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Exploring the influence of Emotional Labour, Emotional Intelligence, Emotional Regulation, and Emotional Valence on Employee Job Satisfaction and Burnout.

This research examined the influences surface acting and deep acting, positive and negative affect, emotional regulation, and emotional intelligence may have on an employee’s ensuing wellbeing. This study further considered the degree of importance emotional processes may have in influencing the outcomes of surface acting and deep acting and if these emotional processes may influence the outcomes of employee job satisfaction and burnout. Businesses profit from the emotional labour employees expend as customer service quality (Grandey, 2003; Groth, Hennig-Thurau & Walsh, 2009) and visitor feedback (Van Dijk, Smith & Cooper 2011) are perceived as better quality. Notwithstanding the positive business outcomes, there are toxic ramifications for the employees. These harmful consequences are one of the contributing factors to the recent increase in emotional labour research. The costs to staff may incorporate burnout (Brotheridge & Grandey, 2002; Kruml & Geddes, 2000; Totterdal & Holman, 2003), decreased positive affect and increased negative affect (Watson, Clark & Tellegen, 1988), mental stress (Pugliesi, 1999) diminished physical health (Schaubroeck & Jones, 2000), declined company commitment (Abraham, 1999a), resignation intentions (Abraham, 1999a) and decreased job satisfaction (Grandey, 2003; Lewig & Dollard, 2003).

The importance of further exploration in to the association between emotional labour, burnout, job satisfaction and negative health outcomes has been strongly demonstrated in several meta-analyses’ (Bono & Vey, 2005; Hülsheger & Schewe, 2011; Mesmer-Magnus, Glew, & Viswesvaran, 2012; Wang, Seibert & Boles, 2001). Notably, very few discuss the importance of predictive measures of emotional processes (emotional intelligence, regulation and valence) in better understanding the employee’s perceptions of emotional labour. By improving the capability of management to predict the employee’s capability to manage their
emotions, management may develop plans to decrease the potentially harmful consequences of emotional labour on staff. Thus, this project aimed to increase the understanding of the employees’ experience of emotional labour and subsequent wellbeing, and test measures of emotional intelligence, emotional regulation and positive and negative affect (emotional valence) as predictors of employee burnout and job satisfaction.

**Emotional Labour**

Emotional Labour is defined as the emotional expression and display rules imposed by the employer within the workplace (Grandey, 2000; Hochschild, 1983). Within the workplace setting, there exists rules that stipulate the prime nature, extent, and object of emotions that should be displayed to optimise customer service (Morris & Feldman, 1996). The two emotional processes of emotional labour are *surface acting* and *deep acting*. Surface acting is emotional incongruence, displaying emotions outwardly that oppose the genuine internal feelings, and deep acting is the act of emotional congruency, where the external emotional display, matches the genuine internal feelings (Hochschild, 1983). Emotional Labour is used to achieve the best customer response (Hochschild, 1983) which results in a more effective and profitable workplace (Grandey, 2000).

**Positive and Negative Affect**

Positive and Negative Affect was defined by Watson et al., (1988) as the overall general outlook and individual may have on life. High positive affect refers to individuals that often view situations in a positive way (Watson, et al., 1988). In contrast, high negative affect or pessimistic people, tend to focus on the negative aspects of situations (Watson, et al., 1988). The present paper has included positive and negative affect as antecedents to emotional labours surface and deep acting. (Brotheridge & Lee, 2003, Gosserand & Diefendorff, 2005; Judge, Piccolo, & Kosalka, 2009). This theory predicts that positive affect influences surface acting negatively and deep acting positively, while negative affect
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**Emotional Regulation**

The most commonly used emotional regulation (ER) model is that of Gross (1998). This model encompasses fundamental tactics people use to influence the type, expression, experience and timing of their emotions (Troth, et al., 2018). These strategies are antecedent-focused or response-focused, meaning the regulation of expression occurs prior to complete development of an emotional occurrence or following the completed emotive experience (Troth et al., 2018). Gross (1998), identified four deep acting classes of antecedent ER approaches; situation selection, situation modification, attentional deployment, and cognitive reappraisal. Surface acting was associated to the fifth response-focused response variation, expressive suppression (Troth, et al., 2018). Emotional regulation is an important measure of a staff members ability to meet personal and company (Gross, 1998; Troth et al., 2018).

Research has shown that regulating emotions is linked to improved communication, work performance, physical health, and psychological well-being (for reviews, see Coˆt´e´, 2005; Grandey, Diefendorff, & Rupp, 2013; Lawrence, Suddaby, & Leca, 2011; Mesmer-Magnus et al. 2012; Webb, Miles & Sheeran, 2012). Recent studies show that the emotional experiences and displays of employees are formed from their perceptions of workplace events and the emotional expressions of others (Grandey et al. 2013; Lawrence et al. 2011). Findings also show that regulating emotions is linked to better business outcomes (see Cot`e´ et al. 2013).

Notwithstanding these developments, researchers appear to have expressively dissimilar thoughts on the conceptualisation of emotional regulation and its measures. The three main theorised perspectives typically used to formulise Workplace ER are: Gross’s (1998) ER process model (Gross 2013b, 2015); Hochschild’s (1978) emotional labour (see
Grandey et al. 2013; Humphrey, Ashforth, & Diefendorff, 2015) While many papers have discussed these models (e.g. Gross 2013a; Hayward & Tuckey 2013; Mikolajczak, Menil & Luminet, 2007). Lawrence et al., (2011) appeared to be solitary review that considered all three individual-level standpoints across a diversity of disciplines and made clear definitions between constructs. Lawrence et al., (2011), distinguished emotional regulation within the context of the workplace, as separate concept to both emotional labour and emotional intelligence. Moreover, Lawrence et al., (2001, p.p 230) stated that “Gross’s (1998) emotion regulation process model and subsequent research does not overtly consider the authentic expression of emotion, but focuses on the effects of increased and decreased regulation of experienced emotion”

As the predominant body of employee wellbeing outcomes have centred on the ability to regulate the expression of genuine and non-genuine emotions, there is a need to consider ER as a distinct process from emotional labour and emotional intelligence that may operate at a social level (e.g. see Ashkanasy 2003; Ashkanasy & Humphrey 2011; Côte,’ Piff, & Willer, 2013; Humphrey, Ashforth & Diefendorff, 2015; Little, Kluemper, Nelson, & Gooty, 2012.; Netzer, Van Kleef, & Tamir et al. 2015).

Webb et al.,’s (2012) meta-analyses focused on the process model of emotional regulation and used experiential, behavioural, and physiological measures to explore the efficiency of the emotional regulation strategies used to alter emotional outcomes, but no measure of employee wellbeing outcomes were undertaken. Notably, this project was unable to trace any analyses that studied the emotional regulation concept as a separate entity from either emotional labour or emotional intelligence dimensions within the workplace (Brackett, Palomera, Mojsa-Kaja, Reyes, & Salovey, 2017; Mesmer-Magnus et al. (2012). Nonetheless, understanding ER in a work setting is crucial to understanding how emotional tones develop over time through interactions and influence the quality of the workplace. This study has
included emotional regulation as a separate construct to emotional labour and emotional intelligence and implemented distinct measures to add to the research on workplace ER by building the on the understanding of ER and its complex relationship with employee wellbeing.

Similarly, there seems to be a dearth of emotional labour literature investigating job satisfaction or burnout that explores the latent influence of emotional regulation alone. This appears to be an odd oversight when considering the that the two scopes of emotional labour are different types of emotional regulation strategies (surface and deep acting; Grandey, 2000). For example, the clinical measures of suppression and cognitive reappraisal within the Emotional Regulation Questionnaire (Gross & John, 2003), embody avoidance and cognitive approach, whereby the emotional labour encompasses display and expression. Emotional regulation may be more effective in predicting the discrepancy in job satisfaction and burn out (Troth et al., 2018), than emotional intelligence as the latter measure is more extensive and less focussed.

**Emotional Intelligence**

Emotional Intelligence (EI) has been associated with a positive impact on work performance (e.g. *higher production rates, increased productivity, higher sales, less staff turnover*) when compared with the performance of personnel with lower emotional intelligence. EI is defined as the facilitated thought ability to perceive, understand, express and regulate emotions to healthier outcomes (Mayer & Salovey, 1997).

The impact of emotional response has been operationalised to date by determining emotional intelligence (Wong & Law, 2002). Emotional intelligence is currently known as a measure of emotional regulation and broader trait based emotional and social style (Wong & Law, 2002). Many studies have explored the influence employees’ emotional intelligence may have on workplace functioning and wellbeing outcomes, however, few agree on the
constructs of emotional intelligence (Kluemper, DeGroot & Choi, 2011). More so, scholars argue as to which measures are best and even if emotional intelligence is a valid predictor of an employee’s emotional abilities at all (Hochschild, 1983). Many authors argue emotional intelligence to be a predictor of employee work performance, wellbeing and associated with higher job satisfaction.

**Burnout**

Burnout had been defined by Kristensen et al., (2005, p 197.) as the ‘degree of physical and psychological fatigue and exhaustion experienced by the person’. Maslach and Jackson (1982) state the condition exists in three distinct states of which personnel feel emotionally “consumed” (emotional exhaustion), express a disconnected attitude toward others (depersonalization), and experience less self-efficacy at work (diminished personal accomplishment). Moreover, Lee and Ashforth (1993) and Maslach and Leiter’s (1997) research has found burnout to be consistently associated negative outcomes of; affect, performance, attitudes, attendance, staff retention, productivity and profitability.

Previous research has highlighted associations between workplace stress and employee burnout (Khamisa, Oldenburg, Peltzer, & Ilic, 2015; Maslach & Jackson, 1982) Workplace burnout is the consequence of ongoing stress exposure to emotional exhaustion (i.e., being worn-out of emotional resources) and negative affect (i.e., holding a negative outlook on work accomplishments)(Maslach & Leiter, 2008) Consequently, the negative impact burnout can have on employees psychological wellbeing may result in increased instances of depression, anxiety, stress leave, negative affect, and increased chances of being prescribed medications (Dahl, 2011). By better predicting an employee’s likelihood of burnout, businesses may be able to develop practical policies that lessen workplace stress and alleviate potential negative outcomes for both the employee and place of business.
Thus, substantial investigations have examined which factors contribute to employee burnout. These include personal attributes such as, emotional labour (Bartram, Casimir & Djurkovic, 2012; Kinman, Wray & Strange, 2001; Naring, Briet & Brouwers, 2006), positive and negative affect (Little, Simmons & Nelson, 2007; Zellars et al., 2006), emotional intelligence (Mikolajczak, et al., 2007; Weng, Hung, Liu, & Cheng, 2011) and emotional regulation (Brackett et al., 2010; Brotheridge & Grandey, 2002; Grandey, 2000; Grandey, Foo, Groth, & Goodwin, 2012). Nevertheless, no research directly predicting burnout by combining the factors of emotional labour, affect, emotional intelligence and emotional regulation was able to be located at the time of this study.

