In Press in International Journal of Stress Management

© 2021, American Psychological Association. This paper is not the copy of record and may not exactly replicate the final, authoritative version of the article. Please do not copy or cite without authors' permission. The final article will be available, upon publication, via its DOI: 10.1037/str0000232

Emotional Labor: A Two-Wave Longitudinal Person-Centered Approach

Nathan Nguyen¹, Francis Cheung², Florence Stinglhamber¹

¹Université catholique de Louvain, Psychological Sciences Research Institute, Belgium

² Lignan University, Department of Applied Psychology, Hong Kong

Correspondence

Nathan Nguyen, Psychological Sciences Research Institute, Place Cardinal Mercier, 10, L3.05.01, 1348 Louvain-la-Neuve, Belgium. E-mail: nathan.nguyen@uclouvain.be. Phone:

+32 10 47 30 76. Fax: +32 10 47 37 74.

Acknowledgments

This study was funded by the "Fonds Spéciaux de la Recherche" of the Université catholique de Louvain and by ARC under grant n°16/20-071 of the French Community of Belgium.

Authors' note

On behalf of all authors, the corresponding author declares that there is no conflict of interest, all procedures performed in studies involving human participants were in accordance with the ethical standards of the ethics commission of the Institute of Research in Psychological Sciences (Université catholique de Louvain, Belgium; Approval number Projet2017-01), and the ideas and data appearing in the present manuscript have never been used or presented elsewhere.

Abstract

To date, scholars advocate adopting a person-centered approach in the study of emotional labor since it gives a more realistic representation of the use of emotional regulation strategies. More importantly, a crucial yet under-explored issue is the understanding of the stability of latent profiles of emotional labor over time. Accordingly, this research aimed to investigate the stability of these profiles, based on workers' use of surface acting and deep acting, over three months. We also analyzed the role of organizational dehumanization, positive affectivity, and negative affectivity in the prediction of profile membership as well as the relationships between these profiles and several job-related outcomes (i.e., job satisfaction, affective commitment, emotional exhaustion, and turnover intentions). Latent profile analyses conducted on a sample of 425 employees revealed five latent profiles of emotional labor that were stable over time. Latent profile transition analyses indicated that most of the employees remained in their initial profile. Organizational dehumanization and negative affectivity, but not positive affectivity, predicted profile membership. Finally, we corroborated that surface actors were related to the worst outcomes, while deep actors were associated with the most adaptive outcomes. As such, these findings provide further evidence to adopt a person-centered approach to the study of emotional labor.

Keywords: Organizational dehumanization, Dispositional affect, Surface acting, Deep acting, Latent transition analysis.

Over the past two decades, emotional labor has received increasing attention in the organizational behavior and psychology literature (Grandey & Gabriel, 2015). It is defined as the management of one's feelings and emotional expressions to comply with the organization's rules in terms of emotions to display (Grandey, 2000). In most jobs, employees are expected to show positive emotions during interactions with inter and intra-organizational members (Grandey, 2000). As such, when felt emotions are not in line with the emotions that need to be displayed, employees may rely on two strategies of emotional labor, namely surface acting (e.g., faking the emotional display) and deep acting (e.g., a reappraisal of the situation to express genuine emotions) to express the organizationally desired emotions.

In line with the theoretical view that surface acting and deep acting are mutually exclusive (i.e., one strategy is used at the expense of the other; Grandey, 2000), most research has adopted a variable-centered approach to examine the predictors and outcomes of these two strategies independently of each other. However, surface acting and deep acting were found to be positively correlated, suggesting a potential synergy of these two regulation strategies (e.g., Cheung et al., 2011; Gabriel & Diefendorff, 2015). The above suggests that both perspectives might be true, but for different individuals.

To examine such a possibility, a line of research adopting a person-centered approach has begun to investigate how emotional labor strategies combine within individuals. Specifically, scholars have revealed the existence of distinct latent profiles of emotional labor displaying different combinations of surface acting and deep acting (Cheung & Lun, 2015; Cheung et al., 2018; Fouquereau et al., 2019; Gabriel et al., 2015; Nguyen & Stinglhamber, 2020). To the extent that this approach allows us to examine the possibility that some employees may use surface acting and deep acting in conjunction, while others may primarily use either surface acting or deep acting, it provides a more realistic representation of the use of emotional labor strategies than the standard variable-centered approach. Following this line

of research, the first objective of the present study was to adopt a person-centered approach and to seek to replicate latent profiles of emotional labor characterized by surface acting and deep acting (e.g., Gabriel et al., 2015; Nguyen & Stinglhamber, 2020).

While this person-centered approach to emotional labor has led to important advances in our understanding of employees' emotional labor, it has so far adopted a rather static view of emotional labor profiles. By not taking into consideration the fluctuations of emotional labor strategies over time, most of this research conveys the idea that time fluctuations do not appear to be relevant in the study of emotional labor profiles. Yet, some researchers highlighted that the use of emotional labor strategies is more of a dynamic process (e.g., Grandey & Gabriel, 2015). In line with this view, several authors have called for further work to better understand whether emotional regulation strategies exhibit change or stability (e.g., Gabriel & Diefendorff, 2015; Grandey & Gabriel, 2015; Grandey & Melloy, 2017). In a similar vein, Meyer and Morin (2016) underlined that it is crucial to determine whether latent profile solutions are robust and stable or, on the contrary, they are merely the result of a transient phenomenon. Such an understanding could serve as a guide for the implementation of intervention strategies customized at distinct profiles of emotional labor (Meyer & Morin, 2016). With the exception of Cheung et al. (2018), little is known however about the stability of these latent profiles of emotional labor. Therefore, the second objective of the present research is to examine, for the first time, the stability (i.e., within-sample and within-person) of latent profiles of emotional labor characterized by surface acting and deep acting.

Finally, Morin et al. (2016) stated that replication of associations between covariates and latent profiles across samples is of utmost importance in "establishing the construct validity of extracted profiles" (p. 233). Accordingly, the third objective of this research was to further explore our latent profiles of emotional labor by attempting to replicate their links with both predictors and outcomes found in previous person-centered studies. On the one hand, we

investigated to what extent dispositional (i.e., positive affectivity and negative affectivity; Gabriel et al., 2015) and situational (i.e., organizational dehumanization; Nguyen & Stinglhamber, 2020) factors predicted profile membership for the following reasons. First, we assessed positive and negative affectivity to be in line with emotional labor models that indicate that they are major determinants in the development of emotional labor strategies (Grandey, 2000). Indeed, Kammeyer-Mueller et al.'s (2013) meta-analysis showed that positive and negative affectivity considerably shape the use of surface acting and deep acting. Second, by focusing on organizational dehumanization (i.e., the employee's feeling to be considered as a tool by his/her organization), we chose to examine a potential determinant of emotional labor that is by nature more exploratory since research on dehumanization is still in its infancy. In particular, by assessing a variable related not to the interpersonal interactions that the employee has to deal with, but capturing a more distal (mal)treatment of the employee within the organization, this research explores the possibility that the determinants of emotional labor may also sometimes be less proximal than most models have suggested so far (Fouquereau et al., 2019; Nguyen & Stinglhamber, 2020). On the other hand, we examined the associations between the profiles of emotional labor and some of the well-known consequences of emotional labor. To cover some of the variety in the effects of emotional labor, we relied on Grandey's (2000) model and assessed both individual (i.e., job satisfaction and emotional exhaustion; Gabriel et al., 2015) and organizational (i.e., affective commitment and turnover intentions; Nguyen & Stinglhamber, 2020) well-being, which were identified as two important categories of outcomes of latent profiles of emotional labor.

