

SERVICE-ORIENTED AND FORCE-ORIENTED EMOTION REGULATION IN POLICE OFFICERS

Larissa K. Barber
Saint Louis University

Matthew J. Grawitch
Saint Louis University

Shawn T. Trares
Saint Louis University

Research on managing emotions as part of one's job (emotional labor) primarily focuses on emotional regulation strategies for displaying positive emotions. However, police work imposes the need for negative emotional expression for law enforcement (force-oriented duties) in addition to positive emotional expression for community service (service-oriented duties). We tested an adaptation of the predominant two-factor model of emotion regulation strategies (deep acting versus surface acting) that differentiated between positive and negative emotional expression. Factor analyses revealed that a three-factor structure (surface acting, service-oriented deep acting, and force-oriented deep acting) provided the best fit. Hierarchical regression showed that only surface acting predicted increased emotional exhaustion. Force-oriented deep acting (but not service-oriented deep acting) was the only predictor of job involvement.

The popularity of criminal justice-related television programs has no doubt familiarized the public with the concept of good-cop/bad-cop, which has shown to be a prevalent negotiation tactic among police officers and in other team negotiation contexts (Brodt & Tuchinsky, 2000; Rafaeli & Sutton, 1991). However, researchers rarely consider that the same officer may have to engage both of these roles daily in a broader work context and that nega-

Correspondence concerning this article should be addressed to Larissa K. Barber, Department of Psychology, Saint Louis University, 3511 Laclede Ave., St. Louis, Missouri, 63103; Email: laciebarber@gmail.com. Matthew J. Grawitch, Saint Louis University, 3840 Lindell Blvd., St. Louis Missouri, 63103; Email: grawitch@slu.edu. Shawn T. Trares, Saint Louis University, 3511 Laclede Ave., St. Louis, Missouri, 63103; Email: traresst@slu.edu.

tive outcomes may result from the subsequent psychological effort. Most research on managing emotions as part of one's job (*emotional labor*) focuses on two strategies to display positive emotions and suppress negative emotions: *surface acting* (masking or hiding felt emotions to conform to emotional display rules) and *deep acting* (modifying the actual felt emotions to conform to emotional display rules).

The current study further expanded the conceptualization and measurement of surface acting and deep acting to include both service-oriented (the expression of positive emotions and suppression of negative emotions) and force-oriented (the expression of negative emotions and suppression of positive emotions) emotional display rules found in police work. Additionally, we investigated the extent to which frequent use of each of these strategies predicts *emotional exhaustion*, a state of depleted emotional resources (Maslach & Jackson, 1986), and *job involvement*, a strong psychological identification with one's job (Kanungo, 1982).

EMOTION REGULATION STRATEGIES AND OUTCOMES

Emotional regulation specifically refers to the effort individuals apply in order to monitor and alter their experience and expression of emotional states (see Carver & Scheier, 1982; Gross, 1998). Regulating emotions and/or emotional expression to meet work role requirements is often referred to as *emotional labor*, a topic that has steadily increased in popularity since the term's inception by Hochschild (1983). Hochschild and others (e.g., Ashforth & Humphrey, 1993; Morris & Feldman, 1996) noted that jobs with a significant amount of interpersonal requirements, such as public service occupations, are more likely to be emotionally demanding on employees. In these occupations, there are often explicit and implicit standards for emotional expression, called *display rules* (Ekman, 1973), which usually entail the display of positive emotions and the suppression of negative emotions. Employees are expected to uphold these display rules to effectively perform their job (Diefendorff, Richard, & Croyle, 2006).

However, there are often situations in which employees feel emotions contrary to those they are expected to display, called *emotional dissonance*. Research has shown that when dissonance arises, employees can employ one of two emotion regulation strategies: surface acting or deep acting. In *surface acting*, the individual attempts to hide the expression of a negative emotion experienced (or enhance the display of a positive emotion). Because this strategy merely masks emotional dissonance (as opposed to reducing it), this strategy has been associated with increased emotional exhaustion in a number of studies (Brotheridge & Grandey, 2002; Glomb & Tews, 2004; Grandey, 2003). Emotional exhaustion has been shown to predict lower affective commitment and greater turnover intentions (Cropanzano, Rupp, & Byrne, 2003). Alternatively, *deep acting* requires an individual to make an effort to actually experience the appropriate emotion, either by redirecting one's attention from or re-appraising the situation (Hochschild, 1983; Gross, 1998; Grandey, 2000). Unlike surface acting, deep acting helps to reduce emotional dissonance by bringing one's felt emotions in line with the emotions s/he is expected to express. This strategy has been shown to have no relationship with emotional exhaustion because, while it does not necessarily increase "emotional resources," it may prevent the exhaustion associated with prolonged emotional dissonance.

