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This research explored the association between authenticity and work engagement within the customer service context of mass-service industries. Authenticity in customer service workers is usually considered detrimental to organisational aims for a consistent standard of good service. However, research which finds that acting the service-persona is associated with emotional exhaustion and cynicism in workers (Brotheridge & Lee, 2002), while authenticity is related to positive customer-outcomes (Bujisic, Wu, Mattila, & Bilgihan, 2014), suggests that authenticity may enhance the experience of service for workers, and their customers, to provide for sustained competitive advantage. In the present research, I sought to examine the relationship between the degree of authenticity that employees use in their interaction with customers, and their experience of work engagement.

Mass-service refers to a sector of the service industry modelled on mass-production. Contrary to principles for work engagement, workers in customer service roles within mass-service, usually repeat a small range of tasks with very little variation or autonomy. One hundred and forty service employees in petrol stations, fast food outlets, supermarkets, and in general retail responded to a survey measuring the extent to which they felt authentic, used surface acting and deep acting, their state of self-efficacy, feelings of personal accomplishment, and work engagement.

Results revealed a positive relationship between authenticity and work engagement. Surface acting emerged as a less authentic approach to service than deep acting, however, deep acting was not strongly related to authenticity. Personal accomplishment strongly moderated associations with work engagement. Overall, results suggest that an authentic approach to interaction with customers and a sense of personal accomplishment are important to work engagement in mass-service workers. Findings support the promotion of authenticity in the workplace, as well as providing opportunities for workers to obtain a sense of accomplishment. Practical implications for the integration of authenticity into the customer service context, such as greater job autonomy and training customer service employees in the beneficial use of personality within the service-role, are discussed.
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CHAPTER 1 - INTRODUCTION

In the current climate of mass-production and global competition, organisations often compete to sell the same products, however, the image conveyed in the service encounter can raise the reputation of one brand above its rivals. Customer service in particular has become key to competitive advantage. Therefore, extraordinary job growth in the services sector represents an immensely valuable and expanding industry (Bureau of Labour Statistics, 2013). Research suggests that quality service is capable of building trust in a brand as well as influencing consumer loyalty intentions (Côté, 2005; Groth, Hennig-Thurau, & Walsh, 2009; Harter, Schmidt, & Hayes, 2002; Hennig-Thurau, Groth, Paul, & Gremler, 2006; Salanova, Agut, & Peiró, 2005; Yagil, 2012; Yagil & Medler-Liraz, 2013). Unfortunately, as awareness of the service encounter’s potential increases, so too does managerial intervention to regulate it (Fineman, 2000; Leidner, 1993). Strict regulation of the service encounter may promote superficial interaction that is harmful to employees and degrades their interaction with customers, to ultimately reduce the capacity for the service interaction to build relationships with customers. This is most apparent in mass-service industries, in which customer-interaction is typically short and prescribed. The positions of interest in this research (petrol station attendants, fast-food workers, supermarket checkout operators, and general retail workers) are considered a part of the mass-service sector. These roles adhere to the mass-service classification (Maister & Lovelock, 1982) because in addition to high-frequency customer contact, these workers usually have little liberty to customise their service to individual needs and preferences. In the present research I examine the experience of work for those employed in mass-service, and consider how this may impact their relations with customers.

Despite the potential for mass-service workers to add value, their role is typically undervalued, and their behaviour extensively regulated. These workers are typical members of what Standing (2014) refers to as ‘the precariat’, a workforce defined by a lack of job security, low wage, poor working conditions, and low social status. As the service version of a factory production line, mass-service roles are designed to balance low cost of labour with efficiency and a consistent standard of quality (Korczynski, 2013). Designed for standardisation, the actions of workers are usually closely regulated (Leidner, 1993). For example, monitoring technology
that records the duration of each interaction as well as the quantity of errors is common. Mass-service roles usually lack opportunity for development, autonomy, task variety, task significance, and task identity (defined as, “the opportunity to do a job from the beginning to end” (Hackman & Lawler, 1971, p. 267), so that an individual can identify the results of their effort). In his study on the experiences of McDonald’s employees, Leidner (1993) observed that, as this highly standardised approach to service substantially reduced the skill required, and the autonomy they were permitted, individual workers were devalued and became expendable.

This drive for standardisation further encompasses interpersonal interaction with customers. In addition to close monitoring for efficient service, ‘feeling rules’ (for example, every customer receives a smile and eye-contact), scripting, and regulations over physical appearance (for example, uniform, hair and make-up rules; Warhurst & Nickson, 2007) control the service persona presented to customers. Typically, mass-service workers must follow scripts, promote offers that they would not personally endorse, or submit to the demands of customers with whom they disagree. Ritzer (2004) contends that the concept of ‘good customer service’ has become standardised to the extent that the role of a service-worker is now to be a ‘non-person’, without a distinguishing personality. Although this extensively standardised model for service is motivated by a drive to secure value (Leidner, 1993), opportunity for the service encounter to positively represent the brand and build relationships with customers may be lost when customers perceive inauthentic expressions such as a forced smile, or are greeted with a detached, robotic manner (Côté, 2005). Therefore, this approach may be detrimental to the organisational goals it is designed to achieve.

Owing to extensive routinisation in mass-service, neither workers nor customers are considered as individuals and for this reason, the interaction between customers and workers is referred to as a service encounter in place of a service relationship (Gutek, 1995). It can be argued that this heavily regulated and standardised service-model serves organisational purposes. Gutek, Groth, and Cherry (2002) highlight that as a ‘non-person’, service can be efficient, pleasant, and positively represent the organisation. They argue that, organisations in mass-service do not need to build relationships between individual customers and individual employees, rather they seek to promote the brand’s image. Requiring
minimal investment in labour, this model is also robust to the high employee-turnover common in these positions (Keltner & Finegold, 1996; Leidner, 1993; Ueno, 2009). However, high employee turnover may itself be indicative of underlying problems with job-design and the strain of an inauthentic work climate (Côté & Morgan, 2002; Leidner, 1993; Ueno, 2009). This focus on standardisation neglects to consider the experience of workers, and as presented in the following discussion, the way in which both directly, and through affected customer relations, this may impact the organisation.

Work engagement is a positive affective state characterised by feeling absorbed, dedicated, and energetic at work (Schaufeli, Salanova, González-Romá, & Bakker, 2002, p. 74). Regarding the experience for workers, work engagement is associated with improved psychological and physical well-being (Bakker, 2011; Bakker & Demerouti, 2008; Bakker, Schaufeli, Leiter, & Taris, 2008; Gross & John, 2003) as well as job satisfaction (Judge & Bono, 2001). Unfortunately, the aforementioned aspects of job-design that are often lacking from the mass-service model (for example, task variety and task significance), are positively associated with work engagement (Bakker & Demerouti, 2008; Saks, 2006). Additional to worker well-being, for its associations with organisational benefits, a working environment that does not promote work engagement may disadvantage the organisation. For example, a body of research indicates that work engagement is related to job performance (Salanova Agut, & Peiró, 2005), pro-active behaviour (Bakker, Tims, & Derks, 2012; Sonnentag, 2003), organisational citizenship behaviours (Moliner, Martínez-Tur, Ramos, Peiró, & Cropanzano, 2008), reduced turnover intention, increased safety behaviours and product quality, reduced absenteeism, and increased organisational profitability and productivity (Harter, Schmidt, Killham, & Agrawal, 2009), and financial returns (Xanthopoulou, Bakker, Demerouti, & Schaufeli, 2009b). In a study of work engagement across industries, Taipale, Selander, Anttila, and Nätti (2011) found that work engagement was particularly low in retail, which is a mass-service industry. Given the above associations with work engagement, findings of Taipale et al. support the argument that this service model, which emphasises efficiency over work engagement, and pleasant but depersonalised interaction, may be detrimental to both employee well-being and organisational goals.
It is widely recognised that service workers have the ability to affect the customer-experience, and as mentioned previously, it may be for this reason that the service encounter in mass-service industries is extensively regulated (Fineman, 2000; Leidner, 1993). However, owing to a disparity between the experience of work, and the image that must be presented, working conditions in mass-service may increase the need for workers to be inauthentic with customers, which may negatively affect the customer-relations outcomes that this model is designed to control. In mass-service roles, the experience of working in a highly restrictive and repetitive environment may be experienced as monotonous. However, as representatives of the organisation, and unlike their counterparts on a factory production line, mass-service workers are usually expected to present a persona to customers that is positive, energised, helpful, and agreeable (MacDonald & Sirianni, 1996). This service model that emphasises task-reduction and standardisation may produce the conditions that make extensive regulation necessary, which may negatively affect the customer-outcomes that this model is designed to control. For example, empirical research indicates that customer satisfaction and loyalty intentions are related to service employees who feel connected to their authentic selves while at work (Yagil & Medler-Liraz, 2013), display authentic gestures to customers (Bujisic, Wu, Mattila, & Bilgihan, 2014; Grandey, Fisk, Mattila, Jansen, & Sideman, 2005; Hennig-Thurau, Groth, Paul, & Gremler, 2006) and experience work engagement (Harter, Schmidt, & Hayes, 2002; Yagil, 2012; Yagil & Medler-Liraz, 2013). Positive associations between authenticity, work engagement and customer loyalty, suggest that by maintaining rigorous control over the service encounter, discouraging authenticity and diversity, organisations may be forgoing opportunity for added value and sustained advantage.

Despite restrictive working conditions, in their approach to the service encounter, mass-service workers may be able to enrich their experience, and that of their customers. Described in Kahn’s theory of personal engagement, evident in Tolich’s (1993) observations of supermarket workers, and Leidner’s (1993) observations of McDonald’s workers, even in mass-service, employees usually have some discretion in the extent to which they integrate their personality into their work-role. For example, Leidner observed that while disagreeable interaction with customers would prompt McDonald’s workers to take refuge in the routinisation of their role performance, and distance their authentic self from the role, he also
observed humour and other positive deviations from their script, which infused their performance of the service persona with their unique personality. For reasons discussed later in this chapter, feeling authentic at work may be positively associated with work engagement. Considering the possible benefits of greater authenticity and work engagement for all stakeholders in the mass-service context, I sought to investigate the association between authenticity at work and work engagement.

In the following section within this chapter I define the variables of interest in this investigation, provide a brief overview of relevant literature and outline my research aims. In the proceeding section I present my theoretical argument and close with a summary of my hypotheses.

**Authenticity in Mass-Service Industries**

Authenticity can be defined as “expressing oneself in ways that are consistent with inner thoughts and feelings” (Harter, 2005, p. 382). The concept of authenticity at work is interesting because contextual norms and expectations mean that, more than an assembly of tasks, many jobs are associated with certain personality characteristics. This is particularly true in services in which the term ‘professional’ may mean ‘authoritative’ for a police officer, ‘compassionate’ for a nurse, or ‘serious’ for a bank officer. Role theories, such as the ‘protean self’ (Lifton, 1993, as cited in Harter) demonstrate how the adoption of multiple roles may necessitate behaving differently across contexts, however, Harter highlights that the feeling of authenticity can be maintained if different roles are used to express different aspects of the authentic self. With a focus on the work context, for the purposes of the present research, ‘authenticity’ refers to the degree to which an individual feels that their behaviour at work is aligned with their enduring sense of self.

Hochschild’s (1983) research on flight attendants highlighted the lack of authenticity in service work. Hochschild recorded flight attendants’ experiences of maintaining a consistently cheerful and polite persona; she described the pressure in service work and the skill required to sustain inauthentic emotional displays. Acknowledging that controlling the emotional display is a part of everyday life, Hochschild coined the term ‘emotional labour’ to describe when this natural ability becomes a part of the labour process and is used to achieve commercial purposes. Although most employees will perform a degree of emotional labour in their
working day, in mass-service, demand for emotional labour is extensive. Subsequent research into the effects of emotional labour has shown that it is associated with strain and burnout (Brotheridge & Grandey, 2002; Brotheridge & Lee, 2002, 2003; Goldberg & Grandey, 2007; Grandey, 2003; Totterdell & Holman, 2003; Yagil, Luria, & Gal, 2008). As the opposing concept to emotional labour, this negative association indicates that authenticity in the workplace may be able to positively impact the experience of service workers.

Impression management in the service industry refers to the controlled behaviour of service employees for the purpose of influencing customers to positively evaluate the organisation (Fisk & Grove, 1996). In mass-service, the impression is usually regulated to convey likeability, competence, and a commitment to going ‘above and beyond’ expectations (Jones & Pittman, 1982, as cited in Bolino & Turnley, 1999). For workers, this means that a positive, open, but submissive attitude is essential to fulfilling the demands of the service-role (MacDonald & Siriani, 1996). Designed according to principles of scientific management (for example, low task variety and job autonomy; Ritzer, 2004) and with high automation, mass-service positions are often regarded as low-skill, however, research indicates that sustaining an inauthentic emotional display is a skill and it requires substantial effort (Leidner, 1993), which is associated with strain and burnout (Brotheridge & Grandey, 2002; Brotheridge & Lee, 2002, 2003; Goldberg & Grandey, 2007; Grandey, 2003; Totterdell & Holman, 2003; Yagil, Luria, & Gal, 2008). This supports Hochschild (1983), who argued that when sustaining an inauthentic emotional display is for organisational purposes, it is a form of labour, however, as emotional labour is not immediately observable, it is typically overlooked and undervalued.

The mass-service context may be an especially inauthentic climate that necessitates a high degree of emotional labour. In traditional service-roles (for example, nurses and teachers) genuine emotion may be likely to be stimulated by the context or a strong personal identification with the role (Ashforth & Humphrey, 1993; Diefendorff, Croyle, & Gosserand, 2005). In contrast, owing to regulations in mass-service that make for short and impersonal conversation, stimuli that provoke spontaneous response may be less common than in other service contexts, and these workers may need to employ greater effort in order to present an
appropriate emotional display. For example, it may be more common in mass-service that the emotional display of workers is motivated by the desire to maintain the employment relationship, than out of a genuine affective response to a customer. Furthermore, in his ethnographic account of the experience of McDonald’s workers, Leidner (1993) contends that despite being classified as ‘low-skill’, this work required physical and emotional effort. He notes that as a result of the low-status of mass-service workers, they are more likely to receive abuse from customers than service workers with higher social status. In these situations, he observed that rather than abandon the service persona, workers were more likely to uphold the service performance and withdraw their authentic self from the interaction. As emotional labour is associated with strain, working conditions that make considerable emotional labour necessary, may make mass-service work more strenuous than it appears.

Additional to high demand for emotional labour, low job autonomy in mass-service may amplify strain. Owing to job-design for low-error and minimal investment in labour, workers in mass-service usually have particularly low job autonomy, moreover, their behaviour may be additionally restricted by the monitoring influence of customers (Korczynski, 2013). This highly standardised model for service that dominates mass-service may perpetuate common expectations among customers for the conduct of service workers. For example, despite the achievement of bureaucratic standards for service such as high speed and low error, in situations in which service workers appear overly casual, tired, bored, or distracted, customers could perceive a poor standard of service, and may report the worker to management. In work environments with low job autonomy, emotional labour is associated with additional strain (Goldberg & Grandey, 2007; Grandey, Fisk, & Steiner, 2005; Grandey, Foo, Groth, & Goodwin, 2012; Wharton, 1993). Considering the regulatory influence of both customers and a restrictive job-design, mass-service may be an especially inauthentic climate, workers may have particularly low job autonomy, and be at high risk of strain from emotional labour.

Shared expectations for the service-role that extend on an already highly regulated service model may be defined and maintained by cultural norms. In a study comparing the emotional labour experiences of service workers in France with those the United States of America, Grandey, Fisk, and Steiner (2005) found
that service workers in France experienced greater job autonomy and significantly less strain than did their American counterparts. Grandey, Fisk, and Steiner suggested that, expressed in culturally-ingrained concepts such as the popular maxim ‘the customer is always right’, in the United States there is a service-culture that promotes expectation for a consistent and controlled customer service identity, and more extensive emotional labour causes workers to feel more strain. The results of Grandey, Fisk, and Steiner’s study indicate that the expectation among customers for a firmly controlled emotional display may be especially high in the United States of America. However, with increasing globalisation, particularly as the spread of American mass-service franchises extends a model of highly efficient, standardised, and controlled service across the world, inauthenticity in service work may increasingly become a world-wide issue. In New Zealand, the roles included in this investigation (petrol station attendants, fast-food service workers, supermarket checkout operators, and workers in general retail) are considered to embody this service model. Although neither strain nor job autonomy are within the scope of the present research, as the results of Grandey, Fisk, and Steiner’s study suggest that reduced control over the emotional display has positive potential for workers, the findings of their study support the fundamental proposition of the present research, that greater authenticity in the service-role will be related to positive outcomes for mass-service workers.

Through consistent exposure to this standardised service model, customers may have assimilated similar expectations for the conduct of mass-service workers, however, these expectations may conflict with the managerial concept of quality service (Korczynski, 2013). Bureaucratic performance measures (high speed, no errors, smile, eye-contact, polite interaction) are useful to maintain a consistent standard of service, however, good service from a customer’s perspective may require departing from the standard interaction to accommodate individual needs and preferences. Extensive monitoring, such as software that makes an employee accountable for the duration of each transaction, and restrictive process, such as high dependence on authorisation from supervisors, may limit their ability to meet consumer needs. For example, owing to managerial concerns for efficiency, the duration of the service encounter may be monitored, as a result, while workers may feel pressure to work quickly, they may also become unwilling to spend time assisting customers to the extent required for a standard of service that is ‘above
and beyond’ expectations, and that could be highly beneficial to the brand’s image. Furthermore, in a study of workers in a McDonald’s fast food outlet, Leidner (1993) observed that, if workers servicing the drive-thru were not as cheerful as regulation required, however the service was efficient, managers would not reprimand workers. In mass-service the aim of quality service is often trumped by a concern for efficiency. Therefore, in addition to causing strain in workers, strict control over their behaviour could damage a brand’s reputation.

Further considering the effects of this highly standardised service-model on workers, a working environment that restricts the ability of customer service representatives to meet customer needs may negatively affect their self-efficacy. For reasons discussed later in this chapter (refer to ‘Self-Efficacy and its Relationship to Authenticity and Work Engagement’, p. 16), inauthentic behaviour prompted by a highly regulated working environment may degrade interaction with customers to further reduce the experience of service work.

In situations in which customers detect inauthenticity in service workers, for both workers and customers the experience of the service encounter may be degraded, and for the organisation, this may represent a loss of value. Bureaucratic standards for service emphasise smiling and consistent positive emotional displays, however, research indicates that to varying degrees, customers are able to detect when the gestures of service personnel are not genuine. For example, an inauthentic smile typically has a shorter duration and visibly does not engage all of the facial muscles of an authentic ‘ducheenne’ smile (Ekman, Davidson, & Friesen, 1990). A large body of research finds that customers positively evaluate service that they perceive to be authentic (Bujisic, Wu, Mattila, & Bilgihan, 2014; Grandey, 2003; Grandey, Fisk, Mattila, Jansen, & Sideman, 2005; Groth, Hennig-Thurau, & Walsh, 2009; Hennig-Thurau, Groth, Paul, & Gremler, 2006; Moliner, Martinez-Tur, Ramos, Peiró, & Cropanzano, 2008; Yagil & Medler-Liraz, 2013) and this translates to organisational outcomes in the form of customer loyalty and brand reputation (Bujisic, Wu, Mattila, & Bilgihan, 2014; Grandey, Fisk, Mattila, Jansen, & Sideman, 2005; Hennig-Thurau, Groth, Paul, & Gremler, 2006). Côté (2005) highlights that while building a relationship between the brand and customers is a fundamental organisational objective, customers who detect acting may lose trust in the brand. Drawing on this research, service models that emphasise rigorous
control over the emotional display, may be detrimental to employees in the form of strain; they may also reduce customer satisfaction, to ultimately disadvantage the organisation. Therefore, promoting a positive persona at the expense of authenticity may undermine organisational aims for quality service that this service model is designed to achieve.

**Deep Acting, Surface Acting, and the Effects of Emotional Dissonance**

Hochschild (1983) suggested that employees engage in one of two strategies to manage their emotional display. ‘Surface acting’ is merely displaying emotion that is not felt, ‘deep acting’ refers to first manipulating the inner emotional experience to create the appropriate emotion before displaying the new emotional state. While an employee using surface acting may fake a smile because of an explicit rule or an implicit norm to smile at every customer, deep acting employees may first convince themselves that they really are happy to see customers (Grandey, 2003). The important distinction is that only in the case of deep acting does the inner emotional experience change.

Also coined by Hochschild (1983), ‘emotional dissonance’ describes an uncomfortable emotional state caused by a discrepancy between emotions that are felt, and the external emotional display, such as smiling while feeling sad. Hochschild recognised this to be a problem particular to service employees in which job demands for impression management may necessitate the suppression of naturally occurring emotions or a consistent display of emotions that are not felt. Although emotional dissonance is not a measured variable in the present research, it is concern for the strain of dissonance that motivates investigation into the experience of workers, and the focus of authenticity.

Hochschild (1983) identified emotional dissonance as a strain that puts employees at risk of burnout and she raised concern that the prolonged acting typical to the service sector is detrimental to employees’ health. Deep acting requires that workers convince themselves into the affective states expected of their work-role (for example, the patient teacher, deferring sales assistant, empathetic nurse). Hochschild considered that, while deep acting caused workers to become alienated from their authentic selves, surface acting referred to a superficial level of acting in which workers remained connected to their authentic feelings. Therefore, Hochschild regarded deep acting as the least authentic and most
damaging approach to emotional labour. However, as burnout in emotional labour is considered to be the result of the strain of emotional dissonance, owing to the absence of an association between deep acting and burnout (Brotheridge & Grandey, 2002; Brotheridge & Lee, 2002, 2003; Goldberg & Grandey, 2007; Grandey, 2003; Totterdell & Holman, 2003), many researchers (for example, Bujisic, Wu, Mattila, & Bilgihan, 2014; Grandey, 2003; Totterdell & Holman, 2003) contend that deep acting does not generate emotional dissonance, and is therefore the more authentic approach to emotional labour and recommended for the well-being of service workers.

Responding to concern for burnout in service workers, research focus in emotional labour has predominated in the distinction between surface and deep acting and its association with burnout. Research since Hochschild (1983) provides evidence to suggest that surface acting is related to burnout and deep acting is not (Brotheridge & Grandey, 2002; Brotheridge & Lee, 2002, 2003; Goldberg & Grandey, 2007; Grandey, 2003; Totterdell & Holman, 2003; Yagil, 2012). A differential relationship to burnout suggests that only surface acting generates emotional dissonance, and while findings also demonstrate that the emotional displays of deep actors appear more genuine than do those of surface actors (Grandey, 2003; Grandey, Fisk, Mattila, Jansen, & Sideman, 2005; Groth, Hennig-Thurau, & Walsh, 2009; Hennig-Thurau, Groth, Paul, & Gremler, 2006), in few studies have researchers considered authenticity directly, or its potential positive implications for the service context. In a rare study in which authenticity in emotional labour was investigated directly, Brotheridge and Lee (2002) found evidence to suggest a weak positive relationship between deep acting and a sense of authenticity, while surface acting was more strongly negatively related.

