to experience the emotions required from them). This gives rise to the outlined by many authors (Sutton, R.I. & Rafaeli, A., 1988 pp, 461-487; Morris, J. A. & Feldman, D. C., 1996, pp. 986-1010) task for management practice to aim at such criteria for personnel selection which would lead to better conformity between the requirements at the work place and the personal characteristics of the applicant.

Currently, the thrust in the emotional dissonance research area is to determine whether individual differences exist in people's ability to handle emotional labor and emotional

dissonance (Brotheridge, C., 2003; Tews, M. & T. Glomb, 2003; Vey, M. & J. Bono, 2003)

Unfortunately, again, such studies have been limited to customer service jobs and generally rely on the 5-factor model of personality.

Whether different personalities result in different emotional dissonance levels across jobs is an important empirical question. This research addressed the question of such individual differences in debt collectors. The underlying rationale was that, because emotional dissonance involves incongruence between felt emotion and displayed emotion, if personality attributes lessened the incongruence, emotional labor would decrease.

There is a comparatively clear need for every business to find individuals that are well suited to the emotional requirements of the job. It is not difficult to see that organizations would do better if they attract and select candidates who are disposed to feel and display required emotions. Selecting employees on the basis of their general tendency to experience certain emotions may lead to a better fit between an employee's expressive behaviors and work role requirements.

However, so far no research has been carried out to show a satisfactory correlation between the individual differences (measured with the big five) and the emotional labor. A clear example of a rejected hypothesis of that type is the recent research carried out by Lorry Diamond from the University of South Florida (Diamond, L., 2005). To my belief, the problem does not lie in the lack of meaningful relationship, but rather in the model's parameters applied in studying the individual differences. This idea is getting adequate empirical support by the research briefly outlined below.

3. Two empirical studies on some pre-requisites and consequences of emotional dissonance

Two surveys will be briefly reported here: at National Agricultural Fund of Bulgaria (focused primarily on confirming the overall importance of emotional labor for job satisfaction and intention to quit) and at Ministry of Finance of Bulgaria (showing the impact of emotional labor on job satisfaction, commitment and performance, and clarifying the role of some individual value and cognitive differences as pre-requisites for emotional labor).

The first survey was carried out by the author in June 2009 as a part of a bigger project concerning human resources development, motivation and strategy at the National Agricultural Fund of Bulgaria (a state agency, administering the utilization of European agricultural, forest, fishing, etc. funds in the country). The survey covered 158 employees (60% men and 40% women).

The Discrete Emotions Emotional Labor Scale (DEELS), which was developed and validated by Glomb and Tews in 2004, was used to measure the level of emotional dissonance in the participants. The DEELS scale consists of three subscales: genuine expression, faking, and suppression. However, since this study focuses on emotional dissonance that results from a difference between felt emotion and displayed emotion, only two of the three subscales (faking and suppression, or hiding) were utilized in the study. Both subscales were comprised

of 14 items, of which each item addressed a certain emotion ranging from irritation to enthusiasm.

In the genuine expression subscale, the participants were asked to respond to the question, "How often do you genuinely express_____when you feel that way?" The above blank indicated one of the 14 emotions listed below the question posited to the participants. The participants then indicated their response on a one to five Likert-type scale. The anchors on the scale were "I genuinely express this many times a day" (5), "I genuinely express this a few times a day" (4), "I genuinely express this a few times a week" (3), "I genuinely express this a few times a month" (2), and "I never genuinely express this" (1). In the faking subscale, the participants were asked to respond to the question, "How often do you express feelings of_____on the job when you really do not feel that way?" The blank indicated one of the 14 emotions listed below the question posited to the participants. The participants were required to indicate their response on a one to five Likert-type scale. The anchors on the scale were "I express this many times a day when I do not feel it" (5), "I express this a few times a day when I do not feel it" (4), "I express this a few times a week when I do not feel it" (3), "I express this a few times a month when I do not feel it" (2), and "I never express this when I do not feel it" (1).

In the suppression subscale, the same emotions were listed for the participants, but in this subscale, the respondents were responding to the question, "How often do you keep feelings of_____to yourself when you really feel that way?" For this scale, the participants were required to indicate their response on a one to six Likert-type scale. The anchors on the scale were "I keep this to myself many times a day" (5), "I keep this to myself a few times a day" (4), "I keep this to myself a few times a week" (3), "I keep this to myself a few times a month" (2), "I never keep this to myself" (1) and "I never feel this" (0). In this subscale, the "I never feel this" the "0" score was to be treated as a missing value because if the research

posited that if a participant never felt that emotion then it is impossible to suppress that emotion.

