THE TRUTH BEHIND THE SMILE: EMPLOYEES’ MANAGEMENT OF EMOTIONAL EXPRESSIONS IN INTERACTIONS WITH LEADERS AND PEERS

by

Xiaoxiao Hu
A Dissertation
Submitted to the
Graduate Faculty
of
George Mason University
in Partial Fulfillment of
The Requirements for the Degree of
Doctor of Philosophy
Psychology

Committee:

_________________________  Director

_________________________

_________________________

_________________________  Department Chairperson

_________________________

_________________________  Program Director

_________________________  Dean, College of Humanities and Social Science

Date: ______________________  Spring Semester 2012

George Mason University
Fairfax, VA
The Truth behind the Smile: Employees’ Management of Emotional Expressions in Interactions with Leaders and Peers

A dissertation submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy at George Mason University

by

Xiaoxiao Hu
Bachelor of Arts
George Mason University, 1987

Director: Seth Kaplan, Professor
Department of Psychology

Spring Semester 2012
George Mason University
Fairfax, VA
DEDICATION

This is dedicated to my parents Jiamei Zhang and Jianguo Hu, for bringing me to this beautiful world and teaching me the most important thing in life – how to love and be loved, unconditionally.
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I wish to thank many individuals who helped me survive and enjoy my graduate years and made this dissertation possible. Words cannot adequately convey my thankfulness for my advisor, Dr. Seth Kaplan, who always supports me instrumentally and emotionally, gives me the complete freedom to explore my interest, provides wise advice with great thoughtfulness and patience, has faith in me even when I doubt myself, and inspires me to grow personally and professionally. For me, he is the best advisor possible. I will always keep my deep gratitude and respect for him. I hope that I would become as good an advisor to my students as he has been to me.

I wish to thank Dr. Lois Tetrick for her thoughtful comments on my dissertation and, more importantly, the considerable amount of support and guidance she offered me throughout my graduate school career. I also want to thank Dr. Richard Klimoski for challenging me to further improve my dissertation and sharing his rich wisdom and knowledge with me. Additionally, I thank all other faculty members in the George Mason I/O program, for being excellent scholars and making our program wonderful and unique. I thank Dr. Jose Cortina in particular for delivering fantastic statistical courses and sharing his research and editorial insights with us. In addition, I thank Dr. Junqi Shi and Yanlai Li from Peking University for their help with my dissertation data collection.

The love and support I have received from my friends have played a critical role in the completion of my dissertation and my graduate degree. I thank my fellow graduate students for making my time in graduate school highly enjoyable. Most notably, I thank Phillip and Vias for being such awesome friends and always being there for me when I needed. I also thank all the friends I have made outside the program during my graduate years. I wish I could name all of you here, but there are just too many to list… I am truly grateful to have the chance to meet each one of you and have wonderful times together. In particular, I thank Yanyan for being an amazing roommate and treating me like a sister. I cannot imagine what my life in the past five years would be like without her company and friendship. I am also thankful to my old friends in China, especially ZT, beibei, a-che, and a-luo (you know your nickname). Guys, thanks for loving me during my graduate years just like you did five years ago, even when we had an ocean in between and only saw each other once a year. I feel so lucky to have you guys in my life and I will always love you.

Finally, my deepest thanks go out to my parents, for all the great sacrifices they have made for me and our family during the past 26 years. Mom and Dad, thanks for being so unbelievably open-minded, respecting and supporting whatever I wanted, and always believing in me. I will try my best to live a life worthy of your love and trust, I promise.
TABLE OF CONTENTS

List of Tables ........................................................................................................................................................................... vii
List of Figures ............................................................................................................................................................................... viii
Abstract ......................................................................................................................................................................................... ix

Chapter One ..................................................................................................................................................................................... 1
Model Overview .............................................................................................................................................................................. 5
Antecedents of EEM ......................................................................................................................................................................... 8
  Employee personality ....................................................................................................................................................................... 9
  Interaction Partner Personality ....................................................................................................................................................... 12
Consequences of EEM ........................................................................................................................................................................ 15
  Employee Outcomes ................................................................................................................................................................... 17
  Interaction Partner Outcomes ...................................................................................................................................................... 20
  Leader-Related EEM versus Peer-Related EEM .......................................................................................................................... 23

Chapter Two .................................................................................................................................................................................... 28
Method .............................................................................................................................................................................................. 28
  Overview ...................................................................................................................................................................................... 28
  Participants and Procedure .......................................................................................................................................................... 28
  Measures .................................................................................................................................................................................... 30

Chapter Three .................................................................................................................................................................................. 37
Results ............................................................................................................................................................................................ 37
  Antecedents of EEM ................................................................................................................................................................. 37
  Outcomes of EEM ...................................................................................................................................................................... 42

Chapter Four .................................................................................................................................................................................. 48
Discussion ........................................................................................................................................................................................ 48
  Summary and Interpretation of Specific Findings .......................................................................................................................... 48
  General Theoretical Implications and Contributions ............................................................................................................. 54
  Practical Implications ............................................................................................................................................................... 59
LIST OF TABLES

Table 1 Study Hypotheses .................................................................................................................. 65
Table 2 Descriptive Statistics, Reliabilities, and Intercorrelations among All Variables. 66
Table 3 HLM Results: The Effects of Employees’ Personality and Leaders’ Personality on Employees’ EEM ........................................................................................................................................ 70
Table 4 Multiple Regression Analyses Predicting Outcomes Variables from EEM ........ 71
# LIST OF FIGURES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Figure</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Figure 1. Theoretical model of employees’ management of emotional expressions within organizations</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ABSTRACT

THE TRUTH BEHIND THE SMILE: EMPLOYEES’ MANAGEMENT OF EMOTIONAL EXPRESSIONS IN INTERACTIONS WITH LEADERS AND PEERS

Xiaoxiao Hu, Ph.D.
George Mason University, 2012
Dissertation Director: Dr. Seth Kaplan

Emotional expression management (EEM) has been widely studied in organizational research due to its impact on organizational behaviors and outcomes. Past research almost exclusively has focused on employees’ interactions with external parties such as customers, clients, and patients. The purpose of the current study was to extend this literature by developing and testing a model of employees’ management of emotional expressions in interactions with parties internal to the organization (i.e., leaders and peers). Data was collected from 40 work groups (129 focal participants, 40 leaders, and 40 peers) from a large real estate agency company located in Beijing, China. Results suggested that employees’ EEM was partially determined by their own and their interaction partners’ personality. Employees’ agreeableness and conscientiousness and leaders’ neuroticism appeared to be the major personality predictors of employees’ EEM. Results also showed that employees’ EEM influenced their emotional exhaustion, felt
inauthenticity, and interaction avoidance behaviors as well as their interaction partners’ communication satisfaction and perceived information sharing. In addition, the present findings revealed that the antecedents and consequences of employees’ EEM differed for different types of interaction partners, namely leaders versus peers. The meaning and implications of these results for theory and practice are discussed.

*Keywords:* emotional expression management, faking positive emotions, suppressing negative emotions, the Big Five, emotional exhaustion
CHAPTER ONE

Monica: What was that?

Chandler: What?

Monica: That noise you just made?

Chandler: Oh, that was my work laugh.

-From an episode of the sitcom *Friends* featuring the main character’s faked laughter when interacting with his boss at a holiday office party (*The One With Chandler’s Work Laugh*; 21 January 1999)

The workplace is saturated with emotions, and regulation of emotional displays constitutes an important part of organizational life (Ashforth & Humphrey, 1995). Such regulation has important implications for employees’ daily and long-term functioning and well-being. For instance, employees’ management of their emotional expressions has been associated with various negative outcomes such as psychological strain (Hulsheger & Schewe, 2010), emotional exhaustion (Hulsheger & Schewe, 2010), physical illnesses (Schaubroeck & Jones, 2000), poor job performance (Grandey, 2003) and antisocial behaviors (Brill, 2000).
During the past two decades, dramatic progress has been made in understanding the role and importance of emotional expression management (referred to here as EEM) in organizational behaviors and outcomes (Kanfer & Kantrowitz, 2002). This research mainly has centered around the construct of emotional labor, which is conceptualized as the act of displaying organizationally desired emotions during interpersonal interactions (Morris & Feldman, 1996). Emotional labor research almost exclusively has focused on employees’ interactions with external parties such as customers, clients, and patients (e.g., Fletcher, 1995; Holman, Martinez-Inigo, & Totterdell, 2008), given that managing emotional expressions in these interactions is often required by the job as a means to promote organizational goals (e.g., Ashkanasy & Daus, 2002; Grandey, 2000).

However, employees do not only manage their emotional displays when interacting with external parties. For most employees outside the service industry, the type of interactions in which they most commonly engage is those with internal members of the organization, such as leaders and peers (Grandey, Kern, & Frone, 2007; Tschan, Rochat, & Zapf, 2005). During these interpersonal interactions, management of emotional expressions is common, although such regulation is not required by the job or the organization. Suppressing or faking emotional displays has been found to occur in almost two-thirds of workplace communications, both at and away from the frontline (Mann, 1999), suggesting that there is just as much EEM between internal members of
the organization as between internal and external parties (Glaso & Einarsen, 2008; Strazdins, 2002).

Although employees may frequently manage their emotional displays during internal interactions in the organization, this phenomenon and its consequences have been neglected almost completely in organizational research (see Diefendorff & Grequras, 2009; Glaso & Einarsen, 2008 for two notable exceptions). EEM within organizations is largely different from EEM with external parties, at least in two important ways. First, in EEM with external parties, emotional displays are often explicitly required by the job and thus are a central part of employees’ job performance (Diefendorff, Richard, & Croyle, 2006; Fuller & Smith, 1996). EEM within organizations, on the other hand, is often not dictated by the organization and therefore is much more discretionary. This difference is important as it suggests that EEM in these two situations may involve dissimilar antecedents. For example, since EEM within organizations is more discretionary, internal factors such as employees’ personality traits may be more influential than situational forces.

Another major difference between interactions with external parties and those with internal parties lies in the nature of the relationships. Unlike employee-outsider interactions, which are often one-time incidents (Gutek, Bhappu, Liao-Troth, & Cherry, 1999), interactions between internal members generally occur on a regular, on-going
basis (Grandey et al., 2007). Since such interactions are repeated rather than one-time incidents, behaviors in, and responses to, earlier interactions may influence later interactions between the two parties. This type of influence does not exist in one-time employee-outsider interactions and is not addressed in traditional EEM research.

Given these two important differences, previous theoretical models on EEM are unlikely to be completely adequate for understanding employees’ EEM in interactions with internal members of organizations. Thus, the purpose of this study is to fill this void by developing and testing a model of employees’ management of emotional expressions within organizations (see Model depicted in Figure 1). As implied by the Friends episode scenario cited above, among all types of internal work relationships, employees’ interactions with their leaders may necessitate the largest amount of EEM. Specifically, since leaders have the power to control and influence followers’ resources and career advancement (Kramer, 1995), followers may feel a strong need to manage their emotional displays in interactions with their leaders. In addition to interactions with leaders, the current study also examines employees’ EEM in interactions with peers and compares these two situations in terms of the antecedents and consequences of EEM.

To these ends, the remainder of the paper unfolds as follows. First, I present a theoretical model of employees’ EEM in interactions with internal members of the organization (see Figure 1). Specifically, I provide a detailed discussion of each proposed
antecedent and consequence of EEM in the model, and I advance hypotheses regarding
the posited relationships. By focusing on these relationships, I also hope to provide
insight into the nature of internal EEM. Subsequently, I describe an empirical study of 40
work groups from a real estate agency company and present the results of that study. The
paper closes with a discussion of the meaning and implications of the findings and
directions for future research.

Model Overview

The proposed model is presented in Figure 1. The purpose of creating this
model was to identify and explicate a set of theoretically justified antecedents and
consequences of employees’ EEM within organizations.