The above body of research is strong evidence that surface acting is more harmful than deep acting. However, referring to Hochschild’s (1983) original concerns for self-deception in deep acting, the absence of a relationship between deep acting and the strain associated with emotional dissonance, does not contradict this assertion. Furthermore, although engagement and burnout are overlapping and opposing constructs, it cannot be assumed that deep acting and surface acting will be differentially associated with work engagement. Lastly, although Hochschild’s assertion that emotional labour is harmful to workers is supported by findings in the
burnout literature, there is also evidence to suggest that, dependent on working conditions and personality characteristics, workers may be able to benefit from emotional labour (Wharton, 1983; Zapf, 2002). For example, research that demonstrates that the physical act of smiling generates positive affect (Strack, Stepper, and Martin, 1988), suggests that by demanding positive displays, in the mass-service context there is potential for emotional labour to enhance well-being in workers. Additionally, owing to extensive routinisation of the service encounter, in the mass-service model, customers as well as workers have a defined role (Leidner, 1993). Ashforth and Humphrey (1993) suggest that this organisation of the service environment protects workers from the uncertainty of interpersonal interaction and provides the conditions for a continuous stream of pleasant interactions. Of particular interest in the present research, is the extent to which authenticity within the service-role may improve the experience of mass-service, as measured in an association with work engagement. The authenticity of deep acting, the relationship of deep and surface acting to work engagement, and the extent to which authenticity affects the experience of emotional labour, are gaps in the literature to which I sought to contribute with the present research (Figure 1).

**The Challenge of Work Engagement in the Mass-Service Industries and its Association with Authenticity**

Work engagement is popularly defined as “a positive, fulfilling, work-related state of mind that is characterized by vigour, dedication, and absorption” (Schaufeli, Salanova, González-Romá, & Bakker, 2002, p. 74). Vigour refers to the will to invest energy into the work task; highly dedicated workers may derive meaning from, and display pride in their work; absorbed workers are able to concentrate intensely on the work task and may find it difficult to detach from their work. Absorption, dedication, and vigour are primary constructs, which are interrelated and contribute to each other as well as to the underlying work engagement construct (Chirkowska-Smolak, 2012; Schaufeli & Bakker, 2004).

As mentioned previously, work engagement is associated with a host of positive outcomes for organisations and employees. For this reason, its cultivation has emerged as a managerial priority across many industries, however, in mass-service, the focus of job-design and managerial style continues to be standardisation and regulation. As face-to-face interaction in mass-service makes workers’ state of
vigour, absorption, and dedication visible to customers, work engagement may be particularly influential to service outcomes. Research indicates that customers respond to employees who experience work engagement, to affect customer evaluation of the service and their loyalty intentions (Harter, Schmidt, & Hayes, 2002; Salanova, Agut, & Peiró, 2005; Yagil, 2012; Yagil & Medler-Liraz, 2013). Furthermore, work engagement is associated with aspects of good customer service such as proactive behaviour (Sonntag, 2003) and positive affect (Christian, Garza, & Slaughter, 2011; Johnson & Spector, 2007). These outcomes have the potential to promote the brand and therefore represent sustained advantage to organisations. For its possible benefits, associations with work engagement in the mass-service context are a chief focus of the present investigation.

Despite the potential to benefit multiple stakeholders, research in the interactive service context has also neglected to consider work engagement. Rather, since Hochschild’s (1983) revelations of strain in service-roles, focus has been emotional dissonance and burnout. Burnout is defined as “a syndrome of emotional exhaustion, depersonalization of others, and a feeling of reduced personal accomplishment” (Lee & Ashforth, 1990, p. 743). Empirical findings indicate that while work engagement is a separate dimension to burnout, they share substantial overlap and are negatively related ($r = -0.65$, $p < .001$, Schaufeli, Taris, & van Rhenen, 2008). For this reason, while examining burnout is beyond the scope of the present research, I have extensively drawn from the burnout literature to support predicted relationships between authenticity, emotional labour, and work engagement.

Burnout may be particularly detrimental to the service environment. Considering the negative relationship between burnout and work engagement, cultivating work engagement in mass-service, may be equally as desirable for employees as it is for organisations and their customers. In a working environment in which conveying friendliness and an attitude of energetic and willing helpfulness are high priorities (Côté, 2005; Yagil, 2012), burnout factors, emotional exhaustion, cynicism (sometimes referred to as depersonalisation), and inefficacy, could damage a brand’s reputation and therefore represent the potential for extensive and long-term loss of value. Factor analysis indicates that while separate dimensions, cynicism is strongly negatively related to the dedication aspect of work engagement.
and emotional exhaustion is strongly negatively related to vigour ($r = -.67, p < .01$, Chirkowska-Smolak, 2012). Owing to negative associations with work engagement, the body of research in emotional labour that observes burnout, further supports a focus to the promotion of work engagement in the service context.

As mentioned previously, given the positive potential for work engagement in the service context, it is unfortunate that job-design in mass-service is rarely for the purpose of promoting work engagement. In its place, job-design is predominantly for maximum efficiency of labour and resources. To reduce waste, error, and variability in service quality, mass-service workers are usually restricted to a small range of tasks, for which the process is usually extensively prescribed (Goldberg & Grandey, 2007). This organisation of work directly opposes aspects of job-design found to contribute to work engagement (Bakker & Demerouti, 2008; Saks, 2006), however, service workers may be able to cultivate their own work engagement. The body of research which shows that deep acting and surface acting are differentially associated with burnout (surface acting is positively associated with emotional exhaustion and cynicism, while deep acting is not; Brotheridge & Grandey, 2002; Brotheridge & Lee, 2002, 2003; Goldberg & Grandey, 2007; Grandey, 2003; Totterdell & Holman, 2003) suggests that, despite working conditions, the approach that service workers take to emotional labour may affect their experience of work.

Considering that emotional dissonance generated by emotional labour makes this context harmful to workers, an authentic approach to the service encounter may hold positive potential for the well-being of service workers. Although across both the work engagement and emotional labour literatures, research on authenticity is rare, job autonomy is a much more common area of investigation. By encouraging employees to act in accordance with their needs, values, and personal judgements, high job autonomy may indicate increased authenticity in workers (Erickson & Wharton, 1997; Totterdell & Holman, 2003). Research findings that demonstrate a positive association between job autonomy and feelings of authenticity (van den Bosch & Taris, 2014a, 2014b), support the argument that autonomy provides the conditions for more authentic behaviour, and in the present investigation I have drawn from research in job autonomy to support
arguments for a relationship to authenticity. Therefore, research that indicates a positive association between job autonomy and work engagement ($r = .44, p < .01$, van den Bosch & Taris, 2014a, 2014b) is empirical support for the prediction that retaining a sense of authenticity in the service encounter will be related to improved well-being in service workers.

Considering research in job autonomy, evidence suggests that specifically in emotional labour, authenticity is related to outcomes for employee well-being. In emotional labour research, empirical findings demonstrate that job autonomy can regulate strain to reduce associations with burnout (Goldberg & Grandey, 2007; Grandey, Fisk, & Steiner, 2005). In the work engagement literature, findings suggest that authenticity has a moderate relationship to work engagement (van den Bosch & Taris, 2014a, 2014b; Yagil & Medler-Liraz, 2013). Combined, these findings indicate that authenticity may be a regulating mechanism for both burnout and work engagement. A lack of authenticity in emotional labour may cause of the strain of emotional dissonance and contribute to the association with burnout, while maintaining the sense of self may be related to work engagement.

Owing to the interactive context, authenticity may be especially influential to well-being outcomes. Referring to his observation of supermarket workers, Tolich (1993) documented the use of humour to customise the service encounter, and noted that this approach appeared to enhance the experience of service for both customers and workers. Concerned for strain and the manipulation of workers in emotional labour for organisational purposes, Hochschild (1983) recommended that workers withdraw their personality and distance themselves from the role. In contrast, with a focus towards enhanced working experience and an enriched service encounter, in the present study I sought to investigate the effects of the opposing approach, that of authentic personality into the service-role.

Authenticity appears to conflict with the emotional labour context, and as a highly regulated environment, authenticity may be particularly challenging to incorporate into the mass-service context. To support my argument for authenticity in the mass-service context, I make extensive use of Kahn’s (1990) description of ‘personal engagement’. In this concept, Kahn highlights that even in contexts in which image is extensively regulated, employees have discretion in the techniques that they use to produce the emotional display. In a diary study conducted across
administrators and workers in public security, Sonnentag (2003) found evidence to suggest that, according to conditions such as opportunity for recovery from work, work engagement fluctuates through the day by around 43%. In contrast, Kahn’s description of personal engagement refers to an active process. He proposed that people at work are in a continuous process of engaging and disengaging their authentic self from the work-role. ‘Personal engagement’ is achieved when the personality and the work-role become integrated; ‘personal disengagement’ refers to withdrawing the personality. Evidence of mass-service workers integrating and withdrawing their personality with the service-role has been described in both Tolich’s (1993) observations of supermarket workers, and Leidner’s (1993) observations of workers at McDonald’s. As previously mentioned, Tolich noted the use of humour. Leidner similarly described workers deviating from their scripts, however, he also referred to a robotic acting of the role, which suggests that workers were withdrawing their authentic selves and more intensely acting the service-role. Although the work-role may still be achieved, without the infusion of personality service may appear forced, or cold and robotic, which may be to the detriment of the service experience for both workers and their customers.

Kahn’s (1990) process of engagement highlights that while service employees are obligated to perform the role in a way that aligns with defined standards, they maintain control over the extent to which they integrate their personality with the service persona. Given that authenticity may be associated with work engagement, this process also demonstrates an avenue through which employees in a particularly restrictive working environment may still be able to influence their own work engagement. For this reason, in the present study I sought to investigate the degree of authenticity associated with different techniques used in emotional labour (deep acting and surface acting) and the relationship between authenticity and work engagement.

Self-Efficacy and its Relationship to Authenticity and Work Engagement

Bandura defined self-efficacy as “beliefs in one’s capabilities to organize and execute the courses of action required to produce given attainments” (1997, p. 3). Self-efficacy is related to a range of positive work-related outcomes, including performance (Stajkovic & Luthans, 1998) and job satisfaction (Judge & Bono, 2001). Self-efficacy is a measured variable in the present research for the reason
that it may be involved in a relationship between authenticity and work engagement. Research findings which suggest that both authenticity (van den Bosch & Taris, 2014a, 2014b; Yagil & Medler-Liraz, 2013) and self-efficacy (Xanthopoulou, Bakker, & Fischbach, 2013) are positively associated with work engagement, and that self-efficacy is positively related to authenticity (Rich, Lepine, & Crawford, 2010), supports this prediction.

As an interactive service context, when examining the experience of workers, it is important to consider the influence of customers. Owing to recognition of emotional contagion (workers can influence customer-evaluation of the service interaction, and therefore impact organisational-outcomes; Pugh, 2001), organisations in the mass-service industries typically strive to regulate the manner of these workers, and scripts as well as prescribed emotion rules are common (Leidner, 1993). Of particular interest in the present research, is the dynamic effects of interpersonal interaction; the way in which workers approach the service encounter may affect the response they receive from customers, which may sequentially influence the affective experience of these workers. For example, in a diary study on workers in a call-centre, Totterdell and Holman (2003) found evidence to suggest that workers experienced increased positive affect following positive interactions with colleagues and clients. Considering the prominence of customer interaction, and the restrictive job-design common to mass-service roles, in the present research I refer to the level of self-efficacy in mass-service workers as an indication of the response that these workers usually receive from customers. To illustrate the potential role of self-efficacy in a relationship between authenticity and work engagement, I refer to the Social Interaction Model (Côté, 2005) and the Model of Interpersonal Sensemaking (Wrzesniewski, Dutton, & Debebe, 2003). By recognising the interpersonal element of mass-service work, these models support the argument for the integration of personality into the service-role for employee well-being.

The Social Interaction Model (Côté, 2005) illustrates a process through which self-efficacy in the service context may be indicative of the experience of customer interaction for workers. According to the Social Interaction Model, workers who are perceived as authentic by their customers will experience more rewarding customer interaction that will increase their sense of self-efficacy.
Workers who appear inauthentic to customers will consequently endure more superficial interaction.

Côté (2005) suggests that in the case of interaction that appears authentic, the experience of the service encounter may be enhanced for both customers and workers. This assertion is supported with Tolich’s (1993) observations of supermarket workers. Describing the length of lines for popular service workers, in his qualitative study, Tolich presents evidence to suggest that customers respond to the approach that workers take to the service encounter. If the approach is pleasant but robotic, customer response is likely to be similar, however, when workers retain their personality while still achieving the demands of the service-role, customers respond positively; an otherwise sterile service encounter can be enriched. In an empirical study on the experience of service workers, Sloan (2014) found evidence to suggest that perceived influence over others and high self-efficacy were associated with reduced self-estrangement in surface actors. ‘Ability to influence’ indicates that these workers produce gestures that appear genuine to customers, self-efficacy suggests rewarding interactions with customers (The Social Interaction Model, Côté), and self-estrangement, the strain of emotional dissonance. Therefore, these findings support the argument that, the less-convincing appearance of gestures produced by surface acting, is an important factor in the strain and reduced self-efficacy associated with surface acting. Furthermore, as self-estrangement is a negative affective state and self-efficacy is an aspect of well-being, Sloan’s findings support arguments that strain is not inherent in emotional labour, and that interaction with customers can improve the working experience.

The Social Interaction Model (Côté, 2005) is supported with research which indicates that workers have different experiences of customer interaction as a result of their approach to the service encounter. For example, surface acting is associated with increased strain (Brotheridge & Grandey, 2002; Brotheridge & Lee, 2002, 2003; Goldberg & Grandey, 2007; Grandey, 2003; Totterdell & Holman, 2003; Yagil, 2012), while associations between deep acting and elevated self-efficacy (Brotheridge & Lee, 2003; Gross & John, 2003; Totterdell & Holman, 2003), support the proposition that positive customer interaction will be able to enhance workers’ affective state.
Evidence that customers can detect and respond positively to authenticity in service (Bujisic, Wu, Mattila, & Bilgihan, 2014), and research findings that suggest that surface acting is associated with gestures that appear less authentic than those generated by deep acting (Groth, Hennig-Thurau, & Walsh, 2009), support the argument that the less-convincing appearance of gestures produced through surface acting is a factor in opposing burnout outcomes. Additionally, Brotheridge and Lee (2002) found evidence to suggest that greater authenticity will enhance the experience of service for both workers and customers. In their study on employees for whom customer-interaction is a part of their role, a sense of authenticity was associated with rewarding interpersonal relationships ($r = .48, p < .01$). Furthermore, although self-efficacy was not measured, associated with Côté’s (2005) theory of rewarding interaction, the related concept of personal accomplishment was significantly related to authenticity, and to rewarding relationships with others. These findings indicate the potential for increased authenticity in the mass-service context to improve both the experience of work, and the customer-experience.

Further than indicate authenticity, promote self-efficacy, and reduce strain, rewarding interaction with customers may support work engagement by provoking a sense of meaning in mass-service workers. For the purposes of the present study, theory drawn from the Model of Interpersonal Sensemaking (Wrzesniewski, Dutton, & Debebe, 2003) extends on the Social Interaction Model (Côté, 2005), to suggest that rewarding interaction communicates that their work is valued and acknowledges their worth as an individual. As discussed in more detail in hypothesis three (authenticity and work engagement), referring to Kahn’s (1990) theory of personal engagement, meaning may encourage workers to integrate their personality into the work-role; considering work as meaningful may inspire workers to become absorbed in their task (absorption), experience a sense of dedication towards it (dedication), and provoke a desire to invest energy and effort into their work (vigour). Therefore, by inspiring meaning, rewarding interaction (represented in the present research by authenticity and self-efficacy), may promote work engagement.

In summary, despite potential benefits for multiple stakeholders, according to concern for impression management and a model of job-design derived from
principles of scientific management, in mass-service, authenticity is not usually promoted and the typical sources of work engagement (for example, task significance) are not often available. However, providing that they achieve expectations for the service-role, the extent to which mass-service workers involve their personality in the service interaction (authenticity, deep, or surface act) is at their discretion. A body of findings from the emotional labour and burnout literatures indicate that greater authenticity in the service interaction, may both directly, and through enhanced interaction with customers, be positively related to work engagement. Therefore, in the present study I sought to investigate the extent to which feeling authentic while working in the mass-service context is related to experiencing work engagement.

Research Aims

Hypotheses in the present study concern a positive and interdependent relationship between feeling true to the authentic self while at work, and experiencing work engagement. I expect that findings will contribute to the following five areas of research.

Findings will contribute to a body of research which demonstrates that authenticity, and related concepts such as job autonomy and a climate of authenticity are associated with work engagement (Grandey, Fisk, & Steiner, 2005; Grandey, Foo, Groth, & Goodwin, 2012; Johnson & Spector, 2007; Taipale, Selander, Anttila, & Nätti, 2011; van den Bosch & Taris, 2014a; van den Bosch & Taris, 2014b; Yagil, 2012). As working conditions in mass-service may obstruct work engagement, I examine the extent to which an authentic approach to service may increase work engagement without modifying job-design.

I expect that results will clarify emotional labour research in which there are two contending arguments, that deep acting is profound self-deception (Hochschild, 1983), or that deep acting aligns feelings with behaviour and is therefore the more authentic approach to emotional labour (Grandey, 2003).

Findings will contribute evidence to Côté’s (2005) theoretical Social Interaction Model, and the Model of Interpersonal Sensemaking (Wrzesniewski, Dutton, & Debebe, 2003), which predict a positive relationship between authenticity and self-efficacy within the interactive service context.
Findings may inform managerial approach to the regulation of customer service workers. I expect that this study will provide empirical evidence that demonstrates the role of authenticity in the service interaction.

Lastly, as this investigation refers to enduring debates over the extent of agency and alienation in the labour process, I expect that findings will also be of interest to sociological and labour studies perspectives.

**Theoretical Model**

This research examines the relationship between authenticity and work engagement. In particular, investigated relationships are between acting (deep and surface) and authenticity, and between degrees of authenticity (including acting) and work engagement. Finally, the moderating influences of authenticity and self-efficacy are also examined.
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*Figure 1.* Predicted relationships between variables. This figure diagrammatically presents the relationships predicted in hypotheses one to nine.

**Authenticity, Acting, and Work Engagement**

**Authenticity, deep acting and surface acting.** As previously discussed, although research in emotional labour focusses on emotional dissonance, few studies have directly measured authenticity and there is some contention as to the level of authenticity involved in deep and surface acting (Grandey, 2003; Hochschild, 1983). Therefore, in addition to the association between authenticity and work engagement, I sought to investigate which form of acting better enables
employees to retain a sense of authenticity. In a study on emotional labour and burnout, Brotheridge and Lee (2002) found evidence of a positive relationship between deep acting and authenticity ($r = .13, p < .05$), and a negative relationship between surface acting and authenticity ($r = -.40, p < .01$). These findings support the hypotheses of the present research, however, owing to a lack of research attention to the role of authenticity, I have primarily drawn from related findings to support my predictions. Drawing from the body of findings in the burnout literature, which suggests that deep acting is absent from the strain of emotional dissonance, I predict that deep acting will be positively, and surface acting negatively related to authenticity.

The Social Interaction Model (Côté, 2005) extends on the emotional dissonance hypothesis. Côté proposes that surface acting is related to burnout for the reason that it causes customer interaction that feels superficial, which workers experience as draining. According to the Social Interaction Model, the positive associations between surface acting, emotional exhaustion, and cynicism discussed above, indicate that workers who use surface acting may experience service as a series monotonous interactions. The absence of associations between deep acting, cynicism and depersonalisation (Brotheridge & Grandey, 2002; Brotheridge & Lee, 2002, 2003; Goldberg & Grandey, 2007; Grandey, 2003; Totterdell & Holman, 2003; Yagil, 2012), and a relationship with enhanced self-efficacy (Brotheridge & Lee, 2003; Gross & John, 2003; Totterdell & Holman, 2003), indicates that with expression that appears more authentic, customers respond more positively, and an otherwise sterile service encounter can be enriched. The Social Interaction Model highlights the positive relationship between deep acting and self-efficacy, and suggests that further than reduce the emotional exhaustion and cynicism associated with monotonous service encounters, owing to a more authentic approach, customer interaction will become rewarding to workers. Considering the above arguments, the association between surface acting and burnout may be the result of an internal process of emotional dissonance, or as a result of the nature of customer interaction, or as a combination of these experiences. However, it is the authenticity of service workers that underlies both of these theories. In contrast to Hochschild’s (1983) original assertion, these theories support the prediction that deep acting will be positively related to worker experience of authenticity, and that surface acting will be negatively related.
A body of related empirical findings further supports the prediction that deep acting will be more authentic than surface acting. Research indicates that emotional displays produced through deep acting appear more authentic to customers and observers than those produced through surface acting (Grandey, 2003; Grandey, Fisk, Mattila, Jansen, & Sideman, 2005; Groth, Hennig-Thurau, & Walsh, 2009; Hennig-Thurau, Groth, Paul, & Gremler, 2006). These findings suggest that surface actors experience greater inauthenticity than do deep actors, and for this reason, their gestures appear less authentic. However, these findings may not reflect a discrepancy in the affective experience between deep and surface actors, in contrast, these results could indicate that surface acting is simply a less-effective technique that produces less-convincing displays. In addition to the above findings, research demonstrates that deep acting is related to role identification (Brotheridge & Lee, 2002, 2003) while surface acting is related to feelings of self-estrangement (Sloan, 2014), to employees who perceive an obligation to hide their emotions in their job (Brotheridge & Lee, 2002, 2003), and is negatively related to role identification (Brotheridge & Lee, 2002, 2003). According to this body of related findings, the direct associations between deep acting, surface acting, and authenticity, identified by Brotheridge & Lee (2002), and the theory described in the Social Interaction Model (Côté, 2005), I hypothesise that authenticity will be positively related to deep acting, and surface acting will be negatively related.

**H1: Authenticity will be positively related to deep acting**

**H2: Authenticity will be negatively related to surface acting**

**Authenticity and work engagement.** Recent research demonstrates a moderate positive association between authenticity and work engagement ($r = .43$, $p < .01$; $r = .39$, $p < .01$, van den Bosch & Taris, 2014a & 2014b, respectively; $r = .37$, $p < .01$, Yagil & Medler-Liraz, 2013). However, owing to a particularly strong focus on impression management and considering the interactive context, more research is required to examine the generalizability of these findings to the mass-service industries. In the present research, the prediction that authenticity will be positively associated with work engagement is fundamentally supported by two theories. The first, that authenticity and work engagement will be associated through an internal process of alignment and meaning. The second, that as an interactive context, the approach that workers take to the service encounter will
affect customer-response to their service, and this feedback will influence workers’ affective experience, including their state of work engagement. In the following paragraphs I present evidence to support a personal process of authenticity and work engagement and an interactive process.

Kahn’s (1990) theory of personal engagement provides insight into the process through which authenticity may be able to contribute to the recent concept of work engagement (as operationally defined by Schaufeli, Salanova, González-Romá, & Bakker, 2002). As discussed previously, personal engagement refers to integrating the self with the demands of the role (Kahn, p. 694). Kahn suggested that workers would be inspired to integrate their self, and make their personal resources available for use in the workplace when their personal values were aligned with the demands of the work-role, and when role-behaviours are supported by personal values, they will consider their work to be meaningful. Therefore, drawing from Kahn’s theory to propose a relationship between authenticity and work engagement, I suggest that authenticity in the workplace will indicate alignment between personal values and expectations for the role (for example, a personal commitment to treat others with respect, and expectations for the service-role to be friendly, polite, and deferring), that will encourage a sense of meaningfulness, which will promote the engagement of cognitive (absorption), physical (vigour), and emotional (dedication) resources.

Positive associations between alignment, authenticity, meaningfulness, work engagement and related outcomes, provides some evidence to support this process. Supporting the theory that authenticity at work reflects alignment of role demands and personal values, research that shows a positive association between authenticity and job satisfaction (van den Bosch & Taris, 2014a, 2014b) indicates that the behaviour of authentic workers is aligned with their personal values, while a positive association with job performance (van den Bosch & Taris, 2014a, 2014b) suggests that their behaviour is also aligned with role requirements. Kahn’s proposal that alignment will promote the evaluation of work as meaningful is supported with evidence of a strong correlation between work-role fit and experienced meaningfulness ($r = .66, p < .05$, May, Gilson & Harter, 2004). Furthermore, this concept is supported with Chalofsky’s (2003) construct of psychological meaningfulness, which is composed of alignment between an
individual’s values, competencies, and sense of purpose, with those required by the occupation.