Much of emotional labor research focuses on the relationships between emotion regulation strategies and negative psychological outcomes, such as burnout (e.g., emotional exhaustion, depersonalization, and personal accomplishment). In contrast, only one study (Kruml & Geddes, 2000) has explored the relationship between deep acting and *job involvement*, which Kanungo (1982) describes as "a cognitive or belief state of psychological identification" with one's work (p. 342). Ashforth and Humphrey (1993) proposed that employees' repeated use of deep acting as a regulation strategy may eventually increase identification with their work role. Making an effort to actually experience the emotions dictated by display rules, such as through cognitive reappraisal tactics, should reduce emotional dissonance and may also reinforce positive appraisals of one's work. Therefore, an increase in deep acting may be associated with increased job involvement, which has been

shown to have a positive relationship with affective commitment and a negative association with turnover intentions (Brown, 1996; Meyer, Stanley, Herscovitch, & Topolnytsky, 2002) and job stress (Lambert, Cluse-Tolar, & Hogan, 2007).

Service-Oriented and Force-Oriented Emotion Regulation

Much of the research on emotion regulation strategies relies on data representing display rules that require the expression of positive emotions and the suppression of negative emotions, but overlooks emotion regulation required by negative display rules that may be found in most occupations. Following the social-functional approach to emotions (see Cacioppo & Gardner, 1999), many employees may use negative emotions as a social influence tactic in dealing with subordinates or co-workers. The expression of appropriate levels of negative emotion in leaders can signal needed behavior change in subordinates, thereby increasing follower effectiveness (Tiedens, 2001). Although negative display rules may not be used with customers, they are prevalent in some intra-organizational work contexts (Fitness, 2000).

Police work is a prototypical occupation for studying emotion regulation with respect to negative display rules (or force-oriented emotion regulation) because negative emotional expression appears to be more prevalent, and even expected, in daily work interactions. For example, Glomb and Tews (2004) found that although police officers reported similar frequencies of faking positive emotions compared to workers at a senior care facility, they used significantly more surface acting strategies to display negative emotions. This finding supports the claim that police work requires a combination of positive and negative display rules (Martin, 1999). For example, much of police work can be divided into service-oriented duties (e.g., helping victims of crime) and force-oriented duties (e.g., dealing sternly with violators). This results in an interesting dynamic of the officer continually oscillating between the expression of positive emotions/suppression of negative emotions and, alternatively, the expression of negative emotions/suppression of positive emotions. Contrasted with traditional customer service display rules that re-

quire one mode of social interaction or emotion regulation (positive), police officers are not only expected to continually modify their service interaction strategy, but also to know the appropriate time to engage in a particular strategy.

Though the concept of negative display rules has been around for some time, there is a dearth of quantitative research examining regulation strategies to express negative emotions, and how this may affect psychological outcomes. The existing literature is often qualitative or focuses on the institutionalization of display rules (Sutton, 1991) rather than the personal experience of displaying these emotions. This trend is also true for studies specifically examining emotional regulation in police work. For example, criminal interrogation techniques using negative emotions as a social influence strategy have been studied (Rafaeli & Sutton, 1991), as well as interviews with detectives who validate the duality of emotional experience that comes with dealing with victims and criminals (Stenross & Kleinman, 1989).

The Current Study

The purpose of the current study was to expand on past emotional labor literature by (a) exploring a possible four-factor structure of emotion regulation strategies in police work, an occupation that requires both positive and negative emotion expression, and (b) to evaluate the predictive utility of this structure using relevant negative (emotional exhaustion) and positive (job involvement) work outcomes.

We expected to find that officers use service-oriented emotion regulation because it has been shown that the majority of police work revolves around service-oriented duties (Brown, 1981; Martin, 1999). However, there is no doubt that additional emotional regulation requirements (force-oriented display rules) are plausible given the unique occupational expectations of force-oriented duties. This is especially true in larger, more urban departments that are generally located in poorer, higher-crime areas (Raphael & Sills, 2003). As such, we proposed that (Hypothesis 1): a four-factor model of emotion regulation strategies would emerge in police officers: service-oriented surface acting and deep acting (expressing positive/

suppressing negative) and force-oriented surface acting and deep acting (expressing negative/suppressing positive).