Latent Profiles of Emotional Labor

In contrast to a variable-centered approach, which looks at how emotional labor strategies are related to each other and associated with predictors and outcomes separately and across individuals, a person-centered perspective first allows identifying profiles of

employees based on their levels on the different emotional labor strategies. To the best of our understanding, three patterns of emotional labor profiles were reported. First, in two separate studies with Chinese work samples, Cheung and Lun (2015) and Cheung et al. (2018) reported three profiles of emotional labor characterized by different combinations of surface acting, deep acting, and genuine emotions. Precisely, they labeled these profiles as "active actors" (high levels of the three emotional regulation strategies), "emotionally congruent employees" (high levels of deep acting and genuine emotions with low levels of surface acting), and "display rules compliers" (high levels of surface and deep acting with low levels of genuine emotions). Second, Fouquereau et al. (2019) also identified three emotional labor profiles across two French work samples. Unlike the studies by Cheung and colleagues, their profiles were based on individuals' levels of hiding feelings, faking emotions (two sub-dimensions of surface acting; Grandey, 2000), and deep acting. Notably, they found a "high emotional labor" profile, a "moderate emotional labor/moderate surface acting and high deep acting" profile.

Third, using surface acting and deep acting as strategies of emotional labor, Gabriel et al. (2015) and Nguyen and Stinglhamber (2020) reported five profiles of emotional labor. Whereas Gabriel et al. (2015) relied on two samples comprising American service employees and Singaporean workers in the service industry, respectively, Nguyen and Stinglhamber's (2020) sample was mainly composed of British employees from diverse jobs. In particular, they identified two qualitative profiles, namely "surface actors" (represented by high use of surface acting along with low levels of deep acting) and "deep actors" (characterized by high use of deep acting associated with low levels of surface acting). In addition, they found three quantitative profiles, i.e. "regulators" (the use of both strategies), "low actors" (moderate levels of surface and deep acting), and "non-actors" (very low levels of both strategies).

While previous studies confirm that employees tend to use a combination of different emotional labor strategies in the workplace, latent profile analysis (LPA) results in the above studies suggest the existence of different profile configurations, indicating that there is no overarching consensus on the number and the nature of profiles. It is thus important to carry out additional research to delineate profile characteristics. To explore latent profiles of emotional labor in the present research, we operationalized emotional labor by using the two main strategies (i.e., surface acting and deep acting) that are found in most emotional labor models and theories and on which there is a broad consensus. In doing so, we proceeded like Gabriel et al. (2015) and Nguyen and Stinglhamber (2020) and not like Cheung and Lun (2015), Cheung et al. (2018), and Fouquereau et al. (2019) for two reasons. First, Cheung and Lun (2015) and Cheung et al. (2018) used genuine emotions in addition to surface acting and deep acting as components of emotional labor. However, because emotional labor refers to the modification of inner emotions in accordance to organizational display rules (Grandey, 2000), genuine emotions that do "not create emotional dissonance between felt and expressed emotion because actors are expressing their true emotions" (Humphrey et al., 2015, p. 752), do not thus pertain to emotional labor strategies (Brotheridge & Lee, 2003). Second, Fouquereau et al. (2019) used hiding feelings and faking emotions -to capture surface actingalong with deep acting. However, the authors argued against the benefit of distinguishing hiding feelings and faking emotions since their profiles of emotional labor showed similar levels on these strategies within each profile, suggesting that surface acting is rather unidimensional. In line with Gabriel et al.'s (2015) and Nguyen and Stinglhamber's (2020) findings, we proposed the following hypothesis:

Hypothesis 1: Five profiles of emotional labor who differ qualitatively (i.e., surface actors and deep actors) and quantitatively (i.e., regulators, low actors, and non-actors) will emerge from the latent profile analyses.

Stability of Emotional Labor Profiles over Time

In a second step, we sought to explore the stability of previously identified latent profiles of emotional labor. The question of whether latent profiles of emotional labor are stable or unstable over time is reflected in two different perspectives in the literature on emotional labor. On the one hand, most variable-centered studies have considered emotional labor as a stable behavioral preference and have therefore focused on surface acting and deep as stable individual differences (e.g., Brotheridge & Lee, 2003; Grandey, 2003). Following this perspective, the use of emotional labor is more of a trait where surface acting and deep acting are used consistently over time, suggesting a high degree of stability in latent profiles of emotional labor. On the other hand, scholars have pointed out that the use of surface acting and deep acting is more of a dynamic process. Accordingly, Diefendorff and Gosserand (2003) stated that emotional labor is "a cyclical discrepancy-monitoring and reduction process in which perceptions of emotional displays and display rules are continuously compared" (p. 955). Supporting this perspective, Gabriel and Diefendorff (2015) found that participants' use of emotional labor strategies may vary during the same interaction, depending on the fluctuation in the customer's incivility, to mitigate the discrepancy between felt and required emotions. In the same vein, scholars also showed that surface acting and deep acting had significant variations throughout the day (e.g., Judge et al., 2009; Totterdell & Holman, 2003). Interestingly, models of emotional labor have also proposed a temporal order in the use of emotional labor strategies (e.g., Grandey & Melloy, 2017). In particular, Grandey and Melloy (2017) suggested that surface acting may first be used as a heuristic strategy, while deep acting may occur much later when one learns from the situation. In a similar vein, Ashforth and Humphrey (1993) proposed that the systematic and routine use of surface acting over time could make it automatic, which would no longer require the use of surface acting. In other words, these views convey the idea that by relying on their work experiences (e.g.,

better anticipation of future situations, professional maturity), individuals have the ability to modify their use of emotional labor strategies over longer periods of time. Accordingly, although recent studies found that emotional labor strategies are more likely to change in a short period of time, the abovementioned rationales also suggest that surface acting and deep acting may potentially change over longer time frames. In sum, all this suggests that emotional labor profiles can be either stable or unstable over time.

A longitudinal person-centered approach makes it possible to shed new light on this issue and to examine whether identified latent profiles are stable over time or, on the contrary, whether they are merely the result of a transitory phenomenon. According to Morin et al. (2016), two types of latent profiles stability, namely within-sample stability and within-person stability, can be assessed in a longitudinal person-centered approach. On the one hand, withinsample stability refers to the nature of the latent profiles that could change over time. In particular, such stability may be investigated by performing a sequence of four models that indicate configural (same number of profiles), structural (same nature of profiles), dispersion (same profiles regardless of context), and distributional (same proportion of profiles) similarity (for more details, see Morin et al., 2016) using latent profile analyses. On the other hand, within-person stability, which refers to the extent to which employees remain in their initial profiles over time in the absence of changes in the sample, is assessed through latent transition analysis. Precisely, latent transition analysis is a variant of latent profile analysis used for testing profile membership change over time by regressing the latent profile variable at a one-time point on the previous ones (for more details, see Morin & Litalien, 2017). In other words, latent transition analysis provides information on the direction in which individuals change their profile over time.

Applying this analytical strategy, Cheung et al. (2018) have recently explored the stability of latent profiles of emotional labor through a two-wave longitudinal person-centered

study. They examined potential profile shifts over 6 months. They found three similar profiles over time, indicating within-sample stability (i.e., configural similarity). Furthermore, their "display rule compliers" profile had a high likelihood (47.5%) to move into the "active actor" profile, suggesting within-person instability. Apart from this unique evidence, personcentered research on emotional labor has treated emotional labor as a static emotion regulation by using one-time assessments of surface acting and deep acting (Fouquereau et al., 2019; Gabriel et al., 2015; Nguyen & Stinglhamber, 2020), so little is known about the stability of latent profiles of emotional labor characterized by surface acting and deep acting only. Therefore, this study sought to further explore the (in)stability of the latent profiles of emotional labor that the testing of Hypothesis 1 will reveal. Although a priori hypotheses are difficult to posit, the limited empirical evidence on the (in)stability of latent profiles of emotional labor provided by Cheung et al. (2018) allows us to propose the following research question:

Research question: Will the identified emotional labor profiles exhibit low withinperson stability and high within-sample stability over a three-month period?