Finally, given the above evidence that authenticity indicates a meaningful experience of work, empirical research that shows strong associations between a sense of meaning and work engagement \((r = .64, p < .01, \text{Geldenhuys, Laba, \\& Venter, 2014; } r = .63, p < .05, \text{May, Gilson \\& Harter, 2004})\), further supports the prediction that authenticity will be positively related to work engagement. Kahn’s argument that the alignment of personal values with work requirements will promote work engagement, is further supported with value-theories of intrinsic motivation and achievement (Wigfield \\& Eccles, 2000). Research demonstrates that, when an individual’s goal is supported with their personal values, they will be more persistent and will expend more effort to achieve that goal (Wigfield \\& Eccles, 2000). As willingness to engage discretionary effort implies vigour (Chughtai \\& Buckley, 2008), this research also supports the argument that alignment, and therefore authenticity, will be related to work engagement.

Drawing from research which indicates that emotional dissonance is an important factor in the strain associated with emotional labour (Brotheridge \\& Grandey, 2002; Brotheridge \\& Lee, 2002, 2003; Goldberg \\& Grandey, 2007; Grandey, 2003; Totterdell \\& Holman, 2003), I find evidence to suggest that in the mass-service context, authenticity will be positively related to work engagement. Although evidence demonstrates that emotional exhaustion and vigour, and cynicism and dedication, do not represent singular bipolar dimensions (Chirkowska-Smolak, 2012; Schaufeli, Taris, \\& van Rhenen, 2008), considering positive associations between surface acting and emotional exhaustion, and surface acting and cynicism (Bujisic, Wu, Mattila, \\& Bilgihan, 2014; Grandey, 2003; Totterdell \\& Holman, 2003), and the argument presented previously that surface acting will be negatively related to authenticity, with increased authenticity I expect increased dedication and vigour that will manifest as higher work engagement.

As discussed previously, as well as research findings in the burnout literature, in the present investigation I draw from research on job autonomy to support my predictions. Evidence from both suggests that in the emotional labour context, authenticity may be a regulating factor in burnout and work engagement outcomes. Relevant to the mass-service context, in which the strain of emotional
dissonance may be a particularly influential factor in reduced work engagement, greater job autonomy is associated with reduced strain, including in the case of surface acting (Goldberg & Grandey, 2007; Grandey, Fisk, & Steiner, 2005; Grandey, Foo, Groth, & Goodwin, 2012). This builds on evidence from the burnout literature, in which the absence of a relationship between deep acting and burnout (Brotheridge & Grandey, 2002; Brotheridge & Lee, 2002, 2003; Goldberg & Grandey, 2007; Grandey, 2003; Totterdell & Holman, 2003; Yagil, 2012) indicates that the strain associated with emotional labour is not inherent to the context, and may be eradicated or greatly reduced when feelings of authenticity replace those of emotional dissonance. Of particular interest, given the focus of the present investigation to enhanced well-being, is evidence of a positive relationship between job autonomy and work engagement (Bakker & Demerouti, 2008; van den Bosch & Taris, 2014a, 2014b; Xanthopoulou, Bakker, Demerouti, & Schaufeli, 2007). In addition to reduced strain, positive associations between job autonomy and work engagement support the argument that feelings of authenticity will be associated with work engagement.

Referring to the Social Interaction Model (Côté, 2005), I extend on a personal association between authenticity and work engagement to consider the impact of customer interaction. As outlined previously, while the Social Interaction Model is a theoretical model, it is supported with a body or related empirical findings. Considering authenticity and work engagement within the framework of the Social Interaction Model, I predict that high authenticity will be evidence of rewarding customer interaction, that will enhance the experience of mass-service work, to contribute to a positive relationship with work engagement. Wrzesniewski, Dutton, and Debebe’s (2000) Model of Interpersonal Sensemaking supports the broadening of the Social Interaction Model to consider the effect of interpersonal feedback on work engagement. Related to the internal process of authenticity and work engagement described above, which considers Kahn’s (1990) theory of alignment, personal meaning, and engagement, the Model of Interpersonal Sensemaking acknowledges the impact that interaction with others has on the extent to which workers derive meaning from their work.

The Model of Interpersonal Sensemaking (Wrzesniewski, Dutton, & Debebe, 2000) does not consider experiences of authenticity, emotional dissonance,
or the appearance of authenticity to others. However, applied to the service context and combined with the Social Interaction Model (Côté, 2005), this model suggests that, as workers are more likely to gain positive feedback from customers when they feel authentic and involve their personality in the service-role, workers will also be more likely to derive meaning from, and be enriched by the service interaction. As discussed previously, a body of empirical research supports the Social Interaction Model. This research that demonstrates relationships with self-efficacy, is also evidence to suggest that workers’ sense of worth towards themselves, and their job, will be related to customer-response and their approach to the service encounter. Therefore, these associations additionally lend support to the Model of Interpersonal Sensemaking. Considering the predictions made earlier regarding a personal relationship between authenticity, meaning, and work engagement, drawing from Kahn (1990) and Chalofsky (2003), I expect that interaction that encourages workers to evaluate their tasks and their personal contribution at work as meaningful, will promote alignment between personal values and role requirements. Referring to Kahn’s theory and value-theories of motivation and achievement (Wigfield & Eccles, 2000), I predict that greater authenticity in social interaction will foster meaning, and the alignment of personal values to expectations for the work-role, which will support work engagement.

Considering that authenticity may contribute to a more meaningful and less monotonous service encounter, authenticity may enhance the working environment by increasing task significance and a feeling of greater task variety. As mentioned previously, aspects of job-design that are related to work engagement (Saks, 2006) are typically lacking from the mass-service working environment. Therefore, without modifying job-design, authenticity in the service encounter may improve the experience of service work to contribute to a positive association with work engagement.

Finally, I expect that work engagement may also contribute to authenticity in a reciprocal relationship. As previously discussed, I consider that common expectations for the service-role would refer to a person who has a positive, friendly, energised and helpful approach to service. As a positive affective state, I expect that work engagement will facilitate alignment between workers’ authentic emotions and those that they are expected to portray in the service-role. For
example, I expect that less acting, and therefore less effort, would be required to be proactively helpful to customers when dedication and vigour are high. Additionally, as a positive state related to vigour, I expect a positive, friendly, and energetic approach to the service encounter. These predictions are supported with research that shows a positive relationship between work engagement and in-role performance (van den Bosch and Taris, 2014a, 2014b). I expect that mass-service workers with high work engagement will be able to achieve expectations for the service-role with less effort and will therefore be able to retain a higher degree of authenticity than their less-engaged counterparts.

In summary, additional to a small body of direct findings, related research in the burnout and job autonomy literatures suggests that authenticity will be positively related to work engagement. Kahn’s (1990) theory of personal engagement and alignment illustrates how an authentic approach to service may be related to workers who engage their cognitive, emotional, and physical resources in the service-role. Interactive models indicate a way in which relations with customers may be involved in an interpersonal relationship with work engagement. Lastly, as high work engagement may promote greater authenticity, I expect a dynamic positive relationship between authenticity and work engagement. I therefore hypothesise that greater authenticity will be related to increased work engagement.

**H3: Authenticity will be positively related to work engagement**

**Deep acting and work engagement.** Studies investigating a direct relationship between deep acting and work engagement are limited. A direct positive relationship \( r = .23, p < .01 \), Yagil, 2012) supports the prediction that deep acting will be positively related to work engagement, however, further research is necessary to demonstrate the generalizability of this association to the mass-service context.

In the absence of a body of direct research from which to draw from, a combination of related findings supports the prediction of a positive relationship between deep acting and work engagement. For example, Totterdell and Holman (2003) found that deep acting was related to performance, enthusiasm, and proactiveness helping customers. These findings are congruent with what could be expected from vigorous, dedicated, and absorbed service employees. Additionally,
given that self-efficacy is positively associated with work engagement ($r = .32, p < .01$ and $r = .40, p < .01$ (repeated-measures design), Xanthopoulou, Bakker, & Fischbach, 2013), evidence of a positive association between deep acting and self-efficacy (Brotheridge & Lee, 2003; Gross & John, 2003; Totterdell & Holman, 2003) indicates that further than protect against the strain associated with surface acting, deep acting will be positively associated with work engagement.

Considering the aforementioned argument that alignment between personal values and those expected of the service persona will support feelings of authenticity within the work-role, I expect that by facilitating alignment, deep acting will support work engagement. As previously mentioned, deep acting involves convincing oneself that behaviour that will best serve the interests of the organisation is a course of action that they personally endorse, for this reason, in the context of emotional labour it also referred to as acting in ‘good faith’ (Rafaeli & Sutton, 1987). For example, in her study on the emotional labour of flight attendants, Hochschild (1983) reported that, in order to generate feelings of compassion in place of irritation, attendants would imagine demanding passengers as scared children. Furthermore, research which demonstrates that deep acting is not associated with the strain of emotional labour (Brotheridge & Grandey, 2002; Brotheridge & Lee, 2002, 2003; Goldberg & Grandey, 2007; Grandey, 2003; Totterdell & Holman, 2003) indicates that emotional dissonance is not produced or is substantially reduced.

As emotional dissonance represents separation of, and conflict between, the personality and the work-role, deep acting may contribute to work engagement by facilitating absorption into the service-role. Research findings which demonstrate that the emotional displays of deep actors appear more authentic (Grandey, 2003; Grandey, Fisk, Mattila, Jansen, & Sideman, 2005; Groth, Hennig-Thurau, & Walsh, 2009; Hennig-Thurau, Groth, Paul, & Gremler, 2006), and that deep acting is related to greater role identification (Brotheridge & Lee, 2002, 2003) and in-role performance than surface acting (Totterdell & Holman, 2003) indicate that deep acting is a technique that allows for the incorporation of personality with the service-role. These associations are evidence to support Kahn’s (1990) concept of merging the personality with the work-role, that authenticity may not be exclusive, rather complementary to absorption in the work-role.
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Extending from emotional dissonance and alignment to consider social interaction, I propose that the authentic appearance of gestures produced by deep acting will further facilitate work engagement in mass-service workers. Considering the high level of standardisation common to mass-service industries, and the theory of rewarding interaction outlined in the Social Interaction Model (Côté, 2005), I expect that customers would respond most positively when they perceive that both, the service was adequate (for example, the service worker was helpful and friendly), and that interaction was genuine. Drawing from the following research, I expect that deep acting will facilitate the obtainment of both of these aspects of service. Research indicates that customers will be likely to perceive the gestures of deep actors as genuine (Grandey, 2003; Grandey, Fisk, Mattila, Jansen, & Sideman, 2005; Groth, Hennig-Thurau, & Walsh, 2009; Hennig-Thurau, Groth, Paul, & Gremler, 2006), and given the aforementioned ‘good faith’ technique involved in deep acting (Rafaeli & Sutton, 1987), their behaviour is likely to be aligned with role expectations. For this reason, I expect that customers will respond positively to mass-service workers who use deep acting, and drawing from the Social Interaction Model, I expect that repeated positive interactions will enhance the working experience for deep actors.

As previously mentioned, findings in the burnout literature, which show the absence of associations between deep acting, emotional exhaustion and cynicism, and a positive relationship with self-efficacy, support the argument that the working experience of deep actors is less draining and more rewarding than that of surface actors. Considering that repeated positive interaction may motivate workers to derive meaning from the service interaction (Wrzesniewski, Dutton, & Debebe, 2000), and align their personal values with those expected in the service-role (Chalofsky 2003; Kahn, 1990), to promote work engagement (Kahn, 1990; Wigfield & Eccles, 2000), I predict that deep acting will be positively associated with work engagement.

In summary, research which finds that deep acting is able to reduce or eliminate emotional exhaustion and cynicism, indicates that it may be positively associated with work engagement components, vigour and dedication. Additionally, the absence of an association with emotional dissonance provides empirical evidence, and Kahn’s (1990) description of integrating the self with the
role, a theoretical mechanism, to illustrate how alignment facilitated by deep acting may promote absorption. Drawing from the interactive models, as deep acting may simultaneously facilitate interaction that appears authentic, and behaviour that achieves customer expectations for the service-role, I expect that it will prompt positive customer-feedback, which through processes of alignment and meaning, will promote work engagement. Considering the above evidence, I hypothesise that deep acting will be positively associated with work engagement.

H4: Deep acting will be positively related to work engagement

Surface acting and work engagement. Evidence of a positive relationship between surface acting and burnout (Brotheridge & Lee, 2002, 2003), and of a negative association between burnout and work engagement (Chirkowska-Smolak, 2012), suggests that surface acting will be negatively related to work engagement. Specifically, positive associations with cynicism and emotional exhaustion (Brotheridge & Lee, 2002, 2003) indicate negative relationships to vigour and dedication (Chirkowska-Smolak, 2012). Furthermore, reduced role identification (Brotheridge & Lee, 2002, 2003) and appearance of authenticity to others (Groth, Hennig-Thurau, & Walsh, 2009), suggests that surface actors refrain from integrating their personality into the role and will experience less absorption.

Supporting the above empirical evidence, the following offers theoretical explanation for a negative relationship between surface acting and work engagement. In contrast to deep acting, which as the ‘good faith’ approach, may function to align behaviour expected of the role with personal values, surface acting simply refers to presenting an emotion that is not internally experienced. Therefore, I expect that the conduct of surface actors will often lack the support of, and at times will be in conflict with, their personal values. According to Kahn’s (1990) theory of personal engagement and value theories of motivation and achievement (Wigfield & Eccles, 2000), I expect that, as surface acting will obstruct alignment with personal values, that it will also hinder workers from deriving meaning from their work, which will inhibit absorption into the service-role, and the desire to feel dedicated towards, or invest discretionary effort in work-related objectives.

In addition to an internal process described above, I consider that, owing to the nature of customer-interaction generated through surface acting, that it will be negatively related to work engagement. Related to Ritzer’s (2004) concept of a
‘non-person’, further than related to feeling less authentic (Brotheridge & Lee, 2002), surface acting is also related to service that appears less affective (Grandey, 2003). Drawing from the Social Interaction Model (Côté, 2005), I expect that the less-authentic appearance of surface acting (Grandey, 2003; Grandey, Fisk, Mattila, Jansen, & Sideman, 2005; Groth, Hennig-Thurau, & Walsh, 2009; Hennig-Thurau, Groth, Paul, & Gremler, 2006; Yagil & Medler-Liraz, 2013) will often produce service encounters that feel superficial. Without the infusion of personality, interaction may feel monotonous, to cause the associations with cynicism and depersonalisation, which as previously discussed, will be negatively related to work engagement.

Adding the Model of Interpersonal Sensemaking (Wrzesniewski, Dutton, &Debebe, 2000) to the Social Interaction Model (Côté, 2005), I consider that surface actors will be less likely to experience rewarding customer-interaction and therefore, to experience their contribution as valued and their tasks as meaningful. I consider that surface actors will be less likely to and will therefore be less motivated to find meaning in their work. This may contribute to the low self-efficacy associated with surface actors (Brotheridge & Lee, 2003; Gross & John, 2003; Totterdell & Holman, 2003), which, owing to a positive association with work engagement, may itself negatively influence work engagement (Xanthopoulou, Bakker, & Fischbach, 2013). Referring to the personal theory of alignment, meaning and work engagement discussed previously, I consider that surface acting will obstruct work engagement by inhibiting workers from experiencing their work as meaningful, which will discourage alignment of personal values with expectations for the service-role, as well as lower self-efficacy, which will be directly associated with reduced work engagement.

Additional to a body of empirical findings, both the personal and interpersonal theories of authenticity and work engagement illustrate a process through which surface acting may be negatively associated with work engagement.

**H5: Surface acting will be negatively related to work engagement**

**Moderating Effects of Authenticity and Self-Efficacy**

In the present research I sought to examine the moderating influences of authenticity and self-efficacy on associations with work engagement. These predictions are largely supported by a body of previous research that indicates
positive relationships between authenticity, self-efficacy, and work engagement. As previously mentioned, owing to a lack of research on authenticity, I have drawn from related research in the burnout and job autonomy literatures to support predictions regarding authenticity and work engagement. Empirical findings suggest that job autonomy and self-efficacy can reduce the strain associated with emotional labour (Job Autonomy: Goldberg & Grandey, 2007; Grandey, Fisk, & Steiner, 2005; Johnson & Spector, 2007; Self-Efficacy: Sloan, 2014) and are each positively related to work engagement (job autonomy, $r = .26$ to $ .38$, $p < .001$, Taipale, Selander, Anttila, & Nättili, 2011; self-efficacy, $r = .32$ to $ .40$, $p < .01$, Xanthopoulou, Bakker, & Fischbach, 2013).

Considering a direct relationship between authenticity and work engagement, and as the result of customer response, I expect that authenticity and self-efficacy will be involved in associations with work engagement. Both the Social Interaction Model (Côté, 2005) and The Model of Interpersonal Sensemaking (Wrzesniewski, Dutton, & Debebe, 2000) support the argument that high self-efficacy will be influenced by positive customer-response prompted by a worker’s ability to meet expectations for the role while retaining a sense of authenticity and individual expression. Considering extensive standardisation and routinisation common to the mass-service industries, I expect that customers in the mass-service environment will respond to performance that is consistent with expectations for the service-role, and workers appear genuine. Therefore, high self-efficacy may suggest that, further than being authentic, that these workers are balancing the demands of the role while retaining a sense of authenticity. As this suggests integration of the self into the role, considering Kahn’s (1990) theory of alignment and absorption, I expect that increased self-efficacy will indicate work engagement. Considering self-efficacy to be the result of customer-acknowledgement of a worker’s individual value, The Model of Interpersonal Sensemaking (Wrzesniewski, Dutton, & Debebe, 2000) further suggests the involvement of self-efficacy in a relationship between authenticity and work engagement.

Referring to the argument for a direct relationship between authenticity and work engagement, I consider that a balance of role and personality will be achieved when workers align their personal values with expectations for the service-role.
According to Kahn’s (1990) theory of meaning, absorption, and dedication, Chalofsky’s (2003) concept of psychological meaningfulness, I expect that alignment will inspire meaning, which through processes of personal engagement (Kahn, 1990) and intrinsic motivation (Wigfield & Eccles, 2000), will provoke feelings of absorption, dedication, and vigour. Considering the aforementioned concepts, I expect that high self-efficacy will indicate a strong relationship between authenticity and work engagement.

In the following hypotheses I examine how combinations of authenticity and self-efficacy may affect relationships with work engagement.

**Deep acting, authenticity, and work engagement.** Referring to Kahn’s (1990) theory of personal engagement, which considered engagement as a continuous interaction between the authentic self and the environment, deep acting may be associated with varying degrees of authenticity. Workers who use deep acting may either continue to express their personality, alternatively, although not in conflict with the demands of their work-role, these workers may set personal expression aside in order to achieve expectations for the service-role. I consider that deep acting combined with high authenticity will indicate alignment between personal values and the demands of the service-role, and that the worker is achieving the service-role while retaining their sense of self. In the following paragraphs I outline how high authenticity may directly, as well as by stimulating rewarding interaction with customers, strengthen a positive relationship between deep acting and work engagement.

More than the lack of emotional dissonance that can be expected from deep acting, I consider that a combination of deep acting and high authenticity indicates that personal values support role-behaviours demanded in the service-role. According to research from the burnout literature, I expect that increased alignment between the self and the work-role will indicate reduced emotional dissonance. Specifically, referring to positive associations between surface acting, emotional exhaustion and cynicism, and a negative relationship between burnout and work engagement, I expect that the absence of dissonance and influence of a sense of authenticity, will increase vigour and dedication. Additionally, I expect that reduced dissonance will facilitate absorption into the service-role.
Referring to the proposition discussed previously, that alignment will generate meaning, which will facilitate work engagement. According to Kahn’s (1990) assertion that alignment will facilitate meaningfulness, and Chalofsky’s (2003) concept of psychological meaningfulness, I expect that with the support of personal values, the service task will become more meaningful. Furthermore, according to theories of personal engagement (Kahn, 1990) and value theories of motivation and achievement (Wigfield & Eccles, 2000), I expect the evaluation of work as meaningful, will provoke experiences of absorption, dedication and vigour, to promote overall work engagement.

Considering the interactive element of the mass-service context, I expect that alignment between personal values and role expectations will appear to customers as a pleasing balance between role performance and individual personality. Referring to the Social Interaction Model (Côté, 2005), I expect that customer-response to workers who engage in deep acting while retaining a sense of authenticity, will generally be positive. According to the Model of Interpersonal Sensemaking (Wrzesniewski, Dutton, & Debebe, 2000), I expect that rewarding feedback from customers will provoke a sense of meaning in service workers. Referring to the aforementioned process of meaning as a proxy between authenticity and work engagement, I expect that a sense of meaning will promote work engagement.

In summary, I predict that the relationship between deep acting and work engagement will depend on the extent to which authenticity is also experienced. While deep acting may indicate the absence of emotional dissonance, authenticity will increase the extent to which role-behaviour is supported with personal values. I expect that a combination of high deep acting and high authenticity will further reduce emotional dissonance, to facilitate absorption, vigour, and dedication. Additionally, indicating a balance of the service persona and authenticity to customers, a combination of high deep acting and authenticity, may provoke rewarding feedback from customers, which through the proxy of inspiring meaning, may promote work engagement. Given the above personal and interpersonal means through which high authenticity could strengthen the relationship between deep acting and work engagement in the mass-service context, I hypothesise that the
relationship between deep acting and work engagement will be stronger when authenticity is also high.

**H6: Authenticity will moderate the relationship between deep acting and work engagement, such that when deep acting and authenticity are both high, the relationship between deep acting and work engagement will be stronger.**

**Authenticity, self-efficacy, and work engagement.** Although the Social Interaction Model (Côté, 2005) does not consider a high degree of authenticity without also fulfilling the service-role, in the following argument I refer to the fundamental principle in this model, that the affective state of workers will influence, and be influenced by, customer-feedback in the service interaction. Particularly in the heavily standardised mass-service context, in which a majority of customers have consistent and well-defined expectations for the service persona, situations in which authenticity alone is high, workers may not achieve expected standards for the service-role. Accustomed to a high degree of standardisation, in situations in which the role is not performed as a customer expects, customers may consider the service interaction to be inadequate, or become uncomfortable. However, considering the theory of rewarding feedback (Social Interaction Model) when self-efficacy is also high, I expect that the approach to customer interaction satisfies the expectations of customers. Therefore, I consider that a combination of high authenticity and self-efficacy, will indicate a balance of authenticity with behaviour that achieves the demands of the service-role, and integration of the self that will be related to work engagement.

Without considering the impact of customer-feedback, referring to the theory of alignment and meaning, I predict that behaviour that is aligned with personal values will promote work engagement through reduced emotional dissonance, and by inspiring a sense of meaning, which will facilitate the experience of absorption, vigour, and dedication. As previously discussed, drawing from research that illustrates a reduction in the strain of emotional labour when job autonomy is high (Goldberg & Grandey, 2007; Grandey, Fisk, & Steiner, 2005; Grandey, Foo, Groth, & Goodwin, 2012; Wharton, 1993), I expect that when behaviour expected of the work-role is supported with personal values, that emotional dissonance will be reduced. Owing to a negative relationship between work engagement and burnout (Chirkowska-Smolak, 2012; Schaufeli, Taris, & van
Rhenen, 2008), and considering the positive relationships between emotional labour, emotional exhaustion and cynicism (Brotheridge & Grandey, 2002; Brotheridge & Lee, 2002, 2003; Goldberg & Grandey, 2007; Grandey, 2003; Totterdell & Holman, 2003), I expect increased vigour and dedication when emotional dissonance is reduced. Additionally, considering Kahn’s (1990) theory of personal engagement, I expect increased absorption into the work-role when behaviour is aligned with personal values. Lastly, referring to the hypothesis that alignment between role behaviour and personal values will encourage a sense of meaning (Chalofsky 2003; Kahn, 1990), which will facilitate work engagement (Kahn, 1990; Wigfield & Eccles, 2000), I consider that through this process, high self-efficacy will further indicate a relationship between authenticity and work engagement that is stronger overall.