The second aim of our study was to evaluate the predictive utility of our more complex structure in relation to two psychological outcomes, emotional exhaustion and job involvement. During surface acting, employees only attempt to alter their expressions rather than their felt emotions. This may lead to emotional exhaustion because of the prolonged experience of emotional dissonance and a perceived lack of “emotional fit” with the job. As such, we proposed that the relationship between surface acting and emotional exhaustion would hold regardless of the display rule. Thus, we expected that (Hypothesis 2): service-oriented and force-oriented surface acting would predict emotional exhaustion.

Building on past research (Ashforth & Humphrey, 1993; Kruml & Geddes, 1998), we proposed that deep acting should lead to increased job involvement regardless of the display rule (positive or negative). Contrary to surface acting, employees who engage in deep acting attempt to alter their emotional experiences in addition to the emotional display. This strategy is more likely to reduce emotional dissonance, which may increase the employee’s psychological identification with the job. Specifically, we hypothesized that (Hypothesis 3): service-oriented and force-oriented deep acting would predict job involvement.

METHOD

Participants and Procedures

Two-hundred and ninety-nine officers from a large, metropolitan police department in the Midwest completed a survey assessing their experience of emotional labor at work. The survey was sent to all employees in the department (a total of 1,376), which resulted in a response rate of approximately 22%. The officers who returned surveys were representative of the entire department. Participants were located in three districts (North-30%, Central-32%, South-38%), predominately male (79%), White/Non-Hispanic (72%), over the

age of 40 (52%), in a patrol function (87%), working a rotating day schedule (84%), and working in a violent crime area (72%).

Measurement of Emotional Labor

Emotional labor was assessed by adapting questionnaire items on surface and deep acting from Brotheridge and Lee (2003) and Grandey (2003). Reliability analyses for surface acting and deep acting frequency are between .75 and .85 (Brotheridge & Lee, 2003). For this study, the item wordings were retained with only minor adjustments to reflect the regulation of both positive and negative emotions. For example, an original surface acting item reads "pretend to have feelings I don't really have." The adaptation for service-oriented emotion regulation for this same item reads "pretend to have positive emotions I don't really have," whereas force-oriented regulation reads "pretend to have negative emotions I don't really have." For each item, our respondents indicated, on a Likert-type scale, how often they engaged in emotional labor behaviors during an average day at work. Possible item responses ranged from 1 (almost never occurs) to 5 (occurs very frequently). Specific items asked officers how often they: (1) pretended to have positive emotions (surface acting-service), (2) resisted the expression of negative emotions (surface acting-service), (3) pretended to have negative emotions (surface acting-force), (4) resisted the expression of positive emotions (surface acting-force), (5) really tried to experience positive emotions (deep acting-service), (6) made an effort to experience positive emotions (deep acting-service), (7) really tried to feel negative emotions (deep acting-force), and (8) made an effort to experience negative emotions (deep acting-force). Thus, the revised version included two items to assess each of the four factors, for a total of eight items.

Emotional Exhaustion

Emotional exhaustion was measured using three items adapted from Maslach and Jackson (1986). The three items were "I feel emotionally drained from my work," "I feel used up at the end of the workday," and "I feel burned out from my work." Responses were provided on a 7-point Likert-type scale ranging from 0 ("Never")

to 6 (“Every day”). Again, internal consistency estimates yielded evidence of good reliability, with alpha equal to .84.

Job Involvement

Job involvement was measured using five items adapted from Kanungo’s (1982) *Job Involvement Scale*. Example items include “I am very much personally involved in my job” and “I like to be absorbed in my job most of the time.” Responses were provided on a 7-point scale ranging from 1 (“Strongly disagree”) to 7 (“Strongly agree”). For the current study, internal consistency estimates yielded evidence of acceptable reliability, with alpha equal to .70.