At the center of the proposed model are different types of EEM. Researchers
have identified two basic types of expression management strategies, namely faking
emotions and suppressing emotions (Diefendorff & Richard, 2003; Ekman & Oster,
1979; Grandey, 2000; Gross, 1998). Faking emotions refers to displaying emotions that
are not experienced internally (Zuckerman, Klorman, Larrance, & Spiegel, 1981). For
example, employees may pretend to be amused by their leaders’ bad jokes or fake interest
in tasks assigned by their leaders. By contrast, suppressing emotions refers to hiding
emotions that are actually felt (Brotheridge & Grandey, 2002; Gross & Levenson, 1993).
Employees, for instance, may hide their anger when receiving perceived unfair treatment
from their leaders or conceal their disappointment when leaders fail to meet their expectations.

Social norms in most organizations encourage displays of positive emotions and suppression of negative emotions (Cropanzano, Weiss, & Elias, 2004; Wharton & Erickson, 1993). Such norms can help employees build and maintain friendly and courteous interpersonal interactions with each other (Clark, Pataki, & Carver, 1996; Tschan et al., 2005). Consistent with this notion, Diefendorff and Grequras (2009) examined employees’ expression management strategies associated with different emotions and work targets. They found that employees generally tend to express positive emotions and suppress negative ones when interacting with different work targets, including supervisors and peers. Therefore, the current model focuses on these two types of expression management strategies.

At the left side of the model are antecedents which are posited to influence employees’ EEM. In previous research, adjusted emotional displays are often a job requirement which is formally enforced by evaluation systems in the organization (Diefendorff et al., 2006; Fuller & Smith, 1996). The management of emotional expressions examined in this study, on the other hand, is not explicitly prescribed and therefore is more likely to reflect the characteristics of the individuals in the interaction. Thus, for antecedents of EEM, the current study focuses on the personality traits of
employees and of their interaction partners (i.e., leaders and peers). In terms of specific personality variables, the present study examines the Big Five personality dimensions. Among these dimensions, agreeableness, extroversion, and neuroticism are posited to be most relevant to employees’ EEM, as detailed below.

In terms of the consequences of employees’ EEM, the current model integrates two types of outcomes, namely employee outcomes and interaction partner outcomes. Specifically, employee outcomes are emotional exhaustion, felt inauthenticity, and interaction avoidance behaviors while interaction partner outcomes are communication satisfaction and perceived information sharing. These variables are proposed to be important consequences of employees’ EEM in interactions within organizations, as detailed in a section below.

The present study examines both EEM in interactions with leaders (i.e., leader-related EEM) and EEM in interactions with peers (i.e., peer-related EEM) and compares these two types of EEM in terms of antecedents and consequences. Below, I first discuss the model in general. Subsequently, I propose possible differences between these two situations (leaders versus peers). In the next section, I provide a detailed discussion of each antecedent in the model.
Antecedents of EEM

As discussed above, the current study focuses on personality traits of employees and their interaction partners as predictors of EEM. Among the Big Five personality dimensions, agreeableness, extraversion/positive affectivity (PA), and neuroticism/negative affectivity (NA) are especially closely linked with social and emotional processes (Costa & McCrae, 1992). Agreeableness concerns how one treats other individuals in interpersonal interactions (Costa & McCrae, 1992) while extraversion and neuroticism have been suggested to be interchangeable respectively with PA and NA which represent one’s chronic affective tendency (Fortunato, 2004; Tellegen, 1985). Given the affective and interpersonal nature of EEM (Cote, 2005; Mann, 1999), these three personality dimensions should be the ones that are most relevant here.

The other two major personality dimensions, namely conscientiousness and openness to experience, may be less important, or even irrelevant, to employees’ internal EEM. People high on conscientiousness tend to work hard and approach their job roles with great diligence (Barrick & Mount, 1991, 2005). Unlike EEM with external parties which is often a central part of employees’ job role (Diefendorff et al., 2006; Fuller & Smith, 1996), EEM within organizations is usually not prescribed by employees’ work roles and therefore may be influenced less by conscientious. In terms of openness, Tan and colleagues (2003) indicated that there was no theoretical reason why openness to
experience and EEM should be related. Consistent with this notion, previous research has found no significant correlation between openness and EEM (Austin, Dore, & O’Donovan, 2008; Diefendorff, Croyle, & Gosserand, 2005). Given this theoretical and empirical evidence, openness is unlikely to be relevant to employees’ EEM within organizations.

Below, each of the three dimensions of interest here (i.e., agreeableness, extraversion/PA, and neuroticism/NA) and its predicted relationship with employees’ EEM is described. The role of the personality dimensions is first discussed in terms of the employees’ standing on the traits and then with respect to the interaction partners’ personality.

Employee personality

Agreeableness. In terms of employees’ agreeableness, it is posited to be positively related with employees’ EEM. This personality dimension involves individuals’ innate need to get along with other people (Carver & Scheier, 1996; McCrae & Costa, 1991). According to McCrae and Costa (1991), agreeable individuals highly value interpersonal harmony and consistently try to develop and maintain positive relationships with others. As such, individuals higher on agreeableness should exhibit great interpersonal sensitivity and tend to alter their emotional displays to fit other people’s emotional reactions in attempting to comply with others and to develop
harmonious and smooth social interactions. Consistent with this view, Tobin, Graziano, Vanman, and Tassinary (2000) showed that individuals with higher agreeableness feel greater need to manage their emotions and conduct emotion management more often than those with lower agreeableness. Also, Yalcin (2010) recently found that, among the Big Five personality dimensions, agreeableness was the best predictor of individuals’ management of emotional expressions. Translating these findings into the current model, employees higher in agreeableness should be more likely to engage in EEM during interactions within organizations. Based on these ideas, I propose the following hypothesis. All study hypotheses are summarized in Table 1.

**Hypothesis 1:** Employees’ agreeableness is positively associated with their suppressing negative emotions (H1a) and faking positive emotions (H1b).

**Extroversion/PA.** The second personality dimension examined here is extroversion/PA which is characterized by positive emotions and the tendency to search for social interactions (McCrae & Costa, 1991; Watson & Clark, 1984). Individuals with higher extroversion/PA tend to naturally experience positive emotions and not feel low arousal negative emotions such as sadness and distress (Tellegen, 1985; Watson & Clark, 1984). Thus, these individuals may have less need to fake positive emotions and suppress negative emotions in social interactions. In addition, extraverts tend to seek out companionship and usually feel very comfortable around other people (Eysenck, 1967;
McCrae & Costa, 1991). They report higher levels of satisfaction with their social interactions, and the enjoyment they derive from interpersonal activities reinforces their desire for future social contact (Berry & Hansen, 1996; Cooper, Okamura, & Gurka, 1992; Watson, Clark, McIntyre, & Hamaker, 1992). Thus, individuals with higher extroversion/PA should be less likely to engage in effortful EEM which would make the interaction tiresome and unpleasant to them. Consistent with this notion, Eysenck and Eysenck (1968) suggested that typical extraverts tend not to regulate their emotional reactions in social interactions. Based on these ideas, I propose the following hypothesis.

Hypothesis 2: Employees’ extroversion/PA is negatively associated with their suppressing negative emotions (H2a) and faking positive emotions (H2b).

Neuroticism/NA. The next personality dimension examined here is neuroticism/NA, higher levels of which are characterized by negative emotional states and the tendency to interpret ordinary situations as stressful and threatening (McCrae & Costa, 1991; Watson & Clark, 1984). Individuals higher on neuroticism/NA are sensitive to negative environmental stimulation and tend to notice and focus on unpleasant aspects of themselves, other people, and the world around them (McCrae & Costa, 1991; Watson & Clark, 1984). In other words, they generally interpret the self and the environment through negative lenses (Clark & Watson, 1991). Therefore, employees with higher neuroticism/NA should tend to experience more frequent negative emotions in
interactions with other people in the organization (Ng & Diener, 2009; Rodell & Judge, 2009; Tong, 2010). Since the social norms within organizations often encourage expressions of positive emotions but not negative emotions (Cropanzano et al., 2004; Wharton & Erickson, 1993), these employees should need to engage in more emotion suppression and/or faking to conceal/mask their negative feelings.

Additionally, since neuroticism/NA is characterized by greater sensitivity to situational influence, individuals high on neuroticism/NA should be more likely to perceive organizational demands to manage emotional expressions. In line with this view, previous empirical research shows that employees’ neuroticism/NA is positively associated with their perception of display rules (e.g., the need to suppress negative emotions) in the organization (Diefendorff & Richard, 2003; Schaubroek & Jones, 2000). Based on these ideas, I propose the following hypothesis.

**Hypothesis 3:** Employees’ neuroticism/NA is positively associated with their suppressing negative emotions (H3a) and faking positive emotions (H3b).

**Interaction Partner Personality**

In addition to employees’ own personality, interaction partners’ personality also may influence employees’ EEM within organizations. Since interaction partners’ personality partly determines the positive/negative affect generated during the interaction (McCrae & Costa, 1987; Watson, Clark, & Tellegen, 1988) and the degree to which they
tolerate and encourage others’ true expressions (Graziano & Eisenberg, 1997), interaction partners’ personality should impact the situational demand for employees’ EEM, as elaborated below.

**Agreeableness.** As discussed above, agreeableness refers to individuals’ tendency to be flexible, caring, tolerant, trusting, good-natured and soft-hearted (Costa & McCrae, 1992). Interaction partner’s high degree of agreeableness is likely to keep situational demand for employees’ EEM at a minimum level. Compared to those with lower agreeableness, individuals with higher agreeableness are more willing to accommodate others and to engage in prosocial behaviors (Costa & McCrae, 1992; Graziano & Eisenberg, 1997; McCrae & Costa, 1987). Thus, these interaction partners should be more likely to tolerate and encourage others’ true expressions of themselves and should be less likely to create situations where others need to suppress negative emotions or fake positive emotions. Therefore, interaction partners’ agreeableness is expected to have a dampening effect on employees’ EEM.

*Hypothesis 4: Interaction partners’ agreeableness is negatively associated with employees suppressing negative emotions (H4a) and faking positive emotions (H4b).*

**Extroversion/PA.** Compared with agreeableness, the influence of interaction partners’ extroversion/PA influence on employees’ EEM is less clear. On one hand, individuals high on extroversion/PA are likely to naturally generate a large amount of
positive emotions (Damen, van Knippenberg, & van Knippenberg, 2008). These positive emotions may pose situational demands for others to suppress negative emotions and fake or amplify positive emotions to match the level of positive affect. On the other hand, the positive affect generated by individuals with higher extroversion/PA may be contagious (Barsade, 2002; Barsade & Gibson, 1998). Such positive affect may enhance others’ actual levels of positive affect and decrease their experienced negative affect and therefore reduce their need to fake positive emotions and suppress negative emotions. Given these competing predictions, the influence of interaction partners’ extroversion/PA’s on employees’ EEM is examined in an exploratory manner in the current study.

**Neuroticism/NA.** Lastly, interaction partners’ high degree of neuroticism/NA is likely to pose a situational demand for employees’ EEM. Compared to those with lower neuroticism/NA, individuals with higher neuroticism/NA are more likely to generate and express negative feelings such as anxiety, anger, and depression (McCrae & Costa, 1991; Watson & Clark, 1984). In interactions with other people, they may transmit their negative emotions through language and nonverbal behaviors (Bono & Ilies, 2006). In addition, individuals high on neuroticism/NA tend to view themselves as victims, rate other people less favorably, and be dissatisfied with themselves, with their jobs, and with the people in their lives (Clark & Watson, 1991). Thus, these individuals are more likely
to have a hostile interaction style (Watson, 2000) which may further elicit negative affect in others. Applying these ideas to the work context, individuals with higher neuroticism/NA should tend to engender negative emotions in others and thus increase the employees’ need to suppress such emotions and/or fake positive emotion to conceal/mask such emotions. Therefore, interaction partner’s neuroticism/NA is expected to have a positive relationship with employees’ EEM.

