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Abstract

In modern age, positive psychological capital is as important as financial capital for organizational development and sustainability. Efficacy, hope, optimism, and resilience are the dimensions of positive psychological capital. Emotional labor is defined by Hochschild as control of self emotions at work by workers who have a high degree of contact with coworkers within the organization or with external clients, so as to create an expression, voice or body gesture which is acceptable to the clients. Emotional labor is analyzed under three components: surface acting, deep acting and naturally felt emotions. This study is aimed to investigate the impact of positive psychological capital on emotional labor. So a research is conducted with the aim of exploring the relationship between the sub-dimensions of psychological capital and emotional labor.
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Introduction

The importance, intensity and complexity of the interaction between people rises significantly in working life as in general social environment. During these interactions, displaying certain actions while suppressing others are accepted to be relevant in meeting high-order standards of both individual and organizational performance. Despite the importance attributed to the process of emotion control, negative effects of this process on the well-being of people in business life is not overlooked. In fact, it is found that inhibiting emotional reactions increase psychological measures of stress and possibly even the likelihood of illness and cancer (Grandey, 1999:1). Positive organizational behavior, which is concerned with people’s strengths rather than weaknesses and dysfunctions, and how they can grow and thrive rather than be fixed and maintained came out to be a powerful asset in terms of decreasing the negative effects of emotion control. Psychological capital (PsyCap) in the form of self-efficacy, optimism, hope and resilience serve certain personal qualities that enable workers to cope better in the workplaces. Therefore, PsyCap is believed to be positively related to psychological health and outcome. Past research shows that PsyCap is indeed positively related to employees’ psychological health and job satisfaction (e.g., Luthans, Avolio, Walumbwa, & Li, 2005). PsyCap is also found to be a personal resource which
is significantly associated with employees’ job performance and psychological well-being (Luthans, 2002; Luthans, Youssef, & Avolio, 2006).

**Literature Review**

**Emotional Labor**

Emotional labor has become an important topic and is rapidly growing in the field of organizational behavior. Today’s business environment does not value emotions as it cherishes rational, task-oriented attitudes. In fact mainstream view argues that these emotions and the following expressions should be controlled and managed. In this sense, the instrument management uses comes up in the form of display rules in organizations. These rules define appropriate and inappropriate behaviors for employees and expected behaviors are achieved by a range of formal and informal methods.

Display rules enable employees to express certain emotions while suppressing others and try to conform these emotions to what is expected by management. Sometimes it is observed that employees’ inner feelings conflict with the expectation of management causing individuals suppressing genuine emotions and expressing fake ones. Nevertheless, an effort of employees to manage their emotions is called as emotional labor.

Emotional labor has originally been proposed by Hochschild (1983, p.7) as “the management of feeling to create a publicly observable facial and bodily display”. After Hochschild (1983), several academicians described and explained emotional labor using different but complementary approaches. These perspectives can be summarized under the dimensions of internal state, internal process and external behavior displays (Glomb et al., 2004). The *internal state perspective* focuses on emotional dissonance which is defined as a state of incongruence between felt and expressed emotion. Here the focus is on the effort exerted by employees in fulfilling the organizationally determined emotional display rules. Morris and Feldman (1996, p.987) states that emotions may vary depending on the conditions at hand causing variations on the level of emotional labor exerted by employees. The *internal process approach* concerns specific self-regulatory processes underlying emotional expressions (Brotheridge & Lee, 1998; Gross; 1998). In the scope of this approach, Grandey (2000) accepts emotional labor as a process and asserts that because emotional labor is a process, it will be possible to turn negative consequences of organizational and individual outcomes into positive ones. The third and last perspective trying to understand emotional labor is *external behavior displays* which focuses on observable display and actual behaviors (Glomb, Tews, 2004). It was Ashforth & Humphrey (1993, p.88) who underlies the importance of observable behaviors instead of underlying emotions of them. They have explained emotional labor as a type of impression management where individuals and management try to change the thought of others about themselves and display behaviors that are acceptable by everyone.