Although the DEELS scale had been just recently published, it had undergone rigorous validity testing. Alphas, convergent validity, discriminant validity and criterion-related validity of the instrument have all been tested for example by Lorie Diamond (Diamond, L., 2005)

Satisfaction was measured by four items from the Job Satisfaction Survey (Spector, P, 1985, pp. 693-713; Spector, P. , 2001). This subscale required the participants to indicate on a one to six Likert-type scale, their agreement with several related statements. The four questions were summed for an overall measure of job satisfaction.

Intention to quit was measured with three statements requiring the assessment of the level of agreement by participants, on a one to five Likert-type scale. This measure was based on the Weisberg and Sagie (Weisberg, J and A. Sagie, 1999, pp. 333-340) measure of intention to quit. The three questions were summed for an overall measure of intention to quit.

Table 1. Means, standard deviations, Cronbach's Alpha's and comparisons

Variable	N	Mean	St. Dev.	Alpha	Comparison
DEELS– faking and suppressing	104	15.74	13.09	.921	.91 (a)
Overall job satisfaction	158	14.52	2.14	.714	.76 (b)
Intention to quit	158	13.29	3.50	.909	.91 (c)

(a) Diamond (2005); (b) Spector (1985); (c) Weisberg and Sagie (1999)

What this particular survey was trying to find out was whether the higher levels of emotional dissonance, as perceived by the employees, will have decreased job satisfaction and higher intention to quit among its consequences. The latter would be influenced by emotional dissonance both directly and indirectly, through the lower job satisfaction, and – of course – by many other factors as well. More precisely, the hypotheses were: (1) Emotional dissonance is a factor, influencing positively the intention to quit; (2) Emotional dissonance is a factor, influencing negatively job satisfaction; (3) Job satisfaction is a factor, influencing negatively the intention to quit. As a matter of principle, these hypotheses are not new and the idea was to see if they will be supported again in this particular case.

It may be expected that emotional dissonance – if causing high levels of emotional labor – should have lowered job satisfaction and higher intention to quit as some of its important consequences. Intention to quit would be influenced by the dissonance both directly and indirectly – through the satisfaction. Some valuable conclusions for human resources management and general management practices may be drawn from these relations, starting with the high economic price of the increased levels of emotional labor and with the importance of emotions as such in any organizational context.

Similar studies are typically interested also in the pre-requisites of emotional labor, investigating two major directions: nature of work and individual differences. Researchers work primarily with professions, for which traditionally high emotional dissonance is expected: tax collectors, flight attendants, executory officers, etc. One of the theses, promoted in this study is that emotional dissonance is present in every organizational (and generally - social) setting and the current research covers comparatively “neutral” jobs.

As far as individual differences as pre-requisites of emotional labor are concerned, researchers’ interest by now has been focused almost entirely on IPIP constructs and more

specifically – on “the big five”. The results in these cases are quite surprising, contradictory and far from encouraging. (Diamond, L., 2005).

I believe that major shortcoming of many previous research attempts in the field is the very direction in which individual differences have been conceptualized, and the ignoring of human values and motivation. Given (say, provoked by the nature of a profession) emotional dissonance would lead to different levels of personally experienced emotional labor, depending – for example – on the importance of feeling (vs. thinking) as judging mechanism in the overall cognitive process; on valence of emotionality as such; on individual preferences towards social or power and achievement needs, etc. These, to my opinion, would serve as far more productive framework for exploring individual differences as pre-requisites of emotional labor, than “the big five” model. Due to some organizational limitations, this idea couldn’t be checked by the first survey, but is in the very core of the second one and we shall visit it again later.

The major findings of the first survey can be summarized as follows.

The descriptive statistics can be seen in Table 2. Table 3 shows the correlation indices of the variables in the model.

Table 2. Descriptive statistics

	Mean	St.dev	N
Intention to quit	7.7051	3.50340	156
Job satisfaction	9.2911	1.68282	158
Emotional labor	0.7469	0.75249	144

- Fake	1.0009	0.85702	140
- Hide	0.4306	0.72620	136

Table 3. Correlations

	Intention to Quit	Job Satisfaction	Emotional Labor	Hide	Fake
Intention to quit					
Pearson Correlation	1	-.710**	.192*	.222**	.081
Sig. (2-tailed)		.000	.021	.009	.350
N	156	156	143	139	135
Job satisfaction					
Pearson Correlation	-.710**	1	-.227**	-.257**	-.102
Sig. (2-tailed)	.000		.006	.002	.236
N	156	158	144	140	136
Emotional labor (Hide & Fake)					
Pearson Correlation	.192*	-.227**	1	.891**	.856**
Sig. (2-tailed)	.021	.006		.000	.000
N	143	144	144	140	136
Hide					
Pearson Correlation	.222**	-.257**	.891**	1	.517**
Sig. (2-tailed)	.009	.002	.000		.000