RESULTS

Descriptive Analyses

The means and standard deviations for each item in our revised *Emotional Labor Scale* are listed in order of descending mean in Table 1 (below). In general, the service-oriented emotion regulation items had the most-reported mean frequency, ranging from

Table 1
Adapted Emotional Labor Scale Item Means and Standard Deviations

Factor	Item	Mean	Std. Deviation
Surface Acting-Service	Resist the expression of negative emotions	3.41	1.08
Deep Acting-Service	Really try to feel positive emotions	3.02	1.01
Deep Acting-Service	Effort to experience positive emotions	2.94	1.05
Surface Acting-Service	Pretend to have positive emotions	2.57	1.08
Deep Acting-Force	Really try to feel negative emotions	2.37	0.88
Surface Acting-Force	Resist expression of positive emotion	2.29	0.99
Deep Acting-Force	Effort to experience negative emotions	2.29	0.94
Surface Acting-Force	Pretend to have negative emotions	1.90	0.87

an average frequency rating between “occasionally occurring” and “occurs frequently.” These items were followed by the use of force-oriented emotion regulation strategies, with an average frequency ranging between “seldom occurs” and “occasionally occurs.” One item (surface acting-force) dropped slightly below the seldom occurrence mark.

Factor Analyses

Contrary to expectations (Hypothesis 1), exploratory factor analysis results indicated the possibility of a three-factor solution being most appropriate (service-oriented deep acting, force-oriented deep acting, and one surface acting factor; see Table 2 below). The surface acting-force item “pretend to have negative emotions” performed poorly due to its low reported frequency and variability

Table 2
Exploratory Factor Analysis: Principal Components Extraction

Item	Surface Acting	Deep Acting (Service)	Deep Acting (Force)	h2
Pretend to have positive emotions	.82	.10	.07	.68
Resist expression of negative emotions	.71	.31	-.17	.64
Resist expression of positive emotions	.66	-.16	.23	.52
Effort to experience positive emotions	.08	.87	.20	.80
Really try to experience positive emotions	.02	.86	.18	.78
Really try to feel negative emotions	-.01	.25	.84	.76
Effort to experience negative emotions	.08	.25	.80	.71
Pretend to have negative emotions	.49	-.30	.54	.62
Eigenvalues After Rotation*	1.86	1.85	1.79	
% of Variance After Rotation	23.23	23.07	22.41	

*Based on a Varimax extraction solution. Total variance accounted for equals 68.71%

($M = 1.90$, $SD = 0.87$). Thus, we used a confirmatory factor analysis that tested seven possible models: two-factor solution with poor item (one surface acting factor and one deep acting factor), two-factor solution without the item, three-factor with poor item (surface acting, service-oriented deep acting, force-oriented deep acting), three-factor without the poor item, four-factor with the poor item (service-oriented surface acting, force-oriented surface acting, service-oriented deep acting, force-oriented deep acting), four-factor without the poor item, and four-factor with the poor item loading on its own factor (surface acting, expression of negative emotions, service-oriented deep acting, force-oriented deep acting; see Table 3 below). In general, the results suggested that, barring the need to set constraints on the one-item measure, the alternate model (B) for the 3-factor solution provides the best fit ($\chi^2(11) = 20.10$, $p < .05$; RMR = .034; CFI = .982; RMSEA = .053).

Table 3
Fit Indices for Confirmatory Factor Analyses

Model	χ^2 (df)	χ^2/df	RMR	GFI	RFI	CFI	RMSEA
2-Factor A	195.53 (19)*	10.29	.095	.860	.549	.711	.177
2-Factor B	139.24 (13)*	10.71	.085	.894	.581	.756	.181
3-Factor A	73.33 (17)*	4.31	.059	.942†	.811	.908†	.105
3-Factor B	20.10 (11)*	1.83†	.034†	.981†	.929†	.982†	.053†
4-Factor A	72.10 (14)*	5.15	.059	.941†	.774	.905†	.118
4-Factor Ba	19.87 (9)*	2.21†	.034†	.982†	.914†	.979†	.064†
4-Factor Ca	48.56 (15)*	3.24	.049†	.964†	.858	.945†	.087

Note: A models include bad item; B models exclude poor item; C model includes expression of negative as own factor; † a required setting the error variance parameter for the 1-item measure as an additional constraint to avoid over-identification

* is significant at the .05 level; † signifies acceptable fit

Hierarchical Regressions of Emotional Regulation Strategies and Outcomes

Items were aggregated to align with the 3-factor structure found in the confirmatory factor analysis. The reliability of the factors indicated moderate levels of reliability: .64 (surface acting), .83 (deep acting positive), and .77 (deep acting negative), with the factors possessing only moderate correlations among themselves (see Appendix). In addition, more frequent surface acting was correlated with less years of experience within the organization (tenure; $r = -.14, p < .05$) and working primarily patrol duties (function; $r = -.14, p < .05$), while more frequent force-oriented deep acting was prevalent in officers who classified themselves as “blue shirts” as opposed to “white shirts” (classification; $r = -.13, p < .05$). Correlation analyses revealed that all three emotion regulation strategies were correlated with at least one outcome variable.

