1-2016

Perceived emotional demands-abilities fit

James M. Diefendorff

Gary John GREGURAS
Singapore Management University, garygreguras@smu.edu.sg

John Fleenor

DOI: https://doi.org/10.1111/apps.12034

Published in Applied Psychology, 2016 January, Volume 65, Issue 1, Pages 2-37
http://doi.org/10.1111/apps.12034

Perceived Emotional Demands–Abilities Fit

James M. Diefendorff*
University of Akron, USA

Gary J. Greguras
Singapore Management University, Singapore

John Fleenor
Center for Creative Leadership, USA

The purposes of this paper are to introduce the concept of perceived emotional demands–abilities (ED–A) fit and develop theory about how it relates to other fit perceptions as well as employee well-being and performance outcomes. ED–A fit is defined as the perceived congruence or match between the emotional demands of the job and one's abilities to meet those demands. In two studies using occupationally diverse samples from Western and Eastern cultures, we empirically distinguished perceived ED–A fit from other fit perceptions (i.e. person–organisation, demands–abilities, needs–supplies, person–group, person–supervisor). In addition, across the two studies, we found that perceived ED–A fit accounted for incremental variance in job satisfaction, work tension, felt inauthenticity, burnout, self and supervisor ratings of job performance, and psychological need satisfaction, controlling for the effects of other fit perceptions.

INTRODUCTION

It is widely recognised that most jobs have emotional demands and that effectiveness is determined, in part, by a person's ability to meet these demands (Arvey, Renz, & Watson, 1998). Difficulty in meeting the emotional demands of one's job can negatively affect one's well-being, health, and performance (Hochschild, 1983). These ideas reflect the classic perspective that congruence between people and their environments is a key to well-being and effectiveness, with better fit leading to more favorable outcomes (e.g. Kristof, 1996). Although research on person–environment (P–E) fit has a long history, and several different types of fit have been identified in the literature (Edwards, Cable, Williamson, Lambert, & Shipp, 2006; Edwards &

Shipp, 2007; Kristof-Brown, Zimmerman, & Johnson, 2005), theory and empirical work on the fit between emotional job demands and individual abilities is lacking. This omission is surprising given the role that emotions play in intrapersonal and interpersonal functioning (Grandey, 2008), the increased recognition of the importance of emotions in organisational contexts (Elfenbein, 2007), and specific calls for research to examine the fit between emotional work demands and employee abilities (Arvey et al., 1998).

The primary purpose of this paper is to formally introduce the concept of perceived *Emotional Demands–Abilities (ED–A) fit*, which we define as the perceived match between the emotional demands of a job and a person's abilities to meet those demands. In doing so, we conceptually and empirically distinguish perceived ED–A fit from other P–E fit perceptions in two studies and examine whether it accounts for incremental variance in well-being and performance outcomes, controlling for the effects of other fit perceptions (in Studies 1 and 2) as well as work-related affect (in Study 2). This paper seeks to contribute to the P–E fit literature by responding to calls to examine new aspects of P–E fit (Cable & DeRue, 2002; Kristof-Brown et al., 2005). Our focus on ED–A fit represents a test of a facet-level, job-based, demands–abilities form of P–E fit (Edwards & Shipp, 2007). The current paper also seeks to contribute to research on emotions at work by explicitly examining the perceived discrepancy between emotional demands and abilities, a concept often alluded to in descriptions of emotional labor (Hochschild, 1983).

PERSON–ENVIRONMENT (P–E) FIT

In organisational research, P–E fit refers to the "compatibility between an individual and a work environment that occurs when their characteristics are well matched" (Kristof-Brown et al., 2005, p. 281). The degree of fit (or misfit) between employee attributes (e.g. needs, values, abilities, personality traits) and environmental attributes (e.g. values, rewards, job demands, cultures, physical environments) is thought to impact employee attitudes and behaviors (Edwards et al., 2006). As noted by Kristof-Brown and Billsberry (2013), there are two dominant and distinct conceptualisations of fit in the literature: one that emphasises direct fit perceptions from the employee's perspective (Cable & DeRue, 2002) and another that emphasises indirect fit that is calculated by researchers from separate assessments of the person and environment (Edwards et al., 2006). Kristof-Brown and Billsberry (2013) argued that these two conceptualisations of fit assess different things and should be viewed as complementary and not competing perspectives. We focus on direct fit perceptions in the current paper because "perceived fit allows the greatest level of cognitive manipulation because the assessment is all done in the head of the respondents, allowing them to apply their own

weighting scheme to various aspects of the environment" (Kristof-Brown et al., 2005, pp. 291–292). Further, perceived fit is thought to be more proximal to individual decision making than indirect assessments of fit and it has been shown to more strongly relate to a variety of outcomes (Kristof-Brown & Guay, 2011).

A number of fit dimensions have been noted in the literature, with perhaps the most commonly examined types of fit being person–organisation (P–O) fit and person–job (P–J) fit (Guan, Deng, Risavy, Bond, & Li, 2011). P–O fit refers to the match between an employee's values and the values of the organisation (Chatman, 1989). This notion of value congruence can also apply to various organisational constituents including supervisors and work groups, resulting in person–supervisor (P–S) fit and person–group (P–G) fit, respectively. P–J fit refers to the congruence between employee characteristics and those of the job (Edwards, 1991). Cable and DeRue (2002) divided P–J fit into needs–supplies (N–S) fit and demands–abilities (D–A) fit. N–S fit reflects the congruence between the employee's needs or desires and the outcomes one receives for performing the work, including pay, recognition, and good conditions. D–A fit reflects the match between the requirements of the job and the person's knowledge, skills, abilities, and other attributes. We contend that D–A fit may be further subdivided as a function of distinct work demands, resulting in narrower D–A fit constructs such as ED–A fit (Arvey et al., 1998). This view is consistent with recent theoretical work by Edwards and Shipp (2007) who developed a 3 (type of fit: supplementary, demands–abilities, needs–supplies) × 3 (content: facet, domain, global) × 5 (level of the environment: individual, job, group, organisation, vocation) typology of fit, resulting in 45 total types of fit. With this framework in mind, we conceptualised ED–A fit as a facet-level, job-based form of demands–abilities fit.

PERCEIVED EMOTIONAL DEMANDS–ABILITIES FIT

The management of emotions is an important aspect of many jobs and employee effectiveness in doing so can impact a variety of well-being and performance outcomes (Elfenbein, 2007). The idea that jobs have emotional demands has been acknowledged in a variety of research domains, including work on the job demands-resources model (Bakker, Demerouti, & Verbeke, 2004), compassion fatigue (Adams, Boscarino, & Figley, 2006), organisational justice (Barsky & Kaplan, 2007), vicarious trauma (Baird & Kracen, 2006), workplace incivility (Cortina, Magley, Williams, & Langhout, 2001), and emotional labor (Glomb, Kammeyer-Mueller, & Rotundo, 2004; Goldberg & Grandey, 2007; Hochschild, 1983). Accordingly, emotional demands may take a variety of forms including the need to express or feel certain emotions as part of the work role (e.g. Rafaeli & Sutton, 1987) and

the need to manage one's emotional reactions to difficult, challenging, monotonous, interpersonally demanding, or unpleasant work circumstances (e.g. Adams et al., 2006). For instance, emotional labor theory posits that organisations specify feeling rules (Hochschild, 1983) or display rules (Rafaeli & Sutton, 1987) that dictate which emotions should be experienced and expressed by employees when interacting with others. Other research has documented that the work itself can be emotional, such as when healthcare employees work with dying patients and experience grief, when service employees work with rude or disrespectful customers and experience anger, when sales employees experience anxiety or frustration in response to losing a big sale, or when the work is repetitive and leads to fatigue or boredom (Adams et al., 2006; Baird & Kracen, 2006; Saavedra & Kwun, 2000). In these jobs, employees must manage negative emotions in order to protect their own well-being and perform non-emotional aspects of their jobs effectively. As these examples illustrate, emotional demands can take a variety of forms, including emotional display rules, feeling rules, demands for emotion regulation, as well as the frequency, duration, and intensity of situations that create emotions in employees (Brief & Weiss, 2002). As such, ED–A fit may be construed fairly broadly as the match of the person with emotional work demands, whatever those emotional demands might be and from whatever source they originate. Rafaeli and Sutton (1987) referred to such a circumstance as reflecting emotional harmony, which is a positive state in which no discrepancy between emotions, displays, and job expectations is present.

Implicit in much of the work describing emotional job demands is the notion that some individuals can more easily handle the demands than others (Adams et al., 2006; Bakker et al., 2004). This idea suggests that individuals differ in the level of knowledge, skills, abilities, and other (KSAO) attributes that they can utilise when attempting to meet the emotional demands of their work. Emotional capabilities can include a diverse array of potential attributes, such as personality traits (Goldberg, 1992), dispositional affectivity (Watson, Clark, & Tellegen, 1988), approach and avoidance motivational tendencies (Carver & White, 1994), emotional expressivity (Gross & John, 1997), emotion regulation capabilities (Gross & John, 2003), coping skills (Skinner, Edge, Altman, & Sherwood, 2003), emotion recognition abilities (Nowicki & Duke, 1994), and emotional intelligence (Brackett, Rivers, Shiffman, Lerner, & Salovey, 2006). Although it would be difficult to identify all of the personal attributes that individuals could use to meet the emotional demands of their work, the key consideration in fit perceptions is whether employees believe they have the ability to meet the emotional demands of the job. This perception of fitting (or not fitting) with the emotional demands of the job should have direct implications for employee well-being and behavior.

Consistent with a fit perspective, research suggests that people prefer to engage in behaviors that are consistent with their personality (Côté & Moskowitz, 1998) and they experience less stress when they do so (Bono & Vey, 2007; Little, 2000). Thus, working in a job that requires one to act in a way or experience emotions that are inconsistent with one's natural tendencies can be difficult and negatively affect well-being. Indirectly supporting this view, Bono and Vey (2007) found that individuals high in extraversion experienced increased heart rates when required to act in a trait incongruent way (i.e. angry) and decreased heart rates when required to act in a trait congruent way (i.e. enthusiastic).

Thus, when employee capabilities enable them to more easily feel and display organisationally desired emotions or manage difficult emotions when they occur, they should perceive greater fit between the emotional demands of their jobs and their abilities. Consistent with other fit research (Kristof-Brown et al., 2005), high ED–A fit should be associated with a variety of positive outcomes, a point that we address in a subsequent section.

WHERE DOES PERCEIVED ED–A FIT "FIT" WITH EXISTING RESEARCH?