*Hypothesis 5: Interaction partners’ neuroticism/NA is positively associated with employees suppressing negative emotions (H5a) and faking positive emotions (H5b).*

**Consequences of EEM**

Above, I proposed the major personality dimensions that may influence employees’ EEM in interactions with internal members of the organization. As seen in Figure 1, EEM, in turn, is predicted to lead to various outcomes. As previously mentioned, emotion management research has revealed various harmful effects of EEM on employees (Bono & Vey, 2005). To my knowledge, only one study has investigated these effects with respect to EEM within organizations. Specifically, Glaso and Einarsen (2008) assessed the degree to which employees and their leaders suppress and fake their emotion displays during interactions and examined two outcome variables, namely, overall job satisfaction and subjective health complaints. They found that, both suppressing and faking emotions in interactions with leaders were negatively related with
overall job satisfaction and positively related with subjective health complaints.

The current study is aimed to provide a more thorough examination of the outcomes of employees’ EEM within organizations by assessing its potential effects on both employees and their interaction partners. With regard to employee outcomes, the present study focuses on emotional exhaustion, felt inauthenticity, and interaction avoidance. The first two variables are the most frequently examined outcomes in EEM research on employee-outsider interactions (e.g., Grandey et al., 2005; Pugh, Groth, & Hennig-Thurau, 2010; Seery & Corrigall, 2009; Wong & Law, 2002; Zapf, 2002). The current study addresses whether managing emotion displays within organizations also shows similar effects on these outcome variables. As noted above, unlike those employee-outsider interactions which are an in-role job requirement in the service industry (Diefendorff et al., 2006; Fuller & Smith, 1996), the interactions examined in the present study are not formally enforced by organizations and thus allows employees’ to find ways to “get away” from them. Given this possibility, interaction avoidance also is examined as an outcome variable of EEM in the current study.

With regard to interaction partner outcomes, the present study assesses communication satisfaction and perceived information sharing. These two particular variables were chosen here because they would seem to be directly influenced by EEM and can reflect EEM’s impact on others’ attitudes and perceptions. Inclusion of these two
variables is also helpful for understanding the effects of EEM on both task-related (e.g., information sharing) and interpersonal (e.g., communication satisfaction) processes in the organization.

In the following sections, I first discuss employee outcomes and then turn to interaction partner outcomes. I propose effects of employees’ EEM on each of these outcome variables based on theoretical arguments and empirical evidence.

**Employee Outcomes**

**Emotional exhaustion.** As one of the three components of burnout, emotional exhaustion is defined as the draining or depletion of emotional resources (Maslach & Jackson, 1986) and has been described as “the central quality of burnout and the most obvious manifestation of this complex syndrome” (Maslach, Schaufeli, & Leiter, 2001, p. 402). Emotional exhaustion can lead to physical complaints, depression, and other serious health problems in the long run (Maslach & Jackson, 1986).

During the process of EEM, one’s actual emotional experience and the external emotional display remain discrepant, which poses a threat to one’s emotional well-being (Grandey, 2000; Totterdell & Holman, 2003). A meta-analysis conducted by Bono and Vey (2005) revealed a positive relationship between managing emotion displays and emotional exhaustion. Brotheridge and Grandey (2002) found that using expression management as a strategy to handle emotions had negative effect on emotional health.
To date, however, empirical research linking EEM and emotional exhaustion has been focused on employee-outsider interactions (e.g., between agents and customers). One may argue that such interactions may take place more frequently than interactions within organizations and thus the EEM-emotional exhaustion relationship should be weaker in the latter situation. However, the burnout literature generally suggests that the frequency of interactions is not a good predictor of emotional exhaustion whereas the quality/nature of the interaction appears to be a better indicator (Koeske & Koeske, 1989). Therefore, when interpersonal interactions within organizations require large amounts of EEM, such interactions are likely to contribute to the employees’ emotional exhaustion even if they do not take place as frequently. Based on these ideas, I propose the following hypothesis.

*Hypothesis 6: Employees’ suppressing negative emotions (H6a) and faking positive emotions (H6b) are positively associated with their emotional exhaustion.*

**Felt inauthenticity.** Since emotion expression management is essentially simulating the expression of emotions that are not actually experienced (Grandey, 2000), it poses a challenge to one’s perceived authenticity (Hochschild, 1983). The concept of authenticity has its roots in ancient Greek philosophy (Harter, 2002). Drawing from the positive psychology literature (Cameron, Dutton, & Quinn, 2003; Snyder & Lopez, 2002), authenticity refers to owning one’s values, emotions and beliefs and behaving in
consistence with one’s real self (Harter, 2002). Thus, to achieve authenticity, individuals need to express their true feelings and emotions instead of suppressing or faking them (Harter, 2002).

Therefore, emotion expression management and the resulting discrepancy between experienced and expressed emotion should lead to feelings of personal inauthenticity (Ashforth & Humphrey, 1993; Hochschild, 1983; Morris & Feldman, 1997). Empirical evidence from service employees suggests that managing emotion displays at work results in high levels of self-reported inauthenticity (Brotheridge & Lee, 2002; Erickson & Ritter, 2001; Gross & John, 2003; Simpson & Stroh, 2004). Based on these ideas, I propose the following hypothesis.

Hypothesis 7: Employees’ suppressing negative emotions (H7a) and faking positive emotions (H7b) are positively associated with their felt inauthenticity at work.

Interaction avoidance. Given that internal EEM is not explicitly dictated by organizations, employees may be more likely to find ways to “get away” from the partners who otherwise would necessitate it. As Frijda (1994, 2007) indicated, affective experiences can energize or prohibit future behaviors. Unpleasant experiences can lead to avoidance behaviors which may serve as a form of coping, a way to address current problems to improve the situation (Cacioppo, Gardner, & Bernston, 1999; Elfenbein, 2007). Consistent with this notion, Grandey (2000) contended that EEM results in
unpleasant physiological arousal, which may lead to avoidance behaviors such as leaving the work floor and absenteeism in customer service jobs. Different from interactions with customers, interactions with leaders and peers are not explicitly dictated in the job requirements and therefore can be actively avoided by employees without leaving the job. Given that EEM stifles personal expression and results in unpleasant experiences of emotional dissonance (Hochschild, 1983; Van Maanen & Kunda, 1989), employees are likely to develop a behavioral tendency to avoid interpersonal interactions that involve large amounts of EEM. Following this reasoning, I propose the following hypothesis.

Hypothesis 8: Employees’ suppressing negative emotions (H8a) and faking positive emotions (H8b) are positively associated with their interaction avoidance with the particular interaction partner.

**Interaction Partner Outcomes**

In addition to their own psychological well-being and behaviors, employees’ EEM may also influence relevant interaction partner outcomes, as elaborated below.

**Communication satisfaction.** EEM is likely to influence interaction partners’ communication satisfaction through their detection of the (in)authenticity in employees’ EEM. Basic psychological research suggests that untrained observers oftentimes can distinguish between authentic and inauthentic displays of happiness (Frank et al., 1993; Grandey, Fisk, Mattila, & Sideman, 2002). Other research demonstrates that when
individuals manage their emotional displays, there seems to be some “leakage” which allows others to detect the inauthenticity (Ekman & Friesen, 1969). Consistent with this finding, self-reports and peer-reports of EEM have been found to be strongly correlated, indicating that the audience is able to detect actors’ inauthentic emotion displays (Gross & John, 2003). Thus, when employees suppress or fake emotion displays, their interaction partners are likely to detect the specious nature of their emotional expressions.

This detection of management of emotion expressions may influence perceivers’ communication satisfaction. Since suppressing or faking emotion displays involves the intention to deceive others about the actors’ real feelings (Grandey, 2000, 2003; Hochschild, 1983), interaction partners generally tend to respond adversely to EEM. This effect holds across different discrete emotions (Cote, 2005). Receivers may see EEM as deliberate attempts to control them and thus view the communication as a manipulative or even deceptive process (Gardner & Martinko, 1988; Rafaeli & Sutton, 1989).

In addition, EEM may take up regulatory resources that are important for high quality communication. Muraven, Baumeister, and their colleagues (Baumeister & Exline, 1999; Baumeister, Muraven, & Tice, 2000; Muraven & Baumeister, 2000) have found that efforts at self-regulation consume regulatory resources thereby limiting one’s ability to engage in other activities, such as processing and remembering information.
(Baumeister, Bratslavsky, Muraven, & Tice, 1998). According to these findings, when employees are trying to suppress the urge to express anger or pretend to be happy or enthusiastic, for example, regulatory resources are used and this may impair their performance on other tasks at hand (Muraven & Baumeister, 2000), such as maintaining high quality communication with others. Based on these ideas, it is expected that employees’ EEM will negatively influence interaction partners’ communication satisfaction.

_Hypothesis 9: Employees’ suppressing negative emotions (H9a) and faking positive emotions (H9b) are negatively associated with their interaction partners’ communication satisfaction._

**Perceived information sharing.** In addition to communication satisfaction, which reflects interaction partners’ affective reactions to interactions (Hecht, 1984; Park & Raile, 2010), the current study also examines interaction partners’ perception of (employees’) information sharing, which reflects their cognitive evaluations of the interactions (Miranda & Saunders, 2003). This latter outcome variable is important because, according to the norm of reciprocity, individuals’ perception of others’ information sharing can largely influence their own information sharing behaviors (Bock, Zmud, Kim, & Lee, 2005). Such behaviors have been suggested to enhance performance by clarifying major issues, bringing unique expertise and perspectives, fostering
awareness of opportunities, and raising alternative solutions to problems (Larson, Christensen, Abbott, & Franz, 1996; Mesmer-Magnus & DeChurch, 2009; Van de Ven, 1986).

In the current paper, employees’ EEM is expected to negatively influence the interaction partner’s perceived information sharing. As mentioned above, people are often able to detect others’ inauthentic emotion displays (Gross & John, 2003). Detection of the inauthentic nature of actors’ nonverbal expression may lead perceivers to question the authenticity and adequacy of the semantic information shared by the actors.

Following this reasoning, I propose the following hypothesis.

Hypothesis 10: Employees’ suppressing negative emotions (H10a) and faking positive emotions (H10b) are negatively associated with their interaction partners’ perceived information sharing.

Leader-Related EEM versus Peer-Related EEM

Above, I discussed predictors and outcomes of EEM in general terms, across interaction partners. However, one goal of this study is to compare the strength of correlates of EEM across interaction partners.

Differences in antecedents of EEM. With regard to the antecedents, I expect that employees’ personality is more influential for peer-related EEM than it is for leader-related EEM. Conversely, I expect interaction partners’ personality to be more important
for leader-related EEM than for peer-related EEM. The basic rationale here is that the leader scenario may be a “stronger situation” given leaders’ power to control and influence followers’ resources and career advancement (Kramer, 1995). That is, leaders’ relatively high status may allow them to determine the situational desirability of follower behaviors based on their own preferences and/or tendencies. Thus, leaders’ personality may be more influential for employees’ EEM while employees’ personality may have less influence and its effects might be overridden. Consistent with this idea, Overbeck and colleagues (2010) recently indicated that high-status individuals follow their natural affective and behavioral tendencies whereas low-status individuals adjust their reactions based on the emotion responses of their more powerful counterparts. That is, low-status employees’ emotional expressions may be mainly determined by high-status employees’ affective tendencies and reactions rather than their own tendencies. In contrast, the peer situation may not involve such power imbalance, so employees’ EEM is likely to be based more on their own chronic behavioral tendencies and less on their interaction partners’ personality. Following this reasoning, I propose the following hypotheses.