Grandey (2000) argued that the consequences of surface acting would relate to positively to burnout, and deep acting would relate to lower burnout and higher job satisfaction (e.g., Abraham, 1998; Morris & Feldman, 1997). Pugliesi (1999) argued that while both surface and deep acting had adverse effects on well-being and job satisfaction, surface acting was more harmful. Similar research has also found that surface acting has stronger associations with emotional exhaustion than deep acting (e.g., Brotheridge & Grandey, 2002; Brotheridge & Lee, 1998, 2002; Grandey, 2000). Moreover, Schaubroeck and Jones (2000), found that surface acting harmfully affected job-related behaviour and health outcomes. These outcomes include; reduced job satisfaction, memory loss, depersonalisation, job stress, hypertension, heart disease, and burnout (Hochschild, 1986; Hulsheger & Schewe, 2011). Additionally, Grandey (2000), stated that in theory, deep acting should be positively related to job performance, and in turn, to job satisfaction, due to the genuine display of emotions. However, the empirical evidence is lacking.

While many studies have investigated the associations between deep acting and job satisfaction the findings are mixed. Several meta-analyses’ did not conclude support for the associations (Hulsheger & Schewe, 2011; Mesmer-Magnus et al., 2012; Wang, Seibert, &
Boles, 2011). For example, Hülsheger and Schewe (2011) referred to surface and deep acting as a type of emotional regulation separate automatic emotion regulation. Automatic regulation refers to the inattentive, unconscious increases or decreases to the individual’s emotions void of intentional control (Mauss et al., 2008). Despite this, no prior attempt had been made to examine the interaction between deep acting, positive affect and burnout outcomes. Moreover, Hülsheger and Schewe (2011), stated future research may benefit from the assessment of emotional labour in a more concentrated manner, as both deep acting and surface acting may strengthen and suppress positive and negative emotions (Holman, Martínez-Inigo, & Totterdell, 2008a), yet no research was able to be located that examined deep acting’s ability to both increase and decrease positive and negative emotions as it relates to burnout.

More recently, researchers had suggested that deep acting ‘should’ be related to lower levels of burnout or emotional exhaustion, however, these theories and suggestions are formed based on the reversal of finding surface acting negatively effects job satisfaction (‘therefore’ deep acting ‘should’ lower burnout)(Grandey, 2000). However, the relationships between deep acting reducing burnout, as first proposed by Hochschild was never empirically evidence. Likewise, Erickson and Ritter (2001), established that workers experienced higher levels of burnout when required to supress negative emotions at work and suggested deep acting to be a healthier substitute to surface acting. Importantly, some research has shown that both surface and deep acting are associated with higher levels of stress and depression (Erickson & Ritter, 2001; Grandey, 2003). Additionally, Hulsheger and Schewe's (2011) meta-analysis proposed that only surface acting was damaging to employee work performance and well-being, while deep acting appeared to be principally unconnected to wellbeing and and may even improve work performance.
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**Burnout**

The predictive reliability of EI measures being used to forecast outcomes such as emotional labour, work productivity, performance and attitudes, academic performance, organizational citizenship behaviour, stress, and work conflict has been confirmed by a large volume of evidence to date (Ashkanasy & Daus, 2002; Bar-On, 2000; Gooty, Connelly, Griffith, & Gupta, 2010; Humphrey, 2002, 2013; Jordan, Ashkanasy, Hartel, & Hooper, 2002; Kluemper, DeGroot, & Choi, 2013; O’Boyle, Humphrey, Pollack, Hawver, & Story, 2011). Unfortunately, the associations between EI and burnout remain unclear notwithstanding the ample literature as most studies use varied measures, one occupational field and apply various moderators (i.e. satisfaction with supervisor)(Platsidou, 2010).

Two meta-analyses found those with higher EI had better mental and physical health, but neither looked at connections to burnout (Martins, Ramalho, & Morin, 2010; Schutte, Malouff, Thorsteinsson, Bhullar, & Rooke, 2007). Those of high EI may also have increased ability to deter the burnout (emotional exhaustion) due to their ability to better regulate their emotions. Additionally, high EI staff may recover from negative emotions, maintain positive ones and therefore preserve emotional and cognitive resources (Lea, Davis, Mahoney, & Qualter, 2019).

Therefore, this research expects to find measures of EI to be positively associated with job satisfaction. This research was designed to examine burnout and look at job satisfaction of client-facing professionals using four major predictors (1) emotional labour (surface and deep acting), (2) emotional regulation (PERCI – two predictors positive and negative; ERQ – two predictors suppression and reappraisal), (3) emotional intelligence (WLEIS – four predictors), and (4) emotional valence (PANAS). The purpose being better measure emotional labour and the impact emotional regulation has on the burn out (Grandey & Gabriel, 2015; Yanchus et al., 2010). Grandey and Gabriel (2015) stated that those
employed in positions demanding daily higher emotional incongruent are most at risk of coping resource depletion and burn out. No research to our knowledge has been undertaken on such a large scale, across such a wide range of occupations outside the meta-analytic context. Client-facing roles are often forced to display infinitely incongruent emotions to what is felt, hence their proclivity of burn out and their proposed inclusion in this research (Grandey & Gabriel, 2015).

**Job Satisfaction**

Job satisfaction is the degree to which an employee is satisfied with their role and whether they enjoy individual aspects or their job, such as nature of work or company management (Maslach & Lieter, 1995). Job satisfaction can be calculated in cognitive (evaluative), affective (emotional), and behavioural components (Maslach & Lieter, 1995). While job satisfaction had been considered as a positive emotive state consequential to an evaluation of one’s occupation or occupational skill (Locke, 1976), Weiss (2002), has argued job satisfaction to be an attitude distinct from affect as it is an evaluative assessment employees’ make on their role based on their needs and expectations being met. Employees with high job satisfaction will have a positive influence on the overall effectiveness of the business they are employed with (Volkwein & Zhou, 2003).

Job satisfaction has been central to the theories of Organisational Psychology research in to behaviour and attitudes (Spector, 1997). Employee job satisfaction has been stated to affect the quality of productivity, staff turnover, absenteeism, job performance, customer satisfaction, company profits and organisational effectiveness (Spector, 1997). Consequently, considerable research has been undertaken examining which factors contribute to employee job satisfaction, including personality attributes such as; emotional labour (Kinman, et al., 2011; Pugliesi, 1999; Mroz & Kaleta, 2016; Hulsheger & Schewe, 2011; Humphrey, Ashforth & Dieendorff, 2015; Yanchus, Eby, Lance & Drollinger, 2009), positive and
negative affect (Bouckenooghe, Raja, & Butt, 2013; Yavs, Karatepe & Babakus, 2018), emotional intelligence (Miao, Qian, & Humprey, 2016; Nauman, Raja, Haq & Bilal, 2018) and emotional regulation (Brackett, et al., 2010; Grandey, 2000; Totterdall & Holman, 2003).

Moreover, while Grandey (2003) and Groth, Hennig-Thurau & Walsh, (2006) argued emotional regulation to be an indicator of job satisfaction, other studies had mixed findings, treating job satisfaction as the consequence of emotional labour approaches (Abraham, 1998, Lewig & Dollard; Morris & Feldman, 1997). Despite these inconsistencies, no research exploring the relationships between job satisfaction from measures of emotional labour, positive and negative affect, emotional intelligence and emotional regulation in client-facing employees could be located at the time of this study. Hence, this study closes a gap in the literature by investigating the relationship between emotional labour and emotional processes as mediating influences on job satisfaction.

Judge and Kammeyer-Mueller (2012) reviewed research on job satisfaction and found that surface acting, and deep acting depend on emotive evaluation and are therefore interlaced within our cognitions. Evidence indicates that there is a reciprocal relationship between our emotions, affect and cognitions (Drevets & Raichle 1998). Thus, cognitions such as surface and deep acting and affect are intimately linked to job satisfaction outcomes and should be examined. Schleichter et al., (2004) had investigated the association between affective satisfaction (positive and negative emotions about work) and job satisfaction and found job satisfaction was strongest when the affective attitudes towards work and the cognitive appraisal of work were congruent with each other. Surprisingly, evidenced research investigating the combined predictive measures of emotional labour, deep acting, positive affect and negative affect in client-facing roles demanding incongruent emotional displays has not been undertaken. Moreover, Judge and Kammeyer-Muller (2012), acknowledged the connection between emotions and job satisfaction and argued the need for further research.
demonstrating that the individual dispositions balance the relationship between work and displayed behaviour. Lastly, Schaubroek and Jones (2000) found that surface acting, and job dissatisfaction were also linked to poor health outcomes such as burnout.

Personnel with advanced emotional intelligence (EI) report higher job satisfaction, more positive work attitudes and are less inclined to resign (O’Boyle et al., 2011). The inclusion of EI measures to the currently used conventional cognitive and personality trait measures, may increase the success of predicted employee job satisfaction, positive work attitudes and resignation intentions (O’Boyle et al., 2011). Moreover, staff with high EI can lessen negative feelings, increase positive feelings, in turn, improving productivity and job satisfaction (O’Boyle et al., 2011).

Evidence continues to emerge claiming that emotional intelligence capabilities and regulate job satisfaction (Carmeli, 2003) and two meta-analyses found that individuals with higher emotional intelligence also reported increased mental and physical health, but neither measured the application of this measure against job satisfaction or burnout (Martins, Ramalho, & Morin, 2010; Schutte, et al., 2007). Moreover, staff higher in emotional intelligence may possess the ability to recover from negative interactions, situations and emotions, while maintaining the positive aspects (Carmeli, 2003). In turn, this reserves emotional and cognitive resources and may assist with deterring burnout due to better emotional regulation choices (Sy, Tram, & O’Hara, 2006). Therefore, this research expects to find measures of EI to be positively associated with job satisfaction.

**Positive and Negative Affect**

Within the work environment, affectivity states may influence several work-related attitudes (Grandey, Tam, & Brauburger, 2002; Thoresen et al., 2003; Weiss & Cropanzano, 1996). Weiss and Cropanzano’s, (1996) Affective Events Theory (AET) stated positive and negative affect are significant intermediaries on wellbeing. Meaning, work attitudes and
outlook should be somewhat interceded by positive and negative state affect. Zhao and Li (2018) argued that positive and negative affect states may also somewhat mediate the influence EI has on job satisfaction (Kafetsios & Zampetakis, 2008). However, empirical evidence specifically defining relationships between affect states and employee wellbeing outcomes of job satisfaction and burnout in client-facing roles are few. Research has shown that even in identical working conditions, those with a positive affect are more inclined to remember work experiences in a positive manner, while those with negative affect are more inclined to have a negative take on work situations and perform with tangibly less independence and work complexity (Judge, Thoresen, Bono, & Patton, 2001).