Positive Affectivity, Negative Affectivity, and Organizational Dehumanization as Predictors of Profile Membership

In a third step, we aimed at examining antecedents of the latent profiles of emotional labor highlighted by Hypothesis 1. Emotional labor models (e.g. Grandey, 2000) spotlight that dispositional factors play a key role in the development of emotional labor. In particular, dispositional positive affectivity and negative affectivity were found to impact employees' chronic use of surface acting and deep acting. Negative affectivity refers to a "general dimension of subjective distress and unpleasable engagement that subsumes a variety of aversive mood states", while positive affectivity reflects "the extent to which a person feels enthusiastic, active (...) and is a state of high energy, full concentration, and pleasurable

engagement" (Watson et al., 1988, p. 1063). Scholars suggested that individuals having high levels of dispositional negative affect have some difficulties in regulating their emotions (Ng & Diener, 2009). In the same vein, Joormann and Siemer's (2004) experimental research showed that people who had been inducted into a negative mood had difficulty using past positive memories or events as an emotional strategy to cope with mood sadness. Because deep acting involves attentional deployment or cognitive change, employees with high levels of negative affectivity may prefer to engage in surface acting, as it does not imply the need to recover past pleasant memories or to reappraise the focus of the situation. In contrast, individuals who are high in dispositional positive affectivity tend to have better control of their emotions through the use of imagery to deal with negative moods (Wood et al., 2003). Thus, individuals having high levels of dispositional positive affectivity may have a better ability to modify their inner feelings to fit with the environmental requirements. Based on Gabriel et al.'s (2015) latent profile analysis, employees with high levels of negative affectivity had a higher likelihood to be classified as surface actors and regulators, while those with high levels of positive affectivity were more likely to be classified as deep actors. Based on the aforementioned rationales, we expected that:

Hypothesis 2: Negative affectivity will be related to profiles with high levels of surface acting, while positive affectivity will be associated with profiles with high levels of deep acting.

Models on emotional labor emphasize that situational factors such as interpersonal mistreatment from members pertaining to the workplace are also critical in the use of emotional labor. Particularly, mistreatment stemming from customers, patients, coworkers, and supervisors leads employees to engage in emotional labor to cope with the abuse situation (e.g., Adams & Webster, 2013). Recently, authors have found that mistreatment from the organization -through the concept of organizational dehumanization- may also entail

emotional labor (Nguyen et al., 2021). Organizational dehumanization, which refers to "an experience resulting from global perceptions and beliefs regarding the extent to which the abstract and distal entity that is the organization considers him/her as a tool or instrument" (Nguyen & Stinglhamber, 2021, p. 833), is an emotion-provoking experience that, as such, might lead to emotional labor in the same way as interpersonal mistreatment (Grandey, 2000).

Drawing upon conservation of resources theory (Hobfoll, 1989), Nguyen and Stinglhamber (2021) argued that workers facing organizational dehumanization would engage in surface acting to comply with the organization's rules, thereby maintaining resources that they value (e.g., social resources). Precisely, violating these rules would entail an additional important loss of resources because of the potential interpersonal conflicts that might follow. In line with their predictions, the authors found in a variable-centered study that high perceptions of organizational dehumanization led individuals to engage in surface acting to comply with the organization's display rules. In a similar vein, they also brought evidence, in a person-centered research, that employees experiencing organizational dehumanization were more likely to be classified as "surface actors" or "regulators" –that is in profiles involving high levels of surface acting– compared to other profiles (Nguyen & Stinglhamber, 2020). Thus, we expected the following:

Hypothesis 3: Experiencing high levels of organizational dehumanization will increase the likelihood of belonging to profiles characterized by high levels of surface acting.

Profiles of Emotional Labor and Consequences

In the final step, we investigated consequences of the latent profiles of emotional labor established through the test of Hypothesis 1. Meta-analytic reviews on emotional labor have clearly indicated the detrimental effect of the use of surface acting on both employees and organizations (e.g., Hülsheger & Schewe, 2011). According to Grandey (2000), when employees engage in surface acting, they feel dissatisfied and exhausted with their job

because of the emotional dissonance that results. Specifically, surface acting implies constant monitoring of the inner and required emotions. By expressing emotions that are not in line with the inner feelings, employees have to make continuous efforts to modify the emotional expression. Such an effort depletes mental resources, which in turn impair employees' wellbeing, such as lower levels of job satisfaction and higher levels of emotional exhaustion (e.g., Mesmer-Magnus et al., 2012). Moreover, it has been suggested that the emotional dissonance resulting from surface acting reflects a mismatch between employees' feelings and their job expectations (e.g., Cho et al., 2017). This misalignment motivates the employee to disengage from the organization and thereby undermines organizational well-being, including increased turnover intentions and reduced affective commitment (e.g., Mesmer-Magnus et al., 2012). Supporting these findings, person-centered research indicated that profiles involving high levels of surface acting and low levels of deep acting were associated with the worst jobrelated outcomes (e.g., Gabriel et al., 2015).

Unlike surface acting, the relations between deep acting and outcomes are mixed. First, deep acting is described to be harmful because it is also an effortful strategy that might drain mental resources and therefore undermines both employees' well-being and organizational well-being in the same way as surface acting (e.g., Alabak et al., 2020; Liu et al., 2008). Second, some researchers suggested that adopting deep acting is indeed beneficial to employees' psychological health and organizational well-being because deep acting can lower the sense of emotional dissonance, which is found to be detrimental to employees (i.e., low job satisfaction and high emotional exhaustion; Pugh et al., 2011) and organizations (i.e., high turnover intentions and low affective commitment; Abraham, 1999). Furthermore, drawing upon conservation of resources theory (Hobfoll, 1989), scholars suggested that deep acting may foster rewarding resources (e.g., social, effort, and competence), which may yield positive consequences for both the employee and the organization (e.g., Gu et al., 2020;

Mesmer-Magnus et al., 2012). Third, some scholars also reported that deep acting was unrelated to employees' well-being and organizational well-being (e.g., Grandey, 2003). As a matter of fact, null effects for deep acting may be explained by the fact that this strategy "involves opponent process leading to a resource loss and gain at the same time, resulting in no net gain or loss" (Hülsheger & Schewe, 2011, p. 367).

Interestingly, a person-centered approach to emotional labor may help to understand the unclear effects of deep acting in variable-centered research. More precisely, personcentered studies found that deep acting (i.e., deep actors; high levels of deep acting and low levels of surface acting) is related to the most favorable outcomes, but is associated with maladaptive outcomes when combined with high levels of surface acting (i.e., regulators). Overall, these findings suggest that surface acting is detrimental to employees, while deep acting is beneficial to them. Based on the above, we expected the following:

Hypothesis 4: Profiles with high levels of surface acting will be associated with the lowest levels of employees' well-being (i.e., lowest levels of job satisfaction and highest levels of emotional exhaustion) and organizational well-being (i.e., lowest levels of affective commitment and highest levels of turnover intentions) as compared to profiles with high levels of deep acting.

The hypothesized model adopting a person-centered approach is displayed in Figure 1.

[Insert Figure 1 about here]

Method

Participants and Procedure

Data were collected via Prolific Academic, a crowdsourcing platform dedicated to academic research (Peer et al., 2017). Participants took part in the study in exchange for monetary compensation of 1.5£ at each time. At Time 1, 685 employees fully completed the survey. After three months, these 685 participants were contacted through Prolific Academic platform and were invited to take part in the study a second time. In total, 497 questionnaires were returned at Time 2 (response rate = 72.6%). Note that we did not include into the analyses participants who indicated that they were unemployed, self-employed, or retired at Time 2, changed organization between Time 1 and 2, and when they failed to attentional check question at Time 1 and Time 2. After matching the responses at both times, our sample was composed of 425 employees, mainly British and coming from diverse organizations. Most of them worked in education (14.4%), health (11.3%), public service (9.6%), information services (9.6%), retail and sales (9.4%), banking and finance (8.7%), engineering and manufacturing (6.8%), consulting and management (3.8%), voluntary work (3.5%), science and pharmaceuticals (2.8%), and tourism (2.6%) for the most represented. The mean age of the participants was 38.54 years (SD = 10.67); the majority were women (61.2%). All procedures contributing to this work comply with the ethical standards of the Helsinki Declaration of 1975, as revised in 2008. All procedures involving human participants were approved by the institutional research ethics committee.