*Hypothesis 11: Employees’ personality accounts for more variance in peer-related EEM than in leader-related EEM.*

*Hypothesis 12: Interaction partners’ personality accounts for more variance in leader-related EEM than in peer-related EEM.*
Differences in outcomes of EEM. The difference between the two situations discussed above is important partly because it may impact the negative effects EEM exerts in the two situations. Since leader-related EEM may be mainly a result of situational demand rather than one’s innate behavioral tendencies, such EEM may pose a greater threat to one’s felt authenticity and emotional well-being. In line with this notion, Diestel and Schmidt (2011) recently found that self-control demand (i.e., need to control spontaneous and automatic reactions and tendencies) amplified the negative influence of emotional dissonance. This finding suggests that, when EEM is a result of environmental requirement rather than one’s innate tendencies, the resulting emotional dissonance has greater harmful impact on one’s psychological well-being. Since leader-related EEM may be more influenced by situational demand (posted by leaders’ behavioral tendencies) than is peer-related EEM, the effects of leader-related EEM on employees’ emotional exhaustion and felt authenticity should be stronger than those of peer-related EEM.

Hypothesis 13: The effects of leader-related EEM on employees’ emotional exhaustion are stronger than those of peer-related EEM.

Hypothesis 14: The effects of leader-related EEM on employees’ felt authenticity are stronger than those of peer-related EEM.

With regard to interaction avoidance, the power asymmetry between employees and their leaders (Glaso & Einarsen, 2008) may lead to employees experiencing greater
difficulty actively “getting away” from their leaders versus from their peers, assuming that their task interdependency with these two types of interaction partners is roughly equal. In addition, employees may want to interact with their leaders due to instrumental concerns (e.g., better performance ratings, promotion decisions, etc.) even if they have to engage in large amounts of EEM in such interactions. Thus, the effects of EEM on employees’ interaction avoidance should be weaker for leader-related EEM than for peer-related EEM.

*Hypothesis 15: The effects of leader-related EEM on employees’ interaction avoidance are weaker than those of peer-related EEM.*

With regard to the interaction partner outcome of communication satisfaction, although people may react adversely to EEM in general due to the insincerity it involves, leaders may interpret employees’ EEM as a demonstration of compliance and submissiveness (Liu, Ferris, Treadway, Prati, Perrewe, & Hochwarter, 2006). In turn, this interpretation may attenuate the negative effects of EEM on leader’s communication satisfaction. According to dominance complementarity theory (Carson, 1969; Kiesler, 1983), in interactions characterized by power imbalance, high-quality communication is facilitated when one party’s dominance is balanced by the other party’s obedience. Previous research shows that low-power individuals tend to use adjusted emotional displays as a deference gesture to please their high-power interaction partners (Hecht
&LaFrance, 1998). Such compliance gesture (i.e., EEM) may match leaders’ dominant posture well, which, based on dominance complementarity theory (Carson, 1969; Kiesler, 1983), can facilitate and smoothen leader-follower interactions, leading to more satisfaction with the communication from the leaders. Thus, although leaders may still react adversely to EEM because of its inauthenticity, the negative influence of EEM on leaders’ communication satisfaction is likely to be weaker than its influence on peers’ communication satisfaction. Since I lack a strong theoretical rationale that supports differential effects of peer-related EEM and leader-related EEM on perceived information sharing, I do not propose corresponding hypothesis here.

*Hypothesis 16: The effects of employees’ EEM on leaders’ communication satisfaction are weaker than those on peers’ communication satisfaction.*
CHAPTER TWO

Method

Overview

To investigate this model and the specific study hypotheses, I conducted a field study in a Chinese organization. Leaders and their multiple followers were recruited from a large real estate agency company located in Beijing, China. In this company, a group leader and all of his/her employees (i.e., followers) work together to serve customers who are attempting to purchase or rent apartments or houses. There is a significant amount of face-to-face interactions between each leader and his/her followers as well as among these followers, which is important for examinations of the target phenomenon (i.e., EEM) because EEM is typically performed in face-to-face interactions. Members of each group (one leader and all his/her followers) were asked to complete paper-and-pencil survey questionnaires (of the relevant variables) in a room on company premises during their working hours.

Participants and Procedure

Participants were members of 40 work groups from the real estate agency company mentioned above. The study was announced by the researcher or her research
assistant during employees’ working hours. Participation was voluntary. If all members of a group (one leader and all his/her followers) agreed to participate, they were asked to respond to paper-and-pencil survey questionnaires. All groups approached by the researcher agreed to participate in the study.

The researcher and/or her research assistant were present during the entire time of survey administration. For each participating group, one follower was randomly selected as the “peer” (by drawing lots). Other followers in the group were the focal participants in this study and rated their EEM towards the leader and this peer, respectively. These focal participants also completed employee outcome measures as well as measures of control variables and demographic information. At the same time, the leader and the peer provided their communication satisfaction and information sharing ratings for each of the focal participants. All participants also provided personality ratings.

Participants were assured that their responses were confidential and would only be seen by the primary investigator of the study. Each focal participant was randomly assigned a letter (e.g., A, B, etc.) as the identifying code at the beginning of the study session. Each individual wore a name tag with the identifying code on it, so the leader and the peer knew each ratee’s code. Only these letters (rather than employee names) appeared in the leader-peer survey. The identifying code was put on the first page of the focal participant survey to ensure that responses could be matched afterwards. A similar
procedure was used by Moon, Kamdar, Mayer, and Takeuchi (2008) in their examination of supervisor and coworker perceptions of taking charge behaviors.

Respondents in this study included 129 focal participants, 40 leaders, and 40 peers. The size of the group (including the leader and the peer) ranged from 4 to 9, with a mean of 5.20 and a median of 5. Among the 129 focal participants, 59% were men. The mean age of the focal participants was 24.02 (SD = 3.93) and their mean organizational tenure was .91 year (SD = .79). Among the 40 leaders, 64% were men. Their mean age was 28.54 (SD = 3.67) and their mean organizational tenure was 2.77 years (SD = 2.70). Among the 40 peers, 71% were men. Their mean age was 25.38 (SD = 3.97) and their mean organizational tenure was 1.29 years (SD = 1.13).

Measures

All measures were translated and back-translated from Chinese and English (Brislin, 1981). The English version of each measure is provided in the Appendix. The measures were arranged in the following order in the survey packets: the outcome measures, the EEM measure (only for focal participants), the personality measures, control variables, and demographic information.

The Big Five. The Big Five personality dimensions were assessed using a 50-item instrument from the International Personality Item Pool (Goldberg, 1999). Although only three of the five personality dimensions were proposed to be related to employees’
EEM, all five dimensions were measured for the purpose of completeness. The inclusion of the other two dimensions also allowed for the possibility of unexpected linkages between the other two traits and EEM. Each of the five personality dimensions was assessed with 10 items.

Sample items are: “I have a soft heart” for agreeableness, “I am the life of the party” for extroversion, “I worry about things” for neuroticism, “I like order” for conscientiousness, and “I have a vivid imagination” for openness. Responses were made on a 5-point scale ranging from 1 (completely disagree) to 5 (completely agree). This measure was completed by all participants (i.e., focal participants, leaders, and peers).

**EEM.** EEM was measured by items adapted from the Discrete Emotions Emotional Labor Scale (DEELS) developed and validated by Glomb and Tews (2004). This measure was developed to assess employees’ EEM on the job in general. Since the current study focused on employees’ EEM in interactions with leaders and peers, the questions were revised and restricted to interactions with a particular target. Specifically, to measure faking, participants were asked to respond to the question “How often do you express feelings of _____ in interactions with person X (leader’s or peer’s identifying code) when you really do not feel that way”. The blank indicated one of three positive emotions (i.e., happiness, interest, amusement). Similarly, to measure suppressing, participants were asked to respond to the question “How often do you keep feelings of
_____ to yourself in interactions with person X (leader’s or peer’s identifying code) when you really feel that way”. The blank indicated one of three negative emotions (i.e., sadness, anger, frustration). The participants answered the questions using a 5-point Likert scale, ranging from 1 (never) to 5 (very often). This measure was completed by focal participants in the study.

The DEELS assesses employees faking and suppression of fourteen emotions. Due to concerns regarding the length of the questionnaire, only six emotions were measured in the current study (three positive emotions to measure faking and three negative emotions to measure suppressing), as indicated above. These six emotions (i.e., happiness, interest, amusement, sadness, anger, and frustration) were selected for two reasons. First, these emotions have been identified as transcultural phenomenon (Ekman, 1999), meaning that individuals with different cultural backgrounds express and recognize these emotions in the same way (Ekman, 1993; Matsumoto, 2001). This is in contrast to some other emotions (e.g., boredom, calmness, excitement) that are not universally expressed and thus may lead to some ambiguity in terms of corresponding facial expressions (Diefendorff & Grequras, 2009). Second, employees have been shown to experience and/or display these six emotions relatively frequently in the workplace (Basch & Fisher, 2000; Grandey, Tam & Brauburger, 2002; Holmes & Marra, 2006). For instance, Glaso and Einarsen (2008) found that interest and gladness (which is a synonym...
for happiness) are two of the emotions employees most frequently fake in interactions with leaders while anger and sadness are two of the emotions employees most frequently suppress when interacting with leaders.

In the current study, the three positive emotions and the three negative emotions were aggregated respectively to form variables “faking positive emotions” and “suppressing negative emotions”. This aggregation was based on the factor structure of DEELS (i.e., faking positive emotions and suppressing negative emotions represent two separate factors; Glomb & Tews, 2004) and is consistent with previous research supporting the two general systems (i.e., positive and negative) of affect and emotions (Tellegen, Watson, & Clark 1999; Watson, Weise, Vaidya, & Tellegen, 1999).

**Outcomes variables.**

*Emotional exhaustion.* Emotional exhaustion was assessed by the five-item emotional exhaustion subscale of Maslach Burnout Inventory-General Survey (MBI-GS; Schaufeli et al., 1996). Responses were made on a 5-point scale ranging from 1 (never) to 5 (always). A sample item is “I feel emotionally drained from my work”. This measure was completed by focal participants.

*Felt inauthenticity.* Felt inauthenticity was measured by six items developed by Sloan (2007). A sample item is “I basically have to become a different person when I am at work”. Responses were rated on a 5-point scale ranging from 1 (completely disagree)
to 5 (completely agree). This measure was completed by focal participants.

**Interaction avoidance.** Interaction avoidance was measured by three items: “I try to stay away from interactions with person X (leader’s or peer’s identifying code) at work”; “I never initiate interactions with person X (leader’s or peer’s identifying code)”; and “I often intentionally avoid opportunities to interact with person X (leader’s or peer’s identifying code)”. These three items were developed for this study to capture employees’ intentional avoidance of interactions with others at work. The items were created partially based on the Social Avoidance and Distress scale (SAD; Watson & Friend, 1969) which assesses individuals’ experienced distress in social interactions and their general avoidance of social encounters. Responses were rated on a 5-point scale ranging from 1 (completely disagree) to 5 (completely agree). This measure was completed by focal participants.

**Communication satisfaction.** Communication satisfaction was measured by three items adapted from Park and Raile (2010). The items were revised to include participant’s identifying code. For example, the item “Overall, I am very satisfied in my conversations with this person” was rephrased as “Overall, I am very satisfied in my conversations with person X (focal participant’s identifying code)”. Responses were rated on a 5-point scale ranging from 1 (completely disagree) to 5 (completely agree). This measure was completed by leaders and peers.
**Perceived information sharing.** Perceived information sharing was measured by three items adapted from Chang and Chuang’s (2011) measurement for knowledge sharing in virtual community. The items were revised to capture perceived information sharing in interactions with other organization members. For instance, the item “The knowledge shared by members in the virtual community is complete” was rephrased to read “The information shared by person X (focal participant’s identifying code) is complete”. Responses were rated on a 5-point scale ranging from 1 (completely disagree) to 5 (completely agree). This measure was completed by leaders and peers.