All of the mentioned approaches naturalize certain but similar methods for emotional control. For instance Hochschild (1983) emphasizes two means of emotional labor as surface act and deep act. Surface acting involves the adjustment of a given response without changing the felt emotion merely modifying one’s outwardly displayed emotions (e.g; facial expression, toneof voice, gestures, etc.). Deep acting on the other hand requires employees to look within themselves about their roles and deeply express the expected emotions by altering one’s actual emotional state (e.g; putting oneself in the others’ shoes and trying to empathize with them) (Mc Chace, Nye, Wang, Jones, Chis, 2013).

According to Ashforth and Humphrey (1993), focusing only on surface and deep act ignores the possibility that employees can spontaneously experience and display appropriate emotions (Diedenoff et al., 2005). In fact some emotions can be felt naturally with little or no effort, but still some conscious effort should be put forth to ensure that their displays coincide with the organization’s expectations. This form of emotional labor is called natural emotions.

As for the reflections of emotional labor, Hochschild (1983) argued that the concept would always be a burden to those showing it. Research shows that engaging in emotional labor is related to poor health in the form of stress, emotional exhaustion and
depression (Abraham, 1999; Brotheridge & Grandey, 2002; Schaubroeck & Jones, 2000), decreased job satisfaction (Ashforth and Humphrey, 1993; Tolich, 1993), lower levels of performance (Baumeister, Bratslavsky, Muraven & Tice, 1998; Goldberg & Grandey, 2007, Richards & Gross, 1999, Totterdell & Holman, 2003), withdrawal behaviors (Cordes & Dougherty, 1993; Grandey et al, 2004), intentions to quit and turnover (Chau, 2007; Cote’ & Morgan, 2002).

On the other hand, some research suggest that consequences of emotional labor doesn’t have to be negative all the time but rather depends on the strategies individuals adopt to regulate their emotions (Cote’, 2005). As mentioned before Grandey (1999) argues that it is possible to turn negative consequences of emotional labor into positive ones by seeing emotional labor as an emotional regulation process. Ashforth and Humphrey (1993) also asserts that the display of naturally felt emotions at work should not be associated with negative effects often attributed to emotional labor and even more, displaying naturally felt emotions can have a positive impact on employee well-being.

Positive Psychological Capital

In the new millennium the mission of psychology shifted from focusing helping the mentally ill to searching out the potential of talented and gifted individuals. It was Martin Seligman (1999) who attempted to renew the attention of psychologists for the study of what is right about people. Encouraged by his approach, some organizational behavior researchers applied positive psychological research to the workplace and came up with the concept of Positive Organizational Behavior.

Positive Organizational Behavior (POB) is defined as “the study and application of positively oriented human resource strengths and psychological capacities that can be measured, developed, and effectively managed for performance improvement in today’s workplace (Luthans, 2002b, p. 59). Luthans and colleagues have demonstrated POB’s relation to numerous organizationally relevant criteria, including employee well-being (Avey, Luthans, Smith, & Palmer, 2010), organizational citizenship behavior (Avey, Luthans, & Youssef, 2010), job performance and employee satisfaction (Luthans, Avolio, Avey, & Norman, 2007).

Luthans and colleagues have identified an explicit set of constructs that can be classified as POB: self-efficacy, hope, resilience, and optimism, which together make up the higher order construct of psychological capital (PsyCap). They have defined this higher order construct as “an individual’s positive psychological state of development [that] is characterized by: (1) having confidence (selfefficacy) to take on and put in the necessary effort to succeed at challenging tasks; (2) making a positive attribution (optimism) about succeeding now and in the future; (3) persevering toward goals and, when necessary, redirecting paths to goals (hope) in order to succeed; and (4) when beset by problems and adversity, sustaining and bouncing back and even beyond (resilience) to attain success” (Luthans, Youssef, & Avolio, 2007, p. 3). They have provided evidence of the psychometric properties of their developed measure of psychological capital and shown that it relates to job performance and satisfaction and accounts for more variance than the four constructs individually (Luthans, Avolio, et al., 2007).