Though prior work has suggested an ED–A fit construct (Arvey et al., 1998), this article represents the first attempt to (a) formally define it, (b) place it within a nomological net of existing P–E fit constructs, (c) develop a measure of perceived ED–A fit, (d) provide evidence that it is empirically distinct from measures of other P–E fit perceptions, and (e) show that it relates to important outcomes beyond the effects of other fit constructs. Although we conceptualise perceived ED–A fit as a facet-level type of job-based D–A fit in Edwards and Shipp's (2007) model, the fact that workplace emotions may be affected by a large number of situational factors (e.g. Brief & Weiss, 2002) suggests that the ED–A fit perceptions may result from the comparisons of personal abilities with more than just task demands. Further, the emotional requirements of many jobs are a by-product of the work itself and may be governed by unwritten norms rather than formal policies, job descriptions, or tasks (Cropanzano, Weiss, & Elias, 2004). As such, we expect that perceived ED–A fit will be factorially distinct from D–A fit perceptions and relate differently and more strongly to certain (i.e. emotion-based) outcomes than D–A fit.

There is less conceptual overlap between ED–A fit perceptions and other types of P–E fit examined in organisational research than there is between ED–A fit and D–A fit. As such, we expected perceived ED–A fit to be distinct from each of the commonly examined types of P–E fit perceptions in organisational research, though consistent with prior work demonstrating positive relations among a variety of fit perceptions (Kristof-Brown et al., 2005), we expected positive relationships among all fit perceptions examined.

STUDY 1

The primary purpose of Study 1 was to distinguish perceived ED–A fit from existing P–E fit perception constructs and to examine whether it incrementally relates to employee outcomes. We started by developing a perceived ED–A fit scale based on the format of the D–A fit scale developed by Cable and DeRue (2002). To do this, we modified the perceived D–A fit items to focus on emotional job demands instead of general work demands (which may include some emotional demands, as well as cognitive, physical, and other demands, at the discretion of respondents). Our goals in developing a measure of ED–A fit perceptions were to create a set of items that (a) comprehensively taps the underlying construct, (b) is widely applicable across occupations, (c) is consistent with existing P–E fit measures, and (d) is brief enough to be easily administered and practically useful. With this in mind, we focused our ED–A fit items at a general, global level, rather than with regard to particular types of emotional demands or abilities. Our perspective is that perceived ED–A fit should be assessed at a general level so as to capture individuals' beliefs about whether their abilities do or do not fit with the emotional demands of their jobs, *whatever those demands and abilities might be*. Given that emotional demands vary from job to job (e.g. some jobs require compassion, others require impartiality, and still others induce boredom) and the emotional capabilities that are useful for effective functioning in a job may vary (e.g. one person may feel/express compassion naturally, another person may effectively regulate his/her emotions to feel/express compassion), we sought to create a measure that could be applicable across individuals and work contexts.

The general focus of this measure is consistent with the majority of research measuring fit perceptions in which the person and environment attributes are specified at a global level, leaving it to the individual perceiver to factor in whatever information he/she deems relevant for the evaluation (Kristof-Brown et al., 2005). For instance, Cable and DeRue's (2002) measures of perceived P–O fit, D–A fit and N–S fit capture the employee-assessed congruence between organisational and individual values without mentioning specific values, the congruence between job demands and personal abilities without specifying any particular demands or abilities, and the match between individual needs and organisational supplies without identifying any particular needs or supplies. These measures of perceived fit have the advantage of being general enough to be applicable to a variety of occupations and allow for comparisons in perceived fit across occupational groups and settings.

As a first step in examining perceived ED–A fit, we tested the distinctiveness of a measure of perceived ED–A fit from five other fit perceptions (P–O, D–A, N–S, P–G, and P–S fit). We anticipated that ED–A fit perceptions would be factorially distinct from these other fit perceptions.

Hypothesis 1: Perceived ED–A fit is distinct from perceived P–O fit, N–S fit, D–A fit, P–G fit, and P–S fit.

Also as part of Study 1, we examined whether perceived ED–A fit related to job satisfaction, work tension, turnover intentions, and psychological need satisfaction above and beyond the effects of other perceived P–E fit constructs. These outcome variables were chosen because they (a) are widely regarded as important outcomes in management research and (b) have a strong conceptual link to fit and affect. The demonstration of incremental validity is an important step in showing the distinctiveness and practical value of a new construct (Zaccaro & Stone, 1988).

Prior research has shown that job satisfaction relates to perceived P–O, D–A, N–S, P–G, and P–S fits (Kristof-Brown et al., 2005). Individuals who perceive that they fit better in each of these ways are more satisfied with their jobs compared to individuals who fit less well because they can contribute more to their organisations, get along better with their fellow employees, and are more likely to have their own needs satisfied (e.g. Greguras & Diefendorff, 2009). Job satisfaction is often defined as an affective evaluation of one's job (Weiss & Cropanzano, 1996). We expect that high ED–A fit will enable individuals to respond to emotional aspects of the work in a more natural and genuine way, resulting in more positive feelings about the job (Côté & Moskowitz, 1998). Further, emotional abilities may represent a type of personal resource that enables employees to cope with emotional work demands, such that when abilities are a good match with demands, employees feel they can manage work effectively and, as a result, experience a variety of positive reactions to the job, including job satisfaction (Demerouti, Bakker, Nachreiner, & Schaufeli, 2001). Such a view is consistent with the job demands-resources model (Bakker & Demerouti, 2007).

A second criterion examined in Study 1 was work tension. Work tension refers to the experience of psychological and physiological distress as a result of work (House & Rizzo, 1972), including such factors as role ambiguity and role conflict (Grandey & Cropanzano, 1999). Work tension is associated with work stress (Grandey & Cropanzano, 1999), which has been shown to negatively relate to P–O, N–S, and D–A fits (Kristof-Brown et al., 2005). Given that scholars have explicitly argued that employees who possess the abilities to perform the job should experience less stress than those without such abilities (e.g. McGrath, 1976), and given the overlap in emotional content between ED–A fit and work tension, we expected perceived ED–A fit to negatively relate to work tension above and beyond the influence of other fit perceptions. Furthermore, individuals with high levels of ED–A fit should be able to respond to the emotional demands of their work in a more natural or self-concordant way, resulting in less stress, tension, and negative affective

states on the job (Bono & Vey, 2007; Côté & Moskowitz, 1998). Thus, work tension should be uniquely related to ED–A fit perceptions.

We also examined turnover intentions as an outcome variable, consistent with prior work linking it to several fit perceptions (Kristof-Brown et al., 2005). Individuals who believe that they do not fit with their work environments are more likely to intend to quit because they are not contributing in a positive way to the organisation or developing strong bonds with other employees (Cable & DeRue, 2002). Emotional job demands and emotional capabilities have both been shown to correlate with turnover intentions (Chau, Dahling, Levy, & Diefendorff, 2009; Griffeth, Hom, & Gaertner, 2000; Maertz & Campion, 2004), suggesting that the degree of congruence between emotional demands and abilities might provide unique information that individuals can use to ascertain whether they are well suited for the job. High ED–A fit could result in decisions to stay with the company as it communicates to employees that they are in a fundamentally good situation in which their personal resources are well aligned with the demands of the work (Demerouti et al., 2001). As such, we expected that perceived ED–A fit would incrementally relate to turnover intentions beyond the effects of other fit perceptions.

The final set of outcomes examined in Study 1 pertained to psychological need satisfaction. Greguras and Diefendorff (2009) argued that one of the most proximal outcomes of fit perceptions is need fulfillment; when employees perceive that they fit with their environment, they are better able to satisfy their psychological needs. According to Deci and Ryan (2000), the degree to which individuals function optimally depends on their ability to satisfy the psychological needs for autonomy (i.e. need to exercise control over one's actions), relatedness (i.e. need to feel connected with others), and competence (i.e. need to have an effect on one's outcomes and surroundings). Environmental conditions that help employees satisfy their psychological needs facilitate intrinsic motivation and personal growth. Greguras and Diefendorff (2009) demonstrated that the level of perceived fit between employees and various aspects of their environments (i.e. P–O, P–G, D–A) was positively related to psychological need satisfaction. We anticipate that the experience of fit with emotional work demands may also relate to psychological need satisfaction. In particular, we expected that high ED–A fit will enable individuals to respond to emotional aspects of the work in a more natural and authentic way, which can facilitate the experience of work as being more intrinsically derived (Deci & Ryan, 2000). That is, perceived ED–A fit may result in individuals feeling greater concordance between their work activities and personal desires, which can facilitate need satisfaction (Greguras & Diefendorff, 2009). In effect, greater concordance may make meeting the emotional demands easier and more rewarding, which can enhance feelings of autonomy and competence in performing the work. Furthermore, this

alignment between emotional demands and abilities will likely result in better interpersonal interactions, higher quality relationships, and a better sense that one is connecting to others on an emotional level. As such, we theorise that high perceived ED–A fit should be associated with high need satisfaction on each of these dimensions.

Hypothesis 2: Controlling for perceptions of P–O fit, N–S fit, D–A fit, P–G fit, and P–S fit, ED–A fit perceptions are (a) positively related to job satisfaction, (b) negatively related to work tension, (c) negatively related to turnover intentions, and (d) positively related to psychological need satisfaction.

Method

Procedure. As part of a voluntary class project, 170 students enrolled in an Introduction to Organizational Behavior course at a university in Singapore were asked to recruit up to two participants for this study who were willing to complete several surveys over the course of the semester. Prior to the distribution of surveys, students were asked to identify up to two participants who (a) were full-time working adults (i.e. worked at least 30 hours per week), (b) were able to read English, and (c) would be willing to complete several surveys over the course of the semester. For all surveys, students distributed the survey packets to the participants and the participants returned their completed surveys directly to the investigators in an enclosed self-addressed postage-paid envelope. Surveys were coded with a number so that we could match surveys across the administration periods. Students did not receive extra credit for recruiting participants, nor were they penalised if they chose not to participate in this project. Of the 170 students asked to identify and distribute surveys, 16 students chose not to participate, 4 students only had one respondent return at least one survey, and the remaining 150 students had two participants return at least one of the surveys.

After participants had been identified, Time 1 survey packets were distributed. Included with the Time 1 survey was a letter describing the entire project. Participants were informed that their responses were voluntary, confidential, and would only be used for research purposes. All surveys were in English which is the official language of education and business in Singapore. Time 1 surveys collected demographic information and included all of the perceived fit measures. Consistent with Cable and DeRue (2002), the items for all fit scales were presented in random order and decoy items about personality (e.g. "I am full of ideas") were interspersed among the fit items to reduce the possibility of response sets in the data. Three weeks later, Time 2 survey packets were distributed. Time 2 surveys included items measuring psychological need satisfaction. Three weeks later, Time 3 surveys were distributed and measured additional demographic information, employee job satisfaction, intent to turnover, and work tension. As a check on the

quality of the data, we called 26 (10.48%) Time 1 respondents (see below) and asked them to confirm their completion of the surveys and to verify one of their responses (e.g. age). All 26 respondents confirmed their participation and accurately confirmed one of their responses. Studies have used similar procedures to collect data (e.g. Hazer & Highhouse, 1997; Smith, Tisak, Hahn, & Schmeider, 1997) and have shown that data collected using this approach are of comparable quality to data collected via more traditional procedures.