Hierarchical regressions were used for each of the two outcome variables, controlling for demographics that were correlated with that particular outcome (see Appendix). Those most likely to report more job involvement were males ($r = -.20, p < .01$), White ($r = -.26, p < .01$), older ($r = .19, p < .01$), had more tenure ($r = .26, p < .01$), classified themselves as “white shirts” ($r = -.23, p < .01$), and worked primarily duties that were other than patrol ($r = .12, p < .05$). Those who reported higher amounts of emotional exhaustion were White ($r = -.13, p < .05$), younger ($r = -.13, p < .05$), had less tenure ($r = -.13, p < .05$), and worked in a high crime area ($r = .13, p < .05$).

The three emotional regulation strategies were entered together in order to test the predictive validity of each construct for a specific outcome. Results showed that, together, they significantly contributed to the prediction of job involvement ($\Delta R^2 = .064, \Delta F = 7.29, p < .001$) and emotional exhaustion ($\Delta R^2 = .219, \Delta F = 27.79, p < .001$; see Table 4, next page). As for each emotion regulation strategy (shown in Table 5, next page), surface acting was the only significant predictor of emotional exhaustion ($t(297) = 8.88, p < .001$), and force-oriented deep acting was the only significant pre-

dictor of job involvement ($t(297) = 3.16, p < .01$). Service-oriented deep acting was not a significant contributor to any of the regression results. Thus, hypotheses 2 and 3 were only partially supported.

Table 4
Hierarchical Regression Model Overview of Outcomes on Emotional Regulation Strategies Controlling for Demographics

Item	R-Square	Adjusted R-Square	Δ R-Square	Δ F	df1/df2
Job Involvement					
Model 1	.16	.14	.16	8.62***	6/269
Model 2	.23	.20	.06	7.29***	3/266
Emotional Exhaustion					
Model 1	.07	.06	.07	5.15**	4/274
Model 2	.29	.27	.22	27.79***	3/271

Note: Model 1= controls for demographic variables associated with outcome, Model 2= emotional labor constructs; surface acting, deep acting positive, and deep acting negative

* is significant at the .05 level; ** is significant at the .01 level; *** is significant at the .001 level

Table 5
Hierarchical Regressions of Study Outcomes on Emotion Regulation Strategies, Controlling for Demographics

Outcome Variable	Emotional Labor Construct	β	t-value
Job Involvement			
	Surface Acting	.08	1.45
	Deep Acting-Service	.08	1.34
	Deep Acting-Force	.19	3.16**
Emotional Exhaustion			
	Surface Acting	.47	8.88**
	Deep Acting-Service	-.01	-0.23
	Deep Acting-Force	.05	0.93

* is significant at the .05 level; ** is significant at the .01 level

DISCUSSION

Overall, the findings are consistent with past research in that surface acting was associated with emotional exhaustion, whereas deep acting was not (Brotheridge & Grandey, 2002; Glomb & Tews, 2004; Grandey, 2003). However, the relationship between deep acting and job involvement and the incorporation of emotion regulation due to negative display rules has been largely ignored in the literature. The results of the current study suggest that when required to express positive (service-orientation) or negative (force-orientation) emotions as a part of the job, exerting effort to place oneself in each emotional state is associated with increased levels of job involvement. However, when incorporated into the same model, only force-oriented deep acting significantly predicted job involvement.

Our findings support a three-factor structure of emotion regulation strategies rather than our originally proposed four-factor structure. This may be due to a force-oriented surface acting item (resist expression of positive emotions) fitting well with the other two service-oriented surface acting items in the factor analyses, and another item (pretending to have negative emotions) performing poorly overall. Perhaps the revision of this item may produce a four-factor structure in the future. However, the factor analytic results did show the need to add a new force-oriented deep acting as an emotion regulation strategy in police officers, especially since it was slightly more correlated with job involvement than service-oriented deep acting, which may be expected in law enforcement occupations. The current study suggests that the nature of the specific population under study must be considered, and the full range of emotion regulation strategies should be evaluated for that population.