**Control Variables.** All participants were asked to provide demographic information such as gender. Focal participants were also asked to indicate how long they had worked with the leader and the peer, respectively. The other control variable was task interdependence which was measured by Campion, Medsker, and Higgs’ (1993) three-item scale. An example item is “I cannot accomplish my tasks without information or materials from person X (peer’s identifying code). Responses were rated on a 5-point scale ranging from 1 (completely disagree) to 5 (completely agree). This measure was completed by focal participants.

These control variables were measured here because employees’ behaviors in interactions with a particular partner are likely to be influenced by how long they have interacted with this partner and their general need to interact with this partner at work.
(which can be measured by assessing task interdependence; Campion, Medsker, & Higgs, 1993; Stewart & Barrick, 2000).
CHAPTER THREE

Results

Table 2 displays means, standard deviations, reliabilities and correlations among study variables. Given the nested structure of the data (i.e., employees nested within groups), multilevel analyses were conducted to test study hypotheses. Faking positive emotions and suppressing negative emotions were treated separately in the analyses. In the following paragraphs, I will use shortened phrases to indicate different types of EEM: “faking with leader” short for faking positive emotions in interactions with leaders, “suppressing with leader” short for suppressing negative emotions in interactions with leaders, “faking with peer” short for faking positive emotions in interactions with peers, and “suppressing with peer” short for suppressing negative emotions in interactions with peers.

Antecedents of EEM

For the antecedent part of the model (i.e., personality-EEM linkages), hierarchical linear modeling (HLM) was performed using the statistical software HLM 6.0. Since employees are nested within groups (and therefore the particular leader and peer), employee personality is Level 1 predictor whereas leader/peer personality is Level 2
predictor.

The unconditional means model (i.e., a null model with no predictors) was run first to determine between-group variance in EEM. Results of these analyses demonstrated significant between-group variance in employees suppressing with leader ($\chi^2(39) = 101.56, p < .001$) and non-significant between-group variance in their faking with leader ($\chi^2(39) = 47.85, p = .156$), faking with peer ($\chi^2(39) = 45.18, p = .229$), and suppressing with peer ($\chi^2(39) = 47.05, p = .176$). These analyses also allowed for the calculation of intraclass correlation coefficients (ICCs) reflecting the proportion of between-group variance relative to total variance of the dependent variable (Hofmann, Griffin, & Gavin, 2000). In the current study, ICC for suppressing with leader was .34, indicating 34% was between group variance (i.e., variance associated with the particular leader). The remaining ICCs were .06 for faking with leader, .06 for faking with peer, and .07 for suppressing with peer.

Although there was no significant between-group variance for faking with leader, faking with peer, or suppressing with peer, multilevel analyses were still conducted to allow for assessing both within-group and between-group effects. Previous research suggests that non-significant ICCs should not be discounted because the power for such significance tests is usually extremely limited (Zucker, 1990). Rooney and Murray (1996) warned that researchers should be careful not to disregard the impact of a small ICC.
Thus, Level 2 predictors were still examined for faking with leader, faking with peer, and suppressing with peer, despite their low ICC values.

To test study hypotheses, control variables, Level 1 predictors, and Level 2 predictors were entered into the multilevel model in HLM. More specifically, I modeled Level 1 effects of employees' personality (Hypotheses 1-3) and Level 2 effects of interaction partner personality (Hypotheses 4 and 5) on employees' EEM while controlling for Level 1 control variables (i.e., employees’ age, gender, tenure with the interaction partner, work interdependence with the interaction partner, and amount of interaction with the interaction partner). The Level 1 intercept was used as the dependent variable in the Level 2 analysis. HLM analyses were conducted separately for the four dependent variables (i.e., faking with leader, suppressing with leader, faking with peer, and suppressing with peer).

**Results regarding Level 1 effects.** Hypothesis 1 predicted that employees’ agreeableness was positively associated with their faking positive emotions and suppressing negative emotions. As shown in Table 3, after controlling for employees’ age, gender, tenure with the interaction partner, work interdependence with the interaction partner, amount of interaction with the interaction partner, agreeableness was negatively related to faking with leader, suppressing with leader, and faking with peer. This result was contrary to Hypothesis 1. Thus, Hypothesis 1 was not supported.
Hypothesis 2 predicted that employees’ extroversion was negatively associated with their faking positive emotions and suppressing negative emotions. As shown in Table 3, after controlling for the five control variables, extroversion was negatively related to faking with peer, but not related to other types of EEM. Therefore, Hypothesis 2 received partial support. Hypothesis 3 predicted that employees’ neuroticism was positively associated with their faking positive emotions and suppressing negative emotions. As seen in Table 3, neuroticism was not related to any of the four types of EEM. Thus, Hypothesis 3 was not supported.

HLM results also showed that employees’ conscientiousness was positively related with suppressing with leader and suppressing with peer. This is an interesting and unexpected finding which is discussed in a section below.

To summarize, with regard to employees’ own personality, both agreeableness and extroversion were negatively associated with faking with peer. That is, less agreeable and less extraverted employees were more likely to fake positive emotions in interactions with peers than were agreeable and extraverted employees. Agreeableness was also negatively associated with EEM in interactions with leaders. In addition, conscientiousness was positively associated with suppressing negative emotions. No other effect of employees’ personality on EEM was found.

Results regarding Level 2 effects. In terms of Level 2 effects (i.e., the effects of
interaction partners’ personality), Hypothesis 4 predicted that interaction partners’ agreeableness was negatively associated with employees’ EEM. HLM results suggested that interaction partners’ agreeableness was not related to EEM. Thus, Hypothesis 4 was not supported.

Hypothesis 5 predicted that interaction partners’ neuroticism was positively associated with employees’ EEM. As seen in Table 3, results suggested that leaders’ neuroticism was positively related to employees faking positive emotions and suppressing negative emotions. However, peers’ neuroticism did not show any significant effect. Thus, Hypothesis 5 received partial support.

**Results regarding comparison between leader-related EEM and peer-related EEM.** Turning to the comparison between leader-related EEM and peer-related EEM, Hypothesis 11 predicted that employees’ personality accounted for more variance in peer-related EEM than in leader-related EEM. To test this hypothesis, pseudo R-squared values were computed based on the formula suggested by Kreft and de Leeuw (1998) and Singer (1998). According to this formula, employees’ personality (i.e., five dimensions as a whole) explained 1.3% of the within-group variance in faking with leader, 8.0% of the within-group variance in suppressing with leader, 12.3% of the within-group variance in faking with peer, and 0.4% of the within-group variance in suppressing with peer. Thus, employees’ personality accounted for more variance in faking with peers than in faking
with leader, but more variance in suppressing with leader than in suppressing with peer, suggesting that Hypothesis 11 is partially supported. These results have important theoretical implications, as elaborated in a section below.

Hypothesis 12 predicted that interaction partners’ personality accounted for more variance in leader-related EEM than in peer-related EEM. Given that leaders’ personality was significantly related with employees’ EEM whereas peers’ personality had no relationship with employees’ EEM, Hypothesis 12 was supported.

Taken together, these results indicated that employees’ personality explained a similar amount of variance in leader-related EEM and peer-related EEM, but that the effect differed as a function of the specific type of EEM. In contrast, interaction partners’ personality accounted for more variance in leader-related EEM than in peer-related EEM.

**Outcomes of EEM**

For the outcome part of the model (i.e., EEM-outcome linkages), multiple group analysis was conducted first to examine the measurement equivalence of the two situations (i.e., interactions with leaders versus interactions with peers) to ensure that the measures performed similarly well in the two situations. This measurement equivalence analysis was not conducted for the antecedent part of the model because the Big Five personality dimensions have been shown to be a robust model of personality (Costa & McCrae, 1992; Poropat, 2009) and the measurement of the Big Five should be equally
applicable to all groups of participants in the study.

Multiple group analysis was performed using the statistical software Mplus. Based on the procedure recommended by Vandenberg and Lance (2000), configural invariance, metric invariance, and scalar invariance were tested sequentially for the two situations. The configural equivalence model was a seven-factor model (i.e., two types of EEM plus five outcome variables). In this model, the scale of the latent factors was set by fixing the variance of the latent factors equal to 1; the factor loadings, covariances, means, item intercepts, and unique variances were freely estimated and allowed to be heterogeneous across situations. This model provided a satisfactory fit to the data ($\chi^2 (563) = 722.29$, CFI = .92, RMSEA = .05), suggesting that the same set of latent factors were underlying all the indicators across the two situations. The next step was to test for metric equivalence. In this test, the matrix of factor loadings was set to be equal across situations. This model also fitted the data well ($\chi^2 (582) = 736.86$, CFI = .92, RMSEA = .05) and there was no significant increase in chi-square between the configural equivalence model and the metric equivalence model ($\Delta \chi^2 (19) = 14.57, p > .05$). The third step was to test for scalar equivalence. In this test, item intercepts were set to be equal across situations. Again, this model fitted the data fairly well ($\chi^2 (594) = 742.86$, CFI = .92, RMSEA = .05) and there was no significant increase in chi-square between the metric equivalence model and the scalar equivalence model ($\Delta \chi^2 (12) = 6.00, p > .05$).
Thus, full configural invariance, metric invariance, and scalar invariance were established between the two situations suggesting that 1) employees responded to leader-related measures and peer-related measure in a conceptually similar manner and 2) leaders and peers interpreted the measures in the same way.

Given that measurement equivalence was established, multiple regression analysis was conducted for each outcome variable to examine the EEM-outcome linkages (Hypotheses 6-10) in the two situations. The nested structure of the data (i.e., employees nested within groups – that is leaders and peers) was taken into account in the regression analyses by including a clustering variable (i.e., work groups) in the regression models in Mplus. In essence, these analyses represent multilevel modeling with no Level 2 predictors.

**Results regarding the effects of EEM on outcome variables.** Turning to proposed outcomes of EEM, Hypothesis 6 predicted that EEM was positively associated with employees’ emotional exhaustion. As seen in Table 4, faking with leader was positively related with emotional exhaustion whereas suppressing with leader was not related with emotional exhaustion. Peer-related EEM was not associated with emotional exhaustion. Thus, Hypothesis 6 was partially supported.

Hypothesis 7 predicted that EEM was positively associated with employees’ felt inauthenticity. Regression results shown in Table 4 suggested that leader-related EEM
was not associated with felt inauthenticity. Faking with peer was positively related with felt inauthenticity whereas suppressing with peer was not related with felt inauthenticity. Thus, Hypothesis 7 was partially supported.

Hypothesis 8 predicted that EEM was positively associated with employees’ interaction avoidance. As shown in Table 4, leader-related EEM was not associated with interaction avoidance. For peer-related EEM, faking with peers was positively related with interaction avoidance whereas suppressing with peer was not related with interaction avoidance, suggesting that Hypothesis 8 was partially supported.

Hypothesis 9 predicted that EEM was negatively associated with interaction partners’ communication satisfaction. As shown in Table 4, leader-related EEM was not associated with communication satisfaction. Faking with peer was negatively related with communication satisfaction whereas suppressing with peer was not related with communication satisfaction, suggesting that Hypothesis 9 was partially supported.

Hypothesis 10 predicted that EEM was negatively associated with interaction partners’ perceived information sharing. Regression results showed that faking with leader was negatively related with leaders’ perceived information sharing whereas suppressing with leader was positively related with leaders’ perceived information sharing. Peer-related EEM was not associated with peers’ perceived information sharing. Thus, Hypothesis 10 was partially supported.
To summarize, the above results showed that faking positive emotions was associated with all five outcome variables in the proposed directions. Suppressing negative emotions, on the other hand, was only (positively) associated with leaders’ perceived information sharing. The direction of this correlation was opposite from what was hypothesized, which is an interesting finding discussed in the next section.