Moreover, the predominante body of work addressing antecedents of workplace burnout concentrates on organisational variables such as autonomy and workload (Halbesleben & Buckley, 2004; Lee & Ashforth, 1996) and chiefly overlooks personality factors such as negative affectivity and positive affectivity. Substantial evidence has highlighted that job performance and job satisfaction can influence work-related attitudes and vice-versa (Fisher & Ashkanasay, 2000; Grandey, Tam & Brauburger, 2002; Judge, et al., 2001; Locke & Latham, 2002) and that positive and negative affect may have a further influence on these relationships (Thoresen et al., 2003; Weiss & Cropanzano, 1996). Hence, Thoresen et al., (2003) state that positive affect to be negatively related to burnout, while negative affect has a strong association to burnout.

Staw and Cohen-Charash (2005) argued those with higher positive affect are further inclined to have a better work outlook than those with negative affect. This difference could influence the employee’s perception of a work situation, recall of the event and interpretation of the situation. A longitudinal project found that individuals with positive emotions receive more complimentary work evaluations, increased salary and added support from peers and
management. This highlights the importance of including affect measures in predicating employee wellbeing as this present study has done.

Judge and Kammeyer-Mueller (2012) further argue that if cognition and affect are interlaced, that organisational psychology research had previously neglected the affective nature of job attitudes and their behavioural consequences (Judge et al., 2011). While further progress has been made researching affectivity and job satisfaction, little research has covered the role emotional states play in job satisfaction. Similarly, Collins et al., (2013) suggests that deep acting may also reduce conflict, increased cooperation, and improved working conditions and therefore, related to positive work outcomes of job satisfaction. Notably, this specific relationship and subsequent outcomes has not been directly empirically evidence in any body of work this present study could locate.

Curiously, despite all the building evidence that affect has an association to employee wellbeing outcomes of job attitudes and outlook, the factor of burnout has chiefly to date been researched in the context of health (Little et al., 2007). Burke and Deszca (1986) found positive associations between burnout and self- induced symptoms such as headaches and chest pains. Moreover, burnout has also been evidence to have associations to drug, alcohol and tobacco use (Burke and Deszca, 1986; Burke et al., 1984; Jackson & Maslach, 1982). For this investigation, two conceptual models were designed of this process whereby the emotional labour, generates affective responses that influence job satisfaction and/or burnout. (Grandey, 2000; Yanchus et al., 2010). The influence that measures of emotional intelligence and regulation may have on these interactions were evaluated based on these models (Preece et al., 2018; Wong & Law, 2012; Yanchus et al., 2010). The general models that was used to guide this research is represented in Figure. 1 and Figure 2.

Consequently, the three research questions (RQ) driving this research are:

RQ1. Effects of Emotional Labour and Affect on Burnout, and on Job Satisfaction
RQ2 Explore the PERCI and ERQ emotional regulation measures, and the WLEIS, emotional intelligence measure in predicting job satisfaction.

RQ3 Explore the PERCI and ERQ emotional regulation measures, and the WLEIS, emotional intelligence measure in predicting burnout.

Figure 1. Emotional Factors and Affectivity to Burnout Process Model (Grandey, 2000).
Method

Research Design

This research is a quantitative, cross-sectional study that focuses on the ability of emotional labour, positive and negative affect, emotional regulation and emotional intelligence have on predicting employee job satisfaction and burnout. The independent variables being measured are the mood repair measurement scales (WLEIS, ERQ and PERCI), the emotional labour at work (ELS), and the positive and negative affect (PANAS).
The dependent variables being measured are the job satisfaction and burnout scores (COPSQIII and CBI). The purpose of this research design is to investigate how much employee outcomes of burnout and job satisfaction may be explained by emotional labour and positive and negative affect predictors, and whether the measures associated with the relatively new area of emotional regulation may predict more of that variance than that of traditional emotional intelligence scales.

**Participants**

All participants were aged 18 or over and employed in client-facing roles on a full-time, part-time or casual basis. A North American sample of 2,385 responses were analysed and ages ranged from 18 - 84 years ($M = 41.7$, $SD = 13.39$). Age was non-normally distributed, with skewness of 0.409 (SE = 0.05) and kurtosis of -.608 (SE = 0.10). Participants identified as: female 1,464 (61.4%); male 904 (37.9%); Non-binary 14 (0.6%); and 3 (0.1%) participants’ chose to not disclose their gender. Table 1 shows a sample that is mostly representative in terms of gender, marital status, number of children at home and work schedule.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>904</td>
<td>37.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>1464</td>
<td>61.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-binary</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prefer not to answer</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0-18 years</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19-44 years</td>
<td>1448</td>
<td>60.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45-64 years</td>
<td>786</td>
<td>33.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65 years and over</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>5.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>(continued)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational Level</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>Percentage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary school</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some high school (not complete)</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High school graduate</td>
<td>391</td>
<td>16.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some college (no degree)</td>
<td>447</td>
<td>18.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate's degree</td>
<td>334</td>
<td>14.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor's degree</td>
<td>680</td>
<td>28.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post-graduate degree (e.g., Masters)</td>
<td>395</td>
<td>16.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advanced post-graduate degree (e.g. PhD)</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Occupation</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Management</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>8.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>5.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Customer Service</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sales</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Work Schedule</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Full-time</td>
<td>1814</td>
<td>76.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part-time</td>
<td>533</td>
<td>22.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Casual</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country of Residence</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>U.S.A.</td>
<td>1246</td>
<td>52.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>1139</td>
<td>47.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Marital Status</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Married or defacto</td>
<td>1339</td>
<td>56.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Widowed</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Divorced</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>8.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Separated</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never married</td>
<td>704</td>
<td>29.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Children at Home</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>1297</td>
<td>54.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-2</td>
<td>929</td>
<td>39.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than 3</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>6.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Current University Student</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>1737</td>
<td>72.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>4.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Racial Category</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>White American</td>
<td>1737</td>
<td>72.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic or Latino American</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>4.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black or African American</td>
<td>197</td>
<td>8.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian American</td>
<td>196</td>
<td>8.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native American and Alaska Native</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I would rather not say</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>3.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
During the initial raw data inspection phase, a total of 3,100 responses were recorded. After removing 715 survey responses that contained more than 20% missing data (Field, 2013), the concluding sample size was 2,385 participants. Respondents' professions were diverse in nature with the most frequently recorded occupations being that of Management, Teaching, Sales, and Information Technology.

**Materials**

The materials required for this study consisted of the ‘The Emotion and Employee Wellbeing Survey’ online questionnaire accessed through the third-party provider ‘Qualtrics’ (Appendix A). Additional scales that were used as part of the broader project included the Perth Alexithymia Questionnaire, Lifestyle Satisfaction Scale and K10 depression scale.

**Predictive Measures.**

*Emotional Labour* - The 14-item Emotional Labour Scale (ELS) (Brotheridge & Lee, 2003) was used to measure emotional labour at work, corresponding items were written to measure frequency, intensity, and variety of interactions, as well as surface and deep acting in the family. Items were measured on a 1 [never] to 5 [always] scale with higher scores indicating greater emotional labour. Frequency was measured with three items (e.g., “Display specific emotion required by my job”). Intensity was measured with two items (e.g., “Express intense emotions”). Variety was measured with three items (e.g., “Display many kinds of emotion”). Surface acting was measured with three items (e.g., “Resist expressing my true feelings”). Deep acting was measured with three items (e.g., “Try to actually feel the emotions that I need to display to others”). Coefficient alpha reliabilities across 14-items were \( \alpha = 0.91 \)

*Positive and Negative Affect to Work* - The twenty-item Positive and Negative Affect Schedule (PANAS) (Watson, et al., 1988) as consistent with Rothbard’s (2001) study of affective responses to work and family, was used to measure affective response to work and
family. Two measures were completed: positive affective response to work, negative affective response to work. Items were measured on a 1 [very slightly or not at all] to 5 [extremely] scale, with higher scores indicating greater positive and negative affective response, respectively. The coefficient alphas across 20 items were $\alpha = 0.89$

**Emotional Intelligence** - The 16-item Wong and Law (2002) Emotional Intelligence Scale (WLEIS) was used to measure emotional intelligence across four dimensions: lower order factors of self-emotion appraisal, others' emotion appraisal, use of emotion, and regulation of emotion. Each dimension is measured by four individual survey items. Items were rated on a 7-point Likert-type scale ([1] = strongly disagree and [7] = strongly agree).
Self-emotion appraisal items were items 1-4 (e.g., “I have a good sense of why I have certain feelings most of the time”). Items 5-8 from the other’s emotional appraisal (e.g., “I always know my friend’s emotions from their behaviour”). Items 9-12 taken from the use of emotion dimension (e.g., “I would always encourage myself to try my best”). Items 13-16 measured the regulation of emotion dimensions (e.g., “I have good control of my own emotions”). Respondents indicated their level of agreement with respective individual survey items on a 5-point Likert-scale, with the subsequent markers describing detailed answer categories: 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree). The coefficient alphas across 16 items were $\alpha = 0.93$

**Emotional Regulation** - The Emotional Regulation Questionnaire (ERQ) scale measures the individuals’ ability to regulate their emotions using a 10-item scale (Gross & John, 2003). The ERQ measures both the ability to mentally reframe an emotional situation in order to positively alter its connotation (cognitive reappraisal) and the aptitude to refrain from externalising true expressions of emotions felt during an emotional circumstance (expressive suppression). Participants responded to five cognitive reappraisal subscale questions (e.g., “When I want to feel less negative emotion, I change what I am thinking about”) administered by a 7-point Likert-type scale reaching from 1 (strongly disagree) to 7 (strongly
agree). Expressive suppression was measured by the remaining five subscale items (e.g., “I control my emotions by not expressing them”). Coefficient alpha reliabilities across 10 items were $\alpha = 0.87$

**Emotional Regulation Competency** – The Perth Emotional Regulation Competency Inventory (PERCI)(Preece, et al., 2018) is a 32-item emotional regulation scale that allowed participants to self-report their ability to regulate emotions using a 7-point Likert-scale for each item. The PERCI used four subscales to measure the regulation of negative emotions (controlling experience, negative-inhibiting behaviour, negative-activating behaviour, negative-tolerating emotions) and another four subscales to measure positive emotions (positive-controlling experience, positive-inhibiting behaviour, positive-activating behaviour, positive-tolerating emotions). The prefix of “Negative” or “Positive” to each subscale provided the emotional valence of each subscale. Coefficient alpha reliabilities across 32-items were $\alpha = 0.94$

**Personal Resource Measures.**

**Job Satisfaction** - The Copenhagen Psychosocial Questionnaire III (COPSQIII) (Useche, Montoro, Alonso & Pastor, 2019), was used to measure job satisfaction by asking participants to respond to a five-item scale using a response range of “Very satisfied” to “Very unsatisfied” in response to questions as, “your work prospects?”. The COPSOQ-III scales have good reliability and validity. Coefficient alpha reliabilities across 5-items were $\alpha = 0.87$

**Burnout** - Copenhagen Burnout Inventory (CBI) (Kristensen et al., 2005) was used to evaluate a work-related burnout. The 7-item subscale measures the physical and psychological exhaustion experienced by the participants due to their occupations (e.g., “is your work emotionally exhausting?”, “Do you feel burnt out because of your work?”). All items were rated on a 5-point Likert scale: 0% of the time [1], 25% of the time [2], 50% of
the time [3], 75% of the time [4], 100% of the time [5] (Appendix A). Coefficient alpha reliabilities across 7-items were $\alpha = 0.87$.