Referring to the impact of customer interaction and the Social Interaction Model (Côté, 2005), I expect that high authenticity and self-efficacy will indicate a balance of role-performance and individual expression that, for the reason that it is pleasing to customers, will generate positive customer-feedback. As discussed previously, drawing from the Model of Interpersonal Sensemaking (Wrzesniewski, Dutton, & Debebe, 2000), I expect that, through mechanisms of a sense of meaning, rewarding customer-feedback will promote work engagement.

High self-efficacy may further be able to strengthen the relationship between authenticity and work engagement by providing workers with the confidence to express their personality in the working environment. In addition to being extensively regulated by management, the mass-service context is highly normatively controlled and expressing the personality in this environment may require a high degree of self-assurance. Therefore, self-efficacy in mass-service workers may indicate the confidence to express their personality. I consider that in situations in which workers experience both work engagement and high self-efficacy, that as a function of feeling dedicated to, energised by and absorbed in, as well as confident in the task, that they will be more likely to express their personality with customers, and will experience a greater sense of authenticity. Considering the above arguments, I hypothesise that there will be greater experience of work engagement and authenticity when self-efficacy is also high.
H7: Self-efficacy will moderate the relationship between authenticity and work engagement, such that when authenticity and self-efficacy are both high, the relationship between authenticity and work engagement will be stronger.

Deep acting, self-efficacy, and work engagement. Similar to the argument that authenticity will moderate the relationship between deep acting and work engagement, referring to the Social Interaction Model (Côté, 2005) and rewarding customer-feedback, I consider that high self-efficacy will indicate that in addition to achieving role demands, workers retain a sense of authenticity in their service interactions. As deep acting is a technique used to reduce conflict between personal values and expectations for the service-role, I consider that deep acting and high self-efficacy will indicate a balance of achieving role expectations and authenticity that by enhancing the working experience, both directly, and as the result of rewarding customer interaction, will promote work engagement.

In the case of deep acting and high self-efficacy, I expect that both the role is performed to a satisfactory standard, and that employees retain a sense of authenticity. As previously mentioned, drawing from research in the burnout literature, and a theoretical process of alignment, meaning, and work engagement, I expect that alignment of personal values with the demands of the service-role will promote work engagement. Considering the impact of customer-feedback, referring to the Social Interaction Model (Côté, 2005), I expect that mass-service workers who engage in deep acting and also have high self-efficacy, will obtain rewarding feedback from customers. Drawing from the Model of Interpersonal Sensemaking (Wrzesniewski, Dutton, & Debebe, 2000), as a result of rewarding interpersonal interaction, I expect that these workers will be prompted to find meaning in their work. Finally, according to theories of personal engagement (Kahn, 1990) and value-theories of motivation (Wigfield & Eccles, 2000), I expect that an enhanced sense of meaning will promote work engagement. Therefore, I hypothesise that there will be greater experience of work engagement when deep acting and self-efficacy are both high.

H8: Self-efficacy will moderate the relationship between deep acting and work engagement, such that when deep acting and self-efficacy are both high, the relationship between deep acting and work-engagement will be stronger.
Surface acting, self-efficacy, and work engagement. For the reasons outlined in hypothesis five (surface acting and work engagement), I expect that the internal experience of emotional dissonance will discourage the alignment of personal values with role behaviours, to fundamentally obstruct work engagement. Additionally, according to the Social Interaction Model (Côté, 2005), I expect that the less-convincing appearance of gestures produced through surface acting will reduce the extent to which workers receive rewarding feedback from customers (and accordingly, their feelings of self-efficacy), to hinder the experience of meaningfulness (Wrzesniewski, Dutton, & Debebe, 2000), and ultimately work engagement (Kahn, 1990; Wigfield & Eccles, 2000). Consistent with the Social Interaction Model, a body of previous research shows a negative association between surface acting and self-efficacy ($r = -0.18$, $p < .01$, Brotheridge & Lee, 2003; Gross & John, 2003; Totterdell & Holman, 2003), however, the Social Interaction Model and the Model of Interpersonal Sensemaking, supported with empirical evidence (Sloan, 2014), illustrates a process through which high self-efficacy may occur in surface actors. Considering that self-efficacy is positively related to work engagement (Xanthopoulou, Bakker, & Fischbach, 2013), and that self-efficacy in service workers may indicate improved experience of the service encounter (The Social Interaction Model), high self-efficacy in surface actors may be associated with increased work engagement.

The Social Interaction Model (Côté, 2005) is supported with evidence that gestures produced by deep acting appear more authentic than do those generated through surface acting (Grandey, 2003; Grandey, Fisk, Mattila, Jansen, & Sideman, 2005; Groth, Hennig-Thurau, & Walsh, 2009; Hennig-Thurau, Groth, Paul, & Gremler, 2006). However, drawing from research which demonstrates that customers have limited ability to detect deep from surface acting (Bujisic, Wu, Mattila, & Bilgihan, 2014; Grandey, Fisk, Mattila, Jansen, & Sideman, 2005; Groth, Hennig-Thurau, & Walsh, 2009), I suggest that surface actors may also be able to experience rewarding customer interaction. Owing to a worker’s acting skills, inauthentic gestures produced through surface acting may regularly appear sincere to customers. In support of this theory, Sloan (2014) found that perceived influence over others was associated with increased self-efficacy in surface actors. Given that the ability to influence others indicates that these workers regularly appear genuine
to customers, these findings support the Social Interaction Model, they also provide empirical evidence to support the occurrence of high self-efficacy in surface actors.

As referred to previously, emotional dissonance is the primary reason for the prediction of a negative association between surface acting and work engagement. In her study on surface actors, Sloan (2014) also found that high self-efficacy and perceived influence over others was associated with reduced feelings of self-estrangement. These findings indicate that high self-efficacy will be related to reduced emotional dissonance in surface actors. Important regarding the focus of the present research, as a negative affective state that corresponds to emotional dissonance, this research indicates that rewarding interaction with others may be able to reduce feelings of conflict between personal values and role-behaviour, therefore, rewarding interaction may be able to promote alignment between personal values and behaviour in surface actors. Referring to the Model of Interpersonal Sensemaking (Wrzesniewski, Dutton, & Debebe, 2000), given that surface actors may be able to obtain rewarding feedback from customers, they may also be provoked to find meaning in their work, which for the reasons discussed earlier, may facilitate alignment with personal values (Chalofsky 2003; Kahn, 1990), and promote work engagement (Kahn, 1990; Wigfield & Eccles, 2000).

**H9:** Self-efficacy will moderate the relationship between surface acting and work engagement such that when self-efficacy is low, surface-acting will have a negative relationship with work engagement, however when self-efficacy is high, there will be a positive relationship with work engagement.

In this chapter, I defined the mass-service population and, supported with the findings of previous literature, described the importance of authenticity and work engagement in this context. In the following chapter, I describe the methodological approach adopted to test the theoretical model. This is followed by a presentation of the research findings, interpretation of the results, and an examination of the contribution that these findings make to existing literature.
Summary of Hypotheses

H1: Authenticity will be positively related to deep acting

H2: Authenticity will be negatively related to surface acting

H3: Authenticity will be positively related to work engagement

H4: Deep acting will be positively related to work engagement

H5: Surface acting will be negatively related to work engagement

H6: Authenticity will moderate the relationship between deep acting and work engagement, such that when deep acting and authenticity are both high, the relationship between deep acting and work engagement will be stronger.

H7: Self-efficacy will moderate the relationship between authenticity and work engagement, such that when authenticity and self-efficacy are both high, the relationship between authenticity and work engagement will be stronger.

H8: Self-efficacy will moderate the relationship between deep acting and work engagement, such that when deep acting and self-efficacy are both high, the relationship between deep acting and work-engagement will be stronger.

H9: Self-efficacy will moderate the relationship between surface acting and work engagement such that when self-efficacy is low, surface-acting will have a negative relationship with work engagement, however when self-efficacy is high, there will be a positive relationship with work engagement.
CHAPTER II - METHOD

The present investigation received approval from the Research and Ethics Committee of the University of Waikato, School of Psychology. The design was cross-sectional and used a self-report survey (Appendix A) administered to employees in customer service-roles across four mass-service industries (petrol stations, fast-food, supermarkets, general retail).

Participants

One hundred and forty mass-service workers between the ages of 17 and 65 (M = 24.30, SD = 9.21) responded to the survey. The sample was 82% female, and the two major ethnic groups were New Zealand European (71%) and Maori (11%). The sample was limited to those who worked in petrol stations (6%), fast food outlets (13%), supermarkets (24%), and in general retail (58%), experience in the customer service-role ranged from one month to 12 years (M (months) = 66.54, SD = 77.56).

Procedure

Posters promoted the online version of the survey. As well as on noticeboards around the University of Waikato campus, in order to promote the study throughout mass-service industries, posters were displayed in staffrooms across the major brands of supermarkets, petrol stations, and fast food restaurants, and in shops with different specialities within general retail (for example, sporting goods, home-ware, clothing). An information sheet for managers (Appendix B) outlined the intent of the research, described the survey, assured the anonymity of respondents, and of their place of employment. To inform respondents, a similar document was included in the survey (Appendix C).

Most participants completed the survey online (89%), which was hosted on the survey site ‘Qualtrics’. To increase participation, an identical hardcopy version of the survey was distributed to workplaces that fit the criteria for mass-service, and to ensure anonymity, these respondents returned their surveys by mail. Individual participation was recognised with the chance to enter a lottery prize-draw for one of three vouchers to a local shopping centre. For ethical reasons, winning a voucher was not contingent on survey-completion. Participating organisations were given the opportunity to be notified of the conclusions.
Measures

The survey (Appendix A) measured the extent to which respondents felt that they were themselves at work (authenticity), their degree of acting (surface or deep), work engagement, and self-efficacy. To gather a demographic description of the sample and to facilitate control of potential confounding variables, the survey also collected data on respondents’ gender, age, ethnicity, their sector of employment (i.e. fast food, petrol station, supermarket, or general retail), and the duration of their experience in the customer-service role over their lifetime.

The survey was composed of 38 items and utilised one five-point and three seven-point Likert-type scales. In order to encourage valid responding and survey completion, where they were available, I used the short versions of measurement scales. Also to encourage valid responses, in the introduction of the survey (Appendix C), participants were advised that neither they nor their organisation could be identified by their responses. Given that the state of authenticity, self-efficacy, work engagement, and degree of acting were expected to fluctuate according to working conditions (Xanthopoulou, Bakker, & Fischbach, 2013), instructions advised participants to respond according to their most typical experience on a usual working day.

Authenticity at work. In place of the more common Goldman and Kernis (2006) trait measure of authenticity, in order to consider authenticity within the workplace context, I used the Individual Authenticity Measure at Work (IAM Work, van den Bosch and Taris, 2014a). The short version of the Individual Authenticity Measure at Work (IAM Work, van den Bosch & Taris, 2014a) consists of 12 items measuring three latent constructs: ‘self-alienation’ (feeling detached from the core self), ‘accepting external influence’ (agreeing with others without resistance), and ‘authentic living’ (making choices in alignment with underlying personal values). Respondents were asked to indicate the extent to which each statement reflected their most typical interactions on a seven-point rating scale (1: “does not describe me at all” – 7: “describes me very well”). Example items are “At work, I always stand by what I believe in” (authentic living), “I am strongly influenced in the workplace by the opinions of others” (accepting external influence), “At work, I feel out of touch with the ‘real me’” (self-alienation).
In the case of item 8, “At work, I feel alienated”, as the word ‘alienated’ is uncommon, I was concerned that participants may come to different conclusions about its meaning, or that it may be confused with ‘self-alienation’ in the sense that Hochschild (1983) used it, feeling disconnected from one’s own humanity. I determined that in this context ‘alienation’ referred to feeling disconnected from other people, and for a more consistent interpretation, I added ‘(isolation)’ in brackets next to this item.

Cronbach’s alphas for the components in this measure (authentic living, $\alpha = .78$; accepting external influence, $\alpha = .65$; self-alienation, $\alpha = .90$) were consistent with previous findings (authentic living, $\alpha = .81, .75$; accepting external influence, $\alpha = .67, .66$; self-alienation, $\alpha = .83, .84$, van den Bosch & Taris, 2014a & 2014b, respectively). Cronbach’s alpha above .70 indicates a reliable measure (Nunnally, 1994); ‘accepting external influence’ did not meet this criteria and the implications are discussed in the following chapter.

**Surface acting and deep acting.** The first section of Brotheridge and Lee’s (2003) Emotional Labour Scale (ELS) measures the job-related demands of emotional labour. As described previously, the mass-service model is regarded as highly standardised. For this reason, I expected that restricting the sample to mass-service, would substantially limit variability across working conditions, and I disregarded the first section In section two of this scale, six items on a five-point frequency scale (1: “never” to 5: “always”) reflect either expressing emotion that is not felt (surface acting), or making an effort to feel the emotion that needs to be expressed (deep acting). Three items measure the extent to which respondents surface act, and three measure deep acting. Example items are “Hide my true feelings about a situation” (surface acting), “Make an effort to actually feel the emotions that I need to display to others” (deep acting). Cronbach alphas from previous studies (surface acting, $\alpha = .85$; deep acting, $\alpha = .82$, Brotheridge & Lee, 2003) align with the estimates of this investigation (surface acting, $\alpha = .86$; deep acting, $\alpha = .82$).

**Work engagement.** Rich, Lepine, and Crawford (2010) developed a scale of engagement that is based on Kahn’s (1990) notion of expressing the self within the role. While this is consistent with the concept of authenticity and work engagement of interest in the present research, using the more popular Utrecht
Work Engagement Scale (UWES-9, Schaufeli, Bakker, & Salanova, 2006) enabled comparison of this research with others in the area of work engagement, and given its popularity, there is substantial evidence supporting the reliability of this scale across cultures (Schaufeli, Bakker, & Salanova, 2006).

The short version of the Utrecht Work Engagement Scale (UWES-9; Schaufeli, Bakker, & Salanova, 2006) measures work engagement as a second-order construct composed of vigour, dedication and absorption. Vigour refers to an employee who is energised in their work, dedication describes obtaining a sense of meaning from work, and absorption illustrates immersion in, and experiencing difficulty detaching from tasks. Each primary construct is measured with three items on a seven-point frequency scale that ranges from 1: “never” to 7: “always”. Example items are, “At my work, I feel bursting with energy” (vigour), “I am proud of the work that I do” (dedication), “I feel happy when I am working intensely” (absorption). Cronbach’s alpha, α = .94, aligns with previous findings (α = .91, Sonnentag, 2003), including in a study across 10 countries (alphas ranged from .85 to .92, Schaufeli, Bakker, & Salanova, 2006).

Self-efficacy. While measures exist that are specifically designed to measure self-efficacy, to aid comparison with emotional labour literature, which has traditionally focussed on burnout, I used the personal accomplishment scale within the Maslach Burnout Inventory – General Scale (MBI-GS, Schaufeli, Leiter, Maslach & Jackson, 1996). Although the previous version of the MBI, the Human Services Scale (MBI-HSS, Maslach & Jackson, 1996) was designed specifically for contact-roles, I judged that items in the MBI-HSS such as “I feel exhilarated after working closely with recipients”, were not relevant to the mass-service context.

Items in the MBI-GS are better suited to the mass-service context and are aligned to Bandura’s (1997) concept of self-efficacy, an example item is “I can effectively solve the problems that arise in my work”. In the short version of the MBI-GS six items on a seven-point Likert scale measure self-efficacy. In previous studies this measure has been used as a single variable and Cronbach’s alphas range from .68 to .83 (Schutte, Toppinen, Kalimo, & Schaufeli, 2000), however, Principal Components Analysis (PCA) in the present research revealed two components of three-items each. While the first component loaded onto items that pertained to a general sense of self-efficacy at work (for example, “In my opinion, I am good at
my job”), items in the second component were specific to the experience of accomplishment (for example, “I feel exhilarated when I accomplish something at work”). Following the results of PCA, I measured self-efficacy as the following two components: ‘self-efficacy’ ($\alpha = .86$), and ‘personal accomplishment’ ($\alpha = .83$).

**Analysis**

To evaluate the extent to which data supported the hypothesised model of relationships between authenticity and work engagement, I used Principle Components Analysis (PCA) with direct oblimin rotation. Internal reliability was assessed using Cronbach’s coefficient alpha. The results of Pearson’s product-moment correlation informed hypotheses one to five, and multiple regression, hypotheses six to nine. In addition, as positive correlations indicated that some groups within the demographic variables had significantly different relationships with authenticity and work engagement, in order to identify which groups, I used one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) with post-hoc pair-wise comparisons, and independent sample t-tests.

**Principle Components Analysis (PCA).** I performed exploratory factor analysis. As recommended by Tabachnick and Fidell (2007), to reduce items to a manageable set of variables that would account for the majority of variance, I employed PCA in place of Principal Analysis Factoring. As I assumed correlation between components, I performed oblique rotation.

**Criteria for factorability.** Recommendations of Floyd and Widaman (1995) supported the use of the interval-level scales of measurement, used in this research, for data analysis. Referring to criteria outlined by Tabachnick and Fidell (2007), I removed three cases with missing values, and assessed the appropriateness of the remaining sample size; clusters of items correlating above .50 in the correlations matrix, a Kaiser Meyer Olkin (KMO) statistic above .60, and significance at the .05 level in Bartlett’s Test of Sphericity, indicated sampling adequacy.

For each variable, I regarded a non-significant Kolmogorov-Smirnov value (K-S) to indicate normal distribution (Field, 2005). Further investigating the results of K-S, referring to critical criteria outlined by Kline (2011), I considered a distribution to be significantly non-normal if kurtosis ($k$) exceeded +/-8.0, or skew ($s$) +/-3.0. Additionally, I reviewed histograms overlaid with a normal curve and Normal Probability Plots (P-P plots) for deviations from normality. In order to
identify curvilinear relationships and outliers, I examined scatterplots of relationships between variables.

**Interpretation of PCA.** Utilising Kaiser’s criterion (Field, 2005) and drawing from the recommendations of Tabachnick and Fidell (2007), I retained components for which eigenvalues exceeded 1.0, and those up to and including the point of inflection on scree plots. Indicating a 20% overlap of variance (Cohen & Lee, 1992, as cited in Field, 2005), I considered component loadings above .45 to be significant (Tabachnick & Fidell, 2007). According to the recommendations of Cohen and Lee, component loadings above .55 were considered to be ‘good’, above .63 ‘very good’, above .71 ‘excellent’; the presence of high component loadings further supported the decision to retain these components.

**Internal consistency of components.** Cronbach’s coefficient alpha estimated internal reliability of variables. Scores greater than .70 indicated that variables measured the same underlying constructs (Field, 2005). The results and their implications are presented in the following chapter.

**Correlation.** I used Pearson’s Product Moment Correlation Co-efficient to test predictions of direct relationships (hypotheses one to five), and to identify demographic groups that would need to be controlled for in proceeding analysis. Given that the assumptions for Pearson’s Correlation and PCA are the same, data met the assumptions for this test. Some p-values were very close to the .05 level of significance (deep acting and self-alienation, r = .17, p = .051; gender and work engagement, r = .16, p = .052). As a small sample size can result in non-significant relationships, as well as effect-sizes much smaller than would be observed in the normal population (Field, 2005), on the correlations matrix (Table 2) I have also indicated p < .10. However, I did not use this level of significance to reject null hypotheses. According to Cohen (1988) who considered the effect size specific to social and personnel psychology, I considered correlations between +/- 1.0 and +/- .30 to be weak, correlations between +/- .30 and +/- .50 to demonstrate a moderate correlation, and values greater than +/- .50 to indicate a strong relationship.

**Moderation.** As my aim was to test alignment to my hypothesised model, I used the forced entry method of multiple regression to test hypotheses six to nine.

**Testing assumptions.** Referring to Green’s criteria (1991), which advises that for a regression model with 10 variables (as is the case for the largest model,
Model 3), that sample size exceed 130 participants, I determined that the sample of 140 participants in the present study was adequate. Variance Inflation Factors (VIF) greater than 1.0 and below 10.0 (Bowerman & O'Connell, 1990) and tolerance statistics (1/VIF) greater than 0.20 (Menard, 1995) were criteria for multicollinearity (refer to Appendix E for the results of this analysis). To analyse heteroscedasticity in the data, I examined scatterplots of residuals for clustering around 0.00 (Tabachnick & Fidell, 2007). According to the recommendations of Durbin and Watson (1951), I assumed independence of residuals when the Durbin-Watson statistic \( d \) approximated 2.0. In order to assess the degree to which models fit the data I reviewed standardised residuals. Critical limits for a normally distributed sample of 140 cases allows for no more than 7 cases above 2.0, no more than 1 case above 2.5, and does not allow for any cases with a standardised residual above 3.0 (Field, 2005). According to cut-off criteria recommended by Cook and Weisberg (1992), Cook’s Distance less than 1.0 indicates that outliers do not have disproportionate influence on the regression equation.

**Interpretation of multiple regression.** Using the forced entry method, I tested four models of multiple regression. I considered a step in regression to have been significant if it resulted in a change in F-statistic significant at the .05 level (Tabachnick & Fidell, 2007), and the significance of t-tests of each new variable indicated if the addition had made a significant contribution to the model. The first step of each model consisted of controlling for the influence of demographic variables, in which gender, age, ethnicity, type of organisation, and experience in the role were entered.

**Differences between means.** I performed one-way analyses of variance (ANOVA) and independent sample t-tests to identify which categories within the demographic groups had means which were significantly different from each other.

**One-way ANOVA.** Given significant correlations between ethnicity and authenticity at work (authentic living \( r = .17, p = .04 \); self-alienation, \( r = .17, p = .05 \)), between gender and work engagement, and between type of organisation and work engagement, I performed one-way ANOVA with post-hoc analyses. The assumptions of independence and normality had been assessed in previous tests, a non-significant Levine’s test indicated homogeneity of variance (Tabachnick & Fidell, 2007). The criterion for a significant difference between means was a
significant f-statistic (Tabachnick & Fidell, 2007), and in this case, the Bonferroni correction was used in post hoc analysis. The results of ANOVA are discussed in Chapter III.

**Independent sample t-tests.** In the case in which ANOVA failed to find a significant difference, given that t-tests are more powerful (Field, 2005), I performed independent sample t-tests between groups with the highest sample sizes. Additionally, t-tests were used to investigate the difference in work engagement score between genders. The results are discussed in Chapter III.

In this chapter, I presented the procedure used to collect and analyse data. PCA with direct oblimin rotation was used to reduce the data to eight principal components. Preliminary evaluation indicated that data was adequate for further analysis without transformation. Pearson’s Product Moment Co-efficient and forced entry multiple regression were used to test hypotheses. Independent sample t-tests and one-way analyses of variance were used to further explore findings. In the following chapter, I present the results of this analysis.
CHAPTER III - RESULTS

First, I present the results of Principal Components Analysis (PCA), which supports the use of the variables measured in this investigation. The results of Pearson’s Product Moment Co-efficient informs hypotheses one to five, the results of multiple regression, hypotheses six-to-nine; independent sample t-tests, and tests of analysis of variance (ANOVA) contribute additional findings.