Luthans (2002a; 2002b) defines self-efficacy as an individual’s conviction (or confidence) about his or her abilities to mobilize the motivation, cognitive resources, and courses of action needed to successfully execute a specific task within a given context” (Stajkovic & Luthans, 1998, p. 66). Self-efficacy has been shown to have a strong positive relationship to work-related performance (Bandura, 1986; 1997). Self-efficacy positively affects goal aspirations and attainment (Bandura, 2000; Bandura & Locke, 2003; Locke & Latham, 1990), and relate to a number of desirable outcomes, including leadership effectiveness (Chemers, Watson, & May, 2000; Luthans, Luthans, Hodgetts, & Luthans, 2001), ethical decision making (May, Chan, Hodges, & Avolio, 2003; Youssef & Luthans, 2005), creativity (Tierney & Farmer, 2002), and participation in decision making (Lam, Chen, & Schaubroeck, 2002). Additionally, self-efficacy has also been shown to relate to work attitudes across cultures, positively relating to organizational commitment and negatively relating to turnover intentions (Luthans, Zhu, & Avolio, 2006).
Hope has been driven by the work of Snyder and colleagues in POS literature (Snyder, 1995, 1996; Snyder & Taylor, 2000; Snyder, Rand & Sigmon, 2002). They (Snyder, 1994; Snyder et al., 1991) define hope as “goal-directed thinking in which people perceive that they can produce routes to desired goals (pathways thinking) and the requisite motivation to use those routes (agency thinking)” (Lopez, Snyder, & Teramoto-Pedrotti, 2003, p. 94). Hope theorists argue that if an individual can consider many alternative routes to accomplishing a definite goal, they will remain hopeful in goal accomplishment as there will always be an alternative route to pursue (Snyder, 1994: 247). Furthermore, when a person high in hope is faced with a very large, insurmountable goal, rather than being discouraged and de-motivated, they may break the goal into several sub-goals and maintain motivation for the overall goal to be accomplished. Peterson and Byron (2008) found that management executives with higher hope produced solutions higher in quantity and better in quality to work-related problems, suggesting that hope may be vital in overcoming obstacles in organizations. Youssef and Luthans (2007) also showed that hope was related to job performance, employee satisfaction, organizational commitment, and work happiness.

Seligman (1998) describes optimism as an explanatory style in which individuals attribute positive events to internal, stable, global causes, and attribute negative events to external, unstable, specific causes. In other words, an optimist would see a positive event as the result of his or her actions, with an expectation that these actions would continue to occur in the future and he/she would be helpful in handling other situations in his or her life. Seligman (1998) has shown that optimism has a significant and positive relationship with employee performance when directly applied to the workplace. Luthans and colleagues have also linked optimism to job performance (Luthans et al., 2005; Youssef & Luthans, 2007), job satisfaction, and work happiness (Youssef & Luthans, 2007), as well as leadership authenticity and effectiveness (Avolio & Luthans, 2006; Jensen & Luthans, 2006; Luthans, Norman, & Hughes, 2006). Resiliency is considered as “a class of phenomena characterized by patterns of positive adaptation in the context of significant adversity or risk” (Masten & Reed, 2002: 74). Luthans (2002b) defined resiliency as “the positive psychological capacity to rebound, to ‘bounce back’ from adversity, uncertainty, conflict, failure, or even positive change, progress, and increased responsibility” (p. 702). Although resilience is often described as a reactive process, it can also be viewed as a proactive process in which individuals assess risks and personal assets that affect employee outcomes (Masten, 2001). In the workplace, pure risks could include external threats such as economic instability, or internal threats such as harassment or missing an important deadline on a project. Pure personal assets, on the other hand, are defined as any factor that leads to positive outcomes while having no effect if they are not present. In the workplace, pure personal assets could include promotions, bonuses, recognition, praise, etc. (Masten & Reed, 2002). Luthans, Vogelgesang, and Lester (2006) argued that by increasing employees’ access to knowledge, skills, and/or abilities and admitting them to react proactively, risks can be decreased and personal assets can be increased.