**Procedure**

Following ethics approval from Edith Cowan University’s Human Research Ethics Committee (HREC), the data was collected via the online Qualtrics survey and distributed to each of the three honours research projects (2019-00213-CROCI – Emotional labour and job satisfaction; 2019-00230-TARASCIRO – Emotional regulation and burnout). Responses to measures and individual scale items intended for the other projects were removed. Participants self-selected for inclusion in this research and accessed the online survey that was completed in the location of the participant’s choice.

Once respondents had been screened for eligibility (i.e., over the age of 18, reside in Canada or America and employed on a full-time, part-time or casual basis), they were briefed by a statement on the first page of the Employee Wellbeing Survey (Appendix A). The information brief detailed the nature of the research, the benefits of participation, any risks, privacy, confidentiality and participation expectations. Consent was implied by completing the survey and respondents were made aware they were free to withdraw from the survey at any time with no negative consequence. Moreover, that all responses would be unidentifiable with all information kept confidential. Lastly, the information brief elucidated that while no mental ill effects should result from participation in this study, resources for any emotional or mental health assistance were supplied.

After considering the content of the information letter, participants commenced the online survey, which presented in eight blocks: questions were grouped under *Predictive Measures* (emotional labour, positive and negative affects to work, emotional intelligence, emotional regulation, and emotional regulation competency) and the *Personal Resources Measures* (job satisfaction and workplace burnout). Lastly, a sequence of demographic
questions related directly to the study were posed. Data on geographical location was obtained by asking the participants to please write the name of the country they reside in. Gender, age, marital status, number of children, was collected in order to meet University ethical requirements as seen in table 1. These question blocks were presented in randomised order for every participant.

**Analysis.**

Data collection was conducted during August 2019, and the minimum number of required survey responses was attained within a two-week period. SPSS-PC version 26 was used to analyse the demographic details inclusive of means, and standard deviations. The data was then analysed for scale item response frequencies, scale reliabilities, intercorrelations of all subscales to outcome variables and forward multiple regressions and tests of normality. After this period, the de-identified data supplied by Qualtrics was stored electronically under password protection for future academic use and analysis.

**Results**

The raw data were examined to ascertain whether they met the assumptions of normal distributions for Pearson’s R correlations and forward multiple regressions. The assumptions of multiple regression include absence of outliers among variables, normality, linearity, homoscedasticity of residuals and absence of multicollinearity and singularity (Field, 2013). All scales and subscales failed to meet the Kolmogorov–Smirnov tests for normal distribution and several transformation techniques were applied (Field, 2013). Again, all scales failed to meet the normal distribution tests and nonparametric measures were then adopted (Field, 2013). For full scale and subscales frequencies see Appendix G and H.

**Effects of Emotional Labour and Affect on Burnout, and on Job Satisfaction**

EL surface acting was moderately associated with negative affect $r_s(2,2383) = .433, p < .001$, and negative affect, in turn, was moderately associated with burnout, $r_s(2,2383) =$
.560, $p < .001$. A nonparametric partial correlation was run to assess the relationship between surface acting, burnout and negative affect. The patterns observed showed that the moderate correlation of 0.46 observed between surface acting and burnout was inflated by negative affect (Table 2). The size of this correlation became low when statistical control was applied to negative affect $r_{\text{partial}}(2,2383) = .294, p < .001$. The converse did not hold, in that the correlation of negative affect and burnout of 0.56 reduced less when surface acting was statistical controlled for $r_{\text{partial}}(2,2383) = .450, p < .001$. EL deep acting was positively and weakly associated with burnout and partial correlation analysis did not find an appreciable contribution of positive affect. These results suggest that EL surface acting is more predictive of negative affect, which itself is predictive of burnout.

Turning to job satisfaction, there was a moderate correlation between EL deep acting and positive affect, $r_s(2,2383) = .357, p < .001$. The patterns observed showed that the weak correlation of -0.178 observed between EL deep acting and job satisfaction was inflated by positive affect (Table 2). The size of this correlation became very weak when statistical control was applied to positive affect $r_{\text{partial}}(2,2383) = -.033, p < .001$. This pattern of results suggests that EL deep acting was correlated with positive affect, which in turn was correlated with job satisfaction.

Table 2.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Emotional Labour, PANAS, Job Satisfaction and Burnout correlations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PANAS_Neg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PANAS_Neg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EL_SA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EL_DA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job_Sat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burnout</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$N = 2385$

Note: PANAS_Neg = negative effect, PANAS_Pos = positive effect, EL_SA = emotional labour, surface acting, EL_DA = emotional labour, deep acting, Job_Sat = job satisfaction and burnout = burnout.

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

*. Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).
Effects of Emotional Regulation and Emotional Intelligence on Burnout

The PERCI total score was moderately associated with burnout, \( r(2,382) = .505 \ p < .001 \), with the PERCI positive and negative subscales being associated at \( r(2,2383) = .468, p < .001 \) and \( r(2,2383) = .489, p < .001 \), respectively. The ERQ emotional suppression subscale was correlated at low levels with burnout, \( r_s(2,2383) = .279, p < .001 \). A nonparametric partial correlation was run to assess the relationship between the PERCI, ERQ suppression and burnout. The correlation between PERCI total and burnout was slightly reduced when ERQ suppression was controlled for \( r_{partial}(3,2382) = .440, p < .001 \), and the same pattern occurred for the PERCI positive and negative subscales, at \( r(3,2382) = .398, p < .001 \) and \( r(3,2382) = .423, p < .001 \), respectively. This pattern of results indicates that both the PERCI and ERQ emotional suppression were associated with burnout.

The correlation between PERCI total and burnout was reduced when negative affect was controlled for \( r_{partial}(3,2382) = .224, p < .001 \) (Table 5). Of the PERCI subscales, there was a moderate positive correlation between burnout and the PERCI negative subscale, \( r_s(3,2382) = .489, p < .001 \), and the PERCI positive subscale, \( r_s(3,2382) = .468, p < .001 \), and the general facilitating hedonic subscale, \( r_s(3,2382) = .504, p < .001 \). All other PERCI subscales were correlated low to moderately, and ranged between \( r_s(3,2382) = .399, p < .001 \) and \( r_s(3,2382) = .489, p < .001 \) (see Table 4 for all correlations). These reductions in association is consistent with the PERCI and its subscales are more associated with negative affect (PERCI positive \( r_s(2,2383) = .620, p < .001 \), PERCI negative \( r_s(2,2383) = .599, p < .001 \), and negative affect being associated, in turn, with burnout \( r_s(2,2383) = .560, p < .001 \).

A more striking reduction in association was observed in the correlation between ERQ suppression and burnout \( r_{partial}(2,2383) = .117, p < .001 \). These combined results suggest that negative affect has a stronger association with burnout than the PERCI, and ERQ
suppression, and that the PERCI and ERQ suppression have a moderate association with negative affect (Table 4).

Turning to EI, the WLEIS total measure was found be weakly and negatively associated with burnout $r_{3}(2,2383) = -.159, p < .001$. This was also the case for all four of the WLEIS subscales and all correlations (Table 4).
Table 3.

PERCI, ERQ, WLEIS, EL & PANAS Correlations Table – Burnout

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Burnout</th>
<th>ER_CR</th>
<th>ER_ES</th>
<th>EI</th>
<th>EI_SEA</th>
<th>EI_OEA</th>
<th>EI_UOE</th>
<th>EI_ROE</th>
<th>EL_SA</th>
<th>EL_DA</th>
<th>PANAS_Pos</th>
<th>PANAS_Neg</th>
<th>PERCI_Pos</th>
<th>PERCI_Neg</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Burnout</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ER_CR</td>
<td>-0.015</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ER_ES</td>
<td>0.279**</td>
<td>0.369**</td>
<td>0.062**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EI</td>
<td>-0.159**</td>
<td>0.499**</td>
<td>0.062**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EI_SEA</td>
<td>-0.147**</td>
<td>0.417**</td>
<td>0.011**</td>
<td>0.863**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EI_OEA</td>
<td>0.001**</td>
<td>0.346**</td>
<td>0.050*</td>
<td>0.778**</td>
<td>0.631**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EI_UOE</td>
<td>-0.162**</td>
<td>0.442**</td>
<td>0.041*</td>
<td>0.847**</td>
<td>0.652**</td>
<td>0.552**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EI_ROE</td>
<td>-0.178**</td>
<td>0.456**</td>
<td>0.141**</td>
<td>0.852**</td>
<td>0.648**</td>
<td>0.537**</td>
<td>0.671**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EI SA</td>
<td>0.462**</td>
<td>0.107**</td>
<td>0.410**</td>
<td>0.057**</td>
<td>0.077**</td>
<td>0.046*</td>
<td>0.053**</td>
<td>0.041*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EI DA</td>
<td>0.201**</td>
<td>0.339**</td>
<td>0.215**</td>
<td>0.266**</td>
<td>0.179**</td>
<td>0.258**</td>
<td>0.266**</td>
<td>0.218**</td>
<td>0.361**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PANAS Pos</td>
<td>-0.082**</td>
<td>0.447**</td>
<td>0.158**</td>
<td>0.521**</td>
<td>0.394**</td>
<td>0.345**</td>
<td>0.517**</td>
<td>0.494**</td>
<td>0.047**</td>
<td>0.357**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PANAS Neg</td>
<td>-0.560**</td>
<td>-0.055**</td>
<td>0.334**</td>
<td>-0.290**</td>
<td>-0.286**</td>
<td>-0.126**</td>
<td>-0.264**</td>
<td>-0.265**</td>
<td>0.433**</td>
<td>0.213**</td>
<td>-0.028</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PERCI</td>
<td>0.505**</td>
<td>0.023**</td>
<td>0.484**</td>
<td>0.266**</td>
<td>0.293**</td>
<td>-0.137**</td>
<td>-0.239**</td>
<td>-0.210**</td>
<td>0.457**</td>
<td>0.243**</td>
<td>-0.910</td>
<td>0.650**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PERCI Pos</td>
<td>0.468**</td>
<td>-0.015**</td>
<td>0.464**</td>
<td>-0.280**</td>
<td>-0.315**</td>
<td>-0.189**</td>
<td>-0.258**</td>
<td>-0.189**</td>
<td>0.427**</td>
<td>0.215**</td>
<td>-0.001</td>
<td>0.620**</td>
<td>0.940**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PERCI Neg</td>
<td>0.489**</td>
<td>0.083**</td>
<td>0.458**</td>
<td>-0.198**</td>
<td>-0.212**</td>
<td>-0.049*</td>
<td>-0.174**</td>
<td>-0.196**</td>
<td>0.447**</td>
<td>0.250**</td>
<td>-0.011</td>
<td>0.599**</td>
<td>0.926**</td>
<td>0.756**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N = 2385

Note: Burnout = Burnout, ER_CR = emotional regulation, cognitive reappraisal, ER_ES = emotional regulation, emotion suppression, EI = emotional intelligence total, EI_SEA = self-emotion appraisal, EI_OEA = emotional intelligence, others emotions appraisal, EI_UOE = emotional intelligence, use of emotions, EI_ROE = emotional intelligence, regulation of emotions, EL_SA = emotional labour, surface acting, EL_DA = emotional labour, deep acting, PANAS_Pos = positive affect, PANAS_Neg, negative affect, PERCI_Pos = positive emotional regulation, PERCI_Neg = negative emotional regulation

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

*. Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).
Table 4.