Principal Components Analysis (PCA)

I conducted PCA on five variables: authenticity, deep acting, surface acting, self-efficacy, and work engagement. The following analysis details that factor solutions for work engagement, surface and deep acting were as expected, however, according to Kaiser’s criterion (Tabachnick & Fidell, 2007), two distinct components were retained from self-efficacy, and three from authenticity, so that analysis proceeded with eight variables.

Assessment of assumptions. The final sample size of 140 respondents against the five original variables obtained a ratio of 28:1 surpassed the general guideline of a 10:1 ratio (Field, 2005). The correlations matrix demonstrated clusters of items which correlated above .50. Across all variables, the KMO statistic exceeded .50 and Bartlett’s Test of Sphericity was significant. This indicated that data was adequate for analysis.

As the Kolmogorov-Smirnov test was significant across all variables except self-efficacy, I reviewed estimates for skew and kurtosis (Table 1), histograms overlaid with a normal curve, and P-P Plots. In all cases, deviations were minimal; most distributions displayed slight negative skew and small platykurtosis; across all variables, skew and kurtosis estimates were less than 1.0 and within the criteria recommended by Kline (s < +/- 3.0, k < +/- 8.0, 2011); P-P Plots did not reveal concerning outliers or curvilinear relationships. Therefore, I proceeded with PCA without carrying out transformations.
Table 1

Descriptive statistics of variables following principal components analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>$M$</th>
<th>$SD$</th>
<th>$s$</th>
<th>$k$</th>
<th>$a$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Authenticity</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Authentic Living</td>
<td>5.53</td>
<td>1.14</td>
<td>-0.60</td>
<td>-0.44</td>
<td>.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accepting External Influence*</td>
<td>3.23</td>
<td>1.04</td>
<td>0.39</td>
<td>-0.03</td>
<td>.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Alienation*</td>
<td>4.95</td>
<td>1.68</td>
<td>-0.38</td>
<td>-0.97</td>
<td>.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Acting</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deep Acting</td>
<td>3.30</td>
<td>0.80</td>
<td>-0.12</td>
<td>-0.02</td>
<td>.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surface Acting</td>
<td>3.07</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>-0.30</td>
<td>-0.14</td>
<td>.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Self-Efficacy</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Efficacy</td>
<td>5.73</td>
<td>0.86</td>
<td>-0.60</td>
<td>0.28</td>
<td>.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal Accomplishment</td>
<td>4.81</td>
<td>1.27</td>
<td>-0.14</td>
<td>-0.47</td>
<td>.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work Engagement</td>
<td>4.34</td>
<td>1.20</td>
<td>0.48</td>
<td>-0.52</td>
<td>.94</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. $N = 140$. Items measuring authenticity, self-efficacy, and work engagement were measured on 7-point Likert scales; deep acting and surface acting were measured on a 5-point scale. *Items are reverse-coded.

Extraction. According to Kaiser’s criterion (Tabachnick & Fidell, 2007), and supported with examination of the scree plots, from the five original variables, I retained eight principal components. Given that oblique rotation produced components that were inter-correlated above .32 (Tabachnick & Fidell, 2007), I determined that direct oblimin rotation had been sufficient in all cases. No components failed to load above .45, and no components loaded greater than .45 onto more than one item. The results of oblimin rotation revealed that authenticity would be better interpreted as three separate variables, and self-efficacy as two. Given high communalities and component loadings, and that each component loaded onto a reasonable number of items (3 - 4 items), I continued analysis with authenticity as three variables, and self-efficacy as two.

Re-assessment of assumptions. In regards to sample size, with eight variables retained from extraction, the case-to-variable ratio became approximately 18:1, which remained above the 10:1 criterion. KMO estimates and Bartlett’s Test of Sphericity remained acceptable. On review of the histograms, the reason for the
highest kurtosis value (self-alienation, $k = -0.97$, refer to Table 1 and Appendix D) became evident; a high frequency of responses on the 7th score of this scale indicated that across items, many participants were rating themselves as being at the lowest end on the self-alienation scale, and this disturbed estimates for the overall distribution. Given that kurtosis and skew remained within critical values (Table 1) and that scatter plots revealed no disturbing departures from normality, I determined that transformation was unnecessary.

**Interpretation of PCA.**

*Authenticity.* While previous studies find three latent variables in authenticity at work (van den Bosch & Taris, 2014a, 2014b), they also find evidence for its use as a single overarching construct. It was my intention to measure a single score for authenticity, however, the results of PCA were unable to support this. PCA revealed three principal components; these accounted for 65% of the variance in authenticity and reflected the three latent constructs identified by van den Bosch and Taris (2014a & 2014b). The final components extracted for each variable, authentic living, accepting external influence, and self-alienation, accounted for 62%, 50%, and 77% of variance in each variable, respectively. The KMO statistic and Bartlett’s Test of Sphericity surpassed the recommended criteria (authentic living, $KMO = .70$, $X^2 (6) = 187.36, p < .001$; accepting external influence, $KMO = .61$, $X^2 (6) = 97.65, p < .001$; self-alienation, $KMO = .79$, $X^2 (6) = 383.03, p < .001$) and component loadings suggested very good to excellent overlap (authentic living ranged from .63 to .87 and indicated very good-to-excellent overlap of variance; loadings of accepting external influence ranged from .67 to .76, very good-to-excellent; self-alienation .78 to .93 indicated excellent overlap).

*Deep acting and surface acting.* PCA confirmed that items on the emotional labour scale were measuring two unrelated variables. PCA revealed two principal components that corresponded with deep acting and surface acting, and accounted for 75% of the total variance. On extraction of these components, 70% of the variance in deep acting was accounted for, and 78% of the variance in surface acting. The KMO statistic and Bartlett’s Test of Sphericity obtained the recommended criteria (deep acting, $KMO = .67$, $X^2 (3) = 133.74, p < .001$; surface acting, $KMO = .70$, $X^2 (3) = 201.91, p < .001$) and component loadings indicated
good to excellent overlap of variance in deep acting (.76 - .87), and excellent overlap in surface acting (.86 - .92).

**Self-efficacy.** Contrary to the findings of a large body of research which has used the self-efficacy measure as one global variable, the results of PCA demonstrated two distinct components of three items each. While items in the first component pertained to general self-efficacy, items in the second component referred to a sense of personal accomplishment. Following these results, I continued analysis with two self-efficacy variables, which I labelled ‘self-efficacy’, and ‘personal accomplishment’. Combined, these two components accounted for 77% of the variance in the overall self-efficacy construct. The extracted component for self-efficacy accounted for 78% of variance, and the extracted component for personal accomplishment accounted for 74% of variance. The KMO statistic and Bartlett’s Test of Sphericity achieved the recommended criteria (self-efficacy, KMO = .73, $\chi^2 (3) = 189.58, p < .001$; personal accomplishment, KMO = .70, $\chi^2 (3) = 162.17, p < .001$) and indicating excellent overlap of variance, component loadings ranged from .86 to .90 for personal accomplishment, and .81 to .90 for self-efficacy.

**Work engagement.** PCA identified a single principal component that accounted for 67% of the variance. According to Sonnentag (2003), who recommends that, due to high commonality between the primary constructs, that work engagement be measured as a single latent construct, I analysed work engagement as one global score. PCA supported this decision, and was confirmed with a high Cronbach’s alpha ($\alpha = .94$). The KMO statistic and Bartlett’s Test of Sphericity surpassed the recommended criteria (KMO = .94, $\chi^2 (36) = 963.95, p < .001$) and component loadings ranging from .52 to .89 indicated good-to-excellent overlap of variance.

**Internal Reliability**

All variables retained for use in the proceeding analysis, with the exception of accepting external influence, obtained a Cronbach’s alpha that surpassed the criterion of .70 (Table 1). Given that the estimate for accepting external influence ($\alpha = .65$) approximated the critical value, and that the scale has been successfully validated and used in previous studies ($\alpha = .67, \alpha = .66$, van den Bosch & Taris, 2014a & 2014b, respectively), I retained this variable for further analysis. This
decision is supported by Kline (1999, as cited in Field, 2005), who contends that, due to the nature of social science research, alphas below .70 are acceptable.

Results indicated that the Cronbach’s alpha of deep acting would rise from .79 to .82 if the item “I make an effort to actually feel the emotions that I need to display to others” was deleted. However, as the original alpha exceeded the critical value of .70, and evidence suggests that factors are not reliable when they are composed of fewer than three items (Costello & Osborne, 2005), I continued without removing this item.

In summary, as authenticity emerged as three separate variables, and self-efficacy, two variables, eight variables were involved in the following analyses. As the original hypotheses pertained to authenticity as a singular variable, accepting external influence, and self-alienation, were reverse-coded, such that, a high score on accepting external influence or self-alienation indicates high authenticity, and a low degree of accepting external influence or self-alienation. As illustrated in Table 1, most variables displayed slightly platykurtic and negatively skewed distributions. This indicated that mean responses were above the midpoint of the scale and that deviation around the means was greater than could be expected from an exactly normally distributed sample.

**Direct Relationships: Hypotheses One to Five**

Table 2 presents the results of Pearson’s Product Moment Correlation. Across all variables involved in this investigation, levels of significance are \( p < .10 \), \( p < .05 \), and \( p < .001 \). As mentioned previously, due to reverse-coding, positive relationships involving accepting external influence and self-alienation indicate a positive association with the overarching construct of feeling authentic at work, however, positive correlations represent a negative relationship to the individual components.

Hypotheses one and two predicted that deep acting would be positively (H1), and surface acting negatively (H2) correlated to authenticity. The relationship between deep acting and authentic living, though significant, is weak (\( r = .22, p = .01 \)), as is the relationship with self-alienation, which also only becomes significant at the .10
Table 2
Correlations between authenticity, acting, self-efficacy, personal accomplishment, work engagement, and demographic variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>AuthLiv</th>
<th>AccExInf</th>
<th>Self-Al</th>
<th>DA</th>
<th>SA</th>
<th>SEff</th>
<th>PAccom</th>
<th>WE</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Ethnic</th>
<th>OrgTyp</th>
<th>RoleExp</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AuthLiv</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>AccExInf</td>
<td>.27**</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>Self-Al</td>
<td>.62***</td>
<td>.27***</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>DA</td>
<td>.22**</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>.17*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SA</td>
<td>-.48***</td>
<td>-.19**</td>
<td>-.60***</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEff</td>
<td>.42***</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.28***</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>-.27***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PAccom</td>
<td>.36***</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.37***</td>
<td>.25**</td>
<td>-.49***</td>
<td>.47***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WE</td>
<td>.43***</td>
<td>.16*</td>
<td>.62***</td>
<td>.23**</td>
<td>-.59***</td>
<td>.45***</td>
<td>.76***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.16*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.26**</td>
<td>.16*</td>
<td>-.14*</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.24**</td>
<td>.25**</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnic</td>
<td>.17**</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.17**</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.16*</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OrgTyp</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>-.16</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.17**</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RoleExp</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.30***</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>-.24**</td>
<td>-.19**</td>
<td>.26**</td>
<td>.24**</td>
<td>.22**</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>.74**</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. AuthLiv = authentic living; AccExInf = accepting external influence; Self-Al = self-alienation; DA = deep acting; SA = surface acting; SEff = self-efficacy; PAccom = personal accomplishment; WE = work engagement; Ethnic = ethnicity; OrgTyp = type of organisation; RoleExp = experience in the Role. Accepting external influence and self-alienation are reverse-coded for ease of comparing across the authenticity concept. N = 140. * p < .10, **p < .05, *** p < .001
level ($r = .17, p = .051$). There is no evidence of a significant relationship between
deep acting and accepting external influence ($p = .44$). Hypothesis one is therefore
partially supported. Regarding hypothesis two, the relationship with surface acting
is stronger and consistent across the authenticity construct (authentic living, $r = -.48, p < .001$; accepting external influence, $r = -.19, p = .03$; self-alienation, $r = -.60, p < .001$). Hypothesis two is fully supported.

Hypotheses three to five concern the relationships of authenticity, deep
acting, and surface acting, with work engagement. Results demonstrate strong and
significant associations between authenticity components, authentic living and self-
alienation, with work engagement (authentic living, $r = .43, p < .001$; self-
alienation, $r = .62, p < .001$), however, the relationship to accepting external
influence was much weaker and only became significant at the .10 level of
significance, $r = .16, p = .06$. Hypothesis three is partially supported.

Regarding hypotheses four and five, correlations were significant and in the
predicted direction. Results reveal a weak but significant relationship between deep
acting and work engagement, $r = .23, p = .01$, and a strong and significant
relationship between surface acting and work engagement, $r = -.59, p < .001$.

**Moderated Relationships: Hypotheses Six to Nine**

**Assumptions of multiple regression.** As previously mentioned, the sample
size was adequate for all regression models. Across all models, Durbin Watson
values approximated the critical value, and minimum values of Tolerance and VIF
achieved the aforementioned criteria (Appendix E). Scatterplots displayed
reasonable heteroscedasticity, however, they also highlighted the presence of
outliers. Standardised residuals violated criteria in each regression model
(Appendix E), however, as in each case, Cook’s Distance was below the critical
criterion, I continued analysis without removing any cases from the data.

**Hypothesis testing.** To test hypotheses six to nine, I analysed four models
of multiple regression. As each demographic variable obtained significance with
the dependent variable (Table 2), in the first step of each model, I held all of these
variables constant; this step accounted for 14% of variability in work engagement,
however at this stage, only gender produced a significant beta weight at the .05 level
of significance ($b = 0.52, p = .04$). $b$ is unstandardized and indicates the change in
work engagement score; \( R \) represents the amount of variability in the work engagement score accounted for by that step in the equation.

Table 3

Model one: Regression of deep acting and authenticity onto work engagement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Step</th>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>( b )</th>
<th>( R )</th>
<th>( R^2 )</th>
<th>( \Delta R^2 )</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Step 1:</td>
<td>Demographics</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>0.52**</td>
<td>.37</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.14***</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 2: Deep Acting</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>0.53**</td>
<td>.46</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>.07***</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deep Acting</td>
<td>0.42***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 3: Authenticity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>0.40**</td>
<td>.69</td>
<td>.47</td>
<td>.26***</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deep Acting</td>
<td>0.25**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Alienation</td>
<td>0.36***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. \( N = 140 \). Step 1, demographic variables = gender, age, ethnicity, type of organisation, experience in the role. Step 3, authenticity variables = authentic living, accepting external influence, self-alienation. Only variables with beta-weights significant at the .05 level are displayed. ** \( p < .05 \), *** \( p < .001 \)

Model one: Deep acting, authenticity, and work engagement. As previously described, step one of this model was for the purpose of controlling the influence of demographic variables. In step two, deep acting was entered (Table 3). This step generated a significant change in \( R^2 \), and the effect of gender remained significant. In step three, deep acting retained a significant beta weight; self-alienation produced a significant change in \( R^2 \); however, authentic living (\( p = .24 \)) and accepting external influence (\( p = .35 \)) did not obtain significance; hypothesis six is partially supported. Although deep acting retained, its impact was substantially reduced with the addition of self-alienation (step two: \( b = 0.42, p = .02 \); step three: \( b = 0.25, p = .02 \)), which explained an additional 26% of variability.
in work engagement. In the final stage of this model gender, deep acting, and self-alienation accounted for 47% of variance in work engagement.

Table 4

Model two: Regression of authenticity and self-efficacy onto work engagement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Step</th>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>b</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>( R^2 )</th>
<th>( \Delta R^2 )</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Demographics</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>0.52**</td>
<td>.37</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.14***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Authenticity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Self-Alienation</td>
<td>0.37***</td>
<td>.67</td>
<td>.45</td>
<td>.31***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Self-Efficacy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Type of Organisation</td>
<td>0.16**</td>
<td>.86</td>
<td>.73</td>
<td>.28***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Self-Alienation</td>
<td>0.27***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Personal Accomplishment</td>
<td>0.54***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. N = 140. Step 1, demographic variables = gender, age, ethnicity, type of organisation, experience in the role. Step 2, authenticity variables = authentic living, accepting external influence, self-alienation. Step 3, self-efficacy variables = self-efficacy, personal accomplishment. Only variables with beta-weights significant at the .05 level are displayed. **p < .05, ***p < .001

Model two: Authenticity, self-efficacy, and work engagement. In step two, the three components of authenticity were entered (Table 4). This step produced a significant change in \( R^2 \), which was accounted for in a significant beta weight for self-alienation, however, the influence of authentic living and accepting external influence were not significant (\( p = .16 \) and \( p = .27 \), respectively). In step three, the addition of personal accomplishment produced a significant change in \( R^2 \), however, self-efficacy did not obtain significance (\( p = 0.101 \)). Also of interest in step three, was that with the addition of personal accomplishment, the variability in work engagement accounted for by self-alienation was substantially reduced (step two: \( b = .37, p < .001 \); step three: \( b = .27, p < .001 \)). As in the final stage of this model, self-alienation and personal accomplishment retained significant beta weights, it is
evident that there is interaction between authenticity and self-efficacy, and as this model accounts for 73% variance in work engagement, their influence is substantial. However, as only one of the three authenticity variables, and only one of the two self-efficacy variables displayed a significant influence, hypothesis seven is only partially supported.

Table 5

*Model three: Regression of deep acting and self-efficacy onto work engagement*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Step 1: Demographics</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>0.52**</td>
<td>.37</td>
<td>.14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Step 2: Deep Acting</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>0.53**</td>
<td>.46</td>
<td>.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deep Acting</td>
<td>0.42***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Step 3: Self-Efficacy</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Type of Organisation</td>
<td>0.19**</td>
<td>.79</td>
<td>.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Efficacy</td>
<td>0.21**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal Accomplishment</td>
<td>0.60***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. N = 140. Step 1, demographic variables = gender, age, ethnicity, type of organisation, experience in the role. Step 3, self-efficacy variables = self-efficacy, personal accomplishment. Only variables with beta-weights significant at the .05 level are displayed. ** p < .05, *** p < .001*

*Model three: Deep acting, self-efficacy, and work engagement.* In step two, deep acting produced a significant change in $R^2$ (Table 5). In step three, self-efficacy and personal accomplishment contributed to a significant change in $R^2$, however, as the influence of deep acting became non-significant, hypothesis eight is not supported. In the final regression equation, self-efficacy, personal accomplishment, and type of organisation retained significance, to account for 63% of variance in work engagement.
Table 6

Model four: Regression of surface acting and self-efficacy onto work engagement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Step</th>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>b</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>R^2</th>
<th>ΔR^2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>0.52**</td>
<td></td>
<td>.37</td>
<td>.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>0.47**</td>
<td></td>
<td>.43</td>
<td>.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Age</td>
<td>0.03**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ethnicity</td>
<td>0.08**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Surface Acting</td>
<td>-0.74***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Type of Organisation</td>
<td>0.14**</td>
<td></td>
<td>.83</td>
<td>.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Surface Acting</td>
<td>-0.37***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Self-Efficacy</td>
<td>0.18**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Personal Accomplishment</td>
<td>0.50***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. N = 140. Step 1, demographic variables = gender, age, ethnicity, type of organisation, experience in the role. Step 3, self-efficacy variables = self-efficacy, personal accomplishment. Only variables with beta-weights significant at the .05 level are displayed. ** p < .05, *** p < .001

Model four: Surface acting, self-efficacy, and work engagement. Surface acting contributed significant influence beyond the demographic variables (Table 6), and in step three, self-efficacy and personal accomplishment accounted for additional variance in work engagement. In the final stage, the beta-weight of surface acting reduced from $b = -0.74$ to $b = -0.37$, as this illustrated reduction in the negative relationship between surface acting and work engagement, hypothesis nine is supported. This model accounted for 68% of variability in work engagement.
Additional Analysis
The following findings were not predicted in the present research, however, as they illustrate interesting relationships between demographic variables, authenticity, work engagement, acting, and self-efficacy, they are presented below.

In cases in which a significant correlation involved a categorical variable, I used further analysis to identify significant differences between the means of different groups. One-way Analyses of Variance (ANOVA) and independent sample t-tests identified categories in which means were significantly different from each other. Table 7 illustrates mean scores on the dependent variable across the main demographic groups. Table 8 presents the mean authenticity scores across the two major ethnic groups in the sample.

Table 7

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Work Engagement</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Gender</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>3.92</td>
<td>1.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>4.43</td>
<td>1.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>**Ethnicity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NZ European</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>4.15</td>
<td>1.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maori</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>4.99</td>
<td>1.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>**Organisat</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ion Type</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supermarket</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>3.80</td>
<td>0.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Retail</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>4.62</td>
<td>0.14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. N = 140. Difference between means is significant: * p < .10, ** p < .05

Gender. Results of independent sample t-tests revealed that there is no significant difference between the degree of work engagement experienced by males (M = 3.92, SD = 1.30) and females (M = 4.43, SD = 1.12), however, it should be noted that this difference becomes significant at the .10 level, t(138) = -1.96, p = .052. This indicates that work engagement in the mass-service industry may be higher in females than in males.
Table 8

Descriptive statistics of authenticity across major ethnic groups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>n</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>SE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Authentic Living</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NZ European</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>5.40</td>
<td>1.15</td>
<td>0.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maori</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>1.04</td>
<td>0.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accepting External Influence</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NZ European</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>3.11</td>
<td>1.04</td>
<td>0.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maori</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>3.77</td>
<td>1.07</td>
<td>0.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Self-Alienation</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NZ European</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>4.69</td>
<td>1.74</td>
<td>0.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maori</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>3.77</td>
<td>1.07</td>
<td>0.27</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. N = 140. Respondents who identified as New Zealand European and Maori composed 71% and 11% of the total sample, respectively. Difference between means is significant: **p < .05

Ethnicity. Pearson’s Correlation Co-efficient indicated that ethnicity is significantly correlated with components of authenticity and work engagement. ANOVA across ethnic groups and with each component within authenticity were not significant (authentic living, p = .26; accepting external influence, p = .32; self-alienation, p = .25). However, independent sample t-tests detected significant differences between the means of New Zealand European (NZE) and Maori on both authentic living and self-alienation (authentic living, t(25.65) = -2.98, p = .01; self-alienation, t(114) = -2.34, p = .02). These results reveal that while NZE (M = 4.69, SD = 1.74) experience less feelings of self-alienation than do Maori service workers (M = 3.77, SD = 1.07), Maori experience greater authentic living (M = 6.00, SD = 1.04) than do NZE (M = 5.40, SD = 1.15). Results demonstrate no significant difference in accepting external influence (p = .052) between NZE and Maori.

Regarding work engagement, an independent sample t-test detected a significant difference between mean work engagement in Maori (M = 4.99, SD = 1.14) and NZE (M = 4.15, SD = 1.20), t(114) = -2.60, p = .01. This suggests that mass-service workers who are Maori, experience higher work engagement than do NZE workers.
Type of organisation. ANOVA with post-hoc pairwise comparisons using the Bonferroni correction revealed that supermarket workers ($M = 3.79, SD = 0.97$) reported significantly less work engagement than workers in general retail ($M = 4.62, SD = 1.22$), $F(3, 136) = 4.56, p = .004$.