Measures

Unless otherwise specified, the participants assessed the following items using a 7point Likert-type scale ranging from "1" (Strongly disagree) to "7" (Strongly agree).

Organizational dehumanization (Time 1). Participants indicated the extent to which they felt dehumanized by their organization by rating the 11 items of Caesens et al.'s (2017) organizational dehumanization scale ($\alpha = .94$). An item was "*My organization considers me as a tool devoted to its own success.*"

Positive affectivity and negative affectivity (Time 1). We used Thompson's (2007) short version of the Positive and Negative Affectivity Schedule. The scale is composed of five positive (e.g., alert; $\alpha = .88$) and five negative (e.g., hostile; $\alpha = .85$) mood-relevant traits.

Individuals indicated how they generally felt each emotion (i.e., on average) using a 7-point Likert scale ranging from "1" (not at all) to "7" (extremely).

Emotional labor (Time 1 and Time 2). Participants' use of emotional labor strategies was measured using the well-known items from Brotheridge and Lee (2003) and Grandey's (2003) scales. Surface acting included four items (e.g., "*Fake a good mood when interacting with others*"; $\alpha_{\text{Time1}} = .93$ and $\alpha_{\text{Time2}} = .94$), while deep acting included three items (e.g., "*I really try to feel the emotions I have to show as part of my job*"; $\alpha_{\text{Time1}} = .95$ and $\alpha_{\text{Time2}} = .93$). Participants rated these items on a 7-point scale from "1" (never) to "7" (always).

Job satisfaction (Time 2). Employees indicated their job satisfaction through the four items ($\alpha = .93$) of Eisenberger et al. (1997). An item included "*All in all, I'm very satisfied with my current job.*"

Affective commitment (Time 2). Respondents' affective commitment was measured by using three items ($\alpha = .90$) from Meyer et al.'s (1993) scale. An example was "*I do feel a strong sense of 'belonging' to my organization.*"

Emotional exhaustion (Time 2). Participants reported their exhaustion through Maslach and Jackson's (1986) scale (9 items; $\alpha = .95$). An item was "*I feel emotionally drained from my work*." They evaluated these statements through a 7-point scale ranging from "1" (never) to "7" (always).

Turnover intentions (Time 2). Workers' intentions to quit their organization were assessed using the three items ($\alpha = .94$) of Jaros (1997). An item was "*I intend to search for a position with another employer within the next year.*"

Statistical Analyses

Latent profiles analyses. Latent profile analyses were performed using Mplus 7.4 (Muthén & Muthén, 2019) and its MLR estimator. We used factor scores computed from confirmatory factor analyses (CFAs) as input for the analyses (Morin, 2016). Four fit indices

were examined to assess the goodness of fit of CFAs: Root Mean Square Error of Approximation (RMSEA) less than .08, Standardized Root Mean Square Residual (SRMR) less than .08, Comparative Fit Index (CFI) more than .90, and Tucker Lewis Index (TLI) greater than .90 indicate a good fit (Marsh et al., 2004). Results indicated that the measurement models of emotional labor (i.e., surface acting and deep acting) at Time 1 and Time 2 had a very good fit to the data (χ^2 (13) = 39.55, RMSEA = .07, SRMR = .03, CFI = .98, TLI = .97 and χ^2 (13) = 57.13, RMSEA = .08, SRMR = .04, CFI = .96, TLI = .94, respectively). Moreover, both measurement models were significantly better than the onefactor model at Time 1 (χ^2 (14) = 710.53, RMSEA = .34, SRMR = .25, CFI = .50, TLI = .25, $\Delta\chi^2$ (1) = 670.98, SBc = 118.98, *p* < .001) and Time 2 (χ^2 (14) = 526.55, RMSEA = .29, SRMR = .24, CFI = .57, TLI = .35, $\Delta\chi^2$ (1) = 469.42, SBc = 88.42, *p* < .001), respectively.

Following the recommendations of Morin (2016), emotional labor latent profiles were estimated with 3000 random start values, 100 iterations of these start values, and 100 solutions retained for final stage optimization. We specified up to eight profiles in which the means of both emotion regulation strategies were freely estimated across profiles and their variances were constrained to equality (e.g., Gabriel et al., 2015; Nguyen & Stinglhamber, 2020). The optimal number of latent profiles was selected through the well-known set of statistical model fit indices (i.e., Loglikelihood (LL), Akaike information criteria (AIC), constant Akaike information criteria (CAIC), Bayesian information criteria (BIC), sample size adjusted Bayesian information criteria (SSA-BIC), adjusted Lo-Mendel-Rubin likelihood ratio (aLMR), bootstrapped likelihood ratio test (BLRT), and entropy). Although LPA fit statistics do not have rules of thumb on how to determine the optimal number of profiles, many studies suggest that LL, AIC, CAIC, BIC, and SSA-BIC for k-profile model should be preferably lower than those obtained from a k-1-profile model. In addition, entropy value should be preferably high indicating a clear delineation of the latent classes. Finally, the aLMR and BLRT that compare a k profile with a k-1 profile should be significant at p < .05, suggesting that the k-profile should be picked as the best profile structure (for more details, see Morin, 2016). Furthermore, it is important to keep in mind that researchers also need to consider the theoretical conformity and meaning of the solution retained when selecting the optimal number of profiles (Morin, 2016).

Longitudinal tests of profile similarity. The profile solution retained at both times were combined into a two-wave longitudinal latent profile analysis model to test withinsample stability of latent profiles of emotional labor. Longitudinal tests of profile similarity were conducted by following the procedure described in Morin and Litalien (2017). Precisely, we first estimated whether the same number of latent profiles was retained at each measuring time (configural similarity). Based on this model, we conducted a series of models in which we constrained within-profile means (structural similarity), variances (dispersion similarity), and proportions (distributional similarity) to be equal over time. The models were compared to each other using the AIC, CAIC, BIC, and SSA-BIC fit indices. The profile similarity analysis fit statistics have no rules of thumb. However, Morin et al. (2016) suggested that the model with the lowest fit indices should be considered as the most similar latent profile over time.

Latent transition analyses. We investigated within-person stability by converting the most similar model into a two-wave longitudinal latent transition analysis model (Collins & Lanza, 2010) while controlling for positive and negative affectivity since they are known to affect the use of surface acting and deep acting (e.g., Grandey, 2000). Accordingly, Table 1 indicates that positive affectivity at Time 1 was negatively associated with surface acting at Time 2 and positively related to deep acting at Time 2, while negative affectivity at Time 1 was positively correlated with surface acting at Time 2.

[Insert Table 1 about here]

Predictors and outcomes. Antecedents and outcomes were analyzed separately (e.g., Gabriel et al., 2015). Furthermore, antecedents were measured at Time 1, while outcomes were measured at Time 2 (e.g., Nylund-Gibson et al., 2014). We used factor scores saved from a confirmatory factor analysis performed on predictors (i.e., organizational dehumanization, positive affectivity, and negative affectivity). Confirmatory factor analyses showed that the three-factor model had a good fit to the data (χ^2 (186) = 540.45, RMSEA = .07, SRMR = .05, CFI = .92, TLI = .91) and was significantly better to all other constrained models. Predictors were included into the final solution retained using the "R3STEP" function available in Mplus (Asparouhov & Muthén, 2014). This command performs a series of multinomial logistic regressions to compare whether an increase in an antecedent would increase the probability that an individual belongs to one latent profile in comparison with another latent profile.

Concerning the outcomes (i.e., job satisfaction, affective commitment, emotional exhaustion, and turnover intentions), we also relied on factor scores saved from a confirmatory factor analysis. These analyses indicated that the four-factor model showed a good fit to the data (χ^2 (146) = 573.40, RMSEA = .08, SRMR = .06, CFI = .93, TLI = .92) and was better to other nested measurement models. Outcomes were modeled with the "BCH" function in Mplus (Asparouhov & Muthén, 2014). This command performs mean comparisons of each continuous outcome variable modeled across latent profiles, which allows testing whether an outcome within one profile significantly differs in comparison with other profiles.