Partial correlations table, controlling for ERQ ‘emotional suppression’ (ER_ES)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Burnout</th>
<th>PERCI</th>
<th>P_Pos</th>
<th>P_Neg</th>
<th>neg_con</th>
<th>neg_inh</th>
<th>neg_act</th>
<th>neg_tol</th>
<th>pos_con</th>
<th>pos_inh</th>
<th>pos_act</th>
<th>pos_tol</th>
<th>gen_fac</th>
<th>pos_conx</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Burnout</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PERCI</td>
<td>.440</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>.398</td>
<td>.923</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neg</td>
<td>.423</td>
<td>.906</td>
<td>.690</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>neg_con</td>
<td>.412</td>
<td>.824</td>
<td>.652</td>
<td>.888</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>neg_inh</td>
<td>.393</td>
<td>.888</td>
<td>.757</td>
<td>.886</td>
<td>.740</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>neg_act</td>
<td>.428</td>
<td>.771</td>
<td>.569</td>
<td>.885</td>
<td>.776</td>
<td>.732</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>neg_tol</td>
<td>.209</td>
<td>.587</td>
<td>.385</td>
<td>.712</td>
<td>.506</td>
<td>.518</td>
<td>.491</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pos_con</td>
<td>.409</td>
<td>.858</td>
<td>.872</td>
<td>.717</td>
<td>.726</td>
<td>.681</td>
<td>.634</td>
<td>.410</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pos_inh</td>
<td>.339</td>
<td>.849</td>
<td>.925</td>
<td>.619</td>
<td>.551</td>
<td>.734</td>
<td>.483</td>
<td>.352</td>
<td>.720</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pos_act</td>
<td>.358</td>
<td>.842</td>
<td>.932</td>
<td>.606</td>
<td>.557</td>
<td>.697</td>
<td>.508</td>
<td>.319</td>
<td>.734</td>
<td>.872</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pos_tol</td>
<td>.316</td>
<td>.795</td>
<td>.896</td>
<td>.545</td>
<td>.505</td>
<td>.648</td>
<td>.403</td>
<td>.318</td>
<td>.665</td>
<td>.837</td>
<td>.833</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gen_fac</td>
<td>.439</td>
<td>.942</td>
<td>.767</td>
<td>.984</td>
<td>.897</td>
<td>.882</td>
<td>.870</td>
<td>.674</td>
<td>.822</td>
<td>.671</td>
<td>.663</td>
<td>.598</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pos_conx</td>
<td>.360</td>
<td>.876</td>
<td>.972</td>
<td>.628</td>
<td>.571</td>
<td>.734</td>
<td>.501</td>
<td>.350</td>
<td>.750</td>
<td>.947</td>
<td>.951</td>
<td>.926</td>
<td>.685</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N=2385

Note: BO = Burnout, PERCI = general emotional regulation, P_Pos = PERCI, positive emotional regulation, P_Pos = PERCI, negative emotional regulation, neg con = negative-controlling experience, neg inh = negative – inhibiting behaviour, neg tol = negative - tolerating emotions, pos con = positive controlling experience, pos inh = positive – inhibiting experience, pos act = positive – activating behaviour, pos tol = positive-tolerating emotions, gen fac = general-facilitating hedonic goals, pos conx = positive containing emotions

**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).
*. Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).
Table 5.

*Partial correlations table, controlling for Negative Affect*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Burnout</th>
<th>PERCI</th>
<th>P_Pos</th>
<th>P_Neg</th>
<th>neg con</th>
<th>neg_inh</th>
<th>neg_act</th>
<th>neg_tol</th>
<th>pos_con</th>
<th>pos_inh</th>
<th>pos_act</th>
<th>pos_tol</th>
<th>gen_fac</th>
<th>pos_conx</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Burnout</td>
<td>.224**</td>
<td>.185**</td>
<td>.231**</td>
<td>.223**</td>
<td>.177**</td>
<td>.265**</td>
<td>.118**</td>
<td>.225**</td>
<td>.136**</td>
<td>.157**</td>
<td>.119**</td>
<td>.242**</td>
<td>.150**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N=2385

Note: BO = Burnout, PERCI = general emotional regulation, P_Pos = positive emotional regulation, P_Neg = negative emotional regulation, neg con = negative controlling experience, neg inh = negative - inhibiting experience, neg tol = negative - tolerating emotions, pos con = positive controlling experience, pos inh = positive – inhibiting experience, pos act = positive – activating behaviour, pos tol = positive-tolerating emotions, gen fac = general- facilitating hedonic goals, pos conx = positive containing emotions

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

*. Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).
Effect of Emotional Intelligence, Emotional Regulation and Emotional Labour on Job Satisfaction

The data showed the largest correlations with Job Satisfaction were with the WLEIS measure and subscales, and the ERQ subscale cognitive reappraisal. The WLEIS total measure was negatively and moderately associated with Job Satisfaction, \( r_s(2,2383) = -.440, p < .001 \), and the WLEIS subscales all had moderate to low negative correlations to job satisfaction; EI regulation of emotion \( r_s(2,2383) = -.410, p < .001 \), EI_use of emotion \( r_s(2,2383) = -.350, p < .001 \), EI_others emotions appraisal \( r_s(2,2383) = -.252, p < .001 \), EI_self emotions appraisal \( r_s(2,2383) = -.322, p < .001 \) (see Table 6).

The ERQ cognitive reappraisal subscale was positively and moderately correlated with job satisfaction, \( r_s(2385) = -.321, p < .001 \), whereas the correlation with the emotional suppression subscale was very weak \( r_s(2,2383) = -.051, p = .012 \). The PERCI total score and associated subscales were all very weakly correlated with job satisfaction (PERCI total \( r_s(2,2383) = .148, p < .001 \), negative \( r_s(2,2383) = .118, p < .001 \), and positive \( r_s(2,2383) = .140, p < .001 \)). Turning to Emotional Labour, both the subscales were weakly correlated with job satisfaction (EL surface acting, \( r_s(2385) = .080, p < .001 \); EL deep acting \( r_s(2,2383) = -.178, p < .001 \)).

Partial non-parametric correlations were calculated for the two variables which had moderate associations with job satisfaction (EI, ERQ cognitive reappraisal), to determine their relative importance for job satisfaction. The associations for the EI total measure with job satisfaction became weaker, when controlling for ERQ cognitive reappraisal \( r_{\text{partial}}(2,854) = -.289, p < .001 \). The same pattern occurred for the EI subscales; EI regulation of emotion \( r_{\text{partial}}(2,2383) = -.219, p < .001 \), EI use of emotion \( r_{\text{partial}}(2,2383) = -.158, p < .001 \), EI others emotions appraisal \( r_{\text{partial}}(2,2383) = -.241, p < .001 \), and EI self emotions appraisal \( r_{\text{partial}}(2,2383) = -.207, p < .001 \).
(2,2383) = -.309, p < .001. Lastly, the ERQ ‘cognitive reappraisal’ became weaker, when controlling for EI total measure \( r_{\text{partial}}(2,854) = -0.154, p < .001 \).

The overall pattern of data for the partial correlation analysis indicated that EI and its subscales are weakly and negatively associated with job satisfaction when the influence of ERQ cognitive reappraisal is controlled for. The reverse also occurs when the correlation of cognitive reappraisal and job satisfaction is controlled for the effects of EI. Hence, both EI as well as ERQ cognitive reappraisal appear to have weak to moderate associations with job satisfaction.

The relative impact of positive and negative affect on the association between job satisfaction, with EI, and with ERQ cognitive reappraisal was investigated using partial non-parametric correlations. The associations for the EI total measure with job satisfaction became weaker, when controlling for positive affect, \( r_{\text{partial}}(2,854) = -0.289, p < .001 \). The same pattern occurred for the EI subscales regulation of emotion \( r_{\text{partial}}(2,2383) = -0.219, p < .001 \), use of emotion \( r_{\text{partial}}(2,2383) = -0.158, p < .001 \), others emotions appraisal \( r_{\text{partial}}(2,2383) = -0.241, p < .001 \), and self emotions appraisal \( r_{\text{partial}}(2,2383) = -0.309, p < .001 \). A similar pattern was observed with the correlation between job satisfaction and ERQ cognitive reappraisal \( r_{\text{partial}}(2,854) = -0.289, p < .001 \). These data therefore showed that EI and its subscales were weakly and negatively associated with job satisfaction when the influence of positive affect is controlled for, which is consistent with EI being moderately associated with positive affect, and positive affect, in turn, is moderately associated with job satisfaction.

Similarly, the associations for the EI total measure with job satisfaction became weaker, when controlling for negative affect, \( r_{\text{partial}}(2,854) = -0.357, p < .001 \). The same pattern occurred for the EI subscales regulation of emotion \( r_{\text{partial}}(2,2383) = -0.370, p < .001 \), use of emotion \( r_{\text{partial}}(2,2383) = -0.306, p < .001 \), others emotions appraisal \( r_{\text{partial}}(2,2383) = -0.231, p < .001 \), and self emotions appraisal \( r_{\text{partial}}(2,2383) = -0.357, p < .001 \). A similar pattern
was observed with the correlation between job satisfaction and ERQ cognitive reappraisal $r_{\text{partial}}(2,854) = -.136, p < .001$. These data therefore showed that the ERQ cognitive reappraisal subscale and the EI and its subscales were weakly and negatively associated with job satisfaction when the influence of negative affect is controlled for. These results are consistent with both positive and negative affect being associated with job satisfaction, while the variables of EI and ERQ cognitive reappraisal are associated with positive and negative affect.