Surface Acting

In line with previous studies, there was only one surface acting factor, unlike our expected differences between displaying positive and negative emotions. Officers seem to perceive a similar need to conform to both negative and positive display rules in terms of surface acting. Specifically, the expression of positive emotion and resistance of positive and negative emotions were highly inter-related and were similar in terms of the frequency in which they

were used. However, our surface acting factor did not include one of the surface acting-force items; specifically “pretend to have negative emotions.” Police officers may have reported a low frequency because this response-focused emotion regulation may not be necessary due to either the “working personality” of police officers or the nature of the work. Although empirical support for enduring personality differences in police officers as compared to the general public has been debated (see Abdollahi, 2002), some research suggests police officers tend to be more suspicious, authoritarian, and detached, leading them to naturally experience more negative emotions (Brown, 1981; Skolnick, 1966). Also, the expression of negative emotions would be required in more force-oriented duties, but these encounters may lead officers to naturally experience negative emotions due to potential safety risks. Thus, there may be little reason for officers to “fake” negative emotions.

Yet, our surface acting construct included resisting the expression of positive emotions, a factor often not examined in the emotional labor literature. The nature of police work seems to pose situations in which officers must hide positive emotions in order to successfully complete their (most likely force-oriented) duties. According to our previous explanation about force-oriented duties eliciting negative emotions, the question remains as to why suppressing positive emotions is necessary if officers are experiencing negative emotions. This is reconciled by previous research indicating that positive and negative *affect*, specifically the *experience* of emotions, are separate bipolar constructs (Watson & Clark, 1997). At any given moment, individuals can be experiencing a number of positive and negative emotions simultaneously. Therefore, although officers may be experiencing negative emotions, they must also regulate their expression of any residual positive emotions to adhere to occupational display rules.

Deep Acting: Service-Oriented versus Force-Oriented

Our study indicated that, in the case of police officers, deep acting is differentiated by the necessity to express both positive and negative emotions. This is consistent with previous qualitative studies suggesting that police officers are expected to display both

positive and negative emotions for different aspects of their work (Martin, 1999; Stenross & Kleinman, 1989). This is an interesting comparison to strictly service-oriented occupations where it would be irrational for an employee to engage in deep acting with respect to negative emotions as a regulatory strategy. In fact, doing so would most likely lead to negative social interaction and work outcomes, as it goes against the occupation's inherent positive display rules.

However, in police work, negative emotions are sometimes essential for law enforcement and personal safety. Following past research linking deep acting and job involvement (Kruml & Geddes, 2000), our results suggest that deep acting for both positive and negative emotional expression are associated with job involvement in police officers, although negative emotional expression tends to primarily drive this relationship. Future research may want to further investigate the relationship between deep acting and job involvement, as this relationship may work both ways. That is, officers who are more involved in their jobs may be more likely to reappraise situations in a manner consistent with their roles (i.e., the display of anger at a law violator) than officers less involved with their jobs.

Limitations

Our study relied strictly on self-report data in order to assess the relationship between emotional labor and work outcomes. This method is best supplemented by objective measures of stress (as evaluated by supervisors, peers, and/or records) and performance measures. Also, like any self-report measure, the officer's report of emotional labor is strongly influenced by retrospective perceptions. In qualitative interviews with police detectives, Stenross and Kleinman (1989) found that officers tend to reappraise their exchanges with criminals in a positive light, focusing on the "game" aspect of apprehending the offender and upholding justice. On the other hand, officers found it challenging to positively reappraise emotionally demanding interactions with victims. This is because officers often feel that victims take out their frustration and anger on police officers, are uncooperative with law enforcement procedures, or are ungrateful for police officers' efforts. These common experiences with victims may explain why service-oriented emotional reg-

ulation methods were more frequently reported than force-oriented emotional regulation, emphasizing the amount of effort needed for service-oriented duties as compared to force-oriented duties. Also, because officers often identify more strongly with force-oriented expectations of their job (Martin, 1999), it is more difficult to fulfill the display rules associated with their service-oriented duties (i.e., harder to go from negative to positive than from neutral to positive). As such, resisting the expression of negative emotions was the most frequent method reported by officers.