POB researchers state that both PsyCap as a whole and its components can be developed through targeted interventions (Luthans, Avey, Avolio, & Peterson, 2010; Luthans, Avey, & Patera, 2008). For example, Bandura (1997, 2000) has demonstrated that strategies like vicarious learning and modeling, mastery experiences, social persuasion increases self-efficacy. Snyder (2000) also provided evidence that hope was developable and published a measure called the “state-hope scale” (Snyder et al., 1996). Furthermore, Carver and Scheier (2003) have recently discussed strategies to develop optimism, and Shifren and Hooker (1995) have demonstrated its situational measurement. Besides, Seligman’s (1998) widely recognized work has emphasized “learned optimism.” As to resilience, Masten and Reed (2002) have provided successful strategies for developmental interventions, and Wagnild and Young (1993) have developed a state-like measure of resilience. Previous research has also shown that psychological capital as a whole has more measurement stability than emotional states but is not
as stable as personality or self-evaluation traits (Luthans, Avolio et al., 2007).

**Emotional Labor and Psychological Behavior**

It has been acknowledged that emotional labor, particularly surface acting, has negative workplace outcomes because of its negative impact on employees’ psychological wellbeings (Hülsheger & Schewe, 2011: 364). When employees engage in surface acting, actual emotions need to be constantly monitored and continuous effort should be invested to change the emotional expression. This continuous effort of cognitive investment enhances strain and diminishes well-being (Coˆte´, 2005; Grandey, 2003). Previous research has also shown that frequent use of surface acting was related to psychological ill-health, job dissatisfaction, and burnout (e.g., Beal, Trougakos, Weiss, & Green, 2006; Brotheridge & Grandey, 2002; Brotheridge & Lee, 2002; Grandey, 2003)

In contrast, researchers have argued that deep acting requires less cognitive resource than surface acting (Totterdell & Holman, 2003). Instead of pretending to feel in a certain way, deep acting truly alters the inner emotional state and turns negative emotion into a positive one. This makes the individual actually experience positive emotions which leads to further increases of positive affect and happiness (Hulsheger et al.). In fact, deep acting was found to relate to psychological well-being, such as job satisfaction and a sense of personal accomplishment (Brotheridge & Lee, 2002; Grandey, 2003).

As for natural feelings, emotional labor in this form describes the effort of a person to express the feelings that he or she is experiencing. A person portraying naturally felt emotions might confront others if angry, or show excitement when happy. Each of these can help the employee feel genuine (Cheung, Tang & Tang 2011). Naturally felt emotions involve effort transferring the “feeling” of a certain emotion to outward expression of that emotion (Ashforth & Humphrey, 1993). However, because an employee does not need to change emotions to match the organizational display rules, fewer resources are invested in this process. Thus, the action of conveying naturally felt emotions should reduce strain (Hobfoll & Freedy, 1993). Cheung et al., 2011 found that expression of naturally felt emotions was negatively related to burnout and positively related to job satisfaction.

The interaction between emotional labor and psychological impact has been established by the study of Cheung, Tang & Tang (2011). Cheung, Tang & Tang (2011: 351) hypothesize that PsyCap serves as a moderator between emotional labor and burnout/job satisfaction and relates differently to the three emotional labor strategies. They argue that when employees possess high PsyCap, psychological well-being will buffer the negative outcome of performing surface acting. So the stated negative association between surface acting and job satisfaction and the positive association between surface acting and burnout will be weaker when PsyCap is high. On the other hand, because employees experience positive emotions and feel more genuine when they perform deep acting and naturally felt emotions, their level of experienced strain is expected to decrease and achieved psychological resources is expected to increase. As a result, employees with high level of PsyCap, will be equipped with extra resources to handle their work tasks.