Participants. At all three waves, 304 surveys were distributed, with 249 (81.91%) surveys returned at Time 1, 209 (69.43%) surveys returned at Time 2, and 183 (60.20%) surveys returned at Time 3. Two participants were dropped because of missing data and three were dropped because of random response patterns, reducing the sample size to 244 full-time employees.[1] As a result, we had responses for all three time periods for 169 participants (though we utilise as much of the sample as possible for each of the analyses). No differences were observed on any substantive or demographic variables for participants who had complete data (across the three time periods) and those who did not have complete data (i.e. had one or two time periods only). The sample was 92.2 per cent Chinese, 2.1 per cent Malay, 3.7 per cent Indian, 0.8 per cent Caucasian, 0.4 per cent Eurasian, and 0.8 per cent Other. The mean age of the sample was 33.3 years ($SD = 11.32$) and 57.8 per cent of the sample was female. Participants had an average tenure of 5.6 years ($SD = 8.02$) with their current organisation, and an average tenure of 3 years ($SD = 4.05$) in their current position. Participants worked in a variety of industries (17.2% service industry; 9.0% government; 13.5% financial industry; 7.0% manufacturing industry; 2.5% transportation industry; 1.6% human services; 21.7% other; with the remaining 27.5% of participants not reporting their industry. Note, however, that the large percentage of participants not reporting type of industry resulted from this information being collected with the Time 3 survey, which was completed by only 183 participants). The majority of participants were in non-managerial positions (51.2%) with fewer participants in first (e.g. supervise line level positions; 14.8%), middle (e.g. supervise line level managers; 24.2%), or upper-level (e.g. at or near the top of the organisation; 7.4%) managerial positions (2.4% of respondents did not report organisational level).

Measures. *Perceived emotional demands–abilities fit*: The items on this scale were modeled after the D–A fit items of Cable and DeRue (2002). We wrote the items to specifically refer to only emotional demands and to do so

[1] The substantive results did not change as a function of dropping these individuals.

in a general way that would make the items applicable across jobs and persons. The content validity of these items was assessed by asking five organisational behavior faculty members not affiliated with the project to review our scale and provide feedback. As subject matter experts, their feedback confirmed the content validity of the items making up this measure. The items were as follows: "The match is very good between the emotional demands of my job and my personal skills", "My ability to manage my emotions is a good fit with the requirements of my job", and "My personal abilities and background provide a good match with the emotional demands that my job places on me." These items were rated on a 5-point scale ranging from 1 (Not at all) to 5 (Completely). Items on all of the fit scales were responded to on this 5-point scale. The estimated reliability of this measure was $\alpha = .70$.

Perceived person–organisation fit: We measured perceived P–O fit using Cable and DeRue's (2002) three-item measure. A sample item is "My personal values match my organisation's values and culture." The estimated reliability of this measure was $\alpha = .86$.

Perceived demands–abilities fit: We measured perceived D–A fit using Cable and DeRue's (2002) three-item measure. A sample item is "The match is very good between the demands of my job and my personal skills." The estimated reliability of this measure was $\alpha = .77$.

Perceived needs–supplies fit: We measured perceived N–S fit using Cable and DeRue's (2002) three-item measure. A sample item is "The attributes that I look for in a job are fulfilled very well by my present job." The estimated reliability of this measure was $\alpha = .87$.

Perceived person–group fit: We adapted Cable and DeRue's (2002) three P–O fit items to measure perceived P–G fit by substituting the word "co-workers" for "organisation" in the original items. The resulting items were: "The things I value in life are similar to the things my co-workers value", "There is a good match between my values and those of my co-workers", and "My personal values match my co-workers' values." The estimated reliability of this scale was $\alpha = .92$.

Perceived person–supervisor fit: Similar to the P–G fit items, we adapted Cable and DeRue's (2002) three P–O fit items to measure perceived P–S fit by substituting the word "supervisor" for "organisation" (see the P–G fit items above). The estimated reliability of this measure was $\alpha = .89$.

Job satisfaction: We measured job satisfaction with the Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire (MSQ; Weiss, Dawis, England, & Lofquist, 1967). The short form of the MSQ consists of 20 items asking participants how satisfied they are with various components of their job, e.g. "the competence of my supervisor in making decisions"; "the way company policies are put into practice"; "the pay and the amount of work I do"; "the working conditions". Items were responded to on a 5-point scale ranging from 1 = Very

dissatisfied to 5 = Very satisfied. The estimated reliability of this measure was $\alpha = .90$.

Work tension: We measured employee work role tension using House and Rizzo's (1972) seven-item scale. These items measure an employee's well-being (both psychologically and psychosomatically) experienced in response to tensions at work. A sample item is "I have felt fidgety or nervous as a result of my job." Responses to these items were made on a 5-point scale ranging from 1 = Strongly disagree to 5 = Strongly agree. The estimated reliability of this scale was $\alpha = .82$.

Turnover intentions: A three-item scale from the Michigan Organizational Assessment Questionnaire (Cammann, Fichman, Jenkins, & Klesh, 1979; Seashore, Lawler, Mirvis, & Cammann, 1982) was used to assess turnover intentions in the current study. Two items were used as in the original scale, whereas the third item, "How likely is it that you will actively look for a new job in the next year?", was modified to be, "I will probably look for a new job in the next year", so that it could be responded to on the same scale as the other two items. Responses to all items were made on a 5-point scale ranging from 1 = Strongly disagree to 5 = Strongly agree. The estimated reliability of this scale was $\alpha = .93$.

Need satisfaction: We measured psychological need satisfaction with the Basic Need Satisfaction at Work Scale (see Deci, Ryan, Gagné, Leone, Usunov, & Kornazheva, 2001), which consists of 21 items used to assess the extent to which individuals experience satisfaction of their needs for autonomy, competence, and relatedness at work. Sample items include, "I am free to express my ideas and opinions on the job" (autonomy satisfaction), "I really like the people I work with" (relatedness satisfaction), and "Most days I feel a sense of accomplishment from working" (competence satisfaction). Items were responded to using a 7-point scale ranging from 1 (Not at all true) to 7 (Very true). The estimated reliability was $\alpha = .63$ for the seven-item autonomy satisfaction scale, $\alpha = .81$ for the eight-item relatedness satisfaction scale, and $\alpha = .69$ for the six-item competence satisfaction scale.

Results

Confirmatory Factor Analyses (CFA). To test Hypothesis 1 that ED–A fit is empirically distinct from other types of P–E fit, we conducted a series of CFAs using LISREL 8.52 (Jöreskog & Sörbom, 2003). Using the χ^2 difference test, the hypothesised six-factor model (Model A, which separated all fit perceptions) was compared to five five-factor models (Models B–F), two four-factor models (Models G–H), and a one-factor model (Model I; see Table 1 for a description of each model). For each CFA model, individual items were allowed to load on only one factor and the latent factors were allowed to freely correlate. As shown in Table 1, the six-factor CFA model

TABLE 1
Summary of Fit Statistics for Study 1

Model	χ^2	df	*RMSEA*	*SRMR*	*TLI*	*CFI*	*Comparing model to model A*	
							Δ df	$\Delta\chi^2$
A. 6-Factor	259.84*	120	.067	.043	.97	.98		
B. 5-Factor (D–A & ED–A combined)	291.99*	125	.073	.049	.97	.97	5	32.14*
C. 5-Factor (N–S & ED–A combined)	306.68*	125	.077	.051	.97	.97	5	46.84*
D. 5-Factor (P–O & ED–A combined)	366.61*	125	.093	.060	.96	.96	5	106.77*
E. 5-Factor (P–G & ED–A combined)	516.58*	125	.110	.150	.93	.94	5	256.74*
F. 5-Factor (P–S & ED–A combined)	405.42*	125	.099	.077	.95	.96	5	145.58*
G. 4-Factor (D–A, ED–A, & N–S combined)	362.15*	129	.089	.056	.96	.96	9	102.31*
H. 4-Factor (P–G, P–S, & ED–A combined)	973.57*	129	.200	.180	.85	.87	9	713.73*
I. 1-Factor	1187.51*	135	.190	.120	.82	.84	15	927.67*

Note: * significant at $p < .05$. In evaluating the adequacy of these models, the following fit indices were used: (a) the χ^2 Goodness of Fit statistic, (b) the root mean square error of approximation (RMSEA), (c) the standardised root mean square residual (SRMR), (d) the Tucker Lewis Index (TLI), and (e) the Comparative Fit Index (CFI). The lower bound of good fit for the CFI and the TLI is typically considered to be .90. For the RMSEA and the SRMR, the upper bounds of good fit are .08 and .10, respectively (Vandenberg & Lance, 2000).

(Model A) achieved good fit, and fit significantly better than every other model. As such, Hypothesis 1 is supported. The correlations of perceived ED–A fit with the other fit variables ranged from .34 to .62 (see Table 2), suggesting moderate, positive relations with these variables. Following the suggestions of Fornell and Larcker (1981) for establishing the discriminant validity of a scale, we observed that the average variance extracted for the ED–A fit items (.44) was larger than the square of the correlations of ED–A fit with the other fit measures (ranging from .12 to .38). These results support the discriminant validity of the perceived ED–A fit measure. The magnitude of the correlations among the fit perceptions is similar to what Kristof-Brown et al. (2005) observed in their meta-analysis (average *r*s = .30–.59). Consistent with our conceptual arguments presented above, the results from the CFAs and the moderate correlations observed among the fit scales indicate that the ED–A fit construct is distinct, though related, to other forms of P–E fit.[2]

Relations of ED–A Fit with Outcome Variables. As can be seen in Table 2, perceived ED–A fit significantly correlated with every outcome variable. Indeed, every outcome variable was significantly correlated with every fit perception, with the exception of the perceived P–G fit with autonomy need satisfaction and the relations of work tension with all of the fit perceptions, except ED–A fit (which was significant). The strength of these relations is noteworthy given that the fit variables were measured at between three and six weeks prior to each of the dependent variables. To test Hypothesis 2, we analyzed the data using hierarchical regression with ED–A fit entered as a predictor at Step 2 after controlling for the other five fit measures. As shown in Table 3, perceived ED–A fit accounted for unique variance in job satisfaction ($\beta = .23$, $p < .05$, $\Delta R^2 = .026$), work tension ($\beta = -.34$, $p < .05$, $\Delta R^2 = .057$), autonomy need satisfaction ($\beta = .24$, $p < .05$, $\Delta R^2 = .028$), competence need satisfaction ($\beta = .21$, $p < .05$, $\Delta R^2 = .022$), and relatedness need satisfaction ($\beta = .18$, $p < .05$, $\Delta R^2 = .016$), controlling for perceived P–O, N–S, D–A, P–G, and P–S fits. The only variable that perceived ED–A fit did not uniquely relate to was turnover intentions ($\beta = -.14$, *ns*). In addition, relative weight analyses (see Tonidandel & LeBreton, 2011) reported in Table 3 demonstrated that perceived ED–A fit accounted for relatively high proportions of the overall model effects in the regression analyses. In sum, these results support Hypotheses 2a, 2b, and 2d, but not 2c.