Summary of Findings
Overall, results of the present research suggest a positive relationship between authenticity and work engagement. Small and weak correlations between deep acting and authenticity variables, and deep acting and work engagement indicate that while deep acting is not an inauthentic technique in emotional labour, it is not particularly authentic, and while it may relate to work engagement, this relationship will be limited. However, with strong negative relationships to authenticity and work engagement, deep acting may have more positive outcomes than surface acting. While the hypothesis that authenticity is related to work engagement was only partially supported, given that the two significant components demonstrated strong correlations (authentic living, $r = .43, p < .001$; self-alienation, $r = .62, p < .001$), evidence is encouraging that there is a strong relationship between authenticity and work engagement. Regression models reinforce the relationship between authenticity and work engagement, and illustrate a strong relationship between self-efficacy and work engagement that is capable of enhancing positive relationships to work engagement and in the case of surface acting, is able to substantially reduce the negative impact of surface acting (variability accounted for by surface acting reduced from $b = -0.74$ to $b = -0.37$), as well as contribute positively to work engagement (self-efficacy, $b = 0.18$; personal accomplishment, $b = 0.50$).
CHAPTER IV - DISCUSSION

As a positive affective state, work engagement represents an enhanced working experience. Owing to the interactive nature of the mass-service context, work engagement may also be key to a range of beneficial outcomes for customers, as well as at the organisational level. Kahn’s (1990) concept of personal engagement describes a process through which mass-service workers may be able to uphold expectations for the service persona while maintaining a sense of authenticity, and suggests that by doing so, increased authenticity may promote work engagement. In the present study I sought to investigate the relationship between authenticity and work engagement in the mass-service environment, in which working conditions appear to promote inauthenticity and hinder work engagement.

Drawing from Kahn’s (1990) concept of aligning the authentic self with the work-role, in the present research, I refer to two fundamental propositions. As mechanisms through which authenticity and work engagement may be positively related, both propositions refer to a balance between upholding the service persona and expressing the authentic self, and a sense of meaning towards work activities. The first, considering authenticity in the service context as the alignment of personal values with expectations of the work-role, (Chalofsky, 2003; Kahn, 1990) suggests that alignment will inspire a sense of meaning towards work activities, which will provoke workers to become engaged in their work (Kahn, 1990; Wigfield & Eccles, 2000). Considering alignment within the interactive nature of the service context, the second proposition referred to the appearance of balance between the service-role and authentic personality to customers. In this theory I suggested that, behaviour that both achieves expectations for the service-role, and appears authentic, may stimulate rewarding feedback from customers (Social Interaction Model, Côté, 2005) that will inspire a sense of meaning in workers (Model of Interpersonal Sensemaking, Wrzesniewski, Dutton, & Debebe, 2003), which as mentioned previously, could encourage work engagement (Kahn, 1990; Wigfield & Eccles, 2000). I expected that evidence from this investigation would inform managerial approach to the regulation of mass-service workers and owing to some contention as to the extent to which deep acting pertains to authenticity, I also sought to contribute empirical evidence to this debate.
To inform the above research aims, workers employed in mass-service industries responded to a survey that measured the extent to which they experienced feelings of authenticity and utilised acting techniques in their interactions with customers, as well as their general state of self-efficacy, sense of personal accomplishment, and work engagement. Overall, results of the present research support a positive relationship between authenticity and work engagement. In particular, as a moderator between authenticity and work engagement, findings highlight a strong relationship between personal accomplishment and work engagement, which supports the concept that balance between the authentic self and the role will be related to work engagement. Positive relationships with work engagement and authenticity support the use of deep acting as a more authentic approach to emotional labour than surface acting. However, results also indicate that deep acting is separate from an authentic approach to service, and a weaker relationship to work engagement suggests that it may not be as beneficial.

In this chapter, I first explore the results of hypothesis testing and examine additional findings. Referring to the underlying research aims that were presented in Chapter I, I discuss the implications of these findings to the mass-service industry. Next, I review the strengths and limitations of the present research, followed by recommendations for future research.

Findings

Mean authenticity scores that are moderate (for example, self-alienation, $M = 4.95$, $SD = 1.68$), indicate that, in the context of a highly regulated service environment, it is possible to retain a sense of authenticity. The absence of a significant correlation between deep and surface acting, as well as a pattern of opposing relationships throughout the data, reinforces the argument that these are two distinct approaches to emotional management, and they have different implications for employee well-being. Positive correlations with work engagement, self-efficacy, and personal accomplishment indicate that authenticity is beneficial to employee well-being, and that it may also be able to enhance interaction with customers.

Substantially different correlations between the two components of self-efficacy (self-efficacy and personal accomplishment) support analysis as two separate components. In general, these results illustrate stronger relationships with personal accomplishment than with self-efficacy. Additionally, associations
between personal accomplishment and work engagement are stronger than those between authenticity and work engagement, this indicates that, at least in the mass-service environment, a sense of accomplishment is highly beneficial to improve the experience of work.

**Direct relationships: Authenticity, acting, and work engagement.**

**Authenticity and acting.** I predicted that deep acting would be positively related to feelings of authenticity at work and that surface acting would be negatively related. Results suggest that employees who engage in surface acting are likely to feel that their behaviour at work often conflicts with their personal values (authentic living), feel alienated from their authentic selves (self-alienation), and that they defer to others (accepting external influence). In contrast, service workers who use deep acting may not feel strongly connected to their authentic selves or to their values while at work, however, they will be less likely to experience the feelings of dissonance associated with surface acting. Overall, findings suggest that deep acting is a more authentic approach to emotional labour than is surface acting. However, a relationship between deep acting and authenticity that is inconsistently significant across the authenticity components, suggests that deep acting is separate from an authentic approach to service.

These findings are consistent with those of previous research. Brotheridge and Lee (2002) found a weak positive relationship between deep acting and feelings of authenticity ($r = .13, p < .05$), and a moderate negative relationship between surface acting and authenticity ($r = -.40, p < .01$). As Brotheridge and Lee’s sample extended to all workers for whom customer-interaction was a part of their work-role, to include office employees and sales clerks, congruence with their research supports the generalizability of the findings of the present research. Furthermore, these findings are consistent with those of Yagil and Medler-Liraz (2013), in which surface acting was negatively related to trait authenticity ($r = -.37, p < .01$), and with Sloan (2014), who found evidence to suggest that surface acting is positively associated with feelings of self-estrangement ($r = .67, p < .001$), which is similar to the concept of self-alienation measured in the present research.

Referring to related findings in the burnout literature, results of the present investigation are as expected and contribute further evidence to the theory that emotional dissonance is a considerable factor in the strain associated with surface
acting. As discussed in Chapter I, there is contention in emotional labour literature as to the degree of authenticity involved in deep acting. In the present research, the absence of negative relationships with authenticity supports previous claims that deep acting facilitates alignment with role-behaviour and does not produce emotional dissonance. However, the absence of consistent positive associations also supports Hochschild’s (1983) original concern, that deep acting is a form of self-deception. Implications are discussed later in this chapter (p. 84).

Extending on the emotional dissonance hypothesis, in the Social Interaction Model, Côté (2005) considers that the nature of customer-interaction generated by these two techniques is a factor in the opposing relationships observed between strain, and deep and surface acting. Although the present investigation did not extend to measuring the experience of customers, or their response to the service interaction, as opposed to merely an acting technique that is less-convincing, these results are evidence that surface actors experience customer interaction as more superficial than do deep actors.

In summary, opposing relationships to authenticity support the argument that emotional labour is not inherently detrimental to workers (Wharton, 1993), and that the approach that workers take to the service encounter can improve their experience of work. These findings support the call to train service workers in deep acting and to discourage surface acting (Bujisic, Wu, Mattila, & Bilgihan, 2014; Grandey, 2003; Totterdell & Holman, 2003). However, the absence of strong, positive, and consistent associations between authenticity and deep acting suggests that, although this approach may reduce internal conflict, neither of these techniques permit workers to retain a connection to their authentic selves in the service context. Finally, as evidence that surface actors experience the service encounter as more superficial than deep actors is congruent with expectations of the Social Interaction Model (Côté, 2005), these findings support further investigation into the role of authenticity in an interactive service environment.

**Authenticity and work engagement.** Overall, the results of the present research illustrate a positive relationship between authenticity and work engagement. These findings suggest that service workers who remain connected with their enduring sense of self (reversed self-alienation) and conduct themselves
in alignment with their personal values (authentic living), will be more likely to
experience work engagement.

Although owing to the results of Principal Components Analysis, in the
present research authenticity was not considered as a single construct, a body of
previous research that shows a moderate positive association between authenticity
and work engagement (van den Bosch & Taris, 2014a & 2014b; Yagil & Medler-
Liraz, 2013, who measured trait-authenticity), is consistent with the present
findings. Additionally, the results of the present investigation are in alignment with
the results of two previous studies in which the IAM Work scale was used to
measure the relationship between authenticity and work engagement (van den
Bosch & Taris, 2014a & 2014b). The consistency of these findings supports
recommendations for greater attention to authenticity in the workplace, and as the
focus of future research.

Referring to the findings of two studies conducted by van den Bosch and
Taris (2014a & 201b), although it should be noted that in these studies, correlations
between accepting external influence and work engagement were each significant
at the .05 level, across each primary construct of authenticity at work, correlations
with work engagement in the present research were stronger than those observed in
van den Bosch and Taris’ studies. For example, in the present study, self-alienation
was correlated with work engagement, \( r = .62, p < .001 \), and in van den Bosch and
Taris’ studies, \( r = -.46 \) and \( r = -.43 (p < .01, 2014a & 2014b, \text{respectively}) \). Given
that the samples used in the studies conducted by van den Bosch and Taris were
comprised of teachers and human resource professionals, a pattern of stronger
correlations in the present study suggests that authenticity may have a particularly
strong influence in the mass-service context. Considering the immense automation
and task-reduction common to job-design in the mass-service industries, I expect
that customer-interaction is usually the predominant aspect of mass-service roles.
Therefore, stronger associations with work engagement for workers in mass-service
industries, may reflect high saliency of authenticity to a variety of outcomes for
these workers.

An additional pattern across these findings becomes evident when they are
cmpared to those of van den Bosch and Taris (2014a & 2014b). Across all three
studies, correlations between accepting external influence and work engagement
were weaker and with higher probability of type one error than with the other primary constructs. In the present research, this pattern was also observed in associations between accepting external influence, and both deep and surface acting. Furthermore, this component obtained a Cronbach’s alpha less than the recommended criterion of $\alpha = .70$ ($\alpha = .65$). Van den Bosch and Taris (2014a) obtained a factor loading of -0.50 for accepting external influence onto the second-order construct of authenticity at work. This was substantially less than the other primary constructs (self-alienation, -0.98; authentic living, 0.73) and contributes to a body of evidence that indicates that accepting external influence may measure an aspect of authenticity that is substantially distinct from the remainder of the authenticity at work construct. Considering the above evidence, future research that investigates the role of accepting external influence may further develop this construct.

In the present research, a weak association between accepting external influence and work engagement that only achieved significance at $p < .10$ ($r = .16$, $p = .06$) was not expected. In the case of workers in mass-service, who usually work according to strict regulatory processes and must defer to the judgements of both management and customers, the absence of a significant positive relationship indicates that, despite restrictive working conditions, these workers may still be able to cultivate work engagement. However, considering the significant and substantially stronger associations between work engagement, and both authentic living ($r = .43$, $p < .001$) and self-alienation ($r = .62$, $p < .001$), a pattern of weaker correlations to accepting external influence, and as discussed above, the extent to which these constructs contribute to the overarching authenticity construct compared to accepting external influence, I recommend that this finding not be considered to support the mass-service model for service.

Positive associations between two of the three authenticity variables and work engagement, and in particular, as the most integral aspect of the authenticity construct, a strong relationship with self-alienation, provides evidence to suggest that retaining a sense of self in the work context will promote work engagement. Considering the negative association between burnout and work engagement, these findings are consistent with those of previous research in emotional labour. Therefore, the findings of the present research contribute to a body of evidence that
in emotional labour, authenticity is fundamental to the affective experiences of workers. These findings also provide empirical support to Kahn’s (1990) theory of personal engagement. Although job autonomy was not a measured variable in the present investigation, positive associations between authenticity and work engagement in the present study, suggest that increased authenticity may be a factor in the positive relationships observed between job autonomy and work engagement in previous research (Bakker & Demerouti, 2008; van den Bosch & Taris, 2014a, 2014b; Xanthopoulou, Bakker, Demerouti, & Schaufeli, 2007), and I recommend that authenticity at work become the focus of future research attention. Examination of job autonomy, individual associations between authenticity and each primary construct of work engagement, investigation of the underlying processes through which they are affected, and a research design to indicate the direction of the relationship between authenticity and work engagement, were all beyond the bounds of this investigation, however, these remaining queries provide scope for future research.

In addition to an internal process of alignment, meaning, and work engagement, I proposed that customer-feedback in the service encounter would contribute to a relationship between work engagement and authenticity. Similar to other underlying mechanisms proposed in Chapter I, findings of the present research can only support future research in this area. As the results of the regression models contribute additional support to the interactive proposition, implications are presented with the discussion of the moderation hypotheses later in this chapter.

In summary, although work engagement is the equivalent of well-being, as a positive affective state, positive associations between feeling authentic in interactions with customers, and work engagement, lend support to the argument that workers can benefit from emotional labour. Furthermore, these findings are evidence that workers in mass-service can enhance their experience of work. Considering positive associations between authenticity and work engagement, the aforementioned findings that surface acting is negatively related to authenticity, while associations with deep acting are weakly positive and inconsistently significant, overall, findings of the present research support the recommendation for a more authentic approach to the service environment. Recommendations for
successfully integrating authenticity into the working environment refer to greater
job autonomy, training and development initiatives, and greater attention to
personality in the hiring process. Refer to page 94 for a discussion of these
recommendations in greater detail.

**Acting and work engagement.** Regarding hypotheses four and five, results
revealed a positive relationship between deep acting and work engagement, and a
strong negative association between surface acting with work engagement.
Significant and opposing relationships between surface acting, deep acting, and
work engagement, support the proposition that the approach to service affects
worker experience of the service encounter. As a positive affective state, these
findings support arguments that workers are able to benefit from emotional labour
(Wharton, 1993), however, surface acting is harmful to service workers. Combined
with the previous findings, that surface acting is negatively, and deep acting,
although intermittently significant across components, is positively associated with
authenticity, these findings support the argument that authenticity is a key
component to the experience of mass-service work.

The correlation between deep acting and work engagement observed in the
present research is consistent with that obtained in a study by Yagil \( r = .23, p <
.01, \) Yagil, 2012). Although there has been little previous research comparing the
associations of deep acting and surface acting to work engagement, according to
opposing relationships between work engagement and burnout, these findings are
comparable with those in the burnout literature, which demonstrate that surface
acting is positively related to burnout while deep acting is not related (Brotheridge
& Grandey, 2002; Brotheridge & Lee, 2002, 2003; Goldberg & Grandey, 2007;
Grandey, 2003; Totterdell & Holman, 2003; Yagil, 2012). Furthermore, these
results contribute to emotional labour research that demonstrates that deep acting is
positively, and surface acting negatively related, to outcomes for psychological
well-being (Gross & John, 2003; Johnson & Spector, 2007).

These findings indicate that surface acting will hinder work engagement and
should be discouraged, and that deep acting is a more beneficial technique.
However, in comparison to a weak correlation between deep acting and work
engagement \( r = .23, p < .05 \), a moderate association between authentic living and
work engagement \( r = .43, p < .001 \) and a strong relationship between self-
alienation and work engagement ($r = .62, p < .001$), supports the promotion of more authentic approaches to service than deep acting. In their ethnographic investigations of mass-service workers, both Tolich’s (1983) and Leidner’s (1983) studies refer to workers integrating authentic personality into their interactions with customers. Building on these studies to inform training and development initiatives, future research could observe mass-service workers who report high authenticity, and observe the ways in which they make the service encounter more authentic.

Although I did not measure alignment with personal values in the present investigation, I proposed that increased authenticity in the work context would indicate greater alignment. Furthermore, drawing from relationships to burnout, and the concept of deep acting as acting in good faith, I proposed that deep acting would demonstrate alignment between personal values and expectations for the work-role, and that surface acting would reflect conflict. Therefore, although alignment was not measured, referring to Kahn’s (1990) concept of personal engagement, the combination of relationships observed in the present research (deep acting displays a relationship to authenticity that though weak, is positive, and a weak, positive relationship to work engagement, while surface acting presents associations with both authenticity and work engagement that are negative and substantially stronger) present evidence to support Kahn’s theory of alignment and engagement.

Although these findings are congruent with the burnout literature, which indicates that surface acting is detrimental to employee well-being, findings in the present investigation extend on previous research to suggest a practical application for surface acting. When results of the present research (negative correlations between surface acting and authenticity, and between surface acting and work engagement) are considered within the framework of personal engagement (Kahn, 1990), these findings suggest that surface acting represents disengagement of the authentic self from the work-role. Withdrawal of the authentic self may be valuable in the mass-service context; in the case of irritating or abusive customers, withdrawing the authentic self and superficially acting the role may protect workers from the negative affective outcomes of unpleasant customer interaction. Further research could investigate this application, which would support training workers in surface acting for short-term use.
Results in the present research lend support to the interactive theory of authenticity and work engagement. Findings suggest that surface acting is related to service that feels superficial (negative relationship with authenticity) and to a degraded experience of work (negatively related to work engagement), while deep acting is related to service that feels more authentic, and to an improved working experience (positive relationship with work engagement). Therefore, findings also support the proposition that the approach that service workers take to service, will affect the experience of the service encounter. However in the Social Interaction Model, Côté (2005) proposed that increased self-efficacy in deep actors demonstrates that the authentic appearance of deep acting provokes customer interaction that is rewarding to service workers. As discussed previously, inconsistent and weak associations between deep acting and authenticity, indicate that deep actors may not feel highly authentic in the service interaction, and that their service, while not likely to appear inauthentic, may not express authentic personality. Therefore, deep acting may not be capable of instigating rewarding interaction to the extent that a more authentic approach to the service encounter could be expected to. Evidence that workers will affect the experience of the service encounter would require measuring the effect of customer response on service workers, which was beyond the bounds of the present research. However, considering a sense of personal accomplishment as an indication of rewarding customer-interaction, the extent to which authenticity could elicit rewarding interaction and affect the experience of service, that is additional to the influence of deep acting, is examined in the discussion of regression models one and three.

In summary, correlations with authenticity (self-alienation and authentic living) and work engagement, were substantially stronger than those between deep acting and work engagement. Implications for authenticity in the training and development, and selection processes of service personnel are considered in more depth in the Implications section of this chapter (p. 84).

**The moderating effects of authenticity and self-efficacy.** According to the aforementioned theories of a personal and an interpersonal relationship between authenticity and work engagement, I predicted that the following moderated relationships would indicate alignment between authenticity and expectations for
the role, or the appearance of alignment to customers, which would enhance relationships with work engagement.

**Model one: Deep acting, authenticity, and work engagement.** The results of this model indicate that service workers who utilise deep acting techniques, report a high degree of authentic living, and tendency to accept external influence, may experience no more work engagement than those who do not experience these aspects of authenticity. Employees who deep act and who experience low self-alienation are likely to experience a greater degree of work engagement than those who undertake deep acting while experiencing self-alienation.

The impact of deep acting was substantially reduced when self-alienation was added to the regression equation. As previously mentioned, according to the extent to which the overarching construct of authenticity at work loaded onto the self-alienation component, I consider this to be the chief component of this construct. Therefore, although this hypothesis was only partially supported, I consider this finding to be evidence that, although deep acting is a useful technique in emotional labour, which may reduce conflict between personal values and behaviour prescribed for the role (the absence of a negative relationship to authenticity; H1), workers could gain greater benefit from service interactions if they retained a sense of authenticity. As I considered that this combination of deep acting and authenticity would indicate that workers were both achieving the demands of the service-role, and were retaining their sense of self, the results of this model present evidence to suggest that a balance between the service persona and authentic expression is beneficial to mass-service workers.

This finding is further evidence to support the recommendations made earlier, and described in more detail in the following sections within this chapter, that in addition to deep acting, authenticity become the focus of future research and workplace interventions. Referring to the call to train workers in deep acting for their own well-being, as deep acting retained significance in the final stage of this model, these findings indicate that deep acting is a useful technique in emotional labour. In particular, these findings extend on those of hypothesis one; the additional variance accounted for by self-alienation indicates that deep acting is not sufficient for workers to benefit from emotional labour, and authenticity in the service encounter must be encouraged. Furthermore, the results of this model are
evidence against a highly standardised model for service that discourages authenticity and diversity, which is common in the mass-service industries.

**Model two: Authenticity, self-efficacy, and work engagement.** I considered that authenticity combined with high self-efficacy would indicate alignment between personal values and the demands of the service-role, and that to customers, these workers would appear to achieve the service-role while retaining their individual personality. Findings illustrate that degree of authentic living, accepting external influence, and self-efficacy will not account for variability in work engagement additional to that of self-alienation; only low self-alienation and a high sense of accomplishment are related to work engagement. However, as this model accounts for 73% of variance in work engagement, their influence is substantial. Although other components did not obtain significance, significance of self-alienation in the final stage of this model remains strong evidence to support a relationship between authenticity and work engagement that is independent of variability accounted for by personal accomplishment. Regarding the theoretical processes underpinning a relationship between authenticity and work engagement, this finding provides evidence to support both the personal and the interactive theories.

The results of this model are evidence to support a personal relationship between alignment of personal values with role-behaviour, meaning, and work engagement. However, this finding does not endorse abandoning the service-role for complete authenticity. As in the final stage of this equation, the addition of personal accomplishment substantially reduced the impact of self-alienation, there is evidence that in the mass-service context, the association between authenticity and work engagement may be partially accounted for by a sense of personal accomplishment. This suggests that, beyond the internal experience of authentic expression, workers in the mass-service context experience reward from achieving the service-role, and in positive feedback from customers. Therefore, the results of this regression model are strong support for the argument that work-engagement in mass-service workers is related to the extent to which they can retain their authentic personality while maintaining the service-role.

As within the framework of the Social Interaction Model (Côté, 2005), high authenticity and high personal accomplishment in interactive service workers
indicates that these workers experience rewarding feedback from customers, the equation in this model assumed that it is possible for workers to be authentic and successfully achieve the service-role. The high degree of variability accounted for in this model, is evidence to suggest that this is an optimum situation for working in mass-service. Given the assumption that workers receive rewarding feedback from customers, this combination may also enhance customer-loyalty, and provide beneficial organisational outcomes; as previously mentioned, there is substantial scope for future research to investigate the implications of authenticity in the service interaction. The high degree of variability accounted for in this model, supports future research that investigates the conditions from which high authenticity and personal accomplishment emerge. Additionally, in order to identify beneficial practices that would inform training and development initiatives, future research could examine the techniques of interactive service workers who report this combination of high authenticity and high personal accomplishment.

Although personal accomplishment largely contributed to variability accounted for in this equation, the influence of self-efficacy was not significant above that of self-alienation. Considering evidence of a moderate relationship between self-efficacy and work engagement \((r = .32 \text{ to } .40, p < .01, \text{ Xanthopoulou, Bakker, } \& \text{ Fischbach, 2013})\), this finding was unexpected. The discrepancy between the influence of self-efficacy and personal accomplishment observed in the present research, supported the decision to measure self-efficacy as two separate components. Future research could seek to replicate the factor loadings in this scale and explore further differential relationships between these components.

In this chapter, I proposed that as a highly normative context, by providing workers with the confidence to express their personality in the working environment, feelings of self-efficacy could enhance the relationship between authenticity and work engagement. However, immense discrepancy between the influence of self-efficacy and personal accomplishment, suggests that it is not self-belief that is related to work engagement in the mass-service context, rather it is the experience of meaning and success. As meaningfulness was not a measured construct in the present research, future research is required to investigate this proposition. The strong relationship between personal accomplishment and work engagement may be distinct to the mass-service context or to service roles. As
mentioned previously, considering the interactive theory, in which service workers obtain meaning and reward from customer interaction, as a working environment in which the traditional sources of work engagement are deficient (for example, task variety and task significance), customer interaction may be a source of personal accomplishment that is particular to the interactive service context. As discussed in more depth in Recommendations for Future Research (p. 95), future research could explore contextual influences on work engagement.