Results

Latent Profile Solutions

Fit indices of the latent profile solutions at Time 1 and Time 2, the detailed rationales for the selected profile solution at Time 1 and Time 2, and the two-wave longitudinal tests profile similarity are provided in online supplemental materials.

Figure 2 displays the 5-profile solution chosen for emotional labor at Time 1 and Time 2. The first latent profile that reported high levels of surface acting and low levels of deep acting was labeled "*surface actors*." The second profile defined as "*regulators*" included employees who indicated high levels of surface acting and deep acting. Then, we identified "*low actors*" profile in which individuals reported similar levels of surface acting and deep acting that might be seen as moderate use of both emotional strategies. The fourth latent profile was labeled "*non-actors*" given that individuals indicated very low levels of surface acting and deep acting and deep acting. Finally, the last profile characterized by employees who reported low levels of surface acting and high levels of deep acting was labeled "*deep actors*." Overall, these findings supported Hypothesis 1.

[Insert Figure 2 about here]

Similarity of Emotional Labor Profiles

Since the five-profile solution was picked as the best representation of our data for both samples at Time 1 and Time 2, the configural similarity of emotional labor profiles across time was supported. In addition, compared to the configural model, the structural model resulted in lower AIC, CAIC, BIC, and SSA-BIC indicating that the nature of the fiveprofile solution at both Time 1 and Time 2 was similar (i.e., structural similarity). Results indicated that both the dispersion and distributional models showed higher values in all fit indices, suggesting that the dispersion similarity and the distributional similarity were not supported. This is not problematic since "profile similarity does not need to be an all or nothing phenomenon" (Morin et al., 2016, p. 237). In sum, these results suggested that the number and nature of profiles of emotional labor were similar over time.

Latent Profile Transitions

The transition probabilities that give information about employees' latent profile status at Time 2 given their membership at Time 1 are provided in online supplemental materials. The findings showed that the latent profiles of emotional labor were quite stable across time. More precisely, 95.4% of surface actors, 88.8% of regulators, 94.2% of low actors, 71.9% of non-actors, and 84.5% of deep actors at Time 1 remained in their respective profiles at Time 2. Furthermore, the results indicated an interesting change over time in profile membership, for the non-actors profile and the deep actors profile. Specifically, a significant number of employees classified as non-actors at Time 1 have moved to the deep actors profile (transition probability = .103). Overall, these findings indicated a high level of within-person stability in the absence of changes in the sample.

Predictors of Latent Profiles

The relationships between organizational dehumanization, positive affectivity, and negative affectivity at Time 1 and the five latent profiles at Time 1 are displayed in Table 2. The results indicated that individuals' positive affectivity had no association with any profile membership. With regard to negative affectivity, employees having high levels of negative affectivity had a higher likelihood to belong to surface actors or regulators compared to deep actors. These findings also indicated that negative affectivity was related to employees being classified as regulators rather than low actors, non-actors, and deep actors. Overall, these findings were partially in line with Hypothesis 2. Furthermore, the results showed that individuals who perceived high levels of organizational dehumanization had a higher likelihood to belong to surface actors compared to low actors, non-actors, and deep actors. Furthermore, organizational dehumanization was found to be associated with employees belonging to regulators and low actors in comparison with deep actors. Finally, employees who felt dehumanized by their organization had a higher likelihood to be identified as low actors than non-actors. In sum, these results were in line with Hypothesis 3.

[Insert Table 2 about here]

Outcomes of Latent Profiles

The relationships between the five latent profiles at Time 2 and job satisfaction, affective commitment, emotional exhaustion, and turnover intentions at Time 2 are indicated in Table 3. Consistent with Hypothesis 4, analyses indicated that surface actors exhibited the worst job satisfaction, affective commitment, and turnover intentions, but were equivalent to regulators for emotional exhaustion. Regulators showed to be the second worst actors on job satisfaction, affective commitment, and turnover intentions but were equivalent to low actors for these outcomes. Furthermore, low actors were doing better than the two above-mentioned latent profiles regarding emotional exhaustion. Concerning the non-actors profile, members reported similar levels of affective commitment in comparison with regulators and low actors. The findings also indicated that non-actors had higher levels of job satisfaction, emotional exhaustion, and turnover intentions than surface actors, regulators, and low actors, but were found to be equivalent to deep actors. Finally, deep actors exhibited the best affective commitment in comparison to all other latent profiles.

[Insert Table 3 about here]

Discussion

Adopting a person-centered approach, the present study aimed at advancing our understanding of the replicability and stability (i.e., within-sample and within-person) of profiles of emotional labor characterized by different combinations of surface acting and deep acting. In particular, we investigated whether latent profiles of emotional labor varied over a 3-month period. In addition, we examined positive affectivity, negative affectivity, and organizational dehumanization as predictors of profile membership at Time 1, and the

associations between these profiles and job satisfaction, affective commitment, emotional exhaustion, and turnover intentions at Time 2.

Latent Profiles of Emotional Labor

First, the main theoretical contribution of this research is that it reinforces the idea that "the two perspectives on the mutually exclusive versus concomitant existence of emotional labor strategies are both relevant" (Nguyen & Stinglhamber, 2020, p. 485). In particular, our research confirmed the existence of five profiles of emotional labor as previously found in previous person-centered research on emotional labor (i.e., Gabriel et al., 2015; Nguyen & Stinglhamber, 2020). Precisely, we found two qualitative profiles in which one strategy is used at the expense of the other (i.e., surface acting and deep acting) as well as three quantitative profiles in which both strategies are used in tandem (i.e., regulators, low actors, and non-actors).

Interestingly, our results indicated the existence of a subpopulation of employees who reported not regulating their emotions at work (i.e., non-actors). As such, employees classified in this profile might display either deviant feelings –that violate the organization's display rules– or authentic emotions to deal with their job demands. Therefore, it would be worthwhile to consider emotional deviance and genuine emotions, along with surface acting and deep acting in future person-centered research.

Latent Transitions

The second important contribution is that this study highlights for the first time that latent profiles of emotional labor are relatively stable over time. Concerning within-sample stability, our findings revealed that the number (configural similarity) and the nature (structural similarity) of the latent profiles of emotional labor replicated over a three-month period. These results indicate that the five-profile solution is robust and not merely the result of a transient phenomenon. More importantly, these findings indicate that organizations and

researchers can confidently rely on the five-profile solution to design interventions tailored to specific profiles of employees. The within-person stability analysis also revealed that profiles of emotional labor are quite highly stable (71.9% to 95.4%) over a three-month period, indicating that employees stay in their initial profile over time without any external changes (e.g., changes in customer behaviors) or interventions (e.g., training in emotion management). Particularly, the non-actors profile showed to be the least stable (71.9%) and had a considerable likelihood to move into the deep actors profile (19.6%) over time. Such change may result from the fact that deep acting may be beneficial to employees since this strategy can lower the sense of emotional dissonance and, therefore, foster rewarding resources (Brotheridge & Lee, 2002). In line with conservation of resources theory (Hobfoll, 1989), employees might strive to obtain and maintain resources they value by engaging in emotional labor strategies that are considered to be more cost-effective, such as high levels of deep acting (i.e., deep actors). Precisely, by expressing genuine emotions, employees would gain rewarding resources because of potential positive interactions and feedbacks that would result (Grandey, 2000).

Overall, our findings suggest that employees do not spontaneously have the ability or inclination to switch to other latent profiles (e.g., deep actors), without external factors leading them to do so. In this respect, one promising approach that would allow employees to shift from a "bad profile" (i.e., surface actors or regulators) to a "good profile" (i.e., low actors or deep actors) is to encourage them to undertake mindfulness training. Indeed, Hülsheger et al. (2013) found that mindfulness exercises contribute to reducing employees' use of surface acting. In addition, organizational factors can also help employees to shift into other, better, profiles of emotional labor. In particular, ensuring a climate of authenticity or providing favorable work conditions such as job autonomy may reduce employees' use of surface acting (e.g., Grandey, 2000; Grandey et al., 2012).