---

[2] We examined whether mean levels of ED–A fit varied as a function of managerial level and type of organisation. No significant differences were observed. In addition, we examined whether the correlation between ED–A fit and D–A fit varied as a function of these grouping variables and did not find any significant differences. These results suggest that perceived ED–A fit and the degree of overlap between perceived ED–A fit and D–A fit were not affected by these organisational or managerial-level variables.

TABLE 2
Means, Standard Deviations, Reliabilities, and Correlations of Variables for Study 1

	N	*Mean*	SD	*1*	*2*	*3*	*4*	*5*	*6*	*7*	*8*	*9*	*10*	*11*	*12*
1. Emotional D–A fit	244	3.53	.63	(.70)											
2. P–O fit	244	3.19	.79	.51	(.86)										
3. D–A fit	244	3.67	.71	.58	.47	(.77)									
4. N–S fit	244	3.35	.82	.62	.68	.65	(.87)								
5. P–G fit	244	3.24	.74	.34	.40	.26	.24	(.92)							
6. P–S fit	243	3.27	.82	.51	.66	.39	.58	.36	(.89)						
7. Job satisfaction	179	3.66	.46	.48	.42	.43	.52	.16	.35	(.90)					
8. Work tension	179	2.78	.63	−.24	.01	−.05	−.13	−.02	−.11	−.30	(.82)				
9. Turnover intent	179	2.53	.86	−.39	−.32	−.39	−.44	−.15	−.25	−.48	.18	(.93)			
10. Autonomy NS	205	4.59	.78	.43	.30	.43	.40	.06	.25	.47	−.38	−.38	(.63)		
11. Competence NS	205	5.12	.85	.47	.38	.51	.42	.15	.39	.46	−.29	−.30	.61	(.69)	
12. Relatedness NS	205	5.09	.85	.39	.32	.38	.33	.36	.27	.44	−.25	−.25	.44	.46	(.81)

Note: NS = Need Satisfaction. Reliabilities are on the diagonal. Values greater than .14 or less than −.14 are significant at $p < .05$.

TABLE 3
Hierarchical Regression Results for Study 1

	Criteria								
	Job Satisfaction			*Work Tension*			*Intention to Quit*		
Predictors	*β At Step*	*β Final Step*	*Final Relative Weights*	*β At Step*	*β Final Step*	*Final Relative Weights*	*β At Step*	*β Final Step*	*Final Relative Weights*
Step 1									
P–O fit	.11	.11	15.6%	.22*	.23*	14.9%	–.02	–.01	11.7%
N–S fit	.31*	.26*	29.1%	–.24*	–.16	14.6%	–.31*	–.28*	32.3%
D–A fit	.15	.07	18.2%	.04	.17	6.6%	–.17	–.12	24.3%
P–G fit	–.02	–.04	1.5%	–.02	.02	1.8%	–.03	–.01	2.1%
P–S fit	.05	.01	8.9%	–.11	–.05	10.1%	.01	.03	5.6%
R^2	.291*			.043			.212*		
Step 2									
ED–A fit	.23*	.23*	26.7%	–.34*	–.34*	52.0%	–.14	–.14	24.0%
ΔR^2	.026*			.057*			.010		
Total R^2	.317		100%	.100		100%	.222		100%

	Criteria								
	Autonomy Need Satisfaction			*Competence Need Satisfaction*			*Relatedness Need Satisfaction*		
Predictors	*β At Step*	*β Final Step*	*Final Relative Weights*	*β At Step*	*β Final Step*	*Final Relative Weights*	*β At Step*	*β Final Step*	*Final Relative Weights*
Step 1									
P–O fit	.03	.05	9.5%	.06	.07	10.9%	.04	.05	9.5%
N–S fit	.16	.08	18.7%	.00	–.07	12.1%	.10	.03	10.6%
D–A fit	.33*	.25*	31.8%	.42*	.36*	36.6%	.22*	.17	22.9%
P–G fit	–.11	–.14	2.3%	–.08	–.11	1.4%	.25*	.23*	29.4%
P–S fit	.07	.02	5.6%	.23*	.19*	14.6%	.01	–.02	5.7%
R^2	.225*			.314*			.223*		
Step 2									
ED–A fit	.24*	.24*	32.1%	.21*	.21*	24.4%	.18*	.18*	21.9%
ΔR^2	.028*			.022*			.016*		
Total R^2	.253		100%	.336		100%	.239		100%

Note: β is the standardised regression weight for each of the variables. The relative weights represent the percentage of the Total R^2 accounted for by each variable. For the dependent variables of job satisfaction, tension and turnover intentions, $N = 179$, *df* Step 1 = 5, 173 and *df* for Step 2 = 1, 172. For the need satisfaction dependent variables, $N = 205$, *df* Step 1 = 5, 199 and *df* for Step 2 = 1, 198. All R^2 values are unadjusted. All tests are two-tailed.
* $p < .05$.

Discussion

Study 1 demonstrated that perceived ED–A fit is empirically distinct from other P–E fit perceptions and incrementally related to attitudinal and well-being outcomes. This study contributes to both the P–E fit and emotions literatures by providing the first test of emotional fit as a construct that is distinct from established fit constructs. In addition, ED–A fit was uniquely related to five of six outcomes, controlling for the influence of the other five fit perceptions. By comparison, P–O, P–G, and P–S fits each uniquely related to only one criterion, and D–A and N–S fits were only uniquely related to two criteria. These results suggest that perceived ED–A fit had consistent, unique relationships with employee outcomes even after controlling for the variance accounted for by the most commonly examined types of perceived P–E fit in the extant literature. Given that emotional demands may take a variety of forms and may come from a variety of task and interpersonal factors, perceived ED–A fit appears to represent an important source of influence on employee outcomes.

The largest effect for perceived ED–A fit was for work tension (assessed six weeks later), with high work tension being associated with low perceived ED–A fit. This finding is consistent with the focus of both constructs on emotional content. P–O fit also related to work tension, but in the opposite direction of what would be expected (i.e. P–O fit was positively related to work tension in Table 3), though this relation was nonsignificant in the bivariate analysis (Table 2), suggesting the possible presence of a spurious effect, perhaps due to multicollinearity among the fit variables.

Perceived ED–A fit was the only variable to uniquely relate to all three need satisfactions (assessed three weeks later), suggesting that emotional congruence between work demands and abilities is important for feeling that one's psychological needs are met. The more general D–A fit was also related to competence and autonomy need satisfactions, suggesting that perceptions of fit with job demands, in general, was related to a stronger sense of autonomy and competence at work. P–S fit was also uniquely related to competence need satisfaction, suggesting that a good perceived match in values with one's supervisor was associated with stronger perceptions of competence at work. Not surprisingly, P–G fit joined ED–A fit in accounting for unique variance in relatedness need satisfaction; believing that one's values align with the group's values was associated with stronger feelings of relatedness. Only perceived ED–A and N–S fits uniquely related to job satisfaction (assessed six weeks later) in the full model, and only N–S fit was uniquely related to turnover intentions (ED–A fit was not uniquely related to turnover intentions). Finding that N–S fit had a strong relationship with these outcomes is consistent with past work (Kristof-Brown et al., 2005). However, the observation that perceived ED–A fit was also uniquely related

to job satisfaction suggests that experiencing fit with emotional aspects of work may be tied to happiness at work. In sum, these findings indicate that not only does ED–A fit incrementally relate to employee outcomes beyond established P–E fit perceptions, it does so more consistently than previously identified types of fit.

STUDY 2

The purposes of Study 2 were to extend the findings of Study 1 by (a) re-examining the discriminant validity of perceived ED–A fit with other P–E fit perceptions, but in a non-Singaporean sample of primarily upper-level managers, (b) examining the ability of perceived ED–A fit to relate to additional, theory-based employee outcomes, and (c) assessing whether perceived ED–A fit could account for incremental variance in outcomes controlling for other types of fit perceptions and typical levels of work-related affect. Recall that participants in Study 1 were predominantly Singaporean of Chinese descent and that we found evidence that ED–A fit was empirically distinct from five other forms of fit, as well as uniquely related to attitudinal and well-being outcomes. In Study 2, we collected data from a diverse sample of Western managers in an attempt to examine the discriminant validity of perceived ED–A fit in a different cultural context with different emotion norms (Matsumoto, Yoo, Hirayama & Petrova, 2005). Our expectation was that we would replicate the Study 1 finding that perceived ED–A fit was distinct from other forms of fit. To test this idea, we assessed perceived P–O fit, D–A fit, and N–S fit, which had the strongest relations with ED–A fit in Study 1. Also in Study 2, we examined how perceived ED–A fit related to two of the same outcomes that were examined in Study 1 (job satisfaction and turnover intentions), as well as additional well-being outcomes examined in emotions research (burnout, felt inauthenticity), and job performance. Importantly, because all measures collected in Study 1 were self-report measures, we examined supervisor performance ratings in Study 2. Finally, we controlled for typical work affect in Study 2 to rule out the possibility that affect is a spurious cause of the perceived ED–A fit and outcome relationships.

Recall that perceived ED–A fit was positively related to job satisfaction and unrelated to turnover intentions in the simultaneous regression analyses in Study 1. As such, we sought to re-examine these relations in Study 2 with a sample from a different cultural context. Consistent with Study 1, we expect perceived ED–A fit to uniquely relate to job satisfaction. However, given the null finding for turnover intentions in Study 1, we did not form an hypothesis for this outcome. The remaining outcomes discussed below were not included in Study 1, allowing us to further explore the relations of ED–A fit perceptions with key outcomes in Study 2.

Felt inauthenticity refers to the extent to which individuals believe they must show or feel emotions that are inconsistent with their true or genuine selves (Erickson & Ritter, 2001). As such, individuals' emotions or expressions are not congruent with their naturally felt emotions, a circumstance that is likely to occur more often when the job demands emotions that do not match with the person's natural emotional tendencies. Individuals who perceive low levels of ED–A fit may find that they need to express emotions that do not come naturally and are not congruent with their true selves, as in the case of a low extraversion salesperson feigning enthusiasm to a customer or a high neuroticism emergency medical technician trying to remain calm in the presence of a seriously injured individual. Similarly, individuals who perceive low ED–A fit may find that they must frequently suppress their true emotions, leading to the sense that their outward expressions to others are not authentic. We anticipate that perceived ED–A fit would uniquely relate to felt inauthenticity after controlling for other fit perceptions and work affect.

Burnout is a state of depleted energy caused by excessive work demands (Jackson, Turner, & Brief, 1987). At its core, burnout is characterised by high levels of emotional exhaustion (Wharton, 1993) and the tendency to perceive others as objects. We expected perceived ED–A fit to be more strongly related to burnout, as individuals who perceive that they do not fit with the emotional demands of the job should be more likely to be emotionally depleted and detached from the people with whom they work. Having low levels of perceived ED–A fit should result in a greater need to monitor and manage the emotional aspects of one's work, which will consume regulatory resources. Indeed, research has linked emotional demands and abilities to burnout (Brotheridge & Grandey, 2002; Brotheridge & Lee, 2003), although no prior work has linked perceptions of fit between emotional demands and abilities to burnout. We anticipate that ED–A fit perceptions will exhibit unique relations with burnout because of the match in emotional focus.