The association of the PERCI total and job satisfaction was low $r_s(2,2383) = .148, p = .001$, and as indicated earlier with the burnout results, the PERCI total, positive and negative scores all correlated moderately with negative affect which, in turn showed a weak association with job satisfaction.
Table 6

WLEIS, ERQ, PERCI, EL and PANAS Correlations - Job Satisfaction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Job_Sat</th>
<th>ER_CR</th>
<th>ER_ES</th>
<th>EI</th>
<th>EI_SEA</th>
<th>EI_OEA</th>
<th>EI_UOE</th>
<th>EI_ROE</th>
<th>EL_SA</th>
<th>EL_DA</th>
<th>Pos AFF</th>
<th>Neg AFF</th>
<th>PERCI Pos</th>
<th>PERCI Neg</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Job_Sat</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ER_CR</td>
<td>- .321**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ER_ES</td>
<td>-.398**</td>
<td>.499**</td>
<td>.062'</td>
<td>EI</td>
<td>-.322**</td>
<td>.417**</td>
<td>-.011**</td>
<td>.863**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EI</td>
<td>-.252**</td>
<td>.346**</td>
<td>.050'</td>
<td>.778'</td>
<td>.631**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EI_SEA</td>
<td>-.346**</td>
<td>.422**</td>
<td>.041'</td>
<td>.847'</td>
<td>.652**</td>
<td>.552**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EI_OEA</td>
<td>-.407**</td>
<td>.456**</td>
<td>.141**</td>
<td>.852'</td>
<td>.648**</td>
<td>.537**</td>
<td>.672**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EI_UOE</td>
<td>.080**</td>
<td>.107**</td>
<td>.410**</td>
<td>-.057'</td>
<td>-.077'</td>
<td>.047**</td>
<td>-.054'</td>
<td>-.041'</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EI_ROE</td>
<td>-.178**</td>
<td>.339**</td>
<td>.215**</td>
<td>.266'</td>
<td>.179**</td>
<td>.258**</td>
<td>.266**</td>
<td>.218**</td>
<td>.361**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EL_SA</td>
<td>-.148**</td>
<td>.023</td>
<td>.484**</td>
<td>-.265'</td>
<td>-.293'</td>
<td>-.137'</td>
<td>-.239'</td>
<td>-.210'</td>
<td>.457**</td>
<td>.243**</td>
<td>-.009</td>
<td>.650**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EL_DA</td>
<td>.140**</td>
<td>-.015</td>
<td>.464**</td>
<td>-.279'</td>
<td>-.315'</td>
<td>-.189'</td>
<td>-.258'</td>
<td>-.189'</td>
<td>.427**</td>
<td>.215**</td>
<td>-.001</td>
<td>.620**</td>
<td>.940**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pos AFF</td>
<td>.118**</td>
<td>.083**</td>
<td>.458**</td>
<td>-.198'</td>
<td>-.212'</td>
<td>-.049'</td>
<td>-.174'</td>
<td>-.196'</td>
<td>.447**</td>
<td>.250**</td>
<td>-.011</td>
<td>.599**</td>
<td>.926**</td>
<td>.759**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neg AFF</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PERCI Pos</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PERCI Neg</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N = 2385

Note: JS = Job Satisfaction, ER_CR = emotional regulation, cognitive reappraisal, ER_ES = emotional regulation, emotion suppression, EI = self-emotion appraisal, EI_OEA = emotional intelligence, others emotions appraisal, EI_UOE = emotional intelligence, use of emotions, EI_ROE = emotional intelligence, regulation of emotions, EL_SA = emotional labour, surface acting, EL_DA = emotional labour, deep acting, Pos AFF = positive affectivity, Neg AFF = negative affectivity, PERCI_Pos = positive emotional regulation, PERCI_Neg = negative emotional regulation

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

*. Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).
### Table 7.

**WLEIS, ERQ, PERCI to Job Satisfaction and partial correlations**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Normal</th>
<th>Control</th>
<th>Control</th>
<th>Control</th>
<th>Control</th>
<th>Control</th>
<th>Control</th>
<th>Control</th>
<th>Control</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>EI_WLEIS</td>
<td>ERQ_ES</td>
<td>ERQ_CR</td>
<td>PERCI</td>
<td>Neg A</td>
<td>Pos A</td>
<td>EL_SA</td>
<td>EL_DA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PERCI</td>
<td>.148**</td>
<td>.048*</td>
<td>.197**</td>
<td>.164**</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>.006</td>
<td>0.158**</td>
<td>0.125**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PERCI Neg</td>
<td>.118**</td>
<td>.043*</td>
<td>.185**</td>
<td>.153**</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>.018</td>
<td>0.125**</td>
<td>0.092**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PERCI Pos</td>
<td>.140**</td>
<td>.033</td>
<td>.159**</td>
<td>.143**</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>.005</td>
<td>0.154**</td>
<td>0.118**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ERQ ES</td>
<td>- .051**</td>
<td>- .029</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>- .132**</td>
<td>- .066**</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>- .093**</td>
<td>- .014</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EL_SA</td>
<td>0.80**</td>
<td>0.60*</td>
<td>.111**</td>
<td>.122**</td>
<td>0.29</td>
<td>- .017</td>
<td>0.110**</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EL_DA</td>
<td>- .178**</td>
<td>- .086**</td>
<td>- .171**</td>
<td>- .77**</td>
<td>.283**</td>
<td>- .235**</td>
<td>- .033</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*N = 2385*

Note: EI = emotional intelligence total, EI = self-emotion appraisal, EI_OEA = emotional intelligence, others emotions appraisal, EI_UOE = emotional intelligence, use of emotions, EI_ROE = emotional intelligence, regulation of emotions, PERCI = PERCI totals, PERCI_Pos = positive emotional regulation, PERCI_Neg = negative emotional regulation ER_CR = emotional regulation, cognitive reappraisal, ER_ES = emotional regulation, emotion suppression, EL_SA = emotional labour, surface acting, EL_DA = emotional labour, deep acting

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

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

This investigation has facilitated an employee wellbeing survey and built two models to demonstrate how EL, ER, EI, burnout (Figure 1) and job satisfaction all traverse (Figure 2). The first model explored the relationship between emotional labour, emotional intelligence, emotional regulation and burnout as interceded by the role of negative affect. The second model explored the relationship between emotional labour, emotional intelligence, emotional regulation and job satisfaction as interceded by positive and negative affect. Furthermore, this research has demonstrated that the surface acting is moderately associated to negative affect, which in turn, indicates potential burnout. Moreover, that both deep acting, positive affect both increase the reported levels of job satisfaction. This study has shown that ER measures may more reliably, indicate potential burnout while EI measures may be more reliable for signifying potential job satisfaction. Overall, the combination of both measures strongly suggests an effective and dependable way of measuring employee suitability and better predicting their wellbeing. As expected, those subjected to high levels of surface acting in client-facing roles experienced higher levels of negative affect and subsequently reported higher levels of burnout.

The present findings support the work of Totterdell and Holmen’s (2003) argument that both EL surface and deep acting deplete emotional resources (Diefendorff, Erickson, Grandey, & Dahling, 2011; Grandey, 2003; Holman, Chissick, & Totterdell, 2002). That is, both EL surface and deep acting are both forms of emotional incongruency and both require the employee to ‘fake’ feelings, meaning whether by surface or deep acting, both can deplete an employee’s emotional resources. The currently literature states that employees have a limited amount of emotional resources and it has been argued that surface acting consumes more resources than deep acting because of the ongoing effort required to display incongruent expressions to that of internal emotions (Goldberg & Grandey). Empirical
findings have consistently supported that surface acting has a positive association to burnout, however, the association to deep acting and burnout is often found to be weak or negligible as it was found in the present study (Brotheridge & Grandey, 2002; Grandey, 2003). These results allow us to recognise that occupational emotional labour requirements, of deep acting may be equally as deleterious to employee wellbeing outcomes as surface acting surface acting, contradicting previous findings. Bono and Vey’s (2005) meta-analysis that also found surface acting to have a positive relationship to burnout, and deep acting to have a positive, albeit weaker, relationship to burnout. It had been argued that the weaker association of deep acting may be caused by the lesser effort required to initially produce than surface acting (Martinez-Iñigo et al. 2007). Moreover, it may be that the deep acting may endorse resource gains by creating a feedback loop that develops genuine expressions of emotion, that lead to better outcomes and great self-authenticity (Brotheridge & Lee, 2002). That is, any negative effects of deep acting on well-being due to expended effort might be counteracted by its positive effects on other resources. This also helps to explain why some studies find positive and non-significant effects of deep acting on well-being.

Additionally, EL deep acting was found to have a positive correlation with burnout and a negative association to job satisfaction supporting the research findings of Mikolajczak et al., (2017). As also found by Mikolajczak et al. (2017), a possible explanation of the present study finding a weak positive association between deep acting and burnout, maybe be that the energy levels used in deep acting expend far more emotional resources that surface acting. However, the act of deep acting simultaneously reduces emotional incongruency and promotes feelings of satisfaction due to adhering to organisational display rules, in turn, leading to feelings of job satisfaction.

While surface acting has an established negative relationship with job satisfaction (Grandey, 2000), EL deep acting was found to be moderately positively associated with both
positive and negative affect which was inconsistent with previous research findings (Grant, 2007; Huang et al., 2015, Scott. & Barnes, 2017). The most probable explanation for the differences in the findings are the previous studies much smaller sample sizes taken from specific occupational groups (i. bus drivers, Scott & Barnes, 2017). Another potential factor considered by Scott and Barnes (2017) is that instances of deep acting may in fact lower negative affectivity due to positive outcomes, in turn increasing positive affect. It is also possible that deep acting may have a positive association to both positive and negative affect, as the positive affect may offset the emotive losses from deep acting (Grandey & Gabriel, 2015). To reduce the instances of mixed findings, further research using consist measures and connotations of affect should be used in conjunction with varying occupations all from within a customer service-based role that requires emotional labour.

Similarly, these findings contradict those of (Hülsheger & Schewe, 2011; Kammeyer-Mueller, Rubenstein, et al., 2013). Hülsheger and Schewe (2011), provided a quantitative review on the of the associations between emotional labour, wellbeing and performance outcome. A possible explanation for the discrepancies in results maybe that Hülsheger and Schewe (2001) included emotional-rule dissonance within their analysis as well as job performance measures. Many of the results included the factors of job attitudes and emotion-rule dissonance whereas the present study used fewer confounding factors. Likewise, Kammeyer-Mueller et al., (2013) developed a quantitative review on 116 studies and demonstrated that their results exploring affective dispositions, emotional labour and positive and negative affect were found to be consistent with literature stating surface acting is associated to negative outcomes, and deep acting is associated to positive outcomes. However, in this instance in addition to the examining positive and negative affect measured by the PANAS as used in the present study, neuroticism’s measures were accounted for as
negative affect and extraversion for positive affect. These replacement/additional measures may contribute to the discrepancies in findings.

Most of the research examining the predictors of employee burnout concentrates on organisational variables such as autonomy and management support (Halbesleben & Buckley, 2004; Iverson, 1998; Karatepe, Babakus & Yavas, 2012; Lee & Ashforth, 1996) and overlooks personality factors such as positive and negative affect (Thorensen et al., 2003). Moreover, most of the work on EL suggests that it is moderately to strongly associated with burnout, where the present results demonstrate that affect was more strongly associated with burnout. The results of this study also support those of Alarcon et al., (2009) meta-analysis that indicated negative and positive affect to have stronger relationships to burnout than other self-reported personality factors such as optimism. It is important to note that most studies use affect differently, some meaning work related positive and negative affect and others refer to the term as a personality-based disposition (Halbesleben & Buckley, 2004; Iverson, 1998; Lee & Ashforth, 1996). The differing operational applications of affect are likely to have had an impact on the outcomes and interpretations of previous studies.