N	139	140	140	140	132
Fake					
Pearson Correlation	.081	-.102	.856**	.517**	1
Sig. (2-tailed)	.350	.236	.000	.000	
N	135	136	136	132	136

* Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed)

** Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed)

The most important results of the correlation analysis show the following:

(a) There is a statistically very significant and negative correlation between overall job satisfaction and employees' intention to quit (-.710).

(b) There is a statistically significant and also negative correlation between emotional labor and overall job satisfaction (-.227).

(c) A positive and significant correlation is present between emotional labor and intention to quit (.192).

It is also obvious that the intention to quit and job satisfaction – on the one hand, and hiding and faking emotions as two forms of emotional labor – on the other hand, are not equally statistically significant. At least in this case, suppressing of felt emotions has a considerably stronger connection with intention to quit and job satisfaction than expression of non-existent emotions, probably because of their different frequency in this particular institution.

For assessing the strength of the causal relationships between dependent and independent variables, regression analyses were performed and their results are summarized in Table 4.

Table 4. Regression analyses

Independent variable	Dependent variable			
	R ²	F	Beta	t
Emotional Labor	Job Satisfaction			

	.051	7.68	-.227	-2.772
Emotional Labor	Intention to Quit			
	.037	5.411	.192	2.326
Job Satisfaction	Intention to Quit			
	.504	156.595	-.710	-12.514
Emotional Labor (managers)	Intention to Quit (managers)			
	-.050	.376	.174	.613
Emotional Labor (experts)	Intention to Quit (experts)			
	.005	1.527	.119	1.236
Emotional Labor (managers)	Job Satisfaction (managers)			
	-.065	.211	-.131	-.459
Emotional Labor (experts)	Job Satisfaction (experts)			
	.032	4.59	-.203	-2.144
Emotional Labor (men)	Job Satisfaction (men)			
	.013	.614	-.112	-.784
Emotional Labor (women)	Job Satisfaction (women)			
	.118	10.681	-.343	-3.268

It could be concluded that the results confirm hypotheses 1, 2 and 3 proving the existence of a correlation, which is sufficiently strong (in such types of studies), between the general emotional labor, on the one hand, and the general job satisfaction and the intention to quit – on the other. The results also substantiated the strong interdependence between job satisfaction and the intention to quit, which was previously ascertained by other authors.

An interesting point, which deserves to be particularly and independently studied, is the issue about the individual motivational orientation as a prerequisite for emotional labor. The conditions of this research did not allow for a confirmation of this correlation (this was done to some extent in the next survey, explained below), but the regression analyses, carried out independently for managers and experts indicated an interesting and significant difference in the intensity with which emotional labor influences intention to quit of these two groups of people. The most important parameters of the results from the regressions “Overall

satisfaction to emotional labor” for managers and experts respectively and “Intention to quit to emotional labor” – again independently for managers and experts - can be seen in Table 4.

Another important issue is the role of gender in terms of the impact of emotional labor on job satisfaction. The two regressions, carried out in terms of gender, illustrate a considerably stronger effect of emotional labor among women than among men. The most important result parameters of the regressions “Overall satisfaction to emotional labor”, independently for men and women and “Intention to quit to emotional labor” again independently for men and women can be seen in Table 4.

There are many and various factors influencing the climb of an expert up the corporate ladder to a leadership position, but there are several necessary ones, such as high levels of intrinsic achievement and/or power motivation. From this point of view it is reasonable to expect that it will be easier for managers to experience emotional labor since it will not be considered of very great importance given the achievement of success and power. Generally speaking, each person’s value system would influence the way this person accepts and experiences emotional dissonance and the judgment whether emotional labor “is worth it”. Value priorities such as power, self-enhancement, competitive success can even attach positive bias, not negative, to emotional labor if ultimately it leads to attaining the core needs. For people with more altruistic and collective value system, who are more concerned about the harmony in relationships, about being liked etc., emotional labor could be more harrowing and have impact on job satisfaction and intention to quit. A difference like that can be expected in connection with Jung’s cognitive styles, operationalised, for example, in the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator or Keirsey Temperament Sorter. The assessment component in these styles can be implemented mainly through mental or affective criteria (T and F types). For T-types emotiveness and related ethical and aesthetic criteria could be of much less importance than the normative (right/wrong), for instance. It would be quite the opposite for F-types, which

could directly affect the importance which these two types would attach to their emotions and consequently – to emotional dissonance and emotional labor.