We also expected that perceived ED–A fit would relate to job performance. Being able to complete aspects of their jobs that are explicitly emotional (e.g. meeting emotional display requirements, managing emotional reactions) should result in higher overall evaluations of effectiveness, as well as free up cognitive and regulatory resources that can be utilised for performing other aspects of the work (e.g. task-work). That is, being in job situations in which one must feel difficult or negative emotions or must express emotions that are not congruent with one's feelings will require more conscious regulation or suppression of affect, which can deplete cognitive and regulatory resources that could otherwise be used to perform the job (Beal, Weiss, Barros, & MacDermid, 2005). Individuals who perceive that their abilities do not fit with the emotional demands of their work will not be able to perform the associated behaviors as easily and may not have regulatory resources to

perform other work tasks as well, leading to lower performance, compared to individuals whose abilities fit with the emotional work demands.

Hypothesis 3: Controlling for work affect and perceptions of P–O fit, N–S fit, and D–A fit, ED–A fit perceptions are (a) positively related to job satisfaction, (b) negatively related to burnout, (c) negatively related to felt inauthenticity, and (d) positively related to job performance.

Method

Participants and Procedure. Our original database consisted of 11,917 employees who had participated in a leadership development program in which Benchmarks® (CCL, 2004) was used, between 19 August 2002 and 15 February 2006. Benchmarks® is a multi-rater instrument used to provide developmental performance feedback to employees. In March 2006, we emailed a survey link and invitation to participate in our study to the 11,917 employees for whom we had archival Benchmarks® performance data. Of these invitations, 1,365 email invitations bounced back (the participants' email addresses were no longer valid), resulting in 10,552 email invitations being sent. One thousand four hundred and nineteen employees responded to our survey, resulting in a response rate of 13.45 per cent. Because of missing or incomplete data, the sample size was reduced to 1,111 participants. Of these participants, we were able to match 375 archival supervisor ratings on Benchmarks® completed in the previous 12 months. We restricted the supervisor ratings to this timeframe to better ensure that the ratings were relevant to employees (although supplemental analyses involving all 779 employees with supervisor ratings yielded similar results; these analyses are available from the first author). Note that in cases where employees had more than one set of supervisory ratings, the ratings from one supervisor were randomly chosen to be in the analyses.

Of the 1,111 participants for whom we had demographic information (depending on the demographic item, demographic information was available for between 66.0% and 72.1% of participants), 61.7 per cent were male with an average age of 43.4 years (SD = 7.74). The majority of employees were Caucasian (52.6%), followed by African American (2.0%), Hispanic (1.9%), Asian (1.8%), Other (7.8%), and missing (34%). Participants were engaged in a variety of organisational functions, with 12.2 per cent at the Executive level, 32.3 per cent at top or upper management, 25.2 per cent at middle management, and 3.3 per cent at first-level management (.8% were Other and 26.1% were unidentified).[3] Average tenure with the organisation

[3] Occupational functions included Operations (10.7%), Top Management (6.9%), Sales (6.5%), Information Systems (4.5%), Engineering (4.1%), Marketing (4.0%), Administration

was 11.3 (SD = 8.43) years and in the current job was 4.6 years (SD = 4.56). Supervisor ratings on the Benchmarks® did not differ for those with self-ratings of fit perceptions (mean = 4.01) and those without self-ratings (mean = 3.98) (t(10326) = 1.55, *ns*).

Measures. Unless noted otherwise, the response scale for all items ranged from 1 (Strongly disagree) to 5 (Strongly agree). The fit variables examined in Study 2, P–O fit, N–S fit, D–A fit, and ED–A fit, were assessed with exactly the same scales used in Study 1. The reliabilities for these scales were all at or above α = .86 (see Table 4). The three items used to assess turnover intentions in Study 1 were used in Study 2. The estimated reliability of this scale was α = .90.

Work-related affect: In an attempt to broadly assess and control for the typical affective experiences of employees, participants indicated the frequency (1 = Never; 5 = Extremely often) with which they experienced 11 emotion items chosen from the Job-Related Affective Well-Being Scale (JAWS; Van Katwyk, Fox, Spector, & Kelloway, 2000) to sample from the entire circumplex of affective experience. Through principal axis factor analyses (and the subsequent dropping of one cross-loading item, i.e. "bored"), we identified a three-factor structure, represented by high activation positive affect (enthusiastic, happy; α = .80), low activation positive affect (calm, relaxed; α = .66), and negative affect (frustration, anger, gloomy, fury, annoyance, anxiety; α = .75).

Job satisfaction: Job satisfaction was measured with a three-item scale developed by Cammann et al. (1979). A sample item is, "All in all, I am satisfied with my job." The estimated reliability of this scale was α = .84.

Felt inauthenticity: We adapted the felt inauthenticity items from Richard (2005). The three items used in our study were: "I feel that I am not being myself in my interpersonal interaction at work", "I feel a fake when interacting with others at work", and "I feel that I am not being 'authentic' in my work interactions with others." Participants were asked to indicate how true each item was of them at work on a 7-point Likert scale, ranging from 1 (Not at all true) to 7 (Very true). The estimated reliability of this scale was α = .82.

Burnout: We developed a three-item measure of burnout based on its core dimensions of emotional exhaustion (feeling emotionally drained) and depersonalisation (feeling emotionally detached). The items are "I feel

---

(3.7%), Human Resources (3.2%), Accounting (3.0%), Finance (2.9%), Research and Development (2.3), Other (consisting of 11 additional occupations and totaling 9.8%) and unidentified (28.1%). We examined whether mean levels of ED–A fit varied as a function of managerial level and occupational function. No significant differences were observed. In addition, we examined whether the correlation between ED–A fit and D–A fit varied as a function of these grouping variables and did not find any significant differences.

TABLE 4
Means, Standard Deviations, Reliabilities, and Correlations of Variables for Study 2

	N	*Mean*	SD	*1*	*2*	*3*	*4*	*5*	*6*	*7*	*8*	*9*	*10*	*11*	*12*	*13*
1. Emotional D–A fit	1,111	4.00	.65	(.87)												
2. P–O fit	1,111	3.77	.88	.42	(.95)											
3. N–S fit	1,111	3.74	.98	.44	.43	(.94)										
4. D–A fit	1,111	4.05	.69	.48	.34	.55	(.87)									
5. High activation PA	1,110	3.81	.64	.38	.40	.47	.42	(.80)								
6. Low activation PA	1,110	3.01	.74	.27	.18	.15	.15	.25	(.66)							
7. NA	1,110	2.46	.49	−.34	−.26	−.31	−.25	−.27	−.34	(.75)						
8. Job satisfaction	1,111	4.09	.76	.47	.50	.72	.53	.56	.25	−.42	(.84)					
9. Felt inauthenticity	1,111	2.16	1.14	−.30	−.26	−.27	−.27	−.29	−.14	.29	−.37	(.82)				
10. Burnout	1,111	2.30	.83	−.39	−.26	−.32	−.26	−.32	−.38	.47	−.47	.40	(.72)			
11. Intention to quit	1,111	2.12	1.06	−.36	−.41	−.62	−.42	−.42	−.19	.36	−.74	.32	.46	(.90)		
12. Archival perf.: Super. ratings	375	4.01	.44	.23	.18	.20	.19	.15	.10	−.05[a]	.24	−.12	−.16	−.19	(.99)	
13. Concurrent perf.: Self-ratings	1,111	4.49	.42	.28	.17	.19	.22	.23	.08	−.12	.17	−.12	−.15	−.08	.14	(.75)

Note: PA = Positive Affectivity; NA = Negative Affectivity. Reliabilities are on the diagonal. Values above the diagonal are correlations corrected for unreliability in the measures. [a] indicates that a correlation was *not* significant at $p < .05$; all other correlations are significant at $p < .05$.

burned out at work", "My job emotionally exhausts me", and "I feel emotionally detached from the people with whom I work." Although a low sense of personal accomplishment is sometimes conceptualised as a component of burnout, it also has been identified as an outcome of burnout (Cordes, Dougherty, & Blum, 1997). Consistent with past research (e.g. Best, Stapleton, & Downey, 2005), we did not include items tapping personal accomplishment in our burnout scale. The estimated reliability of this scale was $\alpha = .72$.

Job performance: archival supervisor ratings: Archival supervisor ratings of performance were obtained from the Benchmarks® measure. The Benchmarks® is a feedback instrument used primarily for leadership development purposes (Lombardo & McCauley, 1994; Lombardo, McCauley, McDonald-Mann, & Leslie, 1999). The scale has been subjected to a number of validation studies (see Leslie & Fleenor, 1998) and is considered a valid measure of leadership behavior and performance (Carty, 2003; Spangler, 2003). The survey includes 16 scales (115 items) measuring a variety of managerial behaviors (e.g. building and mending relationships, self-awareness, resourcefulness). Consistent with previous research, these scales were averaged into one measure of overall performance (for a detailed discussion and evidence justifying aggregation of the 16 scales, see Atwater, Ostroff, Yammarino, & Fleenor, 1998). The estimated reliability of this measure of supervisor ratings of performance was $\alpha = .99$.

Job performance: concurrent self-ratings: Job performance was assessed with the five-item scale developed by Ostroff, Atwater, and Feinberg (2004). Whereas Ostroff et al. had supervisors evaluate their employees using these items, in the current study the items were modified for a self-report format (i.e. "I get the job done", "I get the work done on time", "I accomplish a great deal", "I am an effective manager overall", and "I produce high quality work"). Responses ranged from 1 (Never) through 5 (Almost always). The estimated reliability of this scale was $\alpha = .75$.

Results

A series of CFAs, similar to those performed in Study 1, supported the idea that perceived ED–A fit is distinct from D–A, N–S, and P–O fit in Study 2.[4] Means, standard deviations, and correlations for study variables are pre-

[4] We conducted a series of CFAs using LISREL 8.52 (Jöreskog & Sörbom, 2003) in Study 2. The hypothesised four-factor model (Model A) that separates the fit constructs was compared to three three-factor models [Model B (combining D–A and ED–A fit), Model C (combining N–S and ED–A fit), and Model D (combining P–O fit and ED–A fit)], one two-factor model (Model E, combining D–A, ED–A, and N–S fits), and a one-factor model (Model F, combining all four fits). For each CFA model, individual items were allowed to load on only one factor and the latent variables were allowed to freely correlate. Model A achieved good fit ($\chi^2 = 494.32$, $df = 48$,

sented in Table 4. The correlations of ED–A fit with the other fit perceptions ranged from .42 to .48, suggesting moderate, positive relations with these variables. As can be seen in Table 4, all four fit measures were significantly correlated with every outcome variable examined, although ED–A fit was most strongly correlated with burnout, felt inauthenticity, and both measures of performance. Further, it is worth noting that perceived ED–A fit was significantly correlated with each measure of work affect, with higher ED–A fit perceptions corresponding to more favorable affective tendencies (i.e. more positive affect and less negative affect, see Table 4). To provide a more stringent test of perceived ED–A fit's relationships with outcomes, we performed hierarchical regression analyses in which the three affect variables were entered as predictors at Step 1, P–O, D–A, and N–S fits were entered at Step 2, and ED–A fit was entered at Step 3 (see Table 5).