Emotional Labor Profiles and Predictors

Another contribution is that our research supports that both dispositional and situational factors play a determinant role in predicting latent profiles of emotional labor membership. In particular, our results showed that negative affectivity, but not positive affectivity, and organizational dehumanization predicted emotional labor profiles membership. We found that individuals with high levels of negative affectivity had a higher likelihood to belong to surface actors and regulators (i.e. profiles in which employees rely on high levels of surface acting). However, we did not find supporting evidence on the association between positive affectivity and emotional labor profiles. Our findings were thus partially echoing the results by Gabriel et al.'s (2015) in which positive affectivity was not a significant factor in predicting the membership in an Asian work sample. Further research aimed at examining the role of dispositional affects on emotional labor in cross-cultural contexts is therefore required.

Concerning organizational dehumanization, we found that the more employees felt dehumanized by their organization, the more they were likely to surface act (i.e., surface actors and regulators), which is in line with prior research (e.g., Nguyen et al., 2021). In a more original way, the present research reinforces the idea that the determinants of emotional labor may be less proximal than most models and theories have suggested so far, in that a more distal and abstract entity that is the organization can influence the development of emotional labor strategies.

Emotional Labor Profiles and Consequences

The last theoretical contribution of this research is that it points out once again that a person-centered perspective for the study of emotional labor may reconcile the mixed effects of deep acting found in variable-centered studies (e.g., Gabriel et al., 2015). Our findings indicated that surface actors were associated with the worst outcomes in terms of employees'

well-being and organizational well-being, while deep actors were found to be associated with the most adaptive outcomes. However, our results emphasized that the regulators profile – where employees relied on high levels of surface acting and deep acting– experienced better job-related outcomes than surface actors but still worse than all other profiles. These results thus underline that deep acting may be beneficial but when associated with surface acting is rather detrimental to employees and organizations. In this respect, beneficial (harmful) effects of deep acting may be the result of the majority presence of deep actors (regulators) in previous variable-centered studies, while null effects may be explained by the fact that deep actors and regulators were probably both at stake. Overall, this study supports previous research by suggesting, once again, the need for a person-centered approach in the study of emotional labor.

Practical Implications

This research provides several practical recommendations for managers and organizations. First, organizations should be aware that the felt dehumanization leads their employees to engage more in surface acting, which is detrimental to their well-being. Thus, organizations should strive to decrease the feeling of dehumanization among their staff to mitigate the use of surface acting. One promising way is to foster the perception that their well-being is valued and their contributions are acknowledged (Caesens et al., 2017) by implementing practices that promote the development of employees (e.g., Eisenberger & Stinglhamber, 2011). In addition, organizations and their supervisors should be careful to promote justice in the way organizational practices and policies are administrated, by ensuring that organizational rules and procedures are consistently applied for instance (Bell & Khoury, 2016). Finally, organizations should raise awareness among supervisors who have abusive behaviors toward their collaborators (Caesens et al., 2019). Concretely, organizations should

encourage their supervisors to undertake training to develop their management skills to correct abusive practices.

Second, by spotlighting that in the absence of any external changes, profiles of emotional labor are relatively stable over time, our results suggest that the five-solution profile is common in the workplace, so organizations and managers can confidently rely on the five-profile solution to design interventions tailored to specific emotional labor profiles of employees. In particular, this study showed that the "surface actors" and "regulators" profiles entail higher use of surface acting when compared to other profiles. Since the use of surface acting is related to poorer psychological well-being and health outcomes (e.g. Hülsheger, & Schewe, 2011), organizations should discourage their employees from relying on high levels of surface acting that are detrimental. They could thus provide training workshops that would help employees belonging to the "surface actors" and "regulators" profile to identify solutions to reduce the use of surface acting such as mindfulness techniques (Hülsheger et al., 2013). Organizations could also implement human resource practices that buffer the negative impacts associated with high levels of surface acting. For instance, ethical leadership (Lu & Guy, 2014) and job autonomy (Johnson & Spector, 2007) have been found to lessen negative workrelated consequences from surface acting. By promoting these factors as much as possible, organizations would help their personnel who reside in a "bad" profile (i.e., surface actors and regulators) to be more resilient. In line with Chi and Wang's (2018) findings, organizations could also propose mentoring to their "surface actors" and "regulators" and, in particular, to the newcomers pertaining to these two profiles. By acting as useful job resources that help newcomers to deal with the emotional job demands, mentoring programs characterized by high levels of career development and role modeling indeed lessen the adverse effects of surface acting.

Limitations and Future Research

As in most studies, this research has some limitations. First, the use of self-reported questionnaires exposed this study to potential biases (i.e., common method bias). However, we overcame the threat of method effects by following the recommendations of Conway and Lance (2010). In particular, to mitigate participants' social desirability, we stated at the beginning of the survey that there were no right or wrong answers, and we guaranteed their anonymity. We also counterbalanced the items of each measure to lessen the effects of the order of items that might adversely influence the results. In addition, Conway and Lance (2010) underlined that "self-reports are clearly appropriate for (...) private events (p. 329), hence the use of self-reported measures was probably the best option because the variables used in this research are by nature personal interpretations. Furthermore, we introduced a temporal separation between the antecedents and the outcomes. Technically, positive affectivity, negative affectivity, and organizational dehumanization were assessed at Time 1, while job satisfaction, affective commitment, emotional exhaustion, and turnover intentions were evaluated at Time 2. Finally, Conway and Lance (2010) stated, "one way to rule out substantial method effects is to demonstrate construct validity of the measures used" (p. 329). In this respect, our results showed that the predictor, emotional labor, and outcome scales had good internal consistencies and presented good discriminant validity. Based on the above, one can thus be confident that method biases do not compromise the validity of the findings of the present study.

Second, the use of crowdsourcing platforms, which encourage individuals to voluntarily participate in online surveys in exchange for financial incentives, has limitations that may have threatened the validity of our findings (e.g., Behrend et al., 2011). For instance, participants may have participated in the study despite not being actual employees. However, participants were asked at the end of the survey if they were real employees. They were reassured that they would receive their financial compensation regardless of their answer. In

addition, some participants may have completed the questionnaire randomly, in order to spend as little time as possible and still get their financial compensation. In this regard, attentional check questions were integrated into the questionnaire to exclude these participants. Despite these potential limitations, several authors have suggested that the reliability of data from crowdsourcing samples (e.g., Mturk, Prolific Academic) is equivalent to, if not better than, traditional participant samples composed of employees (e.g., Behrend et al., 2011; Peer et al., 2017). Based on the above, it can be assumed that voluntary participation in exchange for financial incentives does not compromise the quality of our data.

Our third limitation is related to the fact that participants in this study were specifically recruited via Prolific Academic. Although this platform allows for rapid recruitment of participants, it does not accurately represent the study population since only people with an account on this platform can participate in the survey (selection bias). In addition, while this platform makes it possible to have employees from various sectors and organizations, it does not, however, make it possible to take into account the effect of specificities related to a particular organizational context. Finally, the recruitment of participants via Prolific Academic means that the majority of our participants are British citizens. All this raises the question of whether the sample for this research is representative of the general employee population and whether our findings can be generalized to specific organizations. Therefore, future research would benefit from replicating our results in specific sectors and organizations and/or in other countries.

Finally, we examined latent profiles transition over a three-month period. More critically, Spector (2019) stated that "longitudinal designs can lead to erroneous inference when the timeframe chosen does not match the timeframe of the phenomenon in question" (p. 128). On the one hand, scholars have considered the use of emotional labor as a stable behavioral preference (e.g., Brotheridge & Lee, 2003). From this perspective, it is

questionable whether a three-month period is sufficient to conclude that the latent profiles of emotional labor are highly stable over time. With such a short timeframe, we probably did not put ourselves in the best conditions to observe an instability. Concluding on the stability of the latent profiles of emotional labor on the basis of a longer period would certainly generate more confidence in the results obtained. Consequently, it would be fruitful for future studies to replicate the present research with longer timeframes. On the other hand, employees' use of surface acting and deep acting can vary throughout the day, and even within the same interpersonal interaction (e.g., Gabriel & Diefendorff, 2015). Therefore, it would be interesting to study how daily work experiences can influence the transition of latent profiles of emotional labor in the course of a working day. In particular, the experience sampling method combined with the latent profile transition analysis would be relevant to account for real-time experiences on the transition of latent profiles of emotional labor.