Additionally, prior studies have argued positive affect improved job performance which in turn, increased job satisfaction (Cropanzano, et al., 1993; Thoresen et al., 2003) and that negative affect exacerbated burnout, while positive affect lessened reported burnout (Iverson et al., 1998; Thoresen et al., 2003). That is, the possibility lies that those with high positive affect may facilitate deep acting over surface acting as they may consider the effort required as intrinsically worthwhile in relation to the external rewards such as promotions or salary increases (Thoresen et al., 2003).

The results of the present study revealed that the practice of emotional incongruency and the weakening of social interactions may be the mechanisms driving the link between surface acting and well-being outcomes. Bono and Vey (2005) have previously claimed that
associations between surface acting and personality traits of positive and negative affectivity may influence the outcomes of correlations between surface acting and wellbeing outcomes as the present study has. Zapf, Seifert, Schmutte, Mertini, and Holz (2001) state that employees with negative affect tend to engage in more occasions of surface acting, while employees with appear to engage in fewer instances of surface acting (Brotheridge & Grandey, 2002; Brotheridge & Lee, 2003; Gosserand & Diefendorff, 2005). Consequently, it may be that the associations found between emotional labour and job satisfaction and burnout outcomes are more heavily influenced positive and negative affect. Notwithstanding the findings of this research, further systematic studies of a longitudinal nature may be crucial to develop a better understanding of the fundamental mechanics that influence emotional labor outcomes.

Lastly, Thoresen, Kaplan and Barsky’s (2003) and Connolly and Viswesvaran’s (2000), previous meta-analyses both found that negative affect correlated negatively with job satisfaction. The present study found opposing results demonstrating a weak positive association between negative affect and job satisfaction, and a moderate negative association between positive affect and job satisfaction. A possible explanation for the differing results may be that Thoresen et al.’s (2003) meta-analyses combined varying measures of job satisfaction and studies that examined both state and trait affectivity, using different measures of affectivity and accounted for personality factors such as neuroticism. Similarly, Connolly and Viswesvaran’s (2000) study combined varying measures of affectivity and most included studies used the Minnesota job satisfaction scale to report job satisfaction with no specific focus on client-facing or service roles. Moreover, this present study had drawn data from a large westernised sample of client-facing roles analysed void of other interceding factors such as employment dimensions (supervisor support, co-workers, pay and promotion) (Bowling, Hendricks & Wagner, 2008) which may also account for the discrepancies. Furthermore, the
present study has found results inconsistent with current theory and posits that positive and negative affect may have a mediating role among the present set of data that may require further non-parametric structural equation modelling to gain more reliable insights into the relationship between surface acting, negative affect and burnout, and deep acting, positive affect, job and burnout satisfaction.

Importantly, this study found a negligible negative, but statistically significant relationship between emotional labour deep acting and job satisfaction. Although weak, this relationship has not been found in three more recent meta-analyses (Hulsheger & Shewe, 2011; Mesmer-Magnus et al., 2012; Wang et al., 2011). While these meta-analyses did not find a similar relationship, possibly due to the weak association, further exploration may reveal other factors mediating this association and reveal a stronger negative correlation between deep acting and job satisfaction.

**Effects of Emotional Regulation and Emotional Intelligence on Burnout**

Moderate to weak support was found for research question two. The present study found that those who scored lower in emotional regulation and emotional intelligence reported higher burnout, however, those results were influenced by negative affect. The key finding is that it appears that negative affect potentially moderates the relationship between emotional wellbeing influence on burnout. Further research investigating this by analysing the dataset with a non-parametric SEM approach may further clarify the results (Awang, Afthanorhan & Asri (2015). Moreover, the results suggest that the PERCI measure of positive and negative emotional regulation ability, may be better at anticipating potential employee burnout. The PERCI measure consistently showed strong associations in predicting burnout with the subscale ‘general facilitating hedonic’ resulting as the strongest subscale correlation with all remaining subscales resulting in moderate to strong associations. While controlling for ERQ emotional suppression and negative affect lowered the PERCI’s
association to burnout, they still indicated strong correlation to indicating potential burnout in employees. The results suggest the PERCI’s ability to make a distinction on the intention of emotion regulation attempts. Specifically, the subscale ‘general facilitating hedonic’ combines both positive and negative emotional regulation ability scores and shows an individual’s propensity to avoid negative emotions by increasing positive emotions in a manner that is consistent with emotional exhaustion and predicted burnout (Preece et al., 2015, Zou et al., 2017).

Comparing measures, the ERQ emotional suppression and negative affect measures both had moderate associations to burnout and impacted the association the PERCI and PERCI subscales had on indicating burnout. It seems the ERQ scale is only able to measure the outcome of an individuals’ ability to regulate their negative emotions using cognitive reappraisal/deep acting and expressive suppression/surface acting. That is, there is currently no scale items within the ERQ that can measure or report the individual’s ability to contest, challenge and change unwanted emotions prior to expression as the PERCI is able to do. The ERQ simply measures the regulated emotions outcome, and not the perceived ability to change that outcome.

Conversely, the WLEIS measure of emotional intelligence showed a weak to very weak relationship to burnout. One possible explanation is that employees that have high emotional intelligence may appraise workplace situations as more challenging, then threatening, and have better coping strategies than co-workers with lower emotional intelligence. (Mikolajczak & Lumine, 2008). Lower instances of workplace stress would then result in fewer instances of mood deterioration (Mikolajczak et al., 2007). The importance of emotional intelligence is that further to managing stressful situation more effectively, the employee is also better able to manage bouts of anger or sadness (Mikolajczak et al., 2007). The present research adds to the body of literature on emotional
intelligence and emotional labour and suggest that EI may have a mediating influence between affectivity and employee wellbeing outcomes.

When comparing to the PERCI, neither the ERQ, nor WLEIS measure can quantify a person’s overall level of difficulty down regulating negative-emotions and up-regulating positive emotions to maximize on the positive ones. The results of this study express the importance of the ability to down-regulate positive emotions independently. Given the association between positive emotions and extraversion (Watson & Clark, 1997), these data suggest that an individuals’ inability to down-regulate positive emotions rather than negative emotion is equally as problematic when displaying company dictated emotional expression as negative emotions. These conclusions add to the literature on emotional labour and surface acting as the results show a strong indicator that hedonistic personalities types and regulation of positive emotions have potentially equal importance to negative ones and are a predictor of the predisposition to suffer workplace burnout (Preece et al., 2015, Zou et al., 2017).

The finding of this study showed that positive affect has an association with emotional wellbeing predictors and job satisfaction. Furthermore, there is some evidence that negative affect also has a potential mediating role on job satisfaction. In explaining the variance in job satisfaction scores, the WLEIS measure of emotional intelligence and all the subscales were weakly to moderately, and negatively associated with job satisfaction. When controlling for measure of emotional regulation, emotional labour and affect, the WLEIS measure maintained a negative correlation to job satisfaction, although the association lowered slightly.

Similarly, the ERQ emotional regulation measure showed a weak negative association to job satisfaction with a stronger negative, moderate correlation with subscale item ‘cognitive reappraisal’. When controlling for measure of emotional regulation, emotional labour and affect, the ERQ measure of cognitive appraisal maintained a negative correlation
to job satisfaction, again, the association was slightly lower. In contrast, the PERCI measure resulted in very weak, negligible associations across all subscales.

Important antecedents in predicting job satisfaction are instances of emotional incongruency as stimulated by surface acting which are both known to be negatively related to job satisfaction (Abraham, 1998, Groth, et al., 2009, Judge et al., 2009; Lewig & Dollard, 2003, Morris & Feldman, 1997; Pugliesi, 1999). No prior research to my knowledge has investigated the relationship of emotional intelligence, affect, and positive and negative measures of emotional regulation with job satisfaction. Emotional intelligence measures may have resulted in the strongest predictor or job satisfaction as interpersonally, the specific emotional regulatory process associated with emotional awareness is anticipated to improve social relationships. That is, being aware of one’s own emotions increases the ability to regulate stress and negative emotions, in turn, lowering workplace stress and improving work performance. While several studies between emotional intelligence have observed weak to modest relationships between trait EI measures (i.e., EQi, Carmeli, 2003; Kafetsios & Loumakou, 2007; and job satisfaction, this study found a strong relationship and the WLEIS has been shown to predict job satisfaction (Law et al., 2004; Sy et al., 2006).

**Implications for theory**

This research has several theoretic consequences. Foremost, to my knowledge this is one of the largest client-facing role samples collected outside the meta-analytic framework. The findings have essential support to the existing exploration on emotional labour’s deep and surface acting and their disparity of effects among individuals, Moreover, that the effective application of deep acting practices may be reliant on more adequate emotional regulation (Grandey, 2000).

This research also finds that individuals with higher emotional intelligence not only reported less negative affective responses to work but had greater positive affect than the
average individual. This finding suggests that to decrease the emotional labour demands of work and increase the positive aspect, emotional intelligence may be distinctively crucial.

Lastly, this thesis contributes to conceptual differences between emotional regulation and emotional intelligence. Moreover, the need to measure each independently of each other, and in conjunction. Lastly, to the need to more carefully consider the regulation of both positive and negative emotions in respect to emotional exhaustion and workplace burnout.

**Implications for practice**

The findings of this research delivered empirical evidence of the importance of understanding the emotional intelligence and regulation ability of personnel. This understanding better predicts workplace attitudes (job satisfaction) critical to organisational outcomes of job performance, staff turnover and profitability. Moreover, the importance of employing contented and productive workers highlights the cruciality of being able to better predict staff suitability and wellbeing (Walter et al., 2011) Additionally, the inclusion of emotional regulation and emotional intelligence focused employee education, training and development may help build the emotional regulation and deep acting techniques to manage the emotional stresses of client-facing roles, while teaching the harmful effects of surface acting (Walter et al., 2011).

Schleicher et al., (2011) stated job satisfaction is associated with employee commitment, task performance and positive physical and psychological health outcomes of employees. In contrast, burnout, has an association with staff turnover intentions, poor work attitudes, behaviours, performance and productivity (Schleicher et al., 2011). Importantly, the findings of this research indicate incorporating a low-cost and effective measure of EI and ER abilities during personnel selection, would assist in the employment of more satisfied staff. That is, higher emotionally skilled employees have more positive work attitudes and wellbeing outcomes. Abbott, White and Charles (2005) stress the engagement of personnel
with high levels of emotional competence does not release organisations from their obligations to provide a safe, supportive and healthy workplace.

**Limitations and further considerations**

The research conducted has several strengths inclusive of sample size, extensive occupational diversity, a multiplicity of psychometric, item-level measures, several limitations should be acknowledged. Foremost, although the online sample from North America was ethnically diverse, participants were homogeneous to America and Canada, a White American–centric population (Devos, & Mohamed, 2014). Therefore, I cannot presume that the identified structure will replicate in other countries and cultural contexts. Additionally, this study relied on self-report measures which are susceptible to common method variance, self-perception response bias and societal desirability effects (Roberts et al., 2001). Nonetheless, surveying respondents’ superiors or co-workers may gain a more objectivity and less biased variable measures (Beal & Weiss, 2003).