The second research was designed and carried out by the author in 2010 in the central administration of the Ministry of Finance in Bulgaria.

In addition to job satisfaction and intention to quit as dependent variables (explained above in connection with the first study), here another dependent variable was added – job performance. This was measured by the mean of the last three scores, given to the respondent by the existing Performance evaluation system, currently in use in the Ministry.

The main goal of this second research was twofold: to check once again the most important organizational consequences of emotional labor, and to study the facilitating function that personality plays in respect to the impact of emotional dissonance on performance, satisfaction and commitment. The main research hypothesis was that *power and achievement motivations – the “self-enhancing” personality value characteristics - as well as “predominantly thinking” judgement function under Jung’s cognitive typology - would lead to weaker (or even in reverse proportion) impact of the emotional dissonance on the dependent variables and one’s belonging to “self-transcendence” value domain and to the group of the “predominantly feeling” in Jung’s cognitive typology would mean greater impact of emotional dissonance on job performance, job satisfaction and intention to quit.*

Specific (let’s say, induced by the type of profession) emotional dissonance could lead to much different levels of experienced emotional labor in a given respondent depending on how

important feeling as a judging mechanism is in his cognitive process; on the valency of emotion itself for the individual, and on the fact whether the respondent gives priority to his relations with people, on the one hand, or power and success – on the other. The framework of human values would be a much more successful conceptual tool with respect to individual differences as a prerequisite for emotional labor with all its negative consequences.

For studying values, Shalom Schwartz' Portrait Value Questionnaire – PVQ – the way it is described in the methodology of ESS (European Social Surveys) was used. For judging type (T vs. F), elements of Carl Jung's cognitive typology were used (similarly to their implementation by Myers-Briggs Type Indicator and in Keirsey Temperament Sorter).

PVQ is used within the framework of “The European Social Survey” (ESS, additional questionnaires GF1, GF2), which represents a long-term, large-scale research and development project, and since 2001 internationally recognized teams from Austria, Belgium, Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Luxembourg, Netherlands, Norway, Poland, Portugal, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, Ukraine, have been working together under the leadership of professor Roger Jowell. For the participation of Bulgaria in the European Social Survey a Consortium European Social Survey - Bulgaria (ESS-Bg) was set up. It includes representatives from different research organizations with broad experience in the implementation of international research projects. Data gathering was based on the methodology, the research techniques, the methods for primary data processing and analysis implemented by ESS.

PVQ is a short verbal portrait of different people and it describes goals, desires and wishes, which implicitly represent the importance of one principal value. For example, the assessment “It is important for him/her to come up with new ideas and be innovator. He/She loves doing things their own way” describes a man who gives priority to self-direction. “It is important for him/her to be rich. He/She wants to have a lot of money, luxurious and expensive things” describes a man with markedly authoritative values. By describing a man through the goals and desires he pursues, the verbal portraits detect values without necessarily identifying them explicitly as a respondent (Srull, T. K., & Gaelick, L, 1983, pp. 108-121). The 10 values, used in PVQ are: self-direction, stimulation, hedonism, achievement, power, security, conformity, tradition, benevolence, universalism. For this study, power and achievement (comprising the so called “self-enhancement” index, vs. benevolence and universalism as forms of the “self-transcendence”) are of specific importance.

For each portrait respondents have to reply to the question, “whether this man resembles you?” on a 6-grade scale starting from “entirely like me” to “nothing like me” and an option is provided when the respondent does not know the answer or cannot decide.

PVQ includes 20 items, grouped in 10 indices – one for each principal value. The indices are compiled with the belief that they will provide more precise gauge than one single variable. The variables included in one index are supposed to measure different aspects of one and the same dimension. Cronbach’s alpha is a measure of the internal consistency of items on one scale and takes values between 0 and 1. It is usually assumed that alpha, higher than 0.7, is desirable with indices used as scales. In the case of PVQ the alphas arrived at when validating the method are relatively low for some of the indices. This is due to two circumstances. Firstly, the indices items are selected and constructed in such a way as to cover different

conceptual components of one and the same principal value rather than logically repeat each other as gauges of a closely defined concept. For example, the authoritative items include wealth and power, while universalism – concern for nature and understanding. If either “power” or “universalism” index included items which are close in meaning or formulation, the alphas would be higher but the notional width of each type of value would be worse covered. Second, each index includes only two questions, which is insufficient and it becomes impossible to achieve higher alphas unless the questions are almost identical. Ultimately when we consider the small number of questions used to measure each of the ten values and their heterogeneity required in this case, then the alphas are sufficiently high. They are as follows: self-direction (.49), stimulation (.63), hedonism (.67), achievement (.69), power (.44), security (.62), conformity (.58), tradition (.37), benevolence (.55), universalism (.58).