Perceived ED–A fit exhibited unique relationships with burnout ($\beta = -.16$, $p < .05$, $\Delta R^2 = .016$) and felt inauthenticity ($\beta = -.11$, $p < .05$, $\Delta R^2 = .008$), but not turnover intentions ($\beta = .01$, *ns*) or job satisfaction ($\beta = .03$, *ns*). These results support H3b, and H3c, but not H3a. Further analysis revealed that the non-significant relation of ED–A fit with job satisfaction in Study 2 was attributable to the inclusion of affect variables as controls. The non-significant finding for ED–A fit and turnover intentions replicated the results of Study 1, providing consistent support for the idea that this form of fit does not uniquely contribute to the desire to quit. ED–A fit was uniquely related to both measures of job performance, exhibiting the only significant unique relationship with archival supervisor ratings of performance ($\beta = .14$, $p < .05$, $\Delta R^2 = .013$) and having the largest unique relationship with concurrent self-ratings of overall performance ($\beta = .19$, $p < .05$, $\Delta R^2 = .023$). These findings support H3d. Relative weight analyses reported in Table 5 further confirm the importance of perceived ED–A fit in the regression models.

Discussion

Consistent with Study 1, Study 2 demonstrated that perceived ED–A fit is empirically distinct from and accounts for incremental variance in well-being and performance outcomes beyond other fit perceptions. Study 2 also showed that the relations of perceived ED–A fit with outcomes occurred

---

$p < .05$; RMSEA = .09; SRMR = .05; TLI = .97; CFI = .98) and fit significantly better than Model B ($\Delta\chi^2(3) = 1784.19$, $p < .001$), Model C ($\Delta\chi^2(3) = 2119.73$, $p < .001$), and Model D ($\Delta\chi^2(3) = 2138.84$, $p < .001$). These findings support the notion that perceived ED–A fit is distinct from other fit perceptions. Following the suggestions of Fornell and Larcker (1981) for establishing the discriminant validity of a scale, we observed that the average variance extracted for the ED–A fit items (.78) was larger than the square of the correlations of ED–A fit with the other fit measures (ranging from .18 to .23). More details on these results are available from the first author.

TABLE 5
Hierarchical Regression Results for Study 2

	Criteria								
	Job Sat.			*Felt Inauthenticity*			*Burnout*		
Predictors	β *At Step*	β *Final Step*	*Final Relative Weights*	β *At Step*	β *Final Step*	*Final Relative Weights*	β *At Step*	β *Final Step*	*Final Relative Weights*
Step 1									
High PA	.48*	.20*	17.0%	−.23*	−.12*	18.1%	−.18*	−.10*	8.9%
Low PA	.04	.04	2.4%	−.01	.01	2.6%	−.22*	−.20*	22.0%
NA	−.28*	−.15*	9.6%	.23*	.17*	24.4%	.35*	.30*	35.8%
R^2	.397*			.133*			.304*		
Step 2									
P–O fit	.15*	.14*	12.6%	−.10*	−.08*	12.9%	−.05	−.02	4.4%
N–S fit	.45*	.45*	37.1%	−.04	−.03	10.8%	−.10*	−.08*	8.5%
D–A fit	.10*	.09*	13.1%	−.11*	−.08*	13.1%	−.02	.02	4.1%
ΔR^2	.238*			.028*			.014*		
Step 3									
ED–A fit	.03	.03	8.1%	−.11*	−.11*	18.0%	−.16*	−.16*	16.3%
ΔR^2	.001			.008*			.016*		
Total R^2	.636*		100%	.169*		100%	.335*		100%

	Critera								
	Intent. to Quit			*Archival: Supervisor Performance*			*Concurrent: Self Performance*		
Predictors	β *At Step*	β *Final Step*	*Final Relative Weights*	β *At Step*	β *Final Step*	*Final Relative Weights*	β *At Step*	β *Final Step*	*Final Relative Weights*
Step 1									
High PA	−.34*	−.10*	12.3%	.14*	.02	7.7%	.21*	.12*	22.4%
Low PA	−.02	−.03	1.9%	.08	.05	5.0%	.01	−.01	1.3%
NA	.26*	.15*	11.2%	.02	.08	1.6%	−.07*	−.01	3.4%
R^2	.243*			.027*			.055*		
Step 2									
P–O fit	−.13*	−.13*	12.7%	.11	.07	16.4%	.05	.02	7.7%
N–S fit	−.44*	−.44*	43.8%	.11	.10	19.5%	.03	.00	8.6%
D–A fit	−.05	−.06	11.8%	.10	.06	17.2%	.12*	.07	16.6%
ΔR^2	.202*			.040*			.019*		
Step 3									
ED–A fit	.01	.01	6.3%	.14*	.14*	32.6%	.19*	.19*	40.1%
ΔR^2	.000			.013*			.023*		
Total R^2	.446*		100%	.080		100%	.097*		100%

Note: β is the standardised regression weight for each of the variables. The relative weights represent the percentage of the Total R^2 accounted for by each variable. PA = Positive Affect; NA = Negative Affect. For all dependent variables except archival supervisor performance ratings, *df* Step 1 = 3, 1106, *df* for Step 2 = 3, 1103, and *df* for Step 3 = 1, 1102. For archival supervisor performance ratings, *df* Step 1 = 3, 371, *df* for Step 2 = 3, 368, and *df* for Step 3 = 1, 367. All R^2 values are unadjusted. All tests are two-tailed. * $p < .05$.

controlling for the influence of affect at work as well as perceived P–O fit, N–S fit, and D–A fit. Consistent with the underlying theoretical causes of burnout (Leiter & Maslach, 1988), perceived ED–A fit accounted for incremental variance in feelings of being emotionally drained by one's work. In addition, ED–A fit perceptions, as well as perceived P–O and D–A fits, uniquely related to felt inauthenticity, suggesting that perceived fit may help to explain why individuals feel like their emotional behaviors are incongruent with their true selves. Consistent with Study 1, turnover intentions were not uniquely related to perceived ED–A fit. In contrast to Study 1, perceived ED–A fit did not uniquely relate to job satisfaction, with the primary reason being that the inclusion of work-related affect removed this effect. Interestingly, perceived ED–A fit was the only fit perception that was uniquely related to both performance measures, although the small size of the relation with archival supervisor ratings (accounting for approximately 1.3% of the variance) should be acknowledged. Nonetheless, the consistency of these performance findings is especially noteworthy given that the assessments differed in their (a) timing (archival, concurrent), (b) constructs assessed (ratings of leadership skills, ratings of overall job performance), (c) purpose (leadership development, research purposes), and (d) rating source (self, supervisor). Perceived ED–A fit may have been related to the performance measures because being able to effectively deal with emotional demands may be both an in-role requirement and have the beneficial consequence of freeing up regulatory and cognitive resources for other non-emotional aspects of work. Such dual benefits may be especially likely for managers, which comprised this sample.

GENERAL DISCUSSION

P–E fit is critically important to both individuals and organisations (Kristof-Brown et al., 2005). This is the first study to demonstrate the relevance of perceived ED–A fit to organisational research. The lack of prior work on this topic is surprising given the increased recognition of the importance of emotions in today's organisations (Elfenbein, 2007) as well as calls to examine more specific forms of P–E fit (Cable & DeRue, 2002), including that of emotional fit in particular (Arvey et al., 1998). Indeed, research on emotions at work has often invoked the notion of emotional congruence as an explanation of performance and well-being (e.g. Bono & Vey, 2007; Diefendorff & Gosserand, 2003). However, the current paper is the first to provide direct evidence that perceived ED–A fit is important. As such, research on emotion management and well-being at work may benefit by incorporating a fit perspective on the links between individual characteristics and the emotional content of work (Arvey et al., 1998).

The two studies reported in this paper provide support for the validity of the perceived ED–A fit construct. Our measures demonstrated adequate internal consistency reliability and homogeneity of items. Across the studies, perceived ED–A fit was factorially distinct from other forms of perceived fit, including fit with the organisation, job, supervisor, and group. Of particular importance is the finding that ED–A fit was distinct from the more general D–A fit, showing that the perception of fitting well with emotional demands is not encompassed in the more general perception that one's abilities match the demands of the job. It may be that when individuals consider their fit with job demands in general, they focus on objective, rational aspects of their jobs, including job descriptions, explicit performance expectations, and performance evaluation criteria. However, because emotional demands pertain to the "irrational" side of organisational life (Ashforth & Humphrey, 1995) and may reflect unwritten expectations or norms (Cropanzano et al., 2004), such demands may not be completely factored into employee evaluations of their D–A fit. It may also be the case that people working in jobs with explicit emotional requirements (e.g. a front-line service employee) may exhibit greater overlap between their perceptions of ED–A fit and D–A fit. This idea may explain the stronger correlation between ED–A and D–A fit perceptions in Study 1 than in Study 2. Although individuals in Study 2 were all managers, participants in Study 1 worked in a more diverse set of occupations that may have included more service work. Systematic research on the influence of occupational differences on ED–A fit perceptions (and its overlap with D–A fit) is needed.

Across the two studies, perceived ED–A fit was incrementally related to well-being-based outcomes (i.e. burnout, work tension, inauthenticity, need satisfaction) and performance (i.e. self- and supervisor ratings). The consistency of these effects is noteworthy given the use of two occupationally diverse samples from different cultural contexts and the use of different data collection methodologies (self-ratings collected at different time periods in Study 1; concurrent and archival self- and supervisor ratings in Study 2). It also is worth pointing out the null effect for turnover intentions across both studies. Though the bivariate relationship of perceived ED–A fit and turnover intentions was significant in both cases, this aspect of P–E fit did not account for increment variance beyond the other fit perceptions, most notably perceived N–S fit which had strong relationships. Although speculative, it may be the case that ED–A fit is a more distal determinant of turnover intentions that operates through the more general evaluation of whether the job supplies what one needs. More research on this issue is needed.

Practical Implications

Given the links of ED–A fit with well-being and performance outcomes, a practical implication of this study is that managers could strive to enhance

the perceived fit between the emotional demands and employee abilities. Generally, this can be accomplished by changing either employee perceptions of their abilities or their emotional job demands. Both approaches could benefit from a job analysis aimed at documenting the actual emotional demands of jobs as well as the KSAOs needed to meet those demands (Arvey et al., 1998). Once the emotional demands and emotional abilities are known, organisations may choose to modify the demands (e.g. job re-design) or modify employee attributes (e.g. selection, training). A selection approach would require assessing the relevant personal attributes of job applicants and making hiring decisions based on this information. These personal attributes may include traits related to felt affect, emotional expressivity, emotion regulation, and emotional intelligence, among other constructs. In addition, recruiters and human resources managers might consider assessing ED–A fit when screening job applicants. As an alternative to selection, individuals could be trained to better meet the emotional demands of their jobs. Research has shown that individual well-being and quality of work life can be enhanced through emotion regulation training (see Clarke, 2006; van der Klink, Blonk, Schene, & van Dijk, 2001). In addition to objectively changing the emotional capabilities of the workforce, management could work to increase employee perceptions of their emotional competence, through self-efficacy manipulations (Bandura, 1997).