**Results regarding comparison between leader-related EEM and peer-related EEM.** Hypotheses 13 and 14 predicted that the effects of leader-related EEM on emotional exhaustion and felt inauthenticity (respectively) were stronger than those of peer-related EEM. In contrast, Hypotheses 15 and 16 predicted that the effects of peer-related EEM on interaction avoidance and communication satisfaction (respectively) were stronger than those of leader-related EEM. To test these hypotheses, confidence intervals of the regression coefficients were computed. As seen in Table 4, the confidence intervals of the regression coefficients overlapped between the leader situation and the peer situation for all outcome variables. According to these results, Hypotheses 13-16 were not supported.

However, worth noting is that, as seen in Table 4, significance tests of regression coefficients showed that the effects of EEM on the five outcome variables only existed in one of the two situations (i.e., either EEM with leaders or EEM with peers). Specifically, faking positive emotions was related with emotional exhaustion and perceived
information sharing in the leader situation (but not the peer situation) and linked with felt inauthenticity, interaction avoidance, and communication satisfaction in the peer situation (but not the leader situation). These results suggested that EEM in the two situations were linked with different consequences, which is an important finding discussed in the next section.
CHAPTER FOUR

Discussion

The purpose of this study was to examine employees’ management of emotional expressions within organizations by addressing three general research questions. First, does employees’ and their interaction partners’ personality impact employees’ EEM with their leaders and peers? Second, does employees’ EEM within organizations influence their psychological well-being and behaviors as well as their interaction partners’ perceptions of and attitudes about those interactions? Finally, do the antecedents and consequences of EEM differ across different types of interaction partners, specifically, leaders versus peers? While the results indicate that all of these questions can be answered in the affirmative, findings also reveal that the pattern of relationships among study variables are more complex than previously proposed, as detailed below.

Summary and Interpretation of Specific Findings

General findings regarding the effects of personality on EEM. In terms of antecedents of EEM, employees’ own personality was significantly related to EEM in both the leader situation and the peer situation. In general, employees’ personality accounted for a similar amount of variance in leader-related EEM and peer-related EEM.
In contrast, Level 2 effects only existed for leader-related EEM, indicating that leaders’ personality influenced employees’ EEM whereas peers’ personality did not. This finding supports the proposed role of power status in employees’ EEM such that the power dynamics (i.e. power imbalance/equality) between the two parties determines whether interaction partners’ personality has influence on employees’ EEM.

More specific results showed that employees’ personality explained more variance in faking with peers (12.3%) than in faking with leaders (1.3%). However, the reverse was true for suppressing negative emotions where results showed that employees’ personality accounted for more variance in suppressing with leaders (8.0%) than in suppressing with peers (0.4%). Thus, although the general influence of employees’ personality on EEM appeared to be similar in the two situations, the effects of employees’ personality on specific types of EEM largely differed across the two situations. Since faking with leaders requires employees to fake positive emotions in relatively formal and serious social interactions (i.e., interactions with leaders) with less overt emotional cues rather than relatively casual interactions (i.e., interactions with peers), performing this type of EEM in interactions with leaders may largely rely on employees’ ability to detect and understand emotions. In terms of suppressing negative emotions, since displaying negative emotions towards peers may have less serious consequences than does expressing negative emotions towards leaders, employees’ own
ability to control emotions may be especially important for suppressing with peers. Thus, faking with leaders and suppressing with peers may depend relatively more on employees’ emotional abilities and thus are influenced less by their personality. Obviously, these explanations are speculative. Future research testing these ideas would be interesting and valuable. As a whole, these findings reveal the complexity of the influence of personality on EEM and highlight the importance of differentiating different types of EEM and interaction partners in examining and understanding antecedents of EEM within organizations.

**Findings regarding specific personality traits.** In terms of specific personality traits, in both situations, agreeableness appeared to be the strongest (employee) personality predictor for faking positive emotions while conscientiousness was the strongest (employee) personality predictor for suppressing negative emotions. However, contrary to my hypothesis, agreeableness was negatively associated with faking positive emotions. One potential explanation for this finding is that, although agreeableness represents the tendency to be pleasant and accommodating, which may increase EEM, it is also linked with straightforwardness, trust, and authenticity (Matsumoto & Juang, 2012). Agreeableness can be viewed as the opposite of Machiavellianism which refers to individuals' tendency to deceive and manipulate others (Jakobwitz & Egan, 2006). Thus, agreeable employees may engage in less EEM because they tend to be genuine and
candid in interpersonal interactions. In addition to faking positive emotions, the current results also showed that agreeable employees were less likely to suppress negative emotions when interacting with leaders. This finding is very interesting in that it indicates that agreeable employees may, in fact, be “bold enough” to “be disagreeable” with their leaders.

Another possible explanation for the unexpected negative relationship between agreeableness and faking positive emotions is that agreeable individuals may be more interpersonally likable in general (Graziano & Tobin, 2009) and thus their interaction partners may treat them in ways where faking positive emotions is less necessary. That is, interactions partners may tend to display a friendly and warm attitude towards agreeable employees due to their relatively high likeability and encourage them to express true emotions instead of faking emotional displays.

The other major personality predictor of EEM found in the current study was conscientiousness, which represents the tendency to be self-disciplined, hardworking, and diligent (Costa & McCrae, 1992). Although EEM with internal members of the organization is not a formal part of their work role, employees with higher conscientiousness may be more concerned with maintaining a professional attitude in the workplace (Bono & Vey, 2004) and may have better self-control, which could lead to more suppression of negative emotions.
In terms of interaction partners’ personality, leaders’ neuroticism was positively related with employees suppressing negative emotions, indicating that more neurotic leaders may generate more negative affect in the interaction and thus pose greater situational demand for employees’ emotion suppression. Interestingly, leaders’ neuroticism was also positively associated with employees faking positive emotions, suggesting that employees may tend to fake positive emotions to mitigate the harsh interpersonal atmosphere created by more neurotic leaders.

**Finding regarding the impact of EEM on outcome variables.** In terms of outcomes, EEM was indeed significantly associated with all five outcome variables in the model. Generally speaking, faking positive emotions appeared to have more negative consequences than did suppressing negative emotions. This finding is surprising given that, unlike faked positive emotions, the negative emotions may recur later and further exert negative influences on individuals through rumination processes (Lyubomirsky & Nolen-Hoeksema, 1995; Nolen-Hoeksema, Wisco, & Lyubomirsky, 2008). One explanation for this somewhat counterintuitive finding is that, in interactions outside the workplace, individuals may be more likely to engage in, and therefore be more accustomed to, emotion suppression than faking. As a parallel, when interacting with family and friends, people often may suppress negative emotions to avoid arguments and conflicts, but it may be less usual to actively fake positive emotions. Consistent with this
notion, Richards and Gross (1999) indicated that, in daily lives, people constantly tried to look less emotional than they actually were. According to this idea, individuals should be generally more apt to suppressing emotions and therefore may be affected less by this type of EEM than by faking positive emotions.

**Findings regarding the differential effects of EEM in the two situations.**

Although the confidence intervals of the regression coefficients overlapped between the leader situation and the peer situation, significance tests of these coefficients suggested that the effects of EEM on outcome variables were only significant in one situation but not the other. More specifically, leader-related EEM was significantly associated with employees’ emotional exhaustion and leaders’ perceived information sharing whereas peer-related EEM was significantly associated with employees’ felt inauthenticity, interaction avoidance behaviors, and peers’ communication satisfaction. These findings suggest that the nature of, and interaction partners’ reactions to, EEM, in the two situations may be largely different.

More specifically, in the leader situation, because employees’ EEM seems to be partially determined by the leaders’ behavioral tendencies and emotional responses, employees may feel less control over such EEM and thus consider it as a heavier emotional burden. Since the leader-follower interactions may be task-focused rather than relationship-oriented (Chemers, 2000), employees’ EEM in these interactions may be
interpreted mainly from a work-related perspective (e.g., information sharing) by the leaders who focus more on task-related communication than affective communication.

In contrast, because interactions with peers may involve relatively more personal and non-task communication, authenticity is likely to be more strongly expected. EEM in these interactions may be viewed as a violation of such expectation by both employees themselves and their interaction partners, resulting in employees’ felt inauthenticity and peers’ communication dissatisfaction. In addition, since employees have more leverage in deciding whether to interact with peers, an important consequence of peer-related EEM is interaction avoidance behaviors which may be conceived as a form of counterproductive work behaviors (Sackett, Berry, Wiemann, & Laczo, 2006). These behaviors may be especially detrimental for team functioning given that the quantity and quality of interactions among team members have been found to be crucial for team cohesion and performance (Lechler, 2001; Palonen, Hakkarainen, Talvitie, & Lehtinen, 2004).

**General Theoretical Implications and Contributions**

In addition to the implications of specific findings discussed above, the current results appear to have several general theoretical implications and contributions. First, the current study added to the EEM literature by examining discretionary EEM in which most employees are likely to engage routinely at work. In previous EEM research, adjusted emotional displays were often an in-role job requirement which was formally
enforced by monitoring and evaluation systems (Diefendorff, Richard, & Croyle, 2006; Fuller & Smith, 1996). The management of emotional expressions examined in this study, on the other hand, was not explicitly promoted. This difference is important because EEM in these two situations may be differentially affected by antecedent variables. Consistent with this notion, the employee personality-EEM linkages found in the current study are not very consistent with what has been found in studies that focused on employees’ interactions with external parties such as customers and clients.

Before making comparisons between these two sets of results, two general points should be noted first. One point is that research on employees’ EEM in interactions with external parties has largely focused on the consequences of EEM rather than its antecedents (Kiffín-Petersen, Jordan, & Soutar, 2011). The influence of personality on EEM is not widely examined or well understood in this research (Kiffín-Petersen et al., 2011). The present study, therefore, contributes to the general EEM literature by providing another examination of personality’s effects on EEM. The other point worth mentioning here is that the few studies that have linked personality with EEM did not differentiate faking positive emotions and suppressing negative emotions (e.g., Austin et al., 2008; Diefendorff et al., 2005; Kiffín-Petersen et al., 2011), making it difficult to compare the current results with the findings from these studies.

These being said, a general comparison between the personality-EEM linkages
found in this study and those found in previous studies is still made here in an attempt to identify the different patterns of personality predictors for EEM in interactions with external parties versus EEM within organizations. In previous studies, all five personality dimensions except for openness were significantly related with EEM. Specifically, conscientiousness, agreeableness, and extroversion were found to be negatively associated with EEM whereas neuroticism was found to be positively associated with EEM (Austin et al., 2008; Diefendorff et al., 2005). In contrast, the present study showed that employees’ agreeableness and extroversion were negatively related with EEM, conscientiousness was positively related with EEM, and neuroticism was not related with EEM. Thus, the influences of personality antecedents of EEM in interactions with external parties and EEM within organizations do indeed appear to differ, especially with regard to conscientiousness and neuroticism. However, some of these differences may be partially due to the lack of distinction made between specific types of EEM (i.e., faking and suppressing) in previous research. Future research corroborating the current results and explaining why these (potential) differences exist would be of great value.

Second, as noted, unlike most of the past research on EEM which focused one-time interactions between employees and external parties (Gutek, Bhappu, Liao-Troth, & Cherry, 1999), the present study examined interactions that generally occur on a regular basis. The current results showed that EEM within organizations influenced employees’
interaction avoidance behaviors, suggesting that employees’ EEM in earlier interactions does seem to influence later interactions between the two parties. This influence could not be addressed in previous EEM research examining one-time interactions between employees and external parties and therefore is missed in the current EEM literature.