Corrections related to individual differences are required when using the scales since the totality of such differences ultimately results in the different way in which respondents use the response scale. Some respondents disperse their answers along the entire width of the scales when they answer that some of the portraits resemble them, while others – do not. Quite a few respondents, however, tend to channel their answers in one or two directions (agreement – nearly all portraits resemble them, or disagreement – nearly all portraits do not resemble them) along the scale. To ignore these trends when answering the questions would result in drawing a wrong conclusion that all values are essential to some respondents and there is not a single value that is essential to others, which, of course, is not correct. What is of interest to us is the relative importance of the ten principal values for each respondent, his value priorities. And since values function in a system, the importance of each value for the respective person or culture should be seen as absolute, not relative value compared to the importance of all other values for this person (Schwartz, S. H., 1996).

To study the individual characteristics of cognitive styles (as far as the “judging” function is concerned) Jung’s paradigm was used (Jung, C., 1971) which is widely known and widely used succeeding in fighting off decades-long attacks against itself. This paradigm underlies two recognized tools for measuring individual differences – Myers-Briggs Type Indicator (Myers, I. & Peter B. Myers, 1989,1995), and Keirsey Temperament Sorter (Keirsey, D., 1998), whose approach is used in this research.

Jung’s typology contains two functions related to perception (sensing and intuition) and two – “thinking” and “feeling”, T and F – related to assessment of the information gathered. The judging functions describe the prevailing mechanisms with the help of which an attitude towards the perceived is built up. T-type grounds the decision-taking and their assessment upon more distant, impersonal base relying more on what seems reasonable, logical, consistent and corresponding with a system of rules. F-type carries out the evaluation by identifying themselves with situations and other people, taking into consideration personal dimensions of the situation, empathizing and looking for harmony and understanding. It should be emphasized that it is not a matter of ability, but of preference, i.e. we cannot state, for example, that T-type is more capable of showing logic and thinking than F-type.

It seems completely unnecessary to focus on the long lasting argumentation of the validity of test constructs based on Jung and lasting for years arguments related to their methodological soundness. I believe that there are moments when all that should be done is to mention the fact that Keirsey’s questionnaire has been applied to over 40 million people in different cultural and organizational environment and among those who have used it are: US army and air forces, the Universities of Yale and Wharton, Pfizer, Shell, Motorola, McDonalds, IBM corporations, Deloitte consultancy etc, and the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator has much more impressive history. However, we could mention the facts that those who created the “big five”

concept - McCrae and Costa (McCrae, R. R & Costa, P.T. , 1989, pp 17-40) find significant correlations between MBTI scales on the one hand and the “big five” on the other. Jung’s scale T-F, which we are interested in particular, correlates with the so-called “agreeableness” with 0.44 coefficient.

What else matters in this case is the finding of Quenk, Hammer and Majors who prove that the T-type representatives demonstrate considerably higher levels of dominance (power) than the F-type representatives, while the latter are considerably more active when it comes to taking care of the other person and empathy. (Quenk, N. L., Hammer, A.L., & Majors, M. S. (2001).

For the purposes of this study a research methodology was developed which included the development of methodologically and methodically substantiated questionnaire, the distribution and completing the main questions in this questionnaire and a section to record the demographic and job position characteristics of the respondents. Sending out the questionnaires and collecting the completed ones was coordinated and implemented in collaboration with the employees from “Human Resources” Department at the Ministry of Finance and the assistance of the management of the Ministry. The study was carried out in compliance with the developed methods with a sample range: all employees, working at the central administration units (circa 340 people) with 241 completed questionnaires which were handed in and after disposing of those which were filled out incorrectly there were 233 left. Some of the demographics of this survey are shown in table 5.

Table 5. Demographics

Years with organization	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
under 5 years	41	17,6	17,6	17,6
5-10 years	65	27,9	27,9	45,5
11-15 years	43	18,5	18,5	63,9
16-20 years	24	10,3	10,3	74,2

21-25 years	18	7,7	7,7	82,0
26-30 years	18	7,7	7,7	89,7
above 31 years	24	10,3	10,3	100,0
Age				
20-30 years	55	23,6	23,6	23,6
31-40 years	98	42,1	42,1	65,7
41-50 years	42	18,0	18,0	83,7
51-60 years	35	15,0	15,0	98,7
above 61 years	3	1,3	1,3	100,0
Gender				
Male	52	22,3	22,3	22,3
Female	181	77,7	77,7	100,0
	233	100,0	100,0	

In the current study the following hypotheses were tested:

Hypothesis 1 – Higher levels of emotional dissonance would lead to decreased parameters of performance and work motivation.