In general, our results suggest that more dynamic approaches offer a more complete understanding of emotional labor and thus open up interesting perspectives for its study that certainly deserve the attention of researchers in the years to come.

References

- Abraham, R. (1999). The impact of emotional dissonance on organizational commitment and intention to turnover. *The Journal of Psychology*, *133*, 441-455.
- Adams, G. A., & Webster, J. R. (2013). Emotional regulation as a mediator between interpersonal mistreatment and distress. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology*, 22, 697-710.
- Alabak, M., Hülsheger, U. R., Zijlstra, F. R., & Verduyn, P. (2020). More than one strategy:
 A closer examination of the relationship between deep acting and key employee
 outcomes. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, 25, 32-45.

Ashforth, B. E., & Humphrey, R. H. (1993). Emotional labor in service roles: The influence

of identity. Academy of Management Review, 18, 88-115.

- Asparouhov, T., & Muthén, B. (2014). Auxiliary variables in mixture modeling: Three-step approaches using Mplus. *Structural Equation Modeling: A Multidisciplinary Journal*, 21, 329-341.
- Behrend, T. S., Sharek, D. J., Meade, A. W., & Wiebe, E. N. (2011). The viability of crowdsourcing for survey research. *Behavior Research Methods*, *43*, 800-813.
- Bell, C. M., & Khoury, C. (2016). Organizational powerlessness, dehumanization, and gendered effects of procedural justice. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 31, 570-585.
- Brotheridge, C. M., & Lee, R. T. (2002). Testing a conservation of resources model of the dynamics of emotional labor. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, *7*, 57-67.
- Brotheridge, C. M., & Lee, R. T. (2003). Development and validation of the emotional labour scale. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, *76*, 365-379.
- Caesens, G., Nguyen, N., & Stinglhamber, F. (2019). Abusive supervision and organizational dehumanization. *Journal of Business and Psychology*, *34*, 709-728.
- Caesens, G., Stinglhamber, F., Demoulin, S., & De Wilde, M. (2017). Perceived organizational support and employees' well-being: The mediating role of organizational dehumanization. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology*, 26, 527-540.
- Cheung, F., & Lun, V. M. C. (2015). Emotional labor and occupational well-being. *Journal of Individual Differences*, *36*, 30-37.
- Cheung, F., Lun, V. M. C., & Cheung, M. W. L. (2018). Emotional labor and occupational well-being: Latent Profile Transition Analysis Approach. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 9, 1084.
- Cheung, F., Tang, C. S. K., & Tang, S. (2011). Psychological capital as a moderator between emotional labor, burnout, and job satisfaction among school teachers in China.

International Journal of Stress Management, 18, 348-371.

- Chi, N. W., & Wang, I. A. (2018). The relationship between newcomers' emotional labor and service performance: The moderating roles of service training and mentoring functions. *The International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 29, 2729-2757.
- Cho, Y. N., Rutherford, B. N., Friend, S. B., Hamwi, G. A., & Park, J. (2017). The role of emotions on frontline employee turnover intentions. *Journal of Marketing Theory and Practice*, 25, 57-68.
- Collins, L. M., & Lanza, S. T. (2010). *Latent class and latent transition analysis: With applications in the social, behavioral, and health sciences.* John Wiley & Sons.
- Conway, J. M., & Lance, C. E. (2010). What reviewers should expect from authors regarding common method bias in organizational research. *Journal of Business and Psychology*, 25, 325-334.
- Diefendorff, J. M., & Gosserand, R. H. (2003). Understanding the emotional labor process: A control theory perspective. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, *24*, 945-959.
- Eisenberger, R., Cummings, J., Armeli, S., & Lynch, P. (1997). Perceived organizational support, discretionary treatment, and job satisfaction. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 82, 812-820.
- Eisenberger, R., & Stinglhamber, F. (2011). *Perceived organizational support: Fostering enthusiastic and productive employees*. APA Books.
- Fouquereau, E., Morin, A. J., Lapointe, E., Mokounkolo, R., & Gillet, N. (2019). Emotional labour profiles: Associations with key predictors and outcomes. *Work & Stress*, *33*, 268-294.
- Gabriel, A. S., Daniels, M. A., Diefendorff, J. M., & Greguras, G. J. (2015). Emotional labor actors: A latent profile analysis of emotional labor strategies. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 100, 863-879.

- Gabriel, A. S., & Diefendorff, J. M. (2015). Emotional labor dynamics: A momentary approach. *Academy of Management Journal*, *58*, 1804-1825.
- Grandey, A. A. (2000). Emotional regulation in the workplace: A new way to conceptualize emotional labor. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, *5*, 95-110.
- Grandey, A. A. (2003). When "the show must go on": Surface acting and deep acting as determinants of emotional exhaustion and peer-rated service delivery. *Academy of Management Journal*, 46, 86-96.
- Grandey, A. A., Foo, S. C., Groth, M., & Goodwin, R. E. (2012). Free to be you and me: A climate of authenticity alleviates burnout from emotional labor. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, 17, 1-14.
- Grandey, A. A., & Gabriel, A. (2015). Emotional labor at a crossroads: Where do we go from here? Annual Review of Organizational Psychology and Organizational Behavior, 2, 323-349.
- Grandey, A. A., & Melloy, R. C. (2017). The state of the heart: Emotional labor as emotion regulation reviewed and revised. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, 22, 407-422.
- Gu, Y., You, X., & Wang, R. (2020). Job demands and emotional labor as antecedents of female preschool teachers' work-to-family conflict: The moderating role of job resources. *International Journal of Stress Management*, 27, 23-34.
- Hobfoll, S. E. (1989). Conservation of resources: A new attempt at conceptualizing stress. *American Psychologist*, *44*, 513-524.
- Hülsheger, U. R., Alberts, H. J., Feinholdt, A., & Lang, J. W. (2013). Benefits of mindfulness at work: the role of mindfulness in emotion regulation, emotional exhaustion, and job satisfaction. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *98*, 310-325.

Hülsheger, U. R., & Schewe, A. F. (2011). On the costs and benefits of emotional labor: A

meta-analysis of three decades of research. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, *16*, 361-389.

- Humphrey, R. H., Ashforth, B. E., & Diefendorff, J. M. (2015). The bright side of emotional labor. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, *36*, 749-769.
- Jaros, S. J. (1997). An assessment of Meyer and Allen's (1991) three-component model of organizational commitment and turnover intentions. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 51, 319-337.
- Johnson, H. A. M., & Spector, P. E. (2007). Service with a smile: Do emotional intelligence, gender, and autonomy moderate the emotional labor process? *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, 12, 319-333.
- Joormann, J., & Siemer, M. (2004). Memory accessibility, mood regulation, and dysphoria: Difficulties in repairing sad mood with happy memories? *Journal of Abnormal Psychology*, *113*, 179-188.
- Judge, T. A., Woolf, E. F., & Hurst, C. (2009). Is emotional labor more difficult for some than for others? A multilevel, experience-sampling study. *Personnel Psychology*, 62, 57-88.
- Kammeyer-Mueller, J. D., Rubenstein, A. L., Long, D. M., Odio, M. A., Buckman, B. R., Zhang, Y., & Halvorsen-Ganepola, M. D. (2013). A meta-analytic structural model of dispositonal affectivity and emotional labor. *Personnel Psychology*, 66, 47-90.
- Liu, Y., Prati, L. M., Perrewé, P. L., & Ferris, G. R. (2008). The relationship between emotional resources and emotional labor: An exploratory study. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 38, 2410-2439.
- Lu, X., & Guy, M. E. (2014). How emotional labor and ethical leadership affect job engagement for Chinese public servants. *Public Personnel Management*, *43*, 3-24.
- Marsh, H. W., Hau, K. T., & Wen, Z. (2004). In search of golden rules: Comment on hypothesis-testing approaches to setting cutoff values for fit indexes and dangers in

overgeneralizing Hu and Bentler's (1999) findings. *Structural Equation Modeling*, *11*, 320-341.