Cause-and-effect inferences cannot be conferred, nor can ruling out reverse causality. That is, surface acting may lead to a negative affect and subsequent burnout, however, the higher need for workplace emotional incongruent maybe the consequence of burnout. Additionally, this research included client-facing roles and did not consider relationships between associates, peers, or managers. Moreover, future research should include salary level as varied sources all state that salary is a reliable predictor of job satisfaction however, this construct was not measured here. Lastly, competing conceptualizations of EI are still debated. While the empirical evidence for the construct validity of EI is accumulating, further research is needed on the influence of cultural or contextual factors on EI (Little et al. 2012).

As the predominant body of employee wellbeing outcomes have centred on the ability to regulate the expression of genuine and ingenuine emotions, there is a need to consider ER as a distinct process from emotional labour and emotional intelligence that may operate at a
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social level (e.g. see Ashkanasy 2003; Ashkanasy & Humphrey 2011; Côté, Piff, & Willer, 2013; Humphrey et al. 2015; Little et al. 2012; Netzer, Van Kleef, & Tamir, 2015; Niven et al. 2011). To give a real-world instance, contemplate an employee that may attempt to regulate their co-workers emotional experience and display after a heated exchange with a difficult customer. This ability to regulate emotions may increase job satisfaction due to outcomes associated with instances like this or increase burnout due to the effort involved if emotional regulation skills are not adequate. This example has partly contributed to the need for different conceptions and measures that distinguish emotional labour from the emotional regulation process.

Conclusion

Notwithstanding these limitations, this research makes some vital contributions to concepts and literature. Chiefly, this research as part of a broader project has served to create a valid, reliable and comprehensive “Employee Wellbeing” survey. The findings of this individual research project contributes to the research on employee wellbeing. That being the distinguished differences between the functions of high emotional intelligence as a predictor of employee job satisfaction and low emotional regulation as a strong predictor of burnout in client-facing roles. This investigation has also bought the importance of varied and comprehensive measures that may better predict employee wellbeing and role suitability with greater accuracy. Finally, we bridge the gap in emotional labour and employee wellbeing literature by presenting an original expression of how both emotional intelligence and emotional regulation measures are equally imperative in predicting employee job satisfaction and workplace burnout.
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APPENDIX A

is not included in this version of the thesis.
Are You a Medical Professional or Emergency Responder?

ADDRESSING EMOTIONAL LABOUR AT WORK AND THE IMPACT OF EMOTIONAL REGULATION ON JOB SATISFACTION

If you are a current serving member of the Police, Fire Service, Ambulance, or a Medical Professional? If so, I invite you to participate in this online survey.

I am an Honours student from Edith Cowan University (ECU) and I am conducting a research study as part of my Honours degree requirements. This project investigates Emotional Labour Influences and Affective Responses on Job Satisfaction: The moderator roles of Emotional Intelligence and Regulation which seeks to investigate the moderating role emotional regulation measures may have on employee wellbeing.

You are being asked to take part in this project because of the high emotional demands of your role. The survey will last approximately 25 minutes and your participation will contribute to the current literature on Emotional Labour, Emotional Regulation and Employee Wellbeing.

You could win one of two $100 gift vouchers drawn at random if you choose to be included in the draw. An information letter about this study is provided prior to the commencement of the survey or if you would like to know more information about this study, an information letter can forward to you by emailing kwl920@ecu.edu.au. If you decide to participate after reading this letter, you can access the survey from the link below or via the QR Code Qualtrics XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX

HUMAN RESEARCH ETHICS COMMITTEE
For all queries, please contact:
Research Ethics Office Edith Cowan University 270 Joondalup Drive JOONDALUP WA 6027
Phone: 6504 3370 Fax: 6504 3381
Email: research.ethics@ecu.edu.au

Dr. Ken Robinson (Principal Supervisor)
k.robinson@ecu.edu.au
Dr. David Moores (Supervisor)
d.moores@ecu.edu.au
Prof. Stephen Teo (Supervisor)
s.teo@ecu.edu.au

Chief Investigator
Kirby Wilson
School of Arts and Humanities
Edith Cowan University
270 Joondalup Drive
JOONDALUP WA 6027
Phone: 6504 34559
Email: kwl920@ecu.edu.au
Dear Potential Survey Participant,

I am an Honours student from Edith Cowan University (ECU) and I am conducting a research study as part of my Honours degree requirements. This project investigates emotional labour influences and affective responses on job satisfaction: The Moderator Roles of Emotional Intelligence and Regulation which seeks to investigate the moderating role emotional regulation measures may have on employee wellbeing. You are being asked to take part in this project because of the high emotional demands of your role. This is a letter of invitation to participate in this research study.

Should you choose to participate in this online survey, your consent is being given for the research team to include your responses in the study and any subsequent published materials. Any participation is strictly voluntary, and you should you choose not to participate, you may decline or withdraw without fear of penalty or any negative consequences. You will be able to withdraw from the survey at any time and should you choose to withdraw, all survey responses will be deleted.

An informed consent letter will be available on the first screen, prior to the commencement of the survey. All information will be de-identified and kept electronically for a period of 7 years. You may request a copy of the results of the survey by emailing myself at kwilso29@our.ecu.edu.au

The survey will last approximately 25 minutes. Your participation will contribute to the current literature on Emotional Labour, Emotional Regulation and Employee Wellbeing. A separate link will be provided at the end of the study to enter a draw to win one of two $100 gift vouchers drawn at random if you so choose.

An information letter about this study is provided prior to the commencement of the survey or If you would like to know more information about this study, an information letter can forward to you by emailing kwilso29@our.ecu.edu.au. If you decide to participate after reading this letter, you can access the survey from the link below;

Qualtrics: https://ecua.qualtrics.com/jfe/form/SV_dgvcK2knqyRmOLX

Thank you for your consideration,

Kirsty Wilson
Chief Investigator: Kirsty Wilson
School of Art and Humanities
Edith Cowan University
270 Joondalup Drive
JOONDALUP WA 6027
Phone: 
Email: 

HUMAN RESEARCH ETHICS COMMITTEE For all queries, please contact: Research Ethics Officer Edith Cowan University 270 Joondalup Drive JOONDALUP WA 6027 Phone: 6304 2170 Fax: 6304 2661 Email: research.ethics@ecu.edu.au

Dr. Ken Robinson (Research Supervisor) k.robinson@ecu.edu.au
Dr. David Preece (Research Supervisor) d.preece@ecu.edu.au
Approval to conduct this research has been provided by the Edith Cowan University’s Human Research Ethics Committee, approval number 2019-00212-WILSON in accordance with its ethics review and approval procedures. If at any time you are not satisfied the research or wish to make a complaint about the research process, you may contact the Human Research Ethics team on 6304 2170 or by emailing them at research.ethics@ecu.edu.au.
## APPENDIX G

### SCALE FREQUENCIES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Median</th>
<th>Skewness</th>
<th>Std. Error of Skewness</th>
<th>Percentiles</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EL</td>
<td>45.00</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>25 40.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>75 52.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PANAS</td>
<td>56.00</td>
<td>0.57</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>25 49.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>75 64.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ERQ</td>
<td>45.00</td>
<td>-0.17</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>25 39.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>75 53.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EI</td>
<td>70.00</td>
<td>-0.56</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>25 61.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>75 78.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BO</td>
<td>19.00</td>
<td>0.28</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>25 14.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>75 24.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JS</td>
<td>12.00</td>
<td>0.46</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>25 9.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>75 15.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PERCI</td>
<td>102.00</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>25 69.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>75 133.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\( N = 2385 \)

**Note:** EL = emotional labour, PANAS = positive and negative affect, ERQ = emotional regulation questionnaire, EI = emotional intelligence, BO = burnout, JS = job satisfaction, PERCI = Perth emotional regulation competency inventory, ER_CR = emotional regulation cognitive reappraisal, ER_ES = emotional regulation – emotional suppression, EI_SEA = emotional intelligence – self emotion appraisal, EI_OEA = emotional intelligence – others emotions appraisal, EI_UOE = emotional intelligence -use of emotion, EI_ROE = emotional intelligence, regulation of emotion, EL_F = emotional labour – frequency, EL_I = emotional labour – intensity, EL_V = emotional labour – variety, EL_SA = emotional labour – surface acting, EL_DA = emotional labour – deep acting, PANAS = positive and negative affect – positive, PANAS_Neg = positive and negative affect – negative, PERCI_Pos = Perth emotional regulation competency inventory, positive, PERCI_Neg = Perth emotional regulation competency inventory – positive.
## APPENDIX H

### SUBSCALE FREQUENCIES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Median</th>
<th>Skewness</th>
<th>Std. Error of Skewness</th>
<th>Percentiles</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ER_CR</td>
<td>29.00</td>
<td>-0.41</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>24.00 35.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ER_ES</td>
<td>16.00</td>
<td>-0.05</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>13.00 20.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EI_SEA</td>
<td>18.00</td>
<td>-0.71</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>15.00 20.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EI_OEA</td>
<td>18.00</td>
<td>-0.66</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>15.00 20.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EI_UOE</td>
<td>2.89</td>
<td>-1.82</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>2.71 3.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EI_ROE</td>
<td>17.00</td>
<td>-0.53</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>14.00 20.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EL_F</td>
<td>12.00</td>
<td>-0.55</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>10.00 13.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EL_I</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>4.00  8.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EL_V</td>
<td>9.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>7.00 12.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EL_SA</td>
<td>9.00</td>
<td>-0.09</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>7.00 12.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EL_DA</td>
<td>10.00</td>
<td>-0.29</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>8.00 12.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PANAS_Pos</td>
<td>34.00</td>
<td>-0.29</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>28.00 40.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PANAS_Neg</td>
<td>21.00</td>
<td>0.60</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>15.00 30.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PERCI_Pos</td>
<td>41.00</td>
<td>0.64</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>24.00 64.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PERCI_Neg</td>
<td>59.00</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>41.00 73.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*N = 2385

**Note**: EL = emotional labour, PANAS = positive and negative affect, ERQ = emotional regulation questionnaire, EI = emotional intelligence, BO = burnout, JS = job satisfaction, PERCI = Perth emotional regulation inventory ER_CR = emotional regulation cognitive reappraisal, ER_ES = emotional regulation – emotional suppression, EI_SEA = emotional intelligence – self emotion appraisal, EI_OEA = emotional intelligence – others emotions appraisal, EI_UOE = emotional intelligence -use of emotion, EI_ROE = emotional intelligence, regulation of emotion, EL_F = emotional labour – frequency, EL_I = emotional labour – intensity, EL_V = emotional labour – variety, EL_SA = emotional labour – surface acting, EL_DA = emotional labour – deep acting, PANAS = positive and negative affect – positive, PANAS_Neg = positive and negative affect – negative, PERCI_POS = Perth emotional regulation competency inventory, positive, PERCI_Neg = Perth emotional regulation competency inventory – positive.