Conclusions and Future Research

This study provided added empirical support for the presence of emotion regulation strategies for negative emotional expression in police officers. Our research examining the emotion regulation experiences among police officers can serve as a springboard for future research in other occupations that require complex display rules (e.g., lawyers and teachers). Specifically, the relationship between force-oriented deep acting and job involvement (and its influence on other organizational outcomes) should be explored in other work contexts. For example, would high job-involvement individuals in leadership positions be more likely to use negative display rules to influence their followers? What are appropriate levels of negative expression when influencing others (e.g., avoiding high amounts of frustration and anger)? One study has found that the expression of anger increases the appearance of competence (Tiedens, 2001), an impression management strategy that may serve as an important mechanism for obtaining and maintaining a leader's power status. Although much of the research examines effective and ineffective leadership strategies, one question that remains is how this impression management may affect the actor's well-being and performance over time.

Finally, beyond studying outcomes of emotion regulation strategies, we suggest further exploration into Glomb and Tews' (2004) genuine emotional displays construct (i.e., "How often do you genuinely express (anger) on the job?"). Genuine emotional experiences take into account the possible consequences of experiencing negative emotional states inherent in the occupation, in addition

to the regulation of emotions. For example, they found that genuine expression of negative emotions resulted in more emotional exhaustion, whereas we found that deep acting with respect to negative emotions was not. Future studies may find it beneficial to examine these assumptions associated with police work by focusing on the dynamic between service-oriented versus force-oriented job expectations. This concept may also be useful in other occupations with dual (and conflicting) role requirements, such as teaching and managing, which include both supportive and disciplinary aspects.

REFERENCES

- Abdollahi, M. K. (2002). Understanding police stress research. *Journal of Forensic Psychology Practice, 2*, 1-24.
- Ashforth, B. E., & Humphrey, R. H. (1993). Emotional labor in service roles: The influence of identity. *Academy of Management Review, 18*, 88-115.
- Brodth, S. E., & Tuchinsky, M. (2000). Working together but in opposition: An examination of the "good-cop/bad-cop" negotiating team tactic. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes, 81*, 155-177.
- Brotheridge, C. M., & Grandey, A. A. (2002). Emotional labor and burnout: Comparing two perspectives of "people work." *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 60*, 17-39.
- Brotheridge, C. M., & Lee, R. T. (2003). Development and validation of the Emotional Labour Scale. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology, 76*, 365-379.
- Brown, M. K. (1981). *Working in the street: Police discretion and the dilemmas of reform*. New York: Russell Sage Foundation.
- Brown, S. P. (1996). A meta-analysis and review of organizational research on job involvement. *Psychological Bulletin, 120*, 235-255.
- Cacioppo, J. T., & Gardner, W. L. (1999). Emotion. *Annual Review of Psychology, 50*, 191-214.
- Carver, C. S., & Scheier, M. F. (1982). Control theory: A useful conceptual framework for personality-social, clinical, and health psychology. *Psychological Bulletin, 92*, 111-135.
- Cropanzano, R., Rupp, D. E., & Byrne, Z. S. (2003). The relationship of emotional exhaustion to work attitudes, job performance, and organizational citizenship behaviors. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 88*, 160-169.
- Diefendorff, J. M., Richard, E. M., & Croyle, M. H. (2006). Are emotional display rules formal requirements? Examination of employee and supervisor perceptions. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology, 72*, 273-298.
- Ekman, P. (1973). Cross-culture studies of facial expression. In P. Ekman (Ed.), *Darwin and facial expression: A century of research in review* (pp.168-22). New York: Academic Press.
- Fitness, J. (2000). Anger in the workplace: An emotion script approach to anger episodes between workers and their superiors, co-workers and subordinates. *Journal of Organizational Behavior, 21*, 147-162.
- Glomb, T. M., & Tews, M. J. (2004). Emotional labor: A conceptualization and scale development. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 64*, 1-23.
- Grandey, A. A. (2000). Emotional regulation in the workplace: A new way to conceptualize emotional labor. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology, 5*, 95-110.
- Grandey, A. A. (2003). When "the show must go on": Surface acting and deep acting as determinants of emotional exhaustion and peer-rated service delivery. *Academy of Management Journal, 46*, 86-96.