**Research and Methodology**

The purpose of this study is to determine sub-dimensions of psychological capital's influence on sub-dimensions of emotional labour. In other words, the research is conducted with the aim of exploring the relationship between the sub-dimensions of psychological capital and emotional labour.

The scope of the study involves the workers and managers of companies operating in a variety of businesses in Istanbul. 350 questionnaires were distributed and 292 valid questionnaires were obtained. The study is based on the data acquired from those 292 questionnaires. The response rate of the survey is %83.

The study was conducted only in Istanbul and with accessible business fields rather than all available fields. These facts comprise the limitations of the study and therefore, the findings and results should not be generalised.

This study which tries to explain the relationship between the workers’ and managers’ perception of psychological capital and emotional labour is based
on relational screening model. The study aims to determine the sub-dimensions of psychological capital’s effect on sub-dimensions of emotional labour. Similar to its purpose here, relational screening models are employed to analyse the current conditions of a given situation which took place in the past or is still taking place.

**Sampling and Data Collection**

The population of the study composes of workers and managers of companies operating in a variety of business fields in Istanbul. As it was impossible to communicate with all members of the population, convenience sampling method is used to reach workers and managers.

Questionnaire is used as data collection method. Workers and managers took part in the survey through e-mails or face to face interviews. The number of complete and valid questionnaires out of the 350 questionnaires distributed is determined to be 292.

The questionnaire consists of 2 parts. The first part covers proposals for response scales related to psychological capital and emotional labour. Respondents are asked to specify their level of agreement or disagreement on survey proposals and statements through Likert-type scale, items ranging from 1=Strongly Disagree, 2=Disagree, 3=Partially Disagree, 4=Partially Agree, 5=Agree, 6=Strongly Agree. The same part includes 24 statements for Psychological Capital scale and 13 statements for Emotional Labour scale. The second part of the questionnaire includes 6 demographic questions in order to identify the demographic features.

As mentioned above, the first part of the survey employs 2 scales, Psychological Capital and Emotional Labour. While the psychological capital scale consists of 4 dimensions, hope, optimism, resilience and self-efficacy, the emotional labour scale consists of 3 dimensions, natural emotions, surface act and deep act. The psychological capital scale was developed by Luthans et. al. (2007a). Emotional labour scale was developed by Diefendorff et. al. (2005) but have an authentic application in this study. The psychological capital scale which consists of 24 statements covers each 4 sub-dimension with 6 statements. On the other hand, the emotional labour scale covers 13 statements for each sub-dimensions; NE 3, DA 4, SA 6.

**Data Analysis**

Two statistical package softwares, SPSS 21 and AMOS 20 are used for the analysis of the collected data. While frequency analysis for the determination of the demographic features and the correlation analysis for the determination of the relationship between sub-dimensions of psychological capital and emotional labour are made with SPSS, the determination of the relationship between the variables related to structural equational modelling and the test of the hypothesis are made with AMOS.

**Demographic Findings**

The demographic features of the 292 valid participants of the sampling are given in the table below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>18-24</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>13.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-30</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>41.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31-39</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>32.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40-49</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>6.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50 and older</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 1 Cont'd

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Manager (with at least 1 subordinate)</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>28.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worker</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>57.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Educational Background</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High School</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>6.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two-year degree</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>6.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undergraduate</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>34.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>49.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Marital Status</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Married</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>40.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>54.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Divorced</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Widow</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The scale of the company</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Small (Less than 50 employees)</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>18.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium (Less than 250 employees)</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>11.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Big (250 and more employees)</td>
<td>189</td>
<td>64.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

When the results shown in the table are analysed, it can be observed that women compose %50 of the participants of the sampling in the study. The majority of the age group is between 25-30 years old which is followed by people aged between 31-39 with a rate of %32.3. Likewise, workers compose the majority of the participants with a rate of %57.4. When the educational and marital status are examined, the sample distributed as %49.8 master graduates which composes half of the sampling. On the other hand, the marital status distributed as %54.3 single and %40.5 married. The scale of the companies they worked at is determined to be predominantly large companies which have 250 and more employees. Those participants composes %64.9 of the sampling.