Third, the present study explored the interpersonal influence of emotions which had been largely neglected by current organizational research on emotion. Social psychology research reveals that emotional expressions of one individual can shape the attitudes and thoughts of other people (Glaser & Salovey, 1998; Hecht, 1995) and suggests that investigation of this impact is crucial for understanding the nature and development of interpersonal processes (Gonzaga, Keltner, Londahl, & Smith, 2001). In organizational research, the influence of emotion displays on others has been mainly addressed by emotional contagion research which primarily concerns unconscious and automatic mimicry of others’ emotional expressions (Barsade, 2002; Barsade & Gibson, 2007). The present study, on the other hand, focused on the effects of adjusted emotional displays on the attitudes and thoughts of others in the organization. By doing so, this study responded to the burgeoning view of emotions as interpersonal phenomena (Morris & Keltner, 2000; Parkinson, Fischer, & Manstead, 2005) and to Hareli and Rafaeli’s (2008) recent call for research on “the social influence of emotion in organizations” (p. 35). The significant influence of EEM on interaction partners’ perception and attitudes
found in the current study underscored the importance of this emerging perspective and its application in organizations.

Fourth, as mentioned above, an interesting and somewhat surprising finding of the present study was that faking positive emotions and suppressing negative emotions appeared to have different antecedents and consequences. These two types of EEM were typically not differentiated in previous EEM research and are usually examined as a single construct (i.e., surface acting; e.g., Chi, Grandey, Diamond, & Krimmel, 2011; Diefendorff, Erickson, Grandey, & Dahling, 2011; Hulsheger & Schewe, 2011). The current findings highlighted the importance of separating these two forms of EEM in organizational research. Future research corroborating the present results and explaining why such differences exist would be of great value.

Fifth, the current findings showed that EEM in the leader situation and the peer situation involved dissimilar antecedents and consequences, indicating that employees’ behaviors may be qualitatively different in these two situations. This finding has important implications for examinations of other organizational behaviors as it suggests that employees may behave highly differently in interactions with leaders versus peers and thus ignoring interaction partners in organizational research may seriously undermine the understanding of a given phenomenon. For example, for organizational citizenship behaviors towards individuals (OCBI, Williams & Anderson, 1991), the reasons for
which employees engage in such behaviors and the outcomes of these behaviors are likely to differ across interaction partners (e.g., leaders versus peers). However, most OCBI research and the OCBI measurement do not differentiate the types of beneficiary (LePine, Erez, & Johnson, 2002) and thus may lose valuable information that can help researchers understand the antecedents and outcomes of OCBI more accurately and thoroughly.

**Practical Implications**

In addition to theoretical implications, the current findings also have several practical implications. First, given the negative consequences associated with employees’ EEM, managers and leaders should pay special attention to employees’ engagement in EEM and be aware of the potential negative effects of such behavior. In addition to attention and awareness, managers and leaders may want to find ways to actively reduce employees’ EEM, especially faking positive emotions given its stronger negative influence. For instance, creating an authentic interpersonal climate within the group/organization may be helpful. Grandey, Foo, Groth, and Goodwin (2012) recently showed that a climate of authenticity (i.e., shared norms of expressing true emotions) among coworkers alleviated the negative effects of emotional labor. Such climate may be built through role modeling and professional training which are designed to enhance unit members’ acceptance of, and respect for, authentic emotional expressions (Grandey et al., 2012).
Second, since agreeableness and extroversion were negatively associated with faking positive emotions which, in turn, was linked with various negative interpersonal outcomes (e.g., interaction avoidance, communication satisfaction, etc.), these two personality dimensions should be important criteria for selecting employees into work groups that require a high degree of interdependence and frequent communications. Consistent with this notion, team research demonstrates that team members’ agreeableness and extroversion have favorable effects on team cohesion and effectiveness (Barrick, Stewart, Neubert, & Mount, 1998; Peeters, Van Tuijl, Rutte, & Reymenm, 2006; Van Vianen & De Drew, 2001). For existent groups that consist of employees with low agreeableness and extroversion, building and maintaining authentic emotional display rules within the group should be especially important and beneficial for effective group functioning.

Third, another interesting finding of the current study was that employees’ faking positive emotions was negatively related with leaders’ perceived information sharing whereas employees suppressing negative emotions was positively related with leaders’ perceived information sharing. This result suggests that leaders may interpret the two types of EEM in different ways. Specifically, leaders may view employees’ faked emotions as a form of concealment or deception but consider their emotion suppression
as a form of compliance or respect which deserves more favorable leader ratings.

Although this is just a speculation which should be tested in future research, the current finding does indicate that leaders’ evaluations of employees’ information sharing may be largely compromised when employees tend to suppress negative emotions. Realization of this potential effect may help leaders form more accurate perceptions and interpretations of employees’ behaviors.

**Study Limitations**

Several potential limitations and boundary conditions of the study (results) also warrant mention. First, the sample for this study was composed of non-Western employees from China. Arguably, this is more of a potential boundary condition than a limitation, given that China plays a very significant role in the global economy and that examinations of organizational phenomena in China are becoming increasingly important (Luo & Nord, 2005; Ralston, Gustafson, Elsass, Cheung, & Terpstra, 1992). Although one cannot be sure at this point of the extent to which findings from this study will generalize to a Western context, there are several reasons to believe that cultural factors should have a limited influence on the specific linkages under investigation here, as elaborated below.

First, the discrete emotions measured in this paper have been found to be transcultural phenomenon (Ekman, 1999), meaning that individuals from different cultures express and recognize these emotions (Ekman, 1993; Matsumoto, 2001).
Displays of these emotions and receipt of these emotion expressions are believed to modulate cognition and actions in the same manner across cultures (Ekman, 1999). Following this idea, managing expressions of these emotions should influence the sender/receiver through the same mechanism across different cultures. Second, while certain cultural factors such as high power distance in the Chinese culture (e.g., Yang, 1988) may affect the mean score of certain variables in the model (e.g., employees’ interaction avoidance with leader), they are unlikely to alter the relationships among variables substantially. Many theoretical framework and arguments (e.g., the Big Five personality) employed in this paper have been found to be generalizable across cultures (e.g., Heine & Buchtel, 2009). Thus, the variable relationships proposed based on these theories are likely to be universal. Third, the sample in this study came from one of the largest cosmopolitan cities in China. Such cities are comparable to typical US cities with regard to many societal and demographic factors, such as education and job opportunities (Logan, 2002). Thus, respondents in this study may share similar professional attitudes and concerns with their counterparts in Western contexts, which increases the generalizability of findings in the current study. These being said, future research corroborating the present results in the Western context would be of great value.

Another point worth noting here is that no model, including the current one, is all-inconclusive. The present study focuses on personality antecedents of EEM within
organizations and outcome variables which seem to be the most direct consequences of EEM based on the literature. However, other variables and related phenomena also merit investigation. For instance, the current findings showed that employees’ personality only explained a limited amount of variance (i.e., from 0.4% to 12.3%) in different forms of EEM, suggesting that other variables may be more important in determining employees’ EEM within organizations. Future research examining other individual characteristics (e.g., emotional intelligence) and potential situational determinants of EEM (e.g., task characteristics) would be of great value. In addition, given the dynamic nature of affective processes in the workplace (Weiss & Cropanzano, 1996), employees’ EEM within organizations is likely to fluctuate over time. Future research capturing within-individual variance in EEM within organizations will significantly expand the understanding of this phenomenon and add to the present model. My hope is that the current model can serve as a starting place for these queries.

**Conclusion**

In sum, the results of the current study partially supported the theoretical model proposed for employees’ management of emotional expressions within organizations. Employees’ EEM was partly determined by their own and their interaction partners’ personality and it exerted influence on the employees’ psychological well-being and behaviors as well as their interaction partners’ perceptions and attitudes. The current
results also demonstrated that the antecedents and consequences of EEM differed for different types of interaction partners. I hope that these conclusions and the discussion of their implications will help to instigate what I consider as an important, but neglected, area of research.
### APPENDIX

Table 1 Study Hypotheses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hypothesis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>H1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2: Descriptive Statistics, Reliabilities, and Intercorrelations among All Variables