Of the four regression equations tested in the present study, the combination of authenticity and personal accomplishment accounted for the highest degree of variability in work engagement (73%). This highlights the importance of authenticity and personal accomplishment in the mass-service context. Considering the potential for the effects of work engagement in an interactive service context to profit the organisation, as discussed in Chapter I, as is outlined in the Implications section of this chapter (p. 84), the results of this model in particular, support the argument for job-design and regulatory processes that foster authenticity and personal accomplishment.

**Model three: Deep acting, self-efficacy, and work engagement.** This model demonstrated that deep acting does not contribute to work engagement additional to that of self-efficacy and personal accomplishment, however, as the influence of self-efficacy, personal accomplishment, and type of organisation, accounted for 63% of variance in work engagement, this model indicates the immense impact of these variables in the mass-service context.

Regarding the theory that deep acting will be positively related to work engagement for the reason that, as the ‘good faith’ technique, deep acting promotes alignment between personal values and expectations for the service-role, the results of this model do not support this theory. These results are congruent with previous findings in the present research, that deep acting has a weak and inconsistent relationship with authenticity, and a weak relationship with work engagement, they therefore provide further evidence that, although deep acting can reduce conflict, role behaviours may not necessarily be supported by personal values. For this reason, these findings reinforce the argument that an authentic approach to the service encounter is separate to, and more beneficial to workers, than is deep acting.
Applying the interactive theory to the results of this model suggests that deep acting is positively associated with work engagement for the reason that deep actors receive positive feedback from customers and a sense of meaning from their tasks, which increases their self-efficacy and sense of personal accomplishment. Although deep acting remains beneficial to reduce emotional dissonance and burnout, to promote work engagement, it may not be useful beyond the extent to which it is able to provoke positive customer-feedback. The extent to which self-efficacy and personal accomplishment are related to work engagement supports the salience of customer-feedback in the interactive service context and endorses the recommendation for future research to consider the interpersonal element of service, mechanisms through which the experience of service work is affected, as well as customer-outcomes.

As deep acting is consistently positively associated with self-efficacy, a non-significant finding continues to support the training of service workers in deep acting. However, deep acting may only be beneficial to the extent that it reduces emotional dissonance, promotes self-efficacy and a sense of personal accomplishment. Therefore, I uphold the recommendation that, beyond reducing strain, for workers to benefit from emotional labour, authenticity is encouraged. The integration of authenticity into the mass-service context is discussed in greater detail in the Implications section of this chapter (p. 84). Referring to theory discussed in Chapter I, greater job autonomy may provide the conditions to encourage authenticity, self-efficacy, and personal accomplishment in mass-service workers. While strict regulation such as scripting, discourages authenticity, high task-reduction and low autonomy may also restrict opportunities for workers to obtain self-efficacy and experience a sense of accomplishment. Therefore, although job autonomy was not a measured variable in the present investigation, the results of this model in particular, lend support to the argument for increased autonomy in the mass-service context. Recommendations to increase authenticity and personal accomplishment in the mass-service industry are discussed in the implications section of this chapter (p. 84).

Model four: Surface acting, self-efficacy, and work engagement. In the interactive theory of a relationship between authenticity and work engagement, in place of the experience of authenticity, concern is for the appearance of authenticity
to customers, and the response that this provokes. Drawing from these models and empirical findings that the ability to influence others in the service interaction affects the affective outcome for workers (Sloan, 2014), I expected that, surface actors may regularly experience rewarding feedback from customers, which could positively contribute to a relationship with work engagement. Reduction in the relationship between surface acting and work engagement in the final stage of this model, illustrates that mass-service workers who use surface acting, and have high self-efficacy and personal accomplishment, will have greater experience of work engagement than those who surface act with low self-efficacy and personal accomplishment.

Significance of self-alienation in the final stage of this model indicates that self-alienation is related to work engagement independent from the effect accounted for by personal accomplishment. However, this finding does not endorse complete authenticity in service workers. In the present investigation, self-efficacy and personal accomplishment represented reward from achieving the work-role and from positive feedback from customers. Therefore, the results of this model are evidence to support the conclusions drawn from model two (authenticity, self-efficacy, and work engagement), that the extent to which workers receive rewarding feedback may contribute to work engagement beyond that of a sense of authenticity. Therefore, the immense amount of variability accounted for by personal accomplishment and self-efficacy in this model indicates that, additional to authentic expression, reward from achieving the work-role and in positive feedback from customers, is important to work engagement.

Although different measures were used, this finding is consistent with the findings of Sloan (2014), who in a sample of surface actors found that high self-efficacy and perceived influence over others was associated with reduced self-estrangement. Although body of previous research demonstrates a negative association between surface acting and self-efficacy (Brotheridge & Lee, 2003; Gross & John, 2003; Totterdell & Holman, 2003), as the findings of Sloan’s study also indicated a positive relationship between self-efficacy and the perceived ability to influence others, her findings support the assumption made in this regression model, that it is possible for workers who regularly engage in surface acting to obtain a high degree of self-efficacy. However, consistent with a pattern of findings
throughout the present research, in this model, the influence of personal accomplishment was substantially stronger ($b = .50$, $p < .001$) than was self-efficacy ($b = 0.18$, $p < .05$), and it should be noted that Sloan’s (2014) research did not extend to personal accomplishment. As discussed previously, this degree of influence from personal accomplishment may be particular to the mass-service context, and there is scope for future research to investigate contextual influences on the experience of work engagement.

I have referred to feelings of personal accomplishment and self-efficacy as a result of customer interaction and the experience of meaning. However, it is also possible that, in a reciprocal relationship, the experience of work engagement, particularly of dedication and absorption, prompts these workers to experience a greater sense of accomplishment. This model supports various practical applications, which are discussed below, as well as future examination of the mechanisms through which self-efficacy and a sense of accomplishment can be cultivated in surface actors.

This finding contributes to findings in the present research which indicate that, despite an extensively regulated working environment, workers in mass-service may have substantial ability to affect their experience of service, and that of their customers. Results of this model support the implementation of initiatives that develop a sense of personal accomplishment and enhance self-efficacy in interactive service workers. Considering the interactive proposition, the results of this model are evidence to suggest that workers who must use surface acting, may benefit from training that increases the appearance of their authenticity in their gestures; recommendations for training are discussed in the Implications section of this chapter (p. 84). However, although a negative relationship with work engagement was reduced with the addition of self-efficacy and personal accomplishment, owing to a negative relationship with authenticity, and a negative relationship with work engagement that was sustained in the final stage of this regression equation, the results of this model remain supportive of the recommendation that for their own well-being, workers in mass-service should be discouraged from surface acting.

As discussed previously, considering these findings within the framework of Kahn’s (1990) theory of personal engagement, surface acting may represent the
withdrawal of the authentic self from the work-role. In situations of abusive or unpleasant customer-interaction, surface acting may function to protect the worker from the negative affective outcomes of abusive interaction, and may protect the organisation from a loss of value. Considering the concept of surface acting as withdrawal, and a protective measure, the results of this regression equation, supported with similar previous findings (Sloan, 2014), indicates a valuable application to working environments in which the demands of the role make prolonged surface acting necessary. For example, in call-centres in which employees are regularly exposed to abusive customer-interaction, to limit decreased well-being among these workers, I recommend that management develops efforts aimed at enhancing feelings of self-efficacy and a sense of personal accomplishment in those workers. Regarding the Social Interaction Model (Côté, 2005) applied to self-efficacy and personal accomplishment, I recommend that workers in this situation receive extensive training in surface acting techniques designed to influence abusive customers and promote pleasant interaction. This training may be beneficial to outcomes for both service workers, and at the organisational level.

Additional findings. In the present investigation I did not consider the effect of demographic variables beyond their influence as control variables. However, where significant relationships relate to research aims fundamental to hypotheses of the present study, I have included them in the discussion below.

Type of organisation. In a study across industries, Taipale, Selander, Anttila, and Nätti (2011) found that, compared to other sectors of employment, workers in the retail sector had significantly lower work engagement. In contrast, in the present research, the mean work engagement score of workers in general retail ($M = 4.62, SD = 1.22$) was the highest of the four mass-service industries surveyed, and was significantly higher than supermarket workers ($M = 3.79, SD = 0.97$), $F(3, 136) = 4.56, p = .004$.

Owing to their size, supermarkets are an excellent example of the mass-service model. The supermarket environment may be more standardised and workers may be more intensely monitored, than are the majority of workers in general retail. For this reason, the finding that work engagement is significantly reduced in supermarket workers, suggests that service models that use extensive
regulation are detrimental to worker well-being. Referring to the previous findings, that feeling authentic within the service encounter is positively related to work engagement, and as personal accomplishment and self-efficacy may indicate enriched interaction with customers, the expression of personality in the service encounter may improve the consumer-experience, to ultimately contribute to organisational goals. Therefore, this combination of findings is strong evidence that this model for service does not serve organisational purposes to the extent that its increasing uptake around the world would suggest.

Given the prevalence of this type of working environment around the world, I recommend that future research examine this service model and its implications for outcomes across stakeholders. Future research could seek to replicate this finding, examine the potential for the suggestions made in the present research for improvements to the mass-service model (job-design and regulating policy to promote authenticity and personal accomplishment), and investigate alternative approaches to the organisation of service work.

**Ethnicity.** The results of this investigation present evidence to suggest that there is a significant difference in authenticity and in work engagement between New Zealand European (NZE) and Maori mass-service workers. Regarding authenticity, NZE reported less feelings of self-alienation than did Maori service workers ($t(114) = -2.34, p = .02$), and Maori experienced greater authentic living than did their NZE counterparts, $t(25.65) = -2.98, p = .01$. Results demonstrate no significant difference in accepting external influence ($p = .052$) between NZE and Maori. Regarding work engagement, Maori scored significantly higher than did NZE, $t(114) = -2.60, p = .01$. These findings suggest that, although Maori are more likely to refer to their personal values in the workplace (authentic living), they may also feel less connected to their authentic selves (self-alienation) than do NZE at work.

That Maori feel more disconnected from their core selves in this working environment supports the idea that the service model in mass-service has been founded on, and may therefore perpetuate, norms for service that are not objective standards for good service, rather they are culturally-specific (Grandey, Fisk, & Steiner, 2005). As previously discussed, modelled on systems of mass-production, this organisation of work emerged from the industrial revolution, in which
rationality was a core value, and maximum efficiency of time and resources were the ultimate objectives. Higher authentic living in Maori indicates that the cultural approach of the mass-service model may have particularly low regard for authenticity within the workplace context.

Despite experiencing greater self-alienation, Maori demonstrated higher work engagement than NZE. This finding indicates that there may be approaches to service that are founded on different cultural values, which may better allow for individuality and authenticity at work, which may therefore have positive implications for service work. This theory is supported with the findings of previous research in which a difference between the approach to service, and outcomes of emotional labour on service workers, was observed between cultures. However, although Allen, Diefendorff, and Ma (2014) found a difference in approach and outcomes between Chinese service workers those in the United States of America, and Grandey, Fisk, and Steiner (2005), between French service workers those in the United States, this investigation has been the first examine the role of authenticity in the cultural context. Considering the interpersonal element of service, organisations in mass-service industries may benefit from observing and incorporating other approaches to service, in particular, those which recognise the potential for value inherent in authentic interpersonal interaction.

Regarding both authenticity and work engagement, a significant difference between groups was unexpected. There were few Maori respondents in the sample and this finding requires replication in a larger sample. Significant differences between ethnic groups, supports the recommendation that future research seek to replicate this finding and extend investigation into authenticity and work engagement across cultures. Future research could investigate cultural concepts of the role of authenticity at work, and in particular this finding supports future research into different approaches to service across cultures.

Implications

Authenticity in the workplace. Overall, the findings of the present research support increased authenticity in the workplace for an enhanced experience of work. Findings indicated that authenticity reduces the experience of strain that has been associated with emotional dissonance in emotional labour, there is also evidence to suggest that authenticity is related to increased work
engagement. Although the sample used in this investigation was exclusive to the mass-service industries, consistency with the findings of previous studies in which broader samples were used, indicates a degree of generalizability to other work contexts.

As discussed in Chapter I, in addition to being a positive affective state for workers, work engagement represents immense implications for organisations. In the case of an interactive service context, these effects may be amplified. Referring to the interactive element in the mass-service context, evidence of the moderating influence of personal accomplishment in a relationship between authenticity and work engagement, provides evidence to suggest that an authentic approach to customer interaction that is also aligned with the work-role, may positively affect customers. Customers may respond positively to engaged workers, to further improve their experience of the service interaction, and as rewarding interaction builds a relationship between customers and the brand, organisations may experience increased market-share and improved financial performance. I expect that this relationship will not be exclusive to the mass-service population and will be applicable to all work contexts in which there is an interactive element.

According to the findings of the present research, I recommend that employees are supported to achieve balance between the demands that they must fulfil to achieve their work-role, and to remain connected to their sense of self. Allowing for the authenticity of workers is not usually considered in job-design, however evidence in the present investigation supports the argument for job-design that permits workers greater autonomy and opposes regulation for homogeneity. With a trend towards flatter organisations and broader job-scope (Friedman, 2005), I consider that a high degree of job autonomy may become more common, and given previous research that suggests a positive relationship between autonomy and authenticity (van den Bosch & Taris, 2014a, 2014b), that a higher degree of authentic may also become more common, as well as more acceptable, in the workplace. For successful integration of authenticity into the working environment, I recommend that changes be applied across the organisation, to include modification of job-design, regulatory policy and processes, training and development initiatives, and in some cases, may extend to criteria for personnel selection. For each of these initiatives, the implications are discussed below.
The mass-service model. The mass-service industry is particular in a strong focus towards homogeneity and conformity. As highlighted in Ritzer’s (2004) account of service workers as ‘non-people,’ intense regulation over the service encounter can standardise interaction with customers to the point of excluding the personality. The results of the present research demonstrate that authenticity significantly contributes to work engagement, and therefore support the following recommendations to integrate authenticity into the mass-service framework.

As discussed previously, face-to-face interaction in mass-service makes a worker’s state of work engagement visible to customers. Furthermore, as role-expectations for the service persona pertain to positive affect, increased work engagement may reduce the degree of acting required to achieve the service-role. For example, when workers are experiencing a high degree of work engagement, they may be better able to be authentic in the service encounter and continue to achieve the service-role. These workers may receive the benefits of feeling authentic, as well as personal satisfaction from achieving the service-role, and from positive customer response. Therefore, there is potential that adjustments to job-design in mass-service to promote work engagement, such as increased job autonomy, may both encourage work engagement, and enhance its benefits.

As a strong relationship between personal accomplishment and work engagement denotes reward from achieving the work-role and positive customer-feedback, the findings of the present research suggest that service workers continue to achieve the demands of the service-role. However, a positive relationship between authenticity and work engagement, which is independent of the variability accounted for by personal accomplishment, indicates that while service workers should conform to expectations for the service-role to an extent, it is also important that they retain a sense of authenticity and express their personality with customers. These findings support a change in managerial focus in the mass-service industries, from discouraging, to promoting the integration of personality into the service encounter. To encourage both the individual expression and to build feelings of personal accomplishment, these findings also support greater job-autonomy in mass-service roles.

As mentioned in Chapter I, a factor in the design of mass-service that is distinct from the general customer service context is that mass-service is not
designed for service providers to build relationships with customers. However, evidence that supports a more authentic approach to service that promotes a sense of meaning, implies that this service model could benefit from greater recognition to interpersonal relationships between workers and customers. A more authentic approach to service may make service encounters less monotonous, reduce depersonalisation, and encourage a more meaningful experience of service. Owing to the high priority of efficiency in the mass-service model, workers are typically rewarded for quick and error-free service or the most sales (Leidner, 1993), however, to promote authentic and meaningful interaction with customers, management could recognise workers who become familiar with their regular customers, such as by remembering names and preferences. Observations made by Tolich (1993) in his qualitative study of supermarket workers, indicates a way in which personality may be able to be integrated with the role. For example, in cases in which service workers have traditionally adhered to a script, by permitting the use of their own choice of greeting and farewell (as it also aligns to the objectives of the service-role), and the use of personal judgement to modify the script according to the preferences and needs of individual customers, these changes allow for the service role to be infused with individual personality.

Greater acceptance of authenticity would not need to solely come from management. The service environment is particular in that the conduct of workers is regulated by both management and consumers. According to widespread routinisation of the mass-service model for service, the implementation of greater authenticity into the service interaction would necessitate changing the expectations of customers. In the situation in which customers who have come to expect a pleasant but superficial interaction are confronted with a more authentic approach, they may negatively evaluate the interaction and perceive poor job performance from the service worker. However, according to the Social Interaction Model (Côté, 2005), authenticity may promote trust in the brand. Additionally, there is empirical evidence to suggest that customers respond positively to service that appears authentic (Bujisic, Wu, Mattila, & Bilgihan, 2014), and Ritzer (2004) considers that the consistent presentation of customer service representatives as ‘non-people’ promotes abuse from customers. Therefore, there is potential that with a shift towards a more authentic service culture, there will be less depersonalisation, and
service interactions will become more rewarding for both workers and customers, as well as endorse the brand.

Considering the implications for increased authenticity, personal accomplishment and work-engagement to enhance the service encounter for both workers and their customers, the findings of the present research indicate that the mass-service model may be detrimental to the organisational aims for quality service that it is designed to protect. Successful integration of a higher degree of authenticity into the service encounter would require re-training workers in appropriate use of both authenticity and acting, recommendations for which are outlined below.

**Training and development for service personnel.** The service encounter has immense potential to affect customer outcomes. Referring to the Social Interaction Model (Côté, 2005), interaction that customers detect as superficial may degrade the service encounter, while authentic interaction that also achieves the demands of the service-role, has potential to enhance the customer-experience, and add value. By encouraging homogeneity, the mass-service model may inhibit potential in the service encounter to generate value, however, it may also ensure an acceptable level of profit. To continue to protect value, organisations that seek to integrate authenticity into their service culture will need to encourage the responsible use of personality in service their workers. For this reason, I recommend that training and development initiatives compliment a less standardised and regulated model for service. Additionally, findings of the present research provide evidence to suggest that in place of complete authenticity, or deep acting, service workers will benefit most from integrating their personality into the service-role. Therefore, I recommend that service workers receive training in the beneficial use of personality in the service-role. For example, new employees might be trained to identify aspects of their personality that enhance their role performance (for example, friendly, talkative, caring, helpful).

Considering the extensive influence of personal accomplishment evident in the findings of the present research, I recommend training and development initiatives that encourage workers to find meaning in their work tasks; as the predominant task in mass-service roles. I recommend that initiatives focus on building meaning in customer interaction. As discussed previously, a more
authentic approach service may support meaningful interaction. Additionally, an intervention using narrative with service workers could promote the evaluation of service work as meaningful, and accordingly, may increase the sense of personal accomplishment drawn from work tasks.

Although findings in the present research are consistent with those of previous studies, and support the recommendation of deep acting over surface acting, findings also indicate an application for surface acting. Owing to their low social status (Hochschild, 1983) and the promotion of the ‘non-person’ (Ritzer, 2004), workers in mass-service may be especially prone to abuse from their customers. In this situation, it is desirable to both, protect the worker from the effects of abuse, and to uphold the brand’s image. Evidence in the present research (strong negative associations between both surface acting and authenticity, and surface acting and engagement), combined with Kahn’s (1990) theory of personal engagement, suggests that surface acting represents withdrawal of the authentic self from the work-role; surface acting may be a technique to maintain the service-role while protecting the authentic self. In place of a more authentic approach, which may be detrimental to the worker’s well-being and the brand’s reputation, both organisations and workers may benefit from training workers to engage in surface acting in these situations.

Given the negative associations between surface acting, authenticity and work engagement observed in the present research, it is not recommended that workers use this technique regularly, however, the demands of some roles may necessitate extensive surface acting. For example, in the case of call centres in which employees must cold-call potential clients, the results of the present investigation and the results of Sloan’s (2014) study, recommend that job-design and managerial policies promote feelings of self-efficacy and personal accomplishment in these workers. Empirical findings in Sloan’s study, propositions in the Social Interaction Model (Côté, 2005), and the findings of the present research support the recommendation to train workers in techniques to positively influence the service encounter, so that, while they may not experience authenticity, they may appear authentic to customers and gain a sense of personal accomplishment from the service interaction.
Finally, to promote self-efficacy and a sense of personal accomplishment, I recommend that the mass-service industries make opportunities for continuous development available to service workers. This may involve the incremental award of greater responsibility and autonomy. In large organisations such as supermarkets, this could involve training across the organisation in different departments. Although these initiatives represent substantially more investment in labour, as well as a more committed and engaged workforce, there is potential for reduced employee-turnover.

**Personnel selection in interactive service positions.** In organisations in which more autonomy is permitted and more authenticity expected, it may become necessary to give greater consideration to alignment between personality and the demands of the service-role. Regarding physical and cognitive labour, selection processes regularly select-in applicants who align with the demands of the role. However, it may be that, owing to a conception that personality is malleable, or owing to the precariat nature of the mass-service workforce, personality does not typically receive a high degree of consideration. Findings of the present research indicate that the greater extent to which employees can integrate their authentic personality into their work-role, they can avoid acting, and will have an enhanced experience of work. There is also potential for improved customer-loyalty, to increase financial performance. Therefore, I recommend that when a role requires extensive emotional labour, that the concept of person-job fit extend to personality. Personality characteristics that are consistent with the demands of the interactive service environment may include extraversion and agreeableness.

**Strengths**

The present investigation benefited from the consideration of many aspects in which research attention has been lacking. While mass-service is a substantial section of the service sector that is continuing to grow around the world, the majority of research in emotional labour has focussed on teachers and nurses. Relationships between authenticity components and work engagement that were stronger than expected, indicate that working conditions may make authenticity especially salient to the well-being of mass-service workers. Also unexpected, were strong associations to personal accomplishment and much weaker associations with self-efficacy. As personal accomplishment may indicate a meaningful experience
of the service encounter and rewarding feedback from customers, strong relationships with personal accomplishment may also be particular to conditions in the mass-service context.

While the majority of research in emotional labour has considered burnout, the positive focus of this investigation has supported many practical recommendations to enhance the working experience. Also not usually considered in emotional labour research, this investigation benefited from the recognition of the interactive element of the mass-service context. Although measuring the effects of customer-feedback was beyond the scope of this study, evidence of strong influence of personal accomplishment in the mass-service context, provides support for the Social Interaction Model (Côté, 2005) and the Model of Interpersonal Sensemaking (Wrzesniewski, Dutton, & Debebe, 2003). The immense impact of personal accomplishment considered through the lenses of these interactive models, indicates a way in which expressing individual personality and retaining a sense of authenticity may affect workers, their customers, and therefore could be extended to imply organisational outcomes.

A substantial strength of this study is the recommendations that can be drawn from the findings. A positive relationship between deep acting, authenticity, personal accomplishment, and work engagement, indicates that emotional labour is not inherently detrimental to mass-service workers, and is evidence to suggest that all service workers may be able to benefit from emotional labour. A relationship between personal accomplishment and work engagement that is stronger than the relationship between authenticity and work engagement, suggests implications for job-design in mass-service. As permitting workers in mass-service greater autonomy may increase opportunities to realise a sense of personal accomplishment, the findings of the present research provide support for arguments to re-design these roles and regulatory processes. A significant difference in mean work engagement between supermarket workers and those in general retail provides further evidence to suggest that the extensively standardised and regulated mass-service model is detrimental to worker well-being. A significant relationship with work engagement beyond the influence of personal accomplishment indicates the independent value inherent in authenticity to well-being in service workers. Considering the significance of both authenticity and personal accomplishment,
regression models support the proposition that, for their own well-being, service workers should strive to balance achieving the expectations of the service-role while retaining a connection to their authentic sense of self.