- Gross, J. J. (1998). The emerging field of emotion regulation: An integrative review. *Review of General Psychology, 2*, 271-299.
- Hochschild, A. R. (1983). *The managed heart: The commercialization of human feeling*. The Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.
- Kanungo, R. N. (1982). Measurement of job and work involvement. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 67*, 341-349.
- Kruml, S. M., & Geddes, D. (2000) Catching fire without burning out: Is there an ideal way to perform emotional labor? In N. M. Ashkanasy, C. E. J. Härtel, & W. J. Zerbe (Eds.), *Emotions in the workplace: Research, theory, and practice* (pp. 177-88). Westport, CT: Quorum Books.
- Lambert, E. G., Cluse-Tolar, T., & Hogan, N. L. (2007). This job is killing me: The impact of job characteristics on correctional staff job stress. *Applied Psychology in Criminal Justice, 2*, 117-142.
- Martin, S. E. (1999). Police force or police service? Gender and emotional labor. *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science, 561*, 111-126.
- Maslach, C., & Jackson, S. E. (1986). *The Maslach Burnout Inventory* (2nd ed.). Palo Alto, CA: Consulting Psychologists Press.
- Meyer, J. P, Stanley, D. J., Herscovitch, L., & Topolnytsky, L. (2002). Affective, continuance, and normative commitment to the organization: A meta-analysis of antecedents, correlates, and consequences. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 61*, 20-52.
- Morris, J. A., & Feldman, D. C. (1996). The dimensions, antecedents, and consequences of emotional labor. *Academy of Management Review, 21*, 986-1010.
- Raphael, S., & Sills, M. (2003). Urban crime in the United States. Retrieved May 15, 2007, from http://ist-socrates.berkeley.edu/~raphael/draft_june2003.pdf
- Skolnick, J. H. (1966). *Justice without trial*. New York: John Wiley & Sons.
- Steinross, B., & Kleinman, S. (1989). The highs and lows of emotional labor. *Journal of Contemporary Ethnography, 17*, 435-452.
- Sutton, R. I. (1991). Maintaining norms about expressed emotions: The case of bill collectors. *Administrative Science Quarterly, 36*, 245-268.
- Tiedens, L. Z. (2001). Anger and advancement versus sadness and subjugation: The effect of negative emotion expressions on social status conferral. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 80*, 86-94.
- Watson, D., & Clark, L. A. (1997). The measurement and mismeasurement of mood: Recurrent and emergent issues. *Journal of Personality Assessment, 68*, 267-296.

APPENDIX

APPENDIX: Correlation Matrix of Study Variables

Factor	M	SD	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11
1. Sex	—	—											
2. Race	—	—	.04										
3. Age Classification	—	—	-.12*	-.21**									
4. Tenure	16.32	9.90	-.20*	-.17**	.72**								
5. Classification	—	—	.13*	.09	-.27**	-.41**							
6. Function	—	—	.00	-.06	.18**	.20**	-.04						
7. High Crime Area	—	—	-.02	.07	-.05	-.07	-.00	-.15*					
8. Surface Acting	2.76	.79	.00	-.07	-.10	-.14*	.08	-.14*	.07				
9. Deep Acting-Service	2.98	.95	.11	-.02	-.01	.06	-.11	.03	.01	.14*			
10. Deep Acting-Force	2.33	.82	.03	-.06	-.06	-.03	-.13*	.07	.00	.17**	.36**		
11. Job Involvement	3.07	.83	-.20**	-.26**	.19**	.26**	-.23**	.12*	-.03	.11	.19**	.26**	
12. Emotional Exhaustion	2.94	1.61	.02	-.13*	-.13*	-.13*	.09	-.10	.13*	.52**	.08	.14*	.00

Note: Sex was coded as 0 = male, 1 = female; race was coded as 0 = White, 1 = Non-white; classification was coded as 0 = white-shirt, 1 = blue-shirt; function was coded as 0 = patrol, 1 = other; and high crime area was coded as 0 = no, 1 = yes.

* is significant at the .05 level; ** is significant at the .01 level

Received: 9/08

Accepted: 7/09

Suggested Citation:

Barber, L. K., Grawitch, M. J., & Trares, S. T. (2009). Service-oriented and force-oriented emotion regulation in police officers. [Electronic Version]. *Applied Psychology in Criminal Justice*, 5(2), 182–202.