<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>...</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Faking with leader</td>
<td>2.27</td>
<td>.90</td>
<td>.77</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Suppressing with leader</td>
<td>2.74</td>
<td>1.08</td>
<td>.45**</td>
<td>.83</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Faking with peer</td>
<td>2.11</td>
<td>.94</td>
<td>.45**</td>
<td>.21*</td>
<td>.86</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Suppressing with peer</td>
<td>2.68</td>
<td>1.16</td>
<td>.21*</td>
<td>.44**</td>
<td>.33**</td>
<td>.90</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Employee agreeableness</td>
<td>4.05</td>
<td>.56</td>
<td>-.20*</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>-.23**</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Employee extroversion</td>
<td>3.60</td>
<td>.55</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>-.19*</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Employee neuroticism</td>
<td>2.51</td>
<td>.65</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>.19**</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Employee conscientiousness</td>
<td>3.59</td>
<td>.66</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>.20*</td>
<td>-.14</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Employee openness</td>
<td>3.39</td>
<td>.61</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Leader agreeableness</td>
<td>4.16</td>
<td>.48</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Leader extroversion</td>
<td>3.73</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>-.16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Leader neuroticism</td>
<td>2.80</td>
<td>.59</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Leader conscientiousness</td>
<td>3.95</td>
<td>.60</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>-.11</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Leader openness</td>
<td>3.47</td>
<td>.55</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>.19*</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Peer agreeableness</td>
<td>4.13</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>-.14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Peer extroversion</td>
<td>3.52</td>
<td>.53</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Peer neuroticism</td>
<td>2.56</td>
<td>.67</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>-.21*</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Peer conscientiousness</td>
<td>3.59</td>
<td>.52</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Peer openness</td>
<td>3.29</td>
<td>.52</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Emotional exhaustion</td>
<td>2.69</td>
<td>.77</td>
<td>.20*</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>-.17</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. Felt inauthenticity</td>
<td>2.63</td>
<td>.77</td>
<td>.29**</td>
<td>.31**</td>
<td>.28**</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. Interaction avoidance (leader)</td>
<td>1.89</td>
<td>1.01</td>
<td>.25**</td>
<td>.19*</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. Information sharing (leader)</td>
<td>3.43</td>
<td>.83</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. Communication satisfaction (leader)</td>
<td>3.78</td>
<td>.75</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>-.14</td>
<td>-.13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. Interaction avoidance (peer)</td>
<td>1.65</td>
<td>.85</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.30**</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. Information sharing (peer)</td>
<td>3.38</td>
<td>.94</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27. Communication satisfaction (peer)</td>
<td>3.73</td>
<td>.78</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>-.21*</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28. Gender</td>
<td>.42</td>
<td>.51</td>
<td>-.11</td>
<td>-.19*</td>
<td>-.20*</td>
<td>-.16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29. Tenure with leader</td>
<td>.71</td>
<td>.61</td>
<td>-.13</td>
<td>-.11</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30. Tenure with peer</td>
<td>.71</td>
<td>.63</td>
<td>-.12</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>-.11</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31. Task interdependence with leader</td>
<td>3.15</td>
<td>.79</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32. Task interdependence with peer</td>
<td>3.09</td>
<td>.83</td>
<td>.19*</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>.21*</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variable</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Employee agreeableness</td>
<td>.65</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Employee extroversion</td>
<td>.38**</td>
<td>.59</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Employee neuroticism</td>
<td>-.39**</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>.66</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Employee conscientiousness</td>
<td>.38**</td>
<td>.47**</td>
<td>-.39**</td>
<td>.57</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Employee openness</td>
<td>.30**</td>
<td>.45**</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.55**</td>
<td>.68</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Leader agreeableness</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.59</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Leader extroversion</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.18*</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Leader neuroticism</td>
<td>-.14</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>-.38**</td>
<td>.27**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Leader conscientiousness</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.20*</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.32**</td>
<td>.28**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Leader openness</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>.34**</td>
<td>.25**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Peer agreeableness</td>
<td>.22*</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.18*</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Peer extroversion</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.18*</td>
<td>-.21*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Peer neuroticism</td>
<td>-.12</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>-.16</td>
<td>-.23**</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>-.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Peer conscientiousness</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>-.13</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>-.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Peer openness</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>-.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Emotional exhaustion</td>
<td>-.17</td>
<td>-.19*</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>-.11</td>
<td>.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. Felt inauthenticity</td>
<td>-.12</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>-.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. Interaction avoidance (leader)</td>
<td>-.28**</td>
<td>-.35**</td>
<td>.22*</td>
<td>-.29**</td>
<td>-.19*</td>
<td>-.14</td>
<td>-.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. Information sharing (leader)</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. Communication satisfaction (leader)</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>-.25**</td>
<td>.18*</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. Interaction avoidance (peer)</td>
<td>-.33**</td>
<td>-.39**</td>
<td>.33**</td>
<td>-.39**</td>
<td>-.12</td>
<td>-.12</td>
<td>-.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. Information sharing (peer)</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>-.14</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>-.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27. Communication satisfaction (peer)</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>-.14</td>
<td>-.15</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>-.20*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28. Gender</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>-.25**</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>-.23**</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>-.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29. Tenure with leader</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>0.23*</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.20*</td>
<td>-.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30. Tenure with peer</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>-.13</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.23*</td>
<td>-.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31. Task interdependence with leader</td>
<td>.21*</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>-.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32. Task interdependence with peer</td>
<td>.18*</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>-.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variable</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Leader neuroticism</td>
<td>.56</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Leader conscientiousness</td>
<td>-.21*</td>
<td>.76</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Leader openness</td>
<td></td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.50**</td>
<td>.75</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Peer agreeableness</td>
<td></td>
<td>-.36**</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.60</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Peer extroversion</td>
<td></td>
<td>-.19*</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>-.12</td>
<td>.57**</td>
<td>.62</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Peer neuroticism</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>-.30**</td>
<td>.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Peer conscientiousness</td>
<td></td>
<td>-.25**</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>-.11</td>
<td>.41**</td>
<td>.22*</td>
<td>-.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Peer openness</td>
<td></td>
<td>-.16</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>-.31**</td>
<td>.30**</td>
<td>.25**</td>
<td>-.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Emotional exhaustion</td>
<td></td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>-.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. Felt inauthenticity</td>
<td></td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>-.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. Interaction avoidance</td>
<td></td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>-.12</td>
<td>-.17</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>-.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(leader)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. Information sharing (leader)</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. Communication satisfaction (leader)</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.27**</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>-.19*</td>
<td>.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. Interaction avoidance (peer)</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>-.12</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>-.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. Information sharing (peer)</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>-.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27. Communication satisfaction (peer)</td>
<td>-.23**</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>-.21*</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>.18*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28. Gender</td>
<td>-.28**</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>-.12</td>
<td>.24**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29. Tenure with leader</td>
<td>-.11</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30. Tenure with peer</td>
<td>-.13</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>-.12</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31. Task interdependence with leader</td>
<td>-.14</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.19*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32. Task interdependence with peer</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.17*</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variable</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. Felt inauthenticity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. Interaction avoidance (leader)</td>
<td>.64</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. Information sharing (leader)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. Communication satisfaction (leader)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. Interaction avoidance (peer)</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.55**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. Information sharing (peer)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27. Communication satisfaction (peer)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28. Gender</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29. Tenure with leader</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30. Tenure with peer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31. Task interdependence with leader</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32. Task interdependence with peer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. N = 129 at the individual level; N = 40 at the group level. Reliabilities of the scales are noted in the diagonals. **p < .01. * p < .05.
Table 3HLM Results: The Effects of Employees’ Personality and Leaders’ Personality on Employees’ EEM

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Faking with leader</th>
<th>Suppressing with leader</th>
<th>Faking with peer</th>
<th>Suppressing with peer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Intercept</td>
<td>2.28**</td>
<td>2.80**</td>
<td>2.09**</td>
<td>2.66**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Level 1 control variables</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>-.24</td>
<td>-.44*</td>
<td>-.27</td>
<td>-.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenure with Interaction Partner</td>
<td>-.23</td>
<td>-.28*</td>
<td>-.12</td>
<td>.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task Interdependence</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>.27*</td>
<td>.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Level 1 independent variables</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employee agreeableness</td>
<td>-.40*</td>
<td>-.44*</td>
<td>-.49*</td>
<td>.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employee extroversion</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>-.39**</td>
<td>-.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employee neuroticism</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>-.18</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employee conscientiousness</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.51**</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>.46*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employee openness</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>.24</td>
<td>-.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Level 2 independent variables</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interaction partner agreeableness</td>
<td>-.17</td>
<td>-.23</td>
<td>.29</td>
<td>-.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interaction partner extroversion</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>-.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interaction partner neuroticism</td>
<td>.40**</td>
<td>.55**</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interaction partner conscientiousness</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>-.20</td>
<td>-.16</td>
<td>-.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interaction partner openness</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.07</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. HLM = hierarchical linear modeling. N = 129 at the individual level; N = 40 at the group level.  
**p < .01. * p < .05.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Emotion exhaustion</th>
<th>Felt inauthenticity</th>
<th>Interaction avoidance</th>
<th>Perceived information Sharing</th>
<th>Communication satisfaction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Leader situation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faking positive</td>
<td>.32* (0.01 - 0.63)</td>
<td>.11 (-0.24 - 0.46)</td>
<td>.35 (-0.10 - 0.81)</td>
<td>-.30* (-0.59 - -0.01)</td>
<td>-.13 (-0.39 - 0.13)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suppressing negative</td>
<td>-.01 (-0.31 - 0.07)</td>
<td>.26 (-0.01 - 0.53)</td>
<td>.07 (-0.16 - 0.31)</td>
<td>.23* (-0.01 - 0.59)</td>
<td>.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peer situation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faking positive</td>
<td>.14 (-0.10 - 0.37)</td>
<td>.30* (0.01 - 0.59)</td>
<td>.29* (0.02 - 0.57)</td>
<td>-.06 (-0.26 - 0.13)</td>
<td>-.22* (-0.44 - 0.00)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suppressing negative</td>
<td>-.16 (-0.31 - -0.01)</td>
<td>-.05 (-0.21 - 0.12)</td>
<td>-.08 (-0.22 - 0.06)</td>
<td>-01 (-0.17 - 0.16)</td>
<td>-.04</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Confidence intervals of regression coefficients shown in brackets. N = 129 at the individual level; N = 40 at the group level. **p < .01. * p < .05.
Employee Personality
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Figure 1. Theoretical model of employees’ management of emotional expressions within organizations
Survey Items

Big Five (Goldberg, 1999)
Please indicate the extent to which you agree with the following statements using a 5-point scale ranging from 1 (completely disagree) to 5 (completely agree).

1. I am the life of the party.
2. I feel little concern for others.
3. I am always prepared.
4. I get stressed out easily.
5. I have a rich vocabulary.
6. I don't talk a lot.
7. I am interested in people.
8. I leave my belongings around.
9. I am relaxed most of the time.
10. I have difficulty understanding abstract ideas.
11. I feel comfortable around people.
12. I insult people.
13. I pay attention to details.
15. I have a vivid imagination.
16. I keep in the background.
17. I sympathize with others' feelings.
18. I make a mess of things.
19. I seldom feel blue.
20. I am not interested in abstract ideas.
21. I start conversations.
22. I am not interested in other people's problems.
23. I get chores done right away.
24. I am easily disturbed.
25. I have excellent ideas.
26. I have little to say.
27. I have a soft heart.
28. I often forget to put things back in their proper place.
29. I get upset easily.
30. I do not have a good imagination.
31. I talk to a lot of different people at parties.
32. I am not really interested in others.
33. I like order.
34. I change my mood a lot.
35. I am quick to understand things.
36. I don't like to draw attention to myself.
37. I take time out for others.
38. I shirk my duties.
39. I have frequent mood swings.
40. I use difficult words.
41. Don't mind being the center of attention.
42. Feel others' emotions.
43. Follow a schedule.
44. Get irritated easily.
45. Spend time reflecting on things.
46. Am quiet around strangers.
47. Make people feel at ease.
48. Am exacting in my work.
49. Often feel blue.
50. Am full of ideas.

EEM (adapted from Glomb & Tews, 2004)
Please answer the following questions using a 5-point scale ranging from 1 (never) to 5 (very often).

1. How often do you express feelings of happiness in interactions with person X (leader’s or peer’s identifying code) when you really do not feel that way?
2. How often do you express feelings of interest in interactions with person X (leader’s or peer’s identifying code) when you really do not feel that way?
3. How often do you express feelings of amusement in interactions with person X (leader’s or peer’s identifying code) when you really do not feel that way?
4. How often do you keep feelings of sadness to yourself in interactions with person X (leader’s or peer’s identifying code) when you really feel that way?
5. How often do you keep feelings of anger to yourself in interactions with person X (leader’s or peer’s identifying code) when you really feel that way?
6. How often do you keep feelings of frustration to yourself in interactions with person X (leader’s or peer’s identifying code) when you really feel that way?

Emotional exhaustion (Schaufeli et al., 1996)
Below are a number of statements that describe different feelings that you may feel at work. Please indicate how often you have felt each of the following feelings using a 5-point scale ranging from 1 (never) to 5 (always).

1. I feel emotionally drained from my work.
2. I feel burned out from my work.
3. Working all day is really a strain for me.
4. I feel tired when I get up in the morning and have to face another day on the job.
5. I feel used up at the end of the workday.

Felt inauthenticity (Sloan, 2007)
Please indicate the extent to which you agree with the following statements using a 5-point scale ranging from 1 (completely disagree) to 5 (completely agree).
1. The way I act at work is very different from the way I act at home.
2. I feel most like myself at work.
3. I feel that I cannot express my true self when I am at work.
4. When I am at work, I am unsure of what my “real” feelings are.
5. I basically have to become a different person when I am at work.
6. I worry that this job is hardening me emotionally.

Interaction avoidance
Please indicate the extent to which you agree with the following statements using a 5-point scale ranging from 1 (completely disagree) to 5 (completely agree).
1. I try to stay away from interactions with person X (leader’s or peer’s identifying code) at work.
2. I never initiate interactions with person X (leader’s or peer’s identifying code).
3. I often intentionally avoid opportunities to interact with person X (leader’s or peer’s identifying code).

Communication satisfaction (adapted from Park & Raile, 2010)
Please indicate the extent to which you agree with the following statements using a 5-point scale ranging from 1 (completely disagree) to 5 (completely agree).
1. Overall, I am very satisfied in my conversations with person X (focal participant’s identifying code).
2. Conversations with person X (focal participant’s identifying code) flow well.
3. I like to have face-to-face communication with person X (focal participant’s identifying code).

Perceived information sharing (adapted from Chang & Chuang, 2011)
Please indicate the extent to which you agree with the following statements using a 5-point scale ranging from 1 (completely disagree) to 5 (completely agree).
1. New information is shared frequently in my communication with person X (focal participant’s identifying code).
2. The information shared by person X (focal participant’s identifying code) is complete.
3. The information shared by person X (focal participant’s identifying code) is reliable.

Task interdependence (Campion et al., 1993)
Please indicate the extent to which you agree with the following statements using a 5-point scale ranging from 1 (completely disagree) to 5 (completely agree).
1. I cannot accomplish my tasks without information or materials from person X (leader’s or peer’s identifying code).

2. Person X (leader’s or peer’s identifying code) depends on me for information or materials needed to perform his/her tasks.

3. Jobs performed by Person X (leader’s or peer’s identifying code) and me are related to one another.
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