1a – Higher levels of emotional dissonance would lead to lower levels of job performance.

1b – Higher levels of emotional dissonance would lead to lower overall job satisfaction.

1c – Higher levels of emotional dissonance would lead to higher intention to quit (i.e. lower commitment).

Hypothesis 2 – The influence of the emotional dissonance is modulated by the personality traits “Power” and “Cognitive type (T/F – thinking vs. Feeling)”.

2a – There would be much weaker influence of emotional dissonance on a strong thinking type (T type) than for a strong feeling type. For the feeling type the effect of emotional dissonance would be in the same direction as described in hypothesis 1.

2b – For people, scoring high on Power (demonstrating high levels on the power value dimension) the influence of emotional dissonance would be much weaker than for a person with low values on the power dimension.

The hypotheses were tested statistically with analysis of variance (ANOVA).

For hypothesis 1, the depended variables “performance”, “job satisfaction” and intention to quit were tested with the factor “emotional dissonance” (two levels – low and high).

For hypothesis 2, a four-factor model was tested. Emotional dissonance (low vs. high), Type F/T (feeling vs. thinking), Power (low vs. high), Sex (male vs. female) were included as factors. The dependent variables were the same as in hypothesis 1.

Some of the more important findings in this study are summarized below.

1. Emotional dissonance

The analysis of variance (One-way ANOVA) demonstrated main effects of the factor Emotional dissonance for all three dependent variables.

1.1. Dependent variable: performance (Table 6). Performance is significantly higher (3.3) for people with low emotional dissonance than for those with higher ED (3.08) – $F(1, 217) = 5.981, p < 0.05$. These results confirm hypothesis 1a – people with lower ED have better performance levels.

<i>Table 6. Effect of emotional dissonance on performance</i>				
Job performance				
Emotional dissonance	Mean	Standard Error	95% Confidence interval	
			Lower Bound	Upper Bound
- Low	3.30	.057	3.19	3.41
- High	3.08	.070	2.94	3.22

1.2. Dependent variable: job satisfaction (Table 7). The overall job satisfaction is significantly lower (4.25) when the emotional dissonance is high than when the emotional dissonance is low (4.50) – $F(1, 231) = 5.361, p < 0.05$. This confirms hypothesis 1b that employees with high emotional dissonance would have lower job satisfaction than those with low emotional dissonance.

<i>Table 7. Effect of emotional dissonance on job satisfaction</i>				
--	--	--	--	--

Job satisfaction				
Emotional dissonance	Mean	Standard Error	95% Confidence interval	
			Lower Bound	Upper Bound
- Low	4.50	.063	4.38	4.62
- High	4.25	.090	4.07	4.43

1.3. Dependent variable: intention to quit (Table 8). Hypothesis 1c was confirmed as well – high emotional dissonance leads to significantly higher tendencies to quit: mean 3.30 in the high emotional dissonance group vs. mean 3.05 in the low emotional dissonance group – $F(1, 231) = 4.025, p < 0.05$

<i>Table 8. Effect of emotional dissonance on intention to quit</i>				
Intention to quit				
Emotional dissonance	Mean	Standard Error	95% Confidence interval	
			Lower Bound	Upper Bound
- Low	3,05	,081	2,89	3,21
- High	3,30	,096	3,11	3,49

2. Four-factor model. Independent variables: Emotional dissonance; Feeling/Thinking Type; Power; Gender. Dependent variable: Job performance

The ANOVA showed a main effect of emotional dissonance as well as main effects of the factors T/F and Gender. T-types receive significantly higher performance appraisal results than F-types: $F(1, 217) = 8.869, p < 0.01$.

2a. Interaction between T/F-characteristics and emotional dissonance (Table 9). There is a significant interaction between the factors thinking/feeling and emotional dissonance – $F(1, 217) = 5.008, p < 0.05$. The interaction confirms hypothesis 2a that there would be a weaker effect of emotional dissonance for the thinking type in comparison with the feeling, where high emotional dissonance would lead to lower performance figures. The difference between F-type with low emotional dissonance, and T-type with both low and high emotional dissonance levels are very small, while F-type with high emotional dissonance employees have considerably lower performance results than the other groups.