Another avenue for managerial interventions would be to modify the emotional demands of the job. Emotional demands could be decreased by some fairly straightforward management practices, such as removing potential obstacles, clarifying objectives, giving specific feedback, and removing environmental or work-process factors that result in the experience of negative emotions. For instance, Rafaeli and Sutton (1990) found that the emotional demands on employees varied based on store busyness and the extent to which customers were demanding. Store busyness could be impacted by adding more employees to the work-floor during peak traffic hours and customer demand may be altered by removing situational factors that lead customers to require more attention (e.g. stocking desired products).

However, it may be that some emotional job demands cannot be altered, as in the case of a social worker who provides assistance to battered women. As such, interventions may be targeted at employee perceptions of emotional demands (Salancik & Pfeffer, 1978) and the provision of strategies and resources for coping with strong negative emotions. Such interventions might focus on clarifying the emotional demands of the job and providing interpretations of the demands that focus on positive versus negative attributes (i.e. positive re-framing of emotional demands). Given the "unwritten" nature of many emotional demands (Cropanzano et al., 2004), employees may have developed inaccurate or incomplete views of these demands, leading to negative views of them. Explicitly addressing the emotional

demands in a person's job, and highlighting their potential positive value to employees and the organisation (Salancik & Pfeffer, 1978) could help individuals better understand what is expected of them and why. Such clarification may enable individuals to better allocate their resources toward meeting the emotional demands of their jobs.

Limitations and Future Research

A limitation of this study is that all of the data are correlational and the direction of causality cannot be inferred. For instance, it may be the case that individuals who are burned out perceive low levels of ED–A fit. Indeed, such "reverse causality" is a potential explanation of the relationship of ED–A fit with supervisor ratings of performance in Study 2, which were collected at an earlier time period. However, we expect that these variables (and others examined in our studies) likely exhibit a reciprocally causal relationship with ED–A fit, such that changes in ED–A fit result in changes in performance and changes in performance having implications for subsequent perceived ED–A fit. Future research employing experimental methods in which ED–A fit perceptions are manipulated could help determine the direction of these effects. A second limitation of the study is that the majority of the data came from one source, leading to the possibility that the relations among variables were inflated due to common method bias. We attempted to mitigate these concerns by measuring variables in Study 1 at three different points in time and in Study 2 by including supervisor ratings of performance. However, more should be done to rule out common method bias in shaping these relationships in future work. Furthermore, the longitudinal design in Study 1 required that we match participant data over time, which may have created concerns on the part of participants about the identifiability of their responses, leading them to distort their ratings. However, the nature of the data being collected was not of an especially sensitive or private nature, such that participants would not feel threatened by divulging their true responses. Nonetheless, the results of both studies should be interpreted with these design limitations in mind.

A third limitation of the study was that we did not assess indirect (i.e. objective) fit by measuring the fit components (i.e. abilities and demands) separately (Edwards et al., 2006). Although the subjective assessments of fit we used in this study have been shown to have the strongest links to employee attitudes and well-being (Kristof-Brown et al., 2005), assessing emotional demands and emotional abilities separately and statistically deriving fit may yield additional and potentially valuable information. For instance, an independent assessment of emotional work demands (e.g. job descriptions, supervisor ratings) and employee emotional capabilities could

help researchers determine the relative contribution of the individual and the environment in relating to work-related outcomes (Edwards et al., 2006). Such an approach would also allow for the determination of whether misfit in the form of an overabundance of ability has different effects from misfit in the form of a deficit in ability. A fourth limitation of this paper pertains to the low correlation between our measures of job performance (r = .14) in Study 2, raising questions about whether they are indeed tapping the same underlying performance construct. Interestingly, this value is not all that different from the meta-analytic estimate of the relationship between self- and supervisor performance ratings (.19; Conway & Huffcutt, 1997) for managerial employees (consistent with our sample). Further, when one considers that the measures completed by employees and their supervisors in Study 2 differed in (a) timing (archival vs. concurrent), (b) item content (Benchmarks® vs. Ostroff et al., 2004, measure), and (c) purpose (employee development vs. research), it is not surprising that the observed value is small and slightly weaker than the meta-analytic value in the literature. We suggest that this small correlation doesn't indicate that either measure is invalid; it only means that the measures assess different things. Indeed, given that researchers and practitioners rely on performance ratings from both sources, documenting significant relationships of ED–A fit with both measures provides even more compelling evidence that this fit perception is related to effectiveness. Nonetheless, future research on the links of perceived ED–A fit with performance assessed from different rating sources is needed.

A fifth limitation is that our measures of need satisfaction in Study 1 and low activation positive affect in Study 2 exhibited low reliabilities. However, the low reliabilities for the need satisfaction scales are consistent with past work using these scales in non-US contexts (Deci et al., 2001; Greguras & Diefendorff, 2009) and the use of only two affect items likely contributed to the scale's low reliability. Finally, some of the effect sizes for perceived ED–A fit were fairly small in magnitude, especially in Study 2 which had very high statistical power.

Future research should consider the influence of ED–A fit on additional emotion-based outcomes such as emotional displays (Barger & Grandey, 2006), emotion regulation (Richards & Gross, 2000), emotional labor (Grandey, Diefendorff, & Rupp, 2013), physical symptoms (Schaubroeck & Jones, 2000), and workplace deviance. Future research should also investigate the antecedents of perceived ED–A fit by exploring the person and situation factors that shape ED–A fit perceptions. Finally research might also consider the possibility that an emotional component may be distinguished for other types of P–E fit (e.g. P–O, P–S, P–G, N–S). Although this study is not without limitations, it represents a first step in examining perceived ED–A fit.

REFERENCES

Adams, R.E., Boscarino, J.A., & Figley, C.R. (2006). Compassion fatigue and psychological distress among social workers: A validation study. *American Journal of Orthopsychiatry*, *76*, 103–108.

Arvey, R.D., Renz, G.L., & Watson, T.W. (1998). Emotionality and job performance: Implications for personnel selection. *Research in Personnel and Human Resources Management*, *16*, 103–147.

Ashforth, B.E., & Humphrey, R.H. (1995). Emotion in the workplace: A reappraisal. *Human Relations*, *48*, 97–125.

Atwater, L.E., Ostroff, C., Yammarino, F.J., & Fleenor, J.W. (1998). Self–other agreement: Does it really matter? *Personnel Psychology*, *51*, 577–598.

Baird, K., & Kracen, A.C. (2006). Vicarious traumatization and secondary traumatic stress: A research synthesis. *Counselling Psychology Quarterly*, *19*, 181–188.

Bakker, A., & Demerouti, E. (2007). The Job Demands-Resources model: State of the art. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, *22*, 309–328.

Bakker, A.B., Demerouti, E., & Verbeke, W. (2004). Using the Job Demands–Resources model to predict burnout and performance. *Human Resource Management*, *43*, 83–104.

Bandura, A. (1997). *Self-efficacy: The exercise of control*. New York: Freeman.

Barger, P., & Grandey, A. (2006). "Service with a smile" and encounter satisfaction: Emotional contagion and appraisal mechanisms. *Academy of Management Journal*, *49*, 1229–1238.

Barsky, A., & Kaplan, S.A. (2007). If you feel bad, it's unfair: A quantitative synthesis of affect and organizational justice perceptions. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *92*, 286–295.

Beal, D.J., Weiss, H.M., Barros, E., & MacDermid, S.M. (2005). An episodic process model of affective influences on performance. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *90*(6), 1054–1068.

Best, R.G., Stapleton, L.M., & Downey, R.G. (2005). Core self-evaluations and job burnout: The test of alternative models. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, *10*, 441–451.

Bono, J.E., & Vey, M.A. (2007). Personality and emotional performance: Extraversion, neuroticism, and self-monitoring. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, *12*, 177–192.

Brackett, M.A., Rivers, S.E., Shiffman, S., Lerner, N., & Salovey, P. (2006). Relating emotional abilities to social functioning: A comparison of self-report and performance measures of emotional intelligence. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *91*, 780–795.

Brief, A.P., & Weiss, H.M. (2002). Organizational behavior: Affect in the workplace. *Annual Review of Psychology*, *53*, 279–307.

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*, *70*, 365–379.

Cable, D.M., & DeRue, D.S. (2002). The convergent and discriminant validity of subjective fit perceptions. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *87*, 875–884.

Cammann, C., Fichman, M., Jenkins, D., & Klesh, J. (1979). The Michigan Organizational Assessment Questionnaire. Unpublished Manuscript, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, MI.

Carty, H.M. (2003). Review of Benchmarks [revised]. In B.S. Plake, J. Impara, & R.A. Spies (Eds.), *The fifteenth mental measurements yearbook* (pp. 123–124). Lincoln, NE: Buros Institute of Mental Measurements.

Carver, C.S., & White, T.L. (1994). Behavioral inhibition, behavioral activation, and affective responses to impending reward and punishment: The BIS/BAS scales. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *67*(2), 319–333.

CCL (2004). *Benchmarks facilitators' manual*. Greensboro, NC: Center for Creative Leadership.

Chatman, J.A. (1989). Improving interactional organizational research: A model of person–organization fit. *Academy of Management Review*, *14*, 333–349.

Chau, S.L., Dahling, J., Levy, P.E., & Diefendorff, J.M. (2009). A predictive study of emotional labor and turnover. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, *30*, 1151–1163.

Clarke, N. (2006). Emotional intelligence training: A case of caveat emptor. *Human Resource Development Review*, *5*, 422–441.

Conway, J.M., & Huffcutt, A.I. (1997). Psychometric properties of multisource performance ratings: A meta-analysis of subordinate, supervisor, peer, and self-ratings. *Human Performance*, *10*, 331–360.

Cordes, C.L., Dougherty, T.W., & Blum, M. (1997). Patterns of burnout among managers and professionals: A comparison of models. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, *18*, 685–701.

Cortina, L.M., Magley, V.J., Williams, J.H., & Langhout, R.D. (2001). Incivility in the workplace: Incidence and impact. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, *6*, 64–80.

Côté, S., & Moskowitz, D.S. (1998). On the dynamic covariation between interpersonal behavior and affect: Prediction from neuroticism, extraversion and agreeableness. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *75*, 1032–1046.

Cropanzano, R., Weiss, H.M., & Elias, S.M. (2004). The impact of display rules and emotional labor on psychological well-being at work. In P.L. Perrewé & D.C. Ganster (Eds.), *Research in occupational stress and well being* (Vol. 3, pp. 45–89). Amsterdam: Elsevier.