**Reliability Analysis**

Reliability analysis is made through the data collected in order to determine the reliability of the statements in the scale. The data of the scale is confirmed to be reliable if Cronbach's Alpha is above %70. (Sipahi; Yurtkoroğlu and Çinko, 2006:89). The reliability of the scales together with Cronbach's Alpha values are shown below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor Structures</th>
<th>Statement Score</th>
<th>Cronbach Alpha</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Optimism</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.879</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hope</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.749</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resilience</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.776</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-efficacy</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.849</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NE</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.976</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DA</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.844</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SA</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.785</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
When Cronbach alpha values are analysed it is concluded that factor structures are reliable. Although the statement scores of optimism, resilience and SA are decided to be 6 at the beginning, the analysis was made after the statement scores of these sub-dimensions was taken as 5 since Cronbach Alpha value increases when some of these statements are omitted from the analysis.

**Research Model and Hypotheses**

As mentioned in research methodology, the model of the research is constructed as relational screening model since the study explores the relationship between the sub-dimensions of psychological capital and emotional labour. When the model was constructed, the relationship between the related variables in the literature were taken into account. From this point of view, the research model is demonstrated below in Figure 1.

![Research Model](image_url)

**Figure 1: Research Model**

As a result of the literature scan and the purpose of the study, the hypothesis below are developed to be tested.

- **H₁a:** Optimism has an effect on NE.
- **H₁b:** Optimism has an effect on DA.
- **H₁c:** Optimism has an effect on SA.
- **H₂a:** Hope has an effect on NE.
- **H₂b:** Hope has an effect on DA.
- **H₂c:** Hope has an effect on SA.
- **H₃a:** Resilience has an effect on NE.
- **H₃b:** Resilience has an effect on DA.
- **H₃c:** Resilience has an effect on SA.
- **H₄a:** Self-efficacy has an effect on NE.
- **H₄b:** Self-efficacy has an effect on DA.
- **H₄c:** Self-efficacy has an effect on SA.

Structural equation modelling is applied to test the hypothesis of the study. The application of structural equation modelling consists of two phases as measurement and structural model (Anderson ve Gerbing, 1988:417). In the measurement phase, confirmatory factor analysis was conducted in order to confirm that the factor structures of the data collected are integrated under the same dimensions in the sampling which is studied and in order to determine that the same factor structures are valid in the sampling. The reliability of the data collected and the validity of the model constructed are determined in the same phase.

The values of certain fit statistics are used in order to determine whether the results of the confirmatory factor analysis are valid or not in the measurement model. The values which are used most in the literature are GFI, AGFI, NFI, CFI, RMR ve
RMSEA. Moreover, X²/sd rate is examined as well. Since X²/sd rate is ≤3 and GFI as well as CFI are ≥0.90, AGFI ≥0.80, RMR and RMSEA are ≤0.10 it is concluded that the model fits well (Hu and Bentler 1999:2).

**Measurement Model**

In the first phase of the application of structural equation modelling, the values of fit statistics of the results of confirmatory factor analysis are obtained as X²/sd=3.37 p=0.001, GFI=0.835, AGFI=0.728, CFI=0.819, RMR=0.079 ve RMSEA=0.084. As can be observed, these values do not support acceptable rates of fit statistics and indicate poor model fit. Therefore, statements whose factor loading are below %50 are identified and eliminated from the analysis in order to meet the criteria of the fit values. The statements eliminated from the analysis are described as follows; 1 statement from the sub-dimension of hope, 2 from optimism and 1 from resilience factor for psychological capital, 1 statement from the sub-dimension surface act for emotional labor was removed from the analysis which equals to a total of 5 statements. After these statements were eliminated from the analysis, the values of fit statistics of the results of confirmatory factor analysis are observed as X²/sd=2.17 p=0.001, GFI=0.938, AGFI=0.834, CFI=0.829, RMR=0.080 ve RMSEA=0.083. These values indicate that the measurement model is fit and fit values comply with the criteria specified as well as reflecting good data-model fit.