Table 9. Interaction between emotional dissonance and T/F - type					
Dependent variable: Job performance					
Emotional dissonance	T/F	Mean	Standard Error	95% Confidence interval	
				Lower Bound	Upper Bound
- Low	- F-type	3.168	.115	2.942	3.395
	- T-type	3.262	.111	3.042	3.481
- High	- F-type	2.626	.169	2.293	2.959
	- T-type	3.282	.096	3.093	3.471

2b. Interaction between Emotional dissonance and Power values (Table 10). There is significant interaction between emotional dissonance and power - $F(1, 217) = 5.635, p < 0.05$. This result confirms hypothesis 2b – the performance level of employees scoring high

on Power values would be considerably less influenced by emotional dissonance, while people with low values on the power dimension would have the typical profile – lower job performance with high emotional dissonance.

<i>Table 10. Interaction between emotional dissonance and power as a value</i>					
Dependent variable: Job performance					
Emotional dissonance	Power	Mean	Standard Error	95% Confidence interval	
				Lower Bound	Upper Bound
- Low	- Low	3.32	.135	3.06	3.59
	- High	3.11	.085	2.94	3.28
- High	- Low	2.76	.172	2.43	3.10
	- High	3.14	.090	2.97	3.32

2c. Three-way interaction – Emotional Dissonance - Power – Gender (Table 11). There is a significant three-way interaction between Emotional Dissonance, Power and Sex: $F(1, 217) = 6.08, p < 0.05$. In all but one groups there is the usual tendency for job performance to decrease when emotional dissonance increases. However men with high values on the Power dimension (strong Power type) demonstrate just the opposite tendency – higher emotional dissonance is combined with better performance. In addition, men with low values on the Power dimension (low Power profile) seem to be more influenced by the emotional dissonance factor than women in both high- and low- power groups.

<i>Table 11. Interaction between Emotional dissonance, Power and Gender</i>

Dependent variable: Job Performance						
Emotional dissonance	Power	Gender	Mean	Standard Error	95% Confidence interval	
					Lower Bound	Upper Bound
- Low	Low	M	3.333	.251	2.838	3.829
		F	3.314	.100	3.117	3.511
	High	M	2.737	.146	2.450	3.025
		F	3.475	.089	3.301	3.650
- High	Low	M	2.429	.329	1.780	3.077
		F	3.100	.100	2.903	3.297
	High	M	3.050	.146	2.762	3.338
		F	3.238	.106	3.029	3.447

As far as the dependence of job satisfaction and intention to quit on cognitive (judging) type, value orientation and gender (on any given level of emotional dissonance) is concerned, no statistically significant results were found. Interestingly, in all cases emotional dissonance tends to be considerably more important through its “hiding” than through its “faking” form.

4. Conclusion

It may well be accepted that the two surveys, outlined above:

- confirm that – generally – high levels of perceived emotional dissonance affect negatively job performance, commitment and satisfaction;
- prove that individual differences play an important role as pre-requisites of emotional labor, thus mediating the effect of emotional dissonance on performance, commitment and satisfaction. More specifically, performance of employees belonging to the “Thinking” type in Jung’s typology, and scoring high on “Power” Schwarz’s

value dimension is less affected by emotional dissonance than performance of their “Feeling” and “Low-power” colleagues.

Emotional dissonance may cause different levels of emotional labor in different personalities and eventually may have different impact on their motivation and job performance.

References

- Abraham, R. (1998). *Emotional dissonance in organizations: Antecedents, consequences, and moderators*. Genetic, Social, and General Psychology Monographs, 124, (2)
- Abraham, R. (1999). *The impact of emotional dissonance on organizational commitment and intention to turnover*. Journal of Psychology, 133 (4)
- Ashforth, B.E. & Humphrey, R.H. (1993). *Emotional labor in service roles: The influence of identity*. Academy of Management Review, 18 (1)
- Brotheridge, C., (2003) *Predicting emotional labor given situational demands and personality*. Paper, presented at the 18th annual meeting of the Society for Industrial and Organizational Psychology, Orlando, Florida
- Diamond, L., *Antecedents and Consequences of Emotional Dissonance: Understanding the Relationships Among Personality, Emotional Dissonance, Job Satisfaction, Intention to quit and Job Performance*, Dissertation, University of South Florida, 2005
- Glomb, T.M. & Tews, M. J. (2004). *Emotional labor: A conceptualization and scale development*. Journal of Vocational Behaviour, 64
- Grandey, A. A. (2000). *Emotion regulation in the workplace: A new way to conceptualize emotional labor*. Journal of Occupational Health Psychology, 5
- Hackett, R.D., Bycio, P., & Hausdorf, P.A. (1994). *Further assessment of Meyer and Allen's (1991) three-component model of organizational commitment*. Journal of Applied Psychology, 79
- Hochschild, A.R., (1983). *The Managed Heart: Commercialization of human feeling*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press
- Iaffaldano, M. T. & Muchinsky, P. M. (1985). *Job satisfaction and job performance: A meta-analysis*. Psychological Bulletin, 97
- Jung, C. G. (1971). *Psychological Types (Collected Works of C. G. Yung, Volume 6)*. University Press
- Keirse, D., (1998). *Please Understand Me II: Temperament Character Intelligence* Prometheus Nemesis Book Company
- Kring, A. M., Smith, D. A. & Neale, J. M. (1994). *Individual differences in dispositional expressiveness; Development and validation of the emotional expressivity scale*. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 66, (5)
- Kruml, S. M. & Geddes, D. (2000). *Exploring the dimensions of emotional labor.*, Management Communication Quarterly, 1 (14)