Deci, E.L., & Ryan, R.M (2000). The "what" and "why" of goal pursuits: Human needs and the self-determination of behavior. *Psychological Inquiry*, *11*, 227–268.

Deci, E.L., Ryan, R.M., Gagné, M., Leone, D.R., Usunov, J., & Kornazheva, B.P. (2001). Need satisfaction, motivation, and well-being in the work organizations of a former Eastern bloc country: A cross-cultural study of self-determination. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, *27*, 930–942.

Demerouti, E., Bakker, A.B., Nachreiner, F., & Schaufeli, W.B. (2001). The Job Demands–Resources model of burnout. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *86*, 499–512.

Diefendorff, J.M., & Gosserand, R.H. (2003). Understanding the emotional labor process: A control theory perspective. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, *24*, 945–959.

Edwards, J.R. (1991). Person–job fit: A conceptual integration, literature review, and methodological critique. In C.L. Cooper & I.T. Robertson (Eds.), *International review of industrial and organizational psychology* (pp. 283–357). Chichester, UK: Wiley.

Edwards, J.R., Cable, D.M., Williamson, I.O., Lambert, L.S., & Shipp, A.J. (2006). The phenomenology of fit: Linking the person and environment to the subjective experience of person–environment fit. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *91*, 802–827.

Edwards, J.R., & Shipp, A.J. (2007). The relationship between person–environment fit and outcomes: An integrative theoretical framework. In C. Ostroff & T.A. Judge (Eds.), *Perspectives on organizational fit* (pp. 3–69). New York: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Elfenbein, H.A. (2007). Emotion in organizations: A review and theoretical integration in stages. *Academy of Management Annals*, *1*, 315–386.

Erickson, R.J., & Ritter, C. (2001). Emotional labor, burnout, and inauthenticity: Does gender matter? *Social Psychology Quarterly*, *64*, 146–163.

Fornell, C., & Larcker, D.F. (1981). Evaluating structural equation models with unobservable variables and measurement error. *Journal of Marketing Research*, *18*, 39–50.

Glomb, T.M., Kammeyer-Mueller, J.D., & Rotundo, M. (2004). Emotional labor demands and compensating wage differentials. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *89*, 700–714.

Goldberg, L.R. (1992). The development of markers for the Big Five factor structure. *Psychological Assessment*, *4*, 26–42.

Goldberg, L.S., & Grandey, A.A. (2007). Display rules versus display autonomy: Emotion regulation, emotional exhaustion, and task performance in a call center simulation. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, *12*, 301–318.

Grandey, A.A. (2008). Emotions at work: A review and research agenda. In C. Cooper & J. Barling (Eds.), *The SAGE handbook of organizational behavior* (pp. 234–261). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Grandey, A.A., & Cropanzano, R. (1999). The conservation of resources model applied to work–family conflict and strain. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, *54*, 350–370.

Grandey, A.A., Diefendorff, J.M., & Rupp, D.E. (2013). *Emotional labor in the 21st century: Diverse perspectives on emotion regulation at work*. New York: Psychology Press/Routledge.

Greguras, G.J., & Diefendorff, J.M. (2009). Different fits satisfy different needs: Linking person–environment fit to employee attitudes and performance using self-determination theory. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *94*, 465–477.

Griffeth, R.W., Hom, P.W., & Gaertner, S. (2000). A meta-analysis of antecedents and correlates of employee turnover: Update, moderator tests, and research implications for the next millennium. *Journal of Management*, *26*, 463–488.

Gross, J.J., & John, O.P. (1997). Revealing feelings: Facets of emotional expressivity in self-reports, peer ratings, and behavior. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *72*, 435–448.

Gross, J.J., & John, O.P. (2003). Individual differences in two emotion regulation processes: Implications for affect, relationships, and well-being. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *85*, 348–362.

Guan, Y., Deng, H., Risavy, S.D., Bond, M.H., & Li, F. (2011). Supplementary fit, complementary fit, and work-related outcomes: The role of self-construal. *Applied Psychology: An International Review*, *60*, 286–310.

Hazer, J.T., & Highhouse, S. (1997). Factors influencing managers' reactions to utility analysis: Effects of SDy method, information frame, and focal intervention. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *82*, 104–112.

Hochschild, A.R. (1983). *The managed heart: Commercialization of human feeling*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.

House, R.H., & Rizzo, J.R. (1972). Role conflict and ambiguity as critical variables in a model of organizational behavior. *Organizational Behavior and Human Performance*, *7*, 467–505.

Jackson, S.E., Turner, J.A., & Brief, A.P. (1987). Correlates of burnout among public service lawyers. *Journal of Occupational Behaviour*, *8*, 339–349.

Jöreskog, K.G., & Sörbom, D. (2003). *LISREL 8.52*. Chicago, IL: Scientific Software International.

Kristof, A.L. (1996). Person–organization fit: An integrative review of its conceptualizations, measurement, and implications. *Personnel Psychology*, *49*, 1–49.

Kristof-Brown, A.L., & Billsberry, J. (2013). Fit for the future. In A.L. Kristof-Brown & J. Billsberry (Eds.), *Organizational fit: Key issues and new directions* (pp. 1–18). New York: John Wiley & Sons.

Kristof-Brown, A.L., & Guay, R. (2011). Person–environment fit. In S. Zedeck (Ed.), *APA handbook of industrial and organizational psychology, Volume 3* (pp. 3–50). Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.

Kristof-Brown, A.L., Zimmerman, R.D., & Johnson, E.C. (2005). Consequences of individuals' fit at work: A meta-analysis of person–job, person–organization, person–group, and person–supervisor fit. *Personnel Psychology*, *58*, 281–342.

Leiter, M.P., & Maslach, C. (1988). The impact of interpersonal environment on burnout and organizational commitment. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, *9*, 297–308.

Leslie, J.B., & Fleenor, J.W. (1998). *Feedback to managers: A review and comparison of multi-rater instruments for management development*. Greensboro, NC: Center for Creative Leadership.

Little, B.R. (2000). Free traits and personal contexts: Expanding a social ecological model of well-being. In W.B. Walsh, K.H. Craik, & R.H. Price (Eds.), *Person–environment psychology: New directions and perspectives* (pp. 87–116). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Lombardo, M.M., & McCauley, C.D. (1994). *Benchmarks: A manual and trainer's guide*. Greensboro, NC: Center for Creative Leadership.

Lombardo, M.M., McCauley, C.D., McDonald-Mann, D., & Leslie, J.B. (1999). *Benchmarks: Developmental reference points*. Greensboro, NC: Center for Creative Leadership.

McGrath, J.E. (1976). Stress and behavior in organizations. In M.D. Dunnette (Ed.), *Handbook of industrial and organizational psychology* (pp. 1351–1395). Chicago, IL: Rand McNally.

Maertz, C.P., & Campion, M.A. (2004). Profiles in quitting: Integrating process and content turnover theory. *Academy of Management Journal*, *47*, 566–582.

Matsumoto, D., Yoo, S.H., Hirayama, S., & Petrova, G. (2005). Development and validation of a measure of display rule knowledge: The display rule assessment inventory. *Emotions*, *5*, 23–40.

Nowicki, S., Jr., & Duke, M.P. (1994). Individual differences in the nonverbal communication of affect: The Diagnostic Analysis of Nonverbal Accuracy Scale. *Journal of Nonverbal Behavior*, *18*, 9–35.

Ostroff, C., Atwater, L.E., & Feinberg, B.J. (2004). Understanding self–other agreement: A look at rater and ratee characteristics, context, and outcomes. *Personnel Psychology*, *57*, 333–375.

Rafaeli, A., & Sutton, R.I. (1987). Expression of emotion as part of the work role. *Academy of Management Review*, *12*(1), 23–37.

Rafaeli, A., & Sutton, R.I. (1990). Busy stores and demanding customers: How do they affect the display of positive emotion? *Academy of Management Journal*, *33*, 623–637.

Richard, E.M. (2005). Applying appraisal theories of emotion to the concept of emotional labor. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Baton Rouge, LA.

Richards, J.M., & Gross, J.J. (2000). Emotion regulation and memory: The cognitive costs of keeping one's cool. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *79*, 410–424.

Saavedra, R., & Kwun, S.K. (2000). Affective states in job characteristics theory. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, *22*, 131–146.

Salancik, G.R., & Pfeffer, J. (1978). A social information processing approach to job attitudes and task design. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, *23*, 224–253.

Schaubroeck, J., & Jones, J.R. (2000). Antecedents of workplace emotional labor dimensions and moderators of their effects on physical symptoms. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, *21*, 163–183.

Seashore, S.E., Lawler, E.E., Mirvis, P., & Cammann, C. (Eds.) (1982). *Observing and measuring organizational change: A guide to field practice*. New York: Wiley.

Skinner, E.A., Edge, K., Altman, J., & Sherwood, H. (2003). Searching for the structure of coping: A review and critique of category systems for classifying ways of coping. *Psychological Bulletin*, *129*, 216–269.

Smith, C.S., Tisak, J., Hahn, S.E., & Schmeider, R.A. (1997). The measurement of job control. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, *18*, 225–237.

Spangler, M. (2003). Review of Benchmarks [revised]. In B.S. Plake, J. Impara, & R.A. Spies (Eds.), *The fifteenth mental measurements yearbook* (pp. 124–126). Lincoln, NE: Buros Institute of Mental Measurements.

Tonidandel, S., & LeBreton, J.M. (2011). Relative importance analysis: A useful supplement to regression analysis. *Journal of Business and Psychology*, *26*, 1–9.

Vandenberg, R.J., & Lance, CE. (2000). A review and synthesis of the measurement invariance literature: Suggestions, practices, and recommendations for organizational research. *Organizational Research Methods*, *3*, 4–69.

van der Klink, J.J.L., Blonk, R.W.B., Schene, A.H., & van Dijk, F.J.H. (2001). The benefits of interventions for work-related stress. *American Journal of Public Health*, *91*, 270–276.

Van Katwyk, P.T., Fox, S., Spector, P.E., & Kelloway, E.K. (2000). Using the job-related affective well-being scale (JAWS) to investigate affective responses to work stressors. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, *5*, 219–230.

Watson, D., Clark, L.A., & Tellegen, A. (1988). Development and validation of brief measures of positive and negative affect: The PANAS scales. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *54*, 1063–1070.

Weiss, D.J., Dawis, R.V., England, G.W., & Lofquist, L.H. (1967). Manual for the Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire. *Minnesota Studies in Vocational Rehabilitation*, *22*, 120.

Weiss, H., & Cropanzano, R. (1996). Affective events theory: A theoretical discussion of the structure, causes, and consequences of affective experiences at work. *Research in Organizational Behavior*, *18*, 1–74.

Wharton, A.S. (1993). The affective consequences of service work: Managing emotions on the job. *Work and Occupations*, *20*, 205–232.

Zaccaro, S.J., & Stone, E.F. (1988). Incremental validity of an empirically based measure of job characteristics. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *73*, 245–252.