As the values of fit statistics indicated good fit, composite or construct reliability = convergent reliability (CR) and Average Variance Extracted (AVE) values should be analysed in order to determine the validity and consistency of the data collected, statements of the scale and factor structures. As CR value is above %60 and AVE value is above %50, it is indicated that the validity and consistency of factor structures and scale statements is established. (Hair et al. 2010:124) Table 3 demonstrates CR and AVE values of the consistency and validity of the research in terms of factor loading and scale statements.

**Table 3:** The Validity and Consistency of Factor Structure

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor Structures</th>
<th>CR</th>
<th>AVE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Optimism</td>
<td>0.796</td>
<td>0.539</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hope</td>
<td>0.634</td>
<td>0.510</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resilience</td>
<td>0.742</td>
<td>0.522</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-efficacy</td>
<td>0.875</td>
<td>0.549</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NE</td>
<td>0.798</td>
<td>0.573</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DA</td>
<td>0.878</td>
<td>0.644</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SA</td>
<td>0.839</td>
<td>0.575</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

When the values in the table are analysed, it is observed that the results indicate an acceptable fit in terms of validity and consistency.

**Structural Model**

After the measurement model, the second phase of the structural equation modelling, structural model, is applied. In this phase, a structural model is constituted and research hypotheses are tested. The structural model is shown in Figure 2. Similar to the measurement model, the values of fit statistics are analysed in this model as well. The values of fit statistics are established as in the following after the structural model is constituted X²/sd=2.15 p=0.001, GFI=0.936, AGFI=0.844, CFI=0.829, RMR=0.080 ve RMSEA=0.083. These results demonstrate that the values of fit statistics indicate good fit for the structural model.

As the values of fit statistics support acceptable rates and indicate good fit the results of the hypotheses concerning the structural model are analysed and shown below.
Figure 2: Structural Model

Table 4: Test Results of Research Hypotheses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hypotheses</th>
<th>Prediction</th>
<th>Standard Error</th>
<th>P</th>
<th>Hypothesis</th>
<th>Result</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>H₁ᵃ</td>
<td>Optimism --&gt; NE</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.571</td>
<td>0.433</td>
<td>Red</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H₁ᵇ</td>
<td>Optimism --&gt; DA</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>0.126</td>
<td>0.173</td>
<td>Red</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H₁ᶜ</td>
<td>Optimism --&gt; SA</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>0.663</td>
<td>0.196</td>
<td>Red</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H₂ᵃ</td>
<td>Hope --&gt; NE</td>
<td>-0.19</td>
<td>0.126</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>Acceptable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H₂ᵇ</td>
<td>Hope --&gt; DA</td>
<td>0.42</td>
<td>0.182</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>Acceptable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H₂ᶜ</td>
<td>Hope --&gt; SA</td>
<td>0.54</td>
<td>0.271</td>
<td>0.203</td>
<td>Red</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H₃ᵃ</td>
<td>Resilience --&gt; NE</td>
<td>0.69</td>
<td>0.322</td>
<td>0.292</td>
<td>Red</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H₃ᵇ</td>
<td>Resilience --&gt; DA</td>
<td>-0.18</td>
<td>0.104</td>
<td>0.007</td>
<td>Red</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H₃ᶜ</td>
<td>Resilience --&gt; SA</td>
<td>-0.25</td>
<td>0.079</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>Acceptable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H₄ᵃ</td>
<td>Self-efficacy --&gt; NE</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>0.068</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>Acceptable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H₄ᵇ</td>
<td>Self-efficacy --&gt; DA</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.082</td>
<td>0.485</td>
<td>Red</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H₄ᶜ</td>
<td>Self-efficacy --&gt; SA</td>
<td>-0.24</td>
<td>0.062</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>Acceptable</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