M. Paunov, On the Mediating Role of Individual Differences on the Consequences of Emotional Dissonance in Organizations

Mathieu, J. E. & Zajac, D. M. (1990). *A review and meta-analysis of the antecedents, correlates, and consequences of organizational commitment*. Psychological Bulletin, 108

McCrae, R. R; Costa, P.T. (1989), *Reinterpreting the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator From the Perspective of the Five-Factor Model of Personality*, Journal of Personality, 57

Morris, J. A. & Feldman, D. C. (1996). *The dimensions, antecedents, and consequences of emotional labor*. Academy of Management Review, 21, (4) 986-1010

Morris, J. A. & Feldman, D. C. (1996). *The dimensions, antecedents, and consequences of emotional labor*. Academy of Management Review, 21, (4)

Morris, J. A. & Feldman, D. C. (1997). *Managing emotions in the workplace*. Journal of Managerial Issues, 9, (3)

Myers, Isabel Briggs with Peter B. Myers (1989,1995). *Gifts Differing: Understanding Personality Type*. Mountain View, CA: Davies-Black Publishing

Petty, M.M., McGee, G. W. & Cavender, J. W. (1984). *A meta-analysis of the relationships between individual job satisfaction and individual performance*. Academy of Management Review, 9

Quenk, N. L., Hammer, A.L., & Majors, M. S. (2001), MBTI® Step II Manual. Mountain View, CA: CPP, Inc.

Schwartz, S. H. (1996), Value priorities and behaviour: Applying a theory of integrated value systems. In C. Seligman, J. M. Olson, & M. P. Zanna (Eds.), *The Psychology of Values: The Ontario Symposium*, Vol.8, Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum

Spector, P. (1985), *Measurement of human service staff satisfaction: Development of the Job Satisfaction Survey*, American Journal of Community Psychology, 1985, 13, pp. 693-713;

Spector, P. (2001), *Job satisfaction survey*. <http://chuma.cas.usf.edu/~spector/scales/jsspag.html>). Accessed May 6, 2010

Srull, T. K., & Gaelick, L. (1983) *General principles and individual differences in the self as a habitual reference point: An examination of self-other judgements of similarity*. Social Cognition, 2

Sutton, R.I. & Rafaeli, A. (1988). *Untangling the relationship between displayed emotions and organizational sales*. Academy of Management Journal, 31,

Tews, M. & T. Glomb, (2003) *Emotional labor and the five-factor model of personality*, Paper, presented at the 18th annual meeting of the Society for Industrial and Organizational Psychology, Orlando, Florida

Tews, M. J., & Glomb, T. M. (2003). *Emotional labor and the five-factor model of personality*. Paper presented at the 18th annual meeting of the Society for Industrial and Organizational Psychology, Orlando, Florida

M. Paunov, On the Mediating Role of Individual Differences on the Consequences of Emotional Dissonance in Organizations

Vey, M. & J. Bono (2003) *Emotional labor: is it labor for everyone?* Paper, presented at the 18th annual meeting of the Society for Industrial and Organizational Psychology, Orlando, Florida

Vey, M.A. & Bono, J. E. (2003). *Emotional Labor: Is it labor for everyone?* Paper presented at the 18th annual meeting of the Society for Industrial and Organizational Psychology, Orlando, Florida

Weisberg, J and A. Sagie (1999), *Teachers' physical, mental and emotional burnout: Impact on Intention to quit*, Journal of Psychology Interdisciplinary and Applied, 1999, 133 (3)