- Maslach, C., & Jackson, S. E. (1986). *Maslach burnout inventory manual (2nd ed.)*. Consulting Psychologists Press.
- Mesmer-Magnus, J. R., DeChurch, L. A., & Wax, A. (2012). Moving emotional labor beyond surface and deep acting: A discordance-congruence perspective. *Organizational Psychology Review*, 2, 6-53.
- Meyer, J. P., Allen, N. J., & Smith, C. A. (1993). Commitment to organizations and occupations: Extension and test of a three-component conceptualization. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 78, 538-551.
- Meyer, J. P., & Morin, A. J. (2016). A person-centered approach to commitment research: Theory, research, and methodology. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, *37*, 584-612.
- Morin, A. J. (2016). *Person-centered research strategies in commitment research*. In J. P. Meyer (Ed.), The handbook of employee commitment (pp. 490-508). Edward Elgar.
- Morin, A. J., & Litalien, D. (2017). Webnote: Longitudinal tests of profile similarity and latent transition analyses. Montreal, QC: Substantive methodological synergy research laboratory.
- Morin, A. J., Meyer, J. P., Creusier, J., & Biétry, F. (2016). Multiple-group analysis of similarity in latent profile solutions. *Organizational Research Methods*, *19*, 231-254.
- Muthén, B. O., & Muthén, L. K. (2019). *Mplus User's Guide. Eighth Edition*. Muthén & Muthén.
- Ng, W., & Diener, E. (2009). Personality differences in emotions: Does emotion regulation play a role? *Journal of Individual Differences*, *30*, 100-106.
- Nguyen, N., Dao, Q. A., Nhan, T. L. A., & Stinglhamber, F. (2021). Organizational dehumanization and emotional labor: A cross-cultural comparison between Vietnam and

the United Kingdom. Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology, 52, 43-60.

- Nguyen, N., & Stinglhamber, F. (2021). Emotional labor and core self-evaluations as mediators between organizational dehumanization and job satisfaction. *Current Psychology*, 40, 831-839.
- Nguyen, N., & Stinglhamber, F. (2020). Workplace mistreatment and emotional labor: A latent profile analysis. *Motivation and Emotion*, *44*, 474-490.
- Nylund-Gibson, K., Grimm, R., Quirk, M., & Furlong, M. (2014). A latent transition mixture model using the three-step specification. *Structural Equation Modeling: A Multidisciplinary Journal*, 21, 439-454.
- Peer, E., Brandimarte, L., Samat, S., & Acquisti, A. (2017). Beyond the Turk: Alternative platforms for crowdsourcing behavioral research. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 70, 153-163.
- Pugh, S. D., Groth, M., & Hennig-Thurau, T. (2011). Willing and able to fake emotions: A closer examination of the link between emotional dissonance and employee well-being. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 96, 377-390.
- Spector, P. E. (2019). Do not cross me: Optimizing the use of cross-sectional designs. *Journal* of Business and Psychology, 34, 125-137.
- Spector, P. E., & Jex, S. M. (1998). Development of four self-report measures of job stressors and strain: Interpersonal conflict at work scale, organizational constraints scale, quantitative workload inventory, and physical symptoms inventory. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, *3*, 356-367.
- Thompson, E. R. (2007). Development and validation of an internationally reliable short-form of the positive and negative affect schedule (PANAS). *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, *38*, 227-242.

Totterdell, P., & Holman, D. (2003). Emotion regulation in customer service roles: testing a

model of emotional labor. Journal of Occupational Health Psychology, 8, 55-73.

- Watson, D., Clark, L. A., & Tellegen, A. (1988). Development and validation of brief measures of positive and negative affect: The PANAS scales. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 54, 1063-1070.
- Wood, J. V., Heimpel, S. A., & Michela, J. L. (2003). Savoring versus dampening: Selfesteem differences in regulating positive affect. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 85, 566-580.

Table 1

Descriptive Statistics and Correlations	among Variables at Time 1 and Time 2
---	--------------------------------------

	М	SD	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11
1. Organizational dehumanization T1	3.88	1.49	(.94)										
2. Positive affectivity T1	4.54	1.18	24**	(.88)									
3. Negative affectivity T1	2.12	0.97	.17**	30**	(.85)								
4. Surface acting T1	4.06	1.40	.37**	20**	.33**	(.93)							
5. Deep acting T1	3.76	1.46	09	.20**	.05	.18**	(.95)						
6. Surface acting T2	3.97	1.42	.27**	18**	.35**	.67**	.13**	(.94)					
7. Deep acting T2	3.86	1.39	14**	.26**	.02	.07	.60**	.16**	(.93)				
8. Job satisfaction T2	4.64	1.60	47**	.30**	19**	32**	.08	31**	.13**	(.93)			
9. Affective commitment T2	4.27	1.69	53**	.32**	09	26**	.17**	23**	.22**	.64**	(.90)		
10. Emotional exhaustion T2	3.45	1.41	.38**	30**	.39**	.46**	.02	.55**	.00	58**	37**	(.95)	
12. Turnover intentions T2	3.68	1.96	.44**	20**	.27**	.28**	04	.30**	07	73**	56**	.59**	(.94)

Note. N = 425. Cronbach's alpha is on the diagonal.

 $p^* < .05. p^* < .01.$

Table 2

The	Three-Step	Procedure	Results	for A	Antecedents	(R3STEP)	at Time	1
	1					\ /		

First profile	Low	Reg	Deep	Non	Low	Reg	Non	Reg	Non	Non
vs.	vs.	vs.	VS.	vs.	vs.	vs.	vs.	vs.	vs.	vs.
Second profile	Surf	Surf	Surf	Surf	Deep	Deep	Deep	Low	Low	Reg
Organizational dehumanization	-1.316**	-1.047	-2.722***	-1.948***	1.406***	1.675*	0.774	0.268	-0.633*	-0.901
Positive affectivity	.301	0.361	0.796	0.029	-0.495	-0.435	-0.766	0.060	-0.271	-0.331
Negative affectivity	-0.095	0.971	-1.416*	-0.621	1.321*	2.386**	0.795	1.065^{*}	-0.526	-1.591*

Note. All values are estimate from the multinomial logistic regressions. Positive (negative) values indicate that a person is more likely to be in the

first (second) profile when having high values on the antecedent; Low = low actors; Reg = regulators; Deep = deep actors; Non = non-actors;

Surf = surface actors.

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

Table 3

	Surf (1)	Reg (2)	Low (3)	Non (4)	Deep (5)	Chi-square	Significant Differences
Job satisfaction	-1.544	-0.152	-0.129	0.612	0.955	57.25***	1 < 2 = 3 < 4 = 5
Affective commitment	-1.542	0.149	-0.079	0.106	0.779	37.84***	1 < 2 = 3 = 4 < 5
Emotional exhaustion	1.545	1.094	-0.010	-1.197	-1.134	151.70***	1 = 2 > 3 > 4 = 5
Turnover intentions	1.479	0.417	0.098	-0.626	-1.127	46.64***	1 > 2 = 3 > 4 = 5

Equality Tests of Means across Profiles for Outcomes (BCH) at Time 2

Note. All values are standardized means. Surf = surface actors; Reg = regulators; Low = low actors; Non = non-actors; Deep = deep actors. Angle

brackets (equal sign) indicate profiles that are (not) significantly different at p < .05.

 $^{***}p < .001.$



Figure 1. The hypothesized model using a person-centered approach. H = hypothesis; RQ = research question.



Figure 2. Prototypical profiles of emotional labor actors at Time 1 and Time 2.