The findings of the present research provide empirical evidence to support the proposition that authenticity is an influential factor to the well-being of workers and to outcomes in the mass-service context. A negative relationship between surface acting and authenticity that was absent between deep acting and authenticity is evidence that the strain associated with surface acting is owing to emotional dissonance. A positive relationship between self-alienation and work engagement is evidence that, while inauthenticity is detrimental to the well-being of service workers, authenticity has potential to influence beneficial outcomes. Additionally, the results of the present research provide empirical evidence to support Kahn’s (1990) theory of personal engagement. While these findings are evidence to suggest that surface acting should be discouraged, as there is also evidence that surface acting is withdrawal of the authentic self, findings of the present research indicate an application of surface acting that may protect both worker well-being and organisational value.

Regarding contention over the extent to which deep acting is an authentic approach to emotional labour, evidence suggests that, although deep acting is not inauthentic, and is a more authentic approach to emotional labour than is surface acting, it should not be considered to be an authentic approach to emotional labour. Opposing relationships to work engagement support the argument that deep acting should be encouraged over surface acting for employee well-being. However, a stronger relationship between authenticity and work engagement indicates that, in place of training workers in deep acting, workers in mass-service should be encouraged to be more authentic in the service encounter. That deep acting was not significantly related to work engagement beyond the extent to which it could generate personal accomplishment and self-efficacy, reinforced that the benefits of deep acting were limited compared to those of authenticity, and regarding the call to train workers in deep acting, contributes a new perspective to this argument.

**Limitations**

The findings of the present research lack generalizability beyond the mass-service context. As mentioned previously, mass-service is particular in the consistency of
working conditions, and to further control for variability, this sample was limited to those industries considered to best embody this service model. Although a broader scope could have generated a larger sample, and provided greater statistical power, different job demands and resources may confound associations with work engagement (Mauno, Kinnunen, & Ruokolainen, 2007; Xanthopoulou, Bakker, Demerouti, & Schaufeli, 2009a). In order to limit variability in working conditions, the scope of the present research was restricted to mass-service work in which there appeared to be extremely high standardisation, including low variation in customer-interaction. For example, as the job of a bank teller may entail high customer-contact and little liberty to customise service, it can be said to meet the requirements for mass-service as outlined by Maister and Lovelock (1982), however, greater task and skill variety as well as opportunities for development, may have affected the experience of work engagement. Greater consequence for error could have increased dedication and absorption, more task and skill variety could have provoked a sense of accomplishment and vigour, and as bank tellers are generally responsible for a broader range of services, requirement for attention to the specific needs of individual customers may have facilitated absorption. Therefore, all aspects of work engagement may have been substantially affected by influences that were beyond the scope of this investigation; findings may not be generalizable to the broader customer service context, to other service contexts, or to other working environments. Although it should be noted that, similar correlations with previous finings in which broader samples were used, indicate a degree of generalizability in these findings.

Stronger correlations in the present study between authenticity and work engagement, than observed in two previous studies (van den Bosch & Taris, 2014a, 2014b), suggest that authenticity may be especially salient to work engagement in mass-service workers. I expect that the job-design typical across mass-service, in which, owing to task-reduction and automation, customer-interaction is usually the most salient task, and the traditional sources of work engagement are low, could amplify the degree to which authenticity and personal-accomplishment contribute to work engagement. I recommend that future research seek to replicate this finding and compare antecedents to work engagement across industries.
As an investigation into a model for service in which consistency is the predominant feature, I expected substantial uniformity between working conditions, across roles, across organisations, and throughout the four industries sampled in the present study. However, evidence in the present research to suggest that work engagement is lower in supermarkets than in general retail, indicates significantly different working conditions. As previously discussed, I expect that, owing to their smaller size, workers in general retail may have greater job autonomy, be less extensively monitored and, on account of less-frequent interaction with customers, may have more task variety. However, the absence of significant differences in authenticity between the mass-service industries sampled, suggests that the demand to perform the service-role, which was the principal concern for this study, is consistent across industries. Future research could seek to replicate this finding and explore the contributing factors.

A lack of diversity in respondents may have reduced the statistical power of the present investigation. 71% of respondents were New Zealand European and 82% of respondents were female. The results of the present study indicate a significant difference in authenticity and work engagement between Maori and New Zealand European respondents, and that females experienced higher work engagement in the mass-service environment than did males. As the service sector is predominantly female, reduced work engagement may indicate that males have a different experience of work in the service sector than do females. Owing to different cultural values, Maori may approach service interaction differently than do New Zealand European workers in mass-service, which may affect engagement outcomes. More variation in the sample would support these findings, and in addition to more Maori respondents, greater representation of other cultures may have illustrated further cultural distinctions.

Finally, although I used validated scales, self-deception may have been a factor in some responses. Respondents who regularly experienced inauthenticity and used self-deception to avoid emotional dissonance, may have also deceived themselves of the authenticity of their responses to the survey used in the present research. I expect that, owing to a desire for congruency, self-deception will be an issue in any research that measures authenticity by self-report. Although difficult to
obtain, future research on authenticity could support self-report data with observer feedback, however, this measure was beyond the scope of the present research.

**Recommendations for Future Research**

The present investigation has provided evidence to suggest that increased authenticity may be a factor in the positive associations observed in previous research between surface acting, deep acting, job autonomy and well-being outcomes, including work engagement. These findings support recommendations for future research to examine the extent to which authenticity affects work-related outcomes. As associations with work engagement across the three components of the authenticity construct were stronger than expected, I recommend that future research in authenticity attend to the interactive service context. Future research could examine the techniques of service workers who report high authenticity in customer interactions. Additionally, a significant difference between the authenticity and work engagement of Maori and New Zealand Europeans supports future research that examines cultural approaches to authenticity in the workplace.

Findings of the present research have highlighted the need to consider contextual influences on work engagement. Stronger than anticipated relationships with authenticity and personal accomplishment may be particular to interactive service work, and may have less influence in work contexts in which interpersonal interaction is not the principal activity, such as in on a factory production-line, and other sources for work engagement are more readily available. I recommend that future research seek to replicate these relationships, as well as investigate the antecedents of work engagement across industries.

In regards to measuring authenticity at work, consistent with findings observed in previous studies in which the IAM Work scale was used (van den Bosch & Taris, 2014a, 2014b), results in the present research illustrate a pattern of correlations involving accepting external influence. Distinct to self-alienation and authentic living, these relationships are generally weaker and with a higher probability of type one error. This pattern indicates that accepting external influence may measure an aspect of authenticity that is substantially distinct from other constructs in this scale, and future research that investigates authenticity at work may further develop this construct.
Although the findings of the present research are evidence to support Kahn’s (1990) concept of engagement as a continuum of involving the self, stronger correlations between personal accomplishment and work engagement indicate that authenticity may not be as central to the concept as Kahn proposed. These findings support the renewal of research focus on personal accomplishment, as a component that is distinct from, and that particularly in the service context, may be more salient than self-efficacy. Given the strength of the association personal accomplishment and work engagement, the findings of future investigation into the antecedents of personal accomplishment could be expected to inform recommendations to increase work engagement in mass-service workers. Additionally, as referred to previously, work engagement may promote feelings of personal accomplishment. Therefore, I recommend that future research consider a reciprocal effect of work engagement on a sense of accomplishment.

In the present investigation I expected that alignment between personal values and the expectations for the role would be related to role-identification. Future research could investigate the extent to which role-identity is related to a sense of meaning, and that role-identity and meaning are each related to work engagement. Additionally, as I proposed theoretical arguments to support distinct relationships between surface acting, deep acting, and authenticity, and their associations with absorption, dedication, and vigour, in place of the overarching work engagement construct, future research could investigate relationships between approaches and each primary construct of work engagement.

Referring to the interactive proposition, I recommend that future research acknowledge and further investigate interactive effects in the service environment. Referring to the Social Interaction Model (Côté, 2005) and the Model of Interpersonal Sensemaking (Wrzesniewski, Dutton, & Debebe, 2003), there is substantial scope to examine customer-response to different approaches to service, and the extent to which customer-response affects service workers.
Summary

Overall, results of the present research highlight that it is possible and beneficial for mass-service workers to maintain a sense of authenticity within the service-role. Results demonstrate that deep acting is a more authentic approach to emotional labour than surface acting, however, an inconsistent relationship across the authenticity construct suggests that, although this technique may reduce internal conflict with behaviour, neither of these techniques permit workers to retain a connection to their authentic self in the mass-service environment. Findings support Kahn’s (1990) concept of a process of personal engagement and disengagement of the authentic self from the work-role, which endorses surface acting in specific contexts. Evidence suggests that the extent to which personal accomplishment is derived from the work-role is strongly related to work engagement. As in the context of an interactive service-role, a sense of personal accomplishment may represent positive customer-feedback, this finding supports ‘humanisation’ of the service persona for an enhanced service experience for customers as well as workers, and ultimately, sustained competitive advantage for organisations.
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Customer Service Employee Experience Survey

Reminder: Please do not write your name or that of your organisation or employer.

**Being Myself at Work**

*How much of your true self do you show in the workplace? Some people are very different people at work than in their personal time.*

*Please indicate how much the following statement describes how you usually feel at work on a typical workday. You may respond using the labelled points on the scale (1, 4, 7) or the points in between (2, 3, 5, 6). Please indicate only one answer and do not respond between points on the scale (e.g. in the space between 2 and 3).*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1. At work, I behave in a manner that people expect me to behave</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Does not describe me at all</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Describes me very well</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2. I am true to myself at work in most situations</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Does not describe me at all</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Describes me very well</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>3. I behave in accordance with my values and beliefs in the workplace</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Does not describe me at all</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Describes me very well</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>4. At work, I feel the need to do what others expect me to do</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Does not describe me at all</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Describes me very well</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>5. At work, I always stand by what I believe in</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Does not describe me at all</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Describes me very well</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
6. I don’t feel who I truly am at work

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Does not describe me at all</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Describes me very well</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7. At work, I feel out of touch with the “real me”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Does not describe me at all</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Describes me very well</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8. At work, I feel alienated (isolated)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Does not describe me at all</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Describes me very well</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

9. I am strongly influenced in the workplace by the opinions of others

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Does not describe me at all</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Describes me very well</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

10. In my working environment I feel “cut off” from who I really am

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Does not describe me at all</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Describes me very well</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

11. I find it easier to get on with people in the workplace when I’m being myself

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Does not describe me at all</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Describes me very well</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

12. Other people influence me greatly at work

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Does not describe me at all</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Describes me very well</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Feelings about My Job
Some people feel energised by their work while some feel drained. How do you feel about your work? Indicate the answer that best describes how you usually feel at work on a typical workday. Please select only one option per question and do not respond between points on the scale (e.g. in the space between 2 and 3).

13. When I get up in the morning, I feel like going to work

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Never</th>
<th>Almost Never</th>
<th>Rarely</th>
<th>Sometimes</th>
<th>Often</th>
<th>Very Often</th>
<th>Always</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

14. I am interested in my work

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Never</th>
<th>Almost Never</th>
<th>Rarely</th>
<th>Sometimes</th>
<th>Often</th>
<th>Very Often</th>
<th>Always</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

15. My job inspires me

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Never</th>
<th>Almost Never</th>
<th>Rarely</th>
<th>Sometimes</th>
<th>Often</th>
<th>Very Often</th>
<th>Always</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

16. At my work, I feel bursting with energy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Never</th>
<th>Almost Never</th>
<th>Rarely</th>
<th>Sometimes</th>
<th>Often</th>
<th>Very Often</th>
<th>Always</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

17. When I get up in the morning, I feel like going to work

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Never</th>
<th>Almost Never</th>
<th>Rarely</th>
<th>Sometimes</th>
<th>Often</th>
<th>Very Often</th>
<th>Always</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

18. I am interested in my work

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Never</th>
<th>Almost Never</th>
<th>Rarely</th>
<th>Sometimes</th>
<th>Often</th>
<th>Very Often</th>
<th>Always</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

19. My job inspires me

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Never</th>
<th>Almost Never</th>
<th>Rarely</th>
<th>Sometimes</th>
<th>Often</th>
<th>Very Often</th>
<th>Always</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

20. At my work, I feel bursting with energy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Never</th>
<th>Almost Never</th>
<th>Rarely</th>
<th>Sometimes</th>
<th>Often</th>
<th>Very Often</th>
<th>Always</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
21. I am enthusiastic about my job

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Never</th>
<th>Almost</th>
<th>Rarely</th>
<th>Sometimes</th>
<th>Often</th>
<th>Very Often</th>
<th>Always</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

22. I am proud of the work that I do

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Never</th>
<th>Almost</th>
<th>Rarely</th>
<th>Sometimes</th>
<th>Often</th>
<th>Very Often</th>
<th>Always</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

23. I feel happy when I am working intensely

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Never</th>
<th>Almost</th>
<th>Rarely</th>
<th>Sometimes</th>
<th>Often</th>
<th>Very Often</th>
<th>Always</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

24. At my job I feel strong and vigorous

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Never</th>
<th>Almost</th>
<th>Rarely</th>
<th>Sometimes</th>
<th>Often</th>
<th>Very Often</th>
<th>Always</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

25. I get carried away when I am working

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Never</th>
<th>Almost</th>
<th>Rarely</th>
<th>Sometimes</th>
<th>Often</th>
<th>Very Often</th>
<th>Always</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Sense of Accomplishment at Work**

*These questions refer to feeling that your job matters and that you can make a difference. Indicate the answer that best describes how you usually feel at work on a typical workday. Please select only one option per question and do not respond between points on the scale (e.g. in the space between 2 and 3).*

26. I can effectively solve the problems that arise in my work

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Never</th>
<th>Almost</th>
<th>Rarely</th>
<th>Sometimes</th>
<th>Often</th>
<th>Very Often</th>
<th>Always</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

27. I feel I am making an effective contribution to what this organisation does

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Never</th>
<th>Almost</th>
<th>Rarely</th>
<th>Sometimes</th>
<th>Often</th>
<th>Very Often</th>
<th>Always</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

28. In my opinion, I am good at my job

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Never</th>
<th>Almost</th>
<th>Rarely</th>
<th>Sometimes</th>
<th>Often</th>
<th>Very Often</th>
<th>Always</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
29. I feel exhilarated when I accomplish something at work

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Never</th>
<th>Almost Never</th>
<th>Rarely</th>
<th>Sometimes</th>
<th>Often</th>
<th>Very Often</th>
<th>Always</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

30. I have accomplished many worthwhile things in this job

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Never</th>
<th>Almost Never</th>
<th>Rarely</th>
<th>Sometimes</th>
<th>Often</th>
<th>Very Often</th>
<th>Always</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

31. At my work, I feel confident that I am effective at getting things done

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Never</th>
<th>Almost Never</th>
<th>Rarely</th>
<th>Sometimes</th>
<th>Often</th>
<th>Very Often</th>
<th>Always</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Emotions at Work**

*Indicate the answer that best describes how you usually manage your own emotions when interacting with customers. Please select only one option per question and do not respond between points on the scale (e.g. in the space between 2 and 3).*

*When serving a customer I usually….*

32. Resist expressing my true feelings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Never</th>
<th>Rarely</th>
<th>Sometimes</th>
<th>Often</th>
<th>Always</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

33. Make an effort to actually feel the emotions that I need to display to others

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Never</th>
<th>Rarely</th>
<th>Sometimes</th>
<th>Often</th>
<th>Always</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

34. Pretend to have emotions that I don’t really have

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Never</th>
<th>Rarely</th>
<th>Sometimes</th>
<th>Often</th>
<th>Always</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

35. Hide my true feelings about a situation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Never</th>
<th>Rarely</th>
<th>Sometimes</th>
<th>Often</th>
<th>Always</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

36. Try to actually experience the emotions that I must show

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Never</th>
<th>Rarely</th>
<th>Sometimes</th>
<th>Often</th>
<th>Always</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

37. Really try to feel the emotions I have to show as part of my job

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Never</th>
<th>Rarely</th>
<th>Sometimes</th>
<th>Often</th>
<th>Always</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Demographics
Please tell us a little about yourself – remember, your responses are anonymous; you will not be asked for your name or that of your workplace and from the information you provide I will not be able to identify you, your workplace, or the organisation you work for.

Please complete all the questions and only select only one option per answer.

38. Are you Male or Female?
Indicate your answer by circling the option that applies to you.

Male / Female

39. What is your ethnicity?
Indicate your answer by circling the option that most applies to you.

NZ European / Maori / Asian
Pacific Islander / European / Indian
African / South American / Other

40. How old are you?


years

41. What type of organisation do you work for?
Indicate your answer by circling the option that applies to you.

Petrol Station / Fast Food / Supermarket / General Retail

42. Experience: In your lifetime, for how long have you worked in roles that require high contact with customers?


years

months

Thank you for taking the time to respond to this survey.

If you would like to be entered into the draw to win one of three $40 shopping vouchers at Te Awa The Base, please send an e-mail with the subject line ‘Customer Service Survey’ to lkps1@students.waikato.ac.nz (Your e-mail address will not be able to be linked to your responses. Your e-mail address will not be shared or used for other purposes. Winners will be notified by e-mail).

Please use the pre-paid and addressed envelopes provided and post completed surveys to the University of Waikato.

If you have been affected by the issues raised in this questionnaire, Youthline (0800 376 633) and Lifeline (0800 543 354) provide support services that are free and confidential.
APPENDIX B

Information Sheet for Managers

Work Engagement in Customer Service – Information Sheet for Management

This research focuses on customer service settings where interaction is typically short, simple, and repetitive. Staff in these roles have immense potential to affect the organisation’s image. This study measures the employee’s approach to customer-interaction – that is the extent to which they ‘act the role’, or use more authentic person-person interaction; it investigates the relationship between their degree of authenticity with their experience of work engagement and feelings of personal accomplishment.

Work Engagement in Customer Service:

Work Engagement is a positive and energetic working state characterised by dedication and absorption in the task. It is particularly desirable in face-to-face customer service, where not only can tasks be repetitive but disengagement is noticeable. Service that is ‘robotic’ reflects on the organisation and affects loyalty intentions. A lack of engagement is related to feelings of cynicism and depersonalisation (“all customers are the same”) and employee turnover. Engagement is related to pro-active behaviour, creative problem-solving, improved safety behaviours, and quality.

Authenticity:

An underlying objective of customer service is to build rapport, which requires trust. Signs of ‘acting’ can be counter-productive, causing negative customer outcomes including poor service evaluation and distrust in the organisation. Given the emphasis in customer service on connecting to others, an authentic approach is expected to play a role in work engagement and feelings of personal accomplishment.

The survey:

The survey uses a selection of empirically validated scales. It measures work engagement, the degree of personal accomplishment employees gain from their work, how much they feel themselves while in their work role, and how authentic their approach to customer service is. The survey will be offered online and in paper form, it has 38 ‘tick the box’ questions and should take 8-10 minutes to complete. It does not ask for information that will make the individual, the store, or the organisation identifiable. Employees who participate are recognised with the chance to win one of three $40 gift cards to be used at The Base. Respondents are made aware on the survey that to enter they need to send me an email with the subject line ‘Customer Service Survey’. I will delete all record of their email once the winners have been notified.

Your participation:

I require consent to hang a poster with ‘tear-away tabs’ in the workplace. Participants can follow the URL from the poster. Alternatively, managers who wish to do so can forward an email to staff which contains a hyperlink to the survey however participants should be
reminded that this is voluntary and their participation cannot be identified, rewarded, or punished. For smaller worksites, a hardcopy of the survey is available. I will leave hardcopies on site with a paid and addressed envelope; respondents especially concerned with confidentiality do not need to keep their completed questionnaires at the workplace. Respondents should not be coerced to participate; participation should not take place on paid work time; neither should respondents fill out the survey together or in the presence of their colleagues or manager.

The results:

Results are confidential, individuals and stores that take part cannot be identified. Results will indicate if encouraging authenticity within the service role is a viable direction for training and development.

If you have any queries or concerns, please do not hesitate to contact me: lisakpsharp@gmail.com; 022-632-1606, or my supervisors who are listed below. This research has been approved by the school of Psychology and is being conducted as a requirement to fulfil my masters in applied psychology (MApPsyOrg). Your consent to promote this questionnaire to employees is very much appreciated.

Best regards,

Lisa Sharp
University of Waikato

Dr Maree Roche (primary supervisor) mroche@waikato.ac.nz
07 838 4466 ext. 8294

Dr Donald Cable (secondary supervisor) dcable@waikato.ac.nz
07 838 4466 ext. 8296
APPENDIX C

Information Sheet for Respondents

Customer Service Employee Experience Survey

Welcome,
Thank you for your consideration to participate in the customer service survey. Specifically, my research is interested how much you feel you can be yourself with customers, and how you feel about your job. Questions are about your emotional experience at work. You will not be asked for any information that would identify you or your workplace. There are 37 questions and the survey should take less than 10 minutes to complete. The feedback you provide will help researchers, psychologists and managers to better understand the reality of working in customer service, and how to make the job easier and more enjoyable.

If for any reason you cannot finish or do not wish to complete the survey please be aware that you can stop at any time. You do not need to provide a reason, there will be no consequence for not finishing, and you will still be entered into the draw to win vouchers. This survey is only open to participants 16 years and over; if you are under 16 please do not participate. By completing this survey you are giving consent to use the information you provide in this study. I will not be able to know who your employer is, data will be combined according to the type of organisation (i.e. fast food) and a general overview of findings will be available to your employer. Data will be kept confidential and will be deleted or destroyed after completion of the study. If you would like to be informed of the results, please contact me at the email address provided below.

To thank you for your participation, you will be entered into the draw to win one of three $40 vouchers for The Base / Te Awa shopping centre. If you wish to enter the draw, please send an email with the subject line ‘Customer Service Survey’ to likps1@students.waikato.ac.nz. Your e-mail address will not be able to be linked to your responses. Your e-mail address will not be shared or used for other purposes. Winners will be notified by e-mail).

If you have any questions about the survey, what happens to the data you provide, or would like to be sent a copy of the conclusions, please contact me on the above e-mail. Alternatively, you may contact the convener of the Research and Ethics Committee, Associate Professor, Dr John Perrone, 07 838 4466 ext. 8292, email: jpnz@waikato.ac.nz, or my supervisors whose details are supplied below.

I appreciate your feedback and thank you very much for your participation.

Lisa Sharp,
University of Waikato.
Dr Maree Roche (primary supervisor) mroche@waikato.ac.nz
Dr Donald Cable (secondary supervisor) dcable@waikato.ac.nz
Figure D-1 shows the frequency of the mean ratings for self-alienation averaged across the four self-alienation items of each respondent. An exceptionally high number of the maximum score (7.0, high authenticity and no feelings of self-alienation) negatively skewed the distribution of responses.

Figure D-1. Frequency of self-alienation ratings. The frequencies of mass-service workers who rated their experience of self-alienation at work (averaged across four items) on a scale of 1 (high self-alienation, low authenticity) to 7 (low self-alienation, high authenticity).
## APPENDIX E

Assumptions of Multiple Regression

### Table E-1

*Criteria and estimates used to assess the assumptions of multiple regression analysis*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>$d$</th>
<th>$D$</th>
<th>$T$</th>
<th>VIF</th>
<th>Std. Residuals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$\geq 2.0$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Model 1</td>
<td>1.651</td>
<td>0.128</td>
<td>.411</td>
<td>1.016</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Model 2</td>
<td>1.846</td>
<td>0.099</td>
<td>.386</td>
<td>1.016</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Model 3</td>
<td>1.816</td>
<td>0.098</td>
<td>.392</td>
<td>1.016</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Model 4</td>
<td>1.767</td>
<td>0.103</td>
<td>.402</td>
<td>1.016</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* $d =$ Durbin-Watson test statistic; $D =$ Cook’s Distance (maximum value); $T =$ Tolerance (minimum value); VIF = Variance Inflation Factor; Std. Residuals = Number of standardised residuals that surpass the criteria at each $z$-score (2.0, 2.5, 3.0), as outlined in Chapter II.