***p=0.001 meaningful rate
When the table is analysed, it is observed that hope sub-dimension of psychological capital has an effect on NE ($H_{2a}, \beta=-0.19, p=0.001$), and DA ($H_{2b}, \beta=0.42, p=0.001$) sub-dimension of emotional labour. The hypotheses that resilience, another sub-dimension of psychological capital, has an effect on SA ($H_{3a}, \beta=-0.25, p=0.001$), and another sub-dimension, self-efficacy has an effect on both SA ($H_{4a}, \beta=-0.24, p=0.001$) and NE ($H_{4b}, \beta=0.19, p=0.001$) are confirmed. The results indicate that the effect hope has on NE, resilience on SA, self-efficacy on SA are negative while the others are reported to be positive. In other words, the data collected suggests that there is a negative relationship between hope and NE and a positive relationship between hope and DA. These relationships are statistically significant. It can be said that the increase of hope affects NE negatively and DA positively. Resilience has a negative relationship which is statistically significant with SA sub-dimension of emotional labour. Therefore, it is concluded that if resilience is higher the effect it has on SA will be more negative. When the relationship between the dimension of self-efficacy and the sub-dimensions of emotional labour is analysed, it is reported that it has a positive relationship which is statistically significant with NE and a negative relationship which is also statistically significant with SA. In this context, it can be said that a positive increase of self-efficacy leads to increase in NE and decrease in SA.

Conclusion

We know that suppressing emotions or showing fake emotions require psychological effort which may have stress outcomes over the long term (Grandey, 1999,1). We also acknowledge that a positive psychological state can energize employees’ cognitive processes and their perceptions of what they can achieve (Luthans et al., 2007b). So it is possible to argue whether a positive psychological capital can diminish the negative effects of emotional labor.

In our study we have found that positive psychological capital dimension of hope has an effect on the emotional labor dimensions of deep acting and natural emotions. Toor and Ofori (2010) indicate that hopeful employees tend to be independent in their thought processes and possess an internal locus of control that help them to be motivated by the accomplishment of enriched tasks. Keeping in mind that deep acting is an emotion regulatory strategy that focuses on changing of felt emotions, the inner feeling to control one’s feelings may help them to change their emotions to what is expected by management. Empirical research of Peterson and Byron (2007) on hope also found that more hopeful employees show higher job performance and produce more and better quality solutions to problems arising at work. Furthermore, Snyder and colleagues (1991) have shown that hope has a significant negative correlation with anxiety. This positive state that creates hope may provide the psychological base for employees to overcome relational and communicational stress factors of work environment and show the genuine emotions they feel at that instant.

Another result that we reached in our study was the effect of the psychological capital dimension of self-efficacy on the emotional labor dimensions of surface acting and natural emotions. Stajkovic & Luthans (1998b, p. 66) states that efficacy is an individual’s conviction about his or her abilities to mobilize the motivation, cognitive resources, and courses of action necessary to successfully execute a specific task within a given context. So this belief may activate the energy to show surface acting which is defined to be emotionally taxing and causes important cognitive resources to be drained away. Moreover, an employee who has faith in his/her capabilities in the form of efficacy will have the required psychological ground that will prevent inappropriate emotions to enter his/her consciousness and thereby interfere with other cognitive tasks that will come out by naturally felt emotions.

Finally in our study we found the effect of the psychological capital dimension of resilience on the emotional labor dimensions of deep acting. Luthans (2002a, 702) defines resilience as developable capacity to rebound or bounce back from adversity, conflict, failure, or even positive events, progress, and increased responsibility” and Avey et al. (2009, 682) argues that this dimension of Psycap is the most important positive resource to navigate a turbulent and stressful workplace. On the other hand, we know that by deep acting emotions need to be regulated and experienced to what is expected or accepted. So the feeling is observed and altered by the employee from the one that had been felt before. The burden of this process is in the form of cognitive strains and involves conflict and adversity which may be overcome